

<b>HOUSING &amp; NEW HOMES COMMITTEE</b>	<b>Agenda Item 61</b>  Brighton & Hove City Council
--	---

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 2 2016/17</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>18 January 2017</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Acting Executive Director Economy, Environment &amp; Culture</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Ododo Dafé</b>	<b>Tel: 01273 293201</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>ododo.dafe@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

## FOR GENERAL RELEASE

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 2 of the financial year 2016/17. The report is attached as Appendix 1.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Housing & New Homes Committee notes and comments upon the report, a summary version of which went to Area Panels in November and December 2016.

### 3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The report continues the use of the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

### 4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION:

- 4.1 A summary version of the performance report went to Area Panels in November and December 2016 and was noted and commented upon. No amendments were requested to contents of the report.

### 5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

#### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The area of performance with the most significant financial impact is the ability to collect rents from tenants. For the second quarter 2016/17, the collection rate has decreased by 0.06% to 98.85% when compared to the first quarter. This collection

rate still compares favourably when benchmarked with other Councils. This continues to be monitored to ensure that appropriate action can be taken to minimise arrears as the effects of welfare reform unfold. Any reduction in the amount of rent collected has a direct impact on the resources available to spend on the management and maintenance of tenants' properties.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Monica Brooks*

*Date: 19/12/16*

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 There are no legal implications to draw to Members' attention.

*Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley*

*Date: 09/12/16*

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The increase in the energy efficiency rating of homes reflects an improvement towards the council's sustainability commitments, among other objectives such as financial inclusion and reducing fuel poverty.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report. Cases of anti-social behaviour involving criminal activity are worked on in partnership with the Police and other appropriate agencies.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 There are no direct risk and opportunity implications arising from this report.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.7 There are no direct public health implications arising from this report.

Corporate or Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 There are no direct corporate or city wide implications arising from this report. However, two performance indicators featuring in this report ('dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard' and 'energy efficiency rating of homes') are among those used to measure success against the Corporate Plan principle of increasing equality.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

### **Appendices:**

1. Appendix 1. Housing Management Performance Report Quarter 2 2016/17.

### **Background Documents:**

1. None

## Housing Management Performance Report (Quarter 2 2016/17)

This Housing Management performance report covers Quarter 2 of the financial year 2016/17. It uses the 'RAG' rating system of red, amber and green traffic light symbols to provide an indication of performance, and also trend arrows to provide an indication of movement from the previous quarter.

Status		Trend	
	Performance is below target (red)		Poorer than previous reporting period
	Performance is close to achieving target, but in need of improvement (amber)		Same as previous reporting period
	Performance is on or above target (green)		Improvement on previous reporting period

Explanations of performance have been provided for indicators which are red or amber. A total of 47 performance indicators are measured against a target, of which 34 are on target (green), six are near target (amber) and seven are below target (red).

The Quarter 4 2016/17 report will include benchmarking data from Housemark.

The icons used throughout the report are sourced from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com) and were designed by 'Freepik.'

## 1. Rent collection and current arrears

Indicators marked with an \* are accumulative throughout the year and their targets are set for the year end. Therefore, the status and trend symbols will be applied in the Quarter 4 report, once performance for the year is known.

	<b>Rent collection and current arrears indicators</b>	<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter</b> Q1 2016/17	<b>Current quarter</b> Q2 2016/17	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
1.1	Rent collected as proportion of rent due for the year (projected rate)	98.50%	98.91% (£50.57m of £51.13m)	98.85% (£50.52m of £51.11m)		
1.2	Total current tenant arrears	£780k	£557k	£586k		
1.3	Tenants served a Notice of Seeking Possession*	No target	154	359	-	-
1.4	Tenants evicted because of rent arrears*	Under 20	1	3	-	-
1.5	Rent loss due to empty dwellings	1%	0.91% (£461k of £50.94m)	1.00% (£509k of £50.96m)		
1.6	Former tenant arrears collected*	25%	7.79% (£50k of £641k)	17.80% (£103k of £580k)	-	-
1.7	Rechargeable debt collected*	20%	3.21% (£6k of £185k)	7.15% (£11k of 148k)	-	-

**Rent collection and current arrears indicators****Target  
2016/17****Previous  
quarter  
Q1 2016/17****Current  
quarter  
Q2 2016/17****Status  
against  
target****Trend  
since last  
quarter**

1.8	Universal Credit – affected tenants	No target	0.3% (32 of 11,420)	0.4% (42 of 11,408)	-	-
1.9	Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy – affected tenants (under occupiers)	No target	6.2% (709 of 11,420)	6.1% (691 of 11,408)	-	-
1.10	Benefit Cap – affected tenants	No target	0.1% (8 of 11,420)	0.1% (9 of 11,408)	-	-
1.11	Arrears related to Universal Credit	No target	2% (£13k)	3% (£15k)	-	-
1.12	Arrears related to Removal of the Spare Room Subsidy	No target	6% (£36k)	7% (£41k)	-	-
1.13	Arrears related to Benefit Cap	No target	0.3% (£2k)	0.1% (£0.4k)	-	-

### 1.14 Area breakdown of rent collected

 Rent collection area	Previous quarter Q1 2016/17	Current quarter Q2 2016/17	Trend since last quarter
North (includes Seniors Housing)	99.25% (£14.42m of £14.53m)	99.19% (£14.40m of £14.52m)	↓
West	99.11% (£10.33m of £10.43m)	99.07% (£10.33m of £10.43m)	↓
Central	98.89% (£9.08m of £9.18m)	98.83% (£9.09 of £9.19m)	↓
East	98.51% (£16.74m of £16.99m)	98.45% (£16.71m of £16.97m)	↓
All areas	98.91% (£50.57m of £51.13m)	98.85% (£50.52m of £51.11m)	↓

### 1.15 Tenants in arrears by amount

 Amount of arrears (Q1 2016/17)	All tenants
No arrears	75% (8,570)
Any arrears	25% (2,838)
... arrears of £0.01 to £99.99	13% (1,472)
... arrears of £100 to £499.99	10% (1,090)
... arrears of £500 and above	2% (276)
Total tenants	11,408

## 2. Customer services and complaints

	<b>Customer services and complaints indicators</b>	<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter Q1 2016/17</b>	<b>Current quarter Q2 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
2.1	Calls answered by Housing Customer Services Team (HCST)	92%	94% (7,239 of 7681)	93% (9,148 of 9,859)		
2.2	Customer satisfaction with HCST ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')	91%	86% (March 2016)	53% (50 of 94)		
2.3	Ease of effort to contact HCST ('very easy' or 'fairly easy' to contact)	92%	92% (March 2016)	85% (81 of 95)		
2.4	Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days – housing management	80%	69% (24 of 35)	75% (24 of 32)		
2.5	Stage 1 complaints upheld – housing management	33% or under	14% (5 of 35)	19% (6 of 32)		
2.6	Stage 1 complaints escalated to Stage 2 – housing management	10%	9% (3 of 35)	9% (3 of 32)		
2.7	Stage 2 complaints upheld – housing management	15% or under	0% (0 of 3)	0% (0 of 3)		
2.8	Housing Ombudsman Complaints upheld – housing management	20% or under	0% (none)	0% (0 of 1)		

## **Customer services and complaints commentary**

Five indicators are on target, one is near target and two are below target.

The indicators below target are:

### **Customer satisfaction with Housing Customer Services Team (HCST)**

This result for this indicator comes from the Customer Satisfaction Surveys, which are carried out by the HCST every six months. The most recent survey is from September 2016, and there here has been a significant drop in overall satisfaction – from 86% to 53% -- since the previous survey was done in March. A key reason behind this is that although a large majority of respondents (86%) agreed that ‘the person I spoke to was helpful and polite’, comparatively fewer (59%) agreed that their enquiry ‘was dealt with satisfactorily.’ Many comments to this effect regarded the quality and timeliness of follow-up work referred to other teams. Since October, improvements have been made to IT processes for capturing and monitoring cases referred by HCST to specialist teams within Housing. Another reason for the drop in overall satisfaction is greater difficulty accessing the service, which is explained in further detail in the commentary for the ‘Ease of effort to contact HCST’ indicator below.

### **Ease of effort to contact HCST**

The Customer Satisfaction Survey also indicates a drop in perceived ‘ease of effort’ to use the HCST, with the proportion of respondents expressing favourable views decreasing from 92% in March to 85% in September. The HCST has needed to adjust to a recent increase in the call volume, with the overall number of direct dial calls increasing by 28% between Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 (from 7,681 to 9,859 respectively). At the same time, the number of calls that weren’t answered increased from 442 to

711, even though the proportion answered remained at a similar level (94% and 93% respectively). Therefore, the increased call volume has made it less easy for some customers to access the HCST.

The indicator near target is:

### **Stage 1 complaints responded to within 10 working days – housing management**

Performance stands at 75% against a target of 80%. A total of 32 Stage 1 complaints were responded to, of which 24 were done within 10 working days and of which eight took longer. Although the target was missed, performance has continually improved over the most recent three quarters – from 59% (Q4 2015/16) to 69% (Q1 2016/17) to 75% (Q2 2016/17).

### 3. Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchanges

	<b>Empty home turnaround time and mutual exchange indicators</b>	<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter</b> Q1 2016/17	<b>Current quarter</b> Q2 2016/17	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
3.1	Average re-let time, excluding time spent in major works (calendar days)	18	16 (147 lets)	16 (118 lets)		
3.2	... as above for general needs properties	17	16 (110 lets)	14 (91 lets)		
3.3	... as above for Seniors Housing properties	30	16 (37 lets)	23 (27 lets)		
3.4	Average re-let time, including time spent in major works (calendar days)	No target	58 (147 lets)	42 (118 lets)	-	-
3.5	Decisions on mutual exchange applications made within 42 calendar days (statutory timescale)	100%	100% (56 of 56)	100% (51 of 51)		

### 3.6 Long term empty dwellings by ward (empty 6 weeks or more as of 1 October 2016)

Ward name (excludes those with no long term empty properties)	No. dwellings	Average days empty for	Range of days empty for	Comment
Central Hove	1	88	88-88	One flat ready to let.
Goldsmid	1	74	74-74	One flat ready to let.
Hangleton and Knoll	3	151	46-347	One house for extension/refurbishment (empty 351 days), one flat in major works and one house ready to let.
Hanover and Elm Grove	18	275	60-858	All studio flats within Stonehurst Court (longest empty 858 days) which is to be closed as part of Seniors Housing scheme review.
Moulsecomb and Bevendean	7	277	53-522	Five houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 522 days), one Seniors Housing studio flat to be converted into larger dwellings, and one house ready to let.
Patcham	6	107	53-172	Six Seniors Housing studio flats to be converted into larger dwellings.
South Portslade	5	290	81-522	Three houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 522 days) and two Seniors Housing studio flats to be converted into larger dwellings.
Queens Park	2	53	53-53	Two flats ready to let.
Wish	2	407	305-508	Two houses for extension/refurbishment (longest empty 508 days).
Total	45	234	46-858	The dwelling which has been empty longest (858 days) is a Seniors studio flat in Hanover and Elm Grove, as per above.

#### 4. Repairs and maintenance

 <b>Repairs and maintenance indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter</b> Q1 2016/17	<b>Current quarter</b> Q2 2016/17	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
4.1	Emergency repairs completed in time	99%	99.8% (2,739 of 2,745)	99.7% (3,350 of 3,359)		
4.2	Routine repairs completed in time	99%	99.4% (4,097 of 4,121)	99.7% (4,833 of 4,843)		
4.3	Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)	14 days	16 days	20 days		
4.4	Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made	97%	97.1% (11,535 of 11,879)	96.4% (9,732 of 10,094)		
4.5	Tenant satisfaction with repairs ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')	96%	96.4% (1,013 of 1,051)	95.2% (374 of 393)		
4.6	Responsive repairs passing post-inspection	97%	95.8% (1,015 of 1,059)	96.6% (1,284 of 1,329)		
4.7	Repairs completed at first visit	92%	89.8% (6,164 of 6,866)	89.8% (7,370 of 8,202)		
4.8	Cancelled repair jobs	Under 5%	7.3% (699 of 9,624)	6.7% (671 of 10,011)		

 <b>Repairs and maintenance indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter Q1 2016/17</b>	<b>Current quarter Q2 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
4.9	Dwellings meeting Decent Homes Standard	100%	100% (11,552 of 11,552)	100% (11,555 of 11,555)		
4.10	Energy efficiency rating of homes (SAP 2009)	64.4	65.2	65.5		
4.11	Planned works passing post-inspection	97%	100% (317 of 317)	100% (332 of 332)		
4.12	Stock with a gas supply with up-to-date gas certificates	100%	100% (10,083 of 10,083)	100% (10,084 of 10,084)		
4.13	Empty properties passing post-inspection	98%	100% (145 of 145)	100% (127 of 127)		
4.14	Lifts – average time taken (hours) to respond	2 hours	2h 10m	1h 56m		
4.15	Lifts restored to service within 24 hours	95%	94.6% (106 of 112)	97.1% (134 of 138)		
4.16	Lifts – average time to restore service when not within 24 hours	7 days	3 days (19 days, 6 lifts)	3 days (13 days, 4 lifts)		

 <b>Repairs and maintenance indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter Q1 2016/17</b>	<b>Current quarter Q2 2016/17</b>	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
4.17	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered	90%	96% (20,909 of 21,779)	93% (20,071 of 21,586)		
4.18	Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds	75%	73% (15,270 of 20,909)	58% (11,618 of 20,071)		
4.19	Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time	5 mins	7m 2s	13m 40s		

## Repairs and maintenance commentary

Eleven indicators are on target, three are near target and five are below target.

The indicators below target are:

### Average time to complete routine repairs (calendar days)

The average time taken has increased by four days, from 16 during Quarter 1 to 20 during Quarter 2. This is because there have been a number of specialist and complex works which have taken a long time to complete, and these are now affecting the average. Whilst this performance measure has not been met, the requirement of routine orders being completed within 20 working days has been met for 99.7% (4,833 of 4,843) of such jobs.

### Repairs completed at first visit

Performance on repairs completed at first visit, at 89.8 during Quarter 2, is 2.2% points below the 92% target and has remained the same since Quarter 1. This is due to a change in Mears' process which means any job with an appointment for a post-inspection is automatically counted as taking more than one visit to complete. Mears are currently working on updating their reporting system to reflect this process change.

### Cancelled repair jobs

Mears have committed to reducing the number of jobs that are cancelled due to 'incorrect instructions' or 'duplicate jobs', as these jointly account for 35% (235 out of 671) of jobs which were raised and later cancelled during Quarter 2. A further 236 jobs were cancelled at the request of the tenant. Examples of other reasons why jobs were cancelled include the operative being unable to get access to the property or no work being required.

### Repairs Helpdesk – calls answered within 20 seconds

Performance from quarter one to quarter two has reduced by 15% points, from 73% to 58%, and is now 17% points below

target. This is due to an increase in staff turnover and the resultant time spent training new staff, but performance is anticipated to be back on target by Quarter 3.

### Repairs Helpdesk – longest wait time

This indicator measures the longest time that any caller has waited for their call to be answered during Quarter 2, which was 13 minutes and 40 seconds. Only three call handlers were working that day, two of whom were new starters. The second longest wait was 8 minutes and 1 second. The average time that a caller waited during Quarter 2 was 56 seconds.

The indicators near target are:

### Appointments kept by contractor as proportion of appointments made

Despite seeing a minor decrease of 0.7% points between Quarter 1 and Quarter 2, from 97.1% 96.4%, the number of appointments kept by contractor remains close to the 97% target.

### Tenant satisfaction with repairs ('very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied')

The result of 95.2% has been affected by a decline in the sample size from 1,051 during Quarter 1 to 393 during Quarter 2. This is a result of higher than usual staff turnover (resulting in more time spent training new staff). Mears have committed to carrying out more telephone surveys over the coming months.

### Responsive repairs passing post-inspection

Performance has improved from 95.8% during Quarter 1 to 96.6% during Quarter 2. During the latter, there were 1,329 post-inspections carried out (a sample of 16.2%) of which 45 failed. The reasons for the failed inspections are as follows: 9 needed corrections to the Schedule of Rates (SOR) codes used; 27 due to poor quality work; 8 due to extra works being required to complete the job; and one failed based on the tenant's perception.

## 5. Estates Service

	Estates Service indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q1 2016/17	Current quarter Q2 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
5.1	Cleaning quality inspection pass rate	99%	100% (194 of 194)	100% (176 of 176)		
5.2	Estates Response Team quality inspection pass rate	99%	100% (195 of 195)	100% (178 of 178)		
5.3	Cleaning tasks completed	99%	98.7% (13,146 of 13,323)	99.6% (13,493 of 13,543)		
5.4	Bulk waste removed within 7 working days	93%	93% (707 of 760)	99.6% (840 of 843)		
5.5	Light replacements/repairs completed within 3 working days	99%	99% (171 of 173)	100% (68 of 68)		
5.6	Mobile warden jobs completed within 3 working days	96%	98% (1,282 of 1,305)	97% (971 of 998)		
5.7	Incidents of drug paraphernalia collected and reported to the Police	No target	15	20	-	-

## 6. Anti-social behaviour (ASB)

 Anti-social behaviour (ASB) indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q1 2016/17	Current quarter Q2 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
6.1 Victim satisfaction with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with*	88%	93% (13 of 14)	89% (16 of 18)		
6.2 Tenants evicted due to ASB	No target	0	1	-	-
6.3 ASB cases closed without the need for legal action	No target	85% (53 of 62)	80% (37 of 46)	-	-

\*Year to date indicator measuring telephone survey respondents who were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with.

## 6.6 Reports of ASB incidents by type

 <b>Type of ASB incident</b>	<b>Previous quarter</b> Q1 2016/17	<b>Current quarter</b> Q2 2016/17
Noise incidents	21% (119)	16% (86)
Harassment / threats incidents	25% (144)	29% (153)
Hate-related incidents	1% (8)	2% (9)
Vandalism incidents	4% (20)	5% (28)
Pets / animals incidents	15% (83)	8% (44)
Vehicles incidents	0% (1)	2% (12)
Drugs incidents	8% (46)	6% (34)
Alcohol related incidents	1% (8)	2% (8)
Domestic violence / abuse incidents	3% (18)	1% (5)
Other violence incidents	4% (22)	6% (32)
Rubbish incidents	5% (30)	8% (43)
Garden nuisance incidents	7% (41)	4% (19)
Communal areas / loitering incidents	3% (17)	5% (26)
Prostitution / Sex incidents	1% (6)	1% (3)
Other criminal behaviour incidents	2% (9)	4% (23)
Total ASB incidents	100% (572)	100% (525)

## 6.7 Reports of ASB incidents by ward

 Ward name	Previous quarter Q1 2016/17	Current quarter Q2 2016/17	Incidents per 1,000 properties Q2 2016/17	Change between quarters Q1 to Q2
Brunswick and Adelaide	0	0	0	0
Central Hove	4	2	22	-2
East Brighton	88	88	35	0
Goldsmid	14	12	26	-2
Hangleton and Knoll	43	51	30	8
Hanover and Elm Grove	29	18	33	-11
Hollingdean and Stanmer	92	58	38	-34
Hove Park	1	2	118	1
Moulsecoomb and Bevendean	54	50	30	-4
North Portslade	25	33	66	8
Patcham	16	10	17	-6
Preston Park	0	2	16	2
Queen's Park	116	97	46	-19
Regency	0	2	67	2
Rottingdean Coastal	0	1	34	1
South Portslade	13	22	51	9
St. Peter's and North Laine	28	30	57	2
Westbourne	6	3	20	-3
Wish	7	12	24	5
Withdean	6	12	211	6
Woodingdean	30	20	40	-10
Total	572	525	37	-47

## 7. Tenancy management

 <b>Tenancy management indicators</b>		<b>Target 2016/17</b>	<b>Previous quarter</b> Q1 2016/17	<b>Current quarter</b> Q2 2016/17	<b>Status against target</b>	<b>Trend since last quarter</b>
7.1	Properties taken back due to tenancy fraud (year to date indicator)	30 by year end	2	3	-	-
7.2	Tenancy fraud cases investigated and closed	No target	29	59	-	-
7.3	New tenancy fraud cases	No target	49	39	-	-
7.4	Total open tenancy fraud cases	No target	121	101	-	-
7.5	Closed Tenancy Sustainment Officer cases where the tenancy was sustained	97%	97% (35 of 36)	98% (40 of 41)		
7.6	Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years	90%	86% (8,782 of 10,259)	88% (9,005 of 10,253)		

## Tenancy management commentary

One indicator is on target (green), one is near target (amber) and four are monitored without targets.

The indicator near target is:

### **Secure general needs tenants who have had a tenancy visit within the last 5 years**

This indicator measures the completion of tenancy visits, which are carried out every five years for general needs households with secure (non-introductory) tenancies. Of the 10,253 households who require such a visit, 9,024 have had one within the past five years, and performance therefore stands at 88% against a target of 90%. Although the target has not been met, performance has improved by 2% points during Quarter 2 and the target is within reach.

## 8. Seniors Housing

	Seniors Housing indicators	Target 2016/17	Previous quarter Q1 2016/17	Current quarter Q2 2016/17	Status against target	Trend since last quarter
8.1	Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months	98%	91% (788 of 864)	95% (815 of 860)		
8.2	Residents living in schemes offering regular social activities	95%	97% (838 of 864)	97% (831 of 860)		
8.3	Residents living in schemes offering regular exercise activities	65%	66% (571 of 864)	80% (689 of 860)		
8.4	Schemes hosting events in collaboration with external organisations	90%	91% (21 of 23)	96% (22 23)		

## **Seniors Housing commentary**

Three indicators are on target and one is near target.

The indicator near target is:

### **Residents who have had a tenancy visit within the last 12 months**

Performance stands at 95% against a target of 98%. Although the target has not been met, performance has improved from 91% to 95% since the previous quarter. Therefore, the target is within reach and is likely to be met during the next quarter.

