



Harborough District Council,

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council,

North West Leicestershire District Council,

Working in Partnership to provide better services...

Meeting	Joint Committee
Time/Date	4.30 pm on Thursday, 14 APRIL 2016
Location	Atkins Building, Lower Bond Street, Hinckley
Officer to contact	Democratic Services (01530 454512)

All persons present are reminded that the meeting may be recorded and by attending this meeting you are giving your consent to being filmed and your image being used. You are kindly requested to make it known to the Chairman if you intend to film or record this meeting.

The Monitoring Officer would like to remind members that when they are considering whether the following items are exempt information under the relevant paragraph under part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 they must have regard to the public interest test. This means that members must consider, for each item, whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption from disclosure outweighs the public interest in making the item available to the public.

AGENDA

Item	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
To receive and note any apologies for absence.	
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring disclosable interests you should make clear the nature of that interest.	
3. MINUTES	
To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2016	3 - 6

Item		Pages
4. RISK BASED VERIFICATION POLICY		
	The report of the Benefits Operational Manager	7 - 12
5. PERFORMANCE REPORT (FEBRUARY 2016)		
	The report of the Head of Partnership	13 - 44
6. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE TO FEBRUARY 2016		
	The report of the Section 151 Officer	45 - 48
7. CIPFA BENCHMARKING CLUB 2015		
	The report of the Head of Partnership	49 - 68
8. UNIVERSAL CREDIT UPDATE		
	Verbal update from the Head of Partnership	
9. FORWARD PLAN		
	To note the Joint Committee's forward plan	69 - 70
10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS		
	The next meeting will be held on Thursday, 9 June 2016 at 4.30pm.	

Circulation:

Councillor R D Bayliss (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor J Hallam (Chairman)
Councillor M Hall
Councillor P King
Councillor T J Pendleton
Councillor M Surtees

MINUTES of a meeting of THE LEICESTERSHIRE PARTNERSHIP REVENUES AND BENEFITS JOINT COMMITTEE held in the Atkins Building, Lower Bond Street, Hinckley on THURSDAY, 28 JANUARY 2016

Present: Councillor J Hallam (Harborough) (Chairman)

Councillors R D Bayliss (NWLDC), M Hall (Hinckley and Bosworth), P King (HDC), T J Pendleton (NWLDC) and M Surtees (Hinckley and Bosworth)

Chief Executives: Mr S Atkinson (HBBC)

Officers: Mrs C Hammond, Ms B Jolly (HDC), Mrs J Kenny (HBBC), Mr M Murphy (NWLDC), Mrs S O'Hanlon (Leicestershire Partnership - Revenues & Benefits) and Mr A Wilson (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council)

In attendance: Mr C Dickens (PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP)

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr R Bowmer, Ms C E Fisher and Mr S Kohli.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no interests declared.

20. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2015.

Mrs S O'Hanlon stated that she had given her apologies for the meeting and that Mr S Coop had attended in her place.

By affirmation of the meeting it was

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record.

21. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT 2015/16

Mr C Dickens presented the report to Members.

He advised Members that overall it was a positive report with two medium risk issues and one low risk issue identified with Council Tax and two low risk issues with the NNDR system along with two advisory findings in Housing Benefits. He informed Members that the issues were not specific to an individual Council and that actions had been agreed.

In response to a question from Councillor M Hall to the lack of detailed procedure notes and the agreed target date for completion, Mr C Dickens advised Members that a full review of procedures may take time, but action was being taken in the interim.

Mrs S O'Hanlon added that when staff returned to work following a lengthy absence they would familiarise themselves with the procedures again, this is in addition to accuracy checks being undertaken, and an officer available for training to new starters, areas of repeated error and new legislation

Councillor P King expressed concerns over the lack of evidence that was retained and felt that there should not be any gaps. He sought reassurance that measures were in place to address this.

Mrs S O'Hanlon reassured Members that plans were in place to address the issues identified and that in relation to the Council Tax element a review of empty properties was undertaken at the end of the year and that due to external agencies undertaking some of the work the evidence was not always recorded a bug in the system the evidence was not always logged.

In response to a question Councillor P King, Mr C Dickens reiterated that it was a good report and that it was not unusual to find a small number of issues and that an expectable rate was no issues however that was not practicable, adding that he was comfortable controls were in place and if there was anything out of sync it would have been raised as a more significant issue.

RESOLVED THAT:

The Partnership Internal Audit Report 2015/16 be noted.

22. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE TO NOVEMBER 2015

Mr A Wilson presented the report to Members.

He highlighted to Members that the budget was currently underspent and that the Partnership was forecasting an underspend with a yearend saving of £110,000 through salary savings and the procurement of a new virtual post room.

Councillor J Hallam stated that the budget was looking good.

RESOLVED THAT:

The financial performance of the Partnership be noted.

23. 2016/2017 PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr A Wilson presented the report to Members.

He advised Members having factored in a 1% pay increase, 1.1% for general inflation and an increase in pay and employer costs for NI and pension contributions there would be an increase in the Partnership budget of £58,820. He highlighted that the Partnership was still delivering savings and that the table at 3.9 outlined the partner contribution splits.

Councillor R D Bayliss stated that as the Partnership went on it was harder to compare, however he was happy that savings were being made.

Following a question from Councillor P King, Mrs S O'Hanlon advised that comparisons had been made from the previous budget post restructure not the commencement of the partnership.

Councillor P King expressed concerns that it appeared that the costs were still going up and that he would like to see them coming down adding that the Partnership could not sit back and should keep looking at ways to make further savings.

Mr S Atkinson stated that the Partnership had made significant savings following the restructure and as such costs were going up at lower rate.

It was moved by Councillor R D Bayliss, seconded by Councillor T J Pendleton and

RESOLVED THAT:

The 2016/2017 budget proposals for the Partnership be approved.

24. PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT AND CONSTITUTION

Mrs J Kenny presented the report to Members.

She advised Members that the Partnership was five years on and the original agreement was coming to an end. She stated that the legal teams of all three partner authorities had agreed the new agreement and that if the Committee were to agree the report the new agreement would be executed on the 1 April 2016 for a further five years.

In response to a question from Councillor M Surtees, Mrs J Kenny advised that each authority was still employing its own staff, but it could be a future change to be looked into.

In response to a question from Councillor M Hall, Mrs J Kenny stated that the Partnership would be offering its services, but not adding into the Partnership itself.

Mrs S O'Hanlon advised that the Partnership had been approached to deliver some Housing Benefit training and officers were currently looking at how to develop the request and expand on it.

It was moved by Councillor M Hall, seconded by Councillor T J Pendleton and

RESOLVED THAT:

That the draft deed of variation for the Partnership be approved.

25. NOVEMBER 2015 PERFORMANCE REPORT

Mrs S O'Hanlon presented the report to Members.

She advised Members that it is currently forecasted that all the targets would be met by the end of the year, however due to some significant write-offs for NNDR for NWLDC it is predicted this target will not be reached. Agreement hadn't been reached to amend its target for the year. It is also forecast the new claims indicator for NWLDC will not be achieved.

She highlighted to Members that each authority had one employee on long term sick and each authority was working with that employee to support returning to work, whilst ensuring action is taken to address any targets that are hit as they arrive.

Councillor R D Bayliss stated that he understood why the target had not been revised but felt that this was correct.

In response to a question from Councillor M Surtees, Mrs S O'Hanlon advised the Committee that a 'golden promise' was when officers tried to process a benefit application within 24 hours which in turn would lessen the impact of Customer Services and landlords would get a prompt payment.

RESOLVED THAT:

The November 2015 Performance Report be noted.

26. SERVICE PLAN 2016/17

Mrs S O'Hanlon presented the Service Plan to Members.

She advised Members that the plan detailed key projects and the performance targets for the year. She drew Members attention to the inclusion of performance indicators for previous years for Council Tax and Business Rates, and that there were no changes to the targets for HBBC and NWLDC and a slight increase to the targets for HDC both Council Tax and Business Rates.

RESOLVED THAT:

The Service Plan 2016/2017 be noted.

27. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED THAT:

In pursuance of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act and that the public interest in maintaining this exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

28. UNIVERSAL CREDIT - UPDATE

Mrs S O'Hanlon presented the report and updated Members on the current position.

RESOLVED THAT:

The report be noted.

29. FORWARD PLAN

Mrs S O'Hanlon presented the Forward Plan to Members.

RESOLVED THAT:

The Forward Plan be noted.

30. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Members noted the date of the next meeting Thursday, 14 April 2016 at 4.30pm.

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5.23 pm



Leicestershire Partnership Revenues & Benefits

**RISK BASED VERIFICATION
POLICY**

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To approve the adoption of the Risk Based Verification Policy in determining evidence requirements for the assessment of new Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support claims.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 To adopt the process of Risk Based Verification for verifying Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support claims

3. BACKGROUND

The Leicestershire Revenues and Benefits Partnership provides Revenues and Benefits services on behalf of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, North West Leicestershire District Council and Harborough District Council

The Partnership is responsible for the calculation and award of Housing Benefit and Local Council Tax Support, subject to an accepted application form and verification of that application. The partnership already has a verification policy in place which deals with the provision of documents, certificates information and evidence to determine entitlement, Risk Based Verification is an enhancement of that policy.

Risk Based Verification (RBV) is a method of applying different levels of checks to benefit claims according to the risk associated with those claims. The approach allows for a more intense verification activity to be focused on claims more prone to fraud and error. The Department for Work and Pensions has confirmed that all Councils are able to adopt this approach (Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit Circular HB/CTB S11/2011).

The Department for Works & Pensions (DWP) has implemented an RBV approach for the assessment of some state benefits and has announced its intention that RBV will be applied to all Universal Credit claims. DWP allows local authorities to implement an RBV approach to the verification of benefit claims. It has identified that adopting such an approach will provide the following benefits to customers and Local Authorities.

- Improved claim processing times, especially in relation to claims assessed as being “low risk”.
- Improved efficiencies through reduced administrative costs.
- Improved opportunity to identify fraud and error at the claim gateway through better targeting of resources. The DWP have made it clear that the adoption of RBV software should not result in a reduction in resources, this is particularly relevant for the partnership as we have already reduced the number of assessment staff following the recommendations made in the service review

The Partnership intends to introduce RBV within the new financial year for all new claims for Housing Benefit and Local Council Tax Support. This will help reduce the burden on customers to provide perceived excessive levels of evidence and reduce the cost of administering claims by reducing correspondence with customers and the subsequent scanning of evidence. It is intended that RBV will initially only be applied to new claims. However, the process will be reviewed and potentially expanded to include changes of circumstances in the future.

Local authorities adopting RBV are still required to comply with relevant legislation (Social Security Administration Act 1992, section 1 relating to production of National Insurance numbers to provide evidence of identity) while making maximum use of intelligence to target more extensive verification activity on those claims shown to be at greater risk of fraud and/or error.

Purpose of Policy

The purpose of this policy is to specify how the Partnership will operate the RBV solution and to indicate the factors and processes that need to be followed to maximise its effectiveness. The Partnership will implement “risk assessment” software which has been provided by Capita/Xantura. The benefit of going with the Capita solution is that the new claims module is fully integrated with the Capita HB application .

At the claim gateway the Capita/Xantura solution will determine the risk score of the claim and that in turn will determine the level of verification that needs to be applied to that claim by the processing officer.

Risk scores cannot be downgraded at anytime by the processing officer. However, they can be increased through approval from a Senior Officer or Team Leader if there are mitigating reasons. Reasons for upgrading a risk score may be due to previous fraud investigations or a customer is known not to report changes in circumstances within the specified time frame. System notes will be kept of all such cases including the reason why the risk score was increased.

Each member of staff responsible for processing claims will be made fully aware of the changes introduced by this Policy as well as being fully trained in the use of the IT solution. In order to mitigate the risk of fraud and error entering at the claim gateway, levels of evidence required for each risk score have been specified.

An integral part of the IT solution being used for RBV is a specially developed risk algorithm. This risk algorithm has been developed to identify the likelihood that fraud and/or error exists in a claim as it is made at the local authority. This has been built using historical local authority data and its performance validated across a number of local authorities.

The risk framework which is embedded in the IT solution is shown below:

Risk Score	Risk Level	Distribution of Risk across claims	Likelihood of error being present in claim
1	HIGH	21%	27%
2			
3			
4	MEDIUM	27%	11%
5			
6			
7			
8	LOW	52%	3%
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			

Low risk claims

On the basis of the risk algorithm it is estimated that around 52% of claims received will be low risk. In this circumstance only essential checks will be made. All low risk claims can be processed once identity has been verified; any other necessary data can be requested post assessment.

Medium risk claims

It is assumed that around 27% of claims will be deemed to be medium risk. In this circumstance these claims will be verified in the same way as they are currently.

High risk claims

Around 21% of claims will be deemed to be high risk. In this circumstance these claims will require further checks in addition to those undertaken for medium risk cases. Further checks will lead to fraud and error being identified at the claim gateway, thus minimising subsequent overpayments and collection costs. In the High Risk category there are three risk scores, risk score 1 being the highest risk of fraud and/or error being present. For each risk score within the High Risk category additional checks will be undertaken as follows:

- Risk score 1 – In addition to the requirement to supply original documents to support the claim, the assessor will conduct a telephone interview with the claimant.
- Risk score 2 – The assessment officer will write to the customer asking them to provide additional evidence to support the claim.
- Risk score 3 – An intervention check will be raised after commencement of the claim.

The base line

A key component of this policy is to create a robust baseline of existing fraud and error. The DWP expect local authorities that participate in RBV to set a robust baseline against which to record the impact of RBV. DWP guidelines allow local authorities to establish their own baseline for the level of fraud and/or error.

Prior to the introduction of RBV, work will be undertaken to set the Council's baseline position by recording (for a period of at least 1 month) all fraud and error identified at the claim gateway.

How checks and balances will be introduced into business as usual processes

The RBV process also incorporates the functionality to randomly escalate Low or Medium Risk cases to High Risk. This is both a DWP requirement and ensures the veracity of the Risk Based Verification process is maintained.

In line with guidelines set, between 4% and 5% of low risk cases will be escalated to high risk.

Performance reporting implications

Performance monitoring will be undertaken on a monthly basis to ensure the effectiveness of the approach. This will include the percentage of cases presented in each risk category and the levels of fraud and error detected in each.

The monitoring will also identify and outline how much fraud and/or error has been detected in blind sample cases.

Data Processing Agreements

Each of the partners will be required to sign a data sharing agreement with Capita/Xantura, the software will be made available as a hosted web solution.

This page is intentionally left blank



13

Revenue and Benefit Service

Performance Report

February 2016

Contents

Page numbers

Key indicators update	3 – 4
Caseload Analysis	5
Individual council's dashboard summaries	6 - 8
Benefits/Fraud performances update	9 - 15
Council Tax performances update	16 – 22
Non Domestic Rate performances update	23 - 27
Complaints, vacancies and sickness update	28 - 31

Summary

Performance – Key Indicators

Collection Rates (Cumulative)

Council Tax in-year

HBBC: 96.4% *(96.5%)	HDC: 97.0% *(97.2%)	NWLDC: 95.8% *(96%)
Target: 96.5%	97.6%	96.0%

* Brackets the position when compared with February 2015

For your information illustrates the increase in net collectable debit when compared with 2014/15:

<u>Net Collectable Debit</u>	<u>2014/15</u>		<u>2015/16</u>		<u>2014/15</u>	
	<u>Out-turn</u>	<u>Annual Debit</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>% increase</u>	<u>For Comparison</u>	
					<u>£</u>	
HBBC	£51.9m	£53.6m	£54.1m	4.1%	£2.2m	
HDC	£48.9m	£50.1m	£50.4m	2.9%	£1.5m	
NWLDC	£45.9m	£47.5m	£47.9m	4.1%	£2.0m	

Non Domestic Rates

HBBC: 95.9% *(96.1%)	HDC: 97.0% (96.7%)	NWLDC: 96.7% *(96.7%)
Target: 96.1%	96.0%	96.0%

* Brackets the position when compared with February 2015

For your information illustrates the increase in net collectable debit when compared with 2014/15:

<u>Net Collectable Debit</u>	<u>2014/15</u>		<u>2015/16</u>		<u>2014/15</u>	
	<u>Out-turn</u>	<u>Annual Debit</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>% increase</u>	<u>For comparison</u>	
					<u>£</u>	
HBBC	£29.1m	£29.9m	£30.0m	3.1%	£0.9m	
HDC	£38.1m	£39.8m	£38.7m	1.6%	£0.6m	
NWLDC	£50.7m	£52.2m	£52.6m	3.6%	£1.9m	

HB/CTLS Claims

Right Time (Combined) end of year target: 11 Days

Days shown below are cumulative:

HBBC	10.4 days *(8.3)	HDC	10.2 days *(8.2)	NWLDC	10.9 days *(8.7)
-------------	------------------	------------	------------------	--------------	------------------

* Brackets the position when compared with February 2015.

New Claims end of year target: 19 Days

Days shown below are cumulative:

HBBC:	18.1 days *(15.6)	HDC:	18.6 days *(15.8)	NWLDC:	19.5 days *(16.0)
--------------	-------------------	-------------	-------------------	---------------	-------------------

* Brackets the position when compared with February 2015.

Change Events end of year target: 9 Days

Days shown below are cumulative

HBBC:	7.8 days *(6.2)	HDC:	7.6 days *(6.1)	NWLDC:	8.3 days *(6.7)
--------------	-----------------	-------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------------

* Brackets the position when compared with February 2015.

Caseload Analysis

Position at:	01/04/2011	01/04/2012	In Year Movement	01/04/2013	In Year Movement	01/04/2014	In Year Movement	01/04/2015	In Year Movement	2015/16		Overall	
										As at 29/2/2016	In Year Movement		%
Council Tax Dwellings													
HBBC	46,172	46,505	333	46,788	283	47,405	617	48,135	730	48,666	531	2,494	5.1%
HDC	35,923	35,965	42	36,494	529	37,048	554	37,312	264	37,875	563	1,952	5.2%
NWLDC	40,026	40,271	245	40,833	562	41,292	459	41,761	469	42,315	554	2,289	5.4%
NDR Rated Assessments													
HBBC	2,876	2,867	-9	2,932	65	2,968	36	2,985	17	3,046	61	136	4.5%
HDC	2,616	2,730	114	2,762	32	2,835	73	2,894	59	2,908	14	292	10.0%
NWLDC	3,182	3,170	-12	3,175	5	3,210	35	3,223	13	3,240	17	32	1.0%
HB/CTLS Live Caseload													
HBBC	7,100	7,579	479	7,555	-24	7,161	-394	6,832	-329	6,462	-370	-328	-5.1%
HDC	4,189	4,246	57	4,345	99	4,274	-71	4,086	-188	3,698	-388	-491	-13.3%
NWLDC	7,187	7,287	100	7,213	-74	6,770	-443	6,550	-220	6,187	-363	-712	-11.5%

Please note: Overall movement is when compared with 1/4/11 and current position

Benefits caseload has reduced resulting from the introduction of Council Tax Support from 1/4/2013. .

The CTLS schemes were changed from 1/4/2014 for both HBBC/NWLDC and resulted in different eligibility percentage (12% and 15% respectively) which may have attributed in the variance)

Dashboard Performance Summaries for each Council is shown below:

HBBC												2015/16	Year-End 2015/16 Target	2014/15 Same month cumulative comparison
BENEFITS	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Cumulative		
In Year: Right Time (days)	11.2	11.0	11.8	10.7	9.8	11.1	13.7	10.9	10.5	10.8	3.1	10.4	11	8.8
In Year: New Claims (Days)	24.0	22.4	16.9	18.3	12.8	20.5	21.7	18.4	12.8	16.2	15.1	18.1	19	15.8
In Year: Change Events (Days)	9.0	9.2	10.8	9.4	9.3	9.6	12.2	9.3	10.0	9.5	2.4	7.8	9	7.6
Right Time Profiled Target 15/16	14.1	14.8	14.7	11.0	10.9	10.2	10.8	9.3	10.4	9.8	3.4			
New Claims Profiled Target 15/16	18.5	22.0	22.9	18.4	16.8	16.7	14.4	15.0	16.2	16.2	17.5			
Change Events Profiled Target 15/16	13.5	13.7	13.2	9.8	9.8	9.1	10.0	8.2	9.0	8.6	2.5			
COUNCIL TAX	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	11.1%	20.4%	29.7%	38.9%	48.2%	57.6%	66.9%	76.2%	85.4%	94.4%	96.4%	96.4%	98.1%	
2015/16 Target	11.2%	20.5%	29.9%	39.2%	48.4%	58.0%	67.4%	76.4%	85.8%	94.7%	96.5%			
In Year Arrears Reduction (£)	£2.1m	£2m	£1.9m	£1.9m	£1.8m	£1.8m	£1.8m	£1.7m	£1.7m	£1.7m	£1.6m	£1.6m	<£1.3m	
Position for: 2014/15	£2.1m	£2m	£1.9m	£1.8m	£1.7m	£1.7m	£1.6m	£1.6m	£1.5m	£1.5m	£1.4m			
NON DOMESTIC RATES	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	11.5%	20.2%	29.7%	38.7%	47.7%	56.8%	65.6%	74.9%	84.3%	93.4%	95.9%	95.9%	98.3%	
2015/16 Target	10.9%	20.1%	29.6%	39.0%	47.6%	56.9%	66.6%	75.5%	84.6%	93.6%	96.1%			
In Year Arrears Reduction (£)	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.5m	£0.5m	<£0.3m	
Position for: 2014/15	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.3m	£0.3m	£0.3m			
HB DEBT RECOVERY	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB Overpayments outstanding at year end	£1.1m	£1.1m	£1.1m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.4m	£1.3m	£1.4m	£1.4m		
Position for: 2014/15	£0.86m	£0.86m	£0.86m	£0.86m	£0.89m	£0.91m	£0.92m	£0.95m	£0.95m	£1.02m	£1.00m			
HB Overpayments Recovered	5%	9%	15%	19%	23%	25%	27%	28%	29%	34%	35%	35%	38%	
2015/16 Target	4%	10%	14%	18%	20%	24%	26%	30%	32%	34%	36%			
FRAUD	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB/CTB Sanctions gained	3	2	2	3	2	0	3	2	4	2	0	23	12	
CTLS Sanctions gained	2	2	0	3	1	0	2	2	1	1	0	14		
Position for: 2014/15	3	2	3	0	3	5	4	2	4	3	0			
2015/16 target	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1			

HDC												2015/16	Year - End 2015/16	2014/15 Same month cumulative comparison
BENEFITS	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Cumulative		
In Year: Right Time (days)	9.8	11.1	11.9	10.1	10.2	10.8	12.0	10.8	11.8	10.9	3.0	10.2	11	8.7
In Year: New Claims (Days)	20.6	22.6	20.9	18.0	16.7	18.9	19.3	19.3	13.1	16.4	15.4	18.6	19	15.8
In Year: Change Events (Days)	8.3	9.5	10.2	8.8	8.9	9.4	10.8	8.9	11.6	9.6	2.4	7.6	9	7.4
Right Time Profiled Target 15/16	15.0	16.4	16.0	10.6	10.3	10.2	10.6	10.3	9.4	9.5	3.2			
New Claims Target 15/16	22.0	25.8	23.0	18.4	18.8	16.5	15.9	17.5	14.8	15.8	14.0			
Change Events Profiled Target 15/16	13.1	14.2	14.9	9.2	8.7	9.1	9.6	9.0	8.5	8.1	2.5			
COUNCIL TAX	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	11.4%	20.8%	30.4%	39.4%	48.7%	58.1%	67.9%	77.0%	86.2%	95.1%	97.0%	97.0%	98.1%	
2015/16 target	10.3%	20.2%	30.1%	39.8%	48.9%	58.3%	68.4%	77.9%	87.1%	96.0%	97.6%			
Arrears Reduction (£)	£2.0m	£1.9m	£1.8m	£1.8m	£1.7m	£1.7m	£1.6m	£1.6m	£1.6m	£1.5m	£1.3m	£1.3m	<£1.3m	
Position for: 2014/15	£1.9m	£1.8m	£1.8m	£1.7m	£1.6m	£1.6m	£1.5m	£1.4m	£1.4m	£1.3m	£1.3m			
NON DOMESTIC RATES	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	10.8%	19.8%	29.5%	38.8%	47.8%	57.7%	66.5%	75.3%	85.2%	93.9%	97.0%	97.0%	98.3%	
2015/16 Target	10.2%	20.4%	29.7%	38.7%	47.6%	57.9%	66.0%	74.9%	83.8%	92.7%	96.0%			
Arrears Reduction (£)	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.4m	£0.3m	£0.3m	£0.2m	£0.2m	£0.2m	£0.2m	<£0.4m	
Position for: 2014/15	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.5m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.4m			
HB DEBT RECOVERY	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB Overpayments outstanding at year end (Academy)	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.8m		
Position for: 2014/15	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m			
HB Overpayments Recovered	3%	7%	11%	15%	17%	18%	21%	23%	24%	24%	27%	27%	42%	
2015/16 target	13%	16%	20%	23%	26%	29%	32%	33%	37%	39%	40%			
FRAUD	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB/CTB Sanctions gained	4	1	0	2	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	16	16	
CTLS Sanctions gained	3	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	10		
Position for: 2014/15	1	1	2	0	4	0	2	7	1	0	0			
2015/16 target	1	1	2	0	3	0	2	5	1	0	0			

NWLDC												2015/16	Year End 2015/16 target	2014/15 Same month cumulative comparison
BENEFITS	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Cumulative		
In Year: Right Time (days)	12.3	10.5	14.2	11.3	11.4	11.6	10.3	12.4	11.7	11.1	3.0	10.9	11	9.3
In Year: New Claims (Days)	23.8	22.2	20.8	20.0	17.6	19.7	20.7	19.4	18.8	15.1	16.2	19.5	19	16.2
In Year: Change Events (Days)	10.5	8.9	12.9	9.5	10.5	10.1	8.9	10.9	10.5	10.2	2.4	8.3	9	8.1
Right Time Profiled Target 15/16	14.9	15.5	15.1	11.5	10.6	9.9	11.1	8.6	10.1	10.2	3.0			
New Claims Profiled Target 15/16	21.0	23.0	25.1	20.4	20.3	14.6	16.2	13.7	15.9	16.5	15.4			
Change Events Profiled Target 15/16	13.6	14.3	13.3	10.3	9.1	9.2	10.0	7.7	8.6	8.9	2.4			
COUNCIL TAX	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	10.5%	19.7%	29.0%	38.2%	47.4%	56.7%	65.9%	75.2%	84.6%	93.7%	95.8%	95.8%	97.8%	
2015/16 Target	10.5%	19.8%	29.0%	38.3%	47.4%	56.8%	66.3%	75.6%	84.9%	94.1%	96.0%			
Arrears Reduction (£)	£2.6m	£2.5m	£2.4m	£2.4m	£2.3m	£2.2m	£2.2m	£2.1m	£2.1m	£2.1m	£2.0m	£2.0m	<£1.6m	
Position for: 2014/15	£2.6m	£2.4m	£2.3m	£2.2m	£2.1m	£2.0m	£1.9m	£1.8m	£1.7m	£1.6m	£1.7m			
NON DOMESTIC RATES	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
In Year (%)	10.8%	20.2%	29.5%	38.6%	46.9%	56.8%	65.6%	74.9%	84.5%	93.4%	96.7%	96.7%	99.0%	
2015/16 Target	11.0%	19.0%	30.9%	40.7%	48.8%	57.9%	67.1%	75.7%	83.9%	92.2%	96.0%			
Arrears Reduction (£)	£1m	£1.1m	£1.1m	£1.1m	£1.0m	£0.7m	£0.6m	£0.5m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£0.4m	<£0.6m	
Position for: 2014/15	£1m	£0.9m	£0.8m	£0.8m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.7m	£0.6m	£0.6m	£0.6m			
HB DEBT RECOVERY	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB Overpayments outstanding at year end (Academy)	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.1m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	
Position for: 2014/15	£1.3m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£1.3m	£1.2m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m	£1.3m			
	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB Overpayments Recovered	4%	4%	11%	16%	19%	34%	35%	37%	37%	38%	39%	39%	34%	
2015/16 Target	4%	8%	11%	14%	17%	20%	23%	24%	26%	29%	31%			
FRAUD	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb			
HB/CTB Sanctions gained	2	4	1	0	0	3	6	3	3	0	0	22	34	
CTLS Sanctions gained	2	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	1	0	21		
Position for: 2014/15	2	0	4	1	1	4	9	1	4	4	1			
2015/16 Target	1	4	2	3	2	3	3	3	4	3	3			

Benefits Operational Team

(Housing Benefit, Council Tax Support and Fraud)

Performance Update from Storme Coop – Benefits Operational Manager

At the end of February all 3 LA's are meeting their 'change events' targets. Our prediction is that it will only be NWLDC who are unable to meet the new claim target by a small margin at year end.

We have put a number of measures in place to both monitor and improve processing times over the last month including the careful monitoring of any stats over 30 days and the continuance of overtime to support the processing of uprates.

Fraud update

From March 1st 2016 responsibility for the investigation of Housing Benefit and residual Council Tax Benefit fraud transferred to the Fraud & Error Service at the DWP. From this date all allegations relating to suspected Housing Benefit fraud are referred to the DWP for investigation, however it should be remembered that the partnership still retains responsibility for preventing and deterring Housing Benefit fraud.

21

The partnership has employed 1.5 FTE fraud and liaison officers who will investigate cases of suspected council tax support fraud and act as nominated Single Points of Contact (SPOC) for the Partnership and Oadby & Wigston Borough Council.

The SPOC part of the role will be to facilitate the exchange of information and documents between the Partnership and the Fraud & Error Service. The LA will be expected to work very closely with the Fraud & Error Service to support their investigations and provide evidence to support legal action. All of this activity has to be undertaken in accordance with an agreed framework prescribed by the DWP.

Fraud and Error Reduction Incentive Scheme

This scheme was introduced in December 2014 to support activities which reduce fraud and error in the benefit system. The partnership has successfully bid for funding for 2015/16 & 2016/17 and will be used, alongside other initiatives, to fund the following:

- Promoting the requirement to notify changes in circumstances
- Continued appointment of a clerical officer to support the intervention process
- Increased staffing costs as a result of identifying changes in entitlement.

The total funding awards received HDC £6,964; HBBC £11,676 & NWLDC £12,010.

Claim activity: (Included in the calculation for performance statistics – source: Capita DWP SHBE extract)

HBBC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£49,462	£61,589	£85,227	£143,838	£95,082	£79,995	£117,591	£62,200	£115,272	£99,285	£109,675	£1,019,216
Partnership collection Rate	5%	9%	15%	19%	23%	25%	27%	28%	29%	34%	35%	
Sundry Debt collection rate												
Combined												
Partnership anticipated collection rate	4%	10%	14%	18%	20%	24%	26%	30%	32%	34%	36%	

HDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£49,159	£30,474	£40,548	£80,846	£51,524	£49,276	£29,362	£31,486	£59,414	£39,765	£52,351	£514,205
Partnership collection Rate	3%	7%	11%	15%	17%	18%	21%	23%	25%	27%	28%	
Sundry Debt collection rate	1%	4%	4%	6%	7%	9%	9%	10%	11%	12%	12%	
Combined	3%	7%	11%	15%	17%	18%	21%	23%	24%	26%	27%	
Partnership anticipated collection rate	13%	16%	20%	23%	26%	29%	32%	33%	37%	39%	40%	

NWLDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£59,454	£45,489	£70,836	£70,401	£85,158	£82,607	£77,391	£87,285	£68,592	£84,009	£73,211	£804,433
Partnership collection Rate	5%	9%	13%	20%	23%	25%	28%	30%	31%	32%	34%	
Sundry Debt collection rate	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	72%	73%	74%	73%	74%	73%	
Combined	4%	4%	11%	16%	19%	34%	35%	37%	37%	38%	40%	
Partnership anticipated collection rate	4%	8%	11%	14%	17%	20%	23%	24%	26%	29%	31%	

22

The table below shows number of documents received in the document management system:

Northgate Documents	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Items received	16520	13658	16193	14723	11801	14395	11215	13083	11516	14190	13019
Items processed	14255	13452	16977	14585	12108	11768	12323	14400	12104	10793	13412
Carried forward	5887	5245	2783	2921	2687	5241	4133	2816	2228	2712	2319

The tables below shows incoming work position for February to include date we are working from:

WEEKLY DATA FROM INFORMATION @ WORK						
Date	New claims - number outstanding	New claims - date being worked on	New claims - number of working days behind	Changes - number outstanding	Changes - date being worked on	Changes - number of working days behind
1st Feb 2016	27	27th Jan 2016	3	220	26th Jan 2016	4
8th Feb 2016	51	2nd Feb 2016	4	133	3rd Feb 2016	3
15th Feb 2016	30	11th Feb 2016	2	122	11th Feb 2016	2
22nd Feb 2016	6	18th Feb 2016	2	39	18th Feb 2016	2
29th Feb 2016	9	24th Feb 2016	3	51	23rd Feb 2016	4

DWP Atlas Performance:

(DWP Pensioner 16/17 Annual Assessed Income up-ratings)

ATLAS PERFORMANCE		
Date	Atlas - number outstanding	Atlas - date being worked on
1st Feb 2016	1584	UPRATES
8th Feb 2016	65/184	5.2.16/uprates
15th Feb 2016	9	343 Uprates
22nd Feb 2016	7	72
29th Feb 2016	24	26th Feb 2016

DWP Real Time Performance:

RTI PERFORMANCE	
RTI - Number Outstanding	RTI - Date being worked on
196	15/12 - 14/1
21	17th Dec 2015
0	
0	

DWP Housing Benefit Subsidy impact – ‘Local Authority Error/ Time Delay’

Cumulative position for each council is as follows:

HBBC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Threshold	£6,836	£14,203	£21,603	£28,910	£35,543	£44,621	£51,781	£58,481	£65,195	£72,430	£78,885
Actual	£2,839	£9,295	£14,124	£21,513	£23,814	£27,193	£30,916	£33,439	£38,161	£40,150	£42,339
Tolerance	£3,997	£4,908	£7,479	£7,397	£11,729	£17,428	£20,865	£25,042	£27,034	£32,280	£36,545

HDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Threshold	£4,071	£8,335	£12,651	£17,908	£22,067	£26,154	£32,560	£36,812	£41,235	£45,371	£49,386
Actual	£450	£983	£4,638	£5,189	£5,252	£5,797	£6,548	£8,007	£10,358	£11,037	£12,309
Tolerance	£3,621	£7,352	£8,013	£12,719	£16,815	£20,357	£26,012	£28,805	£30,877	£34,333	£37,077

NWLDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Threshold	£7,038	£14,843	£21,904	£30,035	£37,029	£43,911	£55,396	£62,311	£67,479	£75,048	£81,967
Actual	£13,099	£17,585	£22,061	£31,910	£33,558	£34,711	£36,923	£42,313	£49,745	£51,654	£52,995
Tolerance	-£6,060	-£2,742	-£157	-£1,875	£3,470	£9,201	£18,474	£19,998	£17,734	£23,394	£28,972

Discretionary Housing Payments

This scheme is to help customers as well as those affected by welfare reform changes and below is the analysis for each Council.

Harborough DC:

2015/16	DWP Allocation:	£46,343
	Net amount paid:	£29,945

Same time last year:

2014/15	Allocation	£52,436
	Total awarded:	£67,748
	Over by:	£15,312

North Hinckley & Bosworth BC:

2015/16	DWP Allocation:	£78,129
	Net amount paid:	£92,594
	Plus HRA Funding:	£20,000
	Amount available:	(£5,535)

Same time last year:

2014/15	Allocation	£93,957
	Total awarded:	£109,809
	Over by:	£15,852

North West Leicestershire DC:

2015/16	DWP Allocation:	£103,678
	Net amount paid:	£110,570
	Plus HRA Funding:	£ 10,000
	Amount available:	(£3,108)

Same time last year:

2014/15	Allocation	£106,669
	Total awarded:	£102,496

Additional funding £20k from HRA (£10k c/fwd. from 2014/15 and 10k allocated for 2015/16) can be utilised.

The above information is extracted from Capita HB8790 DHP Subsidy claim form

Council Tax Discretionary Discount Scheme – Amount Awarded

Hinckley & Bosworth BC - Discretionary Discount Scheme												
Annual Allocation	£34,632											
	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Totals
Award Amount	£6,341	£3,049	£1,297	£2,253	£104	£381	£34	£661	£287	£63	£266	£14,735
Average	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£2,886	£34,632
Variance	-£3,455	-£163	£1,589	£633	£2,782	£2,505	£2,852	£2,225	£2,599	£2,823	£2,620	£19,897
Successful	52	29	21	25	5	13	4	10	11	7	10	187
Unsuccessful	6	3	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	4	2	29
Total number of claims	58	32	24	29	6	15	5	12	12	11	12	216
Case average	£121.94	£105.14	£61.77	£90.13	£20.72	£29.29	£8.42	£66.10	£26.05	£9.07	£26.58	£78.80

Total awarded £14,735

Harborough DC - Discretionary Discount Scheme												
Annual Allocation	£16,957											
	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Totals
Award Amount	£1,663	£859	£1,796	£1,844	£1,001	£357	£577	£527	£837	£557	£183	£10,200
Average	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£1,413	£16,957
Variance	-£250	£554	-£383	-£431	£412	£1,056	£836	£886	£576	£856	£1,230	£6,757
Successful	11	6	8	14	6	7	3	5	6	4	8	78
Unsuccessful	1	3	3	5	2	3	0	4	2	2	2	27
Total number of claims	12	9	11	19	8	10	3	9	8	6	10	105
Case average	£151.20	£143.18	£224.51	£131.71	£166.84	£51.04	£192.30	£105.39	£139.43	£139.21	£22.83	£130.77

Total awarded £10,200

North West Leicestershire DC - Discretionary Discount Scheme												
Annual Allocation	£33,084											
	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Totals
Award Amount	£9,924	£5,564	£2,178	£3,907	£2,238	£1,363	-£834	£1,544	£1,054	-£107	£519	£27,351
Average	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£2,757	£33,084
Variance	-£7,167	-£2,807	£579	-£1,150	£519	£1,394	£3,591	£1,213	£1,703	£2,864	£2,238	£5,733
Successful	63	34	24	34	19	9	4	13	13	3	13	229
Unsuccessful	6	3	1	2	1	2	0	6	1	5	2	29
Total number of claims	69	37	25	36	20	11	4	19	14	8	15	258
Case average	£157.52	£163.66	£90.76	£114.91	£117.80	£151.41	-£208.40	£118.78	£81.08	-£35.57	£39.93	£119.44

Total awarded £27,351

Housing Benefit Overpayments Analysis:

HBBC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£49,462	£61,589	£85,227	£143,838	£95,082	£79,995	£117,591	£62,200	£115,272	£99,285	£109,675	£1,019,216
Partnership collection Rate	5%	9%	15%	19%	23%	25%	27%	28%	29%	34%	35%	
Sundry Debt collection rate												
Combined												
Partnership anticipated collection rate	4%	10%	14%	18%	20%	24%	26%	30%	32%	34%	36%	

HDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£49,159	£30,474	£40,548	£80,846	£51,524	£49,276	£29,362	£31,486	£59,414	£39,765	£52,351	£514,205
Partnership collection Rate	3%	7%	11%	15%	17%	18%	21%	23%	25%	27%	28%	
Sundry Debt collection rate	1%	4%	4%	6%	7%	9%	9%	10%	11%	12%	12%	
Combined	3%	7%	11%	15%	17%	18%	21%	23%	24%	26%	27%	
Partnership anticipated collection rate	13%	16%	20%	23%	26%	29%	32%	33%	37%	39%	40%	

NWLDC	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals
Debt raised	£59,454	£45,489	£70,836	£70,401	£85,158	£82,607	£77,391	£87,285	£68,592	£84,009	£73,211	£804,433
Partnership collection Rate	5%	9%	13%	20%	23%	25%	28%	30%	31%	32%	34%	
Sundry Debt collection rate	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	72%	73%	74%	73%	74%	73%	
Combined	4%	4%	11%	16%	19%	34%	35%	37%	37%	38%	40%	
Partnership anticipated collection rate	4%	8%	11%	14%	17%	20%	23%	24%	26%	29%	31%	

Please note: For HDC in April 2014 (when comparing with this year) a large HB overpayment debt was raised which was then offset by an award and resulted in a much higher collection rate.

Revenues Operational Team

(Council Tax, Non Domestic Rates and Housing Benefit Overpayments)

Performance Update from Sue Williams-Lee – Revenues Operational Manager

Council Tax

The main focus for the team in February was the preparation of each council's critical annual billing runs. The council tax team worked strategically to ensure that each council's individual in-tray items received priority in the lead up to the close down of each database. Specific reports were worked on to ensure the accuracy of the 2016/17 bills and to comply with the deadlines from our new external virtual mailroom contractor, Critiqom.

As reported in January, the 'three team' strategy continued to work well but was adapted, as required, to complete key annual billing tasks and to deal with the large in-flux of calls when summons for each council were issued.

Individual performance has continued to be closely monitored. Where performance targets were not being met, analysis of the work completed has been undertaken to ensure that staff are being compared on a like for like basis. Staff will shortly be notified of their own level of performance and action will be taken to address any issues. When the new 'Destin' performance software is installed in April//May we will be able to produce more accurate, comparable staff performance reports, which will help in managing performance.

As previously reported to the board and discussed with the Head of Partnership, collection performance is still below the profiled target for all three councils, however, the amount to collect to meet target is significantly lower for Harborough's target will be met as that area has a higher propensity to pay.

The dispatch of the annual bills and the resulting influx of correspondence will be the main focus over the next 3 months. In addition, we will allocate resources to focus on maximising collection with proactive telephone debt recovery in March.

Currently there is a knowledge transfer process underway to ensure that movement of cases to the Enforcement Agents can be undertaken by a number of officers and the activity undertaken when returning from court can be automated to create capacity and enable the team to speed up the recovery cycle.

NNDR

In February the NNDR team commenced weekly recovery action, proactively telephoning ratepayers to try to secure payment. This activity will continue throughout March.

As previously reported, in 2015/16 we have seen a much higher amount of charge being scheduled for payment in February and March due to rateable value changes and requests from ratepayers to pay over 12 months. The final Direct Debit collections in March will see an increase in collection late in the financial year. We anticipate that Harborough and HBBC will meet their targets. NWLDC may miss the target, which would mainly be due to the higher amount of insolvency write offs in the early part of the year.

Council Tax

**Gross arrears position:

	<u>*Starting Position</u>	<u>Arrears Reduction</u>	<u>In %Terms</u>
HBBC	£2.273m	£686k	30.2%
HDC	£2.099m	£594k	28.3%
NWLDC	£2.786m	£775k	27.8%

* Starting position represents all outstanding debt carried forward as at 1/4/2015.

**Further analysis on this is given below (p23-25)

Council Tax Support 'In Year' collection (15/16) rate for:

29

<u>Claim category:</u>	<u>Working Age</u>		<u>Elderly</u>	
	<u>Non-passported</u>	<u>Passported</u>	<u>Non-passported</u>	<u>Passported</u>
HBBC	80.4%	71.6%	97.2%	92.5%
HDC	79.5%	72.7%	97.1%	94.1%
NWLDC	79.3%	73.3%	97.9%	94.8%

Incoming post

Items outstanding at the end of each month are given below:

	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>
Items received	9260	7952	7987	8558	6985	8111	6932	6034	5699	7019	6547
Items processed	8026	6911	8384	6408	6304	10496	5909	6727	6316	6905	6386
Carried forward	3184	3887	2753	4401	4684	2021	3044	2105	1488	1835	1996

Debt recovery analysis:

HBBC number of dwellings 48,666

Percentage - is when compared with the number of dwellings

HBBC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Documents Issued													
Reminders	1323	3101	665	1584	1150	0	1506	399	0	796	0	10,524	21.6%
Arrangement Reminders	220	104	109	140	114	38	2	365	66	0	0	1,158	2.4%
Summonses	262	0	875	1269	376	0	0	1003	0	634	314	4,733	9.7%
Bailiff	118	0	0	0	17	0	375	0	32	0	371	913	1.9%
DWP Attachments	19	10	2	13	7	89	55	44	22	0	64	325	0.7%
Attachment of earnings	14	5	3	12	2	97	34	14	19	0	0	200	0.4%
Pending										As at 12/1/16	As at 8/2/16	As at 2/3/16	
Cases returned by enforcement agent - Bailiff								543	478	447	52		
Return letter Issued													
At 'Post Liability Order' enforcement stage								1374	1316	1480	837		

HDC number of dwellings 37,875

Percentage - is when compared with the number of dwellings

HDC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Documents Issued													
Reminders	2132	87	1136	1084	702	0	1263	260	0	668	0	7,332	19.4%
Arrangement Reminders	137	70	75	109	108	15	0	208	80	0	14	816	2.2%
Summonses	102	1281	0	223	457	0	0	397	0	412	210	3,082	8.1%
Bailiff	12	0	0	0	62	0	17	0	17	146	147	401	1.1%
DWP Attachments	24	15	3	6	6	1	9	3	22	0	0	89	0.2%
Attachment of earnings	7	16	4	10	2	3	5	15	19	0	0	81	0.2%
Pending										As at 12/1/16	As at 8/2/16	As at 2/3/16	
Cases returned by enforcement agent - Bailiff								294	192	201	200		
Return letter Issued													
At 'Post Liability Order' enforcement stage								1505	1182	1406	1472		

NWLDC number of dwellings 42,315

Percentage - is when compared with the number of dwellings

NWLDC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Documents Issued													
Reminders	1574	1450	724	1555	1034	0	1392	407	0	986	0	9,122	21.6%
Arrangement Reminders	245	124	167	241	130	0	4	368	202	0	0	1481	3.5%
Summonses	214	1070	815	0	456	0	952	0	0	600	406	4513	10.7%
Bailiff	88	0	0	242	0	0	132	0	89	358	357	1,266	3.0%
DWP Attachments	57	45	15	42	5	15	71	60	53	0	0	363	0.7%
Attachment of earnings	22	23	16	0	1	12	86	21	54	0	8	243	0.5%
Pending													
									As at 12/1/16	As at 8/2/16	As at 2/3/16		
Cases returned by enforcement agent - Bailiff Return letter Issued									692	463	410	409	
At 'Post Liability Order' enforcement stage									1862	1540	1509	1595	

31

Council Tax arrears position:

Hinckley & Bosworth BC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £2.273m and the amount outstanding at the end of February is £1.588m.

Reduction in arrears is £685k which equates in percentage terms to 30.2%

	31/03/2015	30/04/2015	31/05/2015	30/06/2015	31/07/2015	31/08/2015	30/09/2015	31/10/2015	30/11/2015	31/12/2015	31/01/2016	29/02/2016
*Total Arrears	£2,273,000.98	£2,124,833.09	£2,008,289.18	£1,928,773.40	£1,891,550.50	£1,848,554.06	£1,816,246.11	£1,767,649.02	£1,734,112.55	£1,696,826.98	£1,671,289.13	£1,587,509.40
* Working age LCTS	£268,428.08	£243,665.89	£237,584.31	£228,913.15	£231,651.98	£220,946.15	£214,533.60	£201,227.84	£202,115.56	£192,524.26	£189,518.78	£174,595.18
* Pension age LCTS	£37,838.46	£35,664.21	£32,927.33	£34,212.20	£33,828.12	£35,811.94	£39,175.14	37,861.49	£35,045.79	£33,885.54	£33,134.22	£32,569.97
* Empty & unfurnished	£30,129.40	£20,416.22	£12,606.12	£8,136.96	£5,994.32	£5,930.69	£7,386.92	£7,119.04	£5,016.63	£4,004.26	£982.69	£335.53
* Structural alteration	£2,904.19	£1,884.51	£1,690.26	£1,022.66	£901.86	£836.44	£376.98	£105.67	£243.77	£568.80	£483.64	£2,374.07
(* of which are included in total arrears)												
Payments against arrears		-£185,391.38	-£311,030.37	-£409,982.66	-£489,567.95	-£545,009.45	-£594,981.15	-£657,421.32	-£710,047.85	-£759,895.47	-£801,207.16	£0.00
Write offs against arrears		-£4.92	-£4.93	£162.44	£38.27	-£5,365.11	-£5,614.98	-£5,936.10	-£8,327.20	-£8,327.20	-£8,327.66	£0.00
Charge adjustments against arrears		£25,717.07	£36,034.16	£42,657.98	£69,779.05	£84,655.47	£103,556.57	£118,382.67	£134,276.83	£147,399.38	£160,737.27	£0.00
Refunds made against arrears		£164.32	£164.32	£164.32	£164.32	£164.32	£195.32	£370.26	£370.26	£370.26	£370.26	£0.00
Cost adjustments against arrears		£11,338.02	£10,125.02	£22,770.34	£38,135.83	£41,107.85	£40,089.37	£39,252.53	£44,839.53	£44,279.03	£46,715.44	£0.00
Previous years arrears total	£1,984,946.14	£1,845,970.69	£1,736,932.34	£1,666,006.57	£1,566,872.16	£1,506,831.23	£1,467,590.42	£1,359,120.45	£1,301,227.80	£1,264,485.50	£1,224,605.84	£1,151,004.38

Harborough DC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £2.099m and the amount outstanding at the end of February is £1.506m.

Reduction in arrears is £594k which equates in percentage to 28.3%

	31/03/2015	30/04/2015	31/05/2015	30/06/2015	31/07/2015	31/08/2015	30/09/2015	31/10/2015	30/11/2015	31/12/2015	31/01/2016	29/02/2016
*Total Arrears	£2,099,223.53	£1,995,921.04	£1,918,492.31	£1,836,031.44	£1,804,622.43	£1,748,128.01	£1,707,083.33	£1,630,286.18	£1,598,524.14	£1,571,858.65	£1,534,309.76	£1,505,710.65
* Working age LCTS	£209,691.45	£199,717.38	£203,100.61	£199,030.80	£188,256.18	£133,062.22	£171,491.74	£163,097.36	£156,807.77	£154,071.86	£155,322.87	£151,901.99
* Pension age LCTS	£25,108.79	£23,456.24	£21,666.81	£21,910.73	£22,592.70	£20,448.68	£22,442.05	£20,685.26	£19,409.14	£19,744.31	£18,935.33	£18,814.59
* Empty & unfurnished	£18,901.09	£16,138.62	£12,883.17	£12,461.21	£3,930.37	£6,388.88	£5,744.60	£6,475.88	£2,181.91	£2,200.98	£1,238.72	£222.09
* Structural alteration	£1,214.99	£995.89	£998.07	£622.31	£1,897.52	£1,757.52	£543.36	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
(* of which is included in total arrears)												
Payments against arrears		-£137,991.23	-£236,851.27	-£318,232.81	-£372,264.62	-£436,032.05	-£484,457.54	-£523,960.85	-£562,209.09	-£592,474.18	-£631,159.70	£0.00
Write offs against arrears		-£3.12	-£5.02	-£7.23	-£7.93	-£110.60	-£111.74	-£29,030.34	-£29,030.60	-£29,096.10	-£41,175.72	£0.00
Charge adjustments against arrears		£29,802.88	£39,030.64	£39,810.13	£58,695.31	£64,562.99	£72,656.45	£64,483.58	£69,806.04	£73,947.42	£86,210.49	£0.00
Refunds made against arrears		£418.04	£1,480.49	£1,662.76	£1,662.76	£1,662.76	£1,662.76	£1,839.68	£1,839.68	£1,839.68	£1,839.68	£0.00
Cost adjustments against arrears		£4,470.94	£15,613.94	£13,575.06	£17,313.38	£18,821.38	£18,109.87	£17,730.58	£18,894.58	£18,418.30	£19,371.48	£0.00
Previous years arrears total	£2,093,364.55	£1,962,162.71	£1,857,824.93	£1,782,139.19	£1,711,740.32	£1,597,250.21	£1,555,541.87	£1,500,554.67	£1,421,936.62	£1,381,566.32	£1,339,474.71	£1,279,515.18

North West Leicestershire DC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £2.786m and the amount outstanding at the end of February is £2.011m.

Reduction in arrears is £775k which equates in percentage terms to 27.8%.

	31/03/2015	30/04/2015	31/05/2015	30/06/2015	31/07/2015	31/08/2015	30/09/2015	31/10/2015	30/11/2015	31/12/2015	31/01/2016	29/02/2016
*Total Arrears	£2,786,095.65	£2,641,030.60	£2,537,510.48	£2,454,241.92	£2,364,763.25	£2,276,046.37	£2,224,151.27	£2,188,069.43	£2,136,534.01	£2,089,238.84	£2,065,900.80	£2,011,527.38
* Working age LCTS	£359,799.60	£342,997.52	£316,608.38	£314,340.66	£298,823.73	£263,201.91	£266,211.34	£265,109.55	£261,658.76	£252,987.43	£251,055.53	£226,295.08
* Pension age LCTS	£28,389.83	27,617.94	£27,729.30	£25,684.75	£25,200.15	£25,760.59	£25,304.19	£24,062.73	£23,062.32	£20,657.63	£20,074.11	£19,111.71
* Empty & unfurnished	£10,915.57	£15,817.43	£8,161.30	£1,796.46	£2,351.56	£2,248.64	£2,519.12	£2,671.23	£2,595.36	£2,424.48	£1,416.51	£75.00
* Structural alteration	£7,377.50	£4,441.59	£2,848.21	£6,207.59	£3,363.51	£1,564.57	£1,599.83	£918.72	£5.60	£5.60	£0.00	£0.00
(* of which is included in total arrears)												
Payments against arrears		-£180,547.17	-£314,505.69	-£421,798.20	-£508,893.21	-£573,784.25	-£633,247.75	-£688,048.27	-£745,332.78	-£799,165.58	-£845,446.82	£0.00
Write offs against arrears		-£0.21	-£0.21	-£6.25	-£8.07	-£26,340.07	-£26,340.08	-£29,983.72	-£30,012.14	-£30,012.14	-£47,069.46	£0.00
Charge adjustments against arrears		£25,916.91	£41,784.71	£62,515.50	£61,242.10	£61,748.05	£70,872.88	£83,218.43	£89,858.94	£98,490.79	£136,218.08	£0.00
Refunds made against arrears		£288.30	£552.30	£552.30	£552.30	£552.30	£552.30	£1,056.28	£1,056.28	-£686.94	-£686.94	£0.00
Cost adjustments against arrears		£9,277.12	£23,583.72	£26,882.92	£25,774.48	£27,774.69	£26,218.27	£35,731.06	£34,868.06	£34,517.06	£36,790.29	£0.00
Previous years arrears total	£2,708,667.36	£2,558,126.73	£2,436,252.98	£2,306,579.72	£2,200,353.88	£2,106,432.36	£2,036,332.60	£1,983,035.05	£1,833,259.19	£1,790,451.78	£1,747,416.05	£1,687,134.83

Direct Debit

MONTH	HBBC CTAX	%
	No. Items	
April	33074	74.4%
May	33132	74.8%
June	33239	75.0%
July	33439	75.3%
August	33611	75.5%
September	33887	75.2%
October	33784	75.3%
November	33862	75.3%
December	33847	75.0%
January	33867	75.0%
February	6772	74.8%

MONTH	HDC CTAX	%
	No. of items	
April	26867	76.8%
May	26965	77.3%
June	27272	78.0%
July	27185	77.9%
August	27205	78.0%
September	27311	77.9%
October	27515	77.9%
November	27418	78.0%
December	27456	77.7%
January	27429	77.7%
February	5393	77.4%

MONTH	NWL CTAX	%
	No. of items	
April	27837	72.6%
May	28020	73.0%
June	28174	73.1%
July	28273	73.2%
August	28344	73.4%
September	28498	73.1%
October	28477	73.1%
November	28484	73.1%
December	28544	72.8%
January	28522	72.5%
February	5966	72.1%

Non Domestic Rates (Business Rates)

	<u>*Starting Position</u>	<u>Arrears Reduction</u>	<u>Current Position</u>	<u>In % terms</u>
**HDC	£677k	£488k	£171k	79%
***HBBC	£618k	£155k	£463k	25%
****NWLDC	£1.025m	£670k	£355k	65%

* Starting position represents all outstanding debt carried forward as at 1/4/2015.

Please note:

** HDC new charge added to arrears £379k

***HBBC new charge added to arrears £834k

****NWLDC new charge added to arrears £992k

35

Incoming post outstanding as at the end of each month:

	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Items received	512	610	545	694	443	766	699	987	458	565	663
Items processed	515	524	512	687	425	763	673	1037	470	467	716
Carried forward	122	141	110	44	62	65	91	41	29	132	79

Debt Recovery Analysis:

HBBC number of assessments 3,046

Percentage is when compared with the number of assessments

HBBC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Reminders	194	55	43	50	70	70	69	55	69	35	50	760	25.0%
Arrangement Reminders	3	1	1	5	9	9	9	8	1	0	0	46	1.5%
Summonses	7	49	14	16	16	5	23	26	0	32	14	202	6.6%
Liability Orders Granted	0	3	39	0	14	12	5	16	15	0	0	104	3.4%
Bailiff	4	0	2	13	7	5	26	16	16	3	3	95	3.1%

HDC number of assessments 2,908

Percentage is when compared with the number of assessments

36

HDC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Reminders	158	47	36	35	37	70	33	26	37	25	34	538	18.5%
Arrangement Reminders	6	1	2	8	1	6	6	2	1	0	1	34	1.2%
Summonses	9	51	7	8	6	1	10	14	0	22	12	140	4.8%
Liability Orders Granted	0	5	30	0	5	12	1	7	6	0	0	66	2.3%
Bailiff	5	0	3	8	7	2	15	7	0	5	1	53	1.8%

NWLDC number of assessments 3,240

Percentage is when compared with the number of assessments

NWLDC	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Totals	Percentage
Reminders	188	59	53	55	78	52	28	31	21	70	46	681	21.0%
Arrangement Reminders	9	4	7	15	1	12	10	2	1	6	0	67	2.1%
Summonses	11	53	15	19	22	4	16	19	0	20	19	198	6.1%
Liability Orders Granted	0	7	45	0	18	16	4	13	16	0	0	119	3.7%
Bailiff	2	0	2	20	11	34	42	16	0	0	0	127	3.9%

Non Domestic Rate arrears position:

Hinckley & Bosworth BC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £0.618m and the amount outstanding for these specific arrears is £0.193m and these have been reduced by £426k. Please note that £93k is pending for write off which requires consideration and approval from the Executive.

The amount of new charge added to arrears amounts to £834k.

The net movement to arrears

B/fwd. position:	£0.618m - current position is £0.193m)	£0.463m
New debt added position:	Current position is £0.270m)	

The table below illustrates the movement by financial year:

37

Business Rates Recovery Year By Debt	Opening Position	30th April 2015	31st May 2015	30th June 2015	31st Jul 2015	31st Aug 2015	30th Sept 2015	31st Oct 2015	30th Nov 2015	31st Dec 2015	31st Jan 2016	29th Feb 2016
2007	£989.00	£959.00	£929.00	£899.00	£869.00	£0.00	£839.00	£780.00	£750.00	£720.00	£690.00	£660.00
2009	£1,426.59	£1,396.59	£1,336.59	£1,276.59	£1,246.59	£1,432.18	£1,178.84	£1,088.84	£1,058.84	£968.84	£938.84	£878.84
2010	£529.24	£5,331.64	£7,038.52	£4,427.14	£4,399.11	£5,168.58	£3,728.56	£3,228.56	£3,573.76	£3,092.98	£2,491.38	£2,199.16
2011	£3,571.60	£8,443.90	£11,037.25	£8,475.85	£9,807.62	£10,736.77	£10,376.87	£12,500.76	£13,062.63	£13,702.83	£13,197.62	£12,653.56
2012	£25,578.70	£34,363.02	£35,725.93	£31,754.82	£41,433.87	£42,314.06	£43,687.79	£45,923.45	£43,773.46	£43,364.70	£43,192.71	£47,446.78
2013	£132,406.65	£145,766.67	£141,896.17	£121,702.29	£132,917.38	£135,749.28	£134,963.07	£118,402.90	£114,288.51	£99,482.59	£113,734.09	£127,429.27
2014	£453,790.14	£494,495.44	£492,547.16	£420,163.16	£445,042.67	£419,210.22	£394,511.45	£367,230.95	£328,094.72	£268,798.77	£257,485.31	£272,124.23
TOTAL	£618,291.92	£690,756.26	£690,510.62	£588,698.85	£635,716.26	£614,611.09	£589,285.58	£549,155.46	£504,601.92	£430,130.71	£431,729.95	£463,391.84

Harborough DC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £0.677m and the amount outstanding for these specific arrears is £0.129m and these have been reduced by 548k.

The amount of new charge added to arrears amounts to £379k.

The net movement to arrears is as follows:

B/fwd. position:	£0.677m - current position is £0.129m)	£0.171m
New debt added position:	Current position is £0.042m)	

The table below illustrates the movement by financial year:

38

Business Rates Recovery Year		Opening Position	30th April 2015	31st May 2015	30th June 2015	31st Jul 2015	31st Aug 2015	30th Sept 2015	31st Oct 2015	30th Nov 2015	31st Dec 2015	31st Jan 2016	29th Feb 2016
2006	By Debt	£1,138.31	£1,090.59	£1,070.59	£1,050.59	£1,030.59	£1,010.59	£990.59	£970.59	£950.59	£930.59	£910.59	£890.59
2007		£3,198.08	£3,154.01	£3,082.21	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75	£2,914.75
2008		£5,585.87	£5,585.87	£5,585.87	£5,585.87	£5,585.87	£5,585.87	£5,381.50	£5,381.50	£5,442.57	£5,402.14	£5,381.50	£5,381.50
2009		£5,942.90	£5,942.90	£5,942.90	£5,942.90	£5,942.90	£5,942.90	£5,705.25	£5,705.25	£5,781.38	£5,781.38	£5,705.25	£5,705.25
2010		£25,098.26	£24,910.03	£23,785.15	£23,802.08	£20,635.36	£19,693.30	£13,882.29	£13,829.89	£13,799.89	£5,020.22	£6,404.45	£6,958.78
2011		£82,393.99	£81,424.07	£79,477.68	£79,477.68	£73,762.02	£73,643.90	£65,218.29	£49,824.70	£24,958.87	£8,817.54	£11,458.40	£12,266.39
2012		£98,892.94	£98,767.74	£95,131.28	£94,837.08	£221,088.44	£200,380.37	£39,071.83	£28,747.97	£24,846.29	£22,266.49	£21,112.69	£20,599.17
2013		£152,845.82	£142,855.09	£122,732.25	£89,600.52	£161,679.52	£160,754.01	£60,838.90	£50,292.20	£50,274.20	£45,469.24	£39,656.38	£39,095.04
2014		£301,220.01	£196,578.24	£312,961.14	£266,382.04	£280,161.96	£283,563.69	£221,911.28	£190,383.74	£152,363.67	£123,623.29	£95,788.11	£77,415.11
TOTAL		£677,375.75	£561,328.11	£650,668.76	£570,453.20	£775,184.59	£754,108.95	£419,410.29	£348,430.18	£281,671.79	£220,405.22	£189,332.13	£171,226.58

North West Leicestershire DC

On 1st April 2015 arrears opening position was £1.025m and the amount outstanding for these specific arrears is £0.224m and these have been reduced by £801k.

The amount of new charge added to arrears amounts to £992k.

The net movement to arrears

B/fwd. position:	£1.025m - current position is £0.200m)	£0.355m
New debt added position:	Current position is £0.155m)	

The table below illustrates the movement by financial year:

Business Rates Recovery Year By Debt		Opening Position	30th April 2015	31st May 2015	30th June 2015	31st Jul 2015	31st Aug 2015	30th Sept 2015	31st Oct 2015	30th Nov 2015	31st Dec 2015	31st Jan 2016	29th Feb 2016
2007		£731.19	£691.19	£651.19	£608.41	£518.41	£392.40	£302.40	£212.40	£139.00	£73.30	£23.30	£23.30
2008		£9,721.61	£9,721.61	£4,179.27	£4,179.27	£4,179.28	£4,371.64	£4,371.64	£4,442.64	£4,442.64	£8,831.64	£8,831.64	£4,250.25
2009		£8,361.78	£8,361.78	£8,361.78	£8,239.81	£8,239.81	£6,553.64	£6,553.64	£6,062.13	£6,062.13	£9,508.29	£9,508.29	£6,062.14
2010		£31,196.31	£54,183.33	£53,594.45	£51,519.47	£61,002.46	£67,605.32	£35,638.46	£20,196.75	£20,109.66	£26,085.51	£25,998.42	£25,161.61
2011		£59,145.11	£78,280.50	£77,968.82	£70,946.93	£83,371.72	£88,499.55	£55,042.96	£38,407.17	£37,355.23	£15,735.99	£15,460.31	£11,338.70
2012		£135,283.05	£160,861.13	£159,980.06	£144,200.04	£172,413.70	£160,223.45	£101,743.60	£84,952.66	£80,324.37	£31,165.14	£30,836.36	£42,647.62
2013		£326,991.26	£345,047.52	£347,332.42	£306,521.08	£302,908.94	£277,090.03	£179,897.18	£149,546.12	£131,775.94	£86,504.51	£84,239.40	£98,994.78
2014		£453,662.06	£468,903.26	£489,050.92	£470,445.31	£428,769.17	£409,900.82	£329,709.40	£278,656.70	£261,997.08	£237,038.00	£174,730.09	£166,474.59
TOTAL		£1,025,287.25	£1,126,195.20	£1,141,213.79	£1,056,707.97	£1,061,451.14	£1,014,684.45	£713,306.88	£582,524.17	£542,237.05	£414,942.38	£349,627.81	£354,952.99

Complaints

Each Council have there own mechanism for recording complaints.

Below is a summary of complaints for the 2 key service areas for each council:

HBBC

HBBC	April	May	June	QTR1	July	Aug	Sep	QTR2	Oct	Nov	Dec	QTR3	Jan	Feb
Service Area: Revenues														
MP enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Complaints position in 2014/15	1	0	2	3	1	2	0	3	1	0	1	2	0	1
Service Area: Benefits														
MP Enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Complaints position in 2014/15	1	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0

HDC

HDC	April	May	June	QTR1	July	Aug	Sep	QTR2	Oct	Nov	Dec	QTR3	Jan	Feb
Service Area: Revenues														
MP enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints	1	3	1	5	2	0	1	3	1	0	2	3	0	2
Complaints position in 2014/15	2	0	5	7	2	3	0	5	1	2	1	4	1	1
Service Area: Benefits														
MP Enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Complaints	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Complaints position in 2014/15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0

NWLDC

NWLDC	April	May	June	QTR1	July	Aug	Sep	QTR2	Oct	Nov	Dec	QTR3	Jan	Feb
Service Area: Revenues														
MP enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Complaints	1	2	1	4	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	0
Complaints position in 2014/15	0	3	1	4	3	1	0	4	2	1	1	4	0	0
Service Area: Benefits														
MP Enquiries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complaints	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Complaints position in 2014/15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

Staffing

Current Vacancies

Harborough DC

- 1 x FTE Business Development & Support Officer - Grade 5 - Appointment made
- 1 x 0.6 Business Rates Officer - Grade 4 - Vacant from 1/12/15
- 1 x FTE Council Tax Officer - Grade 4 - Interviews scheduled in March

North West Leicestershire DC

- 1 x FTE Visiting Officer Grade C - Vacant from 1/1/16

Hinckley & Bosworth BC

- 1 x 0.8 Benefits Officer - Maternity vacancy from 7/12/15

Current Long Term Sickness

Harborough DC

1 X 0.87 Reconciliation
& Control Officer

From 15/1/16

Hinckley & Bosworth BC

1 x 0.54 Benefit Officer

From 7/10/15 – expected return date is 11/3/16

North West Leicestershire DC

1 x FTE Admin Officer

From 26/6/15 – with HR

1 X FTE Council Tax Officer

From 2/11/15 – expected return date 7/3/16

Sickness

Sickness for January is given below:

(Data cannot be provided in time to meet report deadline and therefore reported 1 month in arrears)

	<u>Annual</u>	<u>Cumulative to January</u>		<u>January in month</u>	
	<u>Target</u>	<u>Actual days</u>	<u>Average days Per fte</u>	<u>Actual days</u>	<u>Average days Per fte</u>
HBBC:	8 days	391.5 days	10.6 days	56.0 days	1.52 days
HDC:	7.9 days	268 days	13.4 days	19.5 days	0.98 days
NWLDC:	7.4 days	342.5 days	14.7 days	60 days	2.59 days

This page is intentionally left blank



Leicestershire Partnership Revenues & Benefits

‘Financial Performance to February 2016’

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Joint Committee of the financial performance of the Partnership for the period April-February 2016.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the financial performance of the Partnership be noted.

3. INFORMATION

Budget Position

- 3.1 The financial position of the Partnership has been outlined in **Appendix 1** to this report. The key headlines have been detailed below for information.
- 3.2 The Joint Committee approved a budget for the Partnership for 2015/2016 which indicated that £3,451,030 would be spent on the Partnership, matched by income from the partners, customers and use of reserves.
- 3.3 Actual spend as at 29th February 2016 against the profiled budget to that date is summarised below. As 29th February 2016, the Partnership had under spent against the profiled budget by £482,728. In addition there were £224,783 of timing differences associated with February expenditure which will be billed to partners following the quarter end, leaving a net under spend of £257,945.

	Budget to Feb 16	Actual to Feb 16	Variance to Date (Over) / Under Spend	Timing Differences	Variance after Timing Differences (Over) / Under Spend
	£	£	£	£	£
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	3,041,964	2,654,155	387,809	224,783	163,026
INCOME	-2,615,354	-2,710,273	94,919	0	94,919
	426,610	-56,118	482,728	224,783	257,945

- 3.4 The key variances to bring to the attention of the Management Board are:
- Salaries: Salary savings of £116,000 resulting from current vacancies
 - Postage and virtual mailroom: £113,000 overspends on postage due to delays in implementation of the virtual mailroom. This is offset by a £86,000 saving on the virtual mailroom cost centre
 - Fraud and Error Reduction Incentive Scheme unspent funding of £74,000, this was funded by a grant, which was for 2015/16, but has not been spent so will be carried forward (subject to approvals).
 - Transfer from reserves: As approved by the Joint Committee, a contribution of £107,770 will be made from reserves to reduce partner contributions towards voluntary redundancy payments. The £99,000 variance therefore represents the transfer relating to the year to February 2016.
- 3.5 There is a direct link between partner contributions and expenditure incurred and therefore partner contributions have been adjusted to reflect the actual expenditure to date.

3.6 At the request of the Management Board, the forecast outturn position of the Partnership is reviewed on a monthly basis. As at 29th February 2016, the Partnership is forecasting a year end saving of £234,000 made up as follows:

- £130,000 salary savings due to various vacancies resulting from the restructure being recruited to later or officers leaving earlier than planned, although this is being reviewed further to confirm.
- Fraud and Error Reduction Incentive Scheme unspent funding of £74,000, this was funded by a grant, which was for 2015/16, but has not been spent so will be carried forward.
- Virtual mail room/postage – following the procurement of the new virtual mail room a reforecasting exercise has been performed to establish the cost of the new contract once in place and interim arrangements to this point. A £10,000 saving on these costs has been calculated for the year, though this is dependent on volumes.
- Mileages claims reduced by £11,000 following restructure.
- £10,000 due to new internal Audit Contract.
- £9,000 due to reduced mileage claims following restructure.

3.7 All forecast variances have been reviewed and agreed by the Head of Partnership

Leicestershire Revenues & Benefits Partnership Monitoring Report to 29th February 2016

Expenditure / Income Type	2015/16 Latest Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Timing Differences	Variance after Timing Differences	2015/16 Total Estimate (Original)	2015/16 Total Estimate (Revised)
	£	£		£	£	£	£
Employees	2,288,235	1,952,497	335,738	219,749	115,988	2,780,820	2,544,750
Premises Related Expenditure	70,183	66,622	3,561	0	3,561	87,760	76,720
Transport Related Expenditure	37,585	23,791	13,794	3,248	10,547	41,000	41,000
Supplies & Services	622,559	588,382	34,177	1,786	32,391	757,360	757,360
Central & Administrative Exp	23,402	22,863	539	0	539	31,200	31,200
Revenue Income	-2,615,354	-2,537,202	-78,152	0	-78,152	-3,648,140	-3,333,260
Other Income	0	-74,282	74,282	0	74,282	0	0
Approved Cfws	0	0	0	0	0	0	-10,000
Transfer from Reserves	0	-98,789	98,789	0	98,789	-50,000	-107,770
Sum:	426,610	-56,118	482,728	224,783	257,945	0	0

Timing Differences

Salaries - January & February 2016	HDC	101,742
	NWLDC	118,008
Mileage & Disturbance Costs - January & February 2016	HDC	1,739
	NWLDC	1,509
Supplies & Services - January & February 2016	HDC	333
	NWLDC	1,453

224,783

Explanations

	Variance at 31/12/15 (Over) / Under Spend £	Forecast variance (Over) / Under Spend £	Explanation £5k+
Salaries	116,000	130,000	Saving arising from vacancies.
Premises Related Expenditure	4,000	0	Variance > £5k
Car Allowances	11,000	11,000	Mileage claims reduced following restructure
Postages	-86,000	10,000	Timing differences due to delay in implementing the Virtual Mail Room. Yearend forecast reflects saving on the new contract
Computer Consumables	-4,000		
Printing & Stationery	-4,000		
Virtual Mail Room	113,000		
Audit Fees	0	9,000	Year End variance due to new audit contract
Liability Expenses	1,000	0	Variance > £5k
Computer Software & Maintenance	4,000	0	Variance > £5k
Legal Fees	5,000	0	Variance > £5k
Consultancy fees	4,000	0	Variance > £5k
Minor Variances	-1,000	0	Variance > £5k
Contributions	-78,000	0	There is a direct link between partner contributions and expenditure incurred and therefore partner contributions have been adjusted to reflect the actual expenditure to date.
Other Income	74,000	74,000	Fraud and Error Reduction Incentive Scheme (FERIS) this is a ring fenced grant for 2015/16, but has been confirmed by DWP as available for carry forward.
Transfer from reserves	99,000		Transfer from reserves for redundancy payments
	258,000	234,000	



Leicestershire Partnership Revenues & Benefits

“CIPFA Benchmarking Club 2015”

1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT

To provide information to individual partners and with regard to the partnership relating to the Benchmarking exercise that was undertaken by CIPFA.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That partners note the many areas of good practice that have been identified as part of the benchmarking exercise.
- 2.2 That areas identified as weak compared to others, are noted together with the work to being undertaken to secure a better situation among comparators and primarily for the partnership and their own authorities.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

- 3.1 All members of the Leicestershire Partnership Revenues & Benefits (LPRB) elected to participate in the chargeable 2015 CIPFA Benchmarking Exercise.
- 3.2 The partnership were previously invited to join the IRRV benchmarking exercise, this invitation was accepted and would have been an ideal place to benchmark against other partnerships. Unfortunately, this invitation hasn't progressed to the formation of a benchmarking club.
- 3.3 The following areas of service were included in the exercise.
 - Council Tax
 - Business Rates
 - Benefits Administration
- 3.4 The data that was supplied for comparison was for the financial year 2014/15. It should be noted that a direct comparison for the current year won't be possible. The partnership implemented a new structure in April 2015 which sees significant changes to the structure and cost base alike. Therefore, some of the areas highlighted have already been addressed as part of the restructure.
- 3.5 In addition to this, there were areas where data couldn't be provided; primarily due to systems not being able to provide requested information. Some of the data appears to be skewed as in some areas the majority of staff are employed by one authority, distorting the real cost to the other two authorities.
- 3.6 The financial data supplied for direct costs was based on apportioned costs and indirect costs actuals for each Local Authority.
- 3.7 A report was produced for each Local Authority for each of the areas detailed above, together with a report for the partnership. Comparator authorities were then selected to compare against; and further reports supplied for each authority for each service area and the same for the partnership. (There were no partnerships in the groups to benchmark against). The reports were distributed directly to each authority at the point of receipt.

- 3.8 The comprehensive reports focus on different areas of administration, cost, and processing to name a few. The key items either positive, with room for improvement or may be considered positive or negative are detailed at Appendix 1.

KEY	
	Positive
	Needs Action
	May be considered positive or negative

- 3.9 There have been significant changes to the cost base and staffing of the partnership, there are some areas identified where further decisions will be required upon completion of key pieces of work with regard to the appetite of partners to remedy the weaknesses identified.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

BUSINESS RATES 2014/15 CIPFA BENCHMARKING					
	Partnership	NWLDC	HBBC	HDC	COMMENTS/ACTIONS
<u>NO IN GROUP</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>	
In year collection 2014/15	4th highest in the group. Collection is well above average.	3rd highest . Well above average. Very positive	Average in the group. HBBC is 98.3%. Highest is 99.2% and lowest is 96.8%	3rd highest . Well above average. Very positive	The Partnership results are not relevant in this context. proactive collection
Amount written off during 14/15 as % net debit	5th from the bottom of the group. Being below average on this is positive.	6th from the bottom of the group. Being below average on this could be positive.	1.1%. Just above average. One Council is skewing the figures at 3.6%. Everyone else ranges from 0.4% to 1.7%. Debts are proactively tackled and if there is no prospect of payment, debts are written off in line with best accounting practice	0.4%. 3rd lowest in the group. Debts are proactively tackled and if there is no prospect of payment, debts are written off in line with best accounting practice	n/a
Net balance o/s as a % of net debit	Lowest in the group. Again this is very positive.	Lowest in the group. Again this is very positive.	3rd lowest in the group. Very positive	0.3%. 2nd lowest in the group. Very positive	Comments contained previously

Direct Debit	2nd highest in the group. At approximately 53% the Partnership is considerably above average for NNDR DD payers. DD is not generally speaking the preferred payment method for businesses hence the difference in percentage between Ctax and NNDR DD penetration.	52% - above average (Ave is 48%)	52% - above average (Ave is 47%)	53% -above average (Average is 47%)	Proposal that all staff Partnership and LA promote Direct Debit at every dealing with a Business Rate payer
Staff Cost	2nd highest in the group in 2014/15. Our costs have since changed due to the restructure. We have bolstered up the NNDR team in order to sell our services	Above average. 6th in the group at £30.41 per hereditament (Ave is £25.74)	Highest in the group at £41.88 per hereditament (Ave is £24.39)	Above average. 4th highest in the group. £30.75 per hereditament (Ave is £25.29).	The overall costs will increase in 2015/16 due to the restructure.
Hereditaments FTE	We are in the middle of the group. 8th from the bottom. We have approx. 1550 against the average of approx. 1750.	Very slightly above average. Approx. 1550 against the average of 1500	below average. Approx. 1300 against the average of 1600	Very slightly above average. Approx. 1600 against the average of 1550	This will change as more staff are now in the team
Direct Costs	Above Average. 5th from the top at £35.16 per hereditament. Ave is £27.07	NWLDC are below average at £31.03 per hereditament against the average of £33.53	HBBC are 3rd from the top at £43.55. Average is £31.91	HDC are below average at £31.10 per hereditament against the average of £33.19	All costs need to be reviewed as part of the budget process and re-negotiation of contracts.
Indirect cost	Above Average. 3rd from the top at £17.80 per hereditament. Average is £12.52	Highest in the group £21.72 per hereditament. Average is £11.97.	Just above average at £12.73 per hereditament against the average of £11.70	2nd highest at £18.66. Average is £12.08	This demonstrates that the recharges are high and need to be reviewed or reconsidered if an alternative model of delivery is agreed for the partnership

Accommodation	We have low accommodation costs. We are below average at 88p per hereditament. Average is £1.30. 5th from the bottom.	4th lowest. Well below average at 93p. Average is £1.54	5th lowest. Well below average at £1.01. Average is £1.49.	3rd lowest. Well below average at 69p. Average is £1.49	No further actions required
Other Central Charges per hereditament	The majority of the group have central recharges under £7.69 per hereditament. We are recharged £13.84.	Highest in the group £17.69 per hereditament. Average is £7.06.	5th highest. £8.38 against the average of £7.14	2nd highest.£15.20 against the average of £7.27.	This demonstrates that the central charges are high and need to be reviewed or reconsidered if an alternative model of delivery is agreed for the partnership

Refunds	<p>We have the highest number of refunds per 1000 hereditaments in the group. This is not a negative position. We do not know what the other councils processes are in regard to refunds. They may leave credits sitting on the system and we may process them in a timely manner. Refund numbers depend on VO changes, appeals, movement between or out of properties etc.</p>	<p>NWL have the highest number of refunds per 1000 hereditaments in the group. 269 against the average of 160. This is not a negative position. We do not know what the other councils processes are in regard to refunds. They may leave credits sitting on the system and we may process them in a timely manner. Refund numbers depend on VO changes, appeals, movement between or out of properties etc.</p>	<p>5th highest. 243 refunds per 1000 hereditaments in the group against the average of 163. This is not a negative position. We do not know what the other councils processes are in regard to refunds. They may leave credits sitting on the system and we may process them in a timely manner. Refund numbers depend on VO changes, appeals, movement between or out of properties etc.</p>	<p>3rd highest. 255 refunds per 1000 hereditaments in the group against the average of 164. This is not a negative position. We do not know what the other councils processes are in regard to refunds. They may leave credits sitting on the system and we may process them in a timely manner. Refund numbers depend on VO changes, appeals, movement between or out of properties etc.</p>	Comments contained previously
---------	---	--	---	---	-------------------------------

Reminders	We are below average on the number of notices issued. This could be positive as we are proactive in our recovery processes and contact customers prior to notices being issued. We have a very robust recovery timetable.	We are below average on the number of notices issued. This could be positive as we are proactive in our recovery processes and contact customers prior to notices being issued. We have a very robust recovery timetable.	We are below average on the number of notices issued. This could be positive as we are proactive in our recovery processes and contact customers prior to notices being issued. We have a very robust recovery timetable.	We are below average on the number of notices issued. This could be positive as we are proactive in our recovery processes and contact customers prior to notices being issued. We have a very robust recovery timetable.	
Costs	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £86. Costs are currently being reviewed.	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £92. Costs are currently being reviewed.	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £89. Costs are currently being reviewed.	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £90. Costs are currently being reviewed.	The costs are currently all incurred at the summons stage. We will be splitting this between the summons and liability order costs in 2016/17.
Number Summonses	Below average due to proactive contact with ratepayers.	Below average due to proactive contact with ratepayers.	Below average due to proactive contact with ratepayers.	Below average due to proactive contact with ratepayers.	This can be looked at two ways, we have a duty to collect. Are our policies strict enough with regard to making arrangements without court action - One for partners to discuss

Liability Orders granted	As expected - below average as we are below average on the number of summonses issued.	As expected - below average as we are below average on the number of summonses issued.	As expected - below average as we are below average on the number of summonses issued.	As expected - below average as we are below average on the number of summonses issued.	See above
Cases referred to enforcement agents	Lowest of the group. Not necessarily a negative as other recovery procedures are used and Enforcement agents will only be considered once other options have been tried. Procedures are being automated so this may	not reported - Info wasn't available at time of submission	not reported - Info wasn't available at time of submission	not reported - Info wasn't available at time of submission	
Colocated flexible workers	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	2nd highest (HDC are highest) Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	Highest in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	This links directly to having low accommodation costs.

COUNCIL TAX 2014/15 CIPFA BENCHMARKING

	<u>Partnership</u>	<u>NWLDC</u>	<u>HBBC</u>	<u>HDC</u>	<u>COMMENTS/ ACTIONS</u>
<u>NO IN GROUP</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>	
In year collection 2014/15	2nd in Group (one didn't supply information) Above average Positive message for the partnership collectively	Slightly above average. 97.8% against the average of 97.7%	Above average. 98.00% against the average of 97.7%	Significantly above average. 98.6% against the average of 97.7%	The Partnership results are not relevant in this context
Amount written off during 14/15 as % net debit	Well below average , which is a positive in this case. 0.3% against the average of 0.9%	At average level 0.4%.	Below average. 0.3% compared to the average of 0.4%	Below average. 0.3% compared to the average of 0.4%	n/a
Net balance O/S as a % of net debit	Well below the average line very good in this case. 1.8% against an average of 3.2%	Below average 2.1% against the average of 2.2%	Below average 1.9% against the average of 2.1%	Below average 1.3% against the average of 2.2%	n/a
Direct Debit	5th in group, the partnership collectively above the average	65.3% against the Average of 61.00%. Positive.	66.4% against the Average of 61.00%. Positive.	70.1% against the Average of 61.00%. Positive.	Proposal that all staff Partnership and LA promote Direct Debit at every dealing with a Business Rate payer
Staff Cost	£6.80 (Average is £6.78)	£6.53. (Average is £6.49)	£7.16. (Average is £6.18)	£6.55. (Average is £6.49)	Costs will change in 2015/16 due to the restructure.

Cost per banded dwelling	£10.60 (Average is £10.29).	£10.11 (Average is £10.42)	£10.17 (Average is £10.22)	Above average £11.70 (Average is £10.42)	This will change as the staff make up is different
Dwellings FTE	Above average. 2nd highest. 5212 dwellings per FTE. The average is 3933. This flags up a possible reason for the backlog as staff are dealing with a high number of properties. The restructure may rectify this once the team are fully competent in their generic roles.	Above average. 5th highest. 5229 dwellings per FTE. The average is 4306. This flags up a possible reason for the backlog as staff are dealing with a high number of properties. The restructure may rectify this once the team are fully competent in their generic roles.	Above average. 6th highest. 5169 dwellings per FTE. The average is 4226. This flags up a possible reason for the backlog as staff are dealing with a high number of properties. The restructure may rectify this once the team are fully competent in their generic roles.	Above average. 4th highest. 5249 dwellings per FTE. The average is 4306. This flags up a possible reason for the backlog as staff are dealing with a high number of properties. The restructure may rectify this once the team are fully competent in their generic roles.	n/a
Direct Costs	3rd lowest. £7.14 against the average of £10.77	4th lowest. £6.84 against the average of £8.92	7th lowest. £7.53 against the average of £8.92	4th lowest. £6.98 against the average of £8.92	n/a
Indirect costs	Highest in the group. £8.10 against the average of £3.63.	3rd highest in the group. £8.65 against the average of £5.36.	5th highest in the group. £7.38 against the average of £5.25.	4th highest in the group. £8.40 against the average of £5.36.	This demonstrates that the recharges are high and need to be reviewed or reconsidered if an alternative model of delivery is agreed for the partnership
Accommodation	Below average at 23p. Average is 55p per banded dwelling.	4th lowest. 24p against the average of 51p per banded dwelling	7th lowest. 25p against the average of 46p per banded dwelling	5th lowest. 24p against the average of 51p per banded dwelling	

Central Charges	Highest in the group. £6.57 against the average of £2.15.	3rd highest in the group. £7.00 against the average of £3.67.	5th highest in the group. £5.87 against the average of £3.62.	3rd highest in the group. £6.98 against the average of £3.67.	Comments contained previously
Band D Charge	£1493 against the average of £1476.	£1524 against the average of £1504.	£1453 against the average of £1496.	£1503 against the average of £1504.	
Refunds	Above average , demonstrate process in timely manner top in group	Average of the group. 8.83%. Average is 8.8%	slightly above average 9.6% per chargeable dwelling against the average of 8.76%.	Above average 10.36% per chargeable dwelling against the average of 8.80%.	
MP enquiries	minimal - doesn't register a percentage.	minimal - doesn't register a percentage.	none	minimal - doesn't register a percentage.	Suggests a quality service is delivered
Ombudsman Enquiry	Lowest in group, well below average demonstrates quality	None	None	minimal - doesn't register a percentage.	Suggests a quality service is delivered
Registered Complaints	well below average. 0.03% against the average of 0.1%	below average. 0.03% against the average of 0.06%	below average. 0.02% against the average of 0.06%	below average. 0.05% against the average of 0.06%.	Suggests a quality service is delivered
Reminders per 1000 chargeable dwellings	Below Average in issue of reminders and finals. Two schools of thoughts can be considered positive or negative	Below average. 301 against an average of 365.	Below average. 273 against an average of 374.	Below average. 245 against an average of 365.	This can be looked at two ways, we have a duty to collect. Are our policies strict enough with regard to making arrangements without court action - One for partners to discuss
Court Costs	Below Average	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £87. Costs are currently being reviewed.	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £87. Costs are currently being reviewed.	Our costs are below average at £71. The average is £87. Costs are currently being reviewed.	n/a

No. of Summonses per 1000 chargeable dwellings	Below Average	Above average. 143 per 1000 dwellings. Average is 130.	Above average. 115 per 1000 dwellings. Average is 131.	Above average. 98 per 1000 dwellings. Average is 130. HDC is a highly affluent area with a high collection rate.	This can be looked at two ways, we have a duty to collect. Are our policies strict enough with regard to making arrangements without court action - One for partners to discuss
Liability Orders granted per 1000 chargeable dwellings	Below Average	Above Average	Below Average	Below Average	This can be looked at two ways, we have a duty to collect. Are our policies strict enough with regard to making arrangements without court action - One for partners to discuss
AOE	Significantly below average at below 10%. Top is above 41.23%	Mid table. 12.26 compared to the average of 13.79 per chargeable dwelling	7th from bottom. 9.95 compared to the average of 13.44 per chargeable dwelling	3.76 compared to the average of 13.79 per chargeable dwelling. HDC is a highly affluent area with a high collection rate.	This process is being looked at to try to automate it.
Cases referred to enforcement agents	not reported - Info wasn't available at time of submission	29 against an average of 55 per chargeable dwelling	27 against an average of 53 per chargeable dwelling	Bottom. 20 against the average of 55	This process will soon be automated but other options (e.g. Attachment of earnings/benefits) will always be considered first before we issue cases to the EA's.

Colocated flexible workers	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	Above average in the group. We have a flexible working policy and across the whole partnership approx. 90% work from home. This is positive.	This is positive and links to low accommodation costs
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	---

BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION 2014/15 CIPFA BENCHMARKING					
	<u>Partnership</u>	<u>NWLDC</u>	<u>HBBC</u>	<u>HDC</u>	<u>COMMENTS/ACTIONS</u>
<u>NO IN GROUP</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>56</u>	
Gross Cost per weighted caseload(1)	£56.18 is higher than the average of £51.17	£50.15 is lower than the average of £56.49	£53.64 is lower than the average of £56.49	£66.60 is higher than the average of £56.49	Post structural review the number of assessors has decreased. Admin subsidy is deducted to obtain the net cost which we have no control over
Weighted Cases/FTE (2)	Weighted caseload per FTE is 1,517 against average of 959	Weighted caseload per FTE is 1,755 against average of 992	Weighted caseload per FTE is 1,616 against average of 992	Weighted caseload per FTE is 1,244 against average of 992	Partnership assessment staff have the highest number of cases per FTE , the number of assessors has decreased. It can be expected that previous years performance levels will not be matched given this information. Though processed exceeded targets This wil increase further now a new structure is in place
Speed of Processing change events (3)	6.4 days against an average of 9 days	6.7 days against an average of 8 days	6.3 days against an average of 8 days	6.2 days against an average of 8 days	Across the Partnership performance exceeds the average . This will not continue as there are fewer staff
Speed of Processing new claims (4)	16.1 days against an average of 23.5 days	16.1 days against an average of 21.4 days	15.9 days against an average of 21.4 days	16.2 days against an average of 21.4 days	Across the Partnership performance exceeds the average must be noted that staff have been reduced so this will not be maintained at this level

HB overpayments recovered (5)	Above average collection rates 82.6% against average of 60.2%	Above average collection rates 79.8% against average of 63.5%	Above average collection rates 82.2% against average of 63.5%	Above average collection rates 85.7% against average of 63.5%	Above average collection rates across the partnership. The calculations are based on in year collection rates excluding arrears b/fwd.
HB overpayments written off (6)	Below average write-offs of 1.36% against 4.0%	Above average write-offs 19.0% against 3.8%	Below average write-offs of 1.6% against 3.8%	Below average write-offs of 2.2% against 3.8%	In the main lower than average write offs which may suggest that we have a stronger commitment to collect before we consider write-off.
Appeals lodged per 1000 claimants (7)	4.6 against an average of 10.4	4.6 against an average of 8.3	3.8 cases against an average of 8.3	5.8 cases against an average of 8.3	Lower than average appeals would suggest that our internal processes attempts satisfy the claimants queries before it goes to appeal.
DHP (8)	Actual spend as a % of Funding = 119.4% against an average of 95.2%	Actual spend as a % of Funding = 104.7% against an average of 95.3%	Actual spend as a % of Funding = 125.5% against an average of 95.3%	Actual spend as a % of Funding = 136.5% against an average of 95.3%	Appears that the majority of respondents do not spend up to the DWP allocation which means that money will have to be returned. Our practise has always been to spend at least the allocation to support those most in need.
Number of fraud staff per 1000 claimants (9)	0.15 FTE compared with the average of 0.20 FTE	0.17 FTE compared with the average of 0.21 FTE	0.23 FTE compared with the average of 0.21 FTE	0.30 FTE when compared with the average of 0.21 FTE	Considering in the main our sanction levels are above average it would suggest that performance has not suffered as a result
Referrals to fraud per 1000 claimants (10)	40 above the average of 34 referrals per 1000 caseload	34 just below the average of 36 referrals per 1000 caseload	47 above the average of 36 referrals per 1000 caseload	37 above the average of 36 referrals per 1000 caseload	In the main the number of referrals are above rge average the source of the referral is unknown it is difficult to determine whether this is within our control.

Cleared investigations per 1000 claimants (11)	Average cleared cases is 29 ours is 12	Average cleared cases is 31 ours is 11	Average cleared cases is 31 ours is 12	Average cleared cases is 31 ours is 13	Aswell as delays caused by lack of capacity within the investigators team, delays may be outside of our control including delays from decision makers DWP, assessment, legal and HMRC
Sanctions (12)	Allprocesses associated with sanctions are above average	Apart from cautions offered and accepted all our sanctions are above the average	Apart from cases accepted by court for prosecution which is slightly below the average all sanctions are above the average	Allprocesses associated with sanctions are above average	In the main the number of sanctions are above the average
Overpayment deducted from ongoing benefit (13)	Deduction % of 64.6% is higher than the average of 49.1%	Deduction % of 59.2% is higher than the average of 56.9%	Deduction % of 63.8% is higher than the average of 56.9%	Deduction % of 73.0% is higher than the average of 56.9%	Across the Partnership performance exceeds the average
Attachment of DWP benefits (14)	Deduction % of 2.1% is lower than the average of 2.8%	Information not available	Deduction % of 5.6% is higher than the average of 3.2%	Information not available	Whether to deduct from DWP benefits will be determined on a case by case basis and may not always be possible or may not be the most cost effective method (we may be able to negotiate a higher repayment by allowing direct payments)

Caseload comparison (15)	Apart from CTRS the partnership has the lowest recorded caseloads for new claims and change events	When measured against the responders, with the exception of CTRS NWLDC has the lowest number of new claims and change events	When measured against the responders, with the exception of CTRS HBBC has the lowest number of new claims and change events	Apart from CTRS HDC has the lowest recorded caseloads for new claims and change events	Purely gives the caseload data for those LA's that have responded. As the number of responders who have similar caseloads to to the partnership LA's were limited we have chosen to use all the LA's within the group which would have skewed the figures.
Direct Costs (16)	Direct Costs of £33.57 are marginally higher than the average of £33.08	Direct Costs of £27.60 are lower than the average of £38.37	Direct Costs of £33.79 are lower than the average of £38.37	Direct Costs of £40.85 are higher than the average of £38.37	Staffing numbers have been reduced following the structural review which have reduced staffing costs
Indirect Costs (17)	Indirect Costs of £22.62 are higher than the average of £17.42	Indirect Costs of £22.60 are higher than the average of £17.88	Indirect Costs of £19.84 are higher than the average of £17.88	Indirect Costs of £25.96 are higher than the average of £17.88	In the main we have little or no control over these costs. Interestingly for the partnership our central costs are 1.5 x higher than the average.

This page is intentionally left blank

LEICESTERSHIRE REVENUES & BENEFITS FORWARD PLAN

1st September 2015 to 30th June 2016

What is the Forward Plan?

The forward plan for the partnership does not follow the normal regulatory requirements with regard to decision making.

This plan is to provide information to members and officers of what is coming up. Any decisions/authorisations that are to be made, by which committee/board, the date, and the responsible officer.

The dates for the future meetings will be agreed at the Annual meeting on the 9th June.

SUBJECT	EXPECTED DECISION	EXPECTED DATE OF DECISION	CONSULTATIONS	DOCS AVAILABLES	Decision Taken By	Contact Officer
CIPFA Benchmarking Report	To approve the recommendation within the report	14.04.2016	CIPFA, Management Board	Report and Benchmarking Reports	Joint Committee	Sally O'Hanlon
February Performance Reports	To note the report	14.04.2016	Management Board	Performance Report	Joint Committee	Sally O'Hanlon
Risk Based Verification	To approve the recommendations within the report	14.04.2016	Management Board	Report	Joint Committee	Storme Coop
February Financial Reports	To note the report	14.04.2016	Management Board	Report	Joint Committee	Ashleigh Wilson
Year end performance Reports	To note the report	09.06.2016	Management Board	Performance Report	Joint Committee	Sally O'Hanlon
Year end Financial report	To note the report	09.06.2016	Management Board	Performance Report	Joint Committee	Sally O'Hanlon
May Performance Report	To note the report	09.06.2016	Management Board	Performance Report	Joint Committee	Sally O'Hanlon