

Joint Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of Head of Housing and Environment

Author: Lisa Selby

Tel: 01235 422157

E-mail: lisa.selby@southandvale.gov.uk

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Catherine Webber South Cabinet Member responsible: David Rouane

Tel: 01235 534001

Tel: 07957 287799

E-mail: catherine.webber@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

E-mail: david.rouane@southoxon.gov.uk

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 14 September 2021

Performance review of Biffa Municipal Ltd – 2020 Calendar year

RECOMMENDATION

That scrutiny committee considers Biffa Municipal Ltd (Biffa) performance in delivering the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for the period 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2020 (2020 calendar year) 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 Vale of White Horse for the calendar year 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2020. It should be noted that this review period includes the two national coronavirus lockdowns in March 2020 and November 2020.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

2. The service contributed to Vale's Corporate Plan (2016 – 2020) of running an efficient council and continue to improve our environment and South's Corporate Plan (2016 – 2020) of delivering services that reflect residents needs and build thriving communities by making communities clean and safe.

BACKGROUND

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the councils objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced, the councils

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 councils process for managing contractor performance focuses on continuous improvement and action planning. The councils realise that the success of the framework depends on contractors and the councils working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed measurable targets.
5. The overall framework is designed to be:
 - a way for the councils 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's 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 councils 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 in 2020 for each dimension, the overall assessment and a comparison against 2019 can be seen in the following table:

	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>
Key Performance Target	Good	Good
Customer satisfaction	Good	Good
Council's 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 councils in 2013 decided, in accordance with the conditions of contract to extend the contract for a seven-year period. The contract is due to end in June 2024.
10. The current value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge is £11,722,956 per annum of which the Vale of White Horse proportion is £5,566,188 per annum and South Oxfordshire is £6,156,768 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 clear sacks, collecting textiles from bags placed next to the recycling bin, collecting batteries placed in a clear bag on top of 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, recycling and food waste bins provided for flats and communal properties
 - fortnightly collection of household garden waste to residents who have opted into this charged for service. In January 2020, there were 54,005 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 current KPT for this contract are:
 - KPT 1 - missed collections – number of missed collections per 100,000 collections.
Target - no more than 50.

- KPT 2 - rectification of missed collections – percentage of reported missed household collections rectified within 48 hours of the scheduled collection day. **Target - 100 per cent.**
- KPT 3 - percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting. Although it was agreed that KPT 3 would be removed from the contract when the promotion's role was transferred to the councils (2016) and Biffa can no longer directly influence this, it is still a key outcome from the contract and performance is driven in part by the proficiency of the collection service. **Performance is measured against the most recent official UK waste from recycling rate. For 2019/20 this was 45.5 per cent.**
- KPT 4 - NI 195 - improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus. Since April 2011 national indicator for waste NI 195 is no longer used as national measure, however the councils have continued to use these as a measure of the contractor's performance. **Targets - litter 4 per cent, detritus 7 per cent.**
- KPT 5 – Incomplete rounds – the number of properties affected as a result of incomplete rounds. **Target – fewer than 1,000 per month.**
- KPT 6 – Call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered. **Target – 35 seconds.**
- KPT 7 – Deliveries – New properties, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged. **Target – 85 per cent.**
- KPT 8 – Deliveries – Replacement bins, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged. **Target – 85 per cent.**
- KPT 9 – Fly tipping – percentage of fly tips cleared from high intensity areas within 12 working hours of a report received. **Target – 90 per cent.**
- KPT 10 – Fly tipping – Percentage of fly tips under three cubic metres, not in high intensity areas cleared within 24 hours of a report being received. **Target – 90 per cent.**

KPT 1 – Missed Collections

13. Performance is calculated as the number of reported missed collections per 100,000 collections for the period 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2020.
14. During this review period the average number of missed collections across the two districts was 85 per 100,000 collections. In 2019 the number was 90 per 100,000. A combined total of 12,352 collections were logged as missed throughout the review period across the two districts, this is out of a total of 14,585,311 potential collections (each bin type is recorded as a separate collection) and equates to 99.9 per cent of bins being collected on time. Despite the high percentage of bins collected on time the overall rating for this KPT is “weak” because the target is no more than 50 per 100,000 collections.

15. Out of all the missed collection's food bins are the most frequently missed, 5,661 (45.83% per cent) throughout the review period, although this is not unsurprising as these bins are collected weekly compared to the other types of bins which are collected fortnightly.
16. All crews have access to an electronic device in their cab (PDA) which includes details of all roads they need to collect from and allows crews to actively report back issues with individual collections – for example to highlight where a bin was not out for collection at the time the crew attended; issues with contamination of recycling bins and where there are access problems preventing a collection being made.

KPT 2 – Rectification of missed collections

17. This measure is the percentage of reported missed collections rectified within 48 hours of the scheduled collection day. The target is 100 per cent. During this review period out of the 12,352 reported missed bins 89 per cent were rectified within the 48-hour target, compared to last year's figure of 98 per cent.
18. This results in a “weak” rating for this review period.

KPT 3 – Percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting

19. Table one below shows that the combined performance of both councils for KPT 3 was 65.49 per cent an increase on last year's figure of 63.13 per cent, for information the previous five years' figures are also shown.
20. The figures show an increase of 7,766 tonnes of total recycling collected in 2020, compared to the previous year. This included large increases in the amount of garden waste and food waste collected but only a small increase of 120 tonnes in the dry recycling tonnage. There was an increase of 621 tonnes of refuse collected. It should be noted that during the review period there was a national trend showing an increase in the amount of waste and recycling collected as a result of COVID-19.
21. Although KPT 3 does not have a formal target, it continues to be measured against the official UK waste from households recycling rate which for 2019/20 was 45.5 per cent. This is the official recycling measure which is used as the basis for reporting at UK level against the waste Framework Directive which set a target to recycle 50 per cent of household waste by 2020. The overall rating for this KPT is “excellent”

Table One

	Dry recycling (tonnes)	Food waste (tonnes)	Garden waste (tonnes)	Total recycling (tonnes)	Refuse to Energy Recovery Facility & Landfill (tonnes)	Total recycling plus refuse (tonnes)	% Recycled
1 January – 31 December 2015	32,265	9,455	18,637	60,357	31,056	91,413	66.03%
1 January – 31 December 2016	28,948	9,942	19,888	58,778	34,045	92,823	63.32%
1 January – 31 December 2017	26,854	9,972	20,896	57,722	34,206	91,928	62.79%
1 January – 31 December 2018	28,052	11,015	19,921	58,988	34,781	93,768	62.90%
1 January – 31 December 2019	27,340	11,526	22,006	60,871	35,544	96,415	63.13%
1 January – 31 December 2020	27,463	15,955	25,219	68,637	36,165	104,802	65.49%

KPT 4 – National Indicator (NI) 195 Improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus

22. At the commencement of the contract, the councils and Biffa agreed targets for the levels of 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.

23. The councils are no longer required to report nationally on NI 195, however for consistency contract performance for street cleanliness continues to be monitored using the same methodology. Inspections are carried out by an independent company

specialising in this type of work who assess the levels of litter and detritus using Defra's Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse. It is reported as percentage of relevant land that is assessed as having levels of litter and detritus that fall below an acceptable level.

24. The combined scores achieved in this review period were one per cent for litter and 18 per cent for detritus. The litter score remained the same as the previous year and detritus levels have increased to 18 per cent from 15 per cent last year. Despite the increase in detritus the overall rating for this KPT remains the same at "fair". The increase in detritus is not surprising because due to Covid 19 there were periods when the sweeper drivers had to be redeployed onto collections to ensure they were completed.

KPT 5 – Incomplete rounds – the number of properties affected as a result of incomplete rounds

25. This KPT was introduced in 2017 to quantify the impacts of reliability issues with Biffa's fleet which caused collection rounds to be incomplete on the correct day. These were not measured as part of the missed collection KPT.

26. The target for this KPT is fewer than 1,000 per month. The average number of properties affected by incomplete rounds in this review period was 1,695 per month. This compares to 50 per month in 2019. This increase was caused by the impact of the pandemic on staffing levels, the services were maintained by crews catching up incomplete rounds over the weekends. The overall assessment against this KPT is "weak".

KPT 6 – Call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered

27. The average time residents spent on hold before their call was answered is measured and reported monthly.

28. During this review period the average time residents spent on hold was 39 seconds. This exceeds the target of 35 seconds and a significant deterioration on last year's figure of 18 seconds. The overall rating for this KPT is "fair" as it exceeds the target of 35 seconds.

KPT 7 – Deliveries – New properties, percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged

29. The percentage of bins delivered to new properties within ten working days of the request being logged is measured and reported monthly.

30. During this review period 8,688 out of a total of 9,142 requests for bins were delivered within ten working days this equates to 95 per cent compared to 98 per cent in the previous year. The number of orders for bins remain very high due to the amount of new housing in both districts and the increase in garden waste customers. The overall assessment against this KPT is "excellent".

KPT 8 – Deliveries – Replacement bins, percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged

- 31. The percentage of replacement bin requests delivered within ten working days of the request being logged is measured and reported monthly.
- 32. During this review period 10,759 out of a total of 10,851 replacement bin requests were delivered within ten working days this equates to 99 per cent, the same as the previous year. The overall assessment against this KPT is “excellent”.

KPT 9 – Fly tipping - percentage of fly tips cleared from high intensity areas within 12 working hours of a report being received

- 33. 100 per cent of fly-tips were cleared in high intensity areas within 12 hours of a report being received during this review period. There were 115 fly-tips, up from 94 last year in high intensity areas, there are some occasions when the time being measured is paused for a short period to allow our Envirocrime team time to investigate a fly tip to obtain evidence. Once any evidence is collected, we instruct Biffa to proceed with the clearance.
- 34. The overall assessment against this KPT is “excellent”.

KPT 10 – Fly tipping - Percentage of fly tips under three cubic metres, not in high intensity areas cleared within 24 hours of a report being received

- 35. 100 per cent of fly-tips outside high intensity areas were cleared within 24 hours of a report received during this review period. There were 1295 fly-tips, within this review period, an increase from 1066 last year, there are some occasions when the time being measured is paused for a short period to allow our Envirocrime team time to investigate a fly tip to obtain evidence. Once any evidence is collected, we instruct Biffa to proceed with the clearance
- 36. The overall assessment against this KPT is “excellent”.

Average rating score – KPT 1 – 10

- 37. Based on Biffa’s performance an overall KPT performance rating score of 3.7 has been achieved, the previous satisfaction rating score was 4.4. An analysis of performance against the KPTs can be found in Annex A.
- 38. 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

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

KPT judgement **good**

Previous KPT judgement for comparison **good**

DIMENSION 2 - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

40. Customer satisfaction for this report has not been measured using the results of a Councils residents survey as in previous years. The last resident's satisfaction survey was undertaken in December 2017 and is considered too outdated to be a fair reflection of current satisfaction. The Head of Service awarded a "good" assessment for the previous three performance reviews based on the results of the 2017 survey.
41. The main areas of questioning regarding satisfaction with the waste service have previously focussed on:
- Satisfaction with the waste and recycling collection service.
 - Satisfaction with street cleaning and keeping the area clean and litter free.
42. We acknowledge that customer satisfaction is a key element in the overall assessment of performance and are working with our engagement team to address this for future reviews.

COMMENTS AND COMPLAINTS

43. The councils received eight formal stage one complaints relating to Biffa's performance during this review period compared to seven last year. One complaint was escalated to a formal stage two complaint and reviewed by the Local Government Ombudsman. Of these complaints, five were related to missed collections, two related to contamination issues and one was for not following procedures.
44. During this review period the councils received thirty-eight compliments from residents relating to the waste service especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, including:
- *On behalf of the Great Western Park community, I'd be grateful if you could pass on a big thank you to your waste Operatives who have worked so hard over the Christmas period ensuring that our extra Christmas waste has been cleared. I know I, myself was so pleased yesterday to finally have the green bin and the several clear bags of re cycling collected.*
 - *Just wanted to say a huge thank you to the guys that came out right in the middle of the huge storm to collect my items on Sunday from Woodcote! Really appreciated it.*
 - *Hi! We live in Crowsley, and I just wanted to say how amazing the refuse and recycling crews are, they really do a great job and go above and beyond. I know it's outsourced but I would be grateful if their contract manager or whoever else is made aware of this positive feedback if that is at all possible. Thanks again*
 - *This is just a big thank you note to all refuse collectors we live in Dicot. Although we are grateful to all front line staff we feel that refuse collection doesn't get a mention so from us and I am sure many other people we say a massive THANKYOU.*

- *I really wanted to email to say a massive thank you to you and your crews ! as you can see we have had problems in the past and I wanted to let you know your crews have been absolutely fantastic during this horrendous time so please would you let them know that we are very grateful. I also wanted to let them know that I have been sanitising the key code lock and handle for them just to be reassured, I cannot thank them enough for the job they are doing please let them know we are all very grateful.*
- *The other purpose of this email is to say how much we appreciate our waste collections continuing unchanged. Long may it continue, and I hope that none of the operatives has been abused as seems to have happened in other parts of the country. I did manage to thank the driver of the food waste truck yesterday but missed the others.*

45. Based on the number of complaints and compliments received during the pandemic and that Biffa maintained service during a very difficult period the Head of Service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment

good

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

good

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCILS SATISFACTION

46. 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, services manager, team leader, recycling officers, technical monitoring officers, enforcement officer and business support team. In total 12 questionnaires were sent out and returned.

47. Operationally, key relationships with supervisors and depot managers have been good. There were some persistent repeat missed collections which resulted in 38 remediation notices being issued. The councils also issued ten default notices during the review period. A default notice would normally result in a financial deduction from the Biffa's monthly invoice, however in line with the Governments Procurement Policy Note, which identified the need to provide supplier relief due to Coronavirus, no financial deduction was made.

48. Based on Biffa's performance an overall council's satisfaction rating score of 4.05 has been achieved, the same as last year, maintaining a "good" classification. An analysis of councils' satisfaction can be found in Annex B.

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

50. The head of service has made a judgement on councils satisfaction as follows:

Councils' satisfaction judgement

Previous council's satisfaction judgement for comparison

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

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

- South confirmed by DEFRA as the second highest English recycling authority for 2019/20 with a rate of 64.0 per cent
- Vale confirmed by DEFRA as the third highest English recycling authority for 2019/20 with a rate of 63.3 per cent.
- driver recruitment and retention within the waste sector is a nationally recognised challenge which has continued to be a factor in this review period.
- Despite the impact of Covid 19 on staffing levels Biffa maintained all services throughout the review period

52. KPT1, KPT 2 and KPT 4 have bonus payments linked to them. The cap of £25,000 per council for KPI1 and KPI2 was reduced because of the Governments Procurement Policy Note (PPN 02/20) which identified the need to provide supplier relief due to Coronavirus, this cap was reduced to £18,750. As a result of not achieving these targets in 2019/20 and with the cap in place Biffa had deductions of £53,636 made.

53. Considering the performance of the contractor against KPT, customer satisfaction, council's satisfaction and the other areas of note above the head of service has made an overall assessment as follows:

Overall assessment

Previous overall assessment for comparison

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

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

55. Areas for improvement identified in last year's reviews and actions taken are as follows:

- *Better training at call centre – service knowledge and writing emails, making sure complaints do not escalate by better handling of first contact.*

There are occasions when communication between the call centre and depot has not been as clear as it should be which has led to a delay in an issue being resolved. The business manager is working with the call centre manager to address this. Training the call centre staff to identify any repeat complaints so that they can be flagged with the depot is helping.

- *Repeat missed collections – there are few however when they occur, they result in customer dis-satisfaction. Need to identify and deal with the cause*

This continues to be an issue for a very small number of residents and has resulted in thirty-eight remediation notices and ten default notices being issued during this review period.

- *Insufficient number of supervisory staff – staff too stretched with workload leading to errors*

Additional supervisory staff have been added to the team including an additional Operations Manager which has enabled better cover within the teams during annual leave and sickness and allowed Biffa to manage the impact of Covid 19.

- *Follow enforcement policies e.g., tagging contaminated bins, not taking refuse side waste*

With the use of PDA's in each of the vehicles it has enabled additional information to be available to the crews when they are making collections. However, this still doesn't replace the operational knowledge of individual crew member but the reliance on this is not as significant as it used to be. Regular refresher training for the crews does take place to remind crews of the correct procedures.

56. During last year's review the committee raised the following action points:

- *The committee asked about whether there needs to be a longer window for reporting missed collections.*

This is a contractual issue that would require a Variation to Contract and not something being considered at this time.

- *Councillor request to refer to properties as "homes" instead*

Properties is the recognised terminology used throughout the contract with Biffa and the waste industry in general it is included within the Key Performance Targets which would require changing by way of a Variation to Contract.

CONTRACTORS FEEDBACK

57. A key feature of the process for reviewing the performance of contractors is that the councils provide them with an opportunity to give their feedback on the assessment, including suggestions for improvements to councils' processes. This is included in Annex C.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

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

CONCLUSION

60. This was an exceptionally challenging review period because of Covid 19, all collection services were maintained when many other authorities had to suspend some services. This was the main cause of the slight decrease in overall performance during 2020, with five out of the ten KPI achieving an excellent rating, compared to seven achieving the same rating the previous year. The overall performance rating however remained the same as "good".

61. The number of missed bins and the retention of staff are the two main issues which need to be addressed.

62. 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 2020. The committee is asked to make any comments to the Cabinet Members with responsibility for waste to enable them to make a final assessment on performance by way of an Individual Cabinet Member decision.

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

BACKGROUND PAPERS

64. 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 50 missed collection per 100,000 collections	85 per 100,000 collections	weak	2
KPT 2	rectification of missed collections percentage of substantiated missed household collections rectified within 48 hours of the scheduled collection day	100 %	89%	weak	2
KPT 3	percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	Performance is measured against the official UK waste from households recycling rate which for 2018 was 45%	Combined 65.49%	excellent	5
KPT 4	improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus	4% litter 7% detritus	1% 18%	fair	3

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 5	incomplete rounds – the number of properties affected as a result of incomplete rounds	less than 1,000 per month	1695	weak	2
KPT 6	call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered	35 seconds	39 seconds	fair	3
KPT 7	deliveries – New properties, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	95%	excellent	5
KPT 8	deliveries – Replacement bins, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	99%	excellent	5
KPT 9	fly tipping – percentage of fly tips cleared from high intensity areas within 12 working hours of a report received	90%	100%	excellent	5
KPT 10	fly tipping – Percentage of fly tips under three cubic	90%	100%	excellent	5

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)
	metres, not in high intensity areas cleared within 24 hours of a report being received				
Overall "average" KPT performance rating score – KPT 1-10 (arithmetic average)					37 / 10 = 3.7

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

the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment **good**
(refers to points 37-39 in the report)

Annex B – Councils satisfaction

This assessment allows the councils (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 Ltd			
From (date)	1 January 2020	To	31 December 2020	

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs		11	1		
2 Response time	2	10			
3 Delivers to time	1	10	1		
4 Delivers to budget	1	2			
5 Efficiency of invoicing	1	2			
6 Approach to health & safety	2	6	1		

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	5	7			
10 Communications / keeping the client informed	2	8	1	1	
11 Quality of written documentation		8	1		
12 Compliance with council's corporate identity		3	1		
13 Listening	3	4	5		
14 Quality of relationship	4	7	1		

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		4			
16 Degree of innovation		4			
17 Goes the extra mile	2	6	3		
18 Supports the council's sustainability objectives		2	2		
19 Supports the council's equality objectives	2	2			
20 Degree of partnership working	1	3			

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

Rating	Responses	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	26	X 5	130
satisfied	99	X 4	396
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	17	X 3	51
dissatisfied	1	X 2	2
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	143		579

The overall council's satisfaction is calculated as follows:

Councils total score ÷ number of responses

$$579 \div 143 = 4.05$$

The following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on overall councils' 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

the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment **good**

(refer to point 48 - 50 in the report)

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Responds to issues and ad hoc requests quickly
Customer service – council and residents
Investigates complaints promptly
Response rate to emails and requests at supervisor level
Covid – well done for maintaining the core elements of the service during this challenging period
Commitment from supervisors
Good working relationship with supervisors
Recycling rate
Deliver service well i.e. Bin deliveries
Data is usually uploaded on time
Health and safety reporting / standards

Areas for improvement

Complaints about non collections for WEEE, textiles and batteries need to be improved.
Complaints about the food bin being dropped after collection needs to be improved.
More consistent recording and collections from crews regarding contaminated bins.
Crew induction content/repeated training on best practice collections behaviour adhering to council policies (including implications of incorrect behaviour)
Some repeat problems take a while to resolve
Vehicle breakdowns impacting on collections
Communication could be better/more proactive/information more readily available around truck breakdowns etc/when things have gone wrong – what direction the organisation is going in to remedy the problem.
Response times from management is poor and often have to chase to receive a response
We are keen to trial the electric bin lorry which I know is being investigated
Improvement of the debriefing procedure and communication amongst supervisors.

Annex C - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

Biffa welcomes this report and embraces the opportunity to improve the service it delivers. Over the last two reports Biffa has made improvements to the service and this has been reflected by an improving score. Whilst it is disappointing the score has reduced for 2020, this is in light of an unprecedented global impact of COVID and the complications this brought.

KPT 1 (missed collection) and KPT 2 (rectifications of missed collections) were hampered by staff absence caused by COVID, and by the lack of round knowledge short term agency workers recruited to maintain the service had.

KPT3 (tonnages) demonstrate the spike in tonnages caused by the two national lockdowns, with nearly 8,000 tonnes of additional recycling produced over the year. The combination of the above has reduced crew knowledge and increased their workload.

KPT 4 (streets and environmental cleanliness) has also seen significant additional pressure, with a peak of activity around local attractions increasing the use of litter bins and leading to an increase in detritus, which has been managed well by the Streets team.

KPT 5 (incomplete rounds) has increased unsurprisingly due to the impact Covid had on staffing levels at certain times.

KPT 6 (call centre) has experienced significant additional pressure in line with the lockdowns. However, the average was just 4 seconds over the KPI.

KPT 7 & 8 (bin delivery) has performed well, and we are pleased with this.

KPT 9 & 10 (fly tipping) has also performed well, and we are pleased with this.

Whilst we accept there have been issues with the KPT performance Biffa believe this is consistent with the challenges faced by the results of COVID –staff absence, reliance on agency workers and a significant increase in tonnage to collect.

We also saw the labour market changes, with EU workers returning home during the pandemic. Similarly, travel restrictions and the Brexit impact prevented new labour entering the country, which has historically been fluid. As a result, the supply of local labour has been under increasing demand.

LGV driver roles were most impacted by these changes, although loader roles are also under pressure.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

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

No comment

Feedback provided by Francis Drew

Date 11/08/21