

AGENDA ITEM: 7

Page nos. 9 – 31

Meeting	Audit Committee
Date	27 February 2008
Subject	External Audit report on Data Quality
Report of	Deputy Director of Resources and Chief Finance Officer
Summary	To inform the Committee of the key findings of the external audit data quality review and report on the external auditor's action plan

Officer Contributors	Shahin Farjami, Head of Business Improvement
Status (public or exempt)	Public
Wards affected	All
Enclosures	Appendix 1 – Robson Rhodes Data Quality Audit Report 2006-2007
For decision by	Audit Committee
Function of	Council
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in (if appropriate)	None

Contact for further information: Shahin Farjami, Head of Business Improvement, 020 8359 7019 or Isabelle Apcher, Performance Officer, 020 8359 7853.

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That the committee note the recommendations of the external auditor's report and the agreed action plan.

1.2 That the Committee consider whether they have any views on the external auditor's recommendations and action plan.

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

2.1 The Corporate Plan Technical Appendix was agreed at Council on 20 March 2007.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 The setting, monitoring and revision of corporate priorities and policy considerations is supported by decisions based on corporate data. Good quality data is essential to ensure effective decision making. One of the objectives of the 'More Choice, Better Value' priority is to lead and enable change, improvement and value for money. Performance management is one of the main ways of ensuring this and robust data quality is a pre-requisite of that.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

4.1 Poor data quality opinions from the external auditors may ultimately impact on the Council's reputation and rating under various inspectorates. Robust data quality is essential to the Council's Use of Resources score.

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

5.1 The auditor's report relates to all key data and specifically considers data in relation to services that support the vulnerable. Poor data quality in such services may lead to decisions that have a negative impact on the most vulnerable in our community. In addition, robust data quality also supports the Council in prioritising resources to those people who may be disproportionately affected in the way services are delivered.

6. FINANCIAL, STAFFING, ICT AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None.

7. LEGAL ISSUES

7.1 None.

8. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

8.1 The terms of reference for Audit Committee includes consideration of the external auditor's annual letter, relevant reports, and report to those charged with governance.

9. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

9.1 Audit activity on data quality and performance information supports the Commission's reliance on performance indicators in its service assessments for comprehensive performance assessment (CPA).

- 9.2 In addition to the programmed data quality review, external auditors also followed up their work last year on BV 215a, BV 215b, private sector properties unfit made fit, percentage of planned to responsive repairs and services users who have moved on in a planned way.
- 9.3 The external auditors concluded that the council's overall management arrangements for ensuring data quality are demonstrating adequate performance in respect of the financial year 2006/7. The Council has a long-term focus on improving data quality and have introduced a number of significant improvements, the full benefit of which will be realised in 2007/8.
- 9.4 The auditor's report notes that recommendations raised in prior years and arrangements for securing data quality have improved in 2006/07. Given the improved performance in data quality, no recommendations have been raised in respect of the detailed Stage 3 audit.
- 9.5 A formal, approved data quality policy was not in place at the end of 2006/7; and although the informal policy sets out broad corporate requirements and expectations in relation to data quality, it is not clear if / how subsequent compliance with these requirements is mandated.
- 9.6 An analytical review of the Audit Commission's specified Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) and non-BVPIs was carried out. All PIs were within the plausible and permissible values defined by the Audit Commission; therefore no concerns were noted at Stage 2 with regard to whether or not these specified indicators were fairly stated.
- 9.7 The external auditors have made a number of recommendations. These recommendations are being tackled through a planned programme of work, which is referred to in the report action plan.

10. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 None.

Legal – MM
CFO – JB

Data Quality Audit Report 2006/07

October 2007

The Audit Committee
London Borough of Barnet Council
North London Business Park
Oakleigh Road South
Southgate
N11 1NP

30 October 2007

Dear Sirs

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET COUNCIL - DATA QUALITY AUDIT REPORT 2006/07

This Data Quality Audit Report 2006/07 has been prepared in order to record the key matters arising from our audit. We have discussed our report with Shahin Farjami, Business Improvement Manager, who confirms its factual accuracy, although the views expressed are those of Grant Thornton. The scope and objectives of this report are further detailed in Section 2.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the business improvement team and other staff and directors for the co-operation and assistance afforded to us during the course of our audit.

Yours faithfully

Grant Thornton UK LLP

Contents

Page

1	Background	1
2	Scope and objectives	3
3	Conclusions	4
4	Management arrangements (Stage 1)	6
5	Analytical review (Stage 2)	10
6	Data quality spot checks (Stage 3)	13

Appendix

Action plan

1 Background

Public bodies are accountable for the public money they spend: they must manage competing claims on resources to meet the needs of the communities they serve, and plan for the future. The financial and performance information they use to account for their activities, both internally and externally, to their users, partners, commissioners, government departments and regulators, must be appropriate for these purposes, providing the level of accuracy, reliability and consistency required.

Considerable weight is attached to published performance indicators as the basis for reducing the burden of regulation and awarding freedoms and flexibilities. This has made reliable performance information, and the quality of the underlying data, significantly more important. Regulators and government departments need to be assured that reported information reflects actual performance. This will provide confidence that they are focusing on the key areas for improvement.

Auditors' work on data quality and performance information supports the Commission's reliance on performance indicators in its service assessments for comprehensive performance assessment (CPA). This delivers the commitment to reduce significantly the level of service inspection required.

Introducing the comprehensive area assessment (CAA) framework from 2009 will make reliable performance information even more important. The CAA will place greater emphasis on assessments that are proportional to risk. Councils will also be required to use information to reshape services, and to account to the public for performance.

The responsibility for securing the quality of the data underpinning performance information can only rest with the bodies that collect and use the data. Producing data which is fit for purpose should not be an end in itself, but an integral part of a body's operational, performance management, and governance arrangements. Organisations that put data quality at the heart of their performance management systems are most likely to be actively managing data in their day-to-day business, and turning that data into reliable information.

This is the second year in which we have undertaken work on data quality in local government. Our work is complemented by the Audit Commission's paper, *Improving information to support decision making: standards for better quality data*. This paper sets out standards, for adoption on a voluntary basis, to support improvement in data quality.

The expected impact of our work on data quality is that it will drive improvement in the quality of local government performance information, leading to greater confidence in the supporting data on which performance assessments are based.

2 Scope and objectives

The Audit Commission has developed a three-stage approach to the review of data quality comprising:

Table 1

Stage 1	Management arrangements A review to determine whether proper corporate management arrangements for data quality are in place, and whether these are being applied in practice. The findings contribute to the auditor's conclusion under the Code of Audit Practice on the council's arrangements to secure value for money (the VFM conclusion).
Stage 2	Analytical review An analytical review of 2006/07 BVPI and/ non-BVPI data, and selection of a sample for testing based on risk assessment.
Stage 3	Data quality spot checks In-depth review of a sample of 2006/07 PIs, all of which come from a list of specified BVPIs and non-BVPIs used in CPA, to determine whether arrangements to secure data quality are delivering accurate, timely and accessible information in practice.

All three stages of the review have been carried out at this council.

We have also followed up our work last year on BV 215a, BV 215b, private sector properties unfit made fit, percentage of planned to responsive repairs and services users who have moved on in a planned way non-BVPI indicators where we found data quality issues.

3 Conclusions

Stage 1 – Management arrangements

The council's overall management arrangements for ensuring data quality are demonstrating adequate performance in respect of the financial year 2006/7. The Council has a long-term focus on improving data quality and have introduced a number of significant improvements, the full benefit of which will be realised in 2007/8. The Council's main strengths include:

- Clear leadership and accountability for improving data quality at a senior level, and an overall strategic approach to this area;
- A policy framework which defines expectations and requirements in relation to data quality and a good level of support for staff across the Council in following them;
- Good corporate systems for the collection, recording, analysis and reporting of performance data; and
- Good arrangements for the use and challenge of corporate performance data to drive service improvement.

Areas in which the Council can improve include the following;

- The Council has plans to implement formal mechanisms for monitoring and reviewing the quality of corporate performance indicators, although this has not been completed to date;
- A formal data quality policy is under development;
- There is still some scope for increased sophistication within the first-stat data collection process, and rationalisation of the parallel collection processes for first stat indicators and BVPIs. Systems are still largely manual and require repetitive cleansing and manipulation to produce reports; and
- It is not clear that all corporate plan indicators are supported by adequate audit trails or are approved at a departmental level before publication.

Stage 2 – Analytical review

Our analytical review work at stage 2 identified that the PI values reviewed fell within expected ranges.

Stage 3 – Data quality spot checks

Our review and spot checks of the cost per library visitor and percentage of total private sector homes vacant for more than six months indicators and BV199a-c found that all of these indicators were fairly stated.

Our follow up work from last year on BV 215a, BV 215b, private sector properties unfit made fit, percentage of planned to responsive repairs and services users who have moved on in a planned way non-BVPI indicators found that all indicators were fairly stated, with the exception of BV215a and 215b. It was noted that for these two indicators that data held on the old Mayrise system included data that should be excluded from the calculation of this indicator.

We are pleased to note that recommendations raised in prior years and arrangements for securing data quality for these indicators have improved in 2006/07.

Given the improved performance in data quality in this area, and also that there were no concerns over the quality of data for BV215a and b generated by the new system in place at the Council, no recommendations have been raised in respect of our Stage 3 audit.

4 Management arrangements (Stage 1)

Overall, the council's corporate arrangements for data quality are demonstrating adequate performance.

Governance and leadership

The Council has made progress in the following areas:

Responsibility for data quality is clearly defined:

- The Council has formally assigned responsibility for DQ at a senior level;
- The Council have implemented an enhanced performance framework and have prepared informal data quality guidance for service managers and performance staff. Within these, responsibility for data quality is assigned to service directors and "their representatives". Responsibility for DQ at senior management level is therefore clearly and formally assigned, however accountability at lower levels still remains unclear; and

- There is a short statement on data quality preceding the performance tables within the Council's corporate plan, which reiterates the corporate commitment to DQ and explains the importance of high-quality data.

The Council takes a strategic approach to data quality and has a delivery plan:

- Last year's workshop with a number of service-based performance staff suggested that there is a clear top-down focus on data quality, although this was not enshrined in a formal data quality strategy;
- The Council has two key objectives for data quality, both set out within the corporate plan; (1) to "secure recognition from external audit of improved direction of travel in relation to data quality", and (2) to ensure that the corporate plan is supported by high-quality data in order to support strategic planning and decision-making. The importance of and a commitment to DQ is emphasised within the corporate plan and enhanced performance management framework;
- In this way, there is evidence of a strategic approach to DQ and informal objectives for DQ are clear;

- The Council have adopted a modified version of the action plan arising from last year's DQ review as the delivery plan for these informal objectives. A range of activity is set out from 2006-8, and the Council is on-track with delivery so far;

The Council has adequate arrangements in place for monitoring and review of data quality, with further improvements planned;

- There was little change in the way the Council monitors and reviews data quality for 2006/7, although it is noted that changes are planned in two significant areas for 2007/8. Specifically;
 - All services will be required to record their arrangements for securing high-quality data within their internal control checklist. The Council asserts that this is equivalent to a risk-management approach;
 - Internal audit are to provide some assurance on First Stat data tables as an item in the 2007/8 internal audit plan; and
 - The business improvement team also undertook pre-audit checks on a sample of 2006/7 BVPIs on the basis of a risk assessment.
- The Council has demonstrated that action is being taken to address the results of last year's data quality review.

However;

- Accountability for data quality is only implicitly assigned at an operational level, although the Council has plans to address this during 2007/8 through policy development; and
- The Council has clear plans to implement formal mechanisms for monitoring and reviewing DQ, although this has not been achieved to date.

Policies

The Council has made progress in the following areas;

The Council has put a basic data quality policy framework in place and is working on improving this;

- The Council is in the process of preparing a formal data quality policy, with the aim of going live in April 2008. This will cover arrangements for collecting, recording, analysing and reporting corporate performance information, as well as addressing other aspects of data quality such as criteria for shared data, formal assignment of accountability and training arrangements;
- As an interim arrangement for 2006/7, the Council developed and distributed some informal guidance for managers and performance staff. Although informal, this provides useful guidance on the first stat data collection process, and sets out broad corporate expectations for the quality of the data;

- The business improvement team has also distributed procedure notes and guidance by email to performance contacts across the Council; and

The Council have provided adequate support to staff who follow these policies in practice;

- The Council have put informal policy arrangements in place, including guidance for managers, a workshop training session and ongoing communications and support.

However;

- A formal, approved data quality policy was not in place at the end of 2006/7; and
- Although the informal policy sets out broad corporate requirements and expectations in relation to data quality, it is not clear if / how subsequent compliance with these requirements is mandated.

Systems and processes

The Council has made progress in the following areas;

Good corporate performance systems are in place for the collection, recording, analysis and reporting of performance data;

- The Council continues to operate two parallel systems for data collection (corporate plan indicators and BVPIs), although key features of both have been overhauled;

- The level of control over the collection of corporate plan indicators has been increased significantly;

- The BVPI data collection process remains substantially unchanged, although the business improvement team have undertaken pre-audit checks on the basis of a risk assessment;

- The introduction of the "lock down" approach for collection of corporate plan indicators reinforces the expectation that data is submitted right first time. Amendments are approved by the corporate performance team;

- BVPIs are subject to sign-off and checks, with a clear expectation that data is "right first time"; and

- Data collected through both mechanisms is integrated directly into planning processes (e.g. KPP development and preparation of the corporate plan) and challenge / review processes e.g. First Stat and F&PR.

These systems provide an adequate level of control;

- As above, controls have been strengthened for the collection of corporate plan indicators. The Council's proactive efforts in this area are evidence of an ongoing review process;
- The corporate guidance on data quality sets out a clear requirement that data should be subject to approval by service management before submission to the corporate centre; and

Adequate arrangements are in place for the security and continuity of business-critical performance information systems;

- Security and business continuity arrangements for performance systems are adequate; revised first stat tables provide an increased level of security control i.e. password protection. Electronic data forms are backed up on secure network drives.

However;

- There is still some scope for increased sophistication within the first-stat data collection process, and rationalisation of the parallel collection processes for first stat indicators and BVPIs;
- Systems are still largely manual and require repetitive cleansing and manipulation to produce reports;
- A high-priority recommendation from last year's review, which impacts a number of KLOEs, was the formalisation of audit trails for corporate plan indicators which are not already covered by the

Council's BVPI collection process (i.e. local indicators). This is essential to ensure that ownership of and accountability for the indicator are clear, calculation methods and definitions are transparent, and that source systems are identified along with relevant reports and instructions for re-running them. This would also assist internal audit in undertaking the planned assurance work on corporate plan indicators;

- The resources team has developed informal guidance for managers in the collection, recording, analysis and reporting of corporate performance information, but formal procedure notes are yet to be developed in line with the corporate data quality policy; and
- The Council has not yet developed a set of formal criteria to be applied to all shared data. The Council intends to address this in line with policy development as above.

People and skills

The Council has made progress in the following areas;

Roles and responsibilities for data quality have been effectively communicated;

- Responsibility for data quality is only defined informally and implicitly as being the responsibility of "service directors and their representatives";

- An informal data quality guidance note has been prepared for staff which does a good job of broadly setting out corporate requirements and expectations in relation to data quality;
- Through the preparation of a formal DQ policy, the Council intends to provide additional guidance and support for managers in ensuring that staff are appraised in the context of corporate data quality objectives, however this has not been completed to date;

Arrangements are in place to ensure that staff have appropriate skills and support;

- The business improvement team provide a good level of support to performance staff across the Council, and ways to access support have been communicated effectively;
- The business improvement team have delivered a data quality workshop for relevant performance staff, including First Stat leads. This included information on the Audit Commission's approach to assessing DQ, as well as the specific findings from last years' review at Barnet. There was some workshop discussion around the proposed contents of the Council's DQ policy;
- There is evidence that the business improvement team provides a good level of support to service staff in using corporate performance information systems e.g. First Stat performance tables; and.

- The Council has a good track record of addressing identified problems with DQ, including use of training where appropriate. The workshop undertaken in 2006 showed that service-based performance leads are effective in stimulating local improvements to DQ.

However;

- Roles and responsibilities are not yet clearly defined and documented. The Council plans to address this with the development of a formal DQ policy. There are some examples of staff being set DQ targets, but it is not clear that this is consistently implemented across the organisation at this stage; and
- The corporate DQ guidance note, although useful, remains informal at this stage. The DQ workshop, which was also a useful event, was a one-off and not a formal programme of DQ training as such. The Council should take the opportunity to consider the ongoing provision of DQ training when formulating policy in this area.

Data use and reporting

The Council has made progress in the following areas;

Corporate performance information is used for day-to-day management through a variety of mechanisms;

- Performance reports are clear and focussed, and key strategic documents have carefully-set targets;

- There is clear evidence to show that corporate performance data informs business planning at departmental and corporate levels. The corporate plan is data-driven, and is informed by more detailed key priority plans;
- Performance data is reviewed and challenged through a number of mechanisms, including First Stat, Finance and Performance Review, ongoing member challenge through formal star-chamber reviews and on an ad-hoc basis, and reports to the cabinet resources and overview and scrutiny committees. Members attend these where appropriate. Actions arising from First Stat and F&PR are tracked by the business improvement team; and
- All departments are also required to put in place local arrangements for managing budgets and performance.

The Council has adequate procedures for checking the validity of reported performance indicators, although there are some specific weaknesses;

- All BVPIs are subject to a complete audit trail and sign off by senior managers, however corporate plan indicators are not subject to the same level of control. Although first stat data inputters are requested to obtain approval from heads of service before submitting figures, it is not clear if or how this is mandated in practice;
- A sample of BVPIs are subject to pre-audit checks on the basis of a risk analysis which includes consideration of relevance to CPA performance;

- Definitions are usually applied correctly, however stage 3 in 2006 and 2007 have identified a small number of instances where reported figures have required amendment based on cleansing of the underlying data; and
- The Council has a strong track record of acting on, and resolving problems with data quality where these have been identified through internal or external reviews.

However;

- There are some concerns over the quality of performance data provided to members, and the level of engagement from them in making resource allocation decisions on the basis of this; and
- Some corporate plan indicators are not clearly defined and do not have concrete audit trails. Only a sample of BVPIs are subject to departmental checks.

5 Analytical review (Stage 2)

An analytical review of the Audit Commission's specified BVPIs and non-BVPIs was carried out. All PIs were within the plausible and permissible values defined by the Audit Commission; therefore no concerns were noted at Stage 2 with regard to whether or not these specified indicators were fairly stated.

6 Data quality spot checks (Stage 3)

A number of PIs were reviewed using a series of detailed spot checks and audit tests. Our findings are shown below.

Table 1

Performance indicator	Assessment
Culture Cost per library indicator	Fairly stated
Environment BVPI 199a-c BVPI 215a and b	Fairly stated Amendment required.
Housing Percentage of total private sector homes vacant for more than six months Private sector unfit properties made fit Percentage of planned to responsive repairs Services users who have moved on in a planned way	Fairly stated Fairly stated Fairly stated Fairly stated

It was noted that for BVPI 215a and b that data held on the old Mayrise system included data that should be excluded from the calculation of this indicator. The Council changed systems in May 2006, and data held on the new system was appropriate for the calculation of these indicators.

The impact of the amendments was to change the outturn of BVPI 215a from 2.82 days to 2.64 days, and the outturn of BVPI 215b from 13.25 days to 12.29 days.

We had to revise our approach to the audit of the private sector unfit properties made fit indicator, as the Council had chosen to collect data on direct action taken by the Council to remove Category 1 hazards from private sector properties. We are pleased to note that the data the Council collected was fairly stated, and did not require amendment.

Given the improved performance in data quality in this area, especially as no reservations were recommended over systems to collect data, and also that there were no concerns over the quality of data for BV215a and b generated by the new system in place at the Council, no recommendations have been raised in respect of our Stage 3 audit.

Action Plan

Ref	Recommendation	Priority	Management response	Responsibility	Timescale
KLOE 1.1 Responsibility for data quality is clearly defined					
1	<p>At an operational level, responsibility for data quality is assigned informally at the discretion of heads of service. Services should ensure that staff to whom responsibility is delegated in this way have appropriate skills and support.</p> <p>Not sure there is anything to fix here, it's really just more of the same.</p>	2	Responsibility for DQ is formally assigned to service policy and performance leads. This group of officers work with each other and the Business Improvement Team to ensure continuous improvement. Workshops, regular briefings and timely dissemination formal internal policy updates and national guidance ensure these officers are able to deliver robust DQ.	Head of Business Improvement	Ongoing
KLOE 1.2 The body has clear data quality objectives					
2	In order to meet level 4 criteria, the Council would need to demonstrate that it has developed a formal data quality strategy, and that challenging data quality objectives have been put in place for services. Furthermore, the Council would have to demonstrate that delivery of these objectives was being monitored.	3	The instructions issued alongside the DQ guidance requires all services to manage data in line with the data quality guidance. The Internal Audit Service plan to review levels of compliance with the data quality guidance.	Head of Business Improvement	March 2008

KLOE 1.3 Arrangements for monitoring and securing data quality					
3	The Council already has plans for 2007-8 to improve the level of internal assurance over corporate plan indicators, for example through inclusion of DQ within the mini-SIC and increased involvement from internal audit. These improvements should be implemented in such a way that corporate plan data is demonstrably robust.	2	The 2007/08 Internal Control Checklist has been amended to reflect the increased levels of data quality demonstrated last year. The corporate plan performance tables are reviewed annually to ensure the indicators contained are relevant and quarterly submissions are challenged to set criteria by the Business Improvement Team.	Head of Business Improvement	Ongoing
KLOE 2.1: Policy for data quality					
4	The Council has already developed a revised performance management framework for 2007-8 and is working on a formal data quality policy. In order to meet level 3 criteria next year, the Council will need to show that these have been effectively implemented and are being followed by staff across the organisation.	2	Agreed	Head of Business Improvement	March 2008
KLOE 3.1: Performance systems					
5	The Council should review its corporate processes for collecting, recording, analysing and reporting performance information with the aim of (a) rationalising the separate data collection systems currently used for corporate plan indicators and BVPIs and (b) reducing the amount of manual administration and data cleansing / handling currently required.	3	We do not agree that this action is required. These are two separate processes but this does not cause additional manual administration or data cleansing. Corporate Plan indicators are collated by the Business Improvement Team to allow effective tracking, challenge and support to drive delivery of the corporate priorities. Although BVPI data is challenged annually by the Business Improvement Team, it remains the services' responsibility as data owners to collate regular quality data in relation to	N/A	N/A

			BVPI's. Not all BVPIs are in the Corporate Plan.		
KLOE 3.2: Performance system controls					
6	<p>The Council should be in a position to demonstrate that all corporate plan indicators are supported by an appropriate audit trail (e.g. as currently used for BVPIs). This is to ensure that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ownership of and accountability for the indicator are clear ➤ calculation methods and definitions are transparent ➤ source systems are identified ➤ relevant reports are identified along with instructions for re-running them ➤ indicators are auditable <p>The planned work of internal audit will be useful here.</p>	2	An exercise is being coordinated to assess the robustness of a wide range of quarter 2 performance data. The process currently used for BVPI testing will be applied to a sample of other data. This sample will include data in relation to CAA, the 198 National Indicators and other local indicators.	Head of Business Improvement	March 2008
KLOE 3.4: Data sharing					
7	<p>The Council has not yet developed a set of formal criteria to be applied to all internally or externally shared data. The Council should either take the opportunity to address this as a part of its formal data quality policy, or demonstrate that all significant instances of data sharing are covered by existing arrangements. This area will become increasingly important as we move towards the implementation of Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).</p>	2	Criteria to be applied to data sharing is included in the formal data quality policy.	Head of Business Improvement	March 2008

KLOE 4.1: Communication of data quality responsibilities					
8	Ensure that responsibility for data quality (for example ownership of performance indicators or responsibility for key systems) is consistently reflected in job descriptions and that data quality targets are set in personal appraisals wherever appropriate (the Council has undertaken to complete this in 2007-8)	2	Agreed	Head of Business Improvement	March 2008
KLOE 4.2: Data Quality training					
9	Review the ongoing level of provision of data quality training to assess its adequacy in the light of the findings of this review	2	Agreed	Head of Business Improvement	Ongoing
KLOE 5.1: Reported performance information is actively used in the decision making process					
10	In order to meet level 4 criteria, the Council would need to demonstrate that it has successfully addressed the concerns raised in the Corporate Assessment of October 2006, with regard to the quality of performance information received by members and their engagement in making resource allocation decisions based on this.	3	The revised corporate performance framework and emerging actions from the review of the council's overview and scrutiny process is demonstrating improved member engagement.	Head Of Business Improvement And Director of Corporate Governance	Ongoing