

Appendix 1 - Current state of delivery, performance and risk information at Birmingham City Council (as of August 2024)

To develop a more integrated approach to reporting, it is first important to understand the current or emerging approaches to monitoring. This should help the Task and Finish Group to determine the most appropriate flow of information through the governance structures and to OSCs.

In line with the ambition to become a well-run council, the monitoring and reporting arrangements for delivery, performance and risk are being revised and strengthened. This means that some of the arrangements are early stage rather than fully established but will develop further over the coming months.

Table 2 overleaf summarises the initial fact-finding exercise on the current and emerging monitoring and reporting arrangements for delivery, performance and risk information.

Table 3 provides a more detailed picture of each of the information types, from the initial fact-finding exercise. Headline findings include:

- All of the current reporting products are extracted from source systems using PowerBI. Initially, as we are in a transitional period for all of the arrangements, a first step would be to produce a basic output that allows OSCs access to the reports in one place. Over time, and with the new systems being implemented, we can develop and refine the output into something more sophisticated.
- All the reporting arrangements following intervention and the agreement of our corporate Improvement and Recovery Plan are relatively new and therefore are subject to revision and refining over the coming year. This may require changes in terms of the content and presentation of information.
- The frequency of each information type varies, for example IRP delivery is reported each two months to the IRB, versus corporate performance measures being reported quarterly. In line with the proposal, providing a link to the latest available data that has been through its own governance route means that this shouldn't be an issue. The reports will update once the latest information is available.
- The flow of information is different for each category of data and there are differing final audiences, for example the IRP is reported up to the Improvement and Recovery Board, whereas Corporate Performance is reported up to Cabinet and Risk reports up to Audit Committee. Again this should not be an issue in terms of the proposed dashboard for OSCs, however the timing at which data is released to each audience is important and will need further consideration.
- To address the optimism bias inherent in previous iterations of our corporate performance arrangements, the 2024/25 Key Performance Indicator (KPI) set has a robust set of targets against which performance levels will be assessed. These targets have been set using historical performance and benchmarking data, where available, to ensure validity. A simpler report output, an example

of which will be shared during the task and finish group meeting, will provide greater clarity on where there are performance issues. The Corporate Performance team will provide a factual and objective view of performance each quarter and the same report format will be provided to all audiences to increase transparency.

Table 2 – Summary of initial fact-finding exercise

	Delivery	Corporate Performance	Corporate Risk
Lead Officer	Gemma Malhi - Corporate Portfolio Monitoring Office	Angela Storer Corporate Performance	Anthony Farmer Risk Management and Insurance
Proposed to be Publicly available?	Y - Through notes of IRB mtgs and OSC (Corporate and Finance) meetings.	Y – as part of Cabinet Papers and soon to be published on City Observatory	Audit Committee will get report on approx. 12 principal risks which would be public. Detail around controls may be exempt.
Current reporting frequency	Monthly process, with a bi-monthly report to Improvement and Recovery Board (IRB). Commenced May 2024.	Quarterly	Monthly Commenced June 2024.
Current information flow	<p style="text-align: center;">Directorate Boards ↓ Transformation and Improvement Board (TIB) ↓ EMT (monthly) ↓ Improvement and Recovery Board (IRB) (bi-monthly)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Collected from Directorates quarterly ↓ CLT ↓ Cabinet</p>	<p>Collected from Directorates and updated as needed</p> <p>CLT and Audit Committee</p> <p>Reporting cycle and escalation governance is still to be determined.</p>
Current access to data by OSCs	Emerging. It is anticipated that Corporate and Finance Overview and Scrutiny will receive the report either following EMT or after IRB - this will determine frequency.	There is not a “corporate” performance report to OSCs. Some directorates provide regular performance updates to relevant committees.	Emerging – the reporting cycle and escalation governance is still to be determined.
Format of reporting	Combination of Excel, PowerPoint and PowerBI	Static pdf document is generated from a PowerBI report.	Combination of SharePoint lists and PowerBI.
Planned enhancements to data	A proof of concept with a Portfolio Management system (PERFORM) is being created. This work will enable	Publication on the City Observatory to is planned for Quarter 1 data. A Corporate	New system is being procured, “Resolver”. This will allow risk and internal audit information to

collection and reporting	all delivery data to be held in one place, but it is at a very early stage.	Performance Database is being developed to reduce the manual processing of performance data and provide a single, more secure, location for performance metrics.	be linked, with key risks and control effectiveness informing the internal audit programme.
---------------------------------	---	--	---

Table 3 – Full detail on the current state of information sources

Information set: Corporate Performance	
Summarise the current status for the information set	<p>The Corporate KPI set has recently been revised to better reflect CFGS recommendation that it focus on safe and compliant basic services to citizens.</p> <p>All of the corporate KPIs will have a target against which progress is monitored. A red / amber / green (RAG) status is assigned to each KPI based on performance against the set target.</p> <p>Reporting against the revised indicator set will commence from 30 June (end of Q1) and will take place quarterly to Cabinet. There will also be more frequent updates on a subset of indicators to CLT.</p> <p>A streamlined report is being developed that makes accountability for performance much clearer and enables the user to more easily make sense of the data in context (against target and against comparators where this is possible).</p> <p>Directorates and services will have a broader set of KPIs that are monitored locally.</p>
How frequently is the information refreshed / collected	<p>Quarterly – all corporate KPIS</p> <p>Monthly – subset of corporate KPIs (vital signs and organisational health)</p>
How is the information collected?	From directorate leads via an excel spreadsheet template
What system(s) are used for reporting	<p>Excel for data collection</p> <p>PowerBi to report</p>
Are there any plans to update the way in which info is collected / reported?	<p>Prototype database is being designed as part of the Digital and Technology Services Foundry initiative.</p> <p>Longer term, greater automation of data collection through linking directly to data sources in directorates would be desirable and lead to more timely data availability.</p>
Who is currently receiving the information outputs / products?	<p>Cabinet – quarterly (usually 3 months in arrears from quarter end)</p> <p>CLT – monthly and quarterly updates</p>

<p>And what frequency for each?</p> <p>How does the information flow from audience to audience?</p>	<p>CLT reviews initially Then onto Cabinet quarterly</p>
<p>Do OSCs receive any of this information currently?</p>	<p>Not corporately – some directorates take specific performance reports to committees (for example C&F and HASC)</p>
<p>Any other comments – in particular any further changes or developments already being planned?</p>	<p>Will be published on city observatory from Q1 for greater transparency.</p>

Information set: Delivery	
<p>Summarise the current status for the information set</p>	<p>Delivery of BCC's Strategic Portfolio – includes the IRP and as a part of that the 24/25 and 25/26 savings.</p> <p>All 24/25 savings are reporting monthly – this commenced from April. Each saving reports a RAG and associated delivery details according to assigned priority level. This is in the second cycle of reporting. Accountability is clearly defined with Senior Accountable officers and Responsible Delivery Leads. Once submitted it goes through a corporate assurance process and is then reported through the IRP governance. which also has a clear escalation hierarchy.</p> <p>The 16 IRP priority programmes are set to report from July on a monthly basis with the same assurance approach.</p> <p>25/26 savings proposals and future transformation activities are expected to report later in the year (quarter 3), they will follow the common assurance and reporting approach.</p>
<p>How frequently is the information refreshed / collected</p>	<p>Information is submitted on a monthly basis - 5 working days after the end of the previous month.</p> <p>Frequency of reporting for the various sets of information may differ as time goes on and the process matures.</p> <p>Frequency will be reviewed periodically to ensure reporting is not hindering delivery.</p>

How is the information collected?	Information is currently collected through RDLs/ Delivery Teams submitting an excel highlight report in TEAMS.
What system(s) are used for reporting	The reporting system and format is evolving each month. Last month, we used PowerPoint with excel, next month we are aiming to trial PowerPoint with some power BI and an output from the PERFORM system. This is a work in progress.
Are there any plans to update the way in which info is collected / reported?	<p>We are currently working on a proof of concept with a Portfolio Management system (PERFORM) This work will enable all data to be held in one place, but it is at a very early stage – we are focusing on outputs for stakeholders in the first few months and then will look to engage with users to embed the system in the IRP programme community.</p> <p>Aim is to embed a Portfolio Management system of some kind to reduce the manual process, enable everyone access to data and ensure we can cut the data appropriately without significant effort. It will also provide valuable Portfolio insights and data. A system will also improve data quality and enhance accountability. It will ensure resources are utilised effective and efficiently in the CPMO.</p>
<p>Who is currently receiving the information outputs / products?</p> <p>And what frequency for each?</p> <p>How does the information flow from audience to audience?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Directorate Boards x6 receive a consolidated report of all their savings – monthly – this is approved for reporting at TIB. 2. Transformation and Improvement Board (TIB) – receive a BCC Portfolio report monthly. This is signed off for sharing at EMT 3. EMT – receive the BCC Portfolio report monthly. 4. Improvement and Recovery Board receive the BCC Portfolio report every two months. EMT approve the final IRB pack.
Do OSCs receive any of this information currently?	It is anticipated that Corporate and Finance Overview and Scrutiny will receive the report either following EMT or after IRB.
Any other comments – in particular any further changes or developments already being planned?	

Information set: Risk	
Summarise the current status for the information set	<p>Risk is currently captured at three levels; <i>Directorate</i>, <i>Corporate</i> and <i>Principal</i>. Principal risks are those considered to be the organisations “Top” risks. All risks are captured and held in an <i>Interim Corporate Risk Register</i>, and the current status of risk information at these levels is described as follows:</p> <p>Principal: Live and updated regularly, the closer in proximity a risk is the more frequent updates will be requested. At least a monthly check and refresh of all Principal Risks is expected of Risk Owners or their Delegates.</p> <p>Corporate: Live and updated less frequently currently, this will be the next major area of focussed analysis for the Risk Management Rebuild.</p> <p>Directorate: Live but distributed currently between disparate sources. Following a launch event in early June, Directorate Risk Representatives have access to the Corporate Risk Register, however resources to migrate the risks from the disparate approaches and styles currently deployed are stretched, and this is anticipated to be work in progress for some time.</p>
How frequently is the information refreshed / collected	<p>Risks can be added at any point by risk representatives, directly into the register.</p> <p>Risk status can be updated constantly if circumstances are changing, however – focussing on Principal Risks - the minimum refresh periods are as described as above.</p> <p>Reports have just begun to be taken to CLT monthly, and will feature as part of a monthly update on an ongoing basis.</p>
How is the information collected?	Directly into a SharePoint list on an interim basis, however; the service is transitioning to a proprietary Risk Management solution later in 2024. 6 months approx..
What system(s) are used for reporting	Interim Platform: SharePoint Lists PowerBI dashboard to extract visualisations
Are there any plans to update the way in which info is collected / reported?	Yes – New system is being procured, “Resolver”. This will allow risk and internal audit information to be linked, with key risks and control effectiveness informing the internal audit programme.
Who is currently receiving the information outputs / products?	CLT – first look in June. Audit Committee – first look in September based on agenda prioritisation. Cabinet – to be determined.

<p>And what frequency for each?</p> <p>How does the information flow from audience to audience?</p>	<p>CLT - Monthly Audit Committee - Monthly Cabinet – to be determined, however CfGS recommendations were this should be monthly, and informed by discussions at Scrutiny and Audit Committees.</p> <p>Principal Risks will be the initial focus at all levels, however it is anticipated that at CLT level this will broaden to encompass intermediate <i>Corporate</i> level risks in time. The escalation governance process has not yet been finalised and will form part of a Risk Policy/Strategy document that is being drafting beginning in early July, for initial approval by CLT before passing to Cabinet for agreement and adoption.</p>
<p>Do OSCs receive any of this information currently?</p>	<p>Not currently.</p>
<p>Any other comments – in particular any further changes or developments already being planned?</p>	<p>An <i>Assurance Mapping</i> process is planned for all identified Principal Risks, and this is also being tentatively piloted at Cabinet Portfolio level to inform and provide assurance at Cabinet Member Briefings in time. At Principal Risk level, this might be an applicable process to inform OSC</p>