	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	ILY GRO	UP 1 (Rur	ral)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council
Itei				Т						
0.1.01 (PI 63)	SCOTS headline financial PI Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)		Н	l.	-	£4.747	£5,808	£5,747	£4,726	£3.669
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per km)	ř	п	PI	Φ	£4,747	£5,808	£5,747	£4,726	£3,669
	Customer Service				1					
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	84.99%	89.88%	No data
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.	l	H	PI	1	96.17%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	No data
3.3.01 (PI 61) 3.3.02	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	Stat Stat	•	95.96%	No data	76.92% 39	100.00%	No data
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		"	Stat	_ *	99	No data	39	50	No data
	Carriageways									
	Safety									
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		M	PI	1	No data	100.00%	76.92%	No data	100.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time.		M H M	PI PI Stat	1	78.33%	No data	85.25%	No data	95.65%
	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		Н	PI PI Stat Stat	1 1					
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims		Н М Н	Stat Stat Stat	↑ ↓ ↓	78.33% No data 191 0.03	No data 21 31 0.02	85.25% 26 68 0.03	No data No data 178 0.06	95.65% 11 221 0.05
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H M H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	Н М Н	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	† + + + + + + +	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H M H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H H M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	^ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H M H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	† → → → + + + + +	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length	Y	H M H H H M H M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	^ + + + + + + + + + +	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H M H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	† → → → + + + + +	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	↓ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	Y	H M H H H M H M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	↑ → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → →	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H H H H M H M H H H H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	↓ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated		H H H H M H M H H H H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 4.50%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed	Y	H M H H H M M M H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50 24.93% 4.17% 3.69%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32% 2.45%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00 46.48% 5.29% 3.73%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated	Y	H H H H M H M H H H H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 4.50%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Tondition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H M H H H H M H M M H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → → →	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50 24.93% 4.17% 3.69% 0.00% 0.03%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32% 2.45% 0.00% 0.34% 0.00%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 4.50% 5.14% 0.00% 0.64% 0.00%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00 46.60% 2.11% 1.32% 0.00% 0.36% 0.10%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00 46.48% 5.29% 3.73% 0.00% 0.49% 0.49%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H M H H H H M H M M H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50 24.93% 4.17% 3.69% 0.00% 0.03% 0.03%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32% 2.45% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 4.50% 5.14% 0.00% 0.64% 0.00% 0.00%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00 46.60% 2.11% 1.32% 0.00% 0.36% 0.10% 0.10%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00 46.48% 5.29% 3.73% 0.00% 0.49% 0.15% 0.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05 2.3.06	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)	Y	H M H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50 24.93% 4.17% 3.69% 0.00% 0.03% 0.00% 0.01%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 2.45% 0.00% 0.34% 0.00% 0.00% 0.38%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 5.14% 0.00% 0.64% 0.00% 0.00% 0.11%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 2.11% 1.32% 0.00% 0.36% 0.10% 0.00% 0.00%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00 46.48% 5.29% 3.73% 0.00% 0.49% 0.155% 0.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H M H H H H M H M M H H H H H H H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	78.33% No data 191 0.03 30.69% 12.39% 66.75% 79.31 179,629 99.85% 4.58 0.14 4.90 2.50 1.50 24.93% 4.17% 3.69% 0.00% 0.03% 0.03%	No data 21 31 0.02 33.23% 33.23% 64.45% 93.40 9,391 100.00% 5.62 1.08 35.12 0.00 1.00 31.23% 3.32% 2.45% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	85.25% 26 68 0.03 51.91% 9.65% 48.52% 79.71 87,914 100.00% 4.97 0.13 5.05 2.00 1.00 54.20% 4.50% 5.14% 0.00% 0.64% 0.00% 0.00%	No data No data 178 0.06 38.80% 38.80% 57.82% 71.29 176,809 100.00% 7.33 0.12 4.54 2.50 1.00 46.60% 2.11% 1.32% 0.00% 0.36% 0.10% 0.10%	95.65% 11 221 0.05 36.00% 48.36% 74.44% 111.94 61,167 100.00% 1.37 0.09 7.77 4.00 1.00 46.48% 5.29% 3.73% 0.00% 0.49% 0.15% 0.00%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	IILY GRO	UP 1 (Rur	ral)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		Н	Stat	•	0.09%	0.01%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	į	Н	Stat	. ↓	24.80%	21.61%	44.60%	35.52%	33.94%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	. ↓	21.41%	33.31%	63.35%	42.16%	34.52%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	.	18.52%	27.70%	60.23%	42.82%	43.81%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment Financial		Н	Stat	1	30.25%	34.96%	52.89%	54.74%	56.82%
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	н	PI	•	£3,399	£3,737	£3,936	£3,289	£2,735
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		М	PI	i	£13.37	£147.44	£10.42	£5.44	£13.81
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)	İ	Н	PI	•	£3,075	£3,652	£3,252	£3,089	£2,735
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		Н	PI	•	£15.18	£20.30	£16.23	£29.11	£10.18
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	•	£16,008	£27,435	No data	£30,825	£46
6.3.02 6.3.03	Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat Stat	↓	£3,967,476 £8,371	£1,663,431 £256	£124,070 £7,601	£3,013,444 £13,861	£167,297 £16,692
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		Ι¨̈́	Stat	l 🎳	£2,127	£1,335	£3,006	£1,959	£10,092
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	•	£719	£918	£54	£1,013	£40
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		н	Stat	•	£230	£1,386	£192	£117	£145
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		Н	Stat	1	69.16%	36.68%	92.44%	63.43%	91.06%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		М	Stat	V	23.37%	25.23%	1.65%	32.80%	1.93%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance	-	М	Stat	Φ	7.47%	38.09%	5.91%	3.77%	7.01%
	Footways									
44 4 04 (DI 45a)	Safety (af Cat 1 defeats made cafe within reaponed times		Н	Di		No doto	0.00%	73.08%	No data	No data
11.1.01 (PI 45a) 11.2.01 (PI 46)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times % of safety inspections completed on time		Iй	PI	T ↑	No data No data	100.00%	No data	No data No data	No data
11.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects	i	Ľ	Stat	i i	No data	0	26	No data	No data
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		н	Stat	1	9	9	22	8	20
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		Н	Stat	. ↓	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		<u> </u>	Stat	•	0.00%	36.03%	No data	No data	0.00%
11.4.02 11.4.03	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)			Stat Stat	↓	5.97% 470	36.03% 209	No data No data	No data 539	0.00%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment	ŀ	[Stat		0.00	0.00	No data	0.00	0.00
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	•	0.98	0.97	0.00	1.35	0.00
40.4.04 (5) 45)	Condition/Asset Preservation			ļ.,		44 7001	N	N	NI I	4 =001
12.1.01 (PI 47) 12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of footway length treated	l v	L M	PI PI	4	11.70% 2.62%	No data No data	No data No data	No data 0.38%	1.50% 0.11%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated	'	H	Stat	•	2.32%	1.38%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced	İ	H	Stat	•	0.10%	0.56%	0.00%	0.36%	0.00%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching	l	Н	Stat	Φ.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		Н	Stat	Φ	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Financial Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y		Di		0470	C4 004	£665	0004	No data
46 4 04 (DI 40c)			L	PI	Φ	£479	£1,281	£005	£664	No data
16.1.01 (PI 49a) 16.1.02 (PI 58)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment	'	Ī	PI	i i i	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data

	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				DIN					
,	Authorities in red nave NOT returned data		i		PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055
Dof	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council
	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)	Т	L	PI	Ф	£433	£1,223	£549	£408	No data
16.1.04 (PI 49c) 16.3.01 16.3.03 16.3.03 16.3.04 16.3.05 16.3.07 16.3.08	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance Expenditure per km of routine maintenance % of budget spent on planned maintenance % of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance			PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	→ → → → ⊕	£10.41 £0 £1,620 £433 No data 100.00% No data	£34.17 £9,016 £72 £1,268 £12 No data 99.02% 0.98%	No data £710 £0 £548 £1 No data 99.75% 0.25%	£406 £81.67 £89,901 £7,466 £293 £115 No data 71.79% 28.21% 0.00%	No data £0 £0 No data No data No data No data No data No data O data
1	Structures	+								
	Safety Sa									
	% of principal inspections carried out on time % of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI PI	↑ ↑	No data 53.56%	100.00%	No data 99.10%	No data 0.00%	100.00% 100.00%
	Condition/Asset Preservation		l ''		' '	33.3070	100.0070	33.1070	0.0070	100.0070
32.1.02 (PI 303) 8 32.3.01 9 32.3.02 1	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSClcrit % of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network	Y	H H H H	PI PI Stat Stat Stat	^ + + + +	72.00 67.00 10.05% 54 11	87.43 83.71 0.17% 1	89.04 73.55 2.03% 27 4	No data No data 0.33% 30	92.36 87.06 0.00% 0
	Functionality % of Council owned bridges failing European standards		н	PI	↓ [4.18%	0.17%	2.20%	2.50%	0.00%
34.2.01 (PI 305) 34.3.01 134.3.02 14.3.03 14.3.04 14.3.05	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions) No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison) No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17) Financial		н н н н	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ↔ ↔	1.39% 9 9 0 5 4	0.00% 0 0 0 0 0	2.52% 18 13 No data 1 12	No data 3 No data 23 No data 22 2	0.13% 0 2 10 1
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	1	5.88%	38.40%	3.69%	No data	No data
36.2.02 (PI 308) 36.3.01	% of allocated budget spent per annum Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation % of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L L L	PI PI Stat Stat	↑ →	49.12% 18.98% 1.79% £20,000,000	74.71% 1.45% 1.05% £0	No data 1.26% No data £7,300,000	100.00% No data 7.12%	93.79% No data 0.21% £0
	Traffic Management Systems									
9	<u>Safety</u>		ļ ,.		, ,	0	00.000		100 000	05 (50)
	% of faults rectified within target time % of faults rectified on first visit	Y	H M	Stat Stat	↑ ↑	81.19% No data	98.03% No data	No data No data	100.00% 94.23%	93.15% 93.15%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	IILY GRO	UP 1 (Ru	ral)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council
Ref	Indicator									
	<u>Financial</u>									
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		-	Stat	Ф	No data	70.57%	100.00%	54.99%	No data
	Street Furniture									
	Financial									
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		-	Stat	•	No data	1.91%	1.51%	0.88%	No data
	All assets service delivery									
C4 4 04 (DI C0)	Safety			Ctat		No data	No data	Nia data	No data	No dete
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		н	Stat	Ψ	ino data	ino data	No data	No data	No data

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	IILY GRO	UP 1 (Rui	ral)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council
Ref	Indicator									
	Street Lighting									
	Safety									
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	1	0.00%	100.00%	No data	No data	No data
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.	i	ΙĒ	PI	l 🗼	45.27%	11.26%	No data	100.00%	61.70%
,	Condition/Asset Preservation			1	<u> </u>	10.2.70		110 0010	100.0070	01.1.070
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Υ	Н	PI	4	10.05%	9.64%	11.28%	13.70%	3.99%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	М	Stat	1	22.00%	13.40%	16.87%	39.47%	22.66%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Ī	į L	Stat	1	27.77%	14.49%	15.98%	9.25%	5.51%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		М	Stat	Φ	0.35%	1.13%	No data	0.45%	1.56%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		М	Stat	Ф	5.55%	7.20%	0.00%	26.63%	20.48%
	Customer Service									
23.1.01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	1	94.57%	99.00%	64.48%	98.20%	96.70%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)	Į.	Н	PI	Ų.	3.29	2.03	No data	3.06	3.62
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults	l.	М М	PI	Ф	114.05%	68.19%	105.28%	86.73%	101.88%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights	ł	M	PI	•	11.46%	6.58%	11.88%	11.88%	4.07%
23.3.01 23.3.02	% of street lights giving modern white light % of street lights which are LED	ł	M	Stat Stat	↑	35.62% 13.68%	88.57% 56.25%	27.44% 27.44%	73.64% 58.46%	76.38% 68.55%
23.3.02	Availability		IVI	Stat	1	13.06 /6	50.25 /6	21.44 /0	30.40 /6	00.55 /6
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		н	Stat	•	0	5	No data	0	0
	Financial				, i				•	- J
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		М	PI	Ť	52.40%	41.13%	No data	95.86%	248.04%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		М	PI	į	55.06%	47.17%	53.54%	37.51%	55.31%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)	Ī	į L	PI	↓ ·	£31.73	No data	No data	£86.33	No data
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		М	PI	1	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		Н	PI	. ↓	No data	£16.83	No data	£11.91	£25.12
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		Н	PI	1	£27.73	£38.79	No data	£65.72	£96.56
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓	£37.51	£55.61	No data	£77.63	£121.67
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		Н	Stat	1	£45.07	£32.20	£54.98	£29.81	£26.57
07.4.04 (DL4Ch)	Environmental Application of the Company of the Com	Y	М	D.		245.04	007.00	400.50	200.00	200.04
27.1.01 (PI 18b) 27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	'	M	PI Stat	↑ ↑	345.81 184.350	237.02 126.353	423.56 225.800	288.29 153.690	206.24 109.949
27.3.01 (PI 37b) 27.3.04 (PI 38b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light % of street lights dimmable	ł	M	Stat	 	9.82%	21.90%	0.00%	153.690	74.39%
27.3.04 (PI 36b) 27.3.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		H	Stat	D	-5.11%	-16.14%	-3.26%	-16.58%	-18.46%
2	70 Grange in Griegy Consumption from year to year (KMT)	1	Ι "	Otat	. *	-5.11/0	-10.17/0	J.20 /0	-10.0070	-10.70/0

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAM	ILY GRO
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8086	8063	8158		8081
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
Ref	Indicator	Т		Г				I		
	SCOTS headline financial Pl									
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	Н	PI	•	£3,957	No data	£6,811	£5,066	No data
	Customer Service									
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		Н	PI	↑	No data	No data	77.70%	84.19%	73.91%
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.		H	PI	↑	96.00%	No data	No data	98.04%	100.00%
3.3.01 (PI 61) 3.3.02	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat Stat	0	No data No data	No data No data	87.50% 136	90.10%	97.83% 46
	Carriageways Safety									
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		М	PI	1	No data	No data	100.00%	94.23%	50.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39)	% of safety inspections completed on time.		Н	PI	1	No data	No data	85.65%	86.22%	94.44%
1.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects		М	Stat	.	No data	No data	24	21	2
1.3.02 1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		H	Stat Stat	↓	No data No data	No data No data	0.03	129 0.04	0.00
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	Н	Stat	•	32.20%	No data	45.22%	38.29%	39.41%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		Н	Stat	•	32.20%	No data	11.21%	26.55%	No data
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		М	Stat	J	No data	No data	65.01%	62.83%	No data
1.4.04 1.4.05	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		H M	Stat Stat	•	0.00	No data No data	71.08 62,104	72.39 82,431	0.00 8,536
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	İ	н	Stat	•	No data	No data	98.96%	99.80%	86.36%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		М	Stat	4	5.51	No data	5.36	4.96	2.23
1.4.08 1.4.09	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run		M M	Stat Stat	1 1	No data No data	No data No data	0.21	0.30 9.56	0.26
1.4.10	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	•	2.50	No data	2.50	2.29	2.00
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		н	Stat	•	0.00	No data	1.00	0.93	1.00
0.4.04 (B) 40)	Condition/Asset Preservation		,.	D		00.700/	Nin det	27.000/	27.000/	04.0007
2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated	Ϋ́Υ	H H	PI PI	•	38.70% No data	No data No data	37.20% 5.89%	37.98% 4.21%	21.20% 5.50%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed	'	Н	Stat	•	No data	No data	3.42%	3.29%	4.94%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		Н	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.20%	0.03%	0.00%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm)		H	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.23%	0.35%	0.09%
2.3.04 2.3.05	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H H	Stat Stat	•	No data No data	No data No data	0.07%	0.06% 0.00%	0.00%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)		Η̈́	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.28%	0.16%	0.13%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (>60mm – 100mm)		Н	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.36%	0.11%	0.00%
2.3.08	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%
2.3.14	% of carriageway area – planned patching	I	Н	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.63%	0.19%	0.00%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAM	ILY GRO
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8086	8063	8158		8081
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		н	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	Ĭ	29.13%	No data	39.77%	32.77%	22.07%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	1	36.33%	No data	39.98%	38.72%	17.96%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	ų.	40.15%	No data	37.98%	38.74%	15.49%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment Financial		Н	Stat	1	43.32%	No data	34.79%	43.97%	24.34%
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	Н	PI	•	£2,040	No data	£4,080	£3,317	£2,379
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		М	PI	į.	No data	No data	£28.96	£36.57	No data
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		Н	PI	Φ	£1,808	No data	£3,766	£3,054	£1,969
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		H	PI	•	£21.74	No data	£13.20	£17.99	£8.85
6.3.01 6.3.02	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat Stat	1	£26,355 £600,273	No data No data	£29,656 £703,578	£21,721 £1,462,796	£12,919 £207,680
6.3.03	Total cost of feacuve maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		l μ	Stat	ľ	No data	No data	£1,949	£1,462,796 £8,122	£207,000
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat	•	£297	No data	£3,188	£1,972	£1,137
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		Н	Stat	•	£89	No data	£287	£446	£211
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	•	£42	No data	£291	£343	£621
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		H M	Stat	↓	69.33%	No data	84.66%	72.82%	57.74%
6.3.09 6.3.10	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance		l M	Stat Stat		20.81% 9.86%	No data No data	7.62% 7.73%	17.31% 9.87%	10.71% 31.55%
	Footways					0.0070			6161.70	0.13070
	Safety									
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	100.00%	57.69%	0.00%
11.2.01 (PI 46) 11.3.01	% of safety inspections completed on time Total number of Cat 1 defects		M	PI Stat	↑	No data No data	No data No data	92.28%	96.14%	100.00%
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		lй	Stat	Ĭ	No data	No data	15	14	0
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		H	Stat	Ĭ	No data	No data	0.00	0.01	0.00
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	•	No data	No data	0.00%	9.01%	24.78%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		<u> </u>	Stat	•	No data	No data	No data	14.00%	17.81%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		<u> </u>	Stat	1	No data	No data	150	273.6	54
11.4.04 11.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		h	Stat Stat	0	No data 0.00	No data No data	0.00	0.00 0.47	144.00 2.18
	Condition/Asset Preservation					0.00	140 data	0.00	V41	2.10
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	No data	No data	10.00%	7.73%	27.70%
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	•	No data	No data	0.00%	0.78%	1.15%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	•	0.00%	No data	0.89%	0.68%	0.82%
12.2.02 12.2.04	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat Stat	•	0.00% 0.00%	No data No data	0.30%	0.19% 0.00%	0.70% 0.00%
12.2.04	% of footway area – parined patching		Н	Stat	•	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%
	Financial					0.0070		5.52,0	5.5.75	0.0070
16.1.01 (PI 49a) 16.1.02 (PI 58)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment	Y	L L	PI PI	η Φ	£203 No data	No data No data	No data No data	£658 £0	£744 No data

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4	Ī			GRP				FAM	IILY GRO
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8086	8063	8158		8081
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)	1	L	PI	•	£194	No data	£0	£468	No data
16.1.04 (PI 49c)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		L	PI	•	No data	No data	£29.65	£38.98	£36.02
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L L	Stat	4	£0	No data	£2,494	£14,589	£0
16.3.02 16.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		L	Stat Stat	→	No data £90	No data No data	£462 £0	£1,603 £439	£0 £1,394
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		[Stat	•	No data	No data	£0	£439	No data
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance	j	L	Stat	•	No data	No data	No data	£0	No data
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		<u> </u>	Stat	↑	100.00%	No data	99.56%	95.02%	100.00%
16.3.08 16.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat Stat	↓	No data 0.00%	No data No data	0.44% 0.00%	7.47% 0.00%	No data 0.00%
10.5.05				Stat	•	0.0070	140 data	0.00701	0.00 /8	0.0070
	<u>Structures</u>									
31.1.01 (PI 300)	Safety % of principal inspections carried out on time		Н	DI	1	100.00%	No data	74.42%	93.60%	100.00%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		l ї	PI	.	26.00%	No data	98.69%	68.19%	0.00%
(, , , ,	Condition/Asset Preservation									
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav	Y	Н	PI	1	81.40	No data	84.73	84.49	No data
32.1.02 (PI 303) 32.3.01	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	69.00 2.83%	No data No data	73.69 7.07%	75.67 3.21%	No data 0.00%
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		;;	Stat Stat	*	2.83%	No data	48	3.21% 57	0.00%
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network Functionality		H	Stat	Ĭ	4	No data	7	4	0
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		н	PI	4	10.66%	No data	4.58%	3.47%	0.00%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI	↓	0.31%	No data	3.53%	1.32%	0.00%
34.3.01 34.3.02	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions) No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	→	3	No data No data	37 0	10 5	0
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with imposed neight / width restriction (for year on year companson) No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		ΙĤ	Stat Stat	Φ	38	No data	11	14	0
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		H	Stat	•	4	No data	0	2	0
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		н	Stat	Ф	0	No data	0	3	0
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Financial Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	DI DI		No data	No data	6.20%	13.54%	No data
36.1.01 (PI 306) 36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		[PI	↑ ↑	No data	No data	100.00%	83.53%	23.30%
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation	İ	L	PI	1	No data	No data	13.19%	8.72%	No data
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage	l	<u> </u>	Stat	¥	No data	No data	No data	2.54%	20.52%
36.3.02	Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat	Φ	£0	No data	£0	£3,900,000	£0]
	Traffic Management Systems									
	Safety									
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	Stat	↑	96.63%	No data	92.84%	93.64%	No data
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit	I	М	Stat	1 1	No data	No data	94.75%	94.04%	No data

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAN	IILY GRO
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8086	8063	8158		8081
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
Ref	Indicator	1 3,	J							J
	Financial			T						
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		-	Stat	Ф	57.09%	No data	90.24%	74.58%	No data
	Street Furniture									
56.1.01	Financial % of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		1 .	Stat	Φ.	2.78%	No data	0.56%	1.53%	0.27%
00.1.01	70 of total reduce a Lighting experience which is sport off offoct furnitation	1	1	Stat	•	2.1070	NO data	0.0070	1.00 /6	0.21 /0
	All assets service delivery									
	<u>Safety</u>									
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		н	Stat	•	No data	No data	No data	0.00	129.12

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAM	ILY GRO
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17			İ	PIN	8086	8063	8158		8081
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	Executive PI	ce rating		ition Authority	Council	Council	Kinross Council	Average	lands Council
		SCOTS Ex	Confidence	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Highland	Moray Cc	Perth & K	Group Av	Orkney Islands
Ref	Indicator	- 1					_			J
	Street Lighting									
	<u>Safety</u>]					
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	1	No data	No data	No data	50.00%	100.00%
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.		Н	PI	1	54.10%	No data	68.09%	56.74%	100.00%
	Condition/Asset Preservation									
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	1	10.38%	No data	17.12%	10.88%	8.88%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	М	Stat	4	No data	No data	19.01%	22.23%	13.02%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	4	22.38%	No data	33.34%	18.39%	1.30%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		М	Stat	Φ	1.05%	No data	2.09%	1.10%	4.70%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		М	Stat	Φ	10.26%	No data	10.23%	11.48%	38.83%
	Customer Service									
23.1.01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	1	91.00%	No data	98.50%	91.78%	86.33%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)		H	PI	. ↓	No data	No data	2.38	2.88	4.60
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		М	PI	Φ	No data	No data	64.60%	90.12%	90.91%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		М	PI	Φ	No data	No data	11.06%	9.49%	8.08%
23.3.01	% of street lights giving modern white light		М	Stat	1	37.14%	No data	35.47%	53.46%	44.92%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		М	Stat	1	22.16%	No data	19.14%	37.96%	42.19%
01001	Availability		l							
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		Н	Stat	Ф	12	No data	0	3	0
26 4 04 (DL25)	Financial Actual conital investment as a 0/ of annual depreciation (from AMD)		м	DI		00.070/	No detail	105.000/	404.070/	105.050/
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	1	82.87%	No data	105.36%	104.27%	185.35%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		l M	PI PI	1	42.44%	No data	48.69%	48.53%	57.78%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		Iм	PI		No data	No data	£39.03	£52.36	£191.13
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light			1	+	No data	No data	No data	£0.00	No data
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI PI	.	£19.19	No data	£11.01	£16.81	£20.39
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	1	V	£67.40	No data	£49.80	£57.67	No data
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	+	£86.59	No data	£60.81	£73.31	£156.28
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		_ n	Stat	1	£39.32	No data	£39.55	£38.22	No data
27 4 04 (DI 495)	Environmental Average applied electricity concumption per street light (kwHre)	Y	М	PI	T	310.98	No data	297.76	301.38	274.80
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	'	I M			165.786	No data No data	158.734	160.666	146.496
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		I M	Stat				158.734	20.16%	
27.3.04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable % change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		H	Stat Stat	↑ •	0.00% -8.19%	No data No data	-12.74%	-11.50%	0.00% -12.16%
27.3.03										

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP	UP 2 (Isla	nd)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8037	8101	
Dof	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Shetland Islands Council	Western Isles Council	Group Average
Ref	Indicator COOTO has a ciliana financial Di							
0.4.04 (DI 00)	SCOTS headline financial PI		<u> </u>			05.007	00.000	04.422
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	l Y	Н	PI	•	£5,297	£3,623	£4,460
	Customer Service				1			
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		Н Н	PI	1	No data	No data	73.91%
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.		Н	PI	1	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		l H	Stat Stat	•	100.00%	97.44% 39	98.42%
3.3.02	Total number of enquines received under the Freedom of information Act		"	Stat		29	39	38
	Corriggover							
	<u>Carriageways</u>							
4.4.04 (DL000)	Safety		M	DI.		400.000/	400.000/	02 220/
1.1.01 (PI 03a) 1.2.01 (PI 39)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		M H	PI PI	↑	100.00%	100.00%	83.33% 97.11%
1.1.01 (PI 03a) 1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01	Safety			PI PI Stat	† †	100.00% 96.88% 15	100.00% 100.00% 24	83.33% 97.11% 14
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims		Н М Н	PI Stat Stat	1	96.88% 15 14	100.00% 24 12	97.11% 14 9
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims		Н М Н	PI Stat Stat Stat	↑ ↓ ↓	96.88% 15 14 0.01	100.00% 24 12 0.01	97.11% 14 9 0.01
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H M H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat	† ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ •	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims	Y	Н М Н	PI Stat Stat Stat	↑ ↓ ↓	96.88% 15 14 0.01	100.00% 24 12 0.01	97.11% 14 9 0.01
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)	Υ	H M H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	↑ → → → + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)	Υ	H M H H H M M	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	↑ → → → ↔ ↔ ↔	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	↑ → → → + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length	Y	H M H H H M H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	↑ → → → ↔ ↔ ↔	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	Υ	H M H H H M H M M	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H M H M M	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H M H H H M H M M	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H H H H M H M H M	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated		H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed	Y	H M H H M M M H H H H H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)	Y	H M H H M M M H H H H H H H H H H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94% 0.59%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01% 0.30%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96% 0.30%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed	Y	H M H H M M M H H H H H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3,687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary reated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94% 0.59% 0.05% 0.54% 0.18%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3.687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01% 0.30% 0.26% 0.73% 0.00%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96% 0.30% 0.13% 0.42% 0.06%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05 2.3.06	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – strin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)	Y	H M H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7.056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94% 0.59% 0.05% 0.18% 0.05%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3.687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01% 0.30% 0.26% 0.73% 0.00% 0.21%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96% 0.30% 0.13% 0.42% 0.06% 0.13%
1.2.01 (PI 39) 1.3.01 1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Safety % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time. Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary reated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H	PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	96.88% 15 14 0.01 24.00% 57.54% 55.63% 45.30 7,056 100.00% 7.43 1.11 8.84 2.50 1.00 37.70% 6.68% 4.94% 0.59% 0.05% 0.54% 0.18%	100.00% 24 12 0.01 23.08% 39.98% 45.02% 43.79 3.687 100.00% 4.72 1.53 5.51 1.50 1.00 43.10% 0.85% 5.01% 0.30% 0.26% 0.73% 0.00%	97.11% 14 9 0.01 28.83% 48.76% 50.33% 29.70 6,426 95.45% 4.79 0.96 4.78 2.00 1.00 34.67% 4.34% 4.96% 0.30% 0.13% 0.42% 0.06%

Performance Indicator Results 2016-17			1		1				
Ref Indicator Ref In		SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP	UP 2 (Isla	ınd)	
Ref Indicator Ref In		Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8037	8101	
Ref						\			
Ref						\ <u>≥</u>			
Ref						\ j			
						\A	ncil	_	
			ᆸ	b0		\	nog	nuci	
			ive	ıting]	spu	Ö	3e
			scut			i <u>÷</u> i	Islar	sles	erag
			EXE	denc L)	at	Pos	pu	Ē	A A
			OTS	nfic , M,	/ St	ea /	etla	este	dno
2.3.09 % of carriageway area — fully reconstructed	Def	Indiantan	SC	೮ ಕ	ᆸ	9	Sh	>	פֿ
2.3.10 (Pt 0.2d) % of **A***Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment H Stat J 18.80% 37.28% 26.83% 2.3.11				н	Stat	•	0.05%	0.00%	0.02%
2.3.12	2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		н	Stat	↓	19.80%	37.28%	26.38%
2.3.13 % of U"C Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment Financial Finan	2.3.11								
State California Californ	2.3.12					, i			
5.1.02 (P1 87) Total cost per Km of carriageway ravelled for precautionary salling treatment H P1 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$			v				0.1.100	00 704	22.222
5.1.35 (PI 42b) Clast carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway area treated			Y						
Total cost of addressing total backing by road length	6.1.03 (PI 42b)					•			
Total cost of reactive maintenance	6.1.04 (PI 42c)								
S. 3.03									
Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance H Stat \$ £6 £382 £208	6.3.03					į.			
Expenditure per km of routine maintenance	6.3.04								
Bactest Bact									
Footways	6.3.08								
Footways Safety	6.3.09								
11.1.01 (Pl 45a) % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times H Pl ↑ 0.00% 100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 11.3.01 Total number of Cat 1 defects L Stat ↓ 0 1 0.00% 100.00% 11.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims H Stat ↓ 0 0.1 0.01 0.01 11.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims H Stat ↓ 0.02 0.01 0.01 11.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway H Stat ↓ 0.02 0.01 0.01 11.4.01 (Pl 113) % of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment L Stat ↓ 0.00% 12.60% 12.46%	6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		M	Stat	Φ	4.01%	5.16%	10.56%
11.1.01 (PI 45a) % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times H PI ↑ 0.00% 100.00% 33.33% 11.2.01 (PI 46) % of safety inspections completed on time H PI ↑ 0.00% 100.00%		Footways							
11.2.01 (PI 46) % of safety inspections completed on time Total number of Cat 1 defects L Stat	44.4.04 (DL 45-)			ы	Di		0.000/	100.000/ [20.000/
11.3.01 Total number of Cat 1 defects 11.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway 11.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway 11.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway 11.4.01 (PI 113) % of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment 11.4.02 % of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) 11.4.03 Tonnes of salt used 11.4.04 Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment 11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network 11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network 11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network 12.1.01 (PI 47) % of footway length treated 12.1.02 (PI 48) % of footway length treated 12.2.01 % of footway area – surface treated 12.2.02 % of footway area – surface treated 12.2.03 % of footway area – planned patching 12.2.03 % of footway area – planned patching 13.00 1 0.01 1 0.01 1 0.01 1 0.01 1 0.01 1 0.000 1.000									
11.3.03	11.3.01			Ĺ				1	0
11.4.01 (PI 113)	11.3.02							1	1
11.4.02 % of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) 11.4.03 Tonnes of salt used 11.4.04 Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment 11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network 12.1.01 (PI 47) % of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment 12.1.02 (PI 48) % of footway length treated 12.2.01 % of footway area – resurfaced 12.2.02 % of footway area – resurfaced 12.2.04 % of footway area – reconstructed 13.4.05									
11.4.04 Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment 11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network Condition/Asset Preservation 12.1.01 (PI 47) % of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment Y L PI ↓ 0.00% 34.80% 20.83% 12.1.02 (PI 48) % of footway length treated 12.2.01 % of footway area – surface treated Y M PI ♦ 2.79% 0.37% 1.44% 12.2.02 % of footway area – resurfaced 12.2.02 % of footway area – resurfaced H Stat ♦ 0.00% 0.30% 0.33% 12.2.04 % of footway area – planned patching 12.2.03 % of footway area – reconstructed Financial Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	11.4.02			Ē					
11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network H Stat \$ 3.42 1.05 2.22	11.4.03								
Condition/Asset Preservation Y				_					
12.1.02 (PI 48) % of footway length treated Y M PI					- Lui			<u> </u>	
12.2.01 % of footway area – surface treated 12.2.02 % of footway area – resurfaced 12.2.03 % of footway area – planned patching 12.2.03 % of footway area – reconstructed 12.2.04 % of footway area – planned patching 12.2.05 % of footway area – reconstructed 13.2.06 % of footway area – reconstructed 14. Stat \$ 0.00% 0.30% 0.30% 0.30% 0.00% 0	12.1.01 (PI 47)			L	PI	Ų.			
12.2.02 % of footway area – resurfaced H Stat ↓ 0.00% 0.30% 0.33% 12.2.04 % of footway area – planned patching H Stat ↓ 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 12.2.03 % of footway area – reconstructed H Stat ↓ 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% Financial Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Y L PI ↓ £900 £691 £778			Y						
12.2.04 % of footway area – planned patching H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.00% 0.00%<	12.2.01								
Financial 16.1.01 (PI 49a) Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Y L PI \$ £900 £691 £778	12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		н	Stat	Φ	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
16.1.01 (PI 49a) Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length Y L PI \$ £900 £691 £778	12.2.03			Н	Stat	Ф	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
16.1.02 (PI 58) Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment L PI ↓ No data No data £0	16.1.01 (PI 49a)		Υ	L	PI	Ф	£900	£691	£778
	16.1.02 (PI 58)			L	PI			No data	

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4	Π	l		GRP	UP 2 (Isla	nd)	
						,		
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8037	8101	
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Shetland Islands Council	Western Isles Council	Group Average
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)	т -	L	PI	•	£677	£511	£594
16.1.04 (PI 49c)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated	1	L	PI	Φ	£21.50	£147.27	£68.27
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		<u> </u>	Stat	V	£6,263	£7,905	£4,723
16.3.02 16.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance			Stat Stat	•	£0 No data	£0 £455	£0 £925
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		1 .	Stat	•	£54	£455	£55
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		Ī	Stat	•	£623	No data	£623
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance	1	L	Stat	1	No data	89.17%	94.58%
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		<u> </u>	Stat	V	8.01%	10.83%	9.42%
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance	}		Stat	•	91.99%	0.00%	30.66%
	Structures							
	Safety							
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	100.00%	20.00%	73.33%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time Condition/Asset Preservation		Н	PI	1	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav	Υ	н	PI	1	98.38	94.70	96.54
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Ý	H	PI	i i	95.83	83.10	89.47
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		н	Stat	Ų.	0.00%	0.49%	0.16%
32.3.02	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		H	Stat	+	15	No data	8
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		н	Stat	1	0	0	0
34.1.01 (PI 304)	Functionality % of Council owned bridges failing European standards		н	PI	Ţ	5.73%	No data	2.86%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction	1	H	PI	,	0.00%	2.96%	0.99%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)	1	Н	Stat	↓	0	6	2
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)	1	H	Stat	•	0	0	0
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		!!	Stat	0	0	0	0
34.3.04 34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17)	1	H	Stat Stat	Φ	0	0	0
04.0.00	Financial			Otat				
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	1	13.82%	111.43%	62.62%
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum	1	<u> </u>	PI	1	5.90%	88.54%	39.25%
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		-	PI	↓	6.59%	1.50%	4.04% 6.84%
36.3.01 36.3.02	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat Stat	•	0.00% £0	0.00% £0	6.84% £0
30.3.02			ı	1	l			
30.3.02	T CC 10 1	+						
30.3.02	Traffic Management Systems							
	Safety							
41.1.01 (PI 55) 41.1.02 (PI 56)		Y	H	Stat Stat	↑	No data No data	100.00%	100.00% 100.00%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP	UP 2 (Isla	and)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8037	8101	
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Shetlands Council	Western Isles Council	Group Average
lef	Indicator	<u> </u>	0 =		_	ν	>	<u> </u>
5.1.01	Financial			Ctat		No data	No deta	0.000/
5.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend			Stat	Ψ	No data	No data	0.00%
	Street Furniture							
6.1.01	Financial % of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	Φ	3.82%	0.20%	1.43%
	All assets service delivery							
	Safety							
1.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		Н	Stat	•	582.61	1,337.90	683.21

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP	UP 2 (Isla	ınd)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8037	8101	
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Shetland Islands Council	Western Isles Council	Group Average
Ref	Indicator							
	Street Lighting							
	Safety							
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	No data	78.64%	89.32%
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate. Condition/Asset Preservation		Н	PI	1	No data	30.55%	65.27%
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Υ	н	PI	T	6.41%	13.93%	9.74%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Υ	М	Stat	i	No data	39.20%	26.11%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	Į.	No data	40.02%	20.66%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		М	Stat	•	6.57%	0.65%	3.98%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		М	Stat	Φ	8.76%	4.04%	17.21%
	Customer Service	.,						
23.1.01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	1	No data	90.00%	88.17%
23.2.01 (PI 20) 23.2.02 (PI 27)	Average time taken to repair (days) Public calls as a % of faults		M	PI PI	•	No data No data	10.00 15.52%	7.30 53.22%
23.2.02 (PI 27) 23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	•	No data	2.16%	5.12%
23.3.01	% of street lights giving modern white light		M	Stat	^	14.19%	61.73%	40.28%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		М	Stat	<u>,</u>	12.47%	27.74%	27.46%
	Availability					/0		
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		Н	Stat	Φ	0	6	2
	<u>Financial</u>							
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	↑	No data	10.10%	97.72%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	ų.	57.64%	39.46%	51.62%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L M	PI PI	1	No data	£67.93	£129.53
26.2.02 (PI 34b) 26.2.03 (PI 42)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	J	No data £31.42	£0.04 £33.92	£0.04 £28.58
26.2.03 (PI 42) 26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	.	£31.42 £69.09	£33.92 £8.14	£28.58 £38.62
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		н	PI	Ŭ ↓	£100.51	£42.06	£99.62
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		н	Stat	i i	£69.03	£21.23	£45.13
(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Environmental					222,00		211.10
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	Y	М	PI	↓	525.71	145.86	315.46
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		М	Stat	4	280.256	77.757	168.170
27.3.04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable		М	Stat	1	0.00%	0.22%	0.07%
27.3.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		Н	Stat	•	0.27%	5.12%	-2.26%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	AILY GRO	DUP 3 (Se	mi Urba	n)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council
1101											
0.4.04 (PL 00)	SCOTS headline financial PI		,,,	Di Di		00.477	040.044	040.050	040.000	044.504	0-
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	l Y	Н	PI	Ф	£9,477	£12,814	£10,653	£10,326	£11,504	£7
	Customer Service										
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		Н	PI	↑	88.65%	45.41%	No data	97.13%	95.81%	97.
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.		H	PI	↑	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.
3.3.01 (PI 61) 3.3.02	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat Stat	Φ	99.03%	71.30%	94.50%	100.00%	74.16% 89	98.
	<u>Carriageways</u> Safety										
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		М	PI	1	78.65%	86.05%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	71.
1.2.01 (PI 39)	% of safety inspections completed on time.		н	PI	Ť	83.63%	100.00%	100.00%	97.44%	98.09%	100.
								No data		417	
1.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects		М	Stat	. ↓	192	129		5		
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		M H	Stat	1	144	43	148	89	75	
1.3.02 1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway	\ \ \ \	M H H	Stat Stat	+	144 0.12	43 0.05	148 0.06	89 0.13	75 0.07	43
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	M H	Stat	1	144	43	148	89	75	43. 43.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway	Y	M H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88%	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25%	
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ↔ → ↔	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72	43. 53. 9
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H M M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ → ⊕	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59,828	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ↔ → ↔ ↔	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19%	43. 53. 9
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length	Y	M H H H M H M M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ ⊕ → → →	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	Y	M H H H M H M M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ ⊕ → → → →	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H M H M M H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ ⊕ → → → → ⊕	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46.952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	Y	M H H H M H M M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ ⊕ → → → →	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00	43. 53. 9 40
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated		M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → • • • → → • • • → • • •	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50 34.10% 5.46% 2.96%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00 33.60% 0.86% 0.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46.952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → • • • → → • • • • • • • • • • • • •	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94.822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21% 0.18%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ ⊕ → ⊕ ⊕ → → ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59,828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00 39.10% 3.16% 0.88% 0.18% 0.18% 0.09%	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50 34.10% 5.46% 2.96% 0.00% 0.00%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21% 0.18% 0.07% 0.08%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00 33.60% 0.86% 0.00% 0.38% 0.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46,952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00 38.30% 2.75% 1.12% 0.24% 0.93% 0.00%	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Todition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ → ⊕ ⊕ → → → ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00 39.10% 3.16% 0.88% 0.18% 0.18% 0.00%	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50 34.10% 5.46% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21% 0.18% 0.07% 0.08% 0.00%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00 33.60% 0.86% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46.952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00 38.30% 2.75% 1.12% 0.24% 0.93% 0.00%	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05 2.3.06	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin /micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → • • → • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00 39.10% 3.16% 0.88% 0.18% 0.09% 0.00% 0.00%	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50 34.10% 5.46% 2.96% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 1.65%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21% 0.18% 0.07% 0.08% 0.00%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00 33.60% 0.86% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46.952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00 38.30% 2.75% 1.12% 0.24% 0.93% 0.00% 0.00%	43. 53. 9 40 84.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) Todition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → ⊕ → ⊕ ⊕ → → → ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕	144 0.12 46.80% 46.80% 61.88% 91.13 59.828 90.20% 4.45 0.09 4.65 3.00 1.00 39.10% 3.16% 0.88% 0.18% 0.18% 0.00%	43 0.05 56.77% No data 160.49% 21.60 21,840 100.00% 3.37 0.14 2.13 2.00 1.50 34.10% 5.46% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	148 0.06 58.96% No data 68.74% 90.87 94,822 99.60% 1.10 0.03 5.43 3.00 0.00 32.61% 1.54% 0.21% 0.18% 0.07% 0.08% 0.00%	89 0.13 60.53% 60.53% 79.20% 64.82 5,287 100.00% 5.75 0.74 24.60 2.00 1.00 33.60% 0.86% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	75 0.07 48.34% 48.34% 61.25% 81.72 46.952 98.19% 5.32 0.12 4.74 3.00 1.00 38.30% 2.75% 1.12% 0.24% 0.93% 0.00%	43. 53. 9 40 84.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAI	MILY GRO	OUP 3 (S	emi Urba	ın)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		н	Stat	•	0.03%	0.16%	0.01%	0.07%	0.01%	(
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	i	н	Stat	i i	19.10%	29.27%	27.41%	22.72%	36.20%	38
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		н	Stat	. ↓	34.00%	40.30%	33.08%	25.12%	36.80%	43
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	. ↓	38.50%	33.54%	28.74%	30.12%	50.80%	40
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	1	45.60%	33.10%	34.67%	39.75%	34.60%	43
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Financial Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	н	PI	•	£6,040	£6,083	£5,373	£4,679	£4,922	£
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	'	I м	Pi	l ĭ l	£4.73	£71.22	£23.58	£48.59	£7.72	
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		Н	PI	•	£4,783	£5,092	£4,710	£3,499	£4,353	£
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		н	PI	•	£31.66	£23.94	£37.39	£96.11	£27.53	£
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		н	Stat	•	£41,416	£21,315	£28,698	£28,744	£30,570	£3
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	.	£966,025	£474,591	£1,386,314	£168,688	£987,947	£91
6.3.03 6.3.04	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat Stat	↓	£11,987 £3,694	£55,520 £3,206	£3,104 £3,640	£10,580 £2,256	£3,341 £2,986	£1
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		l μ	Stat		£3,694 £802	£3,206 £518	£3,640 £569	£2,256 £249	£2,986 £954	£
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		Н	Stat	•	£287	£452	£502	£995	£413	
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance	i	н	Stat	Ì	77.23%	76.78%	77.27%	64.47%	68.60%	66
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance	i	М	Stat	. ↓	16.76%	12.41%	12.08%	7.11%	21.92%	23
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		М	Stat	•	6.01%	10.81%	10.65%	28.43%	9.48%	ę
	Footways]						
	Safety										
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times		Н	PI	1	62.96%	No data	No data	0.00%	100.00%	66
11.2.01 (PI 46)	% of safety inspections completed on time		M	PI Stat	1 1	77.35%	No data	50.00%	100.00%	83.33%	100
11.3.01 11.3.02	Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims		l H	Stat	↓	27 11	5 20	No data 44	0 No data	49 25	
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		l ї	Stat	ľ	0.01	0.04	0.01	No data	0.02	
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		Ë	Stat	ı ŏ	14.44%	4.57%	0.00%	7.26%	6.25%	1
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	İ	L	Stat	Φ	14.44%	1.66%	11.38%	7.26%	6.25%	1
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		L	Stat	. ↓	78	10	500	178	55	
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	Φ	832.60	14.67	0.00	199.34	652.14	
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		Н	Stat	•	0.48	1.53	1.36	0.65	0.44	
12.1.01 (PI 47)	Condition/Asset Preservation % of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Ιγ	L	PI	1	No data	9.17%	0.00%	9.65%	11.46%	No
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length treated	ΙÝ	м	PI	l ě	0.63%	2.41%	0.42%	1.56%	0.84%	(
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated	İ	Ĥ	Stat	•	0.00%	1.73%	0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	C
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		н	Stat	Φ	0.00%	0.62%	0.14%	0.30%	0.64%	(
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat	Φ.	0.09%	0.07%	0.14%	0.00%	0.02%	(
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		Н	Stat	Ф	0.60%	0.61%	0.18%	1.06%	0.37%	
	Financial				l .						
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Υ	L	PI	Φ	£564	No data	£879	£1,840	£1,837	No

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FAN	AILY GRO	OUP 3 (Se	emi Urba	n)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	PI	•	£443	£3,766	£748	£1.556	£1,707	
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost) Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		[PI		£443 £45.12	£80.94	£89.82	£7,550	£95.03	£4
16.3.01 ` ´	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓ ↓	£31,291	£202,932	£265,338	£0	£134,389	3
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		Ŀ	Stat	.	£3,572	£55,123	£27,304	No data	£66,291	£6
16.3.03 16.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance			Stat Stat	0	£412 £31	£1,891 £422	£594 £88	£1,556 No data	£1,468 £133	
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		[Stat		No data	No data	£67	No data	£106	No
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance	ı	L	Stat	1	93.06%	81.77%	79.32%	100.00%	85.97%	99.
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		<u> </u>	Stat	.	6.94%	18.23%	11.73%	No data	7.80%	0.
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	8.95%	0.00%	6.23%	0.
	<u>Structures</u>										
24 4 24 (17) 222)	Safety			I		10.500/		22.242/		5 4 0 5 0 1	400
31.1.01 (PI 300) 31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of principal inspections carried out on time % of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI PI	†	12.50% 100.00%	No data 98.21%	90.24%	No data 100.00%	54.37% 87.33%	100. 100.
31.1.02 (P1 301)	Condition/Asset Preservation		"	IF!	T	100.00%	90.21%	100.00%	100.00%	07.33%	100.
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav	Y	н	PI	1	85.29	83.15	89.28	90.17	87.80	9
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSClcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	74.86	75.85	73.33	79.48	80.30	8
32.3.01 32.3.02	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat Stat	↓	8.41%	2.41%	2.90%	0.00%	7.56%	6.
32.3.03	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		ΙÄ	Stat	ľ	3	2	8	3	10	
	Functionality								-		
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		H	PI	.	6.63%	4.28%	7.04%	0.92%	1.51%	1.
34.2.01 (PI 305) 34.3.01	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		H	PI Stat	↓	0.49%	0.00%	3.31%	0.92%	1.01%	0.
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		Ι¨̈́	Stat		0	0	15	2	1	
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		H	Stat	•	2	16	1	1	0	
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		Н	Stat	Φ	0	0	10	1	0	
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		Н	Stat	Ф	0	0	5	1	1	
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Financial Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	1	7.34%	No data	19.48%	12.68%	17.28%	6
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		Ĺ	PI	†	27.28%	19.64%	92.31%	74.09%	58.55%	69.
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		Ŀ	PI	↓	17.15%	No data	0.66%	4.46%	3.51%	5.
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		L	Stat Stat	↓ A	0.00%	No data	2.00%	49.49%	2.00%	0.
26 2 02	Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width	I	-	Stat	•	£11,700,000	£0	£133,116	£0	£2,812,000	£2,420
36.3.02				+	1						
36.3.02	Traffic Management Systems										
36.3.02 41.1.01 (PI 55)	Traffic Management Systems Safety % of faults rectified within target time	Y	Н	Stat] 	98.71%	91.53%	99.70%	99.24%	78.32%	95.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FA	MILY GRO	OUP 3 (Se	emi Urba	an)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				PIN	8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042
		SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council
Ref	Indicator										
46.1.01	Financial % of Traffic Means and Custom aurorality and thick in plantage and resistance and an interest and a sixty and a six			Stat		49.94%	2.08%	30.02%	No data	48.88%	41
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		-	Stat		49.94%	2.08%	30.02%	No data	48.88%	41
	Street Furniture										
56.1.01	Financial % of total Deads % Lighting auronality and which is exact an Otroct Furniture			Ctat		2.000/	0.000/	4.020/	No data	0.070/	
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture			Stat	•	2.60%	0.96%	1.83%	No data	2.67%	0
	All assets service delivery										
	Safety										
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		H	Stat	•	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP		FA	MILY GR	OUP 3 (Se	emi Urba	ın)
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council
Ref	Indicator										
	Street Lighting										
	Safety										
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	No data	81.61%	0.00%	100.00%	73.24%	No
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.		Н	PI	↑	22.08%	76.48%	63.78%	No data	62.83%	54
	Condition/Asset Preservation										
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	Н	PI	↓	18.06%	8.95%	14.33%	7.50%	18.74%	21
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	ΙY	М	Stat	.	35.43%	40.91%	32.96%	23.12%	11.03%	24
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		<u> </u>	Stat	.	46.96%	15.50%	23.81%	46.48%	12.15%	39
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		M	Stat	•	0.52%	1.68%	1.67%	4.29%	1.74%	0
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		M	Stat	Ф	6.11%	11.86%	10.32%	4.22%	25.15%	15
22.4.04 (DL02)	Customer Service % of repairs within 7 days	Y	н	PI	1	96.43%	95.41%	96.77%	99.00%	94.42%	88
23.1.01 (PI 03) 23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)	'	1 6	PI	T J	3.07	2.88	4.67	99.00%		88
23.2.01 (PI 20) 23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		Iй	PI		No data	105.48%	110.45%	23.68%	7.16 81.98%	No
23.2.02 (PI 27) 23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		l m	PI	•	No data	9.44%	15.83%	1.78%	15.36%	No
23.3.01	% of street lights giving modern white light		Iй	Stat	1 🕴	60.72%	71.21%	66.31%	47.26%	66.61%	41
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED	i	Iй	Stat	 	18.28%	42.26%	9.34%	25.30%	46.10%	24
	Availability			J		.0.2370	.2.2370	3.5170	20.0070	10070	
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		н	Stat	Φ	0	0	0	12	9	
	Financial										
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		М	PI	1	72.50%	60.92%	67.12%	No data	267.27%	35
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		М	PI	↓	51.42%	47.41%	51.75%	96.67%	60.40%	54
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		<u>L</u>	PI	↓	£31.79	£210.31	£76.99	£241.07	£67.63	£5
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light	Į.	М	PI	↓	No data	No data	No data	£0.03	£0.05	£
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	Ų.	£16.28	£23.44	£15.26	No data	£13.74	£5
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	Ų.	£26.55	£54.99	£31.60	No data	No data	£1
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓	£42.83	£78.43	£46.86	No data	£125.44	£6
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		Н	Stat	1	£39.35	No data	£38.04	No data	£26.07	£4
27 4 04 (DI 49b)	Environmental Average applied electricity consumption per street light //wHz)	Y	м	PI		222.04	235.92	259.90	300.03	242.43	41
27.1.01 (PI 18b) 27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs) Co2 emissions (kg) per street light	'	l M	Stat	↓	332.04 177.011	125.770	138.555	309.92 165.219	129.237	221
27.3.01 (PI 37b) 27.3.04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable		l M	Stat	↑	0.38%	42.26%	60.31%	17.91%	43.95%	22
27.3.04 (F1 36b) 27.3.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		Ι¨¨i	Stat	6	-5.57%	-6.61%	-15.27%	-2.67%	-10.86%	11
27.0.00	70 change in chergy consumption from year to year (xxx11)	ı	I "	Jiai	•	-0.01 /0	-0.01/0	-13.27 /0	-2.07 /0	-10.00 /6	- 11

Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data Ref	R	load Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				
Ref Indicator SCOTS headline financial PI 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total expanditure by camagerary network length (2 per Km) Customer Service 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total expanditure by camagerary network length (2 per Km) Customer Service 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total expanditure by camagerary network length (2 per Km) Customer Service 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total expanditure by camagerary network length (2 per Km) Customer Service Customer Service dead off within Councils own identified response times. 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total number of respirate received under the freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total number of respirate received under the freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time 1.101 (PI 6.3) Total number of requires received under the freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.102 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.103 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.104 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.105 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.105 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.105 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.106 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.107 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.108 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.108 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.108 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.102 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.103 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.104 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.105 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.105 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.106 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.107 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.108 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.109 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.101 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.102 (PI 6.3) Safety 1.103						DIN	9120	8040	8100	
Ref						PIN	8120	8040	8109	
SCOTS headline financial PI 0.1.01 (PI 63) Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) Customer Service 3.1.01 (PI 37) % of customer enquires/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times. 3.2.01 (PI 38) % of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time. 3.3.01 (PI 61) % of aprices made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act Carriageways Safety 1.1.01 (PI 03a) % of carliageway services desired on time. Total number of arguest produces the services of the serv			Executive		_		South Lanarkshire Council	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average
Customer Service Salary Pi Pi Pi Pi Pi Pi Pi P	_		Г		_					
Customer Service 3.1.01 (Pl 37) 3.2.01 (Pl 38) 3.3.01 (Pl 61) 3.3		headline financial PI								
13.101 (Pl 37) 3.2.01 (Pl 81) 3.3.	b	y carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	Н	PI	Ф	£17,658	£8,690	£16,731	£11,696
1.1 of (Pl 37) 3.2 of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times. H PI	_					1			١	
1.2.01 (P138) 3.3.01 (P161) 4 5tat 5 56.87%	n	<u>er Service</u>								
State Stat	•	·		_	PI	↑		79.53%	68.78%	80.24%
Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act						T		No data No data	100.00% 95.18%	100.00% 91.24%
Safety								No data	83	99
1.1.01 (PI 03a) % of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. M PI ↑ 95.72% 1.2.01 (PI 39) % of safety inspections completed on time. M PI ↑ 99.74% 1.3.02 Total number of Cat 1 defects M Stat ↓ 188 1.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims H Stat ↓ 108 1.3.04 Total number of 3rd party claims H Stat ↓ 108 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 51.98% 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 100.05 1.4.07 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 100.05 1.4.08 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 100.05 1.4.08 Total actual length treated precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 100.05 1.4.08 Total actual length treated precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 100.08 1.4.09 Average salt usage by total actual precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 10.78 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run M Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 6.83 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for	1	<u>eways</u>								
1.2.01 (PI 39) % of safety inspections completed on time.	e 1	made safe within response times		М	PI	•	95 72%	55.09%	88.52%	84.46%
1.3.01 Total number of Cat 1 defects M Stat ↓ 1.87 1.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims H Stat ↓ 0.05 1.4.01 (Pl 114) % of carriageway network duemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.05 1.88% 1.4.02 % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 56.27% 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat ↓ 56.27% 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 56.27% 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 56.27% 1.4.05 Stat ↓ 56.27% 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 10.78 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length M Stat ↓ 10.78 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total network length M Stat ↓ 10.78 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run M Stat ↓ 0.14 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.14 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.00 Stat ↓						I ∔		80.18%	100.00%	95.45%
Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway 1.4.01 (Pl 114) % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment 1.4.02 % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.03 Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.07 Total aslt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation 2.1.01 (Pl 40) % of carriageway length treated 1.4.19 % of carriageway length treated 1.4.10 % of carriageway length treated 1.4.11 % of carriageway length treated 1.4.12 % of carriageway area – surface dressed 1.4.13 % of carriageway area – surface dressed 1.4.14 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.01 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.02 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>25mm – 60mm) 1.4.05 % total actual precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to precautionary treatment to provide the provide treatment to provide the provide tre			İ	М		į į		432	488	239
1.4.01 (Pl 114) % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment Y H Stat \$ 51,99% 1.4.02 % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat \$ 51,99% 1.4.03 Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat \$ 51,99% 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat \$ 56,27% 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) M Stat \$ 84,80 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat \$ 172,985 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length M Stat \$ 100,00% 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary run M Stat \$ 10,00% 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat \$ 6.83 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat \$ 1.00 2.1.01 (Pl 40) % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment Y H	rd	party claims				1		84	57	94
1.4.02 % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.03 Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total precautionary reatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 2.1.01 (PI 40) % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment 2.1.02 (PI 41) % of carriageway length treated 2.3.01 % of carriageway area – surface dressed 2.3.02 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.03 % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\frac{1}{2}\$ \$\fra			۱.,			+		0.08	0.05	0.08
1.4.03 Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.15 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes			l Y			•		43.76%	63.75%	52.67%
1.4.04 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.15 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.16 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.17 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.18 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.19 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 Stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 Stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter			l			1 1		98.45% 44.44%	63.75% 87.78%	59.00% 74.82%
1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.13 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.14 State (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.15 State (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for complet						•		99.90	47.35	75.22
1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length 1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 The stated (po						•	172,985	3,952	89,359	59,528
1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length 1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation 2.1.01 (PI 40) % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment 2.1.02 (PI 41) % of carriageway length treated 2.3.01 % of carriageway area – surface dressed 2.3.02 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 2.3.03 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) 3.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) M Stat ↓ 0.14 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.10 ↑ 1.4.10 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.10 ↑ 1.4.10 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.10 ↑ 1.4.10 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.11 ↑ 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.14 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.11 ↑ 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.14 M Stat ↓ 0.83 1.4.11 ↑ 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.484 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.484 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.484 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.484 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stat ↓ 0.484 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) H Stated (policy)						•		100.00%	100.00%	96.91%
1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.12 Condition/Asset Preservation 1.4.13 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.14 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.15 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completions of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completions of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completions of the stated of the stat						1 *		4.21	7.64	5.20
1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) 1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation 2.1.01 (PI 40)			ł			1 1		1.08 0.62	0.09 3.45	0.28 6.39
1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation 2.1.01 (PI 40)								3.00	0.00	2.50
2.1.01 (PI 40)	ή) t	time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		Н		•		1.00	0.00	0.83
2.1.02 (PI 41)	_		l							
2.3.01 % of carriageway area – surface dressed H Stat \$\psi\$ 1.04% 2.3.02 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.79% 2.3.03 % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.45% 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.21%					PI			43.80%	29.35%	35.68%
2.3.02 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.79% 2.3.03 % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.45% 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.21%			'			•		3.40% 1.16%	1.44% 0.52%	3.02% 1.05%
2.3.03 % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.45% 2.3.04 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.21%			l			•		0.00%	0.00%	0.15%
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	a	rea – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm)				•	0.45%	0.58%	0.08%	0.56%
12.3.05 I/w of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)						•		0.33%	0.00%	0.07%
				H	Stat	•	0.08%	0.00%	0.01%	0.01%
2.3.06 % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm) 2.3.07 % of carriageway area – moderate inlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.92% D.50%								0.55% 0.15%	0.48% 0.13%	0.72% 0.16%
2.3.07 % of carriageway area — moderate inlay (>60mm – 100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.50% 2.3.08 % of carriageway area — structural inlay (>100mm) H Stat \$\phi\$ 0.04%						4		0.15%	0.13%	0.16%
2.3.14 % of carriageway area – planned patching H Stat © 0.10%								0.00%	0.13%	0.15%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8120	8040	8109	
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	South Lanarkshire Council	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed	-	н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		н	Stat	Ĭ	23.00%	31.22%	18.32%	27.32%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	į	Н	Stat	T	24.10%	41.84%	27.58%	34.08%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	.	37.90%	41.31%	41.59%	38.08%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	+	35.50%	51.19%	30.10%	38.65%
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Financial Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	н	PI	•	£8,722	£4,414	£7,695	£5,815
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	'	М.	PI	Ĭ	£13.41	£65.05	£19.91	£29.00
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		н	PI	Φ	£7,578	£2,531	£1,943	£4,197
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated	İ	Н	PI	Φ	£30.02	£24.14	£78.04	£41.07
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		Н	Stat	•	£34,448	£45,614	£24,361	£32,343
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	.	£4,761,917	No data	£1,139,862	£1,350,048
6.3.03 6.3.04	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat Stat	•	£1,949 £5,364	£89,509 £2,531	£101,014 £6,303	£32,927 £3,574
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		Н	Stat	•	£2,075	No data	£1,093	£3,574
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	•	£139	No data	£446	£444
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance	į	Н	Stat	1	70.78%	100.00%	80.37%	74.90%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		М	Stat	1	27.38%	No data	13.93%	18.02%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		М	Stat	•	1.84%	No data	5.69%	7.08%
	<u>Footways</u>								
44.4.04 (DL 45-)	Safety			Di		04.460/	42.000/	400.000/ 1	00.000/
11.1.01 (PI 45a) 11.2.01 (PI 46)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times % of safety inspections completed on time		I Н I М	PI PI	Τ ↑	91.18% 99.82%	43.96% 66.67%	100.00%	66.39% 84.65%
11.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects		<u>"</u>	Stat	.	34	91	43	32
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		Н	Stat	ĭ	73	8	23	28
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway	İ	н	Stat	Ų.	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment	ļ	<u> </u>	Stat	•	3.44%	19.71%	92.10%	16.53%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		-	Stat	•	3.44%	19.71%	92.10%	17.47%
11.4.03 11.4.04	Tonnes of salt used Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment			Stat Stat	•	No data 5,576.00	1,068 381.27	126 397.24	252 895.81
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		Ь	Stat	•	0.87	0.78	1.33	0.86
	Condition/Asset Preservation					0.07			7.30
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	17.10%	0.00%	10.14%	8.22%
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length treated	Y	М	PI	•	1.05%	0.69%	0.58%	0.92%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	•	0.46%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%
12.2.02 12.2.04	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat Stat	•	0.28%	0.72%	0.00%	0.30% 0.04%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		НÜ	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	0.43%
	Financial			2.00		-0.0070	0.0070	3.07.70	0.4070
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	Φ	£2,354	£878	£709	£1,294
	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment		Ĺ	PI	J	No data	£379	£467	£576

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8120	8040	8109	
Ref 16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Indicator Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	South Lanarkshire Council	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average 622,13
16.1.04 (PI 49c) 16.3.01 16.3.02 16.3.03 16.3.04 16.3.05 16.3.07 16.3.08 16.3.09	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance Expenditure per km of routine maintenance % of budget spent on planned maintenance % of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance			PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	• → → • • • • • •	£107.86 £1,734,269 £0 £1,407 £728 No data 65.91% 34.09% 0.00%	£59.87 £0 £2,500 £697 No data No data 100.00% No data 0.00%	£66.24 £0 £0 £663 No data £46 93.48% No data 6.52%	£73.79 £263,149 £20,220 £981 £234 £73 88.82% 13.15% 2.41%
	Structures								
31.1.01 (PI 300) 31.1.02 (PI 301) 32.1.01 (PI 302) 32.1.02 (PI 303) 32.3.01 32.3.02 32.3.03	Safety % of principal inspections carried out on time % of general inspections carried out on time Condition/Asset Preservation Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSClcrit % of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network	Y	H H H H	PI PI PI Stat Stat Stat	↑ ↑ ↑ ↓ ↓ ↓	100.00% 100.00% 84.08 73.02 2.33% 3	1.20% 38.98% 80.66 70.47 2.36% 24	98.67% 99.64% 89.27 81.67 0.34% 4	65.28% 91.57% 86.64 76.63 3.67% 17
34.1.01 (PI 304) 34.2.01 (PI 305) 34.3.01 34.3.02 34.3.03 34.3.04 34.3.05	Functionality % of Council owned bridges failing European standards % of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions) No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison) No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17) Financial		H H H H	PI PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	0.39% 1.17% 5 4 0 3	4.72% 5.31% 12 15 No data 7	0.69% 1.03% 1 5 3 3	3.06% 1.53% 4 5 3 3
36.1.01 (PI 306) 36.2.01 (PI 307) 36.2.02 (PI 308) 36.3.01 36.3.02	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP) % of allocated budget spent per annum Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation % of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L L L	PI PI Stat Stat	↑ ↑ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ •	31.44% 34.15% 1.01% 4.17% £0	18.36% 54.40% 1.25% No data £0	37.81% 51.50% 1.89% 0.18% £0	18.86% 53.46% 4.45% 8.35% £1,896,124
	Traffic Management Systems								
41.1.01 (PI 55) 41.1.02 (PI 56)	Safety % of faults rectified within target time % of faults rectified on first visit	Y	H	Stat Stat	†	99.32% 99.12%	95.00% No data	98.27% 93.08%	95.09% 93.74%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17	j			PIN	8120	8040	8109	
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	۲۱/ Stat	Ideal Position Authority	south Lanarkshire Council	stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average
Ref	Indicator	, ,,					<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		
	<u>Financial</u>								
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		-	Stat	•	91.59%	No data	No data	43.92
	Street Furniture				1				
	Financial								
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	•	1.16%	No data	6.09%	2.33
	All assets service delivery								
	Safety								
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		I H	Stat		No data	No data	3,377.00	3,377.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4					GRP				
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17		ı			PIN	8120	8040	8109	
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data					\				
		COTT Exactitive B		Confidence rating (H, M, L)	/ Stat	Ideal Position Authority	outh Lanarkshire Council	Stirling Council	est Lothian Council	Group Average
F	Indicator		7	<u>S</u>	Ы	₽	80	Sti	₹	ច
			1							
	Street Lighting									
2.01 (PI 39)	Safety % of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)			L	PI	1	100.00%	No data	0.00%	59.14%
.01 (Pl 39) .02 (Pl 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.			H	PI PI	T	100.00%	No data	90.01%	67.15%
02 (1140)	Condition/Asset Preservation			•••		' '	100.0070	140 data	30.0170	07.107
)1 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	ΙΥ		Н	PI	4	19.72%	14.07%	9.29%	14.64%
)2 ` ´	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	ΙY	/	М	Stat	. ↓	34.55%	25.37%	20.20%	27.54%
03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	İ	ı	L	Stat	↓	No data	28.55%	23.53%	29.52%
)2	% of columns replaced			М	Stat	•	7.87%	4.29%	1.80%	2.74%
03	% of lanterns replaced			М	Stat	•	21.95%	15.42%	3.71%	12.64%
	<u>Customer Service</u>								/	
01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	′	H	PI	1	No data	82.77%	79.60%	91.64%
1 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)			M	PI PI		No data	20.00	5.10	7.0
)2 (PI 27))3 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of faults Public calls as a % of street lights			M	PI PI	0	20.32% 4.01%	57.76% 8.13%	61.70% 5.73%	65.919 8.619
03 (F1 20) 01	% of street lights giving modern white light			M	Stat	*	85.50%	55.66%	35.41%	58.96%
02	% of street lights which are LED			M	Stat	,	79.61%	51.95%	29.38%	36.26
	Availability				- Car		10.0170	01.0070	20.0070	00.20
01	Number of night inspections annually			Н	Stat	•	0	12	9	
	Financial									
1 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)			М	PI	1	214.31%	No data	102.07%	117.149
2 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)			М	PI	↓	56.30%	43.14%	55.19%	57.45°
01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)			L	PI	. ↓	£63.74	No data	No data	£106.1
02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light			M H	PI	.	No data	£0.04	£0.06	£0.0
3 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs			Н	PI		£20.10	No data	£38.15	£25.4
04 (PI 43) 05 (PI 01c)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement Total investment in infrastructure per street light			Н	PI PI	1	No data £167.67	No data £180.76	£43.99 £82.14	£34.1 £98.6
05 (PI 01c) 02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp			Н	Stat	ı 🐧	£167.67 £26.99	£180.76	£82.14 £44.73	£98.6 £36.1
- (1 1 00a)	Environmental				Ctat	*	220.99	200.24	277.70	200.1
)1 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	Y	1	М	PI	4	228.48	324.16	363.12	301.3
)1 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		ı	М	Stat	į.	121.805	172.811	193.581	160.66
04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable		i	M	Stat	1	80.09%	0.00%	0.00%	27.35%
.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)	I		н	Stat	•	-36.71%	-17.07%	-6.59%	-10.03%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP			FAMILY G	ROUP 4	(Urban)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverdyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council
Rei							-		-		
	SCOTS headline financial PI										
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	Н	PI	•	£16,822	No data	£19,201	£10,897	£22,695	£15
	Customer Service										
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		н	PI		No data	No data	No data	60.44%	96.96%	82.
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.		Н	PI	<u>,</u>	No data	No data	100.00%	99.52%	100.00%	100.
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		н	Stat	Φ	No data	No data	82.95%	100.00%	97.67%	98.
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		Н	Stat	•	No data	No data	88	60	86	
	Carriageways										
	Safety		.,			00.450/	05.000/	22.270	05.740/	04.070/	20
1.1.01 (PI 03a) 1.2.01 (PI 39)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time.		M	PI PI	↑ ↑	96.15% 86.67%	95.00% 100.00%	98.67% 75.00%	85.71% 97.06%	91.07% 92.26%	89. 86.
1.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects			Stat	;	26	20	677	7	56	1
	I rotal number of Cat i defects		M								
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		M H	Stat	1	No data	97	51	67	32	
1.3.02 1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		M H H	Stat Stat	į.	No data No data	0.19	0.11	0.07	0.09	
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	M H H	Stat Stat Stat	↓	No data No data 58.29%	0.19 82.98%	0.11 65.12%	0.07 37.25%	0.09 48.44%	36.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	H H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat	↓ • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	No data No data 58.29% No data	0.19 82.98% No data	0.11 65.12% No data	0.07 37.25% 4.94%	0.09 48.44% 5.50%	36.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	M H H H H	Stat Stat Stat	↓	No data No data 58.29%	0.19 82.98%	0.11 65.12%	0.07 37.25%	0.09 48.44%	
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H M H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ + + + + + + + + + +	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723	36. 57. 7 107
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ + + + +	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82%	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00%	36. 57. 7
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length	Y	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ + + + + + + + + + +	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66	36. 57. 7 107
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length	Υ	M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ + + + + + + + + + +	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16	36. 57. 7 107
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	Y	M H H H M H M M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66	36. 57. 7 107
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	Y	M H H H M H M H M	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20.840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31	36. 57. 7 107
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	н	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → → → → → → →	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 1.00	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00	36. 57. 7 107 100.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated			Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → → → → → → →	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00	36. 57. 7 107 100.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed	Y	н	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat		No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26% 2.88%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75 35.01% 5.07% 1.01%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01% 2.07%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00 40.50% 11.24% 2.39%	36. 57. 7 107 100. 31. 3.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated	Y	H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → → → → → → →	No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00	36. 57. 7 107 100.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	Y	H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat		No data No data S8.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26% 2.88% 0.00% 0.08% 0.08%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75 35.01% 5.07% 1.01% 0.00% 0.41%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00 39.20% 2.03% 0.00% 0.00% 0.27% 0.00%	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01% 2.07% 0.41% 0.05% 0.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00 40.50% 11.24% 2.39% 3.44% 0.02% 0.00%	36. 57. 7 107 100. 31. 3. 0. 0.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	Y	H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat		No data No data S8.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26% 2.88% 0.00% 0.08% 0.58% 0.00%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75 35.01% 5.07% 1.01% 0.00% 0.41% 0.00%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00 39.20% 2.03% 0.00% 0.00% 0.27% 0.00%	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01% 2.07% 0.41% 0.05% 0.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00 40.50% 11.24% 2.39% 3.44% 0.02% 0.00%	36. 57. 7 100. 100. 31. 3. 0. 0. 0.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05 2.3.06	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm) % of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)	Y	H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat		No data No data 58.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26% 2.88% 0.00% 0.08% 0.58% 0.00% 0.47%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75 35.01% 5.07% 1.01% 0.00% 0.41% 0.00% 0.00%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00 39.20% 0.00% 0.00% 0.27% 0.00% 0.00%	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01% 2.07% 0.41% 0.05% 0.00% 0.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00 40.50% 11.24% 2.39% 3.44% 0.02% 0.00% 0.00%	36. 57. 7 100. 100. 31. 3. 0. 0. 0. 0.
1.3.02 1.3.03 1.4.01 (PI 114) 1.4.02 1.4.03 1.4.04 1.4.05 1.4.06 1.4.07 1.4.08 1.4.09 1.4.10 1.4.11 2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41) 2.3.01 2.3.02 2.3.03 2.3.04 2.3.05	Total number of 3rd party claims Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations) Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations) % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations) Total salt usage by total network length Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations) Condition/Asset Preservation % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated % of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm) % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm) % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	Y	H H H	Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat		No data No data S8.29% No data 64.12% 65.50 9,912 100.00% 3.19 0.09 0.00 3.00 1.00 35.20% 6.26% 2.88% 0.00% 0.08% 0.58% 0.00%	0.19 82.98% No data 64.09% 83.28 68,320 100.00% 6.82 0.05 2.53 4.00 0.75 35.01% 5.07% 1.01% 0.00% 0.41% 0.00%	0.11 65.12% No data 56.41% 50.49 40,985 98.82% 7.59 0.09 2.38 3.00 2.00 39.20% 2.03% 0.00% 0.00% 0.27% 0.00%	0.07 37.25% 4.94% 80.96% 45.00 20,840 100.00% 3.91 0.18 6.68 3.00 1.00 35.20% 3.01% 2.07% 0.41% 0.05% 0.00%	0.09 48.44% 5.50% 52.80% 42.36 15,723 100.00% 6.66 0.16 3.31 0.00 0.00 40.50% 11.24% 2.39% 3.44% 0.02% 0.00%	36. 57. 7 100. 100. 31. 3. 0. 0. 0.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP			FAMILY G	ROUP 4	(Urban)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverdyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council
Ref 2.3.09	Indicator % of carriageway area – fully reconstructed	- 1	н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	l i	22.17%	29.16%	16.30%	28.59%	29.62%	19
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	İ	н	Stat	↓	26.34%	27.00%	30.20%	39.55%	37.58%	22
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	↓	28.40%	27.17%	32.70%	37.65%	43.43%	25
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	↓	41.75%	43.46%	44.80%	35.23%	41.17%	36
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Financial Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	н	PI	•	£9,957	No data	£10,801	£5,557	£13,451	£6
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	'	М	PI	li	£12.47	£1.86	£13.52	£28.02	£13.30	£1
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)	İ	н	PI	•	£7,916	No data	£6,659	£4,245	£10,783	£5
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		Н	PI	•	£26.04	£0.00	£69.29	£25.54	£22.85	£3
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		!!	Stat	•	£37,661	£42,369	No data	£38,752	£39,267	£35
6.3.02 6.3.03	Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims			Stat Stat	↓	£464,352 No data	No data £4,412	£1,223,715 £1,977	£933,095 £460	£762,030 £44,093	£2,346 £308
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		Ι¨̈́	Stat	l	£6,131	No data	£3,411	£2,508	£8,431	£300
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance	i	Н	Stat		£1,611	No data	£2,544	£954	£2,063	£1
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance	İ	н	Stat	•	£173	No data	£697	£783	£289	
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		Н	Stat	1	77.46%	No data	51.29%	59.07%	78.19%	70
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		M	Stat	↓	20.35%	No data	38.24%	22.47%	19.13%	26
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		M	Stat	•	2.19%	No data	10.47%	18.45%	2.68%	2
	Footways										
44.4.04 (DL 45-)	Safety W. of Cot 1 defects made acts within response times		ш	DI DI		04.070/	100.000/	No date	100.000/	00.450/	00
11.1.01 (PI 45a) 11.2.01 (PI 46)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times % of safety inspections completed on time		H	PI	↑ ↑	91.67%	100.00% 39.13%	No data 75.00%	100.00% 95.54%	96.15% 100.00%	83 83
11.3.01 (P1 46)	Total number of Cat 1 defects		ï	Stat		90.91%	39.13%	No data	95.54%	26	03
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		н	Stat	l i	No data	23	12	34	20	
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		Н	Stat	↓	No data	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.04	
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment	ļ	<u> </u>	Stat	•	18.37%	15.35%	8.92%	6.65%	0.00%	6
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)			Stat	•	18.37%	15.35%	8.92%	6.65%	0.00%	6
11.4.03 11.4.04	Tonnes of salt used Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		;	Stat Stat	*	95.33	No data 3,009.60	114 242.86	356 1,376.52	0.00	42
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	•	0.77	0.55	0.47	0.59	0.83	72
	Condition/Asset Preservation				,						
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	<u> </u>	PI		31.30%	25.50%	No data	5.27%	20.00%	13
	% of footway length treated % of footway area – surface treated	Y	M	PI Stat	•	0.78%	No data 0.00%	0.52% 0.00%	0.76% 0.61%	2.81% 0.00%	1 0
12.1.02 (PI 48)			lё	Stat	l	0.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	2.97%	0
12.1.02 (PI 48) 12.2.01											
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching		н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.09%	0.30%	0.00%	0.09%	0
12.1.02 (PI 48) 12.2.01 12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		H	Stat Stat	Φ	0.00%	0.09% 0.01%	0.30% 0.58%	0.00%	0.09% 0.00%	0
12.1.02 (PI 48) 12.2.01 12.2.02 12.2.04 12.2.03	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching % of footway area – reconstructed Financial		Н	Stat	Ф	0.00%	0.01%	0.58%	0.01%	0.00%	0
12.1.02 (PI 48) 12.2.01 12.2.02 12.2.04	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching % of footway area – reconstructed	Y									

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP			FAMILY C	ROUP 4	(Urban)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverdyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)	I	L	PI	•	£671	No data	£726	£355	£2,125	:
16.1.04 (PI 49c)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		<u> </u>	PI	•	£61.40	£0.00	£79.00	£35.68	£34.61	£5
16.3.01 16.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		-	Stat Stat	↓	£75,114 No data	£0 £1.133	£139,660 £0	£167,747 £0	£11,000 £0	£810
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		t	Stat	•	No data	No data	£0 £531	£258	£0 £2,101	£281
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	•	£177	No data	£196	£97	£25	
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance	į	L	Stat	•	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No
16.3.07 16.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		-	Stat Stat	1 1	73.65% 26.35%	No data No data	73.07% 26.93%	72.62% 27.38%	98.85% 1.15%	65. 34.
16.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance		;	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.
	Structures										
	Safety										
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		н	PI	1	100.00%	100.00%	84.62%	No data	100.00%	100.
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		н	PI	1	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	81.42%	100.00%	100.
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Condition/Asset Preservation Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav	Y	н	PI	1	86.88	86.00	96.30	78.00	83.87	C
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	ΙÝ	Н	PI	 	81.83	82.30	78.00	65.00	71.00	8
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes	į	Н	Stat	↓	No data	0.97%	2.76%	0.38%	3.70%	No
32.3.02 32.3.03	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		H	Stat Stat	↓	No data No data	2	3	6	1 5	
32.3.03	Functionality		''	Stat	Ψ [NO data		3	اد	3	
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		Н	PI	↓	No data	0.97%	1.84%	2.26%	0.62%	2.
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI Stat	1	0.00%	0.48%	No data	No data	1.23%	0.
34.3.01 34.3.02	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions) No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		l n	Stat	•	0	0 1	No data	No data No data	0 2	
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17)	İ	H	Stat	•	2	1	4	No data	1	
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17)	ļ	Н	Stat	•	0	0	No data	No data	0	
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		Н	Stat	\$	0	1	0	No data	2	
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Financial Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	1	108.46%	No data	No data	54.14%	5.94%	98.
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		ī	PI	†	57.46%	No data	48.41%	95.76%	No data	105.
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L L	PI	. ↓	0.29%	No data	No data	0.99%	0.23%	0.
36.3.01 36.3.02	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat Stat	→	No data £0	No data £0	9.13% £0	0.07% £0	0.00% £250,000	3.
	Poost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weighbrieghbridgh			Stat	*	2.0	2.0	£U	£0	2230,000	
00.0.02					1						
00.0.02	Traffic Management Systems										
41.1.01 (PI 55)	Traffic Management Systems Safety % of faults rectified within target time	Y	Н	Stat	↑	No data	99.49%	96.57%	96.83%	83.87%	93.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP			FAMILY (GROUP 4	(Urban)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				PIN	8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121
		SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverdyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council
Ref	Indicator										
46.1.01	Financial % of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	Ф	73.52%	No data	100.00%	No data	92.53%	40
	Street Furniture				İ						
56.1.01	Financial % of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	Φ	0.89%	No data	2.04%	2.42%	0.71%	3
	All assets service delivery				1						
	Safety Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)				1	No data	No data	No data	No data		No

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP			FAMILY (GROUP 4	(Urban)	
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Posit <u>ion</u> Authority	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverciyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council
Ref	Indicator										
	Street Lighting										
21.2.01 (PI 39) 21.2.02 (PI 40)	Safety % of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years) % of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.		L H	PI PI	↑	No data No data	0.00% 0.00%	No data 95.19%	84.24% 54.30%	0.00% 72.85%	11. No
22.2.01 (PI 29a) 22.2.02	Condition/Asset Preservation Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock % of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	H M	PI Stat	↓	10.71% No data	16.29% 41.21%	7.17% 52.96%	11.92% 23.49%	16.77% 33.06%	13. 31.
22.2.03 22.3.02	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life % of columns replaced		L M	Stat Stat	↓	No data 2.72%	22.79% 1.13%	No data 1.13%	22.56% 1.94%	42.13% 2.81%	38. 0.
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced Customer Service		М	Stat	Ф	28.29%	6.48%	15.12%	6.17%	11.87%	8.
23.1.01 (PI 03) 23.2.01 (PI 20) 23.2.02 (PI 27) 23.2.03 (PI 28) 23.3.01	Average time taken to repair (days) Public calls as a % of faults Public calls as a % of street lights % of street lights giving modern white light	Y	H H M M	PI PI PI PI Stat	↑ ↓ • •	85.77% No data 100.00% 10.71% 53.41%	92.40% No data 113.42% 18.48% 46.78%	97.00% 3.70 140.76% 10.10% 46.48%	90.38% 3.90 68.35% 8.14% 53.59%	88.77% 4.80 74.61% 12.51% 57.64%	81. 64. 8. 18.
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED Availability		М	Stat	Ť	43.99%	42.25%	34.13%	28.29%	23.04%	9.
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		Н	Stat	Ф	0	0	12	1	10	
26.1.01 (PI 35) 26.1.02 (PI 36) 26.2.01 (PI 33)	Financial Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP) Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC) Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		M M L	PI PI PI	↑	60.95% 53.46% £155.33	No data 52.93% No data	No data No data £123.68	31.23% 52.44% £30.87	130.40% 53.81% £154.87	60. 53. £8
26.2.02 (PI 34b) 26.2.03 (PI 42) 26.2.04 (PI 43)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs Capital allocation per street light – replacement		M H H	PI PI PI	↓	No data £29.29 £41.00	No data No data No data	No data £32.72 £14.52	£0.07 £33.83 £19.89	£0.04 £29.35 £68.30	£2
26.2.04 (PI 43) 26.2.05 (PI 01c) 26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light Energy cost per street lamp		н Н	PI Stat	*	£70.29 £37.04	No data No data	£47.24 £42.89	£53.72 £37.14	£97.65 £39.92	£5
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Environmental Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	Y	М	PI	T	329.52	315.50	390.00	343.55	360.26	36
27.3.01 (PI 37b) 27.3.04 (PI 38b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light % of street lights dimmable	'	M M	Stat Stat	↓	175.669 17.56%	168.193 43.33%	207.911 2.92%	183.145 7.78%	192.053 5.22%	194 0.
27.3.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		н	Stat	•	-4.44%	-9.38%	-3.89%	-7.48%	-6.76%	-6.

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAMILY	GROUP
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17	İ			PIN	8036	8057		8073	8159
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Renfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council
Ref	Indicator			П				1		
	SCOTS headline financial Pl									
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	Н	PI	•	£28,529	£18,852	£18,925	£14,325	£15,313
	0				1					
	Customer Service									
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		Н	PI	↑	58.31%	No data	74.49%	No data	No data
3.2.01 (PI 38) 3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time. % of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	PI Stat	↑	100.00% 100.00%	No data 81.82%	99.90% 93.46%	100.00% 95.62%	No data No data
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		Н	Stat	•	197	55	111	137	54
	Carriageways Safety									
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times.		М	PI	1	71.33%	100.00%	90.91%	98.77%	100.00%
1.2.01 (PI 39)	% of safety inspections completed on time.		H	PI	↑	70.80%	93.33%	87.76%	No data	52.82%
1.3.01 1.3.02	Total number of Cat 1 defects Total number of 3rd party claims		M H	Stat Stat	↓	286 190	32 No data	330 95	81 119	33 62
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		l її	Stat	Ĭ	0.22	No data	0.13	0.13	0.11
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	Stat	•	56.80%	58.48%	55.43%	48.30%	56.52%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	•	35.50%	40.55%	24.51%	39.98%	56.52%
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		M H	Stat	↓	80.00%	60.00%	64.53%	82.58%	48.58%
1.4.04 1.4.05	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations) Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		М	Stat Stat	•	54.55 27,840	62.50 1,800	59.38 36,553	44.50 4,153	47.64 9,072
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	İ	H	Stat	•	100.00%	100.00%	99.85%	100.00%	81.12%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		М	Stat	.	5.74	5.56	6.00	5.04	8.56
1.4.08 1.4.09	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		M M	Stat Stat	1	7.61	1.19 39.31	0.26 7.73	1.11 0.00	0.54 4.76
1.4.10	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	•	2.50	3.00	2.75	3.00	2.00
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		н	Stat	•	1.00	1.00	1.09	1.00	1.00
0.4.04 (5) 10)	Condition/Asset Preservation	.,	ļ ,.			60.000	60.000	66.	00.0401	00 700
2.1.01 (PI 40) 2.1.02 (PI 41)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment % of carriageway length treated	Y	H H	PI PI	↓	33.90% 3.59%	32.90% 3.27%	34.53% 4.73%	30.61% No data	26.70% 4.16%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed	'	НÜ	Stat		0.81%	0.00%	1.18%	0.00%	1.97%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)	l	Н	Stat	•	0.00%	1.20%	0.66%	0.00%	0.76%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm)		#	Stat	•	0.00%	1.08%	0.27%	1.04%	0.12%
2.3.04 2.3.05	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm) % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H	Stat Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.09% 0.01%	0.11%	0.00%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)		l μ	Stat	•	0.00%	0.52%	0.40%	0.00%	1.00%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (>60mm – 100mm)	l	Н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.90%	1.25%	0.00%	0.76%
2.3.08 2.3.14	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		!!	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.02%	0.29%
	% of carriageway area – planned patching		H	Stat	Φ	0.00%	0.10%	0.16%	0.00%	0.24%

		1	I						5 4 5 411)	000110
	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAMILY	GROUP
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8036	8057		8073	8159
Ref	Authorities in red have NOT returned data Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Renfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed	Т	н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	i	н	Stat	1	22.40%	27.53%	24.37%	20.86%	17.54%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	1	Н	Stat	Ψ	27.50%	24.25%	29.32%	25.61%	18.44%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	.	36.90%	32.15%	33.00%	27.09%	15.38%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment Financial		Н	Stat	1	36.60%	34.24%	39.26%	32.27%	31.95%
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Υ	н	PI	•	£9,729	£12,567	£9,864	£5,419	£6,268
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	i	М	PI	i	£22.18	£97.09	£25.61	£320.18	£55.54
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)	İ	н	PI	Φ	£4,159	£11,473	£7,236	£4,697	£4,586
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		Н	PI	•	£185.94	£57.45	£52.54	£68.27	£17.30
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	•	No data	£32,976	£37,702	£34,119	£31,378
6.3.02 6.3.03	Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat Stat	1	£1,040,317 £8,178	£559,286 No data	£1,046,986 £61,289	£986,446 £5,717	£823,031 No data
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		l ї	Stat	•	£2,019	£4,976	£4,467	£2,910	£4,586
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance	i	н	Stat	•	£1,231	£1,454	£1,617	£1,080	£1,436
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		н	Stat	•	£909	£688	£529	£609	£217
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		Н	Stat	1	48.54%	69.91%	65.41%	63.28%	73.50%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		М	Stat	V	29.60%	20.42%	25.66%	23.49%	23.01%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		М	Stat	•	21.86%	9.67%	8.93%	13.23%	3.48%
	Footways									
44.4.04 (DL 45-)	Safety We of Cat 1 defeats made and within response times		ы	DI		No dot-	No dot-	0.4.000/	E0 000/	100.000/
11.1.01 (PI 45a) 11.2.01 (PI 46)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times % of safety inspections completed on time		H M	PI PI	T A	No data 64.13%	No data No data	94.23% 78.35%	50.00% No data	100.00% No data
11.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects	1	ΙÜ	Stat	i	1	No data	61	6	6
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		н	Stat	Ĭ.	51	No data	32	23	35
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway	i	н	Stat	1	0.04	No data	0.03	0.01	0.04
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		Ŀ	Stat	•	0.41%	No data	8.01%	0.22%	0.00%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)			Stat	•	13.18%	No data	9.84%	0.22%	23.04%
11.4.03 11.4.04	Tonnes of salt used		[Stat Stat	•	No data 0.00	No data No data	460 736.28	No data 0.00	0.00
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		Ь	Stat	•	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.00
4.00	Condition/Asset Preservation			Jul	,	0.07	0.00	0.04	0.43	0.00
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Υ	L	PI	1	No data	39.00%	22.42%	25.05%	No data
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length treated	Y	М	PI	•	No data	No data	1.18%	0.00%	0.75%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	0.57%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced % of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat Stat	0	0.00% 0.00%	0.00%	0.65% 0.06%	0.10% 0.14%	0.00%
		1	H	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%	0.14%	0.00%
12.2.04 12.2.03										
12.2.04	% of footway area – reconstructed Financial					0.0070	0.0070	0.10701	0.0070	0.0070
12.2.03 16.1.01 (PI 49a)		Y	L	PI PI	Φ	No data No data	£628 No data	£1,134 £746	£489 No data	£749 No data

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAMILY	GROUP
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8036	8057		8073	8159
D. f	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Renfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council
Ref 16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Indicator Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)			DI	•	£1,115	£523	£905	£423	£749
16.1.03 (PI 49b) 16.1.04 (PI 49c) 16.3.01 16.3.02 16.3.03 16.3.04 16.3.05 16.3.07 16.3.08 16.3.09	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost) Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance Expenditure per km of routine maintenance % of budget spent on planned maintenance % of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance			PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	• • → → • • • ↑ → •	£1,115 No data £0 £29,472 £1,115 No data No data 100.00% No data 0.00%	£523 No data £36,528 No data £125 £51 £320 25.20% 10.34% 64.46%	£905 £43.95 £155,027 £51,943 £738 £137 £320 72.75% 21.05% 8.06%	£423 £130.82 £82.908 £8,414 £377 £45 No data 89.26% 10.74%	£749 £36.98 £209,296 No data £528 £221 No data 70.47% 29.53% 0.00%
	Structures									
	Safety									
31.1.01 (PI 300) 31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of principal inspections carried out on time % of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI PI	↑ ↑	100.00% 100.00%	No data 50.42%	97.44% 91.48%	25.00% 100.00%	66.67% 84.62%
31.1.02 (F1 301)	Condition/Asset Preservation		l "	l''	• [100.00701	30.42 /0 [31.40 /6	100.0070	04.02 /0
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav	Y	Н	PI	↑ [65.00	99.60	85.81	85.00	91.19
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	70.00	98.90	78.73		85.16
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat	J	0.00%	0.84%	1.44%	0.32%	9.20%
32.3.02 32.3.03	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		Ĥ	Stat Stat	Ů.	28 8	0	7 5		5
34.1.01 (PI 304)	Functionality % of Council owned bridges failing European standards		н	PI	1 [9.30%	0.00%	2.47%	0.00%	4.60%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		н	PI	i i	No data	0.00%	0.39%	3.48%	4.60%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		Н	Stat	. ↓	2	0	0		4
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	•	No data	0	1	9	0
34.3.03 34.3.04	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		H	Stat Stat	•	No data	0	0		0
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17)		Н	Stat	•	No data	0	1		0
	Financial									
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		<u> </u> -	PI	1	57.40%	No data	64.98%	42.86%	71.07%
36.2.01 (PI 307) 36.2.02 (PI 308)	% of allocated budget spent per annum Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L	PI PI	↑	83.56% 1118.64%	36.14% No data	71.15% 224.11%	19.49% 0.32%	No data 0.40%
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		[Stat	,	0.00%	0.00%	2.12%	8.95%	0.40%
36.3.02	Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		Ē	Stat	•	£0	£0	£31,250	£0	£0
	Traffic Management Systems									
	Safety									
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	ΙΥ	H	Stat	↑	94.44%	94.52%	94.24%	97.24%	98.81%
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit	ı	М	Stat	T	79.41%	82.88%	85.58%	No data	99.32%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAMILY	GROUP
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8036	8057		8073	8159
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	Renfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council
Ref	Indicator									
46.1.01	Financial % of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	Ф	84.10%	93.62%	80.75%	28.47%	57.86%
	Street Furniture									
56.1.01	Financial % of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	Φ	1.03%	2.27%	1.84%	1.61%	1.04%
	All assets service delivery									
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Safety Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		Н	Stat	a	No data	No data	439.00	No data	No data

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP				FAMILY	GROUP
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8036	8057		8073	8159
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	enfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council
Ref	Indicator		Ŭ							
	Street Lighting									
	Safety									
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	1	100.00%	53.57%	41.52%	No data	No data
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.		н	PI	1	56.17%	98.73%	62.87%	27.25%	72.10%
	Condition/Asset Preservation		l	<u></u>						
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	. ↓	19.74%	1.66%	12.27%	20.67%	9.04%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	.	51.21%	35.44%	38.45%	26.82%	24.88%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	V	No data	0.00%	25.18%		7.07%
22.3.02 22.3.03	% of columns replaced % of lanterns replaced	ŀ	l M	Stat Stat	0	2.93% 73.61%	2.69% 0.00%	2.01% 18.69%	3.88% 6.88%	2.70% 3.72%
22.3.03	Customer Service		IVI	Stat	Ψ	73.01%	0.00%	10.09%	0.00%	3.72%
23.1.01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	н	PI	1	93.86%	99.00%	91.04%	53.58%	94.66%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)	'	l ї	PI	i i	3.00	1.20	3.60		2.62
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults	ŀ	м	PI	ŏ	84.73%	No data	92.36%	76.87%	36.89%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights	i	М	PI	Ď	16.73%	No data	12.24%		3.34%
23.3.01	% of street lights giving modern white light		М	Stat	1 1	80.75%	99.72%	57.13%		76.40%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED	i	М	Stat	1	77.52%	99.72%	44.74%	12.97%	19.30%
	Availability									
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		Н	Stat	Φ	No data	0	5	0	24
	<u>Financial</u>									
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	1	No data	39.68%	64.64%		65.12%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	.	No data	79.03%	57.48%	45.46%	52.41%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		l L	PI PI	V	£55.60	No data	£100.28		£125.97
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		H	11.1	+	No data	No data	£0.05		£0.07
26.2.03 (PI 42) 26.2.04 (PI 43)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI PI	1	£55.10 No data	£13.15 £25.92	£31.76 £33.31	£29.20 £57.49	£47.89 £47.61
26.2.04 (PI 43) 26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	ı ,	£267.27	£25.92 £39.07	£33.31 £90.62		£47.61 £95.49
26.2.05 (PI 01c) 26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		H	Stat	ľ	£40.40		£37.10		£95.49 £47.72
20.0.02 (F1 00d)	Environmental			Jiai	, v	240.40	221.30	237.10	200.01	41.12
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	Y	М	PI	T	374.34	160.77	329.88	441.48	316.91
	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		М	Stat	ij	199.559	85.707	175.860		168.943
27.3.01 (PI 37b)										
27.3.01 (PI 37b) 27.3.04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable		М	Stat	1	0.02%	98.11%	21.91%		24.77%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4				GRP	5 (City)			
	Performance Indicator Results 2016-17				PIN	8015	8016		
	Authorities in red have NOT returned data	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
Ref	Indicator								
	SCOTS headline financial PI								
0.1.01 (PI 63)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	Н	PI	Φ	£15,644	£19,608	£16,223	£11,966
					ł				
	Customer Service								
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.		. н	PI	Ť	No data	59.97%	59.97%	78.02%
3.2.01 (PI 38)	% of abnormal load notifications dealt with in time.		H	PI	1	3.77%	No data	51.89%	95.25%
3.3.01 (PI 61) 3.3.02	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat Stat	•	85.21% 257	77.63% 152	86.16% 150	91.87% 100
0.0.02	Total hamber of singulate received and a title received of mornial of received and a singular			Otat	`	201	102	100	100
	Carriageways								
	Safety								
1.1.01 (PI 03a) 1.2.01 (PI 39)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times. % of safety inspections completed on time.		I М I Н	PI PI	Ť	52.58% 100.00%	97.35% 93.30%	87.17% 82.04%	88.10% 90.50%
1.3.01	Total number of Cat 1 defects		lй	Stat		1,940	264	580	259
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		Н	Stat	Ĭ	309	551	260	116
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway	į	Н	Stat	. ↓	0.20	0.28	0.18	0.09
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	ΙY	H	Stat	•	80.67%	40.08%	56.39%	48.31%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		I Н I М	Stat		80.67%	86.91%	66.02%	43.32%
1.4.03 1.4.04	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations) Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)		l m	Stat Stat		100.00% 24.88	46.11% 106.76	69.32% 55.95	67.05% 63.60
1.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		М	Stat	•	34,131	2,855	12,553	47,570
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)		н	Stat	•	100.00%	-286.21%	-1.27%	85.04%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length	İ	М	Stat	↓	1.58	2.79	4.49	5.22
1.4.08	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		М	Stat		0.07	1.92	0.91	0.43
1.4.09 1.4.10	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		M H	Stat Stat	•	1.74 0.00	94.69 5.00	25.30 2.50	9.74 2.47
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (writter maintenance operations) The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		Ιï	Stat	l *	0.00	1.00	0.75	0.93
	Condition/Asset Preservation					0.00		5.70	2.00
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	Н	PI	↓	34.60%	30.80%	31.45%	36.30%
2.1.02 (PI 41)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	•	1.70%	6.05%	3.97%	3.97%
2.3.01 2.3.02	% of carriageway area – surface dressed % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		#	Stat Stat	•	0.26% 0.12%	0.50% 0.28%	0.68% 0.29%	1.88% 0.30%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm – 60mm)	l	l ї	Stat		0.12%	2.17%	0.29%	0.43%
2.3.04	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (>60mm – 100mm)	İ	Н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	0.10%
2.3.05	% of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	İ	Н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (up to 60mm)		Н	Stat	•	0.26%	0.66%	0.48%	0.43%
10 2 07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (>60mm – 100mm)	I	Iн	Stat	Φ	0.18%	0.08%	0.26%	0.44%
2.3.07		ŀ							
2.3.08 2.3.14	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm) % of carriageway area – planned patching % of carriageway area – planned patching		н	Stat Stat	•	0.00%	0.00% 0.52%	0.08% 0.21%	0.05% 0.16%

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4 Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				GRP	^{RP} 5 (City)			
				PI / Stat	Ideal Posit <u>ion</u> Authority	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	
Ref		SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)						Scotland Average
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed	<u> </u>	н	Stat	•	0.04%	0.00%	0.01%	0.02%
2.3.10 (PI 02d)	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	Ĭ	24.15%	29.52%	23.02%	27.14%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	į	н	Stat	1	19.90%	18.98%	20.73%	31.79%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		Н	Stat	.	24.94%	16.71%	21.03%	34.15%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment Financial		Н	Stat	1	37.77%	34.65%	34.16%	39.58%
6.1.01 (PI 42a)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	н	PI	•	£6,100	£10,132	£6,980	£6,057
6.1.02 (PI 57)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	1 '	 М	PI	Ĭ	£31.33	£192.99	£150.01	£52.76
6.1.03 (PI 42b)	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		н	PI	•	£5,461	£7,921	£5,666	£4,678
6.1.04 (PI 42c)	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated	j	н	PI	Φ	£85.68	£27.92	£49.79	£37.01
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		Н	Stat	Φ	£42,250	£43	£26,948	£28,526
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	¥	£2,098,787	£1,531,818	£1,360,021	£1,188,986
6.3.03 6.3.04	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat Stat	•	£200,210 £4,402	£16,259 £6,564	£74,062 £4,615	£34,629 £3,408
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		Н.	Stat	•	£1,389	£0,304 £779	£1,171	£3,408
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		Н	Stat	•	£439	£578	£461	£427
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance	į	н	Stat	↑	70.65%	82.86%	75.82%	73.27%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		М	Stat	1	22.29%	9.84%	16.61%	18.21%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		М	Stat	•	7.05%	7.30%	7.57%	8.52%
	<u>Footways</u>								
44 4 04 (5) 45 :	Safety					<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	.	77.000	A= A==:
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of Cat 1 defects made safe within response times		H M	PI	Î	No data	No data	75.00%	67.95%
11.2.01 (PI 46) 11.3.01	% of safety inspections completed on time Total number of Cat 1 defects		L	PI Stat	↑	22.60% No data	41.88%	32.24% 11	81.02% 30
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		н	Stat	Ĭ	133	230	105	34
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway	İ	Н	Stat	Ĭ	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.02
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	•	11.24%	11.47%	5.73%	11.16%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	l	L L	Stat	•	11.24%	11.47%	11.49%	14.89%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used			Stat	V	183	941	405	292
11.4.04 11.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		L H	Stat Stat	0	556.13 1.23	8.85 0.45	141.24 0.76	515.75 0.81
11.4.00	Condition/Asset Preservation		l ''	Jidi		1.23	0.45	0.76	0.01
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	39.25%	12.90%	25.73%	16.13%
12.1.02 (PI 48)	% of footway length treated	Y	М	PI	•	No data	2.37%	1.04%	1.03%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		н	Stat	Φ	0.00%	1.40%	0.49%	0.41%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.20%	0.08%	0.34%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		Н	Stat	•	0.00%	0.15%	0.07%	0.04%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed Financial		Н	Stat	•	0.48%	0.00%	0.22%	0.18%
	II III III II III III II II II II II II								
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	Φ	£1,887	£460	£896	£1,003

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4 Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data		Confidence rating (H, M, L)		GRP	5 (City)			
				PI / Stat	Ideal Posit <u>ion</u> Authority	City of Edinburgh Council Solution Glasgow City Council	8016		Scotland Average
Ref		SCOTS Executive PI					Glasgow City Council	Group Average	
16.1.03 (PI 49b)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	PI	Φ	£1,647	£471	£822	£891
16.1.04 (PI 49c) 16.3.01 16.3.02 16.3.03 16.3.04 16.3.05 16.3.07 16.3.08 16.3.09	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated Total cost of reactive maintenance Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims Expenditure per km of planned maintenance Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance Expenditure per km of routine maintenance % of budget spent on planned maintenance % of budget spent on reactive maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance % of budget spent on routine maintenance			PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat Sta	→ → → → →	£181.80 £807,266 £403,524 £1,391 £381 No data 78.52% £1.48%	£10.52 £202,223 £55,312 £392 £66 £13 83.34% 13.93% 2.73%	£90.03 £325,423 £155,750 £672 £178 £13 80.40% 18.92% 0.68%	£63.41 £162,146 £36,549 £756 £144 £196 85.34% 14.98% 5.84%
	Structures								
	Safety								
31.1.01 (PI 300) 31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of principal inspections carried out on time % of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI PI	↑ ↑	45.45% 100.00%	38.46% 100.00%	43.90% 96.15%	75.48% 84.45%
32.1.01 (PI 302) 32.1.02 (PI 303) 32.3.01 32.3.02 32.3.03	Condition/Asset Preservation Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSClav Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSClcrit % of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes No of Council owned bridges failing assessment No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network	Y	H H H	PI PI Stat Stat Stat	† † ↓ ↓	79.89 79.78 0.94% 48 8	83.66 68.40 2.72% 20 63	84.94 75.34 3.29% 18 19	86.41 77.71 2.68% 24 6
34.1.01 (PI 304) 34.2.01 (PI 305) 34.3.01 34.3.02 34.3.03 34.3.04 34.3.05	Functionality % of Council owned bridges failing European standards % of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions) No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison) No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction (new Stat for 16-17) No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction (new Stat for 16-17) Financial		H H H H	PI PI Stat Stat Stat Stat Stat	→ → → → → → → →	6.45% 1.75% 1 12 3 2	10.87% 7.61% 1 13 4 2	5.48% 4.36% 2 9 2 1 1	3.34% 1.63% 4 4 5 1
36.1.01 (PI 306) 36.2.01 (PI 307) 36.2.02 (PI 308) 36.3.01 36.3.02	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP) % of allocated budget spent per annum Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation % of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L L L	PI PI PI Stat Stat	↑ ↓ ↓	0.97% No data 7.74% 0.00%	5.06% 62.30% 7.02% 4.59% £12,735,000	29.99% 40.89% 3.87% 3.39% £3,183,750	33.70% 61.01% 52.81% 4.81% £1,850,004
	Traffic Management Systems								j
	Safety								
41.1.01 (PI 55) 41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified within target time % of faults rectified on first visit	Y	H M	Stat Stat	↑ ↑	100.00% No data	93.29% 89.10%	97.34% 94.21%	95.06% 91.70%
71.1.02 (FI 30)	The or radius received out that visit	•	I (VI	otat	' '	INU uala	09.10%	34.2170	91.70/0

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4 Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				GRP	5 (City)			
			Confidence rating (H, M, L)		PIN	8015	8016		Scotland Average
		SCOTS Executive PI		ol / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	2 (City of 相向 Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	
Ref	Indicator	1 37	Ü					J	<u> </u>
46.1.01	Financial % of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	Ф	41.47%	55.76%	45.89%	62.12
	Street Furniture								
	Financial								
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture			Stat	•	1.16%	2.05%	1.46%	1.81
	All assets service delivery								
	Safety								
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		ј н	Stat	Φ	1,423.95	No data	1,423.95	1,214.9

	SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4 Performance Indicator Results 2016-17 Authorities in red have NOT returned data				GRP	5 (City)			and /
					PIN	8015	8016		Scotland
		SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position Authority	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
Ref	Indicator								
	Street Lighting								
	Safety								
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		<u> </u>	PI	↑	No data	No data	0.00%	55.16%
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.		н	PI	1	8.98%	12.89%	30.31%	57.58%
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Condition/Asset Preservation Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	н	PI	T	15.13%	26.77%	17.90%	13.13%
22.2.01 (F1 25a) 22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Ιγ̈́	Ιй	Stat	ı ,	No data	45.48%	32.39%	29.62%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	'	ΙÜ	Stat	Ĭ	No data	63.01%	33.16%	25.27%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		М	Stat	•	0.09%	0.15%	1.70%	2.20%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced	i	М	Stat	Φ	0.00%	8.27%	4.72%	13.36%
	Customer Service								
23.1.01 (PI 03)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	н	PI	1	No data	No data	74.12%	89.94%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)	ļ	Н	PI	1	No data	9.71	8.42	5.49
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		М	PI	•	159.71%	No data	91.16%	81.14%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	•	24.17%	No data	14.46%	10.26%
23.3.01 23.3.02	% of street lights giving modern white light % of street lights which are LED	l	M M	Stat Stat	↑	30.55% 13.35%	21.58% 11.03%	46.10% 14.16%	53.78% 35.13%
23.3.02	Availability		IVI	Stat	T .	13.35 /6	11.03 /6	14.10 /0	35.13 /6
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		н	Stat	•	0	No data	8	5
	Financial								
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		М	PI	1	No data	37.43%	58.38%	93.02%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		М	PI	1	No data	42.00%	46.62%	53.44%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L	PI	↓	No data	£240.36	£140.49	£105.75
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		М	PI	Ų.	No data	No data	£0.07	£0.05
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	Ų.	£22.39	£71.70	£42.80	£28.52
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	+	£23.98	£25.95	£38.76	£41.26
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI Stat	↓	£46.37	£97.66 £60.80	£81.55 £55.68	£88.87 £39.90
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp Environmental			oldt	Ψ	No data	2,00.80	£55.68	£39.90
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kwHrs)	Y	м	PI	T	426.41	554.22	434.75	327.30
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light	'	Iй	Stat	Ĭ	227.319	295.455	231.767	174.49
27.3.04 (PI 38b)	% of street lights dimmable	İ	М	Stat	†	13.35%	9.51%	12.56%	19.78%
27.3.03	% change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)		H	Stat	•	-2.99%	-4.83%	-5.87%	-8.35%
		i	I	i	l '			, , ,	