

Question	Agenda Item	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
1	8	John Dix	<p>At Appendix D, CSG benefits realisation, the figures for the financial year 2016/17 have changed from the last committee meeting even though they relate to the previous financial year and therefore should be fixed. Which figures for 2016/17 should I believe, the ones supplied at the September PCM meeting or the figures supplied at this meeting?</p>	<p>The underlying numbers used to work out gainshare have not changed and the amounts reported in 2016/17 do not impact any payments made in respect of gainshare.</p> <p>The reduction in total savings is due to the fact that when preparing the note, gross figures instead of net were used for additional council tax income and additional income. This was a mistake and out of sync with how other figures are presented in the note elsewhere, how it has been reported in previous years and the text in the note. It gave the appearance of a greater amount of additional income due to the Council to the value of £0.135m. As these sections fed in to the total savings figure, this was also affected by the correction.</p> <p>The review of the current figures, revealed the £100k error and it was felt important to correct it.</p>
2	10	John Dix	<p>Appendix A says “The contract is on track to deliver significant savings to the council, in the order of £39m over the 10-year term”. However the external auditor stated in the audit completion report that there was an under performance of contracted income for the past two years totalling £4.599 million and that this was unbilled by Barnet. In addition, the Partnership Director from Capita said that he “acknowledged the disputed £4.6 million” but that would be subject to debate. Are you sure this report is an accurate reflection of the true financial performance of this contract and why did this shortfall only</p>	<p>The report provides an accurate reflection of the financial performance of the contract, as the price paid for the services each year is fixed by the contract, as is the Minimum Income Guarantee. The external auditor’s report relates to the accounting treatment of any shortfall against the Minimum Income Guarantee for each year of the contract and does not affect the fact that any such shortfall is payable by RE to the council.</p>

Public Questions – Performance and Contract Management Committee – 28 November 2017

			come to light in the audit report.	
3	10	John Dix	When the report says “in the order of £39 million” why is it so ambiguous. Is it more or less than £39 million and if less, by how much?	The actual figure is £39.1m over the 10 year life of the contract.
4	10	John Dix	What is “reasonable quality” and is reasonable good enough?	The word “reasonable” is used with the meaning “adequate” or “satisfactory” and reflects a position where 82% of the contract’s service delivery KPIs achieved or exceeded their targets in 2016/17.
5	10	John Dix	A prepayment of £16 million generating a discount is not a service improvement. Why has it been categorised as such?	The discount has enabled additional investment in the provision of free school meals and street cleansing services. As such, it was considered that this was the most appropriate section in which to reference the discount.
6	10	John Dix	The report states that “the review has been particularly beneficial in terms of securing better awareness of this structure and thereby resolving a number of matters relating to interpretation and understanding of various elements of the contract”. If it has taken you 4 years to interpret and understand this contract is that a success or an admission of failure?	The sentence immediately prior to that quoted in the question states that the challenges have been “in some areas” and this issue did not extend to the contract in its entirety. It is considered to be a success that the Review process has facilitated a more complete understanding of some of the more complex aspects of the contract.
7	10	John Dix	Under regeneration, please can you clarify what are the “ongoing disagreements about what services are covered by the management fee”?	As stated in the “review outcomes”, there is now greater clarity over how the different funding sources contribute to the overall activity of the service and recognition that the output specification remains relevant. The development of flexible four-year workplans is addressing the previous concerns.

Public Questions – Performance and Contract Management Committee – 28 November 2017

8	10	John Dix	8. In Appendix A the report states “it has proved difficult to obtain sufficient information to conclude whether or not overall project costs represent good value for money”. In particular the Impower report notes that there may be a benefit in looking at alternative suppliers of project resources especially firms like supplier D. Why has it taken 4 years to discover this.	Appendix J sets out a range of measures that the council has put in place to ensure value for money. It is helpful that the Review has identified further improvements to this process.
9	10	John Dix	9. The reports states that “contractual commitments have been reviewed and the majority have been delivered” In my submission I identified 132 contractual commitments and have not seen evidence that they have been delivered. Has this committee been provided with evidence that they have been delivered?	The Member-led Working Group has reviewed the commitments in relation to the services that they considered as part of this Review. Delivery of contractual commitments is monitored through the monthly contract monitoring meeting that involves the council’s commercial and client lead officers, as well as officers from RE. Reports on any significant issues feed up from those meetings, via the Partnership Operations Board, into the council’s performance report, which is considered by Performance and Contract Management Committee.
10	10	John Dix	In Appendix C the number of customer satisfaction responses in 2014/15 was 1101 but in 2016/17 was only 162. How confident are you that the data is representative given such a small sample size and why was a larger sample not sought?	All customers are invited to respond to the satisfaction survey and it is up to individual customers to decide whether they wish to respond or not. In addition, the service carries out “door knocking” surveys, where resurfacing work has taken place. As noted in paragraph 1.44, the council appears to be alone amongst London Boroughs in seeking this feedback from its customers and therefore has a comparatively favourable grasp of customer satisfaction data.
11	10	John Dix	In Appendix D the levels of customer satisfaction in 2015/16 fell by 10 percentage points compared to the previous year. The explanation of the 2016 figure implies people are unhappy because applications have been refused. Does this mean that the level of	The analysis of 2016 data relates to the proportion of respondents that expressed satisfaction with the service having had their applications approved compared with the proportion of respondents that expressed satisfaction having had their application refused. This demonstrates that satisfaction levels vary according to outcome. This

Public Questions – Performance and Contract Management Committee – 28 November 2017

			refusals is up on the previous year or is it simply an excuse for falling performance.	analysis does not provide any comparison year on year.
12	10	John Dix	In Appendix E the report notes that contractual commitment T3-100 has only been partially completed even though the commitment should have been completed by December 2013. Do you think a commitment that is 4 years overdue is acceptable?	This commitment has a number of elements to it, with delivery of the final one originally due 30 months from service commencement, i.e. April 2016. Central to this commitment is the development of the Capital Investment Model, which is also known as Barnet Fund. By April 2016, a draft Model had been developed and data from 2015/16 was being entered into the Model for testing. A revised final delivery programme was agreed with the council to allow for completion of a fully operational Model. RE has now substantially completed the work and the focus for both RE and the council is now on training of key stakeholders and users of the Model in its roll out and use. The commitment is an on-going one which means it will be monitored and in use throughout the life of the contract.
13	10	John Dix	In Appendix E the report notes that contractual commitment T3-110 has still not been completed even though the commitment should have been completed by September 2014. What service credit has been levied for this non compliance?	Delivery of this commitment is now well underway, in accordance with an action plan that was agreed with the council, so no remedy is required.
14	10	John Dix	In Appendix E the report notes that contractual commitment T3-112 is not due. However the contract says this commitment was due 12 months after the contract was signed. Please can you clarify why this commitment has been incorrectly labelled as not due?	A revised delivery date was agreed, to tie in with completion of the Local Plan.

Public Questions – Performance and Contract Management Committee – 28 November 2017

15	10	John Dix	In Appendix F the report notes that three contractual commitments T3-091, 097 & 098 are still not complete even though they should have been completed within 1 year of signing the contract. Why?	As stated in Appendix F, commitment T3-091 was delivered in 2014 and subsequently re-opened, as the contract with Local Futures was not facilitating effective outcomes. Delivery of revised arrangements is in progress and will facilitate completion and sign-off of the T3-097 and T3-098,
16	10	John Dix	Given that there is a clear disconnect between the service that was defined by the output specification and KPIs at the time and the council's current requirements, does this mean that the service specification will be changed, will there be additional costs and does this exemplify the problems of trying to specify such a complex service over such a long contract period.	As indicated in the report, the issue regarding output specifications not reflecting current requirements was a perception that was articulated by some officers at the beginning of the Review. The Review process has confirmed that the output specifications remain relevant and do not require re-writing. Discussions on KPIs in some service areas are continuing, but wholesale changes are not anticipated. The contract provides for ongoing review and amendment to address changing requirements and for full reviews at years four and seven to ensure that it continues to meet the council's needs.