Committee:	Cabinet	**Date:**	Thursday, 2 November 2023
Title:	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2023/24 Q1 Performance Update		
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
Report Author:	Angela Knight, Director of Business Performance and People	**Key decision:**	No
	aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk		
	Paula Evans, Contract, Performance and Risk Manager		
	pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk		

Summary

1. This report presents the newly formed suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) which will provide members with quarterly performance data and where possible, benchmarking comparisons to other similar Local Authorities.

2. The CCIs were identified to enable the Corporate Management Team and Members to focus on key areas of performance across the council. Where possible, comparative data has been obtained from other local authorities so that further, indicator specific, analysis can also be completed.

3. Performance trends have been analysed to identify where improvement may be needed particularly when comparing against other 'statistical nearest neighbour' authorities.

Recommendations

4. None. The report is for information only.

Financial Implications

5. There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

6. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report:

   None.

Impact

7.

Communication/Consultation	Reviewed by Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Informal Cabinet Board (ICB)
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Corporate Core Indicators

8. A suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) has been developed and include a number of new indicators which have not been previously reported on. The indicators have been identified and developed to provide members with information on the performance of key activities within the council.

9. A total of 25 indicators have Q1 outturn data entered against them and where applicable this is compared to the previous year's internal data; this is set out in detail at Appendix A. A summary of the current indicators shows that:

- 13 have achieved or exceeded their target
- 6 are showing a decline in the performance levels since the previous comparable quarter
- 10 are showing a decline in performance over the longer term (12 months)

Benchmarking

10. In addition to reporting against our internal targets and performance, an exercise to benchmark our performance externally has been carried out.

11. The benchmarking group used for the purposes of this report represents Uttlesford District Council's statistical near neighbours (SNN) as identified in the annual Financial Resilience Index produced by CIPFA (see table below).

Authority	Area km^2	Population mid 2019
Uttlesford DC	641.18	91,284
Tewkesbury BC	414.4	95,019
South Cambridgeshire	901.63	159,086
Hart DC	215.3	97,073
Tonbridge and Malling BC	240.13	132,153
Horsham DC	530.26	143,791
Sevenoaks DC	370.34	120,750
Harborough DC	591.8	93,807
Test Valley BC	627.6	126,160
Winchester CC	660.97	124,859
Vale of White Horse DC	578.6	136,007
East Hampshire	514.4	122,308
West Oxfordshire	714.40	110,643
South Oxfordshire	678.54	142,057

12. The Nearest Neighbours Model is determined by 40 different metrics across a wide range of social-economic indicators and is designed to help interpret results and deep dive into how the statistical differences between other authorities arises.

13. As there were no other formal benchmarking groups identified at the time of formalising the CCI suite, these were thought to be a good starting point on which to build our benchmarking knowledge. Although it should be noted that this group of SNN is a very close match to the comparative data available on the LG Inform platform, Value for Money Profiles.

14. Work is currently being undertaken to ascertain which benchmarking information would be most appropriate to use through such sources as LG Inform+, CIPFA Insights, APSE. This work will include service specific benchmarking organisations, for example Housemark for the Housing Revenue Account. It is therefore anticipated the 2023/24 Q2 data will be reporting against a more formalised benchmarking group.

15. The benchmarking data contained in this report and the detailed information in Appendix A has been obtained directly from equivalent performance officers in the SNN authorities and/or published data on their authority websites.

16. Comparative data for 8 of the 25 indicators has been obtained and a minimum and maximum value has been identified for each indicator, but for benchmarking purposes the average of the group has been used to determine a comparable performance level for Uttlesford's Q1 outturns. A summary of the benchmarking data for the current group of local authorities selected is set out in the table below.

No. of LA's	Indicator	Average performance level	UDC Outturn	Performance Comments
	Benchmarking Comparison Summary			
4	**CCI 05:** % Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days	92%	**83%**	UDC's performance is the lowest of the benchmarking group, however, UDC's performance is improving, and new processes have been put in place to ensure this trend continues and the current target of 95% responded to within 20 days is achieved.
5	**CCI 06:** % of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council	89%	**90%***	UDC's performance is above the group's average and the second highest out of 5.
8	**CCI 09:** % of Council Tax collected	30%	**29.52%**	UDC's performance is in line with the average for the group and on a par with all other council's bar one, which is an outlier with a very high performance.
8	**CCI 10:** % of Non-domestic Rates Collected	31%	**30.20%**	UDC's performance is in line with the average for the group and on a par with all other council's bar one, which is an outlier with a very high performance.
7	**CCI 24:** Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications (within 13 - 16 weeks with EIA or including any Extension of Time)	83%	**85.90%**	UDC's performance exceeds the average for the group and is 4th highest out of 7.
7	**CCI 25:** Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications (within 8 weeks or including any Extension of Time)	87%	**84.62%**	UDC's performance is 2% below the average for the group and 2nd lowest out of 7.
3	**CCI 26:** % of appeals upheld for Major Applications (min)	12%	**10.81%**	UDC's performance is better than the average for the group, however it should be noted the comparison group is small, and the spread is wide.
7	**CCI 28:** % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	48%	**53.88%**	UDC's performance is 6% above the average and 3rd highest out of 7.

It should be noted that some LA's may offer a different range of services through their CSC function

Risk Analysis

17.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
If performance indicators do not meet quarterly/annual targets then areas such as customer satisfaction and statutory adherence to government led requirements could be affected leading to a loss in reputation for the Council.	2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target. Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.	3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.	Performance is monitored by CMT, and Cabinet on a quarterly basis. Short and long term analysis is carried out to identify performance trends, this supports the appropriate action/improvement plans to be put in place to address issues.

1 = Little or no risk or impact
2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.