



**REPORT TO: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
SERVICES COMMITTEE ON 28 JUNE 2016**

**SUBJECT: PERFORMANCE REPORT (DIRECT SERVICES) – HALF YEAR
TO MARCH 2016**

**BY: CORPORATE DIRECTOR (ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
PLANNING & INFRASTRUCTURE)**

1. REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline performance of the service for the period from 1 October 2015 to 31 March 2016.
- 1.2 This report is submitted to Committee in terms of Section III (E) (33) and (34) of the Council's Scheme of Administration relating to developing and monitoring the Council's Performance Management Framework for Economic, Development and Infrastructure Services and contributing to public performance reporting.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that Committee:-

- (i) scrutinises performance against Economic Development, Planning and Infrastructure Performance Indicators, Service Plan and Complaints to the end of March 2016 as outlined;**
- (ii) welcomes good performance as indicated in the report;**
- (iii) notes the actions being taken to improve performance where required;**
- (iv) approves the changes to the Direct Services' performance indicators, as detailed in Section 6 of the report, which are reported to this Committee.**

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Policy and Resources Committee, at its meeting on 27 April 2010 (Para 12 of the minute refers), approved the development of a quarterly monitoring document which will provide supporting information for the Performance

Management Framework. The half-yearly performance report refers to this document. The document includes performance indicators, service plan and complaints data (including codes as referred to in section 5 of this report), and can be found at:

http://www.moray.gov.uk/moray_standard/page_92321.html

4. **SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE**

Performance Indicators

4.1 The tables below summarise performance: –

Service	No. of Indicators	Green Performing Well	Amber Close Monitoring	Red Action Required	Annual/Data Only (trend rather than target)
Consultancy	4	2	1	1	0
Environmental Protection	14	10	3	1	0
Roads Maintenance	18	9	3	4	2
Transportation	21	9	4	1	7
Total	57	30 (53%)	11 (19%)	7 (12%)	9 (16%)
Total - reporting period	48	63%	23%	15%	

4.2 Of the 57 indicators reported 48 are subject to performance against target at the six month stage. The other nine indicators are subject to trend analysis. Performance against indicators relevant to the reporting period is presented across four service areas and, as stated above, involves 48 indicators. 30 indicators are regarded as performing well, 11 require close monitoring, and seven need action if the target is to be met.

Service Plan

Number of Actions	Completed - Expected by end quarter 4	Completed - Actual by end quarter 4	Cancelled	Overdue at end quarter 4
31	28	20	2	6

4.3 At the end of the reporting period six actions in the Service Plan were overdue and two had been cancelled. Overall, and including progress against actions not completed, the Service Plan was 86% complete at the end of the reporting period.

Complaints

- 4.3 Eighty four complaints were received by Direct Services during the half-year reporting period. Eighty nine complaints were closed during the reporting period. Of the closed complaints, nineteen complaints (21%) were upheld and ten complaints (11%) were partially upheld.

5. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Local Government Benchmarking Framework

- 5.1 In April 2016, Improvement Services released the finalised 2014/15 Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) performance results on how all Scottish councils perform in delivering better services to local communities, including the cost of services and how satisfied citizens are with them.
- 5.2 The details of the LGBF indicators are shown in **APPENDIX 1**. Exceptions for LGBF indicators are reported in paragraphs 5.6 to 5.10 and 5.21 below.

Areas of good performance

Environmental Protection

- 5.3 The cost to the council, of a primary school meal (Envdr211) was 68p in 2015/16 which is 8p or 10.5% lower than the cost in 2014/15. The introduction of free meals for P1 to P3 at the beginning of 2015 has meant that, for all primary pupils, there was a 10% increase for 2015/16 from 2014/15 in the uptake of meals (Envdr071). This increased uptake has allowed economies of scale.
- 5.4 The unit cost per 100 square metres for the cleaning of buildings was £4.65 in 2015/16 against the target of £4.70. Over the last three years, the costs have had a downward trend. There has been a 3% (£0.15) reduction in unit costs since 2013/14.
- 5.5 Four Environmental LGBF costs indicators for 204/15 were ranked in the top quartile for the 32 Scottish Local Authorities.
- 5.6 Cost of Parks and Open Spaces per 1,000 population (Envdr214):- In the LGBF Performance Indicators, Moray is ranked 3 of 32 nationally and ranked 1 of 8 for the comparator benchmarking group. In 2014/15, Moray reduced its cost by 14% from the 2013/14 value of £15.7k to £13.8k.
- 5.7 Gross Cost of Refuse Collection per Premise (Envdr216):- For LGBF, Moray is ranked 5 of 32 nationally and ranked 1 of 8 for the comparator benchmarking group. However, for the Gross Cost of Disposal indicator Moray (Envdr217) is ranked 23 of 32 (in the third quartile). There is not a LGBF indicator for the combined cost for collection and disposal but, if there was, Moray would be ranked 17 of 32. Therefore, the combined costs of collection and disposal for Moray is near the Scottish average.

- 5.8 Percentage of total waste arising that is recycled (Envdr069):- Moray is ranked 6 of 32 nationally and ranked 1 of 8 for the comparator benchmarking group. In 2014/15, the period for the ranking, Moray recycled 55.4% of waste. The recycling rate rose to 57.8% in 2015/16.
- 5.9 Net Cost of Street Cleaning per 1,000 population (Envdr218):- Moray is ranked 1 of 32 nationally. Moray has maintained its first place from 2013/14 in the 2014/15 rankings for the LGBF indicators. In 2014/15, Moray reduced its cost by 6% to £6.8k.

Roads Maintenance

- 5.10 The percentage of roads considered for maintenance treatment. Overall, Moray is ranked 6 against the other 31 councils in Scotland and only A class roads were outside the top quartile for 2015/16.

Percentage Considered for maintenance treatment	2014/15		2015/16		change
A class roads (SRL1a)	20.1%	rank 6	24.5%	rank 15	4.4%
B class roads (SRL1b)	17.7%	rank 1	22.5%	rank 5	4.8%
C class roads (SRL1c)	22.2%	rank 4	23.9%	rank 5	1.7%
Unclassified roads (SRL1d)	33.1%	rank 8	32.7%	rank 8	-0.4%
Overall(SRL1e)	26.3%	rank 6	27.9%	rank 6	1.6%

The table above shows that there has been a 1.6% increase overall, for 2015/16 from 2014/15, in the percentage of roads which are considered for maintenance. The biggest increase was for A and B class roads.

The aim is to reduce the road condition in Moray to the Scottish average. For A class roads this has already been achieved in 2015/16.

Transportation

- 5.11 In December, the Public Transport section won the Campbell Christie Award for Public Sector Reform for the Dial M for Moray service, beating 170 other applicants.

Service Plan

- 5.12 Consultancy – Completion of Elgin Flood Scheme (DirS15-18C.12a). The scheme is operational. Only ancillary works, which are outside the scheme, have still to be done. The work still to be done is to divert a water main, and to reconnect a road.
- 5.13 Consultancy – Deliver River Lossie Cycle way (DirS15-18C.4b). Some additional work was required, at the end of the project, to tie in with road works at Grampian Road. The project is now complete.

- 5.14 Transportation – Promotion of active travel (DirS15-18T.4).
The work done against this includes:-
- i. A cycling roadshow held in Dufftown.
 - ii. Completion of phase 1 and phase 2 of community links scheme in Forres
 - iii. A programme of behaviour change which is ongoing
 - iv. Completion of personal travel planning work.
 - v. Ongoing work through Smarter Choices Smarter People within schools.

Areas of performance identified for improvement

Consultancy

- 5.15 The percentage of responses within 14 days to planning consultations on flooding and drainage (ENVDR208) was 83% in Q4 against a target of 100%. One of six responses was late because of work pressure.

Environmental Protection

- 5.16 The percentage of waste recycled (ENVDR069) was 56.2% and 52.2% for Q3 and Q4 respectively against the target of 60%. The seasonal effect of less garden waste in the winter is the major cause of less recycling in Q3 and Q4. A comparison with Q4 2014/15 shows that in Q4 2015/16 there was a 1.44% increase in recycling. Over the year the recycling rate was 57.8% which is an increase of 2.3% from the preceding year.
- The 2023 Best Value Plan for the Future has targets for diverting waste from landfill. The target for waste diversion is 60% by 2020 and 95% by 2025. Presently the only option available to divert waste is by recycling. The indicator results of 57.8% for 2015/16 show that Moray is on course to meet the 2020 60% target for waste diversion in the 2023 Plan. The Joint Energy from Waste Project with Aberdeenshire and Aberdeen City, which had funding approved for stage 1 by Full Council on 11 November 2015 (para 13 of the minute refers), is expected to be operational by the end of 2021 and to be diverting residual waste from landfill.

Roads Maintenance

- 5.17 The net savings from Pool Cars (ENVDR224) are up £8K on the 2014/15 savings but still well below the target of £190k at £132k. The actual savings for 2015/16 are £22k more than the estimated savings in the recent Pool Car report. In comparison with 2014/15 Revenue costs are down by £46.9K; Depreciation costs are up by £23.6K, and mileage is down by 33.4K (which would have generated £15.1K of avoided spend).

Net Savings from Pool Cars:

Code & Name	Target	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
Envdr224 Net savings for Pool Cars	£190,000	£211,004	£123,907	£132,191

In 2015/16, fuel cost was £41k less than in 2014/15 and is therefore the single biggest reason for the reduction in revenue costs and the increase in savings for 2015/16. Also maintenance costs were £8k less in 2015/16 from the previous year. Up until 2014/15, maintenance costs had been rising but in 2015/16 they fell by 7% to £103k from the 2014/15 level.

Staff are being encouraged to make more use of Pool Cars, not to book for longer than necessary, and, in order to increase efficient use, not to book Pool Cars for journeys under a mile. The possible use of vehicles at weekends by car clubs is being considered by Transport & Travel Research Ltd who have provided a report about this to the Transportation section in May.

- 5.18 In Q4, only 35% of vehicles which were available throughout the quarter achieved 3,000 miles against the target of 75% (ENVDR130g). The average mileage for vehicles which were available throughout Q4 was 2,836 miles. Apart from Q1 2015/16, the average mileage fell short of target. The total mileage for the year in 2015/16 was 1,265K miles against 1,299K in 2014/15. As for para 5.18 above, staff are being encouraged to use Pool Cars more.
- 5.19 The cost of winter maintenance for roads per kilometre (ENVDR227) was £1,081 against a target of £900. For the network as a whole, the cost was £281k more than the target of £1.4M. The target of £900 per kilometre was chosen because it was the first measurement of the indicator in 2013/14 and the 2013/14 winter was a mild winter. The cost for 2015/16 was £101 per kilometre better than the cost for 2014/15.
- 5.20 The percentage of Road Construction Consent applications responded to within timescales (ENVDR074k) was 88% in Q4 against a target of 100%. Two application responses out of 17 were one and three days late respectively. The delays occurred over the Christmas period when staff were on holiday.
- 5.21 Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning (Envdr221):- This is a LGBF indicator. For 2014/15, Moray was ranked 27 of 32 councils for this indicator and was therefore in the bottom quartile. The data for LGBF indicator comes from the Scottish Household Survey and gave 67% satisfied in 2014/15. Direct Services also measure this with a larger sample¹ through the Citizens Panel. The Panel has also a measurement for 2015/16. The Panel results were 58% satisfied in 2014/15 and 68% satisfied in 2015/16. Although the Panel results are worse than the LGBF data for 2014/15, they do show an improvement in 2015/16. Moray is no longer a member of the Local Environmental Audit and Management System and therefore cannot compare with other authorities for Street Cleanliness. However, Moray still monitors street cleanliness and the index score of 84 (ENVDR068a) for 2015/16 is comparable to previous years when Moray ranked in the top three for Scotland.

¹ Typically the number of respondents in Moray are 250 for the Scottish Household Survey while the Citizens Panel has 400.

- 5.22 The percentage of planning applications returned to the planning department within target time (ENVDR252) was 74% and 71% in Q3 and Q4 respectively against a target of 88%. In Q4, there were 110 returned within timescales out of 156 applications received. Performance has been affected by a vacancy within the team.

Service Plan

- 5.23 Consultancy - Develop Surface Water Management Plans (DirS15-18C.12e):- The work scheduled for 2015/16 is 80% complete. The reason for the work being behind schedule was that another area (Duffus) was added to the original list.
- 5.24 Consultancy – Replacement for Seatown Bridge (DirS15-18C.4c):- 35% complete. Delays with land acquisition mean that this won't be done until July.
- 5.25 Consultancy – Design Work for B9016 Buckie-Keith Road Improvement:- 0% complete. This has been delayed because of funding. Funding of £42,000 for the design work was agreed at the meeting of The Moray Council on 30 March 2016 (paras 7 and 10 of the minute refers).
- 5.26 Environmental Protection – Enhancing publicity materials (DirS15-18E.1a):- 95% complete. The production of publicity work has been delayed due to year-end work taking priority.
- 5.27 Environmental Protection – Computerising weighbridge operations (DirS15-18E.1c):- 80% complete. There was a delay due to work pressure. This is expected to be completed in May.
- 5.28 Roads – “Develop further business cases for covered salt storage” (DirS15-18R.9):- 0% complete. This action is not being addressed because of lack of resources.

6 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORTED TO THIS COMMITTEE

- 6.1 Five changes are requested for 2016/17.
- 6.2 Remove the indicator for Flood Reports for Premises done within timescale (Envdr2017) because the UK government and the insurance industry have introduced a scheme to help home owners in flood areas to find insurance. The initiative called 'Flood Re' was introduced in April 2016 and makes the service provided by the Council redundant.
- 6.3 Remove the indicator which measures the use of external contractors for dredging (Envdr090) because the Council now has its own dredger.
- 6.4 The LGBF no longer use Gross Cost of Waste Collection (Envdr216) for benchmarking. Therefore, the request is to remove and replace the indicator with a measurement of Net Cost of Waste Collection.

- 6.5 The LGBF no longer use Gross Cost of Waste Disposal (Envdr217) for benchmarking. Therefore, the request is to remove and replace the indicator with a measurement of Net Cost of Waste Disposal.
- 6.6 Remove the indicator “Net unit cost per passenger per trip of the Dial-A-Bus Service” (Envdr241) and replace with a measurement of the Net unit cost per passenger per trip with the Dial-M Service. Starting in April 2015, and with no additional funding, the Public Transport Section introduced a scheduled bus service and in June 2016 there will be four scheduled services. In order to capture all the costs the Dial-A-Bus service and the scheduled services need to be considered together. The introduced scheduled bus services are already reducing the cost per trip to the Council.

7 SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS

(a) Moray 2023: A Plan for the Future and Moray Corporate Plan 2015 -2017

Performance measurement is used to ensure the efficient and sustainable delivery of services to meet the Council's priorities in the Moray 2023: A Plan for the Future.

(b) Policy and Legal

The Council has a statutory requirement to publish a range of information that will demonstrate that it is securing best value and assist in comparing performance both over time and between authorities where appropriate.

(c) Financial implications

None.

(d) Risk Implications

None.

(e) Staffing Implications

None.

(f) Property

None.

(g) Equalities

An Equality Impact Assessment is not needed because the report is to inform the Committee on performance.

(h) Consultations

The Head of Direct Services and Service Managers within Direct Services have been consulted and any comments incorporated into the report.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 63% of Direct Services' performance indicators, for 2015/16, showed good performance. The service plan progress overall for 2015/16 was 86% complete.**

Author of Report: Bob Ramsay

Background Papers: Held by Bob Ramsay, Research & Information Officer

Ref:

Local Government Benchmarking Framework

In April 2016 Improvement Services released the finalised 2014/15 Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) performance results on how all Scottish councils perform in delivering better services to local communities, including the cost of services and how satisfied citizens are with them. The following table provides a summary of Morays performance compared with the previous year and against benchmarking authorities and nationally:

Please note that LGBF indicators measuring satisfaction with services use the Scottish Government Household Survey data. Direct Services also survey customers using the Citizens panel which asks about many aspects of the services including some topics in the Scottish Household Survey. Because the sample size of the Household Survey is much smaller than for the Citizens Panel the data used locally is from the Citizens Panel.

Also ranking data against the 32 local authorities for 2015/16 for road condition indicators is available ahead of the other LGBF indicators and are shown instead of 2014/15 rankings.

Indicator	2013/14	2014/15	Change	Performance Against Comparators / National	
Lands & Parks					
Cost of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population	£15,654	£13,752	-£1,902	Moray – Cost of Parks and Open Spaces - £65.55 (Rank 3 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 1 of 8 for the family group below)I	
				Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£
				East Ayrshire	18,502
				East Lothian	41,421
				Fife	45,970
				Moray	13,752
				North Ayrshire	33,771
				Perth & Kinross	44,727
				South Ayrshire	34,806
				Stirling	19,983
Scotland	31,304				
Percentage of adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	79%	75%	-4%	No comparator data available as yet	
Waste Management					
Gross cost of refuse collection per premise	£70.25	£65.55	-£4.70	Moray - Gross cost of refuse collection per premise - £65.55 (Rank 5 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 1 of 8 for the family group below)I	
				Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£
				East Ayrshire	81.4
				East Lothian	76.3
				Fife	75.5
				Moray	65.6
				North Ayrshire	81.8
				Perth & Kinross	84.6
				South Ayrshire	104.9
				Stirling	123.2
Scotland	83.4				
Gross cost of Waste disposal per premise	£116.80	£121.86	£5.06	Moray - Gross cost of refuse disposal per premise - £65.55 (Rank 23 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 8 of 8 for the family group below)I	
				Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£
				East Ayrshire	84.8
				East Lothian	81.6
				Fife	97.7
				Moray	121.9
				North Ayrshire	115.5
				Perth & Kinross	119.3
				South Ayrshire	80.6
				Stirling	106.8
Scotland	104.5				
Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	£7,271	£6,850	-£421	Moray - Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population - £65.55 (Rank 1 of 32 local authorities)	

Indicator	2013/14	2014/15	Change	Performance Against Comparators / National																				
				(Rank 1 of 8 for the family group below)I <table><tr><th>Comparator Benchmarking Authorities</th><th>£</th></tr><tr><td>East Ayrshire</td><td>12,436</td></tr><tr><td>East Lothian</td><td>12,749</td></tr><tr><td>Fife</td><td>16,917</td></tr><tr><td>Moray</td><td>6,850</td></tr><tr><td>North Ayrshire</td><td>14,921</td></tr><tr><td>Perth & Kinross</td><td>16,584</td></tr><tr><td>South Ayrshire</td><td>13,341</td></tr><tr><td>Stirling</td><td>20,670</td></tr><tr><td>Scotland</td><td>15,818</td></tr></table>	Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£	East Ayrshire	12,436	East Lothian	12,749	Fife	16,917	Moray	6,850	North Ayrshire	14,921	Perth & Kinross	16,584	South Ayrshire	13,341	Stirling	20,670	Scotland	15,818
Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£																							
East Ayrshire	12,436																							
East Lothian	12,749																							
Fife	16,917																							
Moray	6,850																							
North Ayrshire	14,921																							
Perth & Kinross	16,584																							
South Ayrshire	13,341																							
Stirling	20,670																							
Scotland	15,818																							
Percentage of adults satisfied with refuse collection	86%	89%	3%	Moray - Percentage of adults satisfied with refuse collection £65.55 (Rank 10 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 3 of 8 for the family group below)I <table><tr><th>Comparator Benchmarking Authorities</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>East Ayrshire</td><td>84</td></tr><tr><td>East Lothian</td><td>95</td></tr><tr><td>Fife</td><td>81</td></tr><tr><td>Moray</td><td>89</td></tr><tr><td>North Ayrshire</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>Perth & Kinross</td><td>88</td></tr><tr><td>South Ayrshire</td><td>92</td></tr><tr><td>Stirling</td><td>72</td></tr><tr><td>Scotland</td><td>84</td></tr></table>	Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%	East Ayrshire	84	East Lothian	95	Fife	81	Moray	89	North Ayrshire	82	Perth & Kinross	88	South Ayrshire	92	Stirling	72	Scotland	84
Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%																							
East Ayrshire	84																							
East Lothian	95																							
Fife	81																							
Moray	89																							
North Ayrshire	82																							
Perth & Kinross	88																							
South Ayrshire	92																							
Stirling	72																							
Scotland	84																							
Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning	77%	67%	-10%	Moray - Percentage of adults satisfied with street cleaning - £65.55 (Rank 27 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 7 of 8 for the family group below)I <table><tr><th>Comparator Benchmarking Authorities</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>East Ayrshire</td><td>68</td></tr><tr><td>East Lothian</td><td>86</td></tr><tr><td>Fife</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>Moray</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><td>North Ayrshire</td><td>78</td></tr><tr><td>Perth & Kinross</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>South Ayrshire</td><td>66</td></tr><tr><td>Stirling</td><td>85</td></tr><tr><td>Scotland</td><td>74</td></tr></table>	Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%	East Ayrshire	68	East Lothian	86	Fife	80	Moray	67	North Ayrshire	78	Perth & Kinross	80	South Ayrshire	66	Stirling	85	Scotland	74
Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%																							
East Ayrshire	68																							
East Lothian	86																							
Fife	80																							
Moray	67																							
North Ayrshire	78																							
Perth & Kinross	80																							
South Ayrshire	66																							
Stirling	85																							
Scotland	74																							
Percentage of total waste arising that is recycled	51.4%	54.4%	4%	Moray - Percentage of total waste arising that is recycled - 54.4% (Rank 6 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 3 of 8 for the family group below)I <table><tr><th>Comparator Benchmarking Authorities</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>East Ayrshire</td><td>50.3</td></tr><tr><td>East Lothian</td><td>42.8</td></tr><tr><td>Fife</td><td>53.7</td></tr><tr><td>Moray</td><td>54.4</td></tr><tr><td>North Ayrshire</td><td>56.5</td></tr><tr><td>Perth & Kinross</td><td>56.5</td></tr><tr><td>South Ayrshire</td><td>50.0</td></tr><tr><td>Stirling</td><td>53.1</td></tr><tr><td>Scotland</td><td>42.8</td></tr></table>	Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%	East Ayrshire	50.3	East Lothian	42.8	Fife	53.7	Moray	54.4	North Ayrshire	56.5	Perth & Kinross	56.5	South Ayrshire	50.0	Stirling	53.1	Scotland	42.8
Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	%																							
East Ayrshire	50.3																							
East Lothian	42.8																							
Fife	53.7																							
Moray	54.4																							
North Ayrshire	56.5																							
Perth & Kinross	56.5																							
South Ayrshire	50.0																							
Stirling	53.1																							
Scotland	42.8																							
Roads																								
Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads	£6,222	£5,365	£857	Moray - Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads - £5,365 (Rank 12 of 32 local authorities) (Rank 3 of 8 for the family group below)I <table><tr><th>Comparator Benchmarking Authorities</th><th>£</th></tr><tr><td>East Ayrshire</td><td>8,744</td></tr><tr><td>East Lothian</td><td>12,268</td></tr><tr><td>Fife</td><td>9,083</td></tr><tr><td>Moray</td><td>5,365</td></tr><tr><td>North Ayrshire</td><td>7,568</td></tr><tr><td>Perth & Kinross</td><td>2,868</td></tr><tr><td>South Ayrshire</td><td>4,179</td></tr><tr><td>Stirling</td><td>9,161</td></tr><tr><td>Scotland</td><td>5,618</td></tr></table>	Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£	East Ayrshire	8,744	East Lothian	12,268	Fife	9,083	Moray	5,365	North Ayrshire	7,568	Perth & Kinross	2,868	South Ayrshire	4,179	Stirling	9,161	Scotland	5,618
Comparator Benchmarking Authorities	£																							
East Ayrshire	8,744																							
East Lothian	12,268																							
Fife	9,083																							
Moray	5,365																							
North Ayrshire	7,568																							
Perth & Kinross	2,868																							
South Ayrshire	4,179																							
Stirling	9,161																							
Scotland	5,618																							

Ranking Data for 2015/16 road condition indicators				
Indicator	2014/15	2015/16	Change	Performance Against National
Roads				
Percentage of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	20.1%	24.5%	4.4%	Rank 15 of 32
Percentage of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	17.7%	22.5%	4.8%	rank 5 of 32
Percentage of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	22.2%	23.9%	1.7%	rank 5 of 32
Percentage of unclassified roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	33.1%	32.7%	-0.4%	rank 8 of 32
Overall percentage of road network that should be considered for maintenance treatment	26.3%	27.9%	1.6%	rank 6 of 32