



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

The English Indices of Deprivation 2019 (IoD2019)



Statistical Release

26 September 2019

About this release:

- This release updates the English Indices of Deprivation 2015
- The English Indices of Deprivation measure relative levels of deprivation in 32,844 small areas or neighbourhoods, called Lower-layer Super Output Areas, in England
- The data indicators used to construct the IoD2019 are based on the most up-to-date information available

Key findings:

- Overall, 88 per cent of neighbourhoods that are in the most deprived decile according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 (IMD2019) were also the most deprived according to the IMD2015
- Deprivation is dispersed across England. 61 per cent of local authority districts contain at least one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England
- Middlesbrough, Liverpool, Knowsley, Kingston upon Hull and Manchester are the local authorities with the highest proportions of neighbourhoods among the most deprived in England. This is largely unchanged from the IMD2015
- Many London Boroughs have seen a reduction in the proportions of their neighbourhoods that are highly deprived from the IMD2015
- Seven of the 10 local authority districts with the highest levels of income deprivation among older people are in London – this is unchanged from the IMD2015
- Middlesbrough and Blackpool rank as the most deprived districts regarding income deprivation among children

Introduction	2
Small Area Deprivation	5
Area Summaries – Local Authority Districts	9
Income Deprivation and Employment Deprivation	17
Area Summary Case Study – London	20
Accompanying Tables, Reports and Resources	21
Technical Notes	25

Responsible Statistician:

Bowie Penney

Statistical enquiries:

office hours:

0303 444 0033

indices.deprivation@communities.gov.uk

Media Enquiries:

0303 444 1209

newsdesk@communities.gov.uk

Introduction

Since the 1970s the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and its predecessors have calculated local measures of deprivation in England. This Statistical Release contains the latest iteration of these statistics, the English Indices of Deprivation 2019 (IoD2019). The IoD2019 is an update to the 2015 Indices and retains the same model of multiple deprivation, using the same approach and utilising data inputs from the most recent time points where possible.

This release provides an overview of the findings from the IoD2019 focussing on national and sub-national patterns of multiple deprivation, patterns of income and employment deprivation and some analysis of the supplementary Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI). A full **Research Report**, **Technical Report** and comprehensive **guidance documents** accompany this release, along with a series of supporting **data tables**, **interactive tools** and **Open Data facilities** to aid user's exploration of the data.

Things You Need to Know

The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is the official measure of relative deprivation in England and is part of a suite of outputs that form the Indices of Deprivation (IoD). It follows an established methodological framework in broadly defining deprivation to encompass a wide range of an individual's living conditions. People may be considered to be living in *poverty* if they lack the financial resources to meet their needs, whereas people can be regarded as *deprived* if they lack any kind of resources, not just income¹.

The IoD2019 is based on 39 separate indicators, organised across seven distinct domains of deprivation which are combined and weighted to calculate the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 (IMD2019, see **Key Info** box). This is an overall measure of multiple deprivation experienced by people living in an area and is calculated for every Lower-layer Super Output Area (LSOA), or neighbourhood, in England. All neighbourhoods in England are then ranked according to their level of deprivation relative to that of other areas. High ranking LSOAs or neighbourhoods can be referred to as the 'most deprived' or as being 'highly deprived' to aid interpretation. However, there is no definitive threshold above which an area is described as 'deprived'. The Indices of Deprivation measure deprivation on a *relative* rather than an *absolute* scale, so a neighbourhood ranked 100th is more deprived than a neighbourhood ranked 200th, but this does not mean it is twice as deprived.

Key Info:

IoD2019 Domains

The IoD2019 is comprised of seven distinct domains of deprivation which, when combined and appropriately weighted, form the IMD2019. They are;

- **Income** (22.5%)
- **Employment** (22.5%)
- **Health Deprivation and Disability** (13.5%)
- **Education, Skills Training** (13.5%)
- **Crime** (9.3%)
- **Barriers to Housing and Services** (9.3%)
- **Living Environment** (9.3%)

¹ See 2019 Technical Report, available online here –

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019-technical-report>



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

The English Indices of Deprivation 2019 (IoD2019)

The Indices relatively rank each small area in England from most deprived to least deprived


**1st
most
deprived
area**



There are 32,844 small areas (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) in England, with an average population of 1,500

**32,844th
least
deprived
area**

There are 7 domains of deprivation, which combine to create the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD2019):



How can the IoD2019 be used?



- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ comparing small areas across England ✓ identifying the most deprived small areas ✓ exploring the domains (or types) of deprivation ✓ comparing larger administrative areas e.g. local authorities ✓ looking at changes in relative deprivation between iterations (i.e. changes in ranks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ quantifying how deprived a small area is ✗ identifying deprived people ✗ saying how affluent a place is ✗ comparing with small areas in other UK countries ✗ measuring absolute change in deprivation over time |
|---|---|

The IoD2019 is based on the same methodology as the 2015 Indices, providing a consistent suite of outputs which are in line with previous iterations. Although it is not possible to use the Indices to measure changes in the *absolute* level of deprivation in places over time, it is possible to explore changes in *relative* deprivation, or changes in the pattern of deprivation, between the IoD2019 and previous iterations of the Indices. This will be explored further throughout this release.

At the neighbourhood-level, the IoD2019 provides a place-based insight into deprivation. However, this description does not apply to every person living in these areas. Many non-deprived people live in deprived areas, and many deprived people live in non-deprived areas. It is important to note that the IoD2019 is designed to identify and measure specific aspects of deprivation, rather than measures of affluence.

The IoD2019 methodology is designed to reliably distinguish between areas at the most deprived end of the distribution, but not at the least deprived end. This means that differences between the least deprived areas in the country are less well defined than differences between the more deprived areas.

Exploring Changes in Deprivation Over Time

The purpose of the Indices of Deprivation is to measure as accurately as possible the relative distribution of deprivation at a small area level, but this comes at the expense of ‘backwards’ comparability. Care should be taken when comparing iterations of the Indices over time (see **Key Info** box). However, the data can be used to provide the best measure of relative deprivation as a snapshot in time. When exploring changes in deprivation between the IoD2019 and previous

Key Info:

Changes between Indices mean that care should be taken when comparing iterations over time.

Common changes include:

- changes to indicators used to measure deprivation
- changes in administrative or statistical geographies
- revisions to population estimates

More detail is included in section 3.4 of the Research Report

releases, users should be aware that iterations of the Indices **cannot be used to identify real change over time**. The IoD2019 has been produced using the same approach, structure and methodology for the IoD2015 and previous releases. Keeping a consistent methodology in this way **does allow relative rankings between iterations to be compared over time**. For example, an area can be said to have become more deprived relative to other areas if it was within the most deprived 20 per cent of areas nationally according to the IMD2015 but within the most deprived 10 per cent according to the IMD2019. However, it would not necessarily be correct to state that the level of deprivation in the area has increased on some absolute scale, as it may be the case that all areas had improved, but that this area had improved more slowly than other areas and so been ‘overtaken’ by those areas.

Small Area Deprivation

Across England, the patterns of deprivation are complex. The most and least deprived neighbourhoods are spread throughout the country. **Map 1** illustrates the geographical spread of deprivation based on ranking all 32,844 LSOAs, or neighbourhoods, nationally and dividing them in to 10 equal groups (or deciles) according to their deprivation rank. Areas shaded dark blue are in the most deprived 10 per cent (or decile) of neighbourhoods in England while areas shaded pale green are in the least deprived 10 per cent.

As was the case in previous versions of the Indices, the IoD2019 reveals concentrations of deprivation in large urban conurbations, areas that have historically had large heavy industry manufacturing and/or mining sectors (such as Birmingham, Nottingham, Hartlepool), coastal towns (such as Blackpool or Hastings), and parts of east London. There are also pockets of deprivation surrounded by less deprived places in every region of England.

The most deprived neighbourhood in England according to the IMD2019 is to the east of the Jaywick area of Clacton on Sea (Tendring 018a). This area was also ranked as the most deprived nationally according to the IMD2015 and IMD2010. Neighbourhoods in Blackpool then account for eight of the ten most deprived neighbourhoods nationally, with the Anfield area in the centre of Liverpool (Liverpool 019C) making up the ten most deprived areas in England (see **Key Info** box).

Key Info

LSOAs

Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) are small areas designed to be of a similar population size, with an average of approximately 1,500 residents or 650 households. There are 32,844 Lower-layer LSOAs in England. LSOAs are a standard statistical geography produced by the Office for National Statistics for the reporting of small area statistics. LSOAs are also referred to as neighbourhoods throughout this release.


Most deprived LSOAs based on IMD2019 Rank

	<u>LSOA name</u>	<u>Local Authority name</u>
1.	Tendring 018A	Tendring
2.	Blackpool 010A	Blackpool
3.	Blackpool 006A	Blackpool
4.	Blackpool 013B	Blackpool
5.	Blackpool 013A	Blackpool
6.	Blackpool 013D	Blackpool
7.	Blackpool 010E	Blackpool
8.	Blackpool 011A	Blackpool
9.	Blackpool 008D	Blackpool
10.	Liverpool 019C	Liverpool

Deprivation in some areas has persisted across iterations of the Indices. There are five neighbourhoods which have been ranked among the most deprived 100 LSOAs on each Index of Multiple Deprivation update since 2004. Two of these are located in Liverpool (Liverpool 024A and Liverpool 024B) and one in Wirral (Wirral 011C), Rochdale (Rochdale 010C) and Middlesbrough (Middlesbrough 003F)². See section 5.4 of the Research Report for further detail.

According to the IoD2019, many of the most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods in England face multiple challenges across the domains comprising the IMD2019 (see **Table 1**). Almost all of these areas (98.7 per cent) are ranked as highly deprived (i.e. in the most deprived decile) on at least two of the seven domains of deprivation. Nearly two-thirds (65.5 per cent) are highly deprived on four or more domains, and just under a third (30.7 per cent) are highly deprived on five or six of the seven domains. No neighbourhoods fall into the most deprived decile across all seven domains.

² Analysis based on 31,672 Lower-layer Super Output Areas that have not changed boundaries between 2001 and 2011 updates.

Map 1: Distribution of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019 by LSOA in England


Of these most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods in England (3,284), 137 rank as highly deprived on six of the seven domains. These neighbourhoods are not evenly distributed across England: 88, or 64 per cent of them, are located within just 8 local authority districts - Blackpool contains 15 such neighbourhoods; Liverpool, 14; Birmingham and Leeds, 13 each, and Bradford, 11. Blackpool and Burnley have proportionately more neighbourhoods ranked as highly deprived on six of the seven domains: 15 (or 16 per cent) of 94 neighbourhoods in Blackpool met this criterion, as did 7 (or 12 per cent) of 60 neighbourhoods in Burnley.

Table 1: The most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods nationally based on the IMD2019, by the number of domains on which they are also in the most deprived decile

Number of Domains	Number of LSOAs	Percentage of most deprived LSOAs	Cumulative Percentage of most Deprive LSOAs
7	0	0.0%	0.0%
6	137	4.2%	4.2%
5	870	26.5%	30.7%
4	1,145	34.9%	65.5%
3	778	23.7%	89.2%
2	312	9.5%	98.7%
1	42	1.3%	100.0%
Total	3,284	100%	

Change since the Indices of Deprivation 2015 (IoD2015)

Chart 1: Proportion of neighbourhoods in each decile of the IMD2019 that were in the same decile of the IMD2015



The IoD2019 is broadly based on the same methodology as the 2015 Indices. Although it is not possible to use the Indices to measure absolute changes in deprivation over time, it is possible to explore changes in relative deprivation, or changes in the pattern of deprivation, between iterations – as if comparing two snapshots in time.

Chart 1 shows the proportion of neighbourhoods in each decile of the IMD2019 that were in the same decile according to the IMD2015. Overall, 65 per cent of neighbourhoods remained in the same decile of deprivation between iterations. There was relatively little movement of neighbourhoods between deciles at the extreme

ends of the distribution. This indicates that, in relative terms at least, the most deprived areas and least deprived areas have tended to remain the same between updates.

The majority, 88 per cent, of neighbourhoods that are in the most deprived decile according to the IMD2019 were in the same decile based on the IMD2015, as were 84 per cent of the least deprived (see **Table 2**).

Table 2 presents a more detailed analysis of changes in the relative deprivation of neighbourhoods across deciles by illustrating the numbers of LSOAs in each decile of the IMD2015 and their corresponding deciles according to the IMD2019.

Table 2: Number of neighbourhoods in each decile of the IMD2019 and the IMD2015

Number of Lower-layer Super Output Areas		Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015										Total	
		Most deprived 10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	Least deprived 10%		
Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019	Most deprived 10%	2883	400	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3284
	10-20%	395	2316	567	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3284
	20-30%	6	545	2073	643	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	3285
	30-40%	0	22	612	1892	726	31	1	0	0	0	0	3284
	40-50%	0	1	32	663	1834	721	31	3	0	0	0	3285
	50-60%	0	0	0	76	652	1838	685	33	0	0	0	3284
	60-70%	0	0	0	3	49	641	1833	719	38	1	0	3284
	70-80%	0	0	0	0	6	51	682	1862	671	13	0	3285
	80-90%	0	0	0	1	0	2	51	650	2076	504	0	3284
	Least deprived 10%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	499	2767	0	3285
Total		3284	3284	3285	3284	3285	3284	3284	3285	3284	3285	32844	


Comparing the distributions in this way shows the extent of changes in relative rankings, and how large the changes are for those areas that have moved. Although 2,883 neighbourhoods were in the most deprived decile according to both the IMD2015 and the IMD2019, 401 areas have moved out of the most deprived decile since the IMD2015; almost all of these (395) shifted to the next decile (10 – 20 per cent most deprived) and 6 moved further, to the third most deprived decile.

The table also illustrates that some LSOAs have experienced a considerable change in their relative level of deprivation since the IMD2015, with a small number of areas moving by up to three deciles, and one area (Westminster 016C) moving five deciles from the fourth to the ninth decile of the IMD2019. In total, 19 neighbourhoods have seen changes in relative deprivation of more than plus or minus two deciles between the IMD2015 and IMD2019. It's important to note here that the Indices of Deprivation methodology is designed to reliably distinguish between areas at the most deprived end of the distribution, but not at the least deprived end.

Area Summaries – Local Authority

Although the Indices is designed primarily to be a small-area or neighbourhood measure of relative deprivation, LSOA level outputs are often aggregated and used to describe relative deprivation for higher-level administrative geographies, such as local authority districts. To facilitate this, a range of summary measures are produced for larger areas. These have been carefully designed to help users understand deprivation patterns in higher-level areas. The measures focus on different aspects of deprivation such as identifying the overall intensity of deprivation, how deprivation is distributed across large areas, and the overall volume, or ‘scale’, of deprivation. These measures are described in section 3.8 of the Technical Report and advice on their interpretation is provided throughout section 3 of the Research Report.

Figure 1: LSOAs to higher level administrative geographies for the IoD2019



LSOA's form the building blocks of all higher-level geography summaries of the Indices (see **Figure 1**). However, both statistical and administrative geographies have changed over time (see **Key Info** box). Specifically, the number of LSOAs and local authorities in England has changed between iterations of the Indices.

Since the IoD2004, deprived neighbourhoods have become more dispersed across local authority areas. The proportion of local authorities containing at least one neighbourhood in the most deprived decile has increased with successive updates of the Indices, based on the number of local authorities and LSOAs at the time of each release (see **Chart 2**). Just under half (48 per cent) of local authorities contained at least one highly deprived neighbourhood according to the IMD2004 compared to 61 per cent in the IMD2015 and IMD2019, based on the statistical and administrative geographies at the time of each release. These changes may have had an impact on the pattern of deprivation observed in some places.

The sub-national analysis presented in this Statistical Release focuses mainly on the 10 per cent of neighbourhoods that are most deprived nationally according to the IMD2019 summary measure, although other summaries are explained throughout and key differences between them described to aid interpretation. Summary measures from the IMD2015 and some key domains have been reaggregated to 2019 local authority boundaries to aid the interpretation and comparison of relative changes (this data is available online as **File 14**).


Key Info:

The number of local authority districts in England have changed between iterations of the Indices:

- IoD2019 – 317 local authorities – 32,844 LSOAs
- IoD2015 – 326 local authorities – 32,844 LSOAs
- IoD2010 – 326 local authorities – 32,482 LSOAs
- IoD2007 – 354 local authorities – 32,482 LSOAs
- IoD2004 – 354 local authorities – 32,482 LSOAs

When considering more extreme neighbourhood deprivation, local authorities containing at least one neighbourhood in the *one per cent* most deprived nationally for example, deprivation is more concentrated according to the IMD2019. Overall, 71 local authorities, about one in five or 22 per cent, contain at least one such area. This is similar to the IMD2015.

Chart 2: Proportion of local authorities with at least one neighbourhood in the most deprived decile nationally



Note: this analysis uses local authority district and LSOA boundary configurations as at the time of each release.

Because patterns of deprivation across larger areas can be complex, there is no single summary measure that is the 'best' measure to use in measuring deprivation. Rather, each of the summary measures that are published highlight different aspects of deprivation, and each lead to a different ranking of areas. Comparison of the different measures is needed to give a fuller description of deprivation for larger areas. It is important to remember that the higher-area measures are summaries and that each is measuring a different aspect of deprivation; the LSOA level data provides more detail than is available through the summaries (see **File 1**).

Summary measures help describe relative deprivation at a higher geographical scale. Local authority level summaries are used here to help illustrate three of the most widely used summary measures, their differences and outcomes. Further breakdowns and rankings by the full range of summary measures can be found in the accompanying online tables and technical documentation. Table 3.2 of the Technical Report provides a more detailed summary of each.

(Rank of) Average Rank – this measure summarises the average level of deprivation across an area, based on the population weighted **ranks** of all the neighbourhoods within it. For example, all LSOAs in a local authority, whether highly deprived or not so deprived, contribute to this summary measure. Overall, highly deprived areas and less-deprived areas will tend to average out in the overall rank, so **an area that is more uniformly deprived will tend to rank higher on this measure** compared to other summary measures.

(Rank of) Average Score - this measure summarises the average level of deprivation across an area, based on the **scores** of all the neighbourhoods contained within. Scores are calculated by taking the population weighted average of the combined scores for the neighbourhoods in a larger area. This measure also covers the whole area including both deprived and less-deprived neighbourhoods. The main difference from the average rank measure is that more deprived neighbourhoods tend to have more 'extreme' scores than ranks, so highly deprived areas will not tend to average out in the same way as when using ranks. With scores, **highly polarised authorities will tend to score higher on the average score** measure than on the average rank.

Proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10 per cent nationally – this measure summarises the proportion of neighbourhoods in a larger area that are in the most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods in the country. As such, **this measure is only focused on illustrating the number of neighbourhoods within a larger area which are the most deprived in England**. However, neighbourhoods just outside the 10 per cent most deprived are not included as part of this measure, so large areas, such as local authorities or local enterprise partnerships, may not appear to be so deprived relative to others if they contain zero or few of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the country.

Most deprived local authorities based on Rank

1. Blackpool
2. Manchester
3. Knowsley
4. Liverpool
5. Barking and Dagenham
6. Birmingham
7. Hackney
8. Sandwell
9. Kingston upon Hull
10. Nottingham


Most deprived local authorities based on Score

1. Blackpool
2. Knowsley
3. Liverpool
4. Kingston upon Hull
5. Middlesbrough
6. Manchester
7. Birmingham
8. Burnley
9. Blackburn with Darwen
10. Hartlepool

Most deprived local authorities based on the Proportion of LSOAs in the most deprived 10% nationally

1. Middlesbrough
2. Liverpool
3. Knowsley
4. Kingston upon Hull
5. Manchester
6. Blackpool
7. Birmingham
8. Burnley
9. Blackburn with Darwen
10. Hartlepool

Map 2: Distribution of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019 by local authority based on the proportion of their neighbourhoods in the most deprived decile nationally



Note: there are 123 Districts with no Lower-layer Super Output Areas in the most deprived 10 per cent of areas. These areas score zero on this summary measure and are shown in the least deprived decile.

Map 2 illustrates the geographical spread of deprivation for local authority districts across England according to the proportion of neighbourhoods in the most deprived decile nationally. This higher-level geography masks some pockets of deprivation that are visible in **Map 1**. Areas shaded dark blue are the 10 per cent of local authority districts in England that contain the largest proportion of highly deprived neighbourhoods. Areas shaded pale green contain proportionately few highly deprived neighbourhoods and are relatively less deprived. In total, 123 of the 317 districts (39 per cent) do not contain any highly deprived neighbourhoods and are therefore equally ranked on this measure. These 123 districts are banded together and shown in pale green, corresponding to the least deprived decile.

Change at Local Authority Level since the Indices of Deprivation 2015 (IoD2015)

This section focuses on changes in relative deprivation at a local authority district level from the IoD2015 to the IoD2019. Care should be taken in interpreting change between updates of the Indices. The changes being described are relative, in terms of changes in the degree to which the neighbourhoods in a local authority district are among the most deprived nationally, as determined by each version of the Indices. If an area experienced some absolute decrease (i.e. improvement) in deprivation levels but less so than other areas, the Index would still show an increase in relative deprivation. Summary measures from the IMD2015 and some key domains have been reaggregated to 2019 local authority boundaries to aid the interpretation of relative changes (this data is available online as **File 14**).

It should be noted that geographically large local authorities shown on the **Map 2** may have relatively small populations, while geographically small authorities may contain larger populations. However, neighbourhood level LSOAs have a broadly consistent total population (see **Key Info** box on pg.5). Middlesbrough, Liverpool, Knowsley, Kingston upon Hull and Manchester are the five local authority districts with the largest proportions of highly deprived neighbourhoods in England, ranging from 49 per cent in Middlesbrough to 43 per cent in Manchester (see **Table 3**). By definition, each district would contain just 10 per cent of such highly deprived neighbourhoods if deprivation was evenly distributed across all local authorities in England.

The same five local authority districts have the greatest proportions of highly deprived neighbourhoods according to both the IMD2015 and the IMD2019 (**Table 3**). Middlesbrough was ranked most deprived according to the IMD2015 with just under half (49 per cent) of all neighbourhoods in the authority ranked as in the most deprived decile nationally. This has remained the same according to the IMD2019. The other areas have shifted in the rankings but remain in the top five for this summary measure.

Of the very most deprived neighbourhoods, the most deprived 1 per cent or 328 from 32,844 LSOAs in England, Liverpool is the local authority with the largest number of the most deprived areas (31 out of its 298 neighbourhoods, or 10 per cent are in this group). But Blackpool has the highest proportion of its neighbourhoods in the most deprived one per cent nationally (22 out of 94, or 23 per cent). See Table 4.4 of the Research Report for further analysis.

Table 3: The 20 local authority districts with the highest proportion of neighbourhoods in the most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods nationally on the IMD 2019, and change since the IMD2015

Local Authority		IMD2019		IMD2015		Percentage point change from 2015
		Count of LSOAs in 1st Decile	% of LSOAs in 10% most deprived nationally	Count of LSOAs in 1st Decile	% of LSOAs in 10% most deprived nationally	
1.	Middlesbrough	42	48.8%	42	48.8%	0.0
2.	Liverpool	145	48.7%	134	45.0%	3.7
3.	Knowsley	46	46.9%	45	45.9%	1.0
4.	Kingston upon Hull	75	45.2%	75	45.2%	0.0
5.	Manchester	122	43.3%	115	40.8%	2.5
6.	Blackpool	39	41.5%	36	38.3%	3.2
7.	Birmingham	264	41.3%	253	39.6%	1.7
8.	Burnley	23	38.3%	20	33.3%	5.0
9.	Blackburn with Darwen	33	36.3%	28	30.8%	5.5
10.	Hartlepool	21	36.2%	19	32.8%	3.4
11.	Bradford	104	33.5%	101	32.6%	1.0
12.	Stoke-on-Trent	51	32.1%	48	30.2%	1.9
13.	Halton	25	31.6%	21	26.6%	5.1
14.	Pendle	18	31.6%	16	28.1%	3.5
15.	Nottingham	56	30.8%	61	33.5%	-2.7
16.	Oldham	43	30.5%	32	22.7%	7.8
17.	North East Lincolnshire	32	30.2%	31	29.2%	0.9
- .	Hastings	16	30.2%	16	30.2%	0.0
19.	Salford	45	30.0%	43	28.7%	1.3
20.	Rochdale	40	29.9%	38	28.4%	1.5

Note: table based on 2019 local authority configurations. For 2019, Halton and Pendle rank 13th and 14th respectively and are presented here with the same percentage of LSOAs in the 10% most deprived nationally according to the IMD2019 due to rounding. North East Lincolnshire and Hastings (17th) are equally ranked according to the IMD2019.

Changes have also occurred between iterations in other areas. **Chart 3** shows the ten local authority districts that experienced the largest percentage point decreases on this summary measure and the ten which experienced the largest percentage point increases. A number of London Boroughs have seen large decreases in the proportion of their neighbourhoods that are highly deprived. In Tower Hamlets and Westminster in particular, there were reductions of 22 percentage points and 12 percentage points respectively. This is based on the percentage point change between the proportion of LSOA's present in a local authority area which are ranked in the most deprived 10 per cent nationally from the IMD2015 to the IMD2019. Oldham and Rossendale have seen an increase in the proportion of their neighbourhoods being ranked amongst the most deprived nationally. Oldham has seen an 8 percentage point increase in the proportion of its neighbourhoods ranked in the most deprived 10 per cent nationally. Rossendale has seen an increase of 7 percentage points.

Five of the ten local authority districts with the largest percentage point increases on this summary measure (Oldham, Walsall, Blackburn with Darwen, Halton and Burnley) were also among the most deprived districts nationally according to this summary measure. This is illustrated in **Chart 4** which depicts the 32 most deprived local authority districts according to this measure on the IMD2019 and how they have fared relative to other areas on the IMD2015.

Chart 3: Change in the proportion of neighbourhoods in the most deprived decile according to the IMD2019 and the IMD2015 by local authority district: the ten authorities with the largest percentage point decreases and increases respectively





Chart 4 ranks local authority districts according to the proportion of their neighbourhoods that were in the most deprived decile of the Index at the time. The slope of the lines indicates change in rank position, that is whether the local authority district has become relatively more or less deprived. It is possible that a district may have become less deprived in real terms since the previous Index but more deprived relative to all other districts (or vice versa). However, any change in rank – even of several places – may not represent a large increase or decrease in absolute levels of deprivation.

The absence of any notable changes in rank among the five most deprived local authority districts is of interest as this indicates areas that have been persistently most deprived across historic iterations of the Indices. As well as being the five most deprived local authorities according to the IMD2019 and IMD2015, Middlesbrough, Liverpool, Knowsley, Kingston upon Hull, and Manchester have comprised the most deprived five local authorities since the IMD2010. These five areas were also among the ten most deprived local authorities according to the 2007 and 2004 updates (see Chart 5.4 of the Research Report).

There have been more visible changes further down the ranking. For example, areas such as Walsall, Wirral, South Tyneside and Redcar and Cleveland have become relatively more deprived compared to the IMD2015. Areas such as Wolverhampton, Leicester, Tower Hamlets and Sandwell have become relatively less deprived, given their presence in the most deprived 32 local authority districts according to the IMD2015 but their absence from the list according to the IMD2019.

Chart 4: The most deprived local authority districts according to the IMD2015 and the IMD2019 - local authorities are ranked on the proportion of neighbourhoods in the most deprived 10 per cent nationally




Note: table based on 2019 local authority configurations. For the IMD2015, which has recast 2015 data to 2019 local authority boundaries, Stoke-on-Trent and Hastings are equally ranked (13th). For IMD2019, North East Lincolnshire and Hastings (17th) are equally ranked.

Income Deprivation and Employment Deprivation

The analysis so far has focused on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This section focuses on the two domains of deprivation which contribute the most weight to the overall Index: the Income Deprivation Domain and Employment Deprivation Domain. In addition, this section explores the supplementary indices of income deprivation among children (IDACI) and older people (IDAOP). These indices describe deprivation in terms of proportions of deprived people so allow for direct comparison of deprivation between areas.

Chart 5: Proportion of the population living in income deprived households, for all LSOAs grouped into deciles by Income Deprivation Domain rank (left) and proportion of working-age adults in employment deprivation, for all LSOAs grouped into deciles by Employment Deprivation Domain rank (right)



Levels of income deprivation and employment deprivation vary widely between neighbourhoods. In the most deprived decile of neighbourhoods on the Income Deprivation Domain, on average, 33 per cent of the population are income deprived. But in the least deprived decile of this deprivation domain, only 3 per cent of people are income deprived (**Chart 5**, left side). A similar pattern is observed for employment deprivation among the working-age population. In the most deprived decile of neighbourhoods on the Employment Deprivation Domain, on average, 25 per cent of the working-age adults are employment deprived, compared with 2 per cent of those in the least deprived decile of this domain (**Chart 5**, right side).

Because people experiencing employment deprivation are very likely to also experience income deprivation, the local authority districts that are ranked as most deprived on the Income Deprivation Domain are also ranked as most deprived on the Employment Deprivation Domain (see **Table 4**). Levels of income deprivation and employment deprivation are both highest in Knowsley, Middlesbrough, Blackpool, Liverpool and Hartlepool.

Table 4: The 20 local authority districts with the highest proportions of income deprivation and employment deprivation, respectively

Rank	Income Deprivation Domain		Employment Deprivation Domain	
	Local Authority District	Score - Proportion of population living in income deprived households	Local Authority District	Score - Proportion of working age adults in employment deprivation
1.	Middlesbrough	25.1%	Blackpool	20.9%
2.	Knowsley	25.1%	Knowsley	20.2%
3.	Blackpool	24.7%	Middlesbrough	19.1%
4.	Liverpool	23.5%	Hartlepool	18.5%
5.	Hartlepool	22.8%	Liverpool	17.6%
6.	Kingston upon Hull	22.7%	South Tyneside	17.2%
7.	Birmingham	22.2%	Kingston upon Hull	16.6%
8.	Manchester	21.9%	Redcar and Cleveland	16.5%
9.	Sandwell	21.5%	St. Helens	16.5%
10.	Blackburn with Darwen	21.2%	Burnley	16.3%
11.	Wolverhampton	21.1%	Blackburn with Darwen	16.2%
12.	South Tyneside	20.6%	Great Yarmouth	16.2%
13.	Burnley	20.3%	Sunderland	16.1%
14.	Hastings	20.2%	Hastings	16.0%
15.	Rochdale	20.1%	Halton	15.8%
16.	Walsall	20.0%	Rochdale	15.8%
17.	Nottingham	19.9%	Wirral	15.7%
18.	Leicester	19.6%	Thanet	15.5%
19.	Hackney	19.6%	Wolverhampton	15.4%
20.	Barking and Dagenham	19.4%	Birmingham	15.3%

Note: proportions derived from the published 'average score' statistics for the Income Deprivation Domain and the Employment Deprivation Domain.

The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) measures the proportion of all children aged 0 to 15 living in income deprived families. This is one of two supplementary indices and is a sub-set of the Income Deprivation Domain. The most deprived local authorities on this measure are typically found in the Midlands or the north of England. Around 30 per cent of children in Liverpool, Kingston upon Hull, Nottingham and Manchester are living in income-deprived families according to this measure. In Middlesbrough, Blackpool and Knowsley, over 30 per cent of children are living in income-deprived families (see **Table 5**).

The Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI) measures the proportion of all those aged 60 or over who experience income deprivation. This is a second supplementary indices which is a sub-set of the Income Deprivation Domain. According to the IDAOPI, more than two in five older people are income deprived in Tower Hamlets and Hackney. Seven of the most deprived ten districts based on the IDAOPI are London boroughs.

Nine local authorities appear in the most deprived 20 nationally across both supplementary indices – Knowsley, Liverpool, Kingston upon Hull, Nottingham, Manchester, Birmingham, Islington, Tower Hamlets and Sandwell.

Table 5: The 20 local authority districts with the highest proportions of children and older people in income deprivation, respectively

Rank	Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)		Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI)	
	Local Authority District	Score - Proportion of children living in income deprived households	Local Authority District	Score - Proportion of older people living in income deprived households
1.	Middlesbrough	32.7%	Tower Hamlets	43.9%
2.	Blackpool	30.7%	Hackney	40.7%
3.	Knowsley	30.3%	Newham	37.3%
4.	Liverpool	29.9%	Manchester	33.6%
5.	Kingston upon Hull	29.8%	Islington	33.6%
6.	Nottingham	29.8%	Southwark	31.2%
7.	Manchester	29.7%	Lambeth	30.2%
8.	Hartlepool	28.3%	Liverpool	30.0%
9.	Birmingham	27.6%	Haringey	29.9%
10.	Islington	27.5%	Leicester	29.8%
11.	North East Lincolnshire	27.4%	Knowsley	29.4%
12.	Wolverhampton	27.1%	Barking and Dagenham	26.1%
13.	South Tyneside	26.7%	Sandwell	26.0%
14.	Tower Hamlets	26.6%	Birmingham	25.8%
15.	Hastings	26.5%	Brent	25.8%
16.	Sandwell	26.3%	Kingston upon Hull	25.7%
17.	Walsall	26.1%	Hammersmith and Fulham	25.6%
18.	Stoke-on-Trent	25.7%	Lewisham	24.0%
19.	Redcar and Cleveland	25.6%	Blackburn with Darwen	23.8%
20.	Burnley	25.5%	Nottingham	23.8%


Note: proportions derived from the published 'average score' statistics for the supplementary indices of the Income Deprivation Domain, IDACI and IDAOPI.

Area Summary Case Study – London

Some areas have become less deprived between the IoD2015 and IoD2019. As a case study, local authority districts in London have seen a relative decrease in their levels of deprivation between the IMD2015 and the IMD2019. This overall pattern is shown in **Map 3**. According to the IMD2015, eight London Boroughs were ranked in the most deprived 30 per cent of local authorities when looking at the proportion of their neighbourhoods which were the most deprived nationally - Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Hackney, Islington, Westminster, Enfield, Kensington and Chelsea and Waltham Forest (see **Map 3**, left side). According to the IMD2019, only three London Boroughs are ranked in the most deprived three deciles (Hackney, Haringey Kensington and Chelsea). Tower Hamlets has become considerably less deprived on this measure, ranking 24 in the IMD2015 and 175 in the IMD2019 indicating that the neighbourhoods within the authority have become less deprived relative to other neighbourhoods in England.

This change can also be seen at LSOA level. According to the IMD2015, 274 LSOAs, or neighbourhoods, in London were in the most deprived decile. For the IMD2019, this has reduced to 107. This change is illustrated in **Map 3** (right side).

Map 3: Distribution of the IMD2015 and IMD2019 in London by local authority (left, based on the proportion of their neighbourhoods in the most deprived decile nationally) and LSOA (right, by IMD decile)



Accompanying Tables, Reports and Resources

Accompanying tables are available to download alongside this release.

Neighbourhood (Lower-layer Super Output Area) level data

File 1	Index of Multiple Deprivation - the full Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD2019) ranks and deciles at LSOA level across England
File 2	Domains of deprivation
File 3	Supplementary Indices - Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI)
File 4	Sub-domains of deprivation
File 5	Scores for the Indices of Deprivation (IoD2019)
File 6	Population denominators
File 7	All ranks, deciles and scores for the Indices of Deprivation, and population denominators (CSV file)
File 8	Underlying indicators
File 9	Transformed domain scores

Summary data for higher-level geographies

File 10	Local Authority District Summaries
File 11	Upper-tier Local Authority Summaries
File 12	Local Enterprise Partnership Summaries
File 13	Clinical Commissioning Group Summaries
File 14	Local Authority District Summaries from the IoD2015 reaggregated to 2019 Local Authority District boundaries

The following supporting reports and guidance documents have been published:

- An **Infographic** which illustrates how the Index of Multiple Deprivation is comprised and provides guidance concerning the use of Indices data.
- A **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)** document, providing a range of user guidance to aid interpretation of the data, caveats and answers to many of the most commonly asked questions.
- A **Research Report** provides guidance on how to use and interpret the datasets and presents further results from the IoD2019. It includes a full account of the set of summary statistics available for higher-level geographies such as local authority districts, with an example of their use, and advice on interpreting change over time.
- A **Technical Report** presenting the conceptual framework of the IoD2019; the methodology for creating the domains and the overall IMD2019; the quality assurance carried out to ensure reliability of the data outputs; and the component indicators and domains.

All of the data files and supporting documents are available from:
www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019

Previous versions of the Indices of Deprivation are available from:
www.gov.uk/government/collections/english-indices-of-deprivation

Open Data

These statistics are available in fully open and linkable data formats via the departments **Open Data Communities** platform:

- <https://opendatacommunities.org/def/concept/folders/themes/societal-wellbeing>
- Neighbourhood-level or Postcode level data - <http://imd-by-postcode.opendatacommunities.org/imd/2019>
- Local authority district level data: <http://imd-bygeo.opendatacommunities.org/imd/2019/area>

The **IoD2019 explorer** helps to illustrate the relative deprivation of neighbourhoods for selected areas according to the IoD2019 and IoD2015 and allows users to search by a place name or postcode. The explorer includes a dashboard which provides a brief summary of how relatively deprived the area selected is in each iteration. Data can be downloaded directly using this tool - http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/iod_index.html#

Mapping Resources

The **IoD2019 Local Authority dashboard** allows users to explore the range of summary measures across the IoD2019 at local authority level and the LSOAs within each district. The maps displayed illustrate the location of the local authority within England, the LSOAs within the selected local authority and which decile each LSOA is in for the IMD2019 – <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019-mapping-resources>

A Geopackage, shapefiles, mapping templates and further **mapping resources** are available online here - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019-mapping-resources>

MHCLG in collaboration with the University of Sheffield have created a suite of **Local Authority maps** covering all 317 districts in England. These are available online here - <https://imd2019.group.shef.ac.uk/#>. Each map uses the IMD2019 to illustrate deprivation at LSOA level within each area. Each map also displays the number of LSOAs each area has in each decile of deprivation.

Definitions

Indices of Deprivation (IoD2019)

The Indices of Deprivation 2019 provide a set of relative measures of deprivation for small areas (Lower-layer Super Output Areas) across England, based on seven different domains of deprivation: Income Deprivation, Employment Deprivation, Education, Skills and Training Deprivation, Health

Deprivation and Disability, Crime, Barriers to Housing and Services and Living Environment Deprivation. Two supplementary indices are also available; the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) and the Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI).

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 (IMD2019), domain indices and the supplementary indices, together with the higher area summaries, are collectively referred to as the IoD2019.

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD2019)

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 combines information from the seven domains to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. The domains are combined using the following weights: Income Deprivation (22.5%), Employment Deprivation (22.5%), Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%), Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%), Crime (9.3%), Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%), Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%). The weights have been derived from consideration of the academic literature on poverty and deprivation, as well as consideration of the levels of robustness of the indicators. A fuller account is given in section 3.7 and Appendix G of the Technical Report.

Income Deprivation Domain

The Income Deprivation Domain measures the proportion of the population experiencing deprivation relating to low income. The definition of low income used includes both those people that are out-of-work, and those that are in work but who have low earnings (and who satisfy the respective means tests).

Employment Deprivation Domain

The Employment Deprivation Domain measures the proportion of the working age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market. This includes people who would like to work but are unable to do so due to unemployment, sickness or disability, or caring responsibilities.

Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain

The Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain measures the lack of attainment and skills in the local population. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: one relating to children and young people and one relating to adult skills.

Health Deprivation and Disability Domain

The Health Deprivation and Disability Domain measures the risk of premature death and the impairment of quality of life through poor physical or mental health. The domain measures morbidity, disability and premature mortality but not aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation.

Crime Domain

The Crime Domain measures the risk of personal and material victimisation at local level.

Barriers to Housing and Services Domain

The Barriers to Housing and Services Domain measures the physical and financial accessibility of housing and local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: 'geographical barriers', which relate to the physical proximity of local services, and 'wider barriers' which includes issues relating to access to housing such as affordability and homelessness.

Living Environment Deprivation Domain

The Living Environment Deprivation Domain measures the quality of the local environment. The indicators fall into two sub-domains. The 'indoors' living environment measures the quality of housing; while the 'outdoors' living environment contains measures of air quality and road traffic accidents.

Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index

The Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) measures the proportion of all children aged 0 to 15 living in income deprived families. Family is used here to indicate a 'benefit unit', that is the claimant, any partner and any dependent children for whom Child Benefit is received. This is one of two supplementary indices and is a sub-set of the Income Deprivation Domain.

Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index

The Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index (IDAOPI) measures the proportion of all those aged 60 or over who experience income deprivation. This is one of two supplementary indices and is a sub-set of the Income Deprivation Domain.

Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs)

LSOAs are small areas designed to be of a similar population size, with an average of approximately 1,500 residents or 650 households. There are 32,844 LSOAs in England. They are a standard statistical geography and were produced by the Office for National Statistics for the reporting of small area statistics. LSOAs are referred to as 'neighbourhoods' throughout this release.

Decile

Deciles are calculated by ranking the 32,844 neighbourhoods in England from most deprived to least deprived and dividing them into 10 equal groups (i.e. each containing 3,284 or 3,285 neighbourhoods). These deciles range from the most deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods nationally to the least deprived 10 per cent of neighbourhoods nationally


Technical Notes

Methodology and Data Sources

The Indices of Deprivation 2019 have been constructed for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) by Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion (OCSI) and Deprivation.org.

The construction of the Indices of Deprivation 2019 broadly consists of the following seven stages. These stages fulfil the purposes of defining the Indices, data processing, and producing the Index of Multiple Deprivation and summary measures. These stages are outlined in **Figure 2** below, which can also be found in the Research Report. Chapter 3 of the Technical Report describes these steps in more detail.

Figure 2: Overview of the methodology used to construct the Indices of Deprivation 2019




The majority of the data used for the indicators is sourced from administrative data such as benefit records from the Department for Work and Pensions. Census data is used for a minority of indicators where alternative data from administrative sources is not available. **Figure 3** below provides a summary of the domains, indicators and statistical methods used to create the IoD2019. This can also be found in the Research Report.

As far as is possible, the data sources used in each indicator were based on data from the most recent time point available. Using the latest available data in this way means that there is not a single consistent time point for all indicators. For the highest weighted domains, indicators in the Indices of Deprivation 2019 relate to a 2015/16 time point. As a result of the time points for which

data is available, the indicators do not take into account changes to policy since the time point of the data used. For example, the 2015/16 benefits data used do not include the impact of the wider rollout Universal Credit, which only began to replace certain income and health related benefits from April 2016. Chapter 4 and Appendix A of the Technical Report describe the 39 component indicators in the Indices of Deprivation 2019, including the data sources and time points used.

Figure 3: Summary of the domains, indicators and data used to create the Indices of Deprivation 2019



Data Quality

The Indices of Deprivation 2019 follow on from the previous iterations of the release and have been carefully designed to ensure the robustness and reliability of the output datasets and reports. The design is based on a set of principles and practices that help to ensure data quality. These are described in Chapter 5 of the Technical Report. For example, the domains and Index of Multiple Deprivation bring together 39 indicators of deprivation, from a wide range of data sources (see **Figure 3** above). This sheer diversity of inputs leads to more reliable overall data outputs; to be highly deprived on the Index of Multiple Deprivation, an area is likely to be highly deprived on a number of the domains. Due to the variety of data inputs, there is little chance that an area is identified as highly deprived due to a bias in one of the component indicators; the use of multiple independent indicators increases robustness of the final outputs. The construction of the Indices involves a number of different processes. The quality assurance procedures for the methods, input data sources, data processing steps and outputs build on the experience held by members of the department's contractors (OCSI and Deprivation.org) in developing the Indices of Deprivation since 2000. These are described in Chapter 5 of the Technical Report (with further details in Appendices J, K and L) and include, but are not limited to:

- Use of appropriate and robust indicators, based on well understood data sources. The preference was to use, wherever possible, existing high-quality published data sources that have themselves been validated as National Statistics (or variations thereof). In the absence of these, the second preference was to derive indicators from established and well-understood administrative data sources. In a small number of cases, specially-modelled indicators were used. In determining whether the data source was suitable for the purpose of measuring deprivation the quality of each input data source used was assessed and documented, and there was close communication with data suppliers to ensure the strengths and weaknesses of the underlying data were well understood.
- Minimising the impact of potential bias and error in the input data sources through the design principles outlined above.
- Using audited, replicable and validated processing steps to construct the Indices.
- Real world validation of the data inputs and outputs.

The quality assurance process also drew on the quality assurance and audit arrangements practice models developed by the UK Statistics Authority to ensure that the assessment of data sources and methodology carried out is proportionate to both the level of public interest in the Indices, and the scale of risk over the quality of the data.

Revisions policy

This policy has been developed in accordance with the UK Statistics Authority Code of Practice for Official statistics and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Revisions Policy (found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statistical-notice-dclg-revisions-policy>). There are two types of revisions that the policy covers:

Non-Scheduled Revisions

The Indices of Deprivation draw upon the best available data at the time of their production and, as outlined above, undergo a substantial range of quality assurance checks. However, should an error be identified, the department will consider its impact and review whether an unscheduled revision is required.

Scheduled Revisions

There are no scheduled revisions to the Indices of Deprivation 2019.

Uses of the Data

Since their original publication in 2000 the Indices of Deprivation have been used very widely for a range of purposes, including:

- By national and local organisations to identify places for prioritising resources and more effective targeting of funding;
- To help inform eligibility for Government policies and initiatives;
- Developing the evidence base for a range of national and local policies and strategies;
- Frequent use in funding bids, including bids made by councillors for their neighbourhoods, and from voluntary and community sector groups.

The Indices of Deprivation are appropriate for such uses where deprivation is concentrated at a neighbourhood level. Examples of uses of the Indices are also available in section 1.3 of the Research Report.

User Engagement

As part of the IoD2015, extensive user engagement exercises were carried out to help inform the release and improve the Indices as a resource to help better suit the broader needs of all groups. These recommendations have been carried over to help inform the construction of the IoD2019 with a specific focus on consistency of method and the timely release of an updated dataset. Alongside, key user groups have been consulted to help develop a more complete and comprehensive suite of outputs and resources. The department is grateful to users of the Indices who contributed their thoughts on the development of this update and on how the outputs could be improved.

Users are encouraged to provide feedback on how these statistics are used and how well they meet user needs. Comments on any issues relating to this statistical release are welcomed and encouraged. Responses should be addressed to the "Public enquiries" contact given in the "Enquiries" section below.

The department will also seek opportunities to disseminate the Indices and meet with users through seminars, conferences and bespoke events.

The departments engagement strategy to meet the needs of statistics users is published here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/engagement-strategy-to-meet-the-needs-of-statistics-users>

The views expressed on the Indices during the course of this update and following this publication, such as on outputs and changes to indicators, will be revisited when the department embarks on the next update. Information on how users will be kept informed of future updates and how they can contribute their views is given below under 'Date of the next publication'.

Devolved Administration Statistics

Indices of Deprivation data is published for each of the countries in the United Kingdom. These datasets are based on the same concept and general methodology, however there are differences in the domains and indicators, the geographies for which the indices are developed and the time points on which they are based. These differences mean that the English Indices of Deprivation published here should not be directly compared with those from the Indices produced in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The Office for National Statistics previously published information explaining in more detail the similarities and differences between the four Indices:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20141119170512/http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/Info.do?page=analysisandguidance/analysisarticles/indices-of-deprivation.htm>

The most recent Indices of Deprivation data for the Devolved Administrations are available via the links below:

- Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (WIMD) - <https://gweddill.gov.wales/statistics-and-research/welsh-index-multiple-deprivation/?lang=en>
- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) - <https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/SIMD>
- Northern Ireland Multiple Deprivation Measure - <https://www.nisra.gov.uk/statistics/deprivation>

The department continues to work with the devolved administrations to explore future opportunities for UK wide alignment.

Enquiries

Media enquiries:

Office hours: 0303 444 1209

Email: newsdesk@communities.gov.uk

Public enquiries:

Office hours: 0303 444 0033

Email: indices.deprivation@communities.gov.uk

Queries submitted to the address above will receive an automatic acknowledgement stating that the query has been received. We will endeavour to respond to queries within 20 working days, and more quickly when possible. Complex queries may take longer to resolve. Where the answer to a query is contained within the auto response message, users may not receive a direct reply. Users are encouraged to review the guidance documents prior to emailing the department. The Indices of Deprivation draws upon the best available data at the time of its production and, as outlined above, they undergo a substantial range of quality assurance checks. Where queries relate to the perceived accuracy of the data that feeds into the Indices, it may not be possible to explore all concerns raised but the department will consider referring issues with specific data sources to the suppliers.

Information on Official Statistics is available via the UK Statistics Authority website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/announcements>

Information on other MHCLG statistics is available online here:

www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-communities-and-local-government/about/statistics

Date of the Next Publication

The Indices of Deprivation are typically updated every 3 to 4 years, but the dates of publication for future Indices have not yet been scheduled. Users can be kept informed of future updates, developments and how they can contribute their views by registering for e-mails alerts about the Indices. To register, please e-mail indices.deprivation@communities.gov.uk with 'subscribe' in the subject heading.

© Crown copyright, 2019

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/MHCLG
If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, email contactus@communities.gov.uk or write to us at:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

September 2019

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/mhclg>