

Environment												
PI Code	PI Name	2013/14 - CDC only figures		Q1 2014/15		Q2 2014/15		2014/15		Status	Latest Note	Responsible Officer
		Value	Target	Value (Joint CDC/WDC figures)	Value (Joint CDC/WDC figures)	Value (Joint CDC/WDC figures)	Annual Target (Joint CDC/WDC figures)					
CHI_SER NI 192	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	53.30%	50.00%	58.19%	54.17%	56%	On track	This indicator reflects the amount of waste recycled and composted. Q2 figures are currently being uploaded to our national database and are subject to verification by the Environment Agency. Figures show a slight fall in recycling as a percentage from Q1 due to a fall in the amount of garden waste collected. The combined Q1 and Q2 recycling rate is just under 57%. Recent national figures also show recycling/composting is stagnating potentially due to changes in purchasing habits				Chris Marchant
CHI_SER NI 195a	Street cleanliness indicator - Levels of litter	2%	4%	3%	9%	-	-	This indicator reflects the number of streets in the districts which are below a good standard of cleansing for litter or detritus: Q2 saw a rise in the level below a good standard, leaving us slightly off target for the year (6%). Due to the subjective nature of this indicator training is being done to ensure a constant approach is being adhered to by all staff, and roads which were noted as below standard are being reviewed				Chris Marchant
CHI_SER BV82a i	% of Household Waste Recycled	33.21%	33.00%	24.57%	24.31%	31%	On track	This indicator reflects the amount of waste recycled (not composted): show that recycling as a percentage was the same as in Q1. It should be noted that as garden waste is higher in the summer months the recycling % indicator will be lower in Q1 and Q2 but is expected to be higher in Q3 and Q4 even if the tonnage is the same				Chris Marchant
CHI_SER BV82a ii	Tonnes of Household Waste Recycled	10,553.85	10,500	Q1 - 6690	Q2 -5,931 (Q1 & Q2 - 12,621)	29,900 (full year) 14,950 (half year)	Slightly off track	This indicator reflects the amount of waste recycled (not composted) in tonnes: Q2 figures are currently being uploaded to our national database and are subject to verification by the Environment Agency. Figures show composting tonnages may be slightly higher than predicted. This is due to season fluctuation and more garden waste being produced in Q1 to Q3 than Q4. The current scheme does not yet have a full year of data to enable firm interpretation to be done. Continued monitoring will take place in Q3				Chris Marchant
CHI_SER BV82b i	% of Household Waste composted	20.02%	25.00%	34.20%	31.50%	25%	Above Target	This indicator reflects the amount of waste composted (not recycled): Q2 figures are currently being uploaded to our national database and are subject to verification by the Environment Agency. Figures show composting as a percentage was the same then in Q1. It should be noted that as garden waste is higher in the summer months the composting % indicator will be higher in Q1 and Q2 but is expected to be lower in Q3 and Q4 even if the tonnage is the same				

CHI_SER BV82b ii	Tonnes of Household Waste composted	6,368.00	1,500	Q1 - 9312.24	Q2 - 7,810 (Q1 & Q2 - 17,122)	25,000 (fully year) 16,000 (half year)	Above Target	This indicator reflects the amount of waste composted (not recycled) in tonnes. Q2 figures are currently being uploaded to our national database for verification by the Environment agency, provisional figure show recycling tonnages may be slightly lower than predicted. This may be season fluctuation, or a reduction in the weight of some materials used i.e. lighter glass bottle. The current scheme does not yet have a full years data to enable firm interpretation to be done. Continued monitoring will take place in Q3	
CHI_SER JWS 10	Percentage of fly-tippings removed within 2 working days	42.05%	90%	TBC	44.87%	90%	Below Target	This indicator reflects the speed of flytipping removal once a request as been made to our waste contractor to clear. Although the percentage is below target, this due to a problem dating the sign off tickets rather than the removal having not been done. We are currently working to ensure the database allows for the sign off dates to be entered correctly.	Chris Marchant
CHI_SER JWS 11	Joint Waste Service Customer Service call abandonments Rate	25.30%	10%	13.10%	13.70%	10%	Slightly off track	This indicator reflects the percentage of calls which ring off before being answered by a member of staff through the published waste number. The average waiting time was 1:24. The service has been disadvantaged by a number of staffing issues including long term sick and maternity leave. Additional staff have been recruited in and trained and currently a further recruitment drive is ongoing. During this time around 4,000 additional calls were taken to renew garden waste subscriptions	Chris Marchant
CHI_SER JWS 12	Joint Waste Service Customer Service Calls answered within in 20 seconds	33.10%	60%	46.20%	42.70%	65%	Below Target	This indicator reflects the percentage of calls which are answered by a member of staff through the published waste number in 20 seconds. Waste Services has received 43,361 calls in the first six months of the year a fall of almost 20,000 calls from the same time last year (63,543). The average waiting time was 1:24. 44% of calls were answered within 20 seconds is a rise from the same time last year (31%) but still below the target of 65%. The service has been disadvantaged by a number of staffing issues including long term sick and maternity leave. Additional staff have been recruited in and trained and currently a further recruitment drive is on-going. During this time around 4,000 additional calls were taken to renew garden waste subscriptions	Chris Marchant