Committee:	Cabinet	**Date:**	Tuesday, 19th March 2023
Title:	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2023/24 Q3 Performance Update		
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
Report Author:	Angela Knight, Director of Business Performance and People	**Key decision:**	N
	aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk		
	Paula Evans, Contract, Performance and Risk Manager		
	pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk		

Summary

1. This report presents members with 2023/24 Q3 (October-December) performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).

2. The CCIs were identified to enable the Corporate Management Team and Members to focus on key areas of performance across the council.

3. Where possible, benchmarking comparisons to other similar Local Authorities has been conducted and presented as a separate analysis exercise.

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

Recommendations

5. None. The report is for information only.

Financial Implications

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

Background Papers

7. 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

8.

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

9. The Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) have been developed to provide focus on key service provision areas across the authority. They include a number of new indicators which have not been previously reported on thus limiting some of the analysis that can be completed for them.

10. Of the 30 indicators identified, a total of 27 indicators have Q3 outturn data and supporting performance notes entered against them. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data; this is set out in detail at Appendix A.

11. When reviewing the indicators, the following should be noted:

- Indicators ending with (max) means a *higher* outturn is good performance

- Indicators ending with (min) means a *lower* outturn is a good performance

12. Overall, the statuses of the indicators and performance levels are comparable with 2023/24 Q2 outturns;

- for Q3 there are **14** at green status (achieving or exceeding target), **6** amber (within 10% of target) and **7** red (over 10% off target)

- in Q2 there were **12** at green status, **5** amber and **8** red

13. However, further analysis indicates that there are more indicators trending as improving in performance against target for the short trend (15) as well as the long trend (16).

Benchmarking

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

15. 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, this list has been updated for Q3 following an update by CiPFA (see table below).

Authority	Area km^2 (2021)	Population (2022)
Uttlesford	641.18	92,578
Harborough	591.78	100,481
Winchester	660.97	130,268
Tandridge	248.19	88,707
Vale of White Horse	577.62	142,116
South Cambridgeshire	901.63	165,633
Sevenoaks	369.2	121,106
Tonbridge and Malling	240.14	133,661
Waverley	345.17	130,063
South Oxfordshire	678.53	151,820
Hart	215.27	100,910
Test Valley	627.58	132,871
Tewkesbury	414.42	97,000
Mole Valley	258.32	87,769
East Hampshire	514.44	127,319
Bromsgrove	216.97	100,076

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. Comparative data for 7 of the 27 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 Q3 outturns. A summary of the benchmarking data for the current group of local authorities selected is set out in the table below.

Benchmarking Comparison Summary

Please note that our performance is compared against smaller groups within the Statistical Near Neighbours group as set out in the table earlier in the report, as data is either not available or not in a comparable format for us to use. These are high level comparisons; detailed comparisons on how each authority calculates its indicators has not been carried out.

No. of LA's	Indicator	Average performance level	UDC Outturn	Performance Comments
3	**CCI 05:** % Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days (max)	93%	**87%**	UDC's performance is lower than the 2 other comparative organisations. Since we introduced FOI champions (Liaison Officers) in most service areas it has resulted in significantly improving our response rate year on year and it is anticipated that UDC performance will continue to improve.
5	**CCI 09:** % of Council Tax collected (max)	85%	**84%**	UDC's performance is the lowest out of the 5 in the group. Some of the other authorities in the benchmarking group have more generous Council Tax support schemes that impacts positively on their collection rates.
5	**CCI 10**: % of Non-domestic Rates Collected (max)	84%	**82%**	UDC's performance is 4th out of the 5 in the group.
4	**CCI 24:** Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications (within 13 - 16 weeks with EIA or including any Extension of Time) (max)	88%	**85%**	UDC's performance is in the middle of the group and slightly below the average.
4	**CCI 25:** Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications (within 8 weeks or including any Extension of Time) (max)	87%	**84%**	UDC's performance is in the middle of the group and slightly below the average for the group.
4	**CCI 26:** % of appeals upheld for Major Applications (min)	8%	**13%**	UDC has the highest number of its appeals upheld within the group reported. This is the metric for which UDC's planning service is designated. It is noted that the comparator authorities have far more up to date Local Plans and thus are likely to be able to better defend planning refusals. The publishing of UDC's five-year housing supply will assist going forward, as will the eventual adoption of a new Local Plan.
5	**CCI 28:** % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (max)	47%	**49%**	UDC's performance is in the middle of the group and above the average.

Risk Analysis

20.

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.