

Joint Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of Head of Housing and Environment

Author: Ian Matten

Tel: 01235 422113

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

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Sally Povolotsky

Tel: 07939 912997

E-mail: sally.povolotsky@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 19 September 2022

South Cabinet Member responsible: Sue Cooper

Tel: 07717274703

E-mail: sue.cooper@southoxon.gov.uk

Performance review of Biffa Municipal Ltd – 2021 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 2021 to 31 December 2021 (2021 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 District Councils for the calendar year 1 January 2021 to 31 December 2021.

Strategic Objectives

2. The service contributed to Vale's Corporate Plan (2020 – 2024) of Tackling the Climate Emergency and South's Corporate Plan (2020 – 2024) of Action on Climate Emergency.

Background

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the councils' objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the councils 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. councils 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 contracts, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. A summary of officer's assessment in 2021 for each dimension, the overall assessment, and a comparison against 2020 can be seen in the following table:

	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>
Key Performance Target	Good	Good
Customer satisfaction	Good	Fair
Councils 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 £12,011,043 per annum of which the Vale of White Horse proportion is £5,731,168 per annum and South Oxfordshire is £6,279,875 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 2022, there were 57,429 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 2020/21 this was 44 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 2021 to 31 December 2021.
14. During this review period the average number of missed collections across the two districts was 96 per 100,000 collections. In 2020 the number was 85 per 100,000. A combined total of 13,224 collections were logged as missed throughout the review period. This is out of a total of 13,970,808 potential collections (each bin type is recorded as a separate collection) and equates to 99.9 per cent of bins being collected as scheduled. Despite this high percentage 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, 5,827 (44.06 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.

KPT 2 – Rectification of missed collections

16. 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 13,224 reported missed bins 86 per cent were rectified within the 48-hour target, compared to last year's figure of 89 per cent.

17. This results in a "weak" rating for this review period.

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

18. Table one below shows that the combined performance of both councils for KPT 3 was 61.93 per cent a decrease on last year's figure of 65.49 per cent, for information the previous five years' figures are also shown.

19. The figures show a decrease of 4,956 tonnes of total recycling collected in 2021, compared to the previous year. Although there was an increase in the amount of dry recycling produced there were decreases in the amount of food and garden waste collected. This was partly caused by the suspension of the garden waste service during August and September because of insufficient drivers and general staffing levels. There was an increase of 2,979 tonnes of refuse collected.

20. 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 2020/21 was 44 per cent. This is the official recycling measure which is used as the basis for reporting at UK level against the waste Framework Directive. 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 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%
1 January – 31 December 2021	29,596	13,116	20,969	63,681	39,144	102,825	61.93%

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

21. 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.

22. 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 a percentage of relevant land that is assessed as having levels of litter and detritus that fall below an acceptable level.

23. The combined scores achieved in this review period were 1 per cent for litter and 11 per cent for detritus. The litter score remained the same from the previous year and detritus levels have decreased to 11 per cent from 19 per cent last year. The overall rating for this KPT is "good".

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

24. 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 are not measured as part of the missed collection KPT.

25. 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 10,307 per month. This compares to 1,695 per month in 2020. This significant increase was caused by the impact of the driver shortages on staffing levels, the services were maintained by crews catching up incomplete rounds over the weekends. The overall assessment against this KPT is "poor".

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

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

27. During this review period the average time residents spent on hold was 86 seconds. This exceeds the target of 35 seconds and is a deterioration on last year's figure of 39 seconds. The main cause of the increase was the volume of calls caused by service disruptions. The overall rating for this KPT is "poor".

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

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

29. During this review period 7,810 out of a total of 7,888 requests for bins were delivered within ten working days this equates to 99 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. 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

30. The percentage of replacement bin requests delivered within ten working days of the request being logged is measured and reported monthly.

31. During this review period 8,919 out of a total of 8,981 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

32. 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 79 fly-tips, down from 119 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.

33. 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

34. 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 1,257 fly-tips, within this review period, a decrease from 1,342 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

35. The overall assessment against this KPT is “excellent”.

Average rating score – KPT 1 – 10

36. Based on Biffa’s performance an overall KPT performance rating score of 3.5 has been achieved, the previous satisfaction rating score was 3.7. An analysis of performance against the KPTs can be found in Annex A.

37. 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

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

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 2 - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

39. 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.
40. Customer satisfaction has therefore been based on the number of formal complaints received, the number of compliments and KPT 6 which relates to the hold time customers have experienced when contacting the call centre.
41. We acknowledge that customer satisfaction is a key element in the overall assessment of performance and our engagement team is working on a new process to address this.

Comments and complaints

42. The councils received nineteen formal stage one complaints relating to Biffa's performance during this review period compared to eight last year. There were eleven relating to recurring missed collections, six relating to garden waste issues, one concerned a bulky waste collection and one concerned poor bin return. Two complaints were escalated to stage two and related to a missed collection and a garden waste issue. One complaint was reviewed by the Local Government Ombudsman which concluded that there had been an injustice to the resident due to missed bins, but that action had been taken to rectify it.
43. During this review period the councils also received ten compliments from residents relating to the waste service, including:
- *I was a bit late in getting my garden waste out this morning and the guys came back up the road to collect it. I thanked them, but please acknowledge this, it was greatly appreciated.*
 - *Would like to say a huge thank you to all staff of the waste disposal team on what is becoming an increasingly difficult job to do. They are exceptional whatever the weather.*
 - *I would like to mention what an excellent job Biffa have done on cleaning up the paths and gutters at the end of Gorwell in Watlington. I know from personal experience it is hard work.*
 - *Voicemail from resident in Garsington, she wanted us to know that the refuse crew are amazing, and nothing is too much trouble for them.*

44. Based on the number of formal complaints received, the number of compliments, the result of KPT 6. and that Biffa continued to provide most services without disruption, despite the impact Covid had on service delivery, the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

DIMENSION 3 – COUNCILS SATISFACTION

45. 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 at the time, service manager, team leader, recycling officers, technical monitoring officers, enforcement officer and business support team. In total 13 questionnaires were sent out and returned.

46. Working relationships with supervisors and depot managers have remained good despite some of the operational issues caused by insufficient drivers. There were 21 remediation notices issued which is 17 less than the previous year. Of these seven related to missed bins, seven for missed assisted collections, one for street cleansing, three presentation issues and three related to crew behaviour. The councils also issued three default notices during the review period. Two for presentation issues and one for missed assisted collection. A default notice results in a financial deduction from the Biffa’s monthly invoice.

47. Based on Biffa’s performance an overall councils satisfaction rating score of 3.94 “Good” was achieved which is the same as last year’s classification”. An analysis of councils satisfaction can be found in Annex B.

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

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

councils satisfaction judgement

Previous councils satisfaction judgement for comparison

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

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

- South Oxfordshire confirmed by DEFRA as the second highest English recycling authority for 2020/21 with a rate of 63.6 per cent
- Vale of White Horse confirmed by DEFRA as the fourth highest English recycling authority for 2020/21 with a rate of 62.6 per cent.
- this review period includes the period of the third national coronavirus lockdown in January 2021.
- driver recruitment and retention within the waste sector is a nationally recognised challenge and had a significant impact in the general performance of Biffa throughout this review period. This led to the suspension of the garden waste service during the review period

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

Overall assessment

good

Previous overall assessment for comparison

good

Strengths and areas for improvement

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

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

- *Complaints about non collections for WEEE, textiles and batteries need to be improved.*

The number of reported missed WEEE, textiles and batteries fell from 347 reports in 2020 to 153 reports in this reporting period, a reduction of 55 per cent. Biffa collected 49 tonnes of WEEE, 20 tonnes of batteries and 37 tonnes of textiles during the review period.

- *Complaints about the food bin being dropped after collection needs to be improved.*

The crews were reminded that they should be returning the food bins correctly and not dropping them unnecessarily. The actual number of replacement food bins reduced by 12 per cent compared to the previous year, although the reason for a replacement isn't specifically recorded and therefore this reduction cannot be solely attributed to Biffa's handling of the bins.

- *More consistent recording and collections from crews regarding contaminated bins.*

The crews were reminded that bins containing contamination should not be emptied, they should be tagged and left. The councils recycling officers have been working closely with the supervisors to identify areas where contamination is a particular issue, especially in bulk bin stores. The average monthly contamination rate in the review period was 8.21 per cent, an improvement on 2020 figure of 9.16 per cent.

- *Crew induction content/repeated training on best practice collections behaviour adhering to council's policies (including implications of incorrect behaviour)*

This is an ongoing process with every new member of staff receiving induction training, regular reminders are issued to all staff.

- *Some repeat problems unresolved*

There was a 44 per cent reduction in remediation notices issued compared to the previous year. A remediation notice is issued when there are repeated collection issues at a particular property.

- *Vehicle breakdowns impacting on collections*

This continues to be a problem and is exacerbated by the lack of availability nationally of certain parts required. Biffa are addressing this with the use of hired vehicles, although this creates a problem for textile/WEEE collections because they do not have the cages fitted. They also do not have the CCTV fitted.

- *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.*

The councils' receives daily depot updates setting out any issues with vehicles or staffing and Biffa management does inform the councils if there are any significant issues with collections as they occur throughout the day.

- *Response times from management is poor and often have to chase to receive a response*

This has continued to be a problem at times although once a reminder has been sent the response is normally very quick. It is an area of improvement that needs to be continued in the next review period.

- *We are keen to trial the electric bin lorry which I know is being investigated*

A trial was actual undertaken in March 2022 across the districts in a mixture of rural and urban areas. The main points from the trial were:

- Identified very early on it was struggling to complete a whole round if doing more than one load of collected material. A vehicle would normally do two and sometimes three loads in a day.

- With the current depot infrastructure charging took too long so coming back to charge mid shift was not an option, the vehicle had to be charged overnight.
- The vehicle completed around 60-70% of the round depending on the distance from the depot the particular round was.
- The feedback from drivers was very positive because of how quiet it was although some considered it was eerily quiet. There was no specific incidents but there was concern that it was too quiet and could be an issue for other road users who didn't hear it. Drivers were also anxious that they may run out of battery power during the day.

Currently the use of electric waste collection vehicles wouldn't be an option on our contract for the reasons identified above, however manufacturers continue to make significant improvements to vehicles and battery performance and we will continue to review this for future service provision.

- *Improvement of the debriefing procedure and communication amongst supervisors.*

This has improved and has led to the daily depot update being sent to the councils and any incomplete rounds being incorporated in the update.

54. During last year's review the committee made a number of comments that were answered at the time, there were no follow up actions identified.

Contractors feedback

55. 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.

Climate and ecological impact implications

56. There are no Climate and Ecological Impact implications arising from this report. KPI's relating to the councils' Climate Emergency objectives will be included when a new waste management contract is agreed.

Financial Implications

57. Whilst there aren't any financial implications arising from this report it should be noted that as a result of suspending the garden waste service in 2021 for a period of time, it was agreed that the councils would provide an extension to customers direct debit payments by three months. This did cause an in-year reduction in income for 2021 of £210,000 as those customers who were due to pay in January – March 2022 actually paid in April - June.2022. There was also a financial implication of sending out letters to all customers regarding the garden waste stoppage which amounted to £96,128.

Legal Implications

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

Risks

59. There are no risks associated with this report

Conclusion

60. This was an exceptionally challenging review period due to the impact of Covid on sickness levels and the well documented national driver shortage. The shortage was caused by:

- driver training being paused because of Covid and therefore there were no new drivers coming through,
- EU drivers being restricted from travelling due to Covid and Brexit
- drivers taking the decision to retire or move away from the waste industry and take up different driver roles.

This driver shortage led to the difficult decision to suspend garden waste collections so the crews could prioritise the other waste streams.

61. There was a slight decrease in overall KPT performance from a score of 3.7 in 2020 to 3.5 in this review period, despite this the overall performance rating remains the same as “good”.

62. Biffa’s Business Continuity Plan had to be implemented due to the driver shortage mentioned above and as a result the garden waste service had to be suspended. All other services remained in place and while there were some delays all collections were completed by the end of each week. To achieve this Biffa worked over the weekends to clear any uncollected bins.

63. The head of service has assessed Biffa’s overall performance as “good” for its delivery of the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for 2021. 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.

64. 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

65. 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	96 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 %	86%	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 61.93%	excellent	5
KPT 4	improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus	4% litter 7% detritus	1% 11%	good	4

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	10,307	poor	1
KPT 6	call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered	35 seconds	86 seconds	poor	1
KPT 7	deliveries – New properties, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	99%	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) refers to points 36-38 in the report					35 / 10 = 3.5

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 2021	To	31 December 2021	

SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs	1	9	2	1	
2 Response time	1	9	3		
3 Delivers to time	1	10	2		
4 Delivers to budget	2	6			
5 Efficiency of invoicing	1	3	1		
6 Approach to health & safety	3	6			

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	6	7			
10 Communications / keeping the client informed	2	7	4		
11 Quality of written documentation		11	1		
12 Compliance with councils’ corporate identity		3	4		
13 Listening	2	11			
14 Quality of relationship	2	10			

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		3	4		
16 Degree of innovation		3	4		
17 Goes the extra mile	4	4	5		
18 Supports the councils' sustainability objectives		5	2		
19 Supports the councils' equality objectives	2	6	1		
20 Degree of partnership working	1	6		2	

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

Rating	Responses	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	28	X 5	140
satisfied	119	X 4	476
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	33	X 3	99
dissatisfied	3	X 2	6
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	183		721

The overall councils satisfaction is calculated as follows:
councils total score ÷ number of responses

$$721 \div 183 = 3.94$$

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

Overall assessment **Good**

(refer to point 47 - 49 in the report)

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths

Drivers and loaders staff have worked amazingly over the last year and really pulled together despite Covid and driver issues.
H&S procedures that have been put in place in the depot have worked well.
Usually happy to accommodate last minute requests to fulfil customer needs.
Communication with supervisors on collection issues.
Provide a good waste collection service to majority of households in South and Vale.
Good at dealing with urgent requests
Always willing to accommodate late requests if at all possible.
Working relationship
The vast majority of collections take place with no issues
Very good working relationship with Operations Manager who is understanding and helpful in resolving issues
Approach to health and safety

Areas for improvement

Communication in general – verbal and written between crews and supervisors
Sometimes there's a delay in the call centre and management responding to emails, which has a knock-on effect for residents.
Can be difficult to get Biffa to process an escalated complaint without raising with senior management. They need a robust procedure in place to identify when something needs to be escalated.
Crew training on round knowledge/assisted collections/bin placement/contamination.
Could be more proactive around work on busy roads/road closures
Increase permanent staffing levels, reduce use of Agency staff.
Ensure enforcement policies such as tagging bins are always followed.
Improve on those KPI's not achieving their target, in particular the number of missed bins, incomplete rounds and the call centre holding times.
Use of PDAs to prevent missed collections
Deliver bins to correct address first time

Annex C - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCILS ASSESSMENT

The 2021 performance review covers a period of substantial challenges, such as COVID & instability in the labour market, with rapidly increasing labour costs.

Whilst Biffa have made significant investment into the contract, particularly around agency pay, it must be remembered that income has remained relatively fixed.

KPT 1 & KPT 2

Both of the above were hampered by challenges with the labour market.

KPT 3

Collection tonnages have fallen, due to a combination of service suspension and the 2020 tonnages peaking due to lockdowns / business closures / HWRCs closing.

KPT 4

Street Environmental cleanliness has improved during the review period, which is very pleasing.

KPT 5

Incomplete rounds has increased, which is a direct result of KPT 1 & KPT 2.

KPT 6

Whilst call centre performance was outside the target, the overall result was very close. This is a good performance when considering the staffing issues experienced.

KPT7 & KPT 8

Bin delivery performance remains very strong.

KPT9 & KPT10

Fly tip performance remains very strong.

2020s labour market challenges remained into 2021. This provided challenges with staff absence, reliance on agency workers, reduction in EU workers. As a result the performance period has produced mixed results. However, the results also show strong performance in a number of areas, even with these challenges.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

None

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 16/08/2022