

Joint Scrutiny Committee Agenda



Listening Learning Leading



Contact: Susan Harbour, Democratic Services Team Leader

Telephone 01235 422525

Email: susan.harbour@southandvale.gov.uk

Date: 12 May 2017

www.southoxon.gov.uk

www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

A meeting of the

Joint Scrutiny Committee

will be held on Monday, 22 May 2017 at 6.30 pm

Meeting Room 1, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton OX14 4SB

Members of the Committee: Councillors

South

Richard Pullen (co chair)

David Dodds

Toby Newman

John Walsh

Ian White

Vale

Debby Hallett (co chair)

Alice Badcock

Mohinder Kainth

Ben Mabbett

Chris Palmer

Substitutes

South

Pat Dawe

Sue Lawson

Jeanette Matelot

Bill Service

Alan Thompson

Vale

Every political group may appoint all or some of its members who are not voting members to serve as substitute members, provided that they are not members of the Cabinet

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email and easy read. For this or any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.



Margaret Reed, Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Agenda

Open to the Public including the Press

1. Apologies for absence

To record apologies for absence and the attendance of substitute members.

2. Minutes

(Pages 3 - 6)

To adopt and sign as a correct record the Joint Scrutiny Committee minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2017.

3. Declarations of interest

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

4. Urgent business and chairman's announcements

To receive notification of any matters which the chairman determines should be considered as urgent business and the special circumstances which have made the matters urgent, and to receive any announcements from the chairman.

5. Public participation

To receive any questions or statements from members of the public that have registered to speak.

REPORTS AND OTHER ITEMS BROUGHT BEFORE THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR ITS CONSIDERATION

6. Performance review of Sodexo Ltd (Horticultural Services) - 2016

(Pages 7 - 24)

To consider the Chief Executive's report.

7. Performance review of Biffa Municipal Limited - 2016

(Pages 25 - 43)

To consider the Chief Executive's report.

8. Work schedule and dates for all South and Vale scrutiny meetings

(Pages 44 - 48)

To review the attached scrutiny work schedule. Please note, although the dates are confirmed, the items under consideration are subject to being withdrawn, added to or rearranged without further notice.



Minutes

of a meeting of the

Joint Scrutiny Committee

held on Thursday, 9 March 2017 at 6.30 pm

at the Meeting Room 1, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton OX14 4SB

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members:

South Oxfordshire District Councillors: David Dodds, Toby Newman, Ian White and Jeannette Matelot (in place of John Walsh)

Vale of White Horse District Councillors: Debby Hallett (co-Chair, in the chair), Alice Badcock, Mohinder Kainth, Ben Mabbett and Chris Palmer

Officers: Susan Harbour, Gerry Brough, Karen Brown, Liz Hayden and Helen Novelle

Also present:

South Oxfordshire District Councillors: Anna Badcock, Elizabeth Gillespie and David Turner.

Vale of White Horse District Councillors Councillor Eric Batts and Councillor Elaine Ware. Superintendent Rory Freeman (Thames Valley Police)

Sc.46 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from South Oxfordshire Councillor John Walsh and South Oxfordshire Councillor Jeannette Matelot was his substitute.

Sc.47 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2017 were agreed as an accurate record and were signed by the Chair as such.

Sc.48 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest or conflicts of interest raised by councillors.

Sc.49 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

There were no items of urgent business.

South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council – Joint Scrutiny Committee minutes

The Chairman made the housekeeping announcements.

Sc.50 Public participation

South Oxfordshire District Councillor David Turner asked a question to the committee about why South Oxfordshire District Council had withdrawn its funding which contributed to the provision of six PCSOs. Although this was considered to be a question appropriate for South Council or South Scrutiny, it led to a further conversation about the valuable work done by PCSOs and it was established that there had not been a significant reduction in the number of PCSOs in the TVP area.

Sc.51 Work schedule and dates for all South and Vale scrutiny meetings

The work schedule and date for all South and Vale scrutiny meetings was noted by councillors.

The clerk reported that, in consultation with the Chairman designate, the Five Councils' Partnership Scrutiny committee had been postponed from 28 March to 23 May 2017.

Sc.52 South and Vale Community Safety Partnership – performance report

In attendance to present this item and to answer questions from the Scrutiny Committee were:

- Councillor Eric Batts, Cabinet member Vale of White Horse
- Councillor Anna Badcock, Chair of the South and Vale Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and Cabinet member South Oxfordshire
- Superintendent Rory Freeman, Local Police Area Commander, South and Vale
- Liz Hayden, Legal Licensing and Community Safety Manager
- Karen Brown, Community Safety Team Leader

Liz Hayden introduced the report on behalf of the South and Vale Community Safety Partnership.

The report had two recommendations:

Recommendation One - To note the progress that the South and Vale CSP has made so far in 2016-17 in delivering its priorities and statutory functions.

Statutory duties include:

- a) the need to develop and publish an annual plan
- b) functions relating to anti-social behaviour
- c) duties to protect vulnerable people, This includes:
 - a Prevent action plan in accordance with section 26 of the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 which places a duty on local authorities to have due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism;
 - raising awareness of and reporting to the Secretary of State any person identified as a victim of Modern Day Slavery;

- carrying out a Domestic Homicide Review when a homicide takes place in either district and the victim and offender were in a relationship.

The added value work of the Partnership includes:

- a) funding an outreach service for victims of domestic abuse and paying to help secure victims' homes;
- b) joint agency tasking meetings (JATAC) have been combined with police tasking. The aim being to maximise partnership working and make best use of resources;
- c) funding community based projects that aim to improve resilience for example projects that divert young people away from committing anti-social behaviour and/or becoming victims of crime.

Recommendation Two - To support the CSP's view that the 2017-18 plan will focus on the protection of vulnerable people, prevention and early intervention, reducing re-offending and serious organised crime and terrorism.

The committee then discussed the report with the panel. The following is a summary of the main topics raised.

The committee was interested in the funding arrangements for the Partnership and how it best managed its funding challenges to enable it to carry out its functions.

- The Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) provides annual funding via Oxfordshire County Council to allow the partnerships to deliver on a local level.
- The Partnership would like to work with charities in partnership arrangements for longer term projects.
- The Partnership is working across the county and sharing resources on some issues, for example Prevent and domestic abuse services.
- The PCC funding has reduced year on year and, therefore, the Partnership is working in collaboration with other bodies to work smarter, for example in commissioning groups. As a third party funder it can be effective in opening the doors to other funding and group working.
- The community safety officers are all mainstream funded by the districts and this represents a significant contribution and commitment to the Partnership.

The committee asked a range of questions about the focus of the Partnership and its areas of work and how it identified who to work with and in what way.

- Over the last ten years there have been changes to the main focus of crime: it had been focussed on vehicle crime, but is now more focussed around vulnerable people.
- The Partnership funds projects in secondary schools that work with vulnerable young people. Young people are referred to projects by schools, direct street work in areas of need, and from early intervention hubs. The purpose of interventions is to assist young people in learning to make the right choices in their behaviours and aiming to improve their resilience to exploitation.
- Hate crimes. After reviewing the project, the Partnership is working with SOHA to develop a third party reporting centre during 2017-18. This approach would help to keep the Champions and the victims safe.
- The police have changed their crime recording standards and are recording far more crime, which explains some of the increases in crime statistics this year.

The committee was keen to express its gratitude at the work done by the Community Safety Partnership in a variety of areas.

Resolved

South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council – Joint Scrutiny Committee minutes

To commend the work of the Community Safety Partnership, to note its progress in delivering its priorities and statutory functions and to support their focus for 2017/18.

Action points for officers for the next report

- To set specific and measurable targets for the next year.
- To specify the numbers of gold, silver and bronze Nightsafe awards.
- Other specific localised questions raised by members of the committee would be addressed through the action log.

Sc.53 Use of Affordable Housing Commuted Sums

In attendance to present this item and to answer questions from the Scrutiny Committee were:

- Councillor Elaine Ware, Cabinet member Vale of White Horse
- Councillor Elizabeth Gillespie, Cabinet member South Oxfordshire
- Gerry Brough interim head of development and regeneration
- Helen Novelle, team leader housing development and regeneration

The report was brought to Scrutiny at the request of the committee and intended to inform Scrutiny of the recommendations to be made to South and Vale Cabinets and Scrutiny committee was invited to provide guidance on the strategy.

The committee discussed this item.

Options were raised including that the council purchase land and allow self build on the land and that third party organisations such as the Oxford Community Land Trust who offer long term/ guaranteed affordable housing, could be engaged in partnership working.

There is currently an identified shortage of housing that meets specialist needs and this needs to be tackled. There is a county wide physical disability strategy. The County Council provides each district with a summary of housing need for different client groups and South and Vale Councils aim to address this need on strategic sites and/or perhaps on small pieces of land. There are also issues for people with learning disabilities, for example, complex autism. There are particular difficulties for people who are currently having to live out of district.

RESOLVED

- To support the recommendations to Cabinets
- To receive an annual report on the status of commuted sum payments received and expenditure to date, including measurable Key Performance Indicators.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Joint Scrutiny Committee Report



Report of Chief Executive

Author: Ian Matten

Tel: 01235 422113

E-mail: ian.matten@southandvale.gov.uk

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Charlotte Dickson South Cabinet Member responsible: Tony Harbour

Tel: 01235 767848

Tel: 01235 810255

E-mail: charlotte.dickson@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

E-mail: tony.harbour@southoxon.gov.uk

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 22 May 2017

Performance review of Sodexo Ltd (Horticultural Services) - 2016

RECOMMENDATION

That scrutiny committee considers Sodexo Limited's performance in delivering the grounds maintenance services contract for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016 and makes any comments before a final assessment on performance is made.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To ask scrutiny committee for its views on the performance of Sodexo in providing grounds maintenance services in the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

2. The service contributes to Vale's strategic objective of running an efficient council and South's strategic objective of delivering services that reflect residents' needs.

BACKGROUND

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced, the council cannot deliver high quality services to its residents unless its contractors are

performing well. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.

4. The council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The council realises that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the council working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be:
 - a way for the council to consistently measure contractor performance, to help highlight and resolve operational issues
 - flexible enough to suit each contract, including smaller contracts which may not require all elements of the framework
 - a step towards managing risk more effectively and improving performance through action planning.

OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW FRAMEWORK

6. Evaluating contractor performance has four elements:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPT)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client
 4. summary of strengths and areas for improvement, plus feedback from the contractor on the overall assessment and the contractor's suggestions of ways in which the council might improve performance.
7. The first three dimensions are assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. The fourth element is a summary of strengths and areas for improvement and includes contractor feedback. Where some dimensions are not relevant or are difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. A summary of officer's assessment for 2016 for each dimension, the overall assessment and a comparison against 2015 can be seen in the following table:

	<i>2015</i>	<i>2016</i>
Key Performance Target	Good	Excellent
Customer satisfaction	Good	Excellent
Council satisfaction	Good	Good
Overall officer assessment	Good	Excellent

9. Sodexo were awarded a joint contract for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse district councils for the supply of grounds maintenance in October 2011 with a

commencement date of January 2012. During 2016, in accordance with the original terms, the contract was extended for three years and is now due to end in December 2019.

10. The current value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge is £566,000 per annum of which the Vale proportion is £442,000 per annum and the South Oxfordshire proportion is £124,000 per annum. The reason for the significant difference in values is because of the amount of land ownership at each authority.

11. The contract includes delivery of the following services:

- grass cutting
- maintenance of horticultural features:
 - flower beds
 - hanging baskets
 - shrub beds
 - mixed borders
- maintenance of hedges
- maintenance of play areas
- litter clearance
- vegetation control of hard surfaces
- minor tree works
- a burial service at Wallingford and Kidmore End cemeteries
- maintenance of sports facilities.

DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS (KPT)

12. KPT are recognised as an important element of monitoring the contractor's performance. The KPT cover those aspects of the service which are considered to be most important as a means of benchmarking against which performance can be measured. The KPT are:

- KPT 1 – quality inspection– the average percentage quality rating of randomly selected play areas and open spaces. Target – 85 per cent
- KPT 2 – the percentage of notifications and complaints that are resolved within agreed timescales. Target – 90 per cent
- KPT 3 – Overall customer satisfaction rating for the grounds maintenance service. Target – 85 per cent

- KPT 4 – Percentage of actions, identified as part of health and safety audit inspections, which are rectified within agreed time scales. Target – 95 per cent
- KPT 5 – Percentage of work orders issued that are completed within agreed time scales. Target – 80 per cent.

KPT 1 – quality inspections

13. This KPT is measured by monthly joint inspections by the client and contractor of randomly selected sites. As well as an overall assessment, providing a general impression of the quality of the service being achieved, each service activity for the particular site is subject to a more detailed assessment and given a score out of ten. The total of all scores for the site are then shown as a percentage, for the purposes of this review the average for the year is then calculated.
14. During this review period the average percentage rate of randomly selected play areas and open spaces was 86 per cent. This exceeds the target of 85 per cent and is an improvement on last year's score of 85 per cent. In total 44 joint inspections took place.

KPT 2 – percentage of notifications and complaints that are resolved within agreed timescales

15. This KPT is measured by evaluating the length of time the contractor takes to resolve an issue that has been brought to their attention. These can be as a result of a member of the public contacting us or as a result of the council's parks team monitoring. A notification notice is issued to the contractor with a period of time to resolve the issue, the amount of time given varies depending on the nature of the issue. For the purpose of this review the number of notifications resolved in the agreed timescale are shown as a percentage.
16. During the review period 73 notices were issued and 63 were completed within the timescale set. This is 86 per cent against a target of 90 per cent, a reduction in last year's score of 89 per cent.

KPT 3 – overall customer satisfaction

17. The overall customer satisfaction rating for the cleanliness and maintenance of the council owned parks and open spaces was 82 per cent, the target is 85 per cent. This is based on 75 respondents out of 91 being fairly or very satisfied. The score last year was 71 per cent and therefore this year's result is an improvement although the target was not achieved. Out of the six respondents who were fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall cleanliness and maintenance five commented on the amount of litter at the time of their visit. More details on customer satisfaction are included in Dimension 2 that follows.

KPT 4 – percentage of actions identified during health and safety monitoring that are rectified within agreed timescales

18. There were seven joint health and safety inspections by the contract supervisor and parks officer, this involved attending sites, observing the crews and examining personal protective clothing and machinery.

19. As a result of the inspections four action sheets were raised. All actions were rectified within the agreed timescales, exceeding the target of 95 per cent.

KPT 5 – percentage of work orders completed within agreed timescales

20. Additional work not included within the core service is issued to Sodexo as a work order. This includes a timescale in which to complete the work. The timescales vary depending on the urgency of the work required.

21. During the review period 270 work orders have been issued and 238 were completed within the agreed timescale. This is 88 per cent against a target of 80 per cent and an improvement on last year's score of 85 per cent.

22. Based on Sodexo's performance an overall "average" KPT performance rating score of 4.6 has been achieved. An analysis of performance against the KPT can be found in Annex A.

23. For reasons of consistency and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of Sodexo against all KPT:

Score	1 – 1.4999	1.5 – 2.499	2.5 – 3.499	3.5 – 4.499	4.5 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

24. The head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

25. Customer satisfaction for this report has been measured by the results of questionnaires handed out to users of the council's parks, open spaces and play areas. In total 91 questionnaires were completed.

26. The main areas of questioning relating to satisfaction with the grounds maintenance service were:

- satisfaction with the overall cleanliness and maintenance of the park
- satisfaction with the different elements of the grounds maintenance service
- whether there were areas of improvement that customers would like to see.

27. There were no formal complaints regarding Sodexo logged as part of the council's complaints procedure during the review period. We received nine compliments directly linked to Sodexo's work. Five regarding the burial services in South Oxfordshire, two regarding the quality of tree pruning work and two relating to the quality of grass cutting.

28. Based on Sodexo's performance a combined overall customer satisfaction rating score of 4.35 has been achieved. An analysis of customer satisfaction can be found in Annex B.

29. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of Sodexo on overall customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

30. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Customer satisfaction judgement

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION

31. As part of the performance review officers with direct knowledge and who frequently interact with the contractor were asked to complete a short questionnaire, this included the head of service, parks manager, parks officer, and parks business support team. In total five questionnaires were sent out and returned.

32. Based on Sodexo's performance an overall council satisfaction rating score of 4.25 has been achieved. An increase in last year's score of 3.98. An analysis of council satisfaction can be found in Annex C.

33. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of Sodexo on council satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

34. Based on this performance, the head of service has made a judgement on council satisfaction as follows:

Council satisfaction judgement

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

35. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPT, customer satisfaction and council satisfaction, the head of service has made an overall judgement as follows.

Overall assessment **excellent**

Previous overall assessment for comparison **good**

36. Other areas of note within the period of this review are:

- We retained the Green Flag for Abbey Gardens, this was first awarded to Abbey Gardens in 2009.

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

37. Annex C also records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor in this review period.

38. Areas for improvement identified in last year's review were:

- *Accuracy of some paperwork and quality of hand written paperwork*

Accuracy with some of the paperwork, calculations and quality of hand written paperwork has improved but there are still occasional problems with Sodexo's invoicing team neglecting to identify the correct Purchase Order number on the invoice. During the review period the client team had direct access to the contractor's electronic monitoring system which allowed them to monitor the contractor's progress in more detail. Sodexo are updating the system as a company and this will be rolled out on our contract over the next couple of months.

- *more use of electronic recording*

There was a change in roles and responsibilities with team leaders becoming more accountable for their team. Combined with the use of their electronic monitoring system mentioned above this is no longer an area for improvement.

- *openness and honesty from management team*

Last year officers had concerns that Sodexo was not informing the parks team in advance of changes to work programmes or staffing issues. This has improved and Sodexo are now more open with the council team.

- *compliance with council's corporate identity*

This is still an issue, however, now that the extension has been approved this is something that the parks team will work with Sodexo to implement.

- *delivers to budget*

This related to a request from Sodexo for the council to consider an increase in the contract sum payment due to increased costs and an acceptance that the contract had been unpriced. This was agreed by council as part of the contract extension and is no longer an area for improvement.

- *offers suggestions beyond the scope of work*

Officers work closely with Sodexo to resolve day to day problems and listen to any suggestions on how issues can be resolved in a mutually beneficial way.

- *supports the council's sustainability objectives*

Sodexo support the council's sustainability objectives particularly by increasing the amount of recycling collected during their litter collection responsibilities and also as part of their other routine activities. Sodexo do need to focus on reducing fuel consumption as there was an increase in fuel used in 2016 compared to 2015. However, fuel usage is very dependent on individual seasons and work activities.

39. During last year's review the committee requested the following action be taken

- *That the survey for the customer satisfaction key performance target be reviewed to ensure that issues outside of Sodexo's control were excluded*

Officers reviewed the questionnaire to ensure that the respondents were only responding to areas over which Sodexo had direct control.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

40. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

CONCLUSION

41. Sodexo have had another good year and provided a good grounds maintenance service to the council throughout the review period. They have achieved an "excellent" rating on three of their five Key Performance Targets. Last year's "weak" customer satisfaction rating has improved to "good". This very public facing service has not received any official complaints, an indication that members of the public are happy with the service provided.

42. The head of service has assessed Sodexo's performance as "excellent" for its delivery of the grounds maintenance services contract for 2016. The committee is asked to make any comments to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for grounds maintenance to enable them to make a final assessment on performance by way of an Individual Cabinet Member Decision.

43. If the committee does not agree with the head of service assessment, then this report will be referred to Cabinet for further discussion and a final assessment of Sodexo's performance.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

44. None

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	average percentage quality rating of randomly selected play areas and open spaces	85%	86%	excellent	5
KPT 2	percentage of notifications and complaints resolved within timescale	90%	86%	good	4
KPT 3	Overall customer satisfaction	85%	82%	good	4
KPT 4	percentage of actions identified during health and safety monitoring that are rectified with agreed timescales	95%	100%	excellent	5
KPT 5	percentage of work orders completed within agreed timescales	80%	88%	excellent	5
Overall “average” KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average) refers to point 21 in the report					4.6

Annex B – Customer satisfaction

In total, 91 users completed a questionnaire about the grounds maintenance service although not all respondents answered every question.

Q. How satisfied overall are you with the cleanliness and maintenance of the park?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	38	X 5	190
Fairly satisfied	37	X 4	148
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	10	X3	30
Fairly dissatisfied	5	X 2	10
Very dissatisfied	1	X 1	1
Total	91		379

Overall satisfaction with cleanliness and maintenance $379 \div 91 = 4.16$

The following is a guide to the assessment of Sodexo on overall customer satisfaction for the grounds maintenance service:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

Q. How satisfied are you with the standard of grass cutting?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	64	X 5	320
Fairly satisfied	20	X 4	80
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	6	X 3	18
Fairly dissatisfied	0	X 2	0
Very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	90		418

Satisfaction with standard of grass cutting calculation: $418 \div 90 = 4.64$

The following is a guide to the customer satisfaction assessment of Sodexo for the standard of grass cutting:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

Q. How satisfied are you with the standard of shrub bed maintenance?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	55	X 5	275
Fairly satisfied	24	X 4	96
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	7	X 3	21
Fairly dissatisfied	1	X 2	2
Very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	87		394

Satisfaction with standard of shrub bed maintenance calculation: $394 \div 87 = 4.52$

The following is a guide to the customer satisfaction assessment of Sodexo for the standard of shrub bed maintenance:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

Q. How satisfied are you that the park is kept litter free?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	34	X 5	170
Fairly satisfied	41	X 4	164
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3	X 3	9
Fairly dissatisfied	8	X 2	16
Very dissatisfied	2	X 1	2
Total	88		361

Satisfaction that the park is kept clear of litter calculation: $361 \div 88 = 4.10$

The following is a guide to the customer satisfaction assessment of Sodexo that the park is kept clear of litter:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

The combined overall customer satisfaction rating for the grounds maintenance is calculated as follows:

Users total weighted scores ÷ number of residents

$$(379 + 418 + 394 + 361) \div (91 + 90 + 87 + 88)$$

$$1552 \div 356 = 4.35 \text{ (refers to point 27 in the report)}$$

Areas of improvement to the park that customers identified which are outside of Sodexo's control were:

- more play equipment
- update some of the play equipment
- picnic benches
- improve the toilet facilities
- provide cafe selling drinks.

There were a few compliments on the refurbishment of the play area at Manor Road Wantage.

Annex C - Council satisfaction

This assessment allows the council (as a client) to record its own satisfaction with aspects of a contractor's performance which lie outside Key Performance Targets and customer satisfaction. Each officer with direct knowledge and who frequently interacts with the contractor should complete this form. Some questions can be left blank if the officer does not have direct knowledge of that particular question.

The numbers indicated in the following table are the total number of responses received for each question.

Contractor / supplier / partner name

From (date) To

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs	1	4			
2 Response time	2	2			
3 Delivers to time	1	3			
4 Delivers to budget		2			
5 Efficiency of invoicing		2			
6 Approach to health and safety	1	1			
7 *					
8 *					

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	3	1			
10 Communications / keeping the client informed	2	2			
11 Quality of written documentation		3	1		
12 Compliance with council's corporate identity		1	1		
13 Listening	1	4			
14 Quality of relationship	3	2			

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
15 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work	1	2	1		
16 Degree of innovation	1	2			
17 Goes the extra mile	3	1			
18 Supports the council's sustainability objectives		1	1		
19 Supports the council's equality objectives		1			
20 Degree of partnership working	1	4			

The following table is a summary of council satisfaction based on the completed questionnaires

Rating	Votes	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	20	X 5	100
satisfied	38	X 4	152
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	4	X 3	12
dissatisfied	0	X 2	0
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	62		264

The overall council satisfaction is calculated as follows: $264 \div 62 = 4.25$ (refers to point 31 in the report).

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Experienced core team
Approachable. Willingness to react quickly when asked
Knowledgeable regarding burials
Team Leaders are very approachable
Very good working relationship with local staff
Quality of written work has improved from last year

Areas for improvement

Accuracy with some of the paperwork – invoicing team often forget to put on correct Purchase Order number paperwork

Compliance with council's corporate identity
--

Supports the council's sustainability objectives
--

Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

We feel that the report is a fair assessment of our current performance and would like to add our client relationship / partnership has been excellent. This is mainly due to our continued drive to ensure our standards are kept at a very high level on all aspects of the specification. Our site maintenance teams are well established and a stable workforce mostly employed from the local area and take great pride to achieve the highest possible standards. They are very focused on their daily responsibility and understand the importance of the council's policy to ensure they meet their objectives ensuring the parks and open spaces are a very safe and pleasing environment to use as intended by local residence and visitors. We have been totally focused as a business to continually improve on the service we provide and the report clearly demonstrates the great work we are doing for Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. We are always looking to improve the service we provide and with the additional 35 thousand pounds investment this year on new equipment including two ride-on mowers, which again will increase performance and productivity. We will ensure there is extra focus on items that have been highlighted in the report for improvement.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

We note the comments from participants of the customer satisfaction survey regarding improvements to park areas which are items out of our control and hope the council will be able to address some of these.

- more play equipment
- update some of the play equipment
- picnic benches
- improve the toilet facilities
- Provide café selling drinks

WHAT COULD / SHOULD THE COUNCIL DO DIFFERENTLY TO ENABLE THE CONTRACTOR TO DELIVER THE SERVICE MORE EFFICIENTLY / EFFECTIVELY / ECONOMICALLY?

We need to strengthen on public / community engagement. By involving the local community with projects that will help enhance the general area especially in parks and open spaces. This would also give opportunity to meet the general public and engage in further, open discussion around their expectation of the service we currently provide and enable us to help them understand our objectives. We are also looking to trial battery operated equipment. If successful, this will help reduce fuel consumption and reduce our carbon footprint which would give clear benefits to efficiencies and to the environment.

Feedback provided by

Date

Joint Scrutiny Committee Report



Report of Chief Executive

Author: Ian Matten

Tel: 01235 422113

E-mail: ian.matten@southandvale.gov.uk

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Charlotte Dickson

Tel: 01235 767848

E-mail: charlotte.dickson@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 22 MAY 2017

South Cabinet Member responsible: Tony Harbour

Tel: 01235 810255

E-mail: tony.harbour@southoxon.gov.uk

Performance review of Biffa Municipal Limited - 2016

RECOMMENDATION

That scrutiny committee considers Biffa Municipal Limited's (Biffa) performance in delivering the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016 and makes any comments before a final assessment on performance is made.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To ask scrutiny committee for its views on the performance of Biffa in providing the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services in South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

2. The service contributes to Vale's strategic objective of running an efficient council and continue to improve our environment and South's objective of delivering services that reflect residents needs and making communities clean and safe.

BACKGROUND

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced, the council cannot deliver high quality services to its residents unless its contractors are performing well. Using an agreed framework and working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.
4. The council's process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The council realises that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the council working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed and measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be
 - a way for the council to consistently measure contractor performance, to help highlight and resolve operational issues
 - flexible enough to suit each contract, including smaller contracts which may not require all elements of the framework
 - a step towards managing risk more effectively and improving performance through action planning.

OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW FRAMEWORK

6. Evaluating contractor performance has four elements:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPT)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client
 4. a summary of strengths and areas for improvement, feedback from the contractor on the overall assessment plus the contractor's suggestions of ways in which the council might improve performance.
7. The first three dimensions are assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. The fourth element is a summary of strengths and areas for improvement and includes contractor feedback. Where some dimensions are not relevant, or difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. A summary of officer's assessment for 2016 for each dimension, the overall assessment and a comparison against 2015 can be seen in the following table:

	<i>2015</i>	<i>2016</i>
Key Performance Target	Good	Fair
Customer satisfaction	Good	Good
Council satisfaction	Good	Good

Overall officer assessment	Good	Good
-----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

9. Biffa were awarded the joint waste contract in December 2008 with a commencement date in South Oxfordshire of June 2009. The Vale of White Horse element of the contract commenced in October 2010. The council in 2013 decided, in accordance with the conditions of contract to extend the contract for a seven year period. The contract is now due to end in June 2024.
10. The current value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge is £9,680,149 per annum of which the Vale of White Horse proportion is £4,491,463 per annum and South Oxfordshire is £5,188,686 per annum.
11. The contract includes delivery of the following services:
- weekly collection of household food waste from 23 litre bins
 - fortnightly collection of household recycling from 240 litre wheeled bins or green sacks, collecting textiles from bags placed next to the recycling bin
 - fortnightly collection of household residual waste from 180 litre wheeled bins or pink sacks this is collected on the alternate week to recycling, collection of small electrical items in bags placed next to the residual bin
 - emptying bulk bins for refuse and recycling and food waste bins which service flats and communal properties
 - fortnightly collection of household garden waste to residents who have opted into this charged for service. As of January 2017, there were 47,500 garden waste bins provided to customers across the two districts
 - collection from Waste Electronic and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) bring banks
 - collection of household bulky waste items for which there is a charge
 - litter collection and cleansing of roads, streets and public areas
 - emptying of litter and dog bins
 - provide a dedicated call centre facility to residents
 - removal of fly-tipping.

DIMENSION 1 – KEY PERFORMANCE TARGETS (KPT)

12. KPT are included in the Biffa contract to provide a benchmark against which performance can be measured. The KPT cover those aspects of the service which are considered to be of most concern to our residents and are measured on an ongoing basis and reported monthly by Biffa. The KPT for this contract are:

- KPT 1 - missed collections – number of missed collections per week per 100,000 collections. Target - no more than 40
- KPT 2 - rectification of missed collections – percentage of reported missed household collections rectified within 24 hours. Target - 100 per cent
- KPT 3 - NI 192 - percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting. 2015/16 Target – 50.0 per cent (Vale) and 53.3 per cent (South)
- KPT 4 - NI 195 - improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus. Targets - litter 4 per cent, detritus 7 per cent.

Since April 2011 national indicators for waste NI 192 and NI 195 are no longer used as national measures, however the council has continued to use these as a measure of the contractor's performance.

13. As part of the contract extension a new set of KPI's have been agreed and came into force in January 2017, these will be used for future reporting.

KPT 1 – Missed Collections

14. For the purpose of this report performance has been measured against the number of reported weekly missed collections per 100,000 collections for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016.
15. During this review period the average number of weekly missed collections across the two districts was 65 per 100,000 collections. Last year the number was 28 per 100,000. The target is no more than 40 missed collections. A combined total of 8,542 collections were logged as missed throughout the review period across the two districts, this is out of a total of 13,108,450 potential collections (each bin type is recorded as a separate collection) and equates to 0.06 per cent of bins being missed. There has been a substantial increase in the number of missed bins during the review period, mainly because of vehicle breakdown which results in different crews being used for catch up and who may not know particular rounds so well.

KPT 2 - Rectification of missed collections

16. This measure is the percentage of reported missed collections rectified within 24 hours of Biffa being informed. The target is 100 per cent, during this review period out of the 8,542 reported missed bins 77.96 per cent were recorded as rectified within the 24 hour target.
17. This results in a "poor" rating caused mainly because of the problems with vehicle breakdowns which has led to redeployment of staff who have taken longer to attend to the missed collections.

KPT 3 - NI 192 percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting

18. At the commencement of the contract the council and Biffa agreed baselines for assumed recycling rates as follows:

Vale

- 2014/15 – 49. per cent
- 2015/16 – 50.0 per cent.

South

- 2014/15 – 52.9 per cent
- 2015/16 – 53.3 per cent.

19. Table one below shows that the combined performance of both councils for KPT 3 for the period to which this report relates was 63.32 per cent, for information the previous five years' figures are also shown. The individual NI192 scores for this review period are Vale 63.1 per cent and South 63.5 per cent.

20. The figures show a decrease in the amount of dry recycling collected, compared to the previous year, which is disappointing but officers believe is mainly due to contamination and the work done to address this problem. However there has been an increase in the amount of food and garden waste collected.

Table One

NI 192 Performance

	Dry recycling (tonnes)	Food waste (tonnes)	Garden waste (tonnes)	Total Recycling (tonnes)	Refuse to ERF & Landfill (tonnes)	NI192
1 January – 31 December 2011	32,116	10,913	16,526	59,555	26,876	68.90%
1 January – 31 December 2012	31,865	9,800	16,711	58,376	29,957	66.08%
1 January – 31 December 2013	31,758	9,921	14,890	56,569	31,070	64.54%
1 January – 31 December 2014	32,404	9,770	18,806	60,980	30,835	66.41%

1 January – 31 December 2015	32,265	9,455	18,637	60,357	31,056	66.03%
1 January – 31 December 2016	28,948	9,942	19,888	58,778	34,045	63.32%

KPT 4 – NI 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus

21. At the commencement of the contract, the council and Biffa agreed targets for litter and detritus. These targets were as follows:

- no more than four per cent of relevant land to have unacceptable levels of litter
- no more than seven per cent of relevant land to have unacceptable levels of detritus.

22. As previously mentioned we no longer report nationally on NI 195, however officers have continued to monitor street cleanliness using the same methodology. The inspections are carried out by an independent company specialising in this type of work.

23. The combined scores achieved in this review period were, level of litter two per cent and level of detritus 11 per cent. This was a decrease in detritus levels from last year's 14 per cent, the levels of litter remained the same.

24. Based on Biffa's performance an overall "average" KPT performance rating score of 3.0 has been achieved. An analysis of performance against the KPT can be found in Annex A.

25. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa against all KPT:

Score	1 – 1.4999	1.5 – 2.499	2.5 – 3.499	3.5 – 4.499	4.5 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

26. The head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows:

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 2 – CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

27. Customer satisfaction for this report has been measured by the results of the most recent residents survey carried out in December 2015. M-E-L Research was

commissioned to undertake a door stepping survey. In total 1109 responses were received in Vale and 1107 responses in South.

28. The main areas of questioning regarding satisfaction with the waste service were:

- satisfaction with the waste and recycling collection service
- satisfaction with street cleaning and keeping the area clean and litter free.

29. In terms of satisfaction with the waste and recycling collection service 87 per cent of both Vale and South residents are either satisfied or very satisfied. A decrease of two per cent in Vale and one per cent in South since the previous survey in 2013.

30. In terms of satisfaction with street cleansing 70 per cent of Vale residents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the cleanliness of the streets and pavements in their local area. This is a decrease of 10 per cent from the 2013 survey. In South 79 per cent said they were either satisfied or very satisfied, an increase of four per cent.

31. Based on Biffa’s performance a combined overall customer satisfaction rating score of 3.88 has been achieved, the previous satisfaction rating score was 3.90. An analysis of customer satisfaction can be found in Annex B.

32. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on overall customer satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

33. Taking into account that 87 per cent of residents are satisfied or very satisfied with the waste collection service, the relatively small number of complaints received and that the combined overall satisfaction rating score is only 0.01point away from a good rating the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCIL SATISFACTION

34. As part of the performance review officers with direct knowledge and who frequently interact with the contractor were asked to complete a short questionnaire, this included the head of service, waste manager, team leader, technical monitoring officer and business support team. In total six questionnaires were sent out and returned.

35. Based on Biffa's performance an overall council satisfaction rating score of 4.19 has been achieved. Last years overall rating score was 4.17. An analysis of council satisfaction can be found in Annex C.

36. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on council satisfaction:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

37. The head of service has made a judgement on council satisfaction as follows:

Council satisfaction judgement

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

38. Other areas of note within this review period are:

- South confirmed by DEFRA as the highest recycling authority for 2015/16 with a rate of 66.6 per cent
- Vale confirmed by DEFRA as the fourth highest recycling authority for 2015/16 with a rate of 64.8 per cent
- the success of the deep cleanse scheme in both districts
- a very successful campaign to reduce contamination took place and has resulted in the level of contamination falling from 12 per cent down to six per cent.

39. Taking into account the performance of the contractor against KPT, customer satisfaction, council satisfaction and the other areas of note above the head of service has made an overall judgement as follows:

Overall assessment

Previous overall assessment for comparison

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

40. Annex C also records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor in this review period.

41. Areas for improvement identified in last year's reviews were:

- *Reporting of information such as late collections*

There have been significant improvements on this with regular updates being received from the operations team throughout the day.

- *Delivery times for bins can be slow which creates a back log*

Biffa have implemented planned stock deliveries for peak times and have arranged with suppliers to hold additional stock. Deliveries are sometimes delayed due to peak demand and there have been some occasions when a bin gets missed off the system but overall deliveries have improved.

- *Quicker feedback/response to emails would be appreciated*

Biffa have improved their response times but due to issues with vehicle breakdowns it has meant that on occasions supervisors have been unable to respond as quickly due to other work commitments.

- *Review current performance measures and consider making them more robust*

A new set of Key Performance Targets have been agreed. Future performance reviews will include these new KPT.

- *Implementation of projects can be slow*

Yes, this is still the case in certain circumstance because of the large scale and public facing nature of the service. However, the most recent project to reduce contamination has been hugely successful and was implemented quickly once the problem had been identified.

- *Quality of written documentation*

This is improving as we continue to work with Biffa to ensure the accuracy of the information they provide.

- *Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work*

Officers work closely with Biffa to resolve day to day problems and listen to any suggestions on how issues can be resolved in a mutually beneficial way.

- *Degree of innovation*

The new vehicle fleet that is on order will be fitted with 360 degree cameras and technology to enable route planning and reporting of issues in real time.

42. During last year's review the committee requested the following:

- *That the leaflet for new residents should be circulated to all residents, Parish and Town Councils, libraries and to all councillors*

Because of the contamination issue last year and the implementation of the clear sack policy it was considered an appropriate time to amend the leaflet. This has been done and has now been distributed to Parishes, Town councils and libraries. It will be sent to residents in June/July as part of a campaign to encourage more food waste recycling.

COMMENTS AND COMPLAINTS

43. The council received 21 official stage one complaints during this review period compared to nine last years. Of these, nine were due to missed collections, six because a resident was unhappy that their recycling bin was left because of contamination, two were reports of damage to property, two for bin placement issues, one was for poor street cleansing and one was because a residents own garden waste sack went missing after collections.

44. During this review period Biffa and the council received eight compliments from residents relating to the waste service such as:

- *I have just returned from a holiday in Cornwall and I wanted to say how great SODC are with regard to waste and recycling in comparison with Cornwall. It was a minefield trying to work out what to put in each different coloured bag so in the end we just gave up which is what a lot of holidaymakers do. You have made the whole process so simple and easy to use and I wanted to say that I only wish other counties could follow your excellent lead. Keep up the good work!*
- *Excellent Waste service provided by Biffa in Henley for Olympian parade event*
- *Chairman of Stanford in the Vale Parish Council, Ref: Big Clean, I would like to pass on our sincere thanks to yourself for making all the necessary arrangements as well as the team that came to carry out the work.*

CONTRACTORS FEEDBACK

45. A key feature of the process for reviewing the performance of contractors is that the council provides them with an opportunity to give their feedback on the assessment, including suggestions for improvements to council processes. This is included in Annex D.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

46. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

47. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

CONCLUSION

48. It was a very busy year and at times very difficult because of the significant operational problems with the aging fleet. This resulted in a lot of incomplete rounds and additional pressure on Biffa's management at Culham and the drivers and crews. Consequently, there was a lot more officer time spent dealing with residents. Biffa implemented an action plan and brought in additional vehicles to resolve the main problems and this has generally worked well, although they do still experience some disruption. The new fleet has been ordered and will start arriving in June/July.

Introducing the clear sack policy had a positive impact on the contamination rate and whilst the quality of the recyclate we now collect is much improved the amount of recycling collected during the review period has dropped.

The Deep cleanse has continued in South and its introduction in Vale has seen some real improvements to some areas. The Council has now agreed to make the scheme permanent.

49. The head of service has assessed Biffa's performance as "good" for its delivery of the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for 2016. The committee is asked to make any comments to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for waste to enable them to make a final assessment on performance by way of an Individual Cabinet Member decision.
50. If the committee does not agree with the head of services assessment, then this report will be referred to Cabinet for further discussion and a final assessment of Biffa's performance.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

51. None

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	missed collections	No more than 40 missed collection per 100,000 collections	65 per 100,000 collections	weak	2
KPT 2	rectification of missed collections	100 per cent rectified within 24 hours of contractor being informed	77.96%	poor	1
KPT 3	percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	V – 50.0% S – 53.3%	Combined 63.32% Vale 63.1% South 63.5%	excellent	5
KPT 4	improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus	4% litter 7% detritus	2% 11%	good	4
Overall “average” KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average) refers to point 23 in the report					3.0

Annex B – Customer satisfaction

In total 2216 residents across both councils responded to questions about the waste contract. Not every respondent answer all the questions.

Q. How satisfied are you, with the waste and recycling collection service?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	632	X 5	3160
Fairly satisfied	1295	X 4	5180
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	98	X3	294
Not very satisfied	131	X 2	262
Not at all satisfied	53	X 1	53
Total	2209		8949

Waste and recycling collection service - resident satisfaction calculation: $8949 \div 2209 = 4.05$

The following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on customer satisfaction for the waste collection service:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

Q. How satisfied are you with the standard of cleanliness of the streets and pavements in the village or town where you live?

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	292	X 5	1460
Fairly satisfied	1357	X 4	5428
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	241	X 3	723
Not very satisfied	268	X 2	536
Not at all satisfied	46	X 1	46
Total	2204		8193

Standard of cleanliness - resident satisfaction calculation: $8193 \div 2204 = 3.72$

The following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on customer satisfaction for the standard of cleanliness of the streets and pavements:

Score	<3.0	3.0 – 3.399	3.4 – 3.899	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent

The combined overall customer satisfaction rating for the waste and recycling collection service and standard of cleanliness is calculated as follows:

Residents total scores ÷ number of residents

$$\frac{(8949 + 8193)}{17142} \div \frac{(2209 + 2204)}{4413} = 3.88 \text{ (refers to point 30 in the report)}$$

Annex C - Council satisfaction

This assessment allows the council (as a client) to record its own satisfaction with aspects of a contractor's performance which lie outside Key Performance Targets and customer satisfaction. Each officer with direct knowledge and who frequently interacts with the contractor should complete this form. Some questions can be left blank if the officer does not have direct knowledge of that particular question.

The numbers indicated in the following table are the total number of responses received for each question

Contractor	Biffa Municipal Limited			
From (date)	1 January 2016	To	31 December 2016	

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs	2	5			
2 Response time	2	4	1		
3 Delivers to time	2	3	2		
4 Delivers to budget	2	1			
5 Efficiency of invoicing	2				
6 Approach to health & safety		6			

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	3	4			
10 Communications / keeping the client informed	2	2	3		
11 Quality of written documentation	1	3	1		
12 Compliance with council's corporate identity	2	2	1		
13 Listening	3	4			
14 Quality of relationship	3	4			

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
15 Offers suggestions beyond the scope of work	1	5	1		
16 Degree of innovation		5	2		
17 Goes the extra mile	2	5			
18 Supports the council's sustainability objectives	2	2	1		
19 Supports the council's equality objectives	2	2			
20 Degree of partnership working	2	4			

The following table is a summary of council satisfaction based on the completed questionnaires

Rating	Votes	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	33	X 5	165
satisfied	61	X 4	244
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	12	X 3	36
dissatisfied	0	X 2	0
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	106		445

The overall council satisfaction is calculated as follows: $445 \div 106 = 4.19$ (refers to point 34 in the report)

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Biffa are always on hand to help and are always responsive to requests that are above and beyond normal duty. For example-transporting promotional information to events for me, delivering 100's of sets of litter picks for the Great British Spring Clean weekend and storing stock for us.
Good relationships with operational staff
Focused on service delivery
Work in partnership to resolve problems, for example with the contamination issue
Very responsive when an urgent issue is raised
Good working relationship with senior manager/supervisors
Undertake a large number of collections each day with only a very small number of missed collections

I feel that I have a very good working relationship with Biffa and that they value my opinion and work with me for the benefit of customers and residents

Responsiveness of some members of staff

Areas for improvement

Communication needs to be improved. Often it is the residents telling us about a problem before Biffa have told us.

Vehicle maintenance/reliability

Systems/IT – very paper based and locational info poor and not fit for purpose for street cleansing side of contract
--

Response times for fly-tipping, street cleaning and bin deliveries
--

Call centre need to review information more in particular looking at historical information to make better informed decisions

Not always receiving responses to emails or acknowledgement that the email has been received
--

Staff retention

Adequate supervision

Compliance with council's corporate identity
--

Supports the council's sustainability objectives
--

Degree of innovation

--

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

Whilst disappointing Biffa accept the assessment of GOOD. We would like to have improved quicker over the 12 months in question but have been hampered by the maintenance issues regarding the aging fleet.

The new fleet is due this summer and that will allow for a much more reliable service performance. Currently the plan is to replace the street cleansing vehicles first with the collections fleet coming in straight afterwards, this is mainly due to the manufacturing process for the larger vehicles taking longer, however all the fleet will have been replaced by the end of September.

Following the reliability issues we have had over the last year the service provider for maintenance was removed from the contract at the end of December 2016. This means that all the staff in the workshop work directly for Biffa meaning that the maintenance and operational teams are able to work together much better to ensure that the vehicles are getting back on the road when we need them and also prioritising the repair of vehicles that have the higher operational impact. With the new fleet there will also be a full roll-out of the Whitespace reporting system which will allow for the real time reporting of exceptions such as bins not out and contamination. This should assist in addressing some of the comments below and will move away from the 'paper' system. Also, as mentioned previously all of the collections fleet will have 360 degree CCTV fitted and will all also have trackers which will report in real time and can also be downloaded retrospectively when there is an incident. At the last scrutiny meeting there were some comments about the desirability of bin washing. Biffa have taken these on board and over the next few weeks we will be introducing a bin washing service (Biffa Wheelie Clean) to both districts, which will involve a dedicated crew and vehicle washing bins on a pre-agreed frequency to subscription paying customers. The success or failure of this service does not constitute any risk at all to the council.

Finally, as stated before, we are confident that with the new fleet, new routes and higher staff morale that both of these will bring we will improve the services to residents, and their satisfaction, over the coming years.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

No

WHAT COULD / SHOULD THE COUNCIL DO DIFFERENTLY TO ENABLE THE CONTRACTOR TO DELIVER THE SERVICE MORE EFFICIENTLY / EFFECTIVELY / ECONOMICALLY?

None

Feedback provided by

Date

Schedule for Scrutiny Committees 2017/18

(further items to be added to schedule as required)

Meeting date	Council	Agenda items	Purpose of Report	Cabinet members	Lead Officer	Head of Service
Tues 23 May	5CP	Review of the contracts	To receive updates on the contracts	Lynn Lloyd/Robert Sharp	Dawn Adey (Interim Client Relationship Director)	Andrew Down
Tues 25 July	South	Didcot Garden Town	To consider the draft Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan document and feedback from the public consultation and make recommendations to Cabinet	Elizabeth Gillespie	Gerry Brough	Gerry Brough
		Temporary Accommodation Strategy	To consider the draft strategy and comment on/make recommendations to Cabinet	Elizabeth Gillespie	Phil Ealey	Gerry Brough
		Joint Housing Strategy	To consider the draft strategy and comment on/make recommendations to Cabinet	Elizabeth Gillespie	Helen Novelle	Gerry Brough
		Corporate Delivery Plan	To review the draft Corporate Delivery Plan, scrutinise progress and make recommendations for changes to Cabinet	Will Hall	Sally Truman	Andrew Down
			To consider the draft strategy			

		CIL	and comment on/make recommendations to Cabinet	Elizabeth Gillespie	Cathie Scotting	Adrian Duffield
Thurs 27 July	Vale	Didcot Garden Town	To consider the draft Didcot Garden Town Delivery Plan document and feedback from the public consultation and make recommendations to Cabinet	Mike Murray	Gerry Brough	Gerry Brough
		Temporary Accommodation Strategy	To consider the draft strategy and comment on/make recommendations to Cabinet	Elaine Ware	Phil Ealey	Gerry Brough
		Joint Housing Strategy	To consider the draft strategy and comment on/make recommendations to Cabinet	Elaine Ware	Helen Novelle	Gerry Brough
		Corporate Delivery Plan	To review the draft Corporate Delivery Plan, scrutinise progress and make recommendations for changes to Cabinet	Matt Barber	Sally Truman	Andrew Down
		Council Tax Reduction Scheme Review	Annual review of the effect of the scheme on council taxpayers.	Robert Sharp	Paul Howden	William Jacobs
Tues 12	Joint	Annual Performance Review of	To consider the 2016	Anna Badcock/	Chris Webb	?

Sept		GLL	performance of GLL and to make comments to the Cabinet Members for leisure to enable them to make a final assessment on performance for 2016	Charlotte Dickson		
Tues 26 Sept	South	Financial Outturn 2016/17	To consider the overall outturn position of the council as well as the outturn of individual service areas	Jane Murphy	Simon Hewings (Capita)	William Jacobs
Thurs 28 Sept	Vale	The Beacon, Annual Review	To consider the performance of The Beacon during 2016 and to make comments to the Cabinet Member for leisure on future improvements	Charlotte Dickson	Jo Paterson	
Page 46		Financial Outturn 2016/17	To consider the overall outturn position of the council as well as the outturn of individual service areas	Robert Sharp	Simon Hewings (Capita)	William Jacobs
	Tues 28 Nov	South	Corporate Delivery Plan – progress review	Will Hall	Sally Truman	Andrew Down
Thurs 30 Nov	Vale	Corporate Delivery Plan – progress review	To scrutinise progress against the Corporate Delivery Plan	Matthew Barber	Sally Truman	Andrew Down
Tues 5 Dec	Joint					
Tues 23 Jan	South					
Thurs 25 Jan	Vale					

Tues 6 Feb	South	Review of Final Draft Budget	To consider and comment on the draft budget prior to its consideration by Council	Jane Murphy	William Jacobs	William Jacobs
Thurs 8 Feb	Vale	Review of Final Draft Budget	To consider and comment on the draft budget prior to its consideration by Council	Robert Sharp	William Jacobs	William Jacobs
Tues 6 March	Joint	Community Safety Partnership Annual Report	To update the committee on the progress that the South and Vale Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is making to reduce crime and the fear of crime	Anna Badcock/Eric Batts	Liz Hayden	Margaret Reed
		Spend on commuted housing sums	To receive an annual report on the status of commuted sum payments received and expenditure to date, including measurable Key Performance Indicators.	Elizabeth Gillespie/Elaine Ware	Helen Novelle	Gerry Brough
Tues 27 March	South					
Thurs 29 March	Vale					

Page 47

Item for future Scrutiny Committees (date to be determined)

Vale

Consultation (*may be Joint*)

The Cabinet work programmes can be accessed via the following links:

South

<http://democratic.southoxon.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=121&RD=0>

Vale

<http://democratic.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=507&RD=0>

Meeting Start times: Joint: 6:30; South: 6:30; Vale: 7.00; 5CP: tbc