

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Quarterly report for 2015-2016

No headings

For Environment - Cllr Neal Davey 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 |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|

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 |
| Well below target | <u>Reduce the carbon footprint of our offices and public buildings by 2% pre adjustment</u> | +28.2 | +2.0 | +2.0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | -0.5 |
| <p><u>Management Notes:</u> (2015 - 2016)</p> <p>Increases in the leisure properties do not necessarily mean this is a negative indication of poor energy management ie more people coming through the door using more electricity/gas. Also, this can be further explained in the annual EEVS (independent energy report). Electricity isnt degree day corrected.</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Reduce the carbon footprint of our offices and public buildings by 0.5% post adjustment</u> | 21.7% | 0.5% | 0.5% | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3.4% |
| <p><u>Management Notes:</u> (2015 - 2016)</p> <p>Last years reduction was following the installation of the energy saving project and high investment therefore, 2015/16 is showing at a much lower % reduction.</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| No Target | <u>Number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) Issued (Environment)</u> | 16 | No target - for information only. | No target - for information only. | 2 | 8 | 16 | 21 |
| <p><u>Management Notes:</u></p> | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>Residual household waste per head (measured in Kilograms)</u> | 462.6 | 455.00 | 455.00 | 117.44 | 225.63 | 329.42 | 426.82 |
| <p><u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 1 - 4)</p> <p>The large diversion of waste (nearly 10%) from residual collections to recycling and a reduction in overall total tonnage of waste collected is very encouraging and will relate to the new recycling scheme introduced. Figures yet to be verified by DCC</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | <u>% of Household Waste Reuse, Recycled and Composted</u> | 48.2% | 52.0% | 52.0% | 50.2% | 52.2% | 50.9% | 50.6% |
| <p><u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 4)</p> <p>The recycling rate has increased in all quarters compared to the same quarters in the previous year. The recycling rate in the second half of the year rose by between 4% and 5% following the launch of the new scheme. Figures yet to be verified by DCC</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well | <u>Number of Households</u> | n/a | 15% | 15% | 0% | 0% | 18% | 20% |

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 |
| above target | <u>on Chargeable Garden Waste</u> | | | | | | | |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) There were 7,021 customers at the end of the financial year which is above the target set. Numbers continue to grow in April and move toward the final target of 10,000. (SK) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>% of missed collections reported per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u> | 0.10% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.02% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>% of Missed Collections logged per Quarter (recycling)</u> | 0.13% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.05% | 0.08% | 0.13% | 0.12% |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Missed collections were up in the year due to two round reschedules for both phases of the roll out of the new scheme. The second phase of roll out in Q3 involved changing collections cycles and rounds to match refuse rounds. Perm staff were used for deliveries and agency staff used on rounds leading to reduced route knowledge. Missed collections began to reduce again in Q4 and were down to 66 (0.04%) in March as rounds became established and route knowledge grew. (SK) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Number of Missed Collections reported per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u> | 1,797 | 540 | 540 | 99 | 203 | 354 | 472 |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>Number of Missed Collections reported per Quarter (Recycling)</u> | 1,162 | 270 | 270 | 126 | 380 | 895 | 1,294 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Missed collections were up in the year due to two round reschedules for both phases of the roll out of the new scheme. The second phase of roll out in Q3 involved changing collections cycles and rounds to match refuse rounds. Perm staff were used for deliveries and agency staff used on rounds leading to reduced route knowledge. Missed collections began to reduce again in Q4 and were down to 66 (0.04%) in March as rounds became established and route knowledge grew. (SK) | | | | | | | | |