

SCRUTINY PANEL REPORT NOVEMBER 2013: BSW HEATING LIMITED

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Panel is a group of residents who meet to discuss the performance of specific areas of Newlon's activities. Currently it is looking at the two main responsive repairs contracts. It is planned that it will widen its remit to consider other areas of Newlon's activities and become more self determining in how it operates and what it assesses.
- 1.2 The current aim of the group is to scrutinise the contractor's delivery, and Newlon's management of the contract; to establish if it is effective and meeting the agreed standards. The Panel receives an extensive range of information which they consider at an initial meeting. This covers job completion rates; the budget & spend; complaints; resident satisfaction and benchmarking information. From this they identify areas of concern or where they need further information and an agenda and questions are agreed. Three of the Panel members then attend the face-to-face meeting with BSW to discuss these issues and the delivery of the contract.
- 1.3 The three Panel Members met with Jackie Glynn, Contracts Manager; Robert Bazil, Service Director, from BSW and Duncan Lee, Assistant Director Property Services for Newlon. The full notes from the meeting are attached as appendix A.
- 1.4 This report contains the Panel's recommendations and a rating of very satisfied; satisfied, neither / nor; concerned or very concerned for each area.
- 1.5 The report also asks for agreement from the Residents' Services Committee that the Panel become self-determining in terms of Newlon's service areas that it chooses to assess.

2. DAY-TO-DAY REPAIRS

2.1 Area 1: Job completion statistics within agreed timescales

The only concern noted was around the number of 'seven day' jobs without a date recorded on Orchard (78) and with the overall percentage without a date being 13.5%. The Panel were happy with the explanation and with the assurance that the planned automated upload being developed will address this. The current practice of manually completing the data transfer between BSW and Newlon can lead to gaps in the statistics.

Recommendation: None

Panel's rating: Satisfied

3. GAS SAFETY CERTIFICATION PROGRAMME

The panel had no concerns about the quality of the safety certification programme, being very positive about it's delivery.

Recommendations: None

Panel's rating: Very satisfied

4. NEWLON'S SERVICE CENTRE REPAIR SATISFACTION SURVEY

The Panel found the rates of satisfaction to be good but asked if Newlon might

consider altering the wording of one question. Duncan explained at the time that extra questions may loose more respondents during the survey.

Recommendations: Newlon to consider whether it would be beneficial or not to change question 3 of the Service Centre repairs survey to 'was the appointment kept within the agreed timeslot?'

Panel's rating: Satisfied

5. COMPLAINTS

The Panel was satisfied with the numbers, handling and use of complaints to improve services.

Recommendations: None

Panel's rating: Satisfied

6. BUDGET AND SPEND

The Panel discussed the over-spend as seen by July 2013 and heard explanations as to the spend being 'front ended' into the first half of the year; and that it is on course to be within budget by year end.

Recommendations: None

Panel's rating: Very satisfied

7. CONCLUSION

The Panel was pleased with both BSW's performance and with Newlon's management of the contract; finding little to raise as an area of concern with BSW or Newlon.

8. RECOMMENDATION

To consider the report above and discuss the proposal below to allow the Panel to be self-determining.

The Panel was originally established to solve a specific problem of ensuring that residents are clearly involved in the management of the main repairs contracts.

It was proposed that after the first year the Panel could then choose which service areas or contracts to assess. The Residents' Services Committee asked that this be brought to them again for approval at that stage. Due to the slower than expected turn around of meetings this has been delayed until now.

It is both common *and* good practice, as well as a QHS expectation, that the Panel be self determining; and the Committee is asked for approval that the Panel be able to choose which service areas to assess in future.

Current suggestions from the Panel include keeping a watching brief on Breyer; how Newlon is managing the new welfare benefit changes, the affect on residents and on Newlon's income; and to look at the worst performing key performance indicators to see which other services should be scrutinised.