

# Leaders' Committee

10 July 2018 – 10:30 am

At London Councils offices, 59½ Southwark St., London SE1 0AL

Refreshments will be provided

London Councils offices are wheelchair accessible

<b>Labour Group:</b>	Room 2 and 3	9:30
Political Adviser: 07977 401955)		
<b>Conservative Group:</b>	Room 5	9:30
(Political Adviser: 07903 492195)		
<b>Liberal Democrat Group:</b>	Room 1	9:30
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Derek Gadd	
<b>Telephone and email:</b>	020 7934 9505	derek.gadd@londoncouncils.gov.uk

**Lunch will be provided in Room 2 for members after the meeting**

Followed by Congress at 11:30

Agenda item	Page
-------------	------

1.	Apologies for absence and Announcement of Deputies
----	--

2.	Declarations of Interest*
----	---------------------------

The Chairman to move the removal of the press and public since the following items are exempt from the Access to Information Regulations under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12(a) (as amended) Section 3 Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Agenda item	Page
-------------	------

E1	Minutes of the exempt part of the Leaders' Committee meeting on 20 March 2018	1
----	---	---

E2	London Councils' finance lobbying strategy	7
----	--	---

E3	Minutes and summaries:-	23
	• Exempt part of Executive on 19th June 2018	

### **\*Declarations of Interests**

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

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

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

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

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

---

The Chair to move that the remainder of the meeting be held in open session and the press and public invited to attend.

---

3. Minutes of the Leaders' Committee AGM and business meeting 5 June 2018	1
4. Strengthening local and collective resilience: Local Authorities Panel Implementation Plan - John Barradell to attend	21
5. Revising London Councils Priorities	47
6. Minutes and summaries :-	55
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grants – Leadership in the Third Sector – 27 February 2018</li><li>• GLPC – 14 March 2018</li><li>• Grants – 21 March 2018</li><li>• Executive – 19 June 2018</li></ul>	

---

At the close of this meeting there will be the Annual General Meeting of London Councils Ltd

# London Councils

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the London Councils Leaders' Committee held on 5 June 2018

Cllr Peter John OBE chaired the meeting from item 3

## Present:

BARKING AND DAGENHAM  
BARNET  
BEXLEY  
BRENT  
BROMLEY  
CAMDEN  
CROYDON  
EALING  
ENFIELD  
GREENWICH  
HACKNEY  
HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM  
HARINGEY  
HARROW  
HAVERING  
HILLINGDON  
HOUNSLOW  
ISLINGTON  
KENSINGTON & CHELSEA  
KINGSTON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
MERTON  
NEWHAM  
REDBRIDGE  
RICHMOND UPON THAMES  
SOUTHWARK  
SUTTON  
TOWER HAMLETS  
WALTHAM FOREST  
WANDSWORTH  
WESTMINSTER  
CITY OF LONDON  
LFEPa

Cllr Darren Rodwell  
Cllr Richard Cornelius  
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE  
Cllr M. A. Butt  
Cllr Kate Lymer  
Cllr Georgia Gould  
Cllr Tony Newman  
Cllr Julian Bell  
-  
Cllr Danny Thorpe  
Mayor Philip Glanville  
Cll Stephen Cowan  
Cllr Joseph Ejiofor  
Cllr Graham Henson  
Cllr Damien White  
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE  
Cllr Steve Curran  
Cllr Richard Watts  
Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cllr Liz Green  
Cllr Jack Hopkins  
-  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis  
Cllr Charlene McLean  
Cllr Jas Athwal  
Cllr Gareth Roberts  
Cllr Peter John OBE  
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE  
Mayor John Biggs  
Cllr Clare Coghill  
Cllr Jonathan Cook  
Cllr Nickie Aiken  
Ms Catherine McGuinness  
-

CO-PRESIDENT

Lord Toby Harris of Haringey

## Apologies:

BROMLEY  
ENFIELD  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
NEWHAM  
WANDSWORTH

Cllr Colin Smith  
Cllr Nesil Caliskan  
Cllr Lib Peck  
Mayor Damien Egan  
Mayor Rokshana Fiaz OBE  
Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE

Officers of London Councils were in attendance.

The Chief Executive introduced Lord Toby Harris of Haringey, one of London Councils' Co-Presidents, and reported the apologies of Baroness Joan Hanham and Baroness Sally Hamwee.

The Chief Executive informed the meeting that Baroness Hamwee had tendered her resignation as a Co-President and he thanked her for her fifteen years service in that role and he thanked all the Co-Presidents for their service to London Councils, in particular for their work on the organisation's behalf in parliament.

Lord Harris recollected that he had been the chair of the body that was now called London Councils from its inception in 1995 to 2000 and that it had been created as the coming together of two borough organisations that had divided on party political lines. The organisation had developed with the addition of other London-wide bodies to become a counterweight to the Mayor and Greater London Authority when that had come into existence. He went on to argue that making London local government's case particularly when others were prepared to argue that London received a disproportionately large slice of resources, was as important as it had ever been and made London Councils' existence all the more necessary.

### **1. Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **2. Apologies for absence and notification of deputies**

Apologies are listed above.

### **3. Election of Chair**

Lord Harris called for nominations for the position of Chair of London Councils and Cllr Peter John OBE (Southwark, Labour) was nominated by Cllr Georgia Gould (Camden, Labour) and seconded by Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE (Bexley, Conservative). In the absence of any other nominations he was elected Chair and took over chairing the meeting.

The Chair thanked Lord Harris and his fellow Co-presidents, Baroness Hanham and Baroness Hamwee (including for her commitment over a long period on the occasion of her standing down) for their support and positive contribution they made to the work of London Councils from the House of Lords. The Chair invited Lord Harris to stay if he so wished.

### **4. Election of Deputy Chair and up to three Vice-Chairs**

The Chair then invited nominations for the Deputy Chair and up to three Vice-chairs and he nominated the following who were seconded by Cllr Nicki Aiken (Westminster, Conservative) and in the absence of any other nominations were returned unopposed:

Deputy Chair	Cllr Lib Peck (Labour, Lambeth)
Vice-Chair	Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE (Conservative, Bexley)
Vice-Chair	Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE (Lib Dem, Sutton)
Vice-Chair	Ms Catherine McGuinness (Ind, City of London)

## **5. Minutes of the meeting of the AGM Leaders' Committee on 17 July 2017**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the minutes of the meeting of the AGM of Leaders' Committee on 17 July 2017 already agreed by Leaders' Committee on 10 October 2017.

## **6. Appointment of London Councils Co-Presidents for 2017/18**

The Chair asked for nominations for the posts of Co-Presidents and the following: Lord Graham Tope, Baroness Joan Hanham and Lord Toby Harris were put forward and Leaders' Committee agreed to appoint them as London Councils' Co-Presidents.

## **7.-14. Composition of London Councils' member bodies and appointment of office-holders**

The Chair proposed to take items 7-14 *en bloc*; items 7-9 (a) were the noting of the members of Leaders' Committee, the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) the Grants Committee, the Pensions CIV Sectoral Joint Committee and the Greater London Employment Forum on the nomination of boroughs. Items 9 (b) – 14 were the appointment of the employers side of the Greater London Provincial Council, London Councils Executive (including Portfolios), the appointment of party group lead members, the Group Whips, the appointment of the Audit Committee and election of its Chair and the appointment of the Capital Ambition Board and the election of its Chair and Deputy Chair and the YPES board members. These are listed on the pages that follow and all were agreed by Leaders' Committee.

In the tables on the following pages all those listed are councillors unless otherwise specified.

## 7. LEADERS'

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party		
Barking & Dagenham	Darren Rodwell	Lab	Saima Ashraf	Lab	Sade Bright	Lab		
Barnet	Richard Cornelius	Con	Daniel Thomas	Con	Barry Rawlings	Con		
Bexley	Teresa O'Neill	Con	Louie French	Con	David Leaf	Con		
Brent	Muhammed Butt	Lab	Margaret McLennan	Lab				
Bromley	Colin Smith	Con	Peter Fortune	Con	Kate Lymer	Con		
Camden	Georgia Gould	Lab						
Croydon	Tony Newman	Lab	Alison Butler	Lab	Stewart Collins	Lab		
Ealing	Julian Bell	Lab	Yvonne Johnson	Lab	Bassam Mahfouz	Lab		
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Daniel Anderson	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab		
Greenwich	Danny Thorpe	Lab	David Gardner	Lab	Jackie Smith	Lab		
Hackney	Philip Glanville	Lab	Anntoinette Bramble	Lab	Feryal Demirci	Lab		
Hammersmith & Fulham	Stephen Cowan	Lab	Sue Fennimore	Lab	Adam Connell	Lab		
Haringey	Joseph Ejiofor	Lab	Emine Ibrahim	Lab	Peray Ahmet	Lab		
Harrow	Graham Henson	Lab	Adam Swersky	Lab				
Havering	Damian White	Con	Robert Benham	Con	Roger Ramsey	Con		
Hillingdon	Ray Puddifoot	Con	David Simmonds	Con	Philip Corthorne	Con		
Hounslow	Steve Curran	Lab	Lily Bath	Lab	Guy Lambert	Lab		
Islington	Richard Watts	Lab	Janet Burgess	Lab	Paul Smith	Lab		
Kensington & Chelsea	Elizabeth Campbell	Con	Kim Taylor-Smith	Con	Will Pascall	Con		
Kingston upon Thames	Liz Green	LD	Malcolm Self	LD	Kevin Davis	Con		
Lambeth	Lib Peck	Lab	Jack Hopkins	Lab				
Lewisham	Damien Egan	Lab	Kevin Bonavia	Lab				
Merton	Stephen Alambritis	Lab	Nick Draper	Lab	Mark Allison	Con		
Newham	Rokhsana Fiaz	Lab	Charlene McLean	Lab				
Redbridge	Jas Athwal	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab	Elaine Norman	Lab		
Richmond upon Thames	Gareth Roberts	LD	Alexander Ehmann	LD	Liz Jaeger	LD		
Southwark	Peter John	Lab	Rebecca Lury	Lab	Victoria Mills	Lab		
Sutton	Ruth Dombey	LD	Jayne McCoy	LD				
Tower Hamlets	John Biggs	Lab	Rachel Blake	Lab	Sirajul Islam	Lab		
Waltham Forest	Clare Goghill	Lab	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Grace Williams	Lab		
Wandsworth	Ravi Govindia	Con	Jonathan Cook	Con	Guy Senior	Con		
Westminster	Nickie Aiken	Con	David Harvey	Con	Tim Mitchell	Con		
City of London	Catherine McGuinness	Ind	Simon Duckworth	Ind	Tom Sleight	Ind	Christopher Hayward	Ind

## 8 Note of borough nominations to the Transport and Environment Committee, Grants Committee and Pensions CIV Sectoral Joint Committee

TEC	borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party	Deputy 3	Party
Barking & Dagenham		Syed Ghani	Lab	Cameron Geddes	Lab				
Barnet		Dean Cohen	Con	Peter Zinkin	Con	Alan Schneiderman	Con	Geof Cooke	Con
Bexley		Peter Craske	Con	Alex Sawyer	Con	Melvin Seymour	Con		
Brent		Shama Tatler	Lab	Krupa Sheth	Lab				
Bromley		William Huntington-Thresher	Con	Kira Gabbet	Con	Will Harmer	Con	David Jeffreys	Con
Camden		Adam Harrison	Lab	Meric Apak	Lab				
Croydon		Stuart King	Lab	Paul Scott	Lab				
Ealing		Julian Bell	Lab						
Enfield		Daniel Anderson	Lab	Dinah Barry	Lab	Ian Barnes	Lab		
Greenwich		Denise Scott-McDonald	Lab	Sizwe James	Lab	Gary Parker	Lab		
Hackney		Feryal Demirci	Lab	Guy Nicolson	Lab	Jon Burke	Lab		
Hammersmith & Fulham		Wesley Harcourt	Lab						
Haringey		Kirsten Hearn	Lab	Matt White	Lab	Preston Tabois	Lab		
Harrow		Varsha Parmar	Lab	Chloe Smith	Lab	Jerry Miles	Lab		
Havering		Osman Dervish	Con	Jason Frost	Con	Viddy Persuad	Con	Robert Benham	Con
Hillingdon		Keith Burrows	Con						
Hounslow		Hanif Khan	Lab	Guy Lambert	Lab	Candice Atterton	Lab	Sue Sampson	
Islington		Claudia Webbe	Lab	Phil Graham	Lab	Rowena Champion	Lab	Tricia Clarke	
Kensington & Chelsea		Will Pascall	Con	Malcolm Spalding	Con				
Kingston upon Thames		Hilary Gander	LD	Liz Green	LD	Malcolm Self	LD	Dave Ryder-Mills	LD
Lambeth		Claire Holland	Lab	Nigel Haselden	Lab				
Lewisham		Brenda Dacres	Lab	Sophie McGeevor	Lab	Alan Smith	Lab		
Merton		Martin Whelton	Lab	Nick Draper	Lab				
Newham		Rachel Tripp	Lab						
Redbridge		John Howard	Lab	Sheila Bain	Lab	Ross Hatfull	Lab	Jas Athwal	Con
Richmond upon Thames		Alexander Ehmann	LD	Martin Elengorn	LD				
Southwark		Richard Livingstone	Lab	Johnson Situ	Lab				
Sutton		Manuel Abbelan	LD	Richard Blake	LD	Ali Mirhashem	LD	Steve Penneck	LD
Tower Hamlets		David Edgar	Lab	Rachel Blake	Lab	Amina Ali	Lab		
Waltham Forest		Clyde Loakes	Lab	Naheed Asghar	Lab	Grace Williams	Lab		
Wandsworth		Richard Field	Con	Jonathan Cook	Con	Guy Humphries	Con		
Westminster		Tim Mitchell	Con	Karen Scarborough	Con				
City of London		Christopher Hayward	Ind	Jeremy Simons	Ind	Alistair Moss	Ind	Keith Bottomly	
TfL		Alex Williams		Colin Mann					

## GRANTS

Borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1	Party	Deputy 2	Party	Deputy 3	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Saima Ashraf	Lab	Sade Bright	Lab				
Barnet	Richard Cornelius	Con	Daniel Thomas	Con	Reema Patel	Con	David Longstaff	Con
Bexley	David Leaf	Con	Alex Sawyer	Con				
Brent	Magaret McLennan	Lab	Amer Agha	Lab				
Bromley	Colin Smith	Con	Peter Fortune	Con	Diane Smith	Con	Kate Lymer	
Camden	Jonathan Simpson	Lab	Angela Mason	Lab	Richard Olszewski		Abdul Hai	
Croydon	Hamida Ali	Lab	Oliver Lewis					
Ealing	Jasbir Anand	Lab	Julian Bell	Lab	Bassam Mahfouz	Lab		
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab	Daniel Anderson	Lab		
Greenwich			Denise Scott-McDonald					
	Miranda Williams	Lab		Lab	Christine Grice		Averil Lekau	
Hackney	Philip Glanville	Lab	Caroline Selman	Lab	Antionette Branble	Lab	Jon Burke	Lab
Hammersmith & Fulham	Ben Coleman	Lab	Sharon Holder	Lab				
Haringey	Mark Blake	Lab	Zena Brabazon	Lab	Charles Adje	Lab		
Harrow	Sue Anderson	Lab	Graham Henson	Lab	Christine Robson	Lab	Philip O'Dell	Lab
Havering	Viddy Persaud	Con	Jason Frost	Con		Con		
Hillingdon	Douglas Mills	Con	J Bianco	Con				
Hounslow	Katherine Dunne	Lab	Shantanu Rajawat	Lab	Sue Sampson	Lab	Pritam Grewal	
Islington	Kaya Comer-Swartz	Lab	Andy Hull	Lab	Asima Shaikh	Lab	Janet Burgess	Lab
Kensington & Chelsea	Gerard Hargreaves	Con	Emma Will	Con	Sarah Addenbrooke	Con		
Kingston upon Thames	Jon Tolley	LD	Malcolm Self	LD	Liz Green	LD	Margaret Thompson	Con
Lambeth	Andy Wilson	Lab	Mo Seedat	Lab				
Lewisham	Jonathan Slater	Lab	Joan Millbank	Lab				
Merton					Caroline Cooper-Marbiah			
	Edith Macauley	Lab	Nick Draper	Lab		Lab		
Newham	Charlene McLean	Lab	John Gray	Lab				
Redbridge	Helen Coomb	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab	Elaine Norman	Lab	John Howard	Lab
Richmond upon Thames	Gareth Roberts	LD	Michael Wilson	LD				
Southwark	Rebecca Lury	Lab	Evelyn Akoto	Lab				
Sutton	Marian James	LD	Ruth Dombey	LD				
Tower Hamlets	Candida Ronald	Lab	David Edgar	Lab	Asma Begum		Amina Ali	
Waltham Forest	Louise Mitchell	Lab	Clyde Loakes	Lab	Ahsan Khan	Lab		
Wandsworth	Paul Ellis	Con	Cllr. Senior	Con	John Locker	Con		
Westminster	David Harvey	Con	Tim Mitchell	Con	Heather Acton	Con		
City of London	Alison Gowman	Ind	Dhruv Patel	Ind				



## Pensions CIV

borough	Rep	Party	Deputy 1			
Barking & Dagenham	Dominic Twomey	Lab	Dave Miles	Lab		
Barnet	Mark Shooter	Con	John Marshall	Con		
Bexley	Steve Hall	Con		Con		
Brent	Shafique Choudhary	Lab	Margaret Mclennan	Lab		
Bromley	Keith Onslow	Con	Russell Mellor	Con		
Camden	Rishi Madlani	Lab	Richard Olszewski	Lab		
Croydon	Simon Hall	Lab	Andrew Pelling	Lab	Clive Fraser	Lab
Ealing	Yvonne Johnson	Lab				
Enfield	Doug Taylor	Lab				
Greenwich	Peter Brooks	Lab	Olu Babatola	Lab		
Hackney	Robert Chapman	Lab	Rebecca Rennison	Lab		
Havering	John Crowder	Con	Jason Front	Con		
Hammersmith & Fulham	Iain Cassidy	Lab	Mike Adam	Con		
Haringey	Matt White	Lab	John Bevan	Lab		
Harrow	Nitin Parekh	Lab				
Hillingdon	Philip Corthorne	Con	Mike Markham	Con		
Hounslow	Rajinder Bath	Lab	Sukhbir Dhaliwal	Lab		
Islington	Mick O'Sullivan	Lab	Andy Hull	Lab		
Kensington & Chelsea	Mary Weale	Con				
Kingston upon Thames	Mark Beynon	LD	Alikson Holt	LD	Dennis Goodship	LD
Lambeth	Iain Simpson	Lab	Josh Lindsey	Lab		
Lewisham	Mark Ingleby	Lab				
Merton	Owen Pritchard	Lab	Mark Allison	Lab		
Newham	John Gray	Lab				
Redbridge	Elaine Norman	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab		
Richmond upon Thames	Geoff Acton	LD	Ian Craigie	Con		
Southwark	Victoria Mills	Lab	Peter John	Lab		
Sutton	Jill Whitehead	LD	Sunita Gordon	LD		
Tower Hamlets	Muhammad Harun	Lab				
Waltham Forest	Paul Douglas	Lab				
Wandsworth	Guy Senior	Con	Melanie Hampton	Con	Rory O'Broin	
Westminster	Antonia Cox	Con	Rachael Robathan	Con		
City of London	Mark Boleat	Ind	Andrew MCMurtrie	Ind		

**9. (a) Note of borough nominations to the employers side of the Greater London Employment Forum**

<b>GLEF</b>	<b>borough</b>	<b>Rep</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deputy</b>	<b>Party</b>
	Barking & Dagenham	Sade Bright	Lab	Irma Freeborn	Lab
	Barnet	Richard Cornelius	Con	Daniel Thomas	Con
	Bexley	Steven Hall	Con	Nick O'Hare	Con
	Brent	Margaret McLennan	Lab	Amer Agha	Lab
	Bromley	Pauline Tunncliffe	Con	Michael Turner	Con
	Camden	Richard Olszewski	Lab	Alison Kelly	Lab
	Croydon	Simon Hall	Lab	Patsy Cummings	Lab
	Ealing	Jasbir Anand	Lab		
	Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab	Mary Maguire	Lab
	Greenwich	Christine Grice	Lab	Chris Kirby	Lab
	Hackney	Carole Williams	Lab	Philip Glanville	Lab
	Hammersmith & Fulham	Andrew Jones	Lab		
	Haringey	Noah Tucker	Lab	Khaled Moyeed	Lab
	Harrow	Antonio Weiss	Lab		
	Havering	Robert Benham	Con	Viddy Persuad	Con
	Hillingdon	Philip Corthorne	Con		
	Hounslow	Katherine Dunne	Lab		
	Islington	Tricia Clarke	Lab		
	Kensington & Chelsea	David Lindsay	Con		
	Kingston upon Thames	Malcolm Self	LD	Dave Ryder-Mills	LD
	Lambeth	Jack Hopkins	Lab	Andy Wilson	Lab
	Lewisham	Joe Dromey	Lab	Amanda De Ryk	Lab
	Merton	Mark Allison	Lab	Marsie Skeete	Lab
	Newham	Mayor Rokhsana Fiaz	Lab	Charlene McLean	Lab
	Redbridge	Jas Athwal	Lab	Kam Rai	Lab
	Richmond upon Thames	Geoff Acton	LD		
	Southwark	Kieron Williams	Lab	Leo Pollak	Lab
	Sutton	Richard Clifton	LD	Joyce Melican	LD
	Tower Hamlets	Mayor John Biggs	Lab		
	Waltham Forest	Asim Mahmood	Lab	Sally Littlejohn	Lab
	Wandsworth	TBC	Con		
	Westminster	Angela Harvey	Con	Rachael Robathan	Con
	City of London	Edward Lord	Ind	The Revd Stephen Decatur Haines	Ind

## 9 (b) Appointment of Greater London Provincial Council Employers Side

Barking & Dagenham	Sade Bright	Lab
Camden	Richard Olszewski	Lab
Croydon	TBC	Lab
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab
Greenwich	Christine Grice	Lab
Hackney	Carole Williams	Lab
Hounslow	Katherine Dunne	Lab
Kingston	Malcolm Self	LD
Lambeth	Jack Hopkins	Lab
Lewisham	Joe Dromey	Lab
Waltham Forest	Asim Mahmood	Lab

Conservative nominees to be confirmed

## **10. Appointment of London Councils Executive (including Portfolios)**

Leaders' Committee agreed to establish an Executive comprising twelve members

- **Cllr Peter John OBE** Chair of London Councils
  - Public Service Reform and Devolution
  - Finance & Resources
- **Cllr Lib Peck** Deputy Chair and Crime & Public Protection
- **Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE** Vice Chair and Conservative lead for Public Service Reform and Devolution; Finance & Resources,
- **Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE** Vice Chair
- **Ms Catherine McGuinness** Vice Chair
- **Cllr Muhammad Butt** Welfare, Empowerment & Inclusion
- **Cllr Clare Coghill** Business Engagement, Europe and Good Growth
- **Cllr Julian Bell** Transport & Environment
- **Cllr Darren Rodwell** Housing & Planning
- **Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE** Health & Care (including Adult Care Services)
- **Cllr Georgia Gould** Skills & Employment
- **Cllr Nickie Aiken** Schools & Children's Services (including Education, Children's Social Care and Safeguarding)

### **Substitutes**

Labour: Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney), Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets), Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest)

Conservative: Cllr. Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth)

Liberal Democrat: Cllr Liz Green (Kingston)

## 11. Appointment of party group lead members

Policy area	Portfolio holder/Chair	Party lead (Labour)	Party lead (Conservative)	Party lead (Liberal Democrat)
Chair including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finance and Resources</li> <li>Devolution and Public Service Reform</li> </ul>	Cllr Peter John OBE		Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE
Welfare, Empowerment & Inclusion	Cllr Muhammad Butt		Cllr Damien White	To be confirmed
Business, Europe and Good Growth (including high streets, lead liaison with Wider South East, leisure, sport & culture)	Cllr Clare Coghill		Cllr David Harvey	Cllr John Coombs
Transport & Environment	Cllr Julian Bell	Cllr Feryal Demirci (Vice Chair)	Cllr Tim Mitchell	Cllr Manuel Abellan
Housing & Planning	Cllr Darren Rodwell		Cllr Richard Cornelius	Cllr Jayne McCoy
Crime & Public Protection	Cllr Lib Peck		Cllr Nickie Aiken	Cllr Liz Jaeger
Health & Care (including Adult Care Services)	Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	Cllr Richard Watts		Cllr Margaret Thompson
Skills & Employment	Cllr Georgia Gould		Cllr Catherine Faulks	Cllr Alison Holt
Schools & Children's Services (including Education, Children's Social Care and Safeguarding)	Cllr Nickie Aiken	Cllr Danny Thorpe		Cllr Penny Frost
Greater London Employment/ Greater London Provincial Council	Mayor John Biggs		Cllr Angela Harvey	Cllr Malcolm Self
Capital Ambition	Cllr Steve Curran (Chair)	Cllr Victoria Mills (Vice Chair) Cllr Stephen Alambritis	Cllr David Simmonds CBE Cllr Kevin Davis TBC	
Audit Committee	Cllr Roger Ramsey (Chair)	Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Vice Chair) Cllr Victoria Mills Cllr Yvonne Johnson		Cllr Robin Brown
Grants	Mayor Phil Glanville	Cllr Saima Ashraf (Vice Chair)	Cllr Paul Ellis	Cllr Gareth Roberts
Pensions CIV Sectoral Joint Committee	Sir Mark Boleat (City)	Cllr Yvonne Johnson	To be confirmed	Cllr Jill Whitehead

### Group whips

- Labour** Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest)

- **Conservative** Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE (Wandsworth)
- **Liberal Democrat** Cllr Liz Green (Kingston)

## **12. Appointment of Audit Committee and election of its Chair and Deputy Chair**

- Cllr Roger Ramsey (Chair)
- Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Labour, Merton) (Deputy Chair)
- Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Labour, Ealing)
- Cllr Victoria Mills (Labour, Southwark)
- Cllr Robin Brown (LD Richmond)

**Substitutes** Labour: Cllr David Gardner (Greenwich)  
Conservative nominees to be confirmed

## **13. Appointment of Capital Ambition Board and election of its Chair and Deputy Chair**

- Cllr Steve Curran (Chair)
- Cllr Victoria Mills (Labour, Southwark) (Deputy Chair)
- Cllr Stephen Alambritis (Labour, Merton)
- Cllr David Simmonds CBE (Conservative, Hillingdon)
- Cllr Kevin Davis (Conservative, Kingston) TBC
- **Substitutes** Labour: Mayor Philip Glanville (Hackney), Cllr Yvonne Johnson (Labour, Ealing)  
Conservative nominees to be confirmed

Conservative:

## **14. YPES Board**

- Cllr Georgia Gould (Labour, Camden, Chair)
- Cllr Nickie Aiken (Conservative, Westminster)

## **15. London Councils Members Remuneration Scheme**

Leaders' Committee agreed:

- To accept and implement the Panel's recommendations for the London Councils Members' Remuneration Scheme
- The baseline for applying the annual up-lifts set out in Annex 2 of the report (below)

- That the panel's recommendations on annual uprating in line with the officers pay award would be applied each year.

	<b>From April 2018<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Plus 2% from April 2019</b>
<b>Executive</b>		
Chair	£21,417	£21,845
Deputy Chair, Vice-Chair (x3) and other Executive members with portfolios	£10,709	£10,923
without portfolio	£5,355	£5,462
<b>Party Group Policy Leads</b>	£2,678	£2,731
<b>Grants Committee</b>		
Chair	£10,709	£10,923
Grants Vice-Chair (x3)	£2,678	£2,731
<b>Transport and Environment Committee</b>		
Chair	£10,709	£10,923
Vice-Chair (x 3)	£2,678	£2,731
<b>Greater London Employers' Forum</b>		
Chair	£10,709	£10,923
Vice-Chair (x2)	£2,678	£2,731
<b>Pensions CIV Joint Committee</b>		
Chair	£10,709	£10,923
Vice-Chair	£2,678	£2,731

<sup>1</sup> Includes the 2% increase in line with the officers' cost of living pay award as recommended by the Independent Panel on Members Remuneration

	<b>From April 2018<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Plus 2% from April 2019</b>
Audit Committee Chair	£5,355	£5,462
Capital Ambition Chair	£5,355	£5,462
Lead member for Equalities <sup>2</sup>	£5,355	£5,462
Whips (x3)	£5,355	£5,462

## **16. Constitutional matters**

Leaders Committee agreed the variations set out in the reports to:

- A: London Councils' Scheme of Delegations to Officers
- B: Terms of Reference for Sub Committees and forums
- C: Amendments to London Councils Financial Regulations

## **17. Extension of External Audit Contract**

The Director of Corporate Resources introduced the item saying that the Audit Committee had agreed to recommend the extension of KPMG's three-year contract by one year.

Leaders' Committee agreed:

- To note the recommendation of the Audit Committee and
- Approve the extension of the external audit contract with KPMG for an additional year to include the audit of the 2018/19 accounts.

## **18. Role profiles for London Councils' Remunerated Members**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the role profiles for members of the Executive and for Party Group Policy Leads.

## **19. London Councils meeting dates 2017/18**

---

<sup>2</sup> To be deleted and become part of the Welfare, Empowerment and Inclusion portfolio



Leaders' Committee agreed the meeting dates for 2018/19 set out in an appendix to the report.

## **20. Annual Review 2017/18**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the annual review.

## **21. Any other business**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 11:50

# London Councils

Minutes of the London Councils Leaders' Committee held on 6 June 2018  
Cllr Peter John OBE chaired the meeting

## Present:

BARKING AND DAGENHAM  
BARNET  
BEXLEY  
BRENT  
BROMLEY  
CAMDEN  
CROYDON  
EALING  
ENFIELD  
GREENWICH  
HACKNEY  
HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM  
HARINGEY  
HARROW  
HAVERING  
HILLINGDON  
HOUNSLOW  
ISLINGTON  
KENSINGTON & CHELSEA  
KINGSTON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
MERTON  
NEWHAM  
REDBRIDGE  
RICHMOND UPON THAMES  
SOUTHWARK  
SUTTON  
TOWER HAMLETS  
WALTHAM FOREST  
WANDSWORTH  
WESTMINSTER  
CITY OF LONDON  
LFEPA

Cllr Darren Rodwell  
Cllr Richard Cornelius  
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE  
Cllr M. A. Butt  
Cllr Kate Lymer  
Cllr Georgia Gould  
Cllr Tony Newman  
Cllr Julian Bell  
-  
Cllr Danny Thorpe  
Mayor Philip Glanville  
Cll Stephen Cowan  
Cllr Joseph Ejiofor  
Cllr Graham Henson  
Cllr Damien White  
Cllr David Simmonds CBE  
Cllr Steve Curran  
Cllr Richard Watts  
Cllr Elizabeth Campbell  
Cllr Liz Green  
Cllr Jack Hopkins  
-  
Cllr Stephen Alambritis  
Cllr Charlene McLean  
Cllr Jas Athwal  
Cllr Gareth Roberts  
Cllr Peter John OBE  
Cllr Ruth Dombey OBE  
Mayor John Biggs  
Cllr Clare Coghill  
Cllr Jonathan Cook  
Cllr Nickie Aiken  
Ms Catherine McGuinness  
-

## Apologies:

BROMLEY  
ENFIELD  
HILLINGDON  
LAMBETH  
LEWISHAM  
NEWHAM  
WANDSWORTH

Cllr Colin Smith  
Cllr Nesil Caliskan  
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE  
Cllr Lib Peck  
Mayor Damien Egan  
Mayor Rokshana Fiaz OBE  
Cllr Ravi Govindia CBE

Officers of London Councils were in attendance

The Chair welcomed new leaders to Leaders' Committee.

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

The apologies and deputies listed above were noted.

### **2. Declarations of interest**

No interests were declared.

### **3. Minutes of Leaders' Committee meeting held on 20 March 2018**

Cllr Kate Lymer (Conservative, Bromley) raised the matter, recorded in the minutes, of the undertaking made by GLA Deputy Mayor Pipe on Housing and population figures which had been raised by her borough's leader at previous meetings of Leaders' Committee and was yet to be resolved to her borough's satisfaction. The Chief Executive assured Cllr Lymer that London Councils' officers had taken this up with GLA colleagues and would do so again.

Leaders' Committee agreed the minutes of the Leaders' Committee meeting held on 20 March 2018.

Leaders' Committee agreed to vary standing orders so that item 5 *Minutes and summaries* could be taken next

### **5. Minutes and summaries**

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the minutes and summaries of:

- GLEF – 15 February 2018
- CAB – 13 March 2018
- Pensions – 14 March 2018
- TEC – 22 March 2018

Leaders' Committee resolved to remove the press and public

E1 Exempt Minutes and Summaries:

Leaders' Committee agreed to note the minutes and summaries of:

- Exempt part of CAB Minutes – 13 March 2018
- Exempt part of Pensions CIV Sectoral Joint Committee minutes – 14 March 2018
- Exempt part of TEC minutes – 22 March 2018

#### **4. Introduction to London Councils, discussion on key areas of focus and developing future business planning/overview summary of policy positions from Chair**

The Chair introduced the item by saying that he thought that this point at the start of the four-year cycle was a good moment to begin a process of reviewing the priorities of London Councils as an organisation. He was keen to ensure the best possible fit between boroughs' priorities and the work of London Councils. To set the scene he asked the Chief Executive and the Corporate Director Policy and Public Affairs to provide an overview of London Councils, key areas of work that Leaders' Committee had focused on in the past four years and to highlight some impending challenges.

The Chief Executive and the Corporate Director Policy and Public Affairs presented to Leaders' Committee.

After the presentations the Chair asked members of Leaders' Committee to consider their three top priorities and then opened the item up for contributions. Leaders made a range of comments on key issues such as:

- Heathrow and Air Quality
- Spending Review and Fair Funding Review
- TfL Board membership
- Transport and Infrastructure in outer London
- Movements of poverty and deprivation to outer London
- Housing and the ability to combine grants and RTB receipts more flexibly
- Working with Core Cities
- Policing, Crime and Serious Youth Violence
- Homes for local people
- Making devolution achievements clearer to Londoners

- The Chair indicated that this feedback would help the Executive to set out a process for reviewing priorities and there would be further consultation with Leaders' Committee in the coming months.

The meeting ended at 12:20

# Leaders' Committee

## Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: Local Authorities' Panel Implementation Plan

Item no: 4

**Report by:** Doug Flight      **Job title:** Head of Strategic Policy  
**Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018  
**Contact Officer:** Doug Flight  
**Telephone:** 020 7934 9805      **Email:** [doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

---

**Summary:**

Leaders' Committee received the report of an independent Peer Challenge, on London's collective resilience arrangements at its meeting in February 2018 and went on to agree that the London Resilience Forum - Local Authorities' Panel would oversee implementation of the recommendations emerging from the Challenge.

There was an expectation that:

- a) The Panel would work up a detailed implementation plan, which would be reported to Leaders' Committee in summer 2018.
- b) A progress report on implementation would be brought to Leaders' Committee in 2019.

The Panel has prepared a detailed implementation plan, which is **attached as Appendix A**. The plan integrates the recommendations of the Panel's earlier review (known as EP2020 and reported to Leaders' Committee in 2017), which underpins the peer review's recommendations.

**Recommendations:** Leaders' Committee is asked to:

1. Receive the Local Authorities' Panel integrated implementation plan. This is **attached as Appendix A**
2. Confirm the expectation that Leaders' Committee will receive an annual review of progress in respect of this plan, starting in 2019.
3. Note the paper summarising national guidance on role of Leaders and Members in emergency planning, **attached as Appendix B**.



## Emergency Planning into the 2020s – Implementation Plan

1. Leaders' Committee received the report of an independent Peer Challenge, on London's collective resilience arrangements at its meeting in February 2018. The review was designed to inform a reflection on the effectiveness of the collective resilience arrangements, particularly in the light of a number of emergency events throughout 2017:
  - The Westminster Bridge terrorist attack in March.
  - The knock-on impact of the Manchester Arena terrorist attack in May and the subsequent move to the 'Critical' level of alert.
  - The terrorist attacks at Borough Market/London Bridge in early June.
  - The Grenfell Tower Fire in mid-June.
  - The terrorist attack near Finsbury Park Mosque in mid-June.
  - The consequences of fire safety testing and reviews on high blocks flowing from the Grenfell Fire tragedy and the evacuation of four tower blocks in Camden in late June.
  - The terrorist attack on a tube train near Parsons Green in mid-September.
2. The review noted the importance of work which London local government undertook in 2016/17 to review and strengthen its emergency planning capacity. The outcome of the work – the Emergency Planning (EP) 2020 Prospectus – set out ways in which both individual and collaborative resilience arrangements between boroughs and sub-regional partnerships could be strengthened. This was reported to Leaders' Committee in February 2017.
3. Tom Riordan, Chief Executive of Leeds City Council, and Mary Ney, former Chief Executive of the Royal Borough of Greenwich, who conducted the peer challenge, presented their findings to Leaders' Committee in February 2018. Eleanor Kelly, Chief Executive of the London borough of Southwark, attended the meeting to represent the London Resilience Forum Local Authorities' Panel (LAP – which has managerial oversight of the collective borough resilience arrangements).
4. After due consideration of the issues raised, Leaders' went on to agree that the LAP would oversee implementation of the recommendations – an overarching theme being that Leaders and chief executives should provide clear leadership for resilience (including through active engagement in training and exercises) to ensure the effectiveness of assurance, response and recovery arrangements in all boroughs. There



was an expectation that the Panel would work up a detailed implementation plan, which would be reported to Leaders in summer 2018 and that a progress report on implementation would be brought to Leaders' Committee in 2019.

## Recent Activity

5. Following the independent review of London's collective resilience arrangements, LAP, chaired by John Barradell (Town Clerk & Chief Executive of the City of London Corporation) has put a series of work-streams in place to begin implementation of the recommendations. The Panel has systematically worked through each recommendation, mapping interdependencies and establishing a means of delivering them more securely but with the necessary pace.
6. Over the last six months, LAP has overseen a number of more immediate initiatives to help strengthen collective resilience arrangements:
  - Agreeing a high-level plan which sets how boroughs can support communities and partner organisations in response to and recovery from emergencies.
  - A London community resilience forum has also been established, working with the Mayor of London.
  - Work has commenced on developing a robust system for ensuring that London local government has a clear picture of emergency planning and response capabilities across boroughs and at a pan-London level.
  - A fresh approach to sub-regional collaboration is being put in place with the support of Chief Executives.
7. LAP forms part of the broader partnership arrangements sitting under the statutory London Resilience Forum and its secretariat is provided by the London Resilience Group, based within the London Fire Brigade. London Councils officers continue to provide targeted support, where appropriate, to assist delivery of the implementation plan, as referenced in Appendix A. The Peer Challenge recommended that London embeds a common approach towards the role of Leaders and members, with an emphasis on assurance, civic leadership, community cohesion, engagement and communication before, during and after the types of emergencies likely to be faced in London.
8. As an initial step, officers have met with the LGA to help inform revisions to national guidance and support programmes to take account of the particular circumstances and needs in London. A summary of the role envisaged for Leaders and members in London is attached at Appendix B. This is extracted from national guidance for councillors during

civil emergencies, as published by the LGA (developed with the MHCLG Resilience and Emergencies Division). The summary has been adapted to take account of the London context.

9. As noted during the Preparedness section of the implementation plan at Appendix A, it is proposed that London-specific training materials are commissioned through LAP. These materials will be positioned to enhance existing local briefing and training initiatives, at the same time as instilling greater consistency across boroughs. It is envisaged that this will encompass guidance on how to provide assurance; how to respond to, and support recovery from the types of emergency events that are likely to occur in London; as well as providing guidance on relevant emergency planning protocols and procedures. This should enhance the national training and support offer which is available through the LGA's improvement programmes.

## Conclusion

10. Following Leaders' consideration of the Peer Challenge in February 2018, the LAP has moved swiftly to initiate a number of work-streams that will implement the recommendations. LAP has produced an integrated implementation plan, which will allow all of the recommendations to be systematically addressed with due diligence.

Leaders' Committee is asked to:

1. Receive the Local Authorities' Panel integrated implementation plan. This is **attached as Appendix A**
2. Confirm the expectation that Leaders' Committee will receive an annual review of progress in respect of this plan, starting in 2019.
3. Note the paper summarising national guidance on the role of Leaders and Members in emergency planning, **attached as Appendix B.**

### **Financial implications for London Councils**

No immediate implications.

### **Legal implications for London Councils**

None

### **Equalities implications for London Councils**

None

### **Attachments**

**Appendix A:** Local Authorities' Panel integrated implementation plan. (*Separate Document*)

**Appendix B:** Paper summarising the national guidance on role of Leaders and Members in emergency planning. (*See Below*)

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Overview of the role of London Leaders and Members – before, during, and after emergency incidents.**

#### **Introduction**

This document summarises the national guidance for councillors during civil emergencies, as published by the LGA (developed with the MHCLG Resilience and Emergencies Division). The summary has been adapted to take account of the London context.

In accordance with the consolidated implementation plan, London Councils will work with the Local Authorities Panel to commission the production of tailored, London-specific training materials during the course of 2018. These materials will be positioned to enhance existing local briefing and training initiatives, at the same time as instilling greater consistency of approach. It is envisaged that this will encompass guidance on how to provide assurance; how to respond to, and support recovery from the types of emergency events that are likely to occur in London; as well as providing guidance on relevant emergency planning protocols and procedures. This should enhance the national training and support offer which is available through the LGA's improvement programmes.

The provisional guidance set out below is intended as a generic guide for all elected members; however there are clearly differences between the roles of Leaders and Cabinet members, which are distinct from ward members or scrutiny panel members. The materials that we plan to commission later in 2018 will better reflect this division of roles and responsibilities.

#### **Preparedness**

1. London boroughs should participate regularly in local multi-agency training and exercises, which are a good way to provide assurance of local level preparedness. Councillors can support this work and also help to ensure that local resilience forums are aware of the particular issues in their communities. Members may wish to liaise with other elected representatives across London to share best practice.
2. Senior politicians are involved in considering key policy decisions and recommendations on strategic choices, making representations to government for additional resources and financial assistance where necessary.

3. Leaders and members can promote awareness and understanding among the general public of the roles and responsibilities of the wide range of agencies that can be involved in managing risk and responding to an emergency. This helps to reassure communities by giving the public a better idea of who to turn to in an emergency. Members can also promote community resilience, manage expectations locally and help to raise awareness amongst the communities served about the risk posed by extremism, climate change and other issues that can result in emergencies.
4. Continuing to build personal relationships with key personnel from council emergency planning teams, key resilience partners and community members involved in community resilience will facilitate effective working during a crisis. Members' local knowledge of their community can help to identify local groups and partners who may be able to play a role in recovery.
5. Training and emergency planning exercises are regularly carried by boroughs and these may provide opportunities for members to engage.

## **Response**

6. It is important that the borough's communications team agree the key borough messages before members engage in any communications (face to face, social media, local and national press etc.). These will reflect messages developed at pan-London communications level by the MPS. Members are asked to draw on these messages during all communications, whilst working closely with communications teams to:-
  - Assist in getting key messages to the community
  - Hold public meetings where necessary and engage with residents on social media (using key messages consistent with advice from communications team)
  - Assist with VIP visits, ensuring they are sensitive to the needs of the community
  - Communicate updates to public for information and reassurance
  - Support and assist those affected in how they engage with the media
7. Leaders and Directly Elected Mayors will be a public face for the council in interactions with the media and the wider community by repeating agreed key messages through social media and face to face interactions
8. A variety of channels can be used to communicate key messages to as wide an audience as possible based on local knowledge of what works best for residents. Social media is a good way of communicating with lots of people at once but harder to reach,

elderly residents may need more direct contact such as public meetings, or councillors and officers stationed in key locations to relay information.

## **Recovery**

9. Councillors play a vital role in rebuilding, restoring, rehabilitating and reassuring the communities affected by an emergency and speaking on their behalf. Members can help keep the community well informed of plans and progress, whilst visiting those affecting and acting as a community 'champion'.
10. Members could use their local knowledge to identify problems and vulnerabilities in the community, which may require priority attention, and feed these back to the relevant council staff. Senior politicians can help to ensure the community is involved in the recovery stage by chairing public (and business) debrief meetings and undertaking door-knocking rounds, and bring back those issues identified by the community to council staff.
11. Actively engaging with community members involved in recovery efforts and working closely with community groups will help to develop knowledge of who is active within the community. Members will also play a key role in helping to plan, and subsequently attend, social events to bring displaced communities together as part of the recovery phase.

## Appendix A

London Councils Leaders' Committee papers, 10 July 2018

Item 4: Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience- Local Authorities' Panel Implementation Plan

# Strengthening Local and Collective Resilience: Consolidated Implementation Plan



## **Introduction**

This report contains 27 recommendations that offer a clear framework for chief executives regarding the approach required by London local authorities to efficiently reinforce services and ensure they can continue to provide effective individual and collective leadership on resilience into the 2020s.

## **Background**

On the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2018 the Local Authorities' Panel (LAP) endorsed a high-level implementation plan designed to address 11 recommendations contained in the Independent Peer Challenge Review conducted by Tom Riordan and Mary Ney between October 2017 and February 2018.

Tom and Mary noted that the Recommendations for Local Government Emergency Planning and Resilience for the 2020s (EP 2020) report contained a range of recommendations that are in the process of implementation and endorsed this improvement work. They then went on to make further recommendations to build on EP2020, considering the further experiences and learning during 2017.

In addition to the Peer Challenge, LAP also commissioned a review of assurance and requested recommendations on how chief executives could be assured of individual and collective preparedness, particularly capacity and capability, through a credible, transparent, efficient and cost-effective approach. The report produced by Sean Ruth Consultancy contained 15 recommendations.

## **Recommendation Review**

To ensure the refreshed EP 2020 recommendations remain relevant and concise, with similarity or duplication avoided, all recommendations included in the following reports were analysed:

- Recommendations for Local Government Emergency Planning and Resilience for the 2020's – (EP 2020)
- London Local Government's Collective Resilience Arrangements Independent Peer Challenge Tom Riordan and Mary Ney, February 2018
- An assurance framework for London Local Government 'Providing individual and collective assurance' - Sean Ruth, February 2018

In addition, areas requiring immediate development identified during one to one meetings with lead officers from the Grenfell Fire Response Team, have also been included along with a review of large scale incidents which occurred in 2017.

Those recommendations already delivered or considered no longer relevant have been removed. The source documents have previously been circulated but are available on request.

## **Delivery Approach**

To follow the principles set by the original EP 2020 review, all 27 recommendations are consolidated into logical groupings. This approach has assisted with the identification of inter-dependencies, timeframes for implementation, appropriate action plans to deliver the recommendations in the most efficient and cost-effective way without creating additional burdens for borough emergency planning teams. The recommendations along with an assessment of their status can be found in Annex A. Those recommendations of particular interest to Leaders have more information included.

See Annex B for the delivery timeline associated to all 27 recommendations.

To ensure LAP members remain sighted on the progress of each recommendation, a status report along with any matters requiring decisions will be tabled at all future meetings.



## Consolidated Implementation Plan

### A. Overarching Priority Recommendations for London Borough Resilience Arrangements

<b>A1.</b> Refresh EP2020 to incorporate the work of the independent peer challenge on London's collective resilience arrangements, into an agreed implementation plan.	
<b>Action Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update the LAP Business Plan to ensure it includes all activities and priorities detailed in the implementation plan.</li> <li>Review the SLA between LAP on behalf of all boroughs, the London Fire Commissioner and City of London Corporation</li> <li>Research and subsequent production of an organisational question set, including guidance, for chief executives specifying criteria necessary to support their oversight of local resilience and assurance.</li> <li>Offer update on status of implementation plan to Leaders Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2018</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 0 - 4 months
	<b>Status:</b> On Track
	<b>Origin of Recommendation:</b> Independent Peer Challenge
	<b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b> All
<b>A2.</b> All London Local Authorities adopt the assurance framework recommended in the <i>Sean Ruth Review 2018</i> and commit to credible self-assessment locally led by chief executives and overseen by Members which focuses on capacity and capability and organisational commitment to the resilience agenda. This local assurance is supported by sub-regional peer challenge and external independent peer review.	
<b>Action Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement from all chief executives to adopt the new assurance framework.</li> <li>Review of existing governance arrangements in all boroughs</li> <li>Interim assurance process to be developed and rolled out in Sept/Oct 2018</li> <li>Long-Term assurance process to be developed</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 9 - 18 months
<b>Origin of Recommendation:</b> Assurance Review	<b>Status:</b> On Track. The stage 2 assurance approach was

<b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b> F1-4 – Assurance (all)	endorsed by LAP on 6 June 2018. Work will commence in July 2018 on developing the interim process. Development of comprehensive Resilience Standards for London will commence in September 2018
---	---

<b>A3.</b> The Local Authorities' Panel should oversee the development and implementation of a clear assurance framework to set expected and consistent standards at borough and regional levels, across all relevant aspects of resilience, and provide an annual assurance report to regional and national partners. This should utilise peer challenge and improvement partner arrangements to ensure all boroughs operate to a high and consistent standard with the right level of capacity and capability.	
<b>Action Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning assumptions to be developed for standardised response capabilities.</li> <li>Criteria to be developed across the range of assurance areas with the emphasis on capacity and capability.</li> <li>Borough emergency planning teams and London Resilience Group to be consulted on assurance criteria</li> <li>Standardised reporting template for local assessments to be developed.</li> <li>Draft criteria and standardised reporting template to be presented to LAP for sign off.</li> <li>Options for external independent peer review to be developed and presented to LAP</li> <li>Options for timeframes/periods for undertaking the assurance programme to be presented to LAP</li> <li>Consult at the pan London level on what reporting and assurance it is that the pan London level, specifically, is seeking to achieve</li> <li>Develop a meaningful and sufficiently detailed reporting system for London Councils Leaders Committee.</li> <li>The agreed assurance approach to be presented to CELC and Leaders Committee.</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months <b>Status:</b> Framework established with work starting in July <b>Origin of Recommendation:</b> Assurance Review <b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b> A2 - Assurance Framework F1-4 – Assurance (all)

<b>A4.</b> Develop and agree the role of councillors in preparation for (e.g. assurance role), response to and recovery from (e.g. community leadership role rather than operational role) emergencies.	
<b>Action Plan:</b> <b>Role</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London Councils to commission London-specific training materials and guidance,</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months

<p>working through LAP. The work will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consideration of good practice</li> <li>- consultation with interested parties</li> <li>- guidance on support offered to Members and Leaders in the lead up to and during incidents and the recovery phase following incidents</li> <li>- guidance on protocols and procedures necessary to support Leaders and Members to ensure they are briefed and able to effectively support the overall response and recovery process.</li> <li>- Advice on effective means of delivering training to Leaders and Members</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be positioned to enhance current local training programmes and the national support and training programme offered by the LGA</li> </ul> <p>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following consideration by LAP, the final package will be reported to Leaders' Committee for consideration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Status:</b>  <b>On Track,</b>  <b>London Councils are engaging with the LGA and other relevant organisations to ensure this recommendation is progressed at pace but with the appropriate level of consultation. London Councils are investigating options for developing a package of training materials which will build on good practice and help ensure a level of consistency across London.</b></p> <p><b>Origin of Recommendation:</b>  Peer Challenge  Initial Learning from Incidents in 2017</p> <p><b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b>  B3 – Community Resilience  F1 – Assurance Community Engagement</p>
--	---

<b>A5.</b> A review of the Gold Resolution and Addendum should be commissioned to consider options to make triggers and the escalation process clearer.	
<p><b>Action Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• London Councils to commission a legal advice on the Gold Resolution and addendum to consider opportunities to make triggers and the escalation process clearer.</li> <li>• The scope of the review should include consideration of whether greater clarity can be achieved by amending the face of the resolution or whether it would be more effective to seek to reach a shared view on purpose, supported by the development of suitable guidance.</li> </ul> <p><u>If Resolution does not require amendment (as per initial legal advice received)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review existing training delivered to chief executives on the LLAG and SCG Chairs rota and enhance where necessary.</li> <li>• Initiate a communications strategy to raise awareness and understanding of local authority policy following review of the Gold Resolution.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 3 - 6 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b>  <b>On Track</b>  Initial Legal advice has been obtained by London Councils on the Gold Resolution, which suggests that it would be more effective to change the supporting protocols and guidance, rather than the face of the resolution.</p> <p>Consequently, discussions have begun with a view to developing suitable guidance, in liaison with the Local Authorities Panel and the London Resilience Group</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalise the role of the SCG Chairs Rota in supporting the LC Chief Executive in briefing Leaders on critical decisions evoking the Gold Resolution, ensuring that this is done in a timely and appropriate manner.</li> </ul>	<b>Origin of Recommendation:</b> Independent Peer Challenge
	<b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b> A4 – Role of Councillors A6 – Mutual Aid Review

<b>A6.</b> A review should be commissioned to consider options for enhancing, where appropriate, the mutual aid policy which is underpinned by the memorandum of understanding (MoU).	
<b>Action Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct a review of the Mutual Aid MOU covering both front-line services and senior expert support plus the principles required to underpin collective and consistent application of the agreement.</li> <li>Draft changes to the Mutual Aid MOU and recommend changes to application of the agreement if required.</li> <li>Conduct research and scope opportunities for a database of assets and including benefits.</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 4 - 8 months: MOU Review TBC: Database of Assets
<u>Database of Assets</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce a user specification based on consultation with emergency planning teams.</li> <li>Conduct a review of existing systems and processes</li> <li>Consult with system providers to ascertain availability and cost of existing or bespoke systems.</li> <li>Produce proposals for LAP on the means of best delivering and maintaining a London-wide database of assets.</li> </ul>	<b>Status:</b> On Track, LAP IG confirmed the M/A Agreement is fit for purpose but there is a need to consider how it can be applied more proactively.  Work on determining requirements for a database of will follow the appointment of additional resource.
<u>If an existing system can be applied</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage with providers to discuss cost, reliability, accessibility and security of data.</li> <li>Develop policies and protocols to ensure the maintenance and availability of the database 24/7.</li> </ul>	<b>Origin of Recommendation:</b> Independent Peer Challenge
<u>If a bespoke system is required</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage with system developers or existing service providers to scope out system specifications and costings.</li> <li>If a sound business case is established, initiate a procurement process.</li> <li>Initiate a robust testing programme</li> <li>Develop policies and protocols to ensure the maintenance and availability of the database 24/7.</li> </ul>	<b>Relationship with other Recommendations:</b> A5 – Gold Resolution

## **B. Corporate Policy**

<p><b>B1.</b> All London Local Authorities should maintain a corporate resource of professional advice, support and oversight. This is best be achieved by developing and broadening the role of Emergency Planning Teams to encompass support and oversight of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Organisational compliance with the Civil Contingencies Act (2004);</li><li>b) Organisational compliance with Minimum Standards for London;</li><li>c) The organisation's ability to effectively respond to a localised incident;</li><li>d) The organisation's ability to maintain critical services in the lead up to and during emergencies as required by the Civil Contingencies Act and supported by the International Standard for Business Continuity ISO 22301.</li></ul> <p>To support this aim, consideration should be given to locating emergency planning teams within central directorates or ensure effective lines of reporting and communication are in place to enable them to deliver effective professional corporate level support.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Work is yet to start with engagement with Directors of HR Group to be initiated. Means of assessment to be incorporated into assurance development work.</p>
<p><b>B2.</b> Common Standards for London Local Authority Emergency Planning Professionals, reflecting core competencies, should be developed and then adopted as a matter of policy by all local authorities and then continuously reviewed to support staff recruitment, development and service delivery.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 9 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Work is yet to start but no current indication of potential delays.</p>
<p><b>B3.</b> Ensure boroughs recognise the importance of community resilience and have clear community engagement and liaison plans in place, with strong relationships across each sector, that are well connected to emergency plans. Ensure that boroughs understand the impact of incidents (both local and other) on their communities. Test the robustness of these plans and arrangements locally with key community and faith groups.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 9 months</p> <p>This work is intrinsically linked to the community resilience initiative being developed in partnership with the Deputy Mayor and other stakeholders. Learning from Grenfell and other recent incidents will also be reviewed to ensure good practice and guidance is shared. This will build on good work already underway at the local level. The RAG status be reviewed once the community resilience steering group has held its inaugural meeting on 18th July and the completion of multi-agency Grenfell Debriefs</p>

	by the end of July 2018.
--	--------------------------

<b>B4.</b> To support a co-ordinated and efficient approach to maintaining organisational resilience at a time when efficiencies are imperative, consideration should be given to incorporating business continuity functions into the core duties of emergency planning teams, where this is not already the case.	<b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months
	<b>Status:</b> To be incorporated into the assurance work which begins in July 2018.

### **C. Governance**

<b>C1.</b> London Local Authority Chief Executives should reaffirm the Local Authorities' Panel and Implementation Group as the accountable body to drive the refreshed EP2020 Implementation Plan, with the immediate priority of clarifying, simplifying and strengthening the sub-regional arrangements with a lead chief executive for each area.	<b>Timeframe:</b> 0 - 4 months
	<b>Status:</b> On Track ToR discussed at meeting on 6 <sup>th</sup> June and final draft to be signed off by the Chair.

<b>C2.</b> The role of Local Authorities' Panel members, who are nominated by chief executive peers within each sub-regional grouping to represent their views, should include: a) Taking a lead chief executive role on resilience in their respective sub-regional grouping. b) Maintaining oversight of collective assurance. c) Championing the principle of all boroughs contributing equally to sub-regional and regional planning in support of the LAP business plan, and local initiatives, for equal benefit.	<b>Timeframe:</b> 0 - 4 months
	<b>Status:</b> On Track Engagement with all chief executives initiated.

<b>C3.</b> Multi-Agency Sub-Regional Resilience Fora (SRRF) should be replaced by local authority	<b>Timeframe:</b> 3 - 6 months
---	--------------------------------

<p>sub-regional group meetings chaired by the respective LAP Member and comprising strategic level representatives, such as chief executives or Directors with responsibility for emergency planning, from each borough and supported by Emergency Planning Managers. Partners should be invited as necessary. Secretariat support should be provided by a central resource to reduce the burden on boroughs. The new group meetings should focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Assurance</li> <li>b) Fostering collaboration to enhance resilience</li> <li>c) Overseeing the equal contribution to sub-regional and regional operational and contingency planning.</li> </ul> <p>Note: this does not dispense with the need for LAP members to engage with emergency planning managers in their areas.</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> <b>On Track.</b> Boundary options discussed and confirmed to remain the same as previous multi-agency sub-regional fora. Meeting dates set for inaugural meetings in four of the six areas to take place in July with the other two to follow. Meetings are being arranged.</p>
--	---

<p><b>C4.</b> Local Authority Panel Implementation Group (LAP IG) members to take a leading role in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Managing the three-year Local Authority Panel Business Plan and offering advice to LAP members on implementation approaches and a balanced distribution of work;</li> <li>b) Working with central support; agree with respective peers in each sub-regional group the appropriate means of delivering allocated workstreams in accordance with established pan-London working practices.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 0 - 3 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> <b>On Track.</b> ToR discussed at LAP IG and final draft awaits sign off by the Chair.</p>
--	--

#### **D. Planning**

<p><b>D1.</b> Local Authorities' Panel should engage with the LRF to simplify, joint plans and support arrangements between blue light partners and councils.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> On Track. To be discussed at the next LRPB.</p>
---	--

<p><b>D2.</b> Local Authorities' Panel should engage central government departments, securing a single and efficient point of contact through MHCLG.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 9 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> On Track. To be discussed with MHCLG following LAP on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018.</p>
--	---

<p><b>D3.</b> London local authorities should formally recognise in plans the role of Mayor of London as the voice of London and Londoners, and for the communications and advocacy role rather than having a direct operational role in response and recovery.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 3 – 6 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> <b>On Track.</b> Discussions planned with LRG to agree timeframes for completion of action plan.</p>
---	--



<p><b>D4.</b> Building on learning from the experiences of the humanitarian and welfare response in 2017 provided to victims and survivors, the Local Authorities' Panel should commission a review of current plans and exercising, including: the robustness of the initial response; arrangements for longer term response; information sharing; a consistent approach to case management; role of the key worker; achieving consistency of service over a prolonged period; specialist skills; clear well understood and published arrangements for a standing charity for effective collection and distribution to those affected by tragedies; and co-ordination across agencies.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Extensive Learning has already been identified including the publication of a report on 'learning from funder responses to emergencies' commissioned by the Charities Commission. Following the conclusion of Grenfell multi-agency debriefs at the end of July 2018 (delayed due legal complexities associated with the Public inquiry), it is anticipated that this work will progress at pace.</p>
---	--

<p><b>D5.</b> Local Authorities' Panel should commission work to develop plans and procedures to address learning from incidents in 2017 with specific reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Short to medium term accommodation to those made homeless by an incident</li> <li>b) Community Engagement</li> <li>c) Family and Friends Assistance Centre</li> <li>d) Physical donations</li> <li>e) Trusts and foundations</li> <li>f) Communications – delivery of an effective response in the age of social media</li> <li>g) Recovery phase coordination – infrastructure and people</li> </ul>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Following the conclusion of Grenfell multi-agency debriefs at the end of July 2018 (delayed due legal complexities associated with the Public inquiry), it is anticipated that this work will progress at pace.</p>
--	--

<p><b>D6.</b> All chief executives and their deputies should attend periodical training events delivered by accredited trainers and participate in a structured exercise programme to prepare them to undertake London Local Authority Gold duties.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> Ongoing</p>
---	----------------------------------

### **E. Borough Response Capability**

<p><b>E1.</b> All local authorities should support the standardisation work, including principles detailed in the concept of operations, currently being progressed and adopt consistent protocols and procedures for core response functions when published.</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 9 – 18 months: full standardisation</p> <p><b>Status:</b> On Track. ConOps complete and training packages to be delivered to boroughs from July 2018</p>
<p><b>E2.</b> To mitigate any reduction in resource available to support an organisational response, a further piece of work should be initiated, linked to the current Standardisation initiative, to consider the means of:</p>	<p><b>Timeframe:</b> 9 - 12 months</p> <p><b>Status:</b> On Track.</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) identifying local authority roles which possess the requisite core competencies to support operational response and recovery functions;</li> <li>b) identifying how staff undertaking the roles can be incorporated into operational plans;</li> <li>c) ensuring staff are available to undertake the requisite level of training and exercises and are released to undertake response roles during emergencies.</li> </ul>	<b>Work will begin following appointment of additional resource.</b>
---	--

## **F. Assurance**

<b>F1.</b> As part of the Assurance Framework, boroughs need to ensure that they have clear community engagement and liaison plans in place and that they understand the impact of incidents on their communities.	<b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 9 months <b>Status:</b> <b>On Track with work starting in July 2018. .</b>
<b>F2.</b> 'Minimum Standards for London' should be re-branded 'Resilience Standards for London' and to more accurately reflect service requirements, consideration should be given to aligning the assurance process to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Immediate Response Capabilities (covering both local and LLAG operations);</li> <li>b) Contingency Planning to develop capabilities to deal with acute shocks;</li> <li>c) Business Continuity Planning and Corporate Assurance;</li> <li>d) Longer Term Resilience Strategies to provide resilience for chronic stresses.</li> </ul>	<b>Timeframe:</b> 6 - 9 months <b>Status:</b> <b>On Track with work starting in July 2018. .</b>
<b>F3.</b> All local assurance results should continue to be consolidated for the Local Authorities Panel to offer an annual assessment of collective capacity and capability across London and include the way urgent concerns can be escalated to chief executives.	<b>Timeframe:</b> Ongoing <b>Status:</b> Ongoing
<b>F4.</b> Greater detail should be added to assurance criteria pertaining to immediate response capabilities, including clearly defined measurable criteria such as; baseline numbers of trained staff, defined response times and length of operation to be sustained, to establish the level of capacity and capability to be maintained by local authorities to address local incidents.	<b>Timeframe:</b> 3 – 6 months <b>Status:</b> <b>On Track with work starting in July 2018. .</b>



## Refreshed EP 2020 Implementation Plan Timetable – Forward Look by Theme

## Annex B

### Key:

	Preparatory Work
	Key period of Activity
	Deadline Period for Completion

	Overarching Priorities															
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable													
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19	
Overarching Priorities																
1	Refresh EP2020															
	Finalise Implementation Plan and present to CELC.						Expected to be Complete									
	Update the LAP Business Plan							Expected to be complete								
	Review the SLA							Expected to be complete								
	Produce organisational question set for chief execs							Expected to be complete								
	Brief Leaders Committee															

	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable												
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19
<b>2</b>	<b>Adopt Assurance Framework</b>														
	Development of Communications Strategy														
	Chief Exec Agreement to adopt the new Assurance Framework														
	Assurance Approach - Stage 2 developed and presented to LAP														
	All boroughs review existing governance arrangements														
	Interim assurance process to be developed and rolled out														
	Long-Term assurance process to be developed														
	Implementation of enhanced assurance process														

<b>3</b>	<b>Implementation of assurance process</b>														
	Develop Planning Assumptions														
	Produce Organizational Question Set														
	Produce Interim Resilience Standards for London (REL)														
	Local Self-Assessment														
	Sub-Regional Peer Challenge of interim REL														
	London-wide assessment of collective preparedness														
	LAP consider London-wide assessment														
	Collective assessment presented to London Councils Leaders Committee														
	Stakeholder Assurance Working Groups (SAWG) established														
	SAWGs develop Resilience Standards, key lines of enquiry and guidance for judgements														
	Long term approach piloted in selected boroughs														
	Local Authority Self-Assessment of Standards														
	Sub-Regional Peer Challenge of Standards (Oct 2019)														
	London-wide assessment of collective preparedness produced (Nov 2019)														
	LAP consider London-wide assessment of collective preparedness (Jan 2020)														
	Collective assessment presented to Leaders Committee (March 2020)														

4	<b>Develop role of Councillors</b>															
	Engage with political group advisers and leading members															
	Map existing training and guidance															
	Agree process for developing London specific product/guidance and present to Leaders Committee															
	Develop London specific product/guidance including protocols and procedures															
	Deliver protocols and procedures and relevant training															

Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable													
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19	
5	Review Gold Resolution															
	London Councils to commission legal advice						Expected to be complete									
	Initiate actions subject to the advice received	TBC														
6	Review Mutual Aid Protocol															
	Conduct review of mutual aid agreement					Complete										
	Draft changes to agreement if required					Complete										
	Develop guidance and briefings on how the mutual aid agreement is applied															
	Database of Assets															
	Produce user specification															
	Conduct review of existing systems including consultation with providers															
	Produce business case and proposals for delivering oversight of assets															

B. Corporate Policy																
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable													
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19	
1	Corporate resource of professional support															
	Success Criteria to be established and linked to assurance process															
	Further assessment following adoption of common standards for EP Staff															
2	Common Standards for EP professionals															
	Research good practice and existing standards															
	Draft Common Standards															
	Present Standards to Directors of HR and Chief Executives															
	Common Standards adopted by all boroughs and applied to recruitment															
3	Community resilience, engagement and liaison															
	Conduct research and identify good practice															
	Assess feedback produced in one to one interviews with Grenfell Fire Response Team															
	Review relationship with LRP community resilience initiative															
	Develop guidance or plan as necessary and assessment criteria															
	Include in the organisational question set to be produced for chief executives															

4	Business continuity as duty of EP teams																
	Chief Executives agree to adopt this approach																
	Success criteria and means of assessment to be developed																
	Assessment to be conducted following adoption of common standards for EP staff																

C. Governance																
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable													
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19	
1	Reaffirm LAP and LAP IG as accountable															
	Review ToR for LAP and LAP IG and produce draft versions for consideration					Complete										
	ToR agreed by LAP						Complete									
	Revised ToR presented to CELC						Expected to be complete									
2	Role of LAP Members															
	Amend LAP ToR					Complete										
	Brief Chief Executives at CELC on role of LAP members						Expected to be complete									
3	Review established local authority group/alliance boundaries															
	Review established local authority group/alliance boundaries					Complete										
	Develop ToR for Local Authority Sub-Regional Groups						Expected to be complete									
	Set dates and convene inaugural Sub-Regional Group Meetings															
4	Role of LAP IG Members															
	Review and amend ToR					Complete										
	Present revised ToR to LAP						Expected to be complete									
	Consult on support required to effectively discharge LAP IG role															
	Deliver effective central support to LAP IG representatives															

D. Planning															
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable												
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19
<b>1</b>	<b>Join plans with blue light partners</b>														
	Recommendation to be raised at London Resilience Programme Board														
	LLAG suite of Operating Procedures to be amended to reflect any change to approach														
	Standardisation Workstream leads to assess impact of any changes														
<b>2</b>	<b>Engagement with Central Government</b>														
	Consult with MHCLG RED to identify options for developing relationships														
	Review Chief Executive training to ensure relationships are appropriately covered														
	Develop engagement opportunities with central government														
<b>3</b>	<b>Role of the Mayor</b>														
	Chief Executive training and LLAG procedures to be reviewed														
	Update LLAG procedures to ensure they reflect the Mayors role and interaction with LC														
	Mayors Office to be encouraged to participate in regional LA exercises														
<b>4</b>	<b>Humanitarian and Welfare response</b>														
	Review Learning from recent Incidents														
	Conduct research for good practice														
	Develop policy														
	Produce proposal for delivering enhanced support														
	Develop and deliver enhanced support														
<b>5</b>	<b>Learning from Grenfell and 2017 incidents</b>														
	Collate feedback from one to one interviews with Grenfell Tower Response Team members														
	Review learning from recent incidents and include incidents involving spontaneous volunteers														
	Produce a consolidated list of recommendations for LAP to inform plans/guides/procedures														
	Develop Plans/guidelines/procedures														
	Develop and deliver training to support new plans etc.														
	Incorporate new plans etc. in LLAG procedures and local plans														
<b>6</b>	<b>Chief Executive participation in training</b>														
	LLAG Training to be developed to focus on broader issues to be														
	All chief Executives to be invited to attend LLAG training and extended to Deputy LLAGs														
	All Chief Executives attend one Strategic Coordination Summit every two years														

E. Borough Response Capability															
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable												
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19
<b>1</b>	<b>All LAs sign up to standardisation</b>														
	All Chief Executives sign up to standardisation														
	All boroughs incorporate the standardised response capabilities into local plans														
	Standardised BECC and LALO capabilities established														
	Standardised emergency Centre and HA capabilities established														
	Success of standardisation across the range of response capabilities to be assessed in Sept 19														

2	Maximising LA staffing resource															
	All boroughs to consider their available staff resource and skills set															
	Initiate consultation with Directors of HR															
	Options on increasing staff pool to be presented to LAP															
	Agreed approach to be shared with Directors of HR and Chief Executives															

	F. Assurance															
Theme / Number	Summary of Recommendation	RAG Status	Implementation Timetable													
			Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Sep-19	
1	Community engagement incorporated into assurance process															
	Criteria to be included in new assurance approach															
	A measure of success to be included in assessment process															
	Criteria to be presented to LAP for endorsement															
2	Change MSLs to Resilience Standards															
	LAP to endorse rebranding of MSLs															
	Communications strategy to be developed to promote the change and rationale for it															
	Criteria for new approach to build on the work of the MSL Working Group															
3	Annual consolidation of assurance results															
	Annual assessment to be incorporated into stage 2 development of assurance approach															
	Annual assessment to be overseen by the Chief Executive Liaison post holder supported by LRG															
	Annual assessment to be presented to Leaders Committee															
4	Add greater detail on response capabilities to assurance process															
	To be incorporated in planning assumption development															
	Criteria to be incorporated into interim RSL and then finalised Standards															

# Leaders' Committee

## Revising London Councils Priorities    Item no:    5

**Report by:**            John O'Brien            **Job title:**    Chief Executive

**Date:**                    10<sup>th</sup> July 2018

**Contact Officer:**    John O'Brien

**Telephone:**          020 7934 9509          **Email:**       john.o'brien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

**Summary**                    At the meeting of the Leaders' Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2018, the new Chair of London Councils began a conversation about establishing a revised set of London Councils priorities. He informally canvassed members at the meeting about the sort of priorities that underpinned Leaders' own work in their boroughs. This report summarises the results from that initial exercise and sets out a proposed process for engaging in the development of revised London Councils priorities.

**Recommendations**        (i)        That Leaders' Committee note the summary of key priorities each individual borough Leader identified at the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June

   (ii)        That Leaders' Committee agree the process for establishing revised priorities for London Councils.





# Revising London Councils Priorities

## Background

London Councils' business plan is considered annually by its Executive and is subsequently reported to Leaders' Committee.

The plan is currently structured around the following key pillars:

- A statement of overall purpose;
- A description of the key roles that an organisation such as London Councils undertakes in support of that purpose;
- The over-arching themes that sit across all of London Councils' work;
- Individual work programmes that govern detailed activity.

The overall frame of the plan reflects the distinct purposes and roles of London Councils which, of course, are different from individual councils. The exercise instigated on 5<sup>th</sup> June does not set out to change the overall purpose, roles or themes of London Councils and its work, but it does attempt to sharpen individual priorities and make them resonate more with the sorts of issues that councils are dealing with in their places.

## Initial Feedback

At the meeting in June, the Chair asked Leaders to identify the top three priorities for them personally when reflecting on their borough. Accordingly, there were, potentially, ninety nine votes – 33 Leaders or Directly Elected Mayors x 3 Priorities. In the event, ninety six were received.

Table 1 below shows the breakdown of responses.

Subject	Number identifying
Housing	25
Crime and Policing	19
Funding	11
Infrastructure/Transport	9
Mayoral/GLA/Borough Powers and Governance	7
Employment	6
Air Quality	3
Brexit	3
Heathrow Expansion	2
Community/Civic Society	2
Industrial Strategy	1
School Performance	1
Housing and Poverty	1
Reducing Poverty	1

Crossrail	1
Releasing Green Belt	1
Health	1
Protecting Hospitals	1
Social Care	1

The vast bulk of these issues are, in some shape or form, covered in the London Councils Business Plan. That is, of course, not to say that they are reflected in exactly the way that members had in mind when focusing on the exercise in June. Getting to a more granular understanding of how such priorities can best be reflected in the work that an organisation with the sort of purposes that London Councils has is the next phase of the task.

### **Developing a Programme**

In preparing materials for the Executive to consider as part of their Away Day in September Leaders may wish to offer further detail to the broad priorities that emerged from the Leaders' Committee discussion on 5<sup>th</sup> June. It would be especially useful to have further insights and commentary highlighting:

- Specific initiatives that London Councils might take forward within these priorities;
- Proposals where London boroughs'- influence and impact will be greater when all members align their activities around particular approaches to these policy priorities;
- Whether and how current pan London or sub regional forums, Boards or partnerships can be useful in progressing work on these areas.

### **Geographic Breakdown**

In order to provide further context for members, the feedback from the June 5<sup>th</sup> discussion has been further broken down by the main sub-regional groupings identified for economic devolution purposes. This is set out below.

<u>Central London Forward</u> (Camden; City of London; Havering; Haringey; Islington; Kensington and Chelsea; Lambeth; Lewisham; Southwark; Tower Hamlets; Wandsworth; Westminster)	
Housing	10
Crime and Policing	10
Employment	4
Mayoral/GLA/Borough Powers and Governance	3
Funding	3
Air Quality	1
Brexit	1
Community/Civic Society	1
Crossrail	1
Infrastructure/Transport	1
School Performance	1

<u>Local London</u> (Barking and Dagenham; Bexley; Enfield; Greenwich; Havering; Newham; Redbridge; Waltham Forest. <u>Note</u> – Bromley also included in this set for reporting purposes)	
Housing	8
Crime and Policing	8
Infrastructure/Transport	3
Funding	3
Mayoral/GLA/Borough Powers and Governance	3
Brexit	1
Reducing Poverty	1

<u>South London Partnership</u> (Croydon; Kingston upon Thames; Merton; Richmond upon Thames; Sutton)	
Housing	2
Infrastructure/Transport	4
Funding	3
Air Quality	2
Heathrow Expansion	2
Social Care	1
Housing and Poverty	1

<u>West London Alliance</u> (Barnet; Brent; Ealing; Hammersmith and Fulham; Harrow; Hillingdon; Hounslow)	
Housing	5
Employment	2
Funding	2
Crime and Policing	1
Infrastructure and Transport	1
Health	1
Industrial Strategy	1
Mayoral/GLA/Borough Powers and Governance	1
Releasing Green Belt	1
Brexit	1
Community/Civic Society	1
Protecting Hospitals	1

## **Process moving forward**

The Chair has discussed a process for moving forward with other Group Leaders at London Councils and with the London Councils Executive on 19<sup>th</sup> June. A broad outline timescale has been established as follows:

- Initial feedback from 5<sup>th</sup> June meeting provided to Leaders' Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> July (in effect, this report) and invitation to provide a further iteration re feedback (see later in this report);
- London Councils Executive consider further iterations at its Awayday session in September;
- Proposals for revised priorities submitted to Leaders' Committee on October 9<sup>th</sup>;
- New priorities reflected in reports on business planning, budgets, financial strategy and in Chair's business planning sessions with individual Executive portfolio holders between November and January.

## **Further iteration**

At the June meeting, the Chair commented that the exercise at the meeting was only an initial part of the process and that there would be a further, structured opportunity for Leaders to input.

It is suggested that, for the top five scoring priorities identified from 5<sup>th</sup> June meeting, ie:

- Housing
- Crime and Policing
- Funding
- Infrastructure and Transport
- Mayoral/GLA/Borough powers and governance.

Leaders be asked to give some further consideration to the following two questions:

- What, in respect of each of these areas, is the most important thing boroughs want to see achieved?
- Taking account of London Councils' core roles as

- (i) an advocate/lobbyist on boroughs' behalf;
- (ii) a broker of deals and opportunities with others (eg Government, the Mayor, other London public services) on boroughs' behalf;
- (iii) a hub for sharing practice and ideas between boroughs; and
- (iv) a provider of direct services to Londoners on boroughs' collective behalf.

what collective contribution do Leaders wish to see London Councils specifically make to advance their interests?

## **Conclusion**

It is proposed that Leaders be invited to provide responses to London Councils by the end of August to enable the findings to be discussed at the Executive Awayday in September. This would allow the broader timetable set out earlier – including the submission of a report with proposed priorities to Leaders' Committee in October – to be followed.

### **Financial implications for London Councils**

There are not immediate financial implications for London Councils as a result of this report.

### **Legal implications for London Councils**

None

### **Equalities implications for London Councils**

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

# 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 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**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>
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.