



31 March 2008

**Report for the Balanced Scorecard
based on the file sample for April to September 2007 and visits from September
2007 to March 2008**

Basis for conclusions

1. I have reviewed 785 files within my remit and 39 files that should have been notified of full appeal rights. I am satisfied that, overall, I have assessed a sufficient number and range of files to allow me to draw conclusions.

UKvisas global and regional rating for the file sample

2. From the file sample 83.7% of Refusal Notices were reasonable *and* provided accurate information on rights of appeal. The global and regional ratings include family visit and other cases which have been provided with inaccurate information on appeal rights. For the 785 cases with my remit, a reasonable Refusal Notice is one which is in accord with the Immigration Rules, Diplomatic Service Procedures and AECIP guidance, and where the decision has been based, even loosely, on the evidence.
3. My assessment of performance for regions is based on whether they are better or worse than UKvisas' global average for the period. A score from 84% to 89% is better than average and **good**, 90% or more is **very good**. A score of 80% to 84% is **fair**, and a score 79% and below is **poor**.

Regional ratings

Americas	85.5%	GOOD
Asia Pacific	93.1%	VERY GOOD
Europe	87.0%	GOOD
Gulf	84.7%	GOOD
MENA	80.0%	FAIR
RF and CIS	90.9%	VERY GOOD
Pakistan	74.0%	POOR
SE Africa	93.7%	VERY GOOD
South Asia	77.9%	POOR
West Africa	87.3%	GOOD

The Independent Monitor for Entry Clearance

Deep slices

In addition to the sample from across all Posts, I asked to see 100% of the applications that had been refused with limited rights of appeal from 3 medium sized Posts: Algiers, Bridgetown and Gabarone, totalling 132 files.

Algiers	72%	POOR
Bridgetown	91%	VERY GOOD
Gabarone	86%	GOOD

In Algiers, the problem lies with joint Refusal Notices, failures to consider child applicants under Immigration Rule 46A and comments in Refusal Notices that were not adequately detailed, such as “your immigration history” without explaining what history.

Visits: decision quality

4. From September 2007 to March 2008 I visited 7 Posts and examined 602 files where visas had been refused in cases assessed as having limited appeal rights.

New York	VERY GOOD
Ottawa	GOOD
Bangkok	FAIR
Islamabad	FAIR
Amman	FAIR
Dubai	FAIR
Madrid	VERY GOOD

Visits: information and complaint handling

5. My visit reports also examine the information that is available to applicants within my remit and how Posts handle complaints and post decision correspondence from applicants with limited rights. There is fuller information in each of the Post specific visit reports which are circulated separately.

	Information	Complaints
New York	FAIR	GOOD
Ottawa	FAIR	GOOD
Bangkok	GOOD	FAIR
Islamabad	GOOD	FAIR
Amman	POOR	Not assessed
Dubai	GOOD	Not assessed
Madrid	GOOD	GOOD

The Independent Monitor for Entry Clearance

UKvisas' headquarters complaint handling

I undertook a thematic monitoring visit to UKvisas' Visa Customer Services team to assess the way it handled complaints. A significant number of complaints were not being recorded as complaints and responses did not always cover the issues raised. I assessed performance as **POOR**. There is full information in the specific report which is circulated separately

Linda M Costelloe Baker
Independent Monitor
31 March 2008