

Executive

10 November 2020

Location: Teams Virtual Meeting

Contact Officer: David Dent

Telephone: 020 7934 9753 **Email:** David.dent@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda item

1	Declarations of Interest*	
2	Apologies for Absence:	
3	Minutes of Executive Meeting held on 8 September	
4	Covid-19 Update – including an update from London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee	
5	Tackling Racial Disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System	
6	Local Government Finance - update	To follow
7	Transport for London Bailout and Under 18 Travel – verbal update	
8	Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2020/21	
9	Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Subscriptions and Charges 2021/22	
10	Nominations to Outside Bodies	

*** Declarations of Interests**

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

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

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

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive

Tuesday 8th September 2020 09:30 am

Cllr Peter John OBE was in the chair

Present

Member	Position
Cllr Peter John OBE	Chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	
Cllr Claire Holland	
Cllr Darren Rodwell	
Cllr Georgia Gould	
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Muhammed Butt	
Cllr Gareth Roberts	Substitute
Cllr Clare Coghill	
Cllr Danny Thorpe	
Cllr Elizabeth Campbell	
Catherine McGuinness	

Cllr Julian Bell and Kim Smith, Chief Executive of the the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham were in attendance.

London Councils officers were in attendance.

The Chair congratulated Cllr Sir Ray Puddifoot MBE on his recent knighthood. The Chair confirmed that it was to be his last meeting of the Executive, although he would be attending the Leaders' Committee AGM in October.

Cllr Puddifoot announced that this would be his last Executive meeting. The Chair also confirmed that John O'Brien, London Councils Chief Executive, had announced his intention to step down from his role in April 2021.

The Chair also welcomed Cllr Gareth Roberts, who was substituting for Cllr Ruth Dombey, and also Kim Smith, Chief Executive of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, present for item 4 on the agenda.

1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ruth Dombey.

2. Declaration of interest

Cllr Bell declared an interest in that he was a member of the Transport for London (TfL) Board.

3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 16th June 2020

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 16th June 2020 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting

4. Supporting Councils to improve services and practice by addressing Racial Inequality

The Chief Executive introduced the report, informing members that the business plan adopted in July 2020 had included references relating to the importance of fairness and inclusivity in the Capital, and that these ambitions were to be seen in the context of the disproportionate impact on BAME communities by Covid-19, and also the response to the death of George Floyd. Work in these areas had progressed with professional networks and, in particular, a CELC working group, chaired by Kim Smith, Chief Executive of Hammersmith and Fulham Council, as well as Heads of HR and also Cllr Butt, Portfolio Holder for Welfare, Social Inclusion and Empowerment.

The work with boroughs emphasised the importance of avoiding duplication in work, and also of finding ways in which boroughs could better be supported to

fulfill their own objectives. Progress was being shared in order to get for members' feedback, with a view to taking a draft statement to Leaders' Committee for endorsement.

Kim Smith, Chief Executive of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, commented that the paper set out a business case for addressing inequality issues, a number of which had been further revealed by the Pandemic, within three overall themes: Demonstrating Leadership; Building Inclusive Workplaces; and Challenging and Improving Practice across Services.

Ms Smith pointed out that London boroughs had a good reputation for being inclusive employers and in demonstrating positive behaviours, and there were opportunities for looking at further improvements, for example maximising apprenticeship levy budgets, and looking at the issue of recruitment of BAME staff. Ms Smith recognised the large amount of good practice within boroughs, as well the need to accelerate actions in this sphere and for greater visibility in the work being undertaken.

Ms Smith also referenced a number of thematic reviews on health, crime, housing and employment, which now had regard to the disproportionate impact on BAME communities and which were addressing whether work programmes needed to be amended as a result.

Cllr Butt recognised the opportunity for boroughs to have a collective voice and to demonstrate further commitment with a view to increasing confidence. He recognised the importance of boroughs, as large employers, creating mentoring and support systems, and demonstrating that boroughs were taking the issue of inequality seriously.

In terms of the draft statement on race equality, the Chair explored the relationship with MOPAC/MPS work in this area.

Members made the following points in response to the paper:

- it was important that boroughs should look at their own workforce diversity, and how they were developing recruitment, sponsorship and mentoring to promote more diverse organisations;
- it was also important to understand what boroughs already knew about disproportionality in terms of planning for a potential second wave of the Pandemic, and what more could be done to mitigate the risks for communities;
- data held by boroughs should be utilised to help benchmarking activity, examine key issues such as ethnicity pay gaps and to help focus on action to improve outcomes.
- the work should eventually be expanded to cover all areas of diversity.

Executive noted the progress made in co-designing a programme of activity, commented on the emerging model for the programme of work set out in the report, and commended the draft statement set out in Appendix B to Leaders' Committee for its consideration.

5. Local Government Finance – Update

The Director of Local Government Performance and Finance introduced the report, commenting that:

- the paper set out the aggregate financial position for London boroughs as a result of Covid 19 impacts to the end of July based upon individual borough returns. Since the production of the report, boroughs had completed the August survey, the results of which were being analysed.
- Collectively, the financial impact of Covid-19 on boroughs was estimated to be losses of £2 billion

- the paper had been written in the context of the forthcoming Spending Review and further Government consultation on the reform of Business Rates
- In terms of the Business Rates review, there was an initial call for evidence by 18 September and a full response required by the end of October. The draft London Councils response called for the review to take place alongside a wider review of the Local Government finance system
- the paper also set out an approach to Spending Review lobbying.

Members made the following points in response to the report:

- the key financial priority was to make good the financial effects of the Pandemic and address the issues of social care underfunding. Broader ambitions would fall in to the medium term as the immediate priority was seeking greater financial stability;
- that greater clarity on the next phase of Government financial support was clearly needed;
- London had historically been a source of support to other parts of the country, but the lack of available finance would limit the ability of London to assist in that way in the next period;
- the work on the treatment of SEND deficits in relation to DSG had yielded positive results;
- lobbying should not focus too much on the submission of letters to ministers;
- the previously agreed 1/2 page list of 'asks' for London remained a good product and should also include the investment case for London.

Executive noted the information provided on the financial impact of Covid-19 and agreed the broad principle of the joint London Government response to the Fundamental Review of Business Rates.

6. Covid 19 – Recovery and Renewal

The Chief Executive introduced the report, referencing the previously expressed view of the Executive that work should build on the work being carried out by the boroughs on recovery and renewal as well as supporting the Recovery Board. Accordingly, the results of a survey of Leaders and Chief Executives had been included in the report, which covered the work that boroughs have been participating in with communities, cross borough collaborative projects, and how boroughs were addressing the financial challenges caused by the Pandemic.

Members were informed that the themes in the report would be developed further with Portfolio holders, and it was hoped to integrate the work into material in connection with influencing the Spending Review and in responding to the Devolution White Paper. The competing pressures on time and resources, for members, for boroughs and London Councils in supporting various strands of recovery activity would need to be identified and managed.

- Members emphasised the connection to work on Resilience and London local government response to the pandemic.

Cllr Gould drew members' attention to the shared agenda being developed with the GLA in encouraging green jobs, digital access and reinvigorating high streets.

The Executive noted the findings of the borough Leaders and Chief Executive surveys and supported progressing the findings contained in the Recovery and Renewal overview report.

7. Month 3 Revenue Forecast 2020/21

The Director of Corporate Resources reported:

- That the figures reflected the impact of the Pandemic on the Transport and Environment and Joint Committee funding streams;
- while TEC had a small surplus, there has been a reduction in income relating to enforcement activities and Freedom Pass renewal income;
- there had been savings in the running costs of London Councils buildings and utilities, but the income target for meeting room rental had not been met because of the present position;
- in terms of reserves, London Councils were in a broadly comparable position compared with the same time last year;
- the implications of the Pandemic were expected to be clearer at the half year stage.

Cllr Puddifoot felt that the financial position was relatively strong and as good as could be expected in the present circumstances. He congratulated the Finance Team at London Councils for all their work, which the Chair also endorsed.

The Executive noted the overall forecast surplus as at 30 June 2020 (Month 3) of £109,000 and noted the position on reserves.

8. Debtors Update report

The Director of Corporate Resources presented the report, which detailed the level of outstanding debt owed to London Councils from all sources as at 31 July 2020. This report also detailed the reduction in the level of outstanding debt due from boroughs, TfL and the GLA in the period to 31 December 2019.

Executive noted that all borough, TfL and GLA debts raised up to 31 December 2019 and reported to the Executive at its meeting on 3 March 2020 have been paid; the level of outstanding debt of £1.83 million in respect of borough, TfL and GLA invoices raised in the period 1 January to 31 July 2020; the level of outstanding debt of £229,000 in relation to other debtors invoices raised up until 31 July 2020; and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the finances.

In closing, Executive Members paid tribute to Cllr Peter John for his work as Chair of London Councils, recognising his strong leadership, persuasive advocacy on behalf of London local government and his willingness to offer advice and support to fellow Leaders across London throughout his tenure as Chair. Members also paid tribute to the contribution of Cllr Sir Ray Puddifoot to the Executive and thanked him for all of his work.

The meeting closed at 10.45.

Executive

Covid-19 Update

Item no: 4

- including an update from London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee

Report by: Doug Flight **Job title:** Strategic Lead
Date: 10 November 2020
Contact Officer: Doug Flight
Telephone: 07827 352 357 **Email:** Doug.flight@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report provides an overview of London local government's continuing response to Covid-19; the framework for sub-regional and pan-London collaboration; and the overview and governance arrangements – which have recently been strengthened by the initiation of the London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee.

A verbal update will be provided on key points from the most recent weekly meeting of the London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee on 3 November 2020 (which took place after despatch of these papers).

Recommendations: Members of the Executive are asked to:

1. Consider and comment on key issues in the update to help steer London local government's continuing response to Covid-19.

Covid-19 Update

Background

1. London local government's Covid 19 related work sits within a broader partnership response and has evolved through distinct phases to reflect the evolution of the pandemic and national and local policy responses.
2. The initial response was grounded in established ways of working that have been developed through our long-standing shared commitment to building London's resilience and protecting Londoners. The local government response was initially escalated in step with the stand-up of the formal inter-agency London Covid 19 Strategic Coordination Group (SCG) - with London local government representation represented through London Local Authority Gold.
3. As the extent and duration of the pandemic became clearer, bespoke Covid 19 local authority co-ordination arrangements were introduced, to improve capacity and release the regular on-call Gold chief executive to respond to any other incidents which might occur. The arrangements relied on sub-regional working to provide improved strength and depth to the support for individual boroughs.
4. Summer 2020 provided the opportunity for a period of reflection, and a move in strategic focus from mitigating the immediate implications of the pandemic, to transition matters and planning London's recovery and renewal. At this stage, the partnership Strategic Co-ordination Group was stood down and the following were initiated:
 - The London Transition Board – co-chaired by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and the Mayor of London – attended by the London Councils' Chair, Deputy Chair and Vice-Chairs, representing the perspectives of London boroughs. It was originally envisaged that this Board would continue to meet monthly for the remainder of 2020. In view of the SCG being stood up again, it is now meeting on a 6-weekly cycle.
 - The London Recovery Board (LRB) - Co-Chaired by the, Chair of London Councils and the Mayor and attended by the London Councils' Deputy Chair and Vice-Chairs. The LRB was designed to plan and oversee the capital's wider long-term economic and social recovery. Through a series of social and economic working groups,

a package of recovery missions has been agreed and action plans are being developed for consideration by the Board at its meeting on 10 November 2020. This meeting will also consider the programme's cross-cutting themes including equalities.

- London Councils commissioned Mike Cooke to review of London local government's collective response to the Covid-19 pandemic between March and July of this year. Mike Cooke presented to Leaders' Committee on 13th October.

Strengthened Arrangements – Autumn 2020

5. After considering Mike Cooke's recommendations on 13 October 2020, Leaders' Committee went on to agree to formally establish a **London Councils' Pandemic Steering Committee**.
6. The membership includes the Elected Officers, supported by London Councils' chief executive and the coordinating borough chief executive – with wider attendance when required by its agenda The Terms of Reference are attached as appendix A. Its core purpose is to bring political oversight and leadership to the pan-borough response to what is now a long-term situation. NB: It was agreed that other short terms emergency management situations would be responded to as before, through the established 'Gold' arrangements.
7. The new Committee met for the first time on 27 October 2020 and further details of its first meeting are set out below.
8. The Elected Officers continue to play a key part in the London Leaders Covid 19 Committee, along with the Mayor of London and senior resilience and public health officials. This Committee plays a formal role in the escalation process which was agreed with the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. The Committee is regularly briefed by PHE on a range of the latest data and analysis as part of ongoing discussions around potential escalation and de-escalation strategies. Members of the Executive will be aware that much of this material is

then shared on a weekly basis with Leaders and Chief Executives via the 5.00pm call on a Monday.

9. As noted above, the SCG has been re-established and it will now focus on co-ordinating London's strategic response to both the pandemic and, at the request of government, monitor impacts arising from the end of the transition period with the European Union. The LLASC arrangements feed in to the SCG and its structures.

Update on Current Issues

10. Boroughs are receiving regular briefings from London's Public Health England team, with PHE sharing the latest epidemiological data at the weekly London Councils briefings for Leaders and Chief Executives.
11. London moved into Tier 2 (High) Alert Level on the 17th October, subsequently, on Saturday 31st October, the Prime Minister indicated that he would be seeking Parliamentary approval for the introduction of an England-wide lockdown. At the time of writing, the lockdown was expected to begin on Thursday 5th November and to last until at least Wednesday 2nd December.
12. In parallel, discussions have continued between London partners and Government on the shape of a wider escalation and de-escalation process and were due to be reported at the weekly London Councils briefing meeting for Leaders and Chief Executives on 2 November 2020.
13. The first meeting of the Pandemic Steering Committee on 27 October 2020 received a verbal report from the Co-ordinating Chief Executive and went on to discuss and consider a number of key issues:

- Homelessness and rough sleeping

Rough sleepers were accommodated in empty hotels and in other short-term residencies during the initial phase of the

pandemic. London Council's is working through the SCG's structures in order to identify potential solutions to emerging issues around supporting rough sleepers this winter – including housing the current street homeless population and taking account of the stricter guidelines that PHE England has issued.

- Support for clinically extremely vulnerable people

The national shielding programme is not currently in operation and the Government has indicated that in future, when required, shielding should operate at a local authority level. Boroughs are collaborating to look at a minimum support offer to clinically extremely vulnerable (CEVs) should this be required. This includes an expectation of local authorities that they identify and contact all residents that require support. Support could include but not be limited to priority shopping slots, communicating with shielding residents and further support. The provision of medication and other necessities will need to be considered at borough and pan-London level.

- Test and Trace

A number of boroughs have developed local contact tracing initiatives and the learning from their initial experience will be shared through the regular weekly London Councils' briefings. This learning will also inform discussions which are taking place at a national level on options for more localised testing. A pilot in LB Brent has illustrated how local booking of testing slots can provide significant advantages, allowing access to be targeted to match the greatest need. Any consideration of a pan-London approach would need to take full account of capacity issues across the boroughs.

- Funding

London Councils has continued to actively engage with Treasurers, SLT and MHCLG officials to support boroughs to prepare and assure their assessment of the financial implications of managing the pandemic, in light of the second wave, and to analyse and understand the overall impact for London. This will help develop the case to Government around challenges for councils, particularly around loss of income (including Council Tax and business rates), as well as direct costs and undelivered savings.

- Overall package of Public Health support

At the request of the Pandemic Steering Committee, London Councils has been working with the Local Authority co-ordinating Chief Executive, GLA and the SCG to assemble a draft package of public health or 'epidemiological' asks (drawing on the themes mentioned in the bullet points above). This was due to be discussed in more detail at the Pandemic Steering Committee's meeting on 3 November 2020.

- Economic and Business support

In addition to the public health or 'epidemiological' asks noted above, London Councils officers are working with the GLA and other core partners on the SCG Business and Economic Impact Sub-Group to assemble a package of potential London asks around further business support measures – which might be appropriate in the context of the additional control measures being introduced to manage the second-wave.

Issues under discussion include, for example the impact on aviation communities and other sectors such as hospitality, the arts and culture – where staff will require retraining, skills and employment support. This work was also due to be discussed in more detail at the Pandemic Committee's meeting on 3 November 2020.

Conclusion

14. The introduction of the London Councils' Pandemic Steering Committee has formalised political oversight and leadership of the pan-borough response to the pandemic.
15. The Committee has initiated a number of key workstreams, as reported above, and progress on these, and any other matters discussed at the Committee's meeting on 3 November 2020, will be reported verbally to the Executive.
16. Members of the Executive are asked to consider and comment on key issues in the update to help steer London local government's continuing response to Covid-19.

Financial Implications for London Councils

This programme of work will represent a commitment of officer time across the organisation. This is currently being managed largely within existing overall budgets by a flexible deployment of overall resources.

Legal Implications for London Councils

There are no direct Legal implications for London Councils as a result of this report.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

Equalities implications of key elements of the response will be considered as part of the Pandemic Steering Committee's remit.

Background Papers

Appendix A: Terms of Reference for London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee

Appendix A: Terms of Reference for London Councils Pandemic Steering Committee

Overview

This Committee was established following Leaders' Committee's consideration in October 2020 of lessons learned during the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic. Its remit is to give pan borough political leadership to the pandemic. It will:

1. Receive briefings on emerging trends and issues pertaining to the pandemic from a local and sub-regional perspective.
2. Develop and seek to agree a London local government line on key issues, taking account of a range of borough perspectives.
3. Ensure effective political oversight of the London local authority Strategic Co-ordination arrangements for COVID-19.

Role of the Committee

- To receive reports and advice from the London Local Authority Strategic Co-ordinating Chief Executive (LASC) and assess the implications of available data and information.
- To provide strategic direction on any challenges/opportunities that might arise from the above in relation to the management of COVID-19 in London.
- To plan ahead to ensure longer term planning for future challenges arising from the pandemic.
- To form a London local government view of matters relating to the London *Leaders' COVID-19 Committee* as well as the *Transition and Recovery Boards*.
- To ensure the outcomes of the above are communicated appropriately at a London-wide, sub-regional and local level.

Membership

- London Councils Chair,
- Deputy Chair
- 3 Vice Chairs (cross party)
- Other Relevant LC Portfolio Holders and sub-regional political leads by invitation (*based on agenda*)
- London Local Authority Strategic Co-ordinating Chief Executive (LASC) +1 to ensure coverage and continuity
- Chief Executive of London Councils

Executive

Supporting Councils to improve services and practice by addressing Racial Inequality: Disproportional outcomes in the Criminal Justice System

Item no: 5

Report by: Tom Pickup **Job title:** Principal Policy Officer

Date: 10 November 2020

Contact Officer: tom.pickup@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report provides an overview of:

- a) The role of London local government in tackling disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System and some of the broader activity to address racial inequality.
- b) Examples of good practices within local government but also acknowledgement of challenges ahead for the sector to tackle racial inequality.
- c) Next steps required both by local government and wider partnership working to reduce racial disparities between different ethnic groups.

Recommendations: The Executive is asked to:

- 1. Note the findings in the report, including the examples of borough good practice to tackle disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System and wider racial disparities.
- 2. Comment on the issues identified within the report, both specific relating to crime but also wider racial injustice and explore the possibility of additional service area deep dives.
- 3. Endorse the next steps outlined in the report, particularly those specific to London local government. This includes commissioning the Chief Executives London Committee -Policing group to progress these actions at an operational level.

Drivers of disproportional outcomes and race inequality in the Criminal Justice System: the role of local authorities

Background

1. Leaders' Committee adopted a business plan for 2020/21 at its meeting in July 2020, which set a number of strategic objectives and which commits to us working to build a fairer, more inclusive capital. Leaders' Committee went on to agree a statement in October 2020, attached as Appendix A, which set out a commitment to developing a broader programme of work, framed around three blocks of activity:
 - Demonstrating Leadership
 - Building Inclusive Workplaces
 - Challenging and Improving Practice across Services
2. Within this framework, a programme of activity has been developed in outline and which was reported to Leaders' Committee in October 2020. Co-ordination of the overall programme of activity is being led by Cllr Muhammed Butt (Portfolio Holder for Welfare, Social Inclusion and Empowerment), who is working closely with the Chair and other Portfolio Holders. They are engaging with London Councils officers, Chief Executives and other local authority professionals to co-design and deliver a programme of activity that will provide effective support to boroughs in taking this agenda forwards. Members have also indicated an appetite to consider wider dimensions of this issue, including in respect of political leadership.
3. Within this developing programme, the third block of activity (referenced above) seeks to support and enable key local authority service areas to better understand the issues and drivers of disparities in outcomes for Black, Asian and other ethnic minority groups – so that collective effort can be focussed where it will make the most difference.
4. In alignment with this agenda, the Crime and Public Protection Portfolio Holder, and their cross-party shadows, discussed opportunities for addressing this agenda earlier in the year and agreed to recommend a specific piece of work be included in the draft

business plan for 2020/21. Subsequently, Leaders' Committee agreed the following when adopting its business plan in July 2020:

- Develop a practical pan-London project to address the causes of inequality within the Criminal Justice System, including unfair outcomes (disproportionately affecting communities) – supported by targeted early intervention.

5. The Crime and Public Protection Portfolio Holder has led this area of work, working with Chief Executives, professional networks (*Directors of Children's Services, Heads of Community Safety, YOT Leaders*) and supported by London Councils officers. Given the complex and inter-linked landscape of the criminal justice system, it was recognised that partnership would be required to drive system change – however it was also acknowledged the London local government could usefully conduct a deep dive focussed on the drivers of the most apparent racial disparities in criminal justice outcomes (*i.e. the over-representation of Black communities, but particularly young Black men*).
6. As such, London Councils representatives on the London Crime Reduction Board agreed to lead the way and go first in a series of deep dives, across criminal justice partners, to outline local government's role and identify next steps to tackle disproportionality and racial injustice. The findings and next steps within the report, as outlined below, were presented to the Board on 20 October 2020 by Cllr Jas Athwal (current Crime and Public protection Portfolio holder). The Board warmly welcomed the report and the proposed approach to taking forward the identified next steps (*NB: In addition to Cllr Athwal, London Councils is represented on the Board by Cllr Georgia Gould, Cllr Rachel Robathan and Cllr Gareth Roberts*). Some of those next steps are specific to local government and others require a partnership approach – the Chief Executive London Committee Policing Group have been consulted and it is suggested that they are well placed to adopt a convening role to take forward action across local authority departments.

Introduction

7. This report provides a deep dive into the role of local authorities in tackling disproportionality, both in reference to the disproportionality experienced in the Criminal Justice System (CJS) (i.e. the over-representation of Black communities, but particularly young Black men) and the underlying causes that exacerbate the chance of people from these ethnic groups being exposed to and encountering the CJS. This report was received by the London Crime Reduction Board on the 20 October 2020, however it also builds on reports endorsed by both the Executive and Leaders' Committee in relation to the role of London local government in tackling racial inequality and the developing activity at a pan-London level led by Cllr Muhammed Butt and Kim Smith (Chief Executive, Hammersmith & Fulham). This is one specific sectoral contribution, which could act as a prototype for exploration of activity in other specific local government service areas with a view to addressing racial inequality and disparities.
8. The role of local authorities is both essential and multifaceted, comprised of activity and service provision directly targeted at reducing crime in addition to numerous services and practices that boroughs deliver to address wider inequalities (e.g. poverty, education). It is also important to recognise that much of this work is conducted in partnership with multiple stakeholders and partners. Given the broad range of activity local government undertakes, this report adopts the view the disproportionate outcomes we see in the CJS are, to a significant extent, the product of underlying inequalities that can best be solved by tackling the wider systemic, societal and institutional challenges. It is evident but also important for other local government service areas to understand and acknowledge the link between underlying inequalities and the outcomes experiences in specific areas (e.g. public health, mental health etc.) Therefore, this report will examine the important work of London boroughs to tackle racial inequality and disproportionality specifically in relation to crime, but also the work that addresses broader societal disproportionality that link to the drivers of crime.
9. In London, Black communities, and particularly young Black men, are over-represented and are more likely to experience disproportional outcomes in the CJS,

including the Youth Justice System (YJS). Therefore, in examining the work of local authorities, the report will largely focus on the local authority interventions as well as the experiences of Black communities. Reference to specific ethnic groups will be provided where possible.

10. The report will identify wider disproportional outcomes for certain ethnic groups in London, reflecting the underlying issues at play that contribute to the over-representation of particular communities in the CJS. It will examine current activity and best practice in local government, but also the challenges and barriers the sector faces in recognition that there is more work to be done. The report will also outline the next steps required from local government, with partners, to continue tackling disproportionality both specifically in relation to crime but also the underlying causes.

Current state of play

What is the problem?

11. The previous reports received by the London Crime Reduction Board around this issue highlighted the key challenges, namely the core concern around the link between racial inequality and disproportionate outcomes within the CJS. When interrogating this further it is clear that 'BAME' (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic) Londoners, particularly those from Black communities, are more likely to experience a range of negative outcomes when encountering the CJS.
12. These issues are exacerbated when examining the YJS which is characterised by over-representation of 'BAME' – particularly Black - children and young people who also have different experiences (whether it be decisions or outcomes) throughout most processes in the system. For example:
 - Black children are more likely to be arrested than white children
 - White children are more likely to get a caution than black children
 - Black children occupy higher representation in more serious offence groups
 - BAME children are more likely to be sentenced to custody
 - Black children have experienced the lowest rate of decrease in first time entrants

13. When interrogating this further it has been identified that young Black men experience disparity arguably at every stage of the CJS – from policing, through the court system, to prisons and probation. For example, young Black men disproportionately:

- Experience a lack of trust and associated animosity with law enforcement.
- Experience the hard end of police enforcement (stop and search; tasers; traffic stops)
- Experience formal sanctions (rather than formal/ informal warnings and 'out of court disposals, reaching all the way to imprisonment (the court system amplifies disproportionality from the earlier stages of the journey of young Black men).

Why is it a problem?

14. The over-representation of 'BAME' people in the CJS is an outcome of broader societal, systemic and institutional disparities that reduce the chances of this group 'doing well in life'. These issues include education (e.g. school exclusions), deprivation, health and career opportunities. Furthermore, the recent impacts of Covid 19 have exacerbated existing disparities and the resurgence of the Black Lives Matter movement, following the George Floyd murder, has heightened activity to tackle racial inequality.

15. Preventing 'BAME' people from being exposed to, or considering criminality is more effective than intervening when they first make contact with or enter the YJS or CJS. Furthermore, addressing these wider systemic issues will have a positive knock-on effect on other outcomes relating to equality, opportunity and prosperity.

A journey of disadvantage and disproportionality

16. The Youth Justice Board's "Exploring racial disparity"¹ is an effective tool that maps and highlights the multiple layers of racial inequality and disproportionality during key life milestones for 'BAME' communities across the country. While the YJB infographic helps present racial disparities, there is opportunity to develop a more London specific "Journey of disadvantage and disproportionality" that can incorporate additional data sets and compile and utilise borough level data to better understand

¹ [YJB: Exploring racial disparity](#)

outcomes at key milestones for different ethnic groups in the capital. This also emphasises the need for a multi-layered response to tackle disproportionality from numerous angles to address the outcomes we see today. This is also linked to the drivers of crime and how the disproportionality experienced at key milestones exacerbates the chance of criminality.

The role of local authorities

17. London local government is conducting a vast range of activity targeted both directly at tackling disproportionality in the CJS, and indirectly through services seeking to address underlying causes of disproportionality and racial inequality (e.g. Community Safety, YOTs, Children's Services, Education (particularly the role of schools), Public Health and Social Care). Local authorities are also responsible for providing youth justice services which are exercised through the statutory Youth Justice Management Board which consist of cross-sector representation. This activity is not only limited to ensuring representative service delivery but also to ensure local authorities foster inclusive organisations that are diverse and reflect the communities they serve.
18. This section will identify areas of good practice within local government which will highlight the services and practices that seek to tackle disproportionality in relation to crime and wider racial inequality across London and in local communities. It will also acknowledge the challenges, barriers and concerns for local authorities in addressing racial inequality and touch upon the pan-London work underway to overcome this.

Ongoing activity and good practice

Youth Offending Teams (YOTs)

19. YOTs have an instrumental role in tackling and preventing criminality among young people, this includes active work to support those groups that are more likely to encounter the Youth Justice System (YJS) and experience subsequent disproportionate outcomes. They are also a key component to a broader partnership approach to delivering youth justice services. Those ethnic groups that experience disproportionality differ across boroughs but are overwhelmingly represented by

Black young people. In recognising this disproportionality and the need to prevent the persistent over-representation of certain ethnic groups in the YJS many YOTs have been providing tailored and appropriate services and support to these groups. Given the needs of different communities across boroughs and the need to focus on particular groups in different localities (e.g. people of Somali, Black Caribbean or Black African heritage) there is not a one size fits all solution when engaging with different ethnic groups, however there is important value in sharing good practice and understanding the important work undertaken across local areas. The following are examples of the work and activity being undertaken across boroughs, by YOTs, to tackle disproportionality:

- Out of Court Disposals (OOCd). OOCds are an effective way of providing a victim focused and constructive solution to an offence which can also divert or 'triage' young people away from the CJS. However, this option is currently under-utilised by young Black people – hence we see this group over-represented for first-time offending, reoffending and in youth prisons. The causes of this link to a lack trust and confidence in the CJS (i.e. increased likelihood of 'no comment' interviews) and a lack understanding about the options available to them having committed an offence. To tackle this, boroughs have taken steps to actively raise awareness of the alternative options available to those young people who have committed an offence and, by working with partners, seek to increase the use of this option having recognised this as an important contributor to reducing the disproportionate number of young Black people experiencing court outcomes.
 - Promoting the use of OOCd. Some boroughs are using different techniques to raise awareness of the different options available to youth offenders. For example, Westminster has developed leaflets that are provided to offenders which detail the options available to them. They are also working with partners to develop videos for parents and appropriate adults articulating these options so they can better support the offender. Similarly, Hillingdon has developed leaflets that are shared with solicitors and court officers. Currently there is no pan-London approach to this work, therefore there is an opportunity to build on and develop this further to establish a common approach.

- Tackling disproportionality for young people requires a whole system approach - for instance, in addition to activity specific to local government, police custody suites and courts are key gatekeepers to the CJS for young people and reducing over-representation is a national priority for the YJB. One level of contribution from YOTs is through the disproportionality toolkit and their submissions to the YJB on national standards. The toolkit enables teams to identify where in the system disproportionality occurs and through submission to the YJB (the latest were in summer 2020) YOTs outline a cross-sector action plan (involving all key stakeholders) to tackle disproportionality. Through this there are examples of local collaborations to deliver change such as Haringey and Islington YOTs who are working with City University in relation to serious youth violence and disproportionality^{2 3}.

Schools and Education

20. Schooling and education represent key milestones during any young person's development and the impact of a negative schooling experience, lack of education and poor educational outcomes can have significant implications for their life experience, including an increased likelihood of turning towards criminal behaviour. For example, studies on the drivers of crime find that disengagement with education contribute towards likelihood of offending i.e. the impact of teach expectations and bias, school exclusion, pupil and teacher perceptions, lack of positive role models⁴. This link is also evident when examining data trends. For example, young Black men of Caribbean heritage are among the highest rate of permanent and fixed exclusion and poorest grade attainment in London and they are also over-represented in both the YJS and wider CJS. Among Black young people trends also suggests disengagement with education increases in secondary school, rather than primary school, where the disproportionate outcomes become increasingly evident. To tackle this local authorities and schools have an essential role in addressing the disproportionate outcomes within education and ensure young people have the learning and skills to provide them with more positive life opportunities. Local authorities, working with schools and other partners, have established and are developing innovative practices and initiatives to improve the schooling experience

² [Collaborative work between Islington YOS, Haringey YOS and City University](#)

³ [Disproportionality Project, Evaluation Report - Islington and Haringey YOTs \(October 2020\)](#)

⁴ ['Boys on Track': Improving support for white FSM-eligible and black Caribbean boys in London \(2018\)](#)

and attainment of disadvantaged young people. Several boroughs are leading these initiatives – for example:

*Lambeth: Raising the game*⁵.

21. This is a two-year project aimed at tackling the 7-10% academic attainment gap and high exclusion rates that Black pupils of Caribbean heritage experience in the borough. The project is based in selected schools across Lambeth, working to improve outcomes at all key stages, to raise aspirations and to reduce exclusions for Black pupils of Caribbean heritage who underachieve in relation to their peers nationally and locally. The project consists of 3 strands:

1. Aim High - which intends to expose Black students of all ages to successful Black role models from different sectors and life experiences.
2. Diversifying the curriculum – a teacher lead initiative, within both primary and secondary schools, that develops tools for teachers, by teachers centred around actively incorporating Caribbean literature into pupil learning; showcasing diversity in different occupations – promoting the mantra of ‘the sky is the limit’ for Black pupils - and working across primary and secondary schools to support pupils transition.
3. Parental Engagement Network – a repository of tools and resources for parents, that will help them support their child(ren)’s learning.

22. The project has resulted in an 11% improvement for Black students at age related expectations at KS2 in comparison to their peers and 3% improvement at KS4, and an overall reduction in permanent exclusions by 49% and over 70% reduction for Black students of Caribbean heritage.

*Haringey Education Partnership (HEP): The BAME Achievement Strategy*⁶.

23. Haringey has the largest gap in Britain at GCSE between higher achieving White British students and lower achieving ‘BAME’ groups, especially those Black students of Caribbean heritage. In response, HEP have established a programme to address

⁵ [Lambeth: Raising the game](#)

⁶ [Haringey Education Partnership](#)

and improve 'BAME' achievement in the borough which is outlined in the BAME Achievement Strategy: Raising Black Caribbean and BAME Achievement:

- Achieve outcomes for all children and young people as good as, or better than, anywhere else in the country.
- Close the gaps in attainment for our different ethnic groups and disadvantaged pupils.
- Tackle related inequalities and negative outcomes such as exclusions, which impact on life chances.

24. To deliver the strategy HEP have established and created several resources for schools, public sector organisations, pupils and parents:

- Self-evaluation tools (for schools).
- Vulnerable to Underachievement Checklist which aims to:
 - to promote/target pupils for participation in extra-curricular activities or the need to maintain extra-curricular attendance records
 - to be proactive in rewarding pupils/ a group of pupils to build self-esteem, e.g. there could be a pattern by gender, ethnicity or ability
 - to reconfigure a tutor group where there are greater pastoral needs or for more staff training on attachment theory and how to respond.
 - to help governors in directing resources at greatest need or secure class-wide support from Early Help
- 'BAME' action plan template (for schools).
- 'BAME' children literature (for parents and pupils).
- Achievement database to capture key trends around education in the borough.

25. These are just two examples of important activity to improve the achievement and schooling experiences of young Black people - there are many other programmes and projects across boroughs that are actively addressing this challenge and making a real difference in outcomes. For example:

- Brent has an ongoing programme aimed at raising the achievement of young Black men – this has resulted in an improvement in exclusion rates for Black

students of Caribbean heritage, including a 9.4% reduction in permanent exclusion in the last year.⁷

- Lewisham is conducting tailored activity to improve outcomes for 'BAME' pupils, with significant focus on addressing disproportionate schooling outcomes for Black pupils of Caribbean heritage.⁸
- Hackney has established a programme of work to improve outcomes for young black men, this includes, but is not limited to, addressing educational outcomes for young Black men of Caribbean heritage.⁹

Children's Services

26. London local government's Children's Services have a core role in supporting young people and ensuring they can thrive throughout life. Across London, boroughs have been undertaking proactive work to improve outcomes for young people from different ethnic backgrounds – this includes an active role in tackling racial inequality. In addition to work of individual borough services, the London Innovation and Improvement Alliance (ALDCS's sector-led improvement partnership) has a dedicated disproportionality and anti-racism workstream which attempts to collate good practice across London. Examples of positive action includes:

- Establishing Youth Justice disproportionality sub-regional working groups, led by Directors of Children's Services, dedicated to reducing racial disparities for 'BAME' young people, particularly those from Black communities. The first of these groups have been established in North Central London with other sub-regions expected to follow and develop their own networks.
- Directors of Children's Services have been working with the YJB on a proposed alternative to custody provision in the London Accommodation Pathfinder project. Children from London are over-represented in the secure estate and 80% of those receiving a remand or custodial sentence are from 'BAME' backgrounds. The proposed provision will comprise four houses across London providing for twenty places which will be a direct alternative to custody. The Pathfinder will test

⁷ [Raising the Achievement of Boys of Black Caribbean Heritage in Brent Schools \(see agenda item 6\)](#)

⁸ [Educational outcomes for BAME children and young people in Lewisham schools \(see agenda item 6\)](#)

⁹ [Hackney: Improving outcomes for young black men](#)

approaches which, if successful, will directly address the disproportionate use of custody for 'BAME' and particularly young Black men in London.

- MoJ/YJB are supporting the Turning Point pilot in North West London which enables adults and children to benefit from diversion from prosecution when they have not made a full admission in police interview. Recommendations in the Lammy Review¹⁰ found that this approach addresses issues around mistrust in the police – the pilot seeks to build on the success of the original Turning Point pilot in the West Midlands. Further London diversion pilots, which are specifically aimed at children, are also in discussion with the YJB to support the Board's strategic objective of reducing racial disparities in the YJS.
- Racial disparities are recognised as a key priority within the ALDCS adolescent safeguarding workstream. This pan-London work is currently being promoted through investment from the Tackling Child Exploitation Support Programme, which seeks to enable children's services and their partners to develop strategic approaches which respond effectively to exploited children. Central to this process is a reframing of our understanding of these children, which is trauma-informed, culturally competent and sees children as 'children first and offenders second'.

27. It is important to recognise that these are only a limited number of examples that present the role of local government and that there is merit in a more comprehensive programme of work to identify the range of good practice and important activity, in the interest of informing learning across public sector partners and possible future pan-London or sub-regional activities. Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that this work is not done in isolation, rather a cross-sector approach is essential to effectively address the challenges around disproportionality. Knowledge of existing practices and initiative should be used to drive new ideas that can be developed with a range of partners and stakeholders.

¹⁰ [Lammy Review](#)

Challenges, barriers and concerns in tackling racial inequality

28. Although there are many examples of good practice by boroughs to tackle disproportionality and racial inequality across the CJS there are several challenges, barriers and concerns that local government must seek to address, similar to those experiences across the public sector landscape. At a high level, the following examples have been identified by boroughs¹¹ with the view that they can be tackled both individually and collectively:

1. Changing existing workforce and organisational attitudes.

- This is a priority issue for an overwhelming number of London boroughs. While some boroughs have succeeded in establishing a representative workforce, generally there is an understanding that some local authority workforces fail to reflect the diversity of the communities they represent, this is particularly evident in more senior positions within local government.
- There is a lack of consistent training and support for staff, including training in unconscious bias and trauma informed practice.

2. Some mainstream services fail to cater to the needs of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities, reflecting the need to improve cultural competency within organisations.

3. Schooling practices and outcomes.

- There remains disproportionate schooling outcomes for pupils based on their ethnicity e.g. exclusion. It is recognised that there needs to be more work to minimise exclusion and maximise inclusion. This includes active monitoring and interventions for Black young people facing exclusion (e.g. possibly through oversight of each case that comes to the exclusion panels so that decisions can be made before the exclusion has happened).
- Need to promote a more inclusive school curriculum to ensure young people can better understand different cultural identities (e.g. representative and inclusive histories).

¹¹ Findings are from the Chief Executives London Committee (CELC) Tackling Racial Inequality Working Group survey of CELC service area leads

- There needs to be an increased focus on raising Black boys' achievement and aspirations to tackle the persistent disproportionate outcomes and opportunities, throughout many aspects of life.

4. Lack of robust and granular data.

- The lack of granular data (e.g. data that covers intersectionality) and data sharing among public sector partners (including between boroughs) limits the understanding of the experiences and outcomes of specific ethnic groups, and subsequent interventions.

29. London local government recognises a collective need, across boroughs and with other public sectors partners, to ensure the sector is more inclusive and proactively seeks to tackle disproportionality and racial inequality. A Chief Executive led working group (the Chief Executives London Committee Tackling Racial Inequality Working Group) has been established to demonstrate leadership in local government on this issue, accelerate action to ensure an inclusive workforce and challenge and improve practice across services. The working group will help guide and support London boroughs' efforts to become more inclusive, build trust and confidence with communities and actively tackle racial inequality.

Next steps

30. Tackling disproportionality in the CJS requires an approach that addresses the disproportionate experiences and outcomes that exist in the wider CJS and responds to the underlying causes of disproportionality and racial inequality. But this approach requires continued and committed cross-sector partnership working to make a real impact on those most affected groups which are also able to actively incorporate their voice when establishing solutions.

31. There is already activity underway, both by local government and other partners in this area, but there is scope to develop existing action and establish new ways to tackle disproportionality. London local government remains committed to playing a central role in these efforts, however this work cannot be completed in isolation. The next steps local authorities are committing to have been separated into those directly related to tackling disproportionality in the CJS and those that can help tackle the

underlying causes that contribute to the challenges within the CJS. Furthermore, there is scope for the LCRB to deep dive into some of specific activity described in this paper and elsewhere in local government.

Tackling disproportionality in CJS – with a focus on young people

32. Action(s) that require a partnership approach:

- Out of Court Disposal – while work and exploration around this issue is underway, there is an important opportunity to embed an approach across London that makes better use of OOCs. This includes raising awareness, for instance by building on materials and programmes established in some boroughs to develop a pan-London approach, and better using and sharing data to understand the levels of fairness and inform how to ensure partners can get interventions right.
- Working with partners to build on local activity to establish a strategic pan-London approach around serious youth violence and child criminal exploitation.
- Developing a more joined up public sector approach across London's criminal justice agencies to establish inclusive workforces - this will help enable frontline and strategic managers to engage with the issues of disproportionality and racial inequality. This will help address underlying issues but also disproportionality in the CJS.

33. Action(s) specific to local government:

- Developing the work of London boroughs to support and advocate for young people, in particular to keep them out of the CJS. For example, reviewing existing contracts for appropriate adult services provision and understanding existing activity and levels of consistency across London.

Tackling underlying causes

34. Action(s) that require a partnership approach:

- Improving data by developing existing data repositories (e.g. London Innovation and Improvement Alliance data) to establish a pan-London pitch around critical

milestones, with the view of identifying when and what interventions are required. This includes improved data sharing and regular reporting - for example, in relation to crime, this take the form data sharing agreements disproportionality analysis between local authorities and YJB (e.g. on prevention, early intervention, OOCR, court, post-court and resettlement from secure estate).

35. Action(s) specific to local government:

- Sharing best practice – the good practice shared in this paper exemplifies the positive activity underway and the need for partners to do more to promote, learn from and share experiences and outcomes e.g. proactive activity in schools to tackle disproportionate outcomes and sub-regional activity dedicated to tackle racial inequality. There is also merit in prioritising the identification and dissemination of good practice to help establish an immediate impact on practitioners' day-to-day work.
- Addressing local authority barriers to tackling racial inequality – the CELC Tackling Racial Inequality working group will continue to address these challenges at a pan-London level but there is also important work and progress boroughs are making individually. Furthermore, these challenges are not limited to local government, therefore additional action will need to develop and emerge with partners across the public sector.
 - Changing existing workforce and organisational attitudes – the CELC working group are undertaking a review of recruitment and workforce practices to encourage more inclusive organisations. Currently this work takes the form of reviewing data collection across boroughs to better understand where in the system the challenges are and where subsequent action is required. The group is also collecting and sharing examples of good practice to encourage learning between boroughs.
 - Tailoring service provision and improving cultural competency – the CELC working group is developing a Racial Equality Standard which will help local authorities benchmark themselves and understand what good, inclusive service delivery and practice looks like. This work appreciates that local

authorities are in different levels of maturity around this issue and that learning can be develop between boroughs and service areas.

- Schooling practices and outcomes – boroughs, in partnership with key stakeholders, will continue to progress the ongoing work to tackle this issue and current activity shows positive improvement for the Black community in some boroughs. Sharing good practice, such as the examples within the paper, will remain essential to help establish, develop and embed ideas and solutions.
- Lack of robust and granular data – in relation to disproportionate outcomes for different ethnic groups in London, this is addressed in the above point around establishing a data repository and improving data sharing with partners and between local authorities. The issue around organisational data is also covered in the above point around the CELC working group activity to improve workforce and organisational attitudes.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

1. Note the findings in the report, including the examples of good practice to tackle disproportionality in the Criminal Justice System and wider racial disparities.
2. Comment on the issues identified within the report, both specific relating to crime but also wider racial injustice and explore the possibility of additional service area deep dives.
3. Endorse the next steps outlined in the report, particularly those specific to London local government. This includes commissioning the Chief Executives London Committee Policing group to progress these actions.

Financial Implications for London Councils

The next steps proposed in this paper will require, as a minimum, input -in-kind from colleagues in boroughs in order to progress and deliver actions. A more detailed specification of the ask from senior officers and professional groupings is still being assessed and will considered by senior borough representatives.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None specifically flowing from this paper.

Equalities Implications for London Councils

These are addressed in the body of the report.

Background Papers

Appendix A: statement agreed by Leaders' Committee in October 2020,

Appendix B: Tackling Race Inequality slide

Item 5 - Appendix A

LONDON COUNCILS STATEMENT ON RACE EQUALITY

Introduction

In recent months, the brutal killing of George Floyd has brought to the forefront feelings of enormous frustration and anger about the ongoing scale of racial injustice that confronts us. The disproportionate impact of COVID 19 on Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic communities underscores the longstanding challenge that we must address - making London a fairer place for its citizens.

London Councils is itself reflecting on that challenge and the things that the organisation can do to contribute to addressing that challenge. That includes its day to day work with London's boroughs, our partner organisations and with Londoners, as well as our organisation internally.

This statement captures the state of that reflection to date, but also acknowledges that there is an ongoing and evolving conversation on these issues and that the content will change as that conversation changes.

London Local Government and Racial Inequality

London Councils recognises that racial inequalities exist in all areas of public life with devastating consequences for far too many Londoners. We pledge to work with our member authorities to create a fairer and more equal society.

As public bodies, we and our member authorities have a legal duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations

Councils across the capital along with London Councils itself agree that they can make a difference by committing to lead change across different communities, building more diverse and inclusive workplaces and challenging ourselves and others to identify and remove inequalities in access to services.

By working together and with London's Black, Asian and other Minority Ethnic communities, London local government will work consistently towards the goal of greater equality.

London Councils working with its member authorities

London Councils will work with its member authorities on this agenda against the same three broad areas of activity as illustrated below.

Demonstrating Leadership

We will:

- Reflect the importance of this agenda in our Business and Work Plans. Our 2020/21 Business Plan commits to us working to build a fairer, more inclusive capital and to collecting and sharing best emerging local government practice on tackling inequalities, co-ordinating where appropriate across service areas with the aim of helping local initiatives to tackle unfair outcomes (e.g. those disproportionately affected BAME communities). The importance of this theme is reflected more broadly in the Business Plan and work plans, for example in the work with Public Health England and other partners to identify and tackle the disproportionate impact of COVID 19 on Londoners from minority ethnic communities.
- Seek to ensure that tackling racial inequality is an issue that is captured in the work of the London Recovery Board.

Building Inclusive Workplaces

We will:

- Support London local government to collect, analyse and publicise pan London local government workplace ethnicity data.
- Support the development of inclusive employment policies and practices (e.g. training and mentoring programmes) as well as career progression and recruitment initiatives designed to advance the goal of building more inclusive workplaces at all levels.

Challenging and Improving Practice across Services

We will:

- Facilitate and support thematic reviews by CELC Lead Advisers exploring disproportionality issues across a range of service and policy areas and share emerging best practice among member authorities in tackling inequality.
- Challenge our own direct service delivery at London Councils to identify disproportionality issues and practice that may tackle inequality.

London Councils as an Employer

London Councils strives to create a working environment that is free from discrimination in any form and in which our staff and our stakeholders are treated with dignity and respect. We recognise that many of our staff, along with those across the capital, are feeling pain and anger as a result of the wider racial injustices highlighted by document. We wish to discuss these feelings with our staff, in a variety of settings, gain a better and deeper understanding of the impact this has on individuals and identify ways in which, in our working environment and lives, we can help colleagues feel that London Councils is striving for fairer outcomes.

We will:

- Prompt wider conversations with staff about the issues that racial inequality raises and identify further steps that we can take to promote equality in the workplace
- Learn from initiatives on successfully building inclusive workplaces that our member authorities implement
- Reaffirm our commitment to training and support, including mandatory equalities training for staff across the organisation to raise awareness of these issues and as a means of tackling inequality in the workplace.

Adopted by London Councils Leaders' Committee in October 2020

Race equality pan-London work

Item 5 - Appendix B

Demonstrating Leadership

- CELC lead identified – Kim Smith, CEO H&F
- Appointing borough leads
- High profile messaging – commitment statement by leaders and CELC statement
- Audit of external validations (race and wider inclusion) including Runnymede Trust, Race at Work and LGA equalities self assessment
- Approach to assurance and accountability e.g. peer reviews
- Drafting a London Boroughs Race Equality Standard
- London Councils Business Plan – including BAME equalities initiatives as headline priorities in current business plans and in Covid recovery initiative inc London Recovery Board
- Celebrating Black History Month
- Reviews of statues, roads, buildings, crests etc

Accelerating Action to Ensure an Inclusive Workforce (*Work as Large Employers*)

- Undertaking focussed work on race inequality in the workplace
- Collecting, analysing and publishing pan-London workforce ethnicity data
- Using data to understand representation across grades and potential barriers
- Career progression initiatives/ L&D – e.g. adapting/ developing the London Leadership Programme (LLP) and individual borough initiatives
- Recruitment practices e.g. anonymised recruitment, diverse panels, interview training, 'Black on Board'
- Sharing inclusive employment policies/ practice (e.g. mandatory and optional training for staff, managers and councillors, mentoring and reverse mentoring programmes)
- Promoting (and linking) diversity networks
- Reviewing internal and external websites and comms

Challenging and Improving Practice Across Services

- Thematic reviews by CELC Lead Advisers (Adult Care; Children's Services; Health; Crime and Policing; Employment; Housing and Growth; Skills; Transport; Environment; Finance; Welfare) – exploring disproportionality sector by sector
- New pan-London campaigns
- Support service improvement by collecting and sharing emerging practice in tackling inequality – best practice compendium/ resources hub
- Commissioning and procuring services – leveraging authorities collective buying power
- Social value
- Co-production

Executive

Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2020/21 Item no: 8

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 10 November 2020
Contact Officer: Frank Smith
Telephone: 020 7934 9700 **Email:** frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary

This report summarises actual income expenditure recorded in the accounts as at 30 September 2020 (Month 6), provides a projected outturn figure for the year and highlights any significant forecast variances against the approved budget. A separate forecast is provided for each of London Councils three funding streams. The summary forecast outturn position is as follows:

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Total expenditure	185,754	381,464	376,948	(4,516)
Total income	(185,149)	(379,942)	(374,631)	5,311
Use of reserves	-	(1,522)	(2,642)	(1,120)
Net deficit/(surplus)	605	-	(325)	(325)
Net expenditure by Committee				
Grants	51	-	(31)	(31)
Transport and Environment	714	-	(200)	(200)
Joint	(160)	-	(94)	(94)
Net deficit/(surplus)	605	-	(325)	(325)

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to note the overall forecast surplus as at 30 September 2020 (Month 6) of £325,000, which compares to a forecast surplus at month 3 of £109,000 and note the position on reserves as detailed in paragraph 18.

Introduction

1. London Councils revenue expenditure budget for 2020/21, as approved by the Leaders' Committee in December 2019, was £383.171 million. The budget was then adjusted to reflect the decision of TEC to bring forward underspends of £91,000 that arose in 2019/20 into the current year. In addition, the TEC budget was reduced by a further £1.029 million on confirmation of the finalised funding available from boroughs and TfL for the Taxicard Scheme in 2020/21 and £1.222 million for Rail Delivery Group payments in respect of the Freedom Pass. Finally following agreement by members £452,000 of unspent budget in relation to the Challenge Implementation Fund was carried forward, making a revised expenditure budget for 2020/21 of £381.464 million.
2. The corresponding revenue income budget approved by the Leaders' Committee in December 2020 was £383.171 million, which included an approved transfer of £979,000 from reserves. Additional transfers from reserves of £543,000 were made to cover carry forward expenditure (see paragraph 1), plus reduced Taxicard funding from the boroughs of £1.029 million. Finally, there was a reduction in Borough contributions to the Rail Delivery Group element of the Freedom Pass of £1.222 million. Total revised income, therefore, is budgeted to be £381.464 million, of which £1.522 million is an approved transfer from reserves to produce a balanced budget for the year.
3. This report analyses actual income and expenditure after six months of the current financial year and highlights any significant variances emerging against the approved budget and includes an estimate of the financial effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.
4. Table 1 below details the overall forecast position, with Tables 2-4 showing the position for the three separate funding streams.

Table 1 – Summary Income and Expenditure Forecast 2020/21, as at 30 September 2020.

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	2,796	5,847	5,845	(2)
S.48 Employee Exit Costs	15	-	15	15
Running Costs	1,604	3,624	3,198	(426)
Central Recharges	398	795	837	42

Total Operating Expenditure	4,813	10,266	9,895	(371)
Direct Services	4,247	9,959	9,038	(921)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	173,227	353,780	349,806	(3,974)
Commissioned grants services	2,938	6,173	6,153	(20)
Commissioned grants services NRPF	171	-	945	945
London Funders Group	60	60	60	-
Improvement and Efficiency work	75	182	125	(57)
YPES Regional/Provider Activities	13	50	50	-
Challenge Implementation Fund	130	452	452	-
Commissioning and Research	80	542	424	(118)
Total Expenditure	185,754	381,464	376,948	(4,516)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(173,431)	(353,910)	(350,057)	3,853
Borough contribution towards grant payments	(3,087)	(6,173)	(6,173)	-
Borough contribution towards YPES payments	(180)	(180)	(180)	-
Income for direct services	(4,012)	(10,626)	(9,604)	1,022
Core Member Subscriptions	(2,872)	(5,744)	(5,744)	-
Borough contribution towards LCP payments	(341)	(496)	(341)	155
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(9)	(75)	(18)	57
Other Income	(91)	(487)	(263)	224
Central Recharges	(1,126)	(2,251)	(2,251)	-
Transfer from Reserves	-	(1,522)	(2,642)	(1,120)
Total Income	(185,149)	(381,464)	(377,273)	4,191
Net Expenditure	605	-	(325)	(325)
Applied to Funding Streams				
Grants Committee	51	-	(31)	(31)
Transport and Environment Committee	714	-	(200)	(200)
Joint Committee Functions	(160)	-	(94)	(94)
Net Expenditure	605	-	(325)	(325)

Revenue Forecast Position as at 30 September 2020 – Grants Committee

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

Table 2 – Summary Forecast – Grants Committee

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	114	257	248	(9)
S.48 Staff Exit costs	15	-	15	15
Running Costs	9	19	19	-
Central Recharges	80	159	159	-
Total Operating Expenditure	218	435	441	6
S.48 Commissioned services	2,938	6,173	6,153	(20)
S.48 Commissioned services - NRPF	171	-	945	945
London Funders Group	-	60	60	-
Total Expenditure	3,387	6,668	7,599	931
Income				
Borough contributions towards commissioned services	(3,087)	(6,173)	(6,173)	-
Borough contributions towards the administration of commissions	(248)	(495)	(495)	-
Interest on Investments	(1)	-	(2)	(2)
Other Income	-	-	-	-
Transfer from Reserves	-	-	(960)	(960)
Total Income	(3,336)	(6,668)	(7,630)	(962)
Net Expenditure	51	-	(31)	(31)

6. The projected deficit of £31,000 will be monitored throughout the year however factors that impact on the overall net expenditure to budget which is explored in more detail in the narrative below, is broadly split between the following:
- A projected underspend of £20,282 in respect of 2020/21 S.48 borough funded commissioned services which relates to Tender Education;
 - A £9,000 underspend on S.48 salary costs, which recognises a saving against the maternity budget;
 - Expenditure in relation S.48 ESF staff exit payments of £15,000. The programme completed in 2019/20 and these were previously unbudgeted but are fully funded by unspent S.48 ESF grant held in reserves;
 - Members agreed that unspent S.48 ESF grant is to be utilised for priority 1 & 2 providers to support advice around No Recourse for Public Funds (NRPF). It is forecasted that £945,000 will be paid to providers in 2020/21;
 - Expenditure in relation to the above NRPF payments will be transferred from S.48 ESF reserves held by the Grants Committee; and

- An additional sum of £2,000 from investment income is forecasted to be received on Committee reserves, not previously budgeted for.

Revenue Forecast Position as at 30 September 2020 – Transport and Environment Committee

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

Table 3 – Summary Forecast – Transport and Environment Committee

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000
Employee Costs	362	757	818	61
Running Costs	67	253	203	(50)
Central Recharges	243	486	528	42
Total Operating Expenditure	671	1,496	1,549	53
Direct Services	4,247	9,959	9,038	(921)
Research	0	40	35	(5)
Payments in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	173,228	353,780	349,806	(3,974)
Total Expenditure	178,146	365,275	360,428	(4,847)
Income				
Contributions in respect of Freedom Pass and Taxicard	(173,433)	(353,910)	(350,057)	3,853
Income for direct services	(3,911)	(10,525)	(9,503)	1,022
Core Member Subscriptions	(49)	(97)	(97)	-
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(2)	-	(5)	(5)
Other Income	(38)	(73)	(136)	(63)
Transfer from Reserves	0	(670)	(830)	(160)
Total Income	(177,432)	(365,275)	(360,628)	4,647
Net Expenditure	714	-	(200)	(200)

8. The projected surplus of £200,000 is made up broadly of the following:

- A projected overall deficit of £45,000 in respect of TEC parking traded services, after considering an estimate of the level of borough/TfL/GLA usage volumes during the first half of the year. The level of appeals heard has dramatically reduced compared to prior years due to the nationwide COVID-19 lockdown. This has had a significant impact on the level of income and expenditure within traded services. Some level of recovery has been built into the forecasted figures. The variance is attributable to several areas:

- Firstly, there is a projected net surplus of £67,000 in respect of environmental and traffic appeals. This is made up of a reduction in appeals income of £273,000 less net reduction in costs against budget of £340,000 on Northgate unit charges and adjudicator fees. As stated above the estimated number of notice of appeals and statutory declarations received over the first three months was impacted upon by the lockdown. Further analysis of the full year forecasted appeals will be reported at the 6 monthly forecast report, when more accurate data is available.
 - Secondly, the transaction volumes for other parking systems used by boroughs and TfL over the first half of the year are projected to result in a net deficit of £135,000.
 - Finally, the other Northgate fixed costs i.e. excluding the above, are forecasted to underspend by £23,000, which reflects a lower than anticipated inflation factor applied to the annual contract increase compared to when the budget was set along with a reduction on RUCA.
- An underspend of £137,000 on the cost of administering the Hearing Centre at Chancery Exchange where the above appeals are heard. This is largely as a result of an additional £100,000 being included in the approved budget in anticipation of a rent increase in accordance with the lease. Following completion of a rent review a new lease was signed at no increase in cost.
 - There is a forecasted overspend on non-operational staffing costs and central recharges of approximately £61,000 and £42,000 respectively, which is in part due to the impact of additional Environmental Policy officers funded by TEC reserves and TfL less other general savings.
 - An underspend of £50,000 on general running costs as a result of a number of small variances across many budgets.

- The level of trips made in the claims submitted by the independent bus operators has been severely impacted upon by the COVID-19 lockdown. A recovery scenario has been built into the forecast however, the anticipated annual expenditure is forecast to be £975,000 compared to an annual budget of £1.3 million, a projected reduction of £325,000. A detailed review of the claims received over the coming months will indicate more accurate levels and the true position of any increase of trips following lockdown which may impact this variance.
- A projected underspend of £172,000 in respect of the £1.518 million budget for the issuing/reissuing costs of Freedom Passes. This however is based on invoices received in the early part of the year so may fluctuate as the year progresses. This budget will therefore be monitored and managed throughout the financial year.
- Based on income collected during the first half of the year, income receipts from replacement Freedom Passes have been severely impacted by the lockdown. Of the £750,000 annual budget, forecasted receipts are anticipated to be reduced by approximately £345,000 net of bank charges. Due to level of uncertainty in the current climate it is likely that this variance will fluctuate throughout the year.
- Charges are currently not being enforced for replacement Taxicards. This has resulted in reduction against the income budget of £18,000
- Enforcement of the London Lorry Control Scheme ceased during the period from 17 March 2020 to 15 June 2020 in order to ease pressures during the lockdown. The number of PCNs issued have returned to normal levels since; however, the impact of the first quarter has resulted in a projected reduction of income of approximately £250,000 against an annual budget of £1 million;
- Additional income from TfL of £63,000 and transfer from reserves of £160,000 to funded additional Environment Policy officers as previously agreed by members; and

- A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £5,000 not previously budgeted for.

Revenue Forecast Position as at 30 September 2020 – Joint Committee Core Functions

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

Table 4 – Summary Forecast – Joint Committee core functions

	M6 Actual	Budget	Forecast	Variance
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Expenditure				
Employee Costs	2,322	4,833	4,779	(54)
Running Costs	1,528	3,352	2,976	(376)
Central Recharges	75	150	150	-
Total Operating Expenditure	3,925	8,335	7,905	(430)
Direct Services	-	-	-	-
Commissioning and Research	80	502	389	(113)
Improvement and Efficiency work	75	182	125	(57)
YPES Regional/Provider Activities	13	50	50	-
Challenge Implementation Fund	130	452	452	-
Total Expenditure	4,223	9,521	8,921	(600)
Income				
Income for direct services	(101)	(101)	(101)	-
Core Member Subscriptions	(2,576)	(5,152)	(5,152)	-
Borough contribution towards YPES payments	(180)	(180)	(180)	-
Borough contribution towards LCP payments	(341)	(496)	(341)	155
Government Grants	-	-	-	-
Interest on Investments	(6)	(75)	(11)	64
Other Income	(53)	(414)	(127)	287
Central Recharges	(1,126)	(2,251)	(2,251)	-
Transfer from Reserves	-	(852)	(852)	-
Total Income	(4,383)	(9,521)	(9,015)	506
Net Expenditure/(Income)	(160)	-	(94)	(94)

10. There is a projected surplus of £94,000 forecasted in respect of the joint committee core functions. Employee costs are projected to underspend by £54,000, primarily due to deferring recruitment to certain vacant posts, time lag during recruitment campaigns or an underspend on the maternity budget provision.

11. There is an anticipated underspend of £376,000 in running costs against an annual budget of £3.352 million. Whilst this projected underspend is spread across several

budgets, the COVID-19 lockdown has particularly impacted upon the levels of expenditure. Savings on general office running costs and supplies and services of approximately £180,000 are anticipated, some in relation to London Care Placements, therefore matching a reduction in income (paragraph 16), along with a reduction in meeting support costs of £15,000 as a result of being unable to host external meetings, which has led to a projected reduction in income as detailed in paragraph 14.

12. Whilst transactions processed during the first half of the year suggest an underspend of £57,000 in respect of the improvement and efficiency budget, this is an area which will be subject to developing proposals throughout the year. Similarly, the commissioning budget is currently forecasted to be underspent by £113,000. There is relatively low expenditure in the first half of the year; however, it is anticipated that this budget will be called upon to support work assisting boroughs in respect of COVID-19 pandemic response and recovery work. Members will be advised throughout the year on how expenditure against this budget is developing.
13. A forecasted amount of interest on investments of £11,000 which is £64,000 below the approved budget largely as a result of historically low interest rates.
14. Other income is forecasted to be £287,000 less than budget for the year. This budget line has been seriously impacted upon by the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown. It is estimated that £170,000 for rental income from leasing out of vacant office space at Southwark Street will not be realised. Receipts in relation to room bookings, where external organisations hire out London Councils' meetings rooms, are forecasted to be nil against a budget of £100,000. However, this is netted off against other savings such as general support costs of £15,000 as noted above in paragraph 11.
15. The 2019/20 unspent Challenge Implementation Fund budget has been rolled forward in to 2020/21, as approved by members in June. As the agile and other building works at Southwark Street continue, it is anticipated that this budget will be fully utilised during the year.
16. There is a forecasted deficit on income in respect of London Care Placements (LCP) of £156,000. This is a result of some boroughs opting out of the scheme. However, the

remaining income is at a level which covers the full LCP costs and with prior year surpluses being held there is a low risk of the service not remaining self-funding. The reduction in income is also matched to savings on expenditure such as running costs noted in paragraph 11.

Externally Funded Projects

17. The externally funded projects are estimated to have matched income and expenditure of just over £4 million for 2020/21, including funding for the borough (non-S.48) ESF programme and the London Office of Technology and Innovation (LOTI). This is based on a review of the indicative budget plans held at London Councils by the designated project officers, which confirms that there is no projected net cost to London Councils for running these projects during 2020/21; any underspend on the external funds received will be carried forward to be utilised in the next financial year. A fuller picture of transactions relating to these activities will be included in the Month 9 forecast report to be present to the February Executive meeting.

Reserves

18. The projected uncommitted reserves as at 31 March 2021 are estimated to be £10.440 million and are explored in more detail in paragraphs 51 to 59 of the draft proposed revenue budget 2021/22 report elsewhere on this meeting agenda.

Conclusions

19. This report highlights the projected outturn position for the current year, based on transactions undertaken up until 30 September 2020 (month 6), together with known future developments. At this point, a forecast underspend of £325,000 is projected for 2020/21 across the three funding streams. Uncommitted reserves are currently projected to be just over £10.4 million by the end of the current financial year.

20. The next forecast will be presented to the Executive in February, which will highlight the projected position at the three-quarter year stage of the 2020/21 financial year.

Recommendations

21. The Executive is asked to note the overall forecast surplus as at 30 September 2020 (Month 6) of £325,000 and note the position on reserves as detailed in paragraphs 19.

Financial Implications for London Councils

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

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

None

Background Papers

London Councils Revenue Forecast File 2020/21

Executive

Proposed Revenue Budget and Borough Subscriptions and Charges 2021/22

Item 9

Report by: Frank Smith **Job title:** Director of Corporate Resources
Date: 10 November 2020
Contact Officer: Frank Smith
Telephone: 020 7934 9700 **Email:** frank.smith@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This report proposes the level of boroughs subscriptions and charges to be levied in 2021/22, together with the consolidated revenue income and expenditure budget for 2021/22. The report also updates the Executive on the current level of London Councils reserves after considering all current and proposed commitments and the timetable for the overall budget approval process. Following consideration by this meeting, proposals will be submitted to the Leaders' Committee meeting on 8 December for final consideration and approval.

Recommendations The Executive is asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee approve at their meeting on 8 December 2020 the following borough subscription and charges:

- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for boroughs of £161,958 per borough for 2021/22, no change on the charge of £161,958 for 2020/21 (paragraph 14);
- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for MOPAC of £15,410 for 2021/22, no change on the charge of £15,410 for 2020/21 (paragraph 15);
- An overall level of expenditure of £6.668 million for the Grants Scheme in 2021/22, no change from 2020/21; and
- Borough contributions for 2021/22 to fully cover the scheme of £6.668 million, the same level as for 2020/21 (paragraphs 16-18).

The Executive is also asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee endorse the following subscription and charges for 2021/22 for TEC, which will be considered by the TEC Executive Sub-Committee on 19 November, before being presented to the main meeting of TEC on 10 December for final approval:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2020/21 - £1,500) (paragraph 19);
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which is covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2020/21 – no charge) (paragraph 21);
- The net Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2019/20 - £338,000); (paragraph 22);
- No charge to boroughs and TfL in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2020/21 – no charge) (paragraph 23);
- The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3596 per PCN, which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the number of PCNs issued in 2019/20 (2020/21 - £0.3708 per PCN; paragraphs 26-27);
- The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £27.84 per appeal or £24.06 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2020/21 - £27.35/£23.63 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £22.15 for hard copy submissions and £21.40 for electronic submissions (2020/21 - £21.78/£21.04 per SD) (paragraphs 28-29);
- Congestion Charging Appeals including the ULEZ scheme – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, as for 2020/21, under the current contract arrangement with the GLA (paragraph 30);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2020/21 - £7.53) (paragraphs 31-33);
- The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which is levied in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2020/21 - £15.23) (paragraphs 31-33); and
- The TEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2020/21 - £0.175) (paragraphs 31-33).

Based on the above proposed level of subscriptions and charges, the Executive is asked to recommend to the Leaders' Committee:

- The provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for 2021/22 for London Councils of £341.317 million, as per Table 4 at paragraph 34 and Appendix A of this report;
- The provisional consolidated revenue income budget for 2021/22 for London Councils of £339.787 million, also as per Table 4 at paragraph 34 and Appendix B;

- Within the total income requirement, the use of London Councils reserves of £1.530 million in 2021/22, as detailed in paragraph 53.

The Executive is also asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee note:

- The position in respect of forecast uncommitted London Councils reserves as at 31 March 2021, as detailed at paragraphs 51-59; and
 - The positive statement on the adequacy of the residual London Councils reserves issued by the Director of Corporate Resources, as detailed in paragraphs 58-59.
-

Introduction

1. This paper outlines the background and context to setting the London Councils budget for 2021/22 and sets out a proposed approach. It reflects the impact of several budgetary pressures that will impact on 2021/22, which are highlighted in detail at paragraph 6.
2. The on-going national COVID crisis is significantly impacting the finances of all London Councils member boroughs. The crisis is having a less dramatic impact on London Councils finances, although effects will be felt in both the current financial year and into 2021/22. Forecasts for the current year (2020/21) indicate that whilst overall levels of London Councils expenditure are being managed within the overall approved budgetary provision, certain income targets are unlikely to be met for both the Joint Committee and the Transport and Environment Committee. The Month 6 forecast position reported to the Executive in a separate report on this agenda projects a small overall surplus of £325,000 and highlights the specific areas of concern.
3. The COVID crisis has also delayed the development of the Southwark Street building into a more agile and contemporary working environment. Whilst the extension of agile working arrangements has been completed, the approved wider building improvements are now not likely to be fully completed until February 2022, compared to the estimated original completion date of March 2021 pre-COVID.
4. In terms of budget strategy, the delays highlighted above have impacted on previously agreed plans to seek/attract new income paying tenants to Southwark Street to occupy significant office space released on both the ground and 4th floors through the extension of agile working. This rental income was projected to accrue an estimated £250k in the current year (2020/21), rising to £550k by 2023/24, which would progressively reduce the annual amounts requiring transfer from uncommitted Joint Committee reserves to balance the Joint Committee budget over this period. This strategy would allow borough subscription to be held at the

current level. Apart from the continued occupation of LOTI, no additional tenants have been sourced in the current year.

5. Whilst efforts to explore the potential for suitable tenants can be taken forward as the office space is now technically available, the effect of COVID on the Central London commercial rental sector is likely to make this a very challenging task. In addition, it would seem increasingly unlikely that any income will be yielded in respect of the hire of meeting rooms in the current year (annual budget target £100k) and could be further compromised into 2021/22.

Budgetary pressures

6. Amongst the backdrop of the current unprecedented circumstances, traditional budget pressures prevail to increase future expenditure levels. Specifically, these include:
 - A necessary increase to the 2021/22 base budget to cover a deficit arising from the increased employers pension contribution of 1.6%, effective from 1 April 2020, and the additional 0.75% agreed pay award for 2020/21 (2% provided in budget, 2.75% settled). This in-year budget deficit equates to approximately £166,000 across all committees' salary budgets.
 - A further estimated 2% increase in pay and price movements for 2021/22.
 - The ending of, and funding for, certain functions during 2020/21 such as the borough ESF programme and Capital Ambition activities reduces the base for allocating centrally incurred costs, with these costs now needing to be reallocated across all services, leading to a net loss of central recharge income to the Joint Committee.
 - Slippage and increased costs in respect of the wider building works will mean that the increased depreciation charge relating to the capital spend will be spread over a reduced time-period up until the expiry of the current lease in March 2026.

Summary Budget Outlook

7. For the current year, the Leaders' Committee and TEC approved the total use of uncommitted general reserves of £979k (£400k and £579k respectively) to balance the budget. In addition, TEC subsequently approved the transfer of resources from its special projects specific reserve to fund the climate change/EV/car club policy work in 2020/21, which is estimated to amount to £160k. These decision were taken, however, against the pre-COVID backdrop of a budget strategy that envisaged the more effective use of the Southwark Street building, which, as referenced in paragraph 4, was intended to reduce the take from uncommitted Joint Committee reserves in the period up until 2023/24 and move towards delivering a balanced budget, with the only on-going commitment from Joint Committee reserves being the annual sum of £100,000 earmarked by members to support collaborative work on the health agenda.
8. London Councils has, of course, made significant savings since 2011/12. If the proposals outlined in this report are agreed by the Leaders' Committee in December, these savings will amount to £65.4 million, with a further £183.7 million of savings related to payments to commissions made by the Grants Committee. Overall savings through this period equate to £7.5 million per borough. In addition, London Councils has contained all inflationary pressures since 2011 within existing subscription levels, including absorbing 12.5% of total salary costs as a result of pay awards since that time.
9. This report, therefore, proposes the level of borough subscriptions and charges to be levied in 2021/22, together with the indicative consolidated revenue income and expenditure budget for 2021/22. The proposals include:
 - A Joint Committee core subscription of £161,958 per borough, the same level as for 2020/21;
 - A TEC parking core administration charge of £1,500 per borough, the same level as for 2020/21;

- Total S.48 grants administration costs of £435,000, equating to an average cost of £13,182 per borough, the same level as for 2020/21;
- An increase in the level of the proposed transfer from uncommitted TEC reserves of £346,000. The total sum proposed to be transferred is a maximum of £925,000 compared to £579,000 for the current year.
- An increase in the level of the proposed transfer from uncommitted Joint Committee reserves of £205,000. The total sum proposed to be transferred is a maximum of £605,000 compared to £400,000 for the current year.

10. The timetable for the approval of the budget for 2021/22 following this meeting is as follows:

- 11 November – Grants Committee considers and agrees the indicative grants budget and borough contributions for 2021/22, and makes recommendations to the Leaders' Committee meeting on 8 December for approval;
- 19 November - TEC Executive Sub-Committee considered the indicative budget and borough charges for 2021/22 and make recommendations to the main TEC Committee meeting on 10 December for approval;
- 8 December - Leaders' Committee considers this report on the indicative consolidated budget and borough charges for 2021/22 (as amended by this meeting), and a separate report seeking approval of the grants budget and borough contributions for 2021/22. This report will include the indicative budget and borough charges for TEC which the Leaders' Committee is asked to endorse; and
- 10 December – main TEC Committee – considers recommendations of TEC Executive Sub-Committee and any views arising from the Leaders' Committee and approves final budget and charges for 2021/22. The views of the Leaders' Committee will be reported orally to the main TEC meeting.

Current position on core subscriptions and other charges

11. Members are reminded that since 2010/11 (covering the ten period between 2011/12 and 2021/22):

- The Joint Committee core subscription has been reduced by £96,005 or 37%;

- The TEC core parking subscription has been reduced by £500 or 25%;
- Payments for commissioned services funded by the Grants Committee have reduced from an annual average of £754,545 per borough to £188,879, an annual average reduction of £565,667 per borough or 75%;
- Payments for the administration of commissioned services have reduced from an average of £43,333 per borough to an average of £13,182, an average reduction of £30,152 per borough or 69.6%; and
- The three main TEC administrations charges for direct services – Freedom Pass, Taxicard and Lorry Control, have reduced by between 5% and 100%.

12. A further sum of £8.7 million has been repaid to member boroughs from uncommitted reserves over the period 2011/12 to 2020/21. The total accumulated benefit to boroughs, therefore, arising from the reduction in the main borough subscriptions and from charges for direct service charges since 2010/11, plus one-off repayments to date, equates to £59.8 million, with an additional overall reduction of £165 million that relates to payments to commissions funded by the Grants Committee. The total accrued benefit to boroughs is, therefore, £224.8 million, an average of £6.8 million per borough. In addition, staffing numbers have reduced by 39% over this period.

Proposed borough subscriptions and charges

13. The following paragraphs detail the proposed borough subscriptions and charges for 2021/22.

Joint Committee Core Subscription

14. As detailed in the first bullet point of paragraph 9 above, the proposed amount to be levied on member boroughs in respect of the JC core and associated functions in 2021/22 is £161,958, the same level as for 2020/21. This includes a sum of £5,455 per borough as a contribution towards the continued funding of the YPES.

15. In line with the overall standstill position, it is proposed that the 2021/22 Joint Committee subscription for MOPAC be £15,410, the same level as for the current year.

Commissioned services funded by the Grants Committee 2021/22

16. The overall budget for commissioned services for the current year, as agreed by the Leaders' Committee in December 2019, is £6.668 million. At its meeting on 11 November 2020, the Grants Committee will be asked to agree to a S.48 borough funded grants programme of £6.668 million for 2021/22, which is the final year of the extended five-year programme of commissioned services agreed by the Leaders' Committee in March 2016, following recommendations by the Grants Committee.

17. Following consideration by the Grants Committee at its meeting on 11 November, the Leaders' Committee will be asked to approve the budget for the Grants Committee for 2021/22 as shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 1 – Indicative Grants Budget 2021/22

	2021/22 Indicative £000	2020/21 Budget £000	Variance £000
LC S.48 grants programme	6,233	6,233	-
Sub-Total	6,233	6,233	-
Grants Administration – LC S.48	435	435	-
Total expenditure	6,668	6,668	-
Financed by:			
Borough contributions to grant payment	(6,173)	(6,173)	-
Borough contributions to grants administration	(495)	(495)	-
Total borough contributions	(6,668)	(6,668)	-
Total Income	(6,668)	(6,668)	-
Transfer from Reserves	-	-	-
Net expenditure	-	-	-

18. The key features of the proposed budget in Table 1 are:

- A core, pan-London scheme of commissioned services to meet service priorities agreed by the Grants Committee of £6.233 million, which includes the membership subscriptions for boroughs for London Funders of £60,000;
- An indicative gross commissions payments budget, therefore, of £6.233 million;

- A provision for grants administration of £435,000 or 6.5% (4.0% excluding central recharges of £169,000) for the S.48 borough programme of £6.668 million, reflecting the actual cost of the current contract management and monitoring arrangements for commissions; and
- A total borough contribution of £6.668 million which will be apportioned in accordance with the ONS 2019 mid-year population data.

TEC Core Parking Subscription

19. This subscription is currently £1,500 per borough and there is little scope to reduce this minimal charge to boroughs, so, as agreed by the Leaders' Committee in November 2010, efforts continue to be concentrated on further efficiencies in the overhead cost for TEC direct services and systems charges, which are explored below.

TEC Direct Services

20. TEC currently provides three direct services on behalf of boroughs, one of which is also provided to TfL, which are recouped by an annual administration fee – the Freedom Pass, Taxicard and the London Lorry Control Scheme (LLCS). In overall terms, a sum of £338,000 needs to be recouped from boroughs in 2021/22, the same as for the current year. The proposed level of charge for each direct service, compared to those for the current year are detailed in Table 2 below:

Table 2 – Proposed TEC Direct Services Administration Charge 2021/22

Charge	Basis	2021/22 (£)	2020/21 (£)	Variance (£)	%
Freedom Pass	Per borough	Nil	Nil	-	-
Taxicard	Total	338,000	338,000	-	-
Lorry Control	Average	Nil	Nil	-	-

21. The **administration of the Freedom Pass** covers London Councils costs in negotiating the annual settlements and managing the relationships with transport operators and other contractors. After considering the overall income requirement for TEC, the proposed charge for 2021/22 remains at zero per borough, as the cost of administering the scheme continues to be met from income collected in

respect of lost and damaged freedom passes. This position is reviewed on an ongoing basis particularly considering the current pressures on this income budget (paragraph 43) to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the costs of administering the scheme.

22. The **administration of the Taxicard Scheme** covers London Councils costs in processing and issuing passes to members and managing the relationships with various contractors. After considering the overall income requirement for TEC, the proposed net cost to be charged to boroughs in 2021/22 is £338,000, no change on the total charge for 2019/20. This proposal includes the use of uncommitted TEC reserves of £118,000 to maintain the unit charge at this level. The active Taxicard total membership as at 30 September 2020 is 58,534, compared to 64,552 as at 30 September 2019, a decrease of 6,018, or 9.3% this is a result of officers carrying out a review of members to establish if they are still active and less members joining since the nationwide lockdown. The decrease in the spreading base and the recommended use of reserves of £118,000 has increased the underlying subsidised unit cost of a scheme member from £5.24 to £5.78 per member.

23. The **Lorry Control administration charge** total charge is calculated in the same manner as the Freedom Pass and taxicard administration charge, although it is apportioned to boroughs in accordance with the ONS mid-year population figures for, in the case of 2021/22, June 2019. The total cost of administering the scheme is estimated to be £769,704 in 2021/22, compared to £754,773 in 2020/21. This figure includes a sum of £50,000 that has been retained in anticipation of further development of the scheme in 2021/22. After consideration of projected income of £1 million from the enforcement of the scheme, it is proposed that there will be no borough or TfL contribution in 2021/22, as for the current year. Again, this position will be reviewed annually to ensure forecast income streams continue to cover the costs of administering the scheme.

TEC Traded Services

24. A further range of services provided by TEC relate to various parking and traffic activities, primarily the London Tribunals (LT). A unit charge for each of these 'traded' services is made to the users, which covers the marginal costs of these services. The volumes of these transactions are solely generated by each borough; London Councils has no influence on the levels generated. In addition, an amount apportioned by the number of PCNs issued by each borough and TfL, covers the fixed costs of the parking related services - principally the LT- covering the actual cost of the appeals hearing centre and the fixed cost of the parking managed services contract.

25. The proposed level of charge for each traded service, compared to those for the current year is detailed in Table 3 below:

Table 3 – Proposed TEC Traded Services Unit Charges 2021/22

Charge	2021/22 (£)	2020/21 (£)	Variance (£)	%
Parking Enforcement Service Charge (total charge)	0.3596	0.3708	(0.011)	(3.0)
Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) Appeals (Hard Copy)	27.84	27.35	0.49	1.79
ETA Appeals (Electronic)	24.06	23.63	0.43	1.80
ETA Statutory Declarations (Hard Copy)	22.15	21.78	0.37	1.70
ETA Statutory Declarations (Electronic)	21.40	21.04	0.36	1.72
TRACE Electronic	7.53	7.53	-	-
TRACE Fax	7.70	7.70	-	-
TEC	0.175	0.175	-	-

26. The **Parking Enforcement Service Charge** is allocated to users in accordance with the number of PCNs issued. For 2021/22, expenditure of £3.060 million needs to be recouped, compared to £3.084 million for 2020/21; a decrease of £24,000. The decrease is largely due to a reduction in the budgeted leaseholder costs.

27. After top-slicing the amount for the estimated fixed costs of £835,798 attributable to the contract with the GLA/TfL in respect of road user charging appeals (RUCA) and ULEZ, a total of £2.225 million remains to be apportioned through the 6.187 million PCN's issued by boroughs and TfL in 2019/20 in respect of parking, bus

lane and moving traffic offences, compared to 5.958 million issued in 2018/19. The increase in the number of PCNs issued over the two comparative years increases the cost spreading base, which together with a reduction in the total costs of the London Tribunal attributable to ETA appeals, leads to a marginal reduction in the actual unit charge to boroughs and TfL of £0.011 per PCN, or 3%, from £0.3708 to £0.3596 per PCN for 2021/22. In addition, under the terms of the contract with Northgate, there is a separate fixed cost identified in respect of the borough use of the TRACE and TEC systems. For 2020/21, this sum was £95,000 and is estimated to increase to £97,000 in 2021/22. This sum will be apportioned to boroughs in accordance with volumes of transaction generated on each system by users.

28. The estimated volume of Environment and Traffic Adjudicators (ETA) appeals for 2021/22, based on actual volumes to date in 2019/20, is 43,995, compared to the budgeted figure of 44,722 for the current year. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on appeal numbers in the current year, the 2019/20 actual number of appeals was used as the base budget.
29. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic the most accurate information on the throughput of appeals is the full 2019/20 year where 3.79 appeals were heard per hour, compared to 3.78 appeals per hour when the current year's budget was set in December 2019. This average figure takes account of all adjudicator time spent on postal and personal appeal hearing and also non-appeal 'duty adjudicator' activities. The slight increase in throughput is attributable to continued system and service improvements that now feed through into the processing figures. Based on this forecast figure, it is proposed that the indicative hard copy unit ETA appeal cost for 2021/22 is £27.35, an increase of £0.49 or 1.79% on the charge of £27.35 for 2020/21. For appeals where electronic evidence is provided by an enforcing authority, it is proposed that the unit cost will increase by £0.43 or 1.80% to £24.06. The lower charge to boroughs recognises the reduced charge from the contractor for processing electronic appeals, demonstrating that there remains a clear financial incentive for boroughs to move towards submitting electronic evidence under the current contract arrangements. As for 2021/22, boroughs will

pay a differential charge for the processing of ETA statutory declarations. For hard copy statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £22.15 compared to the charge of £21.78 for the current year, which represents an increase of £0.37, or 1.70%. For electronic statutory declarations, the proposed unit charge will be £21.40, an increase of £0.36, or 1.72% on the electronic appeal unit charge of £21.04 for the current year.

30. For RUCA Appeals, the estimated volume of appeals for 2021/22, based on 2019/20 actual volumes and taking in to account the extension of the scheme to weekends and evening charging is 19,478, compared to 20,784 for the current year. The original estimate for 2020/21 incorporated an estimate for the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) scheme which came in to force in April 2019 therefore there was a level of uncertainty around appeal levels, which for 2021/22 is compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic. Under the terms of the contract, TfL/GLA will reimburse London Councils on a cost-recovery basis for the variable cost of RUCA appeals, ensuring that a break even position continues in respect of these variable transactions. The rechargeable level of fixed costs associated with this contract is £836,000 for 2021/22; a decrease of £40,000 on the 2020/21 budgeted level of £875,000, due to the net impact of forecasted costs increases and a reduction in estimated leaseholder costs.

31. In respect of **all other parking traded services**, the variable charges form part of the parking managed service contract provided by the contractor, Northgate, the volumes of which are again not controlled by London Councils; the individual boroughs are responsible for using such facilities. The volumes are based on those currently being processed by the contractor and are recharged to the boroughs, TfL and the GLA as part of the unit cost charge. Again, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, 2019/20 actual transactions have been used as the basis for setting the 2021/22 budget which are perceived to be a more accurate reflection of potential caseloads. Trends suggest that transaction volumes appear to be reducing for the use of the TRACE electronic systems but are increasing for the use of the TEC system.

32. The estimated increase in expenditure between 2020/21 and 2021/22 based on the actual transaction volumes for 2019/20 and estimated movement in contract prices is £5,813. The corresponding estimated effect on income, between 2020/21 and 2021/22, based on the 2019/20 actual transaction volumes is an increase of £4,452, leading to a net overall decrease in budgeted income of £1,361.

33. The charging structure historically approved by TEC for the provision of the variable parking services (excluding appeals) includes a contribution to overheads in each of the charges made to boroughs and other users for these services.

Proposed revenue budget for 2021/22

34. Based on the proposed level of subscription and charges, as detailed in paragraphs 13-33 above, the proposed revenue budget position for 2021/22, is summarised in Table 4 below. A detailed breakdown of proposed expenditure and income is shown at Appendices A and B to this report.

Table 4 – Proposed revenue budget 2021/22

	Joint Committee	Grants Committee	TEC	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Indicative Expenditure	9,227	6,499	324,699	340,425
Central Recharges	156	169	567	892
Total Expenditure	9,383	6,668	325,266	341,317
Indicative Income	(6,575)	(6,668)	(324,341)	(337,584)
Central Recharges	(2,203)	-	-	(2,203)
Sub-total	(8,778)	(6,668)	(324,341)	(339,787)
Use of Reserves	(605)	-	(925)	(1,530)
Total Income	(9,383)	(6,668)	(325,266)	(341,317)
Indicative Net Position	-	-	-	-

35. The detailed breakdown of the proposed budgets for the Joint Committee, Grants Committee and TEC funding streams for 2021/22 is outlined in paragraphs 36-49 below.

Grants Committee

36. The provisional position for the Grants Committee for 2021/22 is as follows:

Table 5 – Indicative Grants Committee budget movements for 2020/21

	£000
Expenditure:	
Revised budget 2020/21	6,668
Proposed budget 2020/21	6,668
Budget Movement	-
Income	
Revised budget 2019/20	(6,668)
Proposed budget 2020/21	(6,668)
Budget Movement	-
Net Budget Movement	-

Transport and Environment Committee

37. Excluding the position for the payments to transport operators in respect of the Freedom Pass and Taxicard, which are dealt with in paragraphs 39-47 below, the provisional position for TEC for 2021/22 is detailed in Table 6 below:

Table 6 – Indicative TEC budget movements for 2021/22

Expenditure:	£000
Revised budget 2020/201	14,008
Proposed budget 2021/22	14,291
Budget Movement	283
Income	
Revised budget 2020/21	(14,008)
Proposed budget 2021/22	(14,291)
Budget Movement	(283)
Net Budget Movement	-
Developments – expenditure:	
Increase in Freedom Pass administration	15
Increase in Taxicard administration	17
Increase in Lorry Control administration	15
Decrease in London Tribunals administration	(48)
Increase in Health Emergency Badge administration	1
Increase in non-operational staffing costs	62
Volumes changes – Adjudicators fees	14
Volume changes – Northgate variable costs	(1)
Other running costs	2
Increase in payments between committees	84
Increase in central recharges not included in Direct Services	81
Sub-Total	242
Inflation:	
Salary costs	16

Northgate contract costs	25
Other	-
Budget Movement on expenditure	283
Developments – income:	
Reduction in income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	150
London Lorry Control Scheme PCN income	-
Volumes changes – appeals income	(7)
Volume changes – other parking services income	(4)
Increase in income for Health Emergency Badges	(1)
Reduction in income for replacement Taxicards	-
Decrease in income for fixed parking costs	23
Other adjustments	-
TfL income – Environmental policy work	(98)
Proposed increase in transfer from general reserve	(346)
Budget Movement on income	(283)
Net Budget Movement	-

38. The proposals for the level of subscription and charges for TEC related services in 2021/22, which are detailed in paragraphs 21-33 above, provide the rationale for the majority of the budget movements detailed in Table 6.

Freedom Pass

39. The main settlement with TfL for concessionary travel on its service is estimated to be £281.656 million, representing a provisional reduction of £37.107 million, or 11.64%, on the figure of £318.763 million for 2020/21. The reduction is significant and represents estimates considering the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

40. The Rail Delivery Group (RDG) settlement is still being negotiated. Early estimates are for a reduction of costs of £2.893 Million, reducing this part to £17.772 million compared to the budget of £20.665 million for the current year. However, officers are continuing to negotiate regarding the price per journey to be paid and will update TEC accordingly in December.

41. The budget for payments to other bus operators for local journeys originating in London has been reduced by £200,000 to £1.1 million, following projections for

2021/22, based on the 2019/20 outturn position plus taking into consideration a wider issues such as reduced trips levels as a result of the pandemic.

42. The budget for the freedom pass issuing costs was £1.518 million for 2020/21. For 2021/22, it is proposed that the budget remains at this level, which will include the cost of an annual pass eligibility review that yields significant cost savings to boroughs.
43. For income in respect of replacement Freedom Passes, current trends indicate that income is significantly behind the current year budget of £750,000. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact a bulk renewal process was undertaken in 2020, it is anticipated that fewer replacement cards will be issued. The 2021/22 income budget is being reduced to £600,000 and there is no proposed change to the unit cost of £12 for a replacement pass. As stated in paragraph 20, it is proposed that the in-house cost of administering the Freedom Pass scheme will be fully funded by this income stream in 2021/22.
44. As agreed by TEC in December 2014, any annual surplus arising from both the freedom pass issuing costs budget of £1.518 million (paragraph 42 above) and replacement freedom passes income budget of £600,000 (paragraph 43 above) will be transferred to a specific reserves to accumulate funds to offset the cost of future major pass reissue exercises. As detailed in Table 9 at paragraph 51, the current balance on the specific reserve is £2.741 million, £1.241 million of which relates to Freedom Pass.
45. Final negotiations on the actual amounts payable to operators will be completed in time for the meetings of the Leaders' Committee on 8 December and the main TEC Committee on 10 December; any late variations to these provisional figures will be tabled at these meetings.
46. A summary of the provisional freedom pass costs for 2021/22, compared to the current year, can be summarised in Table 7 below. The total cost of the scheme is fully funded by boroughs and the estimated cost payable by boroughs in 2021/22

is £302.046 million, compared to £342.246 million payable for 2020/21. This represents a reduction of £40.2 million or 11.75% which reflects significant reductions in anticipated usage of the schemes due to the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 7 – Comparative cost of Freedom Pass 2021/22 and 2020/21

Estimated Cost of Freedom Pass	2021/22(£000)	2020/21(£000)
TfL Settlement	281,656	318,763
RDG Settlement	17,772	20,665
Non TfL Bus Operators Settlement	1,100	1,300
Freedom Pass Issue Costs	1,518	1,518
Total Cost	302,046	342,246

Taxicard

47. it is assumed that TfL will provide an estimated fixed contribution of £8.859 million, no change in the figure for 2020/21. The total borough contribution towards the Taxicard scheme in 2021/22 is estimated to be £1.588 million, the same as for the current year, although the decision on boroughs' contributions is a matter for boroughs to take individually and will be confirmed in February 2021. The indicative budgetary provision for the taxicard trips contract with CityFleet Networks Limited, will, therefore, be an amalgam of the TFL and borough funding, currently equating to £10.447 million for 2021/22, the same figure as for the current year. However, several factors such as usage of the scheme particularly considering the COVID-19 pandemic could influence the final outturn position for 2021/22.

Joint Committee

48. The provisional position for the Joint Committee for 2021/22 is as follows:

Table 8 – Indicative Joint Committee budget movements for 2020/21

	£000
Expenditure:	
Revised budget 2020/21	9,069
Proposed budget 2021/22	9,383
Budget Movement	314
Income	
Revised budget 2020/21	(9,069)
Proposed budget 2021/22	(9,383)

Budget Movement	(314)
Net Budget Movement	-
Developments - expenditure:	
Increase in net salary costs	204
Decrease in City of London SLAs	(20)
Decrease in depreciation provision	(9)
Net increase in Southwark Street premises related costs	9
Increase in Supplies and Services	14
Increase in Central Recharges	6
Sub-total	204
Inflation	
Salary costs	100
Other	10
Budget Movement on expenditure	314
Developments - income:	
Decrease in LFC subscription	16
Increase in use of reserves	(205)
Net Increase in income from tenants and funded groups and central recharges	(67)
Decrease in Investment income	10
Transfer between committees - TEC	(68)
Total	(314)
Net Budget Movement	-

49. The key elements included within the net budget movement are detailed below:

- **Increase in salary cost** - this covers the following salary related costs of the Joint Committee:
 - An estimated 2% pay award for 2021/22, which is subject to negotiations, will add £100,000 to total salary costs included members allowances;
 - In addition, staff salary progression through the approved staff structure plus other changes to specific posts and roles amounts to a net additional £44,000 in the JC salaries budget for 2021/22;
 - A necessary increase to the 2021/22 base budget to cover a deficit arising from the increased employers pension contribution of 1.6%,

effective from 1 April 2020, and the additional 0.75% agreed pay award for 2020/21 (2% provided in budget, 2.75% settled) totalling £92,000

- Finally, costs associated with additional environmental policy work, which are funded by TEC, of £68,000.

- **Depreciation charge** – There have been delays to the planned capital expenditure building works at Southwark Street during 2020/21. As a result, there is a net reduction of £9,000 depreciation charge in 2021/22;
- **Reduction in City of London SLA costs** – A reduction to the SLA costs of £20,000 as a result of previously assumed inflationary increases not being applied.
- **Increase in Southwark Street premises costs** – Marginal inflationary increases to premises costs of £9,000;
- **Additional Supplies and Services** – Small inflationary increases to supplies and services totalling £14,000;
- **Central Recharge expenditure** – An increase of central recharges costs within the joint committee due to annual movement of costs being recharge.
- **Decrease in London Fire Commissioner subscription** – London Councils is no longer in receipt a subscription from the LFC.
- **Increase in proposed use of reserves** – the proposed transfer from Joint Committee reserves for 2021/22 is £605,000, a £205,000 increase on the figure of £400,000 for the current year. As stated in paragraph 4, rental income was projected to accrue an estimated £250k in the current year (2020/21), rising to £550k by 2023/24, which would progressively reduce the annual amounts requiring transfer from uncommitted Joint Committee reserves to balance the budget over this period. Delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in no additional tenants in the current year therefore this, coupled with pressures on income and general inflationary cost increases, such as staffing costs as set out

in paragraph 8, has resulted in an increased reliance on uncommitted reserves. As with boroughs, there has been a significant increase in the flexible deployment of resource during the pandemic to try and meet the needs of supporting member councils and working with wider London partners in response. These steps have been previously reported to members and there continues to be a high degree of turbulence in the nature of tasks that need to be undertaken separate from that originally envisaged. In time, it will be necessary to consider what lasting impact these developments will have on the base of ongoing activity and what the medium term impact of that will be in terms of future budget decisions. In the current phase of activity, however, it has not been possible to do that reliably and to engage in a broader debate with members and councils about the impact of that on London Councils service to member boroughs.

- **Net Increase in income from tenants, funded groups and central recharges**
– Net income from funded groups and central recharges across the committees has resulted in a small increase of £67,000 largely due to additional policy posts being funded by TEC and the spreading of central costs which have increased in line with inflation.
- **Decrease in Investment Income** – A reduction in investment income receivable to reflect the reduced interest rates being achieved on cash balances.
- **Transfer between committees (TEC)** – Income for specific Environment Policy work to be funded from TEC as agreed by TEC members in 2019.

Externally Funded Projects

50. In addition to the proposed expenditure of £341.317 million for largely borough funded activity, expenditure on activities financed through external contributions is currently projected to be in excess of £4.2 million in 2021/22, with funding being received through various external sources to fully fund the projects, ensuring no cost to boroughs. Once confirmation of continued funding into 2021/22 is received

from funders over the coming months, budget plans for expenditure will be revised accordingly to ensure that they match the available funding.

Updated position on Reserves

51. The current position on the overall level of London Councils reserves is detailed in Table 9 below, which includes the forecast outturn position for the current year at the half-year stage:

Table 9 – Current Uncommitted Reserves

	Transport and Environment Committee (£000)	Joint Committee (£000)	Grants Committee (£000)	Total (£000)
General Reserve at 1 April 2020	3,889	5,573	820	10,282
Specific/ESF reserve at 1 April 2020	2,741	-	1,074	3,815
Provisional reserves at 1 April 2020	6,630	5,573	1,894	14,097
Committed in setting 2020/21 budget	(579)	(400)	-	(979)
Balances c/f into 2020/21	(91)	(452)	-	(543)
NRPF grants commitments in 2020/21	-	-	(960)	(960)
Use of TEC priority projects reserves in 2020/21	(160)	-	-	(160)
Provisional other commitments for 2021/22 -2022/23	(1,340)	-	-	(1,340)
Projected surplus/(deficit) for the year	200	94	31	325
Uncommitted reserves	4,660	4,815	965	10,440

52. The current level of commitments from reserves, as detailed in Table 9, come to £3.982 million and are detailed in full in Table 10 below:

Table 10– Current Commitments from Reserves

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Balances b/f from 2019/20	543	-	-	543
Approved transfer from JC general reserves	300	-	-	300
Approved transfer from TEC general reserves	579	-	-	579

NRPF grants funding	960	-	-	960
Support to the health transition process	100	-	-	100
TEC priority projects	160	199	1,141	1,500
Totals	2,642	199	1,141	3,982

53. After taking into account the budget proposals outlined in this report and the recommended use of reserves of £1.530 million, which is made up of previously approved resources of £199,000 for TEC priority projects included in table 10 above and £1.331 million in general reserves in Table 11, the level of uncommitted reserves reduces to £9.109 million, as detailed below:

Table 11 - Estimated Uncommitted Reserves as at 1 April 2021

	Transport and Environment Committee (£000)		Joint Committee (£000)	Grants Committee (£000)		Total (£000)
	General	Specific	General	S.48	ESF/ NRPF	
Projected uncommitted reserves (Table 10)	3,419	1,241	4,815	851	114	10,440
Proposal included in 2021/22 budget figures	(726)	-	(605)*	-	-	(1,331)
Transfer to Specific Reserves	-	-	-	-	-	-
Estimated residual uncommitted reserves	2,693	1,241	4,210	851	114	9,109

*Includes £100,000 to support the Health agenda

54. For the Grants Committee, the Grants Executive in September 2013 agreed that the level of reserves to cover the S.48 borough funded commissions (priorities 1 and 2) should be set at 3.75% of the budget, which will equate to £250,000 in respect of a proposed budget of £6.668 million for 2021/22. The forecast level of uncommitted reserves of £851,000 is, therefore, in excess of this benchmark at 12.76% of the proposed budget. In addition, residual S.48 ESF reserves of £114,000 are retained following the end of the programme following payments made in respect of No Recourse to Public Funds.

55. For TEC, uncommitted general reserves are forecasted to be £3.419 million as at 31 March 2021 and reflects the forecast surplus on general reserves of £200,000 for the current year.

56. After considering the proposed use of general TEC reserves of £925,000 in setting the 2021/22 budget (all, subject to agreement of main TEC meeting on 10 December), uncommitted general TEC reserves are forecast reduce to £2.693 million, or 18.8% of proposed operating and trading expenditure of £14.291 million. The TEC Executive Sub-Committee will be considering options for the level of uncommitted reserves in the short-term at its meeting on 19 November, with a view to making recommendations to the main TEC meeting in December.
57. For the Joint Committee functions, uncommitted general reserves are projected to be £4.210 million if the proposals in this report are approved. In a period of continuing financial constraint for London local government, and as demonstrated in the recent past, there is continued value in holding a reasonable level of reserves as a contingency. This will also facilitate a period of transition for the organisation, both in terms of the direction of travel relating to redefined priorities and pledges, the completion of the outcomes of the London Councils Challenge work and managing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.
58. Under existing CIPFA guidance, the Chief Financial Officer of an organisation is advised to make an annual statement on the adequacy of the level of an organisation's reserves. This is achieved by expressing the total level of estimated uncommitted reserves as a percentage of operating costs.
59. If the Leaders' Committee/TEC approves the use of uncommitted reserves of £1.530 million for 2021/22, as detailed in this report, residual uncommitted reserves would reduce to £9.109 million. This would represent 37.8% of total operating and trading expenditure in 2021/22 of £24.108 million. The comparable figures reported to the Executive 12 months ago was projected uncommitted reserves of £11.626 million, which equated to 49.4% of provisional operating and trading expenditure of £23.512 million for 2020/21. This position maintains the desire expressed at recent meetings of the Executive for a healthy reserves position, particularly in the current economic climate. The Director of Corporate

Resources is, therefore, content to issue a positive statement on the adequacy of the residual London Councils reserves for 2021/22.

Conclusions

60. This report proposes the level of boroughs subscriptions and charges to be levied in 2021/22, together with the consolidated revenue income and expenditure budget for 2021/22. The report also updates the Executive on the current level of London Councils reserves after considering all current and proposed commitments, plus the timetable for the overall budget approval process. Following consideration by this meeting, proposals will be submitted to the Leaders' Committee meeting on 8 December for final consideration and approval.

Summary

61. This report proposes the level of boroughs subscriptions and charges to be levied in 2021/22, together with the consolidated revenue income and expenditure budget for 2021/22.

62. The subscription and budget proposals for 2021/22 relating to the Grants Committee, as contained in this report, will be considered by the Grants Committee at its meeting on 11 November. The Grants Committee will be asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee approve the proposals as laid out in this report on 8 December.

63. The subscription and budget proposals for 2021/22 relating to the Transport and Environment Committee will be considered by the TEC Executive Sub-Committee at its meeting on 19 November and will be put before the main TEC meeting on 10 December for final approval. The Executive is, therefore, asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee endorse the provisional TEC figures as laid out in this report, at its 8 December meeting.

Recommendations

64. The Executive is asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee approve at their meeting on 8 December 2020 the following borough subscription and charges:

- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for boroughs of £161,958 per borough for 2021/22, no change on the charge of £161,958 for 2020/21. (paragraph 14);
- The proposed Joint Committee subscription for MOPAC of £15,410 for 2021/20, no change on the charge of £15,410 for 2020/21 (paragraph 15);
- An overall level of expenditure of £6.668 million for the Grants Scheme in 2021/22, no change on the expenditure for 2020/21; and
- Borough contributions for 2021/22 should be £6.668 million to fully cover the cost of the Grants scheme, no change from 2020/21 (paragraphs 16-18).

65. The Executive is also asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee endorse the following subscription and charges for 2020/21 for TEC, which will be considered by the TEC Executive Sub-Committee on 14 November, before being presented to the main meeting of TEC on 5 December for final approval:

- The Parking Core Administration Charge of £1,500 per borough and for TfL (2020/21) - £1,500) (paragraph 19);
- No charge to boroughs in respect of the Freedom Pass Administration Charge, which is covered by replacement Freedom Pass income (2020/21 – no charge) (paragraph 21);
- The net Taxicard Administration Charge to boroughs of £338,000 in total (2020/21 - £338,000); (paragraph 22);
- No charge to boroughs and TfL in respect of the Lorry Control Administration Charge, which is fully covered by estimated PCN income (2020/21 – no charge) (paragraph 23);

- The Parking Enforcement Service Charge of £0.3596 per PCN, which will be distributed to boroughs and TfL in accordance with the number of PCNs issued in 2019/20 (2020/21 - £0.3708 per PCN; paragraphs 26-27);
- The Parking and Traffic Appeals Charge of £27.84 per appeal or £24.06 per appeal where electronic evidence is provided by the enforcing authority (2020/21 - £27.35/£23.63 per appeal). For hearing Statutory Declarations, a charge of £22.15 for hard copy submissions and £21.40 for electronic submissions (2020/21 - £21.78/£21.04 per SD) (paragraphs 28-29);
- Congestion Charging Appeals including ULEZ – to be recovered on a full cost recovery basis, as for 2020/21, under the current contract arrangement with the GLA (paragraph 30);
- The TRACE (Electronic) Charge of £7.53 per transaction (2020/21 - £7.53) (paragraphs 31-33);
- The TRACE (Fax/Email) Charge of £7.70 per transaction, which is levied in addition to the electronic charge of £7.53 per transaction, making a total of £15.23 (2020/21 - £15.23) (paragraphs 31-33); and
- The TEC Charge of £0.175 per transaction (2020/21 - £0.175) (paragraphs 31-33).

66. Based on the above proposed level of subscriptions and charges, the Executive is asked to recommend to the Leaders' Committee:

- The provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for 2021/22 for London Councils of £341.317 million, as per Table 4 at paragraph 34 and Appendix A of this report;
- The provisional consolidated revenue income budget for 2021/22 for London Councils of £341.317 million, also as per Table 4 at paragraph 34 and Appendix B;

- Within the total income requirement, the use of London Councils reserves of £1.530 million in 2021/22, as detailed in Table 11 at paragraph 53.

67. The Executive is also asked to recommend that the Leaders' Committee note:

- The position in respect of forecast uncommitted London Councils reserves as at 31 March 2021, as detailed at paragraphs 51-57; and
 - The positive statement on the adequacy of the residual London Councils reserves issued by the Director of Corporate Resources, as detailed in paragraphs 58-59.
-

Financial Implications for London Councils

As detailed in the body of the report.

Legal Implications for London Councils

None

Equalities Implications for London Councils

None

Appendices

- Appendix A – the provisional consolidated revenue expenditure budget for London Councils for 2021/22.
- Appendix B – the provisional consolidated revenue income budget for London Councils for 2021/22.

Background Papers

London Councils budget working papers 2010/11 to 2021/22.

Appendix A

Proposed Consolidated Expenditure Budget 2021/22

	Jt Ctte £000	Grants £000	TEC £000	Total £000
Payments in respect of Concessionary Fares				
TfL	0	0	281,656	281,656
RDG	0	0	17,772	17,772
Other Bus Operators	0	0	1,100	1,100
Freedom Pass survey and reissue costs	0	0	1,518	1,518
Freedom Pass Administration	0	0	520	520
Comcab	0	0	10,447	10,447
Taxicard Administration	0	0	598	598
Sub-Total	0	0	313,611	313,611
Payments for commissioned services				
S.48 pan-London commisions	0	6,173	0	6,173
Subscription to London Funders Group	0	60	0	60
S.48 ESF pan-London commissions	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	0	6,233	0	6,233
TEC Trading Account Expenditure				
Payments to Adjudicators- ETA	0	0	780	780
Payments to Adjudicators - RUCA	0	0	532	532
Northgate variable contract costs - ETA	0	0	304	304
Northgate variable contract costs - RUCA	0	0	174	174
Northgate variable contract costs - Other	0	0	211	211
Payments to Northampton County Court	0	0	4,000	4,000
Lorry Control Administration	0	0	770	770
ETA/RUCA Administration	0	0	3,060	3,060
HEB Administration	0	0	43	43
Sub-Total	0	0	9,874	9,874
Total Direct Services	0	6,233	323,485	329,718
Operating Expenditure				
Contractual Commitments				
Capital Ambition legacy project costs	82	0	0	82
Contribution to LOTI	100	0	0	100
YPES Regional/Provider Activities	50	0	0	50
Southwark Street Leasehold Costs	1,366	0	0	1,366
Leases for photocopiers	29	0	0	29
HR Metrics Infinistats contract	35	0	0	35
Northgate Fixed Costs	0	0	97	97
External audit fees	40	0	0	40
CoL Finance/Legal/HR/IT SLA	497	0	0	497
Depreciation	191	0	0	191
Grants GIFTS system support	0	10	0	10
Sub-Total	2,390	10	97	2,497
Salary Commitments				
Officers	4,867	218	786	5,871
Members	219	19	20	258
Maternity provision	50	10	30	90
Sub-Total	5,137	247	835	6,219
Discretionary Expenditure				
Staff training/recruitment advertising	112	7	0	119
Staff travel	17	2	0	19
Other premises costs	291	0	0	291
SS ICT support	60	0	0	60
Supplies and service	718	0	157	875
Research	402	0	40	442
Contributiobn to Health related work	100	0	0	100
Other 3rd party payments	0	0	84	84
Sub-Total	1,701	9	281	1,991
Total Operating Expenditure	9,227	266	1,213	10,706
Central Recharges	156	169	567	892
Total Expenditure	9,383	6,668	325,266	341,317

Appendix B

Proposed Consolidated Income Budget 2021/22

	Jt Ctte £000	Grants £000	TEC £000	Total £000
Borough contributions to TfL	0	0	281,656	281,656
Borough contributions to ATOC	0	0	17,772	17,772
Borough contributions to other bus operators	0	0	1,100	1,100
Borough contributions to surveys/reissue costs	0	0	1,518	1,518
Borough contributions to freedom pass administration	0	0	0	0
Income from replacing lost/faulty freedom passes	0	0	600	600
Income from replacing lost/faulty taxicards	0	0	18	18
Borough contributions to Comcab	0	0	1,588	1,588
TfL contribution to Taxicard scheme	0	0	8,859	8,859
Borough contributions to taxicard administration	0	0	324	324
TfL Contribution to taxicard administration	0	0	124	124
Sub-total	0	0	313,559	313,559
Borough contribution to grants payments	0	6,233	0	6,233
ESF Grant Income	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	0	6,233	0	6,233
TEC trading account income				
Borough contributions to Lorry Control administration	0	0	0	0
London Lorry Control PCN income	0	0	1,000	1,000
Borough ETA appeal charges	0	0	967	967
TfL ETA appeal charges	0	0	118	118
GLA RUCA appeal income	0	0	706	706
Borough fixed parking costs	0	0	2,051	2,051
TfL fixed parking costs	0	0	270	270
GLA fixed parking costs	0	0	836	836
Borough other parking services	0	0	566	566
Northampton County Court Recharges	0	0	4,000	4,000
Sub-total	0	0	10,514	10,514
Sub-Total	0	6,233	324,073	330,306
Core borough subscriptions				
Joint Committee	5,119	0	46	5,165
Grants Administration	0	435	0	435
TEC (inc TfL)	0	0	51	51
MPA subscription	17	0	0	17
Sub-total	5,136	435	97	5,668
Other Borough charges				
Borough contributions towards LCP functions	496	0	0	496
Borough contributions towards YPES functions	180	0	0	180
Borough contributions to HR Metrics service	101	0	0	101
Sub-total	777	0	0	777
Other Income				
Investments	65	0	0	65
Room bookings and conferences	100	0	0	100
Letting of office space	252	0	0	252
Deskpace charge to funded groups	113	0	0	113
Sales of publications	18	0	0	18
Employment services trading account income	38	0	0	38
TfL secretariat recharge	0	0	31	31
Sales of Health Emergency badges	0	0	43	43
Miscellaneous income	8	0	0	8
Contribution from TfL for Environmental Policy priorities	0	0	98	98
Transfer from TEC Committee	68	0	0	68
Sub-total	662	0	172	834
Transfer from Reserves	605	0	925	1,530
Central Recharges	2,203	0	0	2,203
Total Income Base Budget	9,383	6,668	325,266	341,317

Executive (sitting as the Appointments Panel)

Nominations to Outside Bodies

Item no 10

Report by: Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager

Date: 10 November 2020

Contact Officers: Alan Edwards; Christiane Jenkins

Telephone: 020 7934 9911 **Email:** alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk
020 7934 9540 Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: This report provides the Executive in its capacity as the Appointments Panel, with details of London Councils' nominations/appointments made to outside bodies.

Recommendations: The Executive is recommended to note the nominations/appointments made by the Chief Executive on behalf of London Councils.

Nominations to Outside Bodies

Background

1. In 2002, London Councils' Elected Officers, acting in their capacity as its Appointments Panel, agreed to delegate the making of nominations to outside bodies to the Chief Executive within agreed guidelines and on Nolan principles and on the basis that they were reported to the next available meeting of the Appointments Panel. The guidelines were refined in 2012 with a fresh set of principles. These are attached at Appendix A.

Nominations

2. The Chief Executive has made the appointments listed in Appendix B on the advice of the Transport and Environment Committee.
3. Other appointments will need to be made to reflect changes to portfolio holders and party leads that were agreed at the Leaders' Committee AGM in October. These will be reported to a subsequent meeting of the Executive.

Financial Implications:

Where remunerated, payments are made by the appointing body and there are, therefore, no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Legal Implications:

In making appointments London Councils complies with relevant legislation. It also seeks to comply with the 'Nolan' Seven Principles of Public Life.

Equalities Implications:

There are no equalities implications for London Councils.

Recommendations:

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

Appendices:

- Appendix A - Principles to be applied in making appointments agreed by London Councils Leaders' Committee Executive 29 May 2012
- Appendix B - Nominations to TEC Outside Bodies for 2020/21

Appendix A

Principles to be applied in making appointments

Agreed by London Councils Leaders' Committee Executive 29 May 2012

Introduction

Appointments to outside bodies have been delegated by members to the Chief Executive. These appointments will be made by the Chief Executive in consultation with members as appropriate. In making appointments the Chief Executive will apply the Particular Principles (1, below) first but will also seek to ensure that nothing is done to depart from the General Principles (2, below). General Conditions (3, below) are included for guidance.

1 Particular Principles

a) In cases where a single appointment is required

- (i) In first instance the relevant portfolio-holder will be considered and if that is not a suitable appointment then the Chief Executive will consult members on an alternative candidate.

b) In cases where an outside body requires more than a single appointment

- (i) The first principle to be applied in such cases is any reasonable external requirement placed on London Councils in making the appointments¹.
- (ii) The second principle to be applied, if the first principle does not obtain, is that the number of appointments made from each political party reflects the balance of the parties on Leaders' Committee² at that time.

2 General Principles

- (i) When the Chief Executive is applying the particular principles set out above, they will seek to reflect any particular interest that the body to be appointed to has expressed to London Councils³.

¹ For example, the mechanism employed in determining the number of appointments for each political party made by London Councils to the former London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority was set out in legislation – the Greater London Authority Act 1999.

² This will be determined by the application of the d'Hondt formula.

- (ii) The Chief Executive will also be mindful of other factors that it would be reasonable or proper for London Councils to consider, for example specialist knowledge, stability of service, diversity as well as applying the Nolan principles set out below and the Chief Executive may - in consultation with members – override the principles set out above when there is a compelling case to do so.
- (iii) All public bodies are under a duty to follow the *Seven Principles of Public Life* set out by the Committee for Standards in Public Life, formerly chaired by Lord Nolan (the principles are often called the *Nolan Principles*). In particular, the Chief Executive will seek to ensure that the following three Nolan principles are applied:

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.⁴

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

- (iv) The Chief Executive will give consideration to the members of the Corporation of London when making any appointments to outside bodies.

³ For example, outside bodies occasionally ask for cross-party appointments.

⁴ Members will be expected to regularly attend meetings of the bodies they are appointed to and may be accountable to and from, London Councils for their actions in that capacity.

3 General conditions

- (i) When an appointment to an outside body ceases to be a member of a London local authority, London Councils will, in general, take whatever steps are necessary to remove them from that outside body.
- (ii) At a freeze date, being the date of the meeting of the London Councils Executive in May of each year, a report will be brought to that meeting setting out the total number of appointments made to outside bodies for each of the political parties with a calculation of how this reflects the agreed principles (above) for appointments and the variation from the balance of the parties on Leaders' Committee.
- (iii) Any variations in proportionality to be dealt with by the groups and whips.

Appendix B

Nominations to TEC Outside Bodies for 2020/21

Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC)

Cllr Steve Curran (LB Hounslow, Lab)

Cllr Peter Craske (LB Bexley, Con, Deputy)

Thames Regional Flood & Coastal Committee (RFCC)

West – Cllr Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet, Con)

South West – Cllr Julia Neden-Watts (LB Richmond, Lib Dem)

South East – Cllr Sizwe James (RB Greenwich, Lab)

North East – Cllr Syed Ghani (LB Barking & Dagenham, Lab)

Central North – Cllr Johnny Thalassites (RB Kensington & Chelsea, Con)

Central South – Cllr Johnson Situ (LB Southwark, Lab)

North – Cllr James Asser (LB Newham)

London Sustainable Development Commission

Cllr Rowena Champion (LB Islington, Lab)

Urban Design London (UDL)

Daniel Moylan (Independent)

Cllr Nigel Haselden (LB Lambeth)

Thames and London Waterways Forum

Cllr Sizwe James (RB Greenwich, Lab)

Cllr Johnson Situ (LB Southwark, Lab)

Cllr Peter Craske (LB Bexley, Con)

London City Airport Consultative Committee (LCACC)

Conservative nomination to follow

London Waste & Recycling Board

Cllr Nesil Caliskan (LB Enfield, Lab)

Cllr Claire Holland (LB Lambeth, Lab)

Cllr Krupa Sheth (LB Brent, Lab)

Cllr Guy Senior (LB Wandsworth, Con)

Chantelle Nicholson (Independent)

Joe Murphy (Independent)

London Cycling Campaign (LCC)

Cllr Clyde Loakes (LB Waltham Forest, Lab)

London Fuel Poverty Partnership

Cllr William Huntington-Thresher (LB Bromley, Con)

TfL/Government Active Travel Board

Cllr Clyde Loakes – LB Waltham Forest (Lab)