

# OSFC

# Statistical Report

**1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015**



# Contents

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>
Purpose of Statistical Report and How to Use It	3
District and Regional comparisons:	
Falls	5
Lisburn	8
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	11
Antrim	14
Armagh	17
foyle	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 – OSFC Contacts	42

# 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 OSFC on 0808 127 0417 or by e-mail at [sfc@dndi.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:sfc@dndi.gsi.gov.uk).

## How often are reports issued?

A Statistical Report is produced every 3 months. This report covers the period 1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015.

## 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.

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 and papers were requested from the SSA, to the day the case papers 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 the office manager at [sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:sfc@dndni.gsi.gov.uk)

# Falls District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>61.4%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>38.6%</b>

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

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 29.5% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>69.2%</b>

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

	Region	Falls
New Information	41.9%	<b>30.8%</b>

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

	Region	Falls
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>7.7%</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	Falls
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>10 (32.3%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>9 (100%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	No offer of interview	<b>3 (100%)</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	Falls
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>73.8%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Falls
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>92.9%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>89.3%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 7.1% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	Falls
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>50.0%</b>

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

	Region	Falls
New information	48.6%	<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	Falls
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	Falls
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Natural justice	<b>2 (66.7%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	No offer of interview	<b>1 (100%)</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
- 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.
- Natural justice - the applicant has not been given a fair opportunity to state his case or to know the case against him.

# Lisburn District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>69.6%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>50.0%</b>

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

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 28.6% of community care grant decisions. This is below the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>56.3%</b>

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

	Region	Lisburn
New Information	41.9%	<b>43.8%</b>

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

	Region	Lisburn
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>6.3%</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	Lisburn
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>11 (100%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>8 (20.0%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	Natural justice	<b>5 (100%)</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.
- 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	Lisburn
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>94.4%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Lisburn
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>90.7%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>93.0%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 9.3% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	Lisburn
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>25.0%</b>

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

	Region	Lisburn
New information	48.6%	<b>25.0%</b>

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

	Region	Lisburn
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	Lisburn
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Exclusions	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	Natural justice	<b>1 (33.3%)</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.
- 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.
- 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.

# Knockbreda & Downpatrick District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>42.6%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>53.7%</b>

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

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 48.1% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>61.5%</b>

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

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
New Information	41.9%	<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>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>0.0%</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	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>6 (16.7%)</b>

Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>4 (100%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	Priority	<b>4 (40.0%)</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	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>95.5%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>69.2%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>82.1%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 23.7% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>55.6%</b>

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

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
New information	48.6%	<b>44.4%</b>

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

	Region	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>4 (12.1%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>2 (100%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	Other issues	<b>1 (100%)</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.
- 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.

# Antrim District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>58.2%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>65.5%</b>

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

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 40.0% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>59.1%</b>

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

	Region	Antrim
New Information	41.9%	<b>40.9%</b>

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

	Region	Antrim
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>0.0%</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	Antrim
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Direction 4 – Qualification	<b>7 (14.9%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Priority	<b>6 (50.0%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>5 (71.4%)</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	Antrim
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>88.7%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Antrim
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>88.4%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>88.4%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 9.3% of crisis loan decisions. This is below the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	Antrim
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>25.0%</b>

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

	Region	Antrim
New information	48.6%	<b>75.0%</b>

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

	Region	Antrim
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	Antrim
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Exclusions	<b>2 (100%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>2 (5.1%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	Direction 7	<b>1 (100%)</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.
- 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.
- 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).



# Armagh District

## Community Care Grants

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>54.9%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>71.8%</b>

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

### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 40.8% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>41.4%</b>

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

	Region	Armagh
New Information	41.9%	<b>58.6%</b>

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

	Region	Armagh
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>0.0%</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	Armagh
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>6 (100%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>6 (10.2%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	Priority	<b>3 (21.4%)</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	Armagh
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>87.9%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	Armagh
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>69.0%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>90.5%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 27.5% of crisis loan decisions. This is above the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	Armagh
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>18.2%</b>

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

	Region	Armagh
New information	48.6%	<b>54.5%</b>

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

	Region	Armagh
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	Armagh
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Other issues	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Direction 7	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>1 (2.6%)</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.
- 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.

## foyle District

### Community Care Grants

#### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	56.4%	<b>52.0%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	56.1%	<b>48.0%</b>

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

#### Reasons for community care grant substitutions

Inspectors substituted 46.0% of community care grant decisions. This is above the regional average of 39.1%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	58.1%	<b>69.6%</b>

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

	Region	foyle
New Information	41.9%	<b>30.4%</b>

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

	Region	foyle
SFI invoked Direction 49	2.3%	<b>4.3%</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	foyle
Direction 4 - Qualification	47 (18.6%)	Direction 4 - Qualification	<b>10 (25.0%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	41 (91.1%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>6 (75.0%)</b>
Priority	20 (37.7%)	Natural justice	<b>5 (100%)</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.
- 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	foyle
% reviews cleared (10 working days)	90.4%	<b>100%</b>

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

## Crisis Loans

### Quality – confirmation and error rates

	Region	foyle
% decisions confirmed	81.5%	<b>81.3%</b>
% decisions handled correctly	89.0%	<b>90.6%</b>

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

### Reasons for crisis loan substitutions

Inspectors substituted 15.6% of crisis loan decisions. This is equal to the regional average of 15.6%.

	Region	foyle
Incorrect	31.4%	<b>20.0%</b>

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

	Region	foyle
New information	48.6%	<b>40.0%</b>

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

	Region	foyle
SFI used Direction 49	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>

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	foyle
Direction 3 - Qualification	11 (5.4%)	Direction 3 - Qualification	<b>2 (6.9%)</b>
Inquisitorial role	5 (100%)	Inquisitorial role	<b>1 (100%)</b>
Direction 7	3 (100%)	Direction 7	<b>1 (100%)</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.
- 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.

## 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	%
Antrim	99	71	71.7%	55	32	58.2%	43	38	88.4%	1	1	100.0%
Armagh	115	70	60.9%	71	39	54.9%	42	29	69.0%	2	2	100.0%
Falls Road	72	53	73.6%	44	27	61.4%	28	26	92.9%	0	0	0.0%
Foyle	84	53	63.1%	50	26	52.0%	32	26	81.3%	2	1	50.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	94	51	54.3%	54	23	42.6%	39	27	69.2%	1	1	100.0%
Lisburn	101	80	79.2%	56	39	69.6%	43	39	90.7%	2	2	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>66.9%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>56.4%</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>87.5%</b>

### Issues Handled Correctly

District	Total Decisions			CCG Correct			CL Correct			BL Correct		
	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%	Total	Correct	%
<b>Antrim</b>	99	75	75.8%	55	36	65.5%	43	38	88.4%	1	1	100.0%
<b>Armagh</b>	115	93	80.9%	71	51	71.8%	42	38	90.5%	2	2	100.0%
<b>Falls Road</b>	72	43	59.7%	44	17	38.6%	28	25	89.3%	0	0	0.0%
<b>Foyle</b>	84	54	64.3%	50	24	48.0%	32	29	90.6%	2	0	0.0%
<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>	94	62	66.0%	54	29	53.7%	39	32	82.1%	1	0	0.0%
<b>Lisburn</b>	101	69	68.3%	56	28	50.0%	43	40	93.0%	2	1	50.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>56.1%</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>89.0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50.0%</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>Antrim</b>	55	22	40.0%	13	59.1%	9	40.9%	0	0.0%
<b>Armagh</b>	71	29	40.8%	12	41.4%	17	58.6%	0	0.0%
<b>Falls Road</b>	44	13	29.5%	9	69.2%	4	30.8%	1	7.7%
<b>Foyle</b>	50	23	46.0%	16	69.6%	7	30.4%	1	4.3%
<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>	54	26	48.1%	16	61.5%	10	38.5%	0	0.0%
<b>Lisburn</b>	56	16	28.6%	9	56.3%	7	43.8%	1	6.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.3%</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>Antrim</b>	43	4	9.3%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Armagh</b>	40	11	27.5%	2	18.2%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%
<b>Falls Road</b>	28	2	7.1%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Foyle</b>	32	5	15.6%	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Knockbreda &amp; Downpatrick</b>	38	9	23.7%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	0	0.0%
<b>Lisburn</b>	43	4	9.3%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	224	35	15.6%	11	31.4%	17	48.6%	0	0.0%

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Northern Ireland

	Total					
Number of decisions	330					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	130	39.4%	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	10	2.1%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	253	52.6%	206	81.4%	47	18.6%
Other Issues	11	2.3%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Eligibility	13	2.7%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%
Inquisitorial Role	45	9.4%	4	8.9%	41	91.1%
Direction 7	3	0.6%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Exclusions	9	1.9%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
Priority	53	11.0%	33	62.3%	20	37.7%
Amount of Award	3	0.6%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Natural Justice	18	3.7%	3	16.7%	15	83.3%
Direction 49	63	13.1%	60	95.2%	3	4.8%
	481		326	67.8%	155	32.2%

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

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Falls

	Total					
Number of decisions	44					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	23	52.3%	Right		Wrong	
<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>	3	4.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	31	46.3%	21	67.7%	10	32.3%
<b>Other Issues</b>	3	4.5%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	1	1.5%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	9	13.4%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	1	1.5%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Priority</b>	6	9.0%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	4	6.0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	9	13.4%	7	77.8%	2	28.6%
	67		37	55.2%	30	44.8%

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

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Lisburn

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	56					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	27	48.2%	<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	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	40	50.0%	32	80.0%	8	20.0%
<b>Other Issues</b>	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	4	5.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	11	13.8%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	2	2.5%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
<b>Priority</b>	4	5.0%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	10	12.5%	10	100.0%	0	0.0%
	80		49	61.3%	31	38.8%

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

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	54					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	20	37.0%	<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-4 Qualification</b>	36	52.2%	30	83.3%	6	16.7%
<b>Other Issues</b>	3	4.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	2	2.9%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	4	5.8%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	3	4.3%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>Priority</b>	10	14.5%	6	60.0%	4	40.0%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	3	4.3%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>Direction 49</b>	8	11.6%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%
	69		48	69.6%	21	30.4%

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

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Antrim

	<b>Total</b>					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	55					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	18	32.7%	<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	1.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Dir-4 Qualification</b>	47	54.0%	40	85.1%	7	14.9%
<b>Other Issues</b>	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	3	3.4%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	7	8.0%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
<b>Direction 7</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	1	1.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Priority</b>	12	13.8%	6	50.0%	6	50.0%
<b>Amount of Award</b>	1	1.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Direction 49</b>	11	12.6%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%
	87		64	73.6%	23	26.4%

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

## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

### Armagh

	Total					
Number of decisions	71					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	17	23.9%	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	3	3.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Dir-4 Qualification	59	59.6%	53	89.8%	6	10.2%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	2	2.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	6	6.1%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Direction 7	1	1.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	14	14.1%	11	78.6%	3	21.4%
Amount of Award	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 49	14	14.1%	13	92.9%	1	7.1%
	99		81	81.8%	18	18.2%

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



## Community Care Grants - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	50					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	25	50.0%	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	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-4 Qualification	40	50.6%	30	75.0%	10	25.0%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	1	1.3%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	8	10.1%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%
Direction 7	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Priority	7	8.9%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Amount of Award	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Natural Justice	5	6.3%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 49	11	13.9%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%
	79		47	59.5%	32	40.5%

\*\* 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	227					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	25	11.0%	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	2	0.8%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	202	84.2%	191	94.6%	11	5.4%
Other Issues	2	0.8%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Eligibility	13	5.4%	13	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	5	2.1%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Direction 7	3	1.3%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Exclusions	4	1.7%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
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	2	0.8%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	6	2.5%	3	50.0%	3	50.0%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	240		211	87.9%	29	12.1%

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

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Falls

	Total					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	28					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	3	10.7%	<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	3.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Dir-3 Qualification</b>	25	75.8%	24	96.0%	1	4.0%
<b>Other Issues</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	1	3.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	1	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>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<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>	2	6.1%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>TFM</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	3	9.1%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	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.

## Lisburn

	Total					
Number of decisions	43					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	3	7.0%	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	37	82.2%	36	97.3%	1	2.7%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	6.7%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	2.2%	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TFM	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Natural Justice	3	6.7%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Jurisdiction	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	45		41	91.1%	4	8.9%

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

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Knockbreda & Downpatrick

	Total					
Number of decisions	39					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	7	17.9%	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-3 Qualification	33	86.8%	29	87.9%	4	12.1%
Other Issues	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Eligibility	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Direction 7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Exclusions	1	2.6%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Priority	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Amount of Award	1	2.6%	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	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%
	38		31	81.6%	7	18.4%

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

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Antrim

	Total					
Number of decisions	43					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	5	11.6%	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	39	86.7%	37	94.9%	2	5.1%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	3	6.7%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Direction 7	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Exclusions	2	4.4%	0	0.0%	2	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	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%
	45		40	88.9%	5	11.1%

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

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

### Armagh

	<b>Total</b>					
<b>Number of decisions</b>	42					
<b>Number with issues handled incorrectly</b>	4	9.5%	<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>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Dir-3 Qualification</b>	39	90.7%	38	97.4%	1	2.6%
<b>Other Issues</b>	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Eligibility</b>	2	4.7%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Inquisitorial Role</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Direction 7</b>	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
<b>Exclusions</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Priority</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<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>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>TFM</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Natural Justice</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	43		40	93.0%	3	7.0%

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

## Crisis Loans - Breakdown of Issues

Foyle

	Total					
Number of decisions	32					
Number with issues handled incorrectly	3	9.4%	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	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Dir-3 Qualification	29	80.6%	27	93.1%	2	6.9%
Other Issues	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligibility	4	11.1%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
Inquisitorial Role	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Direction 7	1	2.8%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
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	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%
	36		31	86.1%	5	13.9%

\*\* 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	%
Antrim	53	47	88.7%	5.1	1	1	100.0%	1	54	48	88.9%	53	98.1%	51	94.4%
Armagh	66	58	87.9%	7.5	2	2	100.0%	3.5	68	60	88.2%	68	100.0%	62	91.2%
Falls Road	42	31	73.8%	9.9	0	0	#DIV/0!	0	42	31	73.8%	35	83.3%	31	73.8%
Foyle	42	42	100.0%	5.5	2	2	100.0%	3	44	44	100.0%	44	100.0%	44	100.0%
Knockbreda & Downpatrick	66	63	95.5%	5.6	1	1	100.0%	2	67	64	95.5%	63	94.0%	65	97.0%
Lisburn	54	51	94.4%	4.4	2	2	100.0%	1.5	56	53	94.6%	50	89.3%	54	96.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>94.6%</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>92.7%</b>

### Appendix 3 – OSFC contacts

<b>Social Fund Commissioner</b>	Mr Walter Rader OBE <b><u>sfc@dsdni.gsi.gov.uk</u></b>
<b>Statistical Reports</b>	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <b><u>sfc@dsdni.gsi.gov.uk</u></b>
<b>Casework</b> (for progress, information before the Inspector’s decision)	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <b><u>sfc@dsdni.gsi.gov.uk</u></b>
(for queries, complaints after the Inspector’s decision)	08081270417 <b><u>sfc@dsdni.gsi.gov.uk</u></b>
<b>Leaflets and Publications</b>	Nikki Croft 08081270417 <b><u>sfc@dsdni.gsi.gov.uk</u></b>
<b>OSFC website</b> (contains a range of information and support including, quarterly and annual statistics reports, Corporate Plans and Annual Reports)	www.osfcni.org.uk