

LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS COMMITTEE
8 February 2017

Minutes of the Grants Committee held at London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL on Wednesday 8 February 2017

London Borough & Royal Borough:

Representative:

Bexley
Brent
Bromley
Camden
Ealing
Greenwich
Hammersmith & Fulham
Haringey
Harrow
Havering
Hounslow
Islington
Kensington & Chelsea
Kingston Upon Thames
Lambeth
Lewisham
Merton
Newham
Redbridge
Southwark
Sutton
Waltham Forest
Wandsworth
Westminster

Don Massey
Margaret McLennan
Stephen Carr
Jonathan Simpson
Ranjit Dheer
Denise Scott-McDonald
Sue Fennimore
Eugene Ayisi
Kiran Ramchandani (substitute)
Melvin Wallace
Richard Foote
Kaya Comer-Schwartz
Gerard Hargreaves
Julie Pickering
Paul McGlone
Joan Millbank
Edith Macauley
Forhad Hussain
Bob Littlewood
Barrie Hargrove
Simon Wales
Liaquat Ali
James Madden OBE
David Harvey (substitute)

London Councils officers were in attendance.

1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllrs Alison Gowman (City of London), Hamida Ali (Croydon), Yasemin Brett (Enfield), Sue Anderson (Harrow), Meena Bond (Richmond) and Antonia Cox (Westminster).

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 There were two declarations of interest: Cllr Joan Millbank (Lewisham) as an employee of City Bridge Trust and Kiran Ramchandani (Harrow) as UK Community Foundations.

3. Minutes of the Grants Committee held on 23rd November 2016

- 3.1 The Minutes of the meeting were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

4. Grants Programme 2017-21: Recommendations

- 4.1 The Chair introduced the item, confirming its importance and informing the Committee that the programme had been the subject of a year long review which had concluded in December 2016. The Chair added that it had been agreed that a programme would be

going forward which focused on three priorities and did not have a priority solely focused on capacity building. However, there was capacity building in Priorities 1 and 2 to support the objectives of supporting the sector. He acknowledged the work of City Bridge Trust and the close alignment in the programme between homelessness and employment, and of the relationship between inner and outer London, both of which had been concerns for the Committee.

- 4.2 The Chair drew attention to the maps, which again had been a specific need expressed by the Committee, and which allowed providers to be held to account for schemes operating for the benefit of people from individual boroughs.
- 4.3 Thanks were extended to Cllr Sarah Hayward who, as Equalities portfolio holder had advised on equalities considerations in the report, principally section 6 (Equalities) on page 23 of the paper.
- 4.4 The Chair invited Katy Makepeace-Gray, Principal Programme Manager, to outline the first section of the report and to receive questions from the Committee: this part of the report included the background to the grants review, value for money considerations and the linking of Priority 1 homelessness projects with Priority 2 sexual and domestic violence; it also included details of the assessment and moderation process, leading to Table 1, a list of applications recommended for funding, and Table 2, a list of those applications not recommended.
- 4.5 Cllr Pickering asked about whether it was possible to develop a greater understanding of inner and outer London delivery within the scoring process and to tease out the differences when reviewing the framework? The Principal Programme Manager confirmed that columns 2 and 3 in the service area maps gave more specific information about targets for each borough which were agreed in the service specifications and the anticipated delivery as outlined in the applications. There would be capacity to review those targets during the life of the programme. Ability to deliver to different parts of London and fit with local services were part of the application scoring framework. Simon Courage, Head of Grants and Community Services, mentioned that this was the first time that targets by borough had been delivered, but that there would also be the opportunity to review the framework later in the programme.
- 4.6 Cllr Millbank asked, in relation to section 7.7 of the report, whether the scoring by 'officers' related to internal staff only and whether all boroughs had been involved? The Principal Programme Manager confirmed that the scoring was carried out by one internal member of staff and one person from the boroughs, and that some boroughs had been more involved than others. It was agreed that London Councils would provide a list of external staff involved in scoring to members of the Committee.
- 4.7 Cllr Littlewood felt that the voluntary sector should be more involved in the assessment process via the boroughs, to achieve a more joined up approach. The Chair acknowledged this and the need for a systematic approach to the issue, but commented that practically London Councils Grants team were small in number. Cllr Hussain also commented that providers could undertake to work with borough officers when confirmed via the commissioning process.
- 4.8 While Cllr Dheer was pleased to see the progress made in the production of the borough maps he felt that the inclusion of the London Voluntary Service Council in the assessment process could be useful.
- 4.9 Cllr Scott-McDonald was concerned that there had been a number of changes of staff within teams in Greenwich and the impact this would have had on contact with London

Councils. The Head of Grants and Community Services confirmed that London Councils now had a good working relationship with the present grants contact in that borough.

- 4.10 The Chair asked the Principal Programme Manager to inform the Committee about the single received Right to Reply against being funded, from Women in Prison. The Committee were informed that although the organisation had in their response mentioned the specialist service provided, it was pointed out that St Mungos also offered a relationship with prisons. After reviewing WiP's response Officers were not minded to change their recommendation.
- 4.11 Cllr Hargreaves asked about the impact on delivery for organisations proposed for funding that were not being recommended at a level of funding that matched the level requested. The Principal Programme Manager confirmed that the organisation would have to submit revised work plans, outcomes and budgets to reflect this (if the bids were approved).Cllr Hargreaves also asked on what basis the recommendation was made not to award the amount requested to particular applications such as SignHealth. The Principal Programme Manager confirmed that there were more high quality applications than budget available and that recommendations were based on addressing the different elements of the service specifications and within the budget envelope.
- 4.12 Cllr Millbank asked about the decision to fund the Women's Resource Centre but not Southall Community Alliance, even though the latter scored higher, and whether the former had the right to challenge. The Principal Programme Manager confirmed that scoring was carried out within the specification and WRC was the only applicant in that area. In terms of appeal, it was confirmed that the Right to Reply was offered to all organisations that were not recommended for funding, although only Women in Prison exercised that right.
- 4.13 In response to a question from Cllr Simpson regarding the lack of inclusion of no recourse to public funds and homelessness, the Principal Programme Manager pointed out the inclusion of Shelter in the bids (page 34 of the report) and the Ashiana Network, and that targets within the 2.4 priority would reflect specialist homeless needs including those with no recourse to public funds. Cllr Simpson felt that as rough sleeping predominantly affected single men, this should be looked at. It was agreed that London Councils would reflect this issue in one of the forthcoming 'themed' reports.
- 4.14 Cllr Hargrove welcomed the equality monitoring aspects of the programme, but asked how any failures to meet Equality Act duties would be reported back to Members. The Chair confirmed that detailed delivery reporting would be made back to members from the November 2017 meeting.
- 4.15 It was noted by Cllr Pickering that some of the organisations' outcome indicators were better defined than others, and asked whether there were any lessons to be learned from some of the clearer bids? The Head of Grants and Community Services commented that for some services outcomes were easier to define than others, but it was hoped that organisations finding it more difficult to clearly articulate outcomes could learn from the best.
- 4.16 The Chair moved to seek approval for the recommendations in the report, and while Councillor Carr pointed out that any approval would be subject to delivery and performance, the Chair confirmed that the Committee would hold commissioned organisations to account in accord with its Commissioning Performance Management policy and procedures, discussed elsewhere on the agenda. Therefore the Committee:
 - Noted London Councils response to the issues raised during the Grants Review (1)

- Noted the approach to embedding equalities throughout the process and the programme (2)
- Agreed the recommendations in Table 1 relating to Priority 1 and the recommended funding for the period 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2021 at an annual level of £2,472,427 and an indicative level of £9,889,711 over four years (3)
- Agreed the recommendations in Table 1 relating to Priority 2 and the recommended funding for the period 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2021 at an annual level of £3,700,705 and an indicative level of £14,802,821 over four years (4)
- Noted the reasons for not recommending funding to applications set out in Table 2 of the report (5)

4.17 The Chair formally thanked the Grants team and London Councils staff involved in the programme for a high quality set of recommendations. This thanks was echoed by the whole Committee.

5. Commissioning Performance Management Review

- 5.1 Cllr Hussain introduced the report, a version of which had been reported to members at the previous meeting. Comments from that meeting and discussions with London Boroughs had now been incorporated to provide a framework where commissioned projects can be effectively managed from their inception. The Head of Grants and Services added that the review focused on outcomes as part of an overall value for money approach, and confirmed that the approach was to performance manage rather than monitor projects. The emphasis would be on those projects deemed high risk, and the use of a triangulation approach involving boroughs and the involvement of providers to ensure that projects issues are quickly highlighted.
- 5.2 Cllr Hargreaves commented that case studies provided tended to be successful ones, and that on occasion it would be good to see studies where there have been problems and lessons learnt.
- 5.3 In response to a question from Cllr Pickering about how it was confirmed whether organisations were 'not for profit' within the due diligence process and whether there were resources to do this, the Principal Programme Manager confirmed that accounts were examined to check that any surpluses made were ploughed back into services.
- 5.4 Cllr Millbank agreed that case studies were important as circumstances within organisations were liable to change and it was therefore good to have a mix of information – it was also helpful to understand where things have not worked well.
- 5.5 Cllr Comer-Schwartz asked that the language relating to closing projects should be softened to reflect the fact that these commissions will be working with very vulnerable people. The Councillor's experience in Islington was to use terms like 'feasibility' and 'signposting' rather than 'closing down.' London Councils agreed to review the language here.
- 5.6 The Chair raised the possibility of asking providers to provide short 20/30 minute presentations to the Committee, which was agreed as a good idea. The possibility of carrying out visits to organisations was also raised. Again while this was agreed to be a good idea there was concern that larger organisations with more resources for such visits would manage whilst smaller organisations might be daunted by such a prospect.
- 5.7 The Committee noted the report and agreed to adopt the Commissioning Performance Management Framework.

6. Leadership in the Third Sector

- 6.1 The Chair introduced the report, confirming that the money budgeted to work with City Bridge Trust had already been agreed by the Committee, and the aim of this paper was to consider the draft Terms of Reference for a new group to provide the necessary political leadership and bolster third sector opportunities.
- 6.2 Members were informed that although some legal advice on the issue had already been obtained the Chair wished for the final agreement on the ToR to be agreed via the Vice Chairs, and that as part of this it was important to get the right numbers of Members involved. He confirmed that this was not a formal sub committee. It was agreed that membership of the group should be agreed via the political groups.
- 6.3 Cllr Carr asked whether this group was more a 'start and finish' body and whether the Executive could fulfil the leadership function? However the Chair felt that many interested Members were not part of the Executive. It was noted however that the group's remit focused on the agreed workplan which was currently for a one year period , and as such the group was time limited, subject to review
- 6.4 Members noted the work plan for leadership in the third sector, the budgetary provision for the work, and the terms of reference, subject to any legal issues. It was agreed at the meeting that the Chair and Vice Chair of Grants Committee take forward constituting the group with the support of the political advisers.

7. Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2016/17

- 7.1 The Chair asked Frank Smith, Director of Corporate Resources, to introduce the item. Members were informed regarding the surplus that there was a slight reduction on the half year position due to processing claims for grants and administration issues – the position had previously been considered and agreed at Leaders Committee.
- 7.2 The Director of Corporate Resources also confirmed that next year was the final year for the payment of £1m for the ESF programme – after that no further money would be demanded and the programme would be funded by the money already levied.
- 7.3 It was confirmed, in relation to the £38k for funding support via City Bridge Trust, that a person had now been appointed to the position.
- 7.4 Members noted the projected surplus of £759,000, the projected level of Committee reserves, and the remainder of the financial report.

The meeting ended at 15.05.

