



# 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.

<b>KEY</b>	
	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.