

Leaders' Committee

Minutes and Summaries

Item no: 10

Report by: Lisa Dominic **Job title:** Senior Governance Support Officer
Date: 8 February 2022
Contact Officer: Christiane Jenkins
Telephone: 020 7934 9540 **Email:** Christiane.jenkins@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary Summaries of the minutes of London Councils

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

- GLPC – 18 October 2021
- TEC Executive - 17 November 2021
- Grants – 24 November 2021

Leaders' Committee

Report from the Greater London Employment Forum

Item no:

Report by: Steve Davies **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers Organisation
Date: 8 February 2022
Contact Officer: Steve Davies
Telephone: 020 7934 9963 **Email:** steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: Summary of the virtual meeting notes of the Greater London Provincial Councils held on 18 October 2021

Recommendations: For information.

Attendance Employers Side - Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden), Cllr Callton Young (Croydon), Cllr Linda Perks (Greenwich), Cllr Carole Williams (Hackney), Cllr Amanda De Ryk (Lewisham), Cllr Richard Clifton (Sutton), Mayor John Biggs (Tower Hamlets), Cllr Clyde Loakes (Waltham Forest), Cllr Guy Senior (Wandsworth), Cllr Rachel Robathan (Westminster) **Trade Unions Side** - Helen Reynolds (UNISON), Simon Steptoe (UNISON), Andrea Holden (UNISON), Christine Lander (UNISON), Sean Fox (UNISON), Gloria Hanson (UNISON), Vaughan West (GMB), Sonya Davies (GMB), George Sharkey (GMB), Donna Spicer (GMB), Gary Cummins (Unite), Henry Mott (Unite) and Susan Matthews (Unite).

In attendance - Steve Davies (Employers Side Secretary), Debbie Williams (Regional Services Officer), Jade Appleton (Conservative Political Advisor), Ella Watson (Labour Political Advisor), Daniel Houghton (Liberal Democrats Political Advisor) and Julie Kelly (UNISON)

Item 1. Apologies for Absence - Apologies were received from Cllr Danny Beales (Camden), Cllr Nesil Caliskan (Enfield), Cllr Robert Benham (Havering), Cllr Candice Atterton (Hounslow), April Ashley (Unite), Danny Hoggan (Unite) and Neil Tasker (Unite).

Item 2 - Listing of the membership of the GLPC as determined by Leaders Committee and Co-Secretaries of the GLPC

Borough	Rep	Party
Barking & Dagenham	Sade Bright	Lab
Camden	Daniel Beales	Lab
Croydon	Callton Young	Lab
Enfield	Nesil Caliskan	Lab
Greenwich	Linda Perks	Lab
Hackney	Carole Williams	Lab
Havering	Robert Benham	Con
Hounslow	Candice Atterton	Lab
Hillingdon	Douglas Mills	Con
Lewisham	Amanda De Ryk	Lab
Sutton	Richard Clifton	LD

Tower Hamlets
Waltham Forest
Wandsworth
Westminster

Mayor John Biggs
Clyde Loakes
Guy Senior
Rachel Robathan

Lab
Lab
Con
Con

UNISON

Helen Reynolds (Secretary)
Sean Fox
Mary Lancaster
Gloria Hanson
Clara Mason
Andrea Holden
April Ashley
Christine Lander
Simon Steptoe

GMB

Vaughan West (Observer)
Penny Robinson
George Sharkey
Donna Spicer
Sonya Davis

UNITE

Gary Cummins
Danny Hoggan
Susan Matthews

Item 3 - Notes of previous meeting held on 18 May 2021 (note for information only) - The notes from the previous meeting held on 18 May 2021 were noted

Item 4 - Matters Arising from the Minutes of 18 May 2021 - There were no matter arising from the notes of the meeting held on 18 May 2021.

Item 5 - London Living Wage – Presentation and Summary of the Position in London

Presentation by Phoebe Devenish from Living Wage Foundation - Phoebe Devenish, Programmes Officer from the Living Wage Foundation informed that she has worked for the Foundation since 2021 and works with organisations on the Accreditation of the London Living Wage.

Attached is a copy of Phoebe's presentation.



London Councils
Presentation.pdf

Mary Lancaster (UNISON) stated that she is from Ealing Council where we have had a significant campaign outing the borough for not implementing payment of the London Living Wage (LLW) with indirect employees or contracted staff. It has taken the authority 13 years to finally implement payment for a group catering staff even though they had it written in the contract that the LLW should be implemented. I would be interested to know what the Foundation does in terms of monitoring local authorities in a more detailed way as the view of many unions is that boroughs are signed-up to the LLW but do not actually make sure indirect staff are paid the LLW. I would also be interested to know how early do you implement the increases? The catering company I just mentioned have stated that they may go bust if they must pay LLW and are worried about this year's increase so where does that fit in?

Are we going to have people on two tiers? Some on this year's LLW rate and some on the increased LLW rate? Also, do you look at terms and conditions? It is very well for lots of staff to earn the £10.85 per hour but many staff are on zero-hour contracts and in an insecure workforce so is there any movement that the Foundation are going to pick up issues other than pay rates?

Donna Spicer (GMB) enquired why councils are not making sure that contractors are paying the LLW?

Phoebe responded that in terms of monitoring the Foundation first started in 2012 when several boroughs joined, and this was not in place or part of the contract. The Foundation is now really focussing on those authorities who are being non-compliant. We are developing an audit system for local authorities. The problem with ensuring that all contractors are paying the LLW is that all authorities report back differently so it is hard to find out if they are paying so we rely on whistleblowing by employees so we can work with councils on their non-compliant contracts. We do understand that there is some non-compliance going on. We have worked with Ealing quite closely specifically on the catering staff contract. The accreditation is based on trust and every year we meet with councils who are accredited to go through our milestones. We are getting a more stringent policy in place.

The Chair stated that he would expect a LLW employer to tell their employees they are a LLW employer and what that means.

Gloria Hanson (UNISON) enquired whether the Foundation monitors where a local authority has 51% control of a smaller outsourced businesses to whether a particular business is paying the LLW?

Helen Reynolds, Union Side Joint Secretary stated that Phoebe mentioned that the new LLW rate will be announced on the 15 November 2021 and that employers have six months to provide employees with the uplift so would like to know if it took an organisation six months to implement the uplift would this be backdated to the 15 November? In terms of monitoring, you say that you rely heavily on whistleblowing so could this information come from the unions as well as the employees?

George Sharkey (GMB) enquired whether when the uplift is recalculated on 15 November will the fact the increase next year on National Insurance? In-house poverty needs to be considered.

Phoebe responded that in term of outsourcing to smaller business, currently these would to be an accredited employer as it seen as a separate entity to the local authority. The authority would have to accredit the separate business as a LLW employer. We do know that authorities have control of smaller businesses, and this is something we are hoping to bring into scope but if they own or part own separate business, we are unable to enforce as part of their licence agreement but have discussed how we could adjust the remit of our licence.

In terms of implementing the uplift we give employers six months to implement but not to back date it. The six months are given to ensure that the uplift does not cripple organisations, it gives them time to implement the new rate.

For monitoring we rely on whistleblowing whether that be from an employee or from someone who has insight to an organisation so we would be happy for the unions to report to us. We have a strict whistleblowing policy in place.

In term of recalculation, we are unable to give people a heads-up on what the new rate will be as we will consider any new government policy e.g., the uplift in the new national insurance rates. The new rate is recalculated several times before the announcement, so we do take into consideration any increases going on elsewhere.

Simon Steptoe (UNISON) enquired whether the Foundation remove the accreditation from Boroughs which do not pay LLW to staff working for contractors and do not have satisfactory plans to do so?

Phoebe responded that the Foundation will firstly work with the borough and go through a policy of trying to uplift however if we have continual issues and they do not have a plan in place we will remove their accreditation. We have and we will do that.

The Chair stated that this item may come back to this committee in the future for an update.

The report was noted.

Item 6 - Recap of Greater London Provincial Council and Greater London Employment Forum meeting items during last 12-15 months - The Chair stated that this report was a recap of the work that had taken place at this Committee as well as the Greater London Employment Forum during the last year as well as highlight topics for the coming year, so would welcome comments/contributions from colleagues.

There was a conversation at the Employers' Side meeting around mental health, hybrid working, tackling racial inequality issues and the return-to-work experience post-Covid which are already included in the future work programme. There is already some innovative stuff going on in boroughs but there are also some challenges for us. We would like to do some more work on all of these. If colleagues have any items, they would like to add these of course can be brought up through the Joint Secretaries throughout the year.

The report was noted.

Item 7 - Local Government Pay Claim 2021 - Harry Honnor, Local Government Association (LGA) stated that there was not much to say today other than the National Employers final offer, as set out in the agenda paper, was made on 27 July 2021 and it is no secret that the final pay offer was subject to a vote of the National Employers and there was no political consensus. Votes on the annual pay round are quite rare, only three in the last 20 years.

The unions have consulted their members and all three unions recommended rejection of the offer which has been the outcome of those consultations. All three unions are now at stages of moving towards industrial action.

The National Employers are expecting a letter today from the unions to formally table a pay dispute and outline what they plan to do next as well as expecting the National Employers to reopen negotiations. Colleagues will be notified of the outcome via Steve Davies in the usual way.

George Sharkey (GMB) stated that with the increase in national insurance contributions looming the offer on the table from the Employers would mean a 0.5% pay increase and wonder if local authorities have thought about the uprise impacting on them as employer, which will ultimately impact on services boroughs provide.

Harry responded that the national insurance increase announcement has only just recently happened so the Employers Side fully expect it will feature quite significantly in the 2022 pay round as this is when it will kick in.

Sean Fox (UNISON) stated that it was no secret that our members rejected the offer heavily. We recognise this is not the body to make an offer but what we need from London employers is to recognise that a 1.75% increase is no good for employees. It is a pay cut on top of all the other increases in energy, fuel prices etc. Members are angry and tired and feel they deserve better. Also, I am aware that a significant number of London authorities have budgeted for more than a 1.75% increase, so the unions ask today is that employer's feedback their views and say that London is a high-cost city, and we need better.

Harry responded that if elected members wished to make their views known then they can do so via the LGA's group offices before the National Employers meet on 19 October.

The Chair stated that any views do need to go through the National Machinery. It would be good to have this sorted.

The report was noted.

Item 8 - Schedule of Outstanding Differences - The schedule of outstanding differences was noted.

Item 10 - Any Other Business - There was no further business.

The meeting concluded at 12.14pm

Item 11 - Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday 17 May 2021 (Group meetings 10am and Joint Meeting 11.30am

Leaders' Committee

Report from the TEC Executive Sub Committee – 17 November 2021

Item no:

Report by: Alan Edwards **Job title:** Governance Manager
Date: 8 February 2022
Contact Officer: Alan Edwards
Telephone: 020 7934 9911 **Email:** alan.e@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary: Summary of the minutes of the London Councils' TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 17 November 2021.

Recommendations: For information.

Attendance: Mayor Phil Glanville (LB Hackney – Chair), Councillor Peter Zinkin (LB Barnet), Councillor Krupa Sheth (LB Brent), Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (LB Bromley), Councillor Johnny Thalassites (RB Kensington & Chelsea), Councillor Martin Whelton (LB Merton), Councillor Manuel Abellan (LB Sutton), and Councillor Julian Bell (Transport for London Board).

1. Apologies for Absence & Announcement & Deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Muhammad Ali (LB Croydon), Claire Holland (LB Lambeth), Councillor Sophie McGeevor (LB Lewisham), and Alastair Moss (City of London Corporation).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no other declarations of interest other than those listed at agenda item 2.

The Chair reminded Members that this was an informal meeting of the TEC Executive Sub Committee, and any decisions would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers, through the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meetings. He confirmed that the meeting was not being livestreamed. The Chair said that it was important to mention the incredible amount of work that had been carried out on Climate Change leading up to COP26.

3. Talk by Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Transport & Energy

Shirley Rodrigues, Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy, GLA, introduced the item and made some of the following comments.

- C40 was a global network that had a membership of over 100 cities and was put in place to ramp-up the work of Climate Change in these cities.
- Although the COP Agreement was not without some disappointments, it had also agreed to cap temperature increases to 1.5 degrees, instead of 2 degrees.
- Reducing the use of fossil fuels had also been discussed and had received collective support.
- It had agreed to cut global emissions by half by 2030, which was great news. There was less than 70 to 80 months left to achieve this, which presented big challenges.
- The Mayor was currently looking at a number of areas around emissions, including “Breathe London”.
- The ULEZ extension had been in operation for one month now and had resulted in a doubling of compliance. A more detailed report on ULEZ compliance would be released in due course.
- Details of the EV Infrastructure Delivery programme included the identification of public land to deliver EV charge points.
- A bad winter for Londoners was forecast, with fuel poverty on the increase, The GLA was looking at ways to reduce fuel bills for Londoners.
- Consultation was taking place with Thames Water, along with mapping being carried out at a borough level

A Q and A session took place

The TEC Executive Sub Committee: **(i)** noted that letter being written to George Eustice MP would be shared with TEC Members, **(ii)** noted that the GLA would find out the details of the boundary “tweak” with regards to the IKEA site, **(iii)** noted that TfL would speak to local authorities, via GULCS, about shared access to EV charging points, and **(iv)** noted that Shirley Rodrigues would share details of best practice and Template 100 (Denmark) and would follow-up this and any other issues with Katharina Winbeck.

4. TfL Board Update

Councillor Julian Bell gave a TfL Board update and presentation to the TEC Executive Sub Committee. He made some of the following comments:

- Demand for public transport continued to rise as confidence in using public transport was growing. Bus ridership now averaged around 77% and higher at the weekend (88%). Many people were still working from home on Mondays and Fridays. Tube ridership was 70% at the weekend.
- Football was higher last weekend than before the pandemic, although this had not been reflected in tube ridership.
- The use of face masks was not required on National Rail services, but they were on the Tube. Uniformity was needed otherwise there would be a lack of compliance, especially if people could not be fined if they did not wear face masks. This issue had been raised at TfL Board level. 40% of passengers were not wearing masks on the Tube, and a national change of view was needed.

- More people were now cycling (Santander cycle hire), perhaps assisted by a milder November than usual. Road traffic levels on the TRLN were up by 94% and were almost back to the pre-pandemic level (this needed to be monitored owing to the detrimental effect this had on air quality).
- The TfL Finance Committee was due to meet shortly. The implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers.
- TfL Government funding expired on 11 December 2021. In January 2021, a TfL financial sustainability plan up to 2023/24 was put forward that had a number of different scenarios in it. The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the TfL Board Update.
- There would be a 4 per cent reduction in bus network services (frequency), as a result of funding challenges for TfL and a change in demand for bus services in central London. There would, however, also be changes to some bus routes.
- A “Bus Action Plan” had been launched with five key priorities, including safety and security, customer satisfaction and connections. TfL was looking to present the action plan by the end of November 2021.

A Q and A session took place

The TEC Executive Sub Committee: **(i)** noted that details of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) would be circulated to borough finance officers, **(ii)** noted that Councillor Bell would take back to the TfL Board the issue on LIP funding commitment to the boroughs, and **(iii)** noted that the presentation would be circulated by email to TEC Executive Members by Alan Edwards.

5. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordination

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that gave details of the coordination function that was created to facilitate and oversee charge point installation at a pan-London level, which provided support to London boroughs to maintain the delivery momentum of the Go Ultra Low Cities Scheme (GULCS) and accelerated the transition to zero emission vehicles.

Claudia Corrigan, Senior Lead, EV Infrastructure Coordination, London Councils, introduced the report, which was an overview to EV coordination across the boroughs, and made some of the following comments.

- Progress was key, with an increased number of charge points - more than 5,000 EV charge points had now been delivered across the Capital, and EV uptake had also increased. One in eight vehicles were electric in 2020 and this would increase in 2021/22.
- Analysis conducted over a twelve-month period (to September 2021) showed a marked increase in EV uptake and utilisation of charge points.
- Public funding was available through the On-Street Residential Charge Point Scheme (ORCS) and more than £6m had been secured by 14 London boroughs to deliver An additional 1,500 charge points by March 2023.
- 75% of capital costs for delivery are available to boroughs. London Councils had worked with operators to secure 25% in match funding for all boroughs. The funding had a time limit and had to be allocated by March 2022. Funds were allocated on a “first come, first served” basis, and boroughs were encouraged to submit their bids by the end of the current calendar year.

- TfL had published a draft summary of the London 2030 Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (EVIS), which was a joint consultation. A draft survey was available online on the TfL website and provided a useful overview of updated forecasting (up to 40 to 60% extra charge points were forecasted by 2030).
- Office for Zero Emissions Vehicles (OZEV) had launched a draft consultation on 29 September 2021 (one of five), where they asked views on whether to deliver four new powers, (a response was drafted by London Councils and needed submitting by Monday 22 November).

The Chair voiced concern that pavements could become cluttered with cables being put across them. The Chair also asked whether there was anything in the consultation regarding data points and whether the debate on data points would be taken forward. Councillor Zinkin said that the UK Power Network (UK PN) did not have enough power to deal with these issues and were less clear on supplying streets. Councillor Huntington-Thresher said that parts of the Borough of Bromley were very rural, with some lanes being miles long and with no street-lighting or electricity connections. Claudia Corrigan said that the charge points would not add to street clutter, although the issue of minimum widths and access would be looked at again. She said that there was a recommendation about free-standing charge points and minimum requirements on pavements

The TEC Executive Sub Committee: **(i)** noted that the final response to the OZEV zero emissions vehicle consultation was required by Monday 22 November 2021, incorporating comments from Members, **(ii)** noted that officers needed to start to consider the diversity of boroughs when it came to supplying charge points in streets etc (eg some of LB Bromley's car parks were rural, had no electricity supply and it was not practical to have charge points); and **(iii)** noted that the issue of energy capacity would be picked-up.

6. Transport Funding Sub Group

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that set out arrangements for a London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee Sub-Group on Transport Funding.

The Chair informed Members that a steer had been received from Leaders' Committee to explain in more detail how transport funding worked. Katharina Winbeck said that Members wanted to have an oversight on transport funding in the future and how they could influence some of those discussions. She said that the subgroup would need to be signed-off by the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021, and membership of the group would need to be in place by then. The Transport Funding Subgroup would discuss infrastructure and would feedback into transport priorities. The Chair said that there was a need to know where funding with regards to LIPs was going. Also, a four-year strategic direction (long-term) came through from Leaders.

The Chair suggested that the TEC Executive Sub Committee be the main voice on behalf of the Transport Funding Subgroup. Councillor Zinkin said that the terms of reference would be quite broad and the subgroup would need to fit in with the existing framework.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee: (i) noted that the Transport Funding Subgroup would be signed-off by full TEC at the meeting on 9 December 2021, (ii) noted that a mixture of boroughs should be represented on the new subgroup to get a real balance, and (iii) noted that a shadow meeting of this sub-group should be convened and party groups to nominate a shadow list to look at the Terms of Reference for this group, before it went for sign-off by full TEC in December. A follow-up letter would also be sent to Baroness Vere to ensure that the boroughs were heard again with respect to transport funding. Shadow Board would come up with workstreams for TEC to focus on. Vice chair representation should be included on this group.

7. Transport & Mobility Performance Information

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the London Councils' Transport and Mobility Services performance information for Q2 2021/22 and full year 2020/21.

Stephen Boon introduced this report. He informed Members that an Improvement Performance Plan had been put in place for the Freedom Pass contact centre. Service Level Agreements were still not being met (causing the "red" ratings), but improvements were being made. Stephen Boon said that there had been a slight drop in performance for ASAP bookings which was due to earlier fuel shortage problems leading to an "amber" rating and taxi supply. He said that the team was working with ComCab to increase provision in private hire vehicles (PHVs) with a plan for approximately 10% of jobs to be carried out by PHVs by the end of 2021

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the Transport and Mobility Services Performance information report

8. Draft Revenue Budget & Borough Charges 2022/23

The TEC Executive Sub Committee received a report that detailed the outline revenue budget proposals and the proposed indicative borough subscription and charges for 2022/23.

David Sanni, Acting Director of Corporate Resources, London Councils, introduced the report which would be going to the TEC Main meeting for final approval. He said that the use of TEC Reserves amounted to £1.2million. An estimated 2% increase in staff salary costs had also been reflected, along with a 1.25% increase in NI contributions for employees. David Sanni said that other costs included the new Director post for Climate Change. There had also been a reduction to Freedom Pass contributions. The final figures would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021. David Sanni informed Members that the Committee's reserves were in a healthy and stable position.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee noted the levies and charges that would be presented to the full TEC meeting on 9 December 2021 and agreed by TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following that meeting in December:

9. Month 6 TEC Revenue Forecast 2021/22

The TEC Executive Sub Committee considered a report that outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved budget to the end of September 2021 for TEC and provided a forecast of the outturn position for 2021/22. At this stage, a surplus of £717,000 was forecast over the budget figure. In addition, total expenditure in respect of Taxicard trips taken by scheme members was forecast to underspend by a

net figure of £1.756 million, due in part to the impact of the Covid-19 on the scheme. The net borough proportion of this underspend was projected to be £1.588 million, with £168,000 accruing to TfL.

David Sanni introduced the second quarter TEC revenue forecast report. He informed Members that one of the key variances was the underspend on the Taxicard Scheme of £1.756 million on projected trip data. This would however be offset by a reduction in borough and TfL contributions. There were additional variances including an underspend on payments to non-TfL bus operators and a surplus from the replacement of Freedom passes. David Sanni said that the next revenue forecast report would be presented to the TEC Executive Sub Committee on 10 February 2022. The Chair said that he noted all the good work in managing the new Climate Change post.

The TEC Executive Sub Committee: **(i)** noted the projected surplus of £717,000 for the year, plus the forecast net underspend of £1.756 million for overall Taxicard trips, as detailed in this report and **(ii)** noted the projected level of Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 5 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Committee included in paragraphs 6-8.

10. Minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021

The minutes of the TEC Executive Sub Committee held on 9 September 2021 were noted to be an accurate record and would be agreed by the TEC Elected Officers via the TEC Urgency Procedure following the meeting.

The Chair asked if the TEC finance reports and concessionary fares settlement and apportionment reports could be placed at the beginning of the agenda for the Main TEC meeting, especially if they were of a critical nature.

The meeting finished at 11:29am

LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS COMMITTEE – INFORMAL MEETING

Minutes of the informal meeting of the Grants Committee held on 24 November 2021 via Microsoft Teams

London Borough & Royal Borough:

Barking and Dagenham
Bexley
Brent
Bromley
Camden
Hackney
Harrow
Havering
Hillingdon
Islington
Kensington and Chelsea
Kingston upon Thames
Lambeth
Lewisham
Merton
Newham
Redbridge
Richmond
Southwark
Sutton
Tower Hamlets
Wandsworth
Westminster

Representative:

Cllr Saima Ashraf
Cllr David Leaf
Cllr Margaret McLennan
Cllr Kate Lymer
Cllr Anna Wright
Cllr Christopher Kennedy
Cllr Sue Anderson
Cllr Viddy Persuad
Cllr Martin Goddard
Cllr Una O'Halloran
Cllr Anne Cyron
Cllr Kim Bailey
Cllr Donatus Anyanwu
Mayor Damien Egan (Chair)
Cllr Marsie Skeete
Mayor Rokhsana Fiaz
Cllr John Howard
Cllr Gareth Roberts
Cllr Alice McDonald
Cllr Marian James (Vice Chair)
Cllr Candida Ronald
Cllr Jonathan Cook
Cllr Heather Acton

London Councils officers were in attendance.

The Chair and members congratulated Cllr Marian James, the new Liberal Democrat Vice Chair of the Grants Committee.

1 Apologies for Absence and Announcement of Deputies

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Jasbir Anand (LB Ealing), Cllr Shantanu Rajawat (LB Hounslow), Cllr Caroline Kerr (RB Kingston upon Thames) and Manju Shahul-Hameed (LB Croydon).

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3 Minutes of the Grants Committee AGM held on 14 July 2021 (for noting)

- 3.1 The minutes of the Grants Committee AGM held on 14 July 2021 were noted (to be agreed via the London Councils' Urgency Procedure following this meeting).

4 Minutes of the Grants Executive held on 30 September 2021

- 4.1 The minutes of the Grants Executive meeting held on 30 September 2021 were noted.

5 Performance of Grants Programme 2017-22: April 2017 to September 2021

- 5.1 Feria Henry, Priority Manager, said that all projects were currently RAG rated Green. She also noted that projects and London Boroughs have also been heavily involved in the ongoing work to help resettle refugees from Afghanistan.
- 5.2 The Priority Manager then gave further information on the performance of Priority 1 – Combatting Homelessness, and Priority 2 – Tackling Sexual Violence.
- 5.3 The Chair and members thanked the Grants team at London Councils for all their hard work during the current Grants cycle, which was now coming to a close. They also thanked all the funded organisations, which had performed extremely well under very challenging circumstances.
- 5.4 Grants Committee Members noted the report.

Action: Strategy Director to arrange for New Horizon Youth Centre and DuPaul to present the work of the Homelessness Hub to Grants Committee in March 2022

6 London Councils Grants Scheme - Budget Proposals 2022/23

- 6.1 David Sanni, Acting Director of Corporate Resources, introduced the report, which detailed the indicative overall budget requirement for the London Boroughs Grants Scheme. An overall level of expenditure of £6.668 million for the Grants Scheme in 2022/23.
- 6.2 Subject to the agreement of London Councils Leaders' Committee on 7 December 2021, the Grants Committee agreed with the recommendations in the report (to be formally agreed through the London Councils' Urgency Procedure).

7 Month 6 Revenue Forecast 2021-2022

- 7.1 David Sanni, Acting Director of Resources, introduced this report, which outlined actual income and expenditure against the approved income and expenditure in the budget to the end of September 2021 for the Grants Committee.
- 7.2 The Grants Committee noted:

- The projected deficit of £31,000 for the year; and
- The projected level of Grants Committee reserves, as detailed in paragraph 10 of this report and the commentary on the financial position of the Grants Committee.

Action: A discussion on reserves to be added to the agenda of the March 2022 Grants Committee meeting.

8 2022-2026 Pan-London Grants Programme: Recommendations for Award of Grants

- 8.1 The Strategy Director introduced this report, which noted the organisations recommended for award of grant for Priorities 1 and 2 and those which were not recommended for funding, for the new 2022-26 Grants Programme. She said that the scoring process had been a robust one, and thanked Cllr David Leaf, Conservative Vice Chair of the Grants Committee, who was involved in assessing applications.
- 8.2 Grants Committee members:
- Agreed with the recommendations for grant funding for Priority 1, Combatting Homelessness, and Priority 2, Tackling Domestic and Sexual Violence outlined in the report (to being agreed via the London Councils' Urgency Procedure)
 - Noted the applications that were not recommended for funding, as set out in the report; and
 - Noted the right to reply submissions from seven applicants (for nine applications) that were not recommended for funding, and officer commentary, as set out in the report.