

COMMITTEE	DATE	CLASSIFICATION	REPORT NO.	AGENDA ITEM
Overview and Scrutiny	6 March 2007	Unrestricted		
REPORT OF: Assistant Chief Executive ORIGINATING OFFICER(S): Sara Williams Louise Russell		TITLE: BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT: MEMBERS' ENQUIRIES WARD(S) AFFECTED: N/A		

1. Summary

- 1.1. Officers, with Member input, have recently facilitated a review of the Members' Enquiry process, using Business Process Improvement (BPI) techniques.
- 1.2. Members' Enquiries are the formal requests for information from a Councillor and are logged onto the Siebel IT system and distributed to the relevant Directorate or external body for response. Raising an enquiry is one way in which Members can act for their ward constituents, and is a valuable opportunity for local issues to be brought to the attention of officers delivering services. It is notable that since the May 2006 election the number of Members' Enquiries raised has increased dramatically (up a third from 6,036 in 2005/06 to an estimated more than 8,000 in 2006/07), creating pressure on Members' Services whose resources have not increased. See Appendix 3 for 2006/07 monthly data.
- 1.3. The BPI project for Members' Enquiries was initiated amidst some concern amongst Members that responses to enquiries could take a long time, and that the quality of the responses they received was variable. Due to increasing numbers of Members' Enquiries, and reduced numbers of staff administering Members' Enquiries, the process was therefore recommended for BPI review.
- 1.4. The overall aims of the BPI project for the Members' Enquiry process can be summarised as follows:
- To increase Members' satisfaction with responses
 - To increase the number of queries answered within target time
 - To reduce the amount of staff time spent dealing with enquiries

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee notes and comments on the proposed actions as identified in Appendix 1 of this report.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 2000 (SECTION 97) LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE DRAFTING OF THIS REPORT	
<p>Brief description of background papers:</p> <p>8.1 Performance Management: Members Enquiries Nov 2006</p>	<p>Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection:</p> <p>Sara Williams, 020 7364 4771 Mulberry Place, 4th Floor</p>

2. Background

2.1. A key aspect of the review was to involve all key stakeholders in the process including Members, Democratic Services staff and Directorate representatives handling enquiries.

2.2. The review started with an 'ideas generation' period where experiences of the process and suggestions for improvement were collected, through interviews with individual Members, and focus groups with Members' Services' staff, and with staff in Directorates. These ideas were captured and grouped into three areas for improvement by the BPI team:

- **Providing information to Members** in order to reduce the number of avoidable enquiries raised through the formal process
- **Improving the quality of responses** in order to ensure the *quality* of responses received are to the satisfaction of Members
- **Streamlining the end-to-end process** including reviewing the Siebel IT system and cutting out unnecessary steps and delays

2.3. The next stage of the process was the 'As-is' analysis. A workshop involving staff from across Members' Services and a number of Directorates took place on 16 January to focus on the 'as-is' state. This session was used to validate the research done by the BPI team to date, to discuss the implications of the 'as-is' state and where the problems lay in the process, and to think about potential improvement statements for each improvement area.

2.4. Before the next stage of the process – the 'To-be' analysis – the BPI undertook a number of activities. These included:

- Updating the 'as-is' information based on feedback from the workshop;
- Sampling almost 100 Members' Enquiries by type and by Directorate (see Appendix 2);
- Measuring the end-to-end Members' Enquiry process;
- Liaising with ICT about possible changes to Siebel;

- Identifying best practice from within the Directorates;
 - Identifying costings both in terms of time and money.
- 2.5. The focus of the 'To-be' workshop held on 24 January – which again involved staff from Members' Services and the Directorates – was to share some of the BPI team's ideas for improvement, to firm up some possible improvement statements and to estimate the potential benefits of the suggested improvements. The output is the draft Project Plan attached at Appendix 1.
- 2.6. It was at the 'Implementation Planning' stage that the BPI team presented their findings to the interim Service Head, as well as the new Service Head, for Democratic Renewal and Engagement. The main purpose of this meeting was to get some agreement on which ideas to pursue and to discuss impact and actions needed to implement them. In addition, the Lead Cabinet Member and other key Members have been briefed on emerging options.

3. Findings

- 3.1. The research activity undertaken by the BPI team as part of the 'As-is' and 'To-be' stages revealed some significant findings. These are highlighted below.
- 3.2. From the sampling exercise it was estimated that approximately 10% of enquiries were simple requests for service which could have been dealt with directly by the Customer Contact Centre. This was particularly the case with requests for housing repairs and confirmed anecdotal evidence from the workshops that some enquiries should really go straight to the Call Centre.
- 3.3. It was suggested that one of the reasons why Members preferred to raise an enquiry than go directly to the Customer Call Centre was to ensure that their activity was logged. If a way could be found to capture this activity by the Call Centre (i.e. a dedicated Member hotline and e-mail address) it was felt this could reduce the number which had to go through the full, more time-consuming Members' Enquiries process. This would need to be supported by clear guidance to Members about the types of calls appropriate to reporting in this way. Whilst the CCC would not be able to follow-up or feedback on action taken as a result of reports, it would nevertheless provide a more direct route to more straight-forward requests being addressed.
- 3.4. The sampling exercise, furthermore, revealed that if provision of information to Members was better and more accessible they may be able answer their own enquiries and therefore may not need to raise an enquiry. This was felt to be the case with approximately a third of the enquiries in the sampling exercise. It was noted, however, that Members would require support and guidance for this to work.

3.5. Ways in which the provision of information to Members could be improved included:

- Improving the content of the website and intranet, including developing the current Members' page on the intranet to contain useful links and FAQs;
- Producing information packs (as is currently done in Housing) for new policies.

3.6. The review found that Members' Enquiries are not administered or responded to in a uniform manner as no single process exists either for Members to raise enquiries in the first place, or for staff in Directorates to respond to them. Currently Members raise enquiries in a variety of ways, and each Directorate has a different process in place for responding to an enquiry. These differences lead to variations in both the quality and speed of response, and create an additional burden on Members' Services staff who currently have to check 100% of enquiries. In many cases this is duplicating work already done in Directorates. Some best practice was found in some of the Directorates where there are well-established and clear processes in place for dealing with enquiries (e.g. Adults Services and Children's Services).

3.7. These Directorates have clear processes and checking mechanisms at Director or Service Head level in place, and as a result the responses to enquiries were found to be of a higher quality. These Directorates were also more likely to meet the 10 day target. However, these Directorates generally received fewer enquiries. The review confirmed that Housing receives far more enquiries than any other Directorate. The process for responding to an enquiry in high volume services may therefore warrant some differences in approach to the other Directorates. Whether any exceptions are required, and what these would be, should be agreed as part of the Quality policy and process developed in the Members' Enquiry Quality Forum and agreed by Directorate Service Heads.

3.8. The review also identified a number of technical issues with the Siebel IT system, which if dealt with, could save up to 10 minutes for each enquiry raised. It was also felt that more could be done to show staff in Members' Services how to use the Siebel system fully.

4 Proposed Improvements

4.1 The following improvement statements were devised to seek to address the problems identified. Where possible, these have been quantified although in some cases baselines need to be set:

Issue	Improvement statement	Baseline	Target
Reducing the numbers of Members' Enquiries raised through the formal	Increase the number of hits to the Members' intranet page	N/a	100 hits per week
	Increase the number of	N/a	20 reports

process	times Members contact the CCC to report e.g. graffiti, ASB, abandoned vehicles		per week
	As a result of these activities, reduce the number of Members' Enquiries logged through the formal process	700 per month	630 (10% reduction)
Improving the quality or responses	Increase Member satisfaction with enquiries	N/a	To be set
	Decrease the amount of follow on enquires	7.5/wk	5/wk Reduce by 1/3rd
	Reduce % responses which fail the MS quality check	N/a	Zero
	Reduce % MS required to check	100%	60%
Streamlining the end-to-end process	Increase the % of enquiries inputted onto the Siebel system within 48 hours Move to a target of 24 hours once this achieved.	90%	100%
	Increase the % of enquiries responded to within the 10 day limit	75%	100%
	Reduce total staff time spent entering an enquiry and closing an enquiry on Siebel	30 mins	20 mins then 15

4.2 To achieve these targets, the following improvement actions have been identified following analysis and discussion with key stakeholders. These are:

Providing information to Members:

Reducing the numbers of Members' Enquiries

- Provide guidance to Members on the type of enquiries that can be raised via the Customer Contact Centre rather than as a formal Members' Enquiry
- Create a "Member Hotline/E-mail" within the Customer Contact Centre, and, via development to Siebel and SX3, devise a method through which this can identify and capture individual Members' activities
- Improve information provided through Members' pages on the intranet (including useful links and FAQs)
- Produce and distribute information packs for new policy initiatives/ changes
- Better information and training for Members so they can respond to residents directly on key policies (for example via FAQs and Alerts)

Improving the quality of responses:

Learning from best practice within the Council to bring up the quality

- Introduce a standard policy and process: for Members to raise enquiries
- Introduce a standard Quality policy and process: for Directorates to respond to enquires
- Launch a Members' Enquiry Quality Forum

Streamlining the end-to-end process

Cutting out unnecessary steps and delays

- Introduce a standard format for Members to raise enquiries; i.e. introduction of a template for enquiries via email or letter
- Increased up to date information on to the Siebel system
- Make basic improvements and alterations to the Siebel system to speed up data entry
- Introduce Siebel training to ensure system used to fullest extent
- Once Siebel improvements have been implemented, pilot direct entry of enquiries into Siebel by a small number of Members and review the success and impact
- Enable direct entry of answers into Siebel and logging off of enquiries by Directorates

4. Benefits

4.1. There are a number of benefits associated with the actions cited above, and these are summarised below. Note, however, that these should be treated with caution as due to time constraints some assumptions were made in calculating potential benefits. Further work to establish robust baselines and targets is programmed in the project plan.

Efficiency savings within Members Services

- Approximately 15 hours per week could be saved by Members' Services if those straightforward enquiries which could be dealt with by the Customer Call Centre could appropriately go directly to the Call Centre rather than being raised as Members' Enquiries;
- The introduction of a standardised policy and process in the Directorates could save up to 30 minutes per enquiry for staff in Members' Services;
- Changes to the Siebel system could reduce the time spent by Members' Services logging enquiries on and off the system and chasing enquiries by up to one day a week.

Increased satisfaction

- For Members who will not only see an improvement in the quality of responses, but will feel more empowered by being able to input directly onto Siebel, for example;
- Amongst staff in Members' Services who will spend less time logging on and off and chasing enquiries;

- For staff responding to enquiries in the Directorates who will get fewer 'follow up' enquiries and will have clear processes in place for dealing with enquiries.

5 Risks and Success Factors

- 5.1 Member buy-in is crucial if the full benefits of the review are to be realised. Involvement of Members in the implementation of the actions should help to ensure this. A Project Board will be set up and the Lead Member, Cllr Sirajul Islam and the Overview and Scrutiny lead for Excellent Public Services have been briefed and are engaged in the implementation of the proposals.
- 5.2 Some of the areas for improvement rely on Directorates changing their processes for dealing with enquiries. Proposed procedures include:
- Members' Services or Members or Directorates log on enquiry
 - Directorate expert would respond to enquiry using agreed template within agreed timescales
 - Members Enquiry & Complaints Officers (MECOs) – Directorate link officers who currently receive the Siebel requests – would check responses for content, tone and grammar
 - Senior staff (or their representative) would be responsible for final checking of responses to enquiries
 - MECOs would sign off enquiries on Siebel
 - MECOs would send response to Member (and/or resident).
- 5.3 It is recognised that a number of these are already happening but this needs to be standardised. The new activities, relating to logging, signing off and sending of enquiries are estimated to take up to an additional 15 minutes per enquiry. However, the proposed procedures would aim to remove duplication of activities between Members' Services and Directorates.
- 5.4 In addition, the improvements will depend on Members signing up to a standard process for raising Members' Enquiries, including providing as much information about the client as possible, using a standard template and submitting enquiries electronically wherever possible.
- 5.5 The times given above would ensure response within the Member-to-Member target time of 10 days. It is essential therefore that all Directorates are bought into the implementation stage.
- 5.6 Further development work to the Siebel system is important to reduce the length of time taken to administer enquiries. We are currently awaiting an upgrade to Siebel due in April 2007 during which time improvements to Siebel have been put on hold. The Siebel Team's work programme for 2007/08 includes a number of required improvements to different aspects of the Siebel system – the overall work programme will be determined by April 2007. This suggested development work will be

assessed alongside other improvements being requested. In the meantime, the improvement actions which do not rely on these improvements will be taken forward.

- 5.7 A proposed scheduling, indicating these dependencies, is included in the Project Plan at Appendix 1. This project plan will be formally managed by a designated Project Manager using the Council's corporate project management methodology. Progress will be regularly monitored and risks logged. A progress report will be made to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in six months time.

6 Equalities Implications

- 6.1 The Members' Enquiries system seeks to ensure that all local residents, including those who require advocacy or support from their elected representatives, have access to the Council's services and information. Improving the process is therefore key to ensuring equal access for all.

7 Comments from the Chief Finance Officer

- 7.1 Any costs associated with implementing the action plan will be met from existing Chief Executive's Directorate budgets.

8 Concurrent Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal)

- 8.1 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

9 Sustainable Action for A Greener Environment

- 9.1 A number of Members' Enquiries relate to reports of environmental issues such as dumped rubbish or condition of streets and estates. Mechanisms which facilitate the rapid resolution of these issues will support the Council's Living Safely and cleaner, greener objectives. It would be environmentally desirable to make the Members Enquiry process paper-free as far as possible.

10 Anti Poverty Comments

- 10.1 The Members' Enquiries system seeks to ensure that all local residents, including those who require advocacy or support from their elected representatives to access benefits or income maximisation, have access to the Council's services and information. Improving the process is therefore key to supporting our anti-poverty activity.

11 Risk Management Implications

- 11.1 The risks of implementation have been addressed in section 5 above. A proposed scheduling, indicating these dependencies, is included in the Project Plan at Appendix 1. This project plan will be formally

managed by a designated Project Manager using the Council's corporate project management methodology. Progress will be regularly monitored and risks logged. A progress report will be made to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in six months time.

Appendix 1: Project Plan

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
1	Baselines and targets for all improvement standards to be set and agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify outstanding information Identify where further sampling would be useful Agree targets with key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong understanding of current situation and where the project is aiming to reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End February 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early April 2007
2	Provide guidance to Members on what should be raised as a Members' Enquiry, or dealt with by the Customer Contact Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Dependant on establishment of Members' Enquiry Quality Forum (9)</i> Develop guidance in consultation with MECOs using ME Quality Forum Publish guidance and distribute to Members and include on Members' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Support Manager MECOs Members Support Manager Customer Contact Centre Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased confidence of Members to choose fastest means of resolving query Other Benefits dependant on establishment of hotline (see below) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early April 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End April 2007 Review annually

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> intranet/ internet page • Review guidance annually • Establish hotline 				
3	Create a “Member Hotline/E-mail” within the Customer Contact Centre, which could identify and capture individual Member’s activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dependant on production of Guidance (2)</i> • Pilot with 5 Members • Review pilot • Roll-out to all Members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Contact Centre Manager • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamlined enquiry process to raise service requests for action (increased satisfaction) – up to 1 week per ME • Reducing unnecessary bureaucracy around basic service requests (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 44 hours per month staff time in MS and Directorates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early April 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot by May 2007 • Launch by June 2007 • Review after six months
4	Introduce a standard policy and process: for Members to raise enquiries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To take place simultaneously with 2</i> • Develop policy and process • Consult key Members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased confidence of Members to choose fastest means of resolving query 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early April 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of April 2007

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch policy and process 				
5	Standard format for Members to raise enquiries i.e. introduction of a template for enquiries via email or letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop standard format for all methods of Member communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster responses to MEs though faster inputs (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 39 hours per month staff time in MS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early March 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End March 2007
6	Review and develop the Members' page on the intranet/ Internet (include useful links and FAQs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dependant on launch of new intranet</i> • Establish what information can usefully be included on Members' page • Publish information • Publicise Members' page • Regularly update Members' page 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Support Manager • IT Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced numbers of Members Enquiries as information available, sharing best practice (increased Member satisfaction, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 109 hours per month staff time in MS and Directorates – <i>this is the expected benefit of all information to Members actions combined</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early March 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By early April 2007 • Update monthly
7	Produce and distribute information packs for new policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directorates identify relevant and useful information for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MECOs • MECOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced numbers of Members' Enquiries as information available • Increased confidence of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early March 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing (possibly Bi-Monthly)

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
	initiatives/ changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Information pack containing information produced Information pack distributed to Members Information pack published on the Intranet/ Internet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Support Manager Members Support Manager 	Members to respond directly to residents (increased Member satisfaction, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 109 hours per month staff time in MS and Directorates – <i>this is the expected benefit of all information to Members actions combined</i>		
8	Better information and training for Members so they can respond to residents directly on key policies (e.g. FAQs and Alerts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish what information and training is required Produce training material Set training dates Conduct training Support page on Members' page on intranet/Internet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced numbers of Members' Enquiries as information available Increased confidence of Members to respond directly to residents (increased Member satisfaction, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 109 hours per month staff time in MS and Directorates – <i>this is the expected benefit of all information to Members actions combined</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early April 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing (review six-monthly)

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
9	Launch Members' Enquiry Quality Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish and commence Members' Enquiry Quality Forum Regularly hold ME Quality Forum meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members Support Manager Members' Enquiry & Complaints Officers (MECOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing good practice Improved communication between Members' Services and Directorates <i>This action enables improved quality actions to be implemented (2 and 10)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early March 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives agreed by end of March 2007 Regular monthly meetings ongoing
10	Introduce a standard Quality policy and process: for Directorates to respond to enquiries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share and agree on good practice Agree standard policy and process Consider whether exceptions are required for high volume services Sign off policy and process Implement training for staff drafting responses based on best 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MECOs MECOs MECOs MECOs Directorate Service Heads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved quality of responses as best practice <i>[including sign off by Service Head or representative]</i> implemented as 'standard' and greater ownership of quality by Directorates – increased Member satisfaction Increase the proportion of MEs resolved first time, therefore reducing the number of follow-on enquiries raised – 10 hours per month staff time saved in MS, increased Member satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From first Quality Forum meeting (end March) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid-May 2007

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
		practice		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster responses to MEs through more efficient process (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – up to 5 days per ME for 100% of enquiries 		
11	Increased up to date information on to the Siebel system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify information sources for inclusion on the system Up load information to system Regularly review and upload further information onto the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Siebel Team Leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster responses to MEs though faster inputs (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 12 hours per month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start may be dependant on completion of upgrade (12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-going – review six-monthly
12	Make basic improvements and alterations to Siebel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorise promotion of Members' Enquiries in Siebel Team's work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMT Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster responses to MEs though faster inputting and logging off enquiries (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing 	<i>Start date to be determined by prioritisation of Siebel work programme</i>	<i>Likely to take 2-3 months once work initiated</i>

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm list of requirements • Consider viability of requirements • Make changes to system • User Acceptance Testing • Launch upgrade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siebel Team Leader • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager • Siebel Team Leader 	enquiries) – 23 hours per month		
13	Introduce Siebel training to ensure system used to fullest extent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce training material • Set training dates • Conduct training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager • Siebel Team Leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster responses to MEs though faster inputting and logging off enquiries (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 18 hours per month 	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>
14	Pilot direct entry into Siebel by Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dependant on launch of Siebel upgrade and improvements</i> • Produce training material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Member satisfaction as greater control of process • Faster responses to MEs though faster inputs (reducing the end-to-end 	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>

No.	Action	Milestones	Lead	Expected Benefit	Timescale From-To	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and guidance • Set training dates • Conduct training • Conduct pilot • Evaluate pilot and review guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Support Manager • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – 6 hours per month staff time in MS <i>based on an assumption of 5% take-up</i> 		
15	Direct entry into Siebel and logging off of enquiries by Directorates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dependant on launch of Siebel upgrade and improvements</i> • Produce training material and guidance • Set training dates • Conduct training • Conduct pilot • Evaluate pilot and review guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager • Members Support Manager • Siebel Team Leader • Members Support Manager • Members Support Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster responses to MEs though faster inputs as not required to go back to MS (reducing the end-to-end process, reducing officer time spent processing enquiries) – up to 4 days faster per ME • Increased ownership of enquiry, leading to increase in quality 	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>	<i>TBC</i> <i>Dependent on completion of action 12</i>

Appendix 2: Members' Enquiry Sampling Exercise

97 sample enquiries were looked from across the council. They were divided into theme, directorate, quality of response and Member.

The results are as follows;

Code	Description	Total	H	E&C	D&R	C	A&S	CE
	A request for service that could have been sent to the Contact Centre	12	5	6				1
	Request for information or an explanation for services received, further services, on behalf of a resident	45	20	12	5	4		4
	Enquiry raising concern with the standard of service requesting explanation (not on behalf of a resident)	5	1	3	1			
	An enquiry concerned with a specific policy or initiative requesting information	30	5	5	5	6		9
	Enquiry for a partner/external organisation	4						
	Total	96	31	27	11	10	0	14

Of the 96 enquiries, 3 did not have a response attached.

For the remaining 93 enquiries a simple quality check was undertaken, enquiries were graded according to whether they fully answered their query and their tone was appropriate, these responses would have been graded 1. **84%** of enquiries were graded 1.

Of the 8 that did not score 1, 1 was from an external organisation (police).

A score of 2 was given if the response answered the enquiry but if the tone was in some way inappropriate, e.g. abrupt. This is a very subjective measure, and shouldn't be looked at as fact. 3 responses were graded as 2. Whilst replies did answer the enquiry raised (requests for information or services on behalf of a resident), they were curt in their reply.

4 responses were graded as 3, or did not answer enquiry. Again depending on the enquiry, this is quite subjective.

Appendix 3: Numbers of Members' Enquiries raised 2006/07

	Members' Services	Executive Office		Scrutiny	Total
		Cabinet	Leadership		
April	395	239	82	132	848
May	372	58	8	22	460
June	546	81	51	102	780
July	537	66	18	87	708
August	504	98	47	98	747
September	456	72	31	84	643
October	479	114	17	94	704
November	490	97	62	70	719
December	281	79	10	50	420
January					
February					
March					
Total	4,060	904	326	739	6,029