

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
1.1	That the Director for Public Health, as a joint appointment, should contribute to the budget and corporate plan scrutiny process in future years	Agree	Carole Burgoyne	October 2011
2.1	Where <b>shared service arrangements with other local authorities</b> are being developed, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be given an oversight role. Partners should be involved at the earliest opportunity to ensure a more joined up approach in delivery of shared services.	Agree with Overview and Scrutiny Management Board having a role in scrutinising relevant decisions and proposals for shared service arrangements and provisions	Ian Gallin and Adam Broome.	Ongoing

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
2.2	Where delivery plans will result in a <b>reduction of service to citizens</b> , modelling should be undertaken to assess the impact on individuals, households and communities. This should include both the differential impact on those groups within each neighbourhood and the cumulative impact on those who are affected by more than one change. Account should be taken in undertaking the modelling of income levels.	Detailed Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) have been undertaken on the budget and a commitment given to undertake further assessments, as required, on the implementation stages of different elements of the plans. Our EIAs already encompass aspects beyond the statutory requirements (eg health inequalities) and extending the process yet further is not considered appropriate or proportionate.	All delivery plan leads	Milestones to be set out in delivery plans
2.3	<b>Value for Money and performance benchmarking</b> information against the Council's 'family group' should form part of the performance management reporting that is submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.	Agree	Ian Gallin and Adam Broome jointly in consultation with CMT	March 2011

Ref	Recommendation	Responses	By who	By when
2.4	<p>The <b>Corporate Income Recovery Plan</b> relating to how the Council collects the money owed to it from a variety of sources should be the subject of pre-adoption scrutiny by the Support Services scrutiny panel. Options relating to cash collection as set out in the Corporate Support Services budget delivery plan should be included.</p>	<p>The Council's performance in collecting income will continue to be reported through the quarterly performance and finance monitoring report. Similarly the Council's delivery of all budget delivery plans will be 'traffic-lighted' via the quarterly performance and finance monitoring report. These quarterly reports will enable the Board to scrutinise progress on income collection.</p>	Adam Broome	Ongoing
2.5	<p>That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board receive a progress report on the <b>Council's new procurement initiatives</b>, namely Procure to Pay, buyer rollout, and 'sell to Plymouth'. The Board will monitor, through the quarterly performance and finance monitoring reports, ongoing work around these projects which equate to £4m savings over the next 3 years.</p>	Agree	Adam Broome	June 2011

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
2.6	That governance and scrutiny arrangements are agreed between the Scrutiny Management Board and the Cabinet and the Corporate Management Team with regard to the <b>prioritisation of the capital programme and the 'invest to save' programme.</b>	A review of capital programme arrangements is to be carried out, focussing firstly on governance arrangements, and secondly on prioritisation of schemes based on reduction of available resources. Involvement of scrutiny will be included within this review.	Anthony Payne	June 2011
2.7	That <b>draft proposals for years 3, 4 &amp; 5 of the capital programme</b> be prepared for this budget and as part of the ongoing budget setting process.	This is not considered appropriate, given the current uncertainty about capital funding arrangements, and the importance of maintaining a realistic, and funded capital programme	CMT	N/A
2.8	That a proposal for a <b>small grants scheme for community and voluntary groups</b> is developed and implemented jointly with Plymouth 2020	Agreed that work will be taken forward on this recommendation. This would need to form part of the discussions with LSP partners with all partners funding contributions being considered.	Ian Gallin	April 2011

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
2.9	That urgent consideration is given to addressing the <b>funding shortfall for the Volunteer Centre and infrastructure support for community and voluntary groups</b> created by the ending of Local Area Agreement Performance Reward Grant.	Subject of LSP Executive discussions 26 January 2011 and the Board on the 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2011. An update can be provided to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.	Ian Gallin	March 2011
2.10	In making <b>savings to the cost of senior management</b> , a risk analysis of potential loss of capacity within the Council to deliver its change agenda should be undertaken.	Agree	CMT	TBA
2.11	That Directors and Assistant Directors should ensure that <b>reporting of service provision</b> which affects people (for example adults' and children's social care) should include statistics as both a percentage and in terms of actual numbers of people. Where possible, measures of dispersion – geographic / neighbourhood information should be included.	The requested statistical information will be included in relevant responses where appropriate and proportional. The other issues raised will be addressed through EIA's.	SMT	ongoing

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
2.12	Cabinet and delegated decision reports include provision to indicate where an <b>Equality Impact Assessment</b> is required, and, if so, this is listed as one of the background papers.	Agree	SMT	From March 2011
2.13	That consideration should be given to ensuring that there is better public understanding of the role of the <b>Plymouth 2020 Partnership</b> and how community views are represented on it.	Agree	Ian Gallin	March 2011

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
3.1	<p>That <b>impact assessments</b> with regard to delivery plan proposals be prepared, as (2.2) above, in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools transport</li> <li>• Locality restructure</li> <li>• Disability Service restructure</li> <li>• Changes to Special Educational needs policies</li> <li>• Reduction in contribution to Youth Offending Service</li> <li>• Financial support and non-statutory payments to Care Leavers</li> </ul>	Response as (2.2) above		N/A
3.2	That a prioritised list of capital projects in Children's Services be prepared and published pending clarity from Government about the availability of resources	As 2.7 above		
3.3	That a review of all grants relating to the provision of children's services that are not continuing, with succession arrangements, is published	Implications of grant changes will continue to be reported via the quarterly budget and performance report.	CMT	Ongoing

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
4.1	That the <b>recycling target</b> be reviewed in the light of Plymouth's aspirations for excellence and the benchmarks for similar authorities within the Council's 'family group'.	The recycling target is currently being reviewed.	Carole Burgoyne	March 2011
4.2	That a policy with respect to <b>community transfer of assets</b> in line with the provisions within the Localities and Decentralisation Bill be developed and submitted to the Scrutiny Management Board. Specifically the feasibility of asset transfers referenced within Community Services budget delivery plans should be quantified.	A policy is included in the Councils Asset Management Plan. Business cases will be developed on individual asset transfer for decision and scrutiny as appropriate	Adam Broome, Carole Burgoyne and Ian Gallin	June 2011
4.3	That a review of all <b>grants relating to the Community services</b> that are not continuing, with succession arrangements, is published.	As 3.3 above		



Ref	Recommendation	Responses	By who	By when
4.4	That <b>impact assessments</b> with regard to delivery plan proposals be prepared, as (2.2) above, in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cemeteries and Crematoria fees</li> <li>• Rationalisation of Environmental Services structure</li> <li>• Changes to library opening hours</li> </ul>	As 2.2 above		N/A
4.5	That a <b>Volunteering Plan</b> for the city is produced, including provision for the increased use of Community Payback resources to undertake work on behalf of the Council and partners to increase efficiency savings.	Agree.	Peter Aley	June 2011
4.6	Plymouth takes a lead role in establishing a <b>Crime Panel</b> in line with legislative proposals.	Agree	Carole Burgoyne	May 2012

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
4.7	That <b>targets for the Personalisation agenda</b> be set in line with 'family group' authorities rather than regional comparators.	Agree	Carole Burgoyne	June 2011
4.8	Proposals for use of the <b>£3.5m health fund</b> , and any other related unallocated resources be brought to the Health and Adult Social Care scrutiny panel.	Agree	Carole Burgoyne	March 2011
4.9	Details are provided of the specific proposals about <b>savings related to events, grants and other initiatives</b> as set out in the Culture, Sports and Leisure budget delivery plan.	Agree	Carole Burgoyne	February 2011
5.0	Details are provided of the <b>transport options for savings</b> currently being considered in the budget delivery plan.	Agree as individual options are developed	Anthony Payne	February 2011 Onwards

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>By who</b>	<b>By when</b>
5.1	Following ministerial feedback, the revised <b>Local Economic Partnership</b> for Plymouth be reviewed by the Growth and Prosperity overview and scrutiny panel	Agree	Anthony Payne	April 2011
5.2	That <b>impact assessments</b> with regard to delivery plan proposals be prepared, as (2.2) above, in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Intervention Project</li> <li>• Anti-social behaviour</li> <li>• Transport options</li> </ul>	As (2.2) above		N/A
5.3	That interim <b>targets for job creation</b> between now and 2026, including monitoring and evaluation criteria with regard to sustainability should be put in place to enable more effective monitoring.	Agree	Anthony Payne	June 2011