

# Leaders' Committee

## Minutes and Summaries

Item no: 6

**Report by:** Derek Gadd      **Job title:** Head of Governance  
**Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018  
**Contact Officer:** Derek Gadd  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9505      **Email:** [Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary**      Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

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

- Grants – Leadership in the Third Sector – 27 February 2018
- GLPC – 14 March 2018
- Grants – 21 March 2018
- Executive – 19 June 2018

# Meeting of the Grants Sub Committee: Third Sector Leadership

Tuesday 27 February 2018 2pm

London Councils, Room 5, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL

## Members

Cllr Paul McGlone  
Cllr Joan Millbank  
Cllr Bob Littlewood  
Cllr Comer Schwartz  
Alderman Alison Gowman  
Cllr Paul Ellis  
Cllr Sue Anderson

## Borough

LB Lambeth (Chair)  
LB Lewisham  
LB Redbridge  
LB Islington  
City of London  
LB Wandsworth  
LB Harrow

## London Councils

Yolande Burgess  
Katy Makepeace-Gray  
Feria Henry

Strategy Director  
Principal Programme Manager  
Priority Manager

## Board Secretariat

David Dent

Principal Corporate Governance Officer

## London Hub

Sharon Long

Interim Hub Director

## London Funders

Geraldine Blake

Interim Projects Director

## City Bridge Trust

Jenny Field

Deputy Chief Grants Officer

## 1. Declarations of Interest

- 1.2 Alderman Alison Gowman as Chair of City Bridge Trust and Cllr Joan Millbank, employee of City Bridge Trust.

## 2. Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Forhad Hussein (LB Newham), Cllr Don Massey (LB Bexley) and Cllr Simon Wales (LB Sutton)

## 3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2017

- 3.1 The minutes of this meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record, subject to the correction removing Alderman Alison Gowman as attendee and changing her borough location from City of Westminster to City of London.
- 3.2 Officers confirmed that all actions from the previous meeting had been completed.

## 4. Leadership in the Third Sector: Work Plan Final Report

- 4.1 The Chair introduced the report, commenting that he was keen to focus on outcomes with a view to reporting back to Grants Committee. He was also keen to clearly show within the report back how influence was used. It was confirmed that, in terms of Appendix 2 of the report, there were still some opportunities to influence.

- 4.2 Yolande Burgess, Strategy Director (YB) recognised the difference in the relationship between local authorities and the Third Sector in recent years, and the usefulness of initiatives which have involved elected members and the voluntary sector working effectively. YB also recognised the valuable work that Fera Henry, Priority Manager (FH) had done with the Borough Officers Group. The work had been 'owned' by the boroughs and there were good examples which demonstrated the power of influencing.
- 4.3 YB recognised the value of partners, and the value of the value of the Grants programme - £21million - to leverage further funding to the Cornerstone Fund. She noted that while not all the outcomes of the third sector work were tangible, a lot had been achieved in a short space of time, and that the work would continue in different ways after the cessation of this group.
- 4.4 The Chair recommended that the Sub Committee review the report by section. Overall he felt that although the report showed a number of different approaches, boroughs were linked by common principles.
- 4.5 Cllr Littlewood mentioned that although he had attended the Systems Change Group, which had been useful in highlighting a variety of experiences, he had not received a set of minutes. Geraldine Blake, Interim Projects Director at London Funders (GB) apologised for not having sent a copy of the draft minutes to him. It was recognised that participation of Borough Officers Group at the Systems Change and Hub Groups was growing. FH confirmed that feedback would be given to the Borough Officers Group.
- 4.5 The Chair apologised that he had been unable to attend meetings of the Hub Advisory group. Cllr Comer Schwartz indicated an interest in attending and YB agreed to send her dates of future meetings. Sharon Long, Interim Director of London Hub (SL) commented that there could be some flexibility with regard to future dates to support member attendance.
- 4.6 YB was now a Trustee of London Funders, which would provide good opportunities for joint working.
- 4.7 Cllr Comer Schwartz asked to what extent the London Hub had been a collective voice for the sector, citing the example of the work she had been doing on the London Living Wage, and a perception that the charity sector was an effective voice outside of the sector but not within it. SL responded that the Hub would be looking at this issue as well as other common topics like housing, once the staffing was in place. The Sub Committee recognised the specific living wage issues and those of scale and resources within the charity sector.
- 4.8 In response to a question from the Chair regarding the consultation mentioned in section 2.6 of the report, YB confirmed that London Councils fed in as much as possible, and that there would be continued involvement because of the Hub. The Chair was keen for negotiations with the GLA to continue.
- 4.9 SL confirmed that there had been some slippage in relation to the Hub and it was hoped to have it live in June; the delay had been due to clarifications in governance, required by the Charity Commission.
- 4.10 In terms of the report's Appendices, Alderman Gowman felt that some of the outcomes on pages 16 to 17 of the report were aspirational; in that these would be reported to Grants Committee the Chair preferred that the outcomes detailed be reshaped as a 'direction of travel.'
- 4.11 With regard to the Cornerstone Fund in Appendix 2, Jenny Field, Deputy Chief Grants Officer from City Bridge Trust (JF) confirmed that there was some flexibility within the £2.8million in respect of individual grants. In terms of the priorities, she emphasised the need for the Fund to support organisations to build more resilient communities.

- 4.12 Cllr Littlewood initiated a discussion regarding the term 'co-production.' It was agreed that the term was defined as users of services co-designing services, although there was concern about how this was reflected when making decisions. GB confirmed that the Systems Change Group was looking at this as part of its work. Cllr Comer Schwartz recognised the importance of governance structures reflecting the community they represented, and the pressure on those structures from those requiring governing bodies to have increased 'professionalism.' It was also confirmed that the GLA Civil Society definition was work in progress.
- 4.13 The Sub Committee considered Appendix 3 to the report. FH explained that the submissions from boroughs were in response to the question 'what does good look like?' and showed the difference in approaches adopted by local authorities, and that these responses would feed into the Systems Change Group work. It was noted that such different ways of working were also prevalent in the Voluntary Sector. Concern was expressed that only 6 responses had been made, 5 of which were included in the Appendix, but the Chair felt that the examples that were given were strong. YB informed members that there had been a better response to the original survey, which also provided useful information for the work of the Borough Officers Group, who would also recommission the survey annually to identify emerging thematic areas. SL also commented that one of the roles of the Hub would be to help boroughs avoid duplicating work.
- 4.14 YB confirmed that the Principles for Good Commissioning in Appendix 4 would be taken forward by the Borough Officers Group with the aim of getting local authorities to adopt the same commissioning principles. Cllr Millbank asked that the issue of 'Keep it local' should not be too prescriptive in that a lot of good work has been done to benefit communities outside of boroughs. Cllr Littlewood also expressed concern that the value of smaller local groups might also be overlooked. YB agreed that both of these issues could be fed back in to the Borough Officers Group.
- 4.15 Cllr Littlewood also raised the issue of boroughs rationalising accommodation for the voluntary sector. This was noted, although the Chair commented that premises could sometimes get in the way of discussions, and mentioned some of the more innovative uses of office space in his own borough of Lambeth.
- 4.16 In response to a question regarding the pie chart included in Appendix 3 to the report, it was confirmed that the results had been produced from the survey carried out by borough officers, although the results had been checked against the National Audit Office statistics. The low percentage given to 'user/customer focussed' (3%) was noted, and Cllr Anderson questioned the extent of engagement with people, for example on commissioning panels. GB thought that future work should bring out any inconsistencies with infrastructure support.
- 4.17 Members:
- Noted the progress and outcomes against the agreed workplan, noted in section 2 of this report and summarised at Appendix 1, and the draft outcomes of the Cornerstone Fund at Appendix 2, accepting that the outcomes should be redefined to show the direction of travel
  - Noted the examples of local practice in commissioning the third sector and funding of civil society infrastructure support in Appendix 3
  - Endorsed the recommended Principles of Good Commissioning in Appendix 4, to be taken forward by the Borough Grants Officers group.
  - Noted the Communications Plan, which has been used to disseminate information and learning from the Leadership in the Third Sector workplan in Appendix 5 and the recommendations for other avenues of communications to be taken forward by the Borough Grants Officers group.
  - Noted the steps which will be taken to continue this work.

## **5. The Way Ahead: Verbal Update**

- 5.1 GB confirmed that The Way Ahead had a variety of different stakeholder groups feeding into its work, including the Hub and the GLA. GB was keen to look at data flows between the GLA and London Councils.
- 5.2 JF reported that the Funders board had met at the end of September, with follow ups due in March. 13 organisations were involved in the second round of City Bridge Trust applications, 9 of which received funding; the remaining 4 were not funded as they hadn't aligned their objectives to those of the Way Ahead. In addition, a consultation event had taken place with 52 organisations around potential outcomes for the Cornerstone Fund.
- 5.3 As a result of that work draft priorities would be reported to the City Bridge Trust Committee in March as well as a Round Table and Cornerstone Reference Group. These priorities were framed around partnership and collaborative approaches being cross sectoral, funding infrastructure support at local and regional level aligned with Civil Society principles. The Cornerstone Fund would support Systems Change initiatives.
- 5.4 JF informed members that the first stage would invite outline proposals, the strongest of which would be offered grants of up to £20K; further proposals and any interested funders would be welcome, and projects would be funded for up to three years. JF wanted to approach a learning partner to work alongside the bidders. Cllr Comer Schwartz supported this process, and the amount of funding offered.
- 5.5 SL reported on the progress towards the opening of the Hub. Since the last meeting:
- The objectives had been revised and these had now been signed off by the Charity Commission
  - From the end of September an advisory group has been meeting monthly, looking at the three key functions: networking, data and intelligence and voice and influencing options (with a view to the Hub not being seen as a single point of access)
  - A review of Trustee arrangements and a membership review were both taking place
  - The team were developing a communications narrative which would be followed by a detailed communications strategy
  - The draft of an outcomes framework had been produced, primarily as an internal document
- 5.6 In terms of recruitment SL confirmed that the Hub would have five posts. Job Descriptions had been produced, reflecting The Way Ahead priorities. A recruitment campaign was also underway for a Chief Executive post, utilising different approaches, and involving partners.
- 5.7 SL and others are starting to take forward some of the key findings of the task and finish groups, such as data, in which they were working with the GLA data team and other partners, towards a data event in April.
- 5.8 SL also mentioned that the Hub wanted to give themselves a new name on their launch, and that they were also looking for premises. There was a discussion as to whether 'start up' style premises, a mobile approach or a more permanent location would be preferable.
- 5.9 Regarding data analysis, Cllr Comer Schwartz mentioned the problems inherent in data capture around social value. SL agreed and confirmed that the Hub's approach to data would look at where money was being spent, and also analyse the impact of funding.

## **6. Next Steps**

- 6.1 The Chair confirmed the actions agreed in the meeting (contained in the minutes above) and thanked representatives from City Bridge Trust, London Funders and the Hub, and also those members of the Sub Committee who had been closely involved in projects.

**Members resolved to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the exempt part of the meeting.**

The meeting finished at 15:25

# Leaders' Committee

## Report from the Greater London Provincial Council – 15 March 2018

Item no:

**Report by:** Steve Davies      **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers Organisation

**Date:**

**Contact Officer:** Steve Davies

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9963      **Email:** Steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

**Summary:** Summary of the minutes of the Greater London Provincial Council held on 15 March 2018

**Recommendations:** For information.

**Present: Employers' Side:** Cllr Cameron Geddes (Barking & Dagenham), Cllr Colin Tandy (Bexley), Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden), Cllr Doug Taylor (Enfield), Cllr Caroline Selman (Sub) (Hackney), Cllr David Glasspool (Kingston), Cllr Kevin Bonavia (Lewisham), Cllr Simon Wales (Sutton) and Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster). **Union Side:** Helen Reynolds (UNISON), April Ashley (UNISON), Kim Silver (UNISON), Sue Plain (UNISON), Maggie Griffin (UNISON), Vaughan West (GMB), Jonathan Coles (GMB), Wendy Whittington (GMB), Peter Murphy (GMB), Danny Hoggan (Unite), Susan Matthews (Unite) and Henry Mott (Unite). **Others in attendance:** Steve Davies (Employers' Side Secretary), Debbie Williams (Regional Services Officer), Mehboob Khan (Labour Political Advisor), Jade Appleton (Conservative Political Advisor) and Julie Kelly (UNISON).

- 1. Apologies for Absence:** Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Simon Hall (Croydon), Cllr Carole Williams (Hackney), Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest), Gloria Hanson (UNISON), Simon Steptoe (UNISON), Sean Fox (UNISON), Mary Lancaster (UNISON), Gary Cummins (Unite) and Kath Smith (Unite).
- 2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 October 2017:** The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2017 were agreed.
- 3. Matters Arising:** Regionalisation of Adoption Services – Page 5, Item 7  
Sue Plain (UNISON) drew attention to this item and mentioned that those present at the Greater London Employment Forum (GLEF) meeting held on 15 February 2018 will recall that colleagues were informed by Ian Smith (London Adoption Board), that in relation to staff being TUPE'd no decision had been made as there are a number of different options around the country which were going to be looked at.

Sue was informed yesterday by her Director of Children's Services that the intention is not to TUPE staff and that this is being challenged.

The Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS) have now commissioned its own HR/legal advice and are advising that employees are protracted on a secondee or TUPE basis.

The Unions have still not been invited to sit at the table, this is now vital. There is a potential disruption to services.

The Unions would like to invite the GLPC as a whole to write to ALDCS asking them to invite the Trade Unions to table and for them to be privy to any legal advice as a matter of urgency.

Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) responded that this news had not yet reached the Employers' Side.

Cllr Doug Taylor (Enfield) stated that this news is different from what we were led to believe a matter of weeks ago and that the Employers' Side will take this information away to discuss.

Sue Plain (UNISON) stated that it is urgent that we jointly ask for clarification. At the GLEF meeting only a few weeks ago all we were given was what was likely to be the intention.

Colleagues in attendance agreed.

There were no further matters arising from the minutes of the 19 October 2017.

4. **NJC National Pay Offer and GLPC Employers London Pay Offer:** The Chair informed colleagues that there was no comment from the Trade Unions Side on this matter.

Steve Davies, Employers' Side Joint Secretary mentioned that if the result of the ballots is that the pay offer is agreed then there needs to be a special meeting of the GLPC organised in mid/late April to formally agree the London offer.

This would be a single item on the agenda but both Sides would need to be quorate, eight from each Side in attendance.

The earliest date a meeting can be accommodated is 12 April as the GLPC Constitution states that at least 21 days' notice and confirmation of the agenda item(s) has to be given.

5. **London Living Wage Summary:** Cllr Doug Taylor (Enfield) stated that the Employers' Side had observed that boroughs may not have interpreted the questions consistently and that our view is that we go back to authorities to get a more consistent approach and for boroughs to iron out any discrepancies. We do not believe that either Side can see comparability as the report stands. Colleagues in attendance agreed.

April Ashley (UNISON) highlighted that a lot of boroughs are stating that they have not got the data to respond to the questions. Boroughs have a list of contractors they use and should be able to see if these pay the LLW or not. This need to be interrogated a bit more. It would also be useful to know in relation to protected characteristics how many BAME and women are affected. Do not believe that this data is not available.



Cllr Doug Taylor (Enfield) responded that we need to go back and get this information. If boroughs are looking for accreditation then they should know what their contractors are paying.

The Chair stated that there is an issue with some of the contracts and boroughs may not know exactly what they are paying employees.

Vaughan West (GMB) stated that this is a slightly false picture as we are aware some boroughs who say they are accredited but we know that their contractors are not paying staff the LLW. This is also the case for staff in schools.

Agreed that this information needs to be made in to a more useful document with more detail and clarity on what the questions are.

Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) stated that we need to have confidence in the information we are providing to the Unions.

**6. Schedule of Outstanding Differences:** Cllr Angela Harvey (Westminster) congratulated the Joint Secretaries for their hard work at getting to the position of no outstanding disputes and differences registered on the list.

**7. Any Other Business:** Sue Plain (UNISON) would like it noted that with the forthcoming election and renewals thanks be given to those who will not be standing again in May.

Special thanks to Cllr Colin Tandy (Bexley) who will be standing down after 44 years of service for his contribution to both the GLPC and GLEF committees.

The Chair wished everyone the best of luck in the elections.

There was no further business.

**8. Date of next meeting:** The next meeting would be held on **Thursday 18 October 2018**. *Group meetings will take place at 10am and the main meeting at 11.30am (or on the rising of the sides).*

**The meeting was concluded at 12.33pm**

**GLPC Future Meeting Dates:** 21 March 2019 (Group Meeting: 10am, Joint Meeting: 11.30) and 24 October 2019 (Group Meeting: 10am, Joint Meeting: 11.30)

# LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS COMMITTEE

21 March 2018

Minutes of the Grants Committee held at London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, London SE1 0AL on Wednesday 21 March 2018

London Borough & Royal Borough:

Representative:

Barking & Dagenham	Cllr Saima Ashraf
Bexley	Cllr Don Massey
Ealing	Cllr Ranjit Dheer OBE
Greenwich	Cllr Denise Scott-McDonald
Harrow	Cllr Sue Anderson
Havering	Cllr Melvin Wallace
Hounslow	Cllr Candace Atterton
Islington	Cllr Kaya Comer-Schwartz
Kensington & Chelsea	Cllr Mary Weale
Kingston upon Thames	Cllr Hugh Scantlebury
Lambeth	Cllr Paul McGlone (Chair)
Lewisham	Cllr Joan Millbank
Merton	Cllr Edith MacCauley MBE
Newham	Cllr Forhad Hussain
Redbridge	Cllr Bob Littlewood
Richmond	Cllr David Linette
Southwark	Cllr Barrie Hargrove
Sutton	Cllr Simon Wales
Waltham Forest	Cllr Liaquat Ali
Wandsworth	Cllr Paul Ellis

London Councils officers were in attendance.

The Chair congratulated Cllr Dheer on his recent OBE.

The Chair informed the Committee that he would not be standing at the forthcoming elections and therefore would no longer be Chair of Grants Committee. On behalf of the Grants Committee Cllr Massey thanked Cllr McGlone for the non-political way in which he had chaired the Committee. He also thanked other members of the Committee who were no longer to stand at the election.

In terms of the agenda for the meeting, the Chair clarified that item 4 was incorrectly listed as minutes of an AGM. The Chair thanked Cllr Hussain for chairing the previous meeting in his absence.

## 1. Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Margaret McLennan (Brent), Alderman Alison Gowman (City of London), Cllr Sue Fennimore (Hammersmith & Fulham), Cllr Douglas Mills (Hillingdon), Cllr Theo Dennison (Hounslow), Cllr Abdul Mukit MBE (Tower Hamlets) and Cllr Antonia Cox (Westminster).

## 2. Appointment of Deputy for LB Hounslow

- 2.1 The Chair reported that as the Grants Committee member for Hounslow was not able to attend the meeting and Cllr Atterton, in attendance, was not one of the appointed deputies, it was for Grants Committee to agree her as Deputy for Hounslow for the meeting. This was agreed.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

### **4. Minutes of the Grants Committee – 22 November 2017**

4.1 The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting, subject to the correction of Councillor Weale's name (spelled 'Wheale' in the minutes). Cllr Comer-Schwartz also mentioned that her name plate had been incorrectly spelled, and the Chair reminded staff to be careful in the correct spelling of members' names.

4.2 In response to a question about the 'No Recourse to Public Funds' thematic review and presentation at the previous meeting, Yolande Burgess, Strategy Director (YB) reported that the suggestions for lobbying mentioned were being worked up with Grants and Policy teams within London Councils, with a view to a paper being reported to a future meeting of Leaders' Committee. YB also confirmed that a member briefing on the subject had been distributed.

### **5. Performance of the Grants Programme 2017-21**

5.1 The Chair confirmed that the full first year of the programme would be reported to Grants Committee at its AGM in July. He also congratulated those who had contributed to the report and was pleased to see the operation of the performance management framework within it.

5.2 Katy Makepeace-Gray, Principal Programme Manager (KM) informed the Committee that Priority 1 outcomes were 15 per cent above profile but Priority 2 were 4.5 per cent below profile for Quarters 1 to 3 of the current financial year. KM also drew members' attention to Appendix 1 of the report and the need to revise the RAG scoring methodology to bring out issues of under delivery.

5.3 In relation to Standing Together Against Domestic Violence (STADV) in section 4.2 of the report, members were informed that as the project was currently at amber, monitoring had been stepped up and there was an action plan in place. Members agreed to endorse the approach of officers to review a number of the outcomes that STADV is delivering against, in light of the fact that the project is delivering specific elements of the 1.3 service area specification.

5.4 KM pointed out that in Appendix 2 of the report the maps showed areas with more significant gaps between profile and delivery and concentrated on improvements which had taken place.

5.5 YB confirmed that in relation to Priority 3 projects, the report confirmed the incentives and approaches being adopted in relation to under performance. A new Quality Assurance officer had been appointed which has been welcomed by partners, the key issues had been identified and London Councils officers continued to work closely with the Priority 3 partners. The impact on partners cashflows had been recognised, and payments to providers continue to be made monthly rather than quarterly, with minimal risk to London Councils due to the robust quality assurance process now in place.

5.6 Cllr Littlewood congratulated the team at London Councils on the work done, as he had been concerned that the Priority 3 projects were not recoverable, and recognised the improvement in provider relationships.

5.7 Cllr Massey asked what organisational lessons had been learned from the issues in that considerable inputs had been required to deal with the problem? YB responded that the key learning was around how projects were taken on and initiated, and the need to build in proper contingencies.

- 5.8 Cllr Massey also asked, regarding the maps, what steps were being taken to look at the underperformance of the three boroughs, in terms of indicative and actual performance? Cllr Hargrove also wanted to know why only three boroughs were included in the report. KM responded that six boroughs had been identified relating to both Priority 1 and Priority 2 and that the three identified in the report were those that appeared on both lists. Work had been undertaken with borough officers to identify the underlying issues for this under-delivery in the three boroughs and to establish actions to address it. It was planned to roll this work out for the additional boroughs. The July Grants Committee would be presented with four quarters reporting, with borough reports for all boroughs, including some further analysis of under-delivery. The aim was to build on the reporting going forward.
- 5.9 Cllr Scott-McDonald informed the Committee that while it was recognised that engagement with borough officers had improved, there was more to do to improve borough engagement. She highlighted concern that the report noted some projects were green rated, which should not be. KM responded that work was underway with borough officers, including grants officers. She also informed the Councillor that there had been nuanced changes to the performance framework because of weighting changes, and the proposed changes, when modelled over the last two quarters would have changed a maximum of two projects from a green rating to an amber rating; issues relating to these two projects were reported on at the time.
- 5.10 Cllr Comer-Schwartz asked about the seeming randomness of outcomes for those performing well and not well, as she was keen to understand this. KM responded that improvements had been made in Quarter 3, but the results could also be influenced by the frequency of return of evaluation forms and the inputting of service users feedback onto the database. Reference was made to section 4.2 and Appendix five of the report, which provided further detail on this.
- 5.11 Cllr Wales asked about the difference between organisations in Priority 1 and 2, and Priority 3, and also felt that some boroughs seemed to be receiving more than they should in terms of delivery. YB confirmed that Priority 3 was part ESF funded, and that the funding regime and delivery strategy for those projects was different.
- 5.12 The Chair asked for staff to consider and report back to the Committee the lessons learned in respect of the Priority 3 issues, and to agree with boroughs the format and content of borough reports before reporting back to July Grants Committee.
- 5.13 Members took a view on the draft AGM paper attached as Appendix 4 to the report. It was agreed that Item 11, Provider Presentations, should focus on Priority 3, highlighting partnership working and key issues.

The Committee noted:

- a) the priority level outcomes for Priority 1, 2 and 3:
- b) the number of interventions delivered within the three Priority groups in the relevant quarters
- c) the progress of schemes, and outcomes at project level
- d) the progress on the administration of £100,000 per year for two years on behalf of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) to enhance training to front-line professionals on identifying harmful practices, as set out in section three.

And:

- e) Endorsed the approach taken by officers to review outcomes for Standing Together Against Domestic Violence (STADV) to ensure these are more in line with the issues raised in the Grants Review as set out in Section 4.2 of the report

- f) Endorsed the approach taken by officers to review the scoring ranges of the Red, Amber, Green (RAG) performance rating framework, as outlined in Appendix One of the report
- g) Endorsed the communications plan set out in Appendix Three, which has been provided in response to requests at the November meeting of the Grants Committee for additional information on communications strategies, noting the Chair's request to strengthen communications between the Committee and Borough lead officers.
- h) Agreed the format for the first annual report on the 2017-21 Grants Programme as outlined in Section Five of the report and Appendix Four.

## **6. Thematic review: Perpetrators**

- 6.1 The Committee was informed that this was the second of the 'thematic review' papers and would be supplemented by presentations from Sara Kirkpatrick (SK) from Respect, and Susie McDonald (SM) and Kate Lexen (KL) from Tender Education and Arts.
- 6.2 KM hoped that the report and presentations would highlight the role of local authorities in tackling perpetrators, including through funding the Grants Programme. It was also hoped to encourage boroughs, when commissioning services, to consider making the Respect standard a requirement
- 6.3 SK from Respect informed the Committee that the organisation had three areas of specialism: perpetrators of domestic abuse; male victims of abuse; and young people living in abusive situations. They also provided pan London training (which was the core funding) and projects with the Drive and Advance programmes as well as working with Women's Aid.
- 6.4 Members were informed that Respect also worked with Ascent, providing a helpline funded by London Councils (second tier support services) and training in areas like developing confidence. SK confirmed that there were two types of training provided. One focused on those directly delivering perpetrator prevention programmes and one supporting an improved response from other services that deal with perpetrators (such as housing and children's services).
- 6.5 SK confirmed that one to one support was in high demand, including delivery of a specialist package with Women's Aid.
- 6.6 SM and KL presented on the work of Tender Education and Arts, which focused on providing two-day healthy relationship projects for groups of 25 to 30 young people, working with them to share experiences via performance. The organisation was also developing a longer term 'champion school' programme which would last a year, with the aim of challenging social norms and helping young people examine peer and their own behaviors via role play.
- 6.7 Cllr Comer-Schwartz was keen for her borough to do more with perpetrators but was concerned that the work was expensive and took a long time. SK confirmed that while it was the case that such work was not short term, it was important for it to be done effectively and safely.
- 6.8 Cllr Comer-Schwartz was also concerned that, as Islington had 63 schools, what could the impact of the 'champion school' programme be across her borough and asked what more London Boroughs could do to assist. SM and KL agreed that while the work was not reaching as many schools as others would like, it was important for the programme to be run well and not to be a 'box ticking' exercise. It was also noted that some boroughs had been able to provide top up funding in the past to assist such programmes, and schools had been able to access finance through trusts and foundations.

- 6.9 Cllr Dheer asked whether the work of the organisations addressed the issues of the negative pressure of social media. It was confirmed that while issues were addressed, it should be noted that the age group covered by the programmes were ‘digital natives’ and therefore care had to be taken not to see social media as inherently destructive, although the programmes did challenge abuse within social media platforms as unacceptable.
- 6.10 In response to a question from Cllr Atterton, it was confirmed that the Tender programmes could be adapted and tailored for specific audiences. Cllr Atterton also asked whether boroughs were using public health money to supplement the Respect work. SK thought not, but recognised that this might be because of the lack of contact from commissioning organisations.
- 6.11 Cllr Linette asked whether female perpetrators were also addressed as well as males. SK agreed that although the examples of research provided in the presentation focused on violence from men to women, which made up the vast majority of reported cases, women to male violence was recognised, and was included in the work to enable all people to understand their rights and responsibilities.
- 6.12 Cllr MacCauley asked whether use of social media as a violation of bail conditions would be picked up. SK confirmed that compliance with bail conditions would form part of the work done with perpetrators, although the programme did not engage with the criminal justice system.
- 6.13 The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentations and was pleased to see the work done to address perpetrator issues in addition to supporting victims. The Chair also noted the comments regarding the impact of the Tender programme due to the timescales and would like to see how opportunities could be maximised to boost the programme.
- 6.14 In response to a question from Councillor Comer-Schwartz KM confirmed that the Policy team at London Councils had fed in to the recent GLA consultation on Domestic Violence
- 6.15 The Committee:
- Agreed to send the thematic report to the London Councils Executive member for crime and public protection.
  - Agreed to share the report and the project information in the 2017-21 report on the agenda for this meeting with their local authority to ensure that officers are aware of the activities regarding perpetrators that are commissioned through the programme.
  - Agreed to share information on the Respect Standard (outlined in paragraphs 2.7 and 3.1 to 3.4 of the report) with their local authority and consider making the Standard a requirement (achieved/working towards) when commissioning perpetrator interventions locally.

## **7. Leadership in the Third Sector: Work Plan Progress**

- 7.1 YB informed the Committee that the paper represented the final report from the Third Sector member sub Group, but not the end of the work; work would continue with City Bridge Trust and London Funders to develop The Way Ahead via a pan London Systems Change Group, a new Hub, and the Cornerstone Fund. Councillor Littlewood and the Chair were both thanked for their involvement, and it was hoped to share the work done with the wider membership.
- 7.2 It was reported that the City Bridge Trust would continue to shape ‘The Way Ahead’ programme of work and were keen that momentum should not to be lost and links with members remain established to make the best use of Third Sector resources. It was also reported that YB was now a London Funders trustee, which would assist this work.

- 7.3 The Committee was informed that members of the Hub Steering groups and the System Change group would be reporting back to members, but embedding the work with borough grants officers through, for example, developing commissioning principles, was important.
- 7.4 Cllr Comer-Schwartz informed the Committee that she met with Sharon Long from the Hub, who is keen to develop conversations with members, focusing initially on governance issues.
- 7.5 Cllr Massey questioned how much progress had been made with the programme. He was also concerned that although the objective was to support the voluntary sector across London, the arrangements might favour those boroughs directly supported by the sector, which may hinder identifying the gaps.
- 7.6 Cllr Ellis and Cllr Littlewood asked about the case studies mentioned in the report, expressing their disappointment at the small number of returns, and asked whether those boroughs that had not yet provided responses would be chased. YB mentioned that the responses were provided by the borough Grants Officers, but Cllr Ellis felt that we could improve responses by involving Grants Committee members. It was agreed that YB would talk to the Communications team about publicising these.
- 7.7 Cllr Littlewood also felt that while he enjoyed his involvement in the Systems Change Group which provided good networking opportunities, he was conscious that his role was limited in terms of how much it could reflect the views of the whole Committee. The Chair noted this and felt that officers should get a steer from members as to how they wanted to be involved in this work. He also stated his concerns about the Hub's capacity.
- 7.8 Cllr Millbank felt that although the case studies were useful, they did not provide context as to why boroughs provided services in the way they did. She was pleased however with the work of City Bridge Trust, particularly in organising a round table for other funders.
- 7.9 Members:
- Endorsed the direction of travel against the agreed workplan, noted in section 2 of the report and summarised at Appendix 1, and the draft outcomes of the Cornerstone Fund at Appendix 2.
  - Noted the examples of local practice in commissioning the third sector and funding of civil society infrastructure support in Appendix 3.
  - Endorsed the recommended Principles for Good Commissioning in Appendix 4 (to be taken forward by the Borough Grants Officers group)
  - Noted the Communications Plan, which has been used to disseminate information and learning from the Leadership in the Third Sector workplan in Appendix 5
  - Endorsed the steps which will be taken to continue this work. In particular, that from April 2018, the Strategy Director as a Trustee of London Funders, will maintain a direct link for the role of London Councils going forward.

## **8. Month 9 Revenue Forecast 2017/18**

- 8.1 David Sanni, London Councils Head of Financial Accounting (DS), presented the Forecast report, informing the Committee that it presented income and expenditure to Quarter 3 of the current financial year with a forecast to the end of the year.
- 8.2 DS reported a projected surplus of £755,000 for the year due to slippage on the ESF grants funded programme. The projected level of Committee reserves as at 31 March 2018 was £328,000

8.3 Cllr Wallace asked whether the cash amounts spent by borough could be shown? KM responded that it would be possible on a borough basis to show the number of beneficiaries against target, but it would be difficult to show specific spend because different beneficiaries cost different amounts. Cllr Massey agreed with the suggestion, although the Chair emphasised that the Grants programme was a London wide scheme, and that financial analysis at a borough level would be problematic.

The Chair thanked the Committee for its hard work and achievements, and on behalf of the Committee thanked London Councils staff for their support.

**The meeting finished at 12:32pm**



## Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive

Tuesday 19 June 2018 9:30 am

Cllr Peter John OBE was in the chair

### Present

Member	Position
Cllr Peter John OBE	Chair
Cllr Lib Peck	Deputy Chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Vice chair
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE	Vice chair
Ms Catherine McGuinness	Vice chair
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Nickie Aiken	
Cllr Georgia Gould	
Cllr Clare Coghill	
Cllr Muhammed Butt	

London Councils officers and Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE were in attendance.

### 1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies

Apologies were received from Cllr Darren Rodwell.

### 2. Declaration of interest

Ms Catherine McGuinness declared a pecuniary interest in the exempt item E4 *Southwark Street Site – Review of Lease* as a member of the City of London Common Council and announced her intention to leave the meeting when that item was reached

Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 4 *Proposals for use of top sliced flexible homelessness support grant: Temporary Accommodation and homelessness prevention joint working* as hers is a potential pilot authority for the scheme.

### **3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 27 February 2018**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 27 February 2018 were agreed.

### **4. Proposals for use of top sliced flexible homelessness support grant: Temporary Accommodation and homelessness prevention joint working**

The Corporate Director Policy and Public Affairs introduced the report saying:

- The report sought strategic guidance from the Executive on London Councils' work on developing a collaborative approach to tackling homelessness
- The number of households placed in temporary accommodation had risen dramatically in London over recent years
- The latest figures showed that 54,370 London households – including 87,320 children – were currently living in temporary accommodation
- To address this challenge, London Councils commissioned an options appraisal that reported last September. This looked at ways to improve how London local authorities procure homelessness accommodation and how to create better outcomes for homeless households. This study was jointly funded by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and the Greater London Authority (GLA)
- The proposal in the report was to strengthen pan-London cooperation by forming a not-for-profit company for procuring accommodation. This would better utilise the boroughs' collective market power, enabling them to procure more housing and to help control costs
- Leaders' Committee agreed last year that a full business plan should be brought forward for this proposal; this should be completed by July. The development of the business plan has been supported by a working group of twenty-four London boroughs
- MHCLG had allocated £39 million to support this programme over three years, which had been top-sliced from the national budget for Flexible Homelessness Support Grant (FHSG). There was the possibility of further funding being allocated following the Spending Review.

While the funding had been provided to support collaboration in London, if the project did not go ahead then it was very likely that the money would be redistributed nationally. Not proceeding with this programme would therefore result in homelessness funding being diverted away from London, and would make it more difficult for London Councils to lobby for extra homelessness funding in the future

By acting collaboratively, the London boroughs could better use their market position to deliver better outcomes for councils and households. It would build on the working of the Inter-Borough Accommodation Agreement to put downward pressure on the price paid for accommodation

Cllr Teresa O'Neill welcomed the idea of regulating and controlling homelessness provision through the approach being proposed which may go some way to tackling the problem of competition between boroughs for temporary accommodation. She asked if there was a good mix of inner and outer London boroughs amongst the participants and the Corporate Director Policy and Public Affairs said he would circulate a detailed response.

Cllr Ravi Govindia urged that steps were taken to ask non-participating boroughs not to act in a way that would disadvantage those that did.

In response to a question from Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE it was reported that a clear set of expectations on those considering initial participation should be available in July.

The Chair concluded by suggesting that a report back with the detailed business case should come back to members after the summer. The Executive agreed to take the proposals for joint working to draw down top sliced Flexible Homelessness Support Grant funding for London to the next stage.

## **5. London Councils – Consolidated Pre-Audited Financial Results 2017/18**

The Director of Corporate Resources introduced the report saying:

- The report highlighted the pre-audited consolidated financial position for London Councils for the 2017/18 financial year
- The provisional consolidated revenue position was shown followed by a separate revenue summary for each of London Councils three funding streams, together with explanations for the significant variances from the approved revised budget
- The pre-audited consolidated balance sheet and the provisional level of London Councils reserves as at 31 March 2018 were also shown, together with overall conclusions and prospects for 2018/19 and beyond, after taking into account known commitments
- Key future initiatives such as the Freedom Pass reissue (at a cost of £600,000 on top of the £1m already set aside) and the section 48 ESF programme had been taken into account
- Balances of £7.5m uncommitted reserves were considered adequate by officers.

Cllr Ray Puddifoot commended the report as comprehensive but urged caution in the use of balances as he suggested there may be many unknowns.

In response to a question from Cllr Nickie Aiken, the Director of Corporate Resources confirmed that the overall level of balances was broadly similar to the previous year.

The Executive agreed:

- To note the provisional consolidated outturn surplus of £4.374 million for 2017/18 and the provisional outturn position for each of the three funding streams
- To note the carry forward of £130,000 into 2018/19 in respect of TEC system developments (£44,000) and the London Lorry Control scheme review (£86,000), subject to final approval by the TEC Executive on 19 July
- To note the provisional level of reserves of £14.256 million as at 31 March 2018 which reduced to £7.455 million once known commitments of £6.801 million were taken into account
- To note the updated financial position of London Councils as detailed in the report and
- To receive a further report in November 2018 after the completion of the external audit by KPMG LLP to adopt the final accounts for 2017/18. The final accounts would

be signed off at the meeting of the Audit Committee on 27 September 2018, at which KPMG would formally present the Annual Audit Report for approval.

The meeting ended at 9:50am.

### **Action points**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Progress</b>
<b>4. Proposals for use of top sliced flexible homelessness support grant: Temporary Accommodation and homelessness prevention joint working</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Circulate a detailed response to the question about the inner/outer London mix</li><li>• Take the proposals for joint working to draw down top sliced Flexible Homelessness Support Grant funding for London to the next stage.</li></ul>	<b>PAPA Housing and Planning/CG</b>	Response circulated on the mix of boroughs in the working group and likely to join. Proposals being taken forward.