**Appendix 2 - Scrutiny recommendation tracker – April 2018**

Total recommendations (year to date): 86

Agreed 70 81%

Agreed in part 12 14%

Not agreed 4 5%

**20 MARCH 2018 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**The Oxford Living Wage Review Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agree?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1 - That the Council continues to pay all its staff and agency workers at least the Oxford Living Wage, which should continue to be set at 95% of the London Living Wage rate. | Yes | Existing policy |
| 2 - That the Council includes in its advice to businesses on selling to the Council a statement about the Council being an accredited living wage employer and the benefits of paying the Oxford Living Wage in terms of best value, wellbeing and quality | Yes | We advise our suppliers that they are expected to pay their staff the Oxford Living wage |
| 3 - That the Council continues to require suppliers with contract values over £100k to pay their staff and subcontracted staff working on Council projects at least the Oxford Living Wage. | Yes | As above but we cannot enforce this |
| 4 - That the Council maintains a watching brief on the legal position (including any emerging case law) relating to public bodies requiring contractors to pay their staff a living wage, with a view to strengthening the obligations on the Council’s own suppliers and their subcontractors, should the opportunity to do so arise in future. | Yes | Yes, we will continue to review the situation |
| 5 – That consideration is given to whether and how the Council could periodically monitor the payment of the Oxford Living Wage by suppliers and their subcontractors so that concerns could be raised with suppliers if they were found to not be keeping to their commitments. | Yes | We will consider whether and how the council might do this. We may seek to obtain confirmation of Living wage payment from suppliers and contractors by including such provision as a contract term to be agreed between the two parties. |
| 6 - That the Council ensures that it remains a fully accredited living wage employer. | Yes | This will continue. |
| 7 - That the Council commits to working with the Living Wage Foundation and the broad coalition of stakeholders, especially local trade unions, on making Oxford a Living Wage City. This could include the City Council promoting the payment of the Foundation’s ‘Real Living Wage’ to local businesses as a step in the right direction towards committing to pay the higher Oxford Living Wage from a future date. | Yes | This is a sensible, staged approach that will support the policy of explaining the Living wage policy to employers, and partnership working to secure a greater level of adoption over time. |
| 8 - That the Council creates, maintains and promotes a list of local employers paying the Oxford Living Wage and makes this list available on the Council website, and newsletter, as well as linking to the Living Wage Foundation’s map of employers paying the Real Living Wage. | Yes, in part | This can be managed by the Economic Development Team with input from other parts of the Council. We would not set up a separate list but provide a link on the council website to the Living Wage Foundation (LWF). LWF are the accrediting body so we would promote their list of accredited employers locally |
| 9 - That the Council makes it very clear that in most circumstances grants will only be awarded to organisations paying their employed staff no less than the Oxford Living Wage, and contacts other local public sector commissioners urging them to do likewise. | Yes | The Charity Leaders Forum is considering whether they can make a formal commitment on behalf of their members. However, the Council’s grants programme involves a great many bodies employing volunteers, staff members and pro bono workers and it would be very difficult to impose this requirement. We suggest instead that we make it clear in the grant letters that employed staff should normally be paid at least the Real Living Wage, and preferably, the OLW. |
| 10 - That the Council puts the issue of the Oxford Living Wage and the Real Living Wage on the agenda of the Economic Growth Steering Group to seek ongoing input into ways of boosting its adoption. | Yes | We are asking the Economic Growth Steering group to set up a Task and Finish group on actions employers can take to support a fairer economy. Living Wage will be a key part of that agenda. |
| 11 - That the Council hosts an annual Oxford Living Wage seminar or symposium, which could involve local employers, trade unions, campaigners, universities, faith leaders and the Living Wage Foundation, to monitor progress and promote the case for the Oxford Living Wage and encourage employers to sign up to that or the Real Living Wage. | In part | We will aim to ensure that we hold an annual event, in partnership with others as appropriate, targeting employers who wish to discuss workforce issues relating to pay, recruitment practices, training and development, and ways of making the most of their workforce within the CSR context. The OLW can be a key part of this discussion, but other aspects of the wider agenda will also be important to secure business engagement. |
| 12 - That the Council allocates responsibility to a designated officer to support and oversee the promotion of the Real Living Wage and the Oxford Living Wage. This should include a suite of ‘business as usual’ activities, as well as specific campaigns, for example around Living Wage Week (building on the successful communications campaign of Living Wage Week 2017). | Yes | The Economic Team can identify an officer to work with colleagues to:   * Undertake promotion during living wage week * Promote living wage adoption as part of ongoing business engagement activity * Commission Research into the barriers to living wage adoption and seek a best practice approaches in line with the agreed recommendations (see 13) * Monitor the RLW accreditation measures over time. * Undertake one related event per annum (see item 11). |
| 13 - That the Council sets additional targets for the promotion of the ‘living wage’, with at least one such target monitored at the corporate level:  a) The number of accredited living wage employers based in the city (e.g. doubling the current number within 2 years).  b) The number of local employers paying the Oxford Living Wage. | In part | The principle of having three targets per corporate priority is one that we want to maintain. At this time, rather than create a new target of the type proposed by Scrutiny, we propose to undertake research in 2018/19 to better understand the position on Living Wage accreditation among Oxford’s employers and to use the budget allocation of £5k to support a broader campaign to increase employer adoption of the Oxford Living Wage.  The Oxford Strategic Partnership has identified this as an important strand of activity for 2018/19 and may link up with research being undertaken by Oxford Brookes University Business School. All these activities will be underpinned by communications campaigns to promote the Oxford Living Wage/Living Wage.  This commitment will be added to the list of Corporate Plan Priorities for 2018/19. |
| 14 - That the Council commits to flying the Living Wage Employer flag when pay rates are raised every April. Consideration should also be given to flying the Living Wage Employer flag during part or all of Living Wage Week (which would require resolving a clash with an existing commitment to fly the Royal British Legion flag during the same week). | In part | This will be considered on each annual occasion that a new rate is announced and will be done if there is flagpole capacity and no precedence given to another organisation’s flag. The commitment to fly the Royal British Legion flag in the week of Remembrance Sunday will not change. |
| 15 – That CEB identifies a specific member to lead on the Oxford Living Wage work over the coming year | Yes | We will continue with the model used for the scrutiny review and will consider which portfolio holder will have a lead on this. |

**13 FEBRUARY 2018 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**Review of Community Protection Notices – Executive Board Member for Community Safety**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agreed?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That a written procedure is produced which required that legal advice is sought and documented in all complex cases that could result in the issuing of a Community Protection Notice or other legal sanction. | Yes | This is current practice. Advice is sought on legal options prior to drafting a legal sanction, and on the sanction once drafted. |
| 1. That in future any informal cross-party meetings, such as those convened for this subject, should be fully documented (i.e. agendas and minutes) with appropriate provision made for members to consider confidential or exempt material at such meetings. | Yes |  |

**Update of the Corporate Plan 2018 – Leader of the Council**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agree?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That the Council sets an additional corporate target for wider engagement in sport, exercise and leisure activities in the city. | Partially | The principle of having three targets per corporate priority is one that we want to maintain. It is important to retain a measure of the success of Fusion Leisure in maintaining and developing the use of the City Council’s facilities. We are considering modifying the existing success measure by using either a target based on the Sport England Active Lives survey data or our internal contractual target with Fusion. Additionally, we propose to break down the overall usage target by measuring the number of users from each of the ‘hard to reach’ target groups.  Additionally, we propose to work up the ideas that were discussed at Scrutiny about the use of different venues owned by the Council where sport and exercise take place (playing fields, community centre etc) with a view to creating a new series of data for the longer term tracking of how active our community is.  It is worth adding that Active Lives data covers a wider range of activities than sport and are published annually. The most recent reporting showed Oxford to be among the most active places in the country. |
| 1. That the Council sets additional targets for the promotion of the ‘living wage’, with at least one such target monitored at the corporate level:   a) The number of accredited living wage employers based in the city (e.g. doubling the current number of 69 within 2 years).  b) The number of local employers paying the Oxford Living Wage. | Not at this time | The principle of having three targets per corporate priority is one that we want to maintain. At this time, rather than create a new target of the type proposed by Scrutiny, we propose to undertake research in 2018/19 to better understand the position on Living Wage accreditation among Oxford’s employers and to use the budget allocation of £5k to support a broader campaign to increase employer adoption of the Oxford Living Wage.  The Oxford Strategic Partnership has identified this as an important strand of activity for 2018/19 and may link up with research being undertaken by Oxford Brookes University Business School. All these activities will be underpinned by communications campaigns to promote the Oxford Living Wage/Living Wage.  This commitment will be added to the list of Corporate Plan Priorities for 2018/19 |

**Budget 2018/19 – Executive Board Member for Finance and Asset Management**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agree?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That Council Tax is increased by 2.99% in 2018/19 and 2019/20. | Y | Recommended to Council |
| 2 - That the Council continues to charge the maximum premium on Council Tax charges for second homes and empty homes and aims to utilise new powers, when available, to increase Council Tax charges further on empty properties. | Y | Recommended to Council |
| 3. That the Council continues to make the case to HM Government through the Local Government Association that the issue of delays to valuations undertaken by the Valuation Office Agency should be urgently addressed. | Y | Council officers have had several meetings with the VOA in relation to the delays in adding rating assessments for properties at the Westgate. Some progress has been made and 11 of the larger assessments out of 91 occupied properties are now on the list. The performance of the VOA is a nationwide problem and the Council will continue to raise this issue where and when it can. |
| 4. That provision is made for additional resources for City Centre Management, including help in preparing for a bid for a Business Improvement District (BID), in view of the pressures upon city centre retail businesses located away from the Westgate Shopping Centre. | In part | The Westgate has initially had a very positive effect on the city centre. We have seen a sustained increase in footfall so far. A number of extra resources have already been made available (for instance, significant capital expenditure on the Covered Market and extra street cleaning). Officers are working to develop a City Centre Partnership, which we hope will prove a catalyst to a BID. At present this work is funded by existing resources.. |
| 5. That annual garden waste collection fees are increased from the current level of £45 to the target price of £52 per year in 2018/19. | N | At this stage we feel the current level of charge is appropriate. |
| 6. That future budget reports clearly set out the total value returned to the Council by its Direct Services companies, as well as the dividend. | Y | Agreed |
| 7. That consideration is given to the option of borrowing to invest (e.g. in commercial properties within the city), drawing on external advice. | Y | Work is currently underway to examine the feasibility of doing this, taking account of any risks of doing so |
| 8. That a review is undertaken to identify whether the Council has the necessary skills, processes and constitutional rules in place to be an active and agile operator in the local property market, while maintaining a watching brief on any emerging government plans to limit such activities. | Y | The work identified above will review the arrangements in terms of governance, capacity and skills to be able to undertake property acquisitions as well as taking account of emerging government policy in this area. |
| 9. That the Council plans to transfer the maximum number of five properties per year to its housing companies (recognising that decisions to purchase the properties are a matter for the companies). | Y | Agreed |
| 10. That the Council maintains the Homelessness reserve at its current level by funding all additional spending on homelessness services from revenue. | In part | Following our budget consultation, we are proposing to top up the homelessness reserve. We will however make some calls on this money to fund our partnership activity in this area, and may need to draw on it further in the future. |
| 11. That the Council continues to engage with partner organisations on the issue of plugging the emerging shortfall in funding for the homelessness pathway from 2019/20. | Y | Agreed. This is a major priority, in particular in our discussions with the County Council. |
| 12. That the Council continues to engage with Oxfordshire County Council to resolve quickly the situation whereby recycling credits paid to the city by the county do not cover higher disposal costs. | Y | This approach has been made and an official response received. The request has been declined on the basis that market prices go up and down, we happen to be in a low demand part of cycle, city council has to manage these ups and downs, and the County has no money. |
| 13. That waste disposal costs are remodelled to take account of the expected impacts on market prices of China’s decision to ban plastic waste imports. | N | None of our plastic waste currently leaves the UK and we have a contract around services and price. Longer term this may become an issue for us. We are seeking to introduce a local recycling transfer station to improve our position in the market this would mitigate the impacts of this issue which at present are unknown. It is therefore premature to budget on a revised basis but attention has been flagged as a risk going forward and will be reflected in view on contingencies. |
| 14. That pension provisions are kept under review given that an actuarial triennial review will take place within the MTFP period, and may have a budgetary impact in year 4. | Y | Agreed |
| 15. That greater effort is made to encourage and identify ‘invest to save’ projects. | Y | The Council has a good track record of invest to save projects although they are not always transparent through the budget process. Examples include, Oxpens temporary car park, the Admin Review, Removal of desk top phones for mobile phones, Fee earning from enhanced Investigations Team, Waste recycling station reduced transportation charges, Additional parking spaces Seacourt Park and Ride, reduced temporary accommodation charges from £20 million investment in homes for the homeless |

**Air Quality Status Report 2016 – Executive Board Member for Climate Change and Cleaner Greener Oxford**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agree?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That the Council looks again at whether there is an opportunity to bid for some of the £4.5m of government funding available for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. | Yes | We consider opportunities for all grant funding in detail and have already been successful in funding of charging points across the city. |
| 2. That the Council keeps a watching brief on the emerging science on the benefits of different types of vegetation as absorbers of pollutants. | Yes |  |
| 3. That the Council engages with Hackney Carriage drivers about the issue of idling and continues with the enforcement of anti-idling and the promotion of electric vehicles. | Yes |  |