Committee:	Cabinet	**Date:**	
Title:	Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs) 2025/26 Q1 Performance Update	Thursday, 4th September 2025	
Portfolio Holder:	Cllr. Petrina Lees, Leader of the Council		
Report Author:	Angela Knight, Chief Operating Officer aknight@uttlesford.gov.uk Paula Evans, Contract, Performance and Risk Manager pevans@uttlesford.gov.uk	**Key decision:** N	

Summary

1. This report presents members with 2025/26 Q1 (April - June) and performance data and analysis for the suite of Corporate Core Indicators (CCIs).

2. There is slight drop in overall performance levels when analysing Q1 2025/26 against Q4 2024/25, however both short and long-term trends are improving.

3. The CCIs were identified to enable the Corporate Management Team and Members to focus on key areas of performance across the council.

4. As in previous reports, Q1 benchmarking comparisons against other Local Authorities has not been possible due to limited availability of information. Therefore, Q4 benchmarking data is presented as a separate analysis exercise.

5. Performance trends have been highlighted and analysed to identify where improvement may be needed particularly when comparing against other 'statistical nearest neighbour' authorities.

Recommendations

6. None. The report is for information only.

Financial Implications

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

Background Papers

8. 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

9.

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

10. The Corporate Core Indicators (CCI's) have been developed to provide focus on key service provision areas across the authority. For the 2025/26 performance reporting year, several new indicators which have been introduced increasing the suite from 30 to 39. The majority of these are associated with the recently introduced monitoring regime for the Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) and therefore relate to Housing activities across various Service Areas. All new indicators are identified in the performance notes contained in Appendix A.

11. There are also several indicators that have been removed from the CCI suite and will not be monitored for the 2025/26 performance year:

- **CCI 07 Contract Management**

  CCI 07 will be removed from the Corporate Core indicator suite temporarily. Further work is being undertaken to identify some lower-level operational indicators that can be introduced to support compliance to both the Procurement and Contract Management processes. It is anticipated that these will commence monitoring and reporting for Q2 2025/26 with outturns being shared with service managers to increase awareness and transparency of performance levels as well as identify areas for improvement. Once the operational indicators are established a more strategically-focused corporate indicator will be introduced.

Performance Summary

12. Of the 40 indicators identified, a total of 34 indicators have Q1 outturn data reported. Reasons for the 6 indicators without Q1 data area as follows:

- CCI 08 – Resident Satisfaction is annually reported
- CCI 28 – Household Waste has not yet had Q1 data finalised by Essex County Council
- Housing Property Services Indicators CCI 37, 38 and 39 will not have data available until later in the year
- CCI 40 – Residents satisfied with council's ASB approach has not yet started to have data collected for it

13. Where relevant supporting performance notes have been entered against each indicator for both Q1 outturns. Officers are encouraged to include information as to how performance can be maintained/improved as relevant.

14. Where applicable, outturn data is compared to both the previous quarters and year's internal data through short and long-term trend analysis. This is set out in detail in Appendix A.

15. 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

16. Indicator status definitions are as follows:

Table 1: Indicator status definitions

Status	Definition
✅	Indicator achieving or exceeding target
⚠️	Warning – indicator performing within 10% of target
🛑	Alert – indicator performing over 10% off target

17. Overall, the statuses for the 34 indicators where Q1 2025/26 data is available, shows that performance levels have dropped slightly from Q4 2024/25 outturns with a lower percentage obtaining a green status and more at red as shown in the summary and Table 2 below:

    - **for Q1 there are 20** (59%) **at green status 5** (15%) **amber and 9** (26%) **at red**

    - in Q4 there were **17** (60%) at green status, **5** (14%) amber and **6** (21%) red

    Please note: Overall percentages for statuses and trends have been used for this comparison due to the increase in the number of indicators from Q4 2024/25 to Q1 2025/26.

Table 2: Q1 Corporate Core Indicator (CCI) status and trend results

Status	Q4 2024/25	Q1 2025/26	Short Trend			Long Trend		
✅	17	**20**	⬆️	**10**	(38%)	⬆️	**13**	(50%)
⚠️	5	**5**	⬇️	**9**	(35%)	⬇️	**11**	(42%)
🛑	6	**9**	➖	**7**	(27%)	➖	**2**	(8%)

18. Further analysis of Q1 indicates that of the 26 indicators where trend analysis can be analysed, there are **10** indicators trending as improving in performance against target for the short trend with **9** indicators declining and also **7** with no change.

    For the long trend there are more indicators, **13,** trending as improving than those declining, **11**, with **2** having no change.

19. Detailed CCI Q1 performance information is available in the supporting appendix document A.

Benchmarking

20. 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 Q4 2024/25 and is attached as Appendix B.

21. 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). We also include Braintree District Council as it is a relatively comparable geographical near neighbour.

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

Authority	Area km² (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

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. For this quarters benchmarking exercise, there are up to 10 authorities benchmarked for some indicators, with an average of 6 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.

Q4 2024-25 Retrospective Benchmarking Table

27. The following table represents UDC's Q4 performance for 11 indicators against the benchmarked performance average of local authorities from the statistical near neighbour group and Braintree DC.

28. UDC's performance was better than, or the same as, the benchmarked average for four indicators and below the average for seven indicators (although it is very close to the average, within 1%, for three of those).

29. **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 Q4 performance for 11 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	**CCI 05** % Information Governance requests (FOIs & EIRs) dealt with in 20 working days	91%	**77%**
3	**CCI 06** % of calls answered vs number of calls received across the council	87%	**96%**
10	**CCI 09** % of Council Tax collected	98%	**99%**
10	**CCI 10** % of Non-domestic Rates Collected	98%	**97%**
3	**CCI 11** Current tenant rent arrears as a percentage of the annual rent debit (excluding HB adjustment)	2%	**3%**

No. of Local Authorities Benchmarked	Performance Indicator	Benchmarked Performance Average	UDC's Performance
5	**CCI 22** % of invoices paid within 30 days	97%	**97%**
4	**CCI 23** Council Housing: Average re-let time in days (all re-lets including time spent in works)	48 days	**87 days**
10	**CCI 24** Processing of Planning Applications: Major Applications	95%	**91%**
10	**CCI 25** Processing of Planning Applications: Non-major Applications	89%	**78%**
7	**CCI 26** % of appeals upheld for Major Applications	5%	**3%**
10	**CCI 28** % Household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	45%	**51%**

30. Further detailed retrospective benchmarked information for the CCIs in Q4 2024/25 is available in Appendix B.

Risk Analysis

31.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
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.	2 – The majority of performance measures perform on or above target. Where necessary, accompanying notes to individual performance indicators detail improvement plans.	3 – The majority of service areas in the Council are customer-facing so has the potential to impact reputationally, service delivery and financially.	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.

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.