

Executive

3rd March 2015: 9.30 am

London Councils offices are wheelchair accessible

Location: Room 1

Contact Officer: Derek Gadd

Telephone: 020 7934 9505 **Email:** derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda item	Page
1 Declarations of Interest*	
2 Apologies for Absence:	
3 Minutes of Executive Meeting held on 20 th January 2015	
4 Refocusing the London Health Board	
5 No Recourse to Public Funds	
6 Business Plan 2015/16	
7 London Devolution and Public Service Reform - Update	
8 Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2014/15	
9 Debtors Update Report	

*** Declarations of Interests**

If you are present at a meeting of London Councils' or any of its associated joint committees or their sub-committees and you have a disclosable pecuniary interest* relating to any business that is or will be considered at the meeting you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your disclosable pecuniary interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public. It is a matter for each member to decide whether they should leave the room while an item that they have an interest in is being discussed. In arriving at a decision as to whether to leave the room they may wish to have regard to their home authority's code of conduct and/or the Seven (Nolan) Principles of Public Life.

*as defined by the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive
Tuesday 20 January 2015, London Councils offices**

Mayor Jules Pipe was in the chair

Present

Member	Position
Mayor Jules Pipe	Chair
Cllr Claire Kober	Deputy chair
Mr Mark Boleat	Vice chair
Cllr Lib Peck	
Mayor Sir Steve Bullock	
Cllr Peter John	
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Philippa Roe	
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Ravi Govindia	Substituting for Cllr Teresa O'Neill

London Councils officers were in attendance.

1. Declarations of interest

No interests were declared.

2. Apologise for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Ruth Dombey and Cllr Teresa O'Neill for whom Cllr Ravi Govindia was substituting

3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 20 November 2014,

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 20 November 2014 were agreed.

4. Freedom Pass 2015 Reissue Update

Cllr Julian Bell introduced the report saying:

- London Councils was in the process of reissuing almost a million Freedom Passes

- The passes, which had a five year life, expire on 31 March 2015
- The response rate had been encouraging so far with 65% of those written to having already responded
- Online renewal was the least costly method and when the budget for the reissue was drawn up this was estimated to be 50% of renewals but in fact 70% had used this method
- Those who do not renew will be given a short period of grace when they will be allowed to continue to travel using their pass.

The Executive agreed to note the progress on the Freedom Pass 2015 reissue since the last report to the Transport and Environment Committee in December 2014.

5. Crossrail 2 Update

Cllr Claire Kober introduced the report saying:

- Crossrail 2 had been described by the Mayor of London as being one of the most important infrastructure projects for London in the near future. It was fundamental to dealing with London's projected population growth – estimated to be about 10 million people by 2030
- In 2013 the Treasury challenged London to identify ways in which at least 50% of the cost for Crossrail 2 could be found by London itself. TfL commissioned PwC to provide answers to this challenge last year.
- Their report to TfL suggested that the cost of Crossrail 2 would be £27.5 billion (up from £20.9 billion previously) and they made a number of suggestions of how Crossrail 2 could be part funded by money raised in London.
- These included many of the mechanisms that were used to fund Crossrail 1, such as Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Business Rate Supplement and project generated revenue.
- London Councils officers had undertaken some preliminary research and had included a list of examples mainly from other countries that could also be explored to bridge some of the funding gap.
- It was not clear when Government would make a decision about funding Crossrail 2. TfL had received £2m in the last spending review to undertake a

more detailed business case for it, which would form part of the case to government and this was planned to be ready before the 2015 spending review.

- The Department for Transport was currently consulting on safeguarding the regional route, which was the preferred route for London local government due to its wider benefits for relatively little additional costs. This consultation was due to close on 29 January and once a safeguarding direction has been issued, would protect the surface and underground route from development
- The report gave Crossrail 2 a benefit to cost ratio of 1.8:1, rising to 2:1 if the wider benefits were considered. This had improved on re-calculation to 2.8:1

Cllr Peter John argued that other possible transport initiatives should not be forgotten, for example the £4½bn Bakerloo Line extension that would open up a whole corner of SE London and bring with it 40,000 new homes.

Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE argued for the need for a wider vision for transport and housing for London and Cllr Philippa Roe thought it should dovetail into the LEP's Infrastructure Development Plan

Cllr Kober summed up by saying:

- She would support pursuing a piece of work looking at how transport projects could be funded in a sustainable manner befitting a World City such as London
- A report should go to Leaders' Committee later in the year taking account of further discussions with TfL, further work by London Councils on wider funding options and broader progress on the London devolution proposition.

The Executive agreed to note the report.

6. Managing Temporary Accommodation Cost Pressures

Mayor Sir Steve Bullock introduced the report saying:

- Rising private rents, a shortage of supply and continuing homelessness had meant growing pressure on temporary accommodation availability in recent years

and this had meant that most boroughs were facing rising temporary accommodation expenditure

- Nightly paid accommodation was one part of the overall supply of temporary accommodation. It could be shared or self-contained accommodation, let on a nightly basis with a charge per night, and was particularly poor value for money compared to other types of accommodation
- London borough expenditure on this type of accommodation had risen by over 150% since 2010/11
- Nightly paid accommodation was often over the limit for what could be claimed back through DWP temporary accommodation subsidy and so ate into borough budgets and it was this that was driving the over-spends in many cases
- In response to concern about rising costs, work was undertaken at the request of London Housing Directors in March 2014 to explore and assess the nightly-paid temporary accommodation market in greater detail. It was concluded that significant variations in rents were being paid by boroughs to procure nightly accommodation.
- Housing Directors concluded that a pan-London response was needed to benchmark information and help ensure that individual boroughs were not unreasonably charged for nightly accommodation. The London sub-regional housing managers collated information and were sharing information with a view to helping reduce costs over the longer term.
- Work of this type had not been tried before, and it would take commitment to continue in times where local challenges arose. If some boroughs continued to pay higher costs then the project would not succeed.
- This work would not solve all of London's Homelessness problems but without any action the situation was only going to get worse

Cllr Ravi Govindia suggested that, in the long run, there needed to be a recognition that not all of London's housing need would be accommodated within the city's boundaries.

In response to a question from Cllr Puddifoot the Head of Housing and Planning clarified that benchmarking had taken place in sub-regions, and rents could be subject to review in future to ensure that they did not become unreasonable. Cllr Puddifoot also asked whether there could be individual opt-outs in extreme cases.

Cllr Roe argued that the management of housing need should be looked at on a broader basis - in her borough, Westminster, one third of those housed had less than a year's association with the borough.

Cllr Kober suggested that government should be lobbied on this and Mayor Bullock concluded by saying:

- It was not only the absence of transport links that could cause problems for low-income workers but the cost of transport; the lower paid often could not afford to move out of central London because the cost of getting to their workplace could become prohibitive
- He had sympathy for the central London boroughs where the high cost of building units impacted on viability
- It was a complex city-wide problem that could not be solved in one borough

The Executive agreed to confirm its support for this work, including providing support to boroughs which may have been facing challenges in implementation.

7. Nominations to Outside Bodies

The Chief Executive introduced the report saying that it put forward nominations to outside bodies since the last meeting.

The Executive agreed to note the nominations/appointments made by the Chief Executive on behalf of London Councils.

8. Devolution and Public Service Reform – Update

The Chair introduced the report saying:

That since Leaders' Committee in December the work that he and Cllr Roe had been leading on had made progress on three fronts:

- Engagement with government

- Chief Executive led borough working on detailed propositions
- Increased political oversight of these developments

On the first front, engaging government, a letter had been sent jointly with the Mayor of London to the Chancellor seeking a meeting to begin a dialogue on public service reform specifically in five areas:

- Skills
- Employment
- Complex dependency
- Housing
- Health

With Cllr Roe, he had met Rt Hon Greg Clark MP, minister for Cities, on 7 January. At that meeting:

- The joint approach to the Chancellor was discussed
- The focus on public service reform through tangible and practical steps that delivered something for government was clarified
- The minister agreed – subject to confirmation from the Chancellor - to support discussions on a London Deal that was outside the Growth Deal process.
- In that context the minister would sanction senior level meetings of officials for detailed conversations.

Separately, on 5 January, he, Cllrs Roe and Ruth Dombey had written to Chief Secretary to the Treasury, Rt Hon Danny Alexander MP, following the Autumn Statement response to the Transformation Challenge Panel Report reinforcing similar points.

On the second front, developing propositions, Cllr Roe and himself had met the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform group in November and sought their support for the development of detailed propositions supporting the political initiative agreed with the Mayor of London.

Consequently, Mr Jeff Jacobs from the GLA and some of his other colleagues had joined that group. A sub-group led by the Chief Executive of the City of Westminster council,

had been set up to lead the development of more detailed propositions for each of the five themes agreed by Leaders' Committee.

- This work would form the basis for discussions with officials prior to the election.
- The intention was to lock in a foundation within Whitehall for more substantive discussions that could be constructed rapidly once a new government had emerged after the general election on May 7.
- It was already becoming clear that there may be a need for an additional theme to develop a proposition on public service reform for parts of the criminal justice system.

On the third front, increased political oversight, it was increasingly clear that each theme raised different types of challenges. There would be questions both about the level of ambition that was felt to be practical and also about how London would govern delivery of these different propositions.

- The process with chief executives would lead to local consideration with members.
- It was important that Portfolio-holders also met those relevant chief executives who are leading different streams of the work. So, this would involve at least Cllr Teresa O'Neill, Cllr Ray Puddifoot, Cllr Peter John, Mayor Sir Steve Bullock and Cllr Lib Peck if they were agreeable.

He concluded by arguing that, realistically, the objective was to develop propositions before the General Election that demonstrated that London – the Mayor and Borough Leaders – were serious and credible. The detailed evolution of those and real negotiation would come after a General Election alongside the Spending Review this summer.

Cllr Roe added that she had been pleasantly surprised at how positive the minister, Greg Clark had been, he had completely accepted the argument that the Mayor of London was not the answer alone and they would also need the London boroughs. However, he was also anxious to reward success and in that context was concerned that London was not meeting its housing targets

The Chair also offered a note of caution in that the minister wanted to see more of an offer on housing and saw the need for the boroughs to be more creative on planning, including greater contestability in the provision of Planning services within the Capital – even amongst boroughs.

Cllr John also expressed his concern over planning, saying that some boroughs were simply not building new homes and that developers wanted greater consistency which could be achieved, perhaps, across an area crossing borough boundaries.

Cllr Roe largely agreed but argued that the sovereignty and identity of boroughs needed to be maintained, there were huge differences within boroughs let alone from one borough to the next.

Mr Mark Boleat asserted that greater devolution to London as a whole was required in those areas but London government needed to be alive to the scale of the challenge it faced.

Cllr Lib Peck argued that clarity and consistency was the key to a planning system working properly. The viability test was not widely understood which made it difficult to explain planning decisions to residents.

The Executive agreed to:

- Note the progress made, including the work which was in hand to develop operational detail to support negotiations with Government.
- Note the preparations that may be required locally to harness devolution and sharpen the offer to Government, such as co-operation across borough groupings to collect intelligence on employers' skills needs;
- Continue broader influencing work around the wider devolution agenda in the run up to the 2015 General Election and the likely Comprehensive Spending Review.

Action Point

	Item	Action	Progress
5.	Crossrail 2 Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">Pursue a piece of work looking at how transport projects could be funded in a sustainable manner befitting a World City such as London	Transport and Env'ment	In progress

Executive

Refocusing the London Health Board

Item no: 4

Report by: Sarah Sturrock **Job title:** Strategic Lead, Health and Adult Services
Date: 3 March 2015
Contact Officer:
Telephone: 020 7934 9653 **Email:** sarah.sturrock@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This paper sets out the proposals for refocusing the London Health Board, in the light of the London Health Commission report published last October. The intention is for the refreshed Board to meet in March.

Recommendations The Executive is asked to agree the proposals for refocusing the London Health Board.

REFOCUSING THE LONDON HEALTH BOARD

Background

1. In February 2013, London Councils Leaders' Committee agreed the creation of a non-statutory London Health Board to provide leadership on health issues of pan-London significance where this adds value to decisions, agreements and action at local level. The Board met for the first time in May 2013 and has continued to do so on average quarterly thereafter.
2. In September 2013, the Mayor of London launched the London Health Commission, led by Professor Lord Ara Darzi. The Commission reported in October 2014. London Councils' Leaders' Committee considered the implications of Lord Darzi's report, alongside other strategic developments, at its meeting in February 2015. This included the intention to refocus the London Health Board to provide a vehicle for political leadership and oversight at a London level of both work flowing from the Commission's report and wider transformation of health and care.
3. London Councils, Greater London Authority and senior health officers have developed a proposal for refocusing the London Health Board. The intention is for a meeting of the refreshed Board to be held in March. This paper therefore seeks the Executive's agreement to the proposals for refocusing the London Health Board.

Refocusing the London Health Board

4. The intention is that the London Health Board should become a vehicle for more overt political leadership and engagement at a London level where this can unlock transformation and change in health and care to improve outcomes for Londoners. It will wish to intervene selectively by identifying where its unique strengths can add value to outcomes or accelerate the pace of change in ways that other parts of London government, or public service, cannot. As a starting point, the Board will consider where it can add value to the work being taken forward through a range of programmes in response to the recommendations in the London Health Commission. At its first meeting the Board will discuss some initial priorities on which it wishes to focus.

5. To play this more focused new role, the Board will be smaller. It will have a political majority (the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and 3 Leaders) alongside three key senior health leaders. The borough Leaders will be appointed through the usual London Councils' procedures for external appointments.
6. Support arrangements will be co-ordinated through a small steering group of senior officers from the key partners, including London Councils and a borough chief executive. In addition, a small secretariat will be provided by the GLA. The Board will be able to commission analysis or engagement activity, with the agreement of the steering group.
7. Funding of £400,000 per annum from key partners will support these arrangements. The boroughs' contribution will be £100,000 from the London Councils reserves, under the agreement given by Leaders' Committee in December 2012.
8. The revised draft terms of reference for the London Health Board are at Annex A. These will be tabled for agreement at a first meeting of the refreshed Board.

Conclusion

9. As discussed at Leaders' Committee in February, there are wide-reaching programmes of work being developed to take forward issues from the London Health Commission and drive the transformation of health and care in London, in the context of the NHS Five Year Forward View. The proposals for refreshing the London Health Board are intended to provide a vehicle for focused political engagement in this at a London level where this can add value. They seek to avoid creating a body whose energies will be spread too thin or that duplicates leadership and programme management arrangements locally which should be driving change.
10. **The Executive is asked to agree the proposals for refocusing the London Health Board.**

IMPLICATIONS FOR LONDON COUNCILS

Financial Implications for London Councils

London Councils' will provide £100,000 contribution per annum to funding the £400,000 budget for the London Health Board for the next 2 years. This will come from within the up to £750,000 earmarked from within London Councils' reserves to support the health transition process over three years, as agreed by Leaders' Committee on 11 December 2012.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

DRAFT REFRESHED LONDON HEALTH BOARD TERMS OF REFERENCE

The London Health Board is a non-statutory group chaired by the Mayor of London comprising elected leaders and key London professional health leads.

Purpose

The Board will drive improvements in London's health, care and health inequalities where political engagement at this level can uniquely make a difference. It will seek ways of giving additional impetus to progressing the ambition to make London the healthiest global city. The Board will make the case for investment, power and freedoms to enable the improvement of health and care services and the wider determinants of health in London. It will consider ways of supporting and accelerating the transformation of health and care services in the capital. The Board will champion public participation in health and an increase in choice and accountability in health and care services.

Membership

Mayor of London (Chair)
Deputy Mayor (Health)
3 Local Authority Leaders (London Councils to advise)
London Region Director, NHS England
Chair, London Clinical Commissioning Council
London Region Director, Public Health England

Frequency of meetings

The Board will meet four times a year starting in March 2015. It will hold at least one public engagement event each year.

Support

The Board will be supported by:

- a steering group of senior officers from London Councils and local government, the GLA, NHS England, CCGs and PHE; and
- a small secretariat located at the GLA.

Resources

- The Board will be funded by its partners (London Councils, NHS England (London), London Clinical Commissioning Groups, Public Health England, and the Greater London Authority).
- Funding will cover staffing of the secretariat and a budget for research, analysis and engagement (including the annual engagement event)
- Annual funding contributions will be £100k each from London Councils, NHS England (London) and the London CCGs, and £50k each from the GLA and PHE. This will create a total annual budget of £400k.

Executive

No Recourse to Public Funds

Item no: 5

Report by: Jon Rowney **Job title:** Acting Strategic Lead: Finance, Performance and Procurement

Date: 3 March 2014

Contact Officer: Federico Mor

Telephone: 020 7934 9546 **Email:** Federico.Mor@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

The number of clients with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) is growing rapidly and placing increasing service and financial pressure on local authorities. This is a particularly acute issue in London and has been caused by a range of factors including case law, government policy and broader socio-economic conditions.

This report explores the main challenges of NRPF cases and their impact on London and proposes a number of future actions to alleviate the financial pressure on London local government.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

- a) Note and comment on any of the issues raised in this report; and
- b) Approve the future actions outlined in paragraph 6.2.

No Recourse to Public Funds

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Local authorities in London are reporting increasing numbers of clients with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF). This is creating significant operational and financial pressure on local services at a time of significantly reduced resources for London local government.
- 1.2 Based on the latest available information, there are currently over 1,500 confirmed households receiving some form of support from London boroughs at an annual cost of over £25 million. This is based on a sample of 17 London boroughs with actual expenditure likely to be far higher.
- 1.3 This report explores the main challenges in London and proposes a number of future actions to accelerate positive progress on this issue.

2. Background

- 2.1 No recourse to public funds (NRPF) refers to people who are subject to immigration control and have no entitlement to public funds. Public funds¹ cover a range of financial support payments, including, but not limited to income support, housing benefit, disability living allowance and working tax credit. Local authority housing and homelessness assistance also falls under the definition of 'public funds'.
- 2.2 It is worth noting that services not considered public funds for immigration purposes include social services care and support; compulsory school age state education, student grants or loans, NHS treatment and certain work-related welfare benefits (e.g. incapacity benefit).
- 2.3 Individuals with NRPF have very few alternative avenues for support and can be eligible for assistance from their local authority (subject to meeting relevant eligibility criteria). Local authorities have a duty to undertake an assessment of their needs under a combination of the Human Rights Act, the Children Act 1989 and the National Assistance Act 1948. Though, services provided under NRPF are limited under the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 and the Nationality Immigration and Asylum Act 2002.

¹ attendance allowance, carer's allowance, child benefit, child tax credit, council tax reduction, disability living allowance, housing benefit, income-based employment and support allowance, income-based jobseeker's allowance, income support, personal independence payment, severe disablement allowance, state pension credit, universal credit, working tax credit. For further information, please see: <http://www.nrpfnetwork.org.uk/Pages/NRPF-information.aspx#publicfund>

3. Financial context

- 3.1 There remains no single data source, which provides a comprehensive national view of local government expenditure (or activity) on NRPF clients. Analysis has been undertaken of the NRPF Connect database.² At present, it is felt that this provides the most complete picture of NRPF cases and expenditure both nationally and in London. There are currently 28 local authorities signed up to NRPF Connect of which 17³ are from London.
- 3.2 There are currently over 1,900 households (including approximately 3,300 dependants) receiving some form of accommodation and subsistence provision. This equates to a combined weekly cost of around £580,000, or **£31.4 million** per annum.
- 3.3 Analysis has also been undertaken of the 17 London boroughs using NRPF Connect, The key headlines are as follows:
- There are 1,511 households receiving some form of accommodation and subsistence support, at a combined annual cost of **£25.1 million** in London.
 - This represents 78% of all households on NRPF Connect, and 80% of the total annual cost. This compares to 61% of authorities using NRPF Connect from London.
 - The average time spent on supporting a case is 665 days. However, actual time invested will reflect the nature and complexity of the cases and there is local variation. Average days per case range from c.290 days to c.1100 in different boroughs.
 - The average annual cost per case is around £16,500. Average case costs range between £12,000 and £21,000 per borough. (Anecdotal evidence suggests that some boroughs are facing unit costs beyond these amounts). It is important to note that these figures do not include staff time and overheads. The total average cost to authorities can therefore be expected to be higher.
- 3.4 While information from NRPF Connect is a helpful insight into the pressure across some boroughs, it is noted that this sample size represents just over half of London. Further work is needed with the NRPF Network and the London boroughs to better understand the scale of the issue across London and it is likely that, upon further investigation, these figures will rise. It is also clear from anecdotal evidence that some boroughs may be incurring costs beyond accommodation and subsistence.

² NRPF Connect is a database through which the Home Office and local authorities work together to identify and resolve supported cases through the secure exchange of information. The Home Office has confirmed that this is their preferred method of working.

³ LBs of Barking, Bexley, Brent, Croydon, Enfield, Greenwich, Hackney, Haringey, Havering, Hounslow, Islington, Lambeth, Merton, Newham, Redbridge, Southwark and Wandsworth

4. Growth in demand

- 4.1 It is clear that the number of reported cases of clients with NRPF is increasing. By way of illustration, one borough has seen a rise from four reported cases in 2008 to 142 cases in 2013. There are likely to be a range of local, national and international factors that are driving this increased level of demand across London. These include, but are not limited to:

- **Recent Case Law**

- Zambrano: The European Court of Justice (ECJ) ruling on this case (2011) creates a right to reside and work for sole carers of dependant British Children. The principle of 'Zambrano' is that EEA national children should not be forced to leave the EEA on account of their parent's or guardian's unsettled immigration status.
- Authorities' duty of support to care leavers: Where children have been in the care of the local authority, these responsibilities continue past the age of 18 until they are at least 21 years of age, and beyond if they are pursuing further education or training. This was confirmed as part of the Kebede vs Newcastle City Council [2013] case.

- **Home Office / Central Government policy**

- Dependence on Home Office decision-making: The majority of NRPF cases are supported by local authorities pending the outcome of immigration decisions made by the Home Office. Local authorities can become tied to long periods of support if decisions on applications for Leave to Remain (LTR) are not decided expediently, cases experience significant appeal procedures or removal processes are delayed.
- Changes to the family migration rules allow individuals to apply to stay on right to family / private life grounds, but they will no longer be granted access to public funds unless exceptional circumstances apply.

- **Welfare Reform**

- It may well be the case that some individuals who have previously been supported by friends or family in terms of accommodation (such as the use of a spare room) are no longer able to access this support.
- Time limiting access of European Economic Area (EEA) migrants to allowances such as Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) and housing benefits may be encouraging individuals to seek local authority support.

- **Visibility of Local Authority Services**

- There appears to be increased knowledge of and referral to local authority services, which are driving up client numbers. Judicial review of local authority decisions continues to attract funding despite a general tightening of legal aid rules for immigration-related work.

5. Engagement with Central Government

5.1 Following concerns raised by local authorities, DCLG have held two Immigration Enforcement Roundtables with representatives from the Home Office and local government (including London Councils) to discuss the increasing financial and service pressure arising from clients with NRPF. These meetings have provided an initial opportunity for local government to raise its concerns and issues with senior civil servants.

5.2 Key messages raised within these discussions included:

- The growing financial pressure on local authorities in London,
- Local authorities are dependent on Home Office decision making and any delays in granting leave or removing the NRPF condition for migrants in receipt of local authority support can impact significantly on local authority resources;
- The efficiency of local authority processes can be reliant on information from the Home Office – late or inaccurate information can affect the optimal level of social care and other support provided.
- There are instances where local authorities are providing support to a family that are destitute, but the Home Office has determined the family are not destitute for the purpose of granting recourse to public funds. Often, the same definition of destitution is being worked to.
- There is potential for clearer guidance and consistency in current Home Office policy and processes that would minimise the number of disputes between the Home Office and local authorities.
- It could be possible for the Home Office to treat local authority supported cases, funded at public expenses, as a priority, to support and alleviate the acute pressure on local authority resources.

5.3 In broad terms, three principal outcomes emerged from these discussions, namely:

- The establishment of the NRPF Steering Group as a forum for future discussions,
- An initial financial scoping exercise undertaken by DCLG under the New Burdens doctrine, and
- Renewed commitment from DCLG and the Home Office to the use of NRPF Connect.

The NRPF Steering Group

- 5.4 The NRPF Steering group has been established to bring together officials from the Home Office, DWP, DCLG and representatives from the Association of Directors of Children Services, the NRPF Network, London Councils and local authorities. This includes members of the corporate leadership teams of Islington, Lambeth and Croydon.
- 5.5 The Steering Group⁴ meets quarterly and will:
- a) Act as a forum through which local government is able to discuss with central government issues of strategic and operational importance in relation to NRPF,
 - b) Provide oversight of NRPF Connect and the effectiveness of other programmes being undertaken to address NRPF caseloads,
 - c) Identify and explore any emerging trends/issues, which impact on the NRPF client group; and
 - d) Discuss areas of future development, including the relationship between the NRPF Network and the Home Office.
- 5.6 The NRPF Steering Group has also developed a two year plan, which includes:
- The development and agreement of a Service Level Agreement setting out agreed standards of operation between the Home Office and local authorities that use Connect.
 - The development of robust Key Performance Indicators to enable the Steering Group to monitor and challenge outcomes from this process.
 - Supplying data as evidence for DCLG's new burdens assessment (see paragraph 5.7 to 5.9).
 - Identifying and addressing areas of Home Office case-working practice that can cause delays in the resolution of local authority supported cases, including reviewing removals casework and the role of the family removals team.
 - Extension of direct access to NRPF Connect for Home Office casework teams.
 - Addressing areas where there are differences in policy understanding/interpretation e.g. the definition of destitution.
 - Broader communications and engagement plan to update local authorities on the work of the group and to share best practice.

⁴ The Group is co-chaired by representatives from the Home Office and members of the corporate management team from LBs of Islington and Croydon respectively.

New Burdens

- 5.7 Following the first roundtable meeting, DCLG officials completed an initial New Burdens scoping exercise. While they recognise the broad financial pressure on local government, the results of this exercise were inconclusive. They hold the view that it is difficult, at this stage, to define precisely some of the issues raised as 'new burdens'.
- 5.8 At the same time, DCLG has stressed the point that NRPF Connect should be given more time to become embedded within local authority and Home Office practices. While it is undoubtedly crucial to consider alternative ways of working as a means of reducing the existing cost burden, it will be important to maintain discussions on funding.
- 5.9 London Councils is engaging with DCLG via established links and through the NRPF Steering Group to progress the discussions on funding and to build up a broader understanding of the financial pressure on local authorities. That said, it is clear that any discussions on funding with DCLG and the Home Office are unlikely to be resolved in the short term and will take place within the wider context (and timetable) of Spending Review 2015.

NRPF Connect

- 5.10 The Home Office and DCLG continue to view the NRPF Connect database as the tool through which local authorities and the Home Office can work effectively to record and resolve cases. Both departments believe that NRPF Connect offers a clear opportunity for reductions to on-going burdens to be achieved and have been keen to promote the system. It is recognised that not all affected London boroughs or authorities nationally subscribe to this service.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1 Developments to date have allowed closer working between the Home Office and local authorities. While there remains scope for improvement, the NRPF Steering Group offers an opportunity through which dialogue can be maintained. That said, it remains the case that progress appears slow and uncertain on the funding considerations and this is an area where efforts may need to be intensified, particularly in terms of influencing discussions during Spending Review 2015. Gaining traction with Ministers and civil servants is likely to require a stronger evidence base than is currently the case.

6.2 With this in mind, it is proposed that:

- Pressure is maintained to accelerate the discussions on funding through both political and officer engagement,
- Work continues to challenge and influence current Home Office policies and practices, which give rise to the increasing pressure on local authorities (as detailed in paragraph 5.2)
- Continuing dialogue is maintained with the Home Office and DCLG through the London representatives of the NRPF Steering Group,
- London Councils continues to work with the NRPF Network and London boroughs to develop a strong evidence base that fully articulates the level and nature of the financial impact on London local government from NRPF clients, and
- A round of influencing and public affairs engagement is undertaken to ensure that there is a wider understanding of the pressure on London boroughs from those with NRPF. Some escalation to member level may be required to support this.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

- c) Note and comment on any of the issues raised in this report; and
- d) Approve the future actions outlined in paragraph 6.2.

Financial Implications for London Councils

There are no financial implications for London Councils arising from this report

Legal Implications for London Councils

There are no legal implications for London Councils arising from this report.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

There are no equalities implications for London Councils arising from this report.

Executive

Business Plan 2015/16

Item no: 6

Report by:	Christiane Jenkins	Job title:	Director, Corporate Governance
Date:	3 March 2015		
Contact Officer:	Christiane Jenkins		
Telephone:	020 7934 9540	Email:	Christiane.Jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	This report informs the Executive on the development of London Councils' business plan for 2015/16, and includes the proposed purpose, themes, work programmes and services. This has been developed following a series of meetings between portfolio holders and the Chair.
----------------	--

Recommendations	<p>The Executive is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment on the proposed purpose and themes for the organisation;• Comment on the proposed Directorate work in Appendices One and Two;• Note that the Business Plan will be submitted for noting at Leaders' Committee on 24 March 2015 incorporating any comments/changes from this meeting.
------------------------	--

Business Plan 2015/16

Background

1. As in previous years, London Councils will develop two levels of business plan; a high level plan available for external organisations and stakeholders and detailed internal work plans developed for management purposes.
2. This report outlines the proposed content for the high level business plan. It has been developed following discussions between portfolio holders and the Chair which took place between December 2014 and February 2015. Meetings have been held on the following areas of work:
 - Housing
 - Capital Ambition
 - Crime and Public Protection
 - Health
 - Devolution and Public Services Reform
 - Adult Care Services
 - Greater London Employment Forum (GLEF) and Greater London Provincial Council (GLPC)
 - Infrastructure and Regeneration
 - Transport and Environment
 - Grants
 - Finance & Resources, Welfare Reform and Arts & Culture
 - Equalities
 - Children, Employment and Skills.
3. The business plan outlines the purpose of London Councils and the context in which we work. It identifies our overarching themes for 2015/16, the priority work planned and notes the principles which underpin the way we work.
4. The Executive is asked to comment on the text below. Amendments to the plan will be made following this Executive meeting and a final version will be submitted for noting by Leaders' Committee on 24 March 2015.

Proposed Business Plan 2015/16 - Introduction and purpose

5. London Councils' core purpose is to help London local government successfully shape London both as a world class capital city and its localities. Specifically, London Councils aspires to be:
 - a highly respected and influential lobbyist and advocate for boroughs, promoting their leadership of a broad range of local public services and communities, as well as fighting for them to get the resources, powers and freedoms necessary to play that role;
 - a catalyst for effective sharing between boroughs – people, practice, knowledge, information and services. London Councils seeks to be instrumental in both challenging and supporting London local government to improve performance and efficiency;
 - a provider of a clearly defined range of quality and responsive services to Londoners and London organisations on boroughs' behalf.
6. This plan sets out the five broad, over-arching themes for the year that set all of our work into context. It describes the ways in which London Councils goes about its work – with members, member authorities and others.
7. Appendices one and two set out the individual projects and main work programme for the Policy and Public Affairs and Services Directorates, which underpin the overall work of the organisation, help deliver its core purpose and reflect its over-arching themes.

Context

8. In the context of 2015/16, London Councils needs to undertake this role against the backdrop of two significant challenges facing our member authorities. They are:
 - Supporting councils in their work to meet the challenges of significant further reductions in funding over the next spending review period;
 - Seeking to secure greater devolution to London government and London boroughs in order to help drive a broader agenda of public service reform based

on closer integration of local public services. This devolution and integration will be critical to helping councils manage future service demand and drive local economic growth.

Themes

9. Our over-arching themes for 2015/16 are as follows:

- Resourcing London. In a period of acute financial retrenchment, we will continue to work alongside our member boroughs and partners to:
 - Ensure the best possible public financing climate for London including arguing for greater fiscal devolution;
 - Support councils as they seek to manage significant reductions in their funding base;
 - In the period running up to the 2015 Spending Review, we will continue to communicate the financial pressures faced by London local government and develop a strong case that will advocate the need for both a fair financial outcome for our member boroughs and Londoners, as well as continuing to make the case for why wider devolution and reform can secure greater value for public money.
- Securing devolution and reform. We will:
 - Continue to highlight the strong London argument for boroughs, groups of boroughs and the Mayor to be at the heart of commissioning a broader range of integrated local public services;
 - Work closely with the Mayor of London to negotiate with Government on a further devolution settlement to London;
 - Support London local government in its work to turn this into action on the ground by providing shared learning and approaches and developing London frameworks that help facilitate devolution to take place at local level among boroughs and groups of boroughs.
- Supporting London Delivery. We will:
 - Provide a defined range of direct services to Londoners and London organisations directly on the collective behalf of boroughs;

- Support London local government's collective efforts to enhance the effectiveness of public services across the capital;
 - Act as a focal point for brokerage and co-ordination between different London public services, the GLA group and boroughs on key delivery issues;
 - Work with key political, professional and managerial groupings across London local government to help strengthen the capacity of our membership to deliver high quality and cost effective services.
- Preparing for a new Mayoral Administration. In the run up to the 2016 Mayoral election we will:
 - Focus on ensuring that candidates for the office of Mayor understand the potential of a mature and balanced collaboration with London boroughs.
 - Organisational Change. In the context of significant organisational changes in the last five years, we will focus on:
 - Managing our resources to drive on-going improvements in value for our member authorities;
 - Equipping ourselves with the skills, knowledge and competences required to support London local government in this critical period;
 - Creating an environment in which we continue to attract talented people and challenge them to deliver outstanding performance.

Directorate work programmes

10. Our Directorate programmes detail the range of work that will support our overall objectives, all of which relate in some way to our over-arching themes of Resourcing London, Securing Devolution and Reform, Supporting London Delivery, Preparing for a new Mayoral Administration and Organisational Change.
11. These Directorate programmes are set out in detail in Appendices One and Two, attached.

The way we work

12. Underpinning the way we work is the following set of principles:
 - We are a cross party, politically led organisation motivated by our common commitment to the interests of London and London local government;

- We seek to harness the power that comes from the practice and the people of our member authorities;
- We work closely with a range of public, private and third sector partners across London and more broadly to secure our aims;
- We work in partnership with the national Local Government Association and seek mutually to reinforce our respective work on local government's overall behalf;
- We strive continuously to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our organisation on behalf of our member authorities and seek to make London Councils an attractive and challenging place for people to develop their careers.

Next steps

13. The draft business plan will be revised following comments received from this meeting of the Executive and a final version will be submitted for noting by Leaders' Committee on 24 March 2015.
14. As in the previous six years, the high level business plan will be available online as hard copies will not be produced.

Recommendations

15. The Executive is asked to;
 - Comment on the proposed purpose and themes for the organisation;
 - Comment on the proposed Directorate work in Appendices One and Two;
 - Note that the plan will be amended following this Executive meeting and then submitted for noting at Leaders' Committee on 24 March 2015.

Financial Implications for London Councils

16. The activities set out in the plan are contained within the 2015/16 budget approved by Leaders' Committee in December 2014.

Legal Implications for London Councils

17. There are no legal implications for London Councils arising from this report.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

18. There are no equalities implications for London Councils arising from this report. However, much of our core work is based on ensuring that equality and diversity issues are positively addressed. London Councils continues to ensure that equalities issues are taken fully into account in all service delivery programmes.
- In addition, the objectives which were identified in line with our obligations under the Equalities Act 2010, have recently been reviewed and revised, as appropriate. .
- The areas concerned include some of our policy work, communications and accessibility, both to our building and services. Our portfolio leads, our lead Member for Equalities, our Corporate Equalities Group and Trade Union side were engaged and/or consulted in the development/identification of these objectives.

Objectives:

- One: Policy - Tackling community disadvantage effectively;
- Two: Improving accessibility to London Councils website;
- Three: Improving accessibility to Freedom Pass and Taxicard;
- Four: Improving Freedom Pass take up;
- Five: Ensuring that the London Health Board supports improvement of the health of all Londoners, aiming for greater improvements in more disadvantaged communities;
- Six: Improving accessibility to PATAS website;
- Seven: Improving the accessibility to Southwark Street.

Full details can be found on our website at:

<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/aboutus/equalities/equalities.htm>

Appendices:

- **Appendix One:** Policy and Public Affairs projects
- **Appendix Two:** Services main work programme.

Appendix One

Policy & Public Affairs Directorate 2015/16 Business Plan Priorities

Cross Cutting

1. Securing devolution and public service reform in London
2. Managing the impact of welfare reform: encouraging work

Finance & Performance

3. Delivering a fair, financial outcome for local public services in London from Spending Review 2015
4. Supporting the case for a more resilient and long-term financial settlement for London
5. Supporting London to drive its own performance and improvement
6. Delivering a collaborative pensions vehicle for London local government

Housing and Planning

7. Accelerating housing delivery to meet London's needs
8. Developing solutions to address homelessness in London
9. Ensuring the planning system supports effective place-making

Transport, Environment & Infrastructure

10. Strengthening local leadership for infrastructure investment
11. Collaborating to enable boroughs to provide transport and environmental services at current or improved levels

Economic Growth & Regeneration

12. Collaborating to accelerate London's economic growth
13. Supporting local economic growth
14. Securing devolution to enhance individual opportunity: employment and skills

Education & Children

15. Securing policy change which strengthens councils' strategic leadership of the London schools system
16. Enabling leadership and partnership working which keeps children safe and improves services
17. Shaping the development of a framework of support to children and parents during the early years

Health & Social care

18. Strengthening local leadership of health and care
19. Securing devolution to transform health and care
20. Securing a viable future for adult social care in London
21. Leveraging well-being through public health

Policing & Crime

22. Shaping London's local policing, public safety and rehabilitation of offenders
23. Collaborating to tackle violent crime and extremism (to include gangs and violence against women)

NB: All programmes will take account of equalities implications and their linkage to borough work in this area.

Appendix Two

Services directorate – Business Plan Priorities 2015/16

Transport and Mobility

- Introducing an online and postal application process for new Freedom Pass holders and manage the Post Offices withdrawal from supporting the scheme.
- Managing the renewal of around 100,000 Freedom Passes expiring in March 2016.
- Investigating data sharing agreements with boroughs to help streamline future Freedom Pass renewals and improve the day-to-day management of Freedom Pass and Taxicard.
- Negotiating the Freedom Pass annual settlements with Transport for London (TfL) and other bus operators to keep increases to a minimum in 2016/17.
- Subject to approval following consultations, introducing charging for replacement Taxicards.
- Working with TfL and boroughs to investigate and deliver improvements and efficiencies to door-to-door transport services, such as Taxicard, Dial-a-ride and social needs transport.
- Re-procuring the provision of electronic data management and data transfer services for the management of the London Lorry Control Scheme.
- Working with TfL and the boroughs to implement the London Safer Lorry Scheme.
- Agreeing and implementing a car club/car sharing strategy for London.

PATAS

- Managing the move of all appeals services infrastructure and staff from Angel Square to Chancery Exchange.
- Managing the smooth transition to a new PATAS service provider in July, including the upgrading of data management and data transfer to fully electronic and web-based systems, realising significant savings.
- Managing and publicising the change of PATAS' name and branding to better reflect the wider range of matters covered by the tribunals service.

Young People's Education and Skills

- Provide regional leadership and influence - lobby for London, shape London's response to national and regional policies, manage relationships with the London Enterprise Panel and other stakeholders and strategic partners.

- Support the London Growth Plan and other strategies through which partners and stakeholders work together to implement the Young Persons' Education and Skills strategy - publish a Statement of Priorities, manage a data and research programme and support collaborative working.
- Lead strategic services and activities - support local authorities in their plans to implement major reforms for young people with special educational needs and phase two of Raising the Participation Age.
- Secure additional resources for London and work with the London Enterprise Panel and other partners to maximise the impact of investment - shape the 2014-20 European Structural and Investment Fund youth programmes.

Capital Ambition

- Maintain active governance of Capital Ambition from a financial and programme management perspective.
- Work with our London Ventures (LV) partners EY on developing a strategic portfolio of ventures. Consulting key stakeholders to ensure continued relevance.
- Supporting the delivery of the LV programme by using London Councils' role to promote the opportunities of the current 'live' ventures to London's boroughs, through developing and implementing a broad communication and stakeholder plan.
- Work with the investment case pilots to ensure maximum benefit is accrued for other boroughs to help de-risk implementation. Support the Capital Ambition Board to consider investing in future generations of ventures.

Community Services and Grants

- Identifying new sources of income for London Care Services so it continues to provide high-quality, value-for-money services to boroughs and vulnerable children in the Capital.
- Implement the recommendations of the NOTIFY Review and establish a new service providing shared information between boroughs for housing purposes.
- Implementing the grants programme for 2015-17 as agreed by the Grants Committee in November 2014. In doing so, strengthening the relationship between the boroughs and the programme and ensuring the programme stays up to date with the changing demands on boroughs.
- Developing options for the grants programme post 2017.
- In summer 2015, closing down the existing seven-year London Councils European Social Fund programme and creating a new seven-year programme in its place. In doing so, ensuring the programme meets the needs of boroughs.

Executive

Devolution and Public Service Reform - Update

Item no: 7

Report by: Doug Flight **Job title:** Head of Strategic Policy
Date: 3 March 2015
Contact Officer: Doug Flight **Email:** Doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk
Telephone: 020 7934 9805

Summary

This report provides an update on recent work in pursuit of devolution and reform of public services in London. This work follows the agreement to a joint approach with the Mayor of London, seeking talks with Government on the scope of a London devolution and public service reform agreement.

Work is in hand to develop the technical detail required to support this joint approach for devolution and reform. These proposals relate to:

- Skills
- Employment
- Housing
- Health
- Crime, Community Safety and Criminal Justice

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

- 1) Note the progress made, including the work which is in hand to develop a platform to support negotiation with Government.
- 2) Comment on the draft discussion paper on re-commissioning the Work Programme, attached as Appendix A, and agree a submission to DWP officials.
- 3) Agree to continue influencing work around the case for London, including the drafting of a short publication for sign-off by Elected Officers.

Devolution and Public Service Reform Update

Introduction

1. This report provides an update on recent progress in pursuit of devolution and reform of public services in London. This follows the agreement at Leaders' Committee on 9 December 2014 to a joint approach with the Mayor of London, seeking talks with Government on the scope of a London devolution and public service reform agreement.

Background

2. Leaders' Committee has considered a series of linked reports over the last two years on the longer-term prospects for financing local government together with wider opportunities for devolution and reform, including the London Growth Deal.
3. At Leaders' Committee on 15 July 2014, members agreed that it would be advantageous for the focus of London Councils work in this area to encompass wider public service reform initiatives, particularly given the preparations for the General Election and likely comprehensive spending review expected in the summer of 2015 and the consequent opportunities for influencing manifestos and post-election spending plans.
4. This work led to the drafting of an outline proposition, which had been designed as a platform for practical delegation of responsibility to London in relation to a range of public services, where integration at a local level would produce more effective outcomes and greater efficiency.
5. The outline proposition included proposals for governance of newly devolved responsibilities, focussed on Borough Leaders and the Mayor and building to some degree on existing joint arrangements. The powers sought and the governance arrangements to support them do not take any powers away from any existing local or regional authority. The sovereignty of individual authorities in respect of existing functions remains unaffected and paramount.
6. The Mayor of London and London Councils Executive considered the broad scope of a potential proposition at the Congress Executive meeting on 20 November 2014. There was support for an approach to Government seeking talks on the scope of a London devolution and public service reform agreement.

7. The Chair and the Conservative Group Lead for Devolution & Public Service Reform met the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform Group in November and sought their support for the development of detailed propositions supporting the political initiative agreed with the Mayor of London.
8. At Leaders' Committee on 9 December 2014, members formally agreed the broad scope of the proposals as a potential basis for negotiations with Government. Following a formal approach by the Mayor of London and Chair of London Councils, the Chancellor wrote to confirm that the Government was happy to discuss further devolution to cities and encouraged London to pursue this through discussions with the Minister for Cities and his officials.
9. Leaders' Committee considered a report on the London Devolution Proposition at its meeting on 10 February 2015 and endorsed the approach being taken, including the work being taken by chief executives to develop the initial framework of operational detail to support negotiations with Government.
10. Increased political oversight will be added as the propositions develop, through direct engagement between relevant London Councils' Portfolio Holders and the individual chief executives who are leading specific streams of the work. In addition, the Chair and Cllr Philippa Roe are scheduled to meet with Chief Executives' Group to review progress before Easter.

Supporting the Proposition

11. Operational work to develop more detailed propositions is now underway and is being co-ordinated by the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform Group, facilitated by London Councils. The Group encompasses both borough and GLA representatives. This phase of work aims to develop credible propositions, underpinned by a thorough analysis of the available data, to support exploratory discussions with officials before the General Election. This work should also provide a detailed foundation for rapid progress in engaging with the next government once its policy priorities emerge following the general election.
12. Building on the themes agreed by Leaders' Committee the five current areas of focus are:
 - Employment
 - Skills
 - Health
 - Housing
 - Crime Community Safety and Criminal Justice.

13. The development of the propositions has begun with wide-ranging engagement with member authorities and officials. As a result of these discussions, it is increasingly clear that each of the five areas is likely to demand some different approaches to governance, geography and delivery.
14. As reported to Leaders' Committee on 10 February 2015, the addition of a Crime, Community Safety and Criminal Justice strand offers the opportunity for a clearer examination of the case for reform of parts of the criminal justice system.

Influencing Re-commissioning the Work Programme

15. In addition to the London proposition on employment, London Councils officers have been discussing arrangements for the re-commissioning of the Work Programme¹ with DWP officials. This opportunity arose out of the London Growth Deal – specifically from Central London Forward's (CLF) Working Capital pilot. The pilot negotiated a commitment from DWP to gain London government's input into the considerations around the design of a future Work Programme – that is, support for long-term unemployed Londoners. Discussions have therefore included representatives from the GLA and CLF.
16. DWP officials have invited London to submit a paper outlining its proposed approach to co-commissioning the successor to the Work Programme by early March 2015. This will inform their discussions with current Ministers and will be an opportunity to influence officials' thinking after the General Election in May 2015.
17. The draft paper outlines three localised models, allowing for a differential approach to devolution across London:
- Co-commissioning and co-design of specialist employment support;
 - Partnership delivery of specialist employment support (partial devolution);
 - Local leadership and control of specialist employment support (full devolution).
18. A summary of the draft proposals is attached as Appendix A. The Executive is asked to comment on and agree the draft proposals prior to the submission of this paper.

Promoting the Case for London

19. In addition to the detailed technical work being developed to support the proposition, it will be important to continue broader influencing work around the wider devolution agenda in the run

¹ Work Programme contracts are due to end by June 2016, although it is possible this may be extended to June 2017.

up to the 2015 General Election and to encourage wider engagement with stakeholders and in particular elected members and officers across London.

20. The Charter for Local Freedom which was launched by the Core Cities in February has provided a useful hook for discussion about the importance of devolution to local government. However, its focus is on the national case for devolution, within which London might be overlooked.
21. To help ensure that the case for London is made in advance of the general election it is proposed that a short and accessible publication be produced, setting out London Councils' high-level aspirations around devolution, as discussed above, set in the context of the wider London local government case. The publication could then provide a reference point for discussions with local business, voluntary and public sector partners.
22. It is proposed that the publication would cover:
- Devolution and reform in respect of:
- Employment
 - Skills
 - Health
 - Housing
 - Crime Community Safety and Criminal Justice.
- Together with London Councils' established asks around:
- Infrastructure
 - Fair Funding
 - School Places
23. Following guidance on the scope of the document from today's Executive, a draft will be prepared for sign-off by Elected Officers.

Long Term Economic Plan for London

24. As this report was being finalised, the Chancellor and the Mayor of London made an announcement on a long term economic plan for London. The plan includes measures that relate to the devolution and reform agenda, including:

- Skills - Devolution of the Apprenticeship Grant to Employers and a remit to work with Government to reshape skills provision in London.
- Land - Establishing a London Land Commission to identify public sector land for development and support home building.
- Planning - Beginning discussions on planning devolution, including powers over sight lines for strategic views and wharves (i.e. those safeguarded for waterborne freight handling use).
- Housing - The designation of nine Housing Zones.

Members may wish to take account of these initiatives within their overall consideration of devolution and public service reform opportunities in London.

Conclusion

25. Work is now in hand to add operational detail to the London proposition, and to assemble a platform which might gain traction in negotiation with officials in advance of the General Election.

26. It is envisaged that these initial discussions will be followed after the General Election by the development of firmer propositions and supporting evidence, which could then become the basis of detailed negotiations with the new government. Leaders will have the opportunity to shape any evolution of the propositions.

27. Given the timetable for the re-commissioning of the Work programme, it is important that engagement with the DWP officials, which arose from the London Growth Deal, continues to take place. To ensure consistency, this engagement will be aligned with the Chief Executive's Devolution & Public Service Reform Group's work on the employment elements of the London proposition.

28. The work on the London devolution and public sector reform proposition could usefully be supplemented by a short accessible publication making the case for London, for use in discussion with partners.

29. The Executive is asked to:

1. Note the progress made, including the work which is in hand to develop a platform to support negotiation with Government.
2. Comment on the draft discussion paper on re-commissioning the Work Programme, attached as Appendix A, and agree a submission to DWP officials.
3. Agree to continue influencing work around the case for London, including the drafting of a short publication for sign-off by Elected Officers.

Financial implications for London Councils

None

Legal implications for London Councils

Any work to develop shared governance structures recommendations would be subject to detailed legal advice.

Equalities implications for London Councils

There are no direct equalities implications for London Councils as a result of this paper.

Attachments

Appendix A: Summary of London's draft co-commissioning proposals for the Work Programme

Appendix A:

Summary of London's draft co-commissioning proposals for the Work Programme

Overview

London's engagement in this area is driven by a broader ambition around transforming public services to effectively address complex dependency. It is increasingly clear that a radical re-design of public spending along these lines is needed if services are to be put on a more sustainable financial footing. This paper provides a starting point for negotiations on how, through a new relationship between central and London government, we can collectively devise solutions that will maximise our impact on this complex challenge. Below we outline three models:

- Co-commissioning and co-design of specialist employment support²;
- Partnership delivery of specialist employment support (partial devolution);
- Local leadership and control of specialist employment support (full devolution).

This allows for a differential approach for employment devolution. However, London's ambition has always been to move as far towards full devolution as possible. We expect parts of London to have the opportunity to operate on partial devolution model when the successor to the Work Programme is re-commissioned, with the potential for full devolution for people with complex needs.

All three models require a **new approach to common assessment** and opportunities for early referral to the programme for some clients. London proposes using a more sophisticated jobseeker profiling and segmentation tool, building on models tested in Australia and Ireland. Clients in certain benefit groups or on Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) for a certain period of time should also trigger an in-depth common assessment that would direct them to suitable support as early as possible.

1. Co-commissioning and co-design of specialist employment support

This is the least ambitious model and is closest to the current Work Programme. It will retain the framework of a national programme for specialist employment support delivered by prime providers, with outcome-based payments. However, it will involve substantially greater local authority and LEP participation in the design and commissioning of the programme. There is local involvement at all stages of the procurement cycle.

Advantages

This model will address the lack of integration of mainstream employment programmes with other local services. By joining up throughout the commissioning process both DWP and local areas will have a better understanding of what is being commissioned, who is being targeted and what the needs of this client group will be. This will allow London boroughs to consider how best to allow clients accessing this employment support to also access the other services they

² Specialist employment support is support for long-term unemployed people and jobseekers with complex needs

require and join-up their customer journey. It would result in a much more locally responsive programme. However, this model's ability to unlock access to and the value of other local services would be limited compared to the other proposed models.

Proposed process

- Contract Package Areas (CPAs) will be agreed between DWP and councils, leading to units smaller than the current CPAs and aligned with existing multi-borough arrangements in London;
- The programme will be funded by DWP, with outcome payments for prime providers that incentivise sustained employment and a focus on those with complex needs. The balance of service and outcome payments will depend on the client group³;
- The prime provider will 'own' the participants after their referral from JCP, holding them on a caseload and managing the customer journey;
- Local authorities will commit to aligning provision of related services and funding streams, based on 'statements of intent' with prime providers;
- DWP will lead on contract management with increased accountability to the GLA/ LEP and borough sub-regional groupings on performance.

In practice this would mean London involvement in 6 key areas:

Assessing local needs - London boroughs would come together in sub-regional groups to work in partnership with DWP and jointly develop a Local Labour Market Agreement setting out local needs and priorities for intervention;

Deciding the priorities for intervention - Joint decision making on the priorities of the programme in each CPA to ensure that local priorities are reflected in the programme specification;

Design of services – retaining the 'black box' model of service delivery but developing with DWP common minimum standards for providers to work with clients and more directive conditions in relation to the priority groups in local areas - for example, focusing services on particular areas with concentrations of long term unemployed residents;

Shaping the structure of supply – London boroughs and DWP working together to ensure sufficient time and opportunities for the inclusion of specialist providers in the supply chain;

Selecting the provider – groups of boroughs to have co-decision making powers with DWP on their assessment panels, including validating their supply chains and interrogating the robustness of providers' local service integration plans.

Monitoring and evaluating provision - A sub-regional programme board would be established to provide an additional level of performance management and scrutiny on Work Programme Plus contract. This would be made up of political leads, business representation, skills providers and Jobcentre Plus representatives. This board would report to the DWP contract manager for the CPA on matters relating to local integration, performance against local priorities, best practice and operational delivery.

³ The recent Work Programme evaluation indicated that differential pricing by benefit group made little difference to how the delivery providers segmented support for customers. This partly related to funds not being high enough for complex groups. In London detailed work on payment by results models for a range groups has been developed to help inform the 2014-20 London ESF programme which can be used to help inform Work programme Plus.

2. Partnership delivery of specialist employment support (partial devolution)

This will be a development of CLF's 'Working Capital' model. It would give groups of London boroughs the lead commissioning role in relation to DWP programme funding for their area, in return for contributing agreed resources and services of its own into the programme. To sharpen incentives and drive meaningful collaboration, boroughs would also share any financial reward for strong performance.

Advantages

The main advantage is that this model will unlock and align other local service resources⁴ towards clients on the programme and consequently, improve programme performance, particularly for those with more complex needs. Other advantages include clear links with local support services for Universal Credit (UC) and drawing on London's USdI⁵ pilots to future proof the programme with regards to UC; London's ability to align European Social Fund (ESF) resources to the programme and the opportunity to design in protocols around data sharing where needed.

Proposed process

- DWP and local government will jointly sign off on the core objectives and specification for the programme;
- There will be smaller contract package areas, aligned to existing multi-borough arrangements in London;
- DWP, HMT and local government to agree the level of financial and/or service contribution from the boroughs to unlock national programme funding;
- London boroughs to be responsible for commissioning a provider (or 'managing agent') and will jointly manage and deliver the programme with them;
- DWP to provide technical support for the process and sign off both the tender documents and commissioning decision as a condition for releasing the national programme funding that would pay the 'managing agent', alongside local resource;
- The 'managing agent' will be paid largely on the basis of outcomes. Any bonus payments for exceptional job outcome performance will be split between the 'managing agent' and London boroughs;
- The 'managing agent' will 'own' the participants after their referral from Jobcentre Plus, holding them on a caseload and managing the customer journey;
- Specialist employment support within the programme would be provided by: a) the 'managing agent'; b) the local council; or c) through sub-contracting with other public services, external providers or voluntary organisations; or a combination of the three.
- There will be transparent, published performance and expenditure data, as well as independent monitoring and evaluation of the programme. DWP will establish a mechanism for resolving any disputes between local authorities and 'managing agents'.

⁴ These include health and public health, skills, Homelessness support services; adult social services; childcare and early years; Troubled Families; local financial support such as Discretionary Housing Payments

⁵ Universal Services – delivering locally

3. Local leadership and control of specialist employment support (full devolution)

London's ambition has always been to have full local leadership and control over specialist employment support services, such as the Work Programme and Work Choice. This would involve London taking full control of the design and delivery of specialist employment support. Operating as a service rather than a programme, it would involve devolving national funding on the basis of rolling central-local agreements on employment priorities and goals, in return for London boroughs committing quantified financial and/or service contributions and agreeing to a 'risk and reward' sharing formula based on performance.

Advantages

This model will provide the opportunity to develop a truly integrated and co-ordinated job brokerage service for employers that reduces bureaucracy and interactions with public agencies. Integration with local services could be developed further through pooled budgets and joint commissioning, allowing significant public service reform. It will enable London boroughs to work with partners including schools, colleges, providers, careers service and JCP to build effective local partnerships and monitor performance of all commissioned employment programmes.

Proposed process

- Central and local government will enter into an agreement, covering a defined time period, about the priorities for specialist employment support and the expected outcomes. As part of this agreement, central government will devolve programme funding on condition that local government commits an agreed level of resources and services towards shared priorities and goals and enters into risk and reward sharing arrangement;
- Local government will then have the freedom and responsibility to organise specialist employment support in its area, using the national and local resources at its disposal. Authorities could decide to directly provide services or commission services or use a combination of both;
- Councils will be required to publish a service plan, setting out how resources would be used and how support will be delivered. DWP will provide technical assistance and plans would be subject to open and independent scrutiny, for example from the National Audit Office;
- The local service will 'own' the participants after their referral from Jobcentre Plus, holding them on a caseload and managing the customer journey. It will also be responsible for overseeing service data and systems;
- Local government will share the financial dividend from lower benefit expenditure resulting from effective performance, while assuming a share of the liability for underperformance;
- At the end of the agreed timescale, a further central-local agreement would be struck for the next period, drawing on the lessons of past performance. If performance had been weak, there would be provision for DWP to: demand greater local risk sharing for continued devolution; add additional 'strings' to national funding; or, in the last instance, to re-commission employment support from Whitehall.

Executive

Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2014/15

Item no: 8

Report by: Frank Smith

Job title: Director of Corporate Resources

Date: 3 March 2015

Contact Officer: Frank Smith

Telephone: 020 7934 9700

Email: frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report summarises actual income expenditure recorded in the accounts as at 31 December 2014 (Month 9), provides a projected outturn figure for the year and highlights any significant forecast variances against the approved budget. A separate forecast is provided for each of London Councils three funding streams. The summary forecast outturn position is as follows:

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Total expenditure	289,209	391,752	388,348	(3,404)
Total income	(289,638)	(389,743)	(387,376)	2,367
Use of reserves	(1,139)	(2,009)	(2,098)	(89)
Net deficit/(surplus)	(1,568)	-	(1,126)	(1,126)
Net expenditure by Committee				
Grants	250	-	(91)	(91)
Transport and Environment	(890)	-	(418)	(418)
Joint	(928)	-	(617)	(617)
Net deficit/(surplus)	(1,568)	-	(1,126)	(1,126)

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to note the overall forecast surplus as at 31 December 2014 (Month 9) of £1.126 million (surplus £769,000 at Month 6).

Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2014/15

Introduction

1. London Councils revenue expenditure budget for 2014/15, as approved by the Leaders' Committee in December 2013 was £390.763 million. The budget for TEC was then adjusted to reflect the increase of £882,000 in payments to the taxicard provider, plus funding of £107,000 was carried forward from 2013/14 to give a revised expenditure budget for 2014/15 of £391.752 million.
2. The corresponding revenue income budget approved by the Leaders' Committee in December 2013 was £390.763 million, which included an approved transfer of £1.902 million from reserves; £1.309 million of which related to the return of funds to boroughs. Additional income available from both boroughs and TfL for 2014/15 in respect of taxicard was then included, along with a further transfer from reserves of £107,000 in respect of the brought forward expenditure. Total income, therefore, equals £391.752 million, which produces a balanced budget for the year.
3. This report analyses actual income and expenditure at the nine month stage of the current financial year and highlights any significant variances emerging against the approved budget. Briefly, after excluding the £1.852 million projected underspend on taxicard, the projected surplus of £1.126 million is broken down as follows:
 - A projected net underspend of £359,000 in respect of officer employee costs;
 - A projected net deficit of £161,000 in respect of TEC traded services;
 - A projected net underspend of £96,000 relating to commissions in respect of the S.48 grants scheme, £12,000 of which relates to liabilities from 2011/12;
 - A projected overspend of £696,000 relating payments relating to the borough/DWP ESF programme, as the 2013-15 two year programme winds down to completion and slippage in respect of the first year is applied, offset by an increase in ESF grant of £348,000 and a matched by a transfer from accumulated ESF reserves of £72,000 and borough contributions received in advance in 2013/14 of £276,000;
 - A projected underspend of £155,000 on the £2 million budget for payments to independent bus operators, based on invoices received to date in the financial year;
 - An underspend of £290,000 in respect of the commissioning budget and an underspend of £105,000 in respect of improvement and efficiency work; and
 - Projected additional income arising from Lorry Control enforcement and net replacement Freedom Passes income of £102,000 and £190,000 respectively, offset by a projected net deficit on various sources of other income of £10,000.

4. Table 1 below details the overall forecast position, with Tables 2-4 showing the position for the three separate funding streams.

Table 1 – Summary Income and Expenditure Forecast 2014/15, as at 31 December 2014.

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	3,395	5,299	4,940	(359)
Running Costs	2,234	2,769	2,845	76
Central Recharges	230	257	305	48
Total Operating Expenditure	5,859	8,325	8,090	(235)
Direct Services	7,199	11,836	10,442	(1,394)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	266,980	359,813	357,835	(1,978)
Commissioned grants services	5,448	7,540	7,444	(96)
London Funders Group	60	60	60	-
ESF commissioned services	2,091	1,880	2,576	696
One-off borough payment	1,139	1,309	1,309	-
Improvement and Efficiency work	167	305	200	(105)
YPES Regional/Provider Activities	134	132	162	30
Commissioning and Research	132	552	230	(322)
Total Expenditure	289,209	391,752	388,348	(3,404)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(268,841)	(360,051)	(358,418)	1,633
Borough contribution towards grant payments	(6,957)	(8,540)	(8,816)	(276)
Borough contribution towards YPES payments	(66)	(66)	(66)	-
Income for direct services	(6,552)	(11,920)	(10,440)	1,480
Core Member Subscriptions	(6,016)	(6,131)	(6,131)	-
Borough contribution towards LCP payments	(222)	(210)	(222)	(12)
Government Grants	(680)	(1,461)	(1,826)	(365)
Interest on Investments	(79)	(75)	(81)	(6)
Other Income	(225)	(421)	(460)	(39)
Central Recharges	-	(868)	(916)	(48)
Transfer from Reserves	(1,139)	(2,009)	(2,098)	(89)
Total Income	(290,777)	(391,752)	(389,474)	2,278
Net Expenditure	(1,568)	-	(1,126)	(1,126)
Applied to Funding Streams				
Grants Committee	250	-	(91)	(91)
Transport and Environment Committee	(890)	-	(418)	(418)
Joint Committee Functions	(928)	-	(617)	(617)
Net Expenditure	(1,568)	-	(1,126)	(1,126)

Revenue Forecast Position as at 31 December 2014 – Grants Committee

5. Table 2 below summarises the forecast outturn position for the Grants Committee:

Table 2 – Summary Forecast – Grants Committee

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	272	350	401	51
Running Costs	15	72	52	(20)
Central Recharges	88	86	117	31
Total Operating Expenditure	375	508	570	62
Research	-	12	-	(12)
Commissioned grants services	5,448	7,540	7,444	(96)
London Funders Group	60	60	60	-
ESF grant payments	2,091	1,880	2,576	696
One-off payment to boroughs	800	800	800	-
Total Expenditure	8,774	10,800	11,450	650
Income				
Borough contribution towards commissions	(6,957)	(8,540)	(8,816)	(276)
Borough contributions towards the administration of commissions	(345)	(460)	(460)	-
Government Grants	(411)	(1,000)	(1,365)	(365)
Interest on Investments	(11)	-	(11)	(11)
Other Income	-	-	-	-
Transfer from Reserves	(800)	(800)	(889)	(89)
Total Income	(8,524)	(10,800)	(11,541)	(741)
Net Expenditure	250	-	(91)	(91)

6. The projected surplus of £91,000, is split between the following:

- A projected underspend of £83,208 in respect of borough funded commissioned services, as agreed by the Grants Committee, relating to 2014/15;
- An underspend of £12,500 relating to a potential liability for 2011/12 which will now not be paid;
- A projected overspend of £696,000 relating payments relating to the borough/DWP ESF programme, as the 2013-15 two year programme winds down to completion and slippage in respect of the first year is applied, offset by an increase in ESF grant of £348,000 and matched by a combined transfer from accumulated ESF reserves of £72,000 and borough contributions received in advance in 2013/14 of £276,000; and
- A projected net overspend of £5,000 in respect of the administration of commissions, compared to a projected net overspend of £44,000 at the half-year stage.

Revenue Forecast Position as at 31 December 2014 – Transport and Environment Committee

7. Table 3 below summarises the forecast outturn position for the Transport and Environment Committee:

Table 3 – Summary Forecast – Transport and Environment Committee

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure				
Employee Costs	374	644	515	(129)
Running Costs	133	134	155	21
Central Recharges	38	42	51	9
Total Operating Expenditure	545	820	721	(99)
Direct Services	7,133	11,770	10,376	(1,394)
Research	-	40	20	(20)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	266,980	359,813	357,835	(1,978)
One-off payment to boroughs	-	170	170	-
Total Expenditure	274,658	372,613	369,122	(3,491)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(268,841)	(360,051)	(358,418)	1,633
Income for direct services	(6,552)	(11,920)	(10,440)	1,480
Core Member Subscriptions	(97)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(16)	-	(16)	(16)
Other Income	(42)	(63)	(87)	(24)
Transfer from Reserves	-	(482)	(482)	-
Total Income	(275,548)	(372,613)	(369,540)	3,073
Net Expenditure	(890)	-	(418)	(418)

8. The projected surplus of £418,000 is made up of the following:

- A projected overall deficit of £161,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during this nine month period. This is attributable to a number of areas.
 - Firstly, there is a projected net deficit of £117,000 in respect of parking and traffic appeals. The number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations processed over this period amounts to 44,273, giving a projected number for the year of 56,957, 13,043 less than the budgeted figure of 70,000. The current throughput of appeals is 2.93 appeals per hour, compared to a budget figure of 3.29.
 - Secondly, the use of other parking systems by boroughs and TfL has reduced over this period, which has led to a projected reduction in income of £85,000 for the year offset by a reduction in variable unit charges of £42,000 payable to the contractor, Capita. The projected net deficit for other parking systems is, therefore, £43,000.

- A projected underspend of £88,000 in respect of employee costs. The cost of staff providing direct services (included within the various service administration charges) is estimated to overspend by £26,000, although this is offset by an underspend on staffing costs attributable to non-operational and policy staff of £114,000. In addition, the maternity cover budget is estimated to be underspent by £15,000.
- A projected overall underspend of £155,000 on the £2 million budget for payments to independent bus operators, based on invoices received to date in the financial year;
- Based on income collected during this period and focussing on receipts in the most recent month (December), receipts from Lorry Control PCN income are forecast to exceed the budget of £450,000 by £102,000.
- Based on income collected during this period and focussing on receipts in the most recent month (December) income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes are forecast to exceed the budget of £500,000 by £219,000. This additional income is offset by bank charges of £22,000, plus a projected marginal overspend on annual survey and reissue costs of £7,000.
- In respect of the overall cost of the 2015 Freedom Pass issue exercise, expenditure is projected to be £200,000 less than the £3.141 million budget provision and this sum will be returned to reserves at the end of the process. This sum is also reflected in the current position on reserves as highlighted at Table 2 at paragraph 5.
- Based on income collected during this period and focussing on receipts in the most recent month (December), receipts from the administration of the Health Emergency Badge scheme are forecast to exceed the budget of £30,000 by £26,000.
- Investment income on Committee reserves is estimated to generate £16,000 in the current year, against a zero budgetary provision. The average monthly cash balance held over this nine month period in £2.774 million.
- General/office running costs and central recharges are projected to overspend by £30,000.
- The research budget is projected to underspend by £20,000.

Revenue Forecast Position as at 31 December 2014 – Joint Committee Core Functions

9. Table 4 below summarises the forecast outturn position for the Joint Committee core functions:

Table 4 – Summary Forecast – Joint Committee core functions

	M9 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure				
Employee Costs	2,749	4,305	4,024	(281)
Running Costs	2,086	2,563	2,638	75
Central Recharges	104	129	137	8
Total Operating Expenditure	4,939	6,997	6,799	(198)
Direct Services	66	66	66	-
Commissioning and Research	132	500	210	(290)
Improvement and Efficiency work	167	305	200	(105)
YPES Regional/Provider Activities	134	132	162	30
One-off borough payment	339	339	339	-
Total Expenditure	5,777	8,339	7,776	(563)
Income				
Income for direct services	-	-	-	-
Core Member Subscriptions	(5,574)	(5,574)	(5,574)	-
Borough contribution towards YPES payments	(66)	(66)	(66)	-
Borough contribution towards LCP payments	(222)	(210)	(222)	(12)
Government Grants	(269)	(461)	(461)	-
Interest on Investments	(52)	(75)	(54)	21
Other Income	(183)	(358)	(373)	(15)
Central Recharges	-	(868)	(916)	(48)
Transfer from Reserves	(339)	(727)	(727)	-
Total Income	(6,705)	(8,339)	(8,393)	(54)
Net Expenditure	(928)	-	(617)	(617)

10. A surplus of £617,000 is projected against the approved budget in respect of the joint committee core functions. Employee costs are projected to underspend by £281,000, primarily due to holding off recruiting to certain current vacant posts and maximising charging of salary costs to other funding sources.
11. Improvement and efficiency projects are forecast to underspend by £105,000 due to project slippage and the commissioning budget is forecast to underspend by £290,000.
12. The YPES regional programme is projected to overspend by £30,000, but this is fully offset by additional income sources of £30,000. Residual infrastructure improvements have been undertaken to the meeting rooms and the access control system at Southwark Street, costing

£75,000, but this has been partially funded by the approved carry forward of earmarked reserves from 2013/14.

13. The projected underspends are offset by a small projected deficit on investment income of £21,000 and a deficit in projected income from a number of sources of £15,000.

14. Finally, central recharge income will increase by £48,000 due to the revised methodology in central services chargeable to the TEC and Grants funding streams.

Externally Funded Projects

15. For the externally funded projects managed by London Councils, the projected outturn position is detailed at Table 5 below:

Table 5 – Summary Forecast – Joint Committee external projects

	M9 Actual	Budget Plans	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure				
Employee Costs	458	586	610	24
Running Costs	5,640	6,650	7,679	1,029
Total Expenditure	6,098	7,236	8,289	1,053
Income				
Borough Contributions (Non-grants ESF/ EU)	(6,846)	(7,211)	(8,258)	(1,047)
Other Income	(10)	(25)	(31)	(6)
Transfer from Reserve		0		
Total Income	(6,956)	(7,236)	(8,289)	(1,053)
Revised Net Expenditure	(858)	-	-	-

16. The externally funded projects are estimated to have matched income and expenditure of £8.289 million for 2014/15. This is based on a regular review of the indicative budget plans held at London Councils by the designated project officers, which confirms that there is no projected net cost to London Councils for running these projects during 2014/15.

Reserves

17. The current position on the overall level of London Councils reserves is detailed in Table 6 below, which includes the forecast outturn position for the current year this stage:

Table 6 - Estimated level of Reserves as at 31 March 2015

	Transport and Environment Committee (£000)		Joint Committee (£000)	Grants Committee (£000)		Total (£000)
	General	Specific	General	S.48	ESF	
Total audited reserves at 1 April 2014	1,886	1,800	6,051	1,177	773	11,687
Resources committed in 2014/15	(487)	-	(918)	-	(89)	(1,494)
One-off payment to boroughs 2014/15	(170)	-	(339)	(800)	-	(1,309)
Resources committed in 2015/16 and 2016/17	(916)	(1,800)	(1,091)	-	(250)	(4,057)
One-off payment to boroughs 2015/16	-	-	(825)	-	-	(825)
Provisional (deficit)/surplus for 2014/15	418	-	617	91	-	1,126
Provisional reserves as at 31 March 2015	731	-	3,495	468	434	5,128

18. The current level of commitments from reserves, as detailed in Table 6, comes to £7.685 million and are detailed in full in Table 7 below:

Table 7– Current Commitments from Reserves

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Approved transfer from JC general reserves	164	164	-	328
Approved transfer from TEC general reserves	255	-	-	255
TEC system developments	57	-	-	57
Housing Directors Fund	127	-	-	127
Depreciation provision	50	-	-	50
Accumulated YPES regional funds	174	150	527	851
Slippage of ESG grants funding	89	250	-	339
2015 Freedom Pass Issue	-	2,541	-	2,541
One-off repayment to boroughs in 2013/14	1,309	825	-	2,134
New appeals hearing centre	175	175	-	350
Support to the health transition process	403	250	-	653
Totals	2,803	4,355	527	7,685

19. Table 7 includes the outcome of the 2015/16 budget setting process agreed in December 2014, where members approved the repatriation of £825,000 to boroughs from joint committee reserves, the use of joint committee reserves of £164,000 to set the 2015/16 joint committee budget and the approved sum £250,000 from grants committee reserves to continue funding the 10 existing ESF commissions for the first quarter in 2015/16.

Conclusions

20. This report highlights the projected outturn position for the current year, based on transactions undertaken up until 31 December 2014 (month 9), together with known future developments. At this point, a forecast underspend of £1.126 million is projected for 2014/15, across the three funding streams, compared to £769,000 projected at the half year stage.
21. The next monitoring report will be presented to the Executive in June 2015, which will highlight the pre-audited outturn position against the approved budget for the 2014/15 financial year.

Recommendations

22. The Executive is asked to note the overall forecast surplus as at 31 December 2014 (Month 9) of £1.126 million.

Financial Implications for London Councils

No additional implications other than detailed in the body of the report.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

None

Background Papers

London Councils Revenue Forecast File 2014/15

Executive

Debtors Update Report

Item no: 9

Report by: David Sanni **Job title:** Head of Financial Accounting
Date: 3 March 2015
Contact Officer: David Sanni
Telephone: 020 7934 9704 **Email:** david.sanni@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the level of outstanding debt owed to London Councils from all sources as at 31 December 2014. This report also details the reduction in the level of outstanding debt due from boroughs, TfL and the GLA in the period to 31 July 2014.

A summary of the level of London Councils outstanding debts as at 31 December 2014 is shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1- Summary of London Councils Outstanding Debts at 31 December 2014

Period	Borough / TfL / GLA Debts £000	Other Debts £000	Total Debts £000
Debts invoiced up to 31/7/2014	24	61	85
Debts invoiced between 1/8/2014 to 31/12/2014	1,458	220	1,678
Total	1,482	281	1,763

Recommendations

The Executive is asked:

- To note the level of outstanding debt of £23,559.47 in relation to borough, TfL and GLA invoices raised up until 31 July 2014, a reduction on the outstanding figure of £4.056 million reported to the Executive at their meeting on 9 September 2014;
- To note the level of outstanding debt of £1.458 million in respect of borough, TfL and GLA invoices raised in the period 1 August to 31 December 2014;

- To note the level of outstanding debt of £281,368.33 in relation to other debtors invoices raised up until 31 December 2014; and
 - To note the specific action being taken in respect of significant debtors, as detailed in paragraph 6 and 9 of this report.
-

Debtors Update Report

Introduction

1. London Councils' Executive received a report at its meeting on 9 September 2014 which detailed the level of outstanding debt due from member boroughs, TfL and the GLA for invoices raised up to 31 July 2014. The position reported to this meeting is illustrated in Table 2 below:

Table 2 – Outstanding Borough/TfL and GLA debt invoiced up until 31 July 2014, as reported to the Executive on 9 September 2014

Debtor	Debt Amount (£)
Member boroughs	3,520,324.14
TfL	122,913.02
GLA	412,758.60
Total	4,055,995.76

Current Position

2. The current position in respect of outstanding debt due from member boroughs, TfL and the GLA up to 31 July 2014 is detailed in Table 3 below:

Table 3 – Outstanding Borough/TfL and GLA debt invoiced up until 31 July 2014, as at 31 December 2014

Debtor	Debt Amount (£)
Member boroughs	23,559.47
TfL	-
GLA	-
Total	23,559.47

3. A breakdown of the outstanding debt is included at Appendix A to this report. Finance officers are currently liaising with the appropriate borough officers with the aim of clearing the bulk of this debt by the end of March 2015.

Borough/TfL/GLA Debt 1 August to 31 December 2014

4. Appendix B to this report shows the level of outstanding debt owed to London Councils by its member boroughs and TfL/GLA over the period 1 August to 31 December 2014, which totals £1.458 million. This debt is profiled as illustrated in Table 4 below:

Table 4 – Outstanding Borough/TfL and GLA debt 1 August to 31 December 2014

Debtor	0-30 days (£000)	30-60 Days (£000)	60-90 Days (£000)	Over 90 Days (£000)	Total (£000)
Member boroughs	98	837	286	236	1,457
TfL	1	-	-	-	1
GLA	-	-	-	-	-
Total	99	837	286	236	1,458

5. Under the terms of the Financial Services SLA with the City of London, reminders in respect of unpaid invoices are sent out to debtors by the City on behalf of London Councils after 21 and 35 days. If a debt is still outstanding after 42 days, it is handed back over to London Councils for further action to be taken. Finance officers are, therefore, actively pursuing the debt of £635,000 that has been outstanding for over 60 days. The aim is to ensure that the majority of the unpaid debt at any point in time has been outstanding for less than 30 days, with a minimal amount being outstanding for between 30 and 60 days. Boroughs, TfL and GLA are urged to ensure that any disputed amounts are promptly reported back to London Councils, detailing the full nature of the dispute. In cases where the value and/or number of outstanding invoices owed by a borough are unacceptably high, the debts are referred to the Chief Executive and Borough Treasurer through contact from the London Councils Chief Executive and /or Director of Corporate Resources to assist in the recovery of the funds.

Significant Borough/TfL/GLA Debtors

6. The significant individual borough, TfL and GLA debtors within the outstanding balances over 60 days are:
- LB of Brent – £76,121.50 - 6 invoices (Now £66,464.06 – 4 invoices)**
 The balance is made up of six invoices that relate to charges for TEC parking services for the second quarter of 2014/15 (£44,033.68), Taxicard subscriptions for the second and third quarters of 2014/15 (£22,083.00), contribution to the discretionary ESF match funded programme (£8,333.33) and charges for TEC parking services for abandoned/untaxed vehicles (£1,671.49). The invoice for the match funded programme and an invoice for the TEC parking services for abandoned/untaxed vehicles (£1,324.11) were paid in January 2015. The borough's Chief Finance Officer has been advised of the outstanding Taxicard subscriptions and finance officers are currently liaising with colleagues in the borough to ensure the debts are settled as soon as possible.

- **LB of Camden - £68,936.44 – 3 invoices (Now £66,968.73 – 1 invoice)**

The balance is made up of three invoices that relate to charges for TEC parking services for the second quarter of 2014/15 (£66,968.73), 2014/15 annual parking core subscription (£1,500) and charges for TEC parking services for abandoned/untaxed vehicles (£467.71). The invoices for the annual parking core subscription and the TEC parking services for abandoned and untaxed vehicles have now been paid. Borough officers have confirmed that the remaining invoice will be paid as soon as possible.

- **LB of Ealing - £42,736.50 – 1 invoice (Now Nil)**

The balance consists of one invoice that relates to charges for TEC parking services for the second quarter of 2014/15. This invoice was paid in January 2015.

- **LB of Haringey - £34,083.99 – 3 invoices (Now Nil)**

The balance is made up of three invoices that relate to a contribution to the discretionary ESF match funded programme (£33,250), an interest charge on the late payment of Concessionary Fares scheme contribution to TfL (£782.45) and other charges (£51.54). All three invoices have been paid.

- **LB of Havering - £64,922 – 1 invoice**

The balance consists of one invoice that relates to the subscription to London Councils Grants Committee for the third quarter of 2014/15. Finance officers are currently liaising with colleagues in the borough to ensure the debt is settled as soon as possible.

- **RB of Kensington & Chelsea - £46,923.50 – 1 invoice (Now Nil)**

The balance consists of one invoice that relates to the Taxicard subscription for the third quarter of 2014/15. This invoice has now been paid.

- **LB of Lambeth - £37,385.99 – 1 invoice (Now Nil)**

The balance consists of one invoice that relates to charges for TEC parking services for the second quarter of 2014/15. This invoice has now been paid.

- **LB of Newham - £112,510.50 – 2 invoices (Now Nil)**

The balance is made up of two invoices that relate to the Taxicard subscription for the third quarter of 2014/15 (£106,710.50) and the annual subscription to London Care Services for 2014/15 (£5,800). Both invoices have been paid.

- **LB of Waltham Forest - £37,195.86 – 1 invoice (Now Nil)**

The balance consists of one invoice that relates to charges for TEC parking services for the second quarter of 2014/15. This invoice has now been paid.

7. The total value of the debts detailed in paragraph 6 above is £520,816.28 and consists of 19 invoices. If these amounts are excluded from all the debts that are over 60 days old which total £545,302.75, a sum of £24,486.47 remains outstanding in respect of 5 invoices, an average of £4,897.29 per invoice outstanding. In addition to the reminders sent out by the City of London, the borough officers have also been contacted by letters and telephone but some of the debts still remain unpaid. Finance officers will continue to chase up these debts with the relevant borough officers with a view to clearing as much as possible in the period up until 31 March 2015.

Other Debtors

8. Appendix C to this report shows the level of outstanding debt owed to London Councils by third parties other than member boroughs, TfL and the GLA at 31 December 2014. An aged analysis of these debts is summarised in table 5 below:

Table 5 – Non-borough/TfL/GLA outstanding debt as at 31 December 2014

	Total Debt (£)	No. of invoices
2012/13 debts	57,010.25	1
2013/14 debts	704.39	1
2014/15 debts over 90 days old	12,672.39	5
2014/15 debts between 60 – 90 days old	4,148.30	5
2014/15 debts between 30 – 60 days old	91,157.70	16
2014/15 debts 30 days or less	115,675.30	15
Total	281,368.33	43

9. The significant individual debtors within the outstanding balances over 60 days are:

- **Cratus Communications - £2,288 – 1 invoice**

The balance is made up of one invoice that relates to a charge for an exhibition stand and delegate places at London Councils' summit held in November 2014. London Councils' officers are currently liaising with the organisation to ensure the debt is settled as soon as possible.

- **Repayment of ESF Community Grants - £12,113.79 – 5 invoices**

Table 6 below contains a list of organisations awarded community grants under the discretionary ESF co-financing programme that have been asked to repay their unused grant funding. London Councils' officers are liaising with the organisations to establish if there are any underlying reasons why these debts have not been paid. Where appropriate, the cases will be referred to the City of London Solicitor's Department for advice on the course of legal action to be taken to recover the debts.

Table 6 – List of Community Grant debtors

Name of organisation	Outstanding repayment at 31 December 2014
CDI London	1,485.75
Community Business Enfield	6,249.82
Creative Innovation	704..39
London Bangla Press Club	2,860.29
Mosaada Centre for Single Women	1,517.93
Total	12,113.79

- **UBM Information Ltd - £1,048.80 – 2 invoices**

The balance is made up of two invoices that relate to charges for the use of meeting rooms at the Southwark Street offices. Both invoices have been paid.

- **Uganda Community Relief Association (UCRA) - £57,010.25 – 1 invoice**

The balance is made up of one invoice that relates to the repayment of funds awarded under the ESF Co-financing programme. The repayment invoice was issued as London Councils' officers acquired evidence to suggest that there had been double funding of UCRA's project by London Councils and the UK Border Agency. UCRA disputed the invoice and the case was referred to the City of London Solicitor's Department to take legal action to recover the outstanding debt. UCRA made a

counter claim for £ 43,745 in respect of unpaid grant funding relating to an eligible contractual period of the project. Representatives of both parties attended a mediation meeting in February 2015 and further negotiations are currently taking place.

10. The City of London's role in raising London Councils' debtor invoices is detailed in paragraph 5 of this report. For those debts that have reached the 42 day cut-off point, letters are prepared seeking immediate payment, otherwise London Councils will consider taking further action. The Finance Section undertakes prompt follow up action as soon as the debt is referred back by the Corporation.

Summary

11. This report details the level of outstanding debt owed to London Councils from all sources as at 31 December 2014. This report also details the reduction in the level of outstanding debt due from boroughs, TfL and the GLA in the period to 31 July 2014.

12. A summary of the level of London Councils outstanding debts as at 31 December 2014 is shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1- Summary of London Councils Outstanding Debts at 31 December 2014

Period	Borough / TfL / GLA Debts	Non-borough / TfL / GLA Debts	Total Debts
	£000	£000	£000
Debts invoiced up to 31/7/2014	24	61	85
Debts invoiced between 1/8/2014 to 31/12/2014	1,458	220	1,678
Total	1,482	281	1,763

Recommendations

13. The Executive is asked:

- To note the level of outstanding debt of £23,559.47 in relation to borough, TfL and GLA invoices raised up until 31 July 2014, a reduction on the outstanding figure of £4.056 million reported to the Executive at their meeting on 9 September 2014;
- To note the level of outstanding debt of £1.458 million in respect of borough, TfL and GLA invoices raised in the period 1 August to 31 December 2014;

- To note the level of outstanding debt of £281,368.33 in relation to other debtors invoices raised up until 31 December 2014; and
 - To note the specific action being taken in respect of significant debtors, as detailed in paragraph 6 and 9 of this report.
-

Financial Implications for London Councils

The financial implications are incorporated into the body of the report.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None.

Appendices

- Appendix A: Outstanding Borough/TfL/GLA debts invoiced up to 31 July 2014
Appendix B: Outstanding Borough/TfL/GLA debts invoiced from 1 August to 31 December 2014
Appendix C: Outstanding Other debts at 31 December 2014

Background Papers

London Councils Debtors working papers 2014/15
Report to Executive on 9 September 2014

Appendix A - Outstanding Borough/TfL/GLA debts invoiced up to 31 July 2014

Number	Customer Name	Customer Number	Transaction Date	Original Amount (£)	Balance Due (£)	Days Late
4119059	London Borough of Barnet	65237	03/04/2014	243.88	243.88	273
	London Borough of Barnet Total			243.88	243.88	
4125073	London Borough of Brent	80673	07/07/2014	11,041.50	11,041.50	178
4126263	London Borough of Brent	80673	23/07/2014	347.38	347.38	162
	London Borough of Brent Total			11,388.88	11,388.88	
4121493	London Borough of Camden	73305	12/05/2014	1,500.00	1,500.00	234
4126490	London Borough of Camden	73305	28/07/2014	467.71	467.71	157
	London Borough of Camden Total			1,967.71	1,967.71	
4122325	London Borough of Hounslow	67448	21/05/2014	3,459.00	3,459.00	225
4122604	London Borough of Hounslow	67448	27/05/2014	700.00	700.00	219
	London Borough of Hounslow Total			4,159.00	4,159.00	
4123715	London Borough of Newham	54574	16/06/2014	5,800.00	5,800.00	199
	London Borough of Newham Total			5,800.00	5,800.00	
	Grand Total			23,559.47	23,559.47	

Appendix B - Outstanding Borough/TfL/GLA debts invoiced from 1 August to 31 December 2014

Number	Customer Name	Customer Number	Transaction Date	Original Amount (£)	Balance Due (£)	Days Late	0-30 days	30-60 days	60-90 days	Over 90 days
4130013	LB of Barking & Dagenham	83338	24/09/2014	5,800.00	5,800.00	99				5,800.00
	LB of Barking & Dagenham Total			5,800.00	5,800.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	5,800.00
4132991	London Borough of Barnet	65237	10/11/2014	207,092.00	207,092.00	52		207,092.00		
4134307	London Borough of Barnet	65237	01/12/2014	2,500.00	2,500.00	31		2,500.00		
4135130	London Borough of Barnet	65237	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
4135136	London Borough of Barnet	65237	15/12/2014	267.24	267.24	17	267.24			
4135138	London Borough of Barnet	65237	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
	London Borough of Barnet Total			210,385.32	210,385.32		793.32	209,592.00	0.00	0.00
4130333	London Borough of Brent	80673	01/10/2014	11,041.50	11,041.50	92				11,041.50
4131332	London Borough of Brent	80673	15/10/2014	44,033.68	44,033.68	78			44,033.68	
4132008	London Borough of Brent	80673	22/10/2014	8,333.33	8,333.33	71			8,333.33	
4132023	London Borough of Brent	80673	22/10/2014	1,324.11	1,324.11	71			1,324.11	
4133249	London Borough of Brent	80673	12/11/2014	180.00	180.00	50		180.00		
4133504	London Borough of Brent	80673	17/11/2014	360.00	360.00	45		360.00		
4134765	London Borough of Brent	80673	08/12/2014	263.04	263.04	24	263.04			
4134768	London Borough of Brent	80673	08/12/2014	267.27	267.27	24	267.27			
4135339	London Borough of Brent	80673	17/12/2014	263.04	263.04	15	263.04			
	London Borough of Brent Total			66,065.97	66,065.97		793.35	540.00	53,691.12	11,041.50
4131336	London Borough of Camden	73305	15/10/2014	66,968.73	66,968.73	78			66,968.73	
4132992	London Borough of Camden	73305	10/11/2014	15,239.00	15,239.00	52		15,239.00		
4134382	London Borough of Camden	73305	03/12/2014	14,196.00	14,196.00	29	14,196.00			
	London Borough of Camden Total			96,403.73	96,403.73		14,196.00	15,239.00	66,968.73	0.00
4133074	Croydon Council	71501	10/11/2014	360.00	360.00	52		360.00		
4134383	Croydon Council	71501	03/12/2014	28,000.00	28,000.00	29	28,000.00			
4134917	Croydon Council	71501	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			
	Croydon Council Total			28,672.00	28,672.00		28,312.00	360.00	0.00	0.00
4131338	London Borough of Ealing	88277	15/10/2014	42,736.50	42,736.50	78			42,736.50	
4134306	London Borough of Ealing	88277	01/12/2014	360.00	360.00	31		360.00		
4134931	London Borough of Ealing	88277	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			
4135144	London Borough of Ealing	88277	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
4135145	London Borough of Ealing	88277	15/12/2014	267.24	267.24	17	267.24			
4135146	London Borough of Ealing	88277	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
4135192	London Borough of Ealing	88277	15/12/2014	108.00	108.00	17	108.00			
	London Borough of Ealing Total			44,309.82	44,309.82		1,213.32	360.00	42,736.50	0.00
4132999	London Borough of Enfield	95679	10/11/2014	6,356.00	6,356.00	52		6,356.00		
4134385	London Borough of Enfield	95679	03/12/2014	3,549.00	3,549.00	29	3,549.00			
	London Borough of Enfield Total			9,905.00	9,905.00		3,549.00	6,356.00	0.00	0.00
4134389	Royal Borough of Greenwich	124082	03/12/2014	7,126.00	7,126.00	29	7,126.00			
4135326	Royal Borough of Greenwich	124082	17/12/2014	263.04	263.04	15	263.04			
4135327	Royal Borough of Greenwich	124082	17/12/2014	263.04	263.04	15	263.04			
4135330	Royal Borough of Greenwich	124082	17/12/2014	267.24	267.24	15	267.24			
	Royal Borough of Greenwich Total			7,919.32	7,919.32		7,919.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
4134398	London Borough of Hackney	37291	03/12/2014	9,912.00	9,912.00	29	9,912.00			
	London Borough of Hackney Total			9,912.00	9,912.00		9,912.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4129121	London Borough of Haringey	79442	10/09/2014	782.45	782.45	113				782.45
4132011	London Borough of Haringey	79442	22/10/2014	33,250.00	33,250.00	71			33,250.00	
4132409	London Borough of Haringey	79442	29/10/2014	51.54	51.54	64			51.54	

Number	Customer Name	Customer Number	Transaction Date	Original Amount (£)	Balance Due (£)	Days Late	0-30 days	30-60 days	60-90 days	Over 90 days
4133013	London Borough of Haringey	79442	10/11/2014	192,892.00	192,892.00	52		192,892.00		
4133014	London Borough of Haringey	79442	10/11/2014	13,713.00	13,713.00	52		13,713.00		
4133502	London Borough of Haringey	79442	17/11/2014	3,000.00	3,000.00	45		3,000.00		
4134400	London Borough of Haringey	79442	03/12/2014	5,047.00	5,047.00	29	5,047.00			
London Borough of Haringey Total				248,735.99	248,735.99		5,047.00	209,605.00	33,301.54	782.45
4133015	London Borough of Harrow	79451	10/11/2014	13,951.00	13,951.00	52		13,951.00		
4134304	London Borough of Harrow	79451	01/12/2014	30,000.00	30,000.00	31		30,000.00		
London Borough of Harrow Total				43,951.00	43,951.00		0.00	43,951.00	0.00	0.00
4129858	London Borough of Havering	67402	22/09/2014	64,922.00	64,922.00	101				64,922.00
4135141	London Borough of Havering	67402	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
London Borough of Havering Total				65,185.04	65,185.04		263.04	0.00	0.00	64,922.00
4130363	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea	111455	01/10/2014	46,923.50	46,923.50	92				46,923.50
4134896	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea	111455	10/12/2014	216.00	216.00	22	216.00			
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea Total				47,139.50	47,139.50		216.00	0.00	0.00	46,923.50
4134926	Royal Borough of Kingston	75215	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			
Royal Borough of Kingston Total				312.00	312.00		312.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4131371	London Borough of Lambeth	3330	15/10/2014	37,385.99	37,385.99	78			37,385.99	
London Borough of Lambeth Total				37,385.99	37,385.99		0.00	0.00	37,385.99	0.00
4135170	London Borough of Lewisham	39651	15/12/2014	605.14	605.14	17	605.14			
London Borough of Lewisham Total				605.14	605.14		605.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
4131395	City of London	5408	15/10/2014	14,283.59	14,283.59	78			14,283.59	
City of London Total				14,283.59	14,283.59		0.00	0.00	14,283.59	0.00
4135206	London Borough of Merton	65185	15/12/2014	216.60	216.60	17	216.60			
London Borough of Merton Total				216.60	216.60		216.60	0.00	0.00	0.00
4130401	London Borough of Newham	54574	01/10/2014	106,710.50	106,710.50	92				106,710.50
4135163	London Borough of Newham	54574	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
4135164	London Borough of Newham	54574	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
4135297	London Borough of Newham	54574	17/12/2014	267.24	267.24	15	267.24			
London Borough of Newham Total				107,503.82	107,503.82		793.32	0.00	0.00	106,710.50
4134774	London Borough of Redbridge	87468	08/12/2014	263.04	263.04	24	263.04			
4134777	London Borough of Redbridge	87468	08/12/2014	267.24	267.24	24	267.24			
4135166	London Borough of Redbridge	87468	15/12/2014	263.04	263.04	17	263.04			
London Borough of Redbridge Total				793.32	793.32		793.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
4133962	LB of Richmond Upon Thames	92507	24/11/2014	3,000.00	3,000.00	38		3,000.00		
4134413	LB of Richmond Upon Thames	92507	03/12/2014	7,490.00	7,490.00	29	7,490.00			
LB of Richmond Upon Thames Total				10,490.00	10,490.00		7,490.00	3,000.00	0.00	0.00
4134418	London Borough of Southwark	8589	03/12/2014	10,031.00	10,031.00	29	10,031.00			
London Borough of Southwark Total				10,031.00	10,031.00		10,031.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4135169	London Borough of Sutton	39800	15/12/2014	2,171.45	2,171.45	17	2,171.45			
London Borough of Sutton Total				2,171.45	2,171.45		2,171.45	0.00	0.00	0.00
4131391	London Borough of Waltham Forest	39794	15/10/2014	37,195.86	37,195.86	78			37,195.86	
4133061	London Borough of Waltham Forest	39794	10/11/2014	197,896.00	146,477.00	52		146,477.00		
4134900	London Borough of Waltham Forest	39794	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			
London Borough of Waltham Forest Total				235,403.86	183,984.86		312.00	146,477.00	37,195.86	0.00
4133066	London Borough of Wandsworth	93501	10/11/2014	360.00	360.00	52		360.00		
4133954	London Borough of Wandsworth	93501	24/11/2014	3,000.00	3,000.00	38		3,000.00		
4134874	London Borough of Wandsworth	93501	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			
4134885	London Borough of Wandsworth	93501	10/12/2014	624.00	624.00	22	624.00			
4134922	London Borough of Wandsworth	93501	10/12/2014	312.00	312.00	22	312.00			

Number	Customer Name	Customer Number	Transaction Date	Original Amount (£)	Balance Due (£)	Days Late	0-30 days	30-60 days	60-90 days	Over 90 days
London Borough of Wandsworth Total				4,608.00	4,608.00		1,248.00	3,360.00	0.00	0.00
4133063	City of Westminster	65194	10/11/2014	197,896.00	197,896.00	52		197,896.00		
4134267	City of Westminster	65194	01/12/2014	288.00	288.00	31		288.00		
4134739	City of Westminster	65194	08/12/2014	263.04	263.04	24	263.04			
4134742	City of Westminster	65194	08/12/2014	267.24	267.24	24	267.24			
4135337	City of Westminster	65194	17/12/2014	263.04	263.04	15	263.04			
4135346	City of Westminster	65194	17/12/2014	252.00	252.00	15	252.00			
4135519	City of Westminster	65194	22/12/2014	303.47	303.47	10	303.47			
City of Westminster Total				199,532.79	199,532.79		1,348.79	198,184.00	0.00	0.00
4135303	Transport For London	382905	17/12/2014	1,498.97	1,498.97	15	1,498.97			
Transport For London Total				1,498.97	1,498.97		1,498.97	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grand Total				1,509,221.22	1,457,802.22		99,034.94	837,024.00	285,563.33	236,179.95

Appendix C - Outstanding Other Debts at 31 December 2014

Number	Customer Name	Customer Number	Transaction Date	Original Amount (£)	Balance Due (£)	Days Late
4082586	Uganda Community Relief Association (UCRA)	573677	24/10/2012	57,875.25	57,010.25	799
2012/13 debts				57,875.25	57,010.25	
4117848	Creative Innovation	576747	17/03/2014	3,204.39	704.39	290
2013/14 debts				3,204.39	704.39	
4124370	Mosaada Centre for Single Women	575711	25/06/2014	1,517.93	1,517.93	190
4126673	CDI London	577555	30/07/2014	1,485.75	1,485.75	155
4129152	Community Business Enfield	577767	10/09/2014	6,249.82	6,249.82	113
4129154	London Bangla Press Club	577768	10/09/2014	2,860.29	2,860.29	113
4129967	NHS England	575551	24/09/2014	777.00	558.60	99
2014/15 debts over 90 days old				12,890.79	12,672.39	
4130648	Department for Works & Pensions	475427	06/10/2014	157.50	157.50	87
4130706	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	9121	06/10/2014	714.00	654.00	87
4132007	Cratus Communications	576040	22/10/2014	2,288.00	2,288.00	71
4132218	UBM Information Ltd	568594	27/10/2014	524.40	524.40	66
4132219	UBM Information Ltd	568594	27/10/2014	524.40	524.40	66
2014/15 debts between 60 - 90 days old				4,208.30	4,148.30	
4132605	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	9121	03/11/2014	658.20	658.20	59
4132630	Buckinghamshire New University	578060	03/11/2014	450.00	450.00	59
4133277	NHS Central London CCG	578127	12/11/2014	810.00	810.00	50
4133279	Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust	578132	12/11/2014	180.00	180.00	50
4133525	British Parking Association	286343	17/11/2014	83,109.90	83,109.90	45
4133937	Wandsworth CCG	578162	24/11/2014	180.00	180.00	38
4133964	Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	572072	24/11/2014	180.00	180.00	38
4134098	Deirdre Cregan	578200	26/11/2014	180.00	180.00	36
4134103	UBM Information Ltd	568594	26/11/2014	1,000.80	1,000.80	36
4134112	Young Futures CIC	578201	26/11/2014	240.00	240.00	36
4134135	UK Power Networks Ltd	575429	26/11/2014	696.60	696.60	36
4134138	Premier People Solutions Limited	578186	26/11/2014	180.00	180.00	36
4134142	Care Quality Commission	573362	26/11/2014	1,095.60	1,095.60	36
4134269	Electrical Safety First	577947	01/12/2014	381.60	381.60	31
4134272	Care Quality Commission	573362	01/12/2014	1,134.00	1,134.00	31
4134312	London Fire Brigade	43024	01/12/2014	681.00	681.00	31
2014/15 debts between 30-60 days old				91,157.70	91,157.70	
4134354	School Home Support Service (UK)	567655	03/12/2014	120.00	120.00	29
4134411	First4skills Limited	576680	03/12/2014	288.00	288.00	29
4134792	London Social Care Partnership	578242	08/12/2014	16,082.05	16,082.05	24
4135035	British Parking Association	286343	12/12/2014	87,327.55	87,327.55	20
4135195	Care Quality Commission	573362	15/12/2014	1,134.00	1,134.00	17
4135203	Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	572072	15/12/2014	159.60	159.60	17
4135210	Bournemouth University	481054	15/12/2014	300.00	300.00	17
4135212	London Work Based Learning Alliance	563629	15/12/2014	123.00	123.00	17
4135310	Bramley Care Limited	570580	17/12/2014	800.00	800.00	15
4135315	Castlecare Group Limited	570842	17/12/2014	1,460.00	1,460.00	15
4135321	Kites Children's Services Ltd	570579	17/12/2014	500.00	500.00	15
4135324	Kisimul Group Ltd	570490	17/12/2014	500.00	500.00	15
4135507	London Energy Project	578294	22/12/2014	749.10	749.10	10
4135525	Cipfa South East	390107	22/12/2014	252.00	252.00	10
4135530	Northern Ireland Fire & Rescue Service	578296	22/12/2014	5,880.00	5,880.00	10
2014/15 debts 30 days or less				115,675.30	115,675.30	
Total other debts at 31 December 2014				285,011.73	281,368.33	