	Department	Costing	Response
1.	**Social Protection**	Detailed description of item or policy on which a costing is required: To provide in tabular form, listed by payment type, the cost of increasing all social welfare payments under the following scenarios: Scenario 1 – a €1 increase on each weekly and month payment Scenario 2 – a €3 increase on each weekly and monthly payment Scenario 3 – a €5 increase on each weekly and month payment Scenario 3 – indexation of all payments in line with increases to HICP Scenario 4 – indexation of all	**See Table Below**

		payments in line with increases to CPI Scenario 5 – indexation of all payments in line with assumed wage growth of 2%	

The table below outlines the cost of a €1, €3 and €5 increase in weekly and monthly social welfare schemes. The cost includes proportional increases for qualified adults and for those on reduced rates of payment.

Table: Increases to weekly and monthly social welfare rates of payment

	€1 increase	**€3 increase**	**€5 increase**
Weekly payments	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**
<u>Social Insurance Schemes</u>			
State Pension (Contributory)	20.6	61.9	103.2
Widow/er's or Surviving Civil Partner's (Con) Pension	5.7	17.2	28.7
Deserted Wife's Benefit	0.3	1.3	2.2
Invalidity Pension	3.4	10.3	17.1
Guardian's Payment (Contributory)	0.1	0.2	0.3
Death Benefit Pension	0.0	0.1	0.2
Disablement Pension	0.2	0.7	1.2
Illness Benefit	2.9	8.7	14.5
Injury Benefit	0.1	0.3	0.4
Incapacity Supplement	0.1	0.2	0.3
Jobseeker's Benefit	1.7	5.2	8.6
Carer's Benefit	0.1	0.4	0.7
Health and Safety Benefit	0.0	0	0
Maternity & Adoptive Benefit	1.0	3.1	5.2
Paternity Benefit	0.0	0.1	0.2
<u>Social Assistance Schemes</u>			
State Pension (Non Con)	5.0	15.1	25.2

Blind Person's Pension	0.1	0.2	0.3
Widow/ers or Surviving Civil Partner's (Non-Con) Pension	0.1	0.2	0.4
Deserted Wife's Allowance	0.0	0	0
One-Parent Family Payment	2.0	6.1	10.1
Carer's Allowance	3.2	9.5	15.9
Guardian's Payment (Non-Contributory)	0.0	0.1	0.1
Jobseeker's Allowance	9.9	29.8	49.7
Pre-Retirement Allowance	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disability Allowance	7.5	22.6	37.7
Farm Assist	0.5	1.4	2.4
Employment Support Schemes (BTWEA & BTEA)	1.1	3.2	5.3
Employment/Internship Schemes (CE, Tús, RSS etc.)	1.9	5.7	9.5
Supplementary Welfare Allowance	0.9	2.8	4.7
TOTAL	**68.7**	**206.3**	**344.1**
	€1 increase	**€3 increase**	**€5 increase**
	Cost (€m)	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**
Monthly payments			
Child Benefit	14.6	43.8	73.0
Domiciliary Care Allowance	0.4	1.3	2.2

The table below outlines the cost of a HICP, CPI and 2% average wage growth increase (as provided in the query) in weekly and monthly social welfare schemes.

The 2018 HICP forecast is from the Department of Finance’s *Summer Economic Statement*. The 2018 CPI forecast is from the Central Bank’s most recent *Quarterly Bulletin* (Q3, 2017). The costs listed below include proportional increases for qualified adults and for those on reduced rates of payment.

Table: Percentage increases to weekly and monthly social welfare rates of payment

	1.2% increase	**1.3% increase**	**2% increase**
Weekly payments	**€m**	**€m**	**€m**
Social Insurance Schemes			
State Pension (Contributory)	57.4	63.3	96.0
Widow/er's or Surviving Civil Partner's (Con) Pension	15.4	16.8	25.7
Deserted Wife's Benefit	0.8	0.9	1.4

Invalidity Pension	8.2	8.6	13.4
Guardian's Payment (Contributory)	0.1	0.1	0.2
Death Benefit Pension	0.1	0.1	0.2
Disablement Pension	0.7	0.7	1.1
Illness Benefit	6.6	7.2	11.0
Injury Benefit	0.2	0.2	0.3
Incapacity Supplement	0.1	0.1	0.2
Jobseeker's Benefit	3.9	4.3	6.5
Carer's Benefit	0.4	0.4	0.6
Health and Safety Benefit	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maternity & Adoptive Benefit	2.9	3.1	4.8
Paternity Benefit	0.1	0.1	0.2
Social Assistance Schemes			
State Pension (Non Con)	13.6	14.6	22.6
Blind Person's Pension	0.2	0.2	0.3
Widow/ers or Surviving Civil Partner's (Non-Con) Pension	0.2	0.2	0.3
Deserted Wife's Allowance	0.0	0.0	0.0
One-Parent Family Payment	4.6	5.1	7.7
Carer's Allowance	8.1	8.8	13.4
Guardian's Payment (Non-Contributory)	0.1	0.1	0.1
Jobseeker's Allowance - Long Term	22.7	24.8	37.5
Pre-Retirement Allowance	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disability Allowance	17.3	18.8	28.5
Farm Assist	1.1	1.2	1.8
Employment Support Schemes (BTWA & BTEA)	2.4	2.6	4.0
Employment/Internship Schemes (CE, Tús, RSS etc.)	4.8	5.2	7.9
Supplementary Welfare Allowance	2.2	2.3	3.6
TOTAL	**174.3**	**189.8**	**289.3**

	1.20%	**1.30%**	**2%**
	Cost (€m)	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**
Monthly payments			

Child Benefit	24.8	26.3	40.9
Domiciliary Care Allowance	1.6	1.8	2.7

2.	**Social Protection**	Detailed description of item or policy on which a costing is required: To provide in tabular form, listed by scheme, the cost of increasing participation fees for all activation schemes under the following scenarios: Scenario 1 – a €2.50 increase on each weekly payment Scenario 2 – a €5.00 increase on each weekly payment Scenario 3 – indexation of all payments in line with increases to HICP	**See Table below**

		Scenario 4 – indexation of all payments in line with increases to CPI Scenario 5 – indexation of all payments in line with assumed wage growth of 2%	

The table below provides the cost of a €2.50 and €5 increase to the top-ups payable to employment programme participants. These costs are based on increasing the top-up only (currently payable at €22.50 per week).

The 2018 HICP forecast is from the Department of Finance's *Summer Economic Statement*. The 2018 CPI forecast is from the Central Bank's most recent *Quarterly Bulletin* (Q3, 2017).

The percentage increases are based on increasing the top-up payable to an employment programme participant based on the total rate payable to a single person i.e. increasing the €215.50 rate (€193 weekly rate plus the €22.50 top up) by the relevant percentages (whereby a 1.2% HICP increase would result in an increase to the top-up payable of €2.60 per week).

	€2.50	**€5**	**1.2% - HICP (€2.60)**	**1.3% - CPI (€2.80)**	**2% (€4.30)**
Programme	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**	**Cost (€m)**
Community Employment	2.8	5.6	2.9	3.1	4.8
Tus	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.9	1.4
Rural Social Scheme	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.7
Gateway	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jobs Initiative*	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
Total	**4.1**	**8.2**	**4.2**	**4.5**	**7.1**

*Closed to new entrants. Top-ups paid at a double rate.

3.	**Social Protection**	To provide in tabular form the savings that will accrue to the exchequer from the abolition of the Gateway schemes and a 10% reduction in the number of TUS places. Can it also be confirmed that the current allocations of €15 million for JobBridge, and €7.25m for Gateway in Vote 37 are available for re-allocation?	The abolition of the Gateway scheme, whereby current participants continue until the end of their placement, would provide minimal savings in 2018. With regards to Tus, a 10% reduction in the number of places is estimated to provide net savings of €1.6 million in a full year (net of Jobseeker's Allowance payments - gross savings of €5.1 million), if the reduction occurs as participants finish their time on the scheme. While Vote 37 for the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection is expected to record underspends on JobBridge and Gateway in 2017, these underspends will be required to fund overspends elsewhere in the Vote.
4.	**Social Protection**	The detailed costs of introducing an income linked job seekers payment amounting to up to €30 a week extra above existing benefit levels, as a first step towards creating a system of contributory welfare that recognises that those who contribute to our social insurance fund should benefit when they need it most.	Based on 2016 data, 25% of Jobseeker's Benefit recipients earned in excess of €30,000 per year. It should be noted that the earnings data from Revenue arrives as an annual figure for each customer. Accordingly, it is not possible to ascertain if the earnings were from continuous full-time employment. Applying this 25% to the 2018 estimated number of Jobseeker's Benefit recipients, the full year cost for a €30 increase in the weekly rate of Jobseeker's Benefit to those with previous earnings of €30,000 is €13.1 million in 2018.

		(To assume the introduction of the scheme with effect from January 2018, noting any technical issues that may prevent such early introduction. To provide for a maximum additional payment of €30 per week in cases where a person has been in continuous, full-time employment, earning over €30,000 per year.)	
5.	**Social Protection**	A) The cost of providing an additional 2,000 places on the JobsPlus programme in 2018.	A) JobsPlus provides employers with two levels of payment: €7,500 and €10,000. The €7,500 is paid primarily in respect of those who are 12 months or more on the live register, with the higher grant paid in respect of those who have been unemployed for more than 24 months. The incentive is paid in monthly instalments over a two year period provided the employment is maintained. The JobsPlus incentive is currently paid at the higher rate in respect of approximately 73% of employees on the scheme. Therefore, the full year cost of 2,000 JobsPlus places at this ratio of the higher and lower grant is estimated at approximately €9.325 million. The full year cost of jobseeker's payments for 2,000 customers is estimated at €21 million. In this regard, the net savings to the Department if an additional 2,000 people who are long-term unemployed moved into employment and their employers utilised the JobsPlus scheme in 2018 is estimated at circa €11.675 m in a full year. The first year savings/costs would depend on how quickly the additional places would roll out. It should be noted that this savings figure may be inflated as it (a) takes no account of any deadweight impacts (whereby the employer could have hired the employee without payment of the subsidy) and (b) assumes that the jobseekers would have been in receipt of a jobseeker's payment for the full year, which may not be the case. In this regard, it is estimated that circa 40% of jobseekers who have been unemployed for more than two years exit the Live Register within the year.

		B) To also cost the impact of amending the JobsPlus programme to change the subvention of €7,500 to apply to those more than 2 years unemployed, and the subvention of €10,000 to apply to those more than 3 years unemployed.	B) This cannot be accurately costed as it would be difficult to predict the ratio of lower to higher payments, or what the overall uptake would be. As outlined above, approximately 73% of recipients are more than 2 years unemployed. Accordingly, targeting the incentive at those who are longer term unemployed is effective. This implies that it is likely that this measure would see a significant uptake at the higher level (those unemployed for 3 years or more). However, given factors such as the distance from the labour market of this cohort, the exact ratio would be difficult to predict. This measure may help mitigate any deadweight effects that may occur in an improving labour market. In August 2017 there were almost 112,000 persons on the Live Register for one year or more. Of these, almost 29,000 were on the Live Register for between one and two years. Therefore, implementing this measure would reduce the numbers potentially eligible for JobsPlus to 83,000, a reduction of over 25%.
6.	**Social Protection**	The cost of restoring the Dental Treatment Benefit scheme to pre-2009 levels, and the cost of similar restoration for the optional benefit scheme, and restoring the hearing aid benefit max amount to €750.	<u>Dental Benefit:</u> The cost of the Dental Treatment Benefit scheme (DTBS) was €62 million in 2009. The cost of re-introducing the scheme, as available in 2009, would be dependent on the uptake and the fee payable for each treatment. The DTBS is a demand led scheme and as a result it is not possible to predict the potential level of demand with any certainty. In addition the recent inclusion of self-employed contributors to the scheme is projected to increase uptake in 2018 by circa 15% overall. Allowing for these changes and the relevant fees payable, it is estimated that the total cost of re-introducing the dental scheme at its pre-2010 levels of treatment and uptake, and allowing for increase demand due to increased coverage, the projected cost would be an additional €30.4 million in 2018 and a full year. <u>Optical Benefit:</u> The Optical Benefit scheme is being largely restored to 2009 levels from October 2017. <u>Hearing Aid Grant:</u> The number of applications for the Medical Appliance grant has increased by 27% between 2009 and 2016. With 15,500 hearing aids supplied in 2016, it is estimated that the cost of increasing the grant from €500 to €750 per device could cost an addition €3.9m per annum. It should be noted that due to the current structure of the grant, (50% of the cost to a maximum of €500 per aid), to get the maximum €750 grant, a claimant would have to spend €1,500 on an aid. The average expenditure on a hearing aid currently is €1,800.

7.	**Social Protection**	The cost of expanding Child Benefit to parents with children who have passed their 18th birthdays, but remain in second-level education.	The full year cost of extending Child Benefit to parents with children who have passed their 18th birthdays, but remain in second-level education is estimated at €98.5 million. The costing is based on the latest published figures from the Department of Education and Skills (for 2016) which show c. 58,650 individuals 18 years of age and over in second level education.
8.	**Social Protection**	The cost of increasing the increase for a qualified child payment from €29.80 by €3.20 to €33, and €5.20 to €35, and outline any knock on effects on other payment schemes. To also provide the cost for similar increases to the Back to Work Family Dividend.	The full year cost of increasing the qualified child increase by €3.20, from €29.80 to €33 per week, is estimated at €59.7 million in 2018. This includes the costs associated with the Back to Work Family Dividend (€2.3 million), the weekly rate of which is based on the rate of the qualified child increase. The full year cost of increasing the qualified child increase by €5.20, from €29.80 to €35 per week, is estimated at €97 million in 2018. This includes the costs associated with the Back to Work Family Dividend (€3.7 million), the weekly rate of which is based on the rate of the qualified child increase.
9.	**Social Protection**	The cost of increasing the Family Income Supplement thresholds by €5, €10, €15 and €20 respectively.	Based on the proposed thresholds outlined in the table below, the costs of a €5, €10, €15 and €20 increases to the FIS thresholds are €8.8 million, €18.8 million, €30.3 million and €40.1 million respectively.

	Current threshold	**Proposed thresholds**			
		+€5 to each threshold	**+€10 to each threshold**	**+€15 to each threshold**	**+€20 to each threshold**
1 child	€511	€516	€521	€526	€531
2 children	€612	€617	€622	€627	€632

3 children	€713	€718	€723	€728	€733
4 children	€834	€839	€844	€849	€854
5 children	€960	€965	€970	€975	€980
6 children	€1,076	€1,081	€1,086	€1,091	€1,096
7 children	€1,212	€1,217	€1,222	€1,227	€1,232
8 children	€1,308	€1,313	€1,318	€1,323	€1,328

<table>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>The cost of increasing the Living alone allowance by €5 per week from €9 to €14, by €6 per week, and by €11 per week.</td>
<td>The cost of increasing the Living Alone Allowance by €5 per week, from €9 to €14 per week is estimated at €52.2 million in 2018.

The cost of increasing the Living Alone Allowance by €6 per week, from €9 to €16 per week is estimated at €62.6 million in 2018.

The cost of increasing the Living Alone Allowance by €11 per week, from €9 to €20 per week is estimated at €114.8 million in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>The cost to the Department of ending the current JobPath contracts.</td>
<td>The Department considers the information requested to be confidential and commercially sensitive and is therefore not in a position to release same. It should be noted that any decision by the Minister to terminate the contracts early would require six months’ notice to be given to the contractors. Therefore there is no option at this time to cease the operation of the contracts from 1st January 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>Detailed description of item or policy on which a costing is required:

A) The cost of increasing the current Back to School Clothing and Footwear Allowance as follows:
- for children aged 4-11: increase by €25, €50 and €75 respectively.
- for children aged 12-22 increase by</td>
<td>(A) Additional Cost of Increasing Rates (based on age category of children benefiting in 2016)
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Number of Children</th><th>Rate Increase of €25</th><th>Rate Increase of €50</th><th>Rate Increase of €75</th></tr>
<tr><td>Age 4-11</td><td>166,000</td><td>€4,150,000</td><td>€8,300,000</td><td>€12,450,000</td></tr>
<tr><td>Age 12-22</td><td>117,000</td><td>€2,925,000</td><td>€5,850,000</td><td>€8,775,000</td></tr>
</table>
Scheme expenditure in 2016 totalled €39.8 million. €47.4 million has been provided for the scheme in 2017.</td>
</tr>
</table>

€25, €50 and €75 respectively.
- to provide the annual cost of administration of the scheme, and the total cost of the payments in 2016 and 2017 respectively.
B) The cost of provide a universal payment to all school going children as follows:
- for children aged 4 -11: payment of €125, or €150, €175, or €200.
- for children aged 12-22: payment of €250, or €275, €300, or €325.

For (A) assume parameters to stay the same. For (B) assume payment made universally to all school going children, registered in a public primary or secondary school and payment made alongside July Child benefit payment. Can the Department also furnish with its

(B) The Department does not have an age profile breakdown of all children enrolled in public schools. However on the basis of the 2016/2017 school enrolment statistics published by the Department of Education and Skills, an estimated cost of the measures is provided in the table below.
Enrolment Figures Source: https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Statistics/Key-Statistics/Key-Statistics-2016-2017.pdf

Total Cost of Universal Payment

	Number of Children	**Rate/ Total Cost**	**Rate / Total Cost**	**Rate / Total Cost**	**Rate / Total Cost**
Age 4-11	558,314	**€125** €69,789,250	**€150** €83,747,100	**€175** €97,704,950	**€200** €111,662,800
Age 12-22	352,257	**€250** €88,064,250	**€275** €96,870,675	**€300** €105,677,100	**€325** €114,483,525

Please note the cost figures quoted in table above refers to the total cost of the measure rather than the increased cost. €47.4 million has been provided for the scheme in 2017.

		costing the underlying numbers projected in each age category in 2018 for both (A) and (B)	
13.	**Social Protection**	Detailed description of item or policy on which a costing is required: To provide the following in tabular form related to Jobseekers Allowance (JA) for those aged under 26:	
		A) Cost of restoring JA for all those under 26 to full adult rate of €193 per week.	A) The full year cost of increasing the age-related reduced rates of Jobseeker's Allowance, from €102.70 per week (for 18 to 24 year olds) and €147.80 per week (for 25 year olds) to €193 per week is €97.6 million in 2018. This includes the cost of bringing the qualified adult rate for those on the €102.70 rate up to the maximum of €128.10 per week. It also includes the cost of increasing the equivalent age-related reduced rates for Supplementary Welfare Allowance.
		B) Cost of increasing JA for all those aged 18-24 to €147.80 per week.	B) The full year cost of increasing the age-related reduced rate of Jobseeker's Allowance from €102.70 per week (for 18 to 24 year olds) to €147.80 per week is €44.95 million in 2018. This costing is based on an estimated 21,138 JA recipients aged 18 to 24 on age-related reduced rates in 2018. This includes the cost of bringing the qualified adult rate for those on the €102.70 rate up to the maximum of €128.10 per week. It also includes the cost of increasing the equivalent age-related reduced rates for Supplementary Welfare Allowance.
		C) Cost of increasing JA for all	C) The full year cost of increasing the age-related reduced rate of Jobseeker's Allowance from €147.80 per week (for 25 year olds) to €193 per week is €7.6 million in 2018. This costing is based on an estimated 3,640 JA

		those aged 25 to €193 per week.	recipients aged 25 on an age-related reduced rate in 2018. This includes the cost of increasing the equivalent age-related reduced rates for Supplementary Welfare Allowance.
		D) Cost of increasing the JA payment per week for those aged 18-24, and those aged 25 by: €5, €10, or €20 respectively.	D) The full year cost in 2018 of increasing the age-related reduced rate of Jobseeker's Allowance of €102.70 per week (for 18 to 24 year olds) by €5, €10 and €20 per week is €5 million, €9.8 million and €19.9 million respectively. This includes the costs of also increasing the qualified adult rate, and increasing the equivalent age-related reduced rate for Supplementary Welfare Allowance.
		E) Cost of increasing the JA payment to Back to Education Allowance (BTEA) participants aged under 26 from €188 per week as of September 2017, to €193.	E) Budget 2017 provides for the rate payable to jobseekers on age-related reduced rates of payment to increase to the maximum rate of €193 per week when participating in Back to Education Allowance from September 2017.
		F) Cost of increasing underlying Jobseekers	F) Budget 2017 provides for the rate payable to jobseekers on age-related reduced rates of payment to increase to the maximum rate of €193 per week when participating in Back to Education Allowance from September 2017. Age-related reduced rates of payment do not apply to young jobseekers who participate in employment programmes, such as Community Employment. Accordingly, age-related reduced rates of payment do not apply

		Allowance claim to €193 once recipient aged 18 to 25 inclusive engages in any recognised State training or activation scheme. Using the same parameters as currently apply. Can the Department also furnish with its costing the underlying numbers projected in each age category in 2018.	to young jobseekers who participate in any DSP programme. The rate of training allowances payable to young jobseekers who participate in SOLAS or other FET courses is a matter for the Department of Education and Skills.
14.		Confirm that the cost of increasing the free travel scheme allocation by 10% to €88 million is €8 million.	The 2017 allocation for the Free Travel scheme is €80 million. Accordingly, a 10% increase in 2018 would cost €8 million.
15.		To determine the once off, and then the 2018 cost of returning to the PRSI contribution schedule for	It should be noted that: These costs assume no increase in the rates of payment. Any rate increases would result in comparable percentage increases in the cost of this measure. It is assumed that the reference to being "*uprated to the previous payment they would have been eligible for under the pre-2012 PRSI bands*" is a reference to the percentages of the maximum rate in place for various yearly averages in the period

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qualification to the contributory old age pension that existed pre-2012.</td>
<td>from January 2000 to August 2012 (i.e. it is not the cash amounts that were in place prior to 2012, as the rates have since increased as a result of Budgets 2016 and 2017).
It is assumed that there would be no back-dating, i.e. the rates payable during the period 2012-2017 would remain unchanged and so no back-payments would arise. Were this to change, there would be a very substantial once-off cost, the level of which would depend on a number of factors.
The following calculations are based on current SPC claim-load, i.e. they are increases in the rates payable in respect of individual SPC claims, and do not include people who are alternatively on SPNC or IQA payments, but who would gain if their underlying SPC entitlement was increased and they switched to that payment (this additional cost may be in the region of €10 million per annum, but would be very difficult to calculate without seeking claims from those who would be affected).
The cost has been calculated as €50 million in 2017, and rising at €10 million per annum.

<table>
<tr><td>Year</td><td>Cost in that year of increased SPC rates (not including costs of people moving from other schemes, which may be in region of an additional €10m per annum).</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018</td><td>€60 million</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of providing a 2%, 5%, or 10% increase in the materials and training grant for community employment schemes. To also outline the current cost in 2017.</td>
<td>CE is an active labour market programme designed to provide eligible long-term unemployed people and other disadvantaged people with an opportunity to engage in part-time work and training within their communities on a temporary, fixed-term basis.

The current CE cost for 2016 was €357m with an average of 962 schemes, 23,965 participants and supervisors (22,590 participants and 1,375 supervisory staff). This costing consists of wages paid to participants, supervisory costs, material and training costs.

The materials spend for 2016 was €13.818 million. The training spend on CE participants for 2016 was €5.849 million.

Increasing the CE materials budget for each scheme by 2%, 5% and 10% would require an increase of €0.27m, €0.69m and €1.38m respectively in the overall budget.

An increase in the CE training budget for each scheme by 2%, 5% and 10% would require an increase of €0.12m, €0.29m and €0.58m respectively in the overall budget.

The current training grant is an average payment of €250 per participant. With an estimated average of 23 participants per scheme, a 10% increase would result in an average monetary increase of €575 for each scheme.

Each CE scheme has its own individual materials rate, based on the specific circumstances of the scheme, which is used to pay consumables and materials necessary for the effective operation of the scheme. This rate can vary substantially</td>
</tr>
</table>

			between schemes depending on the individual circumstance, therefore in these circumstances it is not possible to provide an average monetary value for a 10% increase in the materials budget.
17.		The cost of extending the wage subsidy scheme to those in receipt of partial capacity benefit, and the cost of providing an additional 1,000 places on the scheme.	The cost of extending the Wage Subsidy Scheme (WSS) to existing Partial Capacity Benefit (PCB) recipients is estimated to be €15 million in a full year. However, by extending the WSS to PCB recipients, new PCB recipients would also become eligible at an additional cost of €2.5 million in a full year. The cost of providing an additional 1,000 places on the WSS is estimated at €7.9 million in a full year.
18.		Confirm the cost for a 5% increase in the budget for CSP.	The 2017 allocation for the Community Services Programme (CSP) is €46.2 million. This includes the service fee paid to Pobal as well as the supports paid to beneficiaries. The number of projects supported at the end of August 2017 is 388. The average level of support under CSP is for 1 Manager and 4 FTEs. This equates to funding of c. €108,000 per annum. Therefore, an additional 5% allocation of €2.3 million could be expected to support in the region of 21 new, average-sized projects. Some additional administrative costs may also need to be covered to bring these projects on stream.
19	**Education & Skills**	The cost of improving the staffing schedule to reduce class sizes by one point each year in 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021, in tabular form. It should be assumed that all school sizes should benefit from this measure, and an example of the new staffing schedule for 2017 should be provided.	Each 1 point adjustment to the primary staffing schedule is estimated to cost in the region of €16.5m per annum.

20		The cost of reducing the effective pupil-teacher ratio in non-DEIS schools to 18:1, with a comparable reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio in DEIS schools and no change to the staffing of fee-charging schools.	The PTR in DEIS and Non-DEIS schools is currently 19:1. Each 1 point adjustment to the pupil teacher ratio in post primary schools is estimated to cost in the region of €60m per annum. (€11m in DEIS schools, €49m in Non-DEIS schools)
21		The cost of increasing primary and post-primary school capitation rates under the following scenarios:	See Table below.

		Scenario 1 – an increase of €10 for each child Scenario 2 – a 1% increase in capitation funding Scenario 3 – a 3% increase in capitation funding Scenario 4 – a 5% increase in capitation funding. In the cases of Scenarios 2, 3 and 4, the cost of doubling this increase in the case of any schools who commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contributions, on the assumption that 50% of schools may do so.	

SCHOOL FUNDING

The table below outlines costings for increase in capitation rates for €10 for each child, 1%, 3% & 5% increase in capitation funding. It also outlines the cost of doubling the percentage increases in the case of any schools who commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contribution, on the assumption that 50% of schools may do so.

	€10 increase in capitation per pupil €m	**1% increase in Capitation Grant €m**	***Doubling increase on assumption 50% of schools end Voluntary Contributions €m**	**3% increase in Capitation grant €m**	****Doubling increase on assumption 50% of schools end Voluntary Contributions €m**	**5% increase in Capitation Grant €m**	*****Doubling increase on assumption 50% of schools end Voluntary Contributions €m**
Primary	5.85	0.99	1.49	2.98	4.48	4.97	7.46
Post-Primary (Vol Sec, C&C, ETB)	3.68	1.01	1.52	3.03	4.55	5.06	7.59
Total Cost	**9.53**	**2.00**	**3.01**	**6.01**	**9.03**	**10.03**	**15.05**

*It is assumed all schools will get a 1% increase and 50% of schools will get double the increase where they commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contributions.
**It is assumed all schools will get a 3% increase and 50% of schools will get double the increase where they commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contributions.
***It is assumed all schools will get a 5% increase and 50% of schools will get double the increase where they commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contributions.

It is assumed that schools who commit in writing to end the practice of requesting voluntary contributions do so, as this is dealt with at local level.

The calculations for Primary capitation funding in the table above are based on the standard capitation rate per mainstream pupil.

Voluntary Secondary schools are funded on the basis of capitation related grants on a per capita basis. Community & Comprehensive and ETB schools are funded on a budget basis. It is assumed that the increases applied to the capitation grant in the voluntary sector will also be applied to the budgets in the Community & Comprehensive and ETB sector.

22		The cost of reducing school transport charges under the following scenarios: Scenario 1 – a 25% reduction on all charges in 2018 Scenario 2 – a 50% reduction on all charges in 2018 Scenario 3 – a 75% reduction on all charges in 2018 Scenario 4 – a 100% reduction on all charges in 2018	Scenario 1 – a 25% reduction on all charges in 2018 €3.6 million (full year) : €1.2 m (1/3 year 2018) €5.0 million (full year) : €1.7 m (2018) Scenario 2 – a 50% reduction on all charges in 2018 €7.3 million (full year) :€2.4 m (2018) €10.0 million (full year) : €3.3 m (2018) Scenario 3 – a 75% reduction on all charges in 2018 €11.0 million (full year) : €3.7 m (2018) €15.2 million (full year) : €5 m (2018) Scenario 4 – a 100% reduction on all charges in 2018 €14.5 million (full year) : €4.8 m (2018) €20.0 million (full year) : €6.7 m (2018) The additional amounts under each scenario is based on taking a percentage of the 2016 receipts from the scheme i.e. €14.6 million It is very difficult to estimate the number of additional pupils who would avail of school transport if costs were reduced given that there were significant rule changes for school transport in 2012 and this may account for some of the reduction in those availing of the scheme since then. If however the number of children on primary and post primary school transport rose to 16% (the figure it was at prior to 2008) then this would represent a 38% increase in the numbers on mainstream transport. It could be expected that income from these children would also increase by 38% but that would depend on variables such as the number of medical card holders. The figures in green above represent the income that would be foregone if income increased by 38%.
23		To provide the latest available data on the number of schools operating book rental schemes at primary and post-primary levels, along with any available data	Schools have autonomy in relation to the management and operation of book rental schemes. The Department does not therefore have information on the extent to which the book rental schemes encompass all classes or only some, or all relevant books or only some. It is not therefore possible to provide a reliable costing for the estimated cost of seed capital and recurrent funding required to achieve 100% coverage of book rental schemes across all schools and classes and incorporating all relevant books. The number of schools operating Book Rental schemes are contained in the table below.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>on whether such schemes encompass all classes or only some, or all relevant books or only some. The estimated cost of seed capital and recurrent funding required to achieve 100% coverage of book rental schemes across all schools and classes, and incorporating all relevant books.</td><td><table><tr><td>Number of schools operating a Book Rental scheme</td><td>Primary 1</td><td>Post-Primary 2</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>3,262</td><td>435</td></tr></table>
This represents the position for the 2015/16 school year which is the most up to date information available.
This represents the position for the 2016/17 school year which is the most up to date information available.</td></tr>
<tr><td>24</td><td></td><td>The cost for the State to provide free school text books to all children attending primary and secondary level schools.</td><td>It is a matter for the Board of Management of each individual school to decide on its own policy in relation to the use of textbooks in the school.   Therefore, the Department does not have data in relation to overall school book costs at primary and post-primary level. It is not possible therefore to provide a reliable estimate of the cost of providing text books to all children attending primary and post-primary level schools.</td></tr>
<tr><td>25</td><td></td><td>The estimated cost of funding all valid applications on hand for the summer works scheme.
An estimated cost required to allow all schools to install solar panels meeting at least 50% of their energy needs.</td><td>An estimated cost (i.e. €40 million) is indicated to meet the SWS request, it is not possible as set out below to provide a costing in relation to the “Solar Panel” request.
The Department of Education and Skills has, through its ongoing energy research programme, reviewed the application of renewable technologies in school buildings with respect to technical, environmental, economic feasibility and operational issues. The applications tested include solar (thermal and photovoltaic), wind and biomass
It must be remembered that a sustainable solution involves the matching of a sustainable resource with the end users’ needs and not just the application of that resource.
It is important that renewables provide a benefit to the school and do not become either a management, operational or financial burden on the school.
In the interest of sustainability, it is critical that renewable applications are properly suited to the schools needs and not just applied for the sake of having a renewable tag on a school. It is also critical that demand for energy is minimised before investing in renewable energy applications.</td></tr>
</table>

		Assumptions: If no assessment of the applications on hand has yet been carried out, it should be assumed that the likelihood of an application being valid is the same rate as that for the categories already funded. In the case of solar panels, it should be assumed that the technology to store the energy produced is now adequate to allow a full consideration of this proposal.	Research and trials of hot water generation in schools have shown that solar thermal generation is not considered an optimum design solution for schools due to schools' operating profile (closed during summer months, midterms, etc., short days and closed for weekends) and the minimum and irregular hot water demand present. A typical 16 classroom school is supplied with an 80 litre hot water cylinder; if a solar installation was to be provided, this would have to increase to a minimum 300 litre cylinder (to provide a thermal store). This significant additional water quantity for which there is no significant demand would require heating using fossil fuels for the majority of the schools' operational hours, thus increasing running costs to a school, not reducing them. Photovoltaic (PV) panels that generate electricity represent the least impact in terms of management, operational or financial burden on a school. One barrier is in relation to the connection of the installation to the national electrical grid so that the school may sell back any excess energy generated and the provision of a feed in tariff or cost offsetting/ balancing given that the school is closed approximately 50 % of the year. Presently there is no access for schools to connect to the grid on a sell back or cost offsetting/ balancing basis. The introduction of a Renewable Obligation scheme where rooftop solar PV is supported would possibly alter the payback analysis and open a market for private investment to offer to schools the benefit of securing renewable energy without any capital investment, monitoring and maintenance issues. The use of batteries to store excess power generated during the day, which is then used at night, has made advancements; however, it still has some way to go to be viable in schools where again the school operating hours and load schedules will impact on viability. In view of the above, and the variables involved in relation to school sizes and energy use, no costings are advanced presently in this area.
26		The cost of expanding the minor works scheme to all second-level schools on the same basis on which it is granted to primary schools.	€11 million Applying the primary level rates to the post-primary sector is unlikely to have the same impact at post-primary level due to the size and complexity of provision in that sector. Under Circular 0062/2013 the Minor Works Grant only issues to primary schools as funding permits.
27		The cost of increasing, with effect from September 2018, the substitution provided to primary	The proportion of schools with teaching principals should be assumed to remain constant. **PPC2 G of 2017**

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>schools with teaching principals, sufficient to ensure that all teaching principals can avail of one full day of administrative duties each week.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Ref No:</th><th>Policy</th><th>Department</th><th>First Year Cost (€, millions)</th><th>Full year cost (€, millions)</th><th>Basis/ PQ Reference</th><th>Notes</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Education</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>57</td><td>"Provide one administration day per week for teaching principals"</td><td>Education</td><td>€4.2</td><td>€12.5</td><td>23190/16</td><td>As per PQ reply "Improving these arrangements so as to enable teaching principals to have one release day per week would cost in the order of €12.5 million per annum."</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of increasing funding to the third-level sector in 2018 to maintain the current level of funding per student (scenario 1), to improve the level of funding per student back to 2013 levels (scenario 2), or to restore the level of funding back to peak levels (scenario 3).</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Proposal</th><th>Full Year Cost</th><th>Comment</th></tr>
<tr><td>Cost of funding to the third-level sector in 2018
1. To maintain the current level of funding per student
2. To improve the level of funding per student back to 2013 levels
3. To restore the level of funding back to peak levels.
Assumption - Participation rates should be assumed to be</td><td>€22m
€97m
€525m</td><td>Amounts are calculated based on expected increase in student numbers and maintaining existing levels of total Core Funding.
Projections of student numbers: Department of Education and Skills, Projections of Demand for Full Time Third Level Education 2015 - 2029, Scenario S2 used and HEA Facts and Figures publication.
Core Funding takes account of income from the State, student contributions, tuition fees and other income sources. Direct comparisons between the State grant funding only per</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><table><tr><td></td><td>constant, while the number of students predicted to enter third-level should be modelled based on known levels of demographic growth.</td><td></td><td>student are difficult as increases in the student contribution over the years were matched by decreases in the block grant.

These figures do not include any additional costs to the student support budget.</td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>29</td><td></td><td>The estimated cost of improving student-staff ratios to improve the effective ratio to a level of 22:1.</td><td>On the basis of the most up-to-date data we have to hand, we calculate the current staff : student ratio to be 21.76:1 or 22:1 when you round up. Therefore, on this basis, a costing cannot be calculated.</td></tr>
<tr><td>30</td><td></td><td>The cost of reinstating postgraduate student grants. based on the previous system of postgraduate student grants which was significantly curtailed over recent years.</td><td>Restore Post Graduate Grants to 2011 Levels

Assumptions:
There were 2,141 post-grad students in receipt of a SUSI grant in 2016/17. It is assumed that the number of post-grad students, will return to the levels prior to the Budget adjustment i.e. 6,027 students.
The calculations are based on the assumption that the measure would be announced in Budget 2018, and implemented for the 2018/19 academic year.
It is assumed that all additional students (3,886 students) will receive the non-adjacent maintenance grant of 100% and the full fee grant of €6,270.

Costings
<table><tr><td>Year</td><td>Student Numbers (A/Y)</td><td>Cost</td></tr><tr><td>2018 (Sept – Dec)</td><td>6,027</td><td>€31.56m</td></tr><tr><td>2019 (Full year Cost)</td><td>6,027</td><td>€44.36m</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>31</td><td></td><td>The cost of:
A) Increasing the rate of the student grant levels across all headings by i) 5% ii) at the projected rate of inflation with</td><td>**Increasing the rate of student grant levels across all headings by 5%**
Assumptions:
Calculations are based on student numbers for the academic year 2016/17 with no adjustment for future demographics.
Calculations are based on the student maintenance grant levels.
Calculations are based on increasing maintenance grant rates by 5%.</td></tr>
</table>

CPI and HICP costings.
B) Cost of decreasing non-adjacent rate of grant from 45km to 24km.

The calculations are based on the assumption that measure would be announced in Budget 2018, and implemented for the 2018/19 academic year.

Costings

Year	Student Numbers (A/Y)	Cost
2018 (Sept – Dec)	63,002	€3.82m
2019 (Full year Cost)	63,002	€8.65m

Increasing the rate of the student grant levels across all headings by 2018 Projected Inflation Rate with CPI

Assumptions:

1. Calculations are based on student numbers for the academic year 2016/17 with no adjustment for future demographics.
2. Calculations are based on the student maintenance grant levels.
3. Calculations are based on the Projected Inflation Rate with CPI for 2018. Inflation Rate in Ireland is expected to 0.70 in 12 months' time (September 2018) according to Trading Economics global macro models and analysts expectations.*
4. The calculations are based on the assumption that measure would be announced in Budget 2018, and implemented for the 2018/19 academic year.

Costings

Year	Student Numbers (A/Y)	Cost
2018 (Sept – Dec)	63,002	€0.54m
2019 (Full year Cost)	63,002	€1.21m

*Source: tradingeconomics.com/ireland/inflation-cpi/forecast

Increasing the rate of the student grant levels across all headings by 2018 Projected Inflation Rate with HICP

Assumptions:

Calculations are based on student numbers for the academic year 2016/17 with no adjustment for future demographics.

Calculations are based on the student maintenance grant levels.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations are based on the Projected Inflation Rate with HICP for 2018. Inflation forecast Total, Annual growth rate for Ireland is 4% for 2018*
The calculations are based on the assumption that measure would be announced in Budget 2018, and implemented for the 2018/19 academic year.
<u>Costings</u>
<table>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Student Numbers (A/Y)</th><th>Cost</th></tr>
<tr><td>2018 (Sept – Dec)</td><td>63,002</td><td>€1.54m</td></tr>
<tr><td>2019 (Full year Cost)</td><td>63,002</td><td>€3.46m</td></tr>
</table>
*Source: data.oecd.org/price/inflation-forecast.htm

B) Cost of decreasing non-adjacent rate of grant from 45km to 24km.
2. What assumptions/parameters do you wish the Department to make/specify?
No additional assumptions. Use SUSI/DES projections for eligible numbers in 2018.
<u>Assumptions:</u>

In 2016/17, of the students who received the maintenance grant 52.5% qualified for the non-adjacent rate and 47.5% for the adjacent rate.
The percentage split before the change in Budget 2011 was 78% of maintenance grant recipients qualifying for the non-adjacent rate with 22% of maintenance grants paid at the adjacent rate broken down as follows:
It is assumed that the percentage split between adjacent and non-adjacent would revert back to the split that existed pre-Budget 2011.
Student numbers are based on the actual maintenance grant holders for 2016-17 A/Y (63,002) with no adjustment for future demographics
The calculations are based on the assumption that the measure would take effect from September 2018 (academic year 2018/19)
<u>Costing</u>
<table>
<tr><th>Year</th><th>Student Numbers (A/Y)</th><th>Cost</th></tr>
<tr><td>2018 (Sept – Dec)</td><td>63,002</td><td>€11m</td></tr>
<tr><td>2019 (Full year Cost)</td><td>63,002</td><td>€25m</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>The quantum of funding which the Department estimates is required over each of the next three</td>
<td>Funding for Technological Universities:

There are currently four consortia engaged with the process to become designated as TUs:

• TU4Dublin (Dublin Institute of Technology, Institute of Technology Tallaght, Institute of Technology Blanchardstown)</td>
</tr>
</table>

		years to allow for the creation of Technological Universities in Dublin, in the South East and in Munster.	• Technological University for the South-East (**TUSE** – consisting of Waterford Institute of Technology and Institute of Technology Carlow), • Munster Technological University (**MTU** – consisting of Cork Institute of Technology and Institute of Technology Tralee) and • Connacht Ulster Alliance (**CUA** – consisting of Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Institute of Technology Sligo and Letterkenny Institute of Technology). **TU4Dublin** and **MTU** are the most advanced consortia in terms of being in a position to apply for TU designation, subsequent to the Technological Universities Bill being enacted, having already gone through an international panel assessment process established by the HEA in 2014 with a view to merging. Amendments and insertions to the Technological Universities Bill are currently being drafted by the Department of Education and Skills in consultation with the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel with a view to the Bill's re-introduction at Committee Stage during the Government's Autumn 2017 legislative programme. TU4Dublin have already signalled their intention to apply in April 2018 seeking designation in September 2018. The CUA and TUSE are less advanced and are unlikely to be ready to apply for designation until late 2019 / early 2020. They still have substantial work to do on developing their implementation plans. In early 2015 the **CUA** expressed an interest in merging and in applying to become a technological university. This application was approved to proceed to the next stage involving the preparation of a plan by the CUA to meet the criteria for designation as a Technological University. In the last year, three institutions not currently involved in any technological university project, namely Athlone Institute of Technology (AIT), Dundalk Institute of Technology (DkIT) and Limerick Institute of Technology (LIT) explored the potential for an expanded consortia of six institutions. In this context an initial impact assessment for the proposal "*The Economic Impact of a New Technological University in Ireland - An Exploratory Study*" was produced in 2017 but both LIT and AIT subsequently decided not to progress further in terms of joining the CUA. However, engagement between CUA and DkIT is still ongoing and a decision on whether DkiT will formally seek to join the CUA is expected by the end of 2017. The previous process for designation as a Technological University consisted of four stages but it is now intended to streamline this process through amendments to the Technological Universities Bill and obviate the need for IoTs to merge in advance of applying for designation as a technological university. This new approach followed consultations with stakeholders such as Teachers' Union of Ireland, THEA and USI in early 2017, and proposes that merger and designation of IoTs will now occur simultaneously following an expert panel assessment and the consideration of the Minister for Education and Skills of the recommendations of the panel, the views of the Higher Education Authority (HEA) and all other relevant considerations. Therefore, CUA and TUSE will complete a single assessment process by an expert panel rather than two which was required previously.

In terms of the financial costs, TU4Dublin and MTU have developed implementation plans acknowledging the costs involved in the then merger and the designation process, but also committing to meeting those costs within their own budgets. They also acknowledged that while there are up-front costs in the shorter term, in the longer term, designation as a Technological University will allow them to recoup these costs and provide for new income streams.

The HEA has provided for a fund to support HEIs with these costs. In terms of additional financial support, the HEA has provided a level of funding since 2013 to provide some support to institutions involved in the TU process, the details of which are set out in the table under in terms of incurred expenditure by TU consortia and funding provided by the HEA.

TU Consortia	Incurred Expenditure (€m)	HEA funding paid to mid-2017
TU4Dublin	4.11	2.62
MTU	1.52	1.27
TUSE	0.31	0.57
CUA	1.52	0.92
Total	**7.46**	**5 .38**

€4million was ring-fenced to support the development of technological universities in 2017.

Funding for the future:
As already outlined, the Institutions involved in the processes will be required to meet some of the costs involved in the creation of Technological Universities from within their own resources. However, given the significant benefits that will arise from the development of Technological Universities, the Department of Education and Skills and the HEA have provided ongoing financial support to the consortiums to assist in their progress towards Technological University status.

The Department of Education and Skills, in its letters to both the TUI and IMPACT trade unions, in May and July 2017 respectively, indicated that funding would be sought with "a view to ensuring that consortia can meet all of the eligibility criteria for designation as a TU as soon as practicable following the implementation of the legislation." (Previous funding made available for TU consortia was not provided for activities related to eligibility criteria).

The HEA has provided the following estimates for the requirement for Exchequer funding for each of the four TU consortia in 2018:

TU4Dublin	€5.2m
MTU	€1.2m
TUSE	€1.45m
CUA	€2.7m

As stated earlier, TUSE and CUA have not created detailed implementation plans as yet but we would expect the costs for these two projects to increase in 2019 and early 2020 as they increase their TU related activities and prepare to apply for designation. The CUA costs will also be impacted by the final make-up of the consortium, i.e. Whether there are three or four institutions in the consortium.

In terms of future direct financial support TU consortia seeking to achieve designation, the Department believes that, based on the HEA estimates for 2018, additional funding in the region of €10m to €15m per annum up to 2020 would off-set a portion of the costs that will be incurred in the process and that will need to be met from the HEIs own resources.

This funding would be used towards projects specifically related to the TU project and for project and change management costs and costs associated with achieving the criteria for TU (as referred to above).

It is assumed that this funding would not meet the costs of other projects which might benefit the development of a technological university but are not directly attributed to the project. For instance, there may be requests for capital investment such as building refurbishments or expansion of physical capacity, ICT infrastructure and equipment costs which the institutions may wish to pursue.

In addition, it is anticipated that there will be adjustments to the recurrent funding model for technological universities to support and reflect their increased activity in areas such as research and development and regional engagement. This would be part of annual allocation for a technological university once designated.

33	**D/Children and Youth Affairs**	The cost of increasing funding to the Youth Services Grant Scheme by 5% in 2018.	The cost of increasing the funding to the Youth Services Grant Scheme by 5% for 2018 is **€527,924.73**, bringing the total cost of the scheme for 2018 to **€11,086,419.34**
34		The cost, broken down for each year, of providing CPD free-of-charge to staff working in early years sectors, sufficient to ensure that 60% of all staff will be qualified to at least degree (level 7) level by 2025.	It is difficult to estimate the number of staff that will be employed in the Early Years sector by 2025. While it is acknowledged the number is unlikely to remain static, for the purpose of providing information for skill levels in early years care and education, this Department are basing a reply on the current estimate of 26,000 staff employed in the Early Years Sector. The minimum cost of upskilling a person with a Level 5 qualification to a Level 7 qualification is €4,200. Based on Pobal's data from the annual Early Year's sector survey, there are approximately 7,540 employees with a Level 5 qualification. Therefore the costing required to upskill this category is €31.7 million. The minimum cost of upskilling an employee with a Level 6 qualification to a Level 7 qualification is €3,000. Again, based on Pobal's data from the annual Early Year's sector survey, there are approximately 11,960 employees with a Level 6 qualification. Therefore the costing required to upskill this category is €3.9 million. The combined total for upskilling all employees in the Early Years Sector with a Level 5 qualification and/or a Level 6 qualification to a Level 7 qualification is €67.6 million.
35		The cost of increasing the funding allocated to the Learner Fund by 5%, and the number of staff who could receive training as a result of such an increased allocation during 2018.	The amount allocated to the Learner Fund for 2017 was a significant increase on previous years. The Department is currently redesigning the delivery model to support a greater range of training for the Early Years Sector. Until this new delivery model has been finalised it is not possible to say how many people will be covered.
36		The cost of increasing to a minimum of €11.70 per hour the wages	The Living Wage is a voluntary societal initiative centred on the social, business and economic case to ensure that, wherever it can be afforded, employers will pay a rate of pay that provides an income that is sufficient to meet an individual's basic needs, such as housing, food, clothing, transport and healthcare. The Living Wage is voluntary and has no legislative basis and is therefore not a statutory entitlement and cannot be imposed on suppliers or

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>of all those working to provide the free pre-school year.</td><td>contractors. In addition to this, it has to be emphasised that the DCYA is not the direct employer of childcare workers in the sector and there is no mechanism in place to ensure that increases in capitation would lead to a direct and corresponding increase in employee wages.</td></tr>
<tr><td>37</td><td></td><td>The cost of increasing the universal childcare subsidy (Universal Band) from €1,040 per year to respectively: €1,800; €2,400; €3,000 and €3,600. With pro rata increases for the part time, sessional and half sessional subsidies.
The cost of increasing the Band AJ subsidy by €20 per week to €100, the Band B subsidy by €20 per week to €90 and the Band D subsidy by €30 per week to €80.
The increases in subsidy assume that the cost of child care to parents will be legislatively</td><td>The questions under the heading "Affordable Childcare Scheme Subsidy" appear to relate to the existing CCS/TEC schemes following the changes made in September 2017, rather than to the Affordable Childcare Scheme itself, and this response is therefore based on this assumption. The costings are based on the same assumptions and parameters as previously used to cost the measures introduced in September 2017, which include an assumption of full participation among relevant childcare providers (i.e. excluding ECCE-only providers).

(a) The cost of increasing the universal childcare subsidy (Universal Band) from €1,040 per year to respectively: €1,800; €2,400; €3,000 and €3,600. With pro rata increases for the part time, sessional and half sessional subsidies.

The table below sets out cost estimates for the different scenarios proposed, based on the following assumptions:
There are no changes in the subsidy-rates for other Bands (A, AJ, B, D).
The costs are full-year costs.
There is no additional change in the level of parental demand for childcare as a result of the increased subsidies.

<table>
<tr><td>Universal subsidy (max per year)</td><td>Max per week</td><td>Additional cost</td></tr>
<tr><td>€1,040</td><td>€20.00</td><td>€0m</td></tr>
<tr><td>€1,800</td><td>€34.62</td><td>€14m</td></tr>
<tr><td>€2,400</td><td>€46.15</td><td>€26m</td></tr>
<tr><td>€3,000</td><td>€57.69</td><td>€37m</td></tr>
<tr><td>€3,600</td><td>€69.23</td><td>€49m</td></tr>
</table>

(b) The cost of increasing the Band AJ subsidy by €20 per week to €100, the Band B subsidy by €20 per week to €90 and the Band D subsidy by €30 per week to €80.

The additional full-year cost of this combined measure would be €7m, based on the following assumptions:

There are no changes in the subsidy-rates for Band A or for the Universal Band.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>capped at current rates.</td><td>The changes proposed are for full-time childcare, and (except in the case of Band AJ) there are pro rata increases for part-time, sessional and half-sessional subsidies.
For Band AJ, it is assumed that there are no changes to part-time, sessional or half-sessional subsidies, as the rates of these are set at the same value as Band A rates, which are assumed to be unchanged.
The costs are full-year costs.
There is no additional change in the level of parental demand for childcare as a result of the increased subsidies.</td></tr>
<tr><td>38</td><td>D/Housing Planning Community and Local Government</td><td>The cost of employing a sufficient number of occupational therapists in each local authority in order to clear existing assessment backlogs in the housing needs assessment section for each local authority, broken down by each local authority</td><td>In relation to the employment of Occupational Therapists it is noted that they are employed directly by the HSE and the Department is not aware of any being employed by the Local authorities. More generally we have no indication that backlogs of housing needs assessment are arising due to a lack of Occupational Therapists to carry out assessments.</td></tr>
<tr><td>39</td><td></td><td>The cost of building an additional 5,000 social housing units on local authority in 2018, 2019 and 2020 respectively.

The units would be built on land local authority or state owned</td><td>Costing based on 5,000 units per annum, following clarification from DPER.

The overall “Construction Only Cost” to providing these houses is €2.978 billion, broken down as €964m in year 1 (2018); €992m in year 2 and 1.022 billion in year 3.

If we include “All in Costs” the costs rise to €3.769 billion, broken down as €1.219 billion in year 1 (2018); €1.256 billion in year 2 and 1.294 billion in year 3.

Breakdown of the costings for the request:

CONSTRUCTION COST OF 5000 SOCIAL HOUSING UNITS PER ANNUM 2018,2019,2020
<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Construction Costs Only</td><td colspan="4">All-IN COSTS</td></tr>
<tr><td>Year</td><td>Houses (€)</td><td>Apartments (€)</td><td>Total (€)</td><td>Year</td><td>Houses (€)</td><td>Apartments (€)</td><td>Total (€)</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018</td><td>578,756,028</td><td>384,824,137</td><td>963,580,165</td><td>2018</td><td>729,825,759</td><td>489,437,977</td><td>1,219,263,736</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>property. Assume a mix of 60% houses, 40% apartments with 2000 2 beds properties, 2000 3 bed properties, 500 single bed units and 500 4 bed units per year. Further assume 50% built in Dublin, 50% outside.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>2019</td><td>596,118,709</td><td>396,368,861</td><td>992,487,570</td><td>2019</td><td>751,720,532</td><td>504,121,116</td><td>1,255,841,648</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020</td><td>614,002,270</td><td>408,259,927</td><td>1,022,262,197</td><td>2020</td><td>774,272,148</td><td>519,244,749</td><td>1,293,516,897</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">TOTAL</td><td colspan="2">2,978,329,932</td><td colspan="2">TOTAL</td><td colspan="2">3,768,622,281</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Average unit Cost</td><td colspan="2">198,555</td><td colspan="2">Average unit Cost</td><td colspan="2">251,241</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8">Notes/Assumptions</td></tr>
</table>

5000 housing units per annum.
Houses: 100 - 1 beds; 1200 - 2 beds; 1200 - 3 beds; 500 - 4 beds.
Apartments: 400 - 1 beds; 800 - 2 beds; 800 - 3 beds.
Assumed Location - 50% Dublin Area and 50% Outside Dublin.
Inflation included at an average of 3.75% per annum on current UCC's Q3 2016-2020.
Revisions to statutory requirements if applicable going forward excluded.
Site abnormal works if applicable excluded.
All-in cost reflects a composite figure / unit to include the addition of site purchase cost,

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of increasing HAP limits to reflect market rents.</td>
<td><p>Local Authorities have discretion to exceed HAP Rent limits by up to 20%, where required. On the basis of Q.2 2017 figures, 17.8% of active HAP tenancies, including Homeless Households supported by the Dublin Regional Homeless Executive, are receiving a discretionary payment that exceeds the rent limits for their household type in their area. When homeless households supported by the DRHE are excluded the % of households receiving HAP payment that exceed the rent limits is 12.6%. The average rate of discretion being applied across all household types and all local authorities (for non DRHE households) is 14.7%.</p>
<p>On this basis the department considers that current HAP rent limits including the available discretion, have the capacity to reflect market rents without adjustment.</p></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>D/Arts Heritage R and Gaeltacht Affairs</td>
<td>The cost, in tabular form, of increasing the funding of Culture Ireland, the Arts Council and the Irish Film Board respectively by 5%, 105 and 20% respectively in 2018.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Culture Ireland</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017</td><td>€ 3.5m</td></tr>
<tr><td>+ 5%</td><td>€ 3.675m</td></tr>
<tr><td>+10%</td><td>€ 3.850m</td></tr>
<tr><td>+20%</td><td>€4.200m</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Further the cost of increasing the allocation to: the National Archives, the National Gallery, the National Library, the National Museum, Irish Museum of Modern Art, the Chester Beatty Library, National Concert Hall and Crawford Gallery by 5%, 10% or 20% respectively.

Arts Council	
2017	€ 65.15m
+ 5%	€ 68.41m
+10%	€ 71.67m
+20%	€78.18m

The Irish Film Board

Irish Film Board	
2017	€ 16.49m
+ 5%	€ 17.31m
+10%	€ 18.14m
+20%	€ 19.79m

42

Further the cost of increasing the available allocation to Regional Museums, Galleries, Cultural Centres and Projects by 5%, 10% or 20% respectively.

	Total Figure after % increase applied		
	5%	**10%**	**20%**
National Archives	1,644,000	1,723,000	1,879,000
National Gallery	9,863,700	10,333,400	11,272,800
National Library	7,658,000	8,022,000	8,752,000
National Museum	13,493,550	14,136,100	15,421,200
Irish Museum of Modern Art	5,321,400	5,574,800	6,081,600
Chester Beatty Library	2,647,050	2,773,100	3,025,200
National Concert Hall	2,844,450	2,979,900	3,250,800
Crawford Gallery	1,404,900	1,471,800	1,605,600

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further the cost of increasing the available allocation to Regional Museums, Galleries, Cultural Centres and Projects by 5%, 10% or 20% respectively.
<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2"></th><th colspan="3">Total Figure after % increase applied</th></tr>
<tr><th>5%</th><th>10%</th><th>20%</th></tr>
<tr><td>Regional Museums, Galleries, Cultural Centres and Projects</td><td>**5,565,000**</td><td>**5,830,000**</td><td>**6,360,000**</td></tr>
</table></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of opening the National Museums and Irish Museum of Modern Art as follows:
A) Open until 8pm on a Friday (including Good Friday).
B) Open every Monday.
C) Open every Monday, and every Friday evening until 8pm for June, July, and August.
For the National Gallery, the cost of opening on a Friday until 8.30pm.
For the Crawford Gallery the cost of opening on a Sunday from 12 to</td>
<td>National Museum: €50,000; IMMA: €148,872.
National Museum: €150,000; IMMA: €525,741.
National Museum: €180,000; IMMA: €170,226.
€154,000
€59,441</td>
</tr>
</table>

		5pm, and on a Friday until 8pm	
44		The cost, in tabular form, of increasing the funding to each local authority arts officer by 5% in 2018.	**5%** The Arts Council – 120,000 Culture Night – 11,000
45		The cost of increasing by 5% in 2017 the amount spent by any body under the aegis of the Department awarding grants or other forms of funding to young or emerging artists.	€233,000
46		The amount spent on the decade of commemorations for each year over the last five years, and the amount anticipated to be spent on such commemorative events and programmes in the years 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021.	2013* - €257,321 2014 - €432,000 2015 - €304,000 2016 - €340,000 *Responsibility for commemorative initiatives under Department of an Taoiseach prior to this. A provision of €1.1 million was made in 2017 to close off the Ireland 2016 Centenary Programme and to provide for the on-going Decade of Centenaries Commemorative Programme. The anticipated expenditure on the Decade of Centenaries commemorative programme in 2018 is approximately €600,000. It's not possible at this stage to estimate the anticipated expenditure for the remainder of the Decade to 2021 but activity will, at the very least, remain at current levels of engagement.
47	**D/Transport**	Scenario a - The cost providing a subvention to all councils operating a public bikes scheme, amounting to 5c,	<u>**Response to Scenario (a):**</u> Four city bike share schemes are operated across the State. These are in Dublin, Cork, Limerick and Galway. Based on the number of trips taken in each city during 2015 using the bike share scheme, the overall cost of a 5c, 10c and 20c subvention per trip is set out in the table below.

10c or 20c of each trip. Scenario b – the cost to the exchequer if the capital cost of all expansion plans proposed by councils operating public bike schemes are funded by national Government

City	Total 2016 Trips	5c subvention	10c Subvention	20c Subvention
Dublin	4,355,437	€217,772	€435,544	€871,087
Cork	290,590	€14,530	€29,059	€58,118
Limerick	32,892	€1,645	€3,289	€6,578
Galway	13,574	€679	€1,357	€2,715
Total Subvention for one year based on 2016 usage		**€234,625**	**€469,249**	**€938,499**

<u>Response to Scenario (b):</u>

Four local authorities have been in discussion with the NTA regarding potential bike share schemes or expansions. These are:

- Dublin (Dublin Bikes)
- Dun Laoghaire (Town Centre and environs)
- South Dublin (Tallaght Town Centre)
- Waterford Public Bike Scheme (Part of the original Regional Bikes proposal together with Cork, Galway and Limerick, but not progressed)

Approximate costs for each of these four local authority's plans for bike share schemes are set out below:

Local Authority	Area	Approximate Capital Cost Estimate
Dublin City Council	Dublin (all phases)	€20m
Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council	Dun Laoghaire	€0.7m

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>South Dublin County Council</td><td>Tallaght</td><td>€1.2m</td></tr>
<tr><td>Waterford City & County Council</td><td>Waterford</td><td>€1.0m</td></tr>
</table>

Both Cork City Council and Limerick City & County Council are seeking expansions of the existing scheme in each respective city. The details of these expansions are not yet available, but the indicative cost is likely to be €1m per city.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of zero-pricing all child (school hours) journeys using child leap cards.</td>
<td>
The zero-rated fare should apply on all transport routes where child (school hours) fares exist. The estimated number of journeys should be assumed to be relatively constant, and only adjusted to reflect the demographic growth which is increasing the number of school-going children.
<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Estimated additional cost taking account of growth in passenger numbers / growth in school going children and inflation</th></tr>
<tr><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th></tr>
<tr><td>€12.60 million</td><td>€12.78 million</td><td>€12.92 million</td></tr>
</table>

Notes on Table above
To estimate the annual cost of free travel for school going children on the four main public transport operators we can apply a Leap fare of €0.80 to all school journeys taken by children. Note the actual loss to the operators will be slightly higher than the Leap cost as they still have a number of school children paying the higher cash fare.
An expected increase in child passenger numbers would need to be included in the first year of 15%. The cost would need to be adjusted annually for inflation which is expected to be in the region of 1.5% per year over the next few years. Finally the growth in pupil numbers attending school based on the birth rate as calculated by the CSO would need to be accounted for.
Assumptions
Average Leap child fare in 2018 will be €0.80 and schoolchildren currently paying cash for a schoolchild fare would get a Leap card and avail of zero fares which would be available on all Leap enabled PSO and Luas operators.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inflation: 1.5% pa / Increase in school going children: 1.5% (2018), 1.4% (2019), 1.1% (2020)
Additional children 16 years and older who have not availed of a personalised Leap card would do so to avail of occasional free travel during the week and on Saturday mornings.
Total PSO family fares are around €1.1 million and if children travelled free parents accompanying their young children to school would only have to pay an adult fare instead of a family fare resulting in a loss in revenue to the operators of an estimated €50,000.
Increase in child passenger numbers as a result of the initiative difficult to specify but assumed at 15% (Current 'Kids go Free' promotion in summer results in +40% increase)

Other Issues for Consideration
Additional journeys would be taken by children if travel during school times were free and this would in some cases require additional services to be provided where operators are currently operating at full loading resulting in additional buses been required. This could result in additional capital costs of several million.

Parents may also take additional trips if their children travelled free to school and on Saturday mornings and this would partly off-set the cost of free school travel for children.

If free school travel was free for children up to their 19th birthday on PSO services it would also probably have to be subsidised for commercial operators. NTA does not have the data required to estimate the cost to other transport operators.

The Department of Education school transport scheme would also have to be considered. The scheme currently takes in about €14m in fares from schoolchildren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost of increasing by 1% the public subvention of each CIE company, and the cost of a 10% increase in the PSO for each.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>**Base**</td><td>**+1%**</td><td>**+10%**</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>**Total 2017 PSO Programme***</td><td>262.9m</td><td>+2.629m</td><td>+26.29m</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**BÁC**</td><td>**BÉ**</td><td>**IÉ**</td><td>**Total**</td></tr>
<tr><td>**2016 Operator Allocation***</td><td>59.6m</td><td>40.8m</td><td>133m</td><td>233.4m</td></tr>
<tr><td>**1%**</td><td>+0.596m</td><td>+0.408m</td><td>+1.33m</td><td>+2.334m</td></tr>
<tr><td>**10%**</td><td>+5.96m</td><td>+4.08m</td><td>+13.3m</td><td>+23.34m</td></tr>
</table>
**NB: 2017 final operator allocation not yet known, so 2017 total PSO Programme allocation with costings provided as well as look back at 2016 individual operator allocations with costings.*
In terms of projections it is better to work off 2017 total PSO Programme costings.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

50		We wish to cost a fast-tracking of the Metro North project. The costing should be provided on a multi-annual basis, based on the best available estimates of when it might be possible to commence each phase of the project.	New Metro North is a modified version of the original Metro North proposal which proposes providing a similar service at significantly reduced costs. This new metro line will provide a high-speed, high-capacity, high-frequency public transport link from the city centre to Dublin Airport and Swords. The overall project cost is estimated at €2.432 billion (excl VAT). The Government's Capital Plan "Building on Recovery: Infrastructure and Capital Investment 2016-2021", published last September, stated that "*construction of the project will commence in 2021 and that the new rail line will be open to passengers by 2026 / 27*". The timeline to commence construction in 2021 envisages an application to An Bord Pleanála for planning consent in mid-2019. The timeline for subsequently determining the planning application will be up to An Board Pleanála, but given the magnitude of the scheme and likely opposition to elements of its route, a twelve to fifteen month decision period has been allowed, with final tendering to be completed thereafter. The scheme will differ from the original Metro North proposal, and the time period up to mid-2019 is going to be required in full to robustly develop the revised project, engage in the necessary public consultations, carry out the various survey and investigations required (availing of all of the previous work), prepare a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement and develop the required "Railway Order" documentation, including extensive property referencing work. There is limited scope to reduce this overall time period and commence construction earlier. As additional funding will not materially accelerate the delivery of the New Metro North project, alternative cost profiles have not been developed.
51		We wish to cost a fast-tracking of the Metro North project. The costing should be provided on a multi-annual basis, based on the best available estimates of when it might be possible to commence each phase of the project.	Same as Q39

<table>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>The full cost that would accrue in 2018 and subsequent years if immediate approval was given to proceed with full electrification of rail lines to Maynooth and Kildare.</td>
<td>The electrification of the Maynooth and Kildare Railway lines are individual components of the overall DART Expansion programme.
The electrification of the Maynooth line would comprise the electrification of the Sligo line as far as Maynooth Station and Pace Station, and some upgrades to the existing signalling system. In addition, it would be necessary to remove the existing level crossings on this section of line in order to operate trains at enhanced frequencies.
The cost of this project is estimated at €357 million.
An indicative time line from design phase, though the planning process and construction would be 6 years. In the order of €15 million would be required over the first 3 years (say €5 million per year) to carry out the design, planning and procurement phases with the remainder of the expenditure being incurred during the construction phase.
With regards to the electrification of the Kildare line, there is limited justification to proceed with this in advance of the DART Underground project, as a large part of the work approaching Heuston Station of the surface would be completely replaced by a revised layout to link the electrified Kildare line to the underground DART tunnel.
However, if it were to be considered, the best available cost estimate is €190 million, excluding fleet costs. The first three years would be for planning and design work, requiring approximately €3 million per year, with the remaining amount expended over the subsequent three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost which would accrue in 2018 and subsequent years, broken down by project, if immediate approval was given to all national road projects where planning has commenced.</td>
<td>On the understanding that this question relates to the acceleration of the national road projects included in the Capital Plan if annual budgets could be increased, the following is the position:
<table>
<tr><th>Route</th><th>Project</th><th>Current Construction Start</th><th>Accelerated Construction Start</th></tr>
<tr><td>N7</td><td>Naas to Newbridge Upgrade</td><td>Q3/2017</td><td>Q3/2017</td></tr>
<tr><td>M8/N40/N25</td><td>Dunkettle</td><td>Q1/2019</td><td>Q1/2019</td></tr>
<tr><td>N22</td><td>Ballyvourney to Macroom</td><td>Q1/2020</td><td>Q4/2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>N4</td><td>Collooney to Castlebaldwin</td><td>Q2/2019</td><td>Q4/2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>N5</td><td>Westport to Turlough</td><td>Q1/2021</td><td>Q4/2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>N59</td><td>Moycullen Bypass</td><td>Q1/2021</td><td>Q4/2018</td></tr>
<tr><td>N56</td><td>Mountcharles to Inver (section)</td><td>Q4/2017</td><td>Q4/2017</td></tr>
<tr><td>N56</td><td>Dungloe to Glenties (section)</td><td>Q4/2017</td><td>Q4/2017</td></tr>
</table>
The achievement of this accelerated programme would require additional funding for the next five years as follows.
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>2018</th><th>2019</th><th>2020</th><th>2021</th><th>2022</th></tr>
<tr><td>Additional funding required in each year</td><td>€27m</td><td>€128</td><td>€82</td><td>-€95</td><td>-€126</td></tr>
</table>
The bringing forward of expenditure for these projects would mean that the expenditure profile for the later years of the Capital Plan would need to be adjusted.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>54</td><td></td><td>The cost which would accrue in 2018 and subsequent years, broken down by project, if immediate approval was given to all applications on hand to expand or construct cycle lanes</td><td>The Greater Dublin Cycle Network Plan was developed by the National Transport Authority in conjunction with the local authorities in the Greater Dublin Area, and published in 2013.
It comprises 500km of existing routes (many in need of significant upgrade) and 2,400km of new routes. Recent urban schemes would indicate the cost of new or upgraded urban cycle route varies between €1m and €2m per kilometre. (Costs would be significantly less in less urbanised areas of the city-region, where much of the new infrastructure would be located).

However, many of the planned cycle routes are integrated with enhanced bus network development, including bus rapid transit projects, and will be undertaken as part of those larger projects, providing a full improvement of the relevant road corridor in most locations, benefitting cars, public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. For the remaining cycle projects in the region, their cost has been estimated to be in the order of €375 – 400 million.
The cycle network planning for the four regional cities of Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford are less advanced. A working estimate for the combined costs of delivering their indicative networks would be in the order of €200 million, accepting that there may be some degree of overlap with bus corridor improvement projects in these cities.
Excluding investment in bus network development projects which incorporate delivery of key parts of the cycle network, an additional expenditure of approximately €60 – 80 million per annum, would facilitate the full development of the cycle network in both the Greater Dublin Area and the regional cities over a period of about 8 to 10 years.</td></tr>
<tr><td>55</td><td></td><td>How much would it cost the Exchequer to begin work on the M20 Cork to Limerick, and how many jobs it would create in construction.</td><td>The initial costs of construction, costs of payments to workers employed on construction, the potential savings through using Public Private Partnership model and the savings made on improvements to sections of the N20 already in the last year.
Response
The overall estimated cost of the M20 project as proposed in 2011 was of the order of €800 million. If the project were to be reactivated initial work on the project would relate to project planning followed by land acquisition once development consent was obtained. A possible expenditure profile for these costs is as follows (this does not include construction costs):
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>2018</td><td>2019</td><td>2020</td><td>2021</td><td>2022</td></tr>
<tr><td>M20 Cork to Limerick</td><td>€3</td><td>€10</td><td>€30</td><td>€50</td><td>€70</td></tr>
</table>

The Department does not have the additional information sought including detailed construction payments and a comparison between PPP and direct build options as it is too early in the development process. The Capital Plan 2016-2021 does not make provision for any further road PPP projects. As a point of information, under road PPP projects, enabling costs including planning and land acquisition are carried by the State as the party best placed to manage those risks while construction costs are funded by the PPP concession company and recouped over the concession period, generally 25 years. Accordingly the costs outlined above would be incurred by the State whichever construction financing model were adopted.</td></tr>
</table>

56	**D/PER**	The cost of introducing a Living Wage of at least €11.70 per hour for each person directly employed within the public sector, along with details of the cohorts who currently earn less than this amount.	The detailed costings sought in this request would require detailed data on the position of staff on each salary scale across the public service and details of the standard working hours per week for each individual grade. This data is not available to the Department. Pay band data available to the Department indicates that some 94% of all public service staff are on salary points in excess of €25,000 per annum. The suggested wage at €11.70 per hour based on the Civil Service 37 hour standard net working week equates to an annual salary of €22,589. Data based on Civil Service staff only indicates that only some 1% of staff (FTE) in the Civil Service are on salary points less than €22,589. The estimated cost within the civil service, which is some 12% of the overall public service, would be some €3.8m (Headcount). Detailed costings in other sectors of the public service would require collation and estimation on an individual sector level. Any of those currently on an annual salary of less than €22,589 could be receiving remuneration in excess of the suggested living wage through additional premium payments in respect of shift or atypical working hours or are on salary scales that progress to the suggested living wage through incremental progression. The proposed pay increases under the new Public Services Stability Agreement 2018-2020 from January 2018 would contribute further to a reduction in this cost also.