

# OSFC

# Statistical Report

01 April 2010 to 31 March 2011



# Contents

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>
Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It	3
District and Regional comparisons:	
Belfast North & East Antrim	5
Belfast West & Lisburn	8
East Down	11
North	14
South	17
West	20
Appendix 1:	
Quality of decisions	23
Issues handled correctly	24
CCG Substitutions	25
CL Substitutions	26
CCG – Breakdown of Issues	27-33
CL – Breakdown of Issues	34-40
Appendix 2 - Time to process:	
CCG & BL – Time to process	41
Appendix 3 – Help & Support	42
Appendix 4 – OSFC Contacts	43

# Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It

## Why are the reports produced?

This Report is intended to help Social Fund Managers identify trends and issues in their District. The information in the report can therefore be used to help improve decision making and customer service. The report contains information relating to performance based on data collected by the Office of the Social Fund Commissioner (OSFC) through our casework.

## Who produces the reports?

The report is prepared by the OSFC. If you would like to raise an issue or if you want more information please contact Nikki Croft on 028 90897541 or e-mail her at [nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk](mailto:nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk).

## How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 01 April 2010 to 31 March 2011.

## How to interpret the information about the quality of decision making

An Inspector's review has one of three outcomes, to:

- **confirm** the Reviewing Officer's decision. The confirmation rate is the percentage of decisions where the outcome remained the same;
- **substitute** a new decision with a different outcome; or
- **refer back** the matter to the Reviewing Officer.

The Inspector also records whether the Reviewing Officer handled the decision correctly in law. This is irrespective of the outcome, so that a:

- confirmed decision could have been handled wrongly in law
- correctly made decision could be substituted (e.g. on new information)

The "correct rate" is the percentage of decisions in which all the crucial issues are handled correctly. A low "correct rate" therefore suggests a need for technical training.

It is also important to examine the relationship between "confirmations" and "correct rates". If the confirmation rate is lower than the correct rate this indicates new information frequently came out at the Inspector stage. Could this information have been obtained earlier?

Alternatively, if the confirmation rate is higher than the correct rate, training may be required.

## How to focus training in the right areas

This Report provides a further breakdown of the decisions so that it is possible to focus training and development in the right areas.

- Firstly, by showing the reasons for substituting a community care grant or crisis loan. It is possible for there to be more than one reason. This includes the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.
- Secondly, by detailing why Inspectors concluded Reviewing Officer’s decisions were not handled correctly over a 12 month period.

The top section of the breakdown of issues table shows the number of decisions where the Inspector concluded that the Reviewing Officer’s decision was incorrect (i.e. Direction 1 error). If there was an error, the reason could have been a rationality error, a natural justice error, a law error, or a combination of the above. If the error was a law error, further details are provided. The table therefore shows the frequency of an error, which can be compared to the frequency across the region.

### **How to use the tables on time to process**

The time to process tables provide information on performance against:

- Reviewing Officer process time – 10 days (CCGs & BLs). This is the time from receipt of the request for review, to the date of the Reviewing Officer's decision; and
- Cases received within 4 days. This is the time from when an applicant asked for an independent review, to the day the case arrived at the OSFC.

### **Comments on Statistical Report**

OSFC welcomes comments from District Managers on any aspect of the statistical information provided, including suggestions as to how you feel this Statistical Report may be improved. Your comments should be sent to Steven Rea at [steven.rea@dndni.gov.uk](mailto:steven.rea@dndni.gov.uk).

# Belfast North & East Antrim District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>47.2%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>57.0%</b>

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Belfast North & East Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 44.4% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>61.9%</b>

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
New Information	49.6%	<b>38.1%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>9.5%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>22 (19.0%)</b>

Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>9 (100.0%)</b>
Priority	58 (41.1%)	Priority	<b>8 (40.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.

#### **Time to process**

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>54.3%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

### **Crisis Loans**

#### **Quality – confirmation and error rates**

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>67.0%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>73.6%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Belfast North & East Antrim. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

#### **Reasons for crisis loan substitutions**

Inspectors substituted 28.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>69.2%</b>

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
New information	50.5%	<b>38.5%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

### **Breakdown of issues**

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>17 (21.5%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Natural justice	<b>4 (80.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>3 (100.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed

## Belfast West & Lisburn District

### Community Care Grants

#### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>46.1%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>55.3%</b>

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from Belfast West & Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

#### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 46.6% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>60.4%</b>

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
New Information	49.6%	<b>39.6%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>11.5%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

#### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	Belfast West & Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>39 (23.4%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>14 (100.0%)</b>

Priority	58 (41.1%)	Priority	<b>9 (64.3%)</b>
----------	------------	----------	------------------

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.

### Time to process

	Region	<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>48.0%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>68.8%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>70.1%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from Belfast West & Lisburn. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 29.2% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>73.8%</b>

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>
New information	50.5%	<b>38.1%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	<b>Belfast West &amp;</b>
--	--------	---------------------------

		<b>Lisburn</b>
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>2.4%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an above average percentage of grant cases.

### **Breakdown of issues**

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>21 (17.1%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Priority	<b>10 (100.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Natural justice	<b>4 (80.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

## East Down District

### Community Care Grants

#### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>51.5%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>57.6%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from East Down. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

#### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 40.4% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>61.3%</b>

An above average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	East Down
New Information	49.6%	<b>38.8%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	East Down
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>10.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

#### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	East Down
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>29 (19.2%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>23 (100.0%)</b>
Priority	58 (41.1%)	Priority	<b>10 (40.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.

**Time to process**

	Region	East Down
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>40.8%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

**Crisis Loans**

**Quality – confirmation and error rates**

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>62.2%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>72.1%</b>

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from East Down. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

**Reasons for crisis loan substitutions**

Inspectors substituted 36.9% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>58.5%</b>

An above average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer’s decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	East Down
New information	50.5%	<b>51.2%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	East Down
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

## Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	East Down
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>20 (20.8%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>5 (100.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Natural justice	<b>5 (100.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

## North District

### Community Care Grants

#### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>52.7%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>66.4%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from North. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

#### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 42.5% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>50.0%</b>

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	North
New Information	49.6%	<b>50.0%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	North
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>9.7%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in an above average number of crisis loan cases.

#### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	North
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>13 (100.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Priority	<b>9 (47.4%)</b>
Priority	58 (41.1%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>9 (7.1%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.

### Time to process

	Region	North
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>56.6%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>56.9%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>73.8%</b>

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from North. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is below the regional average.

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 39.1% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>56.0%</b>

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	North
New information	50.5%	<b>52.0%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	North
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

## Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	North
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>11 (19.3%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>3 (100.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Exclusions	<b>1 (100.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Exclusions – in other words an award has been made for an item which is excluded by the directions, or where an item has been incorrectly excluded (e.g. where too wide an interpretation of an exclusion has been applied).

## South District

### Community Care Grants

#### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	South
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>54.5%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>79.9%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from South. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

#### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 41.6% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>30.2%</b>

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	South
New Information	49.6%	<b>69.8%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	South
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>4.3%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

#### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	South
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>16 (6.5%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>14 (100.0%)</b>
Priority	58 (41.1%)	Priority	<b>13 (32.5%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.

### Time to process

	Region	South
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>64.6%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is above the Regional average.

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	South
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>64.4%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>85.2%</b>

The OSFC confirms a below average percentage of decisions from South. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 35.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>37.5%</b>

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	South
New information	50.5%	<b>64.6%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	South
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in a below average percentage of grant cases.

## Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	South
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>9 (7.6%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>4 (100.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Natural justice	<b>2 (100.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

# West District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	West
% decisions confirmed	51.1%	<b>53.0%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	64.8%	<b>65.1%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from West. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 40.4% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 42.6%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	50.4%	<b>47.8%</b>

A below average percentage of grant decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer's decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	West
New Information	49.6%	<b>52.2%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	West
SFI invoked Direction 49	8.5%	<b>7.5%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a grant in a below average number of crisis loan cases.

### Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	West
Direction 4 - Qualification	135 (14.3%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>20 (14.6%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	86 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>13 (100.0%)</b>
Priority	58 (41.1%)	Priority	<b>9 (40.9%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.

**Time to process**

	Region	West
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	52.2%	<b>43.9%</b>

The percentage cleared within 10 working days is below the Regional average.

**Crisis Loans**

**Quality – confirmation and error rates**

	Region	West
% decisions confirmed	65.5%	<b>72.2%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	76.1%	<b>81.9%</b>

The OSFC confirms an above average percentage of decisions from West. The percentage of decisions with all issues handled correctly is above the regional average.

**Reasons for crisis loan substitutions**

Inspectors substituted 27.8% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 32.7%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	56.9%	<b>50.0%</b>

A below average percentage of decisions are substituted due to the Reviewing Officer’s decision being incorrectly made.

	Region	West
New information	50.5%	<b>55.0%</b>

This is the total percentage of cases where important new information was obtained – regardless of whether the decision was correct.

	Region	West
SFI used Direction 49	1.0%	<b>5.0%</b>

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an above average percentage of grant cases.

## Breakdown of issues

The issues with the most common law errors are shown below. In brackets is this number expressed as a percentage of the total number of cases which had this as a key issue:

Most common law errors Issue	Region	Most common law errors Issue	West
Direction 3 - Qualification	85 (15.8%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>7 (10.8%)</b>
Priority	20 (52.6%)	Priority	<b>3 (60.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial Role	17 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial Role	<b>1 (100.0%)</b>

The most common crucial issues are:

- Qualification – for example the law was misinterpreted, the wrong test was applied, or the decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence.
- Priority – for example the priority decision reached was not a reasonable one on the available evidence or irrelevant factors were taken into account or relevant factors not addressed.
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.

## Appendix 1

### Quality of Decisions

DISTRICT	Total Decisions			CCG Confirmed			CL Confirmed			BL Confirmed		
	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%	Total	Con- firmed	%
<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>	240	135	56.3%	142	67	47.2%	91	61	67.0%	7	7	100.0%
<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>	361	204	56.5%	206	95	46.1%	144	99	68.8%	11	10	90.9%
<b>East Down</b>	319	180	56.4%	198	102	51.5%	111	69	62.2%	10	9	90.0%
<b>North</b>	229	130	56.8%	146	77	52.7%	65	37	56.9%	18	16	88.9%
<b>South</b>	426	250	58.7%	279	152	54.5%	135	87	64.4%	12	11	91.7%
<b>West</b>	246	147	59.8%	166	88	53.0%	72	52	72.2%	8	7	87.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1821</b>	<b>1046</b>	<b>57.4%</b>	<b>1137</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>90.9%</b>

### Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL CORRECT		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>	240	156	65.0%	142	81	57.0%	91	67	73.6%	7	7	100.0%
<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>	361	224	62.0%	206	114	55.3%	144	101	70.1%	11	9	81.8%
<b>East Down</b>	319	205	64.3%	198	114	57.6%	111	80	72.1%	10	8	80.0%
<b>North</b>	229	162	70.7%	146	97	66.4%	65	48	73.8%	18	16	88.9%
<b>South</b>	426	348	81.7%	279	223	79.9%	135	115	85.2%	12	10	83.3.0%
<b>West</b>	246	175	71.1%	166	108	65.1%	72	59	81.9%	8	7	87.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1821</b>	<b>1270</b>	<b>69.7%</b>	<b>1137</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>64.8%</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>76.1%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>68.4%</b>

### CCG Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>	142	63	44.4%	39	61.9%	24	38.1%	6	9.5%
<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>	206	96	46.6%	58	60.4%	38	39.6%	11	11.5%
<b>East Down</b>	198	80	40.4%	49	61.3%	31	38.8%	8	10.0%
<b>North</b>	146	62	42.5%	31	50.0%	31	50.0%	6	9.7%
<b>South</b>	279	116	41.6%	35	30.2%	81	69.8%	5	4.3%
<b>West</b>	166	67	40.4%	32	47.8%	35	52.2%	5	7.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1137</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>42.6%</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>50.4%</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>49.6%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>8.5%</b>

## CL Substitutions

District	Total Substituted			Substituted Incorrect		New Information (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)		SFI Invoked Dir 49 (all decisions with new information, both correct/incorrect)	
	Total	Substituted	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>	91	26	28.6%	18	69.2%	10	38.5%	0	0.0%
<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>	144	42	29.2%	31	73.8%	16	38.1%	1	2.4%
<b>East Down</b>	111	41	36.9%	24	58.5%	21	51.2%	0	0.0%
<b>North</b>	64	25	39.1%	14	56.0%	13	52.0%	0	0.0%
<b>South</b>	135	48	35.6%	18	37.5%	31	64.6%	0	0.0%
<b>West</b>	72	20	27.8%	10	50.0%	11	55.0%	1	5.0%
<b>Total</b>	617	202	32.7%	115	56.9%	102	50.5%	2	1.0%

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Northern Ireland

	<b>Total</b>					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	1137					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	329	28.9%	<b>Right</b>		<b>Wrong</b>	
<b>Facts or Evidence</b>	4	0.3%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
<b>Unfairness or bias</b>	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>No offer of interview</b>	12	0.8%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	945	59.1%	810	85.7%	135	14.3%
<b>Other Issues</b>	14	0.9%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%
<b>Eligibility</b>	29	1.8%	24	82.8%	5	17.2%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	86	5.4%	0	0.0%	86	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	7	0.4%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
<b>Exclusions</b>	20	1.3%	6	30.0%	14	70.0%
<b>Priority</b>	140	8.8%	82	58.6%	58	41.4%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	22	1.4%	8	36.4%	14	63.6%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	22	1.4%	0	0.0%	22	100.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	294	18.4%	257	87.4%	37	12.6%
	1598		1193	74.7%	405	25.3%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Belfast North and East Antrim

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	142					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	49	34.5%	<b>Right</b>		<b>Wrong</b>	
<b>Facts or Evidence</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Unfairness or bias</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>No offer of interview</b>	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	116	60.1%	94	81.0%	22	19.0%
<b>Other Issues</b>	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	3	1.6%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	9	4.7%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Priority</b>	20	10.4%	12	60.0%	8	40.0%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	4	2.1%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	5	2.6%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	30	15.5%	25	83.3%	5	16.7%
	193		132	68.4%	61	31.6%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Belfast West and Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	206					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	78	37.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Unfairness or bias	3	1.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
No offer of interview	3	1.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	167	60.7%	128	76.6%	39	23.4%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	7	2.5%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%
Inquisitorial Role	14	5.1%	0	0.0%	14	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	6	2.2%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Priority	14	5.1%	5	35.7%	9	64.3%
Amount of Award	4	1.5%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Natural Justice	7	2.5%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Direction 49	49	17.8%	42	85.7%	7	14.3%
	275		180	65.5%	95	34.5%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### East Down

	Total					
Number of decisions	198					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	70	35.4%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	151	56.1%	122	80.8%	29	19.2%
Other Issues	4	1.5%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Eligibility	7	2.6%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
Inquisitorial Role	23	8.6%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Direction 7	3	1.1%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Exclusions	5	1.9%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
Priority	25	9.3%	15	60.0%	10	40.0%
Amount of Award	4	1.5%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
Natural Justice	5	1.9%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 49	40	14.9%	36	90.0%	4	10.0%
	269		187	69.5%	82	30.5%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### North

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	146					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	42	28.8%	<b>Right</b>		<b>Wrong</b>	
<b>Facts or Evidence</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Unfairness or bias</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>No offer of interview</b>	5	2.4%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	126	60.3%	117	92.9%	9	7.1%
<b>Other Issues</b>	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	2	1.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	13	6.2%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	3	1.4%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Priority</b>	19	9.1%	10	52.6%	9	47.4%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	4	1.9%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	34	16.3%	28	82.4%	6	17.6%
	209		159	76.1%	50	23.9%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### South

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	278					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	45	16.2%	<b>Right</b>		<b>Wrong</b>	
<b>Facts or Evidence</b>	1	0.2%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Unfairness or bias</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>No offer of interview</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	248	58.9%	232	93.5%	16	6.5%
<b>Other Issues</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	3	0.7%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	14	3.3%	0	0.0%	14	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	3	0.7%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	5	1.2%	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
<b>Priority</b>	40	9.5%	27	67.5%	13	32.5%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	6	1.4%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	101	24.0%	93	92.1%	8	7.9%
	421		362	86.0%	59	14.0%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### West

	Total					
Number of decisions	166					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	47	28.3%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	137	59.3%	117	85.4%	20	14.6%
Other Issues	3	1.3%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Eligibility	7	3.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	13	5.6%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%
Direction 7	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	1	0.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	22	9.5%	13	59.1%	9	40.9%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Direction 49	40	17.3%	33	82.5%	7	17.5%
	231		173	74.9%	58	25.1%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	618					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	147	23.8%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	3	0.4%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Unfairness or bias	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
No offer of interview	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	539	79.4%	454	84.2%	85	15.8%
Other Issues	8	1.2%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%
Eligibility	18	2.7%	13	72.2%	5	27.8%
Inquisitorial Role	17	2.5%	0	0.0%	17	100.0%
Direction 7	2	0.3%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	6	0.9%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%
Priority	38	5.6%	18	47.4%	20	52.6%
Amount of Award	8	1.2%	4	50.0%	4	50.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	18	2.7%	16	88.9%	2	11.1%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	17	2.5%	2	11.8%	15	88.2%
Jurisdiction	1	0.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
	679		514	75.7%	165	24.3%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Belfast North and East Antrim

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	91					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	24	26.4%	<b>Right</b>		<b>Wrong</b>	
<b>Facts or Evidence</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Unfairness or bias</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>No offer of interview</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Dir-3 Qualification</b>	79	80.6%	62	78.5%	17	21.5%
<b>Other Issues</b>	1	1.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	3	3.1%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Priority</b>	3	3.1%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Withdrawn</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Repayability</b>	4	4.1%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
<b>TFM</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	5	5.1%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	98		70	71.4%	28	28.6%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Belfast West and Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	144					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	43	29.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Unfairness or bias	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	123	77.4%	102	82.9%	21	17.1%
Other Issues	3	1.9%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Eligibility	9	5.7%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Inquisitorial Role	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	10	6.3%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Amount of Award	2	1.3%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	1	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	1	0.6%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	5	3.1%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	159		111	69.8%	48	30.2%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### East Down

	Total					
Number of decisions	111					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	31	27.9%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	96	79.3%	76	79.2%	20	20.8%
Other Issues	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	4	3.3%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	5	4.1%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	5	4.1%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
Amount of Award	1	0.8%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	3	2.5%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	5	4.1%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	121		86	71.1%	35	28.9%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### North

	Total					
Number of decisions	65					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	16	24.6%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	57	82.6%	46	80.7%	11	19.3%
Other Issues	2	2.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	4.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	2	2.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	1	1.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jurisdiction	1	1.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
	69		50	72.5%	19	27.5%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### South

	Total					
Number of decisions	135					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	20	14.8%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	0.6%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	119	76.8%	110	92.4%	9	7.6%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	1.3%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	4	2.6%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Direction 7	1	0.6%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	3	1.9%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Priority	13	8.4%	11	84.6%	2	15.4%
Amount of Award	4	2.6%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	6	3.9%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	1.3%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	155		134	86.5%	21	13.5%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### West

	Total					
Number of decisions	72					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	13	18.1%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	65	84.4%	58	89.2%	7	10.8%
Other Issues	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	5	6.5%	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	3	3.9%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	77		63	81.8%	14	18.2%

\*\* The total number of issues may be greater than the total number of decisions.

## Appendix 2 - Time to process

### CCG & BL - Time to Process

District	CCG				BL				Combined CCG & BL						
	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		Avg time taken (days)	Number of Reviews	2nd Stage (request to RO review)		3rd Stage (request to papers rec'd)		Combined Time	
		Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%			Within 10 days	%	Within 4 days	%	Within 14 days	%
<b>Belfast North &amp; East Antrim</b>	140	76	54.3%	11.7	7	6	85.7%	3.7	147	82	55.8%	116	78.91%	77	52.4%
<b>Belfast West &amp; Lisburn</b>	202	97	48.0%	12.3	11	10	90.9%	4.5	213	107	50.2%	199	93.43%	129	60.6%
<b>East Down</b>	191	78	40.8%	12.1	10	10	100.0%	4.0	201	88	43.8%	151	75.12%	88	43.8%
<b>North</b>	152	86	56.6%	10.3	18	18	100.0%	3.9	170	104	61.2%	133	78.24%	108	63.5%
<b>South</b>	277	179	64.6%	10.0	12	12	100.0%	3.4	289	191	66.1%	274	94.81%	223	77.2%
<b>West</b>	171	75	43.9%	15.0	8	8	100.0%	2.3	179	83	46.4%	165	92.18%	93	52.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1133</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1199</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	<b>1038</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>59.9%</b>

## Appendix 3 – Help & Support

**OSFC Workshops** – Any District (or Office) that identifies an area for improvement may wish to consider an OSFC workshop. These workshops are free of charge.

Workshops currently offered are:-

- Direction 4
- Evidence gathering
- Priority

If you would like to arrange an OSFC workshop or require further information about them please contact Nikki Croft (90897541).

**Self Instruction Packages** – On a range of technical areas are available to download from [www.irs-review.org.uk](http://www.irs-review.org.uk).

**IRS Journal and Digest** – Issued three times a year and are also available to download from [www.irs-review.org.uk](http://www.irs-review.org.uk).

**OSFC Website** – located at [www.osfcni.org.uk](http://www.osfcni.org.uk). It contains a wide range of information and support including, quarterly and annual statistics reports and information on OSFC workshops.

**Leaflets and Posters** – Available free of charge from OSFC.

## Appendix 4 – OSFC contacts

<b>Social Fund Commissioner</b>	Mr Karamjit Singh CBE 0121 606 2107
<b>Statistical Reports</b>	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
<b>Workshops</b> (for details or to make a booking)	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
<b>IRS Journal and Digest of Decisions</b> (additional copies, mailing list, for administration)	John Delargy 028 90897543 john.delargy@dsdni.gov.uk
<b>Casework</b> (for progress, information before the Inspector’s decision)	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
(for queries, complaints after the Inspector’s decision)	Steven Rea 028 90897549 steven.rea@dsdni.gov.uk
<b>Leaflets and Publications</b>	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
<b>OSFC website</b>	<a href="http://www.osfcni.org.uk">www.osfcni.org.uk</a>
<b>IRS Website (equivalent office in GB)</b>	<a href="http://www.irs-review.org.uk">www.irs-review.org.uk</a>