SCOTS Road Asset Management Report 2023-24

Performance Data

First Version
(inclusive of first batch data)

Scottish Collaboration of Transportation Specialists

Click HERE to start

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Audit Scotland "Maintaining Scotland's Roads" report, recommend in August 2016 in their "Follow-up Report" that "Councils should implement methods for assessing and comparing councils' roads maintenance efficiency with the aim of identifying and learning from councils delivering services more efficiently". It is a fundamental requirement of the Audit Scotland Report 2011 "Maintaining Scotland's Roads: A follow-up report" and the Audit Scotland Report 2013 "Maintaining Scotland's Roads: An audit update on councils' progress" that authorities measure performance and undertake meaningful benchmarking work. Additionally, the "SCOTS RAMP Project: National Audit/Review RAMP Practices, 2015" makes the following recommendation "continue to support the efforts of the Performance Group in trying to improve the reliability and use of the PI data collected in conjunction with APSE".

Additionally, the Scottish National Road Maintenance Review (NRMR) aims to identify how those responsible for, and working in, Scotland's roads maintenance sector can deliver efficiently managed roads for all within the budgets available, and identify opportunities for innovation, collaborative working and the sharing of services. To assist with the aims of the Review, Option 26 of the report states that a consistent unit cost benchmarking methodology across all roads authorities should be developed and implemented and Option 30 states that the optimal delivery of road maintenance services should be explored including joint collaboration/ working arrangements/operational collaboration between all roads authorities. A SRRB grant has facilitated work to be undertaken in relation to the development of unit cost rates and Phase 2 of this development work is now underway.

Introduction

This year 29 Councils made full submissions before October 2024 (**no data has been submitted by East and West Dunbartonshire and North Lanarkshire Councils**). It is recognised through the quality and quantity of data provided that some authorities are more proactive than others in taking part in the benchmarking opportunities that this task provides. It is again hoped that all Councils will submit 2024/25 data in due course and that there will be 100% attendance at future Family Group workshops in recognition of the emphasis that SOLACE and the Improvement Service are putting on measuring and managing performance.

Before going to the 'Results' page of this report please read the 'General Notes' section of 'Notes' page by clicking here.

The data collected will allow road maintenance activities to be benchmarked in a number of ways:- in family groups; nationally; year on year for individual authorities; and ultimately with the private sector to assess value for money in service provision.

The data collected will allow authorities to measure their performance against their own internal levels of service and to set targets and drive improvement where it is required. The Year on Year report is beneficial in this respect, allowing data for several years to be displayed at once and used in the management of the road maintenance service.

Safety, serviceability and sustainability are key areas in terms of measuring performance in the road maintenance environment. Customer service, in terms of providing effective consultation and information; providing efficient enquiry and complaints management and delivering satisfaction in terms of timeliness and quality of work are all important performance measurement areas which are being looked at through the SCOTS Performance Management and Benchmarking Focus Group.

APSE

The SCOTS Performance Management and Benchmarking Focus Group would like to acknowledge the help and support that has been provided by APSE (Association for Public Service Excellence) in collecting, processing and validating the data required for the performance measurement and driving improvement.

Please note that although the same data sources have been used for this task and the corresponding APSE performance networks reports, the outcomes including highest, lowest and average data may not correspond due to different parameters being applied to the reported data. Also, please note that the SCOTS Family Groups do not correspond with the APSE Family Groups.

Performance results should be summarised for use in the Annual Status and Options Report detailing progress in delivering the standards specified. The Annual Status and Options Report should use the performance information to assist in summarising the status of each asset group in terms of its condition, compliance with meeting repair standards, level of public complaint/contact etc. The report should describe the result of the previous year's investment in terms of meeting the target service standards.

Notes

1) You may be contacted by the SCOTS Performance Management and Benchmarking Group at various times throughout the year with questions to which your answers will aid with improving performance and service delivery. Questions will generally be channelled through the Family Group Benchmarking Workshops.

2) If you feel you have a contribution to make to the work of the Group and are interested in joining please contact Dorothy Reid, Stirling Council, reiddot@stirling.gov.uk.

Additions, updates and amendments
If you have any queries on using the enclosed data templates or if you use a different spreadsheet package then please contact SCOTS or APSE (amendments should be e-mailed to performance.networks@apse.org.uk)

Go to Results

The table, below shows how this task fits in with the timescale for other RAMP tasks for 2024-25 data:

	SCOTS RAMP - Annual Programme												
Task	Authorities should update their AMPs using the tasks shown below:												
		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1	Annual Policy Review												
2	Data Assessment												
3	Asset Valuation												
4	Collation of Performance Information												
5	Maintenance Manual Update												
6	Annual Status and Options Report												
7	AMP Update												
8	Works Programme												

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	GRP	FAMILY GROUP 1 (Rural)									FAM
						PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055	8086	8063	8158		8081
						Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
	SCOTS headline financial PI															
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇕		£4,563	£6,806	£9,527	£5,356	£6,231	No data	£8,957	£9,000	**£7,206**	£2,820
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	H	PI	⇕		£4,563	£6,806	£9,118	£5,356	£6,231	No data	£8,957	£9,000	**£7,147**	£2,449
	Customer Service															
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	93.76%	99.49%	33.35%	No data	100.00%	77.50%	**80.82%**	No data
3.1.02	Total number of customer enquiries / requests for service received		H	Stat	⇕		16,248	5,288	6,231	5,056	1,688	No data	2,970	4,911	**6,056**	837
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	PI	↑		90.82%	50.57%	87.50%	91.96%	97.83%	No data	100.00%	74.65%	**84.76%**	90.80%
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat	⇕		98	176	72	112	184	No data	88	142	**125**	87
	Carriageways															
	Safety															
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		M	PI	↑		37.78%	100.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data	97.76%	79.17%	**78.68%**	33.33%
1.2.01 (PI 39a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		H	PI	↑		98.02%	100.00%	No data	100.00%	79.37%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	**96.23%**	96.25%
1.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		M	Stat	↓		90	1	No data	No data	2	No data	223	24	**68**	6
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓		513	182	No data	171	973	214	11	199	**323**	0
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		H	Stat	↓		0.09	0.10	No data	0.06	0.23	0.03	0.01	0.08	**0.09**	0.00
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑		31.33%	33.03%	54.58%	38.55%	36.12%	No data	38.19%	37.34%	**38.45%**	38.63%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		12.34%	33.03%	54.58%	38.55%	36.12%	32.01%	38.19%	37.34%	**35.27%**	38.63%
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	↓		67.27%	64.45%	47.80%	57.82%	67.90%	No data	57.29%	62.00%	**60.65%**	No data
1.4.04	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		81.54	93.40	81.59	71.29	123.85	No data	80.15	68.18	**85.71**	0.00
1.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	⇕		230,597	3,492	88,608	153,564	87,869	No data	51,663	123,690	**105,640**	24,853
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		99.50%	98.28%	100.00%	99.44%	95.60%	No data	96.98%	100.00%	**98.54%**	100.00%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		M	Stat	↓		6.01	6.65	5.28	5.10	2.30	7.50	7.83	5.18	**5.73**	5.81
1.4.08	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		M	Stat	↓		0.15	3.47	0.14	0.10	0.11	No data	0.24	0.10	**0.62**	0.23
1.4.09	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run		M	Stat	↓		0.00	129.22	5.31	3.32	8.69	No data	4.79	4.10	**22.20**	0.00
1.4.10	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		2.50	3.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	**2.69**	2.00
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		1.50	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	**0.88**	1.00
1.5.01 (PI 211a)	% of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways		H	PI	↑		No data	60.00%	No data	No data	77.60%	No data	42.90%	No data	**60.17%**	72.70%
	Condition/Asset Preservation															
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇕		22.23%	32.28%	49.80%	41.20%	49.30%	38.60%	25.90%	31.60%	**36.35%**	21.70%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇕		4.32%	2.23%	No data	1.79%	3.09%	No data	4.78%	3.69%	**3.32%**	1.25%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed		H	Stat	⇕		3.31%	1.41%	1.64%	1.27%	1.91%	No data	3.26%	1.70%	**2.07%**	0.00%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm and less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	0.17%	0.35%	No data	0.40%	0.04%	**0.15%**	0.00%
2.3.04	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.15%	**0.03%**	0.00%
2.3.05	% of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.01%	0.04%	**0.01%**	0.00%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.04%	0.20%	0.00%	0.26%	0.13%	No data	0.11%	0.54%	**0.18%**	0.04%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.04%	0.07%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.05%	0.33%	**0.07%**	0.03%
2.3.08	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.06%	No data	0.03%	0.04%	**0.02%**	0.00%
2.3.14	% of carriageway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.14%	0.10%	No data	0.00%	0.37%	**0.10%**	0.02%
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		H	Stat	⇕		0.09%	0.07%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	No data	0.12%	0.00%	**0.04%**	0.02%
2.3.10	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		21.63%	29.94%	37.40%	36.89%	35.59%	26.25%	26.78%	36.30%	**31.35%**	28.98%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		17.39%	38.29%	56.50%	38.32%	38.71%	34.26%	20.97%	32.30%	**34.59%**	20.78%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		17.86%	28.89%	52.50%	36.04%	48.33%	39.31%	22.72%	30.90%	**34.57%**	16.61%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		26.67%	32.97%	51.10%	47.77%	58.18%	40.66%	29.31%	31.90%	**39.82%**	21.23%
2.4.01 (PI 209a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↑		No data	16.70%	No data	No data	5.00%	No data	7.80%	No data	**9.83%**	54.10%
2.4.02 (PI 209b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↓		No data	75.00%	No data	No data	91.60%	No data	88.30%	No data	**84.97%**	32.40%
	Financial															
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇕		£3,869	£5,272	£6,971	£3,713	£5,221	No data	£6,442	£5,639	**£5,304**	£1,887
6.1.02 (PI 57a)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		M	PI	↓		£19.31	No data	£14.37	£11.48	£13.53	No data	£28.05	£18.73	**£17.58**	No data
6.1.03	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		H	Stat	⇕		£3,386	£4,395	£6,670	£3,435	£2,743	No data	£4,875	£5,240	**£4,392**	£1,154
6.1.04	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		H	Stat	⇕		£18.78	£48.44	£85.06	£38.83	£35.00	No data	£29.49	£29.08	**£40.67**	£335.88
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	⇕		£20,627	£37,385	£49,094	£41,165	£60,497	£34,431	£29,725	£35,633	**£38,570**	£19,297
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓		£6,090,077	£3,637,738	£4,722,224	£3,642,845	£1,304,215	No data	£1,664,603	£547,041	**£3,086,963**	£527,660

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	GRP	FAMILY GROUP 1 (Rural)									FAM
						PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055	8086	8063	8158		8081
						Authority	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
6.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat	↓		£128,333	£1,501	No data	£22,823	£184,311	No data	£563	£3,906	**£56,906**	£0
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat	⇳		£2,030	£1,754	£4,347	£1,981	£2,148	No data	£3,619	£4,961	**£2,977**	£457
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	⇳		£1,087	£1,996	£2,065	£1,217	£311	No data	£1,065	£220	**£1,137**	£535
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳		£269	£645	£258	£238	£283	No data	£191	£59	**£278**	£161
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		H	Stat	↑		59.94%	39.91%	65.17%	57.65%	78.32%	No data	74.23%	94.67%	**67.84%**	39.64%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓		32.10%	45.41%	30.96%	35.43%	11.35%	No data	21.84%	4.19%	**25.52%**	46.38%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳		7.96%	14.68%	3.87%	6.92%	10.33%	No data	3.92%	1.13%	**6.64%**	13.98%
	Footways															
	Safety															
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		H	PI	↑		No data	100.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data	100.00%	No data	**100.00%**	No data
11.2.01 (PI 46a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		M	PI	↑		No data	100.00%	No data	100.00%	No data	No data	No data	100.00%	**100.00%**	89.39%
11.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		L	Stat	↓		4	1	No data	No data	No data	No data	2	1	**2**	No data
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓		6	0	No data	10	22	No data	5	10	**9**	0
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		H	Stat	↓		0.00	0.00	No data	0.01	0.02	No data	0.01	0.01	**0.01**	0.00
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	PI	↑		0.00%	11.06%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	No data	**2.77%**	25.14%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		L	Stat	⇳		6.62%	11.06%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	20.02%	No data	**9.43%**	18.07%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		L	Stat	↓		1484.19	280.43	No data	576.05	65.50	No data	58.00	No data	**492.83**	No data
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	⇳		0.00	298.80	No data	0.00	0.00	No data	0.00	0.00	**49.80**	0.00
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	⇳		1.37	0.48	0.00	1.91	0.96	0.00	1.51	1.37	**0.95**	3.77
	Condition/Asset Preservation															
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓		20.50%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	1.25%	**10.88%**	21.80%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳		0.40%	0.17%	No data	0.48%	0.12%	No data	0.71%	0.59%	**0.41%**	0.93%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	⇳		0.03%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.62%	0.16%	**0.11%**	0.00%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		H	Stat	⇳		0.01%	0.14%	0.00%	0.31%	0.14%	0.00%	0.09%	0.28%	**0.12%**	0.75%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇳		0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		H	Stat	⇳		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.27%	**0.07%**	0.00%
12.3.01 (PI 210a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↑		No data	72.70%	No data	No data	33.50%	No data	39.30%	No data	**48.50%**	71.90%
12.3.02 (PI 210b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↓		No data	18.20%	No data	No data	47.40%	No data	47.20%	No data	**37.60%**	15.60%
12.3.03 (PI 210c)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↑		No data	25.00%	No data	No data	31.40%	No data	36.30%	No data	**30.90%**	36.00%
12.3.04 (PI 210d)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↓		No data	37.50%	No data	No data	30.70%	No data	28.00%	No data	**32.07%**	24.00%
	Financial															
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳		£390.67	£749.57	£2,130.54	£1,656.14	£91.93	No data	£1,203.72	£1,662.09	**£1,126.38**	£1,097.89
16.1.05 (PI 49d)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding CEC)		L	PI	⇳		£390.67	£749.57	£2,046.80	£1,656.14	£91.93	No data	£1,203.72	£1,662.09	**£1,114.42**	£980.40
16.1.02 (PI 58)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment		L	PI	↓		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	**£0.00**	No data
16.1.03	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	Stat	⇳		£368.85	£442.60	£1,938.21	£1,209.05	£91.93	No data	£1,203.72	£1,360.59	**£944.99**	£787.56
16.1.04	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		L	Stat	⇳		£53.10	£204.38	No data	£182.96	£36.79	No data	£83.90	£128.62	**£114.96**	£81.35
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓		£184,446	£0	£7,541	£236,982	£36,465	£0	£41,919	£0	**£63,419**	£0
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		L	Stat	↓		£9,196	£0	No data	£0	£41,440	No data	£0	£0	**£8,439**	£0
16.3.03	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		L	Stat	⇳		£246.70	£325.45	£1,923.48	£858.59	£64.37	No data	£1,135.43	£1,360.59	**£844.94**	£787.56
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	⇳		£122.15	No data	£14.73	£350.46	£27.56	No data	£68.30	No data	**£116.64**	No data
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳		£0.00	£117.15	No data	£0.00	No data	No data	£0.00	No data	**£29.29**	No data
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		L	Stat	↑		66.88%	73.53%	99.24%	71.01%	70.02%	No data	94.33%	100.00%	**82.14%**	100.00%
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓		33.12%	No data	0.76%	28.99%	29.98%	No data	5.67%	No data	**19.70%**	No data
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳		0.00%	26.47%	No data	0.00%	No data	No data	0.00%	No data	**6.62%**	No data
	Structures															
	Safety															
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑		100.00%	No data	No data	No data	82.03%	59.84%	97.06%	21.82%	**72.15%**	0.00%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑		83.33%	No data	96.33%	90.00%	69.31%	89.19%	100.00%	71.13%	**85.61%**	No data
	Condition/Asset Preservation															
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑		71.00	86.59	89.13	No data	89.80	79.36	76.38	83.51	**82.25**	No data
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑		60.00	81.75	59.23	No data	94.41	65.35	52.96	71.79	**69.36**	No data
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat	↓		4.77%	0.17%	2.42%	0.75%	0.23%	0.66%	1.32%	12.03%	**2.79%**	0.00%
32.3.02	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		H	Stat	↓		75	2	28	26	0	284	9	50	**59**	No data
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		H	Stat	↓		4	2	3	1	No data	2	No data	5	**3**	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
GRP						FAMILY GROUP 1 (Rural)									FAM
PIN						8000	8001	8072	8145	8055	8086	8063	8158		8081
32.3.04	No of bridges / structures owned or maintained		H	Stat	⇳	1,677	591	1,197	1,203	1,294	2,267	379	856	**1,183**	51
	Functionality														
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		H	PI	↓	4.47%	0.34%	2.34%	2.16%	0.00%	12.53%	2.37%	5.84%	**3.76%**	No data
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI	↓	1.31%	No data	0.00%	0.33%	0.08%	0.18%	1.58%	No data	**0.58%**	0.00%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		H	Stat	↓	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	37	**7**	0
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	⇳	5	No data	0	4	1	2	3	No data	**3**	0
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction		H	Stat	⇳	2	0	16	27	10	41	8	13	**15**	0
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction		H	Stat	⇳	3	No data	0	2	1	2	0	No data	**1**	0
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction		H	Stat	⇳	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	**1**	0
	Financial														
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	↑	3.53%	93.30%	No data	No data	No data	No data	4.30%	No data	**33.71%**	No data
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		L	PI	↑	No data	76.46%	No data	No data	34.98%	No data	39.18%	No data	**50.21%**	51.87%
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L	PI	↓	11.90%	0.70%	No data	No data	No data	No data	48.38%	18.49%	**19.87%**	No data
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		L	Stat	↓	No data	0.56%	No data	No data	0.00%	No data	5.94%	8.04%	**3.64%**	No data
36.3.02	Annual expenditure to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat	⇳	£2,000,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	**£250,000**	£0
	Traffic Management Systems														
	Safety														
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	78.76%	92.00%	No data	100.00%	87.72%	No data	97.62%	91.42%	**91.25%**	No data
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit		M	PI	↑	100.00%	No data	No data	100.00%	86.55%	No data	97.62%	94.14%	**95.66%**	No data
	Financial														
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	⇳	71.78%	80.87%	100.00%	6.53%	No data	No data	99.57%	92.20%	**75.16%**	No data
	Street Furniture														
	Financial														
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	⇳	No data	No data	0.85%	1.66%	0.89%	No data	1.19%	No data	**1.15%**	4.41%
	All assets service delivery														
	Safety														
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		H	PI	↑	No data	415.37	No data	2335.56	No data	No data	1896.58	No data	**1549.17**	550.61
61.2.01 (PI 212a)	% satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks ("Always/Usually" aware of organisation)		H	PI	↑	No data	40.00%	No data	No data	34.00%	No data	26.30%	No data	**33.43%**	58.30%
61.2.02 (PI 208a)	% satisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↑	No data	9.10%	No data	No data	11.90%	No data	13.60%	No data	**11.53%**	70.30%
61.2.03 (PI 208b)	% dissatisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↓	No data	72.70%	No data	No data	76.70%	No data	73.30%	No data	**74.23%**	18.90%
	Street Lighting														
	Safety														
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	9.74%	No data	No data	0.00%	No data	No data	0.00%	0.00%	**2.44%**	0.00%
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate		H	PI	↑	69.15%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	38.98%	**36.04%**	100.00%
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	3.66%	No data	No data	5.07%	No data	No data	2.13%	7.37%	**4.56%**	3.15%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	37.04%	No data	No data	43.44%	No data	No data	34.48%	27.90%	**35.72%**	10.10%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	↓	5.38%	No data	No data	1.57%	No data	No data	0.50%	10.90%	**4.59%**	No data
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	0.19%	No data	No data	0.14%	No data	No data	2.55%	0.82%	**0.93%**	0.87%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	4.58%	No data	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.70%	7.71%	**1.88%**	0.39%
	Customer Service														
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	54.44%	No data	No data	51.95%	No data	No data	20.89%	97.59%	**56.22%**	No data
23.1.02 (PI 03b)	% of repairs within target time		H	PI	↑	54.44%	No data	No data	51.95%	No data	No data	79.11%	97.59%	**70.77%**	No data
23.1.03 (PI 03c)	% of repairs within 21 days		H	PI	↑	82.54%	No data	No data	73.77%	No data	No data	No data	100.00%	**85.44%**	No data
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)		H	PI	↓	19.90	No data	No data	10.00	No data	No data	35.67	2.04	**16.90**	No data
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		M	PI	⇳	241.41%	No data	No data	119.02%	No data	No data	217.84%	81.84%	**165.03%**	100.00%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	⇳	8.83%	No data	9.88%	6.03%	10.37%	No data	4.64%	6.03%	**7.63%**	3.15%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		M	Stat	↑	87.94%	No data	No data	100.98%	No data	No data	No data	75.01%	**87.98%**	93.35%
23.4.01 (PI 45a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting		H	PI	↑	No data	81.80%	No data	No data	65.60%	No data	55.90%	No data	**67.77%**	65.70%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council
					GRP	FAMILY GROUP 1 (Rural)									FAM
					PIN	8000	8001	8072	8145	8055	8086	8063	8158		8081
	Availability														
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		H	Stat	↕	0.00	No data	0.00	0.00	No data	No data	0.00	0.00	**0.00**	0.00
	Financial														
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	↑	16.91%	No data	20.14%	17.62%	No data	No data	38.88%	42.07%	**27.12%**	No data
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	↓	49.96%	No data	45.16%	35.33%	No data	No data	58.18%	49.06%	**47.54%**	No data
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L	PI	↓	£40.18	No data	No data	£122.11	No data	No data	£53.09	£52.63	**£67.00**	£544.30
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		M	PI	↓	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	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	↓	£7.13	No data	£23.27	£12.15	No data	No data	£8.00	£7.23	**£11.56**	£31.84
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	↓	£10.93	No data	£20.40	£7.66	No data	No data	£39.58	£23.62	**£20.44**	£56.37
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓	£18.05	No data	£43.66	£19.80	No data	No data	£47.59	£30.85	**£31.99**	88.21
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		H	PI	↓	£46.53	No data	£68.69	£38.30	£33.88	No data	£29.65	£48.54	**£44.27**	No data
	Environmental														
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	159.75	No data	No data	130.58	110.90	No data	No data	No data	**133.74**	No data
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		M	PI	↓	36.13	No data	49.06	29.69	26.55	30.08	23.17	35.77	**32.92**	35.00
27.3.05 (PI 38d)	% of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime		M	PI	↑	75.83%	No data	64.81%	No data	0.00%	51.71%	57.41%	74.21%	**54.00%**	0.00%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	FAMILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
	GRP					ILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
	PIN					8037	8101		8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042	8120
	Authority / Ideal Position					Shetland Islands Council	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	**Group Average**	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council	South Lanarkshire Council
	SCOTS headline financial PI														
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇕	£5,042	£3,835	**£3,899**	£9,997	£4,385	£16,668	No data	£14,187	£8,549	£15,254
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	H	PI	⇕	£4,751	£3,592	**£3,597**	£9,580	£4,385	£16,668	No data	£14,089	£8,082	£15,034
	Customer Service														
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times		H	PI	↑	No data	76.33%	**76.33%**	90.23%	No data	55.52%	No data	96.13%	89.29%	83.36%
3.1.02	Total number of customer enquiries / requests for service received		H	Stat	⇕	No data	507	**672**	5,927	No data	14,651	No data	8,944	4,426	9,275
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	PI	↑	No data	94.29%	**92.55%**	98.00%	45.88%	89.51%	No data	92.41%	96.03%	97.64%
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat	⇕	No data	35	**61**	150	194	305	188	79	126	339
	Carriageways														
	Safety														
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		M	PI	↑	100.00%	89.74%	**74.36%**	83.33%	77.42%	68.90%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	96.27%
1.2.01 (PI 39a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		H	PI	↑	100.00%	No data	**98.13%**	99.62%	100.00%	92.02%	95.49%	95.93%	94.94%	96.48%
1.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		M	Stat	↓	2	39	**16**	12	31	299	520	212	21	161
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓	1	10	**4**	79	66	374	294	252	94	222
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		H	Stat	↓	0.00	0.01	**0.00**	0.06	0.06	0.15	0.42	0.24	0.08	0.10
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	23.95%	23.40%	**28.66%**	45.91%	45.66%	52.03%	No data	45.62%	42.70%	51.29%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	57.41%	25.21%	**40.42%**	45.91%	45.66%	35.84%	No data	45.62%	42.70%	51.29%
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	↓	55.63%	47.21%	**51.42%**	61.88%	161.11%	67.20%	No data	63.52%	51.85%	52.80%
1.4.04	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	50.33	59.10	**36.48**	91.13	21.60	91.76	No data	83.89	97.45	118.63
1.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	⇕	6,048	9,374	**13,425**	64,903	28,188	95,830	No data	58,345	34,814	167,477
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	100.00%	100.00%	**100.00%**	97.57%	100.00%	100.00%	No data	99.54%	88.82%	100.00%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		M	Stat	↓	8.76	7.45	**7.34**	5.71	4.03	2.69	0.00	4.99	4.14	8.02
1.4.08	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		M	Stat	↓	1.52	0.95	**0.90**	0.11	0.16	0.07	No data	0.09	0.14	0.11
1.4.09	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run		M	Stat	↓	11.58	3.01	**4.86**	5.80	2.99	4.30	No data	4.19	5.33	6.90
1.4.10	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	2.50	1.50	**2.00**	3.00	2.50	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.75
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	1.00	1.00	**1.00**	1.00	1.50	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1.5.01 (PI 211a)	% of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**72.70%**	64.70%	No data	No data	No data	53.70%	75.00%	No data
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇕	30.60%	38.50%	**30.80%**	33.00%	33.20%	31.60%	39.00%	32.50%	35.50%	31.90%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇕	7.15%	3.14%	**3.85%**	1.77%	2.62%	2.69%	2.11%	4.69%	2.48%	2.49%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed		H	Stat	⇕	5.59%	3.28%	**2.96%**	0.00%	No data	0.17%	0.00%	0.89%	0.00%	1.03%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.02%	0.00%	**0.01%**	0.00%	No data	0.32%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm and less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.00%	0.11%	**0.04%**	1.06%	No data	0.02%	0.00%	0.58%	1.38%	0.00%
2.3.04	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.43%	0.00%	**0.14%**	0.00%	No data	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%
2.3.05	% of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.08%	0.01%	**0.04%**	0.55%	No data	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	1.07%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.00%	0.00%	**0.01%**	0.00%	No data	0.79%	0.00%	4.32%	1.42%	0.00%
2.3.08	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%	No data	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.14	% of carriageway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇕	0.00%	0.04%	**0.02%**	0.00%	No data	0.69%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		H	Stat	⇕	0.05%	0.00%	**0.02%**	0.00%	No data	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
2.3.10	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	13.70%	30.31%	**24.33%**	17.60%	28.07%	28.40%	No data	28.92%	21.70%	24.90%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	27.00%	35.58%	**27.79%**	26.10%	34.82%	32.70%	No data	27.41%	31.00%	27.80%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	29.70%	43.09%	**29.80%**	31.00%	29.40%	27.50%	No data	38.50%	38.10%	36.50%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	40.50%	43.52%	**35.08%**	39.00%	33.62%	33.20%	No data	32.36%	38.50%	32.60%
2.4.01 (PI 209a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**54.10%**	5.90%	No data	No data	No data	15.50%	11.50%	No data
2.4.02 (PI 209b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↓	No data	No data	**32.40%**	88.20%	No data	No data	No data	79.70%	84.60%	No data
	Financial														
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇕	£3,787	£1,970	**£2,548**	£5,483	£3,744	£8,550	No data	£9,039	£6,193	£7,315
6.1.02 (PI 57a)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		M	PI	↓	£198.42	£117.38	**£157.90**	£7.83	£64.30	£12.09	No data	£6.36	£9.78	£11.29
6.1.03	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		H	Stat	⇕	£3,018	£1,737	**£1,970**	£4,292	£3,744	£8,290	No data	£7,628	£5,141	£6,362
6.1.04	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		H	Stat	⇕	£13.19	£12.46	**£120.51**	£53.94	£24.11	£43.79	£0.00	£30.16	£40.90	£54.14
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	⇕	£32,254	£36,232	**£29,261**	£43,191	No data	£40,313	No data	£36,689	£42,766	£45,903
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓	£45,252	£463,881	**£345,598**	£1,689,223	£257,218	£1,223,666	No data	£1,222,465	£1,183,379	£3,741,273

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	FAMILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
	GRP														
	PIN					8037	8101		8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042	8120
	Authority					Shetland Islands Council	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	**Group Average**	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council	South Lanarkshire Council
6.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat	↓	£0	No data	**£0**	£43,661	£2,596	£5,871	£75,465	£25,245	£23,284	£875
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	£2,781	£1,242	**£1,493**	£2,616	£3,330	£6,612	No data	£6,098	£3,806	£3,153
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	£43	£389	**£322**	£1,375	£225	£492	No data	£1,163	£1,000	£1,613
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	£194	£107	**£154**	£301	£189	£1,186	No data	£367	£334	£1,597
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		H	Stat	↑	92.13%	71.48%	**76.08%**	60.96%	88.94%	79.76%	No data	79.95%	74.04%	49.55%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓	1.43%	22.39%	**16.24%**	32.04%	6.01%	5.93%	No data	15.25%	19.46%	25.35%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	6.43%	6.13%	**7.68%**	7.00%	5.05%	14.31%	No data	4.81%	6.51%	25.10%
	Footways														
	Safety														
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		H	PI	↑	No data	100.00%	**100.00%**	83.33%	100.00%	78.95%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
11.2.01 (PI 46a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		M	PI	↑	No data	100.00%	**94.70%**	98.61%	100.00%	91.73%	95.83%	100.00%	88.33%	99.34%
11.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		L	Stat	↓	No data	1	**1**	6	4	19	22	30	3	15
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓	2	0	**1**	13	16	16	4	19	17	38
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		H	Stat	↓	0.02	0.00	**0.01**	0.01	0.02	0.01	No data	0.02	0.02	0.02
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	PI	↑	0.00%	7.91%	**11.02%**	14.28%	3.26%	43.08%	No data	6.14%	1.02%	3.43%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		L	Stat	⇳	45.95%	3.46%	**22.49%**	14.28%	1.19%	43.08%	No data	6.14%	1.02%	3.43%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		L	Stat	↓	83.92	30.00	**56.96**	41.18	240.00	335.00	No data	223.64	4.36	845.00
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	⇳	0.00	288.00	**96.00**	955.05	0.00	0.00	No data	1297.26	36.20	305.43
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	⇳	3.22	1.18	**2.72**	0.58	1.22	1.12	0.00	0.50	0.31	1.34
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	No data	5.10%	**13.45%**	17.50%	No data	No data	No data	11.76%	15.00%	24.10%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	1.58%	0.15%	**0.89%**	0.22%	0.78%	0.54%	No data	0.51%	0.21%	0.31%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	⇳	1.58%	0.00%	**0.53%**	0.00%	0.46%	0.01%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		H	Stat	⇳	0.20%	0.16%	**0.37%**	0.24%	0.11%	0.07%	No data	0.33%	0.29%	0.28%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇳	0.02%	0.00%	**0.01%**	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		H	Stat	⇳	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%	0.20%	0.34%	No data	0.60%	0.00%	0.00%
12.3.01 (PI 210a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**71.90%**	17.70%	No data	No data	No data	35.00%	23.10%	No data
12.3.02 (PI 210b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↓	No data	No data	**15.60%**	70.60%	No data	No data	No data	51.30%	65.40%	No data
12.3.03 (PI 210c)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**36.00%**	9.10%	No data	No data	No data	33.20%	33.30%	No data
12.3.04 (PI 210d)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↓	No data	No data	**24.00%**	54.60%	No data	No data	No data	30.40%	25.00%	No data
	Financial														
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	£414.18	£261.06	**£591.04**	£477.44	No data	£1,199.76	No data	£1,565.15	£601.16	£1,369.45
16.1.05 (PI 49d)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding CEC)		L	PI	⇳	£332.84	£228.46	**£513.90**	£452.68	No data	£1,199.76	No data	£1,561.94	£578.45	£1,341.14
16.1.02 (PI 58)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment		L	PI	↓	No data	£36.11	**£36.11**	£78.83	No data	No data	No data	£13.78	£62.60	No data
16.1.03	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	Stat	⇳	£971.16	£191.61	**£650.11**	£368.83	No data	£1,259.02	No data	£1,474.89	£544.20	£1,191.17
16.1.04	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		L	Stat	⇳	£17.37	£117.30	**£72.01**	£111.46	£0.00	£131.26	No data	£89.35	£102.03	£217.98
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	£33,826	£5,368	**£13,065**	£154,385	£0	£0	£0	£77,597	£250,381	£527,059
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		L	Stat	↓	£0	No data	**£0**	£12,048	£1,000	£2,813	£8,615	£50,723	£102,514	£18,299
16.3.03	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	£535.41	£165.06	**£496.01**	£157.10	No data	£863.34	No data	£1,263.20	£225.59	£635.11
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	£267.99	£26.55	**£147.27**	£150.02	No data	No data	No data	£75.52	£282.14	£216.99
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	£167.75	£0.00	**£83.88**	£61.71	No data	£226.27	No data	£136.16	£36.47	£339.08
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		L	Stat	↑	55.13%	86.14%	**80.42%**	42.59%	No data	68.57%	No data	85.65%	41.45%	53.32%
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	27.60%	13.86%	**20.73%**	40.68%	No data	No data	No data	5.12%	51.84%	18.22%
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	17.27%	0.00%	**8.64%**	16.73%	No data	17.97%	No data	9.23%	6.70%	28.47%
	Structures														
	Safety														
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**0.00%**	No data	No data	0.92%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	99.30%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	No data	96.00%	**96.00%**	100.00%	70.37%	86.96%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	98.24	95.80	**97.02**	83.41	81.13	85.72	87.81	83.11	90.12	81.20
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	95.60	82.60	**89.10**	71.95	81.66	76.90	79.55	68.52	83.20	68.60
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat	↓	0.00%	2.78%	**0.93%**	9.22%	2.05%	4.79%	0.00%	2.99%	5.66%	2.13%
32.3.02	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		H	Stat	↓	0	4	**2**	38	9	47	2	6	3	7
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		H	Stat	↓	0	0	**0**	2	2	8	3	10	3	7

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	FAMILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
GRP						ILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
PIN						8037	8101		8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042	8120
Authority / Ideal Position						Shetland Islands Council	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	**Group Average**	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council	South Lanarkshire Council
32.3.04	No of bridges / structures owned or maintained		H	Stat	⇳	409	216	**225**	618	391	397	172	468	371	750
	Functionality														
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		H	PI	↓	0.00%	1.85%	**0.93%**	6.15%	2.30%	11.84%	1.16%	1.28%	0.81%	0.93%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI	↓	0.00%	3.24%	**1.08%**	0.49%	No data	5.29%	1.74%	0.43%	0.54%	1.33%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		H	Stat	↓	0	6	**2**	3	0	8	0	2	2	7
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	⇳	0	1	**0**	0	No data	13	3	0	0	3
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	0	**0**	2	0	3	1	0	1	0
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	0	**0**	0	No data	8	2	0	0	2
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	1	**0**	0	1	5	1	0	0	1
	Financial														
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	↑	No data	100.00%	**100.00%**	7.64%	No data	6.18%	5.48%	16.17%	9.99%	72.62%
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		L	PI	↑	64.23%	74.99%	**63.70%**	31.51%	No data	72.04%	53.17%	78.48%	16.08%	87.97%
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L	PI	↓	No data	3.82%	**3.82%**	26.76%	No data	29.30%	3.89%	4.76%	9.49%	1.85%
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		L	Stat	↓	0.00%	16.11%	**8.06%**	0.91%	No data	0.06%	17.74%	0.00%	6.63%	1.27%
36.3.02	Annual expenditure to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat	⇳	£0	£0	**£0**	£0	£0	£6,171,617	£0	£0	£0	£0
	Traffic Management Systems														
	Safety														
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	66.67%	**66.67%**	92.37%	No data	97.47%	No data	92.56%	100.00%	99.42%
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit		M	PI	↑	No data	100.00%	**100.00%**	94.27%	No data	92.42%	No data	88.37%	94.59%	95.56%
	Financial														
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	⇳	100.00%	88.11%	**94.06%**	10.59%	No data	84.03%	No data	28.41%	No data	98.14%
	Street Furniture														
	Financial														
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	⇳	3.90%	4.13%	**4.15%**	0.92%	No data	3.46%	No data	1.84%	1.53%	2.04%
	All assets service delivery														
	Safety														
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		H	PI	↑	No data	1208.46	**879.54**	734.54	No data	No data	No data	1098.02	693.95	No data
61.2.01 (PI 212a)	% satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks ("Always/Usually" aware of organisation)		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**58.30%**	28.60%	No data	No data	No data	40.30%	38.50%	No data
61.2.02 (PI 208a)	% satisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**70.30%**	12.50%	No data	No data	No data	24.50%	15.40%	No data
61.2.03 (PI 208b)	% dissatisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↓	No data	No data	**18.90%**	75.00%	No data	No data	No data	59.10%	80.80%	No data
	Street Lighting														
	Safety														
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	No data	0.00%	**0.00%**	No data	80.09%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate		H	PI	↑	No data	13.67%	**56.84%**	No data	0.00%	39.80%	100.00%	32.39%	No data	70.62%
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	No data	9.96%	**6.56%**	5.40%	9.38%	4.21%	7.44%	10.11%	3.58%	5.62%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	No data	46.63%	**28.37%**	34.91%	32.76%	30.12%	No data	17.07%	33.47%	36.34%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	↓	No data	24.19%	**24.19%**	No data	0.52%	3.84%	15.61%	6.98%	0.00%	0.00%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	5.62%	0.70%	**2.40%**	0.00%	1.73%	1.25%	1.84%	No data	1.08%	0.73%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	5.24%	3.35%	**2.99%**	1.58%	1.57%	4.44%	5.85%	0.00%	1.21%	1.49%
	Customer Service														
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	84.83%	**84.83%**	90.96%	No data	93.08%	No data	No data	92.39%	31.83%
23.1.02 (PI 03b)	% of repairs within target time		H	PI	↑	No data	99.13%	**99.13%**	90.96%	No data	93.08%	98.99%	No data	92.39%	76.09%
23.1.03 (PI 03c)	% of repairs within 21 days		H	PI	↑	No data	94.80%	**94.80%**	99.04%	No data	98.69%	No data	No data	99.32%	51.20%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)		H	PI	↓	No data	7.00	**7.00**	3.22	3.00	16.96	3.00	No data	2.75	24.00
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		M	PI	⇳	No data	35.84%	**67.92%**	101.74%	No data	120.54%	54.26%	109.96%	107.47%	151.84%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	⇳	0.62%	3.57%	**2.45%**	5.49%	No data	5.08%	4.04%	11.12%	3.85%	8.53%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		M	Stat	↑	90.15%	47.46%	**76.99%**	92.64%	84.98%	62.43%	100.00%	84.53%	100.00%	99.91%
23.4.01 (PI 45a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**65.70%**	58.80%	No data	No data	No data	64.80%	42.30%	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	GRP	ILY GROUP 2 (Island)			FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)						
						PIN	8037	8101		8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042	8120
						Authority	Shetland Islands Council	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	**Group Average**	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council	South Lanarkshire Council
	Availability															
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		H	Stat	◆		0.00	4.00	**1.33**	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Financial															
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	↑		No data	10.28%	**10.28%**	121.31%	No data	27.25%	No data	112.59%	26.97%	21.88%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	↓		60.36%	29.37%	**44.87%**	45.85%	No data	39.10%	No data	55.40%	50.37%	47.97%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L	PI	↓		No data	£177.13	**£360.72**	£266.27	£195.42	£333.76	No data	No data	£444.15	£351.93
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		M	PI	↓		No data	£0.22	**£0.22**	No data	No data	No data	£0.01	No data	No data	No data
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	↓		£26.96	£11.74	**£23.51**	£14.38	£18.33	£37.67	No data	£14.01	£16.37	£30.99
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	↓		£90.23	£6.35	**£50.98**	£52.81	£26.18	£22.90	No data	£48.34	£9.88	£17.42
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓		117.20	18.09	**£74.50**	£67.19	£44.51	£60.57	No data	£62.35	£26.25	£48.40
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		H	PI	↓		62.84	37.22	**£50.03**	£61.56	No data	£37.20	No data	£51.21	£51.79	£42.57
	Environmental															
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓		No data	No data	**0.00**	215.60	No data	119.51	No data	174.09	159.98	No data
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		M	PI	↓		No data	25.75	**30.38**	50.91	33.04	27.98	No data	40.64	37.94	29.18
27.3.05 (PI 38d)	% of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime		M	PI	↑		55.90%	0.00%	**18.63%**	0.15%	0.00%	98.93%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	87.54%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	GRP				FAMILY GROUP 4 (Urban)						
						PIN	8040	8109		8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121	8036
						Authority	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverclyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council	Renfrewshire Council
	SCOTS headline financial PI															
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇕		£12,660	£15,273	**£12,122**	£12,145	No data	£17,283	£10,320	£25,726	No data	£5,983
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	H	PI	⇕		£12,660	£14,664	**£11,895**	£12,145	No data	£16,716	£10,315	£24,904	No data	£5,021
	Customer Service															
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times		H	PI	↑		63.21%	75.17%	**78.99%**	No data	No data	No data	76.84%	No data	No data	No data
3.1.02	Total number of customer enquiries / requests for service received		H	Stat	⇕		2,574	8,738	**7,791**	No data	No data	3,652	9,538	2,041	No data	6,594
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	PI	↑		No data	95.83%	**87.90%**	No data	No data	89.86%	45.56%	98.06%	No data	No data
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat	⇕		No data	312	**212**	No data	No data	138	90	155	No data	No data
	Carriageways															
	Safety															
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		M	PI	↑		No data	No data	**87.65%**	No data	No data	No data	100.00%	95.24%	No data	No data
1.2.01 (PI 39a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		H	PI	↑		63.48%	86.10%	**91.56%**	100.00%	No data	75.48%	94.12%	99.42%	No data	98.73%
1.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		M	Stat	↓		309	283	**205**	No data	No data	25	1	21	No data	No data
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓		116	217	**190**	23	No data	66	176	19	No data	No data
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		H	Stat	↓		0.11	0.21	**0.16**	0.08	No data	0.14	0.18	0.05	No data	No data
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑		44.13%	49.37%	**47.09%**	56.23%	No data	56.44%	33.32%	49.79%	No data	55.65%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		44.13%	49.37%	**45.07%**	56.23%	No data	56.44%	14.09%	22.47%	No data	55.65%
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	↓		47.02%	80.06%	**73.18%**	64.12%	No data	54.40%	82.27%	52.65%	No data	80.00%
1.4.04	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		96.41	43.47	**80.54**	87.33	No data	84.47	50.30	44.43	No data	85.71
1.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	⇕		33,544	44,092	**65,899**	3,360	No data	29,225	0	20,984	No data	8,983
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		100.00%	100.00%	**98.24%**	98.33%	No data	100.00%	No data	100.00%	No data	100.00%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		M	Stat	↓		3.58	5.63	**4.31**	3.63	No data	6.23	3.25	7.97	No data	5.41
1.4.08	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		M	Stat	↓		0.11	0.14	**0.12**	0.32	No data	0.10	No data	0.14	No data	0.52
1.4.09	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run		M	Stat	↓		0.00	4.49	**4.25**	18.08	No data	4.31	No data	3.21	No data	35.66
1.4.10	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		3.00	0.00	**2.36**	3.00	No data	3.00	3.00	0.00	No data	3.00
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00	0.00	**0.67**	1.00	No data	2.00	1.00	0.00	No data	1.00
1.5.01 (PI 211a)	% of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways		H	PI	↑		51.60%	69.40%	**62.88%**	79.20%	No data	74.40%	41.70%	69.10%	No data	No data
	Condition/Asset Preservation															
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇕		40.10%	31.10%	**33.50%**	33.20%	No data	36.00%	32.73%	33.20%	No data	28.10%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇕		1.37%	1.32%	**2.39%**	0.87%	No data	3.20%	1.54%	1.92%	No data	2.39%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.81%	**0.36%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	**0.04%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm and less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.02%	0.01%	**0.38%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.12%	0.01%	No data	0.00%
2.3.04	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.77%	0.00%	**0.16%**	0.00%	No data	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
2.3.05	% of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.08%	**0.26%**	0.00%	No data	0.02%	0.76%	1.88%	No data	0.00%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.30%	0.13%	**0.87%**	0.86%	No data	3.00%	0.17%	0.23%	No data	1.87%
2.3.08	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	**0.03%**	0.06%	No data	0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
2.3.14	% of carriageway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.01%	**0.13%**	0.06%	No data	0.00%	0.10%	0.04%	No data	0.00%
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		H	Stat	⇕		0.00%	0.00%	**0.02%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	No data	0.00%
2.3.10	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		31.58%	28.70%	**26.23%**	27.89%	No data	20.63%	30.84%	17.42%	No data	14.84%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		38.48%	28.00%	**30.79%**	23.67%	No data	23.12%	30.00%	28.13%	No data	20.72%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		37.48%	43.10%	**35.20%**	25.03%	No data	27.86%	28.14%	41.46%	No data	27.63%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓		46.90%	30.10%	**35.79%**	37.86%	No data	24.86%	34.31%	33.32%	No data	30.98%
2.4.01 (PI 209a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↑		14.70%	14.00%	**12.32%**	38.50%	No data	12.80%	12.00%	9.10%	No data	No data
2.4.02 (PI 209b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↓		76.50%	81.60%	**82.12%**	50.00%	No data	83.00%	84.00%	87.50%	No data	No data
	Financial															
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇕		£6,023	£7,645	**£6,749**	£7,955	No data	£11,963	£5,088	£9,093	No data	£1,611
6.1.02 (PI 57a)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		M	PI	↓		£8.99	£32.46	**£19.14**	£62.82	No data	£14.51	No data	£25.48	No data	No data
6.1.03	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		H	Stat	⇕		£5,074	£6,913	**£5,931**	£6,151	No data	£8,279	£3,412	£6,630	No data	No data
6.1.04	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		H	Stat	⇕		£84.46	£100.45	**£47.99**	£118.19	No data	£52.90	£55.82	£61.65	No data	£12.07
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	⇕		£55,563	£35,937	**£42,909**	£50,909	No data	No data	£47,975	£39,973	No data	No data
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓		£2,019,000	£1,502,890	**£1,604,889**	£393,000	No data	£693,272	£574,528	£386,949	No data	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverclyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council	Renfrewshire Council
	GRP								FAMILY GROUP 4 (Urban)						
	PIN					8040	8109		8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121	8036
6.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat	↓	£400	£23,336	**£22,304**	£1,068	No data	£300	£4,628	£4,154	No data	No data
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	£4,369	£5,143	**£4,391**	£4,732	No data	£6,447	£2,162	£5,226	No data	No data
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	£1,966	£1,421	**£1,157**	£1,315	No data	£1,419	£578	£1,029	No data	No data
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	£349	**£618**	£104	No data	£480	£672	£374	No data	No data
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		H	Stat	↑	86.12%	74.39%	**70.86%**	76.93%	No data	77.87%	63.37%	78.83%	No data	No data
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓	38.74%	20.56%	**17.62%**	21.38%	No data	17.14%	16.95%	15.53%	No data	No data
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	5.05%	**11.52%**	1.69%	No data	5.79%	19.68%	5.64%	No data	No data
	Footways														
	Safety														
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		H	PI	↑	30.30%	No data	**84.65%**	60.00%	No data	100.00%	No data	83.33%	No data	No data
11.2.01 (PI 46a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		M	PI	↑	66.67%	56.94%	**88.61%**	100.00%	No data	No data	97.22%	91.67%	No data	100.00%
11.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		L	Stat	↓	33	No data	**17**	5	No data	5	No data	6	No data	No data
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓	21	14	**18**	0	No data	8	26	7	No data	No data
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		H	Stat	↓	0.03	0.01	**0.02**	0.00	No data	0.01	0.03	0.01	No data	No data
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	PI	↑	19.53%	16.91%	**13.46%**	17.77%	No data	0.00%	10.28%	12.12%	No data	0.44%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		L	Stat	⇳	16.33%	16.91%	**12.80%**	17.77%	No data	8.58%	10.28%	4.23%	No data	14.11%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		L	Stat	↓	153.00	484.00	**290.77**	162.00	No data	37.20	674.00	1.00	No data	380.00
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	⇳	347.13	3760.00	**837.63**	130.00	No data	0.00	1692.32	257.70	No data	0.92
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	⇳	0.89	1.84	**0.87**	0.76	No data	0.48	1.22	1.02	No data	0.48
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	19.04%	4.15%	**15.26%**	31.30%	No data	No data	No data	20.00%	No data	No data
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	No data	0.17%	**0.39%**	No data	No data	0.78%	No data	0.69%	No data	0.67%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	⇳	0.00%	0.00%	**0.06%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.00%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		H	Stat	⇳	0.00%	0.23%	**0.19%**	0.82%	No data	0.99%	0.05%	0.61%	No data	0.59%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇳	0.00%	0.00%	**0.00%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	No data	0.00%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		H	Stat	⇳	0.00%	0.00%	**0.14%**	0.00%	No data	0.80%	0.00%	0.43%	No data	0.00%
12.3.01 (PI 210a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↑	30.30%	41.90%	**29.60%**	50.00%	No data	39.60%	52.00%	30.70%	No data	No data
12.3.02 (PI 210b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↓	51.50%	46.70%	**57.10%**	46.20%	No data	47.90%	36.00%	53.40%	No data	No data
12.3.03 (PI 210c)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↑	32.10%	43.70%	**30.28%**	50.00%	No data	27.00%	40.00%	35.50%	No data	No data
12.3.04 (PI 210d)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↓	35.70%	17.10%	**32.56%**	18.20%	No data	32.40%	30.00%	21.00%	No data	No data
	Financial														
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	£445.35	£613.21	**£895.93**	£1,390.50	No data	£391.66	£396.86	No data	No data	£421.10
16.1.05 (PI 49d)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding CEC)		L	PI	⇳	£445.35	£581.41	**£880.10**	£1,390.50	No data	£340.66	£396.86	No data	No data	£317.99
16.1.02 (PI 58)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment		L	PI	↓	No data	£118.89	**£68.53**	£561.54	No data	No data	£195.56	£11.59	No data	No data
16.1.03	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	Stat	⇳	£445.35	£550.24	**£833.39**	£947.79	No data	No data	£275.18	£7,905.49	No data	No data
16.1.04	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£133.17	**£112.18**	£90.74	No data	£10.88	£487.32	£350.36	No data	£31.64
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	£42,000	£10,709	**£118,015**	£4,281	No data	£0	£234,452	£7,462	No data	£0
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		L	Stat	↓	£0	£350	**£21,818**	No data	No data	£0	£0	£51,491	No data	No data
16.3.03	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	£376.84	£542.53	**£580.53**	£782.81	No data	No data	£47.34	£7,890.28	No data	No data
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	£68.52	£7.71	**£133.48**	£9.75	No data	No data	£227.84	£15.21	No data	No data
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	No data	**£159.94**	£155.23	No data	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	No data	No data
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		L	Stat	↑	84.62%	98.60%	**67.83%**	82.59%	No data	No data	17.20%	99.81%	No data	No data
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	15.38%	1.40%	**22.11%**	1.03%	No data	No data	82.80%	0.19%	No data	No data
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	No data	**15.82%**	16.38%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data
	Structures														
	Safety														
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	0.00%	98.55%	**56.97%**	No data	No data	100.00%	0.00%	15.79%	No data	0.00%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	100.00%	91.55%	**94.32%**	No data	No data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	No data	100.00%
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	76.97	91.77	**84.58**	86.88	No data	94.20	85.38	80.58	No data	No data
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	70.30	83.91	**76.07**	81.83	No data	68.80	78.25	62.48	No data	No data
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat	↓	0.38%	0.17%	**3.04%**	No data	No data	2.86%	0.35%	0.61%	No data	0.00%
32.3.02	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		H	Stat	↓	0	4	**13**	No data	No data	1	5	1	No data	4
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		H	Stat	↓	0	1	**4**	No data	No data	3	3	5	No data	5

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverclyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council	Renfrewshire Council
					GRP				FAMILY GROUP 4 (Urban)						
					PIN	8040	8109		8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121	8036
32.3.04	No of bridges / structures owned or maintained		H	Stat	⇳	522	594	**476**	123	No data	245	282	163	No data	317
	Functionality														
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		H	PI	↓	0.00%	0.67%	**2.79%**	No data	No data	0.41%	1.77%	0.61%	No data	1.26%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI	↓	0.00%	0.34%	**1.27%**	1.63%	No data	1.63%	No data	1.23%	No data	0.63%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		H	Stat	↓	0	0	**2**	0	No data	3	0	0	No data	0
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	⇳	0	2	**3**	2	No data	1	No data	2	No data	2
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	3	**1**	2	No data	3	5	1	No data	0
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	0	**2**	2	No data	1	No data	0	No data	0
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction		H	Stat	⇳	0	2	**1**	0	No data	0	3	2	No data	2
	Financial														
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	↑	No data	30.70%	**21.25%**	81.14%	No data	No data	6.05%	23.90%	No data	No data
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		L	PI	↑	123.11%	94.65%	**69.63%**	100.00%	No data	No data	97.41%	98.29%	No data	No data
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L	PI	↓	0.55%	1.69%	**9.79%**	0.34%	No data	No data	No data	1.49%	No data	No data
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		L	Stat	↓	No data	2.12%	**4.10%**	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	No data	No data
36.3.02	Annual expenditure to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat	⇳	£0	£0	**£685,735**	£0	No data	£0	£0	£0	No data	£0
	Traffic Management Systems														
	Safety														
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	97.44%	99.23%	**96.93%**	85.71%	No data	90.00%	96.08%	No data	No data	No data
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit		M	PI	↑	No data	92.53%	**92.96%**	85.71%	No data	93.85%	90.20%	No data	No data	No data
	Financial														
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	⇳	No data	100.00%	**64.23%**	16.35%	No data	No data	99.27%	91.34%	No data	No data
	Street Furniture														
	Financial														
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	⇳	No data	0.79%	**1.76%**	1.10%	No data	No data	1.33%	1.80%	No data	No data
	All assets service delivery														
	Safety														
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		H	PI	↑	No data	No data	**842.17**	No data	No data	No data	924.74	704.30	No data	221.07
61.2.01 (PI 212a)	% satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks ("Always/Usually" aware of organisation)		H	PI	↑	66.70%	43.40%	**43.50%**	45.50%	No data	33.30%	20.00%	13.60%	No data	No data
61.2.02 (PI 208a)	% satisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↑	15.20%	21.00%	**17.72%**	42.90%	No data	14.90%	16.00%	13.60%	No data	No data
61.2.03 (PI 208b)	% dissatisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↓	69.70%	63.20%	**69.56%**	42.90%	No data	76.60%	64.00%	77.30%	No data	No data
	Street Lighting														
	Safety														
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	No data	0.00%	**26.70%**	No data	No data	No data	85.85%	No data	No data	No data
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate		H	PI	↑	No data	95.31%	**56.35%**	No data	No data	No data	87.02%	No data	No data	No data
	Condition/Asset Preservation														
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	2.67%	1.28%	**5.52%**	No data	No data	3.30%	3.32%	2.19%	No data	No data
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	34.95%	22.94%	**30.32%**	No data	No data	No data	20.16%	No data	No data	No data
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	↓	8.62%	1.26%	**4.60%**	0.00%	No data	No data	1.30%	No data	No data	0.00%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	0.71%	0.96%	**1.04%**	No data	No data	No data	1.10%	No data	No data	0.30%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	1.22%	1.07%	**2.05%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	0.84%
	Customer Service														
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	48.98%	96.50%	**75.62%**	No data	No data	94.38%	93.47%	86.88%	No data	No data
23.1.02 (PI 03b)	% of repairs within target time		H	PI	↑	98.36%	96.50%	**92.34%**	No data	No data	94.38%	93.47%	No data	No data	No data
23.1.03 (PI 03c)	% of repairs within 21 days		H	PI	↑	84.84%	99.20%	**88.72%**	No data	No data	97.94%	No data	No data	No data	No data
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)		H	PI	↓	No data	2.80	**7.96**	No data	No data	4.00	4.00	No data	No data	No data
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		M	PI	⇳	100.00%	145.38%	**111.40%**	No data	No data	158.05%	98.15%	No data	No data	No data
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	⇳	2.67%	1.86%	**5.33%**	No data	No data	5.22%	3.26%	No data	No data	5.41%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		M	Stat	↑	No data	98.98%	**90.43%**	97.69%	No data	93.27%	102.64%	No data	No data	99.73%
23.4.01 (PI 45a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting		H	PI	↑	62.50%	68.90%	**59.46%**	78.60%	No data	71.70%	72.00%	50.60%	No data	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average	Clackmannanshire Council	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverclyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council	Renfrewshire Council
GRP									FAMILY GROUP 4 (Urban)						
PIN						8040	8109		8087	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121	8036
	Availability														
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		H	Stat	◆	0.00	11.00	**2.56**	0.00	No data	No data	No data	9.00	No data	0.00
	Financial														
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	↑	No data	75.67%	**64.28%**	13.16%	No data	No data	35.84%	No data	No data	No data
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	↓	13.97%	51.38%	**43.43%**	No data	No data	No data	50.26%	No data	No data	No data
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L	PI	↓	No data	No data	**£318.31**	No data	No data	No data	£38.88	No data	No data	No data
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		M	PI	↓	No data	£0.08	**£0.05**	No data	No data	No data	No data	5.00%	No data	No data
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	↓	£79.51	£16.71	**£28.50**	£42.63	No data	No data	£22.88	£17.64	No data	No data
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	↓	£4.10	£37.42	**£27.38**	£14.63	No data	No data	£31.03	£15.74	No data	No data
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓	£83.61	£54.13	**£55.88**	£57.26	No data	No data	£53.91	£33.38	No data	No data
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		H	PI	↓	£62.30	£39.62	**£49.46**	No data	No data	£56.97	£42.54	£43.24	No data	£53.13
	Environmental														
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	No data	145.40	**162.92**	No data	No data	No data	150.41	132.56	No data	No data
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		M	PI	↓	48.39	33.10	**37.65**	No data	No data	42.80	35.63	31.46	No data	40.88
27.3.05 (PI 38d)	% of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime		M	PI	↑	0.38%	0.00%	**23.38%**	0.00%	No data	0.00%	63.62%	5.09%	No data	0.00%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
					GRP			FAMILY GROUP 5 (City)					
					PIN	8057		8073	8159	8015	8016		
					Authority	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
	SCOTS headline financial PI												
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇕	No data	£14,291	£3,599	£13,415	£43,050	£20,967	£20,258	£11,541
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	H	PI	⇕	No data	£13,820	£3,599	£13,320	£42,922	£20,916	£20,189	£11,328
	Customer Service												
3.1.01 (PI 37)	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times		H	PI	↑	No data	76.84%	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	79.30%
3.1.02	Total number of customer enquiries / requests for service received		H	Stat	⇕	No data	5,456	8,905	2,909	No data	No data	5,907	5,996
3.3.01 (PI 61)	% of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time		H	PI	↑	No data	77.83%	97.03%	No data	No data	No data	97.03%	86.21%
3.3.02	Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act		H	Stat	⇕	No data	128	101	No data	No data	No data	101	151
	Carriageways												
	Safety												
1.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		M	PI	↑	No data	97.62%	92.86%	No data	No data	89.02%	90.94%	84.75%
1.2.01 (PI 39a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		H	PI	↑	No data	93.55%	No data	100.00%	No data	No data	100.00%	94.15%
1.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		M	Stat	↓	No data	16	14	178	No data	173	122	115
1.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓	No data	71	122	62	No data	2896	1027	283
1.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway		H	Stat	↓	No data	0.11	0.12	0.10	No data	1.50	0.57	0.16
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	50.29%	43.86%	52.70%	No data	44.59%	47.05%	43.25%
1.4.02	% carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	40.98%	26.47%	52.70%	No data	44.59%	41.25%	40.47%
1.4.03	Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	↓	No data	66.69%	65.38%	48.58%	No data	50.98%	54.98%	64.45%
1.4.04	Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	70.45	70.20	47.64	No data	105.19	74.34	74.19
1.4.05	Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)		M	Stat	⇕	No data	12,510	41,769	25,226	No data	49,925	38,973	57,170
1.4.06	% top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	99.58%	100.00%	99.63%	No data	94.95%	98.19%	98.75%
1.4.07	Total salt usage by total network length		M	Stat	↓	No data	5.30	13.09	7.51	0.00	2.92	5.88	5.40
1.4.08	Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length		M	Stat	↓	No data	0.27	0.33	0.18	No data	0.11	0.21	0.39
1.4.09	Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run		M	Stat	↓	No data	15.32	16.15	2.12	No data	6.03	8.10	11.58
1.4.10	The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	2.40	3.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	2.75	2.47
1.4.11	The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	0.83
1.5.01 (PI 211a)	% of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways		H	PI	↑	No data	66.10%	55.30%	No data	No data	No data	55.30%	63.38%
	Condition/Asset Preservation												
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇕	No data	32.04%	27.00%	27.90%	34.30%	29.20%	30.10%	32.56%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇕	No data	1.98%	2.68%	2.08%	3.16%	3.93%	2.96%	2.77%
2.3.01	% of carriageway area – surface dressed		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.52%	0.30%	0.00%	0.21%	1.00%
2.3.02	% of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.63%	0.05%	0.17%	0.04%
2.3.03	% of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm and less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.16%
2.3.04	% of carriageway area – moderate overlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.08%
2.3.05	% of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.21%	0.00%	0.30%	0.05%
2.3.06	% of carriageway area – thin inlay (less than 60mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.53%	2.54%	1.21%	0.00%	1.92%	1.42%	0.44%
2.3.07	% of carriageway area – moderate inlay (60mm – 100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	1.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.20%	0.53%
2.3.08	% of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	0.02%	0.02%
2.3.14	% of carriageway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.01%	0.08%
2.3.09	% of carriageway area – fully reconstructed		H	Stat	⇕	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
2.3.10	% of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	No data	22.32%	18.97%	25.90%	28.91%	30.60%	26.10%	26.77%
2.3.11	% of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	No data	25.13%	28.51%	32.60%	25.36%	22.20%	27.17%	30.03%
2.3.12	% of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	No data	30.02%	20.86%	18.90%	26.04%	23.20%	22.25%	31.67%
2.3.13	% of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment		H	Stat	↓	No data	32.27%	29.50%	30.00%	36.10%	30.20%	31.45%	35.62%
2.4.01 (PI 209a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↑	No data	18.10%	16.70%	No data	No data	No data	16.70%	16.74%
2.4.02 (PI 209b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads		H	PI	↓	No data	76.13%	81.00%	No data	No data	No data	81.00%	77.39%
	Financial												
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇕	No data	£7,142	£1,687	£6,618	£15,928	£10,244	£8,619	£6,257
6.1.02 (PI 57a)	Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment		M	PI	↓	No data	£34.27	£28.84	£34.61	No data	£12.20	£25.22	£34.22
6.1.03	Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)		H	Stat	⇕	No data	£6,118	£1,679	£4,712	£11,560	£8,938	£6,722	£5,210
6.1.04	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated		H	Stat	⇕	No data	£60.13	£9.97	£57.30	£97.34	£42.72	£51.83	£56.65
6.3.01	Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length		H	Stat	⇕	No data	£46,286	£45,972	£47	£56,730	£54,086	£39,209	£39,696
6.3.02	Total cost of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓	No data	£511,937	No data	£656,456	£2,562,784	£1,840,674	£1,686,638	£1,703,693

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
	GRP							FAMILY GROUP 5 (City)					
	PIN					8057		8073	8159	8015	8016		
	Authority					West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
6.3.03	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		H	Stat	↓	No data	£2,538	£8,760	£94	No data	£173,214	£60,689	£30,600
6.3.04	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	£4,642	£1,679	£4,712	£9,821	£71	£4,071	£3,665
6.3.05	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	£1,085	No data	£1,068	£1,696	£956	£1,240	£1,050
6.3.06	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	£408	No data	£368	£42	£1,090	£500	£411
6.3.08	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		H	Stat	↑	No data	73.54%	100.00%	100.00%	84.96%	0.79%	72.49%	72.16%
6.3.09	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		H	Stat	↓	No data	17.36%	No data	22.66%	14.67%	10.70%	18.69%	19.08%
6.3.10	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		H	Stat	⇳	No data	9.10%	No data	7.81%	0.37%	12.20%	8.82%	8.75%
	Footways												
	Safety												
11.1.01 (PI 45a)	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times		H	PI	↑	No data	81.11%	100.00%	No data	No data	100.00%	100.00%	89.06%
11.2.01 (PI 46a)	% of safety inspections completed on time		M	PI	↑	No data	97.22%	96.87%	No data	No data	No data	96.87%	93.29%
11.3.01	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects		L	Stat	↓	No data	5	1	No data	No data	3	2	9
11.3.02	Total number of 3rd party claims		H	Stat	↓	No data	10	32	No data	No data	172	102	19
11.3.03	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway		H	Stat	↓	No data	0.01	0.02	No data	No data	0.06	0.04	0.01
11.4.01 (PI 113)	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment		L	PI	↑	No data	8.12%	0.21%	0.00%	No data	11.49%	3.90%	8.87%
11.4.02	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)		L	Stat	⇳	No data	10.99%	0.21%	3.11%	No data	11.49%	4.94%	12.06%
11.4.03	Tonnes of salt used		L	Stat	↓	No data	250.84	No data	111.12	No data	1750.00	930.56	364.53
11.4.04	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment		L	Stat	⇳	No data	416.19	68.00	0.00	No data	9334.00	3134.00	750.83
11.4.05	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network		H	Stat	⇳	No data	0.79	0.47	0.13	0.00	0.55	0.29	0.99
	Condition/Asset Preservation												
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	No data	25.65%	10.00%	10.00%	40.00%	13.10%	18.28%	16.54%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	No data	0.71%	0.21%	0.09%	0.92%	0.03%	0.31%	0.49%
12.2.01	% of footway area – surface treated		H	Stat	⇳	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.72%	0.00%	0.25%	0.14%
12.2.02	% of footway area – resurfaced		H	Stat	⇳	No data	0.61%	0.35%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.09%	0.25%
12.2.04	% of footway area – planned patching		H	Stat	⇳	No data	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.03%	0.01%	0.01%
12.2.03	% of footway area – reconstructed		H	Stat	⇳	No data	0.25%	0.00%	1.25%	0.18%	0.00%	0.36%	0.15%
12.3.01 (PI 210a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↑	No data	43.08%	15.60%	No data	No data	No data	15.60%	39.52%
12.3.02 (PI 210b)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with pavements/footpaths		H	PI	↓	No data	45.88%	73.30%	No data	No data	No data	73.30%	47.91%
12.3.03 (PI 210c)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↑	No data	38.13%	27.60%	No data	No data	No data	27.60%	32.87%
12.3.04 (PI 210d)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with cycle facilities		H	PI	↓	No data	25.40%	41.40%	No data	No data	No data	41.40%	30.43%
	Financial												
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	No data	£650.03	£340.52	No data	No data	£401.58	£371.05	£837.89
16.1.05 (PI 49d)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding CEC)		L	PI	⇳	No data	£611.50	£340.52	No data	No data	£400.02	£370.27	£812.60
16.1.02 (PI 58)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment		L	PI	↓	No data	£256.23	No data	No data	No data	£21.43	£21.43	£122.26
16.1.03	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£3,042.82	£253.75	No data	£3,979.21	£380.83	£1,537.93	£1,223.53
16.1.04	Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£194.19	£63.17	£0.00	£259.14	£530.46	£213.19	£140.59
16.3.01	Total cost of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	No data	£49,239	£0	£139,727	£1,067,827	£343,611	£387,791	£117,450
16.3.02	Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims		L	Stat	↓	No data	£17,164	£278	£0	No data	£173,148	£57,809	£20,518
16.3.03	Expenditure per km of planned maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£2,906.81	£253.75	£90.77	£3,463.18	£239.08	£1,011.70	£1,009.73
16.3.04	Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£84.27	No data	£19.96	£503.47	£109.99	£211.14	£134.99
16.3.05	Expenditure per km of routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£38.81	No data	£0.00	£12.56	£12.80	£8.45	£70.29
16.3.07	% of budget spent on planned maintenance		L	Stat	↑	No data	66.53%	100.00%	No data	87.03%	62.78%	83.27%	75.67%
16.3.08	% of budget spent on reactive maintenance		L	Stat	↓	No data	28.01%	No data	No data	12.65%	28.88%	20.77%	22.12%
16.3.09	% of budget spent on routine maintenance		L	Stat	⇳	No data	4.10%	No data	0.00%	0.32%	3.36%	1.23%	7.94%
	Structures												
	Safety												
31.1.01 (PI 300)	% of principal inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	No data	28.95%	100.00%	No data	100.00%	72.00%	90.67%	57.37%
31.1.02 (PI 301)	% of general inspections carried out on time		H	PI	↑	No data	100.00%	100.00%	No data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.51%
	Condition/Asset Preservation												
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	86.76	83.52	No data	81.19	83.25	82.65	85.04
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	72.84	76.03	No data	79.33	56.70	70.69	74.07
32.3.01	% of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes		H	Stat	↓	No data	0.96%	0.50%	No data	0.30%	2.19%	1.00%	2.20%
32.3.02	No of Council owned bridges failing assessment		H	Stat	↓	No data	3	2	No data	49	15	22	26
32.3.03	No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network		H	Stat	↓	No data	4	0	No data	9	28	12	4

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
	GRP							FAMILY GROUP 5 (City)					
	PIN					8057		8073	8159	8015	8016		
32.3.04	No of bridges / structures owned or maintained		H	Stat	⇳	No data	226	201	No data	331	183	238	581
	Functionality												
34.1.01 (PI 304)	% of Council owned bridges failing European standards		H	PI	↓	No data	1.01%	1.00%	No data	14.80%	8.20%	8.00%	3.27%
34.2.01 (PI 305)	% of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction		H	PI	↓	No data	1.28%	5.47%	No data	7.25%	7.10%	6.61%	1.74%
34.3.01	No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)		H	Stat	↓	No data	1	1	No data	0	1	1	3
34.3.02	No of Council bridges with imposed height / width restriction (for year on year comparison)		H	Stat	⇳	No data	2	10	No data	24	12	15	4
34.3.03	No of Council bridges with acceptable weight restriction		H	Stat	⇳	No data	2	1	No data	5	4	3	5
34.3.04	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction		H	Stat	⇳	No data	1	1	No data	2	1	1	1
34.3.05	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction		H	Stat	⇳	No data	1	9	No data	22	11	14	2
	Financial												
36.1.01 (PI 306)	Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)		L	PI	↑	No data	37.03%	9.17%	No data	No data	13.66%	11.42%	30.24%
36.2.01 (PI 307)	% of allocated budget spent per annum		L	PI	↑	No data	98.57%	92.27%	No data	No data	11.49%	51.88%	68.33%
36.2.02 (PI 308)	Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation		L	PI	↓	No data	0.92%	1.29%	No data	No data	2.04%	1.67%	9.81%
36.3.01	% of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage		L	Stat	↓	No data	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	3.96%
36.3.02	Annual expenditure to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width		L	Stat	⇳	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0	£39,936	£9,984	£283,157
	Traffic Management Systems												
	Safety												
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	90.60%	97.03%	No data	95.98%	98.28%	97.10%	92.79%
41.1.02 (PI 56)	% of faults rectified on first visit		M	PI	↑	No data	89.92%	No data	No data	98.01%	89.99%	94.00%	93.75%
	Financial												
46.1.01	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend		L	Stat	⇳	No data	68.99%	96.75%	No data	63.22%	52.56%	70.84%	72.62%
	Street Furniture												
	Financial												
56.1.01	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture		L	Stat	⇳	No data	1.41%	8.08%	No data	0.18%	3.06%	3.77%	2.27%
	All assets service delivery												
	Safety												
61.1.01 (PI 60)	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)		H	PI	↑	No data	616.70	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00	980.29
61.2.01 (PI 212a)	% satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks ("Always/Usually" aware of organisation)		H	PI	↑	No data	28.10%	50.00%	No data	No data	No data	50.00%	38.46%
61.2.02 (PI 208a)	% satisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↑	No data	21.85%	2.40%	No data	No data	No data	2.40%	20.24%
61.2.03 (PI 208b)	% dissatisfied with the overall service delivery		H	PI	↓	No data	65.20%	76.20%	No data	No data	No data	76.20%	66.17%
	Street Lighting												
	Safety												
21.2.01 (PI 39)	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)		L	PI	↑	No data	85.85%	100.00%	15.02%	100.00%	£0	53.76%	27.91%
21.2.02 (PI 40)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate		H	PI	↑	No data	87.02%	2.17%	66.99%	81.55%	£0	46.72%	52.11%
	Condition/Asset Preservation												
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	No data	2.94%	9.09%	1.04%	2.46%	No data	4.20%	4.88%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	No data	20.16%	46.02%	25.42%	48.22%	£1	42.68%	33.32%
22.2.03	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life		L	Stat	↓	No data	0.43%	0.00%	0.60%	No data	£0	11.21%	6.02%
22.3.02	% of columns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	No data	0.70%	0.56%	1.37%	0.20%	£0	0.82%	1.14%
22.3.03	% of lanterns replaced		M	Stat	⇳	No data	0.17%	3.60%	0.95%	0.35%	£0	4.24%	2.08%
	Customer Service												
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	91.58%	96.52%	94.76%	33.20%	No data	74.83%	74.27%
23.1.02 (PI 03b)	% of repairs within target time		H	PI	↑	No data	93.93%	96.52%	94.76%	33.20%	No data	74.83%	84.76%
23.1.03 (PI 03c)	% of repairs within 21 days		H	PI	↑	No data	97.94%	96.52%	100.00%	No data	No data	98.26%	90.60%
23.2.01 (PI 20)	Average time taken to repair (days)		H	PI	↓	No data	4.00	No data	5.22	No data	No data	5.22	9.57
23.2.02 (PI 27)	Public calls as a % of faults		M	PI	⇳	No data	128.10%	71.01%	285.39%	No data	115.78%	157.39%	127.13%
23.2.03 (PI 28)	Public calls as a % of street lights		M	PI	⇳	No data	4.63%	6.46%	2.98%	No data	No data	4.72%	5.41%
23.3.02	% of street lights which are LED		M	Stat	↑	No data	98.33%	102.90%	98.40%	91.88%	60.63%	88.45%	89.34%
23.4.01 (PI 45a)	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting		H	PI	↑	No data	68.23%	53.70%	No data	No data	No data	53.70%	63.78%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
					GRP			FAMILY GROUP 5 (City)					
					PIN	8057		8073	8159	8015	8016		
					Authority / Ideal Position	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council	Group Average	Scotland Average
	Availability												
24.3.01	Number of night inspections annually		H	Stat	⇳	No data	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50
	Financial												
26.1.01 (PI 35)	Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)		M	PI	↑	No data	24.50%	63.38%	44.38%	No data	31.61%	46.46%	42.35%
26.1.02 (PI 36)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)		M	PI	↓	No data	50.26%	0.04%	63.58%	No data	43.38%	35.67%	43.82%
26.2.01 (PI 33)	Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (eg component replacement)		L	PI	↓	No data	£38.88	£121.90	£472.04	No data	£225.94	£273.29	£229.32
26.2.02 (PI 34b)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light		M	PI	↓	No data	£0.05	No data	No data	No data	No data	£0.00	£0.09
26.2.03 (PI 42)	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs		H	PI	↓	No data	£27.72	£27.66	£75.02	No data	£67.11	£56.60	£27.69
26.2.04 (PI 43)	Capital allocation per street light – replacement		H	PI	↓	No data	£20.47	£50.90	£31.06	No data	£25.48	£35.81	£29.23
26.2.05 (PI 01c)	Total investment in infrastructure per street light		H	PI	↓	No data	£48.18	£78.56	£106.08	No data	£92.59	£92.41	£56.92
26.3.02 (PI 06a)	Energy cost per street lamp		H	PI	↓	No data	£48.97	No data	£43.55	£43.38	No data	£43.47	£47.37
	Environmental												
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	No data	141.49	265.32	No data	123.37	290.79	226.49	167.56
27.3.01 (PI 37b)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light		M	PI	↓	No data	37.69	59.12	32.10	34.37	85.21	52.70	38.16
27.3.05 (PI 38d)	% of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime		M	PI	↑	No data	13.74%	90.83%	88.36%	No data	12.92%	64.04%	33.11%

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
SCOTS Executive PIs 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	FAMILY GROUP 1 (Rural)									FAMILY GROUP 2 (Isla		
	GRP																
	PIN					8000	8001	8072	8145	8055	8086	8063	8158		8081	8037	8101
	Authority					Aberdeenshire Council	Angus Council	Argyll & Bute Council	Scottish Borders Council	Dumfries & Galloway Council	Highland Council	Moray Council	Perth & Kinross Council	Group Average	Orkney Islands Council	Shetland Islands Council	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar
	SCOTS headline PI																
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇳	£4,563	£6,806	£9,527	£5,356	£6,231	No data	£8,957	£9,000	**£7,206**	£2,820	£5,042	£3,835
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	PI	PI	⇳	£4,563	£6,806	£9,118	£5,356	£6,231	No data	£8,957	£9,000	**£7,147**	£2,449	£4,751	£3,592
	Carriageways																
	Safety																
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	31.33%	33.03%	54.58%	38.55%	36.12%	No data	38.19%	37.34%	**38.45%**	38.63%	23.95%	23.40%
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇳	22.23%	32.28%	49.80%	41.20%	49.30%	38.60%	25.90%	31.60%	**36.36%**	21.70%	30.60%	38.50%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇳	4.32%	2.23%	No data	1.79%	3.09%	No data	4.78%	3.69%	**3.32%**	1.25%	7.15%	3.14%
	Financial																
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇳	£3,869	£5,272	£6,971	£3,713	£5,221	No data	£6,442	£5,639	**£5,304**	£1,887	£3,787	£1,970
	Footways																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	20.50%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	1.25%	**10.88%**	21.80%	No data	5.10%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	0.40%	0.17%	No data	0.48%	0.12%	No data	0.71%	0.59%	**0.41%**	0.93%	1.58%	0.15%
	Financial																
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	£391	£750	£2,131	£1,656	£92	No data	£1,204	£1,662	**£1,126**	£1,098	£414	£261
	Structures																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	71.00	86.59	89.13	No data	89.80	79.36	76.38	83.51	**82.25**	No data	98.24	95.80
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	60.00	81.75	59.23	No data	94.41	65.35	52.96	71.79	**69.36**	No data	95.60	82.60
	Traffic Management Systems																
	Safety																
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	78.76%	92.00%	No data	100.00%	87.72%	No data	97.62%	91.42%	**91.25%**	No data	No data	66.67%
	Street Lighting																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	3.66%	No data	No data	5.07%	No data	No data	2.13%	7.37%	**4.56%**	3.15%	No data	9.96%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	37.04%	No data	No data	43.44%	No data	No data	34.48%	27.90%	**35.72%**	10.10%	No data	46.63%
	Customer Service																
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	54.44%	No data	No data	51.95%	No data	No data	20.89%	97.59%	**56.22%**	No data	No data	84.83%
	Environmental																
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	159.75	No data	No data	130.58	110.90	No data	No data	No data	**133.74**	No data	No data	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

SCOTS Executive PIs 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	Group Average	East Ayrshire Council	East Lothian Council	Fife Council	Midlothian Council	North Ayrshire Council	South Ayrshire Council	South Lanarkshire Council	Stirling Council	West Lothian Council	Group Average	Clackmannanshire Council
GRP	and)	FAMILY GROUP 3 (Semi Urban)															
PIN							8082	8064	8134	8027	8059	8042	8120	8040	8109		8087
	SCOTS headline PI																
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇕	£3,899	£9,997	£4,385	£16,668	No data	£14,187	£8,549	£15,254	£12,660	£15,273	£12,122	£12,145
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	PI	PI	⇕	£3,597	£9,580	£4,385	£16,668	No data	£14,089	£8,082	£15,034	£12,660	£14,664	£11,895	£12,145
	Carriageways																
	Safety																
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	28.66%	45.91%	45.66%	52.03%	No data	45.62%	42.70%	51.29%	44.13%	49.37%	47.09%	56.23%
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇕	30.27%	33.00%	33.20%	31.60%	39.00%	32.50%	35.50%	31.90%	40.10%	31.10%	34.21%	33.20%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇕	3.85%	1.77%	2.62%	2.69%	2.11%	4.69%	2.48%	2.49%	1.37%	1.32%	2.39%	0.87%
	Financial																
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇕	£2,548	£5,483	£3,744	£8,550	No data	£9,039	£6,193	£7,315	£6,023	£7,645	£6,749	£7,955
	Footways																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	13.45%	17.50%	No data	No data	No data	11.76%	15.00%	24.10%	19.04%	4.15%	15.26%	31.30%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇕	0.89%	0.22%	0.78%	0.54%	No data	0.51%	0.21%	0.31%	No data	0.17%	0.39%	No data
	Financial																
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇕	£591	£477	No data	£1,200	No data	£1,565	£601	£1,369	£445	£613	£896	£1,391
	Structures																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	97.02	83.41	81.13	85.72	87.81	83.11	90.12	81.20	76.97	91.77	84.58	86.88
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	89.10	71.95	81.66	76.90	79.55	68.52	83.20	68.60	70.30	83.91	76.07	81.83
	Traffic Management Systems																
	Safety																
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	66.67%	92.37%	No data	97.47%	No data	92.56%	100.00%	99.42%	97.44%	99.23%	96.93%	85.71%
	Street Lighting																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	6.56%	5.40%	9.38%	4.21%	7.44%	10.11%	3.58%	5.62%	2.67%	1.28%	5.52%	No data
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	28.37%	34.91%	32.76%	30.12%	No data	17.07%	33.47%	36.34%	34.95%	22.94%	30.32%	No data
	Customer Service																
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	84.83%	90.96%	No data	93.08%	No data	No data	92.39%	31.83%	48.98%	96.50%	75.62%	No data
	Environmental																
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	0.00	215.60	No data	119.51	No data	174.09	159.98	No data	No data	145.40	162.92	No data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

SCOTS Executive PIs 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	Ideal Position	East Dunbartonshire Council	East Renfrewshire Council	Falkirk Council	Inverclyde Council	North Lanarkshire Council	Renfrewshire Council	West Dunbartonshire Council	Group Average	Aberdeen City Council	Dundee City Council	City of Edinburgh Council	Glasgow City Council
					GRP	FAMILY GROUP 4 (Urban)								FAMILY GROUP 5 (City)			
					PIN	8014	8137	8071	8060	8121	8036	8057		8073	8159	8015	8016
	SCOTS headline PI																
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇳	No data	£17,283	£10,320	£25,726	No data	£5,983	No data	**£14,291**	£3,599	£13,415	£43,050	£20,967
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	PI	PI	⇳	No data	£16,716	£10,315	£24,904	No data	£5,021	No data	**£13,820**	£3,599	£13,320	£42,922	£20,916
	Carriageways																
	Safety																
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	56.44%	33.32%	49.79%	No data	55.65%	No data	**50.29%**	43.86%	52.70%	No data	44.59%
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇳	No data	36.00%	32.73%	33.20%	No data	28.10%	No data	**32.65%**	27.00%	27.90%	34.30%	29.20%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇳	No data	3.20%	1.54%	1.92%	No data	2.39%	No data	**1.98%**	2.68%	2.08%	3.16%	3.93%
	Financial																
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇳	No data	£11,963	£5,088	£9,093	No data	£1,611	No data	**£7,142**	£1,687	£6,618	£15,928	£10,244
	Footways																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	No data	No data	No data	20.00%	No data	No data	No data	**25.65%**	10.00%	10.00%	40.00%	13.10%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	No data	0.78%	No data	0.69%	No data	0.67%	No data	**0.71%**	0.21%	0.09%	0.92%	0.03%
	Financial																
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	No data	£392	£397	No data	No data	£421	No data	**£650**	£341	No data	No data	£402
	Structures																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	94.20	85.38	80.58	No data	No data	No data	**86.76**	83.52	No data	81.19	83.25
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	68.80	78.25	62.48	No data	No data	No data	**72.84**	76.03	No data	79.33	56.70
	Traffic Management Systems																
	Safety																
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	90.00%	96.08%	No data	No data	No data	No data	**90.60%**	97.03%	No data	95.98%	98.28%
	Street Lighting																
	Condition/Asset Preservation																
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	No data	3.30%	3.32%	2.19%	No data	No data	No data	**2.94%**	9.09%	1.04%	2.46%	No data
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	No data	No data	20.16%	No data	No data	No data	No data	**20.16%**	46.02%	25.42%	48.22%	51.06%
	Customer Service																
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	No data	94.38%	93.47%	86.88%	No data	No data	No data	**91.58%**	96.52%	94.76%	33.20%	No data
	Environmental																
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	No data	No data	150.41	132.56	No data	No data	No data	**141.49**	265.32	No data	123.37	290.79

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

SCOTS Executive PIs 2023/24

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

Ref	Indicator	SCOTS Executive PI	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	PI / Stat	GRP / PIN / Ideal Position / Authority	Group Average	Scotland Average
	SCOTS headline PI						
0.1.01 (PI 63a)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Y	H	PI	⇳	£20,258	£11,541
0.1.02 (PI 63b)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	Y	PI	PI	⇳	£20,189	£11,328
	Carriageways						
	Safety						
1.4.01 (PI 114)	% of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	Y	H	PI	↑	47.05%	43.25%
	Condition/Asset Preservation						
2.1.01 (PI 40)	% of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	H	PI	⇳	29.60%	33.49%
2.1.02 (PI 41a)	% of carriageway length treated	Y	H	PI	⇳	2.96%	2.77%
	Financial						
6.1.01	Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	Y	H	Stat	⇳	£8,619	£6,257
	Footways						
	Condition/Asset Preservation						
12.1.01 (PI 47)	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	Y	L	PI	↓	18.28%	16.54%
12.1.02 (PI 48a)	% of footway length treated	Y	M	PI	⇳	0.31%	0.49%
	Financial						
16.1.01 (PI 49a)	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Y	L	PI	⇳	£371	£838
	Structures						
	Condition/Asset Preservation						
32.1.01 (PI 302)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Y	H	PI	↑	82.65	85.04
32.1.02 (PI 303)	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	Y	H	PI	↑	70.69	74.07
	Traffic Management Systems						
	Safety						
41.1.01 (PI 55)	% of faults rectified within target time	Y	H	PI	↑	97.10%	92.79%
	Street Lighting						
	Condition/Asset Preservation						
22.2.01 (PI 29a)	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	Y	H	PI	↓	4.20%	4.88%
22.2.02	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Y	M	Stat	↓	42.68%	33.32%
	Customer Service						
23.1.01 (PI 03a)	% of repairs within 7 days	Y	H	PI	↑	74.83%	74.27%
	Environmental						
27.1.01 (PI 18b)	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Y	M	PI	↓	226.49	167.56

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Customer Services Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	% of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times	Total number of customer enquiries / requests for service received	% 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
		3.1.01 PI 37	3.1.02 PI S85	3.3.01 PI 61	3.3.02 PI S48
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	H	H	H	H
	PI / Stat	PI	Stat	PI	Stat
	Ideal Position	↑	↕	↑	↕
	Family Group 1 (Rural)				
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	No data	16,248	90.82%	98
8001	Angus Council	No data	5,288	50.57%	176
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	93.76%	6,231	87.50%	72
8145	Scottish Borders Council	99.49%	5,056	91.96%	112
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	33.35%	1,688	97.83%	184
8086	Highland Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council	100.00%	2,970	100.00%	88
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	77.50%	4,911	74.65%	142
	Family Group - Average	**80.82%**	**6,056**	**84.76%**	**125**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**16,248**	**100.00%**	**184**
	Family Group - Low	**33.35%**	**1,688**	**50.57%**	**72**
	Family Group 2 (Island)				
8081	Orkney Islands Council	No data	837	90.80%	87
8037	Shetland Islands Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	76.33%	507	94.29%	35
	Family Group - Average	**76.33%**	**672**	**92.55%**	**61**
	Family Group - High	**76.33%**	**837**	**94.29%**	**87**
	Family Group - Low	**76.33%**	**507**	**90.80%**	**35**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)				
8082	East Ayrshire Council	90.23%	5,927	98.00%	150
8064	East Lothian Council	No data	No data	45.88%	194
8134	Fife Council	55.52%	14,651	89.51%	305
8027	Midlothian Council	No data	No data	No data	188
8059	North Ayrshire Council	96.13%	8,944	92.41%	79
8042	South Ayrshire Council	89.29%	4,426	96.03%	126
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	83.36%	9,275	97.64%	339
8040	Stirling Council	63.21%	2,574	No data	No data
8109	West Lothian Council	75.17%	8,738	95.83%	312
	Family Group - Average	**78.99%**	**7,791**	**87.90%**	**212**
	Family Group - High	**96.13%**	**14,651**	**98.00%**	**339**
	Family Group - Low	**55.52%**	**2,574**	**45.88%**	**79**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)				
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	No data	3,652	89.86%	138
8071	Falkirk Council	76.84%	9,538	45.56%	90
8060	Inverclyde Council	No data	2,041	98.06%	155
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	No data	6,594	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**76.84%**	**5,456**	**77.83%**	**128**
	Family Group - High	**76.84%**	**9,538**	**98.06%**	**155**
	Family Group - Low	**76.84%**	**2,041**	**45.56%**	**90**
	Family Group 5 (City)				
8073	Aberdeen City Council	No data	8,905	97.03%	101
8159	Dundee City Council	No data	2,909	No data	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
8016	Glasgow City Council	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group Average	**0.00%**	**5,907**	**97.03%**	**101**
	Family Group - High	**0.00%**	**8,905**	**97.03%**	**101**
	Family Group - Low	**0.00%**	**2,909**	**97.03%**	**101**
	Scotland - Average	**79.30%**	**5,996**	**86.21%**	**151**
	Scotland - High	**100.00%**	**16,248**	**100.00%**	**339**
	Scotland - Low	**33.35%**	**507**	**45.56%**	**35**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Carriageways Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

Safety

PIN	Name of Authority	1.1.01 PI 03a % of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times	1.2.01 PI 39a % of safety inspections completed on time	1.3.01 PI S49 Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects	1.3.02 PI S50 Total number of 3rd party claims	1.3.03 PI S51 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway	1.4.01 PI 114 % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment	1.4.02 PI S01 % carriageway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.03 PI S02 Route efficiency (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.04 PI S03 Average route length (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.05 PI S53 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.06 PI S54 % top priority routes completed on time (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.07 PI S55 Total salt usage by total network length	1.4.08 PI S56 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length	1.4.09 PI S57 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run	1.4.10 PI S70 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.4.11 PI S71 The stated (policy) time for mustering (Winter Maintenance operations)	1.5.01 PI 211a % of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	M	H	M	H	H	H	H	M	H	M	H	M	M	M	H	H	H
	PI / Stat	PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	PI
	Ideal Position	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	⇕	↓	⇕	⇕	⇕	↓	↓	↓	⇕	⇕	↑
	Family Group 1 (Rural)																	
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	37.78%	98.02%	90	513	0.09	31.33%	12.34%	67.27%	81.54	230,597	99.50%	6.01	0.15	0.00	2.50	1.50	No data
8001	Angus Council	100.00%	100.00%	1	182	0.10	33.03%	33.03%	64.45%	93.40	3,492	98.28%	6.65	3.47	129.22	3.00	0.50	60.00%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	54.58%	54.58%	47.80%	81.59	88,608	100.00%	5.28	0.14	5.31	2.00	1.00	No data
8145	Scottish Borders Council	No data	100.00%	No data	171	0.06	38.55%	38.55%	57.82%	71.29	153,564	99.44%	5.10	0.10	3.32	2.50	1.00	No data
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	No data	79.37%	2	973	0.23	36.12%	36.12%	67.90%	123.85	87,869	95.60%	2.30	0.11	8.69	4.00	1.00	77.60%
8086	Highland Council	No data	No data	No data	214	0.03	No data	32.01%	No data	No data	No data	No data	7.50	No data	No data	2.50	0.00	No data
8063	Moray Council	97.76%	100.00%	223	11	0.01	38.19%	38.19%	57.29%	80.15	51,663	96.98%	7.83	0.24	4.79	2.50	1.00	42.90%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	79.17%	100.00%	24	199	0.08	37.34%	37.34%	62.00%	68.18	123,690	100.00%	5.18	0.10	4.10	2.50	1.00	No data
	Family Group - Average	**78.68%**	**96.23%**	**68**	**323**	**0.09**	**38.45%**	**35.27%**	**60.65%**	**85.71**	**105,640**	**98.54%**	**5.73**	**0.62**	**22.20**	**2.69**	**0.88**	**60.17%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**223**	**973**	**0.23**	**54.58%**	**54.58%**	**67.90%**	**123.85**	**230,597**	**100.00%**	**7.83**	**3.47**	**129.22**	**4.00**	**1.50**	**77.60%**
	Family Group - Low	**37.78%**	**79.37%**	**1**	**11**	**0.01**	**31.33%**	**12.34%**	**47.80%**	**68.18**	**3,492**	**95.60%**	**2.30**	**0.10**	**0.00**	**2.00**	**0.00**	**42.90%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)																	
8081	Orkney Islands Council	33.33%	96.25%	6	0	0.00	38.63%	38.63%	No data	0.00	24,853	100.00%	5.81	0.23	0.00	2.00	1.00	72.70%
8037	Shetland Islands Council	100.00%	100.00%	2	1	0.00	23.95%	57.41%	55.63%	50.33	6,048	100.00%	8.76	1.52	11.58	2.50	1.00	No data
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	89.74%	No data	39	10	0.01	23.40%	25.21%	47.21%	59.10	9,374	100.00%	7.45	0.95	3.01	1.50	1.00	No data
	Family Group - Average	**74.36%**	**98.13%**	**16**	**4**	**0.00**	**28.66%**	**40.42%**	**51.42%**	**36.48**	**13,425**	**100.00%**	**7.34**	**0.90**	**4.86**	**2.00**	**1.00**	**72.70%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**39**	**10**	**0.01**	**38.63%**	**57.41%**	**55.63%**	**59.10**	**24,853**	**100.00%**	**8.76**	**1.52**	**11.58**	**2.50**	**1.00**	**72.70%**
	Family Group - Low	**33.33%**	**96.25%**	**2**	**0**	**0.00**	**23.40%**	**25.21%**	**47.21%**	**0.00**	**6,048**	**100.00%**	**5.81**	**0.23**	**0.00**	**1.50**	**1.00**	**72.70%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)																	
8082	East Ayrshire Council	83.33%	99.62%	12	79	0.06	45.91%	45.91%	61.88%	91.13	64,903	97.57%	5.71	0.11	5.80	3.00	1.00	64.70%
8064	East Lothian Council	77.42%	100.00%	31	66	0.06	45.66%	45.66%	161.11%	21.60	28,188	100.00%	4.03	0.16	2.99	2.50	1.50	No data
8134	Fife Council	68.90%	92.02%	299	374	0.15	52.03%	35.84%	67.20%	91.76	95,830	100.00%	2.69	0.07	4.30	3.00	0.50	No data
8027	Midlothian Council	No data	95.49%	520	294	0.42	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00	No data	No data	0.00	0.00	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	100.00%	95.93%	212	252	0.24	45.62%	45.62%	63.52%	83.89	58,345	99.54%	4.99	0.09	4.19	3.00	1.00	53.70%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	100.00%	94.94%	21	94	0.08	42.70%	42.70%	51.85%	97.45	34,814	88.82%	4.14	0.14	5.33	3.00	1.00	75.00%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	96.27%	96.48%	161	222	0.10	51.29%	51.29%	52.80%	118.63	167,477	100.00%	8.02	0.11	6.90	3.75	1.00	No data
8040	Stirling Council	No data	63.48%	309	116	0.11	44.13%	44.13%	47.02%	96.41	33,544	100.00%	3.58	0.11	0.00	3.00	0.00	51.60%
8109	West Lothian Council	No data	86.10%	283	217	0.21	49.37%	49.37%	80.06%	43.47	44,092	100.00%	5.63	0.14	4.49	0.00	0.00	69.40%
	Family Group - Average	**87.65%**	**91.56%**	**205**	**190**	**0.16**	**47.09%**	**45.07%**	**73.18%**	**80.54**	**65,899**	**98.24%**	**4.31**	**0.12**	**4.25**	**2.36**	**0.67**	**62.88%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**520**	**374**	**0.42**	**52.03%**	**51.29%**	**161.11%**	**118.63**	**167,477**	**100.00%**	**8.02**	**0.16**	**6.90**	**3.75**	**1.50**	**75.00%**
	Family Group - Low	**68.90%**	**63.48%**	**12**	**66**	**0.06**	**42.70%**	**35.84%**	**47.02%**	**21.60**	**28,188**	**88.82%**	**0.00**	**0.07**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**51.60%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)																	
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	No data	100.00%	No data	23	0.08	56.23%	56.23%	64.12%	87.33	3,360	98.33%	3.63	0.32	18.08	3.00	1.00	79.20%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	No data	75.48%	25	66	0.14	56.44%	56.44%	54.40%	84.47	29,225	100.00%	6.23	0.10	4.31	3.00	2.00	74.40%
8071	Falkirk Council	100.00%	94.12%	1	176	0.18	33.32%	14.09%	82.27%	50.30	0	No data	3.25	No data	No data	3.00	1.00	41.70%
8060	Inverclyde Council	95.24%	99.42%	21	19	0.05	49.79%	22.47%	52.65%	44.43	20,984	100.00%	7.97	0.14	3.21	0.00	0.00	69.10%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	No data	98.73%	No data	No data	No data	55.65%	55.65%	80.00%	85.71	8,983	100.00%	5.41	0.52	35.66	3.00	1.00	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**97.62%**	**93.55%**	**16**	**71**	**0.11**	**50.29%**	**40.98%**	**66.69%**	**70.45**	**12,510**	**99.58%**	**5.30**	**0.27**	**15.32**	**2.40**	**1.00**	**66.10%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**25**	**176**	**0.18**	**56.44%**	**56.44%**	**82.27%**	**87.33**	**29,225**	**100.00%**	**7.97**	**0.52**	**35.66**	**3.00**	**2.00**	**79.20%**
	Family Group - Low	**95.24%**	**75.48%**	**1**	**19**	**0.05**	**33.32%**	**14.09%**	**52.65%**	**44.43**	**0**	**98.33%**	**3.25**	**0.10**	**3.21**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**41.70%**
	Family Group 5 (City)																	
8073	Aberdeen City Council	92.86%	No data	14	122	0.12	43.86%	26.47%	65.38%	70.20	41,769	100.00%	13.09	0.33	16.15	3.00	1.00	55.30%
8159	Dundee City Council	No data	100.00%	178	62	0.10	52.70%	52.70%	48.58%	47.64	25,226	99.63%	7.51	0.18	2.12	3.00	1.00	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00	No data	No data	0.00	0.00	No data
8016	Glasgow City Council	89.02%	No data	173	2,896	1.50	44.59%	44.59%	50.98%	105.19	49,925	94.95%	2.92	0.11	6.03	5.00	1.00	No data
	Family Group - Average	**90.94%**	**100.00%**	**122**	**1,027**	**0.57**	**47.05%**	**41.25%**	**54.98%**	**74.34**	**38,973**	**98.19%**	**5.88**	**0.21**	**8.10**	**2.75**	**0.75**	**55.30%**
	Family Group - High	**92.86%**	**100.00%**	**178**	**2,896**	**1.50**	**52.70%**	**52.70%**	**65.38%**	**105.19**	**49,925**	**100.00%**	**13.09**	**0.33**	**16.15**	**5.00**	**1.00**	**55.30%**
	Family Group - Low	**89.02%**	**100.00%**	**14**	**62**	**0.10**	**43.86%**	**26.47%**	**48.58%**	**47.64**	**25,226**	**94.95%**	**0.00**	**0.11**	**2.12**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**55.30%**
	Scotland - Average	**84.75%**	**94.15%**	**115**	**283**	**0.16**	**43.25%**	**40.47%**	**64.45%**	**74.19**	**57,170**	**98.75%**	**5.40**	**0.39**	**11.58**	**2.47**	**0.83**	**63.38%**
	Scotland - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**520**	**2,896**	**1.50**	**56.44%**	**57.41%**	**161.11%**	**123.85**	**230,597**	**100.00%**	**13.09**	**3.47**	**129.22**	**5.00**	**2.00**	**79.20%**
	Scotland - Low	**33.33%**	**63.48%**	**1**	**0**	**0.00**	**23.40%**	**12.34%**	**47.02%**	**0.00**	**0**	**88.82%**	**0.00**	**0.07**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**41.70%**

Condition/Asset Preservation

PIN	Name of Authority	2.1.01 PI 40 % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	2.1.02 PI 41a % of carriageway length treated	2.3.01 PI S04 % of carriageway area – surface dressed	2.3.02 PI S05 % of carriageway area – thin/micro surface (up to 25mm)	2.3.03 PI S06 % of carriageway area – thin overlay (>25mm and less than 60mm)	2.3.04 PI S07 % of carriageway area – moderate overlay (60mm – 100mm)	2.3.05 PI S08 % of carriageway area – structural overlay (>100mm)	2.3.06 PI S09 % of carriageway area – thin inlay (less than 60mm)	2.3.07 PI S10 % of carriageway area – moderate inlay (60mm – 100mm)	2.3.08 PI S11 % of carriageway area – structural inlay (>100mm)	2.3.14 PI S72 % of carriageway area – planned patching	2.3.09 PI S12 % of carriageway area – fully reconstructed	2.3.10 PI S13 % of "A" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	2.3.11 PI S14 % of "B" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	2.3.12 PI S15 % of "C" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	2.3.13 PI S16 % of "U" Class roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	2.4.01 PI 209a Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads	2.4.02 PI 209b Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
	PI / Stat	PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	PI	PI
	Ideal Position	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	⇕	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↓
	Family Group 1 (Rural)																		
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	22.23%	4.32%	3.31%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.04%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	21.63%	17.39%	17.86%	26.67%	No data	No data
8001	Angus Council	32.28%	2.23%	1.41%	0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.07%	0.01%	0.12%	0.07%	29.94%	38.29%	28.89%	32.97%	16.70%	75.00%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	49.80%	No data	1.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	37.40%	56.50%	52.50%	51.10%	No data	No data
8145	Scottish Borders Council	41.20%	1.79%	1.27%	0.00%	0.17%	0.05%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	0.01%	36.89%	38.32%	36.04%	47.77%	No data	No data
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	49.30%	3.09%	1.91%	0.02%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.06%	0.10%	0.00%	35.59%	38.71%	48.33%	58.18%	5.00%	91.60%
8086	Highland Council	38.60%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	26.25%	34.26%	39.31%	40.66%	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council	25.90%	4.78%	3.26%	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	0.01%	0.11%	0.05%	0.03%	0.00%	0.12%	26.78%	20.97%	22.72%	29.31%	7.80%	88.30%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	31.60%	3.69%	1.70%	0.00%	0.04%	0.15%	0.04%	0.54%	0.33%	0.04%	0.37%	0.00%	36.30%	32.30%	30.90%	31.90%	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**36.36%**	**3.32%**	**2.07%**	**0.00%**	**0.15%**	**0.03%**	**0.01%**	**0.18%**	**0.07%**	**0.02%**	**0.10%**	**0.04%**	**31.35%**	**34.59%**	**34.57%**	**39.82%**	**9.83%**	**84.97%**
	Family Group - High	**49.80%**	**4.78%**	**3.31%**	**0.02%**	**0.40%**	**0.15%**	**0.04%**	**0.54%**	**0.33%**	**0.06%**	**0.37%**	**0.12%**	**37.40%**	**56.50%**	**52.50%**	**58.18%**	**16.70%**	**91.60%**
	Family Group - Low	**22.23%**	**1.79%**	**1.27%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**21.63%**	**17.39%**	**17.86%**	**26.67%**	**5.00%**	**75.00%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)																		
8081	Orkney Islands Council	21.70%	1.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.03%	0.00%	0.02%	0.02%	28.98%	20.78%	16.61%	21.23%	54.10%	32.40%
8037	Shetland Islands Council	30.60%	7.15%	5.59%	0.02%	0.00%	0.43%	0.00%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	13.70%	27.00%	29.70%	40.50%	No data	No data
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	38.50%	3.14%	3.28%	0.00%	0.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	30.31%	35.58%	43.09%	43.52%	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**30.80%**	**3.85%**	**2.96%**	**0.01%**	**0.04%**	**0.14%**	**0.00%**	**0.04%**	**0.01%**	**0.00%**	**0.02%**	**0.02%**	**24.33%**	**27.79%**	**29.80%**	**35.08%**	**54.10%**	**32.40%**
	Family Group - High	**38.50%**	**7.15%**	**5.59%**	**0.02%**	**0.11%**	**0.43%**	**0.00%**	**0.08%**	**0.03%**	**0.00%**	**0.04%**	**0.05%**	**30.31%**	**35.58%**	**43.09%**	**43.52%**	**54.10%**	**32.40%**
	Family Group - Low	**21.70%**	**1.25%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.01%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**13.70%**	**20.78%**	**16.61%**	**21.23%**	**54.10%**	**32.40%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)																		
8082	East Ayrshire Council	33.00%	1.77%	0.00%	0.00%	1.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	17.60%	26.10%	31.00%	39.00%	5.90%	88.20%
8064	East Lothian Council	33.20%	2.62%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	28.07%	34.82%	29.40%	33.62%	No data	No data
8134	Fife Council	31.60%	2.69%	0.17%	0.32%	0.02%	0.48%	0.00%	0.27%	0.79%	0.22%	0.69%	0.12%	28.40%	32.70%	27.50%	33.20%	No data	No data
8027	Midlothian Council	39.00%	2.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	32.50%	4.69%	0.89%	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.32%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.92%	27.41%	38.50%	32.36%	15.50%	79.70%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	35.50%	2.48%	0.00%	0.00%	1.38%	0.05%	0.00%	0.09%	1.42%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	21.70%	31.00%	38.10%	38.50%	11.50%	84.60%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	31.90%	2.49%	1.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%	0.00%	24.90%	27.80%	36.50%	32.60%	No data	No data
8040	Stirling Council	40.10%	1.37%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.77%	0.00%	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	31.58%	38.48%	37.48%	46.90%	14.70%	76.50%
8109	West Lothian Council	31.10%	1.32%	0.81%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.08%	0.13%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	28.70%	28.00%	43.10%	30.10%	14.00%	81.60%
	Family Group - Average	**33.50%**	**2.39%**	**0.36%**	**0.04%**	**0.38%**	**0.16%**	**0.00%**	**0.26%**	**0.87%**	**0.03%**	**0.13%**	**0.02%**	**26.23%**	**30.79%**	**35.20%**	**35.79%**	**12.32%**	**82.12%**
	Family Group - High	**40.10%**	**4.69%**	**1.03%**	**0.32%**	**1.38%**	**0.77%**	**0.00%**	**1.07%**	**4.32%**	**0.22%**	**0.69%**	**0.12%**	**31.58%**	**38.48%**	**43.10%**	**46.90%**	**15.50%**	**88.20%**
	Family Group - Low	**31.10%**	**1.32%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**17.60%**	**26.10%**	**27.50%**	**30.10%**	**5.90%**	**76.50%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)																		
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	33.20%	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.86%	0.06%	0.06%	0.00%	27.89%	23.67%	25.03%	37.86%	38.50%	50.00%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	36.00%	3.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	0.02%	3.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.63%	23.12%	27.86%	24.86%	12.80%	83.00%
8071	Falkirk Council	32.73%	1.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.76%	0.17%	0.08%	0.10%	0.00%	30.84%	30.00%	28.14%	34.31%	12.00%	84.00%
8060	Inverclyde Council	33.20%	1.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	1.88%	0.23%	0.00%	0.04%	0.01%	17.42%	28.13%	41.46%	33.32%	9.10%	87.50%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	28.10%	2.39%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.84%	20.72%	27.63%	30.98%	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**32.04%**	**1.98%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.03%**	**0.05%**	**0.00%**	**0.53%**	**1.23%**	**0.03%**	**0.04%**	**0.00%**	**22.32%**	**25.13%**	**30.02%**	**32.27%**	**18.10%**	**76.13%**
	Family Group - High	**36.00%**	**3.20%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.12%**	**0.24%**	**0.00%**	**1.88%**	**3.00%**	**0.08%**	**0.10%**	**0.01%**	**30.84%**	**30.00%**	**41.46%**	**37.86%**	**38.50%**	**87.50%**
	Family Group - Low	**28.10%**	**0.87%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.17%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**14.84%**	**20.72%**	**25.03%**	**24.86%**	**9.10%**	**50.00%**
	Family Group 5 (City)																		
8073	Aberdeen City Council	27.00%	2.68%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.97%	28.51%	20.86%	29.50%	16.70%	81.00%
8159	Dundee City Council	27.90%	2.08%	0.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.90%	32.60%	18.90%	30.00%	No data	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	34.30%	3.16%	0.30%	0.63%	0.00%	0.00%	1.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.91%	25.36%	26.04%	36.10%	No data	No data
8016	Glasgow City Council	29.20%	3.93%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.92%	0.79%	0.07%	0.05%	0.00%	30.60%	22.20%	23.20%	30.20%	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**30.10%**	**2.96%**	**0.21%**	**0.17%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.30%**	**1.42%**	**0.20%**	**0.02%**	**0.01%**	**0.00%**	**26.10%**	**27.17%**	**22.25%**	**31.45%**	**16.70%**	**81.00%**
	Family Group - High	**34.30%**	**3.93%**	**0.52%**	**0.63%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**1.21%**	**2.54%**	**0.79%**	**0.07%**	**0.05%**	**0.00%**	**30.60%**	**32.60%**	**26.04%**	**36.10%**	**16.70%**	**81.00%**
	Family Group - Low	**27.00%**	**2.08%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**18.97%**	**22.20%**	**18.90%**	**29.50%**	**16.70%**	**81.00%**
	Scotland - Average	**32.56%**	**2.77%**	**1.00%**	**0.04%**	**0.16%**	**0.08%**	**0.05%**	**0.44%**	**0.53%**	**0.02%**	**0.08%**	**0.02%**	**26.77%**	**30.03%**	**31.67%**	**35.62%**	**16.74%**	**77.39%**
	Scotland - High	**49.80%**	**7.15%**	**5.59%**	**0.63%**	**1.38%**	**0.77%**	**1.21%**	**2.54%**	**4.32%**	**0.22%**	**0.69%**	**0.12%**	**37.40%**	**56.50%**	**52.50%**	**58.18%**	**54.10%**	**91.60%**
	Scotland - Low	**21.70%**	**0.87%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**13.70%**	**17.39%**	**16.61%**	**21.23%**	**5.00%**	**32.40%**

Financial

PIN	Name of Authority	6.1.01 PI S78 Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length	6.1.02 PI 57a Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment	6.1.03 PI S58 Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)	6.1.04 PI S76 Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by square metres of carriageway area treated	6.3.01 PI S17 Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length	6.3.02 PI S18 Total cost of reactive maintenance	6.3.03 PI S19 Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims	6.3.04 PI S20 Expenditure per km of planned maintenance	6.3.05 PI S21 Expenditure per km of reactive maintenance	6.3.06 PI S22 Expenditure per km of routine maintenance	6.3.08 PI S23 % of budget spent on planned maintenance	6.3.09 PI S24 % of budget spent on reactive maintenance	6.3.10 PI S25 % of budget spent on routine maintenance
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	H	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
	PI / Stat	Stat	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat
	Ideal Position	⇕	↓	⇕	⇕	⇕	↓	↓	⇕	⇕	⇕	↑	↓	⇕
	Family Group 1 (Rural)													
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	£3,869	£19.31	£3,386	£18.78	£20,627	£6,090,077	£128,333	£2,030	£1,087	£269.00	59.94%	32.10%	7.96%
8001	Angus Council	£5,272	No data	£4,395	£48.44	£37,385	£3,637,738	£1,501	£1,754	£1,996	£645.00	39.91%	45.41%	14.68%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	£6,971	£14.37	£6,670	£85.06	£49,094	£4,722,224	No data	£4,347	£2,065	£258.00	65.17%	30.96%	3.87%
8145	Scottish Borders Council	£3,713	£11.48	£3,435	£38.83	£41,165	£3,642,845	£22,823	£1,981	£1,217	£238.00	57.65%	35.43%	6.92%
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	£5,221	£13.53	£2,743	£35.00	£60,497	£1,304,215	£184,311	£2,148	£311	£283.00	78.32%	11.35%	10.33%
8086	Highland Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	£34,431	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council	£6,442	£28.05	£4,875	£29.49	£29,725	£1,664,603	£563	£3,619	£1,065	£191.00	74.23%	21.84%	3.92%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	£5,639	£18.73	£5,240	£29.08	£35,633	£547,041	£3,906	£4,961	£220	£59.00	94.67%	4.19%	1.13%
	Family Group - Average	**£5,304**	**£17.58**	**£4,392**	**£40.67**	**£38,570**	**£3,086,963**	**£56,906**	**£2,977**	**£1,137**	**£277.57**	**67.84%**	**25.52%**	**6.64%**
	Family Group - High	**£6,971**	**£28.05**	**£6,670**	**£85.06**	**£60,497**	**£6,090,077**	**£184,311**	**£4,961**	**£2,065**	**£645.00**	**94.67%**	**45.41%**	**14.68%**
	Family Group - Low	**£3,713**	**£11.48**	**£2,743**	**£18.78**	**£20,627**	**£547,041**	**£563**	**£1,754**	**£220**	**£59.00**	**39.91%**	**4.19%**	**1.13%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)													
8081	Orkney Islands Council	£1,887	No data	£1,154	£335.88	£19,297	£527,660	£0	£457	£535	£161.00	39.64%	46.38%	13.98%
8037	Shetland Islands Council	£3,787	£198.42	£3,018	£13.19	£32,254	£45,252	£0	£2,781	£43	£194.00	92.13%	1.43%	6.43%
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	£1,970	£117.38	£1,737	£12.46	£36,232	£463,881	No data	£1,242	£389	£107.00	71.48%	22.39%	6.13%
	Family Group - Average	**£2,548**	**£157.90**	**£1,970**	**£120.51**	**£29,261**	**£345,598**	**£0**	**£1,493**	**£322**	**£154.00**	**76.08%**	**16.24%**	**7.68%**
	Family Group - High	**£3,787**	**£198.42**	**£3,018**	**£335.88**	**£36,232**	**£527,660**	**£0**	**£2,781**	**£535**	**£194.00**	**92.13%**	**46.38%**	**13.98%**
	Family Group - Low	**£1,887**	**£117.38**	**£1,154**	**£12.46**	**£19,297**	**£45,252**	**£0**	**£457**	**£43**	**£107.00**	**39.64%**	**1.43%**	**6.13%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)													
8082	East Ayrshire Council	£5,483	£7.83	£4,292	£53.94	£43,191	£1,689,223	£43,661	£2,616	£1,375	£301.00	60.96%	32.04%	7.00%
8064	East Lothian Council	£3,744	£64.30	£3,744	£24.11	No data	£257,218	£2,596	£3,330	£225	£189.00	88.94%	6.01%	5.05%
8134	Fife Council	£8,550	£12.09	£8,290	£43.79	£40,313	£1,223,666	£5,871	£6,612	£492	£1,186.00	79.76%	5.93%	14.31%
8027	Midlothian Council	No data	No data	No data	£0.00	No data	No data	£75,465	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	£9,039	£6.36	£7,628	£30.16	£36,689	£1,222,465	£25,245	£6,098	£1,163	£367.00	79.95%	15.25%	4.81%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	£6,193	£9.78	£5,141	£40.90	£42,766	£1,183,379	£23,284	£3,806	£1,000	£334.00	74.04%	19.46%	6.51%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	£7,315	£11.29	£6,362	£54.14	£45,903	£3,741,273	£875	£3,153	£1,613	£1,597.00	49.55%	25.35%	25.10%
8040	Stirling Council	£6,023	£8.99	£5,074	£84.46	£55,563	£2,019,000	£400	£4,369	£1,966	No data	86.12%	38.74%	No data
8109	West Lothian Council	£7,645	£32.46	£6,913	£100.45	£35,937	£1,502,890	£23,336	£5,143	£1,421	£349.00	74.39%	20.56%	5.05%
	Family Group - Average	**£6,749**	**£19.14**	**£5,931**	**£47.99**	**£42,909**	**£1,604,889**	**£22,304**	**£4,391**	**£1,157**	**£617.57**	**70.86%**	**17.62%**	**11.52%**
	Family Group - High	**£9,039**	**£64.30**	**£8,290**	**£100.45**	**£55,563**	**£3,741,273**	**£75,465**	**£6,612**	**£1,966**	**£1,597.00**	**88.94%**	**38.74%**	**25.10%**
	Family Group - Low	**£3,744**	**£6.36**	**£3,744**	**£0.00**	**£35,937**	**£257,218**	**£400**	**£2,616**	**£225**	**£189.00**	**49.55%**	**5.93%**	**4.81%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)													
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	£7,955	£62.82	£6,151	£118.19	£50,909	£393,000	£1,068	£4,732	£1,315	£104.00	76.93%	21.38%	1.69%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	£11,963	£14.51	£8,279	£52.90	No data	£693,272	£300	£6,447	£1,419	£480.00	77.87%	17.14%	5.79%
8071	Falkirk Council	£5,088	No data	£3,412	£55.82	£47,975	£574,528	£4,628	£2,162	£578	£672.00	63.37%	16.95%	19.68%
8060	Inverclyde Council	£9,093	£25.48	£6,630	£61.65	£39,973	£386,949	£4,154	£5,226	£1,029	£374.00	78.83%	15.53%	5.64%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	£1,611	No data	No data	£12.07	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**£7,142**	**£34.27**	**£6,118**	**£60.13**	**£46,286**	**£511,937**	**£2,538**	**£4,642**	**£1,085**	**£407.50**	**73.54%**	**17.36%**	**9.10%**
	Family Group - High	**£11,963**	**£62.82**	**£8,279**	**£118.19**	**£50,909**	**£693,272**	**£4,628**	**£6,447**	**£1,419**	**£672.00**	**78.83%**	**21.38%**	**19.68%**
	Family Group - Low	**£1,611**	**£14.51**	**£3,412**	**£12.07**	**£39,973**	**£386,949**	**£300**	**£2,162**	**£578**	**£104.00**	**63.37%**	**15.53%**	**1.69%**
	Family Group 5 (City)													
8073	Aberdeen City Council	£1,687	£28.84	£1,679	£9.97	£45,972	No data	£8,760	£1,679	No data	No data	100.00%	No data	No data
8159	Dundee City Council	£6,618	£34.61	£4,712	£57.30	£47	£656,456	£94	£4,712	£1,068	£368.00	100.00%	22.66%	7.81%
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	£15,928	No data	£11,560	£97.34	£56,730	£2,562,784	No data	£9,821	£1,696	£42.00	84.96%	14.67%	0.37%
8016	Glasgow City Council	£10,244	£12.20	£8,938	£42.72	£54,086	£1,840,674	£173,214	£71	£956	£1,090.00	0.79%	10.70%	12.20%
	Family Group - Average	**£8,619**	**£25.22**	**£6,722**	**£51.83**	**£39,209**	**£1,686,638**	**£60,689**	**£4,071**	**£1,240**	**£500.00**	**72.49%**	**18.69%**	**8.82%**
	Family Group - High	**£15,928**	**£34.61**	**£11,560**	**£97.34**	**£56,730**	**£2,562,784**	**£173,214**	**£9,821**	**£1,696**	**£1,090.00**	**100.00%**	**22.66%**	**12.20%**
	Family Group - Low	**£1,687**	**£12.20**	**£1,679**	**£9.97**	**£47**	**£656,456**	**£94**	**£71**	**£956**	**£42.00**	**0.79%**	**10.70%**	**0.37%**
	Scotland - Average	**£6,257**	**£34.22**	**£5,210**	**£56.65**	**£39,696**	**£1,703,693**	**£30,600**	**£3,665**	**£1,050**	**£410.75**	**72.16%**	**19.08%**	**8.75%**
	Scotland - High	**£15,928**	**£198.42**	**£11,560**	**£335.88**	**£60,497**	**£6,090,077**	**£184,311**	**£9,821**	**£2,065**	**£1,597.00**	**100.00%**	**46.38%**	**25.10%**
	Scotland - Low	**£1,611**	**£6.36**	**£1,154**	**£0.00**	**£47**	**£45,252**	**£0**	**£71**	**£43**	**£42.00**	**0.79%**	**1.43%**	**0.37%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Footways Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	Safety	% of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times	% of safety inspections completed on time	Total number of emergency (Cat 1) defects	Total number of 3rd party claims	Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway	% of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment	% of footway network deemed top priority (Winter Maintenance operations)	Tonnes of salt used	Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment	Number of grit bins per Km of footway network	Condition/Asset Preservation	% of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment	% of footway length treated	% of footway area – surface treated	% of footway area – resurfaced	% of footway area – planned patching	% of footway area – reconstructed	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with pavements/footpaths	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with pavements/footpaths	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with cycle facilities	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with cycle facilities	Financial	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length	Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding CEC)	Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment	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
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)		H	M	L	H	H	L	L	L	L	H		L	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
	PI / Stat		PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat		PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	PI	PI	PI	PI		PI	PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat
	Ideal Position		↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	⇳	↓	⇳	⇳		↓	⇳	⇳	⇳	⇳	⇳	↑	↓	↑	↓		⇳	⇳	↓	⇳	⇳	↓	↓	⇳	⇳	⇳	↑	↓	⇳
			11.1.01 PI 45a	11.2.01 PI 46a	11.3.01 PI S26	11.3.02 PI S52	11.3.03 PI S59	11.4.01 PI 113	11.4.02 PI S27	11.4.03 PI S28	11.4.04 PI S73	11.4.05 PI S74		12.1.01 PI 47	12.1.02 PI 48a	12.2.01 PI S29	12.2.02 PI S30	12.2.04 PI S75	12.2.03 PI S31	12.3.01 PI 210a	12.3.02 PI 210b	12.3.03 PI 210c	12.3.04 PI 210d		16.1.01 PI 49a	16.1.01 PI 49d	16.1.02 PI 58	16.1.03 PI S60	16.1.04 PI S77	16.3.01 PI S32	16.3.02 PI S33	16.3.03 PI S34	16.3.04 PI S35	16.3.05 PI S36	16.3.07 PI S37	16.3.08 PI S38	16.3.09 PI S39
	Family Group 1 (Rural)																																					
8000	Aberdeenshire Council		No data	No data	4	6	0.00	0.00%	6.62%	1,484.19	0	1.37		20.50%	0.40%	0.03%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£391	£391	No data	£369	£53.10	£184,446	£9,196	£246.70	£122.15	£0.00	66.88%	33.12%	0.00%
8001	Angus Council		100.00%	100.00%	1	0	0.00	11.06%	11.06%	280.43	299	0.48		No data	0.17%	0.04%	0.14%	0.02%	0.00%	72.70%	18.20%	25.00%	37.50%		£750	£750	No data	£443	£204.38	£0	£0	£325.45	No data	£117.15	73.53%	No data	26.47%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	0.00		No data	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£2,131	£2,047	No data	£1,938	No data	£7,541	No data	£1,923.48	£14.73	No data	99.24%	0.76%	No data
8145	Scottish Borders Council		No data	100.00%	No data	10	0.01	No data	No data	576.05	0	1.91		No data	0.48%	0.00%	0.31%	0.00%	0.25%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£1,656	£1,656	No data	£1,209	£182.96	£236,982	£0	£858.59	£350.46	£0.00	71.01%	28.99%	0.00%
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council		No data	No data	No data	22	0.02	No data	No data	65.50	0	0.96		No data	0.12%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%	33.50%	47.40%	31.40%	30.70%		£92	£92	No data	£92	£36.79	£36,465	£41,440	£64.37	£27.56	No data	70.02%	29.98%	No data
8086	Highland Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00		No data	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council		100.00%	No data	2	5	0.01	0.00%	20.02%	58.00	0	1.51		No data	0.71%	0.62%	0.09%	0.00%	0.01%	39.30%	47.20%	36.30%	28.00%		£1,204	£1,204	No data	£1,204	£83.90	£41,919	£0	£1,135.43	£68.30	£0.00	94.33%	5.67%	0.00%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council		No data	100.00%	1	10	0.01	No data	No data	No data	0	1.37		1.25%	0.59%	0.16%	0.28%	0.00%	0.27%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£1,662	£1,662	No data	£1,361	£128.62	£0	£0	£1,360.59	No data	No data	100.00%	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**2**	**9**	**0.01**	**2.77%**	**9.43%**	**492.83**	**50**	**0.95**		**10.88%**	**0.41%**	**0.11%**	**0.12%**	**0.00%**	**0.07%**	**48.50%**	**37.60%**	**30.90%**	**32.07%**		**£1,126**	**£1,114**	**£0**	**£945**	**£114.96**	**£63,419**	**£8,439**	**£844.94**	**£116.64**	**£29.29**	**82.14%**	**19.70%**	**6.62%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**4**	**22**	**0.02**	**11.06%**	**20.02%**	**1,484.19**	**299**	**1.91**		**20.50%**	**0.71%**	**0.62%**	**0.31%**	**0.02%**	**0.27%**	**72.70%**	**47.40%**	**36.30%**	**37.50%**		**£2,131**	**£2,047**	**£0**	**£1,938**	**£204.38**	**£236,982**	**£41,440**	**£1,923.48**	**£350.46**	**£117.15**	**100.00%**	**33.12%**	**26.47%**
	Family Group - Low		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**1**	**0**	**0.00**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**58.00**	**0**	**0.00**		**1.25%**	**0.12%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**33.50%**	**18.20%**	**25.00%**	**28.00%**		**£92**	**£92**	**£0**	**£92**	**£36.79**	**£0**	**£0**	**£64.37**	**£14.73**	**£0.00**	**66.88%**	**0.76%**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)																																					
8081	Orkney Islands Council		No data	89.39%	No data	0	0.00	25.14%	18.07%	No data	0	3.77		21.80%	0.93%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	0.00%	71.90%	15.60%	36.00%	24.00%		£1,098	£980	No data	£788	£81.35	£0	£0	£787.56	No data	No data	100.00%	No data	No data
8037	Shetland Islands Council		No data	No data	No data	2	0.02	0.00%	45.95%	83.92	0	3.22		No data	1.58%	1.58%	0.20%	0.02%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£414	£333	No data	£971	£17.37	£33,826	£0	£535.41	£267.99	£167.75	55.13%	27.60%	17.27%
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar		100.00%	100.00%	1	0	0.00	7.91%	3.46%	30.00	288	1.18		5.10%	0.15%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£261	£228	£36	£192	£117.30	£5,368	No data	£165.06	£26.55	£0.00	86.14%	13.86%	0.00%
	Family Group - Average		**100.00%**	**94.70%**	**1**	**1**	**0.01**	**11.02%**	**22.49%**	**56.96**	**96**	**2.72**		**13.45%**	**0.89%**	**0.53%**	**0.37%**	**0.01%**	**0.00%**	**71.90%**	**15.60%**	**36.00%**	**24.00%**		**£591**	**£514**	**£36**	**£650**	**£72.01**	**£13,065**	**£0**	**£496.01**	**£147.27**	**£83.88**	**80.42%**	**20.73%**	**8.64%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**1**	**2**	**0.02**	**25.14%**	**45.95%**	**83.92**	**288**	**3.77**		**21.80%**	**1.58%**	**1.58%**	**0.75%**	**0.02%**	**0.00%**	**71.90%**	**15.60%**	**36.00%**	**24.00%**		**£1,098**	**£980**	**£36**	**£971**	**£117.30**	**£33,826**	**£0**	**£787.56**	**£267.99**	**£167.75**	**100.00%**	**27.60%**	**17.27%**
	Family Group - Low		**100.00%**	**89.39%**	**1**	**0**	**0.00**	**0.00%**	**3.46%**	**30.00**	**0**	**1.18**		**5.10%**	**0.15%**	**0.00%**	**0.16%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**71.90%**	**15.60%**	**36.00%**	**24.00%**		**£261**	**£228**	**£36**	**£192**	**£17.37**	**£0**	**£0**	**£165.06**	**£26.55**	**£0.00**	**55.13%**	**13.86%**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)																																					
8082	East Ayrshire Council		83.33%	98.61%	6	13	0.01	14.28%	14.28%	41.18	955	0.58		17.50%	0.22%	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	17.70%	70.60%	9.10%	54.60%		£477	£453	£79	£369	£111.46	£154,385	£12,048	£157.10	£150.02	£61.71	42.59%	40.68%	16.73%
8064	East Lothian Council		100.00%	100.00%	4	16	0.02	3.26%	1.19%	240.00	0	1.22		No data	0.78%	0.46%	0.11%	0.00%	0.20%	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0.00	£0	£1,000	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8134	Fife Council		78.95%	91.73%	19	16	0.01	43.08%	43.08%	335.00	0	1.12		No data	0.54%	0.01%	0.07%	0.01%	0.34%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£1,200	£1,200	No data	£1,259	£131.26	£0	£2,813	£863.34	No data	£226.27	68.57%	No data	17.97%
8027	Midlothian Council		No data	95.83%	22	4	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£8,615	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council		100.00%	100.00%	30	19	0.02	6.14%	6.14%	223.64	1297	0.50		11.76%	0.51%	0.00%	0.33%	0.00%	0.60%	35.00%	51.30%	33.20%	30.40%		£1,565	£1,562	£14	£1,475	£89.35	£77,597	£50,723	£1,263.20	£75.52	£136.16	85.65%	5.12%	9.23%
8042	South Ayrshire Council		100.00%	88.33%	3	17	0.02	1.02%	1.02%	4.36	36	0.31		15.00%	0.21%	0.00%	0.29%	0.00%	0.00%	23.10%	65.40%	33.30%	25.00%		£601	£578	£63	£544	£102.03	£250,381	£102,514	£225.59	£282.14	£36.47	41.45%	51.84%	6.70%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council		100.00%	99.34%	15	38	0.02	3.43%	3.43%	845.00	305	1.34		24.10%	0.31%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£1,369	£1,341	No data	£1,191	£217.98	£527,059	£18,299	£635.11	£216.99	£339.08	53.32%	18.22%	28.47%
8040	Stirling Council		30.30%	66.67%	33	21	0.03	19.53%	16.33%	153.00	347	0.89		19.04%	No data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.30%	51.50%	32.10%	35.70%		£445	£445	No data	£445	No data	£42,000	£0	£376.84	£68.52	No data	84.62%	15.38%	No data
8109	West Lothian Council		No data	56.94%	No data	14	0.01	16.91%	16.91%	484.00	3760	1.84		4.15%	0.17%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.00%	41.90%	46.70%	43.70%	17.10%		£613	£581	£119	£550	£133.17	£10,709	£350	£542.53	£7.71	No data	98.60%	1.40%	No data
	Family Group - Average		**84.65%**	**88.61%**	**17**	**18**	**0.02**	**13.46%**	**12.80%**	**290.77**	**838**	**0.87**		**15.26%**	**0.39%**	**0.06%**	**0.19%**	**0.00%**	**0.14%**	**29.60%**	**57.10%**	**30.28%**	**32.56%**		**£896**	**£880**	**£69**	**£833**	**£112.18**	**£118,015**	**£21,818**	**£580.53**	**£133.48**	**£159.94**	**67.83%**	**22.11%**	**15.82%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**33**	**38**	**0.03**	**43.08%**	**43.08%**	**845.00**	**3760**	**1.84**		**24.10%**	**0.78%**	**0.46%**	**0.33%**	**0.01%**	**0.60%**	**41.90%**	**70.60%**	**43.70%**	**54.60%**		**£1,565**	**£1,562**	**£119**	**£1,475**	**£217.98**	**£527,059**	**£102,514**	**£1,263.20**	**£282.14**	**£339.08**	**98.60%**	**51.84%**	**28.47%**
	Family Group - Low		**30.30%**	**56.94%**	**3**	**4**	**0.01**	**1.02%**	**1.02%**	**4.36**	**0**	**0.00**		**4.15%**	**0.17%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**17.70%**	**46.70%**	**9.10%**	**17.10%**		**£445**	**£445**	**£14**	**£369**	**£0.00**	**£0**	**£0**	**£157.10**	**£7.71**	**£36.47**	**41.45%**	**1.40%**	**6.70%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)																																					
8087	Clackmannanshire Council		60.00%	100.00%	5	0	0.00	17.77%	17.77%	162.00	130	0.76		31.30%	No data	0.00%	0.82%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	46.20%	50.00%	18.20%		£1,391	£1,391	£562	£948	£90.74	£4,281	No data	£782.81	£9.75	£155.23	82.59%	1.03%	16.38%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council		100.00%	No data	5	8	0.01	0.00%	8.58%	37.20	0	0.48		No data	0.78%	0.00%	0.99%	0.00%	0.80%	39.60%	47.90%	27.00%	32.40%		£392	£341	No data	No data	£10.88	£0	£0	No data	No data	£0.00	No data	No data	0.00%
8071	Falkirk Council		No data	97.22%	No data	26	0.03	10.28%	10.28%	674.00	1692	1.22		No data	No data	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	52.00%	36.00%	40.00%	30.00%		£397	£397	£196	£275	£487.32	£234,452	£0	£47.34	£227.84	£0.00	17.20%	82.80%	0.00%
8060	Inverclyde Council		83.33%	91.67%	6	7	0.01	12.12%	4.23%	1.00	258	1.02		20.00%	0.69%	0.00%	0.61%	0.04%	0.43%	30.70%	53.40%	35.50%	21.00%		No data	No data	£12	£7,905	£350.36	£7,462	£51,491	£7,890.28	£15.21	£0.00	99.81%	0.19%	0.00%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council		No data	100.00%	No data	No data	No data	0.44%	14.11%	380.00	1	0.48		No data	0.67%	0.00%	0.59%	0.00%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£421	£318	No data	No data	£31.64	£0	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average		**81.11%**	**97.22%**	**5**	**10**	**0.01**	**8.12%**	**10.99%**	**250.84**	**416**	**0.79**		**25.65%**	**0.71%**	**0.00%**	**0.61%**	**0.01%**	**0.25%**	**43.08%**	**45.88%**	**38.13%**	**25.40%**		**£650**	**£612**	**£256**	**£3,043**	**£194.19**	**£49,239**	**£17,164**	**£2,906.81**	**£84.27**	**£38.81**	**66.53%**	**28.01%**	**4.10%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**6**	**26**	**0.03**	**17.77%**	**17.77%**	**674.00**	**1692**	**1.22**		**31.30%**	**0.78%**	**0.00%**	**0.99%**	**0.04%**	**0.80%**	**52.00%**	**53.40%**	**50.00%**	**32.40%**		**£1,391**	**£1,391**	**£562**	**£7,905**	**£487.32**	**£234,452**	**£51,491**	**£7,890.28**	**£227.84**	**£155.23**	**99.81%**	**82.80%**	**16.38%**
	Family Group - Low		**60.00%**	**91.67%**	**5**	**0**	**0.00**	**0.00%**	**4.23%**	**1.00**	**0**	**0.48**		**20.00%**	**0.67%**	**0.00%**	**0.05%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**30.70%**	**36.00%**	**27.00%**	**18.20%**		**£392**	**£318**	**£12**	**£275**	**£10.88**	**£0**	**£0**	**£47.34**	**£9.75**	**£0.00**	**17.20%**	**0.19%**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 5 (City)																																					
8073	Aberdeen City Council		100.00%	96.87%	1	32	0.02	0.21%	0.21%	No data	68	0.47		10.00%	0.21%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	15.60%	73.30%	27.60%	41.40%		£341	£341	No data	£254	£63.17	£0	£278	£253.75	No data	No data	100.00%	No data	No data
8159	Dundee City Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00%	3.11%	111.12	0	0.13		10.00%	0.09%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0.00	£139,727	£0	£90.77	£19.96	£0.00	No data	No data	0.00%
8015	City of Edinburgh Council		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.00		40.00%	0.92%	0.72%	0.02%	0.02%	0.18%	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	£3,979	£259.14	£1,067,827	No data	£3,463.18	£503.47	£12.56	87.03%	12.65%	0.32%
8016	Glasgow City Council		100.00%	No data	3	172	0.06	11.49%	11.49%	1,750.00	9334	0.55		13.10%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%	No data	No data	No data	No data		£402	£400	£21	£381	£530.46	£343,611	£173,148	£239.08	£109.99	£12.80	62.78%	28.88%	3.36%
	Family Group - Average		**100.00%**	**96.87%**	**2**	**102**	**0.04**	**3.90%**	**4.94%**	**930.56**	**3134**	**0.29**		**18.28%**	**0.31%**	**0.25%**	**0.09%**	**0.01%**	**0.36%**	**15.60%**	**73.30%**	**27.60%**	**41.40%**		**£371**	**£370**	**£21**	**£1,538**	**£213.19**	**£387,791**	**£57,809**	**£1,011.70**	**£211.14**	**£8.45**	**83.27%**	**20.77%**	**1.23%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**96.87%**	**3**	**172**	**0.06**	**11.49%**	**11.49%**	**1,750.00**	**9334**	**0.55**		**40.00%**	**0.92%**	**0.72%**	**0.35%**	**0.03%**	**1.25%**	**15.60%**	**73.30%**	**27.60%**	**41.40%**		**£402**	**£400**	**£21**	**£3,979**	**£530.46**	**£1,067,827**	**£173,148**	**£3,463.18**	**£503.47**	**£12.80**	**100.00%**	**28.88%**	**3.36%**
	Family Group - Low		**100.00%**	**96.87%**	**1**	**32**	**0.02**	**0.00%**	**0.21%**	**111.12**	**0**	**0.00**		**10.00%**	**0.03%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**15.60%**	**73.30%**	**27.60%**	**41.40%**		**£341**	**£341**	**£21**	**£254**	**£0.00**	**£0**	**£0**	**£90.77**	**£19.96**	**£0.00**	**62.78%**	**12.65%**	**0.00%**
	Scotland - Average		**89.06%**	**93.29%**	**9**	**19**	**0.01**	**8.87%**	**12.06%**	**364.53**	**751**	**0.99**		**16.54%**	**0.49%**	**0.14%**	**0.25%**	**0.01%**	**0.15%**	**39.52%**	**47.91%**	**32.87%**	**30.43%**		**£838**	**£813**	**£122**	**£1,224**	**£140.59**	**£117,450**	**£20,518**	**£1,009.73**	**£134.99**	**£70.29**	**75.67%**	**22.12%**	**7.94%**
	Scotland - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**33**	**172**	**0.06**	**43.08%**	**45.95%**	**1,750.00**	**9334**	**3.77**		**40.00%**	**1.58%**	**1.58%**	**0.99%**	**0.04%**	**1.25%**	**72.70%**	**73.30%**	**50.00%**	**54.60%**		**£2,131**	**£2,047**	**£562**	**£7,905**	**£530.46**	**£1,067,827**	**£173,148**	**£7,890.28**	**£503.47**	**£339.08**	**100.00%**	**82.80%**	**28.47%**
	Scotland - Low		**30.30%**	**56.94%**	**1**	**0**	**0.00**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**1.00**	**0**	**0.00**		**1.25%**	**0.03%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**15.60%**	**15.60%**	**9.10%**	**17.10%**		**£92**	**£92**	**£12**	**£92**	**£0.00**	**£0**	**£0**	**£47.34**	**£7.71**	**£0.00**	**17.20%**	**0.19%**	**0.00%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Bridges & Structures Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	Safety	% of principal inspections carried out on time	% of general inspections carried out on time	Condition/Asset Preservation	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav	Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit	% 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	No of bridges / structures owned or maintained	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	No of Council bridges with imposed width restriction	No of Council bridges with imposed height restriction	Financial	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	Annual expenditure to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width	Total structures asset valuation	Total estimated cost of identified maintenance work	Total bridges and structures maintenance capital and revenue budget allocation
			31.1.01 PI 300	31.1.02 PI 301		32.1.01 PI 302	32.1.02 PI 303	32.3.01 PI S40	32.3.02 PI S41	32.3.03 PI S42	32.3.04 PI S86		34.1.01 PI 304	34.2.01 PI 305	34.3.01 PI S43	34.3.02 PI S44	34.3.03 PI S81	34.3.04 PI S82	34.3.05 PI S83		36.1.01 PI 306	36.2.01 PI 307	36.2.02 PI 308	36.3.01 PI S45	36.3.02 PI S46	PI S87	PI S88	PI S89
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)		H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
	PI / Stat		PI	PI		PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat		PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat		PI	PI	PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat
	Ideal Position		↑	↑		↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↕		↓	↓	↓	↕	↕	↕	↕		↑	↑	↓	↓	↕	↕	↕	↕
	Family Group 1 (Rural)																											
8000	Aberdeenshire Council		100.00%	83.33%		71.00	60.00	4.77%	75	4	1,677		4.47%	1.31%	17	5	2	3	2		3.53%	No data	11.90%	No data	£2,000,000	£840,000,000	£100,000,000	£3,528,719
8001	Angus Council		No data	No data		86.59	81.75	0.17%	2	2	591		0.34%	No data	0	No data	0	No data	0		93.30%	76.46%	0.70%	0.56%	£0	£63,441,832	£444,800	£415,000
8072	Argyll & Bute Council		No data	96.33%		89.13	59.23	2.42%	28	3	1,197		2.34%	0.00%	0	0	16	0	0		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8145	Scottish Borders Council		No data	90.00%		No data	No data	0.75%	26	1	1,203		2.16%	0.33%	0	4	27	2	2		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£481,214,069	£0	£0
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council		82.03%	69.31%		89.80	94.41	0.23%	0	No data	1,294		0.00%	0.08%	0	1	10	1	0		No data	34.98%	No data	0.00%	£0	£0	£0	£1,935,355
8086	Highland Council		59.84%	89.19%		79.36	65.35	0.66%	284	2	2,267		12.53%	0.18%	2	2	41	2	0		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8063	Moray Council		97.06%	100.00%		76.38	52.96	1.32%	9	No data	379		2.37%	1.58%	3	3	8	0	3		4.30%	39.18%	48.38%	5.94%	£0	£128,409,657	£62,129,079	£2,670,000
8158	Perth & Kinross Council		21.82%	71.13%		83.51	71.79	12.03%	50	5	856		5.84%	No data	37	No data	13	No data	0		No data	No data	18.49%	8.04%	£0	£271,403,400	£50,178,500	£0
	Family Group - Average		**72.15%**	**85.61%**		**82.25**	**69.36**	**2.79%**	**59**	**3**	**1,183**		**3.76%**	**0.58%**	**7**	**3**	**15**	**1**	**1**		**33.71%**	**50.21%**	**19.87%**	**3.64%**	**£250,000**	**£223,058,620**	**£26,594,047**	**£1,068,634**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**89.80**	**94.41**	**12.03%**	**284**	**5**	**2,267**		**12.53%**	**1.58%**	**37**	**5**	**41**	**3**	**3**		**93.30%**	**76.46%**	**48.38%**	**8.04%**	**£2,000,000**	**£840,000,000**	**£100,000,000**	**£3,528,719**
	Family Group - Low		**21.82%**	**69.31%**		**71.00**	**52.96**	**0.17%**	**0**	**1**	**379**		**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**3.53%**	**34.98%**	**0.70%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**
	Family Group 2 (Island)																											
8081	Orkney Islands Council		0.00%	No data		No data	No data	0.00%	No data	No data	51		No data	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0		No data	51.87%	No data	No data	£0	£148,427,000	£0	£250,000
8037	Shetland Islands Council		No data	No data		98.24	95.60	0.00%	0	0	409		0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0		No data	64.23%	No data	0.00%	£0	£0	£0	£55,000
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar		No data	96.00%		95.80	82.60	2.78%	4	0	216		1.85%	3.24%	6	1	0	0	1		100.00%	74.99%	3.82%	16.11%	£0	£37,492,915	£1,431,422	£1,431,422
	Family Group - Average		**0.00%**	**96.00%**		**97.02**	**89.10**	**0.93%**	**2**	**0**	**225**		**0.93%**	**1.08%**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**100.00%**	**63.70%**	**3.82%**	**8.06%**	**£0**	**£61,973,305**	**£477,141**	**£578,807**
	Family Group - High		**0.00%**	**96.00%**		**98.24**	**95.60**	**2.78%**	**4**	**0**	**409**		**1.85%**	**3.24%**	**6**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**		**100.00%**	**74.99%**	**3.82%**	**16.11%**	**£0**	**£148,427,000**	**£1,431,422**	**£1,431,422**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**96.00%**		**95.80**	**82.60**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**51**		**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**100.00%**	**51.87%**	**3.82%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£55,000**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)																											
8082	East Ayrshire Council		No data	100.00%		83.41	71.95	9.22%	38	2	618		6.15%	0.49%	3	0	2	0	0		7.64%	31.51%	26.76%	0.91%	£0	£205,518,712	£55,000,000	£4,200,000
8064	East Lothian Council		No data	70.37%		81.13	81.66	2.05%	9	2	391		2.30%	No data	0	No data	0	No data	1		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8134	Fife Council		0.92%	86.96%		85.72	76.90	4.79%	47	8	397		11.84%	5.29%	8	13	3	8	5		6.18%	72.04%	29.30%	0.06%	£6,171,617	£510,288,678	£149,490,316	£9,240,028
8027	Midlothian Council		100.00%	100.00%		87.81	79.55	0.00%	2	3	172		1.16%	1.74%	0	3	1	2	1		5.48%	53.17%	3.89%	17.74%	£0	£115,600,000	£4,500,000	£246,672
8059	North Ayrshire Council		0.00%	100.00%		83.11	68.52	2.99%	6	10	468		1.28%	0.43%	2	0	0	0	0		16.17%	78.48%	4.76%	0.00%	£0	£125,139,006	£5,951,812	£962,690
8042	South Ayrshire Council		100.00%	100.00%		90.12	83.20	5.66%	3	3	371		0.81%	0.54%	2	0	1	0	0		9.99%	16.08%	9.49%	6.63%	£0	£98,025,138	£9,297,796	£928,717
8120	South Lanarkshire Council		99.30%	100.00%		81.20	68.60	2.13%	7	7	750		0.93%	1.33%	7	3	0	2	1		72.62%	87.97%	1.85%	1.27%	£0	£583,300,000	£10,780,000	£7,828,170
8040	Stirling Council		0.00%	100.00%		76.97	70.30	0.38%	0	0	522		0.00%	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0		No data	123.11%	0.55%	No data	£0	£207,004,453	£1,143,401	£2,338,885
8109	West Lothian Council		98.55%	91.55%		91.77	83.91	0.17%	4	1	594		0.67%	0.34%	0	2	3	0	2		30.70%	94.65%	1.69%	2.12%	£0	£316,453,707	£5,355,610	£1,643,965
	Family Group - Average		**56.97%**	**94.32%**		**84.58**	**76.07**	**3.04%**	**13**	**4**	**476**		**2.79%**	**1.27%**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**1**		**21.25%**	**69.63%**	**9.79%**	**4.10%**	**£685,735**	**£240,147,744**	**£26,835,437**	**£3,043,236**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**91.77**	**83.91**	**9.22%**	**47**	**10**	**750**		**11.84%**	**5.29%**	**8**	**13**	**3**	**8**	**5**		**72.62%**	**123.11%**	**29.30%**	**17.74%**	**£6,171,617**	**£583,300,000**	**£149,490,316**	**£9,240,028**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**70.37%**		**76.97**	**68.52**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**172**		**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**5.48%**	**16.08%**	**0.55%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)																											
8087	Clackmannanshire Council		No data	No data		86.88	81.83	No data	No data	No data	123		No data	1.63%	0	2	2	2	0		81.14%	100.00%	0.34%	No data	£0	£50,950,000	£175,000	£142,000
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council		100.00%	100.00%		94.20	68.80	2.86%	1	3	245		0.41%	1.63%	3	1	3	1	0		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8071	Falkirk Council		0.00%	100.00%		85.38	78.25	0.35%	5	3	282		1.77%	No data	0	No data	5	No data	3		6.05%	97.41%	No data	No data	£0	£171,611	£12,000,000	£726,464
8060	Inverclyde Council		15.79%	100.00%		80.58	62.48	0.61%	1	5	163		0.61%	1.23%	0	2	1	0	2		23.90%	98.29%	1.49%	0.00%	£0	£106,607,694	£1,584,636	£378,700
8121	North Lanarkshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council		0.00%	100.00%		No data	No data	0.00%	4	5	317		1.26%	0.63%	0	2	0	0	2		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average		**28.95%**	**100.00%**		**86.76**	**72.84**	**0.96%**	**3**	**4**	**226**		**1.01%**	**1.28%**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**		**37.03%**	**98.57%**	**0.92%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£31,545,861**	**£2,751,927**	**£249,433**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**94.20**	**81.83**	**2.86%**	**5**	**5**	**317**		**1.77%**	**1.63%**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**3**		**81.14%**	**100.00%**	**1.49%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£106,607,694**	**£12,000,000**	**£726,464**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**100.00%**		**80.58**	**62.48**	**0.00%**	**1**	**3**	**123**		**0.41%**	**0.63%**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**6.05%**	**97.41%**	**0.34%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**
	Family Group 5 (City)																											
8073	Aberdeen City Council		100.00%	100.00%		83.52	76.03	0.50%	2	0	201		1.00%	5.47%	1	10	1	1	9		9.17%	92.27%	1.29%	0.00%	£0	£280,000,000	£3,600,000	£330,000
8159	Dundee City Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8015	City of Edinburgh Council		100.00%	100.00%		81.19	79.33	0.30%	49	9	331		14.80%	7.25%	0	24	5	2	22		No data	No data	No data	No data	£0	£0	£0	£0
8016	Glasgow City Council		72.00%	100.00%		83.25	56.70	2.19%	15	28	183		8.20%	7.10%	1	12	4	1	11		13.66%	11.49%	2.04%	No data	£39,936	£1,821,805,910	£37,096,509	£5,067,129
	Family Group - Average		**90.67%**	**100.00%**		**82.65**	**70.69**	**1.00%**	**22**	**12**	**238**		**8.00%**	**6.61%**	**1**	**15**	**3**	**1**	**14**		**11.42%**	**51.88%**	**1.67%**	**0.00%**	**£9,984**	**£525,451,478**	**£10,174,127**	**£1,349,282**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**83.52**	**79.33**	**2.19%**	**49**	**28**	**331**		**14.80%**	**7.25%**	**1**	**24**	**5**	**2**	**22**		**13.66%**	**92.27%**	**2.04%**	**0.00%**	**£39,936**	**£1,821,805,910**	**£37,096,509**	**£5,067,129**
	Family Group - Low		**72.00%**	**100.00%**		**81.19**	**56.70**	**0.30%**	**2**	**0**	**183**		**1.00%**	**5.47%**	**0**	**10**	**1**	**1**	**9**		**9.17%**	**11.49%**	**1.29%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**
	Scotland - Average		**57.37%**	**93.51%**		**85.04**	**74.07**	**2.20%**	**26**	**4**	**581**		**3.27%**	**1.74%**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**		**30.24%**	**68.33%**	**9.81%**	**3.96%**	**£283,157**	**£220,388,061**	**£17,591,686**	**£1,528,238**
	Scotland - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**98.24**	**95.60**	**12.03%**	**284**	**28**	**2,267**		**14.80%**	**7.25%**	**37**	**24**	**41**	**8**	**22**		**100.00%**	**123.11%**	**48.38%**	**17.74%**	**£6,171,617**	**£1,821,805,910**	**£149,490,316**	**£9,240,028**
	Scotland - Low		**0.00%**	**69.31%**		**71.00**	**52.96**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**51**		**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		**3.53%**	**11.49%**	**0.34%**	**0.00%**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**	**£0**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
TMS Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	% of faults rectified within target time	% of faults rectified on first visit	% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure which is planned maintenance spend
		41.1.01 PI 55	41.1.02 PI 56	46.1.01 PI S61
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	H	M	L
	PI / Stat	PI	PI	Stat
	Ideal Position	↑	↑	↕
	Family Group 1 (Rural)			
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	78.76%	100.00%	71.78%
8001	Angus Council	92.00%	No data	80.87%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	No data	No data	100.00%
8145	Scottish Borders Council	100.00%	100.00%	6.53%
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	87.72%	86.55%	No data
8086	Highland Council	No data	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council	97.62%	97.62%	99.57%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	91.42%	94.14%	92.20%
	Family Group - Average	**91.25%**	**95.66%**	**75.16%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**
	Family Group - Low	**78.76%**	**86.55%**	**6.53%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)			
8081	Orkney Islands Council	No data	No data	No data
8037	Shetland Islands Council	No data	No data	100.00%
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	66.67%	100.00%	88.11%
	Family Group - Average	**66.67%**	**100.00%**	**94.06%**
	Family Group - High	**66.67%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**
	Family Group - Low	**66.67%**	**100.00%**	**88.11%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)			
8082	East Ayrshire Council	92.37%	94.27%	10.59%
8064	East Lothian Council	No data	No data	No data
8134	Fife Council	97.47%	92.42%	84.03%
8027	Midlothian Council	No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	92.56%	88.37%	28.41%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	100.00%	94.59%	No data
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	99.42%	95.56%	98.14%
8040	Stirling Council	97.44%	No data	No data
8109	West Lothian Council	99.23%	92.53%	100.00%
	Family Group - Average	**96.93%**	**92.96%**	**64.23%**
	Family Group - High	**100.00%**	**95.56%**	**100.00%**
	Family Group - Low	**92.37%**	**88.37%**	**10.59%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)			
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	85.71%	85.71%	16.35%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	90.00%	93.85%	No data
8071	Falkirk Council	96.08%	90.20%	99.27%
8060	Inverclyde Council	No data	No data	91.34%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	No data	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**90.60%**	**89.92%**	**68.99%**
	Family Group - High	**96.08%**	**93.85%**	**99.27%**
	Family Group - Low	**85.71%**	**85.71%**	**16.35%**
	Family Group 5 (City)			
8073	Aberdeen City Council	97.03%	No data	96.75%
8159	Dundee City Council	No data	No data	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	95.98%	98.01%	63.22%
8016	Glasgow City Council	98.28%	89.99%	52.56%
	Family Group - Average	**97.10%**	**94.00%**	**70.84%**
	Family Group - High	**98.28%**	**98.01%**	**96.75%**
	Family Group - Low	**95.98%**	**89.99%**	**52.56%**
	Scotland - Average	**92.79%**	**93.75%**	**72.62%**
	Scotland - High	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**
	Scotland - Low	**66.67%**	**85.71%**	**6.53%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Street Furniture Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	% of total Roads & Lighting expenditure which is spent on Street Furniture 56.1.01 PI S62
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	L
	PI / Stat	Stat
	Ideal Position	↕
	Family Group 1 (Rural)	
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	No data
8001	Angus Council	No data
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	0.85%
8145	Scottish Borders Council	1.66%
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	0.89%
8086	Highland Council	No data
8063	Moray Council	1.19%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	No data
	Family Group - Average	**1.15%**
	Family Group - High	**1.66%**
	Family Group - Low	**0.85%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)	
8081	Orkney Islands Council	4.41%
8037	Shetland Islands Council	3.90%
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	4.13%
	Family Group - Average	**4.15%**
	Family Group - High	**4.41%**
	Family Group - Low	**3.90%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)	
8082	East Ayrshire Council	0.92%
8064	East Lothian Council	No data
8134	Fife Council	3.46%
8027	Midlothian Council	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	1.84%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	1.53%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	2.04%
8040	Stirling Council	No data
8109	West Lothian Council	0.79%
	Family Group - Average	**1.76%**
	Family Group - High	**3.46%**
	Family Group - Low	**0.79%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)	
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	1.10%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	No data
8071	Falkirk Council	1.33%
8060	Inverclyde Council	1.80%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data
	Family Group - Average	**1.41%**
	Family Group - High	**1.80%**
	Family Group - Low	**1.10%**
	Family Group 5 (City)	
8073	Aberdeen City Council	8.08%
8159	Dundee City Council	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	0.18%
8016	Glasgow City Council	3.06%
	Family Group - Average	**3.77%**
	Family Group - High	**8.08%**
	Family Group - Low	**0.18%**
	Scotland - Average	**2.27%**
	Scotland - High	**8.08%**
	Scotland - Low	**0.18%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4

All assets service delivery results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)	Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km) excluding CEC	% satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks ("Always/Usually" aware of organisation)	% satisfied with the overall service delivery	% dissatisfied with the overall service delivery
		61.1.01 PI 60	0.1.01 PI 63a	0.1.02 PI 63b	61.2.01 PI 212a	61.2.02 PI 208a	61.2.03 PI 208b
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)	H	H	H	H	H	H
	PI / Stat	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI
	Ideal Position	↑	↕	↕	↑	↑	↓
	Family Group 1 (Rural)						
8000	Aberdeenshire Council	No data	£4,563	£4,563	No data	No data	No data
8001	Angus Council	415.37	£6,806	£6,806	40.00%	9.10%	72.70%
8072	Argyll & Bute Council	No data	£9,527	£9,118	No data	No data	No data
8145	Scottish Borders Council	2,335.56	£5,356	£5,356	No data	No data	No data
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council	No data	£6,231	£6,231	34.00%	11.90%	76.70%
8086	Highland Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8063	Moray Council	1,896.58	£8,957	£8,957	26.30%	13.60%	73.30%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council	No data	£9,000	£9,000	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**1,549.17**	**£7,206**	**£7,147**	**33.43%**	**11.53%**	**74.23%**
	Family Group - High	**2,335.56**	**£9,527**	**£9,118**	**40.00%**	**13.60%**	**76.70%**
	Family Group - Low	**415.37**	**£4,563**	**£4,563**	**26.30%**	**9.10%**	**72.70%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)						
8081	Orkney Islands Council	550.61	£2,820	£2,449	58.30%	70.30%	18.90%
8037	Shetland Islands Council	No data	£5,042	£4,751	No data	No data	No data
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	1,208.46	£3,835	£3,592	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**879.54**	**£3,899**	**£3,597**	**58.30%**	**70.30%**	**18.90%**
	Family Group - High	**1,208.46**	**£5,042**	**£4,751**	**58.30%**	**70.30%**	**18.90%**
	Family Group - Low	**550.61**	**£2,820**	**£2,449**	**58.30%**	**70.30%**	**18.90%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)						
8082	East Ayrshire Council	734.54	£9,997	£9,580	28.60%	12.50%	75.00%
8064	East Lothian Council	No data	£4,385	£4,385	No data	No data	No data
8134	Fife Council	No data	£16,668	£16,668	No data	No data	No data
8027	Midlothian Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council	1,098.02	£14,187	£14,089	40.30%	24.50%	59.10%
8042	South Ayrshire Council	693.95	£8,549	£8,082	38.50%	15.40%	80.80%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council	No data	£15,254	£15,034	No data	No data	No data
8040	Stirling Council	No data	£12,660	£12,660	66.70%	15.20%	69.70%
8109	West Lothian Council	No data	£15,273	£14,664	43.40%	21.00%	63.20%
	Family Group - Average	**842.17**	**£12,122**	**£11,895**	**43.50%**	**17.72%**	**69.56%**
	Family Group - High	**1,098.02**	**£16,668**	**£16,668**	**66.70%**	**24.50%**	**80.80%**
	Family Group - Low	**693.95**	**£4,385**	**£4,385**	**28.60%**	**12.50%**	**59.10%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)						
8087	Clackmannanshire Council	No data	£12,145	£12,145	45.50%	42.90%	42.90%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council	No data	£17,283	£16,716	33.30%	14.90%	76.60%
8071	Falkirk Council	924.74	£10,320	£10,315	20.00%	16.00%	64.00%
8060	Inverclyde Council	704.30	£25,726	£24,904	13.60%	13.60%	77.30%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council	221.07	£5,983	£5,021	No data	No data	No data
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**616.70**	**£14,291**	**£13,820**	**28.10%**	**21.85%**	**65.20%**
	Family Group - High	**924.74**	**£25,726**	**£24,904**	**45.50%**	**42.90%**	**77.30%**
	Family Group - Low	**221.07**	**£5,983**	**£5,021**	**13.60%**	**13.60%**	**42.90%**
	Family Group 5 (City)						
8073	Aberdeen City Council	No data	£3,599	£3,599	50.00%	2.40%	76.20%
8159	Dundee City Council	No data	£13,415	£13,320	No data	No data	No data
8015	City of Edinburgh Council	No data	£43,050	£42,922	No data	No data	No data
8016	Glasgow City Council	No data	£20,967	£20,916	No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average	**0.00**	**£20,258**	**£20,189**	**50.00%**	**2.40%**	**76.20%**
	Family Group - High	**0.00**	**£43,050**	**£42,922**	**50.00%**	**2.40%**	**76.20%**
	Family Group - Low	**0.00**	**£3,599**	**£3,599**	**50.00%**	**2.40%**	**76.20%**
	Scotland - Average	**980.29**	**£11,541**	**£11,328**	**38.46%**	**20.24%**	**66.17%**
	Scotland - High	**2,335.56**	**£43,050**	**£42,922**	**66.70%**	**70.30%**	**80.80%**
	Scotland - Low	**221.07**	**£2,820**	**£2,449**	**13.60%**	**2.40%**	**18.90%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project - Task 4
Lighting Performance Indicator Results 2023/24

PIN	Name of Authority	Safety	% of columns with a valid structural inspection (last 6 years)	% of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate	Condition/Asset Preservation	Routine faults as a % of street lighting stock	% of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	% of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life	Total number of columns	% of columns replaced	Total number of lanterns	% of lanterns replaced	Customer Service	% of repairs within 7 days	% of repairs within target time	% of repairs within 21 days	Average time taken to repair (days)	Public calls as a % of faults	Public calls as a % of street lights	% of street lights which are LED	Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting	Availability	Number of night inspections annually	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)	Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light	Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs	Capital allocation per street light – replacement	Total investment in infrastructure per street light	Energy cost per street lamp	Environmental	Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)	Co2 emissions (kg) per street light	% of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime
			21.2.01 PI 39	21.2.02 PI 40		22.2.01 PI 29a	22.2.02 PI S01	22.2.03 PI S02	PI S10	22.3.02 PI S03	PI S11	22.3.03 PI S04		23.1.01 PI 03a	23.1.01 PI 03b	23.1.01 PI 03c	23.2.01 PI 20	23.2.02 PI 27	23.2.03 PI 28	23.3.02 PI S09	23.4.01 PI 45a		24.3.01 PI S06		26.1.01 PI 35	26.1.02 PI 36	26.2.01 PI 33	26.2.02 PI 34b	26.2.03 PI 42	26.2.04 PI 43	26.2.05 PI 01c	26.3.02 PI 06a		27.1.01 PI 18b	27.3.01 PI 37b	27.3.05 PI 38d
	Confidence rating (H, M, L)		L	H		H	M	L	H	M	H	M		H	H	H	H	M	M	M	H		H		M	M	L	M	H	H	H	H		M	M	M
	PI / Stat		PI	PI		PI	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat	Stat		PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	Stat	PI		Stat		PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI	PI		PI	PI	PI
	Ideal Position		↑	↑		↓	↓	↓	↕	↕	↕	↕		↑	↑	↑	↓	↕	↕	↑	↑		↕		↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓		↓	↓	↑
	Family Group 1 (Rural)																																			
8000	Aberdeenshire Council		9.74%	69.15%		3.66%	37.04%	5.38%	46,276	0.19%	48,085	4.58%		54.44%	54.44%	82.54%	19.90	241.41%	8.83%	87.94%	No data		0		16.91%	49.96%	£40.18	No data	£7.13	£10.93	£18.05	£46.53		159.75	36.13	75.83%
8001	Angus Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	0	No data	0	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	81.80%		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data
8072	Argyll & Bute Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	14,348	No data	14,671	0.00%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	9.88%	No data	No data		0		20.14%	45.16%	No data	No data	£23.27	£20.40	£43.66	£68.69		No data	49.06	64.81%
8145	Scottish Borders Council		0.00%	No data		5.07%	43.44%	1.57%	18,488	0.14%	19,717	0.15%		51.95%	51.95%	73.77%	10.00	119.02%	6.03%	100.98%	No data		0		17.62%	35.33%	£122.11	No data	£12.15	£7.66	£19.80	£38.30		130.58	29.69	No data
8055	Dumfries & Galloway Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	0	No data	23,792	0.00%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	10.37%	No data	65.60%		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£33.88		110.90	26.55	0.00%
8086	Highland Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	0	No data	62,002	0.00%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	30.08	51.71%
8063	Moray Council		0.00%	0.00%		2.13%	34.48%	0.50%	17,826	2.55%	20,016	0.70%		20.89%	79.11%	No data	35.67	217.84%	4.64%	No data	55.90%		0		38.88%	58.18%	£53.09	No data	£8.00	£39.58	£47.59	£29.65		No data	23.17	57.41%
8158	Perth & Kinross Council		0.00%	38.98%		7.37%	27.90%	10.90%	23,478	0.82%	25,934	7.71%		97.59%	97.59%	100.00%	2.04	81.84%	6.03%	75.01%	No data		0		42.07%	49.06%	£52.63	No data	£7.23	£23.62	£30.85	£48.54		No data	35.77	74.21%
	Family Group - Average		**2.44%**	**36.04%**		**4.56%**	**35.72%**	**4.59%**	**15,052**	**0.93%**	**26,777**	**1.88%**		**56.22%**	**70.77%**	**85.44%**	**16.90**	**165.03%**	**7.63%**	**87.98%**	**67.77%**		**0**		**27.12%**	**47.54%**	**£67.00**	**£0.00**	**£11.56**	**£20.44**	**£31.99**	**£44.27**		**133.74**	**32.92**	**54.00%**
	Family Group - High		**9.74%**	**69.15%**		**7.37%**	**43.44%**	**10.90%**	**46,276**	**2.55%**	**62,002**	**7.71%**		**97.59%**	**97.59%**	**100.00%**	**35.67**	**241.41%**	**10.37%**	**100.98%**	**81.80%**		**0**		**42.07%**	**58.18%**	**£122.11**	**£0.00**	**£23.27**	**£39.58**	**£47.59**	**£68.69**		**159.75**	**49.06**	**75.83%**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**0.00%**		**2.13%**	**27.90%**	**0.50%**	**0**	**0.14%**	**0**	**0.00%**		**20.89%**	**51.95%**	**73.77%**	**2.04**	**81.84%**	**4.64%**	**75.01%**	**55.90%**		**0**		**16.91%**	**35.33%**	**£40.18**	**£0.00**	**£7.13**	**£7.66**	**£18.05**	**£29.65**		**110.90**	**23.17**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 2 (Island)																																			
8081	Orkney Islands Council		0.00%	100.00%		3.15%	10.10%	No data	3,237	0.87%	3,367	0.39%		No data	No data	No data	No data	100.00%	3.15%	93.35%	65.70%		0		No data	No data	£544.30	No data	£31.84	£56.37	£88.21	No data		No data	35.00	0.00%
8037	Shetland Islands Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	3,738	5.62%	4,011	5.24%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	0.62%	90.15%	No data		0		No data	60.36%	No data	No data	£26.96	£90.23	£117.20	£62.84		No data	No data	55.90%
8101	Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar		0.00%	13.67%		9.96%	46.63%	24.19%	6,832	0.70%	6,949	3.35%		84.83%	99.13%	94.80%	7.00	35.84%	3.57%	47.46%	No data		4		10.28%	29.37%	£177.13	£0.22	£11.74	£6.35	£18.09	£37.22		No data	25.75	0.00%
	Family Group - Average		**0.00%**	**56.84%**		**6.56%**	**28.37%**	**24.19%**	**4,602**	**2.40%**	**4,776**	**2.99%**		**84.83%**	**99.13%**	**94.80%**	**7.00**	**67.92%**	**2.45%**	**76.99%**	**65.70%**		**1**		**10.28%**	**44.87%**	**£360.72**	**£0.22**	**£23.51**	**£50.98**	**£74.50**	**£50.03**		**0.00**	**30.38**	**18.63%**
	Family Group - High		**0.00%**	**100.00%**		**9.96%**	**46.63%**	**24.19%**	**6,832**	**5.62%**	**6,949**	**5.24%**		**84.83%**	**99.13%**	**94.80%**	**7.00**	**100.00%**	**3.57%**	**93.35%**	**65.70%**		**4**		**10.28%**	**60.36%**	**£544.30**	**£0.22**	**£31.84**	**£90.23**	**£117.20**	**£62.84**		**0.00**	**35.00**	**55.90%**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**13.67%**		**3.15%**	**10.10%**	**24.19%**	**3,237**	**0.70%**	**3,367**	**0.39%**		**84.83%**	**99.13%**	**94.80%**	**7.00**	**35.84%**	**0.62%**	**47.46%**	**65.70%**		**0**		**10.28%**	**29.37%**	**£177.13**	**£0.22**	**£11.74**	**£6.35**	**£18.09**	**£37.22**		**0.00**	**25.75**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 3 (Semi Urban)																																			
8082	East Ayrshire Council		No data	No data		5.40%	34.91%	No data	21,082	0.00%	21,317	1.58%		90.96%	90.96%	99.04%	3.22	101.74%	5.49%	92.64%	58.80%		0		121.31%	45.85%	£266.27	No data	£14.38	£52.81	£67.19	£61.56		215.60	50.91	0.15%
8064	East Lothian Council		80.09%	0.00%		9.38%	32.76%	0.52%	19,058	1.73%	19,098	1.57%		No data	No data	No data	3.00	No data	No data	84.98%	No data		0		No data	No data	£195.42	No data	£18.33	£26.18	£44.51	No data		No data	33.04	0.00%
8134	Fife Council		0.00%	39.80%		4.21%	30.12%	3.84%	67,155	1.25%	66,923	4.44%		93.08%	93.08%	98.69%	16.96	120.54%	5.08%	62.43%	No data		0		27.25%	39.10%	£333.76	No data	£37.67	£22.90	£60.57	£37.20		119.51	27.98	98.93%
8027	Midlothian Council		No data	100.00%		7.44%	No data	15.61%	19,895	1.84%	19,895	5.85%		No data	98.99%	No data	3.00	54.26%	4.04%	100.00%	No data		12		No data	No data	No data	£0.01	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data
8059	North Ayrshire Council		No data	32.39%		10.11%	17.07%	6.98%	24,094	No data	24,128	0.00%		No data	No data	No data	No data	109.96%	11.12%	84.53%	64.80%		0		112.59%	55.40%	No data	No data	£14.01	£48.34	£62.35	£51.21		174.09	40.64	0.00%
8042	South Ayrshire Council		No data	No data		3.58%	33.47%	0.00%	19,778	1.08%	20,540	1.21%		92.39%	92.39%	99.32%	2.75	107.47%	3.85%	100.00%	42.30%		0		26.97%	50.37%	£444.15	No data	£16.37	£9.88	£26.25	£51.79		159.98	37.94	0.00%
8120	South Lanarkshire Council		No data	70.62%		5.62%	36.34%	0.00%	60,033	0.73%	61,546	1.49%		31.83%	76.09%	51.20%	24.00	151.84%	8.53%	99.91%	No data		0		21.88%	47.97%	£351.93	No data	£30.99	£17.42	£48.40	£42.57		No data	29.18	87.54%
8040	Stirling Council		No data	No data		2.67%	34.95%	8.62%	15,735	0.71%	18,299	1.22%		48.98%	98.36%	84.84%	No data	100.00%	2.67%	No data	62.50%		0		No data	13.97%	No data	No data	£79.51	£4.10	£83.61	£62.30		No data	48.39	0.38%
8109	West Lothian Council		0.00%	95.31%		1.28%	22.94%	1.26%	48,430	0.96%	49,130	1.07%		96.50%	96.50%	99.20%	2.80	145.38%	1.86%	98.98%	68.90%		11		75.67%	51.38%	No data	£0.08	£16.71	£37.42	£54.13	£39.62		145.40	33.10	0.00%
	Family Group - Average		**26.70%**	**56.35%**		**5.52%**	**30.32%**	**4.60%**	**32,807**	**1.04%**	**33,431**	**2.05%**		**75.62%**	**92.34%**	**88.72%**	**7.96**	**111.40%**	**5.33%**	**90.43%**	**59.46%**		**3**		**64.28%**	**43.43%**	**£318.31**	**£0.05**	**£28.50**	**£27.38**	**£55.88**	**£49.46**		**162.92**	**37.65**	**23.38%**
	Family Group - High		**80.09%**	**100.00%**		**10.11%**	**36.34%**	**15.61%**	**67,155**	**1.84%**	**66,923**	**5.85%**		**96.50%**	**98.99%**	**99.32%**	**24.00**	**151.84%**	**11.12%**	**100.00%**	**68.90%**		**12**		**121.31%**	**55.40%**	**£444.15**	**£0.08**	**£79.51**	**£52.81**	**£83.61**	**£62.30**		**215.60**	**50.91**	**98.93%**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**0.00%**		**1.28%**	**17.07%**	**0.00%**	**15,735**	**0.00%**	**18,299**	**0.00%**		**31.83%**	**76.09%**	**51.20%**	**2.75**	**54.26%**	**1.86%**	**62.43%**	**42.30%**		**0**		**21.88%**	**13.97%**	**£195.42**	**£0.01**	**£14.01**	**£4.10**	**£26.25**	**£37.20**		**119.51**	**27.98**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 4 (Urban)																																			
8087	Clackmannanshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	0.00%	9,805	No data	10,180	0.00%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	97.69%	78.60%		0		13.16%	No data	No data	No data	£42.63	£14.63	£57.26	No data		No data	No data	0.00%
8014	East Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data
8137	East Renfrewshire Council		No data	No data		3.30%	No data	No data	14,981	No data	16,173	0.00%		94.38%	94.38%	97.94%	4.00	158.05%	5.22%	93.27%	71.70%		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£56.97		No data	42.80	0.00%
8071	Falkirk Council		85.85%	87.02%		3.32%	20.16%	1.30%	27,088	1.10%	27,648	0.00%		93.47%	93.47%	No data	4.00	98.15%	3.26%	102.64%	72.00%		No data		35.84%	50.26%	£38.88	No data	£22.88	£31.03	£53.91	£42.54		150.41	35.63	63.62%
8060	Inverclyde Council		No data	No data		2.19%	No data	No data	13,591	No data	14,615	0.00%		86.88%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	50.60%		9		No data	No data	No data	£0.05	£17.64	£15.74	£33.38	£43.24		132.56	31.46	5.09%
8121	North Lanarkshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data
8036	Renfrewshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	0.00%	30,758	0.30%	29,669	0.84%		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	5.41%	99.73%	No data		0		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£53.13		No data	40.88	0.00%
8057	West Dunbartonshire Council		No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data		No data	No data	No data
	Family Group - Average		**85.85%**	**87.02%**		**2.94%**	**20.16%**	**0.43%**	**19,245**	**0.70%**	**19,657**	**0.17%**		**91.58%**	**93.93%**	**97.94%**	**4.00**	**128.10%**	**4.63%**	**98.33%**	**68.23%**		**3**		**24.50%**	**50.26%**	**£38.88**	**£0.05**	**£27.72**	**£20.47**	**£48.18**	**£48.97**		**141.49**	**37.69**	**13.74%**
	Family Group - High		**85.85%**	**87.02%**		**3.32%**	**20.16%**	**1.30%**	**30,758**	**1.10%**	**29,669**	**0.84%**		**94.38%**	**94.38%**	**97.94%**	**4.00**	**158.05%**	**5.41%**	**102.64%**	**78.60%**		**9**		**35.84%**	**50.26%**	**£38.88**	**£0.05**	**£42.63**	**£31.03**	**£57.26**	**£56.97**		**150.41**	**42.80**	**63.62%**
	Family Group - Low		**85.85%**	**87.02%**		**2.19%**	**20.16%**	**0.00%**	**9,805**	**0.30%**	**10,180**	**0.00%**		**86.88%**	**93.47%**	**97.94%**	**4.00**	**98.15%**	**3.26%**	**93.27%**	**50.60%**		**0**		**13.16%**	**50.26%**	**£38.88**	**£0.05**	**£17.64**	**£14.63**	**£33.38**	**£42.54**		**132.56**	**31.46**	**0.00%**
	Family Group 5 (City)																																			
8073	Aberdeen City Council		100.00%	2.17%		9.09%	46.02%	0.00%	33,555	0.56%	35,362	3.60%		96.52%	96.52%	96.52%	No data	71.01%	6.46%	102.90%	53.70%		0		63.38%	0.04%	£121.90	No data	£27.66	£50.90	£78.56	No data		265.32	59.12	90.83%
8159	Dundee City Council		15.02%	66.99%		1.04%	25.42%	0.60%	24,825	1.37%	25,610	0.95%		94.76%	94.76%	100.00%	5.22	285.39%	2.98%	98.40%	No data		0		44.38%	63.58%	£472.04	No data	£75.02	£31.06	£106.08	£43.55		No data	32.10	88.36%
8015	City of Edinburgh Council		100.00%	81.55%		2.46%	48.22%	No data	59,368	0.20%	69,107	0.35%		33.20%	33.20%	No data	No data	No data	No data	91.88%	No data		0		No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	£43.38		123.37	34.37	No data
8016	Glasgow City Council		0.00%	36.17%		No data	51.06%	33.02%	70,977	1.14%	74,588	12.07%		No data	No data	No data	No data	115.78%	No data	60.63%	No data		0		31.61%	43.38%	£225.94	No data	£67.11	£25.48	£92.59	No data		290.79	85.21	12.92%
	Family Group - Average		**53.76%**	**46.72%**		**4.20%**	**42.68%**	**11.21%**	**47,181**	**0.82%**	**51,167**	**4.24%**		**74.83%**	**74.83%**	**98.26%**	**5.22**	**157.39%**	**4.72%**	**88.45%**	**53.70%**		**0**		**46.46%**	**35.67%**	**£273.29**	**£0.00**	**£56.60**	**£35.81**	**£92.41**	**£43.47**		**226.49**	**52.70**	**64.04%**
	Family Group - High		**100.00%**	**81.55%**		**9.09%**	**51.06%**	**33.02%**	**70,977**	**1.37%**	**74,588**	**12.07%**		**96.52%**	**96.52%**	**100.00%**	**5.22**	**285.39%**	**6.46%**	**102.90%**	**53.70%**		**0**		**63.38%**	**63.58%**	**£472.04**	**£0.00**	**£75.02**	**£50.90**	**£106.08**	**£43.55**		**290.79**	**85.21**	**90.83%**
	Family Group - Low		**0.00%**	**2.17%**		**1.04%**	**25.42%**	**0.00%**	**24,825**	**0.20%**	**25,610**	**0.35%**		**33.20%**	**33.20%**	**96.52%**	**5.22**	**71.01%**	**2.98%**	**60.63%**	**53.70%**		**0**		**31.61%**	**0.04%**	**£121.90**	**£0.00**	**£27.66**	**£25.48**	**£78.56**	**£43.38**		**123.37**	**32.10**	**12.92%**
	Scotland - Average		**27.91%**	**52.11%**		**4.88%**	**33.32%**	**6.02%**	**24,636**	**1.14%**	**28,702**	**2.08%**		**74.27%**	**84.76%**	**90.60%**	**9.57**	**127.13%**	**5.41%**	**89.34%**	**63.78%**		**2**		**42.35%**	**43.82%**	**£229.32**	**£0.09**	**£27.69**	**£29.23**	**£56.92**	**£47.37**		**167.56**	**38.16**	**33.11%**
	Scotland - High		**100.00%**	**100.00%**		**10.11%**	**51.06%**	**33.02%**	**70,977**	**5.62%**	**74,588**	**12.07%**		**97.59%**	**99.13%**	**100.00%**	**35.67**	**285.39%**	**11.12%**	**102.90%**	**81.80%**		**12**		**121.31%**	**63.58%**	**£544.30**	**£0.22**	**£79.51**	**£90.23**	**£117.20**	**£68.69**		**290.79**	**85.21**	**98.93%**
	Scotland - Low		**0.00%**	**0.00%**		**1.04%**	**10.10%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**		**20.89%**	**33.20%**	**51.20%**	**2.04**	**35.84%**	**0.62%**	**47.46%**	**42.30%**		**0**		**10.28%**	**0.04%**	**£38.88**	**£0.01**	**£7.13**	**£4.10**	**£18.05**	**£29.65**		**110.90**	**23.17**	**0.00%**

Authorities in red have NOT returned data

SCOTS Road Asset Management Project
Notes / PI Definitions

If you cannot see these notes in full please click on View → Zoom and select a lower percentage

General Notes

Please read these 'General Notes' before going to the 'Results' and 'Asset' pages.

The SCOTS 'Performance Management Task' is undertaken via the annual APSE performance networks data collection exercise. However, the results reported are 'as submitted' and not subject to the APSE PI parameters and therefore will not necessarily reflect the published APSE outputs.

Authority names shown in RED on the 'Results' and 'Asset' tabs indicate authorities who have not returned their data.

Confidence Ratings (H = High, M = Medium, L = Low) indicate the level of confidence that the SCOTS Performance Group have in the accuracy of the data supplied this year. It is anticipated that these Confidence Ratings will improve in future years as more reliable and accurate data is available.

'Ideal Position' markers have been used to indicate, where applicable, it is desirable to be high (↑) or low (↓) for each PI / Stat. In some cases it is not desirable to be high or low and this is indicated with a ↕ symbol. Desirable high or low positions can be subjective, depending upon each authority's policy objectives and circumstances, therefore these markers are intended only as a guide.

Please note that the averages for Family Groups and the overall Scotland average for each PI is calculated using the Microsoft 'Average' function and is an average of the calculated authority outputs. It is not calculated by using total input raw data across the whole sample.

The PI and Stats results are presented in two ways. Firstly, all results for every asset type and all authorities / family groups are shown on the 'Results' tab. This enables comparison across all PIs for every authority 'at a glance' but this report format is not printer friendly.

Secondly, results for all authorities / family groups are shown split out into the asset types 'Customer Services', 'Carriageways', 'Footways', 'Bridges & Structures', 'Traffic Management Systems & Street Furniture' and 'Street Lighting'. This enables greater focus on the asset type and these report formats are printer friendly (A3 landscape except for 'Customer Services', 'Traffic Management Systems', 'Street Furniture' and 'All assets service delivery' which will print on A4 portrait).

The 'PI Definitions' (below) are provided as an explanation / interpretation of each PI / Stat and these can be easily accessed by clicking on the PI reference in row 5 on each of the 'Asset type' reports (e.g. the cell referenced 3.1.01 (PI 37) on the 'Customer Services' tab). By clicking on the 'Return to report' hyperlink after the PI Definition you can return to the same place in the 'Asset type' report tab. Please note, there are no links to the PI Definitions from the overall 'Results' tab.

Not every PI will have a 'PI Definition' and therefore some cell references cannot be clicked on - these will display the message "No PI Definition".

Return to 'Introduction' page

PI Definitions

SCOTS headline financial PI

0.1.01 Total expenditure by carriageway network length (£ per Km)

This is a high level SOLACE Indicator that will be used by and reported at Chief Executive level.

Effective budget monitoring arrangements are crucial to the delivery of best value with systems of financial management being essential in meeting the needs of customers.

Return to report

CUSTOMER SERVICES

Carriageways and footways are major public assets which are highly valued by the community. Maintenance of these assets attracts a high level of public interest and concern. Local authorities have a duty to ensure that services are responsive to the needs of citizens, and not the convenience of service providers. Customer Satisfaction is probably the most important Performance Indicator of all.

3.1.01 % of customer enquiries/requests for service closed off within Council's own identified response times.

Managing complaints and requests for service effectively can make a significant difference to the public perception of service delivery, not only for the Roads Service, but for the authority as a whole. The efficiency and courtesy of response to enquiries and requests for service determine, to a large extent, the local opinion of the service.

All communications received from whatever source and how they are dealt with, including nil returns are crucial to the management and defence of any claim against the authority for failure to maintain.

Each authority will have its own target response times and these times will depend on the type of enquiry/request for service, the urgency of this, and other factors specific to each authority.

Return to report

3.3.01 % of enquiries made under the Freedom of Information Act that were dealt with within the allowable time

Any person or organisation who requests information, subject to certain conditions, under the terms of this Act is entitled to receive the information within 20 working days.

Return to report

3.3.02 Total number of enquiries received under the Freedom of Information Act

Under the terms of this act, persons have a right to request information held by the authority. Any person or organisation who requests information, subject to certain conditions, under the terms of this Act is entitled to receive the information within 20 working days.

Return to report

CARRIAGEWAY ASSETS

Safety

It is crucially important that all those involved in the road maintenance service have a clear understanding of their powers and duties, their implications and the procedures used to manage and mitigate risk. Authorities have a general duty of care to users and the community to maintain the road network in a condition fit for purpose, through determined operational standards such as rectification of defects arising from safety and serviceability inspections and investment priorities.

The main purpose of carriageway maintenance is to maintain the road network for the safe and convenient movement of people and goods, with the core objectives being to deliver a safe, serviceable and sustainable network.

1.1.01 % of emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times

Emergency (Cat 1) defects are safety/dangerous defects that require prompt attention because they represent an immediate or imminent hazard or there is a risk of short-term structural damage. When considering network safety, it is crucial that authorities recognise the consequential implications that failure to make safe, repair and record carriageway defects within identified timescales, when defending public liability insurance claims.

Return to report

1.2.01 % of safety inspections completed on time

Safety inspections are designed to identify all defects likely to create danger or serious inconvenience to users of the network and should include defects such as those identified that require urgent attention as well as those where the locations and dimensions are such that longer periods of response would be unacceptable. The safety inspection regime forms a key aspect of an authority's strategy for managing liabilities and risks.

Return to report

1.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims

Managing claims effectively can make a significant difference to the public perception of service delivery. It is therefore important that authorities have in place effective procedures for claims management. These procedures can protect the authority from unjustified and fraudulent claims.

Return to report

1.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of carriageway

This output will allow for meaningful benchmarking to take place, considering the number of 3rd party claims per km of network rather than the number of claims which isn't really comparable.

Return to report

1.4.01 % of carriageway network subject to precautionary salting treatment

Precautionary salting routes are those deemed to be of primary importance and which form a strategic network. These routes will include routes to hospitals, schools and routes to main emergency service establishments. The % of an authority's network treated as precautionary will vary depending on the importance of the traffic route.

Return to report

1.4.02 % carriageway network deemed top priority

Top priority/High priority routes have been developed by most authorities following the severe winter of 10/11. Routes will have been identified in order to keep strategic and primary routes open during times of significant snowfall and to allow traffic to flow freely on these routes. These routes will be treated when continuous snow is forecast and likely to give significant accumulations in excess of 100mm over a substantial part of the Council area and expected to remain in untreated locations for a prolonged period before a natural thaw disperses it.

Return to report

1.4.03 Route efficiency

This considers the length of non treated route built in to the gritting route, and considers how routes have been developed to minimise non treated areas.

Return to report

1.4.04 Average route length

This considers the number of routes/gritters required to treat precautionary routes and achievable routes for gritters.

Return to report

1.4.05 Total actual length treated with precautionary treatment

Precautionary treatment is undertaken on the top priority routes within the council area, generally these form a strategic network including main traffic routes.

Note. For the purposes of the PI process "precautionary treatment" for carriageways is classed as a pre planned treatment or action based on an adverse forecast.

Return to report

1.4.06 % top priority routes completed on time

Top priority routes are those designated by each authority as the highest priority roads based on their winter treatment hierarchy. This may or may not be the same as 1.4.05 above, the total precautionary treated network length, where no "priority" or snow routes have been developed.

Return to report

1.4.07 Total salt usage by total network length

This includes salt usage for all treatments – precautionary, secondary, reactive, etc on all parts of the carriageway network for the whole of the year. This should also include all salt used in snow (priority) events. This figure should be divided by the total carriageway network length.

Return to report

1.4.08 Total salt usage by total actual precautionary treated length

This is the actual annual tonnage used to carry out the precautionary treatments to the routes for the whole of the year multiplied by the number of runs per a precautionary treatment. This figure should be divided by the length of network normally subject to treatment of salt on a precautionary salting run, multiplied by the number of runs in a year.

Return to report

1.4.09 Average salt usage (tonnes) per precautionary run

This gives the salt usage per total number of precautionary treatment runs.

Return to report

1.4.10 The stated (policy) time for completion of treatment of your highest priority routes

Highest priority routes are those designated by each authority as the highest priority roads based on their winter treatment hierarchy and normally relate to resilience routes in times of extreme prolonged winter weather/conditions. This provides the time given, within the authority's Winter Service Plan/Policy, for completion of routes during extreme conditions.

Return to report

1.4.11 The stated (policy) time for mustering

This relates to the time permitted within the Winter Service Plan/Policy to allow operatives who have been called out to reach their gritter and commence treatment.

Return to report

1.5.01 % of respondents satisfied with the way the Council undertakes gritting & snow clearance of carriageways

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

Condition/Asset Preservation

Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice sets the core objectives for maintenance could be considered to be:

Network Safety:
Complying with statutory obligations
Meeting users' needs for safety

Customer Service:
User experience/satisfaction
Communication
Information
Levels of service

Network Serviceability:
Ensuring availability
Achieving integrity
Maintaining reliability
Resilience
Managing condition

Network Sustainability:
Minimising cost over time
Maximising value to the community
Maximising environmental contribution

Authorities will have service standards detailed within their Road Asset Management Plans.

2.1.01 % of carriageway length to be considered for maintenance treatment

The statutory performance indicator (RCI) for the condition of the Scottish local authority road network is defined as "the percentage of the road network which should be considered for maintenance treatment", i.e. has reached a condition where more detailed monitoring or investigation is appropriate, to establish if and when remedial measures are required.

The RCI is derived from survey data collected over the previous 2 years and the results are presented graphically.

Return to report

2.1.02 to 2.3.09 and 2.3.14 - % of carriageway area treated (various treatment types)

Many Councils could improve their planning of structural maintenance, establishing long-term strategies for maintenance, based on condition information whilst developing asset management strategies. It is anticipated that improved planning of structural maintenance works will result in a reduction in the requirement for reactive maintenance work. The report published by "SCOTS" State of the Scottish Road Network recognises that the lack of investment in road maintenance results in downward changes in the condition of local authority roads.

Return to report

2.3.10 to 2.3.13 - % of roads to be considered for maintenance treatment

The report published by "SCOTS" State of the Scottish Road Network recognises that there is a growing concern that carriageway assets are not receiving the attention or funding required to maintain them in an optimal state of repair. The report recognises that the latest SRMCS results show that the condition of local authority carriageways have continued to deteriorate.

Return to report

2.4.01 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of roads

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

2.4.02 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of roads

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

Financial

Your Road Asset Management Plan will present the investment required in the maintenance of the carriageway asset to maintain the core objectives of safety, serviceability and sustainability of the asset, together with ensuring suitable levels of customer care. There is a requirement to focus on the whole life of the asset, minimising cost over time. Moving beyond reactive maintenance work requires authorities to have sufficient financial flexibility to allow this to happen. Focussing on the whole life cost of the carriageway asset requires authorities to have an asset management regime in place which considers the optimal use of the asset, demonstrates best value and prudent stewardship. To provide the best possible value for money, authorities should ensure that maintenance work is carried out in good time, endeavouring to ensure that maintenance costs do not escalate by allowing assets to deteriorate to the extent that routine maintenance is no longer possible.

6.1.01 Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway length

Effective budget monitoring arrangements are crucial to the delivery of best value with systems of financial management being consistent with delivering high standards of customer responsiveness. Budgetary control systems should be in place that enable easy and electronic retrieval of information for the effective financial management of carriageway assets. Where these systems aren't currently in place, budget headers should be amended to suit more transparent and retrievable financial reporting. It is widely recognised that the integration of works planning and programming within the context of road asset management is likely to require greater flexibility than has previously been the case.

Return to report

6.1.02 Total cost per Km of carriageway travelled for precautionary salting treatment

This gives you the cost per kilometre of treatment of precautionary routes.

Return to report

6.1.03 Total carriageway contractor maintenance expenditure by carriageway network length (excluding client cost)

Operational cost of carriageway maintenance works per kilometre.

Return to report

6.1.04 Total carriageway maintenance expenditure by carriageway area treated

Net unit cost of carriageway maintenance per square metre.

Return to report

6.3.01 Total cost of addressing total backlog by road length

The SCOTS Financial Model has defined the Headline Backlog as the carriageway maintenance funding required to clear all of the red and amber defects reported via the RCI. This figure allows a comparative budget valuation to be calculated which can be monitored on an annual basis.

Return to report

6.3.02 Total cost of reactive maintenance

Reactive maintenance involves a degree of urgency, attending to the rectification of Cat1 defects and other matters requiring urgent attention, arising either from inspections or user requests in accordance with the specified standards of response. Making safe a defect either through repair (temporary or permanent), or through signing/guarding are examples of reactive maintenance works.

Return to report

6.3.03 Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims

Managing claims effectively can make a significant difference to the public perception of service delivery. It is therefore important that authorities have in place effective procedures for claims management as these procedures can assist in defending the authority against claims.

Return to report

6.3.04 Cost per km of planned maintenance

Planned maintenance is undertaken primarily in the interests of providing for a sustainable outcome and to add community value to the network or to the environment. It is recognised that planned maintenance schemes may be more expensive than reactive or routine maintenance at initial cost, but should be designed to have a lower whole life cost, therefore improving value for money. Planned works should align with the objectives of the authority and deliver value for money.

Return to report

6.3.05 Cost per km of reactive maintenance

Reactive maintenance involves a degree of urgency, attending to the rectification of Cat1 defects and other matters requiring urgent attention, arising either from inspections or user requests in accordance with the specified standards of response. Making safe a defect either through repair (temporary or permanent), or through signing/guarding are examples of reactive maintenance works.

Return to report

6.3.06 Cost per km of routine maintenance

Routine maintenance is primarily for the purpose of providing defined standards of network serviceability, maximising availability, reliability, integrity and quality.

Return to report

FOOTWAY ASSETS

Safety

The generic term “footway” should be taken to include footways and footpaths.

Authorities have a general duty of care to users and the community to maintain the footway network in a condition fit for purpose through determined operations standards such as rectification of defects arising from safety and serviceability inspections and investment priorities.

The main purpose of footway maintenance is to ensure the safety of walking surfaces for users with the core objectives being to deliver a safe, serviceable and sustainable footway network.

11.1.01 % of Emergency (Cat 1) defects made safe within response times

Emergency (Cat 1) defects are safety/dangerous defects that require prompt attention because they represent an immediate or imminent hazard or there is a risk of short-term structural damage. When considering network safety, it is crucial that authorities recognise the consequential implications that failure to make safe, repair and record footway defects within identified timescales, when defending public liability insurance claims.

Return to report

11.2.01 % of safety inspections completed on time

Safety inspections are designed to identify all defects likely to create danger or serious inconvenience to users of the network and should include defects such as those identified that require urgent attention as well as those where the locations and dimensions are such that longer periods of response would be acceptable. The safety inspection regime forms a key aspect of an authority’s strategy for managing liabilities and risks.

Return to report

11.3.02 Total number of 3rd party claims

Managing claims effectively can make a significant difference to the public perception of service delivery. It is therefore important that authorities have in place effective procedures for claims management. These procedures can protect the authority from unjustified and fraudulent claims.

Return to report

11.3.03 Total number of 3rd party claims per Km of footway

This output will allow for meaningful benchmarking to take place, considering the number of 3rd party claims per km of footway rather than the number of claims which isn’t really comparable.

Return to report

11.4.01 % of footway subject to precautionary salting treatment

Precautionary salting routes are those deemed to be of primary importance and which form a strategic network. These routes will include routes to hospitals, schools and routes to main emergency service establishments. The % of an authority’s footway treated as precautionary will vary depending on the importance of the traffic route.

Return to report

11.4.02 % of footway network deemed top priority

Top priority / high priority routes have been developed by most authorities following the severe winter of 10/11. Routes will have been identified in order to keep strategic and primary routes open during times of significant snowfall. These routes will be treated when continuous snow is forecast and likely to give significant accumulations in excess of 100mm over a substantial part of the Council area and expected to remain in untreated locations for a prolonged period before a natural thaw disperses it.

Return to report

11.4.03 Tonnes of salt used

Total tonnage of salt used on footways for the year.

Return to report

11.4.04 Total actual length treated with precautionary salting treatment

Precautionary salting routes are those deemed to be of primary importance and which form a strategic network. These routes will include routes to hospitals, schools and routes to main emergency service establishments. This gives the total length of these precautionary salting routes regardless of whether or not they were undertaken during normal working hours or not.

Return to report

11.4.05 Number of grit bins per Km of footway network

Gives number of grit bins per kilometre of footway length.

Return to report

Condition/Asset Preservation

Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice sets the core objectives for maintenance could be considered to be:

Network Safety:
Complying with statutory obligations
Meeting users' needs for safety

Customer Service:
User experience/satisfaction
Communication
Information
Levels of service

Network Serviceability:
Ensuring availability
Achieving integrity
Maintaining reliability
Resilience
Managing condition

Network Sustainability:
Minimising cost over time
Maximising value to the community
Maximising environmental contribution

Authorities will have service standards detailed within their Road Asset Management Plans.

Footway condition data will be required to meet the requirements of the CIPFA Code of Practice on the Highways Network Asset.

12.1.01 % of footway length to be considered for maintenance treatment

There is currently no national survey carried out to assist in condition reporting for footways, as exists for carriageways. Currently, the definition of investigatory levels to meet requirements for serviceability is a matter for local individual authority determination. It is recognised that to secure continuous improvement in the safety and serviceability of footways, in particular network integrity, it is necessary to know and report the condition of footways to assist with the development of longer term works programmes, as required for asset management purposes.

Return to report

12.3.01 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of footways/pavements

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

12.3.02 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of footways/pavements

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

12.3.03 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents satisfied with the condition of cycle facilities

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

12.3.04 Only regarding roads locally, % of respondents dissatisfied with the condition of cycle facilities

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

Financial

Your Road Asset Management Plan will present the investment required in the maintenance of the footway asset to maintain the core objectives of safety, serviceability and sustainability of the asset, together with ensuring suitable levels of customer care. There is a requirement to focus on the whole life of the asset, minimising cost over time. Moving beyond reactive maintenance work requires authorities to have sufficient financial flexibility to allow this to happen. Focussing on the whole life cost of the footway asset requires authorities to have an asset management regime in place that considers the optimal use of the asset, demonstrates best value and prudent stewardship. To provide the best possible value for money, authorities should ensure that maintenance work is carried out in good time, endeavouring to ensure that maintenance costs do not escalate by allowing assets to deteriorate to the extent that routine maintenance is no longer possible.

16.1.01 Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length

Effective budget monitoring arrangements are crucial to the delivery of best value with systems of financial management being consistent with delivering high standards of customer responsiveness. Budgetary control systems should be in place that enable easy and electronic retrieval of information for the effective financial management of footway assets. Where these systems aren't currently in place, budget headers should be amended to suit more transparent and retrievable financial reporting. It is widely recognised that the integration of works planning and programming within the context of road asset management is likely to require greater flexibility than has previously been the case.

Return to report

16.1.02 Cost per Km of footway travelled for salting treatment

This gives you the cost per kilometre of treatment of precautionary routes.

Return to report

16.1.03 Total footway maintenance expenditure by footway length (excluding client cost)

Operational cost of footway maintenance works per kilometre.

Return to report

16.1.04 Total footway maintenance expenditure by square metres of footway area treated

Net unit cost of footway maintenance per square metre.

Return to report

16.3.01 Total cost of reactive maintenance

Reactive maintenance involves a degree of urgency, attending to the rectification of emergency (Cat 1) defects and other matters requiring urgent attention, arising either from inspections or user requests in accordance with the specified standards of response. Making safe a repair either through repair (temporary or permanent), or through signing/guarding are examples of reactive maintenance works.

Return to report

16.3.02 Total settled cost of 3rd party public liability claims

Managing claims effectively can make a significant difference to the public perception of service delivery. It is therefore important that authorities have in place effective procedures for claims management as these procedures can assist in defending the authority against claims.

Return to report

16.3.03 Cost per km of planned maintenance

Planned maintenance is undertaken primarily in the interests of providing for a sustainable outcome and to add community value to the network or to the environment. It is recognised that planned maintenance schemes may be more expensive than reactive or routine maintenance at initial cost, but should be designed to have a lower whole life cost, therefore improving value for money. Planned works should align with the objectives of the authority and deliver value for money.

Return to report

16.3.04 Cost per km of reactive maintenance

Reactive maintenance involves a degree of urgency, attending to the rectification of emergency (Cat 1) defects and other matters requiring urgent attention, arising either from inspections or user requests in accordance with the specified standards of response. Making safe a repair either through repair (temporary or permanent), or through signing/guarding are examples of reactive maintenance works.

Return to report

16.3.05 Cost per km of routine maintenance

Routine maintenance is primarily for the purpose of providing defined standards of network serviceability, maximising availability, reliability, integrity and quality.

Return to report

BRIDGES & STRUCTURES ASSETS

Safety

With reference to Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice – Part C Structures

It is recommended that all highway structures should be subject to a regular Principal Inspection not more than six years following the previous Principal inspection unless a risk assessment has been carried out to define an alternative interval.

Principal Inspections comprise a close examination, within touching distance, of all accessible parts of a structure, including, where relevant, underwater parts and adjacent earthworks and waterways, utilising suitable access and/or traffic management works as necessary. Closed circuit television may be used for areas of difficult or dangerous access, e.g. obscured parts of a structure, confined spaces and underwater inspections.

It is recommended that all highway structures should be subject to a regular General Inspection not more than two years following the previous General or Principal Inspection.

General Inspections comprise a visual inspection of all parts of the structure and, where relevant to the behaviour or stability of the structure, adjacent earthworks or waterways that can be inspected without the need for special access or traffic management arrangements. Riverbanks, for example, in the vicinity of a bridge should be examined for evidence of scour or flooding or for conditions, such as the deposition of debris or blockages to the waterway, which could lead to scour of bridge supports or flooding.

31.1.01 % of principal inspections carried out on time

Number of Principal inspections carried out at their specified frequencies as identified in the Structures Lifecycle Plan as a % of the total number of Principal inspections scheduled for the year.

Return to report

31.1.02 % of general inspections carried out on time

Number of General inspections carried out at their specified frequencies as identified in the Structures Lifecycle Plan as a % of the total number of general inspections scheduled for the year.

Return to report

32.1.01 Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - average BSCIav

The Bridge Stock Condition Indicator is the numerical value of a bridge stock condition evaluated as an average of the Bridge Condition Indicator values weighted by the deck area (m2) of each bridge.

Return to report

32.1.02 Bridge Stock Condition Indicator - critical BSCIcrit

The Bridge Stock Condition Indicator is the numerical value of the critical condition index for a bridge stock evaluated using the BSCIcrit values.

Return to report

32.3.01 % of bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes

Number of Council owned bridges subject to monitoring/special inspection regimes as a % of the total number of Council owned bridges.

Return to report

32.3.02 No of Council owned bridges failing assessment

Number of Council owned bridges failing assessment.

Return to report

32.3.03 No of privately owned bridges failing assessment on Council road network

Number of Privately owned bridges within Council's road network failing assessment.

Return to report

Functionality

34.1.01 % of Council owned bridges failing European standards

Number of Council owned bridges failing assessment as a % of the total number of bridges.

Return to report

34.2.01 % of Council road bridges with unacceptable weight, height or width restriction

Number of bridges (Council owned) weight/height/width restricted as a % of the total number of bridges.

Return to report

34.3.01 No of Council bridges weight restricted (excluding acceptable weight restrictions)

Number of Council bridges weight restricted where the restriction does not affect the road network.

Return to report

34.3.02 No of Council bridges with imposed width / height restriction

Number of Council bridges width and/or height restricted where the restriction affects the road network.

Return to report

Financial

36.1.01 Annual budget allocated as a % of cost of identified work (from AMP)

Annual budget allocated to structures maintenance work (including capital and revenue allocations) as a percentage of the estimated cost of identified work for bridge stock.

Return to report

36.2.01 % of allocated budget spent per annum

Annual actual expenditure (including capital and revenue allocations) as a percentage of the total annual budget allocated to structures maintenance work.

Return to report

36.2.02 Cost of identified potential work as a % of total structures valuation

Estimated cost of identified work for bridge stock as a percentage of the total structure valuation.

Return to report

36.3.01 % of budget spent repairing 3rd party damage

Cost of repairing 3rd party damage as a % of the total budget.

Return to report

36.3.02 Cost to remove unacceptable restrictions by weight/height/width

Cost of removing unacceptable restrictions by weight/height.

Return to report

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

41.1.01 % of faults rectified within target time

Percentage of traffic signal faults repaired within set target time.

Return to report

41.1.02 % of faults rectified on first visit

Percentage of traffic signal faults repaired at first visit to locus.

Return to report

46.1.01 % spend on Traffic Management Systems

This is the proportion of the TMS budget spent on planned maintenance of traffic management systems.

Return to report

STREET FURNITURE

56.1.01 % spend on Street Furniture

This is the proportion of the total budget (Roads & Lighting) spent on street furniture

Return to report

ALL ASSETS SERVICE DELIVERY

61.1.01 Km inspected per Safety Inspector (carriageways & footways)

This is the length of safety inspection undertaken per FTE Safety Inspector.

Return to report

61.2.01 % satisfied with the Council's time taken to complete roadworks (respondents "always/usually" aware of organisation responsible for roadworks only)

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

61.2.02 Taking everything into account, % of respondents satisfied overall with the service provided

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

61.2.03 Taking everything into account, % of respondents dissatisfied overall with the service provided

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

STREET LIGHTING ASSETS

Safety

Street lighting installations comprise large, heavy structures and lanterns of considerable weight at heights typically between 5 and 12 metres. Although defined as “low voltage”, the standard mains supply can be lethal in the typical British street environment where the general public may not understand the dangers of inadvertently exposed or faulty equipment.

There is an extensive body of legislation which places an unequivocal obligation, some absolute, on a street lighting authority to protect the health and safety of its personnel. Less specifically, but possibly with more exacting demands, there is a general duty of care towards the public.

The arduous and unpredictable service conditions of street lighting plant lead to an inevitable deterioration over time of even the best equipment. Many components currently in service are used far beyond their intended service life, assuming that this was ever realistically defined.

Although the hazards resulting from the deterioration of such equipment may seem obvious, ensuring that its condition is adequate is not always systematically addressed. Severely limited funding demands that clearly informed decisions are made to apply the money available effectively in maintaining an acceptably low level of risk, or highlighting the need for increased budgets to attain this.

In contrast to the real but uncertain nature of structural hazards, it is possible to be more specific about danger from electrical hazards. This is demonstrated by legislation such as the Electricity at Work Regulations 1989, which apply to personnel working on street lighting equipment. The HSE Memorandum of Guidance on these regulations states, “In the context of the Regulations, where the risk is very often that of death, for example, from electrocution and where the nature of the precautions which can be taken are so often very simple and cheap, e.g. insulation, the level of duty to prevent that danger approaches that of an absolute duty”. Where there is an absolute duty, cost considerations cannot be accepted as a reason for inaction.

21.2.01 % of columns with a valid structural inspection (within last 6 years)

The most likely reasons for structural failure of lighting columns are impact damage, which should be reported, or detected during routine roads inspections, and corrosion which is a gradual and often unseen process. For the reasons already stated it is essential that deterioration is detected before the probability of collapse becomes unacceptably high.

Some failure modes are not externally visible while others can be detected by visual inspection. There are several techniques for testing the structural integrity of lighting columns. However, there is clearly no point in incurring the expense of testing where a visual inspection is sufficient to decide on the basis of amassed experience and codes of practice, such as the Institute of Lighting Professional Technical Report 22 (TR22), that columns are unsound.

It is reasonable to assume that most deterioration takes place over many years and those older columns are more likely to fail than newer ones. However, age cannot be considered a direct correlation due to many variations in column construction, service conditions and maintenance. Thus to ensure structural safety, an ongoing regime of inspection and testing, based on both age profile and local knowledge, should be undertaken.

By inspecting and testing a proportion of its columns each year, according to a systematic plan, a lighting authority should ensure that no columns deteriorate to a dangerous condition.

Return to report

21.2.02 % of street lanterns with a valid Electrical Test Certificate.

Similar considerations to those already described for structural inspection and testing apply to electrical condition.

BS 7671 (IEE Wiring Regulations) does not specify a maximum interval between test but states that it should be appropriate to the circumstances of the installation; (see regulations 622.1 & 622.2 of the 17th Edition:2008). IET Guidance Note 3, 5th edition, 2008, recommends a maximum period of six to eight years for highway power supplies, as in previous editions of the Guidance Note. It follows that a proportion of the lighting stock should to be inspected and tested each year, but where rapid deterioration is likely, more frequent testing should be undertaken.

Inspection and testing are not alternatives; they must both be undertaken as appropriate to potential hazards. Some faults can only be detected by test instruments but visibly dangerous conditions, such as perished insulation, will not necessarily preclude apparently satisfactory test results.

Inspection and testing procedures should be based on an intelligent interpretation of BS 7671, the advice in Guidance Note 3, and good practice in managing electrical maintenance.

Return to report

Condition/Asset Preservation

The street lighting installation in any authority’s area is likely to be a significant asset whose replacement value greatly exceeds the annual budget. It is therefore important that its value is maintained by systematic replacement of old equipment which is beyond its safe or useful service life.

The useful service life depends on variable equipment quality and service conditions but in general columns older than 30 years and lanterns which are 20 years old are likely to be nearing the end of their life.

22.2.01 Faults as a % of street lighting stock

The vast majority of street lighting depends on electrical and electronic materials and components which conform to the well known “bath tub” reliability curve which indicates a rapid increase in fault numbers as the equipment reaches the end of its life.

Reliability in street lighting systems depends on a suitable choice of equipment and materials for the circumstances of its use and on the workmanship in installation and maintenance.

Unacceptable failure rates can be detected and investigated by monitoring the number of faults in relation to the overall lighting stock.

Return to report

22.2.02 % of columns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life

While many columns are still serviceable well beyond their recommended service life it is necessary to carefully monitor the condition of any older than this to ensure structural integrity. If the percentage of older columns is exceptionally high, it is likely that the replacement rate is not keeping pace with structural deterioration and an accelerated rate of replacement will be needed.

Return to report

22.2.03 % of lanterns which have exceeded their Expected Service Life

Lanterns will often include control gear and reflectors which deteriorate with time. Where remote control gear has used it will normally be replaced by a gear-enclosed lantern so that lantern replacement is a reasonable measure of control gear age too.

Even without age related deterioration, technical developments have been considerable over the last twenty years bringing benefits in optical and electrical efficiency.

To improve on existing efficiency and to benefit from LED developments, an authority should consider the economics of replacing lanterns that have exceeded their service life.

Return to report

22.3.02 % of columns replaced

This is a measure of an authority's success in maintaining the value of the lighting stock asset.

Return to report

22.3.03 % of lanterns replaced

This is a measure of an authority's success in maintaining the value of the lighting stock asset.

Return to report

Customer Service

In general terms, reliability and quality of street lighting is immediately obvious to users. Expectations of serviceability and reliability are high although detail understanding of the technology may be poor.

23.1.01 % of repairs within 7 days

Ideally, all faults would be repaired on the day they were identified but realistically this is unlikely to be attained for many reasons. This limit of seven days was set by Audit Scotland some time ago as a Statutory Performance Indicator but is no longer used for this purpose. It is however a reasonable target for **all** repairs with the implication that the reasons for any faults taking longer than this to repair should be explained or investigated.

The ideal target figure for this measure is 100% but some street lighting failures will be due to electricity supply faults which require a response or repair by the local Electricity Distribution Companies. Electricity Companies have a wide range of responsibilities, some of which must take priority over street lighting when resources are assigned to repairs. There is also a mismatch in agreed National repair targets set by OFGEM. As a result, many of these electricity supply faults are not corrected within seven days, adversely affecting this indicator. On high speed roads, where significant traffic management is necessary before a lighting fault can be investigated, the risks of undertaking an isolated repair may outweigh the risk posed by the fault.

Return to report

23.2.01 Average time taken to repair (days)

The time taken to repair a fault depends on the availability of replacement parts, the general technical and diagnostic skills of personnel, availability of resources, and the efficiency of the administration and fault reporting systems. The time to repair is defined so that a fault which is repaired on the day it is reported is counted as taking one day to repair, making the ideal figure one day.

The actual average time taken to repair faults is a measure of the efficiency of all aspects of the fault repair system.

Return to report

23.2.02 Public calls as a % of faults

Many authorities have a formal system for detecting and reporting street lighting faults, usually by having a "night scout" making regular patrols during the hours of darkness. It is impractical to have every light inspected every night and intervals of a week or more passes between patrols are common. During this time, concerned members of the public may report faults.

Recording the percentage of faults reported by the public is a measure of how demanding the public is in its expectations of the lighting service and how effective the night scouting operation is.

Return to report

23.2.03 Public calls as a % of street lights

This measure uses faults reported by the public as a gauge of public tolerance of street lighting faults and the effectiveness of the authority's maintenance regime.

Return to report

23.3.01 % of street lights giving modern white light

Recent findings and research strongly suggest that full spectrum light sources have many advantages over monochromatic sources such as low pressure sodium (SOX) despite the higher luminous efficacy of the SOX source as determined by current definitions.

The benefits of white light are recognised in the latest British Standards by allowing "S-Class" designs to be one grade lower than schemes designed for lamps with poorer colour rendition.

SOX technology is now obsolescent and therefore inappropriate for new installations. As all modern lamp technologies, except ordinary high pressure sodium (SON), have a colour rendition (R_a) of better than 0.6, the defined limit for "white" light, this measure is an indication of the modernity of the lighting sources used.

Return to report

23.3.02 % of street lights which are LED

Total of LED luminaires including older luminaires fitted with LED retrofit gear trays as a percentage of street lighting stock (not signs nor bollards).

Return to report

23.4.01 % of respondents satisfied with the street lighting

Satisfaction score taken from the APSE / SCOTS online, national Roads & Lighting customer satisfaction survey. To take part in this survey, free of charge, contact performance.networks@apse.org.uk

Return to report

Availability

Availability in the context of these indicators is a summary of the means taken to detect faults and the success of applying that information.

24.3.01 Number of night inspections annually

The number of times an entire system is inspected in each year will influence the repair times. The number of columns each inspector can check varies according to the time of year, which determines the length of hours of darkness, geographic considerations and the ratio of lights on roadways to those which can only be accessed on foot.

The cost of making a given number of inspections will thus vary between authorities but it is still useful to record the number of inspections as one important factor affecting repair times.

Return to report

Financial

Financial measures give some indication of the efficiency of application of allocated funds and also the authority's financial commitment to improving the condition and value of its street lighting asset.

26.1.01 Actual capital investment as a % of annual depreciation (from AMP)

The street lighting asset will depreciate in value unless adequate capital investment is made to replace aged street lights.

The Planned Capital Investment level is the capital investment required to avoid a decline in the total asset value; it is derived from the Asset Management Plan.

The Actual Capital Investment expressed as a percentage of the Annual Depreciation is an indication of the authority's commitment and ability to maintain the asset's condition and value.

Return to report

26.1.02 Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) as a % of Gross Replacement Cost (GRC)

It is important to establish by how much the asset is financially depreciating. This measure is an indication of depreciation.

The Gross Replacement Cost is the calculated overall cost of installing new equipment which would meet acceptable modern standards if the existing lighting were to be replaced.

The existing street lighting asset has a residual value, the Depreciated Replacement Cost, (DRC), which is a fraction of the Gross Replacement Cost and is derived from the Asset Management Plan using criteria such as age and type of equipment.

Return to report

26.2.01 Average cost (client) of repairing routine faults (e.g. component replacement)

Within a single authority's area the average repair and inspection costs can be a useful measure of the effectiveness of repair techniques. Some comparison between authorities may also be possible provided factors such as the travelling distances are similar.

Return to report

26.2.02 Individual cost of night inspecting a street light per light

Night Scouting is an important way of detecting faults and initiating repairs quickly. The cost of this inspection is a good indication of an authority's efficiency and effectiveness in returning best value for the money spent on scouting.

Return to report

26.2.03 Revenue allocation per street light excluding electricity costs

The Revenue budget allocation per street light is a measure of the funding allocated to maintaining and operating each street light. In instances where costs exceed available funding, an authority will have to amend and redefine its policy and service levels to meet budgetary constraints.

Energy charges should be separately recorded to indicate the overall efficiency of the equipment being used and the effectiveness of energy procurement arrangements.

Return to report

26.2.04 Capital allocation per street light – replacement

A continuing capital investment is essential to maintain the quality of the lighting asset.

An inadequate capital allocation will lead to deteriorating stock as equipment will be kept in service beyond its economic service life.

Return to report

26.2.05 Total investment in infrastructure per street light

This indictor is a summation of both the average capital and revenue investment in the street lighting asset and shows the authority's commitment to ensuring its street lighting is adequately funded.

Return to report

26.3.02 Energy cost per street lamp

Total energy costs for street lighting only, divided by the number of street lights. In general, rural areas will have a lower cost per street lamp.

Return to report

Environmental

There is now growing awareness of the need to reduce energy consumption to conserve fossil fuel reserves and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This can be done through efficient design and operational techniques. Where it is not already required, lighting authorities are likely to have to demonstrate to government how they are meeting energy reduction targets.

There has been a sharp increase in energy costs in recent years and the trend is likely to continue. It is in every authority's interest to minimise energy usage and to ensure that the energy used is applied as efficiently as possible.

27.1.01 Average annual electricity consumption per street light (kWh)

Average energy consumption per street light will take account of the factors affecting the average load connection per street light but will also improve where switching times are closely controlled and techniques such as variable lighting levels are suitably applied.

Return to report

27.3.01 Co2 emissions (kg) per street light

It is generally accepted that it is desirable to minimise carbon dioxide emissions and minimisation is likely to become a statutory requirement. In addition to 27.1.01, this value can be reduced by using energy from renewable sources.

Return to report

27.3.05 % of street lamps which had a registered dimming regime

A return for the percentage of lamps which have a registered dimming regime for your energy return for the year is one measure of how an authority is managing it's energy consumption and will include CMS and pre-set dim. It is expected that this will increase as LED use increases.

Return to report

27.3.03 Change in energy consumption from year to year (kWH)

Shows the percentage increase or decrease in energy used from previous year. There may be slight growth from adoption of new developments but in general this should be downward with the rollout of LED luminaires.

Return to report