

## RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR Q1 PERFORMANCE REPORT

### A. 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 from Caterina Abrusci**

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

### B. 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 from Paul Robinson**

The carbon data we report, and measures we implement to reduce carbon under ED002, cover the estate and operational work of the main Council and ODSL and OCHL (emissions associated with office, vehicle, and plant use in the main).

Recommendation: Change measure wording from

ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year)

to

ED002 (Implementation of measures calculated to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year below what it would otherwise have been).

On the further comments about the methodology, I think that the Procedure Note with reference to the latest Carbon Management Plan (CMP link is included within the Proc Note document) does fully explain the methodology employed.

However the existing CMP link is to a file on the M:\ drive, which Councillors may not be able to access. Access by Councillors could be ensured by changing the link to the version of the report on Council public website –

which is available for anyone to view.....

[https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/download/552/carbon\\_management\\_strategy](https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/download/552/carbon_management_strategy)

With access to the CMP then the methodology used for ED002 is explained fully I think.

It is important to note that reporting on actual greenhouse gas emissions arising each year from Oxford City Council energy and fuel use from its estate and operations is reported annually, separately. This is done according to a statutory duty placed on the Council from central government since 2014.

Reports on 17/18 and previous years can be found here...

[https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20062/carbon\\_reduction\\_and\\_energy\\_saving/973/greenhouse\\_gas\\_ghg\\_emissions\\_report](https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20062/carbon_reduction_and_energy_saving/973/greenhouse_gas_ghg_emissions_report)

### **C. 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 from 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 versus 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).

**D. 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 from 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.

**E. 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.**

**Response from Paul Wilding**

Recommendation: To reduce the WR001 target by 25% to reflect the reduction in staffing.

**F. 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 from Paul Wilding**

Recommendation: To leave the CS054 target as it is for the remainder of the year, but to use the narrative to the measure to show the different assessment times for Universal Credit cases and Housing Benefit cases. I would propose to change this measure for next year, effectively splitting it in two.

## Supplementary Questions Submitted by Councillor James Fry

1. BI001 – Are Council Companies considered to be local businesses in these figures? If so, it would be good to know how much of this figure is represented by ODS and the Housing Company.

### Response from Caterina Abrusci:

**The total spend of the Council with local businesses for November 2019 is 73.18%. This figure includes ODS, ODSTL and OCHL. Taking out these clients, the total spend of Oxford City Council with local business is 31.37%.**

2. CS054 – I can understand Paul's comment, but was going to ask whether we face any penalties for moving above 10 days, other than having more worried applicants? Since this is a non-Statutory duty (as far as I know), I imagine that there is no penalty.

### Response from Paul Wilding:

**There are No penalties applied for going over 10 days**

3. ED002 – Is the REGO green electricity truly additional green power, or is it merely that OCC is buying more green power, leaving others to buy the displaced fossil fuel-generated power, i.e., there's no net increase in green electricity supply? If so, I would not count this in the result or target. If Craig is at the meeting, I'll be intrigued to know what he thinks.

### Response from Paul Robinson

**ED002 is the corporate 5%/y carbon reduction target by implemented carbon reduction measures. Monthly progress reporting is via Corvu.**

**We have included the carbon benefit from renewable electricity purchase in recent years. Under current OCC policy on energy purchase we have been able to buy certified renewable electricity (REGO – see # below) if the price is not more than 2% higher than standard electricity.**

**This means we have not been able to know that we will buy renewable electricity every year, as price premium goes above 2%.**

**To treat this conservatively within in our reporting process, we take the carbon saved within a year of renewable electricity purchase (as it appears on the REGO Certificate) and we divide this figure by 21. This is based on experience of existing land based UK wind farms having a life of 21 years. By treating the saved carbon in this annualised way we are equating with other investments we make in carbon reduction measures such as – say – very efficient LED lighting. We make the investment in new light fitting and the carbon savings are made annually over the life of the light fittings (15-20years).**

Going forward there is a corporate commitment to buy renewable electricity every year, so the carbon savings will not need to be accounted for in this way.

(On the issue of the value of REGO electricity purchase and the cost premium paid – it is intended to stimulate the market in renewable energy and hence influence investment in more renewable energy generation capacity such as wind and solar, nationally.)

Post Climate Emergency/Citizens Assembly, OCC will contract to buy REGO electricity, and look for more direct ways of buying renewable electricity from known generation sites.

**#REGO: Extract from Which report...**

**Renewable Energy Guarantee of Origins (REGO):** A REGO certificate is issued to a generator for every megawatt hour (MWh) of renewable power they put into the grid.... .....Energy firms must use them to prove the source of their electricity each year, to energy regulator Ofgem.

<https://www.which.co.uk/news/2019/09/how-green-is-your-energy-tariff/>

4. FN045 – How do we stand in terms of penalties for overpayment this year?

**Response from Laura Bessell:**

**FN045** % of overpaid HB. Cllr Fry has asked where we are in relation to the LA error rate and whether we are going to be capped with DWP funding as we are over the thresholds.

In terms of this year's performance, as of November 2019, the Service is under the lower threshold by £7k and the upper threshold by £23k. We still are working on this data up into Quarter 4 and the current forecast shows that this position could potentially remain and we will attract 100% based upon performance. We have an external audit review in September 2020 for a final decision.

5. CoS031 - I would press strongly for this to be included in the monitoring report next quarter. It's an important part of our intention of improving the OCC performance.

**Response from Nigel Kennedy:**

To be clear the measure CoS031 is just in relation to Community Services and is not a target for the corporate capital programme. In this

respect Hagan's response to the original recommendation is accurate in that the PMO will be picking this up.

If Cllr Fry is referring to the Corporate measure agreed by the Finance Panel of 80% of original Capital Budget to be spent. This is reported quarterly to the Cabinet and Finance Panel.

6. What's happened to other Fusion/Leisure Centre measures, such as attendance, revenues, etc.? I am sure we have requested to be available regularly.

**Response from Ian Brooke:**

**Annual report that goes to cabinet in the Spring and this incorporate the Fusion Service Plan. In January as part of the BDO Audit we will be reporting progress on the Customer Service and Data Audit that was conducted at Fusion. Other high level performance information is already contained within the Council's Corporate Dashboard and this could be shared at the meeting in January for a decision to be made if this is something that would be required to be appended to the Quarterly Scrutiny Report .**