

Leaders' Committee

Summaries and Minutes

Item no: 11

Report by: Derek Gadd **Job title:** Head of Governance
Date: 6 December 2016
Contact Officer: Derek Gadd
Telephone: 020 7934 9505 **Email:** Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

Recommendations Leader's Committee is recommended to note the attached minutes:

- GLEF – 29 June 2016
- Audit Committee – 22 September 2016
- TEC – 13 October 2016
- YPES – 10 November 2016

Leaders' Committee

Report from the Greater London Employment Forum – 11 February 2016

Item no:

Report by: Selena Lansley **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers Organisation
Date: 6 December 2016
Contact Officer: Selena Lansley
Telephone: 020 7934 9963 **Email:** Selena.lansley@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: Summary of the minutes of the Greater London Employment Forum held on 29 June 2016

Recommendations: For information.

In Attendance: Cllr Laila Butt (Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Colin Tandy (Bexley), Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden), Cllr Doug Taylor (Chair) (Enfield), Cllr Ben Coleman (Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Philip Corthorne (Hillingdon), Cllr Andy Hull (Islington), Cllr Adrian Garden (Lambeth), Cllr David Michael (Lewisham), Cllr David Marlow (Richmond), Cllr Fiona Foley (Southwark), Cllr Simon Wales (Sutton), Cllr Guy Senior (Wandsworth), Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster), Vicky Easton (UNISON), Sean Fox (UNISON), Maggie Griffin (UNISON), Gloria Hanson (UNISON), Danny Judge (UNISON), Mary Lancaster (UNISON), Jackie Lewis (UNISON), Sue Plain (UNISON), Jon Rogers (UNISON), Kim Silver (UNISON), Janet Walker (UNISON), Gary Cummins (Unite), Dave Powell (GMB), Wendy Whittington (GMB) and Vaughan West (GMB).

In Attendance: Selena Lansley (London Councils), Debbie Williams (London Councils), Mehboob Khan (Political Advisor to the Labour Group, London Councils), Jade Appleton (Political Advisor to the Conservative Group, London Councils) and Julie Kelly (UNISON).

1. Apologies for Absence: Cllrs B Turner, Irma Freeborn and Laila Butt (Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Mashari (Brent), Cllrs Tim Stevens and Diane Smith (Bromley), Cllr Theo Blackwell (Camden), Cllr Mark Watson (Croydon), Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Ealing), Cllr Kiran Ramchandani (Harrow), Cllr Paul Watson (Kensington & Chelsea), Cllr Paul McGone (Lambeth), Cllr Kevin Bonavia (Lewisham) and Cllr Ken Clark (Newham), Simon Steptoe (UNISON), April Ashely (UNISON), Danny Hogan (Unite), Penny Robinson (GMB) and Peter Murphy (GMB).

2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2016-17: Sue Plain (UNISON) was elected Chair of GLEF for 2016-17. Doug Taylor (Enfield) was elected Vice Chair.

3. Confirmation of GLEF Membership 2016-17: GLEF membership for 2016-17 was agreed and noted.

Employers' Side

| Borough | Rep | Party | Deputy | Party |
|----------------------|--|-------|----------------------|-------|
| Barking & Dagenham | Bill Turner | Lab | Irma Freeborn | Lab |
| Barnet | Richard Cornelius | Con | Daniel Thomas | Con |
| Bexley | Colin Tandy | Con | Linda Bailey | Con |
| Brent | Roxanne Mashari | Lab | Margaret McLennan | Lab |
| Bromley | Tim Stevens J.P. | Con | Diane Smith | Con |
| Camden | Theo Blackwell | Lab | Maeve McCormack | Lab |
| Croydon | Mark Watson | Lab | Simon Hall | Lab |
| Ealing | Yvonne Johnson | Lab | Cllr Hynes | Lab |
| Enfield | Doug Taylor | Lab | Dino Lemonides | Lab |
| Greenwich | Chris Kirby | Lab | | |
| Hackney | Philip Glanville | Lab | Carole Williams | Lab |
| Hammersmith & Fulham | Ben Coleman | Lab | | |
| Haringey | Ali Demirci | Lab | Claire Kober | Lab |
| Harrow | Kiran Ramchandani | Lab | Graham Henson | Lab |
| Havering | Osman Dervish | Con | Melvin Wallace | Con |
| Hillingdon | Philip Corthorne | Con | | |
| Hounslow | Ajmer Gewal | Lab | | |
| Islington | Andy Hull | Lab | | |
| Kensington & Chelsea | Gerard Hargreaves | Con | | |
| Kingston upon Thames | David Glasspool | Con | David Cunningham | Con |
| Lambeth | Paul McGlone | Lab | Jack Hopkins | Lab |
| Lewisham | Kevin Bonavia | Lab | Joe Dromey | Lab |
| Merton | Mark Allison | Lab | Nick Draper | Lab |
| Newham | Ken Clark | Lab | Lester Hudson | Lab |
| Redbridge | Kam Rai | Lab | Jas Athwal | Lab |
| Richmond upon Thames | David Marlow | Con | | |
| Southwark | Fiona Colley | Lab | Johnson Situ | Lab |
| Sutton | Simon Wales | LD | | |
| Tower Hamlets | David Edgar | Lab | | |
| Waltham Forest | Peter Barnett | Lab | Gerry Lyons | Lab |
| Wandsworth | Cllr Guy Senior | Con | | |
| Westminster | Angela Harvey | Con | | |
| City of London | Revd Stephen Decatur Haines MA Deputy | | Edward Lord, OBE, JP | |

UNISON: Vicky Easton, Sean Fox, Maggie Griffin, Gloria Hanson, Danny Judge, Mary Lancaster, Jackie Lewis, Neville McDermott, Sue Plain, Jon Rogers, Kim Silver, Helen Steele, Simon Steptoe, Janet Walker, April Ashley, Julie Kelly (in attendance)

UNITE: Onay Kasab, Gary Cummins, Danny Hogan, Susan Matthews, Kath Smith, Jane Gosnell, Pam McGuffie, Mick Callanan

GMB: Dave Powell, Eileen Theaker, Wendy Whittington, Penny Robinson, Peter Murphy, Vaughan West.

4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 February 2016: The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

5. Matters Arising: Item 5 – Children’s Social Worker Memorandum of Cooperation

(MoC): The Chair raised concern that there were reports that LB Barnet who have signed the MoC s are not going to continue as they wish to do some things differently. The question was asked if London Councils had any knowledge of this?

Selena Lansley (Employers Side Secretary) responded that London Councils were not aware of this issue but would investigate.

The Chair enquired what the state of play is around the retention side and references to employers sharing good practice i.e. working with the LGA regarding employment standards. It was suggested that each borough undertake its own health check?

Selena Lansley (Employers Side Secretary) responded that the MoC is where 31 of the London boroughs have signed up to an informal agreement. With regards to the LGA championed Social Worker Employers Standards the work is mostly being undertaken at local level.

Selena Lansley offered to invite the Head of HR leads for the MoC to attend the next GLEF meeting to give an update. Colleagues in attendance agreed that would be very useful.

6. London Collective Investment Vehicle (CIV) Update – Lord Kerslake (Non-Executive Chair, London CIV) and Hugh Grover (Chief Executive, London CIV): Lord Kerslake reported the following headlines:

- He undertook the role of Chair of London CIV in September 2015 and the CIV has made really good progress over the past year.
- The Board had been recruited in the late summer / early autumn of 2015, the fund had received FCA authorisation in November 2015 and the core team had been recruited.
- Only one borough is currently not involved in CIV but discussions are currently taking place with the aim of them coming on board in the next few months.
- The first sub-fund had opened on 2 December. Two more sub-funds opened in February and April taking total assets under management (AUM) to more than £1.7 billion with over £1 million per annum of fund manager fee savings for the 11 boroughs invested.
- Two more sub-funds will open by the end of June, adding a further £500 million to the AUM, and the aim is to open a further 9 sub-funds by the end of this year. Once all of these sub-funds are open the total AUM will be around £8 billion with approximately £4 million per annum of fund manager fee savings.
- Important that this is a regulated fund with strong oversight from the boroughs themselves.

CIV was set up ahead of the government’s changes. The CIV wants to be the investment vehicle of choice for the London boroughs. There is a government ambition to have 6 or 7 pools across the country.

Danny Judge (UNISON) reported that he sits on Lambeth’s Pension Board and so understands the value of being involved in this Board. He explained how positive the experience has been in jointly establishing Boards through the LGPS. He went onto highlight his concerns as the government’s agenda had now changed things and it appeared now to the unions that there is a deficit at CIV level in being able to represent members, as

in his view the scheme members' do not have a voice at the London level. London Councils Joint Committee has been established which he understood comprises of one nominated councillor from each participating borough so the unions' would like to ask the London boroughs to consider how best scheme members can participate at Board level?

The trade unions' find it unsatisfactory that they currently do not have a voice and would hope the Employers Side and trade unions' can talk about how best they represented their members interests as part of the CIV arrangements.

Lord Kerslake responded that they are very much at the early stages and would see that input from the trade unions' would come through at individual borough level. Representatives on the Joint Committee would be a matter for the London boroughs to consider. He will suggest this receives consideration.

Lord Kerslake offered to attend future meetings to keep the communication open whether at GLEF or at individual borough pension boards.

Hugh Grover informed colleagues that there are some constitutional issues at London Councils and it would not be possible for a member of the scheme to be part of the Joint Committee. Hugh agreed to raise the issue with the Chair and two Vice-Chairs.

The Chair raised concern that the government had referred to pension funds as a 'wealth fund' in relation to future infrastructure investment. The question was asked if the government had identified projects that might be funded nationally or just in London?

Lord Kerslake responded that each fund is responsible for considering its liabilities and obligations. Any imposed decision on infrastructure could undermine the accountability and responsibility of the fund. Decisions would continue to be made on their own merit in the same way as investment decisions are made now. If the CIV agreed to make an infrastructure investment it would do so in collaboration with investing boroughs and only if there was a good deal. As yet, the CIV has not invested in any infrastructure. If we did we would need to look at what the benefits there would be for London.

Sean Fox (UNISON) mentioned that there was currently uncertainty in the markets and concern that Brexit be taken into account when revaluations are undertaken this year.

Cllr Andy Hull (Islington) highlighted the size of boroughs investment in the CIV and asked if the CIV was going to implement the LAPFF guidance and the current thinking around the CIV's future LAPFF engagement?

Lord Kerslake responded that CIV will certainly follow the guidance and look at how it can become more active and involved in the future.

Hugh Grover added that a sub-group of the member Joint Committee was being set up which will explore how best the CIV operates within the LAPFF and delivers its stewardship responsibilities overall. The member sub-group will report back to the Joint Committee and then it will be for the Joint Committee to decide on what option(s) to go with regarding future operating practices.

Mary Lancaster (UNISON) commended the joint report as it clearly set out how the CIV was structured, main purpose and benefits and went on to recommend that it is made available to all members.

The Chair gave whole hearted thanks to Lord Kerslake for giving up his time to come and talk to GLEF.

7. Apprenticeships in London Authorities: Jo Clemente, Head of Organisational Development, LB Enfield presented the apprenticeship programme run in Enfield (attached for information).



Cllr Simon Wales (Sutton) enquired whether Enfield involved members in their programme? Sutton has a member shadowing programme.

Jo responded that members are involved in the scheme and the borough runs a political awareness training programme.

Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) asked that as people will be working longer whether Enfield had any plan to offer apprenticeships for people who they wanted to re-train and re-skill?

Jo responded by confirming that with the introduction of the levy this is definitely an area Enfield will be looking to do further work on.

Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden) congratulated Enfield on their apprenticeship programme and mentioned that Camden also run a very successful scheme but find it increasingly difficult to recruit women whose first language is not English.

Jo responded that Enfield also find this a difficult group to recruit.

Jane Harrison (London Councils) agreed to research whether there is any support for boroughs that already exists for this group.

Cllr Adrian Garden (Lambeth) enquired about the total number of apprenticeships offered and how the characteristics of recruits compared with the demography of the borough?

Jo responded that the overall comparison was good due to the hard worked and focus they have had. The number of applicants is not as high as they would like, explaining that they market the programme regularly including visiting schools to promote the offer. Jo informed the meeting that in the main the young people already part of the programme help to recommend it to their peers and so are recruiting for us.

Cllr Colin Tandy (Bexley) enquired whether Enfield apply a selection criteria when accepting candidates?

Jo responded that this can vary on the framework. Some programmes require candidates to have 3-5 GSE's to apply. Where applicants have less GSE's Enfield look at the pre-apprenticeship framework which is a route of study.

Danny Judge (UNISON) asked if there were any financial implications involved for apprenticeships which might be an incentive/dis-incentive?

Jo responded highlighting the key points below:

- No cost to the young person
- Join the organisation on a set salary
- A year long programme apart from the parks framework which runs for 18 months

- No cost to the council for the qualification although there are some areas where this is not the case. Where an individual is 24 years there is a cost as the government currently do not provide funding for this group.

Vicky Easton (UNISON) asked whether Enfield paid the LLW to apprenticeships and if any work with apprenticeships had been undertaken in schools?

Jo responded that Enfield actively speak to schools who take on apprenticeships to do teaching assistant and administration roles. These can be harder to manage as in a school environment young apprentices could be compared or seen more like pupils.

Jo confirmed that Enfield pays the LLW and undertook a strong marketing campaign to promote this.

Jackie Lewis (UNISON) enquired whether any analysis had been undertaken in relation to gender? It was highlighted by younger UNISON members at a recent conference that some apprentices had been victims of bullying. Has there been any good practice produced on managing apprenticeships appropriately?

Jo responded that in terms of gender mix there had been no specific analysis undertaken but this could be done. In terms of bullying, no incidents as yet have been reported within Enfield.

Jane Harrison (London Councils) highlighted the following from Item 7, Apprenticeships report:

- The paper focused on the government's manifesto
- Apprenticeship target for local authorities
- Legal protection for the term 'apprenticeship'
- Development of new apprenticeship standards led by groups of employees.

The target is likely to take affect from April 2017 for public bodies who have more than 250 employees. For local authorities the target is approximately 4,600 apprenticeships every year.

London Councils have lobbied the government to get them to recalculate targets on the basis that school staff should not be included as councils do not have control over recruitment. There should be a separate target for boroughs and schools. Boroughs should also be able to spend the levy within their supply chains.

London historically has quite low apprenticeship levels directly employed within the boroughs but is likely to have a concentration of contracted out businesses paying the levy. There is a risk therefore that any unspent levy funding could be lost across London.

The target currently set is so large that the recommended focus should be on what will be effectively rather than how boroughs meet the target.

Cllr Andy Hull (Islington) confirmed his understanding that currently the way the government is looking at this is that schools will be included but not contractors.

Jane responded that as it is based on headcount data, contractors are not being included. The target is not connected to the levy. If we do not reach the targets then it is a slap on the wrists there is currently no known sanction.

Sean Fox (UNISON) mentioned that most local authorities struggle to retain staff and asked if the levy could be used for those just aged up to 24 years?

Jane responded that it is currently not clear that boroughs can do this.

The Chair thanked Jo and Jane for coming to speak to GLEF today, emphasizing the importance of apprenticeships to London local government.

8. GLPC Job Evaluation Refresh Update: Selena Lansley (Employers Side Secretary) informed colleagues that the light touch refresh of the GLPC Job Evaluation scheme (agreed last year by all boroughs along with the 3 Union Side GLPC Joint Secretaries) has been approved and will be published shortly. The scheme is widely used in London and across the UK.

The revised scheme has been shared with boroughs (via Heads of HR Network). The next stage is to launch the new materials this month (July) onto the London Councils website as well as contacting all existing GLPC licence holder clients individually to highlight the refreshed scheme.

Selena Lansley thanked union colleagues for their help and support on this piece of work.

Vicky Easton (UNISON) informed colleagues that the next phase will be training. On the trade unions' side the training has been significantly depleted so we would like to re-instate this.

Selena Lansley responded that she is happy to discuss outside of this meeting.

9. Any Other Business: Jackie Lewis (UNISON) informed colleagues that Amnesty International had issued a statement due to the surge in racial attacks following our withdrawal from Europe on 23 June. The unions' would like to raise as an urgent call that local authorities sign up to and issue a joint statement with unions condemning any form of racial abuse.

Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) stated that the situation is dreadful and horrible and that it is happening in London known to be a welcoming city. Highlighting that this central government issue needed to be supported by all boroughs like Westminster who will be reassuring residents.

Cllr Fiona Colley (Southwark) –reported that she had already received numerous emails from residents and Southwark are shocked and saddened that residents are experiencing racial abuse. Cabinet are going to produce a statement.

Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden) reported that their Leader is working with Cabinet members to give a unified response.

Cllr Ben Coleman (Hammersmith & Fulham) reported that following the attack on the Polish entrepreneur reported on the news the borough has put out assistance to residents.

Cllr Andy Hull (Islington) reported that an emergency motion meeting has been called where a statement will follow.

Cllr Simon Wales (Sutton) reported that no council meetings for a while but the Leader issued a statement on 28 July.

Cllr David Michael (Lewisham) –The Brexit result has stirred up racism.

Gary Cummins (Unite) informed colleagues that Unite have made statements on behalf of the union and the community. Racial attacks have never gone away but there seems to be more confidence in people with certain views taking inappropriate action.

A request was made by the union side to ask London Councils Leaders to do a joint statement with the trade unions' so that individual councils could publish this.

Cllr Andy Hull (Islington) – requested that GLEF produce a joint statement stating that we do not tolerate any form of racial abuse.

Cllr Doug Taylor (Vice Chair) agreed that following this meeting the Leader of London Councils and Vice Chairs produce a statement.

Following the meeting the attached was statement was produced.



Microsoft Word 97 -
2003 Document

The next step is for GLEF Employers Side and trade unions' to agree and publish a joint statement to London boroughs.

The meeting was concluded at 13.19

8. Date of Next Meeting: Thursday 9 February 2017

Group Meeting: 10am

Joint Meeting: 11.30

GLEF AGM

Tuesday 13 June 2017

Group Meeting: 10am

Joint Meeting: 11.30

Minutes of the Meeting of the Audit Committee 22 September 2016

Cllr Roger Ramsey was in the Chair

Members Present:

Cllr Roger Ramsey (LB Havering)
Cllr Simon Wales (LB Sutton)
Roger Chadwick (City of London)

In Attendance:

Jeremy Mullins, City of London
Philip Johnstone, KPMG
Stephen Lucas, KPMG
John O'Brien, Chief Executive, London Councils

London Councils' officers were in attendance.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Stephen Alambritis (LB Merton) and Councillor Jas Athwal (LB Redbridge).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 22 June 2016

The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 22 June 2016 were agreed as being an accurate record.

4. Draft Annual Audit Report 2015/16

The Audit Committee received a report that detailed the final draft of the annual audit report to those charged with governance (ISA260) prepared by KPMG, London Councils' external auditors, in respect of the 2015/16 financial year. The final draft was included at Appendix A to the report and contained the proposed management response to the internal control issues raised by KPMG which were detailed on page 18 and 19 of the final draft.

David Sanni, Head of Financial Accounting, London Councils, informed Audit Committee that a revised letter of representation had been sent to members. He confirmed that all relevant information had been disclosed to the auditors. Members were asked to consider and approve the letter of representation before the Director of Corporate Resources could sign the letter off.

Philip Johnstone, Director, KPMG, said that two significant risks had been identified, namely (i) fraud risk of revenue recognition, and (ii) management override of controls. He said that both were standard risks and were assessed as being minimal. Philip Johnstone said that the accounts and the supporting working papers were of a high quality and the previous auditors (PricewaterhouseCoopers) had been quick to respond to any questions asked of them.

Philip Johnstone said that a full debrief will take place with the London Councils' Finance team, and there was nothing to highlight regarding representations (this was a standard request for representations). He reported that this was a smooth and successful audit, with very little to report and with good communications taking place between KPMG and the Finance team. Only one adjustment of £15,000 had been identified during the audit.

Councillor Wales noted that KPMG had cited the Grants Committee as "Grant" Committee throughout the report. Philip Johnstone said that this would be rectified in future reports. Roger Chadwick thanked KPMG and the London Councils' Finance team for the work that they had carried out on the annual audit. He said that it was very much appreciated.

The Audit Committee:

- Noted the key issues detailed in the draft audit report to those charged with governance and agreed the proposed management responses to the recommendations to internal control deficiencies detailed on pages 18 and 19 of the draft audit report included at Appendix A; and
- Approved the revised draft letter of representation that was sent to Audit Committee members separately.

5. Statutory Final Accounts 2015/16

The Audit Committee considered a report that presented the audited statement of accounts for 2015/16. The accounts that went for approval comprised of London Councils' Consolidated Statement of Accounts for 2015/16, London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Statement of Accounts for 2015/16, and London Councils' Grants Committee Statement of Accounts for 2015/16.

David Sanni introduced the Statutory for 2015/16. He said that there were the customary three sets of accounts, namely (i) Consolidated Statement of Accounts, (ii) TEC Statement of Accounts, and (iii) Grants Committee Statement of Accounts. David Sanni said that Table 2 (page 38) showed an audited surplus for the year of £3.293 million. Table 3 (page 39) showed the adjusted position in the audited accounts for 2015/16, including the actuarial gain on pension assets/liabilities. Table 4 (page 39) showed the analysis of the main variances that contributed to the audited surplus of £3.293 million. Table 5 (page 40) outlined the audited position on reserves as at 31 March 2016, amounting to £12.641 million of consolidated audited reserves (this did not include the Unusable Reserves).

Councillor Simon Wales asked what the rationale was for seemingly transferring £3.6 million from reserves and transferring back a sum of £3.3 million (Table 2). Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, explained that the budget was set in November each year for the following financial year, and at that point, he advised members of the likely call on reserves in order to set a balanced budget, which was subsequently approved. The transfer back to reserves takes place at the end of the financial year in question, when the outturn position is determined, some 18 months later and was, therefore, a question of timing. This was particularly relevant to TEC. He also stated that borough funding for the Grants Committee's ESF programme had not been spent during the year, due to slippage in the start of the new programme. Roger Chadwick asked what the process was for transferring sums from reserves. Frank Smith said that approval to transfer sums from reserves was sought from members at the budget setting stage each November/December and members were updated on the position of reserves during the course of the year in the quarterly budget monitoring reports sent to the three main Committees.

The Audit Committee approved the statement of accounts, as detailed in Appendices A to C of the report.

6. London Councils' Corporate Risk Register

The Audit Committee received London Councils' Corporate Risk Register for 2016/17 in accordance with London Councils' Risk Management Strategy and Framework which provides that members would receive the Corporate Risk Register on an annual basis.

Christiane Jenkins, Director of Corporate Governance, London Councils, introduced the Corporate Risk Register report for 2016/17 and gave a brief overview of the main changes. She said that Corporate Risk 1 that related to "loss of borough support" had now been updated to include reference to the London Councils' Challenge. Corporate Risk 2 on "Business Continuity Disaster/Recovery plans not being in place or inadequate" had now been updated to include the new Business Continuity Plan (BCP) that had been approved in April 2016, noting the gold, silver and bronze system. Corporate Risk 6 – "ineffective relationships with key stakeholders" had been updated to acknowledge the need to build a relationship with the new Mayor of London.

The Audit Committee noted the London Councils' Corporate Risk Register for 2016/17, which could be found at Appendix 2 of the report.

7. Revised Risk Management Strategy and Framework

The Audit Committee received a report that outlined the changes proposed to London Councils' Risk Management Strategy and Framework which was last updated in 2012. The proposed approach to risk management comprised of the following elements: (i) Strategy, (ii) Short guide to risk management, and (iii) Guide to completing London Councils' Risk Register.

Christiane Jenkins introduced the report.

This work was undertaken following the Internal Review of Risk Management & Business Continuity, which was reported to Audit Committee in June 2016. One of the review recommendations was; *The Risk Management Strategy & Framework should be scheduled for review and update every three years to ensure that it is reflective of current organisational processes and subsequently approved by the Audit Committee.*

As part of the review, London Councils strategy was compared with the ALARM toolkit to ensure it still represents good practice. Feedback was also sought from senior officers and the Corporate Governance Group. The review has maintained the broad structure of the existing Framework but a number of changes have been made to clarify guidance and ensure it remains up to date, for example by making specific reference to information governance risks. The guidance for staff has also been updated to remove repetition and improve clarity. The main changes are set out in section 4 of the report and can be seen in the appendices.

The Chair said that this was a very comprehensive strategy and framework.

The Audit Committee approved the revised Risk Management Strategy and Framework and guides.

8. Business Continuity Plan (BCP)

The Audit Committee received, for comment, the last version of London Councils' Business Continuity Plan (BCP) at its meeting on 19 June 2012. A revised BCP was approved by London Councils' Corporate Management Board (CMB) at its meeting held on 15 February 2016, and the approved Version 3 of the plan could be found at Appendix 1 in the report.

Frank Smith introduced the BCP report. He informed members that the last BCP report was presented to the Audit Committee in June 2012, during the period when the Olympics were taking place and the refurbishment of 59½ Southwark Street with the City of London. Roy Stanley, Information and Communications Technology and Facilities Manager, had now taken over the responsibility for business continuity for London Councils. Frank Smith said that Roy Stanley had

reviewed the plan, and the document was now much more specific and detailed compared to the previous version in 2012. Frank Smith said that a large number of risks had now been identified and the template was a big improvement to what London Councils had in 2012. He said that issues around remote working had been dealt with and the plan was now “up and ready”.

Roger Chadwick asked whether the IT contract with Agilisys came under the City of London, or whether it was London Councils’ own contract. Frank Smith said that the contract was through the City of London. Roger Chadwick said that the Agilisys contract was up for renewal soon. Frank Smith confirmed that London Councils was aware of this.

Councillor Simon Wales said that he was very impressed with the BCP document. He asked whether the document needed to reflect on what could go wrong during the peak of Freedom Pass activity (Services, page 31 of the BCP). Nick Lester, Corporate Director of Services, said that most activity on the Freedom Pass was undertaken by the contractors. He said that in 59½ Southwark Street, contract management took place continuously. Councillor Simon Wales asked whether the contractors had a disaster plan. Nick Lester said that this was incorporated into the original contract. The Chair asked whether the BCP was available to all London Councils’ staff. Roy Stanley confirmed that it was. Frank Smith said that all staff received a plastic card giving instructions and details of who to contact in the event of an emergency. An example of this could be found at page 56 of the BCP. The Chair asked whether members could be given one of the plastic cards in the event of an emergency taking place. Frank Smith said that this could be looked into. The Chair commended London Councils on the good piece of work that had been carried out on the BCP.

The Audit Committee:

- Noted and commented on the revised Business Continuity Plan, which could be found at Appendix 1 of the report;
- Noted and commented on the position on controls and testing of the plan on pages 62 to 63 (Appendix A) of the BCP report; and
- Agreed that officers would look into whether the plastic cards given to London Councils’ staff, containing instructions and contact numbers in what to do in an emergency, could also be issued to members.

9. Internal Audit Reviews Update

The Audit Committee received a report that provided members with an update of internal audit work that had been undertaken since the last committee update report presented at the June 2016 meeting.

David Sanni introduced the Internal Audit Reviews update report. He informed members that one review had been completed and adequate controls were in place (Appendix B). Colleagues from the Grants team (Nick Lester and Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services) were present to answer in questions that members might have.

David Sanni said that the outstanding internal audit recommendations log could be found from page 101 of the report, including the 2014 ICT review and the 2016 ICT Strategy review (page 117). He informed members that there was one outstanding item from the 2014 review which related to the remote access system. This would be rolled out to all staff once the support arrangements with the Agilisys ICT service desk were in place. The 2016 ICT recommendation was also on course to meet the September 2016 deadline.

The Chair asked for clarification on the monitoring process for a sample of current grant funded organisations (Appendix A, page 86). Simon Courage said that “recommendation 1” now stated that three years audited financial statements should be requested on new funding applications at the near final stage, as opposed to looking at only one year’s accounts. The Chair asked whether the state of the finances of shortlisted organisations were taken into account. Simon Courage

confirmed that the organisation would have been investigated if any problems had arisen after the first year.

The Chair asked for more details on what had happened to “Eaves Housing for Women” charity. Simon Courage said that the organisation had received £165,000 in funding, but had gone into administration in October 2015. London Councils had ended its relationship with them and looked at alternative provision. Frank Smith said that new monitoring arrangements that were now in place enabled monies to be stopped immediately and redirected very quickly. The new monitoring arrangements were now very robust.

Roger Chadwick asked whether London Councils had a relationship with City Bridge Trust. Simon Courage confirmed that London Councils was now entering into a stronger partnership with City Bridge Trust. The Chair said that, as the recommendations were implemented, the internal audit review lists would be reduced.

The Audit Committee:

- Considered and commented on the contents of the Grants review attached at Appendix B of the report;
- Noted the position on outstanding internal audit recommendations as was detailed in the log that was attached at Appendix C of the report; and
- Noted that there were no significant control weaknesses identified in the reviews completed during the period

10. Dates of Audit Committee Meetings for 2017/18

The dates of the Audit Committee meetings for 2017/18 were agreed by members.

Roger Chadwick informed the Audit Committee of changes to senior finance staff at the City of London.

The Chair said that the continued support from the City of London, with regard to the services provided to London Councils, was very much appreciated.

The meeting finished at 11:06am

Action Points

| | Action | Progress |
|------------------------------------|---|----------|
| 8. Business Continuity Plan | <i>To look into whether the plastic cards given to London Councils’ staff, giving instructions and contact numbers in what to do in an emergency, could be issued to members.</i> | |

Leaders' Committee

Report from the Transport & Environment Committee – 13 October 2016

Item no:

Report by: Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager
Date: 6 October 2016
Contact Officer: Alan Edwards
Telephone: 020 7934 9911 **Email:** Alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: Summary of the minutes of the London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee held on 13 October 2016

Recommendations: For information.

1. Attendance: Cllr Lynda Rice (LB Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Dean Cohen (LB Barnet), Cllr Alex Sawyer (LB Bexley), Cllr Ellie Southwood (LB Brent), Cllr Meric Apak (LB Camden - Deputy), Cllr Stuart King (LB Croydon), Cllr Julian Bell (LB Ealing, Chair), Cllr Daniel Anderson (LB Enfield), Cllr Sizwe James (RB Greenwich), Cllr Jonathan McShane (LB Hackney - Deputy), Cllr Peray Ahmet (LB Haringey), Cllr Claudia Webbe (LB Islington), Cllr Tim Coleridge (RB Kensington & Chelsea), Cllr Phil Doyle (RB Kingston-upon-Thames), Cllr Jenny Brathwaite (LB Lambeth), Cllr Rachel Onikosi (LB Lewisham – Deputy), Cllr Martin Whelton (LB Merton), Cllr Peter Buckwell (LB Richmond-upon-Thames), Cllr Mark Williams (LB Southwark – Deputy), Cllr Jill Whitehead (LB Sutton), Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Tower Hamlets), Cllr Caroline Usher (LB Wandsworth), Cllr Heather Acton (City of Westminster), and Alex Williams (Transport for London).

2. Apologies for Absence: Cllr Colin Smith (LB Bromley), Cllr Phil Jones (LB Camden), Cllr Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney), Cllr Wesley Harcourt (LB Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Graham Henson (LB Harrow), Cllr Jason Frost (LB Havering), Cllr Amrit Mann (LB Hounslow), Cllr Alan Smith (LB Lewisham), and Cllr Ian Wingfield (LB Southwark).

3. Urban Design London (UDL) Update by Esther Kurland, Director of UDL & Councillor Daniel Moylan and Councillor Nigel Haselden, TEC Representatives on UDL.

Councillor Moylan and Councillor Haselden gave a brief introduction to the UDL, which had now been in operation for 14 years. Esther Kurland then explained that the UDL had CPD training and was practical and skills based to help people do their job. UDL covered topics that responded to member requests, including housing, planning, street design, transport planning and highway engineering. One of the most recent debates and discussions were around tall buildings. She said that UDL was set-up to support borough officers and councillors, and this remained the primary purpose.

A brief “Q and A” session took place between TEC members and the representatives of UDL. Councillor Moylan said that it would be beneficial if boroughs could provide a single point of contact for the UDL. He said that the UDL provided a great deal of output considering the size of the team and offered good value for money to the boroughs.

4. Talk by Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport

Val Shawcross, Deputy Mayor for Transport, made the following comments to members: (i) Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) has a broad mandate, (ii) a "Towards" document would be published in October 2016. This would outline key issues and principles from a transport perspective, (iii) a 5-year Business Plan from TfL (end of November), which would outline TfL's activities and the challenges faced, (iv) a 30-year Mayors Transport Strategy (MTS) to be produced in 2017, (v) Air Quality work was progressing (over 14,000 responses to the first phase of consultation), (vi) Black cabs and private hire vehicles (PHV) action plan has been published, (vii) river crossings are now moving ahead.

A "Q and A" session took place between Val Shawcross and TEC members, where a number of issues were raised, including: (i) continuation of LIP funding, (ii) increasing bus passenger volumes, (iii) updating Bakerloo line, DLR and Tramlink extensions as well as the roll-out of electric and hybrid buses, (iv) policy framework for "healthy streets", (v) Southern rail franchise, (vi) Crossrail 2 proposals, and (vii) recruitment of a Walking & Cycling Commissioner.

5. Chair's Update

The Committee received a report that updated members on the transport and environment policy since the last TEC meeting on 16 June 2016.

The Chair informed TEC that the two new Labour members nominated to the London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) from 2016 to 2020 were Councillor Ian Wingfield (LB Southwark) and Councillor Feryal Demirci (LB Hackney). He informed members that Shirley Rodrigues was the new Deputy Mayor for Environment and she would be coming to speak at TEC meeting on 8 December 2016. The Chair's report was noted.

6. Flooding Investment in London

The Committee received a report that provided TEC with an update on progress of the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee's (Thames RFCC) six year capital programme. It also provided an update on the work to increase local authority capacity to put forward capital projects for funding, and provided the business case presented by the Environment Agency for an increase in local levy.

Amanda Nobbs, Chair of the Thames RFCC, introduced the report and said that there was a significant flood risk to London. Fluvial flooding had also become more frequent. A longer-term programme of 5-6 years was agreed with Government, along with a 6-year investment programme (agreed in principle). This had enabled the Thames RFCC to develop schemes and make progress.

A brief "Q and A" session took place between Thames RFCC and TEC members, where various issues were raised including issues with Thames Water around accessibility, engagement and flooding to which their infrastructure may be a contributor or could form a solution

The Committee: **(i)** noted that Thames Water now had a separate contact for each partnership, which would be circulated to members, and **(ii)** provided a steer to the TEC members who sit on the Thames RFCC to recommend a levy increase of 1.99% for 2017/18.

7. Electric Vehicles and Car Clubs Update Report

The Committee considered a report that updated members on progress on electric vehicles and on car clubs.

Nick Lester-Davis, Corporate Director of Services, introduced the report and said that several options had been identified for the implementation and delivery for the partnership and governance arrangements for EVs and charging and the Steering Group agreed that a public-private model should be pursued. Nick Lester-Davis said that there were now three car club models operating in London: (i) round trip or back to base, where the car was returned to the same location after customer use, (ii) flexible or "floating" car club, which do not require the vehicle to be returned to a dedicated bay, but permit the parking of vehicles across parking bays in the borough, and (iii) station to station or "point-to-point" car clubs, where the cars are based at fixed locations but users would be able to start and finish at any of the fixed locations, and would not need to take the car back to where it originated from.

The Committee: **(i)** noted the update on the Go Ultra Low City Scheme, **(ii)** gave an “in principle” agreement to London Councils’ TEC taking on the Delivery Partner Strategy role as defined in paragraphs 12 to 16, **(iii)** noted the findings of the “Carplus” survey on the use of car clubs, and **(iv)** agreed that charters for both EV charging networks and car clubs, setting out the public interest in their use, should be prepared, but agreed that the wording with regards to having “charters” be revisited.

8. Freedom Pass Progress Report

The Committee received a report that provided members with a general progress update on the Freedom Pass scheme.

The Committee: **(i)** approved the recommendation to shut the renewal portal and phone line when new customer services enhancements to the Freedom Pass website were launched; and **(ii)** noted the updated timescales for the Freedom Pass and Taxicard managed services contract re-let.

9. Environment and Traffic Adjudicator Recruitment

The Committee considered a report that provided details of the proposed recruitment exercise for Environment and Traffic Adjudicators, as mentioned in the Chief Adjudicator’s report to the Committee on 16 October 2014.

The Committee: **(i)** agreed to the implementation of the proposed recruitment exercise, **(ii)** consented to the new terms and conditions for the appointment of Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (subject to the consent of the Lord Chancellor or nominated officer holder), and **(iii)** consented to the introduction of the new pay structure, allowing payments to be made by allocated lists as well as by hourly rates.

10. Environment and Traffic Adjudicators’ Annual Report 2015/16

The Committee received and noted the joint Annual Report by the Environment and Traffic Adjudicators for the reporting year of 2015/16.

11. Note of the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 15 September 2016

The Committee received and noted the note from the TEC Executive Sub Committee that was scheduled for the 15 September 2016, but was carried out via correspondence.

12. Minutes of the TEC Main Meeting held on 16 June 2016

The minutes of the TEC Main meeting held on 16 June 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting finished at 16:50pm

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Date 10 Nov 2016 **Venue** London Councils

Meeting Chair Cllr Peter John OBE

Contact Officer: Neeraj Sharma

Telephone: 020 7934 9524 **Email:** Neeraj.sharma@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Present

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Cllr Peter John OBE | Executive member for children, skills and employment (Chair) |
| Gail Tolley | Association of London Directors of Children's Services |
| Caroline Boswell | Greater London Authority (GLA) (for Joanne McCartney) |
| Yolande Burgess | London Councils Young People's Education and Skills |
| Tim Shields | Chief Executives London Committee |
| Mary Vine-Morris | Association of Colleges (AoC) London Region |
| Dr Jane Overbury OBE | AoC/Sixth Form Colleges |
| Arwell Jones | Association of School and College Leaders |
| John Prior | AoC/NATSPEC (for Dr Caroline Allen OBE) |
| Denise Donovan | Department for Work and Pensions (on behalf of Derek Harvey) |

Guests and Observers

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Souraya Ali | LEP officer (for Michael Heanue) |
|-------------|----------------------------------|

Officer(s)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Peter O'Brien | London Councils Young People's Education and Skills |
| Neeraj Sharma | London Councils Young People's Education and Skills |

Apologies

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Cllr David Simmonds | Shadow Executive member for children, skills and employment |
| David Jeffrey | Education Funding Agency |
| Nick Lester-Davis | London Councils |
| Dr Caroline Allen OBE | AoC/NATSPEC |
| Dr Graeme Atherton | AccessHE - Higher Education representative |
| Derek Harvey | Department for Work and Pensions |
| Sam Parrett OBE | AoC – Further Education Representative |
| Michael Heanue | LEP |

1 Welcome and introductions

- 1.1 Cllr John welcomed attendees to the Board meeting and apologies were noted.
- 1.2 Attendees were informed that during the summer there were a number of Board membership changes:
 - Greater London Authority
 - Joanne McCartney has replaced Munira Mirza
 - London Work Based Learning Alliance
 - Gary Hunnisett has replaced Vic Farlie
 - Association of Colleges – Further Education Representative
 - Sam Parrett has replaced Sir Frank McLoughlin
- 1.3 Changes had been approved by London Councils' CEO under delegated powers from Leaders' Committee.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 No interests were declared.

3 Notes and Matters Arising from the last meeting

- 3.1 Notes of the last meeting were formally approved.
- 3.2 It was agreed to invite officials from the Department for Education to the next Board meeting to explore options for London to support the pilot of the construction and digital technical pathways outlined in the Skills Plan.

4 Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) reforms

- 4.1 The Board debated the implementation of SEND reforms in London since 2014. It was agreed it would be helpful for the Association of London Directors of Children's Services to consider current workforce development needs.

5 Policy Update

- 5.1 The Young People's Education and Skills Board received a report that highlighted some of the key policy changes/updates since the last Board meeting in July 2016.
- 5.2 The Board noted the contents of the paper.

6 Raising the Participation Age (RPA)

- 6.1 The Board received an update on RPA performance across London. It was also explained that the government recently consulted on changes to tracking and reporting on young people and their participation. These had now been implemented and would result in changes to the format and content of future reports to Board members.
- 6.2 The contents of the paper were noted.

7 Vision 2020

- 7.1 The Board reviewed the draft Vision 2020 document and agreed that changes should be considered. Most notably, changes were suggested around ensuring there was complementarity with other strategies in the capital and an emphasis on social mobility and career pathways.

DRAFT