

I'm calling in the Quarterly Corporate Performance Report for the following reasons:

The information presented is insufficient and inadequate in many areas and it is nigh on impossible in many cases to determine performance. The key information is presented in the two appendices and that is where the weaknesses lie. Firstly, over the last two corporate performance reports in appendix 1 the target column per quarter has disappeared leaving only the annual target column in place. The result of which is that it is not possible to track progress in performance based on quarterly expectations. It also enables poor performance in a quarter to be obscured. In some cases, there is not even an annual target in place making it impossible to determine whether the performance over the year is good, bad or stable. Furthermore, these changes have not been explained in the Report.

I have documented a number of examples below, though this is by no means an exhaustive list.

### **Housing**

In the April 2019 Corporate Performance Report the Housing figure presented for NI 156i (temporary accommodation) had a value for Q3 for 2018/19 of 3392, together with a target for Q3 of 3049, which was the same as the annual target for 2018/19 and therefore shown red in the report. However, this Report has a deteriorating figure for Q1 2019/20 of 3410, but no Q1 target and no annual target for comparison. The figure is therefore seemingly not colour-coded for that reason, but on the basis that the Q3 figure of 3392 was colour-coded red the increase to 3410 should itself be colour-coded red. Indeed, the comparison in the Report of Q1 2018/19 which was 3320 and presented red even further strengthens my argument.

Similarly, for AUD FC003 (recovery of council properties that have been unlawfully used etc.) the Q1 2019/20 value of 36 is colour-coded green, but without a Q1 target it is not apparent as to why this is, given the annual target is 100. By comparison, the Q1 2018/19 figure of 27 (October 2018) is marked green because the target for Q1 2018/19 was stated as being 25 and was therefore exceeded. This is not obviously discernible in this report.

### **Libraries, Arts and Culture**

ENV317 (Participation in Council Led Arts Activities): There is a Q1 2019/20 value of 61,040, but no quarterly target or even annual target.

We can see that compared to Q1 2018/19 where the figure was 65,540 the numbers have fallen quite significantly. Compare this to the April 2019 Corporate Performance Report where the Q3 2018/19 value was 74,350, the Q3 target was 66,404 and the annual target was 132,808 making tracking and comparisons easily discernible.

In the other categories, at least annual targets are presented and the values seem encouraging, but there is an absence of commentary in the notes to explain performance – good or bad – and this common throughout the Corporate Performance Report.

### **Adult Social Care**

NI131 (F10) Delayed transfers of care (days) has a Q1 2019/20 value of 580, but no comparator, no colour coding and no narrative. Likewise, with NI131 (F11) Delayed Transfer of Care has a Q1 2019/20 value of 73 but again no comparator, no colour coding and no narrative. Similarly, with NI146(A) Number of adult learning-disabled clients receiving LTS has a Q1 2019/20 figure of 153, but again no comparator, no colour coding and no narrative.

PA-AO/C72 new Admissions to supported permanent Residential and Nursing Care etc. The Q1 2019/20 value is 123.4, which is less than the corresponding value of 134.8 from Q1 2018/19, but the notes make mention of 54 admissions, which is apparently an improvement on the 59 admissions last year. It is not at all clear how this relates to the 123.4 figure or the 134.8 figure.

### **Public Health**

DAAT-001 NDTMS (Partnership Successful Completion Rate for Drug users in treatment) has an annual target for 2019/20 of 20%, but no Q1 2019/20 value or target. Of more concern is in comparison with the April 2019 Corporate Performance Report, which had a Q3 2018/19 value of 18.5%, a monthly target of 20% and an annual target of 20%, but the notes are identical to what is being said in the latest Corporate Performance Report. This appears to be a cut and paste job.

### **Waste, Recycling and Cleanliness**

NI191 (Residual Waste per Household) there is no Q1 2019/20 value/target/colour-code, but the annual target of 600 kg per h/h is higher than that for 2018/19, which was 580 kg per h/h – something you can only discern from looking at last year's Corporate Performance reports. In the event looking at the column in this section we can see that that figure was significantly exceeded (632.97kg per h/h). This is

clearly of concern given the aim of the waste changes is to reduce residual waste, but this is not easily discernible, and no comment has been made as to why the previous year's figure was considerably exceeded. Furthermore, and on that basis, the target of 600kg per h/h looks highly optimistic and there is no indication in the notes why this target is considered to be more likely to be achieved.

Likewise, NI192 (% of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting) has no Q1 2019/20 value/target/colour code, but the annual target has fallen to 37% from the 2018/19 figure of 40%. Again, this is only discernible from a reference to last year's Corporate Performance reports and is not directly stated. Indeed, in the notes It states that in the event the 2018/19 achievement was a disappointing 33.4% - a significant 6.96% (2.5 tonnes) decrease in household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting on the previous year, but confusingly gives the 2017/18 figure of 35.9%. The 6.96% figure only makes sense in relation to the 40% target of 2018/19 resulting in the stated 33.4%. However, it makes no sense in relation to the 2017/18 figure of 35.9%. Indeed, there is no actual indication as to what the actual value was for the 2018/19 year as it isn't stated.

PRR002 (# of customer reported street scene issues etc.) though there is at least a value for Q1 2019/20 there is no Q1 target and no colour code, which would suggest based on the notes that there is an upward trend over the last 3 years in customer reports suggesting a gradual deterioration in service. On that basis and on an annual target of 950 would suggest a red colour code.

As stated in the Report (1.3 of the Executive Summary) the purpose of Appendix 2 is to focus on a selection of priority measures where performance is currently off target and or direction of travel is negative. Appendix two enables us to see action plans with delivery timeframes and demonstrate what is being done to address underperformance. From the above figures in this section it would seem to suggest that Waste Recycling and Cleanliness should be escalated to Appendix 2.

### **Community Safety**

Almost across the entire indicators, aside from a couple of indicators, the Q1 2019/20 values suggest a significant deterioration in Community Safety, which is of deep concern. The annual targets for 2019/20 are identical as those for the 2018/19 year and there is no explanation as to why that is. Though there is no colour-coding, on the basis of what is being presented, it would suggest that many should be coded red, and in

a number of places no narrative to suggest what action is being taken. Given the significant increase in a number of areas where commentary has been given, i.e. that residential burglary has risen by 9.6%, that serious youth violence has risen by 9.1%, that the number of antisocial behaviour calls has risen by 10.1%, that non-domestic abuse violence with injury has increased by a staggering 20.7%, and that knife crime offences have increased by 15.6%, why has Community Safety not been escalated to an Appendix 2?

## **Appendix 2**

The purpose of Appendix 2 is, as stated above and in 1.3 of the Report's Executive Summary is to focus on a selection of priority measures where performance is currently off target and or direction of travel is negative and is supposed to provide action plans with delivery timeframes and demonstrate what is being done to address underperformance. However, there is a lack of timeframes in evidence across the 4 areas identified.

In Homelessness, though there is reference to a series of actions that have or are being undertaken there is no indication as to when improvements in this area are likely to be seen.

In Complaints, FOIs and Complaints – which is surely a mistake and should read Complaints, FOIs and MEQs – there has been a deterioration in FOI and MEQ responses in Q1 2019/20. Though the notes suggest that for Q2 2019/20 there has been some improvement for FOIs and an improvement for MEQ responses, there has been a deterioration for Complaints closed within 10 days. This suggests that the trend is not consistently upward and there is nothing to indicate that this will change anytime soon.

In Planning there is mention of a detailed performance action plan, but this is absent from the appendix. With regards to the performance, though there has been an improvement in minor applications and other applications determined within target there is nothing there to indicate the quality of those decisions and any indicator on the level of complaints. There has also been a deterioration in major applications determined within target.

For the above reasons this Report should be referred back to the Cabinet Member for re-evaluation.