

<b>Committee:</b>	Cabinet	<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2025
<b>Title:</b>	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2024/25 Q3 Performance Update		
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
<b>Report Author:</b>	Angela Knight, Director of Business Performance and People aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk Paula Evans, Head of Contract, Performance & Risk pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk	<b>Key decision:</b>	N

---

## Summary

1. This report presents members with 2024/25 Q3 (October-December) performance data outturns and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).
2. The CCIs were identified and established in the 2023/24 performance reporting year with a key objective of enabling the Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Members to focus on priority areas of performance across the council.
3. As agreed by both CMT and Members, retrospective benchmarking (previous quarter outturns) has been completed and is presented as a separate analysis exercise. Therefore, for this report benchmarking outturns for Q2 2024/25 have been used.
4. Performance trends have been highlighted and analysed to identify where improvement may be needed particularly when comparing against other 'statistical nearest neighbour' authorities.

## Recommendations

5. None. The report is for information only.

## Financial Implications

6. There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

## Background Papers

7. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report:

None.

## Impact

8.

Communication/Consultation	Reviewed by Corporate Management Team (CMT) and Informal Cabinet Board (ICB)
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

## Corporate Core Indicators

9. The Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) have been introduced to provide performance information on key service provision areas across the authority. They are grouped under the following themes to provide specific performance focus:

- Organisation/Governance
- Cost of Living Crisis
- Health & Safety
- Finance & Income
- Environment/Communities & Development

10. There are two CCIs that to date, have not had outturns submitted:

- **CCI 07 – Contract Management**  
Indicator(s) will be proposed for reporting during the 2025/26 performance year to support the council's revised and evolving contract management process. The aim of the indicator(s) will be to provide transparency and compliance for key performance requirements of the council's contract management processes.
- **CCI 08 – Resident Satisfaction**  
As agreed previously by both CMT and Cabinet, this indicator will be reported on an annual basis using data from an independent survey to all Uttlesford residents. Results of the survey will be reported as part of the Q4 2024/25 CCI report suite.










11. Of the 30 indicators identified, a total of 28 have outturn data and supporting performance notes entered against them. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data; this is set out in detail at Appendix A.

12. When reviewing the indicators, the following should be noted:

- Indicators ending with (max) means a **higher** outturn is good performance
- Indicators ending with (min) means a **lower** outturn is a good performance




13. As detailed in the tables below overall, the statuses of the indicators have worsened compared with the previous quarter (Q2 2024/25) outturns.
14. Further analysis of the indicators where both short and long trend information is available, shows the following for Q3;

Table 1: Q3 Corporate core indicators status and trend results

Status	Q2	Q3	Short Trend			Long Trend		
	17	13		11	39%		13	50%
	5	8		10	36%		11	43%
	6	7		5	18%		2	7%
See note below*	-	-	-	2	7%	-	2	0%
	28	28		28	100%		28	100%

\* Two indicators, one for asbestos management CCI 15 and one for water testing CCI 16 have been amended/updated for Q3 to better present the performance within these areas. Historical data is therefore not yet available.

Table 2: Trend arrow definitions

Trend Arrows	Definition	Description
	Improving	If the Value is <b>better</b> than the calculated average, the Trend arrow will point upwards.
	Worsening	If the Value is <b>worse</b> than the calculated average, the Trend arrow will point downwards.
	No Change	If the Value is <b>the same</b> as the calculated average, the Trend arrow will be replaced with a dash.
<b>Note:</b> Trend Arrows will always be calculated based on the Value getting better or worse relative to the Target, regardless of the PI's status.		

15. Detailed CCI Q3 performance information is available in the supporting document Appendix A.

## Benchmarking

16. In addition to reporting against internal performance indicator targets and performance, an external benchmarking exercise is conducted on a quarterly basis so that comparative data can be analysed.

Due to the limited availability of up-to-date data, the comparison is made using the previous quarters outturns. This report therefore details the analysis from using data from Q2 2024/25 and is attached as Appendix B.

17. The benchmarking group used for the purposes of this report represents Uttlesford District Council's statistical near neighbours (SNN) as identified in the annual Financial Resilience Index produced by CIPFA (see table below).

Performance information from Braintree District Council is also used in the analysis as it is thought to be a good physical neighbouring authority for comparison purposes.

Table 3: Statistical Near Neighbours as identified in CiPFA's Annual Resilience Index

Authority	Area km <sup>2</sup> (2021)	Population (2022)
Uttlesford	641.18	92,578
Harborough	591.78	100,481
Winchester	660.97	130,268
Tandridge	248.19	88,707
Vale of White Horse	577.62	142,116
South Cambridgeshire	901.63	165,633
Sevenoaks	369.2	121,106
Tonbridge and Malling	240.14	133,661
Waverley	345.17	130,063
South Oxfordshire	678.53	151,820
Hart	215.27	100,910
Test Valley	627.58	132,871
Tewkesbury	414.42	97,000
Mole Valley	258.32	87,769
East Hampshire	514.44	127,319
Bromsgrove	216.97	100,076

18. The Nearest Neighbours Model is determined by 40 different metrics across a wide range of social-economic indicators and is designed to help interpret results and deep dive into how the statistical differences between other authorities arises.
19. As there were no other formal benchmarking groups identified at the time of formalising the CCI suite, these were thought to be a good starting point on which to build benchmarking knowledge. It should be noted that this group of SNN is a very close match to the comparative data available on the LG Inform platform, Value for Money Profiles.
20. The benchmarking data contained in this report and the detailed information in Appendix B has been obtained directly from equivalent performance officers in the SNN authorities and/or published data on their authority websites.
21. At the time of producing this report, 11 of the 15 CiPFA statistical near neighbours, and Braintree DC, had published performance data, two organisations have temporarily stopped publishing performance information (whilst they review what and how they publish) and three organisations did not publish any performance information at all.
22. For this quarters benchmarking exercise, there are up to 9 authorities benchmarked for some indicators, with an average of 7.5 authorities benchmarked per available indicator.

Please note: Where data could only be obtained for one other local authority within the group, the indicator has not been analysed.

### 23. Q2 2024-25 Retrospective Benchmarking Table

The following table represents UDC's Q2 performance for 9 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.

UDC's performance was better than the benchmarked average for three indicators and below the average for six indicators (although it is very close to the average, within 1%, for two of those).

**Note: The average performance for each indicator is based on the mean average of all the authorities where their data has been used in the calculation. Data for an individual authority will be excluded if it is classified as an outlier (outside of the expected performance range) due to exceptional or unknown circumstances.**

*Table 4: UDC's Q2 performance for 9 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC*

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator	Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
4	<b>CCI 06</b> % of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council	91%	<b>93%</b>
7	<b>CCI 09</b> % of Council Tax collected	58%	<b>56%</b>
7	<b>CCI 10</b> % of Non-domestic Rates Collected	58%	<b>56%</b>
3	<b>CCI 22</b> % of invoices paid within 30 days	98%	<b>97%</b>
3	<b>CCI 23</b> Council Housing: Average re-let time in days (all re-lets including time spent in works)	36 days	<b>49 days</b>
7	<b>CCI 24</b> Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications	89%	<b>88%</b>
7	<b>CCI 25</b> Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications	86%	<b>83%</b>
7	<b>CCI 26</b> % of appeals upheld for Major Applications	5%	<b>4%</b>
8	<b>CCI 28</b> % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	48%	<b>54%</b>

24. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q3 2024/25 is available in Appendix B.

## Risk Analysis

25.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
<p>If performance indicators do not meet quarterly/annual targets, then areas such as customer satisfaction and statutory adherence to government led requirements could be affected leading to a loss in reputation for the Council.</p>	<p>2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target. Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.</p>	<p>3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.</p>	<p>Performance is monitored by CMT, and Cabinet on a quarterly basis. Short and long term analysis is carried out to identify performance trends, this supports the appropriate action/improvement plans to be put in place to address issues.</p>

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.