

OSFC

Statistical Report

1 October 2011 to 31 December 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@dndni.gov.uk.

How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 1 October 2011 to 31 December 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	60.1%	66.7%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	72.0%

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 community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 25.3% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
Incorrect	37.0%	52.6%

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

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
New Information	63.0%	47.4%

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	5.0%	15.8%

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	22 (7.5%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	9 (13.6%)

Priority	18 (45.0%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Priority	3 (50.0%)

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	Belfast North & East Antrim
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	49.3%	60.3%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
% decisions confirmed	72.2%	75.6%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	82.2%

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 22.2% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	Belfast North & East Antrim
Incorrect	39.3%	60.0%

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	65.6%	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	3.3%	0.0%

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	Belfast North & East Antrim
Direction 3 - Qualification	15 (7.9%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	4 (10.5%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Natural justice	2 (100%)

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.

Belfast West & Lisburn District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	60.1%	61.1%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	69.4%

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 community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 33.3% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
Incorrect	37.0%	33.3%

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

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
New Information	63.0%	66.7%

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	5.0%	25.0%

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	Belfast West & Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	22 (7.5%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100%)
Priority	18 (45.0%)	Exclusions	2 (100%)

Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Natural justice	1 (100%)
--------------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------

The most common crucial issues are:

- 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).
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

Time to process

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	49.3%	14.7%

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	72.2%	76.6%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	83.0%

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 23.4% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
Incorrect	39.3%	36.4%

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

	Region	Belfast West & Lisburn
New information	65.6%	72.7%

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	3.3%	9.1%

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	Belfast West & Lisburn
Direction 3 - Qualification	15 (7.9%)	Natural justice	4 (100%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (8.1%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	2 (100%)

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

East Down District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	60.1%	50.0%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	61.3%

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 48.4% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	37.0%	43.3%

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

	Region	East Down
New Information	63.0%	56.7%

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	5.0%	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	East Down
Direction 4 - Qualification	22 (7.5%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	6 (10.7%)
Priority	18 (45.0%)	Priority	5 (71.4%)
Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Direction 49	4 (19.0%)

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.
- 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	East Down
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	49.3%	43.8%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	East Down
% decisions confirmed	72.2%	69.4%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	77.8%

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 30.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	East Down
Incorrect	39.3%	54.5%

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

	Region	East Down
New information	65.6%	54.5%

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	3.3%	0.0%

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	15 (7.9%)	Natural justice	3 (100%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (9.7%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	No offer of interview	1 (100%)

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.

North District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	60.1%	68.3%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	75.6%

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 24.4% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	37.0%	40.0%

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

	Region	North
New Information	63.0%	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	5.0%	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	North
Direction 4 - Qualification	22 (7.5%)	Natural justice	2 (100%)
Priority	18 (45.0%)	Amount of award	1 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Exclusions	1 (100%)

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.
- 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).
- 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)	49.3%	53.5%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	North
% decisions confirmed	72.2%	65.0%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	80.0%

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 35.0% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	North
Incorrect	39.3%	28.6%

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

	Region	North
New information	65.6%	71.4%

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	3.3%	0.0%

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	15 (7.9%)	Inquisitorial role	1 (100%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Exclusions	1 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Repayability	1 (33.3%)

The most common crucial issues are:

- 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	60.1%	57.7%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	85.9%

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 community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 36.6% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	37.0%	11.5%

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

	Region	South
New Information	63.0%	88.5%

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	5.0%	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	South
Direction 4 - Qualification	22 (7.5%)	Priority	3 (30.0%)
Priority	18 (45.0%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	2 (3.1%)
Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Other issues	1 (100%)

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.
- 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	South
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	49.3%	70.3%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	South
% decisions confirmed	72.2%	73.3%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	95.6%

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 crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 26.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	South
Incorrect	39.3%	16.7%

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

	Region	South
New information	65.6%	83.3%

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	3.3%	8.3%

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	South
Direction 3 - Qualification	15 (7.9%)	Priority	1 (50.0%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	1 (2.4%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)		(%)

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.
- 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.

West District

Community Care Grants

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	West
% decisions confirmed	60.1%	58.5%
% decisions handled correctly	73.7%	75.5%

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 community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 41.5% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 35.2%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	37.0%	45.5%

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

	Region	West
New Information	63.0%	54.5%

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	5.0%	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	West
Direction 4 - Qualification	22 (7.5%)	Priority	5 (62.5%)
Priority	18 (45.0%)	Inquisitorial role	3 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	13 (100%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	3 (6.4%)

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.
- 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.

Time to process

	Region	West
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	49.3%	29.4%

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

Crisis Loans

Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	West
% decisions confirmed	72.2%	66.7%
% decisions handled correctly	84.3%	83.3%

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

Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 33.3% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 27.4%.

	Region	West
Incorrect	39.3%	40.0%

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

	Region	West
New information	65.6%	60.0%

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	3.3%	0.0%

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	West
Direction 3 - Qualification	15 (7.9%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	3 (12.0%)
Natural justice	9 (100%)	Exclusions	1 (100%)
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Other issues	1 (100%)

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).

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	124	88	71.0%	75	50	66.7%	45	34	75.6%	4	4	100.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	87	60	69.0%	36	22	61.1%	47	36	76.6%	4	2	50.0%
East Down	101	58	57.4%	62	31	50.0%	36	25	69.4%	3	2	66.7%
North	63	43	68.3%	41	28	68.3%	20	13	65.0%	2	2	100.0%
South	118	76	64.4%	71	41	57.7%	45	33	73.3%	2	2	100.0%
West	87	55	63.2%	53	31	58.5%	30	20	66.7%	4	4	100.0%
Total	580	380	65.5%	338	203	60.1%	223	161	72.2%	19	16	84.2%

Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL Correct		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	124	95	76.6%	75	54	72.0%	45	37	82.2%	4	4	100.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	87	67	77.0%	36	25	69.4%	47	39	83.0%	4	3	75.0%
East Down	101	68	67.3%	62	38	61.3%	36	28	77.8%	3	2	66.7%
North	63	50	79.4%	41	31	75.6%	20	16	80.0%	2	1	50.0%
South	118	107	90.7%	71	61	85.9%	45	43	95.6%	2	2	100.0%
West	87	69	79.3%	53	40	75.5%	30	25	83.3%	4	4	100.0%
Total	580	456	78.6%	338	249	73.7%	223	188	84.3%	19	16	84.2%

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	75	19	25.3%	10	52.6%	9	47.4%	3	15.8%
Belfast West & Lisburn	36	12	33.3%	4	33.3%	8	66.7%	3	25.0%
East Down	62	30	48.4%	13	43.3%	17	56.7%	0	0.0%
North	41	10	24.4%	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	0	0.0%
South	71	26	36.6%	3	11.5%	23	88.5%	0	0.0%
West	53	22	41.5%	10	45.5%	12	54.5%	0	0.0%
Total	338	119	35.2%	44	37.0%	75	63.0%	6	5.0%

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	45	10	22.2%	6	60.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%
Belfast West & Lisburn	47	11	23.4%	4	36.4%	8	72.7%	1	9.1%
East Down	36	11	30.6%	6	54.5%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%
North	20	7	35.0%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%
South	45	12	26.7%	2	16.7%	10	83.3%	1	8.3%
West	30	10	33.3%	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	0	0.0%
Total	223	61	27.4%	24	39.3%	40	65.6%	2	3.3%

Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	338					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	75	22.2%	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	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	295	60.2%	273	92.5%	22	7.5%
Other Issues	4	0.8%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Eligibility	7	1.4%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Inquisitorial Role	13	2.7%	0	0.0%	13	100.0%
Direction 7	2	0.4%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	5	1.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%
Priority	40	8.2%	22	55.0%	18	45.0%
Amount of Award	7	1.4%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Natural Justice	10	2.0%	1	10.0%	9	90.0%
Direction 49	105	21.4%	96	91.4%	9	8.6%
	490		401	81.8%	89	18.2%

** 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	75					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	17	22.7%	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-4 Qualification	66	62.3%	57	86.4%	9	13.6%
Other Issues	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	2.8%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	2	1.9%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Exclusions	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	6	5.7%	3	50.0%	3	50.0%
Amount of Award	1	0.9%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	2.8%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Direction 49	23	21.7%	21	91.3%	2	8.7%
	106		84	79.2%	22	20.8%

** 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	36					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	9	25.0%	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	30	58.8%	29	96.7%	1	3.3%
Other Issues	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	3	5.9%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Inquisitorial Role	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Priority	5	9.8%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	7	13.7%	6	85.7%	1	14.3%
	51		41	80.4%	10	19.6%

** 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	23	37.1%	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	2	2.1%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	56	59.6%	50	89.3%	6	10.7%
Other Issues	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	7	7.4%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
Amount of Award	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 49	21	22.3%	17	81.0%	4	19.0%
	94		69	73.4%	25	26.6%

** 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	41					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	7	17.1%	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-4 Qualification	32	60.4%	31	96.9%	1	3.1%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	3.8%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	4	7.5%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Natural Justice	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 49	10	18.9%	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
	53		45	84.9%	8	15.1%

** 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	71					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	6	8.5%	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	64	63.4%	62	96.9%	2	3.1%
Other Issues	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	10	9.9%	7	70.0%	3	30.0%
Amount of Award	1	1.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 49	22	21.8%	22	100.0%	0	0.0%
	101		93	92.1%	8	7.9%

** 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	53					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	13	24.5%	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	47	55.3%	44	93.6%	3	6.4%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	2.4%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
Inquisitorial Role	3	3.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	8	9.4%	3	37.5%	5	62.5%
Amount of Award	3	3.5%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	22	25.9%	20	90.9%	2	9.1%
	85		69	81.2%	16	18.8%

** 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	223					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	35	15.7%	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-3 Qualification	189	76.2%	174	92.1%	15	7.9%
Other Issues	3	1.2%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Eligibility	5	2.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	5	2.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 7	1	0.4%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	4	1.6%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Priority	9	3.6%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%
Amount of Award	1	0.4%	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	20	8.1%	18	90.0%	2	10.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	248		207	83.5%	41	16.5%

** 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	45					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	8	17.8%	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	38	71.7%	34	89.5%	4	10.5%
Other Issues	1	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	1.9%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	3	5.7%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Amount of Award	1	1.9%	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	5	9.4%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	53		42	79.2%	11	20.8%

** 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	47					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	8	17.0%	Right		Wrong	
Facts or Evidence	1	2.0%	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	37	72.5%	34	91.9%	3	8.1%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	4	7.8%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	3.9%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	1	2.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	1	2.0%	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	1	2.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	4	7.8%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	51		41	80.4%	10	19.6%

** 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	36					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	8	22.2%	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	1	2.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	31	77.5%	28	90.3%	3	9.7%
Other Issues	1	2.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
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	1	2.5%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	1	2.5%	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	2	5.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	40		31	77.5%	9	22.5%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

North

	Total					
Number of decisions	20					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	4	20.0%	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	16	76.2%	15	93.8%	1	6.3%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
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	3	14.3%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
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%
	21		17	81.0%	4	19.0%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

South

	Total					
Number of decisions	45					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	2	4.4%	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	42	84.0%	41	97.6%	1	2.4%
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	2	4.0%	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	6	12.0%	6	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%
	50		48	96.0%	2	4.0%

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

Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

West

	Total					
Number of decisions	30					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	5	16.7%	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	25	75.8%	22	88.0%	3	12.0%
Other Issues	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	1	3.0%	1	100.0%	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	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Priority	2	6.1%	2	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	3	9.1%	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%
	33		28	84.8%	5	15.2%

** 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	%
Belfast North & East Antrim	73	44	60.3%	10	4	4	100.0%	4.8	77	48	62.3%	51	66.23%	43	55.8%
Belfast West & Lisburn	34	5	14.7%	14.6	4	3	75.0%	7	38	8	21.1%	37	97.37%	18	47.4%
East Down	64	28	43.8%	13.8	3	3	100.0%	3.3	67	31	46.3%	55	82.09%	36	53.7%
North	43	23	53.5%	11.2	2	2	100.0%	3.5	45	25	55.6%	40	88.89%	25	55.6%
South	74	52	70.3%	9	2	2	100.0%	6.5	76	54	71.1%	71	93.42%	62	81.6%
West	51	15	29.4%	18.7	4	4	100.0%	1.5	55	19	34.5%	55	100.00%	22	40.0%
Total	339	167	49.3%	12.9	19	18	94.7%	4.4	358	185	51.7%	309	86.3%	206	57.5%

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