

PERFORMANCE AND RISK REPORT FOR THE 3rd QUARTER OF 2013-14

Cabinet Member Cllr Clive Eginton
Responsible Officer Head of Communities & Governance

Reason for Report: To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2013-14 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. That the PDG reviews the Performance Indicators and Risks that are outlined in this report and feeds back any areas of concern to the Cabinet.
2. That the PDG reviews the Performance Indicators Proposed for 2014-15 and feeds back to the Scrutiny Working Group (attached at Appendix 3)

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Corporate Plan priorities and targets are effectively maintained through the use of appropriate performance indicators and regular monitoring.

Financial Implications: None identified

Legal Implications: None

Risk Assessment: If performance is not monitored we may fail to meet our corporate and local service plan targets or to take appropriate corrective action where necessary. If key business risks are not identified and monitored they cannot be mitigated effectively.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 provides Members with details of performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for the first three quarters of 2013-14.
- 1.2 Appendix 2 shows the section of the Corporate Risk Register which relates to the Environment Portfolio.
- 1.3 Both reports are produced from SPAR, the corporate Service Performance and Risk Management system.
- 1.4 It is now time to set performance targets for the next financial year, the Key Performance Targets proposed by the Scrutiny Working Group are at Appendix 3, please will Members consider the following:
 - Which targets they wish to keep
 - Which targets they wish to stop reporting
 - Any targets they would like to add

- What the actual targets should be
- Any other useful information

This will be taken into account by the Scrutiny Working Group.

2.0 Performance

2.1 The figures for recycling and residual waste rates have to be verified by DCC before submission to WasteDataFlow so are always somewhat delayed. If they have been published before the PDG meeting there will be a verbal update at the meeting.

2.2 The performance on missed collections for both waste and recycling has been very good so far this year.

3.0 Risk

3.1 The Corporate risk register has been reviewed by Management Team (MT) and updated. Risk reports to committees include risks with a total score of 15 or more and all those with an impact score of 5. (See Appendix 2)

3.2 The profile of these risks for Managing the Environment for this quarter is:

Impact	5			2		
	4					
	3					
	2					
	1					
		1	2	3	4	5
		Likelihood				

3.3 This report does not at present show target levels for risks set by MT, which is the tolerance level for each risk, however these are shown in the individual risk entries on SPAR where applicable.

3.4 As Service Business Plans for 2014-15 are approved any risks identified which meet the above criteria for inclusion will be added to the corporate risk register.

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 That the PDG reviews the performance indicators and risks for 2013-14 that are outlined in this report and feeds back any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

4.2 That the PDG reviews the performance indicators proposed for 2014-15 at Appendix 3 and feeds back any comments to the Scrutiny Working Group.

Contact for more Information: Amy Tregellas, Head of Communities & Governance ext 4246

Circulation of the Report: Management Team and Cabinet Member

Glossary of Terms

Prev Year End: This is the actual final value for the year 2012/13

Annual Target: This is the year-end target for 2013/14

Current Target: This is the profiled target for the 2013/14 year to date

Q1-Q4 Act: These are the actuals for the 2013/14 year to date quarter by quarter. Some indicators do not have results for every quarter.

Improvement: This is progress against the corresponding quarter last year

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Quarterly report for 2013-2014

No headings

For Environment - Cllr Clive Eginton Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:

No Data

Well below target

Below target

On target

Above target

Well above target

Key to change on same period in previous year:



Improved Performance



Worse Performance



Unchanged

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Performance Indicators									
Status	Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act	Improvement
Above target	<u>Reduce the amount of waste going to landfill by 9% by 2015</u>	487.71	470.00	235.00 (2/4)	106.50	204.60			↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well below target	<u>Increase Dry Recycling Rate to 20% by 2015</u>	14.70%	20.00%	20.00% (2/4)	13.89%	14.38%			↑
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Below target	<u>% of Household Waste Reuse, Recycled and Composted</u>	46.2%	50.0%	50.0% (2/4)	48.5%	49.5%			↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well above target	<u>% of missed collections per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u>	0.03%	0.30%	0.30% (3/4)	0.02%	0.04%	0.04%		↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
Well above target	<u>% of Missed Collections per Quarter (recycling)</u>	0.06%	0.30%	0.30% (3/4)	0.03%	0.04%	0.05%		↓
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
No Target	<u>Number of Missed Collections per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u>	n/a			163	327	494		n/a
<u>Management Notes:</u>									
No Target	<u>Number of Missed Collections per Quarter (Recycling)</u>	n/a			113	229	355		n/a
<u>Management Notes:</u>									

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014
16:35

MTE PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 2

Report for 2013-2014

For Environment - Cllr Clive Eginton Portfolio

Filtered by Flag:Include: * CRR 5+ / 15+

For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

Key to Performance Status:

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

MTE PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 2

Risk: Security of tenure at Silverton Mill Security of tenure at Silverton Mill

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Waste Management

Current Status: High (15)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Head of Service: Paul N Williams

Review Note:

Risk: Waste Collection - Health and Safety Inadequate training with regards to Manual Handling and workplace hazards (eg contact with broken glass) could result in Health and Safety risks

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood): - Increasing demand and service costs due to increasing population, consumer society and an increasing amount of waste

Service: Waste Management

Current Status: Medium (10)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Head of Service: Paul N Williams

Review Note:

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 14:58

Key Performance Indicators – proposed list

Cabinet Member for the Environment

Reduce the amount of waste going to landfill by 9% by 2015

Increase dry recycling rate to 20% by 2015

% of Household waste reused, recycled and composted

Missed collections per quarter (refuse and organic waste) – *Cllrs to decide if they want % of actual number reported*

Missed collections per quarter (recycling) – *Cllrs to decide if they want % of actual number reported*

Missing energy indicators

Cabinet Member for Housing

Deliver 15 homes per year by bringing empty homes into use

Number of affordable homes delivered

% emergency repairs completed on time

% urgent repairs completed on time

% routine repairs completed on time

% repairs completed at first visit

Ratio of expenditure between planned and responsive repairs

Rent collected as a proportion of rent owed (including rent arrears b'fwd)

Rent arrears as a proportion of annual rent debit

% decent council homes

% properties with a valid gas safety certificate

Average days to re-let local authority housing

There seems to be a disproportionate number of housing indicators – should the ones in *italics* be reported to all committees or should they go to the internal board and SIG?

Cabinet Member for Community Well Being

Ensure 80% of people who contact the Council about ASB see improvements

Conduct a number of community safety information or consultation events for partners and /or the community

Leisure operational recovery rate

Retention rate for leisure members

Do we need to include some meaningful Environmental Health Indicators?

Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration

Reduce the number of empty shops units (Tiverton)

Reduce the number of empty shops units (Crediton)

Reduce the number of empty shops units (Cullompton)

Footfall measurement in Tiverton

Footfall measurement in Crediton

Footfall measurement in Cullompton

Planning Applications – Major Applications

Planning Applications – Minor Applications

Planning Applications – Other Applications

New Planning Performance Guarantee

Cabinet Member for the Working Environment & Support Services

% of incoming calls answered

% calls to customer first answered within 2 minutes

Number of phone calls to CF per month

% of visitors to reception seen to within 15 minutes of arrival

Satisfaction with front line services

% complaints acknowledged within 3 days

% complaints resolved within timescales

% emails received by customer first responded to within 5 days

95% of post received and scanned on the date of receipt

*note: do the Customer First indicators need to be thinned down and maybe amended to link with digital strategy i.e. number of phone calls, number of visitors, number of transactions completed online?

Working days lost due to sickness absence

Cabinet Member for Finance

% total of Council Tax collected monthly

% total of Business Rates collected monthly

% of invoices paid on time

Time taken to process Housing Benefits/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events