Need Further Information?

For further information on the contents of this performance booklet please contact Guy Holloway on 01536 534 243.

Members of the Monitoring & Audit Committee:

If you want to go into further detail on any of the areas contained within the performance booklet at the Monitoring and Audit Committee, please contact either Ian White on 01536 534 200 or Anne Ireson on 01536 534 398 no less than 3 working days in advance of the meeting.
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Financial Information

For the latest Financial Information please refer to the Executive Report dated 10th April 2013, entitled ‘Durable Budget Report 2013/14’.

The report can be found online at www.kettering.gov.uk
## Performance Update

### Managing Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI Ref.</th>
<th>Description of PI</th>
<th>11/12 Outturn</th>
<th>Top Quartile</th>
<th>February 2011/12</th>
<th>February 2012/13</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>2012/13 Profiled Target</th>
<th>2012/13 Target</th>
<th>2013/14 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI 154</td>
<td>Net additional homes provided</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ANNUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 155</td>
<td>Number of affordable homes delivered</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38 (Dec)</td>
<td>128 (Dec)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 157a</td>
<td>Planning major applications processed in 13 weeks</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>89.00%</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
<td>12/23</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 157b</td>
<td>Planning minor applications processed in 8 weeks</td>
<td>79.67%</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
<td>88.04%</td>
<td>63.70%</td>
<td>86/135</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 157c</td>
<td>Planning other applications processed in 8 weeks</td>
<td>84.77%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
<td>88.77%</td>
<td>80.59%</td>
<td>299/371</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI 204</td>
<td>% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficient and Effective Service Delivery

| MPI 25  | Percentage of calls answered by switchboard                     | 95.30%        | N/A          | 92.60%           | 93%             |        | 95%                    | 97.5%         |               |
| MPI 26  | Percentage of calls answered within 15 seconds by switchboard   | 86.30%        | N/A          | 90.20%           | 86.60%          |        | 91%                    | N/A           |               |
| LPI 78a | Average time to process new benefits claims (days)              | 16.50         | 21.2         | 16.70            | 19.32           | 77085/3990| 18.00                  | 14.00         |               |
| LPI 78b | Average time to process change in circumstances (days)          | 6.50          | 7            | 5.00             | 8.33            | 204558/24557| 6.00                   | 5.00          |               |

### Enhanced Local Government

| MPI 8   | % Invoices paid on time                                        | 100.00%       | 97.01%       | 99.20%           | 98.8%           |        | 99%                    | 199%          |               |
| LPI 9   | % Council Tax collected                                       | 98.25%        | 98.5%        | 97.35%           | 97.50%          |        | 97.00%                 | 98.00%        | 98.00%        |
| LPI 10  | % NNDR collected                                               | 99.10%        | 99.36%       | 97.70%           | 97.83%          |        | 97.00%                 | 98.50%        |               |
| LPI 12  | Day staffing lost (per member of staff)                       | 7.81          | 8.33         | 6.88             | 8.21            |        | 7.33                   | 8             |               |
| LPI 66a | Proportion of rent collected                                   | 99.13%        | 98.63%       | 98.08%           | 98.27%          |        | 98.75%                 | 98.70%        |               |
| LPI 79b(i) | Overpaid benefit recovered as % of current year overpayments | 70.00%        | 82.4%        | 66.88%           | 67.80%          |        | 76.00%                 | 70.00%        | 78.00%        |
| LPI 79b(ii) | Overpaid benefit recovered as % of total overpayments outstanding | 35.00%        | 36.8%        | 27.52%           | 39.07%          |        | 38.00%                 | 30.00%        | 40.00%        |

### Greener environment

| NI 192  | % of household waste recycled and composted                   | 46.80%        | 43.18%       | 47.07%           | 47.20%          |        | 43.00%                 | 43.00%        |               |

### Cleaner environment

| NI 195a | % of land / highways that have below acceptable levels of litter | 7.0%          | 3.0%         | 5.0%             | 0.5% (Nov)      |        | 9.00%                  | 9.00%         |               |
| NI 195b | % of land / highways that have below acceptable levels of detritus | 10.7%         | 6.0%         | 5.0%             | 0.5% (Nov)      |        | 15.00%                 | 15.00%        |               |
| NI 195c | % of land / highways that have below acceptable levels of graffiti | 0.0%          | 1.0%         | 0%               | 0% (Nov)        |        | 5.00%                  | 5.00%         |               |
| NI 195d | % of land / highways that have below acceptable levels of fly-posting | 2.0%          | 0%           | 1%               | 0% (Nov)        |        | 1.00%                  | 1.00%         |               |
| LPI 42  | The average time taken to remove fly-tips (days)              | 0.75          | N/A          | 0.69             | 1.30            |        | 1.00                   | 1.00          |               |

### NOTES

- These indicators do not have profiled targets or volume information provided.
- Descriptions of the figures listed in the ‘Volume’ column have been added to the Questions and Amendment log.
- Please note due to the lead times for committee information the data may not be the latest available.

### KEY

- Target met or bettered
- Target missed
- Close to target or cannot compare to target

---

**Planning other applications processesd in 8 weeks**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

**Planning major applications processed in 13 weeks**

% of cases answered by switchboard within 15 seconds

**Planning minor applications processed in 8 weeks**

% of cases answered by switchboard within 15 seconds

**Net additional homes provided**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

**Number of affordable homes delivered**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

**Efficient and Effective Service Delivery**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

**Percentage of calls answered by switchboard**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

**Percentage of calls answered within 15 seconds by switchboard**

% of appeals against authority's decision to refuse planning applications

---

**LPI 42**

The average time taken to remove fly-tips (days)

---

**LPI 12**

Days staffing lost (per member of staff)

---

**LPI 66a**

Proportion of rent collected

---

**LPI 79b(i)**

Overpaid benefit recovered as % of current year overpayments

---

**LPI 79b(ii)**

Overpaid benefit recovered as % of total overpayments outstanding
Housing Rent Arrears Graphs

Headline Arrears Performance: 2012 /13

Lower Quartile - £314,500 -

Lower Median Quartile

Median Quartile - £198,780 - 98.11%

Upper Median Quartile

Top Quartile - £125,000 - 98.87%
9 Week Moving Average

Start of Year 2002 - £554,101
End of Year 2002 - £472,080
End of Year 2003 - £390,661
End of Year 2004 - £316,918
End of Year 2005 - £294,008
End of Year 2006 - £266,519
End of Year 2007 - £291,600
End of Year 2008 - £236,836
End of Year 2009 - £207,405
End of Year 2010 - £171,935
End of Year 2011 - £161,450

End of Year 2007 - £291,600
End of Year 2008 - £236,836
End of Year 2009 - £207,405
End of Year 2010 - £171,935
End of Year 2011 - £161,450

Start of Year 2002 - £554,101
Actual Amount £227,254
9wk moving average £227,154
Comparison of Sickness/Absence
Number of days lost each month - 11/12 & 12/13

Comparison of Sickness/Absence
2011/12 & 2012/13
Compliments and Complaints

Customer Complaints by Service Area - year to date

- Strategic Management Team: 2 complaints
- Finance and Corporate Development: 0 complaints
- Human Resources: 0 complaints
- Community Services: 0 complaints
- Environmental Health: 10 complaints
- Democratic & Legal Services: 2 complaints
- Development Services: 13 complaints
- Customer Services & Information: 0 complaints
- Housing Services: 14 complaints
- Environmental Care Services: 6 complaints
- Income & Debt Management: 5 complaints

Customer Complaints by Category - year to date

- Partner Issue: 2% of complaints
- Service Requests/Suggestions: 14% of complaints
- Information Requests: 0% of complaints
- Community Safety/Environmental Issues: 0% of complaints
- Process Failures/Service Failures: 0% of complaints
- Lack of Facilities/Services: 84% of complaints
The following sanctions have been recorded for 2012/13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Prosecution by KBC</th>
<th>Prosecution by DWP</th>
<th>Caution</th>
<th>Ad-Pen Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£2,047.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£1,597.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£1,403.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>£2,898.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>£7,945.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An administrative penalty (Ad-Pen) is a financial penalty which can be offered as an alternative to a prosecution when there has been no previous sanction of any form.
### Risk rankings definition

There are four categories by which we classify our recommendations. They are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk ranking</th>
<th>Assessment rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>The system has been subject to high levels of risk that have, or could, prevent the system from meeting its objectives, and which may also impact on the delivery of one or more of the organisation's strategic objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>The system has been subject to high levels of risk that have, or could, prevent the system from meeting its objectives, but which are unlikely to impact on any of the organisation's strategic objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>The system has been subject to medium levels of risk that have, or could, impair the system from meeting its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>The system has been subject to low levels of risk that have, or could, reduce its operational effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assurance Levels

There are five categories by which we classify our overall assurance levels. They are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assurance Level</th>
<th>Assessment rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>The audit did not highlight any weaknesses that would impact on the achievement of the system’s key objectives. It has therefore been concluded that key controls have been adequately designed and are operating effectively to deliver the key objectives of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>The audit did not highlight any weaknesses that would materially impact on the achievement of the system's key objectives. The audit did find some low impact control weaknesses which, if addressed, would improve the overall performance of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The audit did not highlight any weaknesses that would in overall terms impact on the achievement of the system’s key objectives. However, the audit did identify some control weaknesses that have impacted on the delivery of certain system objectives. Action is required to improve controls for these specific system objectives to a level that will enable management to fully rely on all elements of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>The audit highlighted some weaknesses in the design or operation of controls that have had a significant impact on the delivery of key system objectives, but which are unlikely to seriously impact on the delivery of the organisation's strategic objectives. Action is required to improve controls so that management can rely on the system to deliver its key objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>The audit highlighted weaknesses in the design or operation of controls that have not only had a significant impact on the delivery of key system objectives, but which could also impact on the delivery of the organisation's strategic objectives. Urgent action is required to ensure that the system meets its objectives and that the organisation’s strategic objectives are protected from failure to achieve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNAL AUDIT REPORTS
Summary of Reports Published since previous Monitoring & Audit Committee

Fixed Assets – overall level of assurance FULL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key control objectives</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Number of recommendations raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to date central register maintained of all assets owned by the authority, in accordance with current financial rules, which is periodically reconciled with independent records/feeder systems.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset verification exercises are undertaken on a periodic basis.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuations are in accordance with CIPFA guidance and valuation programme is promptly updated to include all additions/disposals.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an annual impairment review of tangible and intangible fixed assets.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation is calculated accurately, in accordance with current SORP. Reconciliation of movement in depreciation from prior year to movement in fixed asset balance.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recommendations raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Audit assurance opinion of individual key control objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key control objectives</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Number of recommendations raised</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written policies and procedures covering all processes in place and accessible to staff.</td>
<td><strong>Full</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to creditor/supplier information are authorised, processed promptly and checked. Changes/additions to bank details are reviewed prior to a payment run.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic reconciliations of the creditors system to the general ledger are completed and reviewed.</td>
<td><strong>Full</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All goods/services are requested via an official order (unless specifically exempted) and comply with procurement policies. Expenditure is authorised and committed within system at the time the order is raised and all invoices received are matched to orders and delivery notes and any variances are authorised.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit notes are promptly actioned and where the supplier is no longer used a refund is requested.</td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All payments made are valid, authorised, accurate and timely.</td>
<td><strong>Full</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular payment information is reported to and reviewed by management and committee.</td>
<td><strong>Full</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total recommendations raised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Level Financial Controls (to support AGS) – overall level of assurance SIGNIFICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Level Controls</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accounting &amp; Budgetary Control</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Management</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt, Handling &amp; Banking of Remittances</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Debtors</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Controls – General Ledger &amp; Payroll.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recommendations raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Audit assurance opinion of individual key control objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key control objectives</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Number of recommendations raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A managed process is developed and maintained for business continuity throughout the organisation that includes appropriate information security requirements and which complies with relevant quality standards.</td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events that can cause interruptions to business processes have been identified, along with the probability and impact of such interruptions and their consequences for information security.</td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation has documented continuity plans developed and implemented to maintain or restore operations and ensure availability of information at the required level and in the required timescales following interruption to or failure of critical business processes.</td>
<td><strong>Limited</strong></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business continuity plans are tested and updated regularly to ensure that they are up to date and effective.</td>
<td><strong>Limited</strong></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint delivery of business continuity plans with other local authorities is appropriately defined and managed</td>
<td><strong>Full</strong></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recommendations raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 6 6 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Quality & Performance Information – overall level of assurance SIGNIFICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key control objectives</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Number of recommendations raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council has a data quality and performance information policy and procedures which define the data requirements.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall responsibility for data quality and performance information has been allocated to a senior manager and each service area also has a named individual.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A timetable is in place for submission of performance information and all relevant staff are aware of this.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate information is retained to provide a complete audit trail for all figures submitted.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance information is checked for accuracy prior to submission.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recommendations raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Audit assurance opinion of individual key control objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key control objectives</th>
<th>Assurance level</th>
<th>Number of recommendations raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are up to date approved policies, procedures and methodologies in place for managing projects.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All projects are documented and managed using the appropriate framework.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registers of projects are maintained.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring arrangements are in place during the project, including a post project review on completion.</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total recommendations raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROGRESS AGAINST INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN AS AT 31st March 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of audit</th>
<th>Days planned</th>
<th>Actual to date</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE FINANCIAL SYSTEMS</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital accounting and fixed assets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNDR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit &amp; Council Tax Benefit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry debtors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORPORATE REVIEWS</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership arrangements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level Controls to support AGS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Fraud &amp; Corruption Arrangements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business continuity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality and performance information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER SYSTEMS REVIEWS</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building control - fees, enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking &amp; enforcement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - Choice Based Lettings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - planned and responsive maintenance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Fieldwork complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - services for the elderly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined with Housing repairs to provide more time for testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of audit</td>
<td>Days planned</td>
<td>Actual to date</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER AUDIT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer audit needs assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer audit coverage (tbc)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwork Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT AUDIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferred to follow up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVE DEMAND LED ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation tracking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Fieldwork complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DAYS</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions raised at Committee on 10th June 2009:

With reference to NI 195, what is the difference between litter and detritus?

**Litter**
There is no statutory definition of litter. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 (s.87) states that litter is ‘anything that is dropped, thrown, left or deposited that causes defacement, in a public place’. This accords with the popular interpretation that ‘litter is waste in the wrong place’.

However, local authority cleansing officers and their contractors have developed a common understanding of the term and the definition used for NI 195 (and for the LEQSE) is based on this industry norm.

Litter includes mainly synthetic materials, often associated with smoking, eating and drinking, that are *improperly* discarded and left by members of the public; or are spilt during waste management operations.

**Detritus**
There is no statutory definition of detritus, however, local authority cleansing officers and their contractors have developed a common understanding of the term and the definition used for the NI 195 (and for the LEQSE) is based on this industry norm.

Detritus comprises dust, mud, soil, grit, gravel, stones, rotted leaf and vegetable residues, and fragments of twigs, glass, plastic and other finely divided materials.

Detritus includes leaf and blossom falls when they have substantially lost their structure and have become mushy or fragmented.

**For Council tax and NNDR collection can we provide information to show whether we will achieve the year end target?**
For both LPI 9 and LPI 10 a profile target is now included in the performance report to show whether performance is on target each month. This is to help indicate performance for the year. For example if we are achieving the monthly profiled target then the year end target will be achieved.

Questions raised at Committee on 28th September 2010

Why are lower percentages better for NI 195a-d?

There had been some confusion around NI 195a-d and why lower percentages are better. The indicators highlight the % of land/highways that have levels of litter / detritus / graffiti / flyposting that are unacceptable, meaning that a lower figure represents cleaner streets, which of course is more desirable.
Questions Log

Questions raised at Committee on 28th September 2010

Can in year figures for annual housing completions be included?

In year figures have been included in the Development Services Performance Information taken from the most recent Performance Clinic. This allows members to get a more contemporary position of performance.

Can a year end estimate for the number of affordable homes be included?

Year end estimates for the number of affordable homes expected in the year have also been included.

Can we provide more contemporary comparative data to provide a better idea as to how the benefits service performance compares with others and also find out the impact the current climate is having on claims?

Head of Income and Debt will attend the next meeting in November to provide an update on performance.
Performance Update

The following indicators have been removed from the performance report as they are no longer collected:

LPI 79a - % Benefits cases processed correctly
LPI 71a - The proportion of people paying Council tax by direct debit
LPI 71b - The proportion of people paying NNDR by direct debit
LPI 2a - Equality Standard for Local Government
NI 179 - Value for money - total efficiency gains for the year
NI 185 - % year on year reduction of CO₂ from Local Authority operations
NI 188 - Adapting to climate change

Staff Sickness Summary: Issue 46 - June 2012

Following a request at the previous Monitoring & Audit Committee the ‘LPI 12 - FTE Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence’ and the ‘FTE Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence - %age split between medically & self certificated’ graphs have been removed.’

Fraud Prosecutions and Sanctions: Issue 50 - April 2013

Fraud Prosecutions and Sanctions has been added to this and future booklets, for member information.