

# Joint Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of Head of Housing and Environment

Author: Louise Brown

Tel: 01235 422140

E-mail: louise.brown@southandvale.gov.uk

Vale Cabinet Member responsible: Mark Coleman

Tel: 07483 224436

E-mail: mark.coleman@whitehorsedc.gov.uk

To: JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 15 July 2024

South Cabinet Member responsible: Sam James-Lawrie

Tel: 07824 155901

E-mail: sam.james-lawrie@southoxon.gov.uk

## Performance review of Biffa Municipal Ltd – 2023 Calendar year

### RECOMMENDATION

That joint 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 2023 to 31 December 2023 (2023 calendar year) and makes any comments before a final assessment on performance is agreed.

Implications (further detail within the report)	Climate and Ecological	Financial	Legal	Equality and diversity
	No	No	No	No
Signing off officer	Jessie Fieth	Emma Creed	Pat Connel	Lorne Grove

### Purpose of Report

1. To request that joint scrutiny committee review 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 2023 to 31 December 2023.

### Strategic Objectives

2. The waste collection and street cleansing services provided by Biffa 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, garden waste and bulky waste collections, container deliveries and street cleansing services.

## **Background**

4. Effectively monitoring contractor performance is essential for the councils' to deliver against their objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the councils' services are outsourced, the councils cannot deliver high quality services to their residents unless the 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 services depends on contractors and the councils working together to set and review realistic, jointly agreed measurable targets captured in a review framework.
6. The 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 2023 for each dimension, the overall assessment, and a comparison against 2022 can be seen in the following table:

	2022	2023
Key Performance Target	Good	Good
Customer satisfaction	Good	Good
Councils' satisfaction	Fair	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. A further two-year extension was agreed in December 2023, to take the contract to the end of June 2026 and work is underway to appraise the options available to the councils for the future contract provision from that date.

11. In 2023/24 the value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge was £13,855,441 per annum of which the Vale of White Horse proportion was £6,657,075 per annum and South Oxfordshire was £7,198,367 per annum.

12. The contract includes delivery of the following services:

- weekly collection of household food waste using 23 litre bins
- fortnightly collection of household recycling using 240 litre wheeled bins or clear sacks, collection of textiles in plastic carrier bags placed next to the recycling bin, collection of household batteries placed in a clear bag placed on top of the recycling bin.
- fortnightly collection of household residual waste using 180 litre wheeled bins or pink sacks. This is collected on the alternate week to recycling, collection of small waste electronic and electrical equipment (WEEE) in plastic carrier bags placed next to the residual bin.
- emptying of bulk bins for refuse, recycling and food waste provided for flats and communal properties.
- fortnightly collection of household garden waste from residents who have opted into this charged for service. By the end of December 2023, there were 60,751 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 adopted highway areas.

- emptying of litter and dog waste bins.
- provision of a dedicated call centre facility for residents
- removal of fly-tipping.
- clinical waste collections.

## **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 however, 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 2022/23 this was 43.3 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 a 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 2023 to 31 December 2023.
15. During this review period the average number of missed collections across the two districts was 104 per 100,000 collections. This is an improvement in performance compared against 2022 when the number was 128 per 100,000. A combined total of 15,784 collections were logged as missed throughout the review period. This is out of a total of 15,168,304 potential collections (each bin type is recorded as a separate collection) and this equates to 99.9 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, 4,238 (26.85 per cent) throughout the review period, although this is not uncommon as these bins are collected weekly compared to the other types of bins which are collected fortnightly and they are also much smaller so can sometimes be less visible to the collection crews. It should be noted that this is an improvement on performance in 2022, with a 40.43 per cent reduction on missed food bins.

## **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 15,784 reported missed bins 93 per cent were rectified within the 48-hour target, compared to last year’s figure of 94 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 and this has remained the same as 2022. For information, the previous five years’ figures are also shown.
20. The figures show a decrease of 1,371 tonnes of total recycling collected in 2023 and 657 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 of 4,306 tonnes of garden waste collected. There was also an increase of 1,408 tonnes of refuse collected. This gives an overall net waste increase of 3,686 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 2022/23 was 43.3 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 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%
1 January – 31 December 2023	26,353	11,412	25,921	<b>63,686</b>	38,253	<b>101,939</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 Keep Britain Tidy, which is 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 2 per cent for litter and 6 per cent for detritus. The litter score increased to 2 per cent from 0 per cent and detritus levels have decreased to 6 per cent from 8 per cent the previous year. The overall rating for this KPT is "excellent".

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

25. This KPT was introduced in 2017 to measure the impacts of reliability issues with Biffa's fleet which caused collection rounds to be incomplete on the scheduled collection 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 1,229 per month. This compares to 10,968 per month in 2022 resulting in a decrease of 9,739. The cause of the incomplete rounds was due to vehicle breakdowns resulting in rounds not able to be completed on collection day. As with previous years, the services were maintained by crews catching up incomplete rounds over the weekends. The overall assessment against this KPT is "fair".

### **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 63 seconds. This is above the target of 35 seconds. The cause of the increase was due to staffing levels with high levels of sickness and vacancies. 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 8,181 out of a total of 9,240 requests for bins were delivered within ten working days which equates to 90 per cent success, compared to last year's figure of 98 per cent. 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 8,424 out of a total of 9,717 replacement bin requests were delivered within ten working days this equates to 89 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. 87 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 71 fly-tips, an increase from 32 last year in high intensity areas. Note - 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, officers instruct Biffa to proceed with the clearance.
34. The overall assessment against this KPT is “good”.

### **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 percent of fly-tips outside high intensity areas were cleared within 24 hours of a report received during this review period. There were 1,237 fly-tips, within this review period, an increase from 1,144 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, officers 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, this has increased from 3.5 in 2022. 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 officers 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 March and April 2024. Whilst this performance review is for 2023, the latest feedback from the survey may reflect a different level of service being received in 2024.
41. In total, 252 responses were received for the survey, but not every respondent answered all the questions.
42. The main areas of questioning regarding satisfaction with the services 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 services, 252 respondents provided satisfaction levels. A large majority of respondents (86.5 per cent) are very satisfied (46 per cent) or satisfied (40.5 per cent) with the overall service. An increase of three percentage points since the last survey in June 2023.
44. In terms of satisfaction with street cleansing, there has been a small overall decrease of four percentage points since the last survey in June 2023 with a total of 252 respondents providing satisfaction levels. 33.7 per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction with street cleanliness, with 6.3 per cent reporting being very satisfied and 27.4 per cent indicating being satisfied. However, 36 per cent expressed dissatisfaction with this statement, with 22 per cent being dissatisfied and 14 per cent being very dissatisfied. This question also received a considerable number of respondents (25 per cent) who felt neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the standard of street cleanliness.
45. Table two shows the changes within the satisfaction banding, with the largest variance being seen in a reduction of 3.4 per cent in respondents being very dissatisfied and an increase of 4.9 per cent in residents not knowing.

**Table Two**

	% change
Very satisfied	-0.4%
Satisfied	-3.3%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0.4%
Dissatisfied	1.7%
Very dissatisfied	-3.4%
Don't know	4.9%

46. To help understand and offer more insight on the previous year's survey results which indicated dissatisfaction with street cleansing, we asked a further two questions in relation to the frequency of litter bin emptying and road sweepings.
47. 251 of the 252 respondents answered the question on public litter bins. Most respondents (31.35 per cent) were satisfied with the frequency of emptying. Dissatisfied and neither satisfied or dissatisfied received a relatively equal response of 21.43 per cent and 23.41 per cent respectively.
48. 248 of the 252 respondents answered the question on road sweeping. Most respondents (23.41 per cent) were dissatisfied with road sweeping. Satisfied and neither satisfied or dissatisfied again received a relatively equal response of 19.84 per cent and 23.02 per cent respectively.
49. Based on Biffa's performance a combined overall customer satisfaction rating score of 3.5 has been achieved. An analysis of customer satisfaction can be found in Annex B.
50. 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

51. The outcome derived through the methodology has delivered a score of 'fair' in this dimension. However, the head of service also has the ability to consider additional factors that are not part of the formal methodology but provide a more rounded view of customer satisfaction. These were:
- The number of formal complaints received by the councils about the entire service provided by Biffa in 2023 was four. This is an achievement to be recognised with the size of the contract and the high level of contact with the public daily and range of different services provided.
  - The number of compliments received by the councils about the entire service provided by Biffa in 2023 was 21. This is an increase of two from the previous year.
  - The weighting of satisfaction between waste collections and street cleansing does not reflect the proportion of each service within the contract, and interaction by the public. The satisfaction figure for waste is 4.25, which is at the top of the 'good' band but is unevenly balanced by the fair rating of street cleansing.
52. There is also a question around the scoring for street cleansing which showed as below:
- 33.7 per cent (85 people) of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied.
  - 35.7 er cent (90 people) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.
  - 30.6 per cent (77 people) did not know or are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

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

Overall assessment 

good
------

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison 

good
------

## Comments and complaints

54. The councils received four formal complaints relating to Biffa’s performance during this review period compared to two in the previous year. Two complaints related to missed bins with the remaining two were regarding bin placement after collection.

55. During this review period the councils also received 21 compliments from residents relating to the waste service, including:

- *Hats off to the recycling crew doing Leverton Gardens this morning. They dropped some recycling out the bin and both operatives picked it all up. Then just before they left they realised they had blocked in the food waste caddies with the recycling bins (that they were putting back so neatly) so they moved a bin and pulled all the food caddies to the front so they didn't get missed. Credit where credit is due, hoping you can pass this on, I know how busy they all are at the moment but they took the time to do it all properly.'*
- *I Hi @SouthOxon just wanted to say the guys on this bin lorry in South Stoke this morning were super friendly and made my 3-year old son's day showing him how the bin's get dumped in the back (from several metres away). They didn't have to but they did.*
- *Just wanted to say a big thank you! Just seen the bin people collecting our recycling this morning- 1 female driver and 2 males at Lydalls Close, Didcot. All laughing, joking, talking with the neighbours as they past. But at the same time working so hard and efficiently, making sure everyone got the right bin back. It really made me smile on a Friday morning whilst sat at my desk to see people enjoying their job so much. Thank you for all the hard work, I'm sure it's a difficult job, that's definitely less enjoyable on a hot sunny day. We appreciate you! Please if my message could make it to those specifically on my route this morning that would be amazing, the driver especially negotiates a tricky reverse down our road every time and they always give a smile to my kids glued at the window!*
- *I just wanted to say a really big thank you to the crew member doing the green bins on Friday in GWP North. He was so polite and helpful especially when my son annoyingly asked him to take some recycling and he'd already taken our bins, he didn't have to be so kind to him. think it's important he gets some recognition and I'm sure it's nice for Biffa to get some nice feedback rather than constant whiners which I'm sure you get. I hope he gets this!*

## DIMENSION 3 – COUNCILS’ SATISFACTION

56. 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 service manager, team leaders, recycling officers, technical monitoring officers, enforcement officers, customer services and business support team. In total 22 questionnaires were sent out and 18 were returned.
57. Working relationships with supervisors and depot managers have remained good and a change in the street cleansing supervisor has had a positive effect on the service provided and the working relationship with the councils.
58. Based on Biffa’s performance, an overall councils’ satisfaction rating score of 3.82 “Fair” was achieved which has remained the same compared with the previous year. An analysis of councils’ satisfaction can be found in Annex C.
59. 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

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

councils satisfaction judgement

Previous councils satisfaction judgement for comparison

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT

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

- South Oxfordshire confirmed by DEFRA as the highest English combined recycling authority for 2022/23 with a rate of 61.6 per cent
- Vale of White Horse confirmed by DEFRA as the third highest English combined recycling authority for 2022/23 with a rate of 60.9 per cent.
- An increase in vehicle breakdowns has been seen and is closely being monitored with Biffa. The councils’ have approved a capital budget for replacing vehicles due to the age of the fleet and a vehicle strategy has recently been approved.
- A two-year extension to the contract until June 2026 has been agreed, which puts an emphasis on a closer joint working relationship.

62. The performance of the contractor against KPT and customer satisfaction with waste collections is good, councils satisfaction with performance is fair. Customer satisfaction and councils’ satisfaction in street cleansing continues to be 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 no formal complaints received on street cleansing and there was a small increase in the numbers of compliments received for waste collections over the period:

Overall assessment 

good
------

Previous overall assessment for comparison 

good
------

## Strengths and areas for improvement

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

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

- More consistent recording and collections from crews.

Biffa have made a significant investment in additional whitespace mobile devices, which allow crews to record issues which are immediately visible to the call centre.

- Assisted collections and clinical collections. Making sure crews are kept up to date so as these aren't missed.

As mentioned, additional whitespace mobile devices allowing crews to record issues which are immediately visible to the call centre..

- Need to improve communication between streets supervisor and council, as very limited communication and feedback received.

This has been overcome and confirmed within survey results.

- I would like to see more effective street cleansing.

Street cleansing standards now below target and improved from prior year.

- Better feedback from Supervisors, not every supervisor acknowledges/updates.

- Communication and providing relevant information in a reasonable timeframe.

- Providing data in good time.

- Not every supervisor acknowledges/updates.

With the last four bullet points, the supervisory team is developing and improving over time, with some personnel changes. Additional training has also been provided.

65. 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**

66. 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**

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

### **Legal Implications**

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

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

69. Delivery of this service has major implications for the climate emergency, both positively through the management and recycling of waste and negatively through the release of carbon emissions (in 2022/23 waste collection was responsible for 57.4 per cent of South Oxfordshire District Council's greenhouse gas emissions and 49.76 per cent of Vale of White Horse District Council's greenhouse gas emissions). KPI's relating to the councils' climate emergency objectives will be included when a new waste management contract is agreed.

70. There are no new climate and ecological impact implications arising from this report.

### **Equalities implications**

71. This report is for information only 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 an increase in vehicle breakdowns due to the age of the fleet. Despite this, Biffa have maintained the levels of service and have actively managed the interruption to waste collections at the same time as achieving a reduction to incomplete rounds that would normally increase under these circumstances.

74. 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 2023. The reduction in very dissatisfied scores in street cleansing indicates a very small improvement with the work on improving customer perception for street cleansing. Work that is already underway will continue in partnership with the councils.
77. The committee is asked to make any comments to the Cabinet Members with responsibility for waste collection and street cleansing services to enable them to make a final assessment on performance by way of an Individual Cabinet Member decision (ICMD).
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	104 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 %	93%	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	2% 6%	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 5	incomplete rounds – the number of properties affected as a result of incomplete rounds	less than 1,000 per month	1,229	fair	3
KPT 6	call centre – average time residents spend on hold before the call is answered	35 seconds	63 seconds	poor	1
KPT 7	deliveries – New properties, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	90%	excellent	5
KPT 8	deliveries – Replacement bins, Percentage of bins delivered within ten working days of the request being logged	85%	89%	excellent	5
KPT 9	fly tipping – percentage of fly tips cleared from high intensity areas within 12 working hours of a report received	90%	87%	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 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 252 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	116	X 5	580
Fairly satisfied	102	X 4	408
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	20	X3	60
Not very satisfied	9	X 2	18
Not at all satisfied	5	X 1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>		<b>1,071</b>

Waste and recycling collection service - resident satisfaction calculation:  $1,071 \div 252 = 4.25$

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	16	X 5	695
Fairly satisfied	69	X 4	2524
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	62	X 3	1491
Not very satisfied	55	X 2	826
Not at all satisfied	35	X 1	355
Don't know	15	X 0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>		<b>687</b>

Standard of cleanliness - resident satisfaction calculation:  $687 \div 252 = 2.73$

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

$$(1071 + 687) \div (252 + 252) = 3.5$$

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 87 per cent of residents are satisfied or very satisfied with the waste collection service, the low number of formal complaints, and that the combined overall satisfaction rating score 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 2023	To	31 December 2023	

## SERVICE DELIVERY

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
1 Understanding of the client's needs		17	1		
2 Response time		15	2	1	
3 Delivers to time	1	12	2	2	
4 Delivers to budget	1	2	2		
5 Efficiency of invoicing		4			
6 Approach to health & safety	4	10	1	1	
7 Active communication		1			

## COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

Attribute	(5) Very satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(3) Neither	(2) Dis-satisfied	(1) Very dissatisfied
9 Easy to deal with	6	11		1	
10 Communications / keeping the client informed	2	8	6	1	
11 Quality of written documentation		8	2	2	
12 Compliance with councils’ corporate identity		6	1		
13 Listening	2	12	2	1	
14 Quality of relationship	1	15		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	1	2	
16 Degree of innovation		5	1	1	
17 Goes the extra mile		14	2	1	
18 Supports the councils' sustainability objectives		5		2	
19 Supports the councils' equality objectives	2	4	1		
20 Degree of partnership working		5	1	1	

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

Rating	Responses	Score equivalent	Total
very satisfied	19	X 5	95
satisfied	158	X 4	632
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	25	X 3	75
dissatisfied	17	X 2	34
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>		<b>836</b>

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

$$836 \div 219 = 3.82$$

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

Good at responding to members of the public in a timely fashion
Streets team and supervisors are supporting of litter picks
Good professional relationships overall, responsive team
Good working relationship with depot supervisors and contact centre
Any contact I have had with crews in public have been pleasant and call centre staff will come back to me usually within 1-2 working days if I have a query about a container request.
Easy to work with
Core operational Kerbside collection service runs okay
Staffing levels on collections
Good working relationship between supervisors and Tech Officers
Help with supporting events, these are often over weekends and late in evenings and the support in making sure the equipment arrives on time and setting up is very good
Call centres commitment in times of pressure with reduced staffing numbers
Improvement in street cleaning services/communication
Partnership working
Overall a good depot team spirit

### Areas for improvement

Seem to be quite a lot of missed clinical and assisted collections
Communicating to crews regarding assisted collections
Feedback after ad-hoc requests could be improved
Emails are slow to respond to
Reliability of litter and equipment collections from litter picks (some equipment collections are regularly missed, as well as litter collections because of the bags colour, which shouldn't happen).
Continue to ensure there is suitably trained cover when main supervisor is on leave
Container requests could be improved in terms of accurate name and reasons for request. Sometimes description is too vague or may not match request. I feel there has been some improvement in this more recently.
Better communication with the client and coming up with solutions rather than just offering up blockers when looking to resolve an operational issue or problem.

Photographic evidence of bin deliveries
Street cleansing, it seems something of a dark art, achieving limited public satisfaction
Communication, in particular speed and quality of response
Don't always know until the day of whether a supervisor is off, making it difficult to plan ahead
Not at all times proactively preventing problems
Communications – keeping us up to date without us having to chase them eg incomplete rounds, access issues – need to be more open
Food missed collections – crew members out on their own away from the vehicle. How these misses are resolved long term
Consistency with responding to requests for information. This varies between staff members at Biffa, with some being very responsive and others needed to be followed up for a response
Street cleansing was poor at the start of the year but showed improvement towards the end of the year, this needs to continue to be built on in 2024
Cover at the call centre for sickness and holiday needs review to avoid a backlog

# Annex C - Contractor 360° feedback

## CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCILS ASSESSMENT

Biffa are pleased to note some of the improvements, such as KPT1 a reduction in missed collections from 128 to 104 per 100K.

KPT2 remains consistent.

KPT3 marks the achievement of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> highest recycling rates for English authorities, which is an excellent result.

KPT4 NI195 surveys measuring litter and detritus levels, which are well below target amounts. It is disappointing these strong performances are not reflected within the customer satisfaction survey.

KPT5 incomplete rounds reflect a significant reduction, demonstrating the improved service offered.

KPT6 call centre performance does require improvement.

KPT7 & KPT8, bin delivery performance remains very strong.

KPT9 flytip removal from high intensity areas within 12 hours is good.

KPT10 fly-tip removal from high intensity areas within 24 hours is excellent.

Overall although the classification remains "good", maintaining the score at 3.5 is pleasing and we are working on improving this in 2024.

**ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT**

No disagreement

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

As in previous years, consider further reroutes due to housing growth, when needed to allow for a more efficient, effective and economical service.

Feedback provided by Francis Drew

Date 12.06.2024