

Agenda



Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Jennifer Thompson

Tel: 01491 823619

Fax: 01491 823605

E-mail: jennifer.thompson@southoxon.gov.uk

Date: 15 April 2013

Website: <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk>

A MEETING OF THE

Scrutiny Committee

WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY 23 APRIL 2013 AT 6.00 PM

COUNCIL CHAMBER, SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES

This meeting will be broadcast live on the council's website and the record archived for future viewing. You can view this broadcast and access reports at www.southoxon.gov.uk.

Members of the Committee:

Mrs Eleanor Hards (Chairman)

Ms Joan Bland (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs Celia Collett, MBE

Mr Steve Connel

Mr John Cotton

Ms Kristina Crabbe

Mrs Pat Dawe

Mr Leo Docherty

Mr Will Hall

Mr Paul Harrison

Mr Stephen Harrod

Ms Elizabeth Hodgkin

Mr David Turner

Substitutes

Mr Roger Bell

Mr Felix Bloomfield

Mr David Bretherton

Mr Bernard Cooper

Mr Philip Cross

Mrs Margaret Davies

Mr Mark Gray

Mr Tony Harbour

Mr Marcus Harris

Mr Marc Hiles

Ms Lynn Lloyd

Mrs Ann Midwinter

Ms Anne Purse

Mr Robert Simister

Mrs Jennifer Wood

Miss Rachel Wallis

Mr Michael Welply

If you would like a copy of these papers in large print, Braille or audio cassette or have any other special requirements (such as access facilities) please contact the officer named on this agenda. Please give as much notice as possible before the meeting

1 **Apologies**

2 **Declaration of disclosable pecuniary interest**

3 **Minutes**

Purpose: to approve the minutes of the meeting on 19 February 2013.

The minutes have been previously circulated.

4 **Update on flood prevention work in the district**

Presentation from the shared technical and facilities manager on flood prevention work in the district. There is no report to accompany this item.

Representatives from Thames Water, Oxfordshire County Council highways, Oxfordshire County Council emergency planning, Monson, and the Environment Agency will attend to assist in the presentation and answer questions from the committee.

Specific questions on flood prevention work should be sent to the contact officer by noon on Monday 22 April so that an answer can be given at the meeting.

5 **Performance review of Biffa Municipal Limited** (Pages 3 - 16)

Report of the Head of Corporate Strategy (**attached**).

Purpose: to consider Biffa Municipal Limited's (Biffa) performance in delivering the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012 and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for waste to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

6 **Performance review of Sodexo Ltd (Horticultural Services)** (Pages 17 - 26)

Report of the Head of Corporate Strategy (**attached**).

Purpose: to consider Sodexo Limited's performance in delivering the grounds maintenance services contract for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012 and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for parks to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

MARGARET REED

Head of Legal and Democratic Services

Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of Head of Corporate Strategy

Author: Ian Matten

Tel: 01235 540373

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

South Cabinet Member responsible: David Dodds

Tel: 01844 212891

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

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 23 April 2013

Performance review of Biffa Municipal Limited

Recommendation

That the committee considers Biffa Municipal Limited's (Biffa) performance in delivering the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012 and makes any recommendations to the Cabinet Member for waste to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Purpose of Report

1. The report considers the performance of Biffa in providing the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services in South Oxfordshire for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012.

Strategic Objectives

2. The service contributes to the council's corporate objective of excellent delivery of key services with particular emphasis on achieving excellent levels of recycling, keeping streets and public spaces clean and attractive.

Background

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced (approximately half the revenue budget is spent on seven main contractors), the council cannot deliver high quality services to its residents unless its contractors are performing well. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.

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

Overview of the Review Framework

6. Evaluating contractor performance has four elements:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPTs)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client.
 4. summary of strengths and areas for improvement, plus feedback from the contractor on the overall assessment and the contractor's suggestions of ways in which the council might improve performance.
7. The first three dimensions are assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. The fourth element is a summary of strengths and areas for improvement and includes contractor feedback. Where some dimensions are not relevant or difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. 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.
9. The current value of the contract fixed annual charge is £8,953,000 per annum of which South Oxfordshire's proportion is £4,812,400 per annum. The contract is due to end in June 2017.
10. The contract includes delivery of the following service:
 - weekly collection of household food waste from 23 litre bins
 - fortnightly collection of household recycling from 240 litre wheeled bins or green sacks
 - fortnightly collection of household refuse from 180 litre wheeled bins or pink sacks this is collected on the alternate week to recycling
 - emptying bulk bins for refuse and recycling and food waste bins which service flats and communal properties

- fortnightly collection of household garden waste to residents who have opted into this charged for service. There are approximately 20,600 customers
- collection from 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
- removal of fly-tipping.

Dimension 1 – Key performance targets

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

- KPT 1 - missed collections – number of missed collections per week per 100,000 collections. target - no more than 40
- KPT 2 - rectification of missed collections – percentage of reported missed household collections rectified within 24 hours. target - 100 per cent
- KPT 3 - NI 192 - percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting. target – 52.1 per cent
- KPT 4 - NI 195 - improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus. targets - litter 4 per cent, detritus 7 per cent.

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

KPT 1 – MISSED COLLECTIONS

12. For the purpose of this report performance has been measured against the average number of reported weekly missed collections per 100,000 collections for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012.

13. During this review period the number of missed collections averaged 34 per 100,000 collections, a slight increase from last years figure of 21 per 100,000 collections. This is still below the target of no more than 40 missed collections. The lowest number of missed collections was recorded in April 2012 with an average of 20 per week and the highest was in May with an average of 42 per week.

KPT 2 RECTIFICATION OF MISSED COLLECTIONS

14. This measure is the percentage of reported missed collections rectified within 24 hours of Biffa being informed. During this review period 97.6 per cent of missed collections were rectified within 24 hours of being reported, an improvement on last years figure of 94 per cent.

KPT 3 - NI 192 PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD WASTE SENT FOR RE-USE, RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING

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

- 2011/12 – 51.5 per cent.
- 2012/13 – 52.1 per cent

16. Table one below shows the performance for KPT 3 for the period to which this report relates, 1 January 2012 – 31 December 2012, for information the previous review period figures are also shown.

Table One NI 192 Performance

	Dry recycling (tonnes)	Food waste (tonnes)	Garden waste (tonnes)	Refuse to Landfill (tonnes)	NI192
1 January – 31 December 2011	17,776	5,488	9,650	15,100	68.5%
1 January – 31 December 2012	17,435	5,025	9,622	16,551	65.96%

KPT 4 – NI 195 IMPROVED STREET AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANLINESS – LEVELS OF LITTER AND DETRITUS

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

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

18. As previously mentioned we no longer report on NI 195, however officers have continued to monitor street cleanliness using the same methodology. The scores achieved in this review period were, level of litter 0.4 per cent and level of detritus 10.7 per cent. This is an improvement on last year’s figures of 7.8 per cent for litter and 24.7 per cent for detritus.

19. Based on Biffa’s performance an overall “average” KPT performance rating score of 4.0 has been achieved. An analysis of performance against the KPT’s can be found in Annex A.

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

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

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

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

Dimension 2 – Customer satisfaction

22. Customer satisfaction for this report has been measured by the results of the most recent Citizens Panel dated December 2011. These are the same results that were used in the last performance review of Biffa, however they are sufficiently recent to be considered valid. 973 panel members were invited to participate in this survey, 630 postal and 343 online. In total 560 (58 per cent) responses were received. 58 per cent responding to the postal invite and 57 per cent to the online invite. There is a Citizens panel survey due to be distributed shortly, the overall satisfaction rating is anticipated to be similar

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

- satisfaction with the overall waste collection service
- cleanliness of the area after collections have taken place
- reliability of the waste collection service
- satisfaction with street cleaning.

24. Overall satisfaction with the waste service is very high at 96 per cent. 99 per cent are satisfied with the reliability of the service, 73 per cent are “very satisfied”.

25. Most (88 per cent) are satisfied with the cleanliness of the area and pavements after collections.

26. In terms of street cleansing 82 per cent are satisfied with the cleanliness of the streets and pavements in their local area.

27. Based on Biffa’s performance a combined overall customer satisfaction rating score of 4.16 has been achieved. An analysis of customer satisfaction can be found in Annex B.

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

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

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

Customer satisfaction judgement

Previous customer satisfaction judgement for comparison

Dimension 3 – Council satisfaction

30. 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 strategic director, head of service, shared waste manager and monitoring officers. In total seven questionnaires were sent out and returned.

31. Based on Biffa’s performance an overall council satisfaction rating score of 4.03 has been achieved. There has been a slight drop on last years rating score of 4.30, the main contributing factor for this is some issues around Biffa’s delay in provision of data and information when requested. An analysis of council satisfaction can be found in Annex C.

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

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

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

Council satisfaction judgement

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

Overall assessment

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

Overall assessment

Previous overall assessment for comparison

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

- national winners of LARAC’s most improved recycling award
- the success of the deep cleanse throughout the district
- confirmed by Defra as the second highest recycling authority nationally for 2011/12
- waste team nominated for the national LGC frontline team of the year award
- commenced two new collection streams, white electronic electrical equipment and batteries

Strengths and areas for improvement

36. Annex C records strengths and areas for improvement relating to the performance of the contractor in this review period.
37. Areas for improvement identified in last years review which have improved include the quality of street cleansing, much better communications between the technical officers and Biffa and the feedback we receive from the call centre. Areas that were not addressed fully and remain a weakness are the issues around data provision and some of the back office processes.

Contractor's feedback

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

Financial implications

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

Legal implications

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

Conclusion

41. The last year has been an extremely successful one for the service. South Oxfordshire were second in the national recycling table and we won an award for our recycling rate. We have had good coverage in the local, industry and even national media. The deep cleanse throughout the district has proved a great success confirmed by the number of comments and complements received. Biffa also helped with the flood prevention measures that were taken in the district over the Christmas period. However, there are still some areas for improvement and therefore the head of corporate strategy has assessed Biffa's performance as good for its delivery of the household waste collection, street cleansing and ancillary services contract. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the Cabinet Member for waste to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Background Papers

None

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	missed collections	No more than 40 missed collection per 100,000 collections	Average 34 missed collections	fair	3
KPT 2	rectification of missed collections	100 per cent rectified within 24 hours of contractor being informed	97.6%	good	4
KPT 3	percentage of household waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	52.1%	65.96%	excellent	5
KPT 4	improved street and environmental cleanliness – levels of litter and detritus	4% litter 7% detritus	0.4% 10.7%	good	4
Overall “average” KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average) refers to point 19 in the report					4.0
Overall “average” KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					Good

Annex B – Customer satisfaction

In total, 560 members of the Citizens' Panel responded to questions about the waste contract. The questionnaire was sent to 973 people in total giving a response rate of 58 per cent.

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

Rating	Number of residents	Weighting	Total weighted for residents
Very satisfied	329	X 5	1645
Fairly satisfied	211	X 4	844
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	n/a	X3	n/a
Not very satisfied	13	X 2	26
Not at all satisfied	7	X 1	7
Total	560		2522

Waste collection service - resident satisfaction calculation: $2522 \div 560 = 4.50$

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

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

Comments from residents:

96% are satisfied with overall waste collection service.

99% are satisfied with the reliability of the waste collection service.

88% are satisfied with the cleanliness of the area/pavements after the waste has been collected.

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 residents	Weighting	Total weighted for residents
Very satisfied	121	X 5	605
Fairly satisfied	335	X 4	1340
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	n/a	X 3	n/a
Not very satisfied	85	X 2	170
Not at all satisfied	17	X 1	17
Total	558		2132

Standard of cleanliness - resident satisfaction calculation: $2132 \div 558 = 3.82$

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

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

Comments from residents:

82% are satisfied with the cleanliness of the streets and pavements in their local area.

87% feel their local area is cleaner than or as clean as other towns and villages.

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

Residents total weighted scores ÷ number of residents

(2522 + 2132) ÷ (560 + 558) = 4.16 (refers to point 27 in the report)

Annex C - Council satisfaction

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

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

Contractor / supplier / partner name

From (date) To

SERVICE DELIVERY

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

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

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

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

Rating	Votes	Weighting	Total weighted
very satisfied	33	X 5	165
satisfied	55	X 4	220
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	12	X 3	36
dissatisfied	9	X 2	18
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	109		439

The overall council satisfaction is calculated as follows: $439 \div 109 = 4.03$ (refers to point 31 in the report)

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths	good at responding to problems
	easy to contact and deal with
	emptying the bins resolving issues when raised
	partnership working
	improvements in joint visit requests for problem solving
	responsive to requests for additional services such as flooding and garden waste work
	the contract team and their approachability

Areas for improvement	getting things right the first time
	managing job requests
	delivering targeted / specific promotional campaigns
	data collection and providing data to the council

Agenda Item 5

keeping the Technology working to its full potential
need to be more pro active with feeding information on operational issues such as Health and Safety information requests
need additional supervisory cover and admin support for back office work
customer care at certain times
delivering targeted communications

Annex D - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

Although the overall report is positive, we are disappointed that in the Council Satisfaction Survey, there were a number of solitary dissatisfied's, we need to identify where these failures have occurred and rectify. Everyone should be congratulated on the recycling performance. Street Cleansing is still an area we are looking to continue the improvements made. The past year has been challenging with the very wet conditions in rural areas.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

Although it probably has more to do with the way the formula dictates, we do not agree with 34 missed collections out of 100,000 can be described as only 'Fair'. 40 missed collections per 100k is a very challenging target and to get even near this level for any other contract would be deemed excellent. This actually equates to 99.97% of collections being completed.

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

It is difficult to find areas that can be specifically attributed to the Council where they can improve to facilitate us performing better. We work very closely together towards a common goal.

Feedback provided by

Date

Scrutiny Committee Report

Report of Head of Corporate Strategy

Author: Ian Matten

Tel: 01235 540373

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

South Cabinet Member responsible: David Dodds

Tel: 01844 212891

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

To: SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 23 April 2013

Performance review of Sodexo Ltd (Horticultural Services)

Recommendation

That the committee considers Sodexo Limited's performance in delivering the grounds maintenance services contract for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012 and makes any recommendations to the Cabinet Member for parks to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Purpose of Report

1. The report considers the performance of Sodexo in providing grounds maintenance services in South Oxfordshire for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012.

Strategic Objectives

2. The service contributes to the council's corporate objective of excellent delivery of key services with particular emphasis on delivering high performance services, keeping public spaces clean and attractive and ensuring good quality sport and leisure provision.

Background

3. Managing contractor performance is essential for delivering the council's objectives and targets. Since a high proportion of the council's services are outsourced (approximately half the revenue budget is spent on seven main contractors), the council cannot deliver high quality services to its residents unless its contractors are performing well. Working jointly with contractors to review performance regularly is therefore essential.

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

Overview of the Review Framework

6. Evaluating contractor performance has four elements:
 1. performance measured against key performance targets (KPTs)
 2. customer satisfaction with the total service experience
 3. council satisfaction as client
 4. summary of strengths and areas for improvement, plus feedback from the contractor on the overall assessment and the contractor's suggestions of ways in which the council might improve performance.
7. The first three dimensions are assessed and the head of service makes a judgement of classification. The fourth element is a summary of strengths and areas for improvement and includes contractor feedback. Where some dimensions are not relevant or are difficult to apply fairly to certain types of contract, the framework may be adjusted or simplified at the discretion of the head of service.
8. Sodexo were awarded a joint contract for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse district councils for the supply of grounds maintenance in October 2011 with a commencement date of January 2012.
9. The current value of the contract, as a fixed annual charge is £406,500 per annum of which South Oxfordshire's proportion is £67,800 per annum, a saving of £107,000 per annum on the previous contract. The contract is due to end in December 2016, with an option to extend for a further three years, subject to satisfactory performance.
10. The South Oxfordshire's elements of the contract includes delivery of the following service:
 - grass cutting
 - maintenance of shrub beds
 - maintenance of hedges
 - maintenance of play areas

- litter clearance
- vegetation control of hard surfaces
- minor tree works
- burials at Wallingford and Kidmore End cemeteries.

Dimension 1 – Key performance targets

11. KPT's are recognised as an important element of monitoring the contractor's performance, in this first year we have used KPT 1 and KPT 2 as set out below as a measure of Sodexo's performance. We have agreed with Sodexo additional measurable KPT's which will be used in future years.

- KPT 1 – quality inspection– the average percentage quality rating of randomly selected play areas. Target - 85 per cent
- KPT 2 - quality inspection – the average percentage quality rating of randomly selected parks and open spaces. Target - 85 per cent.

12. The additional KPT's to be used in future are:

- percentage of substantiated complaints received which are resolved within agreed time scales: target – 90 per cent
- overall customer satisfaction rating for the grounds maintenance service: target – 85 per cent
- percentage of actions, identified as part of health and safety audit inspections, which are rectified within agreed time scales: target - 95 per cent
- percentage of additional work orders issued that are completed within agreed time scales: target - 80 per cent.

KPT 1 – QUALITY INSPECTIONS – PLAY AREAS

13. This key performance target is measured by monthly joint inspections by the client and Sodexo of randomly selected sites. As well as an overall assessment, providing a general impression of the quality of the service being achieved, each service activity for the particular site is subject to a more detailed assessment and given a score out of ten. The total of all scores for the site are then shown as a percentage, for the purposes of this review the average for the year is then calculated.

14. During this review period the average percentage rate of randomly selected play areas was 82.2 per cent. This is slightly below the target of 85 per cent. Where a particularly low score is achieved then the contractor is issued with a Notification Notice and given a period of time to bring the site up to the required standard. The site is then jointly re-inspected after the agreed time scale has elapsed.

KPT 2 QUALITY INSPECTIONS – PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

15. This key performance target is also measured by monthly joint inspections by the client and contractor of randomly selected sites. As well as an overall assessment, providing a general impression of the quality of the service being achieved, each service activity for the particular site is subject to a more detailed assessment and given a score out of ten. The total of all scores for the site are then shown as a percentage. For the purposes of this review the average for the year is then calculated.
16. During this review period the average percentage rate of randomly selected parks and open spaces was 80 per cent. This is below the target of 85 per cent. Where a particularly low score is achieved then the contractor is issued with a Notification Notice and given a period of time to bring the site up to the required standard. The site is then jointly re-inspected after the agreed time scale has elapsed.
17. Based on Sodexo’s performance an overall “average” KPT performance rating score of 3.50 has been achieved. An analysis of performance against the KPT’s can be found in Annex A.
18. For reasons of consistency and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of Sodexo against all KPT’s:

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

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

KPT judgement

Previous KPT judgement for comparison

Dimension 2 – Customer satisfaction

20. As this is the first year of the contract and due to the exceptional weather conditions experienced throughout the year it was not considered appropriate to undertake a Customer satisfaction survey this year. Under normal circumstances a face to face survey is carried out in August at some of the council’s parks, open spaces and play areas.
21. Sodexo will be undertaking customer satisfaction surveys in the future and the main areas of questioning regarding satisfaction with the grounds maintenance service will be:
 - satisfaction with the overall grounds maintenance service
 - satisfaction with the different elements of the grounds maintenance service
 - staff attitude and responsiveness
 - does the service meet the needs of the residents.

22. There was a large volume of calls received over the summer period as a result of the weather conditions. The adverse weather had a major impact on Soedexo’s ability to cut grass and the standards they were able to achieve. Despite the conditions there were no official complaints logged as part of the council’s complaints procedure.
23. As no customer satisfaction survey was undertaken this year the head of service has been unable to make a judgement on this dimension.

Dimension 3 – Council satisfaction

24. 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 shared parks manager, parks officers and monitoring officer. In total five questionnaires were sent out and returned.
25. Based on sodexo’s performance an overall council satisfaction rating score of 3.50 has been achieved. An analysis of council satisfaction can be found in Annex B.
26. For reasons of consistency with previous assessments, and for fairness between contractors, the following is a rough guide to the assessment of Sodexo on council satisfaction:

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

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

Council satisfaction judgement

Previous council satisfaction judgement for comparison

Overall assessment

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

Overall assessment

Previous overall assessment for comparison

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

- this contract is being delivered at a much lower cost than the previous one

- Sodexo won the “employer of the year 2012” award presented by the British Association Landscape Industries.

Strengths and areas for improvement

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

Contractors feedback

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

Financial implications

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

Legal implications

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

Conclusion

34. This first year of the contract has been very difficult for Sodexo because of the extreme weather conditions which have had a major impact on this service. There were very few weeks when the service was not disrupted because of wet weather, and this was so prolonged it was difficult for them to catch up missed days and provide the service expected of them. The impact of the weather conditions meant we had to work closely with Sodexo to identify changing priorities and allocate the work force accordingly. These disruptions to service have made it more difficult to accurately assess their performance and their resourcing levels in this first year, compared to a normal season.

35. There are a number of areas for improvement and therefore the head of corporate strategy has assessed Sodexo’s performance as fair in delivering the grounds maintenance service. The committee is asked to make any recommendations to the Cabinet Member for parks to enable him to make a final assessment on performance.

Background Papers

None

Annex A – Key performance targets

KPT ref	Description of KPT	Target	Performance	Individual KPT rating (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)	KPT rating score (excellent = 5, good = 4, fair = 3, weak = 2, poor = 1)
KPT 1	average percentage quality rating of randomly selected play areas.	85 %	82.2 %	good	4
KPT 2	average percentage quality rating of randomly selected parks and open spaces	85%	80%	fair	3
Overall “average” KPT performance rating score (arithmetic average) refers to point 17 in the report					3.50
Overall “average” KPT performance (excellent, good, fair, weak or poor)					good

Annex B - Council satisfaction

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

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

Contractor / supplier / partner name Sodexo Limited (Horticultural Services)

From (date) 1 January 2012 To 31 December 2012

SERVICE DELIVERY

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

COMMUNICATIONS AND RELATIONS

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

IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

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

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

Rating	Votes	Weighting	Total weighted
very satisfied	7	X 5	35
satisfied	36	X 4	144
neither satisfied or dissatisfied	29	X 3	87
dissatisfied	9	X 2	18
very dissatisfied	0	X 1	0
Total	81		284

The overall council satisfaction is calculated as follows: $284 \div 81 = 3.50$ (refers to point 25 in the report).

STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Strengths	the local core staff who know the sites and have worked on the councils areas for many years
	easy to contact and deal with
	willingness to make the contract a success
	partnership working
	responsive to requests for additional services such as flooding and snow clearance
	the team and their approachability
	training programme introduced for new and existing staff, including the apprenticeship scheme
Areas for improvement	implementing the technology identified at tender submission to assist in self monitoring and supervision
	needs additional supervisory staff to monitor day to day work
	additional resources and equipment to deal with peak periods of work
	improve daily communications to enable more effective contract monitoring
	provide more qualified and experienced staff for the skilled elements of the contract
	establish improved procedures and quality of paperwork supplied

Annex C - Contractor 360° feedback

CONTRACTOR'S REACTION / FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

Sodexo believe the performance assessment to be fair, and representative based on Year 1 of the contract during a year of extraordinary weather. Sodexo will continue to work in partnership to improve performance against all KPT's in 2013.

The areas cited for improvement are currently under review and discussions have taken place with the council.

ANY AREAS WHERE CONTRACTOR DISAGREES WITH ASSESSMENT

None

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

Sodexo have asked to review certain areas of the contract operations to enable a more efficient delivery of service. Litter collection, play inspections and grass cutting routes are being reviewed.

Feedback provided by

Date