

## Social Landlord Cumulative Quarterly Performance Report At End Of Quarters Two And Four 2016/17 And At End Of Quarter Two 2017/18

### 1. Quarterly Performance Data For The Key Social Landlords Who Work In The Borough

The following KPIs are collected and reported on cumulatively on a quarterly basis:

1. % all repairs completed in target
2. % respondents satisfied with last completed repair
3. % appointments kept as % of appointments made
4. % properties with a valid gas safety certificate
5. % residents satisfied with outcome of ASB case
6. % complaints responded to in target
7. % Members Enquiries answered in target
8. Average re-let times General Needs only (calendar days) – data collected from quarter one 2017/18

The table below outlines the following for the 14 key Social Landlords who operate in the borough (including Tower Hamlets Homes) who can produce borough-specific data:

1. Cumulative Quarter Two 2016/17 performance from April 2016 to September 2016
2. Cumulative Quarter Four 2016/17 performance from April 2016 to March 2017; and
3. Cumulative Quarter Two 2017/18 performance from April 2017 to September 2017

Quarterly Cumulative Performance For Quarters Two and Four 2016/17 and For Quarter Two 2017/18\*

Social Landlord	Circle Old Ford	East Thames	Eastend Homes	Gateway	Genesis	One Housing Group	Peabody	Poplar Harca	Providence Row**	Southern Housing Group** *	Spitalfields HA****	Swan	THCH	THH
PIs														
<b>1. % all repairs completed in target</b>														
Q2 16/17	86.57 %	88.10 %	94.67 %	96.96 %	93.90%	99.86 %	88%	99.60 %	97.5%	N/A	99.64%	98.77 %	81%	97.55%
Q4 16/17	91.58 %	87.80 %	93.22 %	96.89 %	93.60%	99.57 %	87%	99.40 %	97.60%	N/A	99.90%	98.90 %	93%	95.60 %
Q2 17/18	73.16 %	92%	79.89 %	94.45 %	91.70%	99.68 %	88%	98.90 %	97.10%	87.80%	98.88%	99.54 %	88%	96.40 %
<b>2.% respondents satisfied with last completed repair*****</b>														
Q2 16/17	66.70 %	54.40 %	95.86 %	88.84 %	78.60%	89.94 %	85%	96.30 %	84.6%	83%	95%	94%	N/A	90.99%

Q4 16/17	63%	55.70 %	96.66 %	87.86 %	77.90%	91.89 %	83%	96.4% %	88.20%	66%	95%	92.40 %	N/A	92%
Q2 17/18	N/A	42%	89.53 %	84.50 %	83.80%	99.59 %	87%	93.20 %	80.80%	82%	98%	95%	N/A	92.30 %
<b>3.% appointments kept as % of appointments made</b>														
Q2 16/17	89.79 %	95.90 %	98.59 %	89.74 %	99.00%	100%	96%	99%	97.3%	N/A	100%	98.13 %	N/A	98.87%
Q4 16/17	89.31 %	91.90 %	98.20 %	90.73 %	98.60%	99.83 %	92%	98.90 %	97.60%	N/A	98.76%	98%	N/A	98.30 %
Q2 17/18	84.65 %	N/A	97.20 %	83.23 %	98.10%	98.83 %	96%	97.30 %	100%	N/A	99%	99.40 %	N/A	N/A
<b>4.% properties with a valid gas safety certificate</b>														
Q2 16/17	99.99 %	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.98 %	100%	99.90%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Q4 16/17	99.95 %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.96 %	100%	99.89%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Q2 17/18	99.45 %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.88%	100%	100%	99.99%	100%	100%	100%	100%



Q2 16/17	53.59 %	66.67 %	93.97 %	100%	75%	92.98 %	80%	95%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	73%	60.70%
Q4 16/17	78.88 %	83.70 %	89.42 %	100%	69%	93.82 %	N/A	94%	100%	N/A	100%	100%	76%	67%
Q2 17/18	52.86 %	93%	94%	100%	83%	93.86 %	N/A	99.10 %	100%	N/A	93%	100%	73%	80.50 %
<b>8. Average re-let times General Needs only (calendar days) – data produced from 2017/18 only</b>														
Q2 17/18	39.3 days	29.4 days	30.6 days	15 days	36 days	25.52 days	20 days	16 days	26.5 days	28.4 days	10 days	15.3 days	29 days	24.54 days
<b>Engagement for 2016/17 at THHF Executive and at the 8 THHF sub-groups*****</b> **	Good – 6 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or	Good – 6 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Good – 7 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Average - 5 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Poor – 4 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Good – 7 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Good – 6 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Excellent – 9 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Very Good - 6 of 8 group meetings attended 50% or more (develo	Good – 6 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Poor – 4 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Excellent – 8 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Average - 5 of 9 group meetings attended 50% or more	Poor – 4 of 8 group meetings attended 50% or more (devel

	more								ment sub-group is n/a to them)					opment sub-group was n/a to them in and up to 2016/17)
Social Landlord	Circle Old Ford	East Thames	Eastend Homes	Gateway	Genesis	One Housing Group	Peabody	Poplar Harca	Provide nce Row**	Southern Housing Group** *	Spitalfields HA****	Swan	THCH	THH

Notes:

N/A = data is not available - usually because the social landlord does not measure this PI.

- \* Performance results may vary due to different survey methodologies being used (postal, by phone, transactional methods etc.) and by whether they are undertaken internally - or externally by external parties. Results are normally highest where internal surveys are undertaken over the phone. Thus meaningful comparisons below can be limited unless survey methods are closely scrutinized and caveated. In addition, performance trends can only meaningfully be assessed after at least 2 years' data is produced.

- \*\* Providence Row is a small HA relative to the majority of other Social Landlords on the list - their sample sizes for each indicator are also small in comparison, which does have a magnifying effect on the percentages. It can make it easier to achieve 100% for some PIs due to the smaller sample sizes.
  
- \*\*\* Southern Housing Group use lean systems to measure progress with certain key processes and service delivery areas so do not always use PIs for some of the issues reported on above.
  
- \*\*\*\* As with Providence Row – Spitalfields HA is a small HA relative to the majority of other Social Landlords on the list - their sample sizes for each indicator are also small in comparison, which does have a magnifying effect on the percentages and can make it easier to achieve 100% for some PIs due to the smaller sample sizes.
  
- \*\*\*\*\* The methodology used by different Social Landlords to measure (in particular) repairs satisfaction often differs significantly and therefore results are not directly comparable and need to be treated with caution
  
- \*\*\*\*\* This is from a very small sample size of only 4 surveys
  
- \*\*\*\*\* Engagement with the THHF Executive and 8 sub-groups is regarded as acceptable at each THHF group meeting if a social landlord attends 50% or more of that particular THHF Executive or THHF sub-group in that financial year.