

JUDGEMENT 1: HOW GOOD IS THE SERVICE?

Question 1: What has the service aimed to achieve?

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | This question is for context only. It will not result in a judgement; it will inform all other judgements |
|--|--|
| <p>1. What has the service aimed to achieve in terms of:</p> <p>1.1 community and user needs?</p> <p>1.2 regional and national priorities?</p> <p>1.3 wider corporate ambitions, strategies and priorities for improvement?</p> | <p>Waste management specific</p> <p>Describe how service aims clearly and explicitly support local, national and EU priorities for sustainable waste management; e.g. where they may be geared towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • following the waste hierarchy with the emphasis being on waste minimisation, re-use and recycling, as opposed to energy from waste (e.g. incineration) and landfilling which are the least desirable options; • meeting EU landfill diversion targets (where appropriate); and • waste being disposed of close to the point of production as possible (proximity principle). <p>State if the council has an up to date Waste Management Strategy either of its own or as part of a wider strategy (or is exempt from the need to have a waste management strategy). For waste collection authorities there have been targets and plans for recycling and composting, waste minimisation (measured through BVPI84) to show how the statutory performance targets will be met. The plans detail actions (such as new recycling schemes), education/promotion (such as encouraging waste minimisation) and enforcement (such as action on illegal dumping or mis-use of the household waste collection scheme). For waste disposal authorities there are targets and plans in place (for WDA) to meet or exceed their landfill allowance trading scheme (LATS) allowance (for biodegradable waste) or sufficient provision made to purchase sufficient permits.</p> <p>Describe any appropriate issues re any key service targets and plans in place to improve the cleanliness of the area, specifically concentrating on the areas identified as below standard (BVPI199).</p> |

Question 2: Is the service meeting the needs of the community and/or users?

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Access, customer care and user and / or community focus.</p> <p>2.1 Are the needs of citizens and users at the heart of the design and delivery of the service now and in the future?</p> <p>2.2 Is the service accessible, responsive and based on a robust understanding of local need?</p> <p>2.3 Are service standards clear and comprehensive and have users been involved in setting them where appropriate?</p> <p>2.4 Are there appropriate arrangements for consulting, engaging and communicating with users and non-users?</p> | <p>Waste management specific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council's web-site clearly signposts refuse and recycling queries, provides information on composting, informs of service standards and response times for missed bins, cleansing (both in terms of routine cleaning – frequency if appropriate, and standards of cleanliness to be expected, and for removing graffiti, fly tipping, abandoned vehicles, and dealing with dog fouling); allows on-line bookings of bulky waste collections; and promotion of waste minimisation/avoidance. <p><u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are clear service standards set for the standard of refuse collection, including rectifying mistakes (e.g. missed bins). There is a relevant policy concerning 'assisted' collections (where the refuse collectors help collect a bin); the size of bins; the positioning of bins (relevant to the household and area). There are clear standards set for the collection of bulky waste, including charging, frequency of collection and way of arranging a collection. Where applicable - There is a clear and open charging policy for the trade waste service, covering a range of container types and specific to the type of waste. Recycling facilities are available to all: the majority of the area is served by kerbside collection [BVPI 91], and kerbside collections accept a range of materials (not just paper). Recycling banks are used to effectively supplement kerbside collections and are clean, tidy, well positioned and can be used by all sections of the community. | <p>Waste management specific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council's web-site, whilst providing information, does not clearly sign post refuse and recycling queries, or lacks service standards. Information is available about services, such as bulky waste collections, but they cannot be booked and paid for on-line. <p><u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are accepted standards for refuse collection, including rectifying mistakes (e.g. missed bins). 'Assisted' collections (where the refuse collectors help collect a bin) are available; Bulky waste collections are available, but standards are not clearly published, charges may vary but there is no clear rationale for the charge (or lack of charge). Frequency of collection is low. There is a price list for the trade waste service but this is based on historic charges rather than geared towards any specific policy that the council has covering profitability and encouraging minimisation, reuse and recycling. Recycling facilities are widely available, although kerbside collections maybe limited in either the range of materials collected (for example, just paper) or not wide spread across the area. The positioning of recycling banks is historic rather than based on need. Banks maybe old and dirty and are not adequately designed |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non standard properties, particularly high rise blocks, are provided with suitable facilities for residents to participate in recycling. Residents' representatives have been fully engaged in the siting of communal facilities which are well used as a result. <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is easy to report cleansing incidents (such as fly tipping, abandoned cars, graffiti, etc) via a number of mechanisms - telephone; internet and in person. The means of reporting are well promoted and known by local citizens, and can be used by all local residents (hearing loop, mini-com, interpreters - where appropriate). Litter bins are well distributed, as appropriate, and the design and location are in keeping with the area. Litter bins are useable - i.e. not full throughout the day, all week (check residents views for Saturdays). Signs promote actions to reduce dog fouling. There is a visible enforcement presence - available at key times (remember, lots of people walk their dogs first thing in the morning and last thing at night). <p><u>Hazardous waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste that is hazardous to health is handled appropriately. There are well promoted and available facilities for the disposal of electrical goods, asbestos, clinical waste, tyres. <p><u>Waste disposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recycling banks are used to effectively supplement kerbside collections and are clean, tidy, well positioned and can be used by all sections of the community. | <p>to be accessible to all users (such as wheel chair users, those without a car, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite good coverage of standard housing types with kerbside recycling, non standard property recycling programmes are patchy or non existent. Where they do exist they are not well used. <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incidents can be reported by a variety of means, but not all are well promoted, or there maybe confusion - such as unclear which telephone number to call, or different numbers are promoted, or it is difficult to use - e.g. hard to find on web-site, or not always an answer on the telephone. Litter bins are well distributed but maybe old or poorly located. There maybe areas where there are too few litter bins for the current 'foot fall'. Litter bins may be over full before being emptied - and therefore they become a source of litter themselves. There maybe a lack of visible enforcement presence - such as no dog warden. <p><u>Hazardous waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There maybe facilities to deal with hazardous waste but these are not well promoted or understood within the council or by the community. <p><u>Waste disposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The positioning of recycling banks is historic rather than based on need. Banks maybe old and dirty and are not adequately designed to be accessible to all users (such as wheel chair users, those without a car, etc). |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civic amenity (CA) sites are well located, sign posted or advertised, open when advertised and when people want to use them. Sites are accessible to all (relevant) users, and accept a wide range of materials for recycling. Any restrictions (such as height barriers or permits) are well promoted and appropriate. Assistance is available and promoted to those who need or want it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA sites are developing their range of materials accepted for recycling. However, their location may not be well known or not easily accessible. They may lack sign posting, be hard to find, poorly advertised, or have opening hours that are not convenient for people to use (e.g. weekday 'office' opening only) or subject to closure at short notice (for example, closing when the site is full). There may be restrictions to users (such as height barriers) which may appear inappropriate or poorly promoted. Assistance is available and promoted to those who need or want it. |
| <p>Diversity</p> <p>2.5 Does the delivery of the service embrace equality, diversity and human rights and ensure that all users, or potential users, have fair and equal access?</p> | <p>Waste management specific <u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council ensures services do not adversely impact on/ or are inappropriate for different sections of the community, including those affected by deprivation (e.g. charging for bulky waste and impact that has on street scene versus encouraging reuse or waste minimisation; awareness of religious aspects to food waste; providing wheeled bins to those without room to store them or without access to back of property) There are explicit efforts to join up activities to deal with fly tipping, abandoned vehicles, graffiti and community safety. The council can demonstrate that services are available to all e.g. offering assisted collections to those needing it. The council has considered the implications of charging for bulky waste collection on all sections of the community. Where concessions are available, they are fair, consistent and implemented sensibly. <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services for keeping the area clean are available to everybody. The council has assessed the area, and is effectively providing a good service (within acceptable constraints) across the area. | <p>Waste management specific <u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The council works to deliver an equal service across the area, but there maybe areas where it impacts adversely on different sections of the community, such as those affected by deprivation (e.g. charging for bulky waste and impact that has on street scene versus encouraging reuse or waste minimisation; awareness of religious aspects to food waste; providing wheeled bins to those without room to store them or without access to back of property). Services are offered to all sections of the community (i.e. no obvious discrimination). But the council has yet to effectively assess and demonstrate that services are not favouring certain sections of the community and adversely serving others (for example - bulk waste collections only being paid for by debit card or in person at the council offices - discriminates against those without a bank account. Not accepting SOLO or Electron - or other cards provided on BASIC bank accounts). <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There maybe the occasional area where services are not as widely available, but the council will be aware of this OR the council is unable to demonstrate that the service provided is fair and equitable across the area. |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Service outcomes for users and the community</p> <p>2.6 Is the organisation delivering what it promised to?</p> <p>2.7 Is the service effective in meeting local, regional and national objectives?</p> <p>2.8 What is user experience of, and satisfaction with, the quality of the service?</p> | <p>Waste management specific</p> <p><u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The refuse collection is reliable. Bins are emptied when they are meant to be emptied. There is no residual mess left behind, and the streets look clean and tidy after the bins have been emptied (including, where appropriate, the bins being left neat and tidy after collection). Where applicable - Users of the trade waste service are satisfied with the service (see also vfm). The service contributes to the council's strategy to reduce, reuse and recycling waste. Trade waste collection is integrated effectively with street cleaning services - e.g. timing of collections does not impact on overall street cleanliness. The collection service enables people to dispose of waste effectively and efficiently, minimising fly tipping and abandonment of waste, yet encouraging re-use and recycling. The role of the bulky waste collection is effectively balanced between the door to door refuse collection and the civic amenity sites, providing an integrated service. The service is integrated effectively with the Planning service. Plans for new developments ensure that suitable waste storage facilities are provided. (No level 2 descriptor). <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is predominantly clean throughout the day, all day. This is supported by BVPI199 measurements and reality checks. Hot spots are cleaned frequently (look for outside schools and shopping areas). | <p>Waste management specific</p> <p><u>Waste collection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The refuse collection is striving to be reliable. Bins are generally emptied when they are meant to be emptied, but there maybe problems in certain areas - such as particular rounds or at the end of the day. (This maybe caused by reliance on agency staff, rounds that are too large, unreliable vehicles, etc). The refuse collection maybe a source of litter (especially with bagged collections). Users of the trade waste service are satisfied with the service but it is unclear how the service contributes towards the councils published strategies. Trade waste collection is not well integrated with other street cleaning activities e.g. timing of collections is such that there is an adverse impact on the overall level of street cleanliness. The bulky waste service is dealt with as a separate service (look for budget decisions regarding introducing or changing the price, and see whether the impact on fly tipping the refuse collection and civic amenity sites are considered). Bookings are given, but the service is not integrated with the other waste services, or does not encourage recycling or re-use. See opposite. <p><u>Street cleansing/streetcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is predominantly clean but there are litter hotspots or areas where cleansing standards are lower, or standards vary considerably throughout the day. This is supported by BV199 and/or reality checks. OR reality checks show the area is predominantly clean, but the council can not support this as it does |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Known areas (hot spots) have been identified and action taken to prevent or discourage fly tipping - such as gating an area, or by promoting alternatives such as bulky waste collections, civic amenity sites, etc. Fly tipping and abandoned vehicles are not seen as a major problem in the area. Action is taken to prevent fly tipping in hot spots. When an incident is reported, it is dealt with promptly, meeting or exceeding the service standards set by the council. Difficult incidents (such as hazardous waste, or large amounts of waste) are dealt with promptly. Street cleansing is integrated effectively with other waste collection services - e.g. one does not provide a source of litter / refuse for the other. Reality checks show that the area is predominantly free of fly posting, and there are no 'old posters' (i.e. any fly posting that is found is recent - look for event dates). The council is proactively dealing with fly posting (where appropriate) either through the rapid removal of offending items or applying coatings to street furniture to prevent or reduce fly posting, and the council is able to demonstrate that this has had an effect. Reality checks or the council's own data, or focus groups, show that dog fouling is not perceived as a major problem, or that people are content with the actions the council is taking. The enforcement function accurately reflects both waste management and corporate enforcement policies. It is proactive, risk based and effective – with a negligible complaints backlog. A range of approaches are used to | <p>not have up to date BV199 cleansing data (it should collect the data at least three times a year). There are litter hotspots that are not effectively tackled. BVPI 199 is below the median levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hot spots maybe known but little effective action has been taken to prevent fly tipping in these areas. Whilst fly tipping and abandoned vehicles are not seen as a significant problem in the area, there is either a high level of incidents, or regular recurring incidents that have not been dealt with, OR reported incidents take a long time to deal with (either outside the council's own targets or take typically longer than five days to clear) causing a concern to local people. Street cleansing and waste collection are not well integrated with occasional problems for one service caused by the other. Reality checks show that fly posting is not a major issue, but there are some areas where fly posting remains an issue. Some areas may not have been cleared recently - events have happened and the poster is still displayed. Reality checks or the council's own data, or focus groups, show that dog fouling is still an area of concern, Pavements or alley ways, or parks, have dog fouling on them. Enforcement is seen as a stand alone function. All the appropriate functions are covered, possibly within an enforcement concordat, but are delivered without clear reference to waste management or |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>target resources including use of CCTV and town centre managers. Enforcement is supported by a resourced and targeted education programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are clear and explicit links to other issues, such as deprivation, community safety (such as the obvious - fly tipping, graffiti, etc, and other issues such as needle clearance). • The council works in partnership with other organisations, such as neighbouring local authorities or land owners, to ensure that green spaces and land outside council control are managed properly. • Management and maintenance regimes have successfully improved issues such as community safety, litter, vandalism, graffiti, and dog fouling across public highway and adjoining public land/open space. • Frontline staff (from all council departments) are encouraged to report on litter and graffiti hot spots, and there is evidence that this is successful (maybe as simple as quick removal of fly tipping, fly posters, etc). <p><u>Hazardous waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous waste is dealt with appropriately. The public know how to deal with different types of waste, and the facility is available for them to dispose of it safely (both in theory and in practice. E.g. what happens if somebody turns up at a civic amenity site with some waste that is not licensed at that site?). <p><u>Waste hierarchy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council can demonstrate, through delivery of the waste strategy, that it is taking steps to achieve the best practicable environmental options (BPEO), including transport/proximity, emissions to air, land and water, and energy use. | <p>corporate policies AND/OR there is a backlog of complaints waiting to be addressed AND/OR enforcement is not supported by a resourced and targeted enforcement programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links to other areas are not explicit, or are not consistent. • The council manages its own land holdings properly but does not consistently help to manage other land outside its control. • Management and maintenance regimes have not consistently improved issues such as community safety, litter, vandalism, graffiti and dog fouling across public highway and adjoining public land/open space. • Frontline staff are able to report on litter and graffiti hot spots. <p><u>Hazardous waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council has arrangements in place to deal with hazardous waste but is unable to demonstrate that they are used appropriately. <p><u>Waste hierarchy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is work taking place to develop the BPEO assessment, but firm plans to achieve the BPEO are yet to be agreed. |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of waste are reducing and the council can demonstrate the actions it has taken to contribute effectively to this trend [BVPI 84] OR levels of waste are low (better than median) and stable. • Enforcement of packaging regulations in Trading Standards forms an integral part of routine enforcement in manufacturing premises and there is some evidence packaging use by local manufacturers is reducing. • There are a range of activities and services that are actively promoted and supported, to the community that encourage and enable waste to be re-used, such as charity shops, IT-recycling, cotton nappies, scrap-stores, community re-paint, etc. • The council has evidence of successful education/advertising campaigns to encourage recycling, composting and waste minimisation and can demonstrate this through, for example, improved participation rates. • Composting facilities are available to all appropriate households. (Households with gardens have access to home composting (through containers and/or information). Households without gardens are not subject to a garden waste promotion). • The council can demonstrate it is taking effective action to reduce the amount of waste it produces itself, and is reusing resources or recycling waste as appropriate – e.g. paper, toner. It can demonstrate other examples of environmental management such as fuel choice for refuse vehicles, vehicle energy efficiency and emissions, effective planning of collection rounds. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of waste are stable or increasing and whilst the council is involved in a range of educational and promotional activities to minimise waste it is unable to demonstrate how its actions have led to a decrease in the amount of waste produced (as there are other factors that influence this). • Enforcement of packaging regulations is carried out, but in an uncoordinated way with no evidence of any impact. • A variety of services are available, but it is unclear how active the council is in supporting them, in the context of where the council places re-use within its own strategies. • There are education/promotion/advertising campaigns being undertaken, but the council is unable to demonstrate how successful they are. • There are some composting facilities but these are not generally available to all appropriate households. • Action is beginning to be taken to reduce the amount of waste the council produces itself, and recycling is developing but not yet fully embedded across the council. |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p><u>Waste disposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of waste sent to landfill are consistent with the landfill directive and in line with the Landfill Allowance trading Scheme (LATS) permits available to the authority (either issued or arrangements in place to trade). The trend is that the amount of waste sent to landfill (BV82d) is decreasing. • Civic amenity sites are clean, tidy, well presented and typically recycle over 40 per cent of the household waste delivered. <p>INFORMATION</p> <p>BV82c details the amount of waste that is sent to an incinerator that recovers some or all of the heat and power. Incineration is a better option than landfill, but does not equal composting and recycling. A council should strive to be best in recycling and composting, and minimise the amount of waste sent to landfill. A council that incinerates a lot of its waste is likely to be in the best top 25 per cent for disposal, and likely to be in a good position for LATS. Consequently, BV82c should be treated as a context BVPI.</p> | <p><u>Waste disposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council's actions over the levels of waste sent to landfill are not linked to or governed by the landfill directive, and/or the council does not have a clear plan or costed strategy to deal with the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (either to purchase or sell permits). There is no clear or significant change in the amount of waste sent to landfill. BV82d is not in the best performing 25 per cent. • Civic amenity sites are mainly well presented and are developing their range of materials accepted for recycling. |

Question 3: Is the service delivering value for money?

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | INSPECTION FOCUS | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>3.1 How do the organisation's costs compare to others, allowing for local context, performance and policy choices?</p> <p>3.1.1 How do the service costs compare with others?</p> <p>3.1.2 What external local factors affect costs and how do adjusted costs compare?</p> <p>3.1.3 Are costs commensurate with service delivery, performance and the outcomes achieved?</p> <p>3.1.4 Do costs and resource allocation reflect policy decisions?</p> <p>3.1.5 Is accurate information on costs and services collected and is this used to decide priorities and strategically manage resources?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current level of service costs as shown by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> actual spending in relation to other councils cost profiles and cost PIs audit reports recent external inspections Relationship between costs and the level of services provided, taking account of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> external local contextual factors that can be shown to influence costs for the service (deprivation, geography, demography, etc) quality and standards achieved, including targeted investment to improve poorer services demand and supply levels range of discretionary services provided level of overheads and how accounted for performance of the service capital programme The extent to which resources and policy are aligned, and how costs are assessed when policy decisions are made. Accurate information on costs and services is routinely collected and is used to decide and strategically manage resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear and accurate information on overall service and unit costs, how these compare to others and to the quality of services. Reasons for differences are clearly understood and the service/organisation systematically uses this information to review cost effectiveness. Overall costs compare favourably to other organisations providing similar levels and standards of services and allowing for the local context. There is a positive relationship between costs (including overheads and capital costs) and the range, level and quality of services provided – reflected in high quality services. Unintended high spending is identified and addressed effectively. Resources have been allocated in accordance with policy decisions and are used to target and deliver organisational priorities. Areas of higher spending are also in line with stated service priorities and the investment has resulted in improved services. Full cost implications are assessed as part of the decision making process. Capital spending decisions are always taken with full information on the revenue implications and financial forecasts of their longer term impact. The service has a well managed capital programme (if any) with projects completed on time and within budget. Cost data is timely, accurate and consistently used to improve services. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some information on service costs, how these compare to other providers and to the quality of services, but the reasons for differences are not fully understood or used consistently to review cost effectiveness. Overall costs and unit costs for key service areas are not significantly higher than others providing similar levels and standards of services, allowing for the local context. Where costs are low (including overheads and any capital costs) services provided are of an average range, level and quality. Significant unintended high spending is identified and addressed. There is a positive relationship between costs (including overheads and capital costs) and the range, level and quality of services provided. Service capital projects (if any) are generally completed on time and in budget. Policy decisions do not consistently reflect resource availability and/or allocation. |

| KEY LINE OF ENQUIRY (KLOE) | INSPECTION FOCUS | A service that consistently delivers above minimum requirements for users, is cost-effective and makes contributions to wider outcomes for the community. | A service that delivers only minimum requirements for users, and is not especially cost effective nor contributes significantly to wider outcomes for the community. |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>3.2 How is value for money managed, including through partnership and procurement and taking a long term view?</p> <p>3.2.1 Are modern procurement methods and partnerships applied that result in demonstrable value for money and delivering outcomes that meet the needs of users and/or the community?</p> <p>3.2.2 Do VFM considerations focus on the costs and benefits to the customer?</p> <p>3.2.3 Are management arrangements focused on value for money, and are they underpinned by robust mechanisms to drive and monitor progress, and review impact?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robustness of the procurement strategy • The extent to which the procurement framework and decision making follow good practice. • The impact that procurement practice, partnerships and past investment have made on costs, value and service quality. • The extent to which VFM considerations focus on benefits to users and/or the community • Monitoring and review of service costs includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Consideration of value for money in preparing the annual service budget ◦ Internal reviews (including Best Value reviews) ◦ Reviewing comparative performance ◦ Cost indicators. • How VFM monitoring and review processes help deliver value for money and competitiveness. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement strategies fully embrace and practically apply partnering and other modern procurement frameworks. • The service/organisation uses effective procurement practice. Procurement decisions are taken on an objective basis within a transparent framework that follows good practice. • Demonstrable improvements in value for money have been achieved through procurement/partnership or internal reviews without unintended loss of service quality (or quality increased at no extra cost). Options for joint procurement and working with partners are identified and acted upon to improve value. • Service users recognise that services have been designed to best meet their needs and aspirations within the financial constraints. • The scope for improving cost-effectiveness is kept under review and scrutiny and innovative approaches are used where appropriate. There are clear policies and effective processes for reviewing and improving value for money. Internal reviews are targeted at high cost service areas and lead to improved value for money. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council has effective procurement practices and has in place a strategy that reflects good practice. • Recent procurement examples delivering improving value for money through lower costs and/or improved service. • Consideration is given to the likely impact on service users of changes in spending levels. • Processes for reviewing and improving value for money are in place, including setting targets. Service managers use appropriate information to review value for money and report to the appropriate councillors/governance structure. Areas of high spending identified are subject to review and scrutiny and action to address the results. • Service reviews have led to some improvements in cost-effectiveness or efficiency. |