

Service Indicators in Local Authorities 2008

Report to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage
and Local Government

by the

Local Government Management Services Board

June 2009

© LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES BOARD

Although every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the material contained in this publication, complete accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Neither the LGMSB or the author (s) accept any responsibility whatsoever for loss or damage occasioned, or claimed to have been occasioned, in part or in full as a consequence of any person acting or refraining from acting, as a result of this publication. All or part of this publication may be reproduced without further permission, provided the source is acknowledged.

Service Indicators in Local Authorities 2008

Published by the Local Government Management Services Board.

Foreword

It is my pleasure, as Chairman of the Local Government Management Services Board, to submit this, the fifth Report on Service Indicators, to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Mr. John Gormley, T.D.

This Report which covers the performance of local authorities in 2008 includes data on a number of new indicators, and also reflects modifications or changes in others. This demonstrates the dynamic nature of the process, and the continuing commitment of the local authority sector.

We believe that performance measurement is a key element of Transforming Public Service and see this Report, and its predecessors, as evidence of the commitment of the local authorities to continuous review and improvement.

Tá súil agam go núsáidfear an tuarascáil seo go foirleathan agus go gcabhróidh sé chun tuilleadh fheabhas a chur i gcrích.

Terry Ó Niadh

Chairman

Local Government Management Services Board

June 2009

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	2
Table of Contents	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Frequently Asked Questions on Service Indicators.....	5
Section 1: The Context in which the 2008 Service Indicator Report is framed	11
Section 2: Recent Review of Indicators and its Impact	15
Unaccounted for Water (UFW).....	16
Taking Estates in Charge	20
Climate Change	21
Litter Analysis	24
Section 3: Library, Recreation and Youth.....	27
Section 4: Corporate.....	41
Section 5: Environment	45
Section 6 Fire and Emergency	77
Section 7: Water	85
Section 8: Roads.....	89
Section 9: Housing.....	91
Section 10: Planning.....	105
Section 11: Motor Tax.....	137
Bibliography	161
Appendix One: Report of the Independent Assessment Panel.....	162
Appendix Two: Changes to Service Indicators for 2008	169
Appendix Three: Method	173

Acknowledgements

This report is prepared by the Local Government Management Services Board for submission to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government.

It involves input from and collaboration with a number of different stakeholders and contributors.

The Board wishes to acknowledge the contributions of:

- individual local authorities through the County and City Managers and their Implementation Teams;
- the Local Government Computer Services Board in gathering of the data and development of IT systems;
- some agencies external to the local authority system which supplied data directly; these include the EPA, Vehicle Registration Unit (VRU), Tobin Consulting Engineers; and finally
- the Independent Assessment Panel appointed by the Minister to validate the data prepared by local authorities.

Frequently Asked Questions on Service Indicators

What are Service Indicators?

Service Indicators were introduced in 2004 to measure the performance of Ireland's local authorities across a range of services that they provide. Each local authority is responsible for submitting and verifying data on the range of indicators. This data is collated into tables on each indicator which enable comparisons to be made across the local authorities and the performance of individual local authorities to be tracked on an annual basis.

Where did they come from?

The report "*Delivering Value for People – Service Indicators in Local Authorities*" was published in January 2004 and is the basis for the current service indicator initiative. The Report, which was the work of a working group representative of the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, the local authorities and the Institute of Public Administration, made recommendations on the introduction of a comprehensive suite of service indicators by local authorities on which they would report annually.

When were they introduced?

The first Service Indicator report was published in 2005 in respect of performance in 2004. Since then the annual report produces tables which, where relevant, compare the average result for the indicator to previous years.

What are they used for?

The aim of service indicators is to measure performance by local authorities across an agreed range of services. The Service Indicator reports enable members of the public and other interested parties to get information on the performance of their local authority across a wide range of services. They also compare performance over time at a national level. The initiative also enables each local authority to review its own performance across the range of indicators and in the light of performance by other local authorities and to measure their performance year-on-year.

Who compiles the data on Service Indicators?

The Local Government Management Services Board (LGMSB) was given the task of external monitoring and verification of the data, as well as the compilation and analysis of a central set of

indicators. The Board is also required to make an annual report to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG).

The data gathering process involves active collaboration between key stakeholders including local authorities, the LGMSB, and the Local Government Computer Services Board (LGCSB). Each local authority is required to submit their figures electronically to the LGCSB, with a deadline of 31st March.

The LGCSB then creates data files from these submissions for use by the LGMSB. The tables and summary statistics which form the basis of a report are prepared by the LGMSB. As part of the quality assurance process, the LGMSB also identifies anomalies in the data and, where necessary, gives local authorities an opportunity to review them.

What services do they measure?

The service indicators measure a broad range of services provided by local authorities. The report, *“Delivering Value for People – Service Indicators in Local Authorities”*, referred to earlier, identified 42 indicators to measure over 160 sub-headings. The indicators chosen measure the performance of local authorities in housing, planning, environmental services (including water, waste and litter) fire services, roads, motor tax, libraries, recreational services, revenue collection and corporate issues. The indicators were chosen on the basis that they would be relevant and useful to the general public, elected members and the local authorities themselves. The availability of measurable data also influenced the choice of indicators.

What determined which local authority services were measured?

Other factors that influenced the selection were that the indicators would

- Give wide coverage of a range of local authority work;
- Be capable of consistent interpretation and measurement;
- Ensure benefit is compatible with resources expended;
- Be useful as a tool to enable individual authorities to review performance over time.

Are the original service indicators still used?

It was agreed by the Local Government Customer Services Group that the choice of the 42 indicators would not be revised for a period of three years on the basis that this would allow trends to emerge and relevant comparisons to be made. However, in practice, the difficulty in achieving absolute consistency across a wide range of indicators and among the different, already existing data-collection methods used by local authorities was recognised resulting in

some limited revision of definitions and methodologies for the Reports that measured performance in 2005 and 2006.

In early 2007, a more comprehensive review of the Indicators was initiated by the DoEH&LG and undertaken by the Customer Services Review Group. This led to further amendment of a number of indicators, for the purpose of clarity and ease of comparison, in the Report on local authority performance in 2007.

In addition to some further revisions on a number of the service indicators, this year's Report contains, for the first time since their inception, a number of new service indicators measuring performance in, for example, the areas of unaccounted for water, taking estates in charge and the enforcement of standards in the private rented sector and the exclusion of other indicators for example, the percentage of river channel which is unpolluted and the number and value of arts grants allocated.

Do they measure all services provided by local authorities?

According to political science literature there are two central criteria that service indicators should fulfil: firstly, the indicators should measure something in a relatively straightforward manner so that their meaning is easily understood; secondly, by using the indicators it should be possible to track change in performance over time.

One downside of the "*straightforward to measure*" criterion for service indicators is that much of the work of local authorities is not easy to measure. Local authorities offer a wide range of services and supports to local activity and the breadth and diversity of this activity is not captured. For example, the variety of arts-related assistance from local authorities was not fully reflected in the original funding-based indicator for local authority support of the arts. When reviewing the data then, it is important to remember the existence of this wider, more qualitative context to the figures.

Local authorities provide over 100 services to the community many of which are hard to quantify and therefore not measured.

Who verifies the results?

An independent assessment panel appointed by the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government quality assures the entire process. Each year they visit a number of local authorities to audit the data submitted by that authority. The Independent Assessment Panel for this year is chaired by Eric Embleton.

Who produces the Report?

The Report is produced by the Local Government Management Service Board (LGMSB). For more information on the LGMSB log onto www.lgmsb.ie

Where can I get a copy of the Report?

Service Indicator Reports can be downloaded from www.lgmsb.ie

Can I see previous year's reports?

All previous Reports are available to download on the www.lgmsb.ie website.

Who can I contact if I wish to get more information on a particular local authority's performance?

If you are looking for additional information on a particular authority or region's performance you should directly contact the authority in question.

Do Government Departments or other state agencies measure performance with service indicators?

The local government system has been at the forefront of the public service in introducing explicit and public measurement of their performance. This leading role was recognised with the award of an Excellence in Public Service Award by the Department of the Taoiseach in 2006.

Local authorities have been proud to be at the forefront of the public service – in terms of explicit and public measurement of their performance - and the publication of the indicators, and the accompanying report, has provided evidence of the strong performance of local authorities throughout the country and the essential role that they play in shaping and sustaining their local communities.

In 2009, the Health Service Executive introduced a performance information and improvement system called **HealthStat** which records and measures performance from Irish health service providers.

The OECD, in its recent report on Ireland, *Public Management Review: Towards an Integrated Public Service (2008)*, highlighted the role that performance measurement can play in achieving greater results and efficiency from the systems and mechanisms already in place.

What are the advantages of using service indicators?

The indicators are useful in establishing the effectiveness of programmes, focusing on the quality of service delivery and the impact on the customer. In practice, they are used as an additional tool providing evidence to elected members, City/County Managers and the public on a wide range of local authority services.

Are there any disadvantages to using service indicators?

While the advantages of measuring performance have been well flagged, it is important to bear in mind some of their limitations.

- Firstly, the reader should have an awareness of the diversity of local authorities and the role that local democracy plays in establishing local priorities. Each local authority is different, although providing a similar range of services. Their *raison d'être* is to respond to local needs as represented by local politicians, while taking into account national policies and priorities. They are part of a national system, but primarily focused on local need.

Key differences that are relevant include:

- Geographical size;
- Population density;
- Demographic change;
- Levels of poverty, unemployment and deprivation;
- Levels of inward investment.

Therefore it is not always meaningful to compare results *across local authorities*, but rather it is more appropriate to compare *the performance of individual local authorities over time*:

- Given the vast range of services now provided by local authorities - more than 100 in total – it is fair to say that they do not give a complete picture. There are many contributions that local authorities make that are not easy to measure, especially those concerned with “Quality of Life” issues;
- There is a danger in performance measurement in that “what gets measured gets done” and this could skew the focus of local authorities away from key services which are not easily measured;
- It is easier to measure quantity than quality;
- The wider role of local authorities e.g. in facilitating development, adopting entrepreneurial approaches, building sustainable communities etc. is not easy to measure.

Does the Service Indicator Report reflect the changed environment in which local authorities now operate?

The report is particularly relevant just now when there is a very strong focus on effectiveness and value for money from the public service generally. The Report can assist management in reviewing performance in key areas and assessing value for money for customers.

More recently the economic environment in which local authorities are operating has undergone significant changes. This has resulted in local authorities having to implement a number of stringent measures to deliver reductions in spending. While the Report measures performance of local authorities in 2008, the results will serve as a useful tool in tracking the impact of these changes on performance.

What role do elected representatives have in the process?

They were also involved in the recent review of the performance indicators.

The elected members of local authorities provide a key link to local authority customers and play a big part in developing and reviewing local authority policy. The data in this and previous reports means that they have hard information to inform their input.

Section 1: The Context in which the 2008 Service Indicator Report is framed

This Report has been compiled by the Local Government Management Services Board for submission to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government on behalf of the local authority sector. It is the fifth report on Service Indicators.

Measuring performance of local authorities through an agreed range of service indicators was introduced in 2004, and followed on the recommendations contained in the Report “*Delivering Value for People*”, prepared by a Customer Services Group.

The Place of Performance Measurement in the Modernisation of Public Service

Performance measurement is a key feature of the modernisation agenda for the public service, in Ireland and elsewhere. The OECD Review (2008) contained comments on performance generally, and offered some specific advice and guidance in relation to introducing and strengthening systems of performance measuring. The relevant advice was:

- On balance, it is better to limit the number of targets but to set many measures for the achievement of a target (they also record the reduction in the number of performance targets in the UK in 2004);
- It is desirable to draw up outcome measures identifying how outputs contribute to outcomes;
- The advice on developing measures needs to be clear: including the development of guidelines about measuring outputs versus outcomes;
- Targets need to be measurable and as far as possible quantitative;
- The results should be provided in a timely, simple and integrated manner – ideally against plans;
- There should be an independent element in the process.

Since then, the report on “*Transforming Public Services*” and related Government Statement placed a strong emphasis on performance both by organisations and individuals and stressed the need to “develop performance metrics which are meaningful to the citizen”. In this connection, Government has acknowledged that there is a need for clarity about goals and targets against which performance is to be measured:

“Government will specify priority outcomes for all sectors (e.g. education, health and local government) together with the relevant performance indicators by which achievement will be assessed”.

Interestingly, there is also a promise to develop performance indicators that span the efforts of groups of organisations involved in areas such as children and disability. This would be a major advance, reflecting the idea of interagency collaboration, and would reflect the “lifecycle” approach of T2016.

The Usefulness of Service Indicators

In his recent book, *“Innovation and Best Practice in Local Government”*, Quinlivan (p. 21) acknowledges the value in presenting a view of performance over time and allowing local authorities to chart their progress on a yearly basis. He emphasises the fact that the Service Indicators are just that – a useful tool to indicate to the local authority how it is performing and if there are problems that need to be addressed. He describes the data as “not an end in itself, but a stepping stone to improved service delivery”.

He also cites the experience in the UK where performance (service) indicators are used to serve many different purposes, and suggests that if such an approach is adopted “the greater the risk it will pervert or bureaucratise the organisation. Professionals and Managers alike can become prisoners of the system and the numbers game” (Quinlivan & McCarthy 2007).

Boyle (2000), too, points out that “it is important to realise that performance measurement is not without its limitations. Performance indicators in local government can help focus attention on particular issues but rarely of themselves provide sufficient information as to why things happened as they did. More often than not they point the way to further inquiry rather than providing direct answers. Also, misuse of corporate indicators of performance can lead to dysfunctional behaviours such as concentration on short term issues and gaming (the manipulation of measures to get the “right” results)” (p.53)

A continuing focus of the LGMSB over the last five years has been to ensure that the Service Indicators do not become a “mechanistic chore” but rather that the data emerging is used, especially at individual local authority level, to interrogate the reasons behind changes in performance, and improve processes and systems where necessary. We have continually emphasised their value as a management tool.

This approach is assuming even greater importance, given the reductions in staff resources which have already taken place and are likely to continue because of the financial difficulties

facing local authorities. As a result of a Government decision, local authorities were obliged to reduce their staff costs by 3% for 2009. Since then, many have had to take further action to reflect budgetary realities and it is expected that there will be a reduction of 3,000 approximately in the overall workforce by 2010. This will require elected members and Managers to continue to work together to review priorities and the impact of such reviews is likely to be reflected in the service indicator data for 2009.

Increasing the Use – Maximising the Value

The CPMR Discussion Paper "*Performance Measurement in Local Government*" (2000) summed up the potential of performance indicators in local government as follows:

"The lesson emerging from this brief review of practice is that the primary role of performance measurement in local government is developmental. The main benefit is in raising questions that may not be aired otherwise: posing challenges to conventional wisdom and stimulating new ideas and approaches to service delivery. Ideally, indicators will be used by clients, staff and managers at the local level to set a framework within which local authority performance can be assessed and improved. It is through generating a sense of ownership of performance measurement at the local level that its impact will be more than superficial" (p. 45).

To build on progress to date in the local authority sector it would be highly desirable to see the development of cross-cutting indicators aimed at encouraging effective interagency work at the local level, rather than focussing on the work of local authorities only.

As a first step, and especially given the reductions in staff resources, priority should continue to be given to ensuring that the data collected is used by all relevant parties, and that there is no duplication of effort. The use of other local authorities as benchmarks against which to compare performance is advocated, and, in the report for 2006, an approach to "clustering" was outlined which could be used by authorities to select their comparator authorities. We understand that this has been found useful by some authorities.

Within local authorities, we believe that the data emerging from the service indicators has the potential to be extremely useful to section or department heads. We fully acknowledge the considerable effort that is required to produce the data within a very tight timescale. While there may have been very considerable advances in maximising the use of IT since the introduction of the indicators, nonetheless, the data collection places a burden on the local authority staff responsible. We will continue to work closely with the LGCSB to provide whatever additional

support may be needed so that the focus within local authorities moves beyond the collection to the interrogation, analysis and use of the data.

Section 2: Recent Review of Indicators and its Impact

Given that this is the fifth Report, it is important at this stage to reassess the process, across and within local authorities and, if necessary, to refocus and reenergise it, so that it continues to be regarded as a positive contribution to the management of local authorities.

The opportunity was taken in 2008 to review the range of indicators. This review was carried out by the Customer Service Group, which represents the DoEHLG, the local authorities (both elected members and practitioners), the LGMSB and other interested parties.

As part of this review, the opportunity was taken to assess progress to date on this initiative, to assess the continuing relevance of the existing indicators, and most especially to identify any important or topical areas of the work of local authorities which could be measured, would be of public interest and which had not been included to date. This process was extremely worthwhile and means that, within this year's report, there are a number of new, or substantially amended or extended indicators (please see Appendix 2 for listings of new, deleted or amended indicators). Those indicators are highlighted with explanatory notes as necessary throughout this Report. Clearly, in these cases, comparison with previous years is not possible. A fuller note on a small number of the new indicators is included later in this Section.

The opportunity was also taken to revise and tighten up as necessary the definitions and methodology, to assist in achieving uniformity and consistency in reporting and comparison. However, it remains the case, that if similar data is being collected from local authorities by different agencies at different times for different purposes, it will prove impossible to reconcile the inevitable disparities in the data.

The LGMSB continues to strive towards achieving consistency and is satisfied that the recent work undertaken will further assist towards this end as will the work of the IAP and continued involvement of the Customer Service Group and DoEHLG. Where material is already available from another source, then this will be accessed and included in the Report.

New Indicators for 2008

Throughout this process, the LGMSB has continued to try to ensure that the indicators reflect the characteristics of effective measures, while recognising the desirability of reporting on areas that are of topical value and interest. Examples of new indicators reported for the first time this year, are those related to taking estates in charge and water conservation. In both of these cases, there are many factors which influence performance, affecting the results recorded in the tables

and which need to be borne in mind by the reader. For this reason, relevant background material is provided over to assist in achieving a balanced and fair interpretation of the data.

Unaccounted for Water (UFW)

Because of its importance generally, and inclusion for the first time in this Report, we felt it desirable to provide some commentary and analysis in relation to indicator E1 (Unaccounted for Water) and on the general issue of water conservation. This should be read in conjunction with and to assist in the interpretation of Table 30 of this Report.

Defining UFW

Although there is no universally applied or accepted definition, Unaccounted for Water (UFW) is a measure of water loss within a distribution system i.e. the difference between the water supplied to a distribution system and water that leaves the system through its intended use. More precisely, UFW has recently been usefully defined as the “difference between ‘net production’ (the volume of water delivered into a network) and ‘consumption’ (the volume of water that can be accounted for by legitimate consumption, whether metered or not)” (Sharma, April 2008).¹

Dispelling some Myths about UFW

Before putting the indicator itself in an Irish context, there is a need to dispel some of the common misconceptions that arise when considering and reporting on unaccounted for water.

UFW and Leakage are not the same

Firstly, most people assume that when we refer to unaccounted for water, we are talking about ‘leakage’. This is, in fact, not the case. It is true to say that leakage forms a part of (and often a significant part of) unaccounted-for water. However, water loss is also caused by a number of factors in addition to leakage. The components of UFW can generally be divided into two categories, known as “real losses” and “apparent losses”.

“Apparent losses” are caused by a number of factors which result in the commercial loss of water from the network but which are distinct from leakage. These include:

- Unauthorised use – unauthorised or illegal connections
- Unmetered connections
- Metering errors

¹UN-IHA definition. See Sharma, April 2008.
http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/outputs/pdfs/GEN_PRS_PI_of_Water_Losses_AC_Apr08.pdf

- Billing anomalies
- Lack of, or non-existent metering across all consumer groups / sectors

“Real losses” constitute the physical loss of water. This category includes:

- Leakage by transmission or from distribution mains;
- Other network problems;
- Leakage and overflows at storage tanks;
- Problems with service connections;
- Leakage arising in proximity to house connections.

Acceptable Levels of Leakage Differ

The second assumption often made is that, in reporting on UFW, it is possible to either set a uniform target for all water authorities, or that it is possible to reduce water losses down to zero. In fact, international studies report a considerable degree of variation in UFW values between countries and between cities/towns in the same country.

It is important to recognise that it can be difficult or indeed impractical to reduce levels of leakage beyond a certain point. Water loss is a common feature of all water distribution systems – as electricity loss is a feature of electricity transmission systems. It is generally recognised that it is extremely challenging and/or prohibitively expensive to reduce water losses beyond a certain point:

“From a technical point of view a certain level of losses cannot be avoided and / or is considered acceptable from an economic point of view...” (Sharma, 2009).

This is why the notions of “*acceptable water loss*” or the concept of “*economic levels of leakage*” are so important in helping us to move towards the benchmarking of water losses. In managing water demand, increasingly the emphasis is on trying to achieve a balance between the costs of maintaining the distribution system and reducing water losses on the one hand, and the cost of the water saved from water conservation measures on the other.

Local Authority Service Indicator

In 2008, local authorities for the first time reported on a new indicator which measures unaccounted for water. Nationally and locally, this is seen as a critical indicator which recognises the need to focus on demand management at a high level, by prioritising the issue of water conservation.

Method Used

For the purposes of the Service Indicators report, Unaccounted for Water is defined as the “percentage of the total volume of water supplied under the water supply schemes that the local authority is responsible for”. DoEHLG guidance on this indicator states that it is designed to “measure progress by local authorities on an annual basis in reducing Unaccounted for Water (UFW) in their own area (*Guidelines for Compilation and Submission of Data*).

According to the guidance material, the method to be used to calculate this figure is based on the Total Integrated Flow Method, as set out in policy Circular L7/96 on Water Conservation from the DoEH&LG in order to work out UFW as a % of total supply.

UFW should be seen as a useful tool which will allow for comparisons to be made over time on the amount of water loss on a specific scheme or in relation to an individual local authority. However in a number of cases the figures used to calculate water loss are best estimates, based on a number of assumptions. For instance it can be very difficult to calculate Unaccounted for Water if a water system is not metered. In an Irish context, because the Irish domestic householder is not directly charged for – and therefore not metered for - water consumption, figures used for household consumption should not be treated as absolute and instead represent best estimates.

It should also be noted that since the guidance was issued, ongoing work by the Water Services National Training Group has led to certain refinements in how UFW figures are calculated. These changes mainly relate to the treatment of the domestic allowance.

In reporting on the 2008 results, therefore, it is clear that there is an element of variation in approaches used. We understand that, ahead of compilation of the 2009 figures, the DoEHLG plans to assist local authorities in calculating this figure on a more consistent basis resulting in better quality data.

Performance and Comparison

Local authorities have highlighted a number of factors which need to be taken into account when examining UFW performance.

Old Infrastructure Versus New Infrastructure

A key factor influencing water loss is the age of the infrastructure and the underlying quality of the piping system. Leakage is often a major contributing factor to unaccounted for water and can be a result of either lack of maintenance or failure to renew ageing systems.

For instance, cities or urban centres with old cast-iron mains, lead services and multiple connections do not reasonably compare with new centres with predominantly modern piping networks. Similarly, rural counties tend to have more connections, longer and more dispersed piping networks. Counties which have inherited 60's and 70's group schemes which might have been constructed without appropriate supervisory controls and standards tend to have the same problem. In many cases leakage detection and repair would require both additional capital investment and human resources.

Extent of Remediation/Rehabilitation Complete

The extent of watermain rehabilitation undertaken obviously has a very significant impact on the extent of unaccounted for water.

Proportion of Mains to Connections

The extent of distribution networks relative to the number of connections is a key influence. In many instances, rural counties have low density populations served by public main networks and as a consequence unaccounted for water tends to be higher.

The Number of Significant Users

Local authorities have highlighted the fact that the number and scale of significant users in a local authority area is critical in influencing the % UFW figure reported. For example, if an urban authority had a single 1,000,000 gallon/day user, they point out that this would alter a UFW figure by a significant amount.

This point highlights a general methodological issue where experts have highlighted problems with using simple "% UFW" figures to assess water loss. This is because this type of performance indicator can be mathematically skewed and affected by different levels of customer consumption. In other words the construction of, say a large beverage company in a local authority area would increase consumption and based on the % formula, the UFW figure would appear to have decreased although the amount of non-revenue water lost would not have decreased.

Conclusion on Performance

In overall terms, we can conclude that there are considerable variances in the figures presented in the report. While we are strongly of the view that measurement of unaccounted for water is an essential management tool for water authorities in Ireland, caution needs to be exercised in

interpreting the data and in comparing local authorities. At the same time, we believe that individual interrogation of some of the exceptional figures is warranted. (See Table 30)

Following discussion and examination of the results included at Table 30, and bearing in mind the comment of the Independent Assessment Panel on this indicator, a number of interpretative and methodological issues have been identified which will be addressed prior to the report for 2009 and future years.

Taking Estates in Charge

One of the new indicators for 2008 is that which records progress by local authorities on taking estates in charge.

The Planning and Development Act 2000 places a legal obligation on local authorities to take in charge residential developments, finished or unfinished, where certain conditions have been met. The consequences of a local authority taking an estate in charge are clear: the property owners within the development cease to be responsible for the amenities/services in the exterior parts of the development e.g. roads and footpaths, public lighting, fire services including hydrants and public water supply.

A key issue facing local authorities is that the full cost implications of the taking in charge process are site specific and generally unknown. There are a number of variables that affect the process and which present difficulties for local authorities in estimating costs, staff commitments and in many cases, legal costs. Given that an estimated 30% of the housing stock was constructed in the past 12 years, a substantial portion of which will ultimately be taken in charge by the relevant local authority, the potential scale of the financial challenge facing local authorities is evident.

The taking in charge of an estate is a reserved function and the elected members of the local authority are not legally required to take in charge a residential estate. They are, in fact, legally required to consider the financial implications for the local authority, unless a plebiscite has been carried out by the residents of that estate.

A recent Circular (PD1/08) from the DoEHLG stresses the need for local authorities to have a formal policy on taking in charge, and outlines a number of relevant factors. The publication by the DoEHLG of the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities (May 2009) has had the effect of giving this Circular a statutory basis. However, it is

fair to point out that the process of taking in charge is a lengthy and complicated one, likely to be affected by the current financial situation of local authorities.

This situation has been exacerbated in recent times by the fact that several developers have gone out of business, which means that local authorities might not be able to follow the enforcement route to get work carried out. In some cases, too, there are insufficient bonds in place. These aspects need to be borne in mind by the reader in examining the results for this indicator. (See Tables 54 and 55)

Climate Change

It had been intended to introduce in 2008 a new indicator which would measure and report on energy use in local authorities. In the event, because of the extent of preparatory work involved, there was not sufficient time to put in place a robust, practical system which all local authorities could use. However, considerable work was carried out in 2008 which will allow the early introduction, adoption and reporting on a Service Indicator.

Work already undertaken included the organisation of a conference to promote climate change action among local authority practitioners. A climate change working group was established (under the aegis of the CCMA Environment Committee) to help co-ordinate efforts between the DoEHLG, local energy agencies, local authorities and the national Change campaign. As part of this work, a paper was produced outlining best practice and a range of initiatives being progressed on climate change and energy efficiency at a local level. The Working Group designed a carbon calculator with specific components suitable for use by local authorities to help to calculation their carbon emissions. This was launched by the CCMA Environment Committee in December 2008, and local authorities have now been asked to adopt this approach to measuring their carbon emissions. We are aware that there is very significant progress on piloting this approach being made in the South East Region and that this will be then extended nationally.

In conjunction with this, local authorities worked with the Change campaign on a national level in order to integrate the local authority template into the national Carbon Management Tool for business. This web-enabled tool was launched by Minister Gormley on April 28th and is available at: **www.change.ie/carbonmanagementtool**.

Factors affecting the time taken to re-let a dwelling

One of the existing indicators i.e. Average Time Taken to Re-let Available Dwelling, has been the focus of some discussion at various levels in recent times. For this reason, it was felt useful to include some contextual material, drawing on a submission from the County and City Managers' Association to the Committee for Public Accounts in October 2008. This outlines some of the factors which affect the time taken to re-let dwellings together with actions taken by local authorities to ameliorate the situation. The relevant extract is included in its entirety here, to assist the reader in achieving a more thorough and balanced understanding of the context. The data is at Table 34.

1. **Issue:** Difficulty in locating contractors to complete refurbishment/repairs to dwellings. Up until very recently, local authorities were experiencing acute difficulty in getting contractors to carry out refurbishment/repairs to dwellings.

Action: Given the downturn in the construction industry, contractors are now more readily available and repairs are being completed in faster timeframes. This will have a positive impact on the situation.
2. **Issue:** Refusal to accept a dwelling - for some dwellings there may be a number of refusals before a tenant is found.

Action: As already indicated, many local authorities now operate a refusals policy, so that, if a potential tenant on the waiting list refuses two or more dwellings offered to them, they are then relocated down the waiting list for a period of time, usually one to two years.
3. **Issue:** Expectations of prospective tenants: second-hand dwellings are expected to be of the standard of a new-build.

Action: Where possible local authorities carry out refurbishment/repairs to ensure that the standard of the dwelling compares well with a new unit. However local authorities report that expectations among those on the waiting lists mean that many will not accept a "second-hand unit". This may lead to refusals and thus lengthens the time taken to re-let the dwellings. Prospective tenants may be aware of the plans of the authorities for new houses or indeed even in relation to houses coming on stream under Part V, and this may influence their behaviour. Again, in this situation, authorities may enforce a refusals policy, similar to that mentioned above.
4. **Issue:** The extent of work that may be required to bring the dwelling up to standard.

Action: Local authorities try to improve the standard of houses prior to letting. This can involve:

- Repainting walls;
- Cleaning out rubbish;
- Cleaning the property internally;
- Replacing fixtures, fittings and white goods which may have been removed/damaged by previous tenants e.g. kitchen and bathroom units;
- Changing locks;
- Replacing doors;
- Replacement of sanitary facilities.

In addition, the opportunity may be taken to:

- Install central heating systems and /or fire safety systems;
- Service boilers/ranges.

5. **Issue:** Transfers for tenants - Local authorities have identified what might be regarded as unnecessary transfers, i.e. discretionary moves of tenants from one dwelling to another as quite costly in money and time.

Action: Some local authorities do not allow transfers, except in certain circumstances e.g. tenants fearing for their safety, disability needs, etc.

6. **Issue:** Significant damage from vandalism can occur where a dwelling has been refurbished but before a tenant has taken up occupation.

Action: Dwellings are only refurbished once a tenant has been identified by the local authority and this means that the tenant will move in immediately the work is completed.

7. **Issue:** Personal factors affecting the length of time to re-let.

Action: Where the death has occurred of a tenant, the family of the deceased is normally given a short period of time e.g. four to six weeks to dispose of the deceased person's furnishings and belongings. In some cases, the family may be reluctant to hand back the keys and this requires sensitive but firm pressure from the local authority to resolve the matter. Again, this may take some weeks to resolve, but is handled appropriately by authorities.

8. **Issue:** Dispute regarding automatic right of tenancy for family of deceased tenants.

Action: Family members may feel that they have automatic rights to tenancy where a deceased relation has been tenant. This can often result in legal proceedings which can take a considerable time to bring to a conclusion.

9. **Issue:** Designated housing for the elderly can be vacant on an ongoing basis as prospective tenants are not inclined to accept certain such accommodation and are prepared to wait for one-bed units: again this is an example of prospective tenant having legitimate increased expectations.

Finally in this section, we felt it useful to focus attention on one of the indicators which has been included since 2004, and to give a more detailed analysis of the results. This is contained in the following paragraphs, while the complete data is at Table 20 and following.

Litter Analysis

Litter and pollution control are key activities for local authorities. Over recent years, the public demand for higher standards coupled with EU Directives means increasing pressure on local authorities in this area. The data contained in the Service Indicator Report 2008 highlights the progress made by local authorities across a number of areas including litter control, pollution and environmental campaigns in schools.

Litter Wardens

Litter wardens are the public face of the local authority in relation to litter control. In addition to their normal daily assignments, they are often called on by the public where dumping and other pollution is an issue. Their front-line position is key to assisting local authorities in achieving litter-free status.

Overall, the number of litter wardens working in local authorities in 2008 increased by over 6%, on 2007². Although the number of full-time wardens fell by over 4% in 2008, the number of part-time wardens increased by 15%. The average number of litter wardens per 5,000 population shows a slight increase to 0.44 for 2008 on the previous year. This reflects the effort by local authorities to strengthen enforcement. The move towards more part-time wardens may be a reflection of the increased demands and resource limitations facing local authorities and also due to some re-categorisation. The Service Indicator reports 2004 to 2007 show that, while the number of full-time wardens has been constant over this time, the number of part-time wardens has been on the increase. Again, this may also reflect the expanding roles of local authority staff including community wardens, dog wardens, etc.

² It should be noted that in 2008, a number of local authorities re-classified the staff employed as litter wardens. This will result in significant variation on the figures in the last year's Report. This occurs because wardens previously classified as full-time are now undertaking additional duties e.g. as community wardens, etc. In other cases, litter warden are now operate on a full-time basis with litter and do not carry out other duties.

In general, it is important to note that local authority staff levels have not risen in proportion to the number or breadth of activities which they now carry out. For many years, local authorities have been “doing more with less” with regard to staff and other resources and in the light of the prevailing economic conditions, this is likely to continue and be exacerbated in coming years.

Litter Pollution

In recent years, litter pollution has been a controversial topic in the public domain and enforcement is an important area of local authority activity. The litter pollution data for the Service Indicator Report 2008 is collated by Tobin Consulting and is based on data provided by the local authorities.

In 2008, the average percentage of areas deemed litter free increased to almost 6%, with the areas deemed slightly polluted rising to just below 62%. Alternatively, the areas categorised as moderately polluted or significantly polluted decreased on 2007 figures. These results indicate that more areas are becoming less littered or litter free and the areas affected by significant amounts of litter are becoming less prevalent. The areas deemed grossly polluted remain at very low levels across all local authority areas.

However, the scale of the challenge involved in effecting further improvement is considerable, and will demand significant changes in public behaviour, given the constraints on local authority staff resources.

Fines

In 2008, there was an increase of 7.7% in the number of on-the-spot-fines issued on the previous year. Over 13,900 fines were paid in 2008. This demonstrates that the enforcement of litter laws is regarded as a key responsibility for local authorities with significant impact on offending members of the public. The local authorities also took an increased number of prosecutions because of non-payment of the on-the-spot fines in 2008. The number of prosecutions secured in cases taken was slightly less in 2008 than 2007 but there are many factors which influence this, including many outside the control of the local authority e.g. cases settled prior to the court case, etc.

In this Report, a number of additional indicators have been included under the heading of litter control. Prosecutions taken under the Litter Acts 1997-2003 numbered over 2,400 with the prosecutions secured at over 540, again, highlighting the importance attached by local authorities to improving the physical environment across the country.

Environmental Complaints and Enforcement

Local authorities receive complaints concerning environmental pollution from several sources; with some initiated by the public and others from local authority staff investigation. These complaints relate to waste, litter, water, noise and air pollution. Whilst the number of complaints made in 2008 showed a significant decline, nonetheless, more than 64,000 cases were investigated by local authorities.

In this Report, a new category has been added to measure the number of complaints resolved where no further action was necessary. The data under this indicator shows over 50,000 cases were resolved and this demonstrates that local authorities are working hard to resolve pollution issues at a local level in order to reduce the need for lengthy and costly prosecutions. Nonetheless, over 18,700 enforcement procedures were taken across all local authorities in 2008.

Schools Environmental Campaigns

It is positive to note that a significant increase has been recorded in the percentage of schools participating in environmental campaigns. Across primary schools the average rate of participation is almost 76% and for secondary schools it stands at over 80%. This is a good example of the local authorities working in conjunction with other agencies and the public to raise awareness, to educate young people about the importance of the environment and to build a sense of shared responsibility for dealing with the challenges facing us in protecting the environment.

Section 3 of the Report consists of Tables giving the relevant data for 2008, followed, as appropriate, by comparative figures for 2006 to 2008.

For details on the method, please see Appendix Three, page 173

Section 3: Library, Recreation and Youth

Table 1: Library Public Opening Hours (AMENDED)

(Note: The analysis for this indicator has been expanded in 2008 to include lunchtime, evening and Saturday opening hours)

	L1A Average number of opening hours per week for full-time libraries	L1B Average number of opening hours per week for part- time libraries (where applicable)	L1C Percentage of full time libraries that have lunchtime openings	L1D Percentage of full time libraries that have evening openings	L1E Percentage of full time libraries that have Saturday openings
Carlow County Council	41.00	24.40	100.0	100	100
Cavan County Council	42.56	10.32	100.0	100	100
Clare County Council	38.10	18.20	73.0	91	82
Cork City Council	35.70	6.30	66.6j	67	100
Cork County Council	38.37a	15.61	79.2	33	75k
Donegal County Council	35.50	16.84	75.0	100	88
Dublin City Council	42.54	20.00d	95.8	92	96
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	33.00b	7.00	63.0	100	100l
Fingal County Council	48.93	29.00e	57.1	100	100
Galway Combined	33.47c	11.46	20.0	100	100
Kerry County Council	32.30	0.00	100.0	55	82
Kildare County Council	37.22	13.12	66.0	100	66
Kilkenny County Council	35.80	24.10	100.0	100	100
Laois County Council	33.34	7.52f	100.0	100	100
Leitrim County Council	38.43	11.43	20.0	100	100
Limerick City Council	40.80	9.32	66.0	66	66
Limerick County Council	38.00	11.00	75.0	100	100
Longford County Council	39.30	18.50	100.0	100	100
Louth County Council	34.50	19.40	66.7	100	100
Mayo County Council	37.40	20.40	100.0	100	100
Meath County Council	37.70	14.50	100.0	100	100
Monaghan County Council	39.00	22.00	100.0	100	100
Tipperary Combined	38.92	10.40g	100.0	100	88
Offaly County Council	34.00	14.00h	25.0	100	100
Roscommon County Council	31.30	21.75	100.0	100	100
Sligo County Council	42.40	22.63	100.0	100	100
South Dublin County Council	48.55	18.73i	100.0	80	80
Waterford City Council	47.53	20.11	100.0	100	100
Waterford County Council	35.16	16.76	50.0	100	50
Westmeath County Council m	36.72	14.34	100.0	100	75
Wexford County Council	41.00	23.00	100.0	100	100
Wicklow County Council	41.70	14.10	50.0	100	100

a Shows increase on 2007 - figures in 2007 did not include mobile library hours.

b The opening of an additional full-time library with lesser opening hours has impacted on this figure.

c All Libraries closed for half day (21/11) for staff training. 54 hours in respect of events outside normal working hours.

d Central Library is returned as one location only although 4 service suites are delivered at that location i.e. Business, Lending, Open Learning and Music Library services.

e The reason for the big increase is due to the fact that we increased the opening hours of Garristown Library from 3 hours weekly to 29 hours weekly after the refurbishment of the library.

f Decrease is attributable to the fact that i) Abbeyleix Library, previously open 16 hours per week, now opens 39 hours per week and therefore falls into the full-time Libraries category and ii) under the new methodology only actual opening hours can be furnished and as part time Libraries in Laois close due to annual leave and sick leave this would have led to a decrease in this indicator.

g Borrisokane Library was closed for 4 months due to refurbishment.

h One Branch Library has reduced its opening hours from 26 to 15 to allow renovation works to be carried out

i In relation to part-time opening hours increasing: the definition states that "a full-time library is open more than 30 hours per week". Taking this into account, we traditionally had two part-time branches, one of whose hours increased from 12 hours per week to 22 hours per week. A third branch library (local history library) opens exactly 30 hours per week and as such does not qualify as full-time. These two factors contributed to part-time hours increasing.

j This is based on 6 service points only, as Hollyhill library closed for health and safety reasons; If Hollyhill is included the figures would be 71.42.

k The mobile library schedule does not include Saturdays.

l 3 of the libraries open on alternate Saturdays.

m When Kilbeggan library moved from being the largest of the part time libraries to the smallest of the full time libraries, it brought down the averages of both.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

L 1.A Public opening hours		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	32	33
	Missing	1	2	1
Average	Median	38	38.10	38
	Mean	37.90	38.40	37.30
Percentiles	25%	31.30	36.50	34.80
	75%	34.60	39.50	41

L 1.B Average number of opening hours per week for part-time libraries (where applicable)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	31	30	33
	Missing	3	4	1
Average	Median	16.70	16	15.60
	Mean	15.50	15.60	15.30
Percentiles	25%	3	11.10	10.70
	75%	10.70	20	20.30

L1.C Lunchtime, Evening & Saturday Opening Hours <small>New in 2008</small>		L1C Percentage of full time libraries that have lunchtime openings	L1D Percentage of full time libraries that have evening openings	L1E Percentage of full time libraries that have Saturday openings
N	Valid	33	33	33
	Missing	1	1	1
Average	Median	95.80	100	100
	Mean	77.20	90.40	89.30
Percentiles	25%	64.50	95.80	81.70
	75%	100	100	100

Table 2: Library Visits ^(NEW)

(Note: This indicator has been introduced for the first time in 2008)

	L2 Number of visits to full time libraries per 1,000 population
Carlow County Council	3,543.27
Cavan County Council	3,438.90
Clare County Council	3,187.47
Cork City Council	6,933.49
Cork County Council	3,692.41
Donegal County Council	1,962.80
Dublin City Council	5,102.52
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	2,339.49
Fingal County Council	4,112.59
Galway Combined	2,331.33
Kerry County Council	2,595.78
Kildare County Council	2,830.12
Kilkenny County Council	1,570.39
Laois County Council	2,924.29
Leitrim County Council	6,293.61
Limerick City Council	4,300.12
Limerick County Council	2,770.01
Longford County Council	3,434.04
Louth County Council	1,800.62
Mayo County Council	2,637.30
Meath County Council	2,845.28
Monaghan County Council	1,395.61
Tipperary Combined	3,094.26
Offaly County Council	1,387.09
Roscommon County Council	1,911.75
Sligo County Council	2,311.39
South Dublin County Council	3,781.56a
Waterford City Council	6807.00
Waterford County Council	3472.00
Westmeath County Council	2,077.61b
Wexford County Council	2390.44
Wicklow County Council	3,608.73

a This marks an increase over 2007 figures owing largely to the re-opening of County Library in April and also to the increased usage of branches since September 2008.
b Due to an error, we have had to use figures for one branch for an equivalent 7 day period of 8th-14th Oct.

Summary Statistics 2008

L2 ^(NEW) Number of visits to full time libraries per 1,000 population		2008
N	Valid	30
	Missing	4 ³
Average	Median	2884.79
	Mean	3234.03
Percentiles	25%	2252.95
	75%	3714.70

³ Two cases have been excluded for comparison purposes.

Table 3: Library Stock

	L3A Annual expenditure on stock per head of population (county/city wide)	L3B Number of items issued per head of population (county/city wide) for books	L3C Number of items issued per head of population (county/city wide) for other items
Carlow County Council	2.82	2.77	0.98
Cavan County Council	2.66	2.59	0.09
Clare County Council	3.16	4.03	0.31
Cork City Council	4.33	4.81	1.94
Cork County Council	3.87	4.85	0.19
Donegal County Council	3.10	2.03	0.11
Dublin City Council	4.90	3.31	0.64
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4.90	4.39	0.96
Fingal County Council	6.67	3.40	1.39
Galway Combined	2.81	2.50	0.09
Kerry County Council	3.57	2.97	0.06
Kildare County Council	2.92 ^a	2.48	0.34
Kilkenny County Council	2.86	3.50	0.35
Laois County Council	3.27	2.71	0.75
Leitrim County Council	3.90	3.70	0.11
Limerick City Council	3.59	3.86	1.50
Limerick County Council	3.34	2.49	0.16
Longford County Council	2.85	3.01	0.13
Louth County Council	2.65	2.41	0.28
Mayo County Council	3.18	3.68	0.35
Meath County Council	1.69 ^b	2.23	0.50
Monaghan County Council	3.66	2.78	0.38
Tipperary Combined	2.26	2.66	0.08
Offaly County Council	3.42	3.09	0.16
Roscommon County Council	6.94	2.47	0.47
Sligo County Council	3.34	3.54	0.18
South Dublin County Council	4.00	3.16	1.19 ^d
Waterford City Council	5.74	4.93	1.78
Waterford County Council	2.06	3.19	0.35
Westmeath County Council	2.09	3.68 ^c	0.20
Wexford County Council	3.35	3.10	0.12
Wicklow County Council	3.07	3.70	0.27

^a €657,864 including school library grant per capita and €545,000 excluding school library grant per capita.

^b Does not include Non-Book stock purchased from Disability Funding(€91,000).

^c The figures for books issued to Primary schools has always been books issued on the day on the school van. It has consistently been included in our issue figures over the years. L3: Definitions/Clarifications/Methodology states that - Stock includes all books, DVDs, CDs, etc. Data submitted for this indicator should be reflected in the figures supplied to An Chomhairle Leabharlanna. Westmeath Co Co includes primary schools library service figures in its return to an chomhairle leabharlanna also.

^d This is an increase on 2007 figures for overall issues (948231). The 1000 per head population figures have been adjusted from 246,000 used in 2007 to 246,935 as the figures in the last census for 2008.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

L 3.A Annual expenditure on stock per head of population (county/city wide)	2008
Valid	32
Missing	3 ⁴
Median	3.30
Mean	3.50
25%	2.80
75%	3.90

L 3.B Number of books issued per head of population (county/city-wide)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	32	32
	Missing	1	2	2
Average	Median	3.40	3.23	3.13
	Mean	3.50	3.22	3.25
Percentiles	25%	1.10	2.52	2.61
	75%	2.80	3.67	3.70

L 3.C Number of other items issued per head of population (county/city-wide)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	30	32	32
	Missing	4	2	2
Average	Median	0.2	0.24	0.33
	Mean	0.4	0.39	0.51
Percentiles	25%	0.2	0.11	0.14
	75%	0.5	0.52	0.72

⁴ Leitrim CC has been excluded for purposes of comparison.

Table 4: Internet Access through Libraries

	L4 Number of Internet sessions provided per 1,000 population
Carlow County Council	411.83a
Cavan County Council	588.81
Clare County Council	812.74b
Cork City Council	422.85c
Cork County Council	353.06
Donegal County Council	233.71d
Dublin City Council	648.08e
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	279.46
Fingal County Council	428.61f
Galway Combined	303.87
Kerry County Council	430.64
Kildare County Council	196.86
Kilkenny County Council	277.71
Laois County Council	187.10
Leitrim County Council	805.51g
Limerick City Council	486.93
Limerick County Council	26.45h
Longford County Council	615.45
Louth County Council	134.24
Mayo County Council	598.63
Meath County Council	330.84
Monaghan County Council	444.79
Tipperary Combined	247.82i
Offaly County Council	162.94j
Roscommon County Council	272.89k
Sligo County Council	419.03l
South Dublin County Council	609.69m
Waterford City Council	930.03
Waterford County Council	788.20
Westmeath County Council	134.22
Wexford County Council	257.08n
Wicklow County Council	309.59

a The introduction of EU Regulation 2006/24/EC which restricts computer use to Library members only thus preventing visitors from using the internet on an ad-hoc or guest basis as before.
The standardizing of all computer sessions to 50 minutes thus eliminating express 20 minute sessions and resulting in a fall in the number of sessions but not necessarily usage.

b The decrease in use is attributable to a decline in the numbers of non-nationals using the service.
The continual expansion of broadband in the county is also a factor.

c The number of internet sessions has decreased in 2008 viz a vis 2007 and this is explained by :Hollyhill library was closed for 8 months which would account for c 12,000 sessions, Douglas library dropped almost 8,000 sessions following a move to temporary premises in March, 2008, There is a noticeable downward trend in usage generally, coinciding with the increase in home internet & internet on personal devices.

d A fall in the number of non-Irish Nationals using the Library computers has also impacted on usage.
Possibly influenced by outside factors e.g. Internet Cafés, personal PC's at home.

e Large increase over 2007 due to impact of full year of Learning Zones and Wifi access.

f Decrease in number of internet sessions due to a number of factors. Phased replacement of public pcs in Blanchardstown Library and other service points meant that all pcs were not available for periods during the year. The number of internet sessions provided per 1000 of population as an indicator is obviously also affected by the 22% increase in population of Fingal.

g Public internet use is declining generally in Libraries throughout the country as far as we are aware. This is probably partly due to the decrease in the number of non-nationals in the country – they were the biggest cohort of users of public computer facilities in our experience. Use has declined by 13% in 2008 in Leitrim – all branches showed decreases in the level of use with the exception of HQ in Ballinamore which showed a 15% increase.

h The number of internet hours declined from 30,946 to 29,225 - a decline of 1,721 hours or 5.9%.The main reason for this decline was a power surge in our busiest Library in Dooradoyle which resulted in terminal damage to all 7 PC's and a suspension of the service for 2 months. From 2007 to 2008 Dooradoyle Library showed a decline from 8,159 hours to 5,593 hours a decline of 2,566 hours. This accounts in full for the decline in figures for 2008. It is noted that the service in Dooradoyle in 2009 is fully restored and should reach 2007 levels again in the current year.

i The following may have attributed to a decrease in internet usage in the libraries:quite a number of foreign nationals who were regular users of the services have left the country, there was a significant improvement in Broadband access for home users and reduction in prices for Broadband access during 2008 and the economic downturn may have had a negative impact on usage particularly in relation to children.

j Decrease due to competition from Internet cafes.

k Figure represents actual sessions taken by customers under the revised definition/clarification/methodology as opposed to previously recorded number of sessions provided eg number of PCs in all facilities.

l In relation to number of internet sessions decreasing; the definition has been changed in 2008 and is "the sessions taken by customers as opposed to the number of PC's". Thus the 2008 figure is the total amount of sessions used by our customers not the total number of sessions provided by the Library Service for public use.

m This is a marked increase on 2007 figure. The County Library reopened in April 2008 with a new ICT section containing 50+ PCs and 70+ PCS around the library. Some PCs are express PC providing only 20 minutes sessions. In 2007 the library had 8 PCs for public use.

n This figure refers to the number of sessions actually taken by customers as opposed to the number of sessions available as in 2007.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

L 5 Number of Internet sessions provided per 1,000 population		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	32	32
	Missing	1	2	2
Average	Median	463.80	360.90	382.45
	Mean	499.30	474.90	410.92
Percentiles	25%	132.50	296	250.14
	75%	275.50	591.50	596.18

Table 5: Children's Playgrounds

	REC1.A. Number of children's playgrounds per 1,000 population directly provided by the local authority	REC1.B. Number of children's playgrounds per 1,000 population facilitated by the local authority
Carlow County Council	0.12	0.00
Cavan County Council	0.41	0.41
Clare County Council	0.05	0.07c
Cork City Council	0.13	0.00
Cork County Council	0.04	0.13
Donegal County Council	0.22	0.03
Dublin City Council	0.20	0.01
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	0.08a	0.02d
Fingal County Council	0.07	0.05
Galway City Council	0.30	0.00e
Galway County Council	0.09	0.11
Kerry County Council	0.06	0.08
Kildare County Council	0.05	0.01
Kilkenny County Council	0.17	0.06
Laois County Council	0.12	0.00
Leitrim County Council	0.24	0.24
Limerick City Council	0.17	0.02
Limerick County Council	0.04b	0.00
Longford County Council	0.20	0.00
Louth County Council	0.09	0.01
Mayo County Council	0.13	0.01
Meath County Council	0.10	0.00
Monaghan County Council	0.52	0.05
North Tipperary County Council	0.14	0.06
Offaly County Council	0.04	0.04
Roscommon County Council	0.26	0.02
Sligo County Council	0.10	0.13
South Dublin County Council	0.06	0.00
South Tipperary County Council	0.07	0.05
Waterford City Council	0.22	0.00
Waterford County Council	0.00	0.16f
Westmeath County Council	0.20	0.08
Wexford County Council	0.17	0.18
Wicklow County Council	0.12	0.01

a This does not reflect the fact existing playgrounds are being upgraded including the installation of MUGA's for teenagers and that the Council is monitoring/maintaining playgrounds to what is regarded as a good quality standard.

b Abbeyfeale Playground - Prior to redevelopment in 2008 this playground was community owned and assisted by Limerick County Council. As part of redevelopment Limerick County Council took charge of the playground under a lease agreement.

c Clare Co Council operates a community playground grant scheme which has resulted in an investment of €2m over the four years 2006-2009 being allocated to 27 community playground & play area projects. By end 2008 10 of the projects have been completed. 2 of these projects were play areas for young people and are not included in this return. It is anticipated that most of these projects will be completed by 2010.

d The Council conditions a requirement for playlots and play opportunities in all residential planning applications. There is not however as yet a system in place to monitor compliances.

e One playground facilitated by the Council is now managed and maintained by it and is included in the figure in column 1.

f In 2007 and in previous years, a number of private and community playgrounds were supported by the City Council from a capital perspective. No such support was either sought or granted in 2008. The Council's policy emphasises the direct involvement of the Council in playground provision.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rec 1.A Number of children's playgrounds per 1,000 population (directly provided)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	33	34
	Missing	1	1	0
Average	Median	0.09	0.10	0.12
	Mean	0.11	0.12	0.146
Percentiles	25%	0.01	0.06	0.067
	75%	0.06	0.17	0.20

Rec 1.B Number of children's playgrounds per 1,000 population (facilitated)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	25	26	25
	Missing	9	8	9
Average	Median	0.03	0.04	0.05
	Mean	0.05	0.05	0.082
Percentiles	25%	0.01	0.01	0.02
	75%	0.02	0.08	0.12

Table 6: Local Authority-Facilitated Leisure Facilities (AMENDED)

	REC2. Number of visitors to local authority-facilitated leisure facilities per 1,000 population
Carlow County Council	0.00
Cavan County Council	1,438.89
Clare County Council	5,912.57
Cork City Council	9,760.97
Cork County Council	1,317.27
Donegal County Council	1,433.82
Dublin City Council	1,201.96
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4,133.21
Fingal County Council	0.00
Galway City Council	4,338.95
Galway County Council	1,367.39
Kerry County Council	1,649.97
Kildare County Council	1,173.37a
Kilkenny County Council	1,476.96
Laois County Council	7,487.15b
Leitrim County Council	4,471.05
Limerick City Council	2,198.94
Limerick County Council	241.80c
Longford County Council	5,730.86d
Louth County Council	3,236.69
Mayo County Council	1,901.64e
Meath County Council	2,077.16
Monaghan County Council	2,389.49f
North Tipperary County Council	3,250.14g
Offaly County Council	1,015.86h
Roscommon County Council	3,068.93i
Sligo County Council	3,605.02
South Dublin County Council	2,228.38j
South Tipperary County Council	5,857.69l
Waterford City Council	360.15
Waterford County Council	0.00k
Westmeath County Council	4,719.15m
Wexford County Council	1,221.17
Wicklow County Council	2,363.69

a Swimming pools only included. Other leisure facilities not available.

b Portlaoise Leisure Centre incorporates swimming, gym, all weather pitches and playground facilities. While visits to swimming pool, gym and pitches can be numerically accounted for, visits to the playground are difficult to quantify yet they are using the facility toilets, coffee shop etc.

c In 2007 returns Foynes Swimming Pool was included as a facilitated facility. Under revised guidelines for 2008 the local authority must own the facility. Therefore Foynes which is community owned, but receives assistance from Limerick County Council has not been included in this return.

d New Leisure Facility (Swimming Pool, Gym and Astro Turf soccer pitch) opened in late 2007. Therefore this is the number for a full year.

e One of the Leisure facilities was closed for renovations in 2008, Of the other 3 facilities 2 have figures for pool only and 1 has pool & gym facilities.

f Towards the end of 2008 the first effects of the economic down turn had a noticeable impact upon visitor numbers at the complex. Footfall for the first month of 2009 is down 13% on the corresponding month in 2008. In autumn 2008 the leisure complex in Armagh was re-opened following substantial upgrading works which reduced the number of cross border visitors to the complex from the Armagh area. There has been a significant decrease in cross border visitors to Monaghan Town and the issue of local people traveling to Northern Ireland to shop (due mainly to improved Euro against sterling and lower VAT rates) – this trend is also reflected in pay parking receipts in Monaghan town.

g The increase in this figure is principally as a result of the opening of Thurles Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre. The previous pool in the town had been closed for the duration of construction of the new facilities.

h Local community pool management committees in Birr, Clara, and Edenderry are supported through significant grants for the operation and upkeep of their pools. Tullamore Town Council opened a Swimming and Leisure Complex in October 2008. This facility is being operated by Aura Sport and Leisure Management Ltd for the Town Council. Aura has provided visitor figures for the months of October, November and December 2008 which have been annualised.

i In the previous year, this indicator referred to swimming facilities only. The leisure facilities now include, Lough Key Forest and Activity Park. This accounts for the substantial increase in numbers per 1000 population.

j the total number of visits to TLC, Clondalkin Leisure Centre and Lucan Leisure Centre were returned, rather than just the number of visits to the swimming pool. It must also be borne in mind that the usage figures for Clondalkin Pool alone jumped from 88,215 to 173,159, obviously due to new Pool/Centre.

l Indicator now includes local authority facilitated leisure facility, previously swimming pools only.

m 285,132 is the number of overall visitors to Athlone Regional Sports Centre in 2008; 89,314 is the number of visitors to Mullingar Swimming Pool in 2008.

Summary Statistics 2008

Rec 2 <small>(AMENDED)</small> Number of visitors to local authority-facilitated swimming facilities per 1,000 population		2008
N	Valid	30
	Missing	4 ⁵
Average	Median	2296.04
	Mean	3075.67
Percentiles	25%	1417.21
	75%	4371.98

⁵ For the purposes of comparison one local authority cases was excluded from the summary statistics.

Table 7: Involvement by Schools in Youth Councils/Comhairle na nÓg (CP1 AMENDED, CP2 NEW)

(Note: The definition for this indicator (CP1) was expanded to include the term “youth groups”; CP2 is a new indicator.)

	CP1 Percentage of local schools and youth groups involved in the local Youth Council/ Comhairle na n-Óg scheme	CP2 Number of groups registered with the Community and Voluntary Forum
Carlow County Council	63.64	138
Cavan County Council	43.82	355
Clare County Council	17.88	573d
Cork City Council	36.73	205
Cork County Council	36.67	1,290
Donegal County Council	33.93	502
Dublin City Council	26.92	710
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	28.07a	407
Fingal County Council	61.54	450
Galway City Council	100.00	197
Galway County Council	69.77	540
Kerry County Council	84.69	338
Kildare County Council	68.18	600
Kilkenny County Council	56.25	100
Laois County Council	100.00	449
Leitrim County Council	87.50	350
Limerick City Council	71.43	125
Limerick County Council	37.50b	1,665e
Longford County Council	88.89	167
Louth County Council	65.52	108
Mayo County Council	78.95	570
Meath County Council	23.08	984
Monaghan County Council	43.42	325
North Tipperary County Council	61.76c	69
Offaly County Council	84.62	350
Roscommon County Council	57.14	303
Sligo County Council	45.45	666
South Dublin County Council	17.83	1,068
South Tipperary County Council	26.67	275
Waterford City Council	15.25	250
Waterford County Council	100.00	243
Westmeath County Council	82.61	292
Wexford County Council	89.29	565
Wicklow County Council	83.33	97
Totals		15,326

a The indicators for 2008 are not comparable with previous years as youth groups were not included. The percentage for schools' participation in 2008 was 44%.

b Limerick County Council invited all 21 Secondary Schools in County Limerick to participate at the annual Comhairle na nÓg. In addition 9 Youth Clubs and 2 Traveller Training Centres were invited to send representatives. Overall attendance by representatives increased from 50 in 2007 to 55 in 2008.

c While the percentage participation reduced for 2008 the number of groups participating increased from 16 to 21. This reflects the policy in 2008 to contact groups directly thus increasing awareness among Youth Groups. In 2007 contact was by way of poster campaign. The total number of local schools and youth groups contacted rose from 20 to 34.

d Clare Community Forum is an independent body to Clare County Council and employs a co-ordinator to maintain and develop the data base. Close links are maintained between the Clare CF and CCC C & E Directorate.

e Limerick County Development Board in conjunction the County Limerick Community and Voluntary Forum, Ballyhoura Development Ltd and Limerick County Council established joint database of community and voluntary groups in 2007. This database is available for use by the above mentioned bodies for election and promotional purposes.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

CP 1 <small>AMENDED</small>				
Percentage of local schools involved in the local Youth Council/ Comhairle na nOg scheme		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	60	63.50	61.60
	Mean	60	62	58.50
Percentiles	25%	39.50	37.80	35.90
	75%	84.50	89.30	83.60

CP 2 <small>NEW</small>		
Number of groups registered with the Community and Voluntary Forum		2006
N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Average	Median	350
	Mean	450.76
Percentiles	25%	15326
	75%	203

Section 4: Corporate

Table 8: Percentage of Working Days Lost to Absenteeism

	C1A Percentage of working days lost to sickness absence through certified leave	C1B Percentage of working days lost to sickness absence through uncertified leave
Carlow County Council	4.73	0.65
Cavan County Council	3.75	0.41
Clare County Council	2.37	0.39
Cork City Council	4.16	1.16
Cork County Council	3.98 ^a	0.79
Donegal County Council	3.09	0.51
Dublin City Council	3.92	1.14
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4.11	1.16
Fingal County Council	4.02 ^b	0.80
Galway City Council	3.37	0.32
Galway County Council	3.96	0.50
Kerry County Council	5.48 ^c	0.67
Kildare County Council	4.49	0.74
Kilkenny County Council	4.74	0.60
Laois County Council	4.75 ^d	0.38
Leitrim County Council	4.01 ^e	0.70
Limerick City Council	5.55	0.95
Limerick County Council	3.19	0.45
Longford County Council	4.12	0.50
Louth County Council	4.41	0.97
Mayo County Council	3.30	0.48
Meath County Council	2.48	0.53
Monaghan County Council	4.86	0.35
North Tipperary County Council	3.42	0.56
Offaly County Council	4.32	0.73
Roscommon County Council	4.00	0.65
Sligo County Council	6.13	0.59 ^g
South Dublin County Council	3.35	0.75
South Tipperary County Council	3.88	0.50
Waterford City Council	4.15 ^f	1.05
Waterford County Council	4.97	0.35
Westmeath County Council	3.56	0.74
Wexford County Council	5.01	0.77
Wicklow County Council	3.29	0.63

^aThe reduction in the absenteeism rate in 2008 results primarily from an adjustment to the methodology for calculation, agreed with the LGMSB for the year 2008 to compensate for the recording of sick leave on a 7 day week basis in '08. In '09 the methodology as agreed nationally will apply.
^b 1.56% of staff account for 16% of absences (25 staff >75 working days).
^c The increase reflects a rigorous recording and monitoring of records and also an increased number of long term absences.
^d This indicator is affected by an increase in the number of long-term absences during 2008.
^e Figure is impacted by long-term sick leave (i.e. > 12 weeks).
^f % of working days lost to unpaid sickness absence(certified) was 1.17% not included above.
^g When comparing to 2007 figure, please note that there appears to be an error with the 2007 published figure as it should have been 0.53.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

C 1.A % Working Days Lost to sickness – absence through certified leave		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3.70	4	4.02
	Mean	3.80	3.90	4.09
Percentiles	25%	3.20	3.50	3.41
	75%	4.30	4.30	4.73

C 1.B % Working Days Lost to sickness – absence through uncertified leave		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	0.54	0.60	0.64
	Mean	0.76	0.66	0.66
Percentiles	25%	0.46	0.50	0.50
	75%	0.78	0.90	0.77

Table 9: Expenditure on Training and Development

	C2. Expenditure on Training and Development as a percentage of total payroll costs:
Carlow County Council	5.20
Cavan County Council	4.59
Clare County Council	4.20
Cork City Council	4.47
Cork County Council	5.48
Donegal County Council	3.95
Dublin City Council	6.44
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4.64
Fingal County Council	3.00 ^a
Galway City Council	3.79
Galway County Council	6.06 ^b
Kerry County Council	5.40
Kildare County Council	5.72
Kilkenny County Council	3.88
Laois County Council	4.61
Leitrim County Council	5.20
Limerick City Council	6.28
Limerick County Council	4.69
Longford County Council	6.18
Louth County Council	5.23
Mayo County Council	6.75
Meath County Council	4.14
Monaghan County Council	6.04
North Tipperary County Council	4.40
Offaly County Council	6.75
Roscommon County Council	6.28
Sligo County Council	6.10
South Dublin County Council	4.38
South Tipperary County Council	6.24
Waterford City Council	5.28
Waterford County Council	4.09
Westmeath County Council	5.20
Wexford County Council	3.60
Wicklow County Council	4.36

^a This Council's result does not reflect the full amount of training related activity. A lot of training, particularly in Health and Safety, is delivered by in-house part-time trainers at much lower cost than if it had to be bought in.

^b Includes Ballinasloe TC.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

C 2 Expenditure on Training and Development as a percentage of total payroll costs		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	5	5	5.20
	Mean	5.30	5.20	5.08
Percentiles	25%	4.40	4.30	4.32
	75%	6.60	6.20	6.07

Section 5: Environment

Table 10: Percentage of Households Provided with Segregated Waste Collection (AMENDED) ^a

(Note: This indicator has been expanded to take account of both dry recyclables and organics.)

	E3A. Percentage of households who receive a waste collection service and are provided with segregated waste collection for dry recyclables	E3B. Percentage of households who receive a waste collection service and are provided with segregated waste collection for organics
Carlow County Council	97.89	0.00
Cavan County Council	100.00	0.00
Clare County Council	93.12	0.00
Cork City Council	100.00	0.00
Cork County Council	99.77	0.00
Donegal County Council	57.50	0.00
Dublin City Council	100.00	45.45
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	100.00	0.00
Fingal County Council	100.00	96.97
Galway City Council	97.73	92.01
Galway County Council	77.16	5.48
Kerry County Council	99.90	9.56
Kildare County Council	97.75	6.98
Kilkenny County Council	100.00	0.00
Laois County Council	77.15 ^b	0.00
Leitrim County Council	100.00	0.00
Limerick City Council	99.92	0.00
Limerick County Council	99.76	0.00
Longford County Council	88.30 ^c	0.00
Louth County Council	N/A	N/A
Mayo County Council	95.95	0.49
Meath County Council	87.58	0.28
Monaghan County Council	95.96	5.40
North Tipperary County Council	91.23 ^d	0.00
Offaly County Council	83.42	0.00
Roscommon County Council	100.00	0.00
Sligo County Council	100.00	0.00
South Dublin County Council	100.00	0.00
South Tipperary County Council	100.00	0.00
Waterford City Council	99.29	99.29
Waterford County Council ^e	100.00	100.00
Westmeath County Council	99.12	5.81
Wexford County Council	100.00	23.42
Wicklow County Council	100.00	0.00

^a Source for all E3-E6 is National Waste Database Returns to EPA for 2008 based on information relating to 2007.

^b Waste Collection Service in Laois privatised

^c Service privatised in Longford and offered to 100% of households.

^d 2007 figures are provided as details for 2008 have not been obtained from the Waste Collectors

^e In the previous return (2007) the % of households provided with segregated waste collection was estimated on the basis of the number of households on the network of collection routes availing of the Waterford County Council waste collection service. As Waterford County Council provides a fully segregated waste collection service to its customers the return for 2008 shows the % of households provided with segregated waste collection as being 100%.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E3 <small>(AMENDED)</small> Percentage of Households provided with Segregated Waste		E3A Percentage of households who receive a waste collection service and are provided with segregated waste collection for dry recyclables	E3B Percentage of households who receive a waste collection service and are provided with segregated waste collection for organics
N	Valid	33	13
	Missing	1	21
Average	Median	99.80	9.60
	Mean	95.10	37.80
Percentiles	25%	94.50	5.40
	75%	100	94.50

Table 11: Household Waste Collected and Sent for Recycling (AMENDED) ^a

(Note: This indicator has been amended and now incorporates “waste collected from recycling facilities” –previously a separate indicator.)

	E4A. Percentage of household waste collected from kerbside, which is sent for recycling	E4B. Tonnage of household waste collected from kerbside, which is sent for recycling	E4C. Tonnage of household waste recycled, which arises from waste collected from recycling facilities (i.e. bring banks, civic amenity centres, transfer stations and other recycling facilities)
Carlow County Council	12.73	2,023	3,675
Cavan County Council	16.07	2,454	6,362
Clare County Council	28.92b	5,836f	6,918l
Cork City Council	24.60	8,698	3,879
Cork County Council	32.54	25,133g	27,100
Donegal County Council	15.01	3,834	4,701
Dublin City Council	23.37	36,898	19,851
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	32.96	14,500	17,069
Fingal County Council	33.32	24,233	6,886
Galway City Council	49.16	11,556	2,623
Galway County Council	28.12	12,028	5,764
Kerry County Council	21.97	5,577	6,028
Kildare County Council	21.22	13,658	6,227
Kilkenny County Council	31.22	3,396	3,338
Laois County Council	28.83	4,555h	3,328
Leitrim County Council	25.22c	1,335	1,244
Limerick City Council	21.02	4,433	1,925
Limerick County Council	23.14	5,825i	7,445
Longford County Council	55.12	4,764	1,930
Louth County Council	27.59	10,637	5,590
Mayo County Council	26.67	10,003	7,235
Meath County Council	19.36	9,126	4,516
Monaghan County Council	26.10	3,091	8,425
North Tipperary County Council d	18.51	3,729	3,027
Offaly County Council	23.67	3,693	2,900
Roscommon County Council	26.60	3,358j	3,039
Sligo County Council	17.05e	2,362k	2,751
South Dublin County Council	24.80	19,678	34,320
South Tipperary County Council	24.94	5,299	3,871
Waterford City Council	45.95	6,660	1,976
Waterford County Council	45.59	4,767	2,292
Westmeath County Council	22.68	4,251	3,956
Wexford County Council	25.46	8,490	5,208
Wicklow County Council	20.14	6,290	3,675
Totals		292,170	

a Based on data for EPA National Waste Report 2007.

b Compared with 28.35% for 2007. Provisional figures for 2008, which will be subject to final verification.

c This figure does not reflect full level of recycling activity. When kerbside collection is combined with collection from recycling facilities the % of household waste recycled increases to 39.45% (6,536.5 tonnes collected in total and 2,578.4 tonnes recycled).

d 007 figures are provided as details for 2008 have not been obtained from the private Waste Collectors.

e When the waste accepted at recycling facilities is taken into account the % of total household waste recycled in Sligo is 30.48%. The equivalent figure for 2007 was 29.93%.

f Compared to 5945 tonnes in 2007. Provisional figures for 2008, which will be subject to final verification.

g Significant progress has been made by the Enforcement Team over the last year in improving the collection and collation of Annual Return (AR) data submitted by waste collectors (both in terms of numbers of returns received and their accuracy). This has had a direct influence on the quality of data collected and collated in respect of E4B and does not necessarily mean that there has been an increase in waste collected in absolute terms.

h The discrepancy appears because the figure supplied for 2007 has now been established as incorrect. It also included customers who used the recycling facility, while it should have been for kerbside collection only. It should have read 3,392 tonnes of waste recycled from kerbside in 2007.

i The accuracy of the data may be affected by the failure of some private waste collectors to assign households located near the border between County Limerick and Limerick City to the appropriate local authority area.

j This information is provided by Private Refuse Collectors under Section 18 of the Waste Management Act 1996. One collector has informed us of a reduction of 721 customers from 2007. This is being followed up by Roscommon County Council under the Waste Presentation and storage Bye-Laws.

k When the waste accepted at recycling facilities is taken into account, the % of total household waste recycled in Sligo is 30.48% - tonnage equivalent is 5,112.85. The equivalent figure for 2007 was 29.93% - tonnage of 4,752.47 and this is the figure which was included in the 2007 Indicators.

l Recyclable waste deposited by members of public at 5 No. Civic Amenity Sites (CAS) and 54 No. Bring Banks in the county. This would represent an increase from 4477.03 or 55% on the equivalent figure for 2007. However, the National Waste Report for Clare cites the verified figure in 2007 as 7148.65 tonnes, meaning that there has been a slight drop in the equivalent statistic in 2008. Provisional figures for 2008, which will be subject to final verification.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E4A <small>AMENDED</small>		2008
Percentage of household waste collected from kerbside, which is sent for recycling		
N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Average	Median	25.10
	Mean	27
Percentiles	25%	21.20
	75%	29.50

E4B		2006	2007
Tonnages of household waste recycled			
N	Valid	34	34
	Missing	0	0
Average	Median	5,159	5,735
	Mean	7,005	7,525
Percentiles	25%	3,343	3,747
	75%	10,078	9,475

Table 12: Household Waste Collected and Sent for Landfill

	E5A The percentage of household waste collected which is sent to landfill	E5B The tonnage of household waste collected which is sent to landfill
Carlow County Council	87.27	13,864
Cavan County Council	79.69	12,168
Clare County Council	71.08	14,347
Cork City Council	75.40	26,662
Cork County Council	67.46	52,104b
Donegal County Council	84.99	21,707
Dublin City Council	76.63	121,017
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	67.04	29,490
Fingal County Council	66.68	48,493
Galway City Council	50.84	11,951
Galway County Council	69.80	29,856
Kerry County Council	81.29	20,631
Kildare County Council	78.78	50,698
Kilkenny County Council	67.24	7,314
Laois County Council	71.17	11,242
Leitrim County Council	74.78	3,958
Limerick City Council	73.81	15,564c
Limerick County Council	66.05	16,625d
Longford County Council	44.88	3,879
Louth County Council	72.41	27,911
Mayo County Council	73.24	27,470
Meath County Council	80.64	38,017
Monaghan County Council	73.90	8,752
North Tipperary County Council a	81.49	16,417
Offaly County Council	76.33	11,906
Roscommon County Council	73.40	9,266
Sligo County Council	82.95	11,487
South Dublin County Council	74.91	59,452
South Tipperary County Council	67.21	14,279
Waterford City Council	54.05	7,834e
Waterford County Council	54.41	5,689
Westmeath County Council	77.32	14,493
Wexford County Council	74.54	24,861
Wicklow County Council	79.86	24,946
Total		722,223

a 2007 figures are provided as details for 2008 have not yet been obtained from the private waste collectors
b Significant progress has been made by the Enforcement Team over the last year in improving the collection and collation of Annual Return (AR) data submitted by waste collectors (both in terms of numbers of returns received and their accuracy). This has had a direct influence on the quality of data collected and collated in respect of E5B and does not necessarily mean that there has been an increase in the tonnage to landfill in absolute terms.
c The figures were received from the Regional Waste Management office based on Waste Collection Permit Annual Environmental Reports. The figures included an additional 3500 households from the March 2008 boundary extension area which may be a factor in the increase from 13,225 tonnes in 2007 to 15,564 tonnes in 2008.
d The accuracy of the data may be affected by the failure of some private waste collectors to assign households near the border between County Limerick and Limerick City to the appropriate local authority area.
e In 2008, diversion from landfill for Waterford City Council's own waste collection service rose to over 49.3%. However, the entry into the market of a private collector whose kerbside diversion from landfill was only 29% meant that the overall diversion from landfill fell to below 46%.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 5A Percentage of household waste going to landfill		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	76.50	75.20	73.90
	Mean	75.26	73.70	72.10
Percentiles	25%	72.22	70.40	67.20
	75%	81.02	80.40	79

E 5B Tonnes of household waste going to landfill		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	19,846	17,308	15990.50
	Mean	25,215	24,631	23951.50
Percentiles	25%	10,802	10,555	11426
	75%	28,434	27,733	28305.80

Table 13: Recycling Facilities (AMENDED)

	E6.1 The total number of Bring Sites in the local authority area	E6.2 The total number of Civic Amenity Centres in the local authority area
Carlow County Council	37	3
Cavan County Council	31	3
Clare County Council	54	5
Cork City Council	41	1
Cork County Council	159	9
Donegal County Council	64	3
Dublin City Council	131	2
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	51	3
Fingal County Council	67	3
Galway City Council	12	1
Galway County Council	93	3
Kerry County Council	88	6
Kildare County Council	41	2
Kilkenny County Council	40 ^a	3
Laois County Council	42	1
Leitrim County Council	37 ^b	2
Limerick City Council	56	1
Limerick County Council	47	4
Longford County Council	26	2
Louth County Council	37	2
Mayo County Council	95	2
Meath County Council	35	3
Monaghan County Council	26	1
North Tipperary County Council	39	2
Offaly County Council	46	3
Roscommon County Council	39	3
Sligo County Council	50	2
South Dublin County Council	48	1
South Tipperary County Council	73	4
Waterford City Council	23	1
Waterford County Council	44	3
Westmeath County Council	48 ^c	2
Wexford County Council	153	2
Wicklow County Council	152	5
Totals	2,025	93
<p>a In addition to 67 schools, 8 chemcar locations and 21 private textile banks. b One Bring Site was removed in 2008 due to continued misuse. c 2 additional sites provided in 2008.</p>		

Summary Statistics 2008

E 6 <small>(AMENDED)</small> Recycling Facilities		E6.1 The total number of Bring Sites in the local authority area	E6.2 The total number of Civic Amenity Centres in the local authority area
N	Valid	34	34
	Missing	0	0
Average	Median	46.50	2.50
	Mean	59.56	2.74
Percentiles	25%	2025	93
	75%	37	2

Table 14: Recycling Facilities - Glass

	E6A. Glass: The total number of Bring Sites in the local authority area	E6B. Glass: The total number of Civic Amenity Centres in the local authority area	E6C. Glass: The total number of facilities for recycling	E6D. Glass: The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	37	2	39	3.87
Cavan County Council	31	3	34	2.66
Clare County Council	54	5	59	2.66
Cork City Council	41	1	42	1.76
Cork County Council	159	9	168	2.32
Donegal County Council	64	3	67	2.27
Dublin City Council	118	2	120	1.19
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	46	3	49	1.26
Fingal County Council	67	3	70	1.46
Galway City Council	12	1	13	0.90
Galway County Council	93	3	96	3.01
Kerry County Council	88	6	94	3.36b
Kildare County Council	41	2	43	1.15
Kilkenny County Council	40	3	43	2.46
Laois County Council	42	1	43	3.21
Leitrim County Council	37	0	37	6.39
Limerick City Council	16	1	17	1.62
Limerick County Council	47	4	51	1.94
Longford County Council	26	2	28	4.07
Louth County Council	37	2	39	1.75
Mayo County Council	95	2	97	3.92
Meath County Council	35	3	38	1.17
Monaghan County Council	26	1	27	2.41
North Tipperary County Council	39	2	41	3.10
Offaly County Council	46	3	49	3.46
Roscommon County Council	39	3	42	3.57
Sligo County Council	50	2	52	4.27
South Dublin County Council	48	1	49	0.99
South Tipperary County Council	73	4	77	4.63
Waterford City Council	23	1	24	2.62
Waterford County Council	44	3	47	3.78
Westmeath County Council	48a	2	50	3.15
Wexford County Council	121	2	123	4.67
Wicklow County Council	49	5	54	2.14
Totals	1,832	90	1,922	

a 2 additional sites provided in 2008.

b A considerable number of banks are located on private property and landowners requested that the banks be removed at a few sites.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6A Number of Bring Banks - Glass		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	43	44	45
	Mean	53.10	53.90	53.88
Percentiles	25%	37	37.30	37
	75%	59.80	62.80	64.75

E 6B Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Glass		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2
	Mean	2.40	2.60	2.65
Percentiles	25%	1	1	1.75
	75%	3	3	3

E 6C Total Number of Facilities - Glass		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	44.50	46	48
	Mean	55.60	56.50	56.53
Percentiles	25%	38.80	38	38.75
	75%	62.30	66	67.75

E 6D Number of locations per 5000 of population - Glass		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2.80	2.50	2.64
	Mean	2.90	2.70	2.74
Percentiles	25%	1.80	1.70	1.72
	75%	3.90	3.60	3.62

Table 15: Recycling Facilities - Cans

	E6E. Cans: The number of Bring Sites for recycling	E6F. Cans: The number of Civic Amenity Centres for recycling	E6G. Cans: The total number of facilities for recycling	E6H. Cans: The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	37	3	40	3.97
Cavan County Council	31	3	34	2.66
Clare County Council	54	5	59	2.66
Cork City Council a	0	1	1	0.04
Cork County Council	118	9	127	1.75
Donegal County Council	64	3	67	2.27
Dublin City Council	82	2	84	0.83
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	30	3	33	0.85
Fingal County Council	57	3	60	1.25
Galway City Council	0	0	0	0.00
Galway County Council	93	3	96	3.01
Kerry County Council	88	6	94	3.36
Kildare County Council	37	2	39	1.05
Kilkenny County Council	39	3	42	2.40
Laois County Council	42	1	43	3.21
Leitrim County Council	36	1	37	6.39
Limerick City Council	19 ^b	1	20	1.90
Limerick County Council	47	4	51	1.94
Longford County Council	26	2	28	4.07
Louth County Council	37	2	39	1.75
Mayo County Council	95	2	97	3.92
Meath County Council	35	3	38	1.17
Monaghan County Council	26	1	27	2.41
North Tipperary County Council	39	2	41	3.10
Offaly County Council	46	3	49	3.46
Roscommon County Council	39	3	42	3.57
Sligo County Council	42	2	44	3.61
South Dublin County Council	26	1	27	0.55
South Tipperary County Council	72	4	76	4.57
Waterford City Council	23	1	24	2.62
Waterford County Council	0 ^c	3	3	0.24
Westmeath County Council	48 ^d	2	50	3.15
Wexford County Council	123	2	125	4.74
Wicklow County Council	47	5	52	2.06
Totals	1,598	91	1,689	

a Cans collected in dry recyclable collection.

b Facilities for cans at one bring site were moved inside the adjacent Civic Amenity Site.

c Cans are collected from households as part of the segregated waste collection service.

d 2 additional sites provided in 2008.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6E Number of Bring Banks - Cans		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	40.50	40.50	39
	Mean	48.10	47.20	47
Percentiles	25%	28.30	28.30	29
	75%	57.50	59.50	58.75

E 6F Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Cans		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2.50
	Mean	2.50	2.60	2.68
Percentiles	25%	1	1.80	1.75
	75%	3	3	3

E 6G Total Number of Facilities - Cans		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	43	43	42
	Mean	50.60	49.80	49.68
Percentiles	25%	30	30.30	31.75
	75%	60	63.30	61.75

E 6H Number of locations per 5000 of population - Cans		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	30	33	34
	Missing	4	1	0
Average	Median	2.70	2.50	2.52
	Mean	2.80	2.60	2.49
Percentiles	25%	0	1.50	1.23
	75%	2.10	3.60	3.49

Table 16: Recycling Facilities - Textiles

	E6I. Textiles. The number of Bring Sites for recycling	E6J. Textiles. The number of Civic Amenity Centres for recycling	E6K. Textiles. The total number of facilities for recycling	E6L. Textiles. The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	20	3	23	2.28
Cavan County Council	31	3	34	2.66
Clare County Council	7	5	12	0.54
Cork City Council	0	1	1	0.04
Cork County Council	69a	8	77	1.06
Donegal County Council	31	3	34	1.15
Dublin City Council	85b	2	87	0.86
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	16	3	19	0.49
Fingal County Council	8	3	11	0.23
Galway City Council	7	1	8	0.55
Galway County Council	53c	3	56	1.76
Kerry County Council	0	5	5	0.18
Kildare County Council	34d	2	36	0.97
Kilkenny County Council	22	1	23	1.31
Laois County Council	5	1	6	0.45
Leitrim County Council	16	2	18	3.11
Limerick City Council	7	1	8	0.76
Limerick County Council	19	4	23	0.87
Longford County Council	2	2	4	0.58
Louth County Council	0e	2	2	0.09
Mayo County Council	41f	2	43	1.74
Meath County Council	25	3	28	0.86
Monaghan County Council	0	1	1	0.09
North Tipperary County Council	14g	2	16	1.21
Offaly County Council	4	3	7	0.49
Roscommon County Council	6	3	9	0.77
Sligo County Council	10	2k	12	0.99
South Dublin County Council	19	1	20	0.40
South Tipperary County Council	2	4	6	0.36
Waterford City Council	10	1	11	1.20
Waterford County Council	34h	3	37	2.97
Westmeath County Council	42i	2	44	2.77
Wexford County Council	12	2	14	0.53
Wicklow County Council	31j	5	36	1.43
Totals	682	89	771	

a In 2008 in acknowledgement of the commercial value of recycled textiles and following requests for facilities from a variety of community groups, the Council increased substantially the number of bring banks for recycling textiles. The increased provision of facilities also recognises the need to provide an alternative to unregulated door-to-door collections.

b Increase over 2007 due to the opening of extra locations as a result of a tender process and the addition of Enable Ireland textile banks, which were not previously included.

c In response to demand from a number of textile recycling companies, the Council put in place additional Bring Banks for textiles during 2008.

d The increase in textile banks from 21 in 2007 to 34 in 2008 is explained by the increase in textile recycling companies installing textile banks in carparks, garage forecourts and similar places.

e Charitable organisations have textile bring banks at various locations in Co. Louth, Louth County Council has no information on these banks.

f Pilot Scheme of an additional 18 textile banks implemented.

g The increase from 2007 to 14 was specifically organised in conjunction with Cookstown Textile Recycling in 2008. This resulted in additional facilities being provided at bottle bank locations.

h In 2008 Waterford County Council commenced a new program which for the first time provided textile collection facilities at a number of bring centers around the county.

i 17 additional sites provided in 2008.

j The increase in textile collection points from 13 in 2007 to 31 in 2008 is as a result of more demand and better prices available on the open market for the sale of textile goods. The EPA also determined in 2008 that textiles are no longer a waste material.

k These figures are based on information received. However it is understood that there are a number of other textile re-cyclers in the area but they are not sending in figures.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6I Number of Bring Banks - Textiles		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	6	8	15
	Mean	9.60	12	20.06
Percentiles	25%	0	2	5.75
	75%	17	18.30	31

E 6J Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Textiles		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2
	Mean	2.30	2.40	2.62
Percentiles	25%	1	1	1.75
	75%	3	3	3

E 6K Total Number of Facilities - Textiles		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	8	10.50	17
	Mean	11.90	14.40	22.70
Percentiles	25%	3	5.50	7.75
	75%	19	21.30	34.50

E 6L Number of Locations per 5000 population - Textiles		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	30	33	34
	Missing	4	1	0
Average	Median	0.40	0.60	0.86
	Mean	0.70	0.70	1.05
Percentiles	25%	0	0.40	0.48
	75%	0.20	0.80	1.34

Table 17: Recycling Facilities - Batteries

	E6M. Batteries. The number of Bring Sites for recycling	E6N. Batteries. The number of Civic Amenity Centres for recycling	E6O. Batteries. The total number of facilities for recycling	E6P. Batteries. The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	16	3	19	1.89
Cavan County Council	0	3	3	0.23
Clare County Council	0	5	5	0.23
Cork City Council	0	1	1	0.04
Cork County Council	0	9	9	0.12
Donegal County Council	5	3	8	0.27
Dublin City Council	9	2	11	0.11
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	39a	3	42	1.08
Fingal County Council	72	3	75	1.56
Galway City Council	34b	1	35	2.42
Galway County Council	0	3	3	0.09
Kerry County Council	0	6	6	0.21
Kildare County Council	124	2	126	3.38
Kilkenny County Council	75	1	76	4.34
Laois County Council	0	1	1	0.07
Leitrim County Council	6c	2	8	1.38
Limerick City Council	36	2	38	3.62
Limerick County Council	11	4	15	0.57
Longford County Council	2d	2	4	0.58
Louth County Council	0	2	2	0.09
Mayo County Council	0	2	2	0.08
Meath County Council	0	3	3	0.09
Monaghan County Council	0	1	1	0.09
North Tipperary County Council	0	2	2	0.15
Offaly County Council	0	3	3	0.21
Roscommon County Council	0	3	3	0.26
Sligo County Council	18	2	20	1.64
South Dublin County Council	66	1	67	1.36
South Tipperary County Council	0	4	4	0.24
Waterford City Council	0	1	1	0.11
Waterford County Council	56e	3	59	4.74
Westmeath County Council	0	2	2	0.13
Wexford County Council	113	2	115	4.36
Wicklow County Council	9f	5	14	0.55
Totals	691	92	783	

a Includes 33 collection points in schools.

b Collection facilities provided in schools.

c Battery Recycling units have been provided in 6 primary schools in addition to facilities in our Civic Amenity Sites.

d "Battery Boxes" were distributed to a large number of business premises throughout the county in 2008 - members of the public may bring their used batteries to these points.

e Battery recycling units have been provided in 56 schools.

f Additional collection point in 2008 at Greystones Area Office. Total collection points of 14 does not include all local shops and businesses that also provide collection points.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6M Number of Bring Banks - Batteries		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	0	0	1
	Mean	15.60	17.10	20.32
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	14	17.80	34.50

E 6N Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Batteries		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2
	Mean	2.40	2.50	2.70
Percentiles	25%	1	1	2
	75%	3	3	3

E 6O Total Number of Facilities - Batteries		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	4	4.5	7
	Mean	18.30	19.80	23.03
Percentiles	25%	2	2	2.75
	75%	18.50	19.30	35.75

E 6P Number of Locations per 5000 population - Batteries		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	33	34
	Missing	5	1	0
Average	Median	0.20	0.20	0.25
	Mean	0.70	0.90	1.07
Percentiles	25%	0	0.10	0.11
	75%	0.10	1.30	1.58

Table 18: Recycling Facilities - Oils

	E6Q. Oils. The number of Bring Sites for recycling	E6R. Oils. The number of Civic Amenity Centres for recycling	E6S. Oils. The total number of facilities for recycling	E6T. Oils. The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	16	3	19	1.89
Cavan County Council	0	3	3	0.23
Clare County Council	0	5	5	0.23
Cork City Council	0	1	1	0.04
Cork County Council	0	9	9	0.12
Donegal County Council	5	3	8	0.27
Dublin City Council	9	2	11	0.11
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	39	3	42	1.08
Fingal County Council	72	3	75	1.56
Galway City Council	34	1	35	2.42
Galway County Council	0	3	3	0.09
Kerry County Council	0	6	6	0.21
Kildare County Council	124	2	126	3.38
Kilkenny County Council	75	1	76	4.34
Laois County Council	0	1	1	0.07
Leitrim County Council	6a	2	8	1.38
Limerick City Council	36	2	38	3.62
Limerick County Council	11	4	15	0.57
Longford County Council	2	2	4	0.58
Louth County Council	0	2	2	0.09
Mayo County Council	0	2	2	0.08
Meath County Council	0	3	3	0.09
Monaghan County Council	0	1	1	0.09
North Tipperary County Council	0	2	2	0.15
Offaly County Council	0	3	3	0.21
Roscommon County Council	0	3	3	0.26
Sligo County Council	18	2	20	1.64
South Dublin County Council	66	1	67	1.36
South Tipperary County Council	0	4	4	0.24
Waterford City Council	0	1	1	0.11
Waterford County Council	56	3	59	4.74
Westmeath County Council	0	2	2	0.13
Wexford County Council	113	2c	115	4.36
Wicklow County Council	9b	5	14	0.55
Totals	691	92	783	

a Oil recycling facilities were removed from our Bring Sites in 2007 due to contamination. Facilities are available in our Civic Amenity Sites providing a controlled and better quality disposal facility.
b One additional collection point in 2008 at Rampere Recycling Facility.
c Excludes private garages.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6Q Number of Bring Banks - Oil		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	0	0	1
	Mean	0.7	0.7	20.30
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	0	0	34.50

E 6R Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Oil		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2
	Mean	2.30	2.40	2.70
Percentiles	25%	1	1	2
	75%	3	3	3

E 6S Total Number of Facilities - Oil		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	7
	Mean	2.90	3	23
Percentiles	25%	1	1	2.75
	75%	3.50	3.30	35.70

E 6T Number of Locations per 5000 population - Oil		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	33	34
	Missing	5	1	0
Average	Median	0.10	0.10	0.25
	Mean	0.20	0.10	1.07
Percentiles	25%	0	0.10	0.11
	75%	0.10	0.20	1.58

Table 19: Recycling Facilities - Other Material

	E6U. Other. The number of Bring Sites for recycling	E6V. Other. The number of Civic Amenity Centres for recycling	E6W. Other. The total number of facilities for recycling	E6X. Other. The number of locations for recycling per 5,000 of population
Carlow County Council	9	3g	12	1.19
Cavan County Council	31	3	34	2.66
Clare County Council	6	5	11	0.50
Cork City Council	0	1	1	0.04
Cork County Council	5	9	14	0.19
Donegal County Council	2	3	5	0.17
Dublin City Council	11	2	13	0.13
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	7a	3	10	0.26
Fingal County Council	0b	3	3	0.06
Galway City Council	0	1	1	0.07
Galway County Council c	0	3	3	0.09
Kerry County Council	6	6	12	0.43
Kildare County Council	0	2	2	0.05
Kilkenny County Council	9	3	12	0.69
Laois County Council	0	1	1	0.07
Leitrim County Council	0	2	2	0.35
Limerick City Council	14d	1	15	1.43
Limerick County Council	8	4	12	0.46
Longford County Council	0	2	2	0.29
Louth County Council	37	2h	39	1.75
Mayo County Council	0	2	2	0.08
Meath County Council	0	3	3	0.09
Monaghan County Council	0	1	1	0.09
North Tipperary County Council	0	2	2	0.15
Offaly County Council	0	3	3	0.21
Roscommon County Council	0	3	3	0.26
Sligo County Council	0	2	2	0.16
South Dublin County Council	0e	1i	1	0.02
South Tipperary County Council	1	4	5	0.30
Waterford City Council	0	1	1	0.11
Waterford County Council	0	3	3	0.24
Westmeath County Council	0	2	2	0.13
Wexford County Council	53f	2	55	2.09
Wicklow County Council	14	5	19	0.75
Totals	213	93	306	

a Includes 6 bring banks for plastic and one for paper

b In 2007 "Other Materials" included bring sites for Mixed Papers (8 in total) - no longer in use due to availability of dry recyclable collection & Civic Amenity sites.

c Galway City Council also provides a bulky goods collection service from households.

d In 2007 food cans were specified as a recyclable item. This was not the case in 2008 so the food cans were included under "other".

e The number of bring banks for recycling "other" decreased in 2007 as bottle banks accepting plastic were removed in 2008. Plastic bottles are now accepted in the kerbside green bin.

f 12 for plastic 28 for newspaper.

g Gypsum, polystyrene, green waste, paper, cardboard, WEE, plastic bottles.

h Plastic banks accept plastic bottles.

i Plastic bring sites were removed as plastic bottles were included in green bin collection service. Civic amenity numbers reduced due to downgrading of Esker Green Waste Facility.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 6U Number of Bring Banks – Other		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	0	0	0
	Mean	6.80	6.30	6.30
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	8.30	8.50	8.25

E 6V Number of Civic Amenity Sites - Other		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	2	2.50
	Mean	2.60	2.70	2.70
Percentiles	25%	1.80	2	2
	75%	3	3	3

E 6W Total Number of Facilities - Other		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3	3	3
	Mean	9.50	7.70	9
Percentiles	25%	2	2	2
	75%	11.30	12	12

E 6X Number of Locations per 5000 population - Other		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	30	34	34
	Missing	4	0	0
Average	Median	0.17	0.2	0.2
	Mean	0.43	0.4	0.46
Percentiles	25%	0.06	0.1	0.09
	75%	0.1	0.4	0.47

Table 20: Litter Wardens Employed by Local Authorities

	E7A. Number of full-time litter wardens	E7B. Number of part-time litter wardens	E7C. Number of litter wardens (both full- and part-time) per 5,000 population
Carlow County Council	2	0	0.20
Cavan County Council	3	4	0.55
Clare County Council	3	2	0.23
Cork City Council	4	0	0.17
Cork County Council	5	17	0.30
Donegal County Council	7	1	0.27
Dublin City Council	25	0	0.25
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	6	1	0.18
Fingal County Council	6	0	0.13
Galway City Council	1	7	0.55
Galway County Council	0	15 ^b	0.47
Kerry County Council	4	7	0.39
Kildare County Council	2	7	0.24
Kilkenny County Council	3	13	0.91
Laois County Council	3	2	0.37
Leitrim County Council	0	3	0.52
Limerick City Council	3	2	0.48
Limerick County Council	3	18 ^c	0.80
Longford County Council	3	0	0.44
Louth County Council	7	0	0.31
Mayo County Council	1	9	0.40
Meath County Council	3	2	0.15
Monaghan County Council	1	6 ^d	0.63
North Tipperary County Council	2	7	0.68
Offaly County Council	4	5	0.63
Roscommon County Council	2	3	0.43
Sligo County Council	2	5	0.57
South Dublin County Council	7	0	0.14
South Tipperary County Council	3	15	1.08
Waterford City Council	3	0	0.33
Waterford County Council	3	3	0.48
Westmeath County Council	0	7 ^a	0.44
Wexford County Council	0	12	0.46
Wicklow County Council	7	14 ^e	0.83
Totals	128	187	

a Includes 3 Community Wardens, 2 Westmeath CoCo Traffic Wardens & 2 Athlone TC Traffic Wardens.
b Includes Community Wardens.
c The number includes all staff authorised under the Litter Pollution Acts 1997 to 2003 to operate as litter wardens, including those staff whose primary functions may not be related to litter management.
d Due to revision of definition of part-time warden. As a result, figure has decreased on last year as number qualifying under new definition is less.
e Includes 7 conservation rangers for National parks & Wildlife services and 7 council employees.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 7A Number of full-time litter wardens		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3	3.96	3
	Mean	4	3	3.76
Percentiles	25%	2	2	2
	75%	5.30	5.25	4.25

E 7B Number of part-time litter wardens		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	5	4.76	3.50
	Mean	5.5	3.5	5.50
Percentiles	25%	0.80	0.75	0.75
	75%	7	7.25	7.50

E 7C Number of Litter wardens (full-time and part-time) per 5000 population		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	0.50	0.40	0.44
	Mean	0.50	0.40	0.44
Percentiles	25%	0.10	0.20	0.25
	75%	0.30	0.60	0.56

Table 21: Enforcement of Litter Laws (AMENDED)

(Note: This indicator has been expanded to include number of on-the-spot fines paid.)

	E7D. Number of on-the-spot fines issued	E7E. Number of on-the-spot fines paid	E7F. Number of prosecution cases taken because of non-payment of on-the-spot fines
Carlow County Council	210	59	3
Cavan County Council	517 ^a	243	8 ^l
Clare County Council	581	406	11
Cork City Council	1,565 ^b	527	124 ^m
Cork County Council	717 ^c	447	16 ⁿ
Donegal County Council	320	107	2
Dublin City Council	7,427 ^d	2,765	318
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	1,486	934	179 ^o
Fingal County Council	1,180 ^e	712	143 ^p
Galway City Council	165	125	2
Galway County Council	418	173	40
Kerry County Council	210	83	29
Kildare County Council	1,402	696	222
Kilkenny County Council	237	72	20
Laois County Council	735 ^f	488	132 ^q
Leitrim County Council	57	21	3 ^r
Limerick City Council	677	319	234
Limerick County Council	583 ^g	304	13
Longford County Council	700	313	35
Louth County Council	1,093	910	145
Mayo County Council	243	117	16
Meath County Council	686	406	26
Monaghan County Council	168	114	31
North Tipperary County Council	144 ^h	83	20
Offaly County Council	211	174	14
Roscommon County Council	182	95	13
Sligo County Council	229 ⁱ	96	1
South Dublin County Council	2,965 ^j	1,402	285 ^s
South Tipperary County Council	237	118	12
Waterford City Council	426	385	17
Waterford County Council	105	54	0 ^t
Westmeath County Council	329	246	40 ^u
Wexford County Council	513	324	32
Wicklow County Council	813 ^k	579	15 ^v
Totals	27,531	13,897	2,201

^a A greater focus was placed on the issuing of fines in 2008 compared with 2007.

^b The increase of on-the-spot-fines issued in 2008 is due to the use of CCTV cameras at a number of locations.

^c The drop in number of on-the-spot fines issued in 2008 is largely related to the availability of litter warden resources. If this issue can be addressed in 2009 then there should be a corresponding increase in the number of fines issued.

^d The reason for the decrease is mainly due to the success of a policy of education, awareness and positive engagement with the public. Unfortunately it is also the case in certain circumstances that wardens are experiencing difficulties in obtaining evidence included in discarded waste as members of the public increase their awareness of the various methods employed by the Council to obtain evidence.

^e 1420 non statutory warning notices also issued.

^f The services of an outside CCTV monitoring company were employed during early 2008 to combat illegal dumping at identified problematic bring banks (2) hence the notable increase in the number of fines issued in comparison to 2007 figures.

^g The number reflects increased efforts targeted at specific categories of litter in the County

^h The increase is principally due to an increase in fines issued by Thurles Town Council arising from the installation of CCTV equipment at the bottle bank in the Town.

ⁱ Due to unexpected shortages of staff in this area in the first quarter of 2008, less on-the-spot fines were issued during this period than in 2007.

^j An increase in on-the-spot fines issued can be explained due to the installation of CCTV cameras at various bring centres.

^k All fines paid in 2008. Includes part payments where applicable. Does not necessarily relate to fines issued in same year.

^l A total of 3 prosecutions were initiated in 2008 - 1 of these cases has been struck off and the other 2 are proceeding as at the end of the year.

^m The increase in the number of prosecutions taken in 2008 viz a vis 2007 reflects the increased number of on the spot fines issued.

n The drop in number of prosecutions in 2008 is largely related to the availability of litter warden resources. If this issue can be addressed in 2009 then there should be a corresponding increase in prosecutions.

o 2008 figure refers to number of prosecutions initiated. 2007 referred to prosecutions that reached the Courts.

p Prosecutions for Litter Fines are taken when there is a non-payment of the fine. In 2008 there was an increase in fines that were unpaid within the allocated time and so an increased amount of cases proceeded to court.

q As a result of the factors mentioned at footnote "p" above, the increase in the number of fines issued had a knock-on effect on the number of fines that remained unpaid. Subsequently, there was a notable increase in the number of files that had to be referred to the legal team to initiate legal proceedings.

r The increase in the number of prosecutions taken in 2008 viz a vis 2007 reflects the increased number of on the spot fines issued.

s The installation of CCTV cameras at various bring centres increased the number of on the spot fines issued. Where there has been non-payment there are prosecutions. The increased number of fines therefore increases pro rata with the number of prosecutions.

t In 2008 there were no prosecutions taken in respect of non payment of on the spot fines.

u The decrease in activity is due to lack of resources with non replacement of staff.

v This relates to total number of individuals where prosecutions were instigated. It does not relate to actual fines issued which warranted prosecution. (i.e. 38 fines in total) Number of prosecutions secured does not account for cases that were settled prior to court cases and also cases where summons were undeliverable.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 7D		2006	2007	2008
Number of on-the-spot fines				
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	400	451.50	469.50
	Mean	765.80	751.80	809.73
Percentiles	25%	263	247	210.75
	75%	689.80	810.30	754.50

E 7E <small>(New in 2008)</small>		2008
Number of on-the-spot fines paid		
N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Average	Median	275
	Mean	408.73
Percentiles	25%	104.25

E 7F		2006	2007	2008
Number of prosecution cases taken because of non-payment of on-the-spot fines				
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	34.50	28.50	20
	Mean	65.90	56.90	64.74
Percentiles	25%	16.50	12.80	11.75
	75%	62	68.30	126

Table 22: Litter Enforcement –Prosecutions & Notices

	E7G. Number of prosecutions secured in cases taken because of non-payment of on-the-spot fines	E7H. Number of notices issued (under sections 9, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of the Litter Pollution Act 1997)	E7I. Total number of prosecutions taken (all prosecutions under the Litter Acts 1997 to 2003)	E7J. Total number of prosecutions secured (all prosecutions under the Litter Acts 1997 to 2003)
Carlow County Council	1	3	0	0
Cavan County Council	2	20	6	2
Clare County Council	1	76	11	1
Cork City Council	19	12	124	19
Cork County Council	8	63	26	13
Donegal County Council	0	0	2	0
Dublin City Council	36	8	422	77
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	19	39	189	19
Fingal County Council	34	2	143	34
Galway City Council	2	0	2	2
Galway County Council	9	0	40	9
Kerry County Council	14	4	32	15
Kildare County Council	30	76	235	35
Kilkenny County Council	3	2	43	16
Laois County Council	15	14	132	15
Leitrim County Council	1a	3	3b	1c
Limerick City Council	60	51	234	60
Limerick County Council	4	0	13	4
Longford County Council	20	1	38	21
Louth County Council	44	23	157	44
Mayo County Council	10	0	21	13
Meath County Council	13	1	29	13
Monaghan County Council	9	0	31	9
North Tipperary County Council	3	0	20	3
Offaly County Council	1	124	15	1
Roscommon County Council	4	17	14	5
Sligo County Council	0	1	8	7
South Dublin County Council	63	231	306	54
South Tipperary County Council	7	1	11	6
Waterford City Council	7	6	17	7
Waterford County Council	0	1	3	3
Westmeath County Council	3	167	41	4
Wexford County Council	22	0	22	32
Wicklow County Council	1	2	15	1
Totals	465	948	2,405	545
<p>a Relates to a prosecution initiated in 2007. b A total of 3 prosecutions were initiated in 2008 - 1 of these cases has been struck off and the other 2 are proceeding as at the end of the year. c Relates to a prosecution initiated in 2007</p>				

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 7G Number of litter prosecutions secured		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	8.50	9	7.50
	Mean	15.60	15.90	13.68
Percentiles	25%	3	5	1.75
	75%	18.30	18	19.25

Table 23: Litter Pollution

	E7K. Percentage of areas in the local authority that are unpolluted (i.e. litter- free)	E7L. Percentage of areas in the local authority that are slightly polluted with litter	E7M. Percentage of areas in the local authority that are moderately polluted with litter	E7N. Percentage of areas in the local authority that are significantly polluted with litter	E7O. Percentage of areas in the local authority that are grossly polluted with litter
Carlow County Council	6.86	84.31	8.82	0.00	0.00
Cavan County Council	0.59	70.41	25.44	3.55	0.00
Clare County Council	1.08	61.83	28.49	6.99	1.61
Cork City Council	1.10	67.12	28.22	3.01	0.55
Cork County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Donegal County Council	14.37	62.28	19.76	2.99	0.60
Dublin City Council	11.31	54.75	31.48	2.30	0.16
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	9.00	72.50	15.00	3.50	0.00
Fingal County Council	3.55	63.45	30.96	2.03	0.00
Galway City Council	3.45	75.17	16.55	4.83	0.00
Galway County Council	15.34	42.33	34.92	6.88	0.53
Kerry County Council	15.74	54.04	28.94	1.28	0.00
Kildare County Council a	10.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.00
Kilkenny County Council	11.21	57.94	28.97	1.87	0.00
Laois County Council	8.33	65.00	23.33	3.33	0.00
Leitrim County Council b	0.00	88.24	11.76	0.00	0.00
Limerick City Council	1.04	46.88	44.79	6.25	1.04
Limerick County Council	3.70	55.56	31.48	5.56	3.70
Longford County Council	9.09	52.89	30.58	7.44	0.00
Louth County Council	10.00	77.50	11.88	0.63	0.00
Mayo County Council	6.77	61.65	25.19	4.89	1.50
Meath County Council	1.88	51.88	41.88	4.38	0.00
Monaghan County Council	0.00	77.78	22.22	0.00	0.00
North Tipperary County Council	1.68	70.39	24.58	3.35	0.00
Offaly County Council	2.22	63.33	31.11	2.22	1.11
Roscommon County Council	8.54	50.00	40.24	1.22	0.00
Sligo County Council	10.42	50.00	33.33	4.17	2.08
South Dublin County Council	3.85	50.00	38.46	7.69	0.00
South Tipperary County Council	0.82	93.06	5.31	0.82	0.00
Waterford City Council	0.00	32.00	54.00	11.00	3.00
Waterford County Council	12.99	85.31	1.69	0.00	0.00
Westmeath County Council	0.00	52.21	38.94	8.85	0.00
Wexford County Council	8.05	56.90	26.44	8.62	0.00
Wicklow County Council	4.03	49.66	37.58	6.71	2.01

a It should be noted that Kildare County Council carry out in-house monitoring of litter pollution. These figures have been accepted by TES Consultants for 2008.

b The data for this indicator was forwarded directly by TES Consulting to the LGCSB/LGMSB. From the records (and interpretation of the data submitted) the figure for unpolluted is 0%. This indicator is based on 34 surveys carried out. It is unfortunate that the performance in relation to unpolluted areas has dis-improved but it is positive that 0% of areas were significantly or grossly polluted and that the % areas moderately polluted has decreased from 18% to 12%.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 7K Percentage of areas within the local authority area that are litter free		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	32	33	33
	Missing	2	1	1
Average	Median	5.50	4	5.97
	Mean	6.10	4.5	4.03
Percentiles	25%	1	1	1.09
	75%	10	7	10

E 7L Percentage of areas within the local authority area that are slightly polluted		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	32	33	33
	Missing	2	1	1
Average	Median	50.50	58	61.65
	Mean	53.60	61.20	61.40
Percentiles	25%	41.50	50.50	50.94
	75%	63.80	72.50	71.46

E 7M Percentage of areas within the local authority area that are moderately polluted		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	32	33	33
	Missing	2	1	1
Average	Median	34	29	28.94
	Mean	31.30	28.10	27.34
Percentiles	25%	23	19.50	20.99
	75%	41	38	34.13

E 7N Percentage of areas within the local authority area that are significantly polluted		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	32	33	33
	Missing	2	1	1
Average	Median	7	4	3.50
	Mean	8.30	5.60	4.74
Percentiles	25%	4	1.50	1.58
	75%	11.80	7	6.80

E 7O Percentage of areas within the local authority area that are grossly polluted		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	32	33	33
	Missing	2	1	1
Average	Median	0	0	0
	Mean	0.60	0.80	0.54
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	1	1	0.82

Table 24: Environmental Complaints and Enforcement

(Note: This indicator has been expanded to include “number of complaints resolved where no further action was necessary”.)

	E8A. Total number of cases subject to complaints concerning environmental pollution (relating to waste, litter, water pollution, noise pollution, air pollution)	E8B. Number of complaints investigated	E8C. Number of complaints resolved where no further action was necessary	E8D. Number of enforcement procedures taken
Carlow County Council	1,216	1,216	960	14
Cavan County Council	462	462	134	324
Clare County Council	1,843	1,819	1,697	939j
Cork City Council	1,515	1,081	68	1,031
Cork County Council	1,772	1,772	1,522	2,207k
Donegal County Council	1,894	1,872	1,024	27
Dublin City Council	3,636a	3,636	3,507	44l
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4,705	4,705	2,898	1,807m
Fingal County Council	4,240	3,943	3,863	80
Galway City Council	1,147	1,147	0	3
Galway County Council	1,208	1,208	1,033	175
Kerry County Council	1,532	1,480	597	102
Kildare County Council	2,281	2,096	1,816	189
Kilkenny County Council	1,245	1,245	1,115	131
Laois County Council	903b	903	753g	125
Leitrim County Council	787	787	283h	882n
Limerick City Council	1,190c	1,190	1,104	1,003o
Limerick County Council	2,644	2,329	1,926	1,298p
Longford County Council	1,428	1,428	1,319	775
Louth County Council	2,342	2,294	2,155	139
Mayo County Council	1,203	1,108	775	295
Meath County Council	2,173	2,011	1,741	606
Monaghan County Council	516	421	281	148
North Tipperary County Council	1,219	1,219	1,050	77
Offaly County Council	776	776	691	156
Roscommon County Council	1,083	1,081	444	260
Sligo County Council	4,988d	4,994f	4,935	622
South Dublin County Council	6,680e	6,680	4,869i	1,811q
South Tipperary County Council	810	810	770	267
Waterford City Council	1,173	1,173	803	796r
Waterford County Council	1,118	1,122	1,030	6
Westmeath County Council	1,364	1,364	820	544
Wexford County Council	3,099	2,694	2,975	726
Wicklow County Council	2,193	2,193	1,848	1,105
Totals	66,385	64,259	50,806	18,714

a The City Council commenced the electronic recording of all litter complaints through its Customer Response Management (CRM) System in the last quarter of 2008. The recording of complaints through this system has led to more definitive and accurate data compared to previous years. In order to calculate the figure for 2008 as a whole, the last quarter figure was pro-rated to arrive at the full year figure. The figure represented a reduction of approx 1,500. The trend to date in 2009 is broadly in line with the figures for 2008.

b A new regional complaints database was in place during 2008 which resulted in all complaints being logged by relevant staff and utilised to the maximum. This had been introduced in mid-2007. In addition, the Environment Section have observed a notable increase in the number of complaints received especially with respect to littering/illegal dumping. It also appears that members of the public are reporting complaints more readily with the assistance of the freephone confidential hotline which is highlighted at every opportunity.

c In 2007 this figure was higher because all complaints to the Environment Department were logged including Parks, Dog Control and Horse Control issues.

d 2008 saw an increase in planning and discharge licences over 2007.

e The decrease in the total number of cases can be explained in the main by the introduction of CCTV at bring bank centres. This has had a deterrent effect and an increase in the number of on-the-spot litter fines

f Some complaints need 2 investigations, hence the higher figure.

g 25 pending.

h This figure is an estimate based on the actual level of complaints resolved where no further action was necessary in Quarter 4 2008.

i No system in place to record resolved complaints. Deducted unresolved complaints from overall figure i.e. 63 deducted.

j The increase arises due to the increased use of CCTV footage at a number of locations in the county and also increased number of fines issued regarding unauthorised signage in the county.

k The substantial increase in numbers arises mainly due to the expansion of the term "enforcement procedures" to include warning letters issued under the terms of the various relevant statutory provisions. The figure submitted was collated directly from the council's annual RMCEI report to the EPA..

l The figure of 44 provided is broken between Waste Enforcement (26) and Air/Noise (18). The Waste Enforcement figure reduced from 44 to 26 and is mainly attributed to a shift in focus towards awareness and engagement with various parties to remind them of their obligations. This has had a knock on effect in reducing the need for enforcement actions.

In relation to the Air/Noise figure, which reduced from 33 to 18, the reduction can be attributed to a corresponding reduction in initial complaints and also due to the benefits of a policy of awareness and engagement with relevant parties, which can lead to resolutions and compliance rather than enforcement proceedings.

m Increase is due to inclusion of litter fines and warning notices under the Litter Acts.

n The figure for 2007 did not include Warning and Advice Letters – a total of 621 Warning Letters were issued in relation to Waste Enforcement matters in 2008. A total of 16 Warning Letters and 4 Advice Letters were issued in relation to Water/Air/Noise in 2008.

o This figure includes all enforcement action including litter and waste taken as a result of (a) complaints from the public and (b) routine inspections initiated by our Enforcement Staff; the previous figure was based solely on waste enforcement.

p The number includes all warning letters issued advising that further enforcement actions would follow in the event of non co-operation, as well as statutory notices issued and prosecutions taken.

q Increase in figures relate to the inclusion of Litter Fines as per methodology. The clarification of methodology issued by the LGMSB in 2008 advised that Litter Fines should also be included in the overall figure. Therefore this is the first year litter fines have been included in the calculation. In addition a revised figure of 3246 for 2008 should be submitted to the LGMSB as there was a miscalculation in the spreadsheet in the original submission.

r Decrease in Enforcement Procedures taken was as a direct result of the loss of a staff member employed directly on Enforcement.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 8A Total number of cases subject to complaints concerning environmental pollution		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	1,56	1,944	1396
	Mean	1,990.20	2,255.60	1952.50
Percentiles	25%	984.50	1,146.30	1139.80
	75%	2,203.50	2,726.50	2296.30

E 8B Number of cases investigated		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	1,367	1,690.50	1304.50
	Mean	1,917.80	2,182.60	1890
Percentiles	25%	984.50	1,142.80	1101.30
	75%	2,138.80	2,648	2218.30

E 8D Number of enforcement procedures taken		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	176	222	281
	Mean	290.50	328.90	550.40
Percentiles	25%	81.80	84	119.30
	75%	442.30	501.30	896.30

Table 25: Schools Participating in Environmental Campaigns

	E9A. Percentage of primary schools participating in environmental campaigns	E9B. Percentage of secondary schools participating in environmental campaigns
Carlow County Council	87.80	80.00
Cavan County Council	59.49	90.00
Clare County Council	76.03	80.00
Cork City Council	50.82	46.43
Cork County Council	56.44	61.02
Donegal County Council	70.62	92.31
Dublin City Council	67.11	63.22
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	77.92	67.74
Fingal County Council	78.16	76.47
Galway City Council	96.15	100.00
Galway County Council	76.89	75.68
Kerry County Council	72.03	85.19
Kildare County Council	75.96	65.38
Kilkenny County Council	67.95	80.00
Laois County Council	67.14	81.82
Leitrim County Council	90.48	87.50
Limerick City Council	79.41	80.00
Limerick County Council	75.22	90.91
Longford County Council	97.30	100.00
Louth County Council	76.71	87.50
Mayo County Council	71.19	82.14 ^d
Meath County Council	75.89 ^a	77.78
Monaghan County Council	43.75	66.67
North Tipperary County Council	83.56	82.35 ^e
Offaly County Council	67.16	91.67 ^f
Roscommon County Council	71.88 ^b	80.00 ^g
Sligo County Council	80.99	100.00
South Dublin County Council	79.00	71.43
South Tipperary County Council	56.52	58.82
Waterford City Council	76.19	81.82
Waterford County Council	73.21	77.78
Westmeath County Council	84.21 ^c	100.00
Wexford County Council	74.77	85.00
Wicklow County Council	91.49	95.45

^a 29 with Green Flags at end 2008
^b Includes Toddle In Playgroup.
^c No. of schools corrected from previous years.
^d It is important to note that there is no provision for either Preschools or 3rd Level Colleges. (We have one of each currently registered in the programme). There is a high number of schools in Co. Mayo, thus lowering the % value for those registered. Does not reflect all environmental campaigns within schools which are co-ordinated by Mayo CoCo and which are reflected in the number of Green Flags awarded.
^e This includes two Adult Education Centres involved in the Green School Programme.
^f Two schools amalgamated and are now counted as one
^g Includes 1 Youth Reach Group

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 9A Primary schools participating in environmental campaigns (percentage)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	33	34
	Missing	0	1	0
Average	Median	64.20	71.40	75.93
	Mean	63.30	69.40	74.40
Percentiles	25%	56	60.50	67.75
	75%	73.50	79.20	79.81

E 9B Secondary schools participating in environmental campaigns (percentage)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	33	34
	Missing	0	1	0
Average	Median	73	77.80	80.91
	Mean	69.60	77.20	80.65
Percentiles	25%	55	70	74.62
	75%	83.50	88	90.23

Section 6 Fire and Emergency

Table 26: Fire Service –Time taken to mobilise (AMENDED)

(Note: This indicator has been expanded in 2008 to report on all other emergency incidents in addition to fire incidents. Because of this, comparison with earlier years is inappropriate)

	F1A. Average time taken, in minutes, to mobilise fire brigades in Full-Time Stations in respect of fire	F1B. Average time taken, in minutes, to mobilise fire brigades in Part-Time Stations (retained fire service) in respect of fire	F1C. Average time taken, in minutes, to mobilise fire brigades in Full-Time Stations in respect of all other emergency incidents	F1D. Average time taken, in minutes, to mobilise fire brigades in Part-Time Stations (retained fire service) in respect of all other emergency incidents
Carlow County Council	N/Aa	4.44	N/A	5.09
Cavan County Council	N/A	5.07	N/A	4.53
Clare County Council	N/A	5.03	N/A	5.15
Cork City Council	1.75	N/A	1.83	N/A
Cork County Council	N/A	5.10	N/A	5.16
Donegal County Council	N/A	5.31	N/A	5.57
Dublin Combined b	1.36	6.14	1.40	7.01
Galway Combined c	2.39	4.86	3.15	4.60
Kerry County Council	N/A	5.20	N/A	5.32
Kildare County Council	N/A	5.74	N/A	5.69
Kilkenny County Council	N/A	5.40	N/A	5.50
Laois County Council	N/A	5.15	N/A	5.35
Leitrim County Council	N/A	5.25	N/A	5.15
Limerick City Council	1.42	N/A	1.47	N/A
Limerick County Council	N/A	4.42	N/A	4.60
Longford County Council	N/A	6.09	N/A	6.05
Louth County Council	2.17	3.57	1.82	3.64
Mayo County Council	N/A	5.23	N/A	5.37
Meath County Council	N/A	4.31	N/A	5.05
Monaghan County Council	N/A	5.01	N/A	5.20
North Tipperary County Council	N/A	5.55	N/A	6.03
Offaly County Council	N/A	5.71	N/A	5.84
Roscommon County Council	N/A	4.42	N/A	4.08
Sligo County Council	N/A	4.45	N/A	4.30
South Tipperary County Council	N/A	6.29	N/A	6.26
Waterford City Council	2.00	N/A	2.00	N/A
Waterford County Council	N/A	4.31	N/A	4.11
Westmeath County Council	N/A	6.22	N/A	6.63
Wexford County Council	N/A	6.31	N/A	6.49
Wicklow County Council	N/A	7.02	N/A	6.46

a Local authorities provide two types of fire service: full time and retained. Full-time services (Cork City, Dublin, Galway, Limerick City, Drogheda (Louth) and Waterford City) are operated on a 24-hour shift basis. Tables F1A and F1B refer to Full Time stations. Retained stations account for the majority of fire services in the country and are staffed by part-time personnel. Retained firefighters respond to emergency calls upon activation of a pager system. Tables F1B and F1D refer to Retained Stations.

b Dublin City Council is the Fire Authority for the four Dublin local authorities.

c The fire service for Galway City is operated by Galway County Council on a shared service basis.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

F1A <small>AMENDED</small> Average time (minutes) to mobilise fire brigades in full-time stations in 2008		In respect of Fire	In respect of all other emergency incidents
N	Valid	6	6
	Missing	28	28
Average	Median	1.88	1.83
	Mean	1.85	1.95
Percentiles	25%	1.41	1.45
	75%	2.23	2.29

E 1B <small>AMENDED</small> Average time (minutes) to mobilise fire brigades in part-time stations (retained fire service) in 2008		In respect of Fire	In respect of all other emergency incidents
N	Valid	27	27
	Missing	7	7
Average	Median	5.20	5.32
	Mean	5.24	5.34
Percentiles	25%	4.45	4.60
	75%	5.74	6.03

Table 27: First Attendance at Fire Scenes (AMENDED)

	F2A. Percentage of cases in respect of fire in which first attendance is at the scene within 10 minutes	F2B. Percentage of cases in respect of fire in which first attendance is at the scene after 10 minutes but within 20 minutes	F2C. Percentage of cases in respect of fire in which first attendance is at the scene after 20 minutes
Carlow County Council	64.97	26.55	8.47
Cavan County Council	29.95	48.31	21.74
Clare County Council a	36.25	23.07	9.51
Cork City Council	91.26	7.90	0.84
Cork County Council	42.41	42.34	15.25
Donegal Combined	41.75	43.57	14.68
Dublin City Council	79.07	18.62	2.31
Galway Combined	49.30	36.67	14.02
Kerry County Council	46.19	37.79	16.02
Kildare County Council	28.14	57.47	14.39
Kilkenny County Council	48.57	40.26	11.17
Laois County Council	45.19	43.52	11.30
Leitrim County Council	43.20	41.42	15.38d
Limerick City Council	90.33	8.50	1.17
Limerick County Council	35.92	45.98	18.10
Longford County Council	31.65	51.90	16.46
Louth County Council	60.93	34.94	4.13
Mayo County Council	40.34	42.35	17.31
Meath County Council	32.22	44.94	15.68
Monaghan County Council	51.64	40.16	8.20
North Tipperary County Council	46.72	45.01c	8.27
Offaly County Council	47.66	43.35	13.85
Roscommon County Council	68.50	26.30	5.20
Sligo County Council	59.30	29.94	10.76
South Tipperary County Council	40.00	41.28	18.72
Waterford City Council	90.82	7.19	2.00
Waterford County Council	63.41	29.33	7.26
Westmeath County Council	37.28	49.13	13.58
Wexford County Council	43.64	39.83	16.53
Wicklow County Council b	22.11	59.30	18.59

a Change from 2007 arises because (a) brigade is often stood down en route to an incident (b) technical issues arise with radio coverage in certain areas of the county.

b Increase in attendance at scene times from last year may be due to increased traffic congestion. The area covered by rural stations also covers wide geographical area and in some instances crossing mountainous areas. There is also a chance that due to ERCC now logging calls, brigades may be directed to callouts that would normally be outside their callout area.

c The attendance times for a number of indicators were not recorded in 2008. Arrangements will be put in place in 2009 to ensure that attendance times are subsequently recorded where there are initial difficulties in doing so because of radio blackspots, etc. Unfortunately at this stage it is not possible to provide this data for 2008.

d Reflects rural nature of county and distances travelled.

Summary Statistics 2008

F2 <small>AMENDED</small> First Attendance at Fire Scenes 2008		F2A. % of fire incidents in which first attendance is at the scene within 10 minutes	F2B. % of fire incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 10 minutes but within 20 minutes	F2C. % of Fire incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 20 minutes
N	Valid	30	30	30
	Missing	4	4	4
Average	Median	45.69	40.77	13.72
	Mean	50.29	36.90	11.70
Percentiles	25%	37.02	28.64	7.97
	75%	61.55	44.96	16.13

Table 28: First Attendance at Emergency Incidents (other than Fire)
(AMENDED)

	F2D Percentage of cases in respect of all other emergency incidents in which first attendance is at the scene within 10 minutes	F2E Percentage of cases in respect of all other emergency incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 10 minutes but within 20 minutes	F2F Percentage of cases in respect of all other emergency incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 20 minutes
Carlow County Council	46.39	35.05	18.56
Cavan County Council	47.37	38.46	14.17
Clare County Council	33.51	36.39	13.09
Cork City Council	86.34	12.94	0.73
Cork County Council	36.79	47.36	15.85
Donegal County Council	38.99	49.08	11.93
Dublin Combined	78.30	18.17	3.53
Galway Combined	39.16	46.15	14.69
Kerry County Council	27.83	54.25	17.92
Kildare County Council	24.17	59.48	16.35
Kilkenny County Council	41.74	45.37	12.89
Laois County Council	35.62	48.93	15.45
Leitrim County Council	42.48	40.71	16.81a
Limerick City Council	80.23	16.73	3.04
Limerick County Council	37.70	44.59	17.70
Longford County Council	31.82	53.64	14.55
Louth County Council	53.41	40.91	5.68
Mayo County Council	42.23	43.39	14.39
Meath County Council	22.04	49.84	20.13
Monaghan County Council	39.71	52.94	7.35
North Tipperary County Council	28.80	58.12	13.09
Offaly County Council	37.78	49.63	12.59
Roscommon County Council	72.73	22.91	4.36
Sligo County Council	55.98	33.08	10.94
South Tipperary County Council	26.71	58.22	15.07
Waterford City Council	77.18	18.93	3.88
Waterford County Council	58.43	32.55	9.02
Westmeath County Council	20.56	60.00	19.44
Wexford County Council	31.68	48.76	19.57
Wicklow County Council	20.00	62.94	17.06

a Reflects rural nature of county and distances travelled

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 2D <small>(AMENDED)</small> Attendance at other emergency incidents		F2A % of Other Emergency Incidents in which first attendance is at the scene within 10 minutes	F2B % of Other Emergency Incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 10 minutes but within 20 minutes	F2C % of Other Emergency Incidents in which first attendance is at the scene after 20 minutes
N	Valid	30	30	30
	Missing	4	4	4
Average	Median	39.08	45.76	14.28
	Mean	43.86	42.65	12.66
Percentiles	25%	30.96	34.56	8.60
	75%	54.05	53.12	16.87

Table 29: Applications for Fire Certificates Received & Processed
(AMENDED)

	F3A. Total number of fire safety certificate applications received	F3B. Total number of fire safety certificate applications processed (including cases deemed invalid)	F3C. Total number of applications deemed invalid
Carlow County Council	112	111	4
Cavan County Council	113	115	7
Clare County Council	189	199	14
Cork City Council	164	189a	0
Cork County Council	712	748	46
Donegal County Council	234	229	13
Dublin City Council	800	857	9
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	270	290	7
Fingal County Council	424	428b	8
Galway City Council	187	151	21
Galway County Council	247	257	63
Kerry County Council	208	297c	15
Kildare County Council	345	367	6
Kilkenny County Council	190	187	9
Laois County Council	114	114	6
Leitrim County Council	48	47	1
Limerick City Council	121	120	6
Limerick County Council	157	173	8
Longford County Council	56	70	7
Louth County Council	180	170	6
Mayo County Council	239	254	2
Meath County Council	305	304	23
Monaghan County Council	106	108	27
North Tipperary County Council	115	133	16
Offaly County Council	104	114	4
Roscommon County Council	98	100	0
Sligo County Council	128	128	4
South Dublin County Council	314	346	1
South Tipperary County Council	163	155	2
Waterford City Council	85	87	0
Waterford County Council	73	79	4
Westmeath County Council	155	158d	4
Wexford County Council	222	221e	6
Wicklow County Council	188	235	4
Totals	7,166	7,541	353
<p>a This includes applications received in late 2007 but processed in 2008. b Some applications received previous year processed the following year. c Decrease in number of applications received d Due to the downturn in the economy there are fewer development works, hence fewer fire certs.</p>			

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 3A^(AMENDED)				
Number of Applications for Fire Safety Certificates Received		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	231	228.50	210.76
	Mean	272.60	280.70	172
Percentiles	25%	94	134.30	112.75
	75%	136.50	318.30	241

E 3B^(AMENDED)				
Number of Applications for Fire Safety Certificates Processed		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	207	241.50	221.79
	Mean	278	284.10	171.50
Percentiles	25%	85	126.50	114
	75%	132	337	265.25

Section 7: Water

Table 30: Unaccounted for Water (UFW) ^(NEW)

(Note: This indicator has been introduced for the first time in 2008; See more general explanatory note in Section 2 of the Report.)

	E1A Unaccounted for water (UFW) as a percentage of total volume of water supplied under the water supply schemes that the local authority is responsible for
Carlow County Council	40.00
Cavan County Council	44.70
Clare County Council	35.47
Cork City Council	52.93a
Cork County Council	44.40
Donegal County Council	43.34
Dublin City Council	36.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	29.00b
Fingal County Council	21.61
Galway City Council	49.12
Galway County Council	49.46
Kerry County Council	47.98
Kildare County Council	26.37
Kilkenny County Council	56.79c
Laois County Council	32.44
Leitrim County Council	36.51
Limerick City Council	47.89
Limerick County Council	16.83
Longford County Council	42.18
Louth County Council	44.19
Mayo County Council	43.00
Meath County Council	47.57
Monaghan County Council	43.27
North Tipperary County Council	49.52
Offaly County Council	50.87
Roscommon County Council	58.60d
Sligo County Council	44.12
South Dublin County Council	19.79
South Tipperary County Council	55.43e
Waterford City Council	43.60
Waterford County Council	31.83
Westmeath County Council	45.74
Wexford County Council	38.88
Wicklow County Council	31.34

a It is noted that the City student population may not be adequately reflected in the CSO population figures recorded and as such the domestic consumption may be underestimated and UFW correspondingly overestimated. The Council has assessed its water supply network replacement/rehabilitation needs at €110m. The first phase of this rehabilitation work is included in the 2007-09 Water Investment Programme at an estimated cost of €13m. The Council also has an active leak detection and repair programme which has resulted in ongoing reductions in the average daily water production figures – from 70,776 cum in 2006 m³ to 68,656 m³ in 2007 to 67,269 m³ in 2008.

b Methodology used in Dublin Regional Conservation Project puts UFW at 29% (Water Supplied 41,770; Water Unaccounted for 17,780 m³/day). Alternative figure of 7% supplied to OLAM in line with methodology.

c It should be noted that Kilkenny County Council has just recently commenced Phase 2 of the Water Conservation Programme and significant success has already been seen in reducing unaccounted for water under this programme.

d Calculations include an element of estimation to obtain best available data. Figures used for population served by public supply system are based on a combination of GeoDirector and local mapping estimates, as recommended by Consultants.

e The Percentage UFW is derived from data compiled from Phase 1 of the Water Conservation Project some of which could only be estimated. South Tipperary has over 3000km of network most of which is over 40 years old. Phase 2 and 3 of the Water Conservation Project will include active leakage, detection, control and network rehabilitation which will have a significant effect on reducing UFW.

Table 31: Drinking Water – Compliance with Statutory Requirements

	E2A Percentage of drinking water analysis results in compliance with statutory requirements with regard to public schemes	E2B Percentage of drinking water analysis results in compliance with statutory requirements with regard to private schemes (where appropriate)
Carlow County Council	97.27	89.71
Cavan County Council	96.89	95.86
Clare County Council	99.04	97.74
Cork City Council	97.65	91.89
Cork County Council	97.61	88.93
Donegal County Council	94.87	89.75
Dublin City Council	98.61	N/A
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	98.77	N/A
Fingal County Council	98.83	N/A
Galway City Council	98.98	N/A
Galway County Council	94.91	95.24
Kerry County Council	96.18	94.37
Kildare County Council	98.73	98.08
Kilkenny County Council	97.49	96.24
Laois County Council	97.89	94.17
Leitrim County Council	98.71	95.29
Limerick City Council	99.39	N/A
Limerick County Council	98.89	98.69
Longford County Council	96.05	97.13
Louth County Council	97.47	94.99
Mayo County Council	96.80	92.11
Meath County Council	97.80	95.24
Monaghan County Council	97.42	94.28
North Tipperary County Council	98.84	98.12
Offaly County Council	99.10	96.56
Roscommon County Council	98.51	92.76
Sligo County Council	96.54	95.66
South Dublin County Council	99.14	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	97.50	93.85
Waterford City Council	98.55	N/A
Waterford County Council	93.44	88.10
Westmeath County Council	97.69	96.17
Wexford County Council	96.04	90.85
Wicklow County Council	97.13	89.31
Data for this indicator is supplied directly by the EPA to Office for Local Authority Management for calculation and verification.		

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

E 2.A Percentage of drinking water analysis results in compliance with statutory requirements (public)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	98	97.94	97.67
	Mean	97.79	97.81	97.61
Percentiles	25%	96.63	96.95	96.87
	75%	98.78	98.79	98.79

E 2.B Percentage of drinking water analysis results in compliance with statutory requirements (private)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	26	27	27
	Missing	8	7	7
Average	Median	93.59	95	94.99
	Mean	93.06	93.91	94.11
Percentiles	25%	90.81	91.04	91.89
	75%	96.21	96.11	96.24

Section 8: Roads

Table 32: Roads Restoration Programme (AMENDED)

	R1.A. Number of kilometres of local and regional roads improved and maintained under the Restoration Programme per annum	R1.B. Number of kilometres of local and regional roads constructed under the specific improvement grants scheme per annum
Carlow County Council	85.0	0.2
Cavan County Council	353.9	8.8
Clare County Council	286.6	8.7
Cork City Council	15.4a	0.3g
Cork County Council	834.0	9.5
Donegal County Council	502.0	0.0
Dublin City Council	7.6	0.0
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	16.0	0.5
Fingal County Council	40.3	1.5
Galway City Council	21.0	0.0
Galway County Council	415.8b	19.8h
Kerry County Council	207.1	0.5
Kildare County Council	124.0	3.3
Kilkenny County Council	211.0	0.9
Laois County Council	139.6	0.0
Leitrim County Council	141.8	5.6
Limerick City Council	4.0	0.0
Limerick County Council	283.1c	9.5i
Longford County Council	79.1	1.7
Louth County Council	95.9	0.0
Mayo County Council	368.3	5.6
Meath County Council	185.9d	2.3
Monaghan County Council	198.6	7.7
North Tipperary County Council	164.1	3.1
Offaly County Council	148.1	8.2
Roscommon County Council	355.0	11.0
Sligo County Council	157.3	1.7
South Dublin County Council e	N/A	0.0
South Tipperary County Council	36.0	17.0j
Waterford City Council	1.8	1.4
Waterford County Council	206.4	2.8
Westmeath County Council	190.0f	0.1k
Wexford County Council	1,201.0	9.2
Wicklow County Council	151.6	3.1

a This figure includes 3.7km funded from own resources.

b The 415.801 kms were completed at a cost of €18,833,242 comprised of €18,716,628 funded by the Department of Transport under the Restoration Improvement and Restoration Maintenance Grants, including €370,061 for the Community Involvement in Roadworks Scheme and €116,614 in funding from the Council's own resources.

c These works cost €10,029,728 of which €1,422,613 (14%) was provided by Limerick County Council's own resources. The extent of the works was based on the level of Grant available.

d 77.78km improved & 108.15km maintained(SD)under this heading.A total of €1.070m and €0.585m provided from own resources to supplement grants paid under improvement & maintenance grants.

e Not Applicable to South Dublin County Council.

f This includes 9.27KM completed from Westmeath County Council resources.

g This includes funding from the Councils own resources. Refers to Grand Parade Street Improvement Scheme.

h The 19.76 kms were completed at a cost of €5,315,294, with €4,893,548 funded by the Department of Transport in 2008 under the Specific Improvement Grant.

i The extent of works was based on the level of grant available and all works completed were on Regional Roads.

j Reduction from previous years due to poor weather and lack of supplementary funding.

k This figure relates to one scheme. Other schemes at design stage.

Summary Statistics 2008

R1.A. <small>AMENDED</small> Number of kilometres of local and regional roads improved and maintained under the Restoration Programme per annum		2008
N	Valid	26
	Missing	8 ⁶
Average	Median	194.30
Percentiles	25%	141.30
	75%	354.20

R1.B. <small>AMENDED</small> Number of kilometres of local and regional roads constructed under the specific improvement grants scheme per annum		2008
N	Valid	29
	Missing	5
Average	Median	3.10
	Mean	5
Percentiles	25%	0.70
	75%	8.70

⁶As this indicator mainly relates to rural local authorities, a number of local authorities (Dublin / Cork / Galway / Limerick / Fingal / Dun Laoghaire) have been excluded from summary statistics.

Section 9: Housing

Table 33: Current Status of Local Authority Housing Stock

	H1A The total number of dwellings in local authority stock	H1B The total number of dwellings, excluding those subject to major refurbishment projects	H1C The overall percentage of dwellings that are empty (excluding those subject to major refurbishment projects)	H1D The percentage of empty dwellings unavailable for letting	H1E The percentage of empty dwellings available for letting
Carlow County Council	1,515	1,515	1.78	62.96	37.04
Cavan County Council	1,792	1,776	8.90	44.94	55.06
Clare County Council	2,318	2,273	3.48	91.14d	8.86
Cork City Council	8,514	8,316	4.64	86.14	13.86
Cork County Council	6,325	6,269	4.82	50.99	49.01
Donegal County Council	4,134	4,102	1.90	33.33	66.67
Dublin City Council	27,066	24,963	3.08	53.19	46.81
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	4,153	4,073	1.57	59.38	40.62
Fingal County Council	4,190	4,190	2.03	81.18	7.06
Galway City Council	2,137	2,137	5.90b	39.68	60.32i
Galway County Council	2,284	2,284	5.21	87.39	12.61
Kerry County Council	3,931	3,877	4.98	57.12	42.88
Kildare County Council	3,248	3,240	2.18	68.44	31.56
Kilkenny County Council	1,953	1,924	7.29	57.93	38.15
Laois County Council	1,891	1,891	1.81	34.31	65.69
Leitrim County Council	962	962	3.12c	93.33	6.67
Limerick City Council	2,889	2,824	1.59	24.44	77.78
Limerick County Council	1,975	1,973	4.02	92.11	7.89
Longford County Council	1,735	1,731	3.99	43.48	56.52
Louth County Council	3,344	3,320	1.17	56.41	43.59
Mayo County Council	2,054	2,014	4.67	58.51	41.49
Meath County Council	2,430	2,402	2.71	50.77e	49.23
Monaghan County Council	1,276	1,247	2.77	68.12	31.88
North Tipperary County Council	1,675	1,662	2.35	85.90	14.10
Offaly County Council	1,593	1,521	3.16	83.33	16.67
Roscommon County Council	1,202	1,168	5.65	74.24	25.76
Sligo County Council	1,998	1,893	4.07	76.62	23.38
South Dublin County Council	8,570	8,570	1.08	78.92	21.08
South Tipperary County Council	2,646	2,631	3.74	77.86f	22.14
Waterford City Council	2,914	2,878	2.50	50.17	49.83
Waterford County Council	1,602	1,599	3.50	60.71g	39.29j
Westmeath County Council	1,622a	1,586	2.38	74.17h	25.83
Wexford County Council	2,320	2,320	3.71	63.95	36.05
Wicklow County Council	4,188	4,129	2.39	65.99	34.01
Totals	122,445	119,258			

a In general it would be desirable to develop and utilise "ihouse" (IT system) as a fully integrated system for recording and generating the general housing SI data which would ensure consistent and accurate data as distinct from the present use of spreadsheets and a gresso.

b Higher than previous due to inclusion of new properties not yet allocated.

c There were a significant number of casual vacancies arising in 2008.

d Increase over 2007 is due to the fact that estates at Kilrush and Shannon are awaiting a regeneration scheme and empty dwellings are in the meantime unavailable for letting.

e Excluding 28 Major refurbishment.

f In 2007 a number of vacant dwellings requiring major works were classed as dwellings subject to "major refurbishment scheme". The exclusion of these dwellings from the overall vacant stock figures increased the % unavailable for letting. This has been corrected in the 2008 figures

g There was a significant increase in the number of properties which required maintenance work prior to letting during 2008.

h Slight delays in re-let due to change in policy whereby Westmeath CoCo substantially extended its scope of works undertaken during pre letting period.

i Higher than previous years due to inclusion of newly purchased properties not yet allocated.

j This decreased during 2008 as a result of properties being allocated as soon as they are available for letting.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

H1A The total number of dwellings in local authority stock		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2,026.50	2143	2301
	Mean	3,393.10	3478.70	3601.33
Percentiles	25%	1,590.80	1659.50	1720
	75%	3,747	3860	3981.94

H 1.C Overall percentage of dwellings that are empty		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3.50	4	3.14
	Mean	3.90	4.20	3.47
Percentiles	25%	2.60	2.40	2.14
	75%	4.80	5.40	4.65

H 1.D Percentage of empty dwellings unavailable for letting		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	68.80	70.20	63.50
	Mean	68.70	68.60	64.33
Percentiles	25%	52.90	57.80	50.94
	75%	85.30	80.90	79.49

H 1.E Percentage of empty dwellings available for letting		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	31.60	29.80	36.50
	Mean	31.60	31.10	35.28
Percentiles	25%	14.70	19.10	19.98
	75%	47.10	42.20	49.07

Table 34: Average Time Taken to Re-let Available Dwellings (AMENDED) ^a

(Note: This indicator has been expanded into two categories.)

	H2.1 The average time taken (in weeks) from the date of vacation of dwelling to the date when all necessary repairs are carried out which are deemed necessary to re-let the dwelling	H2.2 The average time taken (in weeks) from the works (above) being completed to the date of the first rent debit
Carlow County Council	13.84	4.51
Cavan County Council	5.0	5.12
Clare County Council	23.78b	8.13
Cork City Council c	18.32	7.03
Cork County Council	9.0	3.0
Donegal County Council	18.0	9.0p
Dublin City Council	21.77d	4.0
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	7.49	14.87
Fingal County Council	14.0	6.0
Galway City Council	3.91e	2.00
Galway County Council	45.0	2.60
Kerry County Council	8.92f	27.56
Kildare County Council	14.30	4.0
Kilkenny County Council	55.96	8.88
Laois County Council	9.0	2.0
Leitrim County Council	15.67g	1.99
Limerick City Council	1.62	1.93
Limerick County Council	27.12h	6.05
Longford County Council	1.0	1.0
Louth County Council	8.0	3.0
Mayo County Council	17.0i	3.0
Meath County Council	12.39	4.0
Monaghan County Council	10.9	3.79
North Tipperary County Council	17.33j	2.98
Offaly County Council	6.65	3.42
Roscommon County Council k	25.5	17.34
Sligo County Council	54.0l	3.0
South Dublin County Council	15.43m	1.4
South Tipperary County Council	4.8n	5.06
Waterford City Council	33.65o	1.76
Waterford County Council	12.46	21q
Westmeath County Council	6.17	3.95
Wexford County Council	12.0	3.0
Wicklow County Council	13.14	3.19

a In 2008, this indicator was expanded into two categories as follows:(a) Average time taken in weeks from date of vacation of dwelling to date repairs carried out: (there is no comparator from previous years) (b) Average time taken in weeks from date of repairs carried out to date re-let. This means that for comparative purposes, the figures at H2.2 above should be compared with H2 of the 2007 Report.

b Increase arises from budgetary constraints.

c The increase in the length of time taken to re-let property has increased in 2008 viz – a vis 2007. This is due mainly to the level of refusals by applicants on property.

d Includes dwellings in low demand areas that may remain vacant with no repairs carried out for some time pending allocation.

e This is an estimate based on a total period, from vacation to first rent debit, of 5.91 weeks.

f High Refusal Rates by Tralee TC& also cost of long term voids.

g There was a significant number of casual vacancies arising in 2008. In addition 2 particular cases are having an especially negative impact on this indicator. The turn-around time is also dependent on the level of pre-letting repair works required.

h There is a substantial increase in this Indicator over the 2007 figure due to the fact that there were 11 properties vacant for a long period of time which became available for letting in 2008. The average vacant time for those 11 properties alone was 76.9 weeks. Does not include properties repaired in December 2008 but let in January, 2009.

i Increase due to Major Refurbishment Programme being carried out in period 2006 – 2009

j The H2 Indicator in 2007 consisted of one part only and our return was 2.46 weeks (from time repairs were carried out to date of next rent debit). In 2008, the H2 Indicator was expanded into 2 parts. Part 2 equates to what the H2 indicator was in 2007. Our Part 2 return for 2008 is 2.98 weeks. Part 1 of this Indicator in 2008 is counting the number of weeks taken to repair dwellings and is 17.33 weeks. This Part 1 did not form part of the 2007 Indicator methodology. The comparison between 2007 and 2008 therefore should be with Part 2 of H2.

k Shortage of Staff resources.

l In 2008, this Indicator was changed which resulted in it being split into two questions, i.e. (1) The average time taken from the date of vacation of dwelling to the date when all necessary repairs are carried out which are deemed necessary to re-let the dwelling, and (2) the average time taken from the works being completed to the date of the first rent debit. In 2007, this Indicator only referred to the average time taken to re-let dwellings available for letting. The methodology explained that dwellings are available for letting when all necessary repairs are carried out which are deemed necessary to relet the dwelling. In this regard, the comparison of 2007 with 2008 would probably be more accurate if looking at the 2nd part of the 2008 Indicator which, in this case, was 3 weeks compared with 2.23 weeks in 2007.

m The 2008 results are based on the whole re-let process while the 2007 results were based on only part of the process.

n Increase due difficulties in reletting a number of dwellings in two urban areas.

o The reason for the increased time taken to relet dwellings was due to an extensive void management programme. Coupled with a regeneration programme throughout the Ballybeg Estate, this resulted in us refurbishing a number of houses that had been vacant for a number of years. (Seven of the Ballybeg houses alone had been vacant for in excess of 3 years). At the present point in time, these voids are now occupied and major improvements have been made the Ballybeg estates. These long term voids disproportionately skewed the 2008 average. As these long term voids have now been addressed, there will be an appreciable reduction in the indicator for 2009.

p There are 6 properties in this category which are affecting the outcome: 3 properties were in areas where there was either low demand or a voluntary scheme in progress, 2 other properties were offered 4 & 6 times respectively and another property was accepted but tenant didn't move in for 6 months. If these properties were discounted the average time would drop to 6 weeks.

q The high average time is because of difficulties in allocating houses in perceived undesirable locations. Repairs were not carried out until the houses were allocated because of the risk of vandalism. This resulted in a significant delay in a small number of cases which increased the average time.

Summary Statistics 2008

H2.1 <small>AMENDED</small>		2008
The average time taken (in weeks) from the date of vacation of dwelling to the date when all necessary repairs are carried out which are deemed necessary to re-let the dwelling		
N	Valid	34
	Missing	0
Average	Median	13.49
	Mean	16.56
Percentiles	25%	7.87
	75%	19.18

Table 35: Housing Repairs Completed by Local Authorities

	H3 Number of repairs completed as a percentage of the number of valid repair requests received
Carlow County Council	94.27
Cavan County Council	78.38
Clare County Council	94.95
Cork City Council	93.24
Cork County Council	87.81
Donegal County Council	93.20 ^a
Dublin City Council	85.53
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	99.83
Fingal County Council	98.15
Galway City Council	99.88
Galway County Council	70.02
Kerry County Council	97.03
Kildare County Council	98.92
Kilkenny County Council	65.54
Laois County Council	92.22
Leitrim County Council	92.95
Limerick City Council	88.30
Limerick County Council	85.24
Longford County Council	94.86
Louth County Council	96.19
Mayo County Council	85.42
Meath County Council	94.54
Monaghan County Council	89.00
North Tipperary County Council	92.48
Offaly County Council	95.06
Roscommon County Council	79.42 ^b
Sligo County Council	89.95
South Dublin County Council	97.78
South Tipperary County Council	88.65
Waterford City Council	94.52
Waterford County Council	91.72
Westmeath County Council	91.85
Wexford County Council	90.18
Wicklow County Council	94.92

a The recorded increase in the number of repair requests in 2008 over 2007 is due to improvements in the recording and tracking of repair requests rather than a substantial increase in the number of repair requests. (This was highlighted as an issue in 2007).

b Pre 2008 repair requests were recorded on in house IT System. In 2008 the "Home" on line system was introduced which has streamlined the process.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

H 3 Number of repairs completed as a percentage of the number of valid repair requests received		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	87.80	90.10	92.72
	Mean	85.80	87.10	90.65
Percentiles	25%	83.20	83.10	88.18
	75%	93.90	94.90	94.98

Table 36: Traveller Accommodation

	H4. Total number of traveller families accommodated as a percentage of the targets set in the local traveller accommodation programme
Carlow County Council	100.00
Cavan County Council	66.67
Clare County Council	65.38
Cork City Council	91.67 ^a
Cork County Council	46.51
Donegal County Council	63.64 ^b
Dublin City Council	80.36
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	23.08
Fingal County Council	77.14
Galway City Council	93.33
Galway County Council	37.50
Kerry County Council	121.74
Kildare County Council	N/A ^c
Kilkenny County Council	40.00
Laois County Council	72.22
Leitrim County Council	100.00 ^d
Limerick City Council	66.00
Limerick County Council	35.16 ^e
Longford County Council	100.00 ^f
Louth County Council	100.00
Mayo County Council	236.67 ^g
Meath County Council	410.00
Monaghan County Council	100.00
North Tipperary County Council	180.00
Offaly County Council	91.67
Roscommon County Council	N/A ^h
Sligo County Council	50.00
South Dublin County Council	97.01
South Tipperary County Council	100.00
Waterford City Council	70.00
Waterford County Council	100.00
Westmeath County Council	141.67
Wexford County Council	80.65
Wicklow County Council	46.43

a It should be noted that this figure includes 4 families who were housed in bays on halting sites for which Cork City Council has no target within the Traveller accommodation programme as it is a demand led service.

bThe Traveller Accommodation Programme 2005 - 2008 expired on the 31st Dec 2008- overall 44 out of 47 units of accommodation were provided. Three families were carried over to the new Traveller Accommodation Programme 2009 - 2013.

c No target in Traveller Accommodation Plan

d Target includes the actual target for 2008 plus the balance of the target carried over from 2007

e Traveller Accommodation Programme 2005-2008 provides for 91 families over the period of the Programme

f Target per Traveller Accommodation Programme is 12 houses per annum over four years.

g This figure includes private rented accommodation secured with the assistance of Local Traveller Accommodation Liaison Officers.

h Original projected figures for Group Housing and Transient Site were not met as there was no demand. No identified need for single instance. Two refusals of offers of houses.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

H 4 Traveller families accommodated (as a percentage of the target in the local Traveller accommodation programme)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	32
	Missing	0	0	2
Average	Median	91	68.50	86.20
	Mean	93.30	78.40	96.40
Percentiles	25%	60.70	48.50	64.10
	75%	124.80	101.80	100

Table 37: Enforcement of Standards in Private Rented Sector (NEW)

(Note: This indicator has been introduced for the first time in 2008)

	H5A Total number of registered tenancies	H5B Number of dwelling units inspected	H5C Number of inspections carried out	H5D Number of dwellings inspected as percentage of registered tenancies (i.e. B as percentage of A)
Carlow County Council	2,405	164	188	6.82
Cavan County Council	1,013	619	642	61.11
Clare County Council	3,617	758	796	20.96e
Cork City Council	16,454	598	775	3.63
Cork County Council	11,276a	1,264	1,264	11.21
Donegal County Council	2,349	438	438	18.65
Dublin City Council	68,880	2,822	4,303	4.10
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	14,103	706	746	5.01
Fingal County Council	18,000b	347	376	1.93
Galway City Council	12,141	235	257	1.94
Galway County Council	4,768	181	181	3.80
Kerry County Council	8,578	428	428	4.99
Kildare County Council	9,206	769	1,117	8.35
Kilkenny County Council	2,419	60	63	2.48
Laois County Council	2,202	101	101	4.59
Leitrim County Council	1,019c	200	200	19.63f
Limerick City Council	5,442	452	498	8.31
Limerick County Council	5,327	178	188	3.34
Longford County Council	2,326	239	462	10.28
Louth County Council	4,595	122	122	2.66
Mayo County Council	3,370	618	627	18.34
Meath County Council	2705	59	30d	1.1
Monaghan County Council	812	744	744	91.63
North Tipperary County Council	1,958	457	465	23.34
Offaly County Council	1,783	78	104	4.37
Roscommon County Council	2,002	170	229	8.49
Sligo County Council	3,990	60	60	1.50
South Dublin County Council	9,669	738	808	7.63
South Tipperary County Council	2,106	1,153	1,155	54.75
Waterford City Council	3,098	73	73	2.36
Waterford County Council	1,825	61	61	3.34
Westmeath County Council	3,800	160	160	4.21
Wexford County Council	1,806	132	177	7.31
Wicklow County Council	6,903	296	295	4.29

a The most recent PRTB figures published relate to the period Jan - Aug '08. No more up to date information was available.
b We do not have access to this total figure. The PRTB website does not categorise by county (for Dublin area).
c 1019 relates to properties registered with PRTB per their database.
d RAS inspections only
e The figure of 3617 may not be up to date as our experience shows that it includes houses that have changed ownership and houses that have returned to owner – occupation.
f Properties previously inspected would not, other than in specific circumstances, need to be inspected on an annual basis.

Note: This indicator is included for the first time in Table 37, and is the subject of comment in the Report of the Independent Assessment Panel (See page 4 of Appendix 1). The IAP recommended that for the reasons outlined in their Report there is a need to review this indicator with a view to achieving greater consistency. The LGMSB has become aware, also, of inconsistencies between this data and data collected by the DoEHLG. This could of course be possible –depending on time of collection, definition, etc. However, in overall terms, the LGMSB is supportive of the views of the IAP on this matter, given the importance of the indicator on the one hand, and the need to strive towards greater consistency.

In addition, since the Report was drafted, the DoEHLG has pointed out that the PRTB provides funding, as per directions from the Department, to the local authorities in relation to the carrying out of inspections on the basis of (a) the annual inspection targets set by the local authorities, and (b) the actual inspections performance as measured against those targets. Local authorities have submitted inspections targets to the Department since 2007. In 2009, 40% of the total funding allocation will be paid based on the target number of inspections and 60% of the total allocation will be paid on the basis of actual inspection performance.

Summary Statistics 2008

H5 ^(NEW) Enforcement of Standards in Private Rented Sector		H5A Total Number of registered tenancies	H5B Number of dwelling units inspected	H5C Number of swellings inspected as percentage of registered tenancies
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3493.50	267.50	335.50
	Mean	7038.26	454.44	533.32
Percentiles	25%	239301	15451	18133
	75%	1991	129.50	150.50

Table 38: Grants to Adapt Housing for the Needs of People with a Disability ^(NEW)

(Note: This indicator has been introduced for the first time in 2008)

	H6A Average time taken (in weeks) to process applications under the Mobility Aids Grant Scheme, including any necessary inspection(s), from the date of receipt of a valid application to the date of decision on the application	H6B Average time taken (in weeks) to process applications under Housing Adaptation Grant for People with a Disability, including any necessary inspection(s), from the date of receipt, to the date of decision on the application
Carlow County Council	12.0	11.0
Cavan County Council	5.0	10.3
Clare County Council	6.4	7.0
Cork City Council a	8.0	8.0
Cork County Council	6.0	9.0
Donegal County Council	11.0	9.0
Dublin City Council	31.6	29.6
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	3.8	12.2
Fingal County Council	8.0	8.0
Galway City Council	10.6	10.6
Galway County Council	14.0	6.0
Kerry County Council	21.6	21.5
Kildare County Council	3.7	8.2
Kilkenny County Council	22.3	22.2
Laois County Council	4.0	8.0
Leitrim County Council	6.0 ^b	12.0 ^c
Limerick City Council	7.8	19.0
Limerick County Council	21.0	19.5
Longford County Council	5.0	5.0
Louth County Council	8.0	8.0
Mayo County Council	31.0	28.0 ^d
Meath County Council	13.0	15.0
Monaghan County Council	5.0	20.0
North Tipperary County Council	14.2	9.9
Offaly County Council	29.5	32.6
Roscommon County Council	7.0	13.0
Sligo County Council	10.0	10.0
South Dublin County Council	14.4	19.7
South Tipperary County Council	8.0	5.9
Waterford City Council	5.0	6.8
Waterford County Council	14.0	10.0
Westmeath County Council	6.0	6.5
Wexford County Council	8.0	11.0
Wicklow County Council	14.6	15.3

a In normal circumstances the time indicated above would be the time-frame for processing a fully completed application. However, subject to Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government funding constraints the time frame is not always achievable.

b Given that these were new Grant Schemes there was a lead-in time in 2008 in familiarising clients with the new requirements and getting the Schemes fully up and running thus impacting on the processing time.

c The Housing Adaptation Grant for People with a Disability also involves obtaining an OT report from the HSE which contributes to the difference in processing times.

d This figure reflects budgetary constraints experienced during the course of 2008.

Comparison Statistics 2009

		H6A <small>NEW</small> Average time taken (in weeks) to process applications under the Mobility Aids Grant Scheme, including any necessary inspection(s), from the date of receipt of a valid application to the date of decision on the application	H6B <small>NEW</small> Average time taken (in weeks) to process applications under Housing Adaptation Grant for People with a Disability, including any necessary inspection(s), from the date of receipt, to the date of decision on the application
N	Valid	34	34
	Missing	0	0
Average	Median	8	10.40
	Mean	11.60	13.20
Percentiles	25%	6	8
	75%	14.30	19.10

Table 39: Pre-Tenancy Familiarisation Courses (NEW)

(Note: This indicator has been introduced for the first time in 2008)

	H7A Pre-Tenancy Familiarisation Courses: Total number of new local authority tenants	H7B Percentage of new local authority tenants who have been offered pre- tenancy familiarisation courses
Carlow County Council	87	51.7
Cavan County Council	277	96.8
Clare County Council	229	100.0
Cork City Council	413	18.6
Cork County Council	544	90.3
Donegal County Council	318	94.7
Dublin City Council	902	51.4
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	112	43.8
Fingal County Council	329	100.0
Galway City Council	193	35.8c
Galway County Council	202	100.0
Kerry County Council	295	80.0
Kildare County Council	204	100.0
Kilkenny County Council	392	100.0
Laois County Council	168	43.5
Leitrim County Council a	112	100.0
Limerick City Council	97	100.0
Limerick County Council	194	63.4
Longford County Council	213	63.9
Louth County Council	406	100.0
Mayo County Council	146	100.0
Meath County Council	255	100.0
Monaghan County Council	122	88.5
North Tipperary County Council	135	91.9
Offaly County Council	145	93.1
Roscommon County Council	131	64.9d
Sligo County Council	185	100.0
South Dublin County Council	542	55.2
South Tipperary County Council	267	95.9
Waterford City Council	400	100.0
Waterford County Council	153	100.0
Westmeath County Council	183	100.0
Wexford County Council	88b	94.3
Wicklow County Council	246	67.1e

a All new tenants are required to attend pre-tenancy training prior to signing of Letting Agreement.
b Figures not available for full year.
c Number is lower than normal due to number of "one off" tenancies allocated in dispersed locations around the city.
d This figure relates to formal courses catering for a number of tenants at one time. One to One training is also carried out where there are individual lettings.
e Some tenants did not undergo formal course but would have received responsibility awareness session from housing staff

Summary Statistics 2009

H7 Pre-Tenancy Familiarisation Courses		H7A ^{NEW} Pre-Tenancy Familiarisation Courses: Total number of new local authority tenants	H7B ^{NEW} Percentage of new local authority tenants who have been offered pre- tenancy familiarisation courses
N	Valid	34	34
	Missing	0	0
Average	Median	203	94.50
	Mean	255.40	81.90
Percentiles	25%	142.50	63.70
	75%	320.80	100

Section 10: Planning

Table 40: Planning Applications –Decision Making - Individual Houses

	P1.1A. Number of applications decided (Individual Houses)	P1.1B. Number of those decisions which were decided within 8 weeks	P1.1C. Number of those decisions which required the submission of further information	P1.1D. Number of those decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant, under section 34(9) of the Planning and development Act 2000	P1.1E. Average length of time taken (in days) to decide an application where further information was sought
Carlow County Council	389	273	116	0	73.93
Cavan County Council	1,026	715	310	0	71.10
Clare County Council	780	345	368	67	86.08
Cork City Council	51	33	16	2	79.00
Cork County Council	2,214	1,097	1,032	85	75.00
Donegal County Council	2,568	1,469	958b	143	65.00
Dublin City Council	369	308	61	0	77.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	255	178	77	0	78.00
Fingal County Council	316	211	105	1	79.00
Galway City Council	125	66	58	1	74.00
Galway County Council	1,451	533	528	391	80.00
Kerry County Council	1,099	683	405	11	78.58
Kildare County Council	817	245	571	1	66.00
Kilkenny County Council	649	346	303	0	77.13
Laois County Council	466	271	194	1	71.99
Leitrim County Council	283	117	164	2	70.79
Limerick City Council	1	1	0	0	0.00
Limerick County Council	725	243	450	33	80.00
Longford County Council	286	170	111	5	79.21
Louth County Council	555	202	344	9	76.05
Mayo County Council	1,070	317	684	68	74.00
Meath County Council	936	618	313	5	79.00
Monaghan County Council	777	255	511	11	73.00
North Tipperary County Council	387	142	189	56	77.81
Offaly County Council	767a	470	295	1	75.37
Roscommon County Council	553	204	348	1	79.13
Sligo County Council	417	321	67	29	74.42
South Dublin County Council	249	184	65	0	78.28
South Tipperary County Council	414	252	162	0	75.00
Waterford City Council	25	16	9	0	76.33
Waterford County Council	770	445	323	2	78.68
Westmeath County Council	571	316	253	0	78.11
Wexford County Council	986	730	248	9	73.00
Wicklow County Council	610	277	247	86	78.03
Totals	22,957	12,053	9,985	1,020	
a One Application fell due in the Christmas holiday period and while the authority is allowed an additional 9 days in this period, in accordance with the Regulations, this application was decided outside the 8 week timeframe.					
b The figures do not add up correctly as two applications for which FI was requested were also granted extensions of time.					

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.1A Individual Houses - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	695	714	563
	Mean	942.90	880.50	675.21
Percentiles	25%	451.30	421.30	308.50
	75%	979.80	967.30	846.75

P 1.1B Number of decisions which were decided within 8 weeks		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	337.50	329.50	272
	Mean	494.90	442.20	354.50
Percentiles	25%	271.80	273.50	182.50
	75%	523	479.80	451.30

P 1.1C Number of decisions which required the submission of further information		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	363	333.50	250.50
	Mean	399.30	392	290.70
Percentiles	25%	128	121.80	98
	75%	527.30	571	377.30

P 1.1D Number of decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	4	1.50	2
	Mean	46.80	45.90	30
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	45.50	47	30

P 1.1E Average length of time (days) taken to decide an application where further information was sought		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	33
	Missing	0	0	1
Average	Median	79	76	77
	Mean	77.80	76.10	76
Percentiles	25%	72.50	74.80	73.97
	75%	80	79	78.84

Table 41: Planning Applications –Decision Making – Individual Houses (continued)

	P1.1F. Percentage of applications granted	P1.1G. Percentage of applications refused	P1.1H. Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed, with or without variations, by An Bord Pleanala	P1.1I. Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala
Carlow County Council	84.32	15.68	88.89	11.11
Cavan County Council	8.41	1.34	33.33	66.67
Clare County Council	81.92	18.08	77.97	22.03
Cork City Council	76.47	23.53	66.67	33.33
Cork County Council	71.23	28.77	64.89	35.11
Donegal County Council	80.26	19.74	38.46	61.54
Dublin City Council	62.87	37.13	70.00	30.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	50.59	49.41	73.49	26.51
Fingal County Council	42.72	57.28	88.33	11.67
Galway City Council	89.60	10.40	88.89	11.11
Galway County Council	81.05	18.95	57.45	42.55
Kerry County Council	67.79	32.21	70.97	29.03
Kildare County Council	69.77	30.23	50.00	50.00
Kilkenny County Council	63.79	36.21	58.33	41.67
Laois County Council	75.75	24.25	90.91	9.09
Leitrim County Council	78.80	21.20	77.78 ^a	22.22 ^a
Limerick City Council	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Limerick County Council	77.79	22.21	82.14	17.86
Longford County Council	76.92	23.08	30.00	70.00
Louth County Council	86.13	13.87	39.13 ^b	60.87 ^b
Mayo County Council	86.45	13.55	70.18	29.82
Meath County Council	55.56	44.44	64.29	35.71
Monaghan County Council	79.02	20.98	50.00	50.00
North Tipperary County Council	84.50	15.50	88.24	11.76
Offaly County Council	81.49	18.51	64.71	35.29
Roscommon County Council	84.81	15.19	52.63	47.37
Sligo County Council	90.41	9.59	61.54	38.46
South Dublin County Council	53.41	46.59	73.58	26.42
South Tipperary County Council	80.43	19.57	61.11	38.89
Waterford City Council	84.00	16.00	50.00	50.00
Waterford County Council	76.88	23.12	61.29	38.71
Westmeath County Council	71.63	28.37	80.95	19.05
Wexford County Council	73.53	26.47	54.26	45.74
Wicklow County Council	72.30	27.70	62.00	38.00

^a 9 appeals were determined by An Bord Pleanala in 2008. Of these 7 of the original decisions by Leitrim County Council were confirmed while 2 were reversed by An Bord Pleanala.

^b Of the 555 applications determined, 23 (or 4.14%) were appealed. Of these 9 of the 23 (or 39.13%) were confirmed by ABP.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.1F Individual Houses - Percentage of Grants		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	72.90	75.10	76.90
	Mean	72.10	72.20	70.61
Percentiles	25%	65.80	64.80	66.79
	75%	79.30	79.50	82.44

P 1.1G Individual Houses - Percentage of Rrefusals		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	27.20	24.90	22.65
	Mean	27.90	27.80	26.74
Percentiles	25%	20.70	20.50	15.92
	75%	34.30	35.20	30.73

P 1.1H Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	69.30	66.20	64.80
	Mean	65.70	67.60	65.95
Percentiles	25%	60.60	58	53.85
	75%	78.20	81.90	78.72

P 1.1I Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	30.70	33.81	35.20
	Mean	34.30	32.42	34.05
Percentiles	25%	21.80	18.14	21.29
	75%	39.40	41.97	46.15

Table 42: Planning Applications –Decision Making – New Housing Development

	P1.2.A. Number of applications decided - New Developments	P1.2.B. Number of those decisions which were decided within 8 weeks	P1.2.C. Number of those decisions which required the submission of further information	P1.2.D. Number of those decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant, under section 34(9) of the Planning and development Act 2000	P1.2.E. Average length of time taken (in days) to decide an application where further information was sought
Carlow County Council	63	33	28	0	81.20
Cavan County Council	64	32	32	0	76.71
Clare County Council	93	29	58	4	57.74
Cork City Council	53	23	28	2	82.00
Cork County Council	277	139	129	9	77.00
Donegal County Council	313	108	170c	36	69.00
Dublin City Council	209	144	65	0	77.75
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	155	106	49	0	74.00
Fingal County Council	136	79	57	1	93.00
Galway City Council	39	12	26	1	79.00
Galway County Council	167	30	72	64	81.00
Kerry County Council	201	110	85	6	79.12
Kildare County Council	148	33	115	0	88.00
Kilkenny County Council	63	26	37	0	79.50
Laois County Council	57	25	32	0	77.47
Leitrim County Council	21	6	14	1	74.57
Limerick City Council	4	1	3	0	73.00
Limerick County Council	81	24	53	5	81.00
Longford County Council	38	18	19	1	82.58
Louth County Council	95	32	62	1	77.00
Mayo County Council	105	34	65	6	76.00
Meath County Council	83a	57	25	1	81.00
Monaghan County Council	86	24	59	3	79.00
North Tipperary County Council	72	27	42	3	81.19
Offaly County Council	54	22	32	0	80.79
Roscommon County Council	93	24	69	0	83.51
Sligo County Council	30	15	15	0	77.87
South Dublin County Council	80	44	36	0	78.33
South Tipperary County Council	81	29	51	1	79.00
Waterford City Council	30b	12	18	0	78.28
Waterford County Council	67	20	47	0	71.84
Westmeath County Council	41	15	26	1	132.74
Wexford County Council	459	336	117	6	77.00
Wicklow County Council	109	55	45	7	80.49
Totals	3,997	1,724	1,781	159	

a Meath CoCo & 3 Town Councils.

b Mixed use developments comprising of commercial and residential have been counted as housing developments in the absence of clarification.

c The figures do not add up here as one planning application had an FI as well as an extension of time.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.2A Developments - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	125	116	81
	Mean	184.60	170.30	107.85
Percentiles	25%	72.30	84.30	53.75
	75%	201.50	183.30	139

P 1.2B Number of decisions which were decided within 8 weeks		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	43.50	52	29
	Mean	93.50	84.50	50.70
Percentiles	25%	28	35	21.50
	75%	78	84.80	55.50

P 1.2C Number of decisions which required the submission of further information		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	64.50	62.50	46
	Mean	83.10	79	52.40
Percentiles	25%	35.50	36.5	27.50
	75%	98.30	96	65

P 1.2D Number of decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	1	1.50	1
	Mean	8.20	6.90	4.70
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	5.30	4.30	4.30

P 1.2E Average length of time (days) taken to decide an application where further information was sought		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	81	80	79
	Mean	81.30	87.50	79.93
Percentiles	25%	78	78	76.93
	75%	83	81	81.05

Table 43: Planning Applications – Decision Making – New Housing Developments

	P1.2F. Percentage of applications granted	P1.2G. Percentage of applications refused	P1.2H. Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed, with or without variations, by An Bord Pleanala	P1.2I. Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala
Carlow County Council	74.60	25.40	58.33	41.67
Cavan County Council	84.38	15.62	45.45	54.55
Clare County Council	61.29	38.71	72.00	28.00
Cork City Council	77.36	22.64	72.73	27.27
Cork County Council	76.90	23.10	65.79	34.21
Donegal County Council	74.44	25.56	58.33	41.67
Dublin City Council	64.35	35.65	70.27	29.73
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	40.00	60.00	76.92	23.08
Fingal County Council	50.00	50.00	67.86	32.14
Galway City Council	74.36	25.64	75.00	25.00
Galway County Council	67.07	32.93	51.52	48.48
Kerry County Council	62.69	37.31	68.63	31.37
Kildare County Council	64.86	35.14	72.34	27.66
Kilkenny County Council	66.67	33.33	37.50	62.50
Laois County Council	68.42	31.58	81.82	18.18
Leitrim County Council	57.14	42.86	40.00 ^a	60.00 ^a
Limerick City Council	25.00	75.00	0.00	100.00
Limerick County Council	65.43	34.57	83.33	16.67
Longford County Council	84.21	15.79	50.00	50.00
Louth County Council	74.74	25.26	61.29 ^b	38.71 ^b
Mayo County Council	73.33	26.67	89.66	10.34
Meath County Council	50.60	49.40	72.22	27.78
Monaghan County Council	70.93	29.07	71.43	28.57
North Tipperary County Council	76.39	23.61	75.00	25.00
Offaly County Council	50.00	50.00	76.92	23.08
Roscommon County Council	72.04	27.96	63.64	36.36
Sligo County Council	86.67	13.33	66.67	33.33
South Dublin County Council	58.75	41.25	68.00	32.00
South Tipperary County Council	76.54	23.46	46.67	53.33
Waterford City Council	80.00	20.00	100.00	0.00
Waterford County Council	74.63	25.37	28.57	71.43
Westmeath County Council	63.41	36.59	88.24	11.76
Wexford County Council	64.05	35.95	58.39	41.61
Wicklow County Council	57.80	42.20	68.97	31.03

^a 5 appeals were determined by An Bord Pleanala in 2008. Of these, 2 of the original decisions by Leitrim County Council were confirmed while 3 were reversed by An Bord Pleanala.

^b Of the 95 applications determined, 31 (or 32.63%) were appealed. Of these 19 of the 31 (or 61.29%) were confirmed by ABP.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.2F Developments - Percentage of Grants		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	66.80	66	67.75
	Mean	67.60	64.10	66.74
Percentiles	25%	60.40	55.10	60.66
	75%	76	74.90	75.15

P 1.2G Development - Percentage of Refusals		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	33.20	34	32.26
	Mean	32.40	35.90	33.26
Percentiles	25%	24	25	24.85
	75%	39.60	44.90	39.35

P 1.2H Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	68.70	71	68.32
	Mean	68	68.70	64.22
Percentiles	25%	54.10	54.50	56.63
	75%	78.70	78.60	75

P 1.2I Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	31.30	29.10	31.69
	Mean	31.90	31.30	35.78
Percentiles	25%	21.30	21.40	25
	75%	43.60	45.50	43.37

Table 44: Planning Applications –Decision Making – Other: Not requiring Environmental Impact Assessment

	P1.3.A Other: Not Requiring EIA: Number of applications decided	P1.3B. Number of those decisions which were decided within 8 weeks	P1.3C. Number of those decisions which required the submission of further information	P1.3D. Number of those decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant, under section 34(9) of the Planning and development Act 2000	P1.3E Average length of time (in days) to decide an application where further information was sought
Carlow County Council	314	237	75	0	75.44
Cavan County Council	641	414	227	0	76.00
Clare County Council	952	705	231	7	69.31
Cork City Council	702	535	153	14	80.00
Cork County Council	4,190	2,676	1,442	72	75.00
Donegal County Council	1,544	1,132	348c	67	67.00
Dublin City Council	3,089	2,746	343	0	77.30
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	1,627	1,376	251	1	74.00
Fingal County Council	1,337	1,052	285	0	96.00
Galway City Council	475	301	174	0	76.29
Galway County Council	1,881	1,309	419	156	80.00
Kerry County Council	1,494	1,121	369	4	79.14
Kildare County Council	1,270	651	618d	0	71.00
Kilkenny County Council	881	596	284	1	78.35
Laois County Council	657	494	163	0	74.79
Leitrim County Council	372	209	163	0	70.84
Limerick City Council	331	186	144	0	68.92
Limerick County Council	1,073	619	442	14	78.00
Longford County Council	279	210	68	1	81.72
Louth County Council	1,000	658	335	7	74.04
Mayo County Council	966	581	362	22	75.00
Meath County Council	1,622a	1,199	413	9	78.00
Monaghan County Council	671	371	298	2	77.00
North Tipperary County Council	594	360	211	23	78.17
Offaly County Council	348b	206	140	0	76.91
Roscommon County Council	559	316	242	1	78.17
Sligo County Council	513	427	83	3	75.16
South Dublin County Council	1,102	950	152	0	77.73
South Tipperary County Council	729	575	151	0	77.00
Waterford City Council	274	203	70	1	73.57
Waterford County Council	367	235	133	3	77.79
Westmeath County Council	550	351	198	3	80.22
Wexford County Council	1,452	1,195	254	4	77.00
Wicklow County Council	1,095	712	358	22	74.77
Totals	34,951	24,908	9,599	437	

a Meath CoCo & 3 Town Councils.

b One application related to a SEVESO site which required the authority to get advice from the Health and Safety Authority regarding the application. The Authority was required to wait a further 4 weeks from the receipt of that advice before deciding on the application. The second Application fell due in the Christmas Holiday Period and while the authority is allowed an additional 9 days in this period, in accordance with the Regulations, this application was decided outside the 8 week timeframe.

c There are 2 applications where both an FI was requested and extension of time granted which explains the discrepancy in the figures.

d Difference relates to a material contravention ref 08/97.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.3A Not requiring EIA - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	1,083	1,339	805
	Mean	1,226.50	1,524.50	1027.97
Percentiles	25%	625	786.30	503.50
	75%	1,450.80	1,764.80	1365.75

P 1.3B Number of decisions which were decided within 8 weeks		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	768.50	931	578
	Mean	908.80	1,136.60	732.59
Percentiles	25%	440.50	597	312.25
	75%	1,126	1,292	1069.25

P 1.3C Number of decisions which required the submission of further information		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	241.50	286	236.50
	Mean	303.90	371.60	282.32
Percentiles	25%	172.80	196.50	151.75
	75%	376.50	433.30	350.50

P 1.3D Number of decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3	3.50	1.50
	Mean	12.60	16.20	12.85
Percentiles	25%	0	1	0
	75%	13	17.30	10.25

P 1.3E Average length of time (days) taken to decide an application where further information was sought		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	77	77.50	76.95
	Mean	74.30	78.80	76.46
Percentiles	25%	73.80	74	74.59
	75%	79	79	78.17

Table 45: Planning Applications –Decision Making – Other: Not requiring Environmental Impact Assessment

	P1. 3F. Percentage of applications granted	P1.3G. Percentage of applications refused	P1.3H. Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed, with or without variations, by An Bord Pleanala	P1.3I. Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala
Carlow County Council	94.27	5.73	74.07	25.93
Cavan County Council	90.02	9.98	65.62	34.38
Clare County Council	91.60	8.30	75.00	25.00
Cork City Council	86.04	13.96	70.49	29.51
Cork County Council	87.71	12.29	79.80	20.20
Donegal County Council	90.16	9.84	63.89	36.11
Dublin City Council	88.33	11.67	74.62	25.38
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	81.87	18.13	83.73	16.27
Fingal County Council	84.44	15.48	72.57	27.43
Galway City Council	83.16	16.84	68.18	31.82
Galway County Council	93.78	6.22	67.21	32.79
Kerry County Council	89.09	10.91	61.63	38.37
Kildare County Council	92.68	7.32	75.51	24.49
Kilkenny County Council	90.01	9.99	72.55	27.45
Laois County Council	90.11	9.89	76.67	23.33
Leitrim County Council	91.94	8.06	80.00 ^a	20.00 ^a
Limerick City Council	91.84	8.16	82.61	17.39
Limerick County Council	89.56	10.44	65.71	34.29
Longford County Council	92.11	7.89	83.33	16.67
Louth County Council	91.30	8.70	72.22 ^b	27.78 ^b
Mayo County Council	95.03	4.97	93.48	6.52
Meath County Council	75.96	24.04	68.24	31.76
Monaghan County Council	93.74	6.26	66.67	33.33
North Tipperary County Council	93.27	6.73	82.61	17.39
Offaly County Council	89.66	10.34	66.67	33.33
Roscommon County Council	95.17	4.83	81.48	18.52
Sligo County Council	92.98	7.02	91.30	8.70
South Dublin County Council	91.20	8.80	71.29	28.71
South Tipperary County Council	91.63	8.37	74.19	25.81
Waterford City Council	86.86	13.14	76.47	23.53 ^c
Waterford County Council	91.28	8.72	48.00	52.00
Westmeath County Council	81.64	18.36	86.67	13.33
Wexford County Council	84.37	15.63	63.15	36.85
Wicklow County Council	85.30	14.70	67.90	32.10

^a 10 appeals were determined by An Bord Pleanala in 2008. Of these 8 of the original decisions by Leitrim County Council were confirmed while 2 were reversed by An Bord Pleanala.

^b Of the 1000 applications determined, 54 (or 5.4%) were appealed. Of these 39 of the 54 (or 72.22%) were confirmed by ABP.

^c Of the 274 applications in this category determined, 17 or 6.02% were appealed and 4 (or 1.46%) of applications determined were reversed by An Bord.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.3F Not requiring EIA - Percentage of Grants		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	93	92.40	90.14
	Mean	91.90	91.80	89.36
Percentiles	25%	89	89.80	86.65
	75%	95	95	92.25

P 1.3G Not requiring EIA - Percentage of Refusals		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	7	7.70	9.80
	Mean	8.10	8.20	10.60
Percentiles	25%	5	5	7.70
	75%	11	10.20	13.40

P 1.3H Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	75.20	70.80	73.32
	Mean	72	70.40	73.63
Percentiles	25%	64.90	66.80	67.07
	75%	80	77.80	80.37

P 1.3I Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	25	29.20	26.7
	Mean	28	29.60	26.36
Percentiles	25%	20	22.20	19.63
	75%	35.10	33.30	32.93

Table 46: Planning Applications – Decision Making – Other: Requiring Environmental Impact Assessment

	P1.4.A Other: Requiring EIA: Number of applications decided	P1.4B. Number of those decisions which were decided within 8 weeks	P1.4C. Number of those decisions which required the submission of further information	P1.4D. Number of those decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant, under section 34(9) of the Planning and development Act 2000	P1.4E. Average length of time taken (in days) to decide an application where further information was sought
Carlow County Council	29	21	8	0	80.25
Cavan County Council	10	6	4	0	74.00
Clare County Council	20	7	13	0	47.76
Cork City Council	10	5	3	2	88.00
Cork County Council	18	3	15	0	103.00
Donegal County Council	8	4	4	0	86.00
Dublin City Council	9	1	8	0	107.25
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	2	1	1	0	110.00
Fingal County Council	3	0	3	0	91.00
Galway City Council	3	0	3	0	119.00
Galway County Council	10	3	4	2	111.00
Kerry County Council	18	9	9	0	96.33
Kildare County Council	14	0	13a	0	111.00
Kilkenny County Council	3	0	3	0	97.33
Laois County Council	11	1	10	0	94.60
Leitrim County Council	1	0	1	0	81.00
Limerick City Council	3	0	3	0	97.33
Limerick County Council	6	4	2	0	81.00
Longford County Council	2	0	2	0	81.50
Louth County Council	16	4	11	1	97.55
Mayo County Council	8	4	3	1	85.33
Meath County Council	21	16	5	0	119.00
Monaghan County Council	16	3	13	0	84.00
North Tipperary County Council	15	8	5	2	91.80
Offaly County Council	16	8	8	0	78.75
Roscommon County Council	4	1	3	0	104.33
Sligo County Council	2	1	1	0	108.00
South Dublin County Council	6	1	5	0	111.00
South Tipperary County Council	17	7	8	2	104.00
Waterford City Council	1	0	1	0	107.00
Waterford County Council	15	12	3	0	90.00
Westmeath County Council	6	0	6	0	91.75
Wexford County Council	7	1	6	1	124.00
Wicklow County Council	17	11	6	0	80.29
Totals	330	142	193	11	

a Difference relates to a material contravention ref08/409

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.4A Requiring EIA - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	6	10	10.21
	Mean	6.50	12.10	9.50
Percentiles	25%	3	4.80	3
	75%	9.30	19	16

P1.4B Number of decisions which were decided within 8 weeks		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	2	5	10.70
	Mean	2.40	5.40	14.70
Percentiles	25%	0.80	1.80	0
	75%	4	8	27.10

P 1.4C Number of decisions which required the submission of further information		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	3.50	5	4.50
	Mean	3.60	6.30	5.68
Percentiles	25%	1	2	3
	75%	5	8.30	8

P 1.4D Number of decisions where an extension of time was agreed to by the applicant		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	0	0	0
	Mean	0.5	0.4	0.32
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	1	0	0

P 1.4E Average length of time (days) taken to decide an application where further information was sought		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	86.50	90	95.50
	Mean	83.40	84.50	95.10
Percentiles	25%	76.50	78	83.40
	75%	100.50	104	107.40

Table 47: Planning Applications –Decision Making – Other: Requiring Environmental Impact Assessment

	P1.4F. Percentage of applications granted	P1.4G. Percentage of applications refused	P1.4H. Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed, with or without variations, by An Bord Pleanala	P1.4I. Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala
Carlow County Council	89.66	10.34	66.67	33.33
Cavan County Council	90.00	10.00	0.00	100.00
Clare County Council	80.00	20.00	100.00	0.00
Cork City Council	70.00	30.00	0.00	100.00
Cork County Council	83.33	16.67	80.00	20.00
Donegal County Council	87.50	12.50	100.00	0.00
Dublin City Council	77.78	22.22	83.33	16.67
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00
Fingal County Council	66.67	33.33	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
Galway County Council	90.00	10.00	100.00	0.00
Kerry County Council	88.89	11.11	66.67	33.33
Kildare County Council	92.86	7.14	88.89	11.11
Kilkenny County Council	100.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
Laois County Council	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Leitrim County Council	100.00	0.00	33.33a	66.67a
Limerick City Council	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
Limerick County Council	33.33	66.67	66.67	33.33
Longford County Council	100.00	0.00	N/A	N/A
Louth County Council	100.00	0.00	100.00b	0.00b
Mayo County Council	87.50	12.50	66.67	33.33
Meath County Council	71.43	28.57	40.00	60.00
Monaghan County Council	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
North Tipperary County Council	73.33	26.67	100.00	0.00
Offaly County Council	93.75	6.25	33.33	66.67
Roscommon County Council	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
Sligo County Council	100.00	0.00	N/A	N/A
South Dublin County Council	83.33	16.67	66.67	33.33
South Tipperary County Council	88.24	11.76	100.00	0.00
Waterford City Council	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
Waterford County Council	93.33	6.67	100.00	0.00
Westmeath County Council	66.67	33.33	100.00	0.00
Wexford County Council	71.43	28.57	100.00	0.00
Wicklow County Council	70.59	29.41	50.00	50.00

a 3 appeals were determined by An Bord Pleanala in 2008. Of these, 1 of the original decisions by Leitrim County Council was confirmed while 2 were reversed by An Bord Pleanala.

b Of the 16 applications determined, 4 (or 25%) were appealed. All of these 4 (or 100%) were confirmed by ABP.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.4F Requiring EIA - Percentage of Grants		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	84	86.20	89.30
	Mean	81.40	85.60	85.30
Percentiles	25%	80	80	72.90
	75%	100	100	100

P 1.4G Requiring EIA - Percentage of Refusals		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	16	13.80	10.70
	Mean	18.60	14.40	14.70
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	20	2	27.10

P 1.4H Percentage of cases where the decision was confirmed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	31
	Missing	0	0	3
Average	Median	67	52.20	88.90
	Mean	67.20	53.60	73.90
Percentiles	25%	0	0	50
	75%	50	100	100

P 1.4I Percentage of cases where the decision was reversed by An Bord Pleanala		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	31
	Missing	0	0	3
Average	Median	0	0	11.10
	Mean	18.10	22.90	26.10
Percentiles	25%	0	0	0
	75%	0	56.70	50

Table 48: Planning Applications by Category

	P1.1.A. Number of applications decided (Individual Houses)	P1.2.A. Number of applications decided - New Developments	P1.3.A Other: Not Requiring EIA: Number of applications decided	P1.4.A Other: Requiring EIA: Number of applications decided
Carlow County Council	389	63	314	29
Cavan County Council	1,026	64	641	10
Clare County Council	780	93	952	20
Cork City Council	51	53	702	10
Cork County Council	2,214	277	4,190	18
Donegal County Council	2,568	313	1,544	8
Dublin City Council	369	209	3,089	9
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	255	155	1,627	2
Fingal County Council	316	136	1,337	3
Galway City Council	125	39	475	3
Galway County Council	1,451	167	1,881	10
Kerry County Council	1,099	201	1,494	18
Kildare County Council	817	148	1,270	14
Kilkenny County Council	649	63	881	3
Laois County Council	466	57	657	11
Leitrim County Council	283	21	372	1
Limerick City Council	1	4	331	3
Limerick County Council	725	81	1,073	6
Longford County Council	286	38	279	2
Louth County Council	555	95	1,000	16
Mayo County Council	1,070	105	966	8
Meath County Council	936	83	1,622	21
Monaghan County Council	777	86	671	16
North Tipperary County Council	387	72	594	15
Offaly County Council	767	54	348	16
Roscommon County Council	553	93	559	4
Sligo County Council	417	30	513	2
South Dublin County Council	249	80	1,102	6
South Tipperary County Council	414	81	729	17
Waterford City Council	25	30	274	1
Waterford County Council	770	67	367	15
Westmeath County Council	571	41	550	6
Wexford County Council	986	459	1,452	7
Wicklow County Council	610	109	1,095	17
Totals	22,957	3,667	34,951	347

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 1.1A Individual Houses - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	695	714	563
	Mean	942.90	880.50	675.21
Percentiles	25%	451.30	421.30	308.50
	75%	979.80	967.30	846.75

P 1.2A Developments - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	125	116	81
	Mean	184.60	170.30	107.85
Percentiles	25%	72.30	84.30	53.75
	75%	201.50	183.30	139

P 1.3A Not requiring EIA - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	1,083	1,339	805
	Mean	1,226.50	1,524.50	1027.97
Percentiles	25%	625	786.30	503.50
	75%	1,450.80	1,764.80	1365.75

P 1.4A Requiring EIA - Number of applications decided		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	6	10	10.21
	Mean	6.50	12.10	9.50
Percentiles	25%	3	4.80	3
	75%	9.30	19	16

Table 49: Planning Enforcement

	P2.A. Total number of cases subject to complaints that were investigated	P2.B. Total number of cases subject to complaints that were dismissed	P2.C. Total number of cases subject to complaints that were resolved through negotiations
Carlow County Council	114	0	28
Cavan County Council	187	1	117
Clare County Council	389	69	143
Cork City Council	200	59	155
Cork County Council	640	1	490
Donegal County Council	862a	93	141
Dublin City Council	1,339	693	614
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	523	0	243
Fingal County Council	456	323f	47
Galway City Council	383	92	0
Galway County Council	631	105g	188j
Kerry County Council	580	69	473
Kildare County Council	345	41	65
Kilkenny County Council	291	0	85
Laois County Council	149	27	206
Leitrim County Council	150	5	32k
Limerick City Council	155	19	0
Limerick County Council	717	103	360l
Longford County Council	147	2	32
Louth County Council	646	123	156
Mayo County Council	344b	88h	90m
Meath County Council	351	59	1
Monaghan County Council	122	28	47
North Tipperary County Council	200	38	50
Offaly County Council	146	33	56
Roscommon County Council	171c	0	24n
Sligo County Council	256	77	193
South Dublin County Council	463	318i	356o
South Tipperary County Council	384d	8	286p
Waterford City Council	141	2	218q
Waterford County Council	221	8	45
Westmeath County Council	195	72	79
Wexford County Council	507e	85	216
Wicklow County Council	304	11	399r
Totals	12,709	2,652	5,635

a A large number of cases that are followed up in Donegal are the result of telephone calls or the public calling at the counter. Because of their significance they are included. We can advise that the actual number of written complaints and internal reports were 496, whereas 366 complaints were made either by telephone or in person.

b Total number of complaints received in 2008. Vexatious files are included as they are investigated.

c The number of cases relates to the number of complaints received from the public which increased during 2008. and does not include cases which relate solely to non-compliance with financial conditions.

d Additional resources focussed on enforcement including development contribution collection.

e The increase is accounted for by increase in level of complaints and extra enforcement proceedings in relation to the collection of planning contributions.

f The "number of cases" dismissed relate to files opened in 2007 and previous years which were determined in 2008

g The "number of cases" dismissed relate to files opened in 2007 and previous years which were determined in 2008

h No. of files closed - vexatious, minor and trivial, no substance or foundation, where the allegation was baseless.

i Large number of old files reviewed and closed during 2008 as matters were minor/trivial

j The figure should be read in conjunction with figures from the previous two years and arises from the timing of dealing with a significant number of cases.

k The low number of cases resolved through negotiation reflects the fact that a significant number of these cases are currently subject to planning applications for retention, remedial works or ongoing discussions - these cases are currently active and are not yet considered resolved.

l The reason for the increase on 2007 was due to a substantial increase in the level of activity in enforcement relating to the collection of development contributions and the cases in question being resolved through payment.

m Number of files closed - no longer have substance or foundation, i.e. unauthorised development was regularised by way of planning retention or the unauthorised development was removed.

n Includes cases closed in 2008 where conditions of planning permissions have been complied with and cases closed because of a grant of retention. Cases that were the subject of a retention application which was not granted were not included as they were not considered to be resolved.

o More proactive approach taken to resolving issues through issue of informal warning letter.

p Increase due to increased concentration of activities in this area

q Cases resolved include cases where complaints were received and upon investigation it was found that development was in accordance with a permission, exempt etc. Cases relating to complaints received in previous years and resolved in 2008 are also included, many of which no longer had any substance or foundation, or unauthorised development had been removed or resolved in various ways including retention applications.

r The query relates to number of cases subject of complaint that were resolved through negotiations. This figure has continued to increase over the last few years. This is mainly due to the increase of cases relating to Wicklow County Council being resolved through negotiations. Wicklow County Council endeavour, where appropriate, to resolve cases as the preferred course of action, rather than instigating legal proceedings. The resolution of these cases allows for the person to apply for retention permission or being given the opportunity to comply with conditions attached to the permission. Of the 253 cases resolved in 2007, all related to Wicklow County Council. With regard to the 2008 figure, of the 399 cases, 386 related to Wicklow County Council. Wicklow County Council consider this a very successful means of resolving matters relating to unauthorised development.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 2A Planning Enforcement - total number of cases subject to complaints that are investigated		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	260	284	324
	Mean	348.50	349.10	373.80
Percentiles	25%	131	146.50	167
	75%	478	533.80	511

P 2B Total number of cases subject to complaints that are dismissed		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	26	28.50	39.50
	Mean	53.90	62	78
Percentiles	25%	2.80	1.80	4.30
	75%	96.50	100.80	89

P 2C Total number of cases subject to complaints that were resolved through negotiations		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	57	125	129
	Mean	139.80	139	165.70
Percentiles	25%	8	24.50	46.50
	75%	136.50	189.30	224.30

Table 50: Planning Enforcement

	P2.D. Number of enforcement procedures taken through warning letters	P2.E. Number of enforcement procedures taken through enforcement notices	P2.F. Number of prosecutions
Carlow County Council	13	21	1
Cavan County Council	19	4	1
Clare County Council	300	157	13
Cork City Council	152	53	6
Cork County Council	913	128	50
Donegal County Council	397	76	24
Dublin City Council	1,177	416	172
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	526	149	54
Fingal County Council	280	104	28
Galway City Council	206a	332a	103
Galway County Council	386b	204	65
Kerry County Council	259	189	7
Kildare County Council	211	65	23
Kilkenny County Council	142	102	14
Laois County Council	143	61	6
Leitrim County Council	154	15	5
Limerick City Council	136	51	11f
Limerick County Council	463	303	36
Longford County Council	88	67	3
Louth County Council	412	168	24
Mayo County Council	166	4	3g
Meath County Council	207	101	34
Monaghan County Council	141	26	6
North Tipperary County Council	224	57	19
Offaly County Council	268	87	18
Roscommon County Council	201	49	7
Sligo County Council	219	126	35
South Dublin County Council	445	184d	78
South Tipperary County Council	446	122	2
Waterford City Council	87	24	0
Waterford County Council	129	82	14
Westmeath County Council	174	48	18
Wexford County Council	622c	464e	129e
Wicklow County Council	492	165	10h
Totals	10,198	4,204	1,019

a Decline in number of complaints received
b The figure is comparable to the five year average and is affected by ensuring only one warning letter is counted for each case
c The increase is accounted for by increase in level of complaints and extra enforcement proceedings in relation to the collection of planning contributions.
d Change in methodology to reflect number of files subject to Enforcement Notice, rather than number of persons on whom a notice was served
e The increase is accounted for by increase in level of complaints and extra enforcement proceedings in relation to the collection of planning contributions.
f 2 convicted, 4 settled, 5 ongoing.
g 31 files currently with the Councils Solicitor.
h Trend to resolve through negotiation if possible. Number of cases 116 greater than last year.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 2D Total number of enforcement procedures taken through warning letters		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	159	186	215.
	Mean	239.60	271.50	299.94
Percentiles	25%	119.50	89	142.75
	75%	327.50	445	420.25

P 2.E Total Number of enforcement procedures taken through enforcement notices		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	72	81	94.
	Mean	94.80	110.90	123.65
Percentiles	25%	35.30	20	50.50
	75%	135.80	130.50	165.75

P 2.F Total number of prosecutions		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	11	18	16
	Mean	21.40	27.40	29.97
Percentiles	25%	3.80	5	6
	75%	31	36	35.25

Table 51: Planning Public Opening Hours

	P3. Average number of opening hours per week
Carlow County Council	35.00
Cavan County Council	36.25
Clare County Council	36.00
Cork City Council	35.00
Cork County Council	35.00
Donegal County Council	35.56
Dublin City Council	35.90 ^a
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	30.00
Fingal County Council	30.00
Galway City Council	35.00 ^b
Galway County Council	34.00
Kerry County Council	40.00
Kildare County Council	34.66
Kilkenny County Council	35.00
Laois County Council	32.50
Leitrim County Council	33.33 ^c
Limerick City Council	35.00
Limerick County Council	33.00 ^d
Longford County Council	39.38 ^e
Louth County Council	37.33 ^f
Mayo County Council	35.00 ^g
Meath County Council	29.00
Monaghan County Council	40.00
North Tipperary County Council	33.75
Offaly County Council	32.50
Roscommon County Council	27.50
Sligo County Council	37.50
South Dublin County Council	33.90 ^h
South Tipperary County Council	35.00
Waterford City Council	35.00
Waterford County Council	34.66
Westmeath County Council	33.33
Wexford County Council	35.00
Wicklow County Council	31.25

a All planning applications received by Dublin City Council and their associated documents (including drawings, observations, reports and orders) are available to view on the Council's web-site at all times. In addition, the Council introduced an electronic planning application service during 2008 which enables planning applications for specified application types to be made 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. An on-line observations service is also provided that enables submissions on a 24 hour basis.

b Allowing for public holidays.

c Standard weekly opening hours is 35 hours. Figure reported takes account of all closures during the year.

d The Planning Desk at County Hall is open for 30 hours per week. Files can also be accessed on-line at Newcastle West and Kilmallock Area Offices and at the Planning Counter at County Hall via PC during normal office working hours ie 35 hours per week.

e Longford County Council increased opening hours to 40 and Longford Town Council increased to 38.75 per week with the introduction of lunchtime opening.

f In a full week, the offices of Louth County Council and Drogheda Borough Council are open for 40 hrs/week, Dundalk for 37.5 hrs up to 2nd June and for 40 hours thereafter.

g IPLAN system available in all 7 Area Offices and planning details also available on website.

h Only the opening hours of the planning counter, where paper planning files can be accessed are included, as per DOE methodology.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 3 Planning Offices: Average number of opening hours per week		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	35	35	35
	Mean	34.60	34.70	34.50
Percentiles	25%	33.10	33	33.30
	75%	35.70	35.90	35.60

Table 52: Pre-Planning Consultation

	P4.A. Number of pre-planning consultation meetings held	P4.B. Average length of time (in days) from request for consultation with local authority to actual formal meeting for pre- planning consultation
Carlow County Council	255	3.50
Cavan County Council	265	4.60
Clare County Council	522	18.00
Cork City Council	435	10.00
Cork County Council	1,769	10.89
Donegal County Council	653	32.00
Dublin City Council	239a	11.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	311	11.00
Fingal County Council	375	0.00
Galway City Council	368	5.93
Galway County Council	1,042	30.00
Kerry County Council	1,371	13.32
Kildare County Council	372	17.00
Kilkenny County Council	1,058	10.80
Laois County Council	568	7.00
Leitrim County Council	174	10.58e
Limerick City Council	166	10.00
Limerick County Council	977	8.00f
Longford County Council	121	10.23
Louth County Council	698	8.04
Mayo County Council	2,209	0.00
Meath County Council	553b	90.00g
Monaghan County Council	1,222	3.00
North Tipperary County Council	620c	220.83h
Offaly County Council	216	8.54
Roscommon County Council	351d	9.77i
Sligo County Council	1,262	10.42
South Dublin County Council	238e	23.15
South Tipperary County Council	526	10.00
Waterford City Council	57	16.50
Waterford County Council	1,413	12.00
Westmeath County Council	312	38.23
Wexford County Council	921	30.00
Wicklow County Council	530	6.00
Totals	22,169	

a Dublin City Council does not provide individual consultations at planning clinics. Because of the late change in methodology in relation to "other consultations", data is not available.
b One off houses only.
c The methodology for counting pre-planning meetings changed from actual meetings in 2007 to queries dealt with by correspondence phone etc. in 2008. The decrease in planning applications make it possible to commence processing the backlog of pre-planning requests.
d Increase on 2007 due to change in methodology from "Formal Meetings" only to "Number of Pre-Planning Consultations", regardless of whether deemed to be held under Section 247 or not.
e 2007 – Only face to face meetings counted. 2008 – All consultations counted, including those on phone, per new methodology.
f This indicator was modified for 2008 to reflect all pre-planning activity – face to face consultations, individual consultations at planning clinics, e-mail and telephone consultations. Previously the indicator only reflected actual face-to-face consultations. The response time in relation to e-mail and telephone consultations etc is generally much quicker than for face to face meetings, and this is now reflected in the figures.
g Revised procedures were put in place at the start of 2008 to set meeting dates and monitor response times. These procedures proved very effective.
h Centralisation of planning process took place in Q1 2008. This re-structuring had a significant impact on resources with resultant delays for pre-planning clinics. Procedures have now been reviewed and a blitz of waiting lists completed. Dates for pre-planning meetings are now scheduled within 1 month of request.
i The increase in the average length of time is because a backlog of pre-planning requests going back from previous years was cleared.
j This is the average length of time for all 351 meetings held.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 4.A		2006	2007	2008
Number of pre-planning consultation meetings held				
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	639	502	524
	Mean	827.40	713.90	652.03
Percentiles	25%	267.30	255.80	262.50
	75%	1,212.80	1002	993.25

P 4.B		2006	2007	2008
Average length of time from request for consultation with local authority planner to actual formal meeting for pre-planning consultation (days)				
N	Valid	34	33	34
	Missing	0	1	0
Average	Median	13	12	10.50
	Mean	16.20	16.80	20.89
Percentiles	25%	8.30	9.20	7.75
	75%	24	26	17.25

Table 53: New Buildings Inspected

	P5 Buildings inspected as a percentage of new buildings notified to the local authority
Carlow County Council	20.55
Cavan County Council	15.95
Clare County Council	13.76
Cork City Council	32.91
Cork County Council	19.63
Donegal County Council	16.33
Dublin City Council	14.33
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	15.40
Fingal County Council	30.15
Galway City Council	86.86 ^a
Galway County Council	27.61
Kerry County Council	30.14
Kildare County Council	47.22
Kilkenny County Council	16.82
Laois County Council	24.00
Leitrim County Council	21.86
Limerick City Council	46.98
Limerick County Council	22.47
Longford County Council	21.90
Louth County Council	20.97
Mayo County Council	13.63
Meath County Council	71.11
Monaghan County Council	22.91
North Tipperary County Council	15.89
Offaly County Council	18.52
Roscommon County Council	69.63 ^b
Sligo County Council	33.51
South Dublin County Council	25.90
South Tipperary County Council	20.50
Waterford City Council	43.44 ^c
Waterford County Council	70.08
Westmeath County Council	14.66
Wexford County Council	31.48
Wicklow County Council	13.08

^a Increase due to significant reduction in number of buildings notified.
^b Due to the reduced level of construction activity and reduced volume of commencement notices a similar number of inspections to 2007 represents a higher percentage of building control inspections.
^c New buildings are taken to mean buildings that did not exist before and excludes new extension to existing buildings.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

P 5 Buildings inspected as a percentage of new buildings notified to the local authority		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	18.90	19.10	29.70
	Mean	25.90	24.50	22.18
Percentiles	25%	15	15.10	16.20
	75%	30.10	30.20	33.06

Table 54: Taking Estates in Charge (NEW)

(Note: This indicator was introduced for the first time in 2008; useful additional contextual material is included at Section 2)

	P6A The number of residential estates for which the planning permission has expired, in respect of which formal written requests for taking in charge (from residents or developers), were on hands at the beginning of the year	P6B Number of estates that were taken in charge in the year in question	P6C Number of dwellings in respect of column B
Carlow County Council	9	7	351
Cavan County Council	2	0	0
Clare County Council	26	9	281
Cork City Council	21	9	213
Cork County Council	217	8	285
Donegal County Council	33	0	0
Dublin City Council	8	2	57
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/Aa	9	1,180
Fingal County Council	71	26	4,030
Galway City Council	39	16	627
Galway County Council	15	11	337
Kerry County Council	31	5	154
Kildare County Council	58	23	1,462
Kilkenny County Council	45	26	1,283
Laois County Council	28	6	541
Leitrim County Council	0	0b	0
Limerick City Council	0	5	174
Limerick County Council	51	16	747
Longford County Council	5	1	21c
Louth County Council	64	8	309
Mayo County Council	4	12	332
Meath County Council	19	12	864
Monaghan County Council	4	0	0
North Tipperary County Council	17	1	34
Offaly County Council	6	2	47
Roscommon County Council	45	4	106
Sligo County Council	28	15	205
South Dublin County Council	22	4	1,649
South Tipperary County Council	45	19	474
Waterford City Council	18	9	786
Waterford County Council	29	4	230
Westmeath County Council	8	7	811
Wexford County Council	55	4	76
Wicklow County Council	39	36	1,630
Totals	1,062	316	19,296
<p>a Developers or residents associations do not make a formal request to the Council for an estate to be taken in charge. b At year end there were approximately 20 applications for taking in charge which were at various stages of the taking in charge process but not completed. c 1 Estate Taken in Charge by Longford Town Council.</p>			

Summary Statistics 2008

P6 ^(NEW) Taking Estates in Charge		P6A The number of residential estates for which the planning permission has expired, in respect of which formal written requests for taking in charge (from residents or developers), were on hands at the beginning of the year	P6B Number of estates that were taken in charge in the year in question	P6C Number of dwellings in respect of column B
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	26	7.50	297
	Mean	32.18	9.29	567.53
Percentiles	25%	1062	316	19296
	75%	8	3.50	71.25

Table 55: Taking Estates in Charge (continued)

	P6D Percentage of estates in column A not completed to satisfaction of the planning authority in line with the planning permission	P6E Number of estates in column D in respect of which enforcement action was taken in the year in question and/or the bond was called in	P6F Number of estates in column D in respect of which works were undertaken by the authority to bring the estate to taking in charge standard
Carlow County Council	22.22	0	2
Cavan County Council	0.00	0	0
Clare County Council	69.23	1	0
Cork City Council	66.67	2	0
Cork County Council	21.83	3	2
Donegal County Council	18.18a	1f	0
Dublin City Council	75.00	0	0
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council b	N/A	N/A	N/Ah
Fingal County Council	5.63c	18g	3
Galway City Council	17.95	1	4
Galway County Council	20.00	0	0
Kerry County Council	25.81	2	1
Kildare County Council	13.79	0	4
Kilkenny County Council	20.00	0	0
Laois County Council	82.14	0	1
Leitrim County Council	N/A	0	0
Limerick City Council	N/A	0	0
Limerick County Council	17.65	7	0
Longford County Council	80.00	0	0
Louth County Council	10.94	1	2
Mayo County Council	0.00	0	0
Meath County Council	5.26	4	1
Monaghan County Council	25.00	1	0
North Tipperary County Council	70.59	2	0
Offaly County Council	100.00d	0	0
Roscommon County Council	100.00	7	0
Sligo County Council	35.71	2	0
South Dublin County Council	81.82	0	0
South Tipperary County Council	55.56	3	0
Waterford City Council	50.00e	0	0
Waterford County Council	27.59	0	0
Westmeath County Council	12.50	0	0
Wexford County Council	50.91	15	0
Wicklow County Council	64.10	3	1

a Other 27 in reasonable condition. Formal applications have been received for takeover of these estates and are under negotiation with developers to comply with our administrative requirements.

b 25 estates have been identified as not being completed to satisfaction of the planning authority.

c The planning issues are related to access walkways.

d The Authority has discussed and agreed the remedial works necessary to bring each estate up to standard with the Developers concerned. The Developers have agreed to carry out this work within an agreed timeframe.

e In the case of the nine estates not taken in charge, developers are working through snag lists and it is anticipated that estates will be taken in charge this year.

f Enforcement files open on 3 estates including one in 2009.

g Enforcement in the form of warning notices issued for the range of Technical Guidance Documents including snag list completion and requests for as constructed drawings and design details.

h Works however, have been undertaken by the authority on 2 of the estates referred to earlier.

Summary Statistics 2008

P6 ^(NEW) Taking Estates in Charge		P6D Percentage of estates in column A not completed to satisfaction of the planning authority in line with the planning permission	P6E Number of estates in column D in respect of which enforcement action was taken in the year in question and/or the bond was called in	P6F Number of estates in column D in respect of which works were undertaken by the authority to bring the estate to taking in charge standard
N	Valid	31	33	33
	Missing	3	1	1
Average	Median	25.81	1	0
	Mean	40.23	2.21	0.64
Percentiles	25%	1247.25	73	21
	75%	17.65	0	0

Section 11: Motor Tax

Table 56: Motor Tax – Number of Motor Tax Transactions

	M1.A. Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with over the counter	M1B. Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with by post	M1C. Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with in other ways (i.e. online)
Carlow County Council	53,707	10,561	17,637
Cavan County Council	49,640	13,887	18,999
Clare County Council	96,684	17,815	35,069
Cork City Council a	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	212,388	172,196	209,317
Donegal County Council	142,921	7,060	26,030
Dublin City Council b	473,066	197,593	531,217
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council c	167,175	35,870	75,982
Kerry County Council	81,481	44,314	48,555
Kildare County Council	108,231	31,296	97,178
Kilkenny County Council	68,021	16,210	30,926
Laois County Council	57,878	12,021	21,987
Leitrim County Council	22,847	7,420	6,896
Limerick City Council	37,174	10,387	18,009
Limerick County Council	86,827	31,405	50,331
Longford County Council	33,572	5,128	7,126
Louth County Council	88,680	4,040	29,339
Mayo County Council	101,502	16,216	32,519
Meath County Council	123,330	20,174	71,186
Monaghan County Council	50,001	8,377	11,469
North Tipperary County Council	52,440	17,188	26,664
Offaly County Council	56,668	12,323	21,858
Roscommon County Council	44,683	17,501	15,059
Sligo County Council	53,359	8,793	15,628
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	78,882	14,379	21,679
Waterford City Council	38,111	4,748	15,228
Waterford County Council	57,971	7,409	19,546
Westmeath County Council	75,442	10,777	21,707
Wexford County Council	86,542	49,590	52,185
Wicklow County Council	97,294	13,073	54,171
Totals	2,696,517	817,751	1,603,497
<p>a Indicator not applicable to Cork City Council as service is provided by Cork County Council. b Motor Tax services are provided by Dublin City Council for the four local authorities in the Dublin area. c The motor tax service for Galway City is provided by Galway County Council on a shared service basis.</p>			

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

M 1.A Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with over the counter		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	76,750	82,621	75442
	Mean	104,360.20	108,310.70	92983.34
Percentiles	25%	55,788.50	56,862.50	51220.50
	75%	101,617	106,945	99398

M 1.B Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with by post		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	17,251	17,742	13887
	Mean	33,773.10	33,356	28198.31
Percentiles	25%	10,298.50	10837	8585
	75%	35,697.50	33462.50	25735

M 1.C Number of motor tax transactions which are dealt with in other ways i.e online		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	15,574	20,513	26030
	Mean	37,096.90	46,430.30	55293
Percentiles	25%	11,882	14,893.50	17823
	75%	31,898.50	41,382	51258

Table 57: Motor Tax – Analysis of Method of Transaction ^a

	M1D. Percentage of motor tax transactions which are dealt with over the counter	M1E. Percentage of motor tax transactions which are dealt with by post	M1F. Percentage of motor tax transactions which are dealt with in other ways (i.e. online)
Carlow County Council	65.57	12.89	21.53
Cavan County Council	60.15	16.83	23.02
Clare County Council	64.64	11.91	23.45
Cork City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	35.76	28.99	35.24
Donegal County Council	81.20	4.01	14.79
Dublin City Council	39.36	16.44	44.20
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council	59.91	12.86	27.23
Kerry County Council	46.73	25.42	27.85
Kildare County Council	45.72	13.22	41.05
Kilkenny County Council	59.07	14.08	26.86
Laois County Council	62.99	13.08	23.93
Leitrim County Council	61.48	19.97	18.56
Limerick City Council	56.69	15.84	27.47
Limerick County Council	51.51	18.63	29.86
Longford County Council	73.26	11.19	15.55
Louth County Council	72.65	3.31	24.04
Mayo County Council	67.56	10.79	21.65
Meath County Council	57.45	9.40	33.16
Monaghan County Council	71.59	11.99	16.42
North Tipperary County Council	54.46	17.85	27.69
Offaly County Council	62.38	13.56	24.06
Roscommon County Council	57.85	22.66	19.50
Sligo County Council	68.60	11.30	20.09
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	68.63	12.51	18.86
Waterford City Council	65.61	8.17	26.22
Waterford County Council	68.26	8.72	23.02
Westmeath County Council	69.90	9.99	20.11
Wexford County Council	45.96	26.33	27.71
Wicklow County Council	59.13	7.95	32.92

^a N/A in the case of Motor Tax indicates that the service is provided by another local authority.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

M 1.D Motor tax transactions at counter (percentage)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	68	65	61.48
	Mean	65.60	64.40	60.49
Percentiles	25%	59	57.70	55.58
	75%	72.50	72.10	68.43

M 1.E Motor tax transactions by post (percentage)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	17	15	12.89
	Mean	18.20	16	14.13
Percentiles	25%	13.50	10.70	10.39
	75%	23	20	17.34

M 1.F Motor tax transactions by other means i.e. online (percentage)		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5
Average	Median	15	18.20	24.04
	Mean	16.40	19.70	25.38
Percentiles	25%	13	15.90	20.10
	75%	20	22.20	27.78

Table 58: Time Taken to Process Motor Tax Postal Applications (AMENDED)

	M2A. Number of postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the same day as receipt of the application	M2B. Number of postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M2C. Number of postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M2D. Number of postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) in over five days from receipt of the application
Carlow County Council	10,263	233	8	57
Cavan County Council	9,024	3,829	704	330
Clare County Council	17,630	76	0	109
Cork City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	167,377	3,272	192	1,355
Donegal County Council	5,868	1,086	61	45
Dublin City Council	43,791	126,998	15,474	11,330
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council	30,741	4,639	88	402
Kerry County Council	35,907	7,753	208	446
Kildare County Council	4,903	9,904	2,775	13,714
Kilkenny County Council	6,126	8,828	832	424
Laois County Council	11,917	64	3	37
Leitrim County Council	7,190	171	3	56
Limerick City Council	9,618	698	3	68
Limerick County Council	26,245	4,940	55	165
Longford County Council	4,977	95	1	55
Louth County Council	1,885	1,863	168	124
Mayo County Council	6,333	6,234	2,527	1,122
Meath County Council	9,448	6,566	1,300	2,860
Monaghan County Council	7,430	881	6	60
North Tipperary County Council	9,226	7,135	319	508
Offaly County Council	9,855	2,196	75	197
Roscommon County Council	17,422	55	0	24
Sligo County Council	8,617	101	3	72
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	14,360	16	0	3
Waterford City Council	4,098	588	30	32
Waterford County Council	6,908	329	34	138
Westmeath County Council	10,428	326	5	18
Wexford County Council	48,530	730	36	294
Wicklow County Council	2,778	8,048	1,237	1,010
Totals	548,895	207,654	26,147	35,055

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

M 2.A Number of motor tax applications dealt with on same day		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	9,958	9,356	9448
	Mean	19,375	18,869	18927.40
Percentiles	25%	5,572	6,637	6229.50
	75%	20,447	20,638	17526

M 2.B Number of motor tax applications dealt with on third day or less		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	4,950	3,149	1086
	Mean	10,338	8,897	7160.50
Percentiles	25%	1,336	742	202
	75%	9,806	8,481	640

M 2.C Number of motor tax applications dealt with on fifth day or less		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	325.50	189	55
	Mean	3,055.10	1,825.10	901.60
Percentiles	25%	34.8	28	3
	75%	3,201	1,706.50	511.50

M 2.D Number of motor tax applications dealt with in over five days		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	400.50	540	138
	Mean	4,140.80	3,764.60	1208.80
Percentiles	25%	6.30	91.50	55.50
	75%	3,301.8	1,896	477

Table 59: Time Taken to Process Motor Tax Postal Applications

	M2E. Percentage of overall postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the same day as receipt of the application	M2F. Percentage of overall postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M2G. Percentage of overall postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) on the fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M2H. Percentage of overall postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc issued) in over five days from receipt of the application
Carlow County Council	97.18	2.21	0.08	0.54
Cavan County Council	64.98	27.57	5.07	2.38
Clare County Council	98.96	0.43	0.00	0.61
Cork City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	97.20	1.90	0.11	0.79
Donegal County Council	83.12	15.38	0.86	0.64
Dublin City Council	22.16	64.27	7.83	5.73
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council	85.70	12.93	0.25	1.12
Kerry County Council	81.03	17.50	0.47	1.01
Kildare County Council	15.67	31.65	8.87	43.82
Kilkenny County Council	37.79	54.46	5.13	2.62
Laois County Council	99.13	0.53	0.02	0.31
Leitrim County Council	96.90	2.30	0.04	0.75
Limerick City Council	92.60	6.72	0.03	0.65
Limerick County Council	83.57	15.73	0.18	0.53
Longford County Council	97.06	1.85	0.02	1.07
Louth County Council	46.66	46.11	4.16	3.07
Mayo County Council	39.05	38.44	15.58	6.92
Meath County Council	46.83	32.55	6.44	14.18
Monaghan County Council	88.70	10.52	0.07	0.72
North Tipperary County Council	53.68	41.51	1.86	2.96
Offaly County Council	79.97	17.82	0.61	1.60
Roscommon County Council	99.55	0.31	0.00	0.14
Sligo County Council	98.00	1.15	0.03	0.82
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	99.87	0.11	0.00	0.02
Waterford City Council	86.31	12.38	0.63	0.67
Waterford County Council	93.24	4.44	0.46	1.86
Westmeath County Council	96.76	3.02	0.05	0.17
Wexford County Council	97.86	1.47	0.07	0.59
Wicklow County Council	21.25	61.56	9.46	7.73

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

M 2.E % of Motor tax applications dealt with on same day		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	74.80	77	86.30
	Mean	62	66.20	75.90
Percentiles	25%	34.80	41.50	50.30
	75%	84.40	91.50	97.20

M 2.F % of Motor tax applications dealt with on third day or less		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	19.40	16	12.40
	Mean	21.60	22	18.20
Percentiles	25%	10.50	6.50	1.90
	75%	33.80	38	32.10

M 2.G % of Motor tax applications dealt with on fifth day or less		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	2.60	2	0.3
	Mean	6	3.90	2.40
Percentiles	25%	0.10	0	0
	75%	12.70	8	4.60

M 2.H % of Motor tax applications dealt with over five days		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	28	29	29
	Missing	6	5	5
Average	Median	3.90	2	0.8
	Mean	10.30	8	3.60
Percentiles	25%	0.10	1	0.60
	75%	17.70	7.50	2.80

Table 60: Time Taken to Process Driving Licence Applications - Numbers ^(NEW)

(Note: In 2008, this indicator has been included in the analysis for the first time.)

	M3A Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the same day as receipt of the application	M3B Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M3C Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the Fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M3D Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with in over five days from receipt of the application
Carlow County Council	7,718	1,154	423	1,084
Cavan County Council	7,185	2,247	244	269
Clare County Council	16,527	416	1	4
Cork City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	74,743	553	142	280
Donegal County Council	13,677	6,426	39	99
Dublin City Council	146,819	32,071	3,571	1,485
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council	15,583	11,314	3,971	4,196
Kerry County Council	20,437	271	28	60
Kildare County Council	3,806	19,210	1,633	5,404
Kilkenny County Council	2,948	4,276	2,652	4,679
Laois County Council	5,853	5,357	32	30
Leitrim County Council	1,661	2,445	167	47
Limerick City Council	2,032	3,752	1,303	1,373
Limerick County Council	18,439	1,419	62	56
Longford County Council	2,883	1,879	435	586
Louth County Council	9,222	2,812	1,599	3,606
Mayo County Council	5,358	3,585	1,172	7,198
Meath County Council	4,997	6,687	6,465	7,064
Monaghan County Council	4,371	4,281	11	43
North Tipperary County Council	2,731	1,423	1,121	5,362
Offaly County Council	5,384	2,505	1,437	1,607
Roscommon County Council	2,893	5,937	132	39
Sligo County Council	5,771	2,090	750	550
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	8,953	5,453	2	47
Waterford City Council	557	3,847	1,543	2,409
Waterford County Council	6,011	1,473	589	1,597
Westmeath County Council	3,074	2,833	2,477	3,722
Wexford County Council	22,287	159	4	51
Wicklow County Council	3,647	5,326	4,126	8,484
Totals	425,567	141,201	36,131	61,431

Summary Statistics 2008

M3 ^(NEW) Time Taken to Process Driving Licence Applications - Numbers		M3A Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the same day as receipt of the application	M3B Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M3C Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the Fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M3D Number of Driving Licence applications which are dealt with in over five days from receipt of the application
N	Valid	29	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5	5
Average	Median	5771	2833	589	1084
	Mean	14674.72	4869	1245.90	2118.31
Percentiles	25%	425567	141201	36131	61431
	75%	3011	1448	50.50	53.50

Table 61: Time Taken to Process Driving Licence Applications - %

	M3E Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the same day as receipt of the application	M3F Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M3G Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M3H Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with in over five days from receipt of the application
Carlow County Council	74.36	11.12	4.08	10.44
Cavan County Council	72.25	22.59	2.45	2.70
Clare County Council	97.52	2.45	0.01	0.02
Cork City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cork County Council	98.71	0.73	0.19	0.37
Donegal County Council	67.57	31.75	0.19	0.49
Dublin City Council	79.82	17.44	1.94	0.81
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway City Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Galway County Council	44.44	32.27	11.33	11.97
Kerry County Council	98.27	1.30	0.13	0.29
Kildare County Council	12.66	63.92	5.43	17.98
Kilkenny County Council	20.25	29.38	18.22	32.15
Laois County Council	51.93	47.52	0.28	0.27
Leitrim County Council	38.45	56.60	3.87	1.09
Limerick City Council	24.02	44.35	15.40	16.23
Limerick County Council	92.31	7.10	0.31	0.28
Longford County Council	49.85	32.49	7.52	10.13
Louth County Council	53.49	16.31	9.28	20.92
Mayo County Council	30.95	20.71	6.77	41.58
Meath County Council	19.82	26.52	25.64	28.02
Monaghan County Council	50.21	49.17	0.13	0.49
North Tipperary County Council	25.67	13.38	10.54	50.41
Offaly County Council	49.25	22.91	13.14	14.70
Roscommon County Council	32.14	65.96	1.47	0.43
Sligo County Council	63.00	22.81	8.19	6.00
South Dublin County Council	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Tipperary County Council	61.94	37.72	0.01	0.33
Waterford City Council	6.67	46.04	18.47	28.83
Waterford County Council	62.16	15.23	6.09	16.51
Westmeath County Council	25.39	23.40	20.46	30.75
Wexford County Council	99.05	0.71	0.02	0.23
Wicklow County Council	16.90	24.68	19.12	39.31

Summary Statistics 2008

M3 ^(NEW) Time Taken to Process Driving Licence Applications - Percentages		M3E Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the same day as receipt of the application	M3F Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the second or third day from receipt of the application	M3G Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with on the fourth or fifth day from receipt of the application	M3H Percentage of overall driving Licence applications which are dealt with in over five days from receipt of the application
N	Valid	29	29	29	29
	Missing	5	5	5	5
Average	Median	50.21	23.4	5.43	10.13
	Mean	52.381	27.1228	7.2648	13.2321
Percentiles	25%	1519.05	786.56	210.68	383.73
	75%	25.53	14.305	0.235	0.40

Table 62: Public Opening Hours

	M4. Average number of opening hours per week
Carlow County Council	31.3
Cavan County Council	28.4
Clare County Council	31.5
Cork City Council	N/A
Cork County Council	34.0
Donegal County Council	22.0a
Dublin City Council	28.4
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	N/A
Fingal County Council	N/A
Galway City Council	0.0
Galway County Council	32.5
Kerry County Council	30.0
Kildare County Council	30.0
Kilkenny County Council	34.2
Laois County Council	32.5
Leitrim County Council	27.9b
Limerick City Council	30.0
Limerick County Council	30.0
Longford County Council	35.0
Louth County Council	32.5
Mayo County Council	27.5
Meath County Council	27.5
Monaghan County Council	25.5
North Tipperary County Council	28.8
Offaly County Council	29.0
Roscommon County Council	21.4
Sligo County Council	32.5
South Dublin County Council	0.0
South Tipperary County Council	31.3
Waterford City Council	33.8
Waterford County Council	30.9
Westmeath County Council	33.2
Wexford County Council	35.0
Wicklow County Council	30.0

a Bank holidays & Christmas break taken into account in 2008.
b Standard weekly opening hours are 30 hours - indicator figure factors in all closures throughout the year.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

M 4 Average number of opening hours per week		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	29	28	29
	Missing	5	6	5
Average	Median	30	30	30.22
	Mean	30.20	30.40	30
Percentiles	25%	28.40	28.40	28.38
	75%	32.50	32.50	32.50

Section 12: Finance

Table 63: House Rent

	Rev1A Amount collected at year end as a percentage of amount due from House Rent	Rev1B Percentage of arrears on House Rent that are 4-6 weeks old	Rev1C Percentage of arrears on House Rent that are 6-12 weeks old	Rev1D Percentage of arrears on House Rent that are more than 12 weeks old
Carlow County Council	96.85	21.36 ⁱ	14.61 ^o	102.95 ^p
Cavan County Council	88.23	41.53	11.09	68.95
Clare County Council	88.51	18.36	8.79	83.67 ^q
Cork City Council	92.23	8.40	19.03	82.37
Cork County Council	92.08 ^a	4.22 ^j	11.77 ^j	50.63 ^j
Donegal County Council	90.71	5.82	8.11	73.89
Dublin City Council	83.48 ^b	5.79 ^k	7.88	86.33
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	86.80	11.77	23.43	73.38
Fingal County Council	94.07	9.24	13.57	61.31
Galway City Council	76.57	2.99	5.77	97.27
Galway County Council	91.16	7.15	10.78	72.94
Kerry County Council	93.05	6.72	16.24	77.04
Kildare County Council	87.46	3.49	6.53	85.73
Kilkenny County Council	90.08	0.02	0.03	0.06
Laois County Council	93.31	10.47	11.85	81.41
Leitrim County Council	95.00	13.06 ^l	19.29 ^l	82.79 ^l
Limerick City Council	91.77	5.21	5.30	80.71
Limerick County Council	92.76	11.24 ^m	17.33	62.19
Longford County Council	89.24	8.80	14.40	77.15 ^r
Louth County Council	89.55 ^c	8.78 ⁿ	14.00 ⁿ	86.49 ⁿ
Mayo County Council	79.12	3.46	4.90	87.54
Meath County Council	88.61 ^d	9.21	11.52	80.94
Monaghan County Council	94.00 ^e	6.39	7.40	34.47
North Tipperary County Council	97.88 ^f	24.99	39.90	135.14
Offaly County Council	87.85	6.43	9.77	100.12
Roscommon County Council	86.84	10.20	16.43	55.04
Sligo County Council	91.06	19.13	12.47	68.41
South Dublin County Council	78.97	1.63	5.00	93.37
South Tipperary County Council	97.38 ^g	27.69	25.70	111.66
Waterford City Council	86.38	6.80	9.80	73.94
Waterford County Council	93.40	6.78	11.40	103.13
Westmeath County Council	83.09 ^h	5.76	10.68	94.67
Wexford County Council	94.73	5.94	4.68	5.48
Wicklow County Council	96.56	14.40	10.89	55.83

^a Figure relates to Cork County Council and nine Town Councils.
^b Data used is based on a draft Annual Financial Statement.
^c AFS are not completed so these are best estimated figures.
^d Based on draft AFS figures for 2008.
^e This amount is net of accounts in credit amounting to €44,035.
^f Based on Draft Annual Financial Statement.
^g Figures include credits and as per draft AFS 2008.
^h 95% of the arrears is accounted for by 55% of the accounts in arrears.
ⁱ Councils Percentage 12.
^j Figures for Town Councils not available - figure supplied relates to Cork County Council.
^k Arrears from 0-6 weeks old are included in the calculations of arrears percentages.
^l This % calculation is incorrect - arrears relate to accounts with debit balances. Some accounts are in credit and the closing balance of €89,066.85 is net of these credits. Value of Debit Balances outstanding at 31/12 = €122,619.
^m Based on nett arrears- formula seems to have been changed since 27/02/2009.
ⁿ LCC has calculated the correct % of arrears to be 8.44%. Percentages do not take credit balances or debts less than 4 weeks into account and therefore do not add to 100%.
^o Councils Percentage 8.
^p Councils Percentage 59.
^q Figures taken from Draft AFS.
^r Actual Arrears for year is €583691.11 as per Ronan Murphy LGMSB.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rev 1.1 Housing rent collected at year end as a percentage of amount due		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	90	89.10	90.90
	Mean	89.40	89.60	89.90
Percentiles	25%	86.30	87	87.30
	75%	93	93.60	93.50

Rev 1.B Housing Rent Arrears: Amount 4-6 weeks old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	8.30	8.50	7.80
	Mean	9.40	9	10.40
Percentiles	25%	5	5.80	5.80
	75%	12.10	10.40	12.10

Rev 1.C Housing Rent Arrears: Amount 6-12 weeks old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	11	11.20	11.30
	Mean	11.40	11.50	12.40
Percentiles	25%	9.20	8.90	7.70
	75%	14	13.30	15

Rev 1.D Housing Rent Arrears: Amount more than 12 weeks old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	68.90	70.60	80.80
	Mean	65.50	69.10	76.10
Percentiles	25%	55.40	59.80	66.80
	75%	77	76.50	89

Table 64: Housing Loans

	Rev2A. Amount collected at year end as a percentage of amount due from Housing Loans	Rev2B. Percentage of arrears on Housing Loans that are 1 month old	Rev2C. Percentage of arrears on Housing Loans that are 2-3 months old	Rev2D. Percentage of arrears on Housing Loans that are more than 3 months old
Carlow County Council	90.96	9.05	19.35	130.41
Cavan County Council	94.10	27.14	25.33	149.54
Clare County Council	87.63	25.95	9.56	64.60
Cork City Council	89.56	6.91	8.86	84.23
Cork County Council	81.08	10.89	3.17	81.95
Donegal County Council	83.07	2.30	2.57	93.17
Dublin City Council	89.90	4.82	2.52	92.67
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	99.59	2.37	3.23	91.02
Fingal County Council	97.20	12.95	3.14	83.90
Galway City Council	88.53	10.45	11.15	105.49
Galway County Council	87.12	5.68	18.59	75.73
Kerry County Council	89.96	0.00	0.00	100.00
Kildare County Council	74.75	2.14	2.38	93.84
Kilkenny County Council	84.81	0.01	0.01	0.11
Laois County Council	94.49	6.37	32.71	126.46
Leitrim County Council	80.36	1.90	10.45	126.02
Limerick City Council	96.89	17.00	11.00	72.00
Limerick County Council	82.82	3.14	2.17	126.08
Longford County Council	88.07	12.18	1.65	105.09
Louth County Council	90.42	10.69	14.95	179.30
Mayo County Council	70.93	2.05	3.68	92.53
Meath County Council	95.51	11.72	18.21	281.22
Monaghan County Council	81.18	16.43	5.79	71.61
North Tipperary County Council	92.96	8.59	13.10	269.24
Offaly County Council	77.20	10.54	5.32	121.86
Roscommon County Council	71.78	4.39	3.55	100.52
Sligo County Council	79.59	1.32	5.66	93.02
South Dublin County Council	96.36	21.46	20.91	57.63
South Tipperary County Council	86.40	4.82	26.63	101.28
Waterford City Council	87.05	18.01	6.00	38.00
Waterford County Council	93.67	29.65	13.86	96.40
Westmeath County Council	64.70	4.72	3.31	120.55
Wexford County Council	96.07	8.59	6.54	9.05
Wicklow County Council	89.90	5.00	7.00	88.00

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rev 2.A Housing loans: Amount collected at year end as percentage amount due		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	89.40	88.40	88.30
	Mean	88	89.30	86.90
Percentiles	25%	82.20	82.50	81.20
	75%	92.70	93.20	93.80

Rev 2.2 Housing loan arrears 1 month old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	7	6.30	8.59
	Mean	9	9	12.06
Percentiles	25%	4	3.70	4.08
	75%	12.50	14	13.82

Rev 2.3 Housing loan arrears 2-3 months old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	6	5.10	6.77
	Mean	7.30	7.40	13.12
Percentiles	25%	2.80	3	3.16
	75%	11.80	9.20	15.77

Rev 2.4 Housing loan arrears more than 3 months old		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	33	34	34
	Missing	1	0	0
Average	Median	83.40	82.40	95.12

Table 65: Commercial Rates

	Rev3. Amount collected at year-end as a percentage of amount due from Commercial rates
Carlow County Council	90.00
Cavan County Council	86.68
Clare County Council	95.26
Cork City Council	91.81
Cork County Council	91.45
Donegal County Council	87.00 ^a
Dublin City Council	89.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	91.29 ^b
Fingal County Council	94.97
Galway City Council	80.00
Galway County Council	89.50
Kerry County Council	89.67
Kildare County Council	91.40 ^c
Kilkenny County Council	96.00
Laois County Council	90.00
Leitrim County Council	90.89
Limerick City Council	82.00
Limerick County Council	94.74 ^d
Longford County Council	87.59
Louth County Council	84.28 ^e
Mayo County Council	89.02
Meath County Council	93.00
Monaghan County Council	87.26
North Tipperary County Council	93.00
Offaly County Council	92.13 ^f
Roscommon County Council	90.00
Sligo County Council	84.73
South Dublin County Council	92.38
South Tipperary County Council	95.91
Waterford City Council	93.00
Waterford County Council	87.00
Westmeath County Council	93.70 ^g
Wexford County Council	91.23
Wicklow County Council	88.00

^a Donegal County Council has been working very closely with individual rate customers in the context of the current economic climate. Amount due for year 2008 was €20.3m - Amount Collected was €17.6m.
^b Data is based on Draft Annual Financial Statement for 2008.
^c AFS not signed at date of submission of figures.
^d Based on draft AFS figures.
^e AFS not completed: this is a best estimated figure.
^f Figures based on Draft A.F.S.
^g As of 13-Feb-09 18% of the arrears has been collected.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rev 3 Rates: Amount collected at year-end as a percentage of amount due		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	93.30	93.30	90.11
	Mean	92.90	92.40	90.45
Percentiles	25%	91	90.80	87.51
	75%	96	95.70	93

Table 66: Refuse Charges

	Rev4. Percentage of households paying refuse charges levied at year end
Carlow County Council	N/A
Cavan County Council	N/A
Clare County Council	N/A
Cork City Council	94.11
Cork County Council	80.94
Donegal County Council	N/A
Dublin City Council	90.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	85.27 ^a
Fingal County Council	100.00
Galway City Council	98.39
Galway County Council	N/A
Kerry County Council	98.95
Kildare County Council	76.90 ^b
Kilkenny County Council	100.00
Laois County Council	N/A
Leitrim County Council	N/A
Limerick City Council	N/A
Limerick County Council	N/A
Longford County Council	N/A
Louth County Council	N/A
Mayo County Council	N/A
Meath County Council	N/A
Monaghan County Council	N/A
North Tipperary County Council	N/A
Offaly County Council ^c	N/A
Roscommon County Council	N/A
Sligo County Council	N/A
South Dublin County Council	100.00
South Tipperary County Council	74.81 ^d
Waterford City Council	100.00
Waterford County Council	100.00
Westmeath County Council	N/A ^e
Wexford County Council	89.19
Wicklow County Council	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable - service privatised.
^a Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council operates a pay by weight system where householders are issued statements, based on weights and lifts, in arrears, unlike a tag system where they pay upfront. The final statement for 2008 has been included, as required. However the system necessarily affects the figure under this heading.
^b The reduction can be attributed to a loss of customers to the private sector. These customers have in some instances left behind arrears which are now a priority to collect.
^c Figures based on Draft A.F.S.
^d Pay by weight system invoices issued in arrears
^e Bin Tag system in operation

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rev 4 Percentage of households paying refuse charges at year end		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	15	14	14
	Missing	19	20	20
Average	Median	94.30	89.60	92.04
	Mean	85.70	85.20	96.25
Percentiles	25%	19.90	80.70	84.19
	75%	79.60	100	100

Table 67: Non-Domestic Water Charges

	Rev5. Amount collected at year end as a percentage of amount due for Non-Domestic Water Charges
Carlow County Council	72.00
Cavan County Council	34.53
Clare County Council	62.74
Cork City Council	81.02
Cork County Council	62.40
Donegal County Council	32.00
Dublin City Council	49.00
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	31.35 ^a
Fingal County Council	78.71
Galway City Council	52.00 ^b
Galway County Council	47.00 ^c
Kerry County Council	76.67
Kildare County Council	67.20 ^d
Kilkenny County Council	48.00
Laois County Council	47.00 ^e
Leitrim County Council	37.66
Limerick City Council	62.00
Limerick County Council	76.04 ^f
Longford County Council	54.41
Louth County Council	59.71 ^g
Mayo County Council	36.25
Meath County Council	24.00
Monaghan County Council	69.93
North Tipperary County Council	70.00 ^h
Offaly County Council	44.22 ⁱ
Roscommon County Council	49.00 ^j
Sligo County Council	48.33
South Dublin County Council	51.46
South Tipperary County Council	92.32
Waterford City Council	60.00
Waterford County Council	92.00
Westmeath County Council	31.30
Wexford County Council	22.84
Wicklow County Council	25.00

^a Data is based on Draft Annual Financial Statement for 2008.
^b Increase due to improved performance of contractor.
^c Issues which arose in 2007 and early 2008 were resolved leading to an increase in collection. During 2008, Galway County Council, in conjunction with its billing & collection contractor, Celtic Anglian Water, made a planned, concerted effort to improve performance on the collection of non-domestic water charges in the county. The 2007 figure represented a low base rate of collection, and significant improvement was required. These targeted efforts account for the increase in collection from 20.3% in 2007 to 47% in 2008. The Council hopes to further increase collection rates in 2009 over the 2008 rate.
^d AFS not signed at date of submission of figures.
^e Debtors figure at 31/12/08 includes an amount of €860,000 in respect of invoices for the period September-December 08 which issued in January 2009. The level of collection was affected by the introduction of a new waste water charge.
^f Our metering of non domestic properties completed in 2008.
^g AFS figures not yet completed these are best estimated figures. Also last quarter bills issued in 2009 but accrued back into 2008.
^h Level of collection was affected by (i) slow down in the economy generally; (ii) change from fixed charge to metered basis for many Town Council consumers with resultant delay in issue of bills and queries on demands; (iii) increased charges relating to wastewater; (iv) problems on individual large accounts.
ⁱ Figures based on Draft A.F.S.

j The reason for the increase is that 2007 bills were not sent to customers until late in December. Consequently, the income was received during 2008 leading to an increased collection rate. It is also the case that the contract for the collection of water charges had started to settle down resulting in improved processes and increased income.

General Note: Throughout the country, work is continuing towards the completion of the non-domestic metering project, which will see meters installed in relevant premises. In the short-term, this work has affected several aspects of performance on this indicator, including the timing of the issuing of bills, with knock-on effects on the amounts collected at year's end.

Summary Statistics 2006-2008

Rev 5 Non-Domestic Water Charges		2006	2007	2008
N	Valid	34	34	34
	Missing	0	0	0
Average	Median	66.50	61	54.36
	Mean	65.20	61.10	51.73
Percentiles	25%	55.20	48.50	37.31
	75%	76.20	76.90	69.95

Bibliography

Boyle, Richard. *Performance Measurement in Local Government*. Committee for Public Management Research, Discussion Paper 15. (2000)

County and City Managers' Association. Submission to the Committee for Public Accounts on Vacant Local Authority Housing (2008)

Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. *Delivering Value for People - Service Indicators in Local Authorities*. (2004)

Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. *Guidelines for the Compilation and Submission of Data*. February (2009)

Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. *Taking in Charge of Residential Developments/ Management Arrangements*. Circular PD1/08. February (2008)

Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, www.change.ie/carbonmanagementtool. (2009)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Public Management Review: Towards and Integrated Public Service*. (2007)

Department of the Taoiseach. *Transforming Public Services*. The Task Force on the Public Service. (2008)

Quinlivan, Aodh. *Innovation and Best Practice in Local Government*. Chamber of Commerce Ireland. (2009)

Quinlivan, Aodh and Tim McCarthy. *An assessment of Cork County Council at the end of the three-year cycle of service indicators, 2004-2006*: research conducted on behalf of Cork County Council. Department of Government, University College, Cork. (2007)

Sharma, Saroj. *Performance Indicators of Water Losses in Distribution Systems*. Unesco-IHE: http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/outputs/pdfs/GEN_PRS_PI_of_Water_Losses_AC_Apr08.pdf. (2008)

Appendix One: Report of the Independent Assessment Panel

1. Background

Since 2005 the *Service Indicators in Local Authorities* Report has been published annually by the Local Government Management Services Board (LGMSB). Each year an Independent Assessment Panel (IAP), appointed by the Minister for the Environment, Heritage, and Local Government, undertakes a quality assurance exercise with a view to verifying the returns contained in the Report. The Panel carries out its work through visits each year to a number of authorities in order to assess the accuracy and reliability of the returns for selected service indicators.

The current members of the IAP are:

Eric Embleton, former Assistant Secretary, Public Service Management and Development, Department of Finance (Chair)

Arthur Coldrick, Consultant and Chair of Performance Verification Group (Local Government Sector)

Mary O'Dea, Consumer Director, Office of the Financial Regulator

Mr. Embleton was appointed to the Panel in 2009. Mr. Coldrick and Ms. O'Dea have been on the panel for a number of years; because of urgent business demands Ms. O'Dea was not in a position to participate in the work of the Panel in 2009.

2. IAP Programme of Work in 2009

The local authorities were required to return 46 service indicators in 2008. Consequent on its own deliberations and discussions with the Office of Local Authority Management (OLAM) for the LGMSB the IAP decided to concentrate on the following five service indicators:

- **H5: Enforcement of Standards in the Private Rented Sector** (new indicator in 2008)

- **M4: Public Opening Hours of Motor Taxation Offices**

- **E1: Unaccounted For Water** (new indicator in 2008)

- **Rev4: Refuse Charges**

- **C2: Staff Training and Development**

The Panel undertook visits to ten local authorities to review each of these indicators with the relevant officers. The visits were conducted as follows:

Mr. Coldrick and Mr. Embleton jointly visited Dublin City and Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Councils;

Mr Coldrick also visited Carlow, Kilkenny, Laois and Wicklow County Councils;

Mr. Embleton visited Cavan, Leitrim, Longford and Meath County Councils.

The visits were carried out in June 2009. During each visit the members of the Panel interviewed the officers responsible for collecting and reporting the authority's returns for the selected indicators. The aims of these interviews were:

- To check that the returns for the selected indicators as returned to OLAM were in fact those submitted by the authority;
- To ascertain whether the authority was satisfied that these returns should stand as submitted;
- To review the systems used by the authority to collect the data for the indicators;
- To verify that all the Town and County Borough Councils within the relevant authority had been included;
- To validate the returns made against the source documents;
- To discuss general issues regarding the indicators, including their usefulness as seen by the authorities and the reporting burden imposed by the service indicator exercise.

The IAP wishes to acknowledge the assistance and guidance received from Ms. Anne O’Keeffe and her colleagues in OLAM throughout the review, and the help and co-operation of all the authorities visited.

3. Report on the Assessment Visits

The members of the Panel were very pleased with the overall level of co-operation received from the officers they met on their visits. The staff involved in the compilation and presentation of the selected indicators demonstrated a high degree of commitment and enthusiasm. Discussions with the staff in question were open and frank and greatly assisted the Panel’s understanding of the underlying data sources and related issues. The Panel is satisfied that the visits were fruitful and successful.

Overall, the visits confirmed the accuracy of the selected indicators as submitted to OLAM. No evidence emerged of any serious error in the reported figures or of underlying flaws of a significant nature in the data collection process. Nonetheless, some data and comparator issues arose and in that context the Panel wishes to make some general and specific comments.

General Comments

In most cases the indicators were compiled quarterly but the completion of the annual set appeared to require a major end-of-year effort and co-ordination exercise. In all cases, there was a requirement that the indicators as submitted by the co-ordinators were verified at an appropriate management level; in some counties this verification involved internal audit staff. While such scrutiny is commended, since authorities are required to make many regular returns and submit to a range of audit/assessment demands, opportunities for integration and consistency in data compilation might be examined.

An important point that emerged was that those charged with producing the actual figures are not always consulted in discussions on the indicator process triggered by OLAM with the designated implementation officers (Heads of Implementation Teams). Moreover, it appeared, in some instances that the guidelines prepared and circulated by the DoEHLG were not available to the staff compiling the indicators leading to local variation and non-adherence to the prescribed process.

There was an acceptance that, on the whole, the indicators are useful and would, in the absence of the current requirement to prepare them, be compiled anyway. The Panel notes, however, that the preparation of indicators takes place with little reference to objectives or to targets set down in the periodic strategic or annual business plans. In this context, there was no clear evidence of any concerted effort to use the indicators as a management tool to aid decision making in relation to policy, budgets and expenditure matters, an aspect of their use promoted and commended in the LGMSB Report of 2008. In this regard, Leitrim County Council was one exception in that the national service indicators have been augmented by 42 local indicators and both sets are compiled quarterly, reported on in some detail, and reviewed by the senior management team at a dedicated meeting. If not already the case elsewhere, the Panel would commend this approach to other authorities as constituting good practice in developing and promoting the use of the indicators as a management tool in reviewing progress and informing decisions.

The new indicators – H5 and E1 - introduced in 2008 and reviewed by the Panel in its selected indicators pose issues with regard to inter-authority comparisons. The Panel notes that both indicators reflect varying circumstances and practices within the authorities visited and, while they are seen as valid indicators at the individual authority level, as inter-county comparators they are misleading in relation to the relative levels of performance across counties. Further observation on this issue is made below under specific comments.

Specific Comments

H5: Enforcement of Standards in the Private Rented Sector

Enforcement inspections of private rental accommodation, though required under legislation, are triggered almost exclusively by external factors and particularly as a result of demands arising under the Rental Accommodation Scheme (RAS). Consequently, there was considerable variation between the authorities visited both in respect of the reasons for inspections (e.g. complaints received, RAS driven, etc.) and in the inspection process itself (e.g. own dedicated staff, HSE staff, other). Apart from an odd exception, there was little evidence of target setting for a specified number of inspections to meet either local needs or the legal requirement. In this regard, it was claimed by some authorities that as the stock of available accommodation in their respective areas is of a high quality - being relatively recently constructed premises - a high level of inspections was not necessary. Furthermore, it was contended that possible comparisons drawn when the indicators are published for each authority may be questionable in that, despite the variations between counties, the rate of inspections for an individual authority may be adequate given its housing needs and stock of quality accommodation. The Panel notes, however, consistent references to the effect that private rental accommodation demand is on the

increase and that there is a rising number of landlords seeking to have their premises included in eligible schemes.

The Panel would recommend that, pending a more consistent approach to inspections in respect of the legal requirement, the indicator be reviewed for 2009.

M4: Public Opening Hours of Motor Taxation Offices

Somewhat surprisingly, given its relative simplicity in compilation, this indicator was not properly reported in a small number of the counties visited owing to the failure to exclude bank holidays from the total number of working days; however, this did not materially affect the returns. All authorities visited keep the public offices open over the lunch period though it was intimated that staffing restrictions may require this to be reviewed in 2009. Every authority visited reported an increase in the level of transactions carried out arising from a growing trend towards quarterly rather than annual renewals. It was also mooted in several cases that this indicator, while of broad interest, does little to demonstrate performance as 'opening hours' is essentially a passive measure

E1: Unaccounted For Water

In all authorities this was considered to be a critically important indicator and the key elements of it were extensively used to identify water usage and to detect leakages. However, the calculations used to compile the indicator varied considerably between the authorities depending on the basic assumptions for household numbers, size and per capita consumption, the degree to which non-domestic water usage is metered and the use of telemetry. These factors, combined with the differences in the age and reliability of trunk mains, piping and fittings and the extent to which progress is being made under water rehabilitation projects, could result in inter-authority comparisons of questionable validity. Indeed, it was suggested, in the course of discussions on its usefulness, that an alternative measure, e.g. litres per property per day or per kilometre of mains might be more appropriate.

The Panel would recommend that, while the indicator should continue to be compiled in accordance with the present process, its use as an inter-authority comparator should be reviewed in 2009 in order to assess the possible use of a more relevant inter-authority comparator.

Rev 4: Refuse Charges

Of the authorities visited this indicator was reported only by Dublin City, Dun Laoghaire Rathdown and Kilkenny Councils as elsewhere refuse collection has been privatised. In the case of the former two, the issues of late and non-payment were evident and both authorities have taken steps to manage more proactively the pursuit and collection of arrears and it is expected that the level of compliance will improve as a result.

Some consideration might be given in 2009 to what actually constitutes a “waiver” as partial waivers appear to apply in certain instances. Another point noted by the Panel is that a restatement of the actual indicator itself might be appropriate since in effect it relates to “eligible” households, i.e. those which avail of the refuse service offered by the authority and not to households generally.

In the case of Kilkenny, the Panel is of the opinion that the methodology used in making the return is not comparable with that adopted in other counties and should be re-examined.

C2: Staff Training and Development

This is an internal corporate indicator the compilation of which is based on a detailed template supplied by the LGMSB; it is a time consuming and demanding exercise. The Panel, however, noted a small number of deviations from the methodology laid down in the template. For example, in two counties training expenditure on elected members was regarded as a corporate services expense whereas the template outlines that it ought to come under training spend. In another county, there was no apportioning of capital/accommodation costs nor were any imputed costs associated with training included. It was noted also that there was a near total reliance in all cases on expenditure data as extracted from the Agresso accounting system and thus on the accuracy of expenditure as recorded by the numerous officers who participated in training and development events.

In every case the target of 3 per cent of total productive payroll was surpassed and, while perhaps outside the immediate scope of IAP comment, some Training Officers did imply that a ‘favourable’ percentage might actually emerge as counterproductive as it could encourage reductions in future training expenditure. The Panel noted that there was limited post-training evaluation of training activity other than in two authorities but all authorities visited were satisfied that their training expenditure was value for money. The current PMDS operation and the related PDP generation have enhanced the training needs process and helped to focus expenditure.

The Panel would suggest that it might be useful to revisit the compilation method for this indicator for 2009 and later years.

4. Concluding Comment

The Panel is satisfied that, in the main, the returns for the selected indicators by the authorities visited are reliable notwithstanding the relatively minor discrepancies noted above. Though the indicators are generally regarded as useful by the authorities and would, in their opinion, be compiled by them in any event, there was little evidence of their use as a management tool to set targets and to inform key decisions. This is a matter for concern given the not insignificant resources devoted to their compilation both on an ongoing basis and at the year end. In this context, the role of senior management in promoting indicator use needs to be stressed. However, as pointed out in a previous report by the Panel, the national service indicators are only one of several reporting requirements that have to be discharged by the authorities and there is a need to strive for greater coherence of reporting under the same heading to various agencies.

Lastly, it is the Panel's view that in annual or ongoing discussions concerning either the selection of new indicators or amendments to existing ones, it would be useful, if not prudent, to include those staff members who are most closely involved, or due to be involved, in the compilation process.

30th June 2009

Appendix Two: Changes to Service Indicators for 2008

Table 1: New Service Indicators

1	Housing (H5)	Enforcement of standards in private rented sector
2	Housing (H6)	Grants to adapt housing for the needs of people with a disability
3	Housing (H7)	Pre-Tenancy Familiarisation Courses
4	Motor Tax (M3)	Time Taken to Process Driving Licence Applications
5	Wastewater (E1)	Unaccounted For Water
6	Energy Awareness (EN1)	Energy Use in Local Authority Offices
7	Planning (P6)	Taking estates in charge
8	Library Services (L2)	Library Visits
9	Community Participation (CP2)	Groups Registered with the Community & Voluntary Forum

Table 2: Deleted Service Indicators

1	Arts Grants (AC1)	Number and value of arts grants allocated
2	Housing (H4)	Time taken (days) to deal with applications for local authority housing services
3	Wastewater (E1)	Percentage of river channel, which is unpolluted
4	Library Services (L2)	Registered library members
5	Library Services (L4)	Percentage of libraries that offer Internet access to the public

Table 3: Amended Service Indicators

1	Housing (H1)	Housing Vacancies (<i>deletion of a category</i>)
2	Housing (H2)	Average time taken to relet dwellings available for letting (<i>expansion of indicator into two categories</i>)
3	Roads (R1)	Number of kilometres of local and regional roads improved and maintained under the restoration programme per annum (<i>replaces 'surface dressing of local and regional roads'</i>)
4	Motor Tax (M2/3)	Number of postal applications and percentage of overall postal applications which are dealt with (i.e. disc/ driver licence issued) from receipt of the application (<i>split into M2 and M3 indicators to include separate reference to driver licence applications</i>)
5	Environmental Services (E3)	Percentage of households provided with segregated waste collection (<i>expansion of indicator to account for both 'Dry recyclables' and 'Organics'</i>)
6	Environmental Services (E4)	Household waste collected which is sent for recycling (<i>expanded to incorporate waste collected from recycling facilities which was previously dealt with under Service Indicator E7</i>)
7	Environmental Services (E6)	Recycling Facilities (<i>deletion of column, which is now incorporated into Service Indicator E6</i>)
8	Litter Prevention and Environmental Protection (E7)	Litter (<i>expanded to include 'number of on-the-spot fines paid'</i>)
9	Litter (E8)	Environmental Complaints and Enforcement (<i>expanded to include 'number of complaints resolved where no further action was necessary'</i>)

10	Fire Services (F1)	Average time, in minutes, to mobilise fire brigades <i>(expanded to include reference to ‘All other emergency incidents’ as well as fire incidents)</i>
11	Fire Services (F2)	Percentage of attendances at scenes in a given time <i>(expanded to include reference to ‘All other emergency incidents’ as well as fire incidents)</i>
12	Fire Services (F3)	Fire safety certificate applications <i>(expanded to include reference to ‘total number of applications deemed invalid’)</i>
13	Library Services (L1)	Public opening hours <i>(expanded to include three further scenarios – lunchtime, evening and Saturday opening hours)</i>
14	Library Services (L3)	Number of items issued per head of population (county/city wide) <i>(inclusion of additional scenario – ‘Annual expenditure on stock per head of population (county/citywide))</i>
15	Recreation (REC2)	Number of visitors to local authority facilitated swimming facilities per 1,000 population <i>(replacement of term Swimming facilities to read Leisure facilities)</i>
16	Community Participation (CP1)	Percentage of local schools involved in the local Youth Council/ Comhairle na n-Óg scheme <i>(Indicator expanded to include the term ‘youth groups’)</i>

Appendix Three: Method

What the Indicators Tell Us

There are service indicators across a wide range of services. The indicators are presented under ten headings: Housing & Roads, Water, Planning, Fire Service, Environment, Culture, Recreation and Amenity, Motor Tax, Finance and Internal Corporate. In many cases, a single “indicator” is actually composed of several statistics.

While the indicators provide measurements across the breadth of local authorities’ activities, it is important to remember that not all services are easy to measure and that local authorities also provide a range of supports that are not measured by the selection of indicators. For each indicator, it is important to recall the wider context from which the measurement is taken.

Comparison from 2006 to 2008

In this report, the national results for every indicator that has been used for the four years are compared in the same manner between 2006 and 2008, as shown:

Indicator number and title		
N	Valid	This shows, for each year, the total number of authorities with valid figures for inclusion in the descriptive statistics
	Missing	This shows, for each year, the number of authorities for which the indicator was non-applicable. These are marked N/A in the tables.
Average	Median Mean	These are the average figures for each year – see over
Percentiles	25%	This is the cut-off point for the lowest and highest quarters of the indicators (also called the “first quartile” and “fourth quartile” respectively) - see over
	75%	

In a number of cases, this has not been possible – principally where there has been a revision of the definition and/or methodology that would affect the situation.

Technical Terms

Mean Average

The *mean average* is what most people understand by an “average”. The mean average is the total of a number of scores, divided by the number in question. It is appropriate to use the mean average when discussing the distribution of a count between the total number of cases.

Median Average

The *median average* is obtained by placing all the numbers in rank order and finding the value that sits half-way between the smallest and the largest numbers. In other words, it is the middle number of a sequence of numbers (or else the *mean average* of the two middle numbers when there is an even number of scores). It is more accurate to emphasise the median average when looking at most of the service indicators. This is because they are small sets of numbers and divergent scores (outliers) can disproportionately bias the mean average, making it unrepresentative of the majority of scores.

Quartile

Quartiles divide the data into four groups of equal size, based on the 25th, 50th and 75th percentile. The bottom quartile is the value below which 25% of the cases fall; the top quartile is the value below which 75% of the cases fall. In this report the descriptive statistics provided for each indicator give the value of the lower and upper quartiles, so that a local authority's performance can be quickly seen relative to those lowest and highest groups. Whether the 25th or 75th represents best practice will depend on whether the indicator values are interpreted as positive when they are higher or lower.

Decimal Places

Some indicators were reported by the local authorities with multiple decimal places. In order to preserve clarity in the tables, these figures were rounded. In most cases, percentages were rounded to one decimal place while counts were rounded to the nearest whole number. In areas where the indicator focuses on a small range within percentages, these are given to two decimal places to highlight subtle changes in these cases. Numbers ending in 0.5 were consistently rounded up. In some cases percentage figures will total 100.1% or 99.9% due to rounding. This approach has been adopted throughout the report to ensure a clear and consistent focus upon what the indicators represent, rather than on multiple decimal places that do not actually present meaningful information.

The Data Gathering Process

The LGMSB is required to report to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government on the local authority service indicators on an annual basis.

As already indicated, the data gathering process involves active collaboration between key stakeholders including local authorities, the LGMSB and the LGCSB. Each local authority submitted their figures electronically to the LGCSB.

The LGCSB then created data files from these submissions for use by the LGMSB. The tables and summary statistics which form the basis of this report were prepared by the LGMSB. As part of the quality assurance process, the LGMSB also identified anomalies in the data and, where necessary, gave local authorities an opportunity to review them.