

Housing Management Services Performance Digest

| | | | End Year Target 2018/19 | Reporting Frequency | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | |
|---------------------------------|----|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------|---------|--------|-------|-----|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | |
| A. Resident satisfaction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 1 | Percentage of tenants satisfied with quality of their repair | 90.0% | Monthly | TQ 92.5% M 85.7% LQ 80.2% | 87.2% | 86.6% | | Amber | ↓ | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | 87.1% | Worse | |
| KPI | 2 | Percentage of leaseholders satisfied with the overall service provided | 47.5% | Quarterly | TQ 51.0% M 48.1% LQ 42.4% | 41.1% | 38.4% | | Amber | ↓ | 43.8% | | | | | 45.1% | - | Worse | |
| PI | 3 | Percentage of tenants satisfied with the overall service provided | 73.0% | Monthly | TQ 77.5% M 74.0% LQ 68.4% | 67.0% | 67.2% | | Amber | ↑ | 73.0% | | | | | 73.0% | 70.1% | Worse | |
| B. Estate services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Satisfaction with the quality of Grounds Maintenance | 80.0% | Monthly | | 79.5% | 79.6% | | Amber | ↑ | 80.0% | | | | | 80.0% | 82.1% | Worse | |
| KPI | 2 | Satisfaction with the quality of Estate Cleaning | 70.0% | Monthly | | 68.4% | 68.3% | | Amber | ↓ | 70.0% | | | | | 70.0% | 69.3% | Worse | |
| PI | 3 | Satisfaction with the quality of communal repairs | 64.0% | Monthly | | 59.6% | 59.6% | | Amber | ↔ | 64.0% | | | | | 64.0% | 58.8% | Improved | |
| PI | 4 | Percentage of CORE surveys completed | 85.0% | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - | |
| MI | 5 | Satisfaction with grounds maintenance and estate cleaning | - | Monthly | | 74.0% | 73.9% | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 75.7% | Worse | |
| C. Repairs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Average number of days to do a repair (Day to day) | 11.5 | Monthly | | 2.7 | 5.4 | | Green | ↓ | 11.5 | | | | | 11.5 | 4.8 | Worse | |
| KPI | 2 | Average number of days to do a repair (Technical) | 9.0 | Monthly | | 2.2 | 2.9 | | Green | ↓ | 9.0 | | | | | 9.0 | 3.4 | Improved | |
| MI | 3 | Average number of days to do a repair (All responsive) | - | Monthly | TQ 7.2 days M 9.8 days LQ 11.0 days | 3 | 5 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| KPI | 4 | Percentage of appointments kept** | 90.0% | Monthly | TQ 97.1% M 95.8% LQ 91.8% | No data | No data | | - | - | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | No data | - | |
| KPI | 5 | Percentage of residents reporting that contractors were polite and helpful | 90.0% | Monthly | | 96.2% | 96.3% | | Green | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | 96.7% | Worse | |
| KPI | 6 | Percentage of residents reporting that contractors left their home clean and tidy | 90.0% | Monthly | | 95.0% | 94.6% | | Green | ↓ | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | 94.6% | Improved | |
| KPI | 7 | Percentage of repairs carried out in 2 or less visits** | 94.0% | Monthly | | No data | No data | | - | - | 94.0% | | | | | 94.0% | - | - | |
| PI | 8 | Percentage of repairs completed on time | 92.0% | Monthly | | 90.1% | 85.1% | | Amber | ↓ | 92.0% | | | | | 92.0% | 96.4% | Worse | |
| PI | 9 | Total number of live disrepair cases | 150 | Monthly | | 150 | 154 | | Amber | ↓ | 150 | | | | | 150 | 111 | Worse | |
| MI | 10 | Average time to complete Priority 1 (PR1) [1 Day] | - | Monthly | | 1 | 2 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 1 | - | |
| MI | 11 | Average time to complete Priority 2 (PR2) [3 working days] | - | Monthly | | 4 | 5 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 3 | - | |
| MI | 12 | Average time to complete Priority 3 (PR3) [7 working days] | - | Monthly | | 7 | 9 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 6 | - | |
| MI | 13 | Average time to complete Priority 4 (PR4) [28 days] | - | Monthly | | 11 | 19 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 14 | - | |
| MI | 14 | Number of new jobs raised (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 7,561 | 14,694 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 9,698 | - | |
| MI | 15 | Number of jobs completed (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 4,991 | 10,254 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 7,496 | - | |
| MI | 16 | Number of raised jobs cancelled (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 1,034 | 2,146 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 718 | - | |
| MI | 17 | Percentage of raised jobs cancelled (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 14% | 15% | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 7% | - | |
| MI | 18 | Number completed jobs varied (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 2,594 | 5,724 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 4,126 | - | |
| MI | 19 | Percentage completed jobs varied (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | 52% | 56% | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 55% | - | |
| MI | 20 | Average cost of a responsive repair (Standard repairs) | - | Monthly | | £90.03 | £91.71 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | £95.17 | - | |

Housing Management Services Performance Digest

| | | End Year Target 2018/19 | Reporting Frequency | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | | |
|--|----|---|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----|-------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|------------|--------------|---|-------|---|
| | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | | |
| D. Technical Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Percentage of homes with up to date Gas Safe Certificate | 100.0% | Monthly | TQ 100% M 99.98% LQ 99.90% | 97.2% | 97.1% | | Amber | ↓ | 100.0% | | | | | 100.0% | 98.7% | Worse | ▼ |
| E. Home ownership* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Percentage of day to day income collected | 105.0% | Monthly | TQ 105.27% M 101.29% LQ 100.42% | 114.2% | 115.1% | | Green | ↑ | 105.0% | | | | | 105.0% | 123.31% | Worse | ▼ |
| MI | 2 | Amount of service charges collected year to date | - | Monthly | | £1,052,902 | £2,122,223 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| MI | 3 | Estimated service charge due year to date | - | Monthly | | £922,086 | £1,844,172 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| KPI | 4 | Amount of major works income collected (Section 20) | £5,000,000 | Monthly | | £788,097 | £1,477,401 | | Green | ↑ | £825,000 | | | | £1,950,000 | £1,244,087 | Improved | ▲ | |
| MI | 5 | Set up SC account within 4 weeks of RTB completion | - | Monthly | | 70 | 92 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | 18 | |
| E2. Right to buy* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 6 | Percentage of RTB 2 applications processed in 28 days | 100.0% | Monthly | | 100.0% | 100.0% | | Green | → | 100.0% | | | | 100.0% | 90.0% | Improved | ▲ | |
| E3. Customer Service* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 7 | Percentage of leaseholder enquiries/contacts responded to within target time. | 90% | Monthly | | 96% | 100% | | Green | ↑ | 90% | | | | 90% | 100% | Same | → | |
| F. Resident engagement and resident services* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 1 | Number of residents undertaking vocational training | 70 | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | 0 | | | | 35 | - | - | | |
| PI | 2 | Number of residents finding work | 30 | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | 8 | | | | 15 | - | - | | |
| PI | 3 | Amount of social value generated | £1,000,000 | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | £250,000 | | | | £500,000 | - | - | | |
| MI | 4 | Number of TRAs taking up grants | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 5 | Number of new Lambeth 500 residents (All) | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 6 | Number of new Lambeth 500 residents (North) | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 7 | Number of new Lambeth 500 residents (Central) | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 8 | Number of new Lambeth 500 residents (South) | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 9 | Percentage of resident body represented by TRA (All) | - | Annual | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 10 | Percentage of resident body represented by TRA (North) | - | Annual | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 11 | Percentage of resident body represented by TRA (Central) | - | Annual | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |
| MI | 12 | Percentage of resident body represented by TRA (South) | - | Annual | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | | |

**Housing Management Services
Performance Digest**

| | | | End Year Target 2018/19 | Reporting Frequency | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | |
|---|----|--|----------------------------|------------------------|--|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-----|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | |
| G. Tenancy enforcement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 1 | Percentage of closed ASB cases successfully resolved / positive outcome | 96.0% | Monthly | TQ 94.7% M 90.4% LQ 77.9% | 89.2% | 92.8% | | Amber | ↑ | 96.0% | | | | | 96.0% | 96.6% | Worse | |
| PI | 2 | Percentage High risk cases responded to within 24 hours | 95.0% | Monthly | | - | 60.0% | | Red | ↓ | 95.0% | | | | | 95.0% | 63.6% | Worse | |
| PI | 3 | Percentage Medium risk cases responded to within 5 days | 95.0% | Monthly | | 96.9% | 82.5% | | Red | ↓ | 95.0% | | | | | 95.0% | 92.9% | Worse | |
| PI | 4 | Percentage Low risk cases responded to within 10 days | 95.0% | Monthly | | 88.1% | 82.3% | | Red | ↓ | 95.0% | | | | | 95.0% | 89.4% | Worse | |
| MI | 5 | Average Number of calendar days taken to resolve ASB cases | - | Monthly | | 102 | 99 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 153 | - | |
| MI | 6 | Number of cases closed | - | Monthly | | 148 | 251 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 149 | - | |
| G1. ASB case categories | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MI | 7 | Noise | - | Monthly | | 49 | 88 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 103 | - | |
| MI | 8 | Harassment / Intimidation | - | Monthly | | 11 | 21 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 24 | - | |
| MI | 9 | Communal / Public Area Nuisance | - | Monthly | | 11 | 38 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 35 | - | |
| MI | 10 | Tenancy Breach | - | Monthly | | 16 | 24 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 14 | - | |
| MI | 11 | Litter / Rubbish | - | Monthly | | 1 | 4 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 13 | - | |
| MI | 12 | Animal Nuisance | - | Monthly | | 1 | 3 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 4 | - | |
| MI | 13 | Drugs | - | Monthly | | 2 | 9 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 9 | - | |
| MI | 14 | Physical Violence | - | Monthly | | 1 | 3 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 0 | - | |
| MI | 15 | Garden Nuisance | - | Monthly | | 0 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 3 | - | |
| MI | 16 | Criminal Damage | - | Monthly | | 0 | 2 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 0 | - | |
| MI | 17 | Hate Related Incidents | - | Monthly | | 0 | 0 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 0 | - | |
| MI | 18 | Sexual Acts | - | Monthly | | 1 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 3 | - | |
| MI | 19 | Alcohol Related | - | Monthly | | 0 | 0 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 0 | - | |
| MI | 20 | Domestic Abuse | - | Monthly | | 1 | 2 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 0 | - | |
| MI | 21 | No Category Recorded | - | Monthly | | 0 | 10 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 25 | - | |
| G2. Evictions (Year to date) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MI | 22 | Number evicted for rent arrears | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| MI | 23 | Number evicted arrears and anti-social behaviour | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| MI | 24 | Number evicted for anti-social behaviour | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| MI | 25 | Number evicted after audit check | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| MI | 26 | Number evicted - other reason | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| MI | 27 | Total evictions | - | Quarterly | | - | - | | - | - | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| G3. ASB case management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MI | 28 | Number of new cases opened year to date | - | Monthly | | 94 | 206 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 233 | - | |
| MI | 29 | Number of new cases opened year to date per 1000 properties managed | - | Monthly | | 3 | 7 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 8 | - | |
| MI | 30 | Number of cases closed successfully resolved year to date | - | Monthly | | 132 | 233 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 144 | - | |
| MI | 31 | Number of cases closed successfully resolved year to date per 1,000 properties managed | - | Monthly | | 5 | 8 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 5 | - | |
| G4. Early interventions (top six) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MI | 32 | Advice & assistance provided to complaints (self help) | - | Monthly | | 35 | 66 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 108 | - | |
| MI | 33 | Written Warning | - | Monthly | | 27 | 51 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 72 | - | |
| MI | 34 | Interview with Perpetrator | - | Monthly | | 6 | 14 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 21 | - | |
| MI | 35 | Verbal Warning | - | Monthly | | 0 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 6 | - | |
| MI | 36 | Referral to Police | - | Monthly | | 0 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 13 | - | |
| MI | 37 | Mediation | - | Monthly | | 2 | 3 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 9 | - | |
| G5. Enforcement actions (top five) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MI | 38 | Notice Seeking Possession | - | Monthly | | 3 | 3 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 2 | - | |
| MI | 39 | Full Injunction | - | Monthly | | 0 | 0 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 3 | - | |
| MI | 40 | Ex parte Injunction | - | Monthly | | 0 | 0 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 3 | - | |
| MI | 41 | Undertaking | - | Monthly | | 1 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 2 | - | |
| MI | 42 | Possession Order | - | Monthly | | 1 | 2 | | - | - | - | | | | | - | 1 | - | |

Housing Management Services Performance Digest

| | | | | | End Year Target 2018/19 | Reporting Frequency | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | | |
|---|---|---|-------|-----------|---|------------------------|--|------------|--------|--------|-----|--------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-----|--------------|---|----------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | | |
| H. Rent arrears and welfare reform | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H1. Arrears collection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Rent collection rate in-year | 99.0% | Monthly | TQ 100.24% M 99.95% LQ 99.27% | | 98.29% | 99.33% | | Green | ↑ | 98.20% | | | | | | | 98.75% | 99.3% | Improved | ▲ |
| KPI | 2 | Percentage of rent and arrears collected | 95.5% | Monthly | TQ 97.26% M 96.28% LQ 95.62% | | 93.75% | 94.79% | | Green | ↑ | 95.00% | | | | | | | 95.50% | 95.3% | Worse | ▼ |
| MI | 3 | Current tenant arrears as a percentage of rent roll | 4.4% | Monthly | | | 4.93% | 4.80% | | - | - | 4.35% | | | | | | | 4.35% | 4.21% | - | |
| MI | 4 | Current tenant arrears | - | Monthly | | | £6,316,132 | £6,362,306 | | - | - | - | | | | | | | - | £5,751,652 | - | |
| PI | 5 | Former tenant arrears as a percentage of rent roll | 1.0% | Monthly | | | 1.70% | 1.64% | | Green | ↑ | 1.75% | | | | | | | 2.00% | 1.39% | Worse | ▼ |
| MI | 6 | Amount of former tenant arrears | - | Monthly | | | £2,567,120 | £2,574,186 | | - | - | - | | | | | | | - | £2,286,361 | - | |
| H2. Welfare reform* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 7 | Number of successful outcomes | 120 | Quarterly | | | - | - | | - | - | 30 | | | | | | | 60 | - | - | |
| PI | 8 | Percentage reduction in welfare reform affected cases | 6% | Quarterly | | | - | - | | - | - | 2% | | | | | | | 3% | - | - | |
| I. Empty properties | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| KPI | 1 | Average days to relet short cycle voids | 24.0 | Monthly | TQ 22.0 days M 30.0 days LQ 41.2 days | | 17.5 | 21.5 | | Green | ↓ | 24.0 | | | | | | | 24.0 | 24.5 | Improved | ▲ |
| KPI | 2 | Number of empty properties as a Percentage of stock | 0.77% | Monthly | | | 0.74% | 0.82% | | Amber | ↓ | 0.77% | | | | | | | 0.77% | 0.86% | Improved | ▲ |
| MI | 3 | Number of empty properties | 150 | Monthly | | | 152 | 168 | | - | - | 150 | | | | | | | 150 | 175 | - | |
| J. Disrepair | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PI | 1 | Time taken from receiving a case to completing works (months) | 5 | Quarterly | | | - | - | | - | - | 5 | | | | | | | 5 | - | - | |

Housing Management Services Performance Digest

K. Complaints and Member's Enquiries

K1. Percentage of local resolution complaints answered on time

| KPI | 1 | Housing Management services (all departments) | 90.0% | Monthly | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | |
|-----|----|---|-------|---------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | |
| MI | 2 | Housing Management services (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 88.2% | 81.0% | | Amber | ↓ | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | 86.4% | Worse | |
| PI | 3 | North Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 34 | 63 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 59 | - | |
| MI | 4 | North Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 100.0% | 100.0% | | Green | → | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 93.3% | Improved | |
| PI | 5 | Central Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 17 | 26 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 15 | - | |
| MI | 6 | Central Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 87.5% | 93.8% | | Green | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 90.0% | Improved | |
| PI | 7 | South Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 8 | 16 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 10 | - | |
| MI | 8 | South Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 50.0% | 33.3% | | Red | ↓ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Worse | |
| PI | 9 | Central Income Team | 90.0% | Monthly | | 3 | 12 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 12 | - | |
| MI | 10 | Central Income Team (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | - | 100.0% | | Green | ↔ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Same | |
| PI | 11 | Home ownership services | 90.0% | Monthly | | 0 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - | |
| MI | 12 | Home ownership services (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 100.0% | 60.0% | | Red | ↓ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Worse | |
| PI | 13 | Responsive repairs | 90.0% | Monthly | | 2 | 5 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 2 | - | |
| MI | 14 | Responsive repairs (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 66.7% | 66.7% | | Red | → | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Worse | |
| | | | | | | 3 | 3 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - | |

K2. Review stage complaints

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---|---|---------|--|-------|-------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| MI | 15 | Number of local resolution complaints referred to review | - | Monthly | | 9 | 17 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - |
| MI | 16 | Percentage of review level complaints that were upheld by CCU | - | Monthly | | 83.3% | 66.7% | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | - | - |

K3. Percentage of Members' enquiries answered on time

| KPI | 1 | Housing Management services (all departments) | 90.0% | Monthly | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | |
|-----|----|---|-------|---------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | |
| MI | 2 | Housing Management services (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | TQ 96.1% M 89.2% LQ 73.4% | 93.7% | 95.3% | | Green | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | | 90.0% | 92.9% | Improved | |
| PI | 3 | North Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 158 | 300 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 182 | - | |
| MI | 4 | North Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 94.1% | 94.1% | | Green | → | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 96.6% | Worse | |
| PI | 5 | Central Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 17 | 51 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 29 | - | |
| MI | 6 | Central Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 97.9% | 100.0% | | Green | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Same | |
| PI | 7 | South Area Housing Office | 90.0% | Monthly | | 48 | 81 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 49 | - | |
| MI | 8 | South Area Housing Office (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 97.3% | 97.9% | | Green | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Worse | |
| PI | 9 | Central Income Team | 90.0% | Monthly | | 75 | 142 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 72 | - | |
| MI | 10 | Central Income Team (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 0.0% | 0.0% | | Red | → | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 100.0% | Worse | |
| PI | 11 | Home ownership services | 90.0% | Monthly | | 1 | 1 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 8 | - | |
| MI | 12 | Home ownership services (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | 70.6% | 72.0% | | Red | ↑ | 90.0% | | | | - | - | 92.3% | Worse | |
| PI | 13 | Responsive repairs | 90.0% | Monthly | | 17 | 25 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 13 | - | |
| MI | 14 | Responsive repairs (total due for an answer YTD) | - | Monthly | | - | - | | Green | → | 90.0% | | | | - | - | - | Same | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 0 | - | |

L. Call handling

| KPI | 1 | Number of calls answered on time (%) | 80.0% | Monthly | Sector benchmark from HouseMark | Quarter 1 | | | | | Q1 Target | Quarter 2 | | | | | Q2 Target | Performance compared to last year (May 2017) | |
|-----|---|--|-------|---------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-----|-------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Apr-18 | May-18 | Jun-18 | RAG | DOT | | Jul-18 | Aug-18 | Sep-18 | RAG | DOT | | | |
| KPI | 2 | Number of abandoned calls (%) | 5.0% | Monthly | | 39.1% | 69.8% | | Red | ↑ | 80.0% | | | | | 80.0% | 85.5% | Worse | |
| MI | 3 | Number of calls received | - | Monthly | | 20.1% | 6.9% | | Red | ↑ | 5.0% | | | | - | - | 1.4% | Worse | |
| MI | 4 | Number of calls received for rents | - | Monthly | | 23,735 | 24,209 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 38,315 | - | |
| MI | 5 | Number of calls received for repairs | - | Monthly | | 2,600 | 2,488 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 4,629 | - | |
| MI | 6 | Number of calls received for leaseholds | - | Monthly | | 14,337 | 14,397 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 21,948 | - | |
| MI | 7 | Number of calls received for tenancy matters | - | Monthly | | 907 | 1,048 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 2,110 | - | |
| | | | | | | 890 | 1,002 | | - | - | - | | | | - | - | 3,057 | - | |

Notes

- * Denotes indicators that are not based on data from Northgate but come from reports using manual data produced by the services themselves
- ** Data for repairs KPI 3 'appointments kept' will not be available until quarter 2. New SQL report required following the introduction of 'Mears ApPOINT'