

BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2002/2003

1 SUMMARY

This document puts forward proposals for change to performance indicators for local authorities for 2002/03 and asks for feedback on these proposals and the definitions used for determining the indicators. The Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR) also provides some new preliminary guidance on how authorities should be setting targets in respect of these indicators.

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 The DTLR's proposals have in mind the following principles:

- Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs) should in normal circumstances be specified in sufficient time to generate a pattern of year-on-year data;
- the creation of as much synergy as possible between the various policy initiatives for local government;
- the overall burden of bureaucracy should be reduced;
- development of effective indicators of broad outcome.

2.2 Particular issues identified in the document are:

- the number of national BVPIs for principal local authorities would decrease from 123 to 95 under these proposals. District Councils would have 5 new indicators, 22 deleted indicators and 13 changed indicators (including part deletions), thereby reducing the number by 17 to 51;
- the DTLR is considering a practical means for inspectors and external auditors to assess the achievement of the required 2% efficiency gains. It is seeking views on this rational and on the introduction of a relevant national performance indicator for the coming year;
- the Audit Commission will not be specifying statutory performance indicators for local authorities for 2002/03;

- performance indicators relating to the 3-yearly customer satisfaction surveys will not be included for 2002/03;
- targets need to be challenging yet realistic. For local authorities to set these they must have a robust performance management framework in place and use the lessons learnt from their best value reviews. They need to have regard to their duty to achieve continuous improvement. This requires a corporate approach to target setting and the need to develop medium and long term targets. Further guidance will be given when the 2002/03 Performance Indicator set is published;
- although 'top quartile' targets will remain and other specific targets are proposed, the remainder should continue to be determined locally;
- the use of a common inflation rate to be used by all authorities for cost based indicators is proposed
- a way of measuring statutory nuisance is to be introduced

3 CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The Audit Commission is seeking feedback on the proposals outlined in [appendix A](#)

4 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The need to calculate fewer performance indicators may result in a saving but this must be weighted against the resource required to set up and audit procedures for new/changed indicators and that required to set short, medium and long term targets. However, no material change is envisaged.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Changes to the gathering and submission of this information will be statutory

6 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**

Subject to Member consideration and comments, to agree the responses detailed in appendix A

Paul Warren
Chief Executive

Background Papers:

Best Value Performance Indicators 2002/2003 – Consultation Paper
(available in Members Room and at
<http://www.local-regions.detr.gov.uk/consult/best02-03/index>)

For further information please contact Chris Paget on

Tel:- 01701 318031
E-Mail:- chris.paget@rochford.gov.uk