

OSFC

Statistical Report

1 July 2011 to 30 September 2011



Contents

Chapter	Page
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@dndi.gov.uk.

How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 1 July 2011 to 30 September 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.

Belfast North & East Antrim District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
% decisions confirmed	60.2%	59.2%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	67.3%

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 36.7% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
Incorrect	53.4%	44.4%

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

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
New Information	46.6%	55.6%

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

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
SFI invoked Direction 49	10.2%	11.1%

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 North & East Antrim
Direction 4 - Qualification	35 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	8 (19.0%)

Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Priority	2 (50.0%)
Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Direction 49	2 (13.3%)

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.
- Direction 49 – the Reviewing Officer has failed to consider if another type of payment is appropriate.

Time to process

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	32.2%	11.5%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	70.6%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	82.4%

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 crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 29.4% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
Incorrect	45.3%	50.0%

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

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
New information	58.5%	50.0%

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

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in and equal 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	Belfast North & East Antrim
Direction 3 - Qualification	13 (7.1%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	5 (16.1%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Natural Justice	1 (100.0%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)		

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.

Belfast West & Lisburn District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	60.2%	52.5%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	65.0%

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 47.5% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
Incorrect	53.4%	57.9%

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	46.6%	42.1%

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	10.2%	0.0%

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	Belfast West & Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	35 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	8 (24.2%)
Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Natural Justice	3 (100.0%)

Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100.0%)
-----------------	-------------	--------------------	-------------------

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.

Time to process

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	32.2%	27.0%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	80.4%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	71.7%

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 17.4% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
Incorrect	45.3%	62.5%

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

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
New information	58.5%	37.5%

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 used Direction 49	0.0%	0.0%
-----------------------	------	-------------

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal 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	Belfast West & Lisburn
Direction 3 - Qualification	13 (7.1%)	Natural Justice	7 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (8.8%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)	Direction 7	1 (100.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.
- 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.
- Direction 7 – the law was incorrectly applied by, for example, failing to consider a previous application for the same item within the relevant time period, or for refusing an item which had not been requested on a previous application within the relevant time period.

East Down District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	60.2%	53.2%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	54.8%

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 community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 45.2% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	53.4%	67.9%

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

	Region	East Down
New Information	46.6%	32.1%

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	10.2%	10.7%

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	35 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	8 (16.3%)
Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Inquisitorial role	7 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Priority	7 (70.0%)

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)	32.2%	28.3%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	72.4%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	82.8%

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 24.1% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	45.3%	71.4%

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

	Region	East Down
New information	58.5%	42.9%

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	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal 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	13 (7.1%)	Exclusions	3 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	2 (7.1%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)	Priority	1 (50.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- 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).
- 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.

North District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	60.2%	70.5%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	79.5%

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 22.7% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	53.4%	40.0%

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

	Region	North
New Information	46.6%	60.0%

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	10.2%	20.0%

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	35 (12.9%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (75.0%)
Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Natural Justice	2 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Exclusions	1 (50.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- 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.
- 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).

Time to process

	Region	North
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	32.2%	57.1%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	78.3%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	91.3%

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 crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 21.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	45.3%	20.0%

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

	Region	North
New information	58.5%	100.0%

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	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal 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	13 (7.1%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	1 (4.5%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)		

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- 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.

South District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	South
% decisions confirmed	60.2%	61.5%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	78.2%

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 37.2% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	53.4%	44.8%

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

	Region	South
New Information	46.6%	55.2%

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	10.2%	10.3%

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	South
Direction 4 - Qualification	35 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	5 (6.7%)
Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Exclusions	4 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100.0%)

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.
- 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).
- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.

Time to process

	Region	South
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	32.2%	45.2%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	South
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	66.7%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	92.2%

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 31.4% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	45.3%	25.0%

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

	Region	South
New information	58.5%	81.3%

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	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal 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	13 (7.1%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Amount of award	1 (100.0%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)	Natural Justice	1 (100.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- Inquisitorial role – in other words the Reviewing Officer failed to ask crucial questions where more information was needed.
- Amount of award – for example where the amount awarded was too low for the item requested to be purchased by the applicant, or where the award was too generous (including when Budget holder advise on restricting awards had not been applied correctly).
- 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	60.2%	65.2%
% decisions handled correctly	69.0%	67.4%

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

Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 30.4% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 37.0%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	53.4%	57.1%

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

	Region	West
New Information	46.6%	42.9%

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	10.2%	14.3%

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	West
Direction 4 - Qualification	35 (12.9%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	5 (12.8%)
Inquisitorial role	17 (94.4%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (100.0%)
Natural Justice	13 (100.0%)	Priority	3 (100.0%)

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)	32.2%	26.7%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	West
% decisions confirmed	73.1%	72.0%
% decisions handled correctly	83.7%	84.0%

The OSFC confirms a below 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 28.0% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 25.5%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	45.3%	57.1%

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

	Region	West
New information	58.5%	28.6%

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	0.0%	0.0%

The Inspector was the first person to consider a crisis loan in an equal 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	13 (7.1%)	Priority	2 (66.7%)
Natural Justice	9 (100.0%)	Amount of award	1 (50.0%)
Priority	5 (55.6%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	1 (4.0%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- 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.
- Amount of award – for example where the amount awarded was too low for the item requested to be purchased by the applicant, or where the award was too generous (including when Budget holder advise on restricting awards had not been applied correctly).
- 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.

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	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	84	54	64.3%	49	29	59.2%	34	24	70.6%	1	1	100.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	87	59	67.8%	40	21	52.5%	46	37	80.4%	1	1	100.0%
East Down	94	56	59.6%	62	33	53.2%	29	21	72.4%	3	2	66.7%
North	69	51	73.9%	44	31	70.5%	23	18	78.3%	2	2	100.0%
South	129	82	63.6%	78	48	61.5%	51	34	66.7%	0	0	0.0%
West	73	50	68.5%	46	30	65.2%	25	18	72.0%	2	2	100.0%
Total	536	352	65.7%	319	192	60.2%	208	152	73.1%	9	8	88.9%

Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL Correct		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	84	63	75.0%	49	33	67.3%	34	28	82.4%	1	1	100.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	87	60	69.0%	40	26	65.0%	46	33	71.7%	1	1	100.0%
East Down	94	61	64.9%	62	34	54.8%	29	24	82.8%	3	3	100.0%
North	69	59	85.5%	44	35	79.5%	23	21	91.3%	2	2	100.0%
South	129	108	83.7%	78	61	78.2%	51	47	92.2%	0	0	0.0%
West	73	54	74.0%	46	31	67.4%	25	21	84.0%	2	2	100.0%
Total	536	405	75.6%	319	220	69.0%	208	174	83.7%	9	9	100.0%

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	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	49	18	36.7%	8	44.4%	10	55.6%	2	11.1%
Belfast West & Lisburn	40	19	47.5%	11	57.9%	8	42.1%	0	0.0%
East Down	62	28	45.2%	19	67.9%	9	32.1%	3	10.7%
North	44	10	22.7%	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	2	20.0%
South	78	29	37.2%	13	44.8%	16	55.2%	3	10.3%
West	46	14	30.4%	8	57.1%	6	42.9%	2	14.3%
Total	319	118	37.0%	63	53.4%	55	46.6%	12	10.2%

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	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	34	10	29.4%	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	46	8	17.4%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%
East Down	29	7	24.1%	5	71.4%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%
North	23	5	21.7%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
South	51	16	31.4%	4	25.0%	13	81.3%	0	0.0%
West	25	7	28.0%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Total	208	53	25.5%	24	45.3%	31	58.5%	0	0.0%

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	318					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	90	28.3%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
No offer of interview	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	272	58.0%	237	87.1%	35	12.9%
Other Issues	5	1.1%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Eligibility	11	2.3%	10	90.9%	1	9.1%
Inquisitorial Role	18	3.8%	1	5.6%	17	94.4%
Direction 7	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	13	2.8%	2	15.4%	11	84.6%
Priority	32	6.8%	19	59.4%	13	40.6%
Amount of Award	3	0.6%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Natural Justice	13	2.8%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%
Direction 49	98	20.9%	89	90.8%	9	9.2%
	469		358	76.3%	111	23.7%

** 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					
Number of decisions	49					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	14	28.6%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unfairness or bias	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
No offer of interview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	42	61.8%	34	81.0%	8	19.0%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	4.4%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	2	2.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Priority	4	5.9%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	15	22.1%	13	86.7%	2	13.3%
	68		52	76.5%	16	23.5%

** 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	40					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	14	35.0%	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-4 Qualification	33	57.9%	25	75.8%	8	24.2%
Other Issues	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	5.3%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Priority	2	3.5%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	3	5.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 49	10	17.5%	8	80.0%	2	20.0%
	57		38	66.7%	19	33.3%

** 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	62					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	27	43.5%	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	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	49	54.4%	41	83.7%	8	16.3%
Other Issues	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	7	7.8%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	10	11.1%	3	30.0%	7	70.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 49	13	14.4%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%
	90		56	62.2%	34	37.8%

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

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

North

	Total					
Number of decisions	44					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	7	15.9%	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	35	53.0%	34	97.1%	1	2.9%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	3.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	4	6.1%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	2	3.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Priority	7	10.6%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 49	14	21.2%	14	100.0%	0	0.0%
	66		58	87.9%	8	12.1%

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

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

South

	Total					
Number of decisions	78					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	16	20.5%	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-4 Qualification	75	61.5%	70	93.3%	5	6.7%
Other Issues	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	4	3.3%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Priority	7	5.7%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
Amount of Award	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	30	24.6%	28	93.3%	2	6.7%
	122		104	85.2%	18	14.8%

** 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	46					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	13	28.3%	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-4 Qualification	39	57.4%	34	87.2%	5	12.8%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	4.4%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	4.4%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Priority	3	4.4%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	16	23.5%	14	87.5%	2	12.5%
	68		51	75.0%	17	25.0%

** 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	208					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	34	16.3%	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	183	81.0%	170	92.9%	13	7.1%
Other Issues	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	2	0.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	2	0.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	3	1.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Priority	9	4.0%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Amount of Award	3	1.3%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	12	5.3%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	9	4.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	226		189	83.6%	37	16.4%

** 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					
Number of decisions	34					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	6	17.6%	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	31	88.6%	26	83.9%	5	16.1%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	1	2.9%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
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	2	5.7%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	35		29	82.9%	6	17.1%

** 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	46					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	13	28.3%	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	34	70.8%	31	91.2%	3	8.8%
Other Issues	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	2	4.2%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
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	2	4.2%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	7	14.6%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	48		34	70.8%	14	29.2%

** 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	29					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	5	17.2%	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	28	84.8%	26	92.9%	2	7.1%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	3	9.1%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Priority	2	6.1%	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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%
	33		27	81.8%	6	18.2%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

North

	Total					
Number of decisions	23					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	2	8.7%	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	22	88.0%	21	95.5%	1	4.5%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	1	4.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
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	4.0%	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	25		23	92.0%	2	8.0%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

South

	Total					
Number of decisions	51					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	7.8%	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	43	78.2%	42	97.7%	1	2.3%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	2	3.6%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.8%	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	7	12.7%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	55		50	90.9%	5	9.1%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

West

	Total					
Number of decisions	25					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	16.0%	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	25	83.3%	24	96.0%	1	4.0%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	3	10.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Amount of Award	2	6.7%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Direction 49	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Withdrawn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Repayability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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%
	30		26	86.7%	4	13.3%

** 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	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	52	6	11.5%	17.5	1	1	100.0%	0	53	7	13.2%	33	62.26%	9	17.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	37	10	27.0%	13.4	1	1	100.0%	3	38	11	28.9%	35	92.11%	16	42.1%
East Down	60	17	28.3%	13.1	3	2	66.7%	8	63	19	30.2%	57	90.48%	21	33.3%
North	35	20	57.1%	10	2	2	100.0%	1	37	22	59.5%	36	97.30%	22	59.5%
South	73	33	45.2%	11.8	0	0	0.0%	0	73	33	45.2%	69	94.52%	49	67.1%
West	60	16	26.7%	20.6	2	2	100.0%	0.5	62	18	29.0%	43	69.35%	19	30.6%
Total	317	102	32.2%	14.4	9	8	88.9%	2.1	326	110	33.7%	273	83.7%	136	41.7%

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 provided 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.

IRS Journal and Digest – Issued three times a year and are also available to download from www.irs-review.org.uk.

OSFC Website – located at 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

Social Fund Commissioner	Mr Karamjit Singh CBE 0121 606 2106
Statistical Reports	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
Workshops (for details or to make a booking)	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
IRS Journal and Digest of Decisions (additional copies, mailing list, for administration)	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
Casework (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
Leaflets and Publications	Nikki Croft 028 90897541 nikki.croft@dsdni.gov.uk
OSFC website	www.osfcni.org.uk
IRS Website (equivalent office in GB)	www.irs-review.org.uk