

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR Q1 PERFORMANCE REPORT

Recommendation 1: There should be clarification about which, if any, of the corporate performance indicators include data from Oxford Direct Services or Oxford City Housing Limited and the way in which these were used, particularly in reference to whether under measure BI001 (percentage of Council spend with local businesses) Oxford Direct Services is recorded as a recipient of Council spend, a contributor to Council spend or both?

Response:

Caterina Abrusci

The figure BI001 records the Council spend with local business and this does include the spending with Oxford Direct Services.

Further measures will be considered for next quarter.

Recommendation 2: That the wording of measure ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year) should be reviewed and that information on the methodology for calculating the Council's anticipated carbon footprint be made available to members of the Scrutiny Committee.

Response:

No response yet, This will be considered for the next meeting.

Recommendation 3: That indicator LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities) be supplemented with two further measures: i) revenue vs previous periods, and ii) progress against maintenance targets.

Response:

Lucy Cherry

Measure LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities)

The organisation agreed for this to be retained as a corporate measure for the reporting period 2019/20. The Council has strong baseline data that supports visualising direction of travel (+ / -) and (where needed) to challenge improvement by Fusion. The measure should remain in 19/20.

Consideration could be given to place this as a Service Measure in 2020/21. However, this would be an organisational decision and should also consider and reflect wider contractual KPI requirements.

Progress against maintenance targets

A prudent output KPI and the Council would need to agree with Fusion how this could be measured and reported (self-reporting by Fusion).

The Agreement for the continuous development, management and operation of leisure services in Oxford could be reviewed to consider alternative opportunity for KPI amendment.

If there is desire to progress this approach this may require a contractual variation. As such, it would be prudent to consider any impact on the contract financial schedule. Satisfaction elements do currently include building condition and cleanliness, which is already a helpful and industry wide KPI.

Revenue vs previous periods

Under the principles of the contract revenue is a risk for Fusion, they also retain all revenue under the terms of the contract. It is an output based KPI and the Council should be encouraging measures for outcomes. This suggests there is no added value of having Revenue vs previous periods as a KPI.

Furthermore, a measure of this type would be public information and as such may breach the contract Commercial Sensitivity clause.

The current contract is very input v output based. However as part of the work for Fusions 2020/21 Service Plan and through the Leisure Partnership Board, the Council could perhaps look to work with Fusion to agree more outcome based KPI's (at no additional cost to either partner).

Recommendation 4: That measure CoS031 (Effective delivery of the capital programme) be changed to either i) disbursements, or ii) contractual commitments as a percentage of budgetary targets.

Response:

Hagan Lewisman

We had recently discussed this measure in the service area managers meeting and we were potentially looking to discontinue this given that there is now a corporate PMO office in the Council monitoring projects.

It does reflect milestones and I will follow this up.

Recommendation 5: That in light of the challenges facing the Welfare Reform team, WR001 (Number of people moved into work by the Welfare Reform Programme) is no longer realistic and that a revised target be agreed.

Recommendation 6: That in light of the growth of Universal Credit and the increasing influence factors external to the Council have on the delivery of this criterion that Cabinet considers whether indicator CS054 (Time taken to determine DHP applications) remains fit for purpose

Response to 5 & 6:

James Pickering

Paul Wilding has been discussing these measures. Our early thoughts are to reduce the target figure of WR001 to a more realistic figure and to replace CS054 with a more helpful measure that reflects the growing complexity of the cases we are required to assess.