

# Joint Scrutiny Committee



Report of Head of Housing and Environment

Author: Louise Brown

Tel: 01235 422140

E-mail: [louise.brown@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:louise.brown@southandvale.gov.uk)

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Mark Coleman

Tel: 07483 224436

E-mail: [Mark.Coleman@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:Mark.Coleman@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 27 November 2023

South Cabinet Member responsible: Sue Cooper

Tel: 07717 274703

E-mail: [sue.cooper@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:sue.cooper@southoxon.gov.uk)

## Performance review of Biffa Municipal Ltd – 2022 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 2022 to 31 December 2022 (2022 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 2022 to 31 December 2022.

### 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.
3. South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council, as second tier local authorities, have responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act 1990

(EPA) for the collection of household waste. They also have responsibility to maintain the clean nature of their streets. These are amongst the highest profile services the councils provide, as they affect all households and have a significant impact upon the climate change outcomes of the districts. The Councils currently contract out the EPA responsibilities to Biffa, which in turn delivers the front-line waste, recycling, food and garden waste collection and street cleansing services.

## **Background**

4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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**

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. A summary of officer's assessment in 2022 for each dimension, the overall assessment, and a comparison against 2021 can be seen in the following table:

	2021	2022
Key Performance Target	Good	Good
Customer satisfaction	Fair	Good
Councils' satisfaction	Good	Fair
<b>Overall officer assessment</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Good</b>

10. 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.
11. The 2022/23 value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge is £12,826,202 per annum of which the Vale of White Horse proportion was £6,162,655 per annum and South Oxfordshire was £6,663,548 per annum.
12. 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. By the end of December 2022, there were 58,978 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)**

13. 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 2021/22 this was 44.1 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**

14. Performance is calculated as the number of reported missed collections per 100,000 collections for the period 1 January 2022 to 31 December 2022.
15. During this review period the average number of missed collections across the two districts was 128 per 100,000 collections. In 2021 the number was 96 per 100,000. A combined total of 18,539 collections were logged as missed throughout the review period. This is out of a total of 14,500,098 potential collections (each bin type is recorded as a separate collection) and equates to 99.87 per cent of bins being collected as scheduled. Despite this high percentage the overall rating for this KPT is “poor” because the target is no more than 50 per 100,000 collections.
16. Out of all the missed collection’s food bins are the most frequently missed, 7,115 (38.38 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**

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 18,539 reported missed bins 94 per cent were rectified within the 48-hour target, compared to last year’s figure of 86 per cent.
18. This results in a “fair” 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 62.5 per cent an increase on last year’s figure of 61.9 per cent, for information the previous five years’ figures are also shown.
20. The figures show a decrease of 1,872 tonnes of total recycling collected in 2022 and 1,047 tonnes of food waste, compared to the previous year. Although there was a decrease in the amount of dry recycling and food waste produced there was an increase in the amount of garden waste collected. Additionally, there was also a decrease of 2,299 tonnes of refuse collected. This gives an overall net waste reduction of 4,572 tonnes across all material streams.
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 2021/22 was 44.1 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 2017	26,854	9,972	20,896	<b>57,722</b>	34,206	<b>91,928</b>	62.79%
1 January – 31 December 2018	28,052	11,015	19,921	<b>58,988</b>	34,781	<b>93,768</b>	62.90%
1 January – 31 December 2019	27,340	11,526	22,006	<b>60,871</b>	35,544	<b>96,415</b>	63.13%
1 January – 31 December 2020	27,463	15,955	25,219	<b>68,637</b>	36,165	<b>104,802</b>	65.49%
1 January – 31 December 2021	29,596	13,116	20,969	<b>63,681</b>	39,144	<b>102,825</b>	61.93%
1 January – 31 December 2022	27,724	12,069	21,615	<b>61,409</b>	36,845	<b>98,253</b>	62.5%

**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 assesses 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.
24. The combined scores achieved in this review period were 0 per cent for litter and 8 per cent for detritus. The litter score remained the same from the previous year and detritus levels have decreased to 8 per cent from 11 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**

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 are 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 10,968 per month. This compares to 10,307 per month in 2021. This increase was caused by the continued impact of the driver shortages on staffing levels and the round reroute which occurred in October 2022. As with 2021, 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**

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 50 seconds. This exceeds the target of 35 seconds but should be noted as an improvement on last year's figure of 86 seconds. The main cause of the increase was the volume of calls caused by service disruptions and the reroute. 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**

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 7,651 out of a total of 7,775 requests for bins were delivered within ten working days this equates to 98 per cent, the same as 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**

- 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 10,064 out of a total of 10,264 replacement bin requests were delivered within ten working days this equates to 98 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 32 fly-tips, down from 79 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 1,144 fly-tips, within this review period, a decrease from 1,257 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 3.5 has been achieved, this has remained the same from 2021. 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	<b>3.5 – 4.499</b>	4.5 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	Fair	<b>Good</b>	Excellent



39. Based upon the score derived through the methodology, the head of service has made a judgement on KPT performance as follows. However, it is also recognised that there was a wide range of scores amongst the KPTs, and the service will work with Biffa to maintain areas that are working well whilst addressing scores that could be improved.

KPT judgement 

good
------

Previous KPT judgement for comparison 

good
------

## **DIMENSION 2 - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

40. Customer satisfaction for this report has been measured by the results of the most recent residents survey carried out in June 2023. Whilst this performance review is for 2022, the latest feedback from the survey may reflect a different level of service being received in 2023.

41. In total 2,069 responses were received for the survey. Not every respondent answered all the questions.

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

- Satisfaction with the overall waste collection service.
- Satisfaction with street cleanliness in the area.

43. In terms of satisfaction with the waste and recycling collection service, 2,058 respondents provided satisfaction levels. A large majority of respondents (83%) are very satisfied (36%) or satisfied (47%) with the overall service. A decrease of one percentage point since the last survey in December 2017.

44. In terms of satisfaction with street cleansing, 2,035 respondents provided satisfaction levels. 38% of respondents expressed satisfaction with street cleanliness, with 7% reporting being very satisfied and 31% indicating being satisfied. However, 37% expressed dissatisfaction with this statement, with 20% being dissatisfied and 17% being very dissatisfied. This question also received a considerable number of respondents (24%) who felt neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the standard of street cleanliness. There has been a decrease of 37 percentage points since the last survey in December 2017.

45. 898 respondents provided a free text comment to this question. The most common themes that are emerging from the qualitative data is dissatisfaction with the service provided by the road sweepers, specifically providing an infrequent, poor-quality service, and not providing prior notice of their arrival.

46. Dissatisfaction with the cleanliness/tidiness of the roads/street is also emerging. Many respondents reporting them to be overgrown with vegetation causing blocked drains and gutters which is leading to flooding.

47. Other comments which are emerging are to do with the amount of litter and items being fly tipped around the districts, as well as overflowing public bins.
48. Based on Biffa’s performance a combined overall customer satisfaction rating score of 3.5 has been achieved, the satisfaction score rating at the beginning of the contract in 2017 was 3.89. An analysis of customer 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 overall customer satisfaction:

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

50. Although the score derived through the methodology has delivered a score of ‘fair’ in this dimension, the head of service has also taken into account a number of other factors that were not part of the scoring. These were:

- The number of formal complaints received by the councils about the entire service provided by Biffa in 2022 was two.

The councils received only two formal stage one complaints relating to Biffa’s performance during this review period, compared to nineteen in the previous year (2021). These two complaints related to:

- actions and behaviour of a crew
- ongoing missed collection issues from a property
- The number of compliments received by the councils about the entire service provided by Biffa in 2022 was 19. This is up from 10 in the previous year.
- The significant change to how the rounds were routed in October/November 2022 was able to take place with only two formal complaints received across the entire service for the whole year.
- Analysis of the responses and comments to the customer satisfaction survey, carried out in June/July 2023, shows that the survey may not have provided clarity for some customers on what responsibilities belong to Biffa as part of the street cleansing service, and what may belong to the county council as part of its maintenance of the road network.

51. Taking these factors into account the head of service believes the score in this dimension could reasonably be considered as “good”.

Overall assessment 

<b>good</b>
-------------

## Compliments and complaints

52. The councils received two formal stage one complaints relating to Biffa's performance during this review period compared to nineteen last year.
53. During this review period the councils also received 19 compliments from residents relating to the waste service, including:
- *Just wanted to congratulate the waste collection teams in Didcot today. Great job. The wheelie bins were put back into positions which would reduce the wind issues and my food waste bin was put in the front door porch to prevent the wind moving it after collection. My neighbour's food waste bin was hooked onto plants or placed behind walls to ensure they didn't move. Well done to the waste collector. Really appreciate the effort and the extra time that would have taken to collect the waste. Great job. Thank you.*
  - *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.*
  - *Firstly, I want to say thank you for the special out of cycle, recycle bin collection this morning. It was as a result of a reported missed bin. It was NOT missed by the crew last week and I want to sincerely apologise to your team, you all do a great job and an essential one. I blurted out a straight-faced lie to one of the crew It is not something I would normally do and as I am unable to apologise in person. Please can you relay my sincere apologies to him and his crew! It was my fault not theirs!*

## DIMENSION 3 – COUNCILS' SATISFACTION

54. 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.
55. Working relationships with supervisors and depot managers have remained good despite some of the operational issues caused by insufficient drivers. There were 11 remediation notices issued which is 10 less than the previous year. Of these, seven related to missed bins, two for missed assisted collections, two presentation issues and three related to crew behaviour. The councils also issued three default notices during the review period. one for presentation issues and two for missed assisted collections. A default notice results in a financial deduction from the Biffa monthly invoice.

56. Based on Biffa’s performance, an overall councils’ satisfaction rating score of 3.85 “Fair” was achieved which is a reduction on last year’s classification of “good”. An analysis of councils’ satisfaction can be found in Annex C.

57. 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	<b>3.4 – 3.899</b>	3.9 – 4.299	4.3 – 5.0
Classification	Poor	Weak	<b>Fair</b>	Good	Excellent

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

councils satisfaction judgement

Previous councils satisfaction judgement for comparison

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT

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

- South Oxfordshire confirmed by DEFRA as the second highest English recycling authority for 2021/22 with a rate of 62.7 per cent
- Vale of White Horse confirmed by DEFRA as the fourth highest English recycling authority for 2021/22 with a rate of 61.9 per cent.
- during the review period Biffa implemented a reroute for collection rounds. Property growth has increased in South Oxfordshire by 11,425 and Vale of White Horse by 16,928 since the start of the contract. This caused an imbalance in collection rounds, which added to issues with incomplete rounds caused by breakdowns or driver shortages.

60. To address the imbalance and reduce delayed collections, a reroute took place in October 2022. This saw 14,528 properties change collection day and 1,440 had a change to their collection week.

61. Missed collections and the call centre call times increased at the end of the review period, from October to December due to the reroute, as both crews and residents learned and adapted to the changes.

62. Driver recruitment and retention within the waste sector is still a nationally recognised challenge and had an impact on the general performance of Biffa throughout this review period.

63. The performance of the contractor against KPT is good, performance against customer satisfaction and councils satisfaction with waste collection is also good, but customer satisfaction and councils’ satisfaction in street cleansing is poor. For this reason and taking account of the other areas of note above, the head of service has made an overall assessment as ‘good’, acknowledging that the street cleansing service makes up

a small proportion of the overall contracted services, coupled with the fact that there were only two formal complaints received on either waste collection or street cleansing and there was an increase in the numbers of compliments received over the period:

Overall assessment 

good
------

Previous overall assessment for comparison 

good
------

## Strengths and areas for improvement

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

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

- Communication in general – verbal and written between crews and supervisors

*Crews are provided with an ongoing issues log, (edited) emails and worksheets. They also participate in shift debriefs and make or receive calls as required. We feel communication has improved.*

- Sometimes there's a delay in the call centre and management responding to emails, which has a knock-on effect for residents.

*Biffa accept that on occasion there is a backlog. For example, during the re-route. There have been personnel changes which should reduce the frequency moving forward, however some causes are outside of Biffa's control.*

- 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.

*Biffa have a complaints procedure in place.*

- Crew training on round knowledge/assisted collections/bin placement/contamination.

*These improvements were made during the re-route process.*

- Could be more proactive around work on busy roads/road closures.

*Crews work around this issue regularly, normally very well. However, the accuracy of closures does make this challenging -sometimes we are granted access, other times we are not, sometime at approved times only. The scope of works also changes due to weather variations.*

- Increase permanent staffing levels, reduce use of Agency staff.

*2022 was initially challenging, however a revised pay deal and new recruitment campaigns have delivered higher deployment numbers than previously achieved. This continues into 2023.*

- Ensure enforcement policies such as tagging bins are always followed.

*Human error will be a factor however, we believe performance has improved.*

- Improve on those KPI's not achieving their target, in particular the number of missed bins, incomplete rounds and the call centre holding times.

*2022 saw a deterioration of these factors, however this was a result of the area-wide re-route, which affected all services. This has improved performance long term.*

- Use of Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) to prevent missed collections

*PDA usage does remain challenging with new staff joining the operation. However, we believe there has been some progress made. We are awaiting an updated model of PDA to drive this improvement further.*

- Deliver bins to correct address first time

*Following review of the issues highlighted, Biffa have made personnel changes we have improved the performance. There will always be an element of human error, especially with new build properties, however we believe this has improved.*

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

### **Contractor's feedback**

67. 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**

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

### **Legal Implications**

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

### **Climate and ecological impact implications**

70. 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.

## **Equalities implications**

71. This report is providing information regarding the service in 2022, and there are no changes to services as a direct result of this report, and therefore there are no equalities implications.

## **Risks**

72. There are no risks associated with this report.

## **Conclusion**

73. In the review period, there has been a significant disruption in the local and national labour market. Driver shortages still proved a challenge and Biffa have seen this extend to loaders. Biffa have increased wages above the Oxfordshire living wage to increase recruitment and address shortages in labour.

74. Despite continued challenges in labour and the round reroute exercise, the KPT performance score (Dimension 1) of 3.5 has been maintained in this review period meaning that the overall performance rating remains the same as “good”.

75. For Dimension 2, although the score using the methodology arrived at a score of fair, the head of service has taken into account other customer satisfaction factors that were not included in the scoring. By doing so he believes that a score of “good” in this Dimension is reasonable.

76. The head of service has assessed Biffa’s overall performance as “good” for its delivery of the household waste collection, and ancillary services element of the contract for 2022. However, the poor scores in street cleansing must be recognised and a targeted effort on improving customer perception must be implemented going forwards. Work is already underway in that area with improved levels of cleansing and litter clearance and a new survey with more specific questions on street cleansing, will be introduced in early 2024 to gauge informed customers views on the overall performance of the contracted waste and street cleansing services.

77. 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.

78. 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**

79. 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	128 per 100,000 collections	poor	1
KPT 2	rectification of missed collections percentage of substantiated missed household collections rectified within 48 hours of the scheduled collection day	100 %	94%	fair	3
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 62.5%	excellent	5
KPT 4	improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus	4% litter 7% detritus	0% 8%	good	4



<b>KPT ref</b>	<b>Description of KPT</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Individual KPT rating</b> (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	<b>KPT rating score</b> (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	10,968	poor	1
KPT 6	call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered	35 seconds	50 seconds	poor	1
KPT 7	deliveries – New properties, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	98%	excellent	5
KPT 8	deliveries – Replacement bins, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	98%	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

<b>KPT ref</b>	<b>Description of KPT</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Individual KPT rating</b> (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	<b>KPT rating score</b> (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
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	90%	100%	excellent	5
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 – Customer satisfaction

In total 2,069 residents across both councils responded to questions about the waste contract. Not every respondent answered all the questions.

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

Rating	Number of responses	Score weighting	Total
Very satisfied	735	X 5	3675
Fairly satisfied	963	X 4	3852
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	215	X3	645
Not very satisfied	105	X 2	210
Not at all satisfied	40	X 1	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,058</b>		<b>8,422</b>

Waste and recycling collection service - resident satisfaction calculation:  $8,422 \div 2,058 = 4.09$

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	<b>Good</b>	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	139	X 5	695
Fairly satisfied	631	X 4	2524
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	497	X 3	1491
Not very satisfied	413	X 2	826
Not at all satisfied	355	X 1	355
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,035</b>		<b>5,891</b>

Standard of cleanliness - resident satisfaction calculation:  $5,891 \div 2,035 = 2.89$

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	<b>Poor</b>	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

$$(8,422 + 5891) \div (2,058 + 2,035) = 3.50$$

The following is a guide to the assessment of Biffa on overall customer satisfaction for the street cleaning and refuse collection:

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

Taking into account that 83 per cent of residents are satisfied or very satisfied with the waste collection service, that only two formal complaints were received, and that the combined overall satisfaction rating score is only 0.42 point away from a good rating the head of service has made a judgement on customer satisfaction as follows:

Overall assessment 

<b>good</b>
-------------

  
(refer to points 45-47 in the report)

# Annex C – 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 2022	To	31 December 2022	

## SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs		11	2		
2 Response time	1	10		2	
3 Delivers to time		10	2		
4 Delivers to budget	2	2			
5 Efficiency of invoicing	2	1			
6 Approach to health & safety	4	3			
7 Active communication	0	2			

## COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	1	10	2		
10 Communications / keeping the client informed		7	4	1	1
11 Quality of written documentation	1	11	1		
12 Compliance with councils’ corporate identity		3	1		
13 Listening	1	5			
14 Quality of relationship	1	10	1	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	2	1	
16 Degree of innovation		5	2		
17 Goes the extra mile		8	3	2	
18 Supports the councils' sustainability objectives		4			
19 Supports the councils' equality objectives	1	3			
20 Degree of partnership working	1	2	1		

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

Rating	Responses	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	15	X 5	75
satisfied	111	X 4	444
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	21	X 3	63
dissatisfied	7	X 2	14
very dissatisfied	1	X 1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>		<b>597</b>

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

$$597 \div 155 = 3.85$$

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

Overall assessment **fair**

(refer to point 52 - 54 in the report)

## STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

### Strengths

Communication from collections supervisors is good when dealing with collection issues.
Consistent collections across all waste streams
Problem solving skills of the Operations manager
Easy to deal with and easy to communicate with
Biffa employees generally have interests of residents in their mind
Call centre staff quick to respond to urgent/time sensitive issues
Handled the collection round re-route process well overall
Biffa have a great and friendly team at the depot and call centre
Keeping us updated when a request has been sent to them by email
Speed of rectification once problem raised
Attending meetings and communicating with councillors

### Areas for improvement

Communications on the streets side of the contract
Providing data in good time
Communication and providing relevant information in a reasonable time frame
I would like to see more effective street cleansing
I would like to see an increase in effective communication
More consistent recording and collections from crews
Assisted collections and clinical collections. Making sure crew are kept up to date so as these aren't missed.
Need to improve communication between streets supervisor and council, as very limited communication and feedback received at moment.
Better feedback from Supervisors
Not every supervisor acknowledges/updates

# Annex C - Contractor 360° feedback

## CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCILS ASSESSMENT

Biffa welcome the annual report and opportunity to feedback.

### KPT1 -Missed Bin Performance

Performance reduced as a result of the re-route across both districts during the review period. However, this represents a "right first time" of 99.87% although performance is classified as "poor".

### KPT2 -Rectification of missed bins

This was 94% achievement and classified as "fair".

### KPT3 -Percentage of waste sent for re-use, recycling or composting

The improvement from 61.9 to 62.5% is very pleasing and represents a considerable amount of work in reducing contamination levels.

### KPT 4 -NI195 Street Cleansing

Retaining 0% litter and a reduction in detritus from 11% to 8% year on year is a very good result, considerably better overall than the national indicator.

### KPT 5 -Incomplete Rounds

There were additional incomplete rounds as a result of the re-route which took place in the review period. During this time, collections were maintained by providing weekend crews.

### KPT 6 -Call Centre Hold Times

It is pleasing the hold times reduced from 86 to 50 seconds, although we recognise this is above target. Not all triggers of multiple calls are a result of Biffa activity.

### KPT 7 & 8 -Bin Delivery

This has become more challenging with bin / container manufacturers under pressure to deliver to more local authorities than before.

### KPT 9 & KPT 10

Flytip performance remains excellent.

### Survey

Whilst we appreciate the survey is opinion based, the results are not reflected by the independent assessments which have been carried out -such as the 0% Litter result in the NI195 surveys, which has been achieved over a 2-year period.

In addition, Biffa have no control over the number of fly tips reported, only the performance to rectify once reported.

South Oxfordshire have transferred Dog Bin emptying and it is therefore difficult to determine if the "overflowing litter bins" comment applied to our service. Similarly, there are a number of bins on private land which we do not service.



**Overall**

Retaining the overall score at 3.5 between 2021 and 2022 is an achievement when considered alongside the significant re-route which took place in 2022, and this result is pleasing.

**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?**

Consider further reroutes due to housing growth, if and when needed to allow for a more efficient, effective and economical service.

Feedback provided by

Date