

**RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE NOTES OF  
PERFORMANCE MONITORING SESSION**

16 December 2024 at 11.30am (Remote Meeting)

**Members in attendance:**

Cllr David Harmer  
Cllr Steven McCormick (Vice-chair)  
Cllr Lesley Steeds (Vice-chair)  
Cllr Hazel Watson  
Cllr Nick Darby  
Cllr Edward Hawkins

**Officers/Cabinet members in attendance:**

Cllr David Lewis, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources  
Louise Lawson, Strategic Finance Business Partner for Resources, Land & Property and Economy & Growth  
David Oates, Head of Performance & Data Management  
Nicola Kilvington, Director of Corporate Strategy & Policy  
Richard Supple, Performance Insights Analyst  
Bella Smith, Head of Insights, Systems & Governance  
Matt Scott, Chief Digital Information Officer  
Lesley Graham, Head of Health and Safety  
Diane Wilding, Director of Land and Property  
Andy Brown, Executive Director of Resources  
Adrian Stockbridge, Assistant Director- Transformation  
Abigail Linyard-Tough, Strategic Lead- Resident Insight  
David John, Audit Manager

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

**Customer & Communities**

1. The Vice-chair asked if the data regarding the % of average online uptake for November 2024 was available, regarding the percentage of transactions or enquiries completed directly by the customer. The Head of Performance & Data Management explained it was not yet available for the report yet but would try to get the metric up to date for the next report.
2. Members noted positive feedback they had received from residents regarding Surrey County Council's FixMyStreet. A member raised that she had expected to see a larger increase in the average online uptake to reflect this and asked when FixMyStreet was launched. The Vice-chair raised that FixMyStreet had been available for a while, but that the integration of FixMyStreet was improved over the last year. The Head of Performance & Data Management confirmed this was partly the reason and agreed to seek an answer to the member's question.

3. A Vice-chair raised that there was as a lack of awareness of FixMyStreet and raised instances where there was a lack of response from the council. The Vice-chair also raised that SCC had done work in the past year to better integrate the data on FixMyStreet not Surrey systems. He requested more background information around how this had been done and improved.
4. A member raised concerns over lack of improvement in the blue badge service, noting wait times to receive the service.

### **People & Change**

5. A Vice-chair stated that she is a trustee and governor of Young Epilepsy in Dormansland and asked what facilities SCC can provide for someone with epilepsy. The Head of Insights, Systems & Governance explained that SCC would normally offer an occupational health referral as part of the recruitment process, after which point SCC could investigate any reasonable adjustments any successful candidate with epilepsy may require. There was a well-utilised reasonable adjustment service. SCC has improved the number of people employed at the council with varied disabilities, they added, with 8% of council workers choosing to declare that they have a disability, and SCC is a disability confident employer. They clarified that, if there is an issue with the recruitment process, SCC's recruitment team can offer help and that the recruitment team could support any person that requires support in completing an application.
6. A member requested more information around the need to have exit interviews, and to ensure where people had left the organisation that an out-of-office message was in place to highlight this and point people towards an alternative contact for continuity of service.

### **Customer, Digital and Change- Project Updates- MySurrey: Stabilisation**

7. Regarding the performance indicator of the resolution of legacy issues backlog, the Chief Digital and Information Officer explained that at the point of transitioning to the Business as Usual (BAU) support and prior to beginning the stabilisation programme, there are several outstanding, high-priority issues and incidents that require resolution. The performance indicator tracked the resolution of those issues to provide insight and awareness of the progress made. Whilst MySurrey remains problematic, steady progress to find root cause resolutions of outstanding issues is being seen.
8. The Vice-chair asked if the performance indicator on the resolution of the legacy issues backlog was specifically dealing with legacy issues until all were resolved, or if it also included any additional issues that are handled by the stabilisation board. The Chief Digital and Information Officer explained that the performance indicator effectively considered all issues within the remit of the Stabilisation Board. For example, if something was identified as a root cause

or an issue through testing, such as in an audit report, it was included in the list of issues this metric measures.

9. The Vice-chair raised that the Stabilisation Board was set up in September 2024 and asked if this could be noted in the report that this was the cut-off for the submission of issues, so that the select committee could see if there had been progress in reducing the issues submitted before then.
10. Regarding the performance indicator on the volume of support calls to the IT & Digital Service Hub, the Chief Digital and Information Officer raised that understanding of normal performance was required to establish what the trend would look like for this metric, before a target for this metric could then be set.
11. A member agreed that targets needed to be set for the performance indicator covering the volume of support calls to the IT & Digital Service Hub but raised the question of what basis the targets would be set on and what current plans exist to do this. The Chief Digital and Information Officer noted that the select committee would assess the information coming through from this performance indicator and suggest, in conversation with officers, what a good target would be. The current stage of this metric was to identify what the normal pattern of the volume of support calls looks like.
12. The member suggested that the volume of support calls may need to be broken down into different categories to provide analysis of where calls for support were coming from and thus which areas to prioritise. A Vice-chair questioned whether all the support calls went to one call centre in Surrey and were then broken down/directed based on what system or area was being queried in the support calls. The Vice-chair asked whether any analysis is available, and suggested this could be something to focus on.
13. The Chief Digital and Information Officer recommended that the committee looked at all three of the performance indicators provided together as its aim was to provide a holistic situational picture. He believed that several of the calls would relate to the availability of the system but also some of the other outstanding root cause issues, and stated that he believed that the volume of support calls would begin to fall once stability is achieved following upcoming upgrades to the system and outstanding issues were resolved. Further metrics could be considered to investigate specific areas, and suggested potentially including greater narrative into the performance indicator's report insight, such as when support calls related to a particular function or technical issue.
14. Regarding the volume of support calls, a member raised that greater understanding was required of what caused the issues, such as staffing difficulties.

15. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources encouraged members to think about whether setting a target was appropriate in some areas or if it would be better to monitor the progress, or consider simply aiming to achieve continuous improvement over time. The Vice-chairman felt that having a target in place could be useful as it provided focus.

### **Service Performance (Audit)**

16. Regarding the performance indicator on the implementation of high priority actions agreed in response to audit findings, the Vice-chairman noted that it could be helpful to have information provided around which audits/ high-risk items were not achieved, and to continue these updates in the performance report. The Audit Manager explained that at the end of September 2024 there was nothing outstanding. As audit headed towards the end of Quarter 3, there may be one or two high priority items that were incomplete, but audit had not yet reached consideration up to the time of the implementation date. He stated that both this committee and the Audit & Governance Committee would be informed when more was known.

### **Finance**

17. Regarding the percentage of Budget Accountability Statements returned, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources raised that he was concerned about the data in early 2024, noting the importance of timeliness and getting 100% of statements returned as soon as possible after the budget was formalised. The Vice-chair agreed.
18. A member asked what the reason was for the reduction in Budget Accountability Statements returned in April and May 2024. The Executive Director of Resources did not know the reasons behind this but stated that his view the passage of the budget at the February meeting of Council constituted the final approval. He also noted that there may be a change to processes for the collection and signing of the Budget Accountability Statements, though this would have to be discussed with the Corporate Leadership Team. He agreed with the Cabinet Member that it should not take until June for all statements to be signed-off but noted that the most important thing was the delivery of the efficiencies and how savings would be delivered.

### **Land and Property**

19. Regarding the *LP02: Health and Safety Building Compliance Assurance (SCC-managed)* performance indicator, the Director of Land and Property noted the seriousness of the metric. Before August 2024, Land and Property examined the depth of the assurance this provided, she added, before stating that the metric had previously just measured the pattern of inspections against the six building compliance elements, but earlier in the year Land and Property sought to ensure this change with the supply chain to measure how

the urgent remedial works were completed and the timeliness. Urgent remedial works was currently set at 28 days for completion, but Land and Property wanted to reduce this to 14 days once the supply chain was delivering. The Council would not accept compliance without certification evidence, which causes a lot of backlogs in the supply chain, she said, noting that the fall in compliance for August 2024 was mainly due to this. It was critical to ensure that there was in-depth assurance around buildings' compliance. Land and Property had insisted with contractors in the supply chain that this was improved by January 2025, and Land and Property would then change the metrics to provide assurance.

20. A Vice-chair raised concerns around changing the metric mid-year and asked for further clarification around what Land and Property would alter. The Director of Land and Property explained that from April 2025 the team would look to reduce the 28 day target to one at 14 days, because it would be demanded or expected that any urgent works be completed within a shorter period following a statutory inspection.

21. A member asked for further information around the facilities management (FM) contract, the warranties within the FM contract, and if there was opportunity to tighten up the target dates. The Director of Land and Property noted there was opportunity though significant notice would need to be provided, and that Land and Property was looking to give notice in Quarter 4. The current focus was ensuring FM could deliver on the changes Land and Property implemented from July. She confirmed that Key Performance Indicators could be changed annually through the contract with sufficient notice.

22. The Director of Land and Property noted that this year's imperative was to get the assurance and certification and ensure that the remedial works were taking place.

## **Health and Safety**

23. Regarding the performance indicator on the percentage of OSHENS incident/accident investigations completed (excluding schools where SCC was the employer, and including Surrey Fire and Rescue Service), a member asked if there had always been a system like OSHENS in place or if it was a recent development. The Head of Health and Safety explained that the council had always been required to have an accident book, though it now used an online reporting system. The member asked what happened in the case where SCC was the employer, such as at a maintained school. The Head of Health and Safety clarified that schools still reported through the OSHENS system, which is reviewed and monitored.

24. Regarding the performance indicator on the percentage of mandatory health and safety training courses completed (excluding schools where SCC was the employer, and including Surrey Fire and Rescue Service), the Head of Health and Safety explained that this metric had been improved but that it would be a long process to reach the target of 100%, which was set by the latest audit report. There were some issues with the online training system 'Olive,' but this is being replaced with a new learning management system in 2025, which was hoped to provide the ability to track training courses more easily, they said. The six mandatory training courses were being considered for a review to potentially be reduced, improving relevancy and ensuring that courses are effective and efficient for all staff. The delay between leavers and starts on 'Olive' was also referenced, though it was hoped that the new system would address this.
25. The Vice-Chairman raised that the latest target for the completion of mandatory health and safety courses was 100% for November 2024 and noted it was now December. The Head of Health and Safety explained the quarterly data was not received until December, but noted the target would not be met.

#### **Councils Finance update as at M7**

26. The Head of Performance and Data Management agreed to investigate a potential formatting issue resulting in a missing figure on page 62 of the report, in corporate funding's directorate budget section of the table, as raised by the Vice-chairman.