

PERFORMANCE AND RISK FOR THE SECOND QUARTER OF 2016-17

Cabinet Member Cllr Ray L Stanley
Responsible Officer Director of Corporate Affairs and Business Transformation, Jill May

Reason for Report: To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for the first quarter of 2016/17 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

RECOMMENDATION(S): 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.

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 2016-17 financial year.
- 1.2 Appendix 2 shows the section of the Corporate Risk Register which relates to the Homes Portfolio. See 3.0 below.
- 1.3 Appendix 3 shows the profile of all risks for the Housing Portfolio for this quarter.
- 1.4 All appendices are produced from the corporate Service Performance And Risk management system (SPAR).

2.0 Performance

- 2.1 Housing tenancy PI's have improved overall from the previous quarter, with only one, **Rent Arrears as a Proportion of Annual Rent Debit**, being slightly under target.

2.2 The PI for the **Average Days to Re-let** times has improved from the last quarter from 17.2 days to 15.6 days, which means the service is currently performing better than the target of 16 days.

2.3 When benchmarking information is available it is included.

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)

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 That the PDG reviews the performance indicators and risks for 2016-17 that are outlined in this report and feeds back any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

Contact for more Information: Catherine Yandle, Audit Team Leader ext 4975

Circulation of the Report: Management Team and Cabinet Member