

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

# CABINET

30 JUNE 2010

### NATIONAL INDICATOR PERFORMANCE OUTTURNS 2009/10

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Roger Hollingworth
Relevant Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Director of Policy, Performance & Partnerships
Non-Key Decision	

#### **1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- 1.1 To report to Cabinet on the Council's performance in 2009/10 for all National Indicators which are collected at District Level.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That Cabinet notes the changes to the format and timing of the Annual Report as described in section 3.
- 2.2 That Cabinet notes the performance outturns for all National Indicators as contained in Appendix 1. Section 4 explains the background to these indicators.

#### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 In previous years the Council was required by statute to publish performance results by the end of June each year in the Best Value Performance Plan (BVPP) which had very proscriptive format and content. That statutory requirement was removed a few years ago, since that time the Council has continued to produce an Annual Report on the same timescale but with a much reduced content than the former BVPP required. Following the implementation of National Indicators (NI's) it has been decided that it would be better to produce two reports at the year end. This report shows the results of all National Indicators that are collected at District level. Some of the NI's (the Place survey ones, e.g. NI 1, 2, 3 etc) are collected every two years. The figures shown in the Appendix for 2009/10 are from the 'viewpoint' survey that was carried out across the county last autumn.
- 3.2 Cabinet has already received a performance report for the end of the year which showed the outturn for all of the corporately reported performance indicator set, which includes a mix of some NI's and local indicators.
- 3.3 A separate Annual Report will be brought to Cabinet in September. The Annual Report will have a more narrative style and will summarise

achievements against priorities and targets, instead of the narrower focus solely on Performance Indicators as in the past.

**4. KEY ISSUES**

4.1 Appendix 1 shows information for those National Indicators where information is collected at a District level. Where targets were set these are also shown in the report.

4.2 Many of these indicators are gathered by other organisations, e.g. the CDRP, or by government departments. In addition the Council is not the Lead Organisation for managing the performance for many of these. As such they do not necessarily reflect on the performance of the Council, rather they are used to provide an overall picture of the district, which is used in judgements made by, for instance, the Audit Commission, as part of the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) regime. However, as this report is being finalised we have been advised that the government is to abolish CAA with immediate effect, what this means for the future of the National Indicators is not clear.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 None

**6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 None

**7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 None

**8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

8.1 Performance reporting & management links to the Improvement objective

**9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Data quality problems
- Poor performance

9.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

- Implementation of the Data Quality Strategy
- Robust follow up on performance issues, including performance clinics

9.3 There are no Health & Safety considerations

**10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 Performance Improvement is a Council Objective

**11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 None.

**12. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT**

12.1 None

**13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY**

13.1 Performance on emissions has been poor, CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from Council activities have increased in 2009/10 (by 4% and 8% respectively), whereas the target was to achieve a 2% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 None

**15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

15.1 Sound performance management and data quality are key to achieving improved scores in the Use of Resources judgement. This performance report supports that aim.

**16. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998**

16.1 None

**17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**30 JUNE 2010**

---

17.1 None

**18. LESSONS LEARNT**

18.1 Not applicable

**19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

19.1 None

**20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT**

Portfolio Holder	Yes (at Leaders Group)
Chief Executive	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director – Leisure, Cultural, Environmental and Community Services	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration, Regulatory and Housing Services	Yes (at CMT)
Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Resources	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes (at CMT)
Corporate Procurement Team	No

**21. WARDS AFFECTED**

All

**22. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 NI Indicator results

**23. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

**24. KEY**

PI - Performance Indicator

NI - National Indicator ( a PI defined by government and used by all Councils)

LPI - Local Performance Indicator – (a PI defined by Bromsgrove, District Council to measure performance on local priorities)

CAA - Corporate Area Assessment – the methodology used by the Audit Commission to judge the performance of Councils and partners

**AUTHOR OF REPORT**

Name: John Outhwaite, Senior Policy & Performance Officer

email: [j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

Tel: (01527) 881602