

Comprehensive Performance Assessment 2007

London Borough of Enfield

Introduction

1.1 This assessment has been undertaken as part of the 2007 Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) programme and does not represent a full inspection of London Borough of Enfield's Benefits service. This report has been produced pursuant to powers contained in sections 10 and 11 of the Local Government Act 1999.

1.2 We gathered information for this assessment from a range of sources including:

- the self-assessment and evidence provided by the council
- Best Value Performance Indicators and performance measures
- discussions with senior officers in the council
- BFI's CPA 2006 report.

Overall Performance

1.3 In 2006 we reported that the council met 8 of the 12 performance measures and 58 of the 65 enablers. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it achieved a rating of excellent against 8 of the 13 performance measures scored by the Department and met 57 enablers. This resulted in the scores reflected below:

Performance Standards score	Excellent
Audit Commission score	4

1.4 While retaining the same overall score, during 2006/07 the council improved its performance for User focus and maintained its performance for the other 3 Performance Standards themes.

1.5 London Borough of Enfield provided a full self-assessment against 2006 HB/CTB Performance Standards. The evidence provided by the council supported its self-assessment.

1.6 Figure 1.1 compares the scores for the individual Performance Standards theme scores for CPA 2006 and CPA 2007 to highlight any changes in reported performance.

Figure 1.1: Performance Standards theme scores			
Theme	2006	2007	Change
Claims administration	3	3	=
Security	4	4	=
User focus	3	4	↑
Resource management	4	4	=
Overall score	4	4	=

Source: BFI analysis

Findings

Claims administration

1.7 London Borough of Enfield's performance measure data for Claims administration is shown in Figure 1.2.

Figure 1.2: Claims administration performance measures 2006/07						
Performance measure	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Full year	Score
PM 1: Average time for processing new claims (days)	38	42	27	25	34	3
PM 2: % of new claims outstanding over 50 days	30	8	10	8	8	4
PM 3: % of new claims decided within 14 days of receiving all information	61	41	79	98	83	3
PM 4: % of rent allowance claims paid on time or within 7 days of a decision being made	94	95	96	92	95	4
PM 5: Average time for processing changes of circumstances (days)	15	24	16	19	18	3
PM 6: % of cases for which the calculation of the amount of benefit due is correct	99	98	98	98	99	3

Source: London Borough of Enfield
(Full year figures are based on an annual calculation and may not reflect the average of 4 quarters performance)

1.8 In 2006 we reported that the council met 3 of the 6 performance measures. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it achieved a rating of excellent against 2 of the 6 performance measures scored by the Department. We also reported that the council met 14 of the 16 enablers. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it met 13 enablers.

1.9 The council improved its performance for new claims outstanding over 50 days and new claims decided within 14 days of receiving all information. However, performance for processing new claims and accuracy, declined. The council told us that it had implemented a new benefits IT system in the first quarter of 2006/07 and this had resulted in the loss of 5 weeks processing time. The council told us that it had recovered from this setback during the third quarter of 2006/07 and had achieved its best ever performance for claims processing during the final quarter of 2006/07.

Security

1.10 In April 2006, Performance Standards were revised to include a scoring mechanism for performance measure PM16. This takes account of the number of successful sanctions applied in relation to a council's live caseload.

1.11 London Borough of Enfield's performance measure data for Security is shown in Figure 1.3.

Figure 1.3: Security Performance measure scores 2006/07			
Performance measure	Annual target	Performance	Score
PM 10: Interventions where review action completed	13,920	101%	4
PM 11: Data matches resolved within 2 months	n/a	95	4
PM 12: Customers visited	4,640	136%	4
PM 16: Number of successful sanctions per 1,000 caseload	n/a	3	3

Source: London Borough of Enfield

1.12 In 2006 we reported that the council met all 3 performance measures. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it achieved a rating of excellent against 3 of the 4 performance measures scored by the Department. We also reported that the council met 20 of the 21 enablers. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it continued to meet 20 enablers.

User focus

1.13 London Borough of Enfield's performance measure data for User focus is shown in Figure 1.4.

Figure 1.4: User focus performance measures 2006/07						
Performance measure	Qtr 1	Qtr 2	Qtr 3	Qtr 4	Full year	Score
PM 17: % of applications for reconsideration /revision actioned and notified within 4 weeks	61	70	73	72	69	4
PM 18: % of appeals submitted to the Appeals Service in 4 weeks	58	96	93	71	78	4
PM 19: % of appeals submitted to the Appeals Service in 3 months	94	100	100	100	98	4

Source: London Borough of Enfield

(Full year figures are based on an annual calculation and may not reflect the average of 4 quarters performance)

1.14 In 2006 we reported that the council met 2 of the 3 performance measures. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it achieved a rating of excellent against all 3 performance measures scored by the Department. We also reported that the council met 9 of the 12 enablers. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it continued to meet 9 enablers.

1.15 The council significantly improved its performance for appeals submitted to the Appeals Service in 3 months, from a score of poor in 2005/06 to excellent in 2006/07. The council told us that it had reviewed and streamlined its process for dealing with appeals and had introduced a new spreadsheet to track all requests for reconsiderations and appeals.

Resource management

1.16 In 2006 we reported that the council met 15 of the 16 enablers. The council's most recent self-assessment showed that it continued to meet 15 enablers.