

CITY OF



WHITEHORSE

BEST VALUE ANNUAL REPORT

2004-05

BEST VALUE PROGRAM

Council has adopted a five-year program of Best Value Service Reviews in accordance with the requirements of section 208 of the Local Government Act 1989. This report provides information on Council's approach to Best Value and on the status and outcome of Best Value Service Reviews carried out in 2003-2004. Information on Council's approach to Best Value, and the timetable for the conduct of the service reviews, is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au under Policies and Publications.

A. Council's Approach to Best Value

Council is required by the Local Government Act to carry out reviews of all its services over the next five years. These reviews are expected to take account of the Best Value principles enshrined in Section 208B of the legislation, namely:

- 1 The need for services to deliver against agreed quality and cost standards.
- 2 Services being responsive to changing community needs.
- 3 Accessibility of services to those who need them.
- 4 Continuous improvement in the delivery of services.
- 5 Community consultation on services and activities.
- 6 Regular annual reporting to the community on Council's performance.

Furthermore, section 208C of the Act requires Council to take account of these factors when developing its quality and cost standards:

- 1 The best on offer in the public and private sectors.
- 2 Value for money.
- 3 Community expectations and values.
- 4 Balance of affordability and accessibility.
- 5 Opportunities for local employment growth.
- 6 Partnership building with other levels of government.
- 7 Environmental sustainability.

Three fundamental principles guide the implementation of Best Value at the City of Whitehorse, namely:

- 1 The Best Value process at the City of Whitehorse is used to ensure that all of the City's services and activities provide high quality and good value for money to the Community;
- 2 Council is committed to ensuring that, where appropriate, the services being provided by Council staff continue to be delivered internally unless it can be demonstrated that it would be better value to the community for these services to be provided by others; and
- 3 The Best Value process is implemented in accordance with the Victorian Government's Competitive Neutrality Policy Victoria 2000.

B. Conduct of Best Value Service Reviews

Each Best Value Service Review is conducted by the relevant work team, led by the manager of that team. Managers and teams are supported in this process through the use of a common review template and the provision of a central resource that provides information, advice and training. Service reviews have three distinct stages:



At the conclusion of each service review, Council receives a report that contains:

- a description of existing service standards and a proposed method of service delivery, with defined service levels and cost and quality standards that have been benchmarked and tested through consultation;
- an analysis of the service delivery options available, including an analysis of the maturity of the market, a risk assessment of each option and an assessment against Competitive Neutrality policy; and
- advice on the preferred service delivery option.

C. Progress of Service Reviews

During 2004-2005, five service reviews were completed in accordance with Council's Best Value Service Review Program. (The Aged and Disability Services Reviews were combined into one review). Council's 5-year program of reviews has now been completed. The timetable for the conduct of the service reviews, is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au under Policies and Publications. Progress of these reviews is listed below:

Service	Commencement Date of Review	Status
Aged Services	3 rd quarter 2001-2002	Completed
Disability Services	3 rd quarter 2001-2002	Completed
Residential Services	1 st quarter 2002-2003	Completed
Infrastructure Maintenance	3 rd quarter 2002-2003	Completed
Building Maintenance (separated form Infrastructure maintenance)	1 st quarter 2003-2004	Completed
Planning	1 st quarter 2003-2004	Completed

D. Outcome of Completed Service Reviews

The outcomes of the Best Value Service Reviews, completed in 2004-2005, are as follows:

Aged & Disability Services

Servicing a large multicultural and ageing population, Council's Aged and Disability Services provide a comprehensive coordinated and integrated range of in-home and community based support services for frail aging people (over 50 years), people with a disability and their carers. A broad variety of individual program areas enable clients to continue living at home through the monitoring and provision of basic health, cleanliness and safety requirements as well as targeting issues of a reduction in isolation and increasing avenues of socialisation. The Aged and Disability Services Best Value review focused on the performance and outcomes of the two major service types of General Home Care (GHC) and Social Support (SS). These service types encompass the key activities found in both the Home and Community Care (HACC) and Community Aged Care Packages (CACPP) programs.

Jointly the GHC and SS service areas offers access to and on going monitoring of approximately 5,300 eligible clients per annum. This is achieved through the provision of approximately 370,423 units/year of appropriate services that include assessment, care management and specific services that aim to enhance a client's independence and quality of life so they can remain living at home. GHC services are coordinated from Council's municipal offices with a total of 225 field workers delivering in-home services, and SS providing community based activities through planned activity groups delivered from Mountain View Cottage and food services production and distribution delivered from Silver Grove and Carrington centres. The majority of these services (97%) are provided Monday – Friday during normal business hours and the remaining 3% of services such as critical respite care and personal care and some planned activity groups are provided beyond these routine hours.

Council provides a central intake process for all clients seeking HACC services and together with other Community Care Package Providers, Council draws its CACP clients from a central Aged Care Assessment (ACAS) waiting list of eligible clients, managed through the key catchment area of the Peter James Centre. Funded through Commonwealth and State Government grants, Council contribution and service recipients fees, clients are required to meet specific eligibility criteria in accordance with Commonwealth and State HACC and CACP service guidelines in order to receive services.

Total income in 2003/04 was \$7,121,773, and expenditure was \$8,466,373. During the 2003-2004 period, 20% of income was generated from client fees and the net contribution from Council was 16% (The contribution noted is exclusive of full overheads, depreciation and CPI costs and if factored in the contribution rate increases to 22.5%). In house staff delivered 96% of the services with the subcontracted services of respite care, visiting nursing services and seasonal home maintenance comprising less than 4% of the overall expenditure. In addition to these external services the GHC and SS programs are supported by approximately 300 volunteers. Without the volunteers assistance Council could not continue to offer the same level of cost effective services currently provided.

Response To Best Value Principles

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES 208B(a)	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Cost Standard	Cost per unit of service delivered (adjusted annually in accordance with Council's long-term financial plan):	\$24.50	\$25.61	\$26.76
Quality Standard	Achieve a score greater than 17.4 in the national HACC accreditation benchmark of certification	>17.4	>17.4	>17.4

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	Action taken to apply the principle
208C Development of cost and quality standards	<p>Best on Offer: During 2003-2004 Council participated in a variety of both external and internal benchmarking practices which included:</p> <p>External</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Services Benchmarking 2003 Aged and Disability Services • Best Practice – HACC National Service Standards • Performance Audit of HACC Delivery – Auditor General of Victoria • Unit price and Client fee benchmarking • Meals on Wheels Delivery model and costs • Social Support and Transport Services • Respite care staff remuneration • Uniform supply to staff <p>Internal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Delivery Commitments- DHS service plan. • User affordability • Council Investment • Resident Service satisfaction • Client satisfaction • Well being indicators/risk management indicators <p>External benchmarking undertaken indicates Council provide quality Aged and Disability Service programs that are cost effective to both users, and the community, with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HACC National Service Standards – Agency Assessment: Council achieved a rating of 'HIGH', with the highest possible indicator score of 20 from 20 with regard to Accreditation. Reflecting high quality standards • Benchmarking Plus 2003 comparisons to other Council's indicate: 70% of gross \$ cost of programs per client were at the median or lower. 70% of overall performance indicators were at median or above. • Cost and Client Fee Benchmarking – Eastern Metropolitan Region Feb 2003 evaluation indicates: Client fees were at or below the median for three of the four service components evaluated. Council costs per service unit were within the median range for three of the four services evaluated. <p>Value for money: Value for money was assessed firstly, by comparing the cost of the service with the service outcomes achieved, both in terms of services provided and levels of user satisfaction; and secondly, by comparing cost and quality outcomes through the benchmarking processes. It was concluded that the current service mix provides Council and the community with the most efficient use of its resources and positions Council well in terms of planning for the future</p> <p>Community Expectations and Values: Community expectations and values were assessed through consultative processes that are reported below under Consultation.</p> <p>Affordability and accessibility: Affordability was defined as operating within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan, which forms the basis for Council's annual budget and Strategic Resource Plan. The cost standard has been prepared within this framework. Accessibility issues were identified during consultation and reported below under Accessibility.</p>

	Local employment: Council's Economic Development Strategy has identified that a major expectation of local businesses is the provision of soft infrastructure as such infrastructure contributes to the desirability of the municipality as a residence for highly skilled employees. The provision of quality aged and disability services contributes to Council's overall provision of soft infrastructure.
208B(b) Responsiveness to community needs	Council continues to review its service provision in this area in the light of changing patterns of resident usage. This Best Value Service Review Service sought the views both of external and internal service users. Details of the consultation processes used are listed under Consultation. This process is continuing through Council's strategic review of aged and disability services.
208B(c) Accessibility of service	Council is required to work in accordance with both Commonwealth and Department of Human Services' guidelines and regulations which define who can access the services. Council rarely maintains a waiting list for services subsequent to the strong safeguarding of an equitable distribution to accessing services, maintaining strict priority of access guidelines, referring clients beyond the scope of service to alternate providers and working within the absolute capacity of fiscal constraints. This is not to say that further unmet need does not exist, but the level of need is monitored and managed to ensure that clients identified as most in need of services gain timely access to those services. Accessibility issues were also highlighted in consultations with regard to difficulty in contacting the department.
208B(d) Continuous improvement	As a result, continuous improvement objectives now include necessary telephone system improvements and the reconfiguration of resources to provide improved ease of access. Benchmarking and community consultation have also identified potential improvement opportunities in the areas of Respite Care, Assisted Transport and Planned Activity Group – High Needs services. This relates specifically to the areas of service marketing and debt recovery processes.
208B(e) Consultation with community	<p>This Best Value Service Review Service sought the views both of existing and potential users through a wide variety of consultation tools, namely: the HACC national standards Consume Survey 2003; Council's own annual survey of residents; surveys of existing HACC clients; a customer satisfaction telephone survey and focus groups with potential and existing users.</p> <p>Consultation responses indicated a high level of satisfaction with service quality and responsiveness. This is demonstrated through the National Standards Instrument score of 20/20 and a community satisfaction rating of greater than 80% of which an increasing percentage of respondents are returning an 'excellent' rating in both Home Care (8%) and Meals on Wheels (19%) programs.</p> <p>During the National Standards Audit, DHS placed a major focus on all Councils enhancing the areas of provision of information, accessibility, support, advocacy and complaints mechanisms. Council, while attaining the highest possible scores for these objectives has continued to provide increased opportunities for clients in these areas through improving its service systems. This has been achieved through the introduction of the centralised intake and customer service focused model and the departmental customer service standards.</p>
208B(f) Reporting to the community	Council reports on the progress of its Best Value service reviews in its Annual Reports. A copy of this report is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au , under Policies and Publications.

Residential Services

While Council's Residential Care Services encompass low care hostel facilities, independent living units and a rooming house, the Best Value review focuses on the management and operational outcomes of the two Low Care Hostel facilities, that is Nunawading Community Hostel (NCH) and Dorking Road Hostel (DRH).

These two hostels offer permanent low level care accommodation and limited short-term respite care. In the case of Nunawading Community Hostel there are 60 beds (58 permanent, 10 of which are multicultural specific, 2 respite) and Dorking Road Hostel provides 50 beds (48 permanent, 2 respite). Under the Aged Care Act 1997 Residential Care programs are able to provide services to residents from any catchment area in Australia, however, Council provides a central intake process with a preferential bed system through allocating its vacancies to residents who live in the City of Whitehorse (approx 65%), have a relative living in the City Of Whitehorse (13%), multicultural places (15%) and respite and other (7%).

Council received in 2003/04 nearly \$3 million in income, with expenditure exceeding \$3.4 million. There are the equivalent of 45.83 full-time staff at the two hostels. The percentage of subcontracted services for nursing, laundry and gardening services is approximately 2%. The services of podiatry, pharmacy, manicurist and hairdresser are provided under a service agreement with no cost to Council as the user pays.

Response To Best Value Principles

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES 208B(a)	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Cost Standard	The cost per resident bed per day, with costs contained within the parameters of Council's long term financial plan	\$88.50	\$92.48	\$96.64
Quality Standard	To successfully obtain The Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency benchmark of Accreditation certification for a three-year period.	3-year accreditation	3-year accreditation	3-year accreditation

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	Action taken to apply the principle
208C Development of cost and quality standards	<p>Best on offer: The Services were benchmarked with 14 other care providers in the City of Whitehorse, and the broader Residential Care Industry by utilising the Bentley MRI benchmarking information from the most recent data collection in 2001. Compared to the benchmarked facilities, Council's hostels rated high on quality and customer satisfaction, but the cost per resident per day is significantly higher. The benchmarked facilities were identified as making an average profit of \$6.19/per resident per day while for the same period it is noted that Council, as a not for profit provider contributed \$2.53/ per resident per day for DRH and \$3.45/ per resident per day for NCH. In relation to the daily costs of providing care to residents in 2002-2003 Council is significantly more expensive than its benchmarked providers, in that it pays more for total staffing costs in relation to the number of rostered hours, per resident per day. This resulted in Council contributing a subsidy of \$5,976 per resident per annum equating to an overall contribution of \$657,308 per annum.</p> <p>Council reviewed three key areas relating to quality of services provided: Accreditation Certification, Resident Satisfaction surveys and the ability of facilities to provide for Ageing in place.</p> <p>Accreditation: Council has been successful in achieving and maintaining a 3-year Aged Care Accreditation Standards certification for its facilities. This was consistent with all benchmarked providers excepting one, which was unsuccessful.</p> <p>Annual Resident Satisfaction Survey: Customer satisfaction for Council's facilities was rated at an average of 96 %. (Refer section on responsiveness to changing needs). While there is no comparative data available from the benchmarked facilities the accreditation process requires satisfaction surveys to be undertaken by organisations and that results be favourable.</p> <p>Ageing in Place: 'Ageing in place' is defined (in this review) as the capacity of a resident to enter a organization/facility and remain in a safe environment that provides continuous care and appropriate staffing and resources necessary to facilitate that residents independence for the duration of their life. Ageing in place is offered by 45% of the benchmarked providers. While Council's facilities do not offer ageing in place, they are able to offer some limited high care services on a short term basis providing staffing, safety and duty of care requirements can be maintained.</p> <p>Value for money: Value for money was assessed by comparing the cost of the service with the service outcomes achieved, both in terms of services provided and levels of user satisfaction. The current Residential Care Service model has served the City of Whitehorse well over the past 6 years. However service demands are changing with an ever increasing need for available beds that provide ageing in place and continual demands of both regulatory and operational requirements. It is appropriate, therefore, to consider the findings of the best value review within the context the broader Aged and Disability Strategic review being undertaken in 2005. This approach will allow Council to make the best decision in the interests of its older people who require residential care services in the future, ensuring that high quality, affordable and accessible services can be offered and provided with minimal risk.</p>

	<p>Community Expectations and Values: Community expectations and values were assessed through consultative processes that are reported below under Consultation.</p> <p>Affordability and accessibility: Affordability was defined as operating within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan, which forms the basis for Council's annual budget and Strategic Resource Plan. The cost standard has been prepared within this framework. Accessibility issues were identified during consultation and reported below under Accessibility.</p> <p>Local employment: Council's Economic Development Strategy has identified that a major expectation of local businesses is the provision of soft infrastructure as such infrastructure contributes to the desirability of the municipality as a residence for highly skilled employees. The provision of quality aged care residential facilities contributes to Council's overall provision of soft infrastructure.</p>
208B(b) Responsiveness to community needs	<p>Council continues to review its service provision in this area in the light of changing patterns of resident usage and changing policy/regulatory settings. This Best Value Service Review Service sought the views both of existing and future service users. Details of the consultation processes used are listed under Consultation.</p>
208B(c) Accessibility of service	<p>Vacancies within Council facilities are filled by lower end market residents applying through a central intake system, based on priority of need, with eligibility in accordance with the Aged Care Assessment (ACAS) requirements. The hostels operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</p> <p>In accordance with the Commonwealth Aged Care Act 1997, Council is required to provide a set percentage of Concessional placements for financially disadvantaged residents. The minimum percentage required by the Commonwealth Government to receive funding is 16.9% of total residents. Council's current service provision of Concessional places of 43% Nunawading Community Hostel and 22% Dorking Rd Hostel.</p>
208B(d) Continuous improvement	<p>Continuous improvement forms an integral part of the Residential Care Services Management system, and is an inherent component of the Residential Care Services and Aged Care Accreditation Standards and it uses set measures to ensure quality services are provided. Both hostels conduct a monthly Innovations meeting which discuss any plan for improvements, comments and complaints and reviews of policies and procedures in relation to the four key areas noted above. This includes linking improvement initiatives to the mission, vision and operational outcomes of the service as well as to the business and quality plans. The Innovations meeting operates on the understanding that is essential to have input and involvement from key stakeholders in order to achieve the best results for the service. An example of a positive outcome from the continuous improvement system can be noted in the changes made subsequent to resident feedback relating to the survey results identifying the complexities of the internal and external complaint processes. The newly introduced simplified system allows residents better opportunity to raise their concerns and have them addressed in a more simplified and timely manner.</p>
208B(e) Consultation with community	<p>Three strategies were employed to consult with the community and users: an annual Hostel Services Resident Satisfaction Survey, a Mystery Shopper analysis and a Community Focus Group of potential service users.</p> <p>A written survey was sent to 106 residents in the hostels (53 returned), which measures resident satisfaction with the service provision relating to the four key standards of Accreditation as determined by the Aged Care Standards Agency. Customer satisfaction was rated at an average of 96% with the highest ratings being in the areas of safety and security, privacy and dignity, health and personal care and food services and to a lesser degree, the provision of information and</p>

	<p>the hostel environment. The lowest satisfaction rating was in response to comments and complaints with a score of 78%.</p> <p>The mystery shopper contacted six aged care facilities, which were surveyed to find out details in relation to entry into an aged care facility. These facilities included Council, one private provider and three church providers. The mystery shopper reviewed 11 key areas and the analysis identified the presence and level of services available on offer. The results revealed that there was alignment in the services provided in relation to: Priority of access, entry requirements, financial arrangements, single accommodation with en suite, diversional therapy, allied services and preference of doctors. This is largely due to the regulated requirements of Accreditation.</p> <p>An independent consultant conducted a focus group of potential and current users. The focus groups raised these issues: concern that private providers focus is on profit; people are attracted to facilities with a variety of levels of care (Ageing in place); provision for accommodation for couples and desire for serviced apartments preferred.</p>
208B(f) Reporting to the community	Council reports on the progress of its Best Value service reviews in its Annual Reports. A copy of this report is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au , under Policies and Publications.

Infrastructure Maintenance

This review focussed on the management and maintenance of Council's road and drain assets. Council's City Works Department provides seven discrete services, through a combination of in-house and contracted providers: footpath maintenance, drain maintenance, road maintenance, street sweeping, street signs and line marking maintenance, city cleansing and after hours emergency response. The demand for the service has grown steadily over the last three years, with the number of customer requests for various maintenance works increasing from 6929 in 2001/02 to 7967 in 2003/04. Total Expenditure Budget for 2004/2005 is \$4,240,026. There are the equivalent of 27 staff in the department of whom 21 are in-house staff the remainder employed through contracted providers.

Response To Best Value Principles

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES 208B(a)	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Cost Standard	2003/2004 unit cost to Council for the footpath, pot hole repair, pit cleaning, pipe clearing and street sweeping) adjusted by parameters of Council's long-term financial plan:			
	Make safe footpath	\$45/Joint	\$47.03	\$49.15
	Pothole repair	\$41/Sq M	\$42.85	\$44.78
	Pit cleaning	\$25.60/Pit	\$26.75	\$27.95
	Pipe clearing	\$3.90/Lin M	\$4.08	\$4.26
	Street sweeping	\$26/Km of Kerb	\$27.20	\$28.40
Quality Standard	Maintain 2004 statewide annual community scores of 3.23 for local roads and footpath and 3.61 for appearance of public places.	3.23	3.23	3.23
		3.61	3.61	3.61

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	Action taken to apply the principle
208C Development of cost and quality standards	<p>Best on offer: Council benchmarked its cost standards through an industry benchmarking activity conducted by LGPro and compared its quality through resident satisfaction as measured by the Victorian Government's annual survey of residents. The industry benchmarking suggests that Council is able to deliver these services at costs that are at the lower range for footpath maintenance and are closer to the median range for drain maintenance. Comparisons were made with other surrounding Councils, using the state wide annual community survey. The City Of Whitehorse's mean score for satisfaction for Local Roads & Footpath and Appearance of Public Places have been consistently higher than the average for Group One (inner Melbourne) councils.</p> <p>Value for money: Value for money was assessed by comparing the cost of the service with the service outcomes achieved, both in terms of services provided and levels of user satisfaction. It was concluded that Council continue to use a mix of in-house and external providers for the maintenance of Council's assets. This option provides Council with a good balance of flexibility and control. Council's in-house staff has been able to retain valuable local knowledge and history that has enabled us to provide a responsive & effective service. City Works has a core of internal staff to carry out the urgent as well as programmed maintenance of Council's assets and utilise external resources for street sweeping, line marking and asphalt & concrete repair/replacement. External resources for these services were utilised mainly because of the high initial set up and on-going maintenance cost of the equipment required and the large number of outdoor staff required. These external resources are specialised in these areas and provide a cost-effective option. This service model has served the City of Whitehorse well over the past 9 years and has been adopted by most Councils.</p> <p>Community Expectations and Values: Community expectations and values were assessed through consultative processes that are reported below under Consultation.</p> <p>Affordability and accessibility: Affordability was defined as operating within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan, which forms the basis for Council's annual budget and Strategic Resource Plan. The cost standard has been prepared within this framework. Accessibility issues were identified during consultation and reported below under Accessibility.</p> <p>Local employment: Council's Economic Development Strategy has identified that a major expectation of local businesses is the provision of hard infrastructure as such infrastructure contributes to the desirability of the municipality as an investment site. The provision of quality infrastructure maintenance contributes to Council's overall provision of hard infrastructure.</p>
208B(b) Responsiveness to community needs	<p>Council continues to review its service provision in this area in the light of changing patterns of community and business needs. City Works dealt with 12,219 customer requests in 2003-2004 for infrastructure maintenance. Council is currently meeting all the maintenance of the infrastructure assets such as the road & footpath networks, drains, signs and cleaning of the local shopping centres. The implementation of the Road Management Act 2004, requires Council to prepare a Road Management Plan that commits Council to provide services at a level satisfactory to the community and ensuring that the physical infrastructure is properly maintained. Council's Road Management Plan adopted in October 2004 provides a framework for the future standard of provision of this service.</p>
208B(c) Accessibility of service	<p>City Works interacts with residents regularly, through face-to-face contact while on the job, phone calls, e-mails, requests and follow up for additional works. City Works dealt with 12,219 customer requests in 2003-2004. Industry benchmarking</p>

	suggests that Whitehorse City Council receives above average requests for infrastructure maintenance from its residents
208B(d) Continuous improvement	It is proposed that continuous improvement will be achieved through compliance with the inspection and maintenance standards as in Council's Road Management Plan. At the same time, the Department has set as its continuous improvement targets - a review of the Township Cleaning program, improvements in the process for handling customer requests and implementation of new technology for carrying out inspection programs.
208B(e) Consultation with community	<p>Community consultations were conducted through Whitehorse annual resident survey, the statewide annual survey and the Road Management Plan. The Council's annual community survey and State wide annual survey were used to survey residents about their general satisfaction of the quality of services for the maintenance of Council's assets. The Road Management Plan contains the inspection & maintenance standards of the various assets were published for comment in August/September 2004 as required in the Road Management Act.</p> <p>Overall the results were consistently high. In 2004, 85% of residents were satisfied with maintenance of public places, 88% satisfied with litter bins in shopping centres, 92% satisfied with road maintenance, 67% satisfied with footpath maintenance and 84% satisfied with street sweeping. The statewide survey showed that the satisfaction level of local roads & footpath and appearance of public places was consistently higher than the average for Group One councils (inner Melbourne councils). In the 2004 annual resident survey, regression analysis suggested that one of the areas where Council can most influence community satisfaction is maintenance of the city's public places. A study conducted during 2003 by the Community Development Department of Perceptions of Safety in Box Hill also revealed concerns regarding cleanliness of the precinct. In the light of this study, Council has increased the level of Township cleaning services to meet community expectations.</p> <p>No comment was received on the maintenance standards of Council's assets proposed in the Road Management Plan when this was published for comment in August/September 2004. Council adopted the Road Management Plan on 25 October 2004.</p>
208B(f) Reporting to the community	Council reports on the progress of its Best Value service reviews in its Annual Reports. A copy of this report is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au , under Policies and Publications.

Building Maintenance

The building maintenance department is responsible for keeping all of Council's 403 buildings in a good state of repair and compliant with all statutory regulations. Building maintenance covers all aspects of keeping buildings well maintained but can generally be split into three main categories as follows: Immediate repairs eg Blocked toilets, Leaking roof; Long term cyclic works eg Carpet replacement, Painting; and Statutory requirements eg Cooling tower testing, Emergency lighting, Lifts.

Prior to July 2004 the Building Maintenance Department (BMD) was located at the Operations Centre and was managed by the Manager Infrastructure. There were 5.3 effective full time employees and many external specialist contractors engaged to provide this service. The BMD was separate from the new building construction and building upgrades department. This split management structure had inefficiencies in that new buildings were constructed with minimal input from the BMD. During the review Council officers determined that there is substantial benefit to be gained by restructuring the BMD so that all building matters reported to the Manager Capital Works. The new reporting structure was

adopted on 1 July 2004 and will lead to better accountability and service delivery for Council's building assets.

During the year 2003/2004 there was a total of \$1,547,892 spent from the recurrent budget on building maintenance. There was an additional amount of \$400,000 spent from the capital budget doing major upgrades and replacement of fixtures.

Response To Best Value Principles

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES 208B(a)	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Cost Standard	Maintain operating budget within parameters of Council's long-term financial plan (based on 2004/05 base)	\$1.5 million	\$1.57 million	\$1.64 million
Quality Standard	Achieve internal client satisfaction of 80% on each of three aspects – service provision, performance and quality.	80%	80%	80%

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	Action taken to apply the principle
208C Development of cost and quality standards	Best on offer: The BMD's activities and costs were benchmarked with four neighbouring Councils. The results in the table below showed a large variation in costs between Councils. This can be attributed to the large number of variables involved in building maintenance such as: size of building, type of use, frequency of use, type of fittings, type of construction materials, recent refurbishments, vandalism. Despite this complexity there is sufficient broad level consistency to show that the building maintenance costs for Whitehorse are reasonably consistent with other Councils.
	Value for money: Value for money was assessed by comparing the cost of the service with the service outcomes achieved, both in terms of services provided and levels of user satisfaction. It was concluded that which is the current combination model made up of an in-house staff and specialist contractors offered Council the best solution in that it kept full management control in house and used the most efficient blend of both internal and external contractors to deliver the service. The risks are minimised as control is retained in house and provides Council with flexibility in responding to requests
	Community Expectations and Values: Community expectations and values were assessed through consultative processes that are reported below under Consultation.
	Affordability and accessibility: Affordability was defined as operating within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan, which forms the basis for Council's annual budget and Strategic Resource Plan. The cost standard has been prepared within this framework. Accessibility issues were identified during consultation and reported below under Accessibility.
	Local employment: Council's Economic Development Strategy has identified that a major expectation of local businesses is the provision of hard infrastructure as such infrastructure contributes to the desirability of the municipality as an investment location. The provision of quality building maintenance contributes to Council's overall provision of soft infrastructure.
208B(b) Responsiveness to community needs	Council continues to review its service provision in this area in the light of changing patterns of community and business needs. This Best Value Service Review Service sought the views of the facility managers about their requirements. Details of the consultation processes used are listed under Consultation.

208B(c) Accessibility of service	The major users of the building maintenance service are the various facility managers that run programs from the various Council buildings. Accessibility for these managers to the BMD is easily and readily available, with access available after hours as well as normal working hours for both in-house and contractors.
208B(d) Continuous improvement	Fundamentally, recurrent costs will be set at (Budget + CPI) which is in line with Council's Long Term Financial Plan. This may need to be varied as additional buildings are constructed or legislation changes may result in increased expenditure. To achieve a customer satisfaction rating of 80% or greater within the next 3 years based on the internal questionnaire used in August 2004, changes will need to be made to the operation of building maintenance specially in relation to programming works and improved communication on projects. The introduction of questions relating to the condition of Council's buildings be introduced into the annual resident survey.
208B(e) Consultation with community	<p>Service needs were determined through consultation with users of the service. During the course of the review in 2004 a survey was undertaken with all the facility managers to gauge how the service was operating from the users perspective. The data indicated that users require prompt, reliable and neat service that keeps them in touch with outstanding works and works programs. The facility managers requested that they be kept informed of all works relating to their facilities and that works are programmed to minimise disruption to the service provision to the public.</p> <p>The facility managers indicated that the community in general is becoming more demanding in relation to the services they use or have provided to them. They are less tolerant of substandard facilities and services. These changing community needs will place a greater expectation on service providers to constantly achieve higher standards for service, performance and quality. In terms of responding to community needs the internal survey from the facility managers pointed to the fact that they believed the standards could be improved in all three areas of Service delivery, Performance and Quality. The facility managers believe that in order to maintain and keep up with the changing needs of the community there needs to be improvement from the services provided by the BMD to allow the standards expected by the community to be continually met.</p>
208B(f) Reporting to the community	Council reports on the progress of its Best Value service reviews in its Annual Reports. A copy of this report is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au , under Policies and Publications.

Planning Services

This review focussed on the provision of Statutory Planning services. Council's Planning Services provides both Strategic and Statutory Planning services. Strategic Planning services concentrates on developing the strategic planning framework that will guide development in the municipality. Statutory Planning services cover a range of statutory and development functions. These are planning application assessments, combined planning application/planning scheme amendment assessments, VCAT Appeal Representation, amended plans and extension of time assessments, matters to responsible authority's satisfaction assessments, subdivision certifications, other – i.e. code of practice advice, provision of public/applicant handouts and guidelines, heritage advice S29A, Liquor Licence responses. The number of planning permit applications received at Council between 2000/2001 and 2003/2004 has steadily increased from 758 in 2000/01 to 954 in 2002/03. Council received 902 applications in 2003/04.

In 2004/05, Planning's annual budgeted income was \$1,628,444 and budgeted expenditure was \$3,045,036. In 2004/05 a significant amount of income has been received through government grants for the conduct of strategy plans associated with the preparation of structure plans. These projects are

managed by the Strategic Planning team. The operating income is comprised of a range of fees charged for the administration and enforcement of planning legislation. This work is the primary focus of the Statutory Planning team. Council's Planning Services has both a Statutory and a Strategic Planning team. The Statutory Planning team comprises 17 staff that includes a Co-ordinator, two Team Leaders, three Principal Planners, one Development Planner and five Urban Planners, one Subdivision Planner, two Enforcement Officers and two Administration Officers. The team also shares two Customer Service Officers with Building and Engineering Services. These Customer Service Officers are located at the Planning/Building/Engineering customer service counter at the Civic Centre. External support is sourced from planning consultants who are typically used to assist the team in generating further information requests, prepare assessment reports for a variety of applications (including minor amendments) and represent Council at VCAT. Specialist external support is also sourced from a Heritage Advisor on a one-day per week basis and external Arborists on an as needs basis. For significant planning projects Council also seeks legal advice and representation.

Response To Best Value Principles

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES 208B(a)	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE TARGETS		
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Cost Standard	The cost standard for the service is the net cost to Council per planning application and maintained within parameters of Council's long-term financial plan (based on 2004/05 base)	\$946.00	\$992.00	\$1040.00
Quality Standard	Maintain a level of community satisfaction as measured by the DVC statewide survey above State average (score of 2.95 in 2004)	>2.95	>2.95	>2.95

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	Action taken to apply the principle
208C Development of cost and quality standards	<p>Best on offer: Council has participated in two 'benchmarking' exercises. The first was in industry-based benchmarking project facilitated by Local Government Professionals (LGPro) where Whitehorse Council compared its performance with other Councils. The second was undertaken by Keaney Planning and Research Pty Ltd as part of a recent Best Value audit of Whitehorse Council's Statutory Planning services. No comparisons were made with private firms as Councils' have the singular responsibility for the administration of the Planning Legislation at local government level</p> <p>Based on the industry benchmarking project, Whitehorse was higher than the median for customer satisfaction. In relation to appeals to VCAT, in 2002 Whitehorse was slightly above the median for the percentage of decisions appealed and below the median number of decisions that were supported at VCAT. The review by Keaney Planning and Research acknowledges that the Whitehorse Statutory Planning team, like many of its counterparts in other Council's, has had to contend with high levels of development activity, staff turnover issues, an increasingly complex planning system and heightened expectations on the part of applicants and residents about preferred planning outcomes</p> <p>Value for money: Value for money was assessed by comparing the cost of the service with the service outcomes achieved, both in terms of services provided and levels of user satisfaction. Whitehorse handles a high level of planning applications and achieved a higher than State average level of community satisfaction with comparable costs.</p> <p>Community Expectations and Values: Community expectations and values were assessed through consultative processes that are reported below under Consultation.</p>

	<p>Affordability and accessibility: Affordability was defined as operating within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan, which forms the basis for Council's annual budget and Strategic Resource Plan. The cost standard has been prepared within this framework. Accessibility issues were identified during consultation and reported below under Accessibility.</p> <p>Local employment: Council's Economic Development Strategy has identified that a sound planning framework and consistent planning decisions creates an environment that makes the municipality a desirable investment location. The provision of efficient statutory planning services contributes to this goal.</p>
208B(b) Responsiveness to community needs	Council continues to review its service provision in this area in the light of changing patterns of community and business needs. This Best Value Service Review Service sought the views of the community – residents and developers- in identifying their current and future needs. Details of the consultation processes used are listed under Consultation.
208B(c) Accessibility of service	The community's ability to access the services provided by Council's Planning Services are reflected in the availability of service during business hours and after-hours. Council's Planning Services are provided at Council's Civic Centre, 379 Whitehorse Road Nunawading during normal business hours, that is, from 8.30 am to 5.30 pm Monday to Friday. There is also a considerable amount of after hours service through Consultation Forums for planning applications and other planning projects. Planning Enforcement Officers are mobile and regularly undertake compliance site inspections.
208B(d) Continuous improvement	A continuous improvement program is being undertaken by the Statutory Planning team to address a number of issues that were identified early in 2004, in addition to the recommendations of the review of Planning Consultation Forums by Phoenix Facilitation and the audit of the Statutory Planning Services by Keaney Planning and Research Pty Ltd., in particular, consultation and decision making processes, file management and systems monitoring.
208B(e) Consultation with community	Two consultation exercises were conducted as part of the Best Value Review. One exercise focussed on the effectiveness of the Planning Consultation Forums and the other was undertaken as part of an independent audit of Statutory Planning Services by Keaney Planning and Research Pty Ltd. Bruce Turner of Phoenix Facilitation observed six Planning Consultation Forums between November 2003 and May 2004. Each forum was chaired by a different Councillor and involved from 5 to 32 objectors. A total of 32 feedback sheets were received and analysed (six applicants and 26 objectors or people supporting objectors). The research found a high level of satisfaction with the way the Consultation Forums were conducted, the information provided and the professionalism of Officers, with satisfaction ratings of 93%, 85% and 81% respectively. Issues identified including clarifying the purposes of the forum, improvements in conduct and set up of forums and better documentation of outcomes. The Keaney Planning and Research consultant team conducted a workshop with four external 'frequent users' of the Statutory Planning Service during the evening of 6 September 2004. The participants indicated that between them they typically lodged approximately 100 permit applications with Whitehorse over a 12 month period. The issues they raised were: increasing turnaround times for processing applications; inconsistency in advice and decision making; poor response times to enquiries, particularly telephone calls, and generally poor communication.
208B(f) Reporting to the community	Council reports on the progress of its Best Value service reviews in its Annual Reports. A copy of this report is located on Council's website, www.whitehorse.vic.gov.au , under Policies and Publications.

BEST VALUE REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE

Kerbside Waste Collection and Recycling*Performance in fourth year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE								EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2001-2002	Actual 2001-2002	Target 2002-2003	Actual 2002-2003	Target 2003-2004	Actual 2003-2004	Target 2004-2005	Actual 2004-2005	
Cost Standard	Service costs per tenement per year: Domestic Garbage Recycling Hard and Green Waste All services	\$56 \$30 \$13 \$99	\$42.75 \$28.27 \$11.90 \$82.92	\$45 \$28 \$12 \$85	\$42.40 \$26.69 \$10.65 \$79.74	\$53 \$26 \$10 \$89	\$46.60 \$28.17 \$ 9.98 \$84.75	\$50 \$30 \$12 \$92	\$48.48 \$28.68 \$10.74 \$87.90	Increase in disposal fees exceeds CPI New target allows for OHS changes New target allows for OHS changes See notes below
Quality Standard	Waste Services Users' Satisfaction Survey	95% satisfaction	91%	95%	89%	95%	86%	90%	86%	Recycling satisfaction lower than expected – new service introduced in April 2005 has improved service
	Complaints per 10,000 users	411	458	355	321	390	370	370	364	See note below

1. Variance comments for domestic garbage refer to the increase from actual in 2003-2004 (rather than comparison with target). Landfill disposal fees continue to rise in excess of CPI.
2. The targets for recycling and hard & green waste increased in 2004-5 because of new OHS requirements that increased the cost of the service
3. Waste Users survey figure is obtained by averaging the satisfaction rating for garbage and recycling services (G =90%, R = 81%)
4. Complaints per 10,000 users – figures used for April & May were typical monthly average complaint levels for that time of year rather than actual. The new recycling service was introduced over this period and complaint levels rose due to one-off factors. The use of monthly 'norms' better reflects the service trends.

Fleet Management*Performance in third year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE						EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2002-2003	Actual 2002-2003	Target 2003-2004	Actual 2003-2004	Target 2004-2005	Actual 2004-2005	
Cost Standard	Vehicle maintenance costs set at 1.2 cents per km traveled	1.2 cents per km traveled	0.63 cents per km	1.2 cents per km travelled	0.69 cents per km	1.2 cents per km travelled	0.91 cents per km	
	Plant & equipment costs kept at \$490,000 pa as per the 2001/2002 budget (growth limited to increases defined by Council's long term financial plan)	\$490,000 pa	\$455,535	\$505,000	\$519,344	\$520,000	\$576,156	A series of expensive unscheduled maintenance breakdowns mainly to do with the large equipment at the Waste Centre contributed to exceeding the target on expenditure. Waste volumes at the Centre were 18% up on budget.
Quality Standard	Maintain 80% plus rating in customer satisfaction on all four key service features – courtesy, repair quality, understanding customer needs and value for money.	80%	Courtesy 96% Repair Quality 89% Customer needs 94% Value 88%	80%	Courtesy 95% Repair Quality 88% Customer needs 92% Value 88%	80%	Courtesy 94% Repair Quality 88% Customer needs 91% Value 87%	

Corporate Services*Performance in third year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE						EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2002-2003	Actual 2002-2003	Target 2003-2004	Actual 2003-2004	Target 2004-2005	Actual 2004-2005	
Cost Standard	Annual IT equipment ownership per device is \$2,700 pa (adjusted by CPI)	\$2700	\$2474	\$2781	\$2582	\$2500	\$2295	The cost structure remains relatively flat whilst the number of devices is increasing.
Quality Standard	Maintain 95% customer satisfaction on five key service features – helpdesk service, timeliness of response, effectiveness of response, systems availability, adequacy of IT tools.	95%	96%	95%	98%	96%	98%	

Arts & Cultural Services:*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		TARGET 2003/04	ACTUAL 2003/04	TARGET 2004/05	ACTUAL 2004/05	
Cost Standard	To meet or improve annual budget targets. Whitehorse Centre: Council's annual subsidy of \$69,751	\$69,751	\$67,592	\$72,771	\$236,515	Changes to the Whitehorse Centre program have seen this facility absorb cost relating to Civic Hospitality and Arts & Culture Management Wages costs higher than expected due to resignation of Centre Coordinator
	Box Hill Community Arts Centre: \$73,065 (adjusted by the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan).	\$73,065	\$43,806	\$76,426	\$78,729.	
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction at or above: Whitehorse Centre: 90% overall Box Hill CAC: 70% at excellent	90%	96%	90%	95%	
		70%	74%	70%	76%	

Active Leisure Centres*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		TARGET 2003/04	ACTUAL 2003/04	TARGET 2004/05	ACTUAL 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Cost to Council in its subsidy per visit and cost to consumer reflected in fees per visit, adjusted by Council's long-term financial plan parameters Aqualink Box Hill (AQBH): subsidy per visit: consumer cost per visit Aqualink Nunawading (AQN): subsidy per visit: consumer cost per visit	\$0.62 \$3.95 \$0.89 \$3.00	\$0.18 \$4.30 \$0.91 \$6.38	\$0.65 \$4.11 \$0.93 \$3.12	\$0.00 \$3.64 \$0.74 \$4.81	Aqualink Box hill produced a surplus (when calculated using cost neutrality pricing). Cost to consumers have gone done due to increase attendances at both centres
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction at or above latest CERM survey result AQBH AQN	5.46 5.38	5.54 5.65	5.46 5.38	5.60 5.90	

Community facilities*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		TARGET 2003/04	ACTUAL 2003/04	TARGET 2004/05	ACTUAL 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Cost per hour of service (adjusted by parameters of Council's long-term financial plan): Box Hill Town Hall: Nunawading Community Centre:	\$53 \$23	\$0 \$20	\$56 \$50	\$0 \$54	Box Hill Town Hall returned an operational surplus this financial year
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction as measured in annual CERM survey Box Hill Town Hall: Nunawading Community Centre:	5.6 5.8	5.7 6.05	5.6 5.8	6 6.1	

Long Day Care:*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Net annual cost to Council per childcare place of no greater than \$2,700	\$2700	\$2,300	\$2700	\$,290	Increased efficiencies delivered to the program since the BV report was prepared in early 2002 combined with a change in accounting recognition of accommodation charges for two centres. Fees have also been set to achieve a net program cost of no more than \$515,000 pa.
Quality Standard	Achieve maximum level of accreditation	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	

Family Day Care*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Net annual cost to Council per childcare place of \$223, and to be reduced over the next five years	\$223	\$209	\$207	\$213	The expenditure side of the budget has achieved a better than anticipated result. The key reason for variance has been a drop in the number of EFTs due to the difficulty in recruiting care providers to replace those who have retired in recent years.
Quality Standard	Achieve full national accreditation	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	

Maternal & Child Health*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Annual net cost to Council of program to be no greater than \$538,000, adjusted each year by parameters of Council's long term financial plan	\$538,000	\$649,000	\$554,140	\$715,000	Report prepared in 2002. Staff salary increases at 5% & 4% greater than 3% projected. Additional staff added to the program (1.4EFT) above the level funded for by an increase in DHS funding in 2003 (1.2EFT). \$40K in additional staff relief costs required due to long term S/L of several staff including the team leader.
Quality Standard	Maintain 95% customer satisfaction	95%	90%	95%	90%	

Youth Services*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Net annual cost to Council of program be no greater than \$318,500 adjusted by parameters of Council's long term financial plan	\$318,500	\$321,727	\$328,055	\$363,000	Higher than budgeted salary costs for the program combined with a discontinuance of funding for the hot spot program and no growth in funding for both the LLENs and Migrant Youth Support program
Quality Standard	Maintain client satisfaction at or above 85%	85%	84%	85%	85%	

Environmental Health*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Net annual cost to Council of program is no greater than \$354,837, adjusted each year by parameters of Council's long term financial plan	\$354,837	\$303,835	\$365,482	\$338,000	The unit's immunisation and food safety programs attracted higher levels of grant and fee income than projected combined with small savings in expenditure.
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction with immunization program at or above 94%	94%	95%	94%	96%	

Building Services*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Cost of building permits (adjusted annually in accordance with Council's long-term financial plan): Dwelling additions to value of \$105,000: Dwelling additions /new dwellings exceeding \$105,000: Multi Unit Developments:	\$430 \$500 \$900	\$430 \$500 \$900	\$450 \$520 \$940	\$700 \$1200 \$1500	The increase in fee level was required to make the service financially sustainable.
Quality Standard	Building permits: 85% completed within 10 days Swimming pool inspections: 90% responded to by next working day	85% 90%	75% 75%	85% 90%	85% 90%	

Traffic Management*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Cost per hour of service: \$30.92, adjusted by parameters of Council's long-term financial plan	\$30.92	\$31.08	\$32.34	\$31.43	
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction at or above 70%	70%	74%	70%	70%	

Traffic & Local Laws*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	The cost standard for the service is the cost per hour of service before VicRoads subsidy is received. The current cost of \$10.81 per hour should be kept within the parameters of Council's long-term financial plan.	\$10.81	\$12.16	\$11.31	\$11.41	
Quality Standard	Compliance with the requirements of Vic Roads Agreement for the training and performance of Supervisors and the maintenance of Council's eligibility to receive the VicRoads subsidy.	Complied	Complied	Complied	Complied	

Human Resources*Performance in second year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE				EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	Target 2003/04	Actual 2003/04	
Cost Standard	Annual cost per EFT employee of \$1,067, adjusted each year by parameters of Council's long-term financial plan	\$1,067	\$1,182	\$1,115	\$1,153	Costs exceeded budget due to increased advertising and recruitment costs associated with higher than anticipated levels of staff turnover and recruitment during the year.
Quality Standard	Maintain a minimum of 70% customer satisfaction	70%	77%	70%	75%	

Open Space*Performance in first year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE		EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Total Street Tree Mgt Cost / Tree Total Street Tree Mgt Cost / Resident Total Street Tree Mgt Cost / Km	\$6.90 \$14.32 \$1510	\$7.15 \$14.85 \$1,565.60	New contracts for Arbor block pruning resulted in slightly greater costs than expected.
Quality Standard	Maintain customer satisfaction as measured by the benchmarked results from the annual IOSS Park User Satisfaction Survey at above Metropolitan average of 7.3.	7.8	7.8	

Civic Services*Performance in first year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE		EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	Cost of the service (adjusted annually in accordance with Council's long-term financial plan):	\$904,850	\$858,002	
Quality Standard	Achieve a minimum of 80% satisfaction as measured in the statewide survey on resident satisfaction with customer contact	80%	84%	

Business Relations*Performance in first year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE		EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	The average unit cost (spend per business) adjusted by parameters of Council's long-term financial plan	\$52.82	\$52.16	
Quality Standard	The Business Monitor survey will provide the performance measurement tool for this standard. The key indicators of quality will be: 1. A minimum satisfaction level with Council's service of 85% 2. An overall positive outlook for the local economy.	85% positive	82% positive	Preliminary data. Closing date for survey 31 August.

Capital Works*Performance in first year*

BEST VALUE PRINCIPLES	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PERFORMANCE		EXPLANATION FOR VARIANCE
		Target 2004/05	Actual 2004/05	
Cost Standard	The percentage of total capital works project costs that are allocated to project management and design (for civil/urban design projects under \$500,000)	5.5%	5.5%	
Quality Standard	Completion of 96% of capital works projects on time	96%	93%	A number of projects were postponed and some projects did not proceed. Other projects were to be funded over 2 financial years and were delayed until late in the year, resulting in funding being carried-over.
	Minimum of 85% satisfaction with condition of roads, as measured in the Council's annual community survey.	85%	90%	