

Responses to questions raised at Overview and Scrutiny Committee
on 4 March 2013

Question 1. Request to be provided to what KPI's and the Local Authorities used to gain further intelligence in the formulation of KPI's.

All Authority services assess their performance using a range of measures to ensure that they are performing well and consistently. These measures could be statutory, such as processing times for Council Tax Benefit claims or processing times for Planning applications, or they could be derived from sector specific 'benchmarking clubs', such as SOCITM (the Society of ICT Managers), which is an organisation which sets industry good practice indicators for the information, communications and technology sector.

Authority services use these performance measures as part of their everyday business to compare how they are performing against other Councils, and to monitor service standards.

In procuring the packages the Authority required its partners to deliver standards of service that were initially at least equal to the existing performance levels, and to commit to continuous improvement in service levels in relevant areas. Using the standard measures most relevant to the service standards that we wished to entrench, the Authority's service matter experts set a range of performance indicators that are used on a day to day basis to monitor service delivery, and key performance indicators (KPIs) that will, if not achieved, lead to penalties being imposed on the partners.

There is a cost associated with securing service standards that exceed those that the Council already delivered, and whilst the partners were required to give commitments to continuous improvement in service standards, immediate improvements in service standards against our chosen measures were something that bidders proposed on a competitive basis in their bids. The levels and mix of the performance measures within the contract reflect how the Authority itself delivered these services, and the balance and direction for service delivery levels based on the budgets available to support improvements in performance.

The KPIs represent a range of issues that are specific to the Authority and it would not have been appropriate to replicate performance measures from other places where circumstances, and the objectives for services may be different.

Performance is monitored by formal partnership governance arrangements, and the contracts allow for performance measures to be adjusted and added as required to provide effective measurement, monitoring and enforcement against our objectives. Governance arrangements and the KPIs will be shared with members at the contract briefing sessions being arranged with each political group.

Question 2. Requested that indication of cost that would be incurred to the termination of the business and technical packages be provided. CX stated that he would seek Legal Advice to what information could be provided. The information was commercially sensitive so may be a in the form of a 'cost range' with analysis on the range.

There is further work required to pull this information together for members. The response will follow in due course.

Question 3. It was requested that the Committee be provided with the VfM information received by the Executive. The Chair stated he could not find this information in the Cabinet agendas.

In relation to Value for Money, the bid process itself for the two packages was the VfM test. Bidders were given the financial target of £4.9m (£2.2m from the Business Package and £2.7m from the Technical Package), whilst delivering the same services. The Authority undertook a competitive dialogue procurement process which allowed for VfM by asking bidders to demonstrate how they could deliver improved services at a reduced cost.