



**GGHT Panel of
Excellence and Scrutiny
22 May 2013
10am
The Gateway
Room 6**

Minutes

Attendance:	Lynda Johnson, Jean Bullock, Fiona Roberts, Alan Rankin, Linda Booth Alison Foy (Part), Allen Barber (Part), Charlie Martin, Gareth Riley, Tracy Trantum
Apologies:	Dot Thacker, Ayo Akinrele

		Action
1.	<p>Apologies/Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Apologies as above, no declarations of interest.</p>	
2.	<p>Feedback from operatives for review – Part II</p> <p>MB responded to the queries raised following the Panel's meeting with the operatives. Due to time restraints MB was unable to respond to all the responses at the Previous Panel Meeting.</p> <p>The following points were highlighted:</p> <p>MB advised that the scheduler allocates jobs on a time basis and does not take into consideration the location of operatives. This means that repairs will be followed up as soon as an operative in any area becomes available. However, this can lead to lots of GGHT vans in one area if several jobs are raised within the same area.</p> <p>AR asked whether operatives talked to one another and to GGD whilst out on call. MB advised that GGD were in regular contact with operatives but that plans were in place to improve the current systems. A focus group has been set up to improve enable staff to provide feedback as part of the review.</p>	

AR asked whether the system would continually evolve to accommodate customer expectations and whether the current system had been designed by an external contractor. MB advised that the current system has been in place for approx. 5 years – the system was designed by an external contractor but had been built to the specifications provided by GGHT. The system will be continually updated to meet customer expectations.

AF asked whether the 2 hour slots related to the time it would take to complete a repair. MB advised that operatives are expected to attend a property within the 2 hour slot and this was not the time it would take to complete a repair.

LB advised that the 2 hour slot should be made clear to tenants on the phone. MB advised that GGD currently advise customers that operatives will *attend* a property within a 2 hour slot. GGD are not given the time it will take to complete the repair. Each component of a repair is given a time slot – for example the time taken to fix a letter box would be different to the time expected to fix a door frame. GGD does not see this breakdown of timings but this is being reviewed as part of the upgrade.

AF advised that the commitment to attend a property within 2 hours is included within the Offer Document. It would therefore be best to wait until after the first 5 years of transfer before a decision is made to move to AM and PM slots. MB agreed and advised that the current system took approx. 4 years and the review is still in the early consultation stage.

MB advised that, in relation to van stock, it is often cheaper to buy packs rather than individual components. This could lead to a surplus of components that are not required. The Panel advised that it was positive to see that money would be saved through this approach.

LJ asked whether the investment programme will result in a gradual reduction in the number of repairs. MB advised that there should be an overall reduction but that some packages included more complex components that will need to be maintained. For example the new windows and security lights are more complex than previous installations.

LJ asked whether the operatives had had to revisit properties where contractors had not completed work to the required standard. MB advised that repairs linked to programmed works should be followed up by contractors. However, in-house repairs have been called to properties where capital investment works have been completed. One example is on the quality of windows installation and this has been feedback to the contractors.

LJ asked whether the in-house team monitor complaints linked to repairs? MB advised complaints are discussed during team briefings that the complaints workshop convenes on a regular basis to discuss any key trends in complaints.

	<p>FR asked whether the out-of-hours team are charged if GGHT operatives are required to revisit a repair completed out of hours. MB advised that the contractors would be charged for parts, labour and overheads. AF asked how these repairs were logged on the system. MB advised that an alert or 'defect warning' would be uploaded onto contact manager so GGD were aware that a contractor had previously attended.</p> <p>TT asked whether all investment work was signed-off by a quality inspector. MB advised that site supervisors are responsible for signing off investment work, TLO's complete a further check and satisfaction surveys are carried out by GGD to monitor customer satisfaction.</p> <p>MB advised that the 3 Technical Inspectors are responsible for <i>diagnosing</i> day to day repairs in the event that the scheduler is unable to do so. They are not responsible for quality checking work completed by contractors or the in-house team. Site Supervisor monitor work completed by the contractors and in-house team. There is currently 1 site supervisor for kitchens and 2 for fencing.</p> <p>LJ asked whether there had been an increase on the number of repairs linked to the investment programme. MB advised that there had not been a significant increase.</p> <p>FR asked how sickness and absence was managed within the In-house Build Maintenance Team. MB advised that the annual work plan takes into account holidays, sickness and flexitime, training and meetings. Once these factors have been built into the work plan the number of working weeks is reduced to 46 (rather than 52 weeks). The number of staff is then divided by 46 and this gives an idea of what the staffing levels are likely to be throughout the year.</p> <p>LB asked whether the new windows had been trialled prior to installation. MB advised that this was correct and that the new windows were A-Rated and complied with British Standard.</p> <p>MB advised that the contractors pay compensation to customers if work is not completed to the required standard. It is important for GGHT to capture the reasons for compensation pay-outs for performance purposes. However, GGHT does not always receive the reasons that compensation was paid out by contractors to tenants. It was agreed that communication between contractor and GGHT could form part of the Panel's recommendation for service improvements.</p> <p>The Panel thanked Mark for his time and were pleased with the responses provided.</p>	PEAS
<p>3.</p>	<p>Minutes of last meeting 24 April 2013 2013</p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ AF advised that the Offer Document was available on the GGHT 	

CM

AF

- Website. The link to the document will be circulated to members.
- ❖ AF advised that an email with dates for the pre-tenancy work shop has been circulated to members. Some members had not received this and it will be resent.
 - ❖ AF provided an overview of the number of repair jobs raised and completed over the last month:

Performance Indicators for in-House Team

PI	Nr Completed	Nr in time	Nr out of time	% complete in time
% Emergencies completed in time	5611	5555	56	99.00%
% Urgent repairs completed in time	5287	5275	12	99.77%
% Routine repairs completed in time	9243	9215	28	99.70%
% Programmed repairs completed in time	2354	1677	677	71.24%
% Appointments made and kept	14930	14896	34	99.77%

Performance Indicators for Gas Teams

PI	Nr Completed	Nr in time	Nr out of time	% complete in time
% Emergencies completed in time	2673	2663	10	99.63%
% Urgent repairs completed in time	3157	3128	29	99.08%
% Routine repairs completed in time	1252	1237	15	98.80%
% Appointments made and kept	4622	4536	86	98.14%

Performance Indicators for All

PI	Nr Completed	Nr in time	Nr out of time	% complete in time
% Emergencies completed in time	8284	8218	66	99.20%
% Urgent repairs completed in time	8444	8403	41	99.51%
% Routine repairs completed in time	10495	10452	43	99.59%
% Programmed repairs completed in time	2354	1677	677	71.24%
% Appointments made and kept	19552	19432	120	99.39%

	<p>included within the CCP Survey.</p> <p>The slides will be circulated to the Panel.</p>	
4.	<p>Value For Money Assessment</p> <p>Allen Barber, Director of Business Services was welcomed to the meeting.</p> <p>AB advised that GGHT are required, under the new regulatory framework, to produce an assessment that explains the organisation's approach to delivering Value for Money.</p> <p>To ensure compliance with regulator's economic standard GGHT must be able to link its activities and initiatives to its organisational objectives. GGHT must also be able to demonstrate that it is able to manage its resources economically, efficiently and effectively</p> <p>As part of the final assessment GGHT will need to measure its return on assets, i.e. what GGHT earns from the investment in its properties (assets). At the same time, GGHT must consider the wider social impact on investment and be able to link investment with its organizational objectives. AB demonstrated that GGHT return on assets was greater than its business plan and during 2012/13 had invested a range of new initiatives linked to the wider organizational objectives.</p> <p>LJ noted that GGHT plans to buy 10 new properties and asked what type of properties these would be. AB advised that GGHT are looking to buy 2 bedroom houses due to meet the growing demand. These properties will also be less affected by the bedroom tax.</p> <p>LJ advised that she was surprised at the level of savings within electrical works. AB advised that the use of Quick Call online tendering has helped procurement staff to tender small projects more efficiently. For example, if large scale repair work was required GGHT would quickly be able to obtain a quote for from 3 different companies.</p> <p>LJ queried whether if £150k spent on health initiatives was giving value for money. AB advised that GGHT are keen to look at issues outside of its core services and health initiatives will improve the wellbeing of GGHT customers and contribute to the wider closing the gap agenda. FR asked whether WBC funded health initiatives. AB advised that this was correct.</p> <p>FR asked whether the budgeting workshops were being offered to customers. AB advised this was correct and GGHT were working with WBC on these initiatives. TT advised that GGHT has been contacting tenants and the workshops have received a high uptake from customers.</p> <p>LJ asked how many customers took part in the Star Survey. TT advised that 1234 responses were received across different areas and tenancies groups and the result was statistically valid. AB advised that the results of the survey can be broken down to enable GGHT to find the reasons of dissatisfaction.</p>	

	<p>AB advised that the restructure of services will generate savings of £300k and more front line staff. LJ asked where operatives will be based following the restructure. AB advised that frontline staff will work on patches of between 200-300 properties. The panel agreed that it would be good for customers to see the operatives out and about and this will have a positive impact on customer satisfaction.</p> <p>AB advised that income collection rate is above the BP forecast of 97.5% and is currently at 100.03%. This is because customers are paying their rent and GGHT are also collecting arrears that weren't built into the original forecast. FR asked if the panel could be shown the overall collection rate including arrears carried forward.</p> <p>LJ asked whether the welfare reforms will have a significant impact on the collection rate. AB advised that the collection rate has been forecast at 98.5% for 2013/14. It is likely that the reforms will have an impact but GGHT is actively engaging tenants who are most likely to be affected. GGHT will need to ensure collection rates do not fall below 95.5%.</p> <p>AB advised that the VFM assessment will be taken to Finance Committee on 12 June and will be included in the Annual Accounts for the Board to approve.</p>	AB
6.	<p>AOB & June Agenda</p> <p>Fiona, Jean and Ayo expressed an interest in attending the Annual Resident Involvement Conference on 6th/7th June</p> <p>Names will be drawn to decide which member will attend the Scrutiny Network event on 21st June 2013</p> <p>June agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication and Customer Access: Complaints, Satisfaction and Performance • Customer Consultation Panel – In-House Repairs Survey • Quarter 4 Performance <p>Forward Plan/Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgeting Workshop 	CM
7.	<p>Evaluation</p> <p>The panel felt that it had been a good meeting.</p>	
8.	<p>Meeting Costs</p> <p>Postage: £ 6.00</p>	

	Out of Pocket Expenses: £39.00 Room Hire: £45.00 Catering Expenses: n/a Total: £95	
9.	Date of next meeting: 12 June 2013, TBC	