

By: Nick Chard, Cabinet Member, Environment, Highways & Waste
Mike Austerberry, Executive Director, Environment, Highways & Waste

To: Environment, Highways & Waste Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee
18th January 2011

Subject: Core Monitoring Report

Classification: Unrestricted

SUMMARY: This second Core Monitoring report covering the period up to the end of September 2010 is presented, providing performance information and trends in a number of key service areas together with a commentary by the Executive Director.

1. Introduction

1.1. The second Core Monitoring report, updated to include information for the period up to the end of September 2010, was reported to Cabinet on 29 November 2010. It also incorporates information drawn from the mid-year update of the individual Service Unit Business Plans.

1.2. The September 2010 Core Monitoring report includes all of the indicators that were in the June 2010 report, which was considered by this Committee at its meeting on 14th September. The format and presentation of the information has been modified somewhat with the objective of making it clearer and more concise, and now includes data tables and some additional comparative information.

1.3. As with the first Core Monitoring report the objective is to pick out a number of key areas of activity Member's attention rather than seeking to provide information about and comments on all of the performance information that is used within the Directorate.

2. Core Monitoring

2.1. Page 4 in the Core Monitoring report sets out the approach adopted for the Red/Amber/Green (RAG) and Direction of Travel (DoT) assessments. Pages 5 to 13 examine a number of cross-KCC indicators including complaints monitoring, where Members will note around half of all the complaints received by KCC are related to KHS. The fact that the number of complaints has increased significantly compared to the same period in 2009 is unsurprising given the fact that firstly the total number of enquiries has risen significantly, largely due to the severe weather of early 2010 which caused substantial damage to the network, and secondly there has been a conscious effort by KCC to encourage complaints as a means of improving services. We are obviously concerned about the impact that the current period of sustained bad weather, the worst that the UK has experienced for this time of the year for three decades, will have on the transport network. Any serious damage to the infrastructure would inevitably be reflected

in measures such as journey time, increased routine highway maintenance demands, and pothole repairs.

2.2. In the case of 'year to date' information there is a degree of overlap between the most recent data in the graphs. So, for example, in the case of *kilograms of waste per head of population* the year ending March 2010 covers the period April 2009 – March 2010, while the year ending June 2010 is for the period July 2009 – June 2010 and that for the year ending September 2010 for the period October 2009 – September 2010. The information presented for earlier periods (the years ending March 2008, 2009 and 2010) are discrete, and non-overlapping, time periods.

2.3. The average am peak journey time in Maidstone is currently calculated on a quarterly basis which both masks short-term variations and has a clear seasonal pattern. The way this is reported is currently being reviewed in order to provide a better insight on performance.

3. Data Quality and Interpretation

3.1. Most of the data included in the Core Monitoring forms part of the management information that is used, in a variety of forms, by managers and leadership teams within the Directorate. In some cases the data used is provisional and it may be subject to revision at a future date, but provisional data is only used where we believe future revisions will be relatively minor and will not make any conclusions drawn unrealistic or invalid.

3.2. Data Quality was the subject of a review by audit during 2010 and while the report is still in draft form the conclusions that have been drawn are that key controls are in place and are effectively applied, data is sound, and risks are low.

3.3. Where comparative or national data is used as a comparison it is extracted from published information that is already in the public domain. Sources of this information include government departments, national indicators and the Office for National Statistics (ONS).

4. Future Reporting

4.1. The Core Monitoring report is part of our overall transparency agenda and it is important that it is both clear and comprehensible. We would therefore welcome any suggestions that would make it more useful and informative.

4.2. The information set out in the Core Monitoring will change over time. On 16 December the County Council approved Bold Steps for Kent, and as the actions necessary to deliver this are developed they may well be included in future Core Monitoring reports.

5. Recommendation

5.1. Members are asked to NOTE and DISCUSS the September 2010 Core Monitoring report for Environment, Highways & Waste and make any suggestions, amendments or recommendations they feel appropriate.

Contact Officers:

Name: *Richard Fitzgerald (Chief Executive's)*
Telephone Number: *01622 22(1985)*
e-mail address: richard.fitzgerald@kent.gov.uk

Name: *Niel Caddick (Environment, Highways & Waste)*
Telephone Number: *01622 69(4254)*
e-mail address: niel.caddick@kent.gov.uk

Background papers:

Core Monitoring report presented to Cabinet 29 November 2010

[http://democracy.kent.gov.uk/Published/C00000115/M00003027/AI00015159/\\$Item8AppendixCoreMonitoring.docA.ps.pdf](http://democracy.kent.gov.uk/Published/C00000115/M00003027/AI00015159/$Item8AppendixCoreMonitoring.docA.ps.pdf)