

Somerset Waste Board meeting  
29 June 2018  
Report for information

---

Performance Report - April 2017 to March 2018

Lead Officer: David Oaten, Contracts Manager – Treatment & Infrastructure

Author: John Helps, Performance Monitoring Officer

Contact Details: 01823 625705

<b>Forward Plan Reference:</b>	SWB/FP/18/03/04
<b>Summary:</b>	This report summarises the key performance indicators for the period from April 2017 to March 2018 and compares these to the same periods in 2015-16 & 2016-17. It also updates the board on the current kerbside collection service performance issues, the actions being taken to address these issues, and the changes proposed to the way we report performance in the future.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>That the Somerset Waste Board notes the tonnage and performance results for the financial year 2017-18, the current kerbside collection service performance issues, the actions being taken to address these issues, and the changes proposed to future performance reporting.</b>
<b>Reasons for recommendations:</b>	Report for information only.
<b>Links to Priorities and Impact on Annual Business Plan:</b>	Transparency – Publishing Key Performance Indicators
<b>Financial, Legal and HR Implications:</b>	Report for information purposes only.
<b>Equalities Implications:</b>	Report for information purposes only.
<b>Risk Assessment:</b>	The risk of service degradation ahead of early termination of the collection service contract has been a key risk monitored through the SWP risk register.

## 1. Background

- 1.1. Reports with a full range of key performance indicators for services managed by Somerset Waste Partnership are presented to the Board in December (Quarter 2 performance) and June (Outturn performance).

## 2. Performance Findings

2.1. Headline figures to note for April to March 2018 compared to the same period in 2016-17 are shown in the table below.

National Indicators	Result	% Change	Appendix	Lines
Residual waste per household (NI 191) - kg/hh	479.72	-1.74%	<b>A1</b>	(39)
Recycling & reuse rate (NI 192) - %	52.28%	-0.45%		(40)
Waste landfilled (NI 193) - %	46.10%	0.22%		(41)
Waste Streams	Tonnes	% Change		
Total Reused, Recycled & Composted	133,309	-2.41%		(24)
Residual Landfilled	116,900	-0.95%		(27, 30, 31)
Recovery	4,991	4.15%		(28, 29, 32)
Total Household Arisings	254,985	-1.57%		(33)
Total Commercial Arisings	5,650	4.72%		(25, 35)

Kg/hh Headlines	Kg/hh	kg/hh + / -	<b>A2</b>	
Garden Waste	172.21	-1.95		
Recycled	276.33	-10.04		
Residual Landfilled	479.72	-3.12		
Total Household Arisings	1005.30	-16.09		

Missed Collections	No.	% Change	<b>B1</b>	
Refuse	7,787	24.23%		
Garden Waste	5,040	6.73%		
Recycling & Food	13,907	9.87%		
Repeat Missed Collections	5,837	26.10%		

Flytips	No.	No. + / -	<b>B2</b>	
Total No.	4,662	-226		

- 2.2.** The headline tonnage figures, shown in Appendix A1, reflect a period where tonnages have continued to decline – a 1.57% (-4,080 tonnes) decrease in overall household waste arisings (line 33). Key points are:
- **2.41% (-3,287 tonnes) decrease in household waste reused, recycled and composted (line 24).** Key drivers for this are:
    - The amount of garden waste treated during this period at the recycling sites and at kerbside decreased by 1.12% (-495 tonnes - line 10),
    - A continued drop in the amount of paper collected, with a decrease of 7.58% (-865 tonnes - line 19),
    - A reduction in the quantity of wood recycled with a decrease of 5.42% (-333 tonnes – line 23),
    - A drop in the weight of sweepings that were recycled 9.65% (-740 tonnes – line 22),
    - A 4.76% (-250 tonnes) decrease in non packaging scrap metal (line 15),
    - A 1.23% (-227 tonnes) decrease of food waste collected from households (line 7),
    - Water based paint recycling continues to show strong growth, with an increase of over 300% this year at 197 tonnes (line 18).
  - A decrease of 1.74% (-8.47 kg/hh) in residual household waste (line 39) and a 0.85% (-997 tonnes) decrease in household waste landfilled (line 34). Key drivers for this are:
    - Significantly, in light of the implementation of the permit scheme a 6.94% (-1,113 tonnes) reduction of residual waste sent to landfill from the recycling sites (line 31) and,
    - Also an insignificant increase of 0.01% (11 tonnes) of residual waste sent to landfill collected from the kerbside (line 30), suggesting that the majority of material displaced from the recycling sites has not been presented for collection.
- 2.3.** Appendix A2 shows that Somerset households produced less waste, when compared to 2016-17, with a reduction of 16.09 kg/hh, bringing the total waste arisings to 1,005.30 kg/hh. The majority of this decrease occurred at the recycling sites. Also of note is a slight drop in garden waste of 1.95 kg/hh, with a total of 172.21 kg/hh. This total is made up with an increase in kerbside collections of 2.40 kg/hh to 75.70 kg/hh, and a decrease at recycling sites of 4.35 kg/hh, a total of 96.51 kg/hh.
- 2.4.** Appendix A3 shows a total reduction of material through the recycling sites of 2,615 tonnes. There was a loss of 507 tonnes of dry recycling and 1,104 tonnes of garden waste, as well as decreases of 1,127 tonnes of residual waste, 97 tonnes of hardcore & soil and an increase of 220 tonnes of wood sent for recovery. The majority of these reductions are still thought to be related to the permit scheme.
- 2.5.** Appendix A3 also shows that the average recycling rate across the network is over 77% with only one site not exceeding a rate of 72%. The lowest performing site at 69.14% being Frome and the highest performing at 86.00% being Chard.

**2.6.** Visits across the recycling site network have decreased of 25,330 (-1.54%), with 1,615,173 visits in the full year April to March. Again this is thought to be permit related. Key points to note are:

- The sites showing the biggest decreases in visitor numbers are Chard with a reduction of 8,168 (-5.59%), Taunton reduced by 7,934 (-3.03%) and Frome down by 6,442 (-5.84%).
- Some sites actually saw an increase in visits, including Cheddar up by 10,007 (23.98%), Street an increase of 1,721 (2.03%) and Wells up by 486 (0.55%). The figure for Cheddar has been verified (as it is a very significant change in usage) and further work will be undertaken to determine the step change in visitor numbers at this site.

**2.7.** Missed collections are an area of particular concern at the moment. Monitoring of contractor performance for missed collections continues as a priority to ensure levels do not return to those seen in previous years:

- Appendix B1 shows quarterly missed collection data for refuse, dry recycling/food and garden waste. Performance is measured by reported 'misses per 1,000 collections' as indicated on the charts. For most service areas, the level appears to be generally worse for 2017-18, compared to the same period in 2016-17. The exceptions to this are refuse collections for West Somerset, which are broadly the same and garden waste which show a slight overall improvement. Additionally recycling collections for South Somerset show a slight overall improvement.
- In February a deep dive on missed collections was reported to the board. This identified that, beneath the headline figures, there was a particularly unacceptable level of performance on missed assisted collections, garden waste, repeat missed collections and the speed with which missed collections are rectified. The actions Kier have taken to date have not led to sufficient progress – indeed performance has worsened in some cases. Whilst there are mitigating circumstances (e.g. the bad weather experienced in Q4) and valid reasons for some of this (e.g. the time it takes after making round changes in Sedgemoor before improvement is realised) this is not acceptable. The mitigating circumstances means that the deadline previously agreed with Kier before performance deductions will be imposed has been extended from the end of April to the end of May.
- More worryingly, there has been a degradation in the quality of service in a number of other aspects of the collection service contract – in particular in the collections for communal properties, the schools service and container delivery. Communal properties have seen significant delays in responding to missed collections, partly as a result of staff shortages within Kier. The risk of service degradation has been a key risk SWP have been monitoring ahead of early termination of our collection contract with Kier. Accordingly these service issues have been escalated by SWP to Director level at Kier. Kier have provided SWP with a written action plan and a weekly director level conference call has been put in place (in addition to the business as usual service monitoring) to track progress against this action plan. A verbal update will be provided to the Board at the meeting on the latest position.

- 2.8.** Appendix B2 shows that the numbers of reported flytips across Somerset continue to decrease slightly compared to 2016-17. In Quarters 1 – 4, the total number of flytips has reduced by 226 (-4.62%). There were decreases in the numbers reported all districts, with the exception of Sedgmoor. It is worth remembering that whilst we report fly tipping numbers as part of this Board report, the Waste Partnership has little control or influence over the numbers being shown as the statutory function to manage fly tipping events still rests with the partner District authorities.
- 2.9.** By material type, the major contributors to this reduction were other household waste, down 129 incidents (-5.60%), black bags - commercial, down 72 incidents (-66.06%), white goods, down 58 incidents (-20.79%) and other electrical, down 50 incidents (-37.31%). Unfortunately, there was an increase in the number of incidents reported as black bags - household, which amounted to an extra 128 (22.86%), tyres an additional 70 (22.01%) and other (unidentified), up 20 (26.67%).

### **3 Future approach to performance reporting**

In December 2017 the board endorsed the approach to incrementally improve the way we report performance. This included undertaking deep dives (the missed collection deep dive in February being the first such analysis), improving the alignment with the business plan (as this sets out the actions we are taking to improve performance) and bringing performance reporting together so that it gives a more rounded picture of performance.

It remains our intention to implement changes to the way we report performance to the board for the 18/19 financial year – with the first revised report being in September (when we present the first data for 2018/19). A further deep dive has not been undertaken for the June Board as our priority is to address the missed collection performance issues identified in February (as explained more fully in paragraph 2.7). A deep dive on participation in our recycling services and waste composition is proposed for the September Board meeting.

It is proposed that future board performance reports will provide:

- A very visual/at a glance way of reporting the performance metrics that matter most and which can be more easily understood by a wider audience (an approach used effectively by Dorset Waste Partnership)
- A dashboard which gives a rounded view of performance, including:
  - bullet point summary of areas of concern and areas of success
  - a traffic light (red/amber/green) status of actions within the three areas of the business plan (action on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery; building capability; maintaining services and operational effectiveness) with the rationale for variances and a brief summary of progress on key projects
  - reporting on key metrics related to finance and risk, performance and environmental impact, customers and communications, workforce and partnership (with detailed reports as currently provided appended to the dashboard)

- A single performance report:
  - bringing together the currently separate performance, risk and health and safety reports.
  - Whilst headline analysis of key financial metrics will be included within this report, a separate finance report will continue to be produced given the significance to all partners of this
  - data related to communications and customers (complaints and service quality issues) will also be covered in this report, reflecting the importance of customer service in the proposed revised vision. This will include an annual survey of attitudes of people in Somerset to recycling (which Viridor are undertaking on our behalf at no cost, so we can benchmark results against others)
- It is proposed that further improvements will be made to performance reporting as a result of the work SWP propose to do on our strategy, and as a result of the national Resources and Waste strategy expected in the autumn. This is likely to include moving towards metrics which give a better assessment of our environmental impact than current weight based targets.

### **3. Consultations Undertaken**

Consultation on findings in this report have been undertaken with SWP's Senior Management Group (officer representatives from partner authorities) and with SWP's Senior Management Team.

### **4. Implications**

Whilst the performance report is normally for information only, the issues around service quality (in particular missed collections) have potentially significant implications:

- Customer dissatisfaction: If the service degrades further then we potentially risk losing the goodwill of the public in Somerset. We ask a lot of the public in Somerset so it is crucial that we fulfil our 'contract' with them to pick their recycling and refuse up on time, leave their environment tidy and resolve issues quickly and effectively. This will be particularly important as we implement the new service model and encourage and enable people to recycle even more.
- Reputational damage: If service quality is not at an acceptable level then there is a risk for reputational damage for SWP, partner authorities and Kier. This could impact upon our effectiveness in working to change public behaviours.

## **5. Background papers**

**5.1.** No background papers referenced for this report.

**5.2.** The following appendices show 2017-18 performance, compared to 2016/17:

- Appendix A1 – shows tonnage by material type as well as the former key national performance indicators, for the Partnership, arranged in alphabetical commodity order and showing 3 comparative years.
- Appendix A2 – shows headline kg per household performance, split between ‘Collection Services’ and ‘Recycling Sites’, with a combined Somerset Waste Partnership result.
- Appendix A3 – indicates the weight and variation from 2016-17 of waste and recycling through the recycling sites, as well as the site recycling rates and total number of recycling site visitors.
- Appendix B1 – shows the level of missed collections compared to all periods in 2016-17, as well as the level of repeated missed collections.
- Appendix B2 – shows the level of reported flytips, broken down by waste type and District across Somerset.