Data correction:

We have previously advised (13/05, █████████) of a slight change to FS117 (staff turnover).

We now also need to advise of a change to ES418 (waste - % of household waste send for reuse, recycling and composting) from 49.91% to 50.00%.

General comments:

We are very keen to ensure this report contains only objective, independent analysis and does not interpret the resulting information on our performance. The exception is obviously that you have presented analysis to help understand the impacts of Covid alongside analysis which does not.

We are very happy to separately discuss the wider use of the analysis and offer our time, interpretation and explanations to support your use of this for research in due course.

As an example, we agree council tax collection is likely influenced by the cost of living, but we would add that interpretation in our wider report, and also refer to our ranking for Ctax collection in England for 22-23 (when we collected 99.24%), and while benchmarking results are yet to be released, our end of year collection rate for 23-24 (99.30%) is an improvement on this.
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/collection-rates-for-council-tax-and-non-domestic-rates-in-england-2022-to-2023
Essentially, adding the potential reasons and context for our performance should be separate from independent analysis to ensure no sense of bias is inferred.

Report content:

The key message is that only Council Tax collection went down, but later on it goes on to state that when adjusting for Covid, 4 KPIs worsened during the pilot period. We would suggest starting with the covid adjustment figures.

Given that, suggest early clarity on what the adjustment for the impact of Covid-19 period means in practice (or signpost to the explanation that comes later in the report).

Introduction:

The majority of the aspects covered by your proposed introduction will be / have been covered by our own committee papers and we suggest minimal context or background for our trial are necessary here; we feel it would be really helpful to have background on the experience you bring to this piece of work in terms of familiarity with and experience of analysing 4DW data and trials. Also a brief overview of how this analysis is presented?

Data inclusion:

Regarding ███████ query on which KPIs were only recently introduced (and so we believe lack enough historical KPI data for comparison):

Introduced in 2023/24:

- AH230 [Number of households with children leaving B&B (bed & breakfast) accommodation after longer than six weeks]
- PN519 (average time to determine validated householder planning applications - in weeks)
- AH215 (% successful homeless preventions as a proportion of all homeless cases closed) – KPI introduced for 23-24 financial year – insufficient historical data.
- AH245 (% of SCDC homes with active HHRS Category 1 or 2 damp and mould cases) - KPI introduced for 23-24 financial year – insufficient historical data.
- ES430 (% of fly tips cleared within 10 working days) – KPI introduced for 23-24 financial year - insufficient historical data.
- ES412 (Kgs of black bin waste per household) - KPI introduced for 23-24 financial year - insufficient historical data.
- ES414 (Kgs of total waste per household) - KPI introduced for 23-24 financial year - insufficient historical data.

In 2022/23:

- CC314 [% of public hybrid meetings run without issues causing downtime exceeding five minutes)

[Note that we may have historical information for our performance in these areas but they are not longstanding KPIs, so we don't have intervention triggers and RAG ratings. A good example is planning PN519 – we will include commentary on our performance on those KPIs, and on broader performance outside KPIs, ourselves in our reporting].

Four KPIs in Shared Planning Services are reported as cumulative figures, over a two-year performance period:

- PN510 [% of major applications determined within 13 weeks or agreed timeline]
- PN511 [% of non-major applications determined within eight weeks or agreed timeline]
- PN512 [% of appeals against major planning permissions refusal allowed]
- PN513 [% of appeals against non-major planning permission refusal allowed].

These KPIs assess performance over a set two-year period (October 2021 to September 2023 / April 2021 to March 2023) reported in alignment with central government's methodology for monitoring local authority planning performance. As such, these data are not useful for monitoring performance of the 4DW and have been excluded. Instead alternative Planning Service measures (not corporate KPIs) have been included to ensure performance can be assessed (number and timeliness of major and non-major planning application decisions).

Data type:
- FS102 (% housing rent collected) may appear cumulative (because there's an upward trend in results, targets and interventions as the year progresses - as is

the case with cumulative KPIs for Ctax and NNDR), but this KPI **is actually non-cumulative.**
- % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting is actually **cumulative.**

Presentation:
We are aware work is being done on graph formatting but wanted to highlight consistent y-axis scales would be helpful, and where the KPI shows a %, a max on the Y scale of 100.

In the section with detailed analysis I may be helpful to state whether the KPI is cumulative or non-cumulative in the title for each KPI, for ease of reference?

Detailed comments on individual KPIs:
- FS125 – the impression is given that sickness was not previously monitored – it has been, for longer than 5 years, but waste wasn't separated from overall org figure, so the data is not comparable.
- Regression analysis 3 and 4 for CC303 refers to complaints but this KPI is for calls handled. Also, shouldn't analysis 4 include December as well as November as 'significantly better'?
- CC305 – 'Approximately 7% more formal complaints were handled during the pilot, compared to before.' - query the wording of this sentence for clarity – it seems to refer to absolute number of complaints which is not data we have provided (we are only looking at % responded to within timescale?).
- FS102 – comment says "the end of year rent collection % fell below the target level in 20-21 and has not recovered in subsequent years." I think this is probably based on the belief that this is a year to date, cumulative KPI, when in fact this isn't the case – unlike FS104 and FS105, this is an non-cumulative KPI, but gives the impression of being cumulative as detailed in the first point un KL KPI Specific Comments.
- Re FS104 and FS105, is it worth having the month by month analysis? Ultimately once we've got to year end, the only thing that really matters is the year end result. There will always be some ups and downs in the year, as new businesses come online etc. and by including in the analysis, this could promote the view that these monthly results are somehow more significant than they actually are (i.e. more than just a view of progress towards year-end). For example analysis 3 says collection was 2.1% lower than the long term average during the pilot, but the collection rate during the pilot was 99.3%. Or make clearer in the month on month analysis?
- FS109 – (as an example – also appears elsewhere) where it states "the KPI target was not met but the intervention level was not reached", I think this would be interpreted by most as being worse than intervention. This would be incorrect. Recommend changing to "but the intervention was exceeded."

- FS113 the analyses say there are 6 significant results but each only refers to 5 months? Is this because the 6th significant result is the whole pilot period itself?
- FS117 – wording under Analysis 1 doesn't seem to be for this KPI. The results met target throughout and there isn't a Nov result for this one because it's a quarterly KPI. Also worth noting this is voluntary leaver turnover rate.
- When describing turnover analysis 'However, it did find a significant improvement in the pilot period compared to before the pilot was introduced. Staff turnover was approximately 1% lower during the pilot, compared to before.' Need to clarify wording or refer to actual turnover %ages rather than talk about the drop. [In our SCDC draft paper we talk about a reduction in turnover of 36% (which is calculated using a turnover rate changing from 1.07% to 0.68% of the organisation using the dates we have analysed).]
- Planning measures – convert graph axis to % format.
- ES418 is a year to date cumulative figure.