

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

Our reference: MGLA100422-8789

Date: 20 May 2022

Dear

Further to the meeting held on 17 March 2022 in which you requested a copy of another version of Lisa Power's report than the final version released last year, thank you for confirming your request in writing on 22 March 2022. Please accept my apologies for the delay.

Your request has been considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

You requested:

A copy of Lisa Power's full report - about 20+ pages we believe.

Our response:

Please find attached the information we hold within the scope of your request - *Review of community advisory arrangements for Pride in London* (November 2020) and five appendices.

We have redacted a small amount of information that would directly or indirectly identify individuals and as such constitutes personal data which is defined by Article 4(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) to mean any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual. This information is exempt from disclosure under s.40 (Personal information) of the Freedom of Information Act. It is considered that disclosure of this information would contravene the first data protection principle under Article 5(1) of GDPR which states that Personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject.

No redactions have been made in the recommendations section - this information is already in the public domain at <https://prideinlondon.org/news-and-views/pride-in-london-review-of-advisory-requirements/>

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference MGLA100422-8789.

Yours sincerely

Information Governance Officer

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

Review of community advisory arrangements for Pride in London

November 2020

Lisa Power

Introduction

London's annual LGBT+ Pride celebrations are some of the largest in the world, as well as one of London's largest community events of any kind. They act as a major contribution to the tourist economy, attracting attendees from not only London but all over the UK and increasingly from abroad. More importantly for many of us who are LGBT+, they also act to signify and celebrate our public strength and determination never to be silenced again, with a host of satellite activities existing around the main parade march and stages. Although there are now well over 150 other Pride celebrations across the UK, London is seen by the public as the original and the primary one, attracting 1.5 million people (32,000 of them paraders) in 2019.

Yet it is less than a decade since the event faced total financial and organisational collapse in 2012. That year's event was only partially rescued by a small number of volunteers and the goodwill of major stakeholders, most notably the Greater London Authority. The GLA subsequently organised a bidding process for the future organisation of the event which was won by the newly formed Pride in London (PiL) group. It is important to remember that, in its current shape, Pride in London has only really existed since 2013 and that, when this incarnation began, much of how it worked was a best guess at what might be needed.

Unlike other global attractions of its size and type, PiL also remains almost entirely run by volunteers, with services contracted out, mostly on an annual basis, to professional companies and individuals. Constituted as a Community Interest Company, it has a Board of Directors, none of whom are paid and who constitute both the governing body directing policy and strategy and the senior management responsible for delivering the annual event. Each of these Directors manages divisions which together involve over two hundred year-round volunteers in a complex delegated structure.

Pride in London holds a contract to run the event from the Greater London Authority, which is also the largest funder. As part of that contract it is expected to consult with, and take advice from, London's wider LGBT+ communities. The relevant project objectives which lay out the baseline expectations are:

- ⤴ To continue to grow Pride in London as a vehicle for additional community engagement
- ⤴ To maintain and develop community relationships
- ⤴ To actively consult across the LGBT+ community on plans for the Pride event

The Mayor of London has indicated his clear commitment to these: *“Pledging ongoing City Hall support to Pride if he’s re-elected as London’s mayor; (Sadiq) Khan ... promised in his manifesto that if re-elected, he would use his influence on the delivery of Pride to further strengthen its links with community groups, unions, and grassroots organisations.”* Pink News, February 27 2020

The origins, scope and structure of the review

As part of their original proposal, PiL created a formal consultative advisory body, the Community

Advisory Board (CAB). They subsequently designated a Director of Community Engagement one of whose primary original roles was to liaise with the CAB. The CAB was to be a monthly meeting of representatives of key stakeholder constituencies of the LGBT+ communities of London (community categories in Appendix 4). Individuals nominated to represent those constituencies by organisations within them would scrutinise PiL's plans and feed back community comment and views. Unsurprisingly, over the following years, these arrangements changed; sometimes by design and sometimes not. Of concern to all parties, the relationship between PiL and the CAB deteriorated significantly over time and PiL set up separate community engagement and feedback structures within an enhanced Community Engagement volunteer team.

The details of this are discussed later in this report, but the culmination in 2019 was an agreement to review PiL's community advisory arrangements. As [REDACTED] wrote: "Six years on and following the renewal in 2018 of our contract to deliver Pride in London, the time is right to take stock, and to review our needs for advisory support for the next phase of our development." Or, as an external interviewee put it, *"PiL's changed hugely since they started and so has the community. Of course we need to do things differently"*.

PiL's [REDACTED] approached the author to do a review and it was agreed this would be conducted pro bono in order to demonstrate full independence. The original proposed scope of the review is found at Appendix 1. It was agreed that the central focus of the review would be the CAB, but that in order to get a full view of advice-taking it would also consider the role of Community Engagement (CE) and any other forms of advice sought and/or given.

The review was conducted in three phases:

1. A desk review of all relevant documentation, including 7 years of minutes and papers from the CAB and other reports and correspondence.
2. External research into advisory arrangements and forms of community consultation in other Prides and similar community-based events
3. A series of interviews with past and present CAB Chairs and members; past and present PiL Directors; and a range of other community leaders with a variety of experiences of the current system; observation of CAB meetings and a survey of current CAB members.

The resulting document has been shown in draft to the Chairs of PiL and the CAB for comment and clarifications, before this final document is shared with the PiL Board, the CAB and the GLA.

During the course of the interviews and research, a range of observations were made which did not fit within the scope of this review. Many of these pertain to the wider organisation and future of PiL and Pride as an event. Rather than muddy the waters and go beyond the agreed remit of this report, those responses will be fed back separately and are not included here, except in passing explanations and for context.

Pride in London's requirements for advice, guidance and accountability

Whereas in 2013, when PiL (or LLCP as it is sometimes referred to in legal documents) was established, it was an untried body taking on a damaged event. Arrangements put in place at that time were to some extent defensive, in order to avoid previous problems of accountability in an event whose management had changed hands multiple times over the previous decades. The advisory and accountability arrangements also reflected a view that the incoming organisers did not have close ties to what was seen as the grass roots community of LGBT London (primarily the activist and NGO community). Thus, scrutiny of e.g. the organisation's solvency took a larger role than strategic advice initially.

By 2020 those needs have changed – and no doubt will again. The organisers are now in the main highly experienced in running the event itself. The advice they require is much more often strategic – and interestingly all parties who commented on this agreed that the most satisfying work (and sometimes the most successful) of advice-giving 2013-2020 had been on strategic issues such as managing difficult political decisions in the wake of divisions. Nobody thought that monthly scrutiny of PiL's cash flow, for example, was either necessary or relevant to a community advisory function. Strategic policy advice was being taken by PiL in a variety of ways, some within existing or evolved structures but increasingly also outside these.

The advice needed by PiL currently is that which ensures that its events are inclusive of all parts of London's LGBT+ community which do not promote hate against others; that they are appropriately diverse in representation and activities; that they enable maximum participation, with special consideration for those who may be marginalised or excluded in some way; that they reflect the concerns and priorities of LGBT+ Londoners; and that everyone has as good a time as possible within the constraints of the budget and the law.

A brief history of the community advisory function at Pride in London

As [REDACTED] PiL explained in a briefing letter about this review “When Pride in London was established in 2013, we were a small, volunteer team of around 50 people, with no track record either as an event organiser or as an organisational entity. We were very aware that there were effectively no external checks on the previous organisers of the Pride event, which meant serious operational difficulties were not made public until too late and the event in 2012 had to become a march under police commissioner’s orders. As we set about establishing a new organisational team, we worked to enlist the support of groups from across the LGBT+ community and a diverse range of volunteers to help guide and inform our decision-making. This proved to be difficult given the reputation of the previous group and because we were new and untested. So, after staging initial open meetings and partly in response to these other issues we established the Community Advisory Board (CAB), to ensure:

- ⬆ We could access the views of the community on our plans and other issues as these arose
- ⬆ The ‘voice’ of the community was effectively represented in our planning and decision-making
- ⬆ We could seek the advice of respected members of the LGBT+ community on matters affecting our event and operations
- ⬆ We could demonstrate a transparent approach to our stewardship and management of London’s Pride celebrations (and be challenged if necessary) “

The first CAB was chosen by lot, drawn from nominations by relevant groups in each of the sectors agreed and subject to gender balance. Subsequent candidates would be subject to election by the existing CAB members. Two observer positions were created, one for the GLA themselves and one for the trade unions via the TUC, as the other major sponsor (at that time) of London's Pride. The initial Chair [REDACTED] was an independent community member agreed between PiL and the GLA and [REDACTED] a volunteer drawn from existing PiL volunteers. A structure was agreed whereby CAB members were expected to have limited terms of office and regular turnover. Not counting the external and non-voting personnel, there were 14 members in all (see Appendix 4).

The level of independence of the CAB was from the start less clear than it could have been. While

its first members were expected to give independent advice from their community bases, they were also expected to scrutinise PiL's work from an insider perspective, with access to relatively confidential material such as budgets and parade formations. Advice given was not public and external reports were to be agreed in advance with PiL. The CAB was, in effect, founded as a function of PiL (and liaison with it was a major part of the original Community Engagement Director's portfolio) but became increasingly independent in its expectations and behaviour. While this is not an uncommon role for Advisory Boards in charities and other NGOs, it is clear that not all members fully understood this. Assumptions of independence grew without explicit rebuttal at an early stage and were later encouraged by functional estrangement. As one person characterised it, "I watched it go from critical friend to inside enemy, us and them". A clear majority of interviewees from all sectors referenced the lack of clarity about role and responsibilities as problematic for the CAB and PiL.

This increasingly poor relationship culminated in 2018 with a highly critical report from the CAB which had not been seen by PiL or some CAB members in advance. It was further exacerbated shortly afterwards by a breach of confidentiality when a CAB member shared a draft paper with the rest of their organisation and it was leaked to the media. An attempt by PiL to require CAB members to sign non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) was resisted on the grounds that it would damage members' ability to report back to their communities. PiL then declined to share any sensitive materials with the CAB, substantially reducing opportunities for scrutiny. As one observer characterised it, *"The CAB pushed to be independent and Pride gave it to them in a way they didn't expect"*. The CAB in 2020 was visibly struggling to overcome this situation but it was clear from both observation and conversation that there still exists substantial and ongoing mistrust on both sides, repeatedly expressed during this review.

Without going into all the detailed changes over the years, by 2020 major changes in structure and membership were:

- ⤴ the change from an independent Chair (agreed between PiL and the GLA and acting as a liaison) in favour of a voting member in the role (felt then to be an important part of handing over control but with hindsight a contributor to the growth of an "us and them" culture)
- ⤴ the PiL-provided [REDACTED] became an independent CAB member role (this appears to have been accidental and due to loss of historical memory after a gap in filling the post, but severed another liaison link)
- ⤴ no external observers (the GLA nominee stopped attending and the TUC post does not appear to have been filled after the retirement of its first holder; but in any case the TUC is no longer a funder and no others were appointed to replace them)
- ⤴ a small number of category changes/additions (for a variety of reasons)
- ⤴ a substantial reduction in operational contact and communications between the CAB and PiL with the CAB operating its own website, recruitment and induction (explored further below)
- ⤴ the cessation of sharing any commercially or otherwise confidential or sensitive material with the CAB following their refusal to sign NDAs, for the reasons above
- ⤴ a complete disconnect from, and parallel existence to, the PiL Community Engagement function (explored further below)

Terms of Reference for the CAB

The last agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the CAB are from May 2015 and are at Appendix 6. There appear to have been subsequent attempts to rewrite these from CAB [REDACTED] (including the insertion of the word "independent" in 2018), but none were agreed by the Board of PiL.

These Terms, which are substantially similar to the original ones of 2013 with minor procedural changes, outline not only the CAB's role but also how it should be fulfilled. It was envisaged as both an advisory and scrutiny body with these defined duties:

- ⤴ to meet the commitment to openness and transparency (financial and operational)
- ⤴ to advise on questions of inclusivity
- ⤴ to advise on the distribution of any grants
- ⤴ to act as a source of guidance on organisational and operational issues including succession arrangements for the BoD.

The ToR goes on to define selection procedures, attendance requirements, diversity requirements, term limits, publication of documents on the PiL website, ways of working with specific BoD members and confidentiality requirements. None of these procedures and safeguards appear to still be adhered to in 2020.

Recruitment, induction and composition of the CAB

The first thing that should be said is that every member of the CAB encountered was doing their best to fulfil their role as they saw it. Everyone wanted the best Pride possible for London's LGBT+ communities and operated in good faith. In particular the [REDACTED] is clearly trying to fulfil what [REDACTED] sees as the CAB's remit, fill vacant posts and improve communications. Recent recruits are obviously engaged, knowledgeable and diligent.

Over the course of its existence the CAB has found it increasingly difficult to recruit new members, resulting in substantial reductions at times in numbers and expertise and a high level of uncontested elections to membership. This appeared to be due to a combination of factors. Vacancies in the CAB are no longer advertised through Pride in London's website or comms functions. While there is passing mention of the CAB on the PiL web page, it is only in a link to the CAB's own website and as of October 2020 this link was not working. The CAB currently has a low profile amongst the LGBT+ communities of London, with limited visibility since the very public row between the CAB and PiL in 2018.

While recruitment is theoretically open, in practice there is little competition for places and very little due diligence done on applicants beyond the application letter and a social media search. Existing members are encouraged to headhunt for new members to fill designated vacancies and [REDACTED] is energetic in pursuing this, but there is no clear recruitment strategy or skills audit beyond the expectation that someone belongs to the community category they are expected to represent (though in one case this is not adhered to, see below). Candidates can be rejected from personal experience, but those where there is no personal knowledge receive little scrutiny for suitability. While the CAB has recently attracted some candidates with high levels of relevant skills this is not a prerequisite for acceptance. Half of the interviewees in this review, from all sectors, mentioned a perception that some CAB members behaved more as representatives of their individual organisation than their community sector.

Given that one of the primary roles of the CAB, at least initially, was scrutiny over Pride's organisation in order to ensure that policies and finances were sound, it is hard to expect that role to be fulfilled without some level of expertise. As respondents from Pride, the CAB and external bodies all pointed out in similar words, if you give someone documents like accounts at short notice and then put them in a position where they feel they should contribute to debate, it isn't surprising if they focus on detail which comes across as nit-picking when they are trying to be helpful. This in turn can lead to advice given not being valued or seen as relevant. A substantial number of interviewees felt that the CAB was no longer taken seriously by PiL and it was noted that complex papers had sometimes been tabled for discussion at short notice.

Over time the principle of gender parity appears to have been lost and diversity in general became a problematic issue internally from 2017 onwards, remarked on by several interviewees; though it should be noted that the 2020 CAB was aware of this and making efforts to address it. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. While minutes showed some discussion of this in 2016-17 with suggested remedies, no further action was taken.

Induction to the CAB currently consists of a briefing call with the Chair and access to the CAB Google documents. There is no formal induction into the wider structures of PiL and CAB members are not considered to be PiL volunteers, despite fulfilling a volunteer function relating to its work. While this was seen as part of their independence, it again reduces opportunities for dialogue and joint understanding. A clear majority of interviewees from all sectors referenced the need for recruitment based on appropriate organisational or consultative experience and skills, or some formal training as part of future induction to ensure that members are clear about the role and able to fulfil their responsibilities in a way that benefits both their communities and PiL.

Attendance levels at and turnover in the CAB

Records show that member attendance at the monthly CAB meetings declined steadily from a 10+ average in 2013 to a low of 5.5 average in 2018. One notable meeting in 2017 had two CAB attendees and nobody from PiL at all. By mid 2020 this had risen to just over 7, but from a pool of 16 rather than 14 members, so still below 50% on average. Previous agreements around non-attendance and turnover were no longer followed, although [REDACTED] clearly made efforts to engage members both inside and out of meetings. Several respondents commented negatively on the lack of turnover arrangements.

The expectation of membership turnover had been lost despite occasional references to the principle in CAB minutes over the years. Two members were still in place from the original 2013 membership, i.e. had been there without break for seven years, although in one case the person had [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The current Chair had been there for almost five years, though only two as Chair. Five other members, though, had been in place for less than a year due to the filling of longstanding vacancies in a recruitment drive.

Attendance by PiL Directors at the CAB also declined over time but fluctuated more. This was in part due to who was required at any given meeting to address agenda items. By 2020, the only regular PiL attendees were one or both of the PiL [REDACTED], who felt that their attendance was important to show that the CAB was listened to at the highest levels. It was notable that the almost constant presence of the first Director of [REDACTED] in the early years had stopped entirely with a change of Director. Attendance was also made more difficult by the CAB's decision to move their meetings to a Saturday morning, which is the time most divisions of PiL also hold their meetings.

The current Director of [REDACTED], in line with what they referred to as a difference in their role, had never attended a CAB meeting in person and only once on a call. They had also never delegated a liaison position to one of their Deputy Directors or a volunteer. They did not receive CAB minutes, and the CAB [REDACTED] confirmed that they only sent minutes to [REDACTED]. The CAB [REDACTED] and the PiL [REDACTED] each thought the other should be responsible for ensuring that minutes reached all relevant people.

This disconnect between the CAB, with a remit to consult London's LGBT+ communities, and the Community Engagement (CE) function, which holds the same task as part of its engagement work, led to several respondents noting a mismatch in community advice given to Directors by the two bodies. Four cited a lack of coordinated follow up in specific situations, while other external interviewees felt there was no clarity about how to raise community concerns. While the total disconnect between CAB and CE was noted by several interviewees from the CAB, PiL and even community, it appeared to come as a surprise to others, including senior PiL personnel.

Advice given from and sought by the current CAB

Current members of the CAB were asked, as part of a questionnaire, what advice they had been asked for by PiL for Pride 2019 and how they gauged their community's concerns. In all, 12 responses were received of which one was a duplicate. This is less than the number of CAB posts (16) because not all posts were filled at this time. [REDACTED]. It should be noted that some respondents were recent additions and this may have impacted the ability or willingness in some cases to answer some of the questions.

Of the eight responses to *“Did the PiL Board ask any advice of you for Pride 2019 and if so, what?”* five members gave details of advice requested and given while one was too new (other new members did not respond to the question). These included: a closed meeting for a community's specific concerns; managing a clash with a religious festival; reviewing (and rejecting) a proposed sponsorship deal; reviewing stalls, parade and wristband applications and feeding back their personal views on one area of the day. Given that some of these were regular all-CAB requests, the responses from two of the longer standing members saying that no advice was requested are concerning.

Five respondents also gave detailed information on *other advice they had given about their community's specific needs*, most of which related to the parade or festival areas on the day. One mentioned a wider policy issue of who should be able to participate (note that this survey related to activity before the PiL request for CAB consultation on police involvement in the parade).

Asked *“What advice do you think Pride needs to hear from the LGBT+ communities”*, everyone responded, sometimes at length. The comments included structural change, policy change and greater inclusion. Many of these were constructive, particularly from newer members, but there were also complaints (sometimes detailed) about past dissatisfactions or behaviour, sometimes voiced in very negative language. Common themes included: better open meetings, the need to adapt to changing community inclusion and expectations, a lack of planning and strategy, a feeling that sponsors came before community for PiL and better communication with the community.

Asked for details of *how they obtained community views*, all participants responded in some way. Three gave the requested details of groups asked and frequency of doing so and two others gave detailed replies. Two cited personal networks and social media; two only mentioned their own group and two gave answers which cited needs but not how the knowledge was obtained or from who. One respondent said they thought it was the job of Community Engagement to poll their community and not theirs, but said they did not know how CE was doing this.

Finally, CAB members were asked to suggest *ways of improving current advisory mechanisms*. Seven of the 11 responses contained further complaints about the existing situation or past actions, but six mentioned the need for better communication or transparency between PiL and the CAB. Three respondents cited the need for less defensiveness from PiL and three asked for various forms of increased liaison with the BoD. Several cited structural changes which would help including

clearer processes (two cited proper monitoring and evaluation), a list of who had been consulted about what, liaison with Community Engagement, term limits for both the CAB and PiL's Directors, and new Terms of Reference for the CAB. One suggested that Community Engagement should receive the same level of scrutiny about its consultation that they felt the CAB did. One newer member observed that the CAB had a part to play in improving relations alongside PiL.

The diversity of these responses and of views within the CAB gives a complex picture of differing expectations and practices, a lack of trust which is due to a mix of historic grievances, poor communication, lack of structure and process and a disconnect with other community consultation and engagement processes being undertaken in parallel. There was a clear pattern of greater optimism from newer members and in general a greater hostility or cynicism from longer term members.

The current view of CAB advice from the Directors of PiL was characterised straightforwardly by one as *"They are not an integral part of our day to day thought processes"*.

Open meetings

As part of their community advice and engagement function, PiL also holds 1-2 open meetings for LGBT+ Londoners every year at which reports are given and issues can be raised from the floor. Pride Directors and the CAB were both initially expected to attend these, with the CAB chairing the meetings. This also drifted over time and by 2020 attendance was low from the CAB. How and when this happened was more difficult to trace since there do not appear to be any formal minutes taken of these meetings or attendance records; no clear records of key issues raised by the public or commitments made at them; and no evaluation of whether any commitments made were kept. The only record offered was a tape made of the most recent meeting. It was therefore not possible to make any comparison of topics or results of this aspect of the advisory function. One person who did attend them commented that *"(Pride) needs to seek advice more generally through open meetings (post-pandemic) and to advertise these properly... attendance is always poor, with the same groups of people each time"*.

Roles and responsibilities of CAB and of PiL

A consistent feature of respondent interviews was about the lack of clarity about the role and responsibilities of the CAB in relation to Pride and also the communities they were in place to represent. While it was clear that people were elected or chosen to represent a sector of London's LGBT+ community, the minuted and reported actions of some suggested that they had seen themselves as there on behalf of their own organisation rather than their sector. This was also an observation in interviews from both CAB members and Pride Directors. Another confusion about responsibilities was the relationship to PiL, compounded by a number of factors discussed in this report but essentially – is or was the CAB a part of Pride, a totally independent body only responsible to the wider community, or somewhere in between? There was neither consensus nor clarity on this, with differing views being held even within the CAB over time. A 2018 proposal by [REDACTED] for changes to the Terms of Reference (never agreed by PiL) shows an attempt to insert the word "independent" for the first time, but this was ignored rather than challenged – and was in any case subsumed by the larger arguments that year.

This lack of clarity is also illustrated by recurring issues over confidentiality. Materials and issues the CAB might reasonably be asked to discuss in order to undertake a scrutiny role included commercial, organisational and political sensitivities such as sponsorship, parade route and lineup and parade groups and numbers. However, following both the critical 2018 CAB report and the

subsequent leak of the parade lineup, CAB members were asked to sign confidentiality agreements (as do many PiL volunteers). This was refused on the grounds that it might limit their external responsibilities, leading PiL to restrict CAB access to sensitive information.

The resulting situation of an increasing “us and them” cannot be said to be the sole responsibility of one partner within this relationship, any more than it has been caused by one incident. Nor can it be said to be something that was sought by the vast majority of participants. CAB members both past and present expressed sadness, frustration, confusion and in some cases distress at the way they felt the system was not working as intended. PiL Directors, in turn, expressed the same emotions with in some cases added exasperation at the feeling that they could do nothing right. But realistically the current poor relationship – and resulting loss of connection between community and organisation – is something that all parties have contributed to. This has seldom been an active choice but more often a passive withdrawal or avoidance.

If the CAB has drifted further and further both from Pride and from its initial remit, PiL must also bear some responsibility for this. As a largely volunteer-run and entirely volunteer managed body running one of the largest events in the London calendar with an enormous budget, it does miracles every year – but the immediate priorities of delivering the event and managing crises leave little time for long term planning and strategic management of the organisation alongside the events. It delivers a massive parade, a day of multiple entertainment, a week of events and a year of campaigning – but it has grown into this without many of the structures and practices that most businesses or charities of its size would expect as basics.

PiL has grown enormously since 2013 and this success has clearly outstripped some of the structures put in place at its inception in 2013, including its advisory arrangements. A majority of interviewees across all parties raised a mismatch between the growth of Pride since 2013 and the lack of strategic structural development. Senior figures in PiL accepted that one of the impacts of this was a short term unwillingness to tackle the problems they saw arising with the CAB because of a wish to avoid time and energy consuming conflict when other issues were more urgent.

Without a clear and consistent role within the overall structure, evaluation of any changes needed over time or a more solid liaison and training arrangement to support attachment, it is not surprising if the CAB has drifted. The need for better resourcing of the CAB or any other future advisory arrangement was raised by several interviewees. When difficulties arose, it must have seemed easier – but only in the short term - to create another structure, in this case within the altered Community Engagement Directorate, which now largely mirrors what the CAB was set up to do without its expectations of independence.

In the case of the CAB, some of the structural safeguards which could have avoided or repaired the breaches in the relationship could have included close and consistent, not reduced, liaison; joint selection, induction and ongoing training arrangements; administrative support including agenda and papers well in advance; strict adherence to agreed term limits and promotion of the CAB's work to attract suitable candidates. They could also have included greater opportunities to socialise and gain closer understanding of the difficulties in making Pride in London happen – but only if there was a better understanding of the importance of the role of critical friendship. As one person put it, *“You need friendship to be able to be a critical friend”*.

While the larger organisational issue of how PiL is structured and managed is not within the remit of this review, and will not be dealt with further here, it is clear from many interviews that there are underlying structural causes and constraints in terms of time, expertise, resourcing and prioritisation which have directly affected PiL's ability to obtain appropriate advice through the existing CAB arrangements, or to hear it when given.

Other key themes from interviews

A small number of other issues were raised by interviewees and respondents during the course of this review, which have informed the final recommendations. These are considered below.

The need to improve communications within PiL and with key stakeholder groups was mentioned in a number of ways alongside a desire for greater transparency in its dealings with community concerns and complaints. It is notable that the minutes of the CAB are only sent to the [REDACTED] of PiL and that the Director of [REDACTED] has no contact, formal or informal, with the CAB while running a near-parallel system of consultation within a larger remit.

Key stakeholders within both large and small community organisations in sectors not represented on the CAB commented on the lack of clarity about input. The CAB was envisaged in 2013 as a balance for the lack of grass roots community experience on the Board of PiL, but the growing importance of large stakeholder NGOs such as Stonewall or the LGBT+ Consortium had not been factored in, nor the increasing influence of corporate LGBT+ groups, both of which generate stakeholder engagement whose advice is not clearly channelled through any formal structure currently. Even where conversations had taken place within the structures, concerns were expressed about lack of promised follow up or consistency from both CAB and Community Engagement; two respondents said that negative remarks by then-CAB members had deterred them from further engagement with PiL on an issue.

These specific experiences ran alongside multiple comments on a perceived need for greater systematic accountability from PiL. While there are a number of systems in place to hear about and discuss community issues, there could be better information in the public domain about how and when this is done, with more systematic monitoring and evaluation of its results. Simple systems might include summary notes of open meetings, Community Engagement workstreams and the CAB on the main website; the role consultation and advice plays within a larger strategic plan; a transparent complaints policy with an annual review of complaints and responses and an annual review of issues raised in open meetings and the CAB alongside responses. These systems can feel like bureaucracy to someone who believes they are doing a good job already and just want to get on with it, but they are central to public trust and understanding. There were also suggestions for clearer role descriptions and clearer ways to reach appropriate people in both the CAB and Community Engagement. However, many of these would take resourcing and a willingness to stand back and look at long term structural change rather than adapting to circumstances as they arise (as in the development of Community Engagement's mirror roles).

The exact sub-communities which were consulted through (sometimes both) the CAB and Community Engagement had seen some change (see Appendix Four), but inevitably could lag behind the rapid development and changing priorities of the LGBT+ community in London. Over time, representative categories had changed into identity groups (bi, women, etc) with less subject-based categories. Inevitably, categorisation can exclude others and there was a feeling from some respondents both that PiL's Board was not currently as well placed to understand NGO as well as it did corporate concerns, or to support those economically deprived or with social support needs. Additionally, in 2020 there is an increasingly developed understanding of both intersectionality and diversity within sub-sections of the LGBT+ community. As someone put it *"Having one person represent a large, diverse community is tokenism"*. This was not an attack, but a plea for more diverse methods of getting nuanced advice on what can be complex political or social issues.

A final theme which arose repeatedly was descriptions on the one hand of PiL as overly defensive,

which could manifest as inflexibility or aggression and on the other hand of the CAB as inappropriately hostile and unhelpful. These are mirrored characterisations which have fed off each other and appear to have become self-fulfilling. They are based in historic hurts but the outcome of low expectations feeding negative responses and unhelpful tones in conversations was notable in both interviews and through observation of meetings. *“It's not helpful to have so much fragility and defensiveness”*

Community advisory arrangements in other organisations

In looking to compare how models of community advisory arrangements were structured in similar organisations to PiL, research was undertaken into other Prides; other LGBT+ organisations; other identity-based events such as BAME festivals; and charities. It rapidly became clear that there were no easy parallels and that, despite concerns about the appropriateness and functionality of PiL's arrangements, they were in practice more than many others were doing. Some very large Prides have a designated staff member to do community liaison, but this is usually within a charitable or NGO structure of other paid staff and a Board of Trustees who are not also effectively an Executive of volunteer staff. The vast majority of other UK Prides are small enough to be able to operate much more ad hoc arrangements, responding to community feedback largely through social media and occasional community meetings.

Most community-based NGOs with a budget and remit the size of PiL's had more substantial structures as charities with one or more executive members of staff and some separation of strategy from everyday management. In a well run organisation this enables a Board to hear and respond to community criticism or advice of their organisation without feeling personally attacked for all their hard work.

Some other festivals had less formal arrangements than PiL, with formal consultative advice restricted to meetings with resident groups affected by their event (PiL operates a similar arrangement for businesses on the route of the parade) and sometimes satisfaction surveys post-event (PiL undertakes substantial market research after the event each year). Community views were largely expected to be heard through representation on their Boards of Trustees. The exception to this (and possibly the nearest equivalent to PiL in terms of event and community ties) is the Notting Hill Carnival, which has a traditional charitable structure of staff and a Board of Trustees, with an additional Advisory Council of senior/key figures within the local communities with extensive experience of Carnival. There is crossover between the Trustees and the Advisory Committee.

Some charities have constructed (and resourced) diverse arrangements like the CAB to hear community feedback. The National Trust, somewhat like Carnival, operates both a Board of Trustees and a larger Council of useful people with clear roles, term limits, a link to the Board and assessment of skills and knowledge needed before new appointments are made to both. On a smaller scale, Terrence Higgins Trust has formal Trustees and a separate Advisory Board which includes business, political and community interests and to which the CEO and Chair take policy ideas and difficult issues for “blue sky” thinking. Queer Britain, the museum project, has a traditional Board of Trustees but then creates community “round table” events to consult on the needs and interests of particular groups within the LGBTQ+ community as well as hosting a slightly more ad hoc Advisory Board of museum experts, community leaders, politicians and business people.

Recommendations for the future

PiL needs to consult with the wider LGBT+ community of London and hear their advice. That advice may be contradictory from different groups or bodies; it may be constructive or simply complaint; it may be well informed or less so; but it is a basic requirement of the contract from the GLA and also a key component in keeping the event alive, well run and responsive to the needs of all LGBT+ Londoners, as well as an enjoyable event. To do this, PiL will need to consider its resources and priorities as well as existing structures.

The following recommendations for the future have evolved across the review period. Initially it was expected that there might be a range of options proposed but from the feedback some quite specific suggestions evolved and were tested with a variety of stakeholders for comment. Many of these suggestions are already strategies in occasional use which could be enhanced or done more systematically. These are shared below for consideration.

All future advisory and consultative activities should be contained within a single umbrella division of PiL. It is clearly unhelpful to have duplicated advisory and consultation arrangements and equally so to have no single oversight of that advice. The obvious place for managing advice from all relevant parties is the Community Engagement Team, which should be strengthened to support all work in this area. This would also help to clarify the status of any advisory arrangement; that it is there to offer expert advice for consideration rather than to act as some kind of independent tribunal. This will very likely take increased resourcing which could include paid staff time to manage the work; this would be a matter between PiL and its funders.

The Community Advisory Board, in its current format, should be replaced with new advisory arrangements designed to better fit current needs. Many people, including the current members of the CAB, have put time and effort into trying to provide useful advice from a community viewpoint to PiL. To say that change is needed is no reflection on the hard work and goodwill of those individuals. But it is clear that, two years on from major disputes, there continues to be a deficit of trust between both parties; that structural arrangements designed to keep the CAB relevant, skilled and diverse have not been adhered to; that it is evident that PiL does not, in general listen to the CAB in comparison to its own internal arrangements; and that the current system is duplicative, under-resourced and lacking in clarity. Any replacement function should be required to be reviewed for fitness for purpose every five years.

PiL should consider creating a new skills-based Advisory Board of key LGBT+ stakeholders with a clear policy remit and strictly advisory role. This would require an explicitly diverse and more flexible membership including people and organisations whose community standing would make it difficult to sideline them, alongside better resourcing and liaison arrangements. It should include a small number of senior personnel from major stakeholders in London's LGBT+ community alongside a similar number of individuals with identified skills and experience to meet current policy advice needs. The group should meet less often, but have full papers in advance, minuted recommendations and clear terms of reference alongside strict term limits and the presence of relevant PiL Directors including the Director of Community Engagement. This recommendation is considered in greater detail at Appendix 5.

Open meetings should be revitalised, resourced and have clearer outcomes and reports back on impact. It is important that there be a public forum of some kind for people to feed back about Pride. Some Prides specifically run these shortly after their annual event. However, these meetings need to be widely advertised with publicised agenda topics; more listening than reporting back; and have clear notes of suggestions given followed by responses, posted on the PiL website. This should be annually evaluated for impact. Frequent questions or misconceptions could inform a useful Q&A on the website.

Round tables (for key respondents from particular sectors of the community to consider their specific needs) or targeted enquiries (into disputed or contentious community topics) should be created as needed. Examples of these strategies being used from time to time by Community Engagement exist and they should be increased. This would enable a wider range of views from within diverse and marginalised communities to be heard and give greater public accountability for findings. There should be public summaries of meetings and calls for evidence for enquiries should provide opportunities for access. Topics could be requested by the Advisory Board or PiL's Directors and proceedings managed by Community Engagement.

A clearer process for public complaints should be established so that these are properly documented, reported on in summary to the Directors and Advisory Board and an annual public report of actions taken as a result published.

All formal advisory arrangements should be properly documented, monitored and evaluated regularly for response and impact. Whatever the structure it adopts, PiL needs to embrace greater clarity in both structure (how people feed in advice or complaints) and consultative activities (could include: published summaries of advisory and open meetings, clear goals and workplans for consultations, lists of organisations consulted on particular issues, annual review of issues raised and actions taken etc). Again, this has resource implications for systematic administration and management.

Appendix One: Terms of reference of the review

Appendix Two: Interviewees

Appendix Three: Desk Research

Appendix Four: CAB roles in 2013 and 2020

Appendix Five: A New Advisory Board structure

Appendix One: Terms of Reference for the review of advisory arrangements

(taken from a letter from [REDACTED] of PiL to the reviewer, later shared with CAB)

1. What are Pride in London's primary requirements for advice, guidance and accountability?
2. How effective are the different mechanisms already in place for obtaining that advice and guidance and making the organisation accountable?
3. Are there obvious deficiencies in the information and accountability?
4. Is the CAB as currently constituted and structures the right vehicle for the next 5-10 years, or are there other forms of advisory body that would be more appropriate at this stage in Pride in London's development?
5. If it is the right structure/body, how should it and its terms of reference change?

Appendix Two: Interviewees and thanks

GLA: [REDACTED]

Pride in London Board of Directors (current and past): [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

PiL volunteer (past): [REDACTED]

CAB (current and past): [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and survey of all current member views

External: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

A small number of people who were approached but did not respond are not listed.

Particular thanks should go to [REDACTED] who helped with much of the desk research and editing; [REDACTED] who opened his archives; [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who fielded many random enquiries; [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

Appendix Three: Desk Research

1. Minutes of meetings of the Community Advisory Board 2013-2020 (these were almost complete with only 1 set missing)
2. Terms of Reference for the CAB (with various revisions over time, and proposed revisions which had not been agreed)
3. Various reports from the CAB (including reports and reviews not agreed by PiL's BoD)
4. Other reports and surveys commissioned by PiL (e.g. post-event audience surveys)
5. Online and phone research into advisory structures of other Prides in UK, Europe and US
6. Online and phone research into advisory structures of other LGBT+ community-based organisations
7. Online research into advisory structures of public-facing major charities.

Appendix Four: CAB roles 2013 and 2020 and Community Engagement networking strands

Independent Chair Secretary (PiL-appointed)	(abolished 2015) Secretary (CAB appointed)	PiL Director Deputy Directors (2)
Reps in 2013	Reps in 2020	Comm Engt 2020
Art & Literature	<i>abolished</i>	
BAME People	BAME (also current Chair)	BAME
Campaigning/Political Groups	Political & Campaigning	
Disabled People	Disabled People	Access
Faith Groups	Faith Groups	
Health Groups	Health Groups	
Local Groups	<i>abolished</i>	
Older People	Older People	Older
Performing Arts	Performing Arts	
Professional Groups	Professional Groups	Employment Networks
Sports	<i>abolished</i>	
Trans People	Trans People	Trans
Young People	Young People	Youth
Other Groups (Parents Group rep)	<i>abolished</i>	
-	Bi People	Bi
-	Environment & sustainability	
-	Families	Family
-	Women	Women
-	-	Students
Major funder observers (2013):	2020	
Mayor's Office	Place available - unused	
Trades Union Council	Place left vacant (TUC not a funder)	

Appendix Five: Proposed New Advisory Committee and PiL advisory structures

This is a skeleton proposal, subject to further discussion if it is seen as a useful vehicle for strategic policy advice from London's LGBT+ community to PiL.

Advisory Committee:

Role:

- ⤴ to advise PiL on strategic policy issues of relevance to the LGBT+ community in London and PiL events
- ⤴ to advise on the maintenance and development of LGBT+ community relationships and engagement by PiL
- ⤴ to support PiL in its consultation across the LGBT+ community on plans for Pride
- ⤴ to advise on issues of inclusivity and diversity

Status: External advisors operating within and as part of PiL's Community Engagement Division

Frequency: Every 3 months, with agenda (agreed between PiL Lead and Chair of AC) and papers circulated at least a week in advance and minutes circulated within a fortnight.

Serviced: by PiL-provided volunteer secretariat

Composition: a combination of up to 15 people plus a Chair and Secretary

- ⤴ 5 senior personnel from key organisations and consortia (Stonewall, The LGBT Consortium, UK Black Pride etc) with reserved organisational places, reviewed every 2 years for relevance
- ⤴ 5 community leaders on issues of current focus (e.g. trans rights, migration, education) with strict 2 year places, next foci and invitations to be agreed between Chair and PiL Lead
- ⤴ 2 places for major sponsoring/participant organisations nominated by PiL, reviewed annually
- ⤴ 3 places for expert advisors from stakeholder communities to address any diversity or knowledge gaps within the above 12 places, nominated by AC and reviewed annually
- ⤴ Chair to be independent and chosen by agreement between PiL and the AC

Working parties, including further expert advisors, may from time to time be created for urgent issues or consultation topics by agreement and relevant AC members may be invited by PiL to participate in round tables, open meetings and other forms of consultation devised as part of PiL's Community Engagement strategic planning.

AC members will be expected to be active participants, with a Code of Conduct, declarations of any conflict of interest, term limits and attendance requirements which are adhered to. The PiL Lead and AC Chair will monitor this annually.

AC members will be considered volunteers within the Community Engagement directorate, with all the rights and privileges accorded to these, invites to social events etc.

All members of the AC must identify as LGBT+ and all specific community leaders must identify as members of the relevant community.

The GLA, as major sponsor and contracting body, will have permanent observer status. Other observers and guests may be invited from time to time by agreement of PiL and the Chair.