

**IMPLEMENTATION EXECUTIVE
28 JANUARY 2009**

PERFORMANCE INFORMATION FOR THE BUDGET BOOKLET**Purpose of Report**

1. This report and its appendices provide a summary of performance management information for five District and County Councils. The information has been produced to aid planning and to inform the budget for 2009-10.

Background

2. The information contained in the tables has been compiled from national sources. The Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) tables use data from the Audit Commission and the cost comparisons are drawn from Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) (Finance and General Statistics).

Main Considerations for the Implementation Executive

3. The main consideration for the Implementation Executive is to review performance in all service areas against the cost of providing that service. The tables at Appendix A show comparative information for all five councils. For district councils the comparison is against all districts, the County Council is compared against all counties. The comparisons contained in this table are broad, so should only be used to stimulate questions.
 - **Table 1: High Level Comparison Matrix:** This places services into a matrix to show the level of performance (e.g. quartile position or 'blob' rating) against the quartile position (CIPFA) for the cost of that particular service. For some services alternative analysis has been used (e.g. cost per school or by km of road).
 - **Table 2: 2007-8 BVPI Results:** This provides a comparison between our 2007-08 results, for national indicators against the latest available national data (mainly 2006-07 quartiles).
 - **Table 3: CIPFA Finance and General Statistics 2008-09 (Districts):** This provides general statistical information about the authority (e.g. percentage change in Council Tax, total expenditure and service expenditure per head of population). These figures are then compared with those of all other district councils in order to place the district in one of four 'cost quartiles' (cheapest, below average, above average and most expensive).
 - **Table 4: CIPFA Finance and General Statistics 2008-09 (County):** As above but relating to the County Council.

(The information in Tables 2, 3 and 4 has been used to compile Table 1).

Environmental Impact of the Proposal

4. None identified.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

5. None considered.

Risk Assessment

6. Risks associated with the budget are detailed in a separate section of the budget book.

Financial Implications

7. This report is designed to inform budget planning.

Legal Implications

8. None identified.

Options Considered

9. This report is a summary of performance information so alternative options are not applicable.

Conclusions

10. Information has been provided about performance and cost to assist with developing the budget and service planning.

Proposal

11. Members are asked to consider the performance information contained in the Appendix alongside the 2009-10 budget proposals to inform budget planning.

Reason for Proposal

12. To inform members about the performance of the five councils and the comparative costs of providing services.

Sharon Britton

Service Director, Performance & Risk

Report Author: Karen Spence, Performance Manager (13 January 2009)

Appendices:

Appendix A, Table 1: High Level Comparison Matrix

Appendix A, Table 2: Best Value Performance Indicator Results