RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE SELECT COMMITTEE NOTES OF

PERFORMANCE MONITORING SESSION

19 September 2024 at 3pm (Remote Meeting)

Members in attendance:
David Harmer
Bob Hughes (Chairman)
Andy Lynch
Steven McCormick (Vice-Chair)
John O'Reilly
Lance Spencer
Lesley Steeds (Vice-Chair)
Hazel Watson

Officers/Cabinet Members in attendance:
David Lewis, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources
Louise Lawson, Strategic Finance Business Partner for CDC, F&CS, Land &
    Property, and Property and Economic Growth.
David Oates, Head of Performance & Data Management
Richard Supple, Performance Insights Analyst
Bella Smith, Head of Insights, Systems & Governance
Matt Scott, Chief Digital Information Officer
Ricky Whitmore, Head of Architecture, Transition & Project Portfolio Management
Adrian Stockbridge, Assistant Director- Transformation
Graham Glenn, Head of Acquisitions & Disposals
Gary Clothier, Freedom of Information Officer
Abigail Linyard-Tough, Strategic Lead- Resident Insight
David John, Audit Manager
Graham Glenn, Head of Acquisitions and Disposals

Key points raised during the discussion:

Transformation

1. The Assistant Director of Transformation responded to previous queries around customer transformation coming out of the funding and where it was being reported to. What had previously been reported to the committee was the financial information relating to the transformation reserve, but general reserves were now being used to fund some of the Surrey County Council's (SCC) other key transformation programmes. All transformation reporting that went into the strategic transformation board had been revamped and it was proposed to do the same for the Resources and Performance Select Committee. The transformation team would like to provide detailed information rather than just the financial elements of the transformation programmes, such as progress to plan, RAG (Red-amber-green) ratings and areas such as key risks and challenges within the programme, as well as key achievements. The Transformation team was working on a refreshed

dashboard which would be ready for the Committee's next performance monitoring session. This should provide a greater degree of assurance around the key transformation programmes, which included Customer Transformation, Core Function Re-design, Digital and Data work and work around people and culture.

2. The Vice-Chairman asked about the £3.5 million (m) being pulled from reserves and where it would be reported on. The Vice-Chairman asked why it was removed from the performance monitoring reports and where it was going to be reported. The Assistant Director of Transformation explained that it was removed from performance monitoring report because previously only the transformation reserve had been reported to the committee and there was not enough time to get the refreshed financial information, across all transformation programmes, ready for this performance monitoring session. The Vice-Chairman further questioned further why it disappeared from the performance monitoring reports. The Assistant Director of Transformation clarified that it was never included in the performance monitoring report to begin with because the business case was being developed. What was previously included in the report was a holding position in the transformation budget, which was dependent upon the business case being developed and approved. Now the business case was developed and approved, and it was a different funding source. The Vice-Chairman asked how the Committee would continue to have sight of this. The Assistant Director of Transformation confirmed the Committee would have sight of it. The information was being refreshed, and it was hoped to have something ready in the next few weeks to share with the committee.

Residents- SCC Residents Survey

3. ***PSR14: Satisfaction that the Council is making the local area a better place to live:*** The Strategic Lead- Resident Insight provided an overview of the 10-percentage point (pp) increase in the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS). SFRS's resourcing had not changed in terms of the services provided but were able to increase their social media presence through resources in the communications team. This meant SFRS was now answering questions raised on social media and providing a more immediate response to the public. SFRS also had a large consultation during the performance reporting period and were therefore out in the community. These two areas combined are believed to be responsible for the increased SFRS' satisfaction rate.

4. A member, in reference to the result of 39.1% for the PSR14 performance indicator, asked how SCC compared with other councils. The Strategic Lead- Resident Insight agreed to provide this information as an action.

Action: Strategic Lead- Resident Insight to provide information on how KPI PSR13 compares with other councils.

Resources- People and Change

5. ***PCO7: Off payroll workers as a % of workforce:*** The Chairman asked how the result of 4.8% for this performance indicator compared with other counties. The Head of Insights, Systems & Governance explained it would vary but agreed to collect neighbouring counties' Off payroll worker data and provide a response.

6. A member requested the same comparative data for Hertfordshire as it was both structurally and geographically comparable to Surrey.

Action: Head of Insights, Systems & Governance to collate neighbouring counties' Off payroll worker data, including for Hertfordshire.

7. ***PC12: Staff with Disabilities (%):*** The Chairman remarked that there was a good improvement in this performance indicator, which had an 8.5% result as of June 2024, but noted there was more that could be done. The Chairman queried if the latest result related to investment made to, for example, making the Woodhatch office more accessible. The Head of Insights, Systems & Governance noted it was too early to directly link this performance indicator to some of the accessibility measures undertaken, particularly in the facilities. However, the latest result reflected the investment made in terms of reasonable adjustments offered to new recruits and existing staff. It also reflected some staff network activity, encouraging people to share that they have a disability. It was noted there was still a lot more work to do in this area.

8. ***PC15: Sickness absence rate (FTE days per employee):*** The Chairman asked how the result, as of August 2024, of 6.2 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) days sickness absence rate per employee compared to the private sector. The Head of Insights, Systems and Governance explained the result was higher than the private sector, which tended to be around 4 FTE days.

Customer, Digital and Change
Project Updates

9. ***MySurrey01- Defined up-time % of availability:*** The Chief Digital Information Officer provided a brief explanation of the new metric. The metric looked to show the infrastructure availability of the system and the performance of Unit 4 as a provider. The intention was to create a trend line to track this.

10. ***MySurrey02- Resolution of legacy issues backlog:*** The Chief Digital Information Officer highlighted there had been several audit reports carried out and it was anticipated there would be actions resulting from these, which would be added to this performance indicator's metric but managed through a holistic stabilisation programme.

11. A member raised whether a metric could be provided on the amount of people who had returned to work for SCC after previously having left. The Head of Insights, Systems & Governance explained this was not measured, though it could possibly be measured, however when an employee left SCC their personal record was closed, and a new one would be created if they returned, therefore, it would be difficult to track. SCC does conduct exit surveys, they added, which are reported on anonymously, as well as exit interviews.

Service performance (Audit)

12. ***IA02: Implementation of high priority actions agree in response to audit findings:*** The Audit Manager explained that the performance indicator regarded how effective audit's findings were and provided an idea of how the council implements the actions that are agreed. The target for June 2024 was 95%. Two follow-up audits conducted in the last quarter that were previously marked as 'Partial Assurance' had remained at this stage as the actions were not implemented as expected. These audits were the Tree Management follow-up audit and the Social Value in Procurement follow-up audit, which had three priority actions between them that were in-progress but not fully implemented. As a result of these outstanding actions, the performance indicator result was below the target level. Implementing the action was incumbent on management. It was being kept under review and the two audits identified now had re-agreed actions and dates.

Land and Property

13. ***LP08: Estates: To achieve £46m of Capital receipts by 2025:*** The Chairman asked if the latest result of £3.712m, as of September 2024, against the latest target of £26m was the result of timings. The Head of Acquisitions & Disposals confirmed it was and explained that along with the £3.712m achieved, there was also an extra £7.8m contracted for the Coxbridge payment which was payable in January 2025. 11 other assets were currently with solicitors and another 16 properties were being marked, 8 of which were anticipated to be in the 2024/25 financial year. There was a current year-end target of £26m which depends on the outcome of bids. Quadrant Court was due to close bids in the following week which would be a good indicator of whether Land and Property is on target for this performance indicator. There is around £15m of receipts going through this year and next year. It had recently been decided to re-market one of the assets that was under offer due to a change in the market, and reduction in inflation and interest rates. This was indicative of the market showing some positive signs.

Legal and Democratic

14. ***LD04: % Responses to Freedom of Information (FOI)/ Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) requests within statutory timescales- ICO target 90.0%- by Council and Directorates:*** The Freedom of Information Officer outlined that the pothole statistics (reported and repaired) were in the

process of getting published on Surrey-i. Sign-off for the insurance data/claims was awaited to also go on Surrey-i. This was hoped to reduce FOI requests as people could go directly to Surrey-i for information.

15. ***LD08.1: Number of reported data breaches across Directorates:*** The Chairman noted the latest result of 42, for August 2024, was impressive for the size of SCC as an organisation. The Freedom of Information Officer noted that the result was for the number of reported data breaches rather than the actual number of data breaches. When the result of data breaches reported was low, there was a concern of whether all data breaches are being reported.

16. A member raised it would be helpful to 'sectorise' data breaches. The Freedom of Information Officer explained that data breaches were categorised when recorded as low, medium or high significance. Some breaches, but not many, were reported to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) if it was a significant breach. This data could be included in the performance indicator.

Action: Freedom of Information Officer to include data on how many data breaches were reported to the ICO in future Performance Monitoring Reports.

17. A member asked if an email sent to someone that should not have been was classed as a data breach. The Freedom of Information Officer confirmed it would be classed as a low severity data breach and would expect this to be logged. The advice to reporting staff member would be to ask whoever received the email to delete it and confirm it had been deleted.

18. The Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources asked what the follow-up procedure was to ensure compliance with the correct procedure. The Freedom of Information Officer explained the report would be logged and advice would be given. It was expected that the reporter of the data breach would follow the advice and confirm it was actioned. It was not always easy to follow-up to ensure that everyone who received an email they should not have had in fact deleted it.

Action: Freedom of Information Officer/ Corporate Information Governance Manager to provide information on how compliance is measured against instructions given following a data breach. Specifically, when asking people to delete emails sent to them by mistake - how is this instruction followed-up on to ensure this was done?

Residents- SCC Resident Survey

19. ***PSR14: Satisfaction that the Council is making the local area a better place to live:*** A member asked for further clarification on the insight that was placed under the 'Bottom 3' heading of this performance indicator. The Head of Performance & Data Management clarified that the Bottom 3 were the areas that most people seemed to be dissatisfied with. 78% of people highlighted they were not satisfied with road maintenance, 50% of people highlighted they were not satisfied with pavement maintenance and 18% of people said that they were not satisfied with community recycling centres (CRCs). Insight placed in the Top 3 (areas people were most satisfied with) included SFRS, Parks and Open Spaces, and Primary Schools.

20. The member asked if any action had resulted from CRC's position in the Bottom 3, with 18% of respondents interviewed this quarter dissatisfied with CRCs. The Strategic Lead - Resident Insight explained that regular reporting to the Senior Leadership Team was being developed. Some of the areas in the Bottom 3 were consistently in this position -three areas had to be in the Bottom 3, as this was what was asked for in the reporting, but it was only just under 1/5 of residents that participated in the survey that reported being dissatisfied with CRCs. The Resident Insight team worked with each individual area to see what was being done and how areas could be improved. The survey was also perception-based, and it may be that a resident had not used a CRC in this quarter.

21. A member raised that different CRCs had differences in effectiveness and queried why all centres were put into one category. The Strategic Lead - Resident insight explained that when the Resident Insight team worked with the CRC facilities, the data could be split up by district and borough. It was not reported by district and borough at these Performance Monitoring sessions as it was beyond the scope, but it could be provided if desired.

22. The Vice-Chairman asked if there were any plans to address the items that were placed in the Bottom 3, to address the concerns raised and if the committee could see these. The Strategic Lead - Resident Insight explained that this was being worked on and would look into what could be provided at the next Performance Monitoring session.

Action: The Strategic Lead - Resident Insight to investigate what can be provided for the next Performance Monitoring Session with regards addressing items in the 'Bottom 3' and concerns raised around them.