

**Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee
15 February 2011**

**Transcript of Item 5: Review into the Skills and Employment Opportunities during the
2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games**

Len Duvall (Chair): Let us move on to item five. Can I ask you to introduce yourselves and then we will begin with our questions. I am Len Duvall, I am the London Assembly Member for Greenwich and Lewisham and I chair today's meeting.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): I am Roger Taylor and I am a director of the Olympic Host Boroughs Unit. There used to be five of us but, of course, as you know, there are now six including Barking & Dagenham.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): Hi, I am Kerry Tweed, I am the director of Greater London Volunteering which is the regional partnership body for volunteering. It includes the Volunteer Centres and other volunteer support agencies across London.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): I am Lindsey Donoghue, the Employment Programme Manager at the Bromley by Bow Centre. Can I assume everybody knows what we do or shall I just give a couple of words?

Len Duvall (Chair): A couple of words will do.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): So we are a community anchor organisation in Tower Hamlets offering a range of services for the community including a doctor's surgery, support for vulnerable adults, and one of those key areas is helping people into work.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I am Jonny Boux and I am the Head of Employment and Training Links at Community Links. Community Links is a charity that delivers community based services in Newham, Tower Hamlets and Barking and Dagenham - including a large employment training arm.

Len Duvall (Chair): Julie Hutchinson will be joining us shortly from the East London Business Alliance and speaking of their work in this area.

If we could just begin then with a fairly simple question - it may not be a simple question in terms of some of the issues - tell us about the barriers that may prevent long-term unemployed Londoners taking advantage of the Games Time opportunity?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Well, I think the first thing to say is that the barriers are very complex and there is no sort of black and white answer on a small set of barriers that people face. I mean I have experienced working in

East London in a company in Newham and Tower Hamlets. One of the main barriers is a lack of skills, particularly around some things you need for particular jobs, and also life skills is an important factor. One of the things that, particularly, our long-term unemployed people face is often a difficulty around reliability and low confidence. There is often a lack of motivation as well; it is what we call, broadly, life skills. Then, I guess, multiple barriers which can be anything from major housing issues to difficult family circumstances and financial pressures. Many people we support are heavily in debt.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): I would echo everything that Jonny said. Obviously some of the roles are quite short-term and that is an issue for some people in terms of them having been on benefits for quite a long time and feeling comfortable on those or perhaps feeling that coming off them might be a risk and feeling unwilling to do so for a short period of time. Also, doing roles like that they would need to arrange things like childcare; a lot of the people that we work with are parents. So, again, a short time role is difficult for them because they need to arrange childcare for that.

Something that we have seen in our community is a sense of, "Well, it's not really for me". We have perhaps seen a limited number of people go into roles in the Olympics so far and because of that people sort of feel, "Well, maybe it is happening separately to me or it is not something that is necessarily part of our community". Perhaps that's something we'll come back to later.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): I can speak in terms of the volunteering programmes: Games Makers and the London Ambassadors programme. The volunteering programmes offer an opportunity for people who are further away from the jobs market to gain skills and confidence in a safer environment and a more supportive environment; the difference between volunteering and work roles to access some of the legacy promised by the Games coming to London.

There are quite some significant barriers to being involved with the volunteering programmes. The biggest barrier risk is the time commitment and reflecting on some of the things that Lindsey and Jonny have both said. For example, if you want to be a Games Maker, you are going to have to give up about 15 days of your time for 8 to 10 hours to be part of it; that is the commitment, the big ask from the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) for the Games Maker programme. That is reduced in terms of the London Ambassadors programme; it is, essentially, six days with five hours. It is slightly more accessible, but it is what is built around that volunteering programme to help people access the volunteering programmes; encourage them to take part; find out what sort of support they need to stay the course. Then identify what skills and experience they have gained through the volunteering programmes to then move on towards further training, further volunteering and employment opportunities.

The time commitment is, I think, the biggest barrier. Some of the work that has been going on to encourage people to take part in the volunteering programmes has been quite encouraging. For example, the London Ambassadors programme is working through the Volunteer Centres which do work very closely with the sorts of audiences that you are interested in in gaining benefits from the Games. It is possible that some of the barriers might be reduced by working

with agencies - like the Volunteer Centres - which can bring in other sorts of support around the official training recruitment programmes for Games Time and the London Ambassadors programme to take part and then benefit, in the long-term, with employability outcomes.

Len Duvall (Chair): Roger, is there anything you wish to add just in terms of the general nature of the long-term unemployed in the host boroughs and some of those barriers?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): Your question, of course, was addressed to all of Londoners and our remit is very much more specifically focussed on the six host boroughs; where we have the largest concentration of deprived people in England and certainly the most intractable problems related to long-term unemployment. I think it is right to pick up the point that some of the barriers are obviously around skills, where we still have a lot of concerns about focus and ability to work with people. We, also, I think, need to recognise that, as other contributors have said, the problems of people who are in long-term unemployment in great deprivation are never going to be confined exclusively to get them into skill and to work. They sit within a cat's cradle of problems which we all need to try and tackle. That is why, last year, we published our Strategic Regeneration Framework because we felt it was important to recognise and capture the long-term challenge of not just addressing employment and not just addressing skills but seeing that in the context of the other aspects of people's lives in East London which need to be addressed.

Apart from that I totally agree with the issue about skills. We are well below the London average in terms of skills in East London. We are well above the London average in terms of unemployment and these are real barriers. I think, too, there is an issue around motivation and the expectations of people with very low self esteem about whether the Olympics are for them. I quite agree about that. I think there is still a lot to do to encourage people. I think some of the things that are going to happen over the next 12 months like the mass testing of access opportunities for the Games which are going to involve bringing lots of people from East London into the park and interconnection with it will be a good thing.

The last thing I wanted to say is whatever happens in terms of the short-term job opportunities within the Olympic Park, it is, as far as we are concerned, a stepping stone into wider and longer term employment opportunities. It needs to be seen in the context of the very, very significant economic growth in East London over the next 20 years.

Len Duvall (Chair): Have you got the support infrastructure right in terms of the good work that you do in pushing people along - mindful of national objectives as well, not just in terms of Olympic boroughs, and the changes that are going to come. We have heard before that language issues - language support - was important and was a significant barrier for some - not for all - in terms of some of the host boroughs attracting jobs. Is the infrastructure right in terms of, not the actual projects - we will come and talk about that - but the infrastructure and the support to move, to encourage, to support people, rather than letting them fail in some ways? Is that support about right in terms of the Olympics?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I think if you are talking about the expertise of providers - I am talking, really, about our patch in Newham,

Tower Hamlets, Barking & Dagenham - the expertise providers are there to provide that support. What is challenging is the future landscape with regards to continuing to have funding to provide the same level of support with the uncertainties around programmes and delivery.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): Just to illustrate that point, it is obviously a major matter of concern for organisations like these but if you look at it from a local authority point of view - the clawing back of the Working Neighbours Fund, the Disadvantaged Area Fund - the general reductions in public expenditure mean that although we have set up what we think is a pretty slick piece of infrastructure for local employment and jobs brokerage, it is very much under threat at the moment from the simple change in the way in which resources are being allocated. You then add-on the fact that it is far from clear what the future infrastructure for job support is likely to be and how it is going to operate in practice once Department for Work and Pensions have appointed their three prime contractors for East London and that is a concern.

Len Duvall (Chair): I think we should also say that last week we asked the question about how that was going to run alongside some of the established networks already in existence and who was going to claim the outcomes. We thought it was quite an interesting question. We never got quite an answer but people are alert to that.

John Biggs (AM): There were two things, the first one is sort of a contextual thing - which you can shoot down if you like - which is that if you are not careful you can go away from a session like this thinking that East London is completely full of people who are workless, hopeless, lost and unsupported and that is obviously not the case. A lot of people are helped by these programmes. I just wanted to put that in in case anyone walks out of this meeting wearing a shroud, because I think there is a lot of success. The question is, last week a number of us - three of the Committee Members - attended a meeting in East London and we looked at the number of training projects there. My question was that during the Olympics there seems to be quite a lot of money for training initiatives which may relate to Olympic jobs; they may relate to a wider range of opportunities as well. Would you say there is a risk that there will be less capacity afterwards? I suppose you could ask this in the context of Barking & Dagenham which is very latterly an Olympic borough and which, maybe, has had the advantage of far less funding over a longer period to tool itself up for Olympic jobs - whether it is voluntary sector organisations or local authority schools that are training providers? From a Community Links or Bromley-by-Bow Centre point of view, are you benefiting from Olympic money at present and do you anticipate that that will disappear with a whoosh in 2012?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): It is an interesting question because I would say, actually, that we have benefited very little from Olympic money and we have benefited more from the longer term traditional programmes.

I mean we have been involved in Personal Best Delivery in East London which has given us a certain amount. I do not know if Lindsey shares this, but our experience, and again I do not speak for voluntary search providers in our area, but our experience has been that the pot is limited, related to Olympic money.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): Yes, I know because our experience is very similar. We have not had any Olympic money directly. We have been offered access to Olympic-funded programmes such as Personal Best and also some Security Industry training. Our experience is that people applying for those training programmes have found it very difficult to access them and have not necessarily had feedback as to why they have not been accepted on them, which then demotivates them to go for future programmes. So I would agree that it has been the long-term funding that has really helped us to support unemployed people and prepare them for these Olympic roles.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Could I just ask a follow-up to that? Could you just explain this bit about having difficulty accessing the programmes and then not having any feedback? Can you just explain how it works?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): Yes, as Jonny said, I would not like to say this is the experience of the whole voluntary sector but certainly our experience is that there is funding, for example, through JobCentre Plus, security training to allow people to then be trained to get jobs in security on the Olympic Park. There is an email address you send the CVs to and no feedback comes through from that, for example.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): So if somebody makes an application they are just told, "You haven't been successful"?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): Well, they are not actually always even told; they just do not hear.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Right and who is running that?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): That is JobCentre Plus.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): JobCentre Plus and being funded by Olympic money.

John Biggs (AM): I think we come to Personal Best a bit later on but my understanding was that the expectation on that programme was that a high chunk of the opportunities there would go to people with lower skills who were out of the job market. Your experience is that a lot of those have been rejected then; just to be very clear about that?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): If you are talking about Personal Best, when we have been dealing with Personal Best, no, it is exactly the point that we took on people below a certain level, all of whom were out of the job market, but beyond that I could not speak in confidence.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): So is Personal Best working or not?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Personal Best is a programme that worked for us but it is one programme which only has certain limits. It is one intervention, yes.

John Biggs (AM): All it does is provide you a non-certified piece of paper, doesn't it? It is not really a NVQ or anything.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Yes, I mean you could argue that the qualification that came out of Personal Best was accredited. Having said that, how closely it relates to employers is arguable in the sense it is not a very job specific qualification.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): It is an event stewarding qualification of sorts, essentially.

John Biggs (AM): It is a sort of a stepping stone and without further support for many people it will not take them very much further.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): It worked in terms of engaging people and capturing people under a certain skill level who were out of work but beyond that, moving them forward into real opportunities, I think, perhaps, its impact was limited.

Andrew Boff (AM): I So you are saying the accreditation that they are getting from this is not worth the paper it is written on or is it something?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): It is something. I would not go that far but it is a qualification and it is accredited, so in that sense it is something.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): The problem is that Personal Best is effectively finished now in London. I have not heard about any evaluation or any further work that might be possible to do with the around 4,000 people who have been through the programme to work with the training that they have been provided with to work with employers to see how that is transferable for them, to offer further support and training to move the participants closer towards work. The last stats that I had from Personal Best was that actually the biggest outcome for most people was they went on to further volunteering. Clearly, they need a bit more time to develop their skills, their confidence and their employability.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I think that is exactly the point; it is the bolt on to the end of the Personal Best programme that has been, perhaps, weak. The activity and the engagement were good but, actually, what is important is the end result and the follow-up with that individual beyond the programme and that has been weak, in my opinion.

John Biggs (AM): To answer Andrew Boff's question, they are not quite not worth the paper they are written on but without another piece of paper afterwards they are not really very helpful.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Without further intervention afterwards.

John Biggs (AM): There is a risk from the provider's point of view, whether it is LOCOG or the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) or the Mayor or me or whatever. I am not a provider by the way. I am just trying to displace the blame here. I am not picking on the Mayor that they fund this thing; they tick a box; they stand on a platform; they say we have trained so many people; but, in reality, it has not led to very much.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Time will tell, but there is a real danger of it not leading to as much as it could have done.

John Biggs (AM): There is some good quality end stuff that we do as well but not much coming out of the Olympics itself.

Tony Arbour (AM): What more could strategic bodies, such as LOCOG and the Mayor be doing to ensure that the opportunities are accessible? I would like to bolt on a question to that to say that: shouldn't the long-term contracts being given to people who are working on the Olympic site have written into them that those companies should be taking on unemployed people to ensure that they do get, in the context of the last question, meaningful qualifications?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): If we, for the sake of this discussion, put behind us the issues about jobs with ODA and the construction part and concentrate on the huge number of quite short-term jobs which are coming up with LOCOG and then the smaller number of much longer term jobs which happen with Olympic Park Legacy Committee (OPLC) - both organisations which are, or will shortly be, in the process of procurement of their contractors to do with that. Then the work which we have been doing with LOCOG. I think, you know, we need to recognise that LOCOG have moved a long way and has reflected some very clear determination to place contractual or similar requirements on their contractors to recruit locally and from the long-term unemployed. It has led us into a position of working with LOCOG to ensure standard application forms, guaranteed interview and working with contractors employed by LOCOG, as well as looking to provide an appropriate level of, as it were, authentic training qualifications.

I think we are looking at a system for LOCOG jobs which is based, I guess, as much as anything on our experience of what has happened before and how to do things better and to concentrate, very much, on how we manage the process into work for people within our area.

We are going through an endless discussion with OPLC at the moment about how far they can stretch the EU Procurement Regulations in relation to requirements about where you look to for the recruitment of your workforce. That is a challenge but we would not be the first set of

organisations to find a reasonably sensible way through that even if it concentrates less on the formal tendering process and more on the way in which we evaluate contractors' offers when they are bidding for the work.

Tony Arbour (AM): Can I ask specifically, you have a target, do you not, of what proportion of these jobs are to go to the Olympic Boroughs? Are you going to meet that target?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): Because we have not really got into the process of looking at the big chunk of odd jobs, we cannot be sure, but we think the way we are approaching it is more likely to achieve the results because we, not only, are setting the target, but we are also creating a system for monitoring how things are going which enables us, with LOCOG, to see whether or not we need to make any corrections, pretty immediately as time goes on. If we look just exclusively at LOCOG's own recruitment, we were able to say at any point in time whether they are on the curve of what we are expecting them to achieve or below it. Then we have a team of people who, together with LOCOG, are looking to see whether or not we need to trim the way in which things are being done.

We are not going to make any false claims about our capacity to achieve it but we think that the targets we have set, both for local employment - that is say from the Host Boroughs - and for long-term unemployed, which I think the first case is around about 15% and the second is about 7% or 8% - are realistic, if stretching targets for us. We have created the mechanism, this time, to try and understand and monitor in a very transparent way what is going on so that we can hopefully make some changes and corrections where we need to.

In fairness, LOCOG's absolute commitment to doing this with us is a huge help in terms of their interest at the very highest levels within LOCOG in ensuring that this happens.

Tony Arbour (AM): Can any of our other guests say what more should be done by the Mayor and LOCOG? What more should be done that is not being done?

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): Can I say in terms of the volunteering programmes, there is a fantastic opportunity for prospective employers in the future to see the volunteering programmes as a testing ground for people's potential: giving them some experience; letting them demonstrate their skills or their potential to learn. One of the things that concerns me about the Games Maker programme is that having looked at the ten functional areas and the volunteer roles within those, most of those require skills, rather than providing opportunities to train up or be trained to learn or try out a role.

For example, there is a role that is to do with helping with the costumes around the Games and it asks for experience as a dressmaker or a tailor. I would question whether or not that is really something that you absolutely have to be able to do in order to help sort out the costumes on the day; to hand them out to some of the performers.

I think that there is lots of potential within the training programmes within the volunteering roles that can help people to build their CV and give them a chance to demonstrate that they can confidentially stick to schedules, complete tasks assigned to them that would be important

then to demonstrate and to discuss with employers afterwards. There is the training through the volunteering programmes and then there is the connection referral post-Games to all those people who have been involved in either the short-term work opportunities or the short-term volunteering opportunities to see where they might link into the gaps in the jobs market.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I think there has been some fantastic commitment from various bodies around employing local people and local unemployed people for Games opportunities. What has always been a bit of a challenge for us, and I think this is where, perhaps, the Mayor could do more and focus his energies, is in the co-ordination of the exercise.

Our experience and the experience of our client group is sometimes that there have been several gatekeepers - and I am harking back to Olympic construction site opportunities here - where there have been several gatekeepers and it has sometimes been rather bewildering for individuals to navigate through the process of finding work and getting to the right place. That is bewildering for us. In terms of the service user who is low on confidence - perhaps low on motivation anyway - that is amplified. I think, certainly, the co-ordination of all bodies involved could be looked at.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): I would agree with that. I mean I started listing the different ways that we have been told local people could engage in roles at the Olympics before coming here and there was quite a lot of different ways and I agree with Jonny that that would be confusing, although very positive on their own, individually.

I think something we would like to ask for - I do not know whether it is possible - is for as much flexibility for the roles, the volunteering roles and also the jobs as possible. A parent being told that they have to volunteer for a set hour and a number of hours a week and having to be willing to volunteer weekends or evenings is extremely difficult and it just puts another barrier in place.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): We have heard from a variety of places about barriers. The example you gave of somebody having to have tailoring skills in order to sort out a costume seems quite extraordinary. We have also heard that, perhaps, all the good intentions for having a first qualification is not really then followed up by having something else. You get to the end of one bit and there is nowhere to go.

I am just wondering about the flexi-time for the volunteers. Is there any way that you can feed these comments back because you are all working, if you like, on the ground? Is there any mechanism for you to feed all these comments back to the people who are deciding that this is how it should be done? Have you ever, for example, been in touch with LOCOG and said, "Well, we think the volunteering programme is really excellent, however we do not think it is going to work as well as it might because of X, Y and Z?" Is there a mechanism? Is there a two-way?

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): Yes. I work with the UK Lifetime Alliance, which is, essentially, a number of chief executives from the voluntary sector - or Civil

Society Organisation, sorry, I must call it that now - who are now the advisory group for LOCOG on the volunteer programme. We have had lots of discussions about the volunteer programme. We have offered a lot of advice and support in terms of access to the programme. I do not have enough information feedback back from them about the detail within the roles that suggests that they have been able to take on board our advice. I understand the challenges that they have with the budget and the resources. We have talked about people being able to job share, effectively, on some of the volunteering roles because it is quite a commitment. Then it comes back to simple resources like the provision of extra uniforms, etc but I think there are ways around that. I am not sure we are having enough discussions early enough to be able to, at least, with a group of people to be able to offer them access to the programmes and take on board the real barriers in terms of their personal commitments and responsibilities and the ask of the standard Games Maker.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Suppose I had in mind something like a clearing house because if you have got direct experience on the ground and there is LOCOG up here with the best intentions in the world to try and make sure that the promises they made, when we won the bid, are going to be fulfilled. I have no doubt that that is what they want to do. I, equally, know that you are trying to make it happen. I am just a bit concerned that there seems to be a barrier that, for example, the example you gave, Lindsey, about people being trained as security guards. We know that this is a key element of the Games and not even getting an acknowledgement, let alone being told, "No, you've been turned down because".

If there was some sort of clearing house where you, perhaps, rather than set up a committee, you could just email your concerns and LOCOG could respond to them. I just wonder if that is something we ought to be looking at because what I am picking up from all of you is that you have got direct experience, you have got reservations about a number of things but there is nowhere to go with them other than just to talk amongst yourselves.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I would share that because I think there were some excellent intentions but again it is navigating to the right people. I think the simplification of what you are talking about would be an excellent idea because at the moment our route to get to the right place can sometimes be fairly longwinded and not easy to get to.

John Biggs (AM): I wanted to try with your indulgence, Chair, to try and stretch this out a little bit. I do not mean in terms of wasting time or anything but in the terms of reference we are looking at because I am reminded of the Mayor's five legacy commitments which were set up under the previous Mayor but which the current Mayor considers himself to be bound by. The second one of those was, "Ensuring London has benefit from new jobs, business and volunteering opportunities", and it says:

"The London 2012 Games will help to create 50,000 new jobs and inspire a series of projects that can help to reduce by 70,000 the number of Londoners without work."

It is a far bigger ambition than just the Games themselves. Obviously, I would like to see as many local people, indeed Londoners as a whole, benefiting from LOCOG opportunities and the

ODA opportunities and so on but what we are talking about, as I understood it, was the Olympic bid was the wider legacy which means all the house building, the shopping centres - whatever else goes up in the area - and the jobs in those places of work that are going to be built there. So at risk of understanding ourselves, both in this evidence session, but also in terms of our challenges because we need to keep, in my opinion, everyone's feet to the fire to hold them to those bigger objectives rather than just the Olympic volunteering opportunities. People are nodding in agreement, which is good news.

The question I have is whether we are at risk of letting people off the hook on that, if you like, because I think we are falling into the trap ourselves, today, if we are not careful of just focussing on the three weeks of the Olympics and not focussing more widely on the bigger legacy and tooling people up for that. That is a very generous question for all of you, is it not? With the Chair's indulgence I am sure you could spend 30 seconds each on each.

Len Duvall (Chair): Or longer.

John Biggs (AM): Or longer.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I think it is an excellent point. It is a once in a lifetime opportunity for people in East London and I think there is a real danger that the focus, in terms of sustainability and longer term opportunity is lost. Particularly, our experience tends to be, we are hearing a lot around the wonderful short-term opportunities, as you say John and the fact that people may find work for a month but there are no guarantees beyond that. It even goes as far as Westfield which is opening up, which, again, is a wonderful opportunity in East London but the job promises there tend, again, to be fairly short-term and with a lack of clarity over commitments around the future.

Andrew Boff (AM): Can I say that it is a bit short-term.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Well they can temporary contract. For instance, employers tend to talk around - and I can see why they may do it - uncertainty around the economic future.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Presumably, if they turn out to be any good, there is a possibility of people staying on; at least they want to try something. When you talked about CV enhancement, which I think somebody mentioned earlier, what would you actually do about it?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I think that it would be good to have the discussions with employers around their commitments, with longer term vacancies?

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Do you do that?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): We do, yes, as best we can.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Good.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Again, I think maybe time pressures dictate that particularly around the Olympic opportunities, for instance, that people are just keen to focus on those short-term opportunities and fill those and, perhaps, there is not the time to focus on the longer term.

John Biggs (AM): To return to my question, I would argue that people like us and the Mayor and the other public agencies need to remain very focussed on the 50,000 to 70,000 jobs rather than the few thousand temporary opportunities as part of the Olympics.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): Yes, I would agree.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): I am not entirely sure what you are saying.

John Biggs (AM): Everyone is interrupting my question, Chair.

Andrew Boff (AM): A very good question.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Sorry. I thought you had finished.

John Biggs (AM): I have not. No, I was hoping we were --

Len Duvall (Chair): We will come back. We will work up and down the table but let --

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): I was just fascinated by what you said. Did I misunderstand you, are you saying that Westfield, those big organisations, big companies that are moving in there. For the Westfield development they are looking at temporary contracts but if they are elsewhere in London they are looking at permanent contracts?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): No, I think it is just generally by the nature of retail.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): So it is not specific to that area?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): No, I would not have thought so.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Right, OK. That is fine. I thought what you were saying is that if you worked for Marks and Spencers somewhere you were full-time and if you --

Len Duvall (Chair): Let us continue with John's question.

John Biggs (AM): Are we being overly focussed on the Olympics, forgetting about the wider legacy which is about regeneration of a large chunk of East London and providing through that opportunities for local people?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): Yes, so I think it is really important to bear that in mind. We do feel really positive about the wider development of the area. As Jonny mentioned, Stratford City, as a whole, is offering a whole range of much longer term jobs. We are actually going to visit Westfield this week and all the retail HR managers are actually going to be there to talk to the voluntary sector directly about how to recruit people into their roles which I think is absolutely fantastic because from what I have heard when Westfield was set up in West London I am not sure that that actually happened. I think that is really positive.

I would say, as well, that we do not think it is too late. There is still another year to go until the Games. I think there were a lot of positive moves towards the beginning. Perhaps at the end of Personal Best it had gone a little bit quiet but we do not think it is actually too late to sort of refocus our efforts.

Len Duvall (Chair): Did you have similar chats, like you are having with Westfield, with LOCOG at any time?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): We did in 2009, we met with LOCOG, we developed an action plan with them, we met with them, we visited the site with them and worked out how we would work together. I would say the latter part of 2010 has been quite quiet.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Did you have an ongoing action plan with them or not?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): No. It was developed in 2009.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): Was it completed?

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): I would say a lot of the action plan involved commitments on LOCOG's part. One of the things that I raised in it was sort of putting people forward for the roles, for security roles, and getting feedback. So, I would not say that all of it has been met yet. So, I guess, yes, you could say it is ongoing.

Len Duvall (Chair): Can I ask from your point of view, the wider question around --

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): Yes, I am not sure that I can really answer that question because my remit is volunteering. The broader picture for us is it is not about three to six weeks of volunteering but it is that it is an opportunity as a stepping stone for people on the longer journey towards being able to take advantage of greater employability prospects in the future. I cannot answer that question for permanent jobs.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): I think there are really some pretty strong solutions already in place. I think if you look at the work that Lend Lease have done with the Athletes Village, its numbers, in my opinion, are actually quite strong. I think it is over 400 people that have got into work. I think it is only 600 from Newham so considering that 400 of them have got into work on the Athletes Village, I personally think that is quite strong.

When I say there are solutions that exist already, I think the employers that are in the area, whether they are temporarily there, as in until 2013, or not. The ones we have spoken to are pretty committed. They are keen to talk about action. They are keen to talk about models that are proven to work and for example, in Lend Lease's case, they have an imbedded team, a team of their own employees that have this as part of their fixed agenda and as part of their day-to-day duties. That is a reflection of the work that we have seen work very well in East London. Also London City Airport have an imbedded account manager, an East London Business Alliance (ELBA) employee imbedded account manager who works continuously to recruit locally; only looking at Newham residents. So there is a commitment there but I think the solutions need to be focussed on more and scaled up where possible.

John Biggs (AM): I suppose in the case in Newham there have been a number of very large planning applications: there has been the Athletes Village, Westfield shopping centre and for both of those, as part of a section 106 agreement, there has been requirements to have training opportunities and placements for local people, I guess. That gives us a pointer to where we might go in the future with leveraging opportunities for local people.

I suppose looking back, this committee issued a report in March 2007 which looked at the employment skills legacy from the Olympic Games and focussed very much on Games Time opportunities and I suppose in my mind is that, following this session, if we were to read you another report it might look at post-Games opportunities and things like this. You would welcome that, would you in terms of getting the public bodies to focus on how we could use the legacy developments, the job opportunities and the training opportunities from that? To very much focus on bringing up the skills levels in East London.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Certainly.

John Biggs (AM): Good.

Len Duvall (Chair): Julie, can I just go back. When you say, in terms of those opportunities, "scaling up", paint me a picture of what that scaling up is and what is required in terms of maximising the opportunities for East Londoners?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): We are always talking about three things at ELBA. The first thing is training into work for the longest term unemployed or the harder to help communities; those who are going to need to make quite a big transition. Training into work to us is, to be honest with you, quite a no-brainer, particularly when you have individuals with complicated benefits cases. The transition needs to be

managed and that is a flexibility that we can only gain when working closely with the JobCentre Plus in the local area in a very, very local context. That is the first thing.

The second thing is imbedded account managers. So making sure that that employer, whoever they are, as long as they have got a good scale of opportunities available they have got somebody who is really concentrating solely on their needs and can be that individual who can hide the wire and who can work with the multiple community partners who are interested in submitting candidates.

The third thing is just having a community partnership that is very able to respond and very able to listen and make the quality submissions at the right speed. That is what I mean. The model has to work, and we have got good brilliant case studies where employer A has gone from being completely against recruiting locally because of the multitude of issues right through to winning awards and being the biggest fan of saying, actually, when these things are in place, it is a no-brainer. It is very easy to deliver on.

Dee Doocey (AM): You are acting sort of like a clearing house in that sense?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Yes, but it is about scale, of course.

Dee Doocey (AM): ELBA, just run me through what that stands for?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): East London Business Alliance. We are an alliance of organisations.

Dee Doocey (AM): To explain then, the sort of people that you would all produce would be handled through someone like Julie? I am just trying to work out where you fit into the pyramid if I may.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Absolutely. We are a charity. We are a 40-strong charity based just behind Canary Wharf, and we work with, as I said, businesses who are members. We have 123 employers in essence and they are financial services, housing regeneration, educational institutions, typically everybody who is interested in corporate social responsibility or the wider regeneration picture.

We have an employment programme within that. We do not only do employment and skills. My team is a team of ten so immediately scale comes to mind. In terms of what we have achieved in the last few years, we have helped 1,000 into work. Not a massive number but interesting given that the opportunities we feel are cleaning opportunities, let us say, in Credit Suisse. It is actually quite challenging to engage local people for those opportunities typically. So, we do the wiring in that case but we do a lot of work with our community partners. Our work is largely about models. We try to find models that can be scaled up that we can work with with our community partners. For example, in Workplace in Newham, the local authority's response to work lessons, we have done a lot of work in trying to bed in their approach with working with employers. There, we are quite pleased to say, we have embedded account managers with the

airport. We have high numbers of people going into work because of those relationships, and we do a lot of work with their management team.

We would not necessarily, given our current size and scale, be able to respond to the needs that would help the Mayor's plans but that is why we are always talking about scaling up what has proven to work rather than replicating and trying to find what is needed. I think employers by and large have bought into the theory --

Len Duvall (Chair): But that is at the upper end of embedded workers' attitude or cultural changes at London City Airport. They are not big employers; they are big in what their operations impact. What is the model for small, medium-size companies that need support and help who could take on either extra volunteers in some capacity or start contributing in taking on other employment opportunities to think differently about areas and stuff like that? Is there anything that ELBA or anybody else can offer in terms of that? We still have John's question to finish with Roger, I know, but are there any other models for small, medium-sized companies on industrial estates in East London; that other end that create employment as well?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Our models are exactly the same.

Len Duvall (Chair): The same, right.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Absolutely. The training-into-work concept works because there are fears and apprehensions on both sides. If you are a recruiter that has a way of recruiting, whether it is through word of mouth within your own circle or through advertising in the *Evening Standard*, you have to be convinced to adapt. There has to be a business case for changing that approach and working with an alternative candidate pool; a more challenging individual to appoint and sustain.

For us, training-to-work works well for those employers because it is try-before-you-buy, it is a low-risk option until you actually say, yes, this person is great for me; you are not investing. For the actual individual concerned - again that transition - if you are talking about the harder-to-help individuals, and I am just going to assume that they have been unemployed for more than a year, those first few weeks are indeed a transition. Where the benefit system allows us to just make sure that both parties are happy with that partnership, it is exactly the same model. Whether you have one embedded account manager working with a series of six or seven different smaller employers, it still means that those employer needs are protected and listened to and heard.

John Biggs (AM): Can I just challenge one thing you said, which was about, obviously, cleaner jobs being important. Many of my family members are cleaners and it is a noble calling but, when I was kid, something like 30% of the jobs in the East End - I am making this up but it is something like this - were low-skilled jobs and did not require any qualifications. Now it is more like 10%. Is that challenging for you in terms of having lots of people you turn away because there simply are not the jobs for them?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): We constantly work at all levels of recruitment at ELBA so we are very keen not to focus on security, catering, cleaning opportunities only because we do not want to send that message to the community. We do not want to be only facilitating opportunities, let us say, that pay under £22,000 only in the support services. We have an awful lot of programmes that target back-office roles and finance teams and graduate interventions for our local graduates who we know are disadvantaged for a number of reasons. But, as far as we are concerned, working within our membership we need to create models that work for each individual employer and, as I am always saying, hide the wiring, because the extent of the need is so great within our local community partners; we would not only work with one type of opportunity.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Borough Unit): Just slightly altering the focus. I think, if you asked anybody in the host boroughs what they felt about legacy, they would say that there is an ever-present danger that legacy becomes conflated exclusively with what happens during the Games and what happens on the comparatively limited, although very important, opportunities that will follow on on the Olympic Park. We feel it is terribly important to constantly remind somebody of what the bid promise was: the most enduring legacy of the Olympics will be the regeneration of an entire community for the direct benefit of everyone who lives there, and also to link that with the sheer scale of the opportunity that inner East London has within its grasp over the next 20 years.

We are not just talking about the Olympic Park, we are not just talking about Westfield and Stratford City, although we think that is actually a pretty successful model largely down to people like Newham and Westfield themselves. We are also talking about the already-given planning approval effectively to double the size of Canary Wharf, and the very, very significant developments that we still expect to take place in the Royal docks and on the Woolwich and Greenwich waterfronts.

Essentially, if anything I think the Mayor's promise about 70,000 jobs is an understatement of what over the next 20 years is likely to be an opportunity in East London. The question then is whether or not we have got a sufficiently strong and clear vision to be able to ensure how that opportunity relates to the people in the communities in East London. I think that is where the really challenging questions lie. It is why we are close to reaching an agreement with the Mayor about thinking about how we create a clear strategy to realise the benefits of all of that for the people who live in East London. It is going to require a great deal of hard work at a strategic level, which should be completely in harmony with what happens on the ground. It is going to involve a very considerable amount of thought about how the still, with respect, quite uncertain skills infrastructure is going to work for us, and how - and I go back to that - we are going to relate what we as the host boroughs and what Job Centre Plus do to what is going to happen with the new prime contractors, and how we are going to develop still further the kind of brilliant accords that we have with ELBA's employers in terms of thinking about the jobs that will be created.

I do think, actually, that at a strategic level there is a lot to do if we are going to capture the broader legacy. What we should never lose sight of is that, for the next two, three, four years, there will be a unique spotlight on this part of London in the run-up to the Games and, I guess,

for a couple of years afterwards, which gives us a wonderful focus for thinking about how important this is.

Basically, if you looked at growth spots in the UK commonly over the next 20 years, East London is probably the most significant one, which only requires us to do something sensible to realise it. In that lies the potential opportunities, not realised necessarily, to radically change the social and economic circumstances of many of the people who live in East London.

Len Duvall (Chair): The host boroughs coming together, recognising individual boroughs alone cannot intervene on this area, what is the thinking about that? Finally, what is it that you want from the Mayor and the allied organisations? What is it that needs to happen for us to make that real difference post-Olympics and keep the momentum going because I am mindful of what John said. There are some good things that have happened in East London but we have had a tradition of areas that have got long-term unemployed. Some may well be generational. I am not convinced it is but there is certainly a younger element about the longer-term unemployment and being out of work. We have also got graduates being out of work. So, what is it that the Mayor or this organisation needs to do with the changes we have got with the wind down of the London Development Agency (LDA) in terms of some of your activities? Tell us about the boroughs; can individual boroughs do this intervention alone or do they need to work collectively?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Borough Unit): I think the fairest way to describe it would be to say that I think that boroughs recognise that for some of the things that they want a federal approach works. That is not to say that they want to sacrifice their opportunities to make arrangements within that framework that are theirs and theirs alone. For example, Tower Hamlets recently concluded their arrangements with JP Morgan for their new European headquarters on Canary Wharf. That has been something that they have done but it is consistent with a pattern of shared ambition.

Right at the heart of that, I guess, is a view that collectively there are some things that we need to see happening in East London that we are going to have much more purchasing power to deliver if we speak together and if we speak together with the Mayor. This reaches right into the thinking that is going on here at the moment about what the London Skills and Employment Board is going to look like and what its priorities are and how it is going to fit with a London-wide Local Enterprise Partnership, and what its priorities are, and what we are going to do about thinking about future investment patterns in relation to infrastructure and promotion of economic investment in the area.

There is that package - that is the one that we are trying to work on with the Mayor at the moment to see if we can develop a really clear pattern of that. On the other side of this, we want through us and the Mayor to think about how we can coherently not just hold our feet to the fire but how we can hold the feet of the new prime contractors to the fire over their delivery of the kind of levels of improved inter-work employment, which they are going to be primarily responsible for with the long-term unemployed.

I think there is a range of things. Then, last but by no means least, I do not think any of us are satisfied yet that the structures around the relationship between what our colleges and universities are training for and what our employers and particularly, for example, the ones on Canary Wharf are looking for. We think that is still a piece of work in progress. I do not think that is by any means as sharp as it should be. I think that is why we are just about to set up our new structures in relation to employment and skills, which recognise the breadth of the challenges around it for us.

So when you ask the question, “What do we want the Mayor to do?” I think there is a discussion that is predicated on an understanding that East London may have had a lot of investment in it but East London is the primary growth point probably in the UK economy over the next 20 years. That is what our work with Oxford Economics shows absolutely unequivocally.

The question then is, if that is going to be one of our major growth points, what can we do to make sure that it is realised. It is partly about making sure that the growth comes but it is equally about making sure that that growth spins off significant benefits à la Olympic promises for the communities who live there. It is about those three things.

If I could just make one other point, one of the problems of East London is that it is a very, very mobile and transient community, and there are questions in that about the judgements that are made over the growth and the distribution of population and the issues about the sustainability of the communities and, therefore, their housing in East London, and the quality of the life experiences that people have; all of which are going to contribute to this. For example, we still cannot understand why our levels of violent crime are so much higher than the rest of London. We still do not understand why we have not yet managed to focus as much housing investment as we need on the acute levels of overcrowding and why there is still no clear regulation of houses in multiple-occupation under three storeys, which, of course, is exactly the position in lots and lots of the under-regulated HMOs [Houses in Multiple Occupation] in Leytonstone, Maryland and out into Forest Gate and things like that. There are other factors in here. The population issue is probably potentially one of the most challenging for us.

What it requires is for the public sector as a whole to really focus on cracking the East London problem as it is at the moment. It is not about wearing a shroud or a hijab. It is just starting to face up to the realities that this is an area of London that could be so much better than it is, and just at the moment it has got opportunities both in the Olympics and in Westfield and Canary Wharf and Greenwich and Woolwich waterfronts that, if we seize them, we can genuinely start to do something about it.

Len Duvall (Chair): Just further in terms of that last one because I want to bring in the others. The element of the host boroughs and their relationship to the infrastructure in their areas and they - the third set - to the social sector, is that attitude right in terms of skills and employment, and are they doing enough - not just what the boroughs are? What thinking or discussion is going on in the host boroughs towards that sector?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Borough Unit): Two years ago, I set up a regular dialogue with the principal - this will not be everybody - voluntary organisations working in East

London. We then helped to fund a post planted within the voluntary sector to try and start to enmesh a little bit more those broader ambitions about what is the strategic regeneration programme. I am not saying it is by any means perfect but, for example, it enabled us not long ago to have a very thoughtful discussion with a large number of voluntary organisations in East London about the impending threat to them of becoming subcontractors to prime contractors and how were they going to manage. Were they going to be expected to carry a vast amount of risk or were they going to be properly remunerated for what they did at the time.

I would not say it was by any means perfect but we recognised that in exactly the same way that it is terribly important for us to develop more and more our work with the growing group of employers in East London as well.

Len Duvall (Chair): We heard earlier in terms of your organisations that you wanted to see better co-ordination; a clearer path in some ways through some of the labyrinth that we work in now. Let us take that as read. Is there anything else that you think that a Mayor could do to make life better for you or the people who you are working with? What else could that do or even the boroughs in some ways? It may well be national agencies. Is there anything else that can be added to that?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I just want pick up Roger's point around work programme primes and the awareness of that. I am not quite sure what the Mayor could do as yet but one of the major challenges for organisations like us is that when the work programme hits us in July, the majority of unemployed people across London will be going through that provision as such. The challenge we have is providing the same level of intervention to prepare people for long-term opportunities under a new funding regime where Roger mentioned about risk but where the signs are that risk for voluntary sector organisations will not be protected, and permanent models will be set and passed on. It becomes much harder to provide the same level of up-front intervention for individuals when preparing individuals for work.

I think, going back to your question, what could the Mayor do, I think that potentially the Mayor could work with the primes on this bit of work and make sure that the awareness is out there around some of the challenges that voluntary sector organisations will face post-July.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow Centre): I would echo that. I think we face the same challenges with the work programme. I am quite concerned about working with the financial models that are out there, and uncertain as to what the future holds in terms of working with primes. It is a very different model to what we have delivered before. Any support with that from the Mayor would be very, very gratefully welcomed.

I think I would say as well that not everybody, not all of unemployed Londoners or East Londoners even, will be going through the work programme. We need to remember that there are hundreds if not thousands of people who may fall through the gap if we are not careful. There are people who we are working with now but once funding streams come to an end we do not want to stop working with them. Let us not forget those individuals as well.

Len Duvall (Chair): Kerry, from your point of view, you talked about some changes to the volunteer programme. The Mayor is very committed to volunteering but in some of the process issues I am not sure if he is sensitised to that or we are sensitised to some of those issues in this organisation. Would that be more of the same of what you said earlier on of the changes that you would be looking for?

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): I would like to see some evaluation and further work on what has happened with Personal Best. In terms of London ambassadors, I am really encouraged by the fact that the LDA and GLA are working really closely with my members, the volunteer centres and other volunteer support agencies to make sure that the programme is as accessible and inclusive as it can be; that it offers opportunities to people to gain skills confidence. I would like to do more work now on the legacy from that programme in terms of a framework for the future; learning that we can pick up now to help Londoners in future and ways in which we can connect the London ambassadors programme with future opportunities for further training, volunteering employment for people going through that.

If the Mayor suggests that he is a quite good relationship broker between the private sector and the voluntary sector or the volunteering sector, I would like to see more work there about employees understanding the relevance of volunteering experience in moving people forward; helping them progress towards more skilled work and not just cleaning jobs.

Most employers do not ask about volunteering experience as a standard on any application forms. That does not give a good message to people who have looked at volunteering as a way to gain confidence and skills. It also does not necessarily help them identify that they could use their volunteering experience as a way of demonstrating that they are ready for work or that they have potential to do more.

Those were the main bits that I wanted to get across but there is a big question around the infrastructure to support volunteering. We are still struggling to work out - past April it will be unclear what the situation will be for local advice and support into volunteering - what the volunteer centre situation is going to be. We have had an advantage across the rest of the country in terms of volunteer centres and provision for general advice support into volunteering in each of the boroughs but Brent have already shut down the volunteer centre, and there are others who are under threat because of the funding situation. Actually, if you look back at the research that the GLA and the LDA commissioned a couple of years ago, those are the very places where people get support, get valued, get asked to get involved in regular activities in a safe supportive environment that then helps move them on this path towards work experience, apprenticeships, further volunteering training, employment. I am not certain that there was enough being done to protect those agencies who really do deal with helping the most disadvantaged across London to feel like they have more choices in life.

Victoria Borwick (AM): One quick point. There are thousands of people who are interning, whether you call them an intern or a volunteer. There are thousands of people who are interning for nothing, for no money - some people say being exploited - in all sorts of jobs I do think we ought to, not shut down, but volunteering is one thing and internships are another. A

lot of this is actually going on organically. It may not be actually organised by a particular volunteering centre but I do think we need to keep our eyes open to the number of people who are out there.

Separately, I help a little local sort of charity, and 50 internship CVs arrive every day. These people come for two or three months, they enhance their CV, they intern, i.e. they volunteer. Let us not beat about the bush; it is a fancy way of calling it. They work for nothing. Then, hopefully, they use that as a CV enhancement and can then talk about that job, as you said, as part of another role. But they do not necessarily do that through an organisation.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): You are talking about perhaps people who are more confident, more proactive, who understand what internships are rather than people who need to be even introduced to the idea of volunteering --

Victoria Borwick (AM): Certainly but I do not want to actually separate off. The point we made not everybody who volunteers is necessarily doing cleaning, catering - I have forgotten the others in the list of things. There is a broader range of volunteering roles going on all the time.

Kerry Tweed (Director, Greater London Volunteering): There are hundreds of thousands of volunteering opportunities with lots of different experiences, levels of skills, level of commitment but I do think it is important to understand the differences between work experience and internships and volunteering, which is not about doing something for nothing. It is about enhancing or achieving more through the support of volunteers to an activity that is for community benefit and is not for profit.

It is actually very positive that the Mayor has endorsed the principles of volunteering that we developed to clarify the difference between work experience and volunteering. Also to clarify the discussion around what is job substitution or taking advantage of people through internships.

I am not quite sure the point you were trying to make around internships and volunteering but, from our perspective, we do think it is very important to be clear about what is genuine volunteering and what are other forms of work experience, which are equally valid but not part of our remit.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Absolutely.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): In terms of what the Mayor can do to help, I would say again hold or work with the single work programme contractors very closely or the prime contractors, I should say, just to encourage them to observe the many examples of good practice that already exist locally. Of course, in relation to the work with the voluntary sector and the risk models, try to encourage as many voluntary sector partners who do know the local communities and their differences to get involved with the programme but also on the employer-engagement side where there are already very embedded relationships in place with models of that activity that are getting people into work.

Having worked in the welfare-to-work sector for a long time, typically when contractors move into an area they generally move into an area with an approach that is often gleaned from speaking to partners a few months before the tendering process began and then getting all the nice words into the bidding process. With all due respect, that is great and that is fabulous but we really need East London dialogue. It is such an active area because of the unemployment, because of the scale of the needs. We really need partners who are going to come to the table and observe and understand that things work already. Employer-engagement activity needs flexibility in East London. That is one thing I know for sure about working in East London in comparison with other areas the nature of the employer needs means that we cannot be too rigid. Whether it is the benefits issue, whether it is the length of work experience that is required, housing benefit roll off, you need flexibility. We are just very nervous about very rigid measures being brought into place, and things starting again and dialogue starting again when actually they have been going on for years. It is about observing good models.

Victoria Borwick (AM): How was ELBA founded?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Founded?

Victoria Borwick (AM): Yes, how was it founded and how is it funded?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): We are 65% funded by our private sector member companies. Member companies pay an annual subscription and in return for that we develop and deliver their corporate social responsibilities. Now, that is everything from mentoring, employee volunteer and brokering into the community. So a good chunk of ELBA's work is in brokering, employee volunteering and this year it is 10,000 employee volunteers that we have taken from our companies into the community in a variety of different roles. The employment and skills element is a team of ten.

Victoria Borwick (AM): And the other 35%?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Public sector grants, project funding specifically but it is largely that we are private sector weighted.

Victoria Borwick (AM): You have obviously gone out of your way to be very, very successful. You have been really impressive this morning. Do you think the way you are set up has helped you? The point is we have to learn lessons this morning about what recommendations we can make and I have obviously been very impressed that you are, as you say, very actively engaged and as a result been very successful. Is that a model you think more people should follow? You say, "What should the Mayor do?" but actually you are proving on the ground what it is possible to do.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Obviously private sector funding is great for the organisation but within the employment and skills context it has shaped our programme because we are genuinely employee-led and so for us it is about who we can work with to make it work. Whoever is in the borough currently, whoever has the

funding this year, we need to work with organisations that are committed solely to the needs of employers and the needs of the unemployed now. I have worked for publicly-funded organisations for my entire career and I can appreciate that when you are working for a particular organisation you can only work with certain communities. You are very restricted in the work that you can do. In many ways when you are working with skills and employment being private sector weighted or funded is certainly an advantage. I do not know how easy it is for other organisations to follow in that. ELBA was created by businesses, by the private sector as a facilitator, so that is in our history as a 21-year-old charity.

Moving forward, as more organisations look to the private sector for funding, that is great but of course the private sector can only fund so many organisation and we have so many wonderful organisations.

Victoria Borwick (AM): Thank you.

Len Duvall (Chair): We are coming towards the end of the session. Shall we do a learning lessons question?

Andrew Boff (AM): Yes. What lessons have been learned during the construction phase of the Olympics about getting people in long-term unemployment into jobs? What are we going to change that we should have changed beforehand?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): I can comment on that. I think the focus on skills instead of training has been excellent but perhaps an area that has been in danger of being overlooked at times is going back to the whole life skills area again, which I realise is harder to fund, but certainly groups of people we sometimes help around confidence-building and motivation. That area is widely called that horrible word 'soft skills'. There has been a danger in the past that funding around opportunities is solely based on skills training and perhaps that the other side can be in danger of being neglected. I would like to see increased focus on that area recognising that that is an important step for some individuals to make the journey not just to find work but to progress and stay in work as well.

Len Duvall (Chair): Anything else?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): If we answered the question thinking specifically about the kind of big opportunities which come along not all that frequently but we need to learn from them and pass them on, I think what we would say is that we have learnt a lot from our experience of working with ODA which is finding its way now as a set of lessons into our relationship with LOCOG and out of that we shall find that that finds its way into our developing relationship with OPLC. I think probably some of the cornerstones of that are, first of all, that we, with these organisations - and 'we' could be any part of the public sector that is engaged with them - share an understanding of what are the absolutely fundamental objectives that we are trying to achieve and that there is therefore genuinely a real partnership. Secondly, we do not over-enthusiastically go into setting targets without understanding that we have created the machinery to see transparently how that is getting on.

Quite a lot of the difficulties with ODA were about how you recorded and reported who was getting jobs and those kinds of things. The third thing is about actually ensuring that between partners engaged in this kind of a project there is an infrastructure that follows the potential for people to come into work through from the very first base, what I was describing earlier: sensible application forms, sensible infrastructure with other organisations involved right through to guaranteed interview and a link to some very specific and accredited training as well.

It is very important that their principals and also their contractors are involved in that process. From the level I am looking at it, there is a package there which we have refined with LOCOG from our experiences at ODA and it is now a package that we are starting to work with with OPLC. It is not significantly different from the package which Newham and others have developed with Westfield, nor is it very different from the way in which we would want to be approaching future developments elsewhere. It is always worth bearing in mind that even in any new set-up one of the most crucial things is going to be the implications for employment conditions in section 106 arrangements.

John Biggs (AM): Do you have a fear that with a Mayoral Development Corporation being mayor-focussed it might lack that local interest in getting details of section 106 agreements right for local communities?

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): I think we are still thinking about that. I do not think I would want to commit myself at the moment because I have hardly read the consultation document yet.

John Biggs (AM): OK. It is quite a detailed question. Something I worry about when I go to sleep at night.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): I think there are at least two different sides to it as well.

John Biggs (AM): Yes.

Andrew Boff (AM): I want to lead on to the next question.

Len Duvall (Chair): I think we are coming to the end so if you --

Andrew Boff (AM): Can I just ask, the ODA was pretty slow off the mark employing apprentices. Is there any scope, do you think, for LOCOG to be able to be involved in apprenticeships? I know it is a peculiar question because obviously it is a three-week event but is there any scope for encouraging apprenticeships?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Apprenticeships to be part of the actual games?

Andrew Boff (AM): Yes.

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Opportunities are opportunities from my perspective and I think with the flexibilities that I know exist with London Apprenticeship Company where apprenticeships can be dropped into locations and then pulled out without payroll implications, I think there is flexibility. We have only started looking at apprenticeships as an agenda in the past year because we are about jobs; not that apprenticeships are not but they are also about qualifications, skills and jobs. We are looking at it to talk to employers who have never recruited by that model before. We are convincing them slowly because it is a different approach to recruitment with age group boundaries and ways that you have to work with local colleges and training providers. If we can make it as simple as possible I see no reason why we could not make apprenticeships part of the offer for employers moving into the area at Games time. I think there is some tidying up maybe about the ease of participation from the employer engagement perspective. It is not as simple and as quick to get apprenticeship places ready and rolling.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Boroughs Unit): Of course what would be interesting but very, very difficult to achieve is to think about how very successful short-term employees of LOCOG or its contractors might have a status which would enable them then to carry on into longer-term permanent employment with the same skills in the same type of jobs within the OPLC. Whether there is a particular form of apprenticeship which would carry people through so that they see that their short-term job with LOCOG is likely to have the expectation of a long-term and permanent job doing the same kind of thing: security, catering, stuff like that, grounds maintenance, FM services within the Park Company, is one of the challenges which I think we still have to think how we might be able to engineer that.

John Biggs (AM): It must be the case though that in an area where a higher proportion of school leavers, for example, have non-academic qualifications, that apprenticeships will be a more important part of the package to get them into work. Although apprenticeships might have been traditionally identified with lower skilled work, from the community's point of view it would be helpful to devise apprenticeships which were aimed at middle-skilled areas of work because those opportunities at the lower-skilled end just do not exist. People are nodding in agreement at that. That will be for the record, if you like, but do people agree with that broadly?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Certainly and that is why we are looking at the agenda with other companies. We are trying to get them to understand how apprenticeships can work for support roles – so security, etc – but also core middle/back office opportunities, let us say, in banks where the individuals are allowed to be supported through level 2, 3 learning and onwards. For us it is an ongoing discussion. I do not know how the other panellists feel about it but it is a big discussion because it is an alternative approach; a very broad and worthwhile one but very different.

John Biggs (AM): Being a big discussion, it might be a good point to stop, Chair.

Andrew Boff (AM): Obviously during the ODA the construction phase there was this great sucking noise as staff were employed at the ODA from the whole of Europe and a lot of the East End bypassed the opportunities. I think the *Evening Standard* recently did a report that almost

50% of the people on the ODA construction phase are not even British, let alone from the East End. Are we going to have this three-week opportunity taken away from us as well because of people coming over temporarily for jobs for the Games period?

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): It is hard to say. There are certainly enough people there to fill these opportunities. That is the challenge, is it not, really to ensure that does not happen?

Andrew Boff (AM): The impression I got, Julie, and you summed it up quite well, was that we were not doing enough to push - whichever way you want to dress it up. I put it that what happened in the ODA during the construction phase is the ODA said, "We have lots of jobs" and they issued lots of leaflets and the job centres said, "Yes, there are opportunities". Nobody was kicking these people up the backside to go down and apply for them. You are doing it in a nicer way. You are saying, "We have got to re-skill, get people's life skills, get back their timekeeping" - that sort of stuff - but there does not seem to be much on the proactive side of getting people who are most needing those opportunities actually into work. Why is this going to be different now?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): I think we really need to step it up. We are constantly trying to speak to as many different employers as they are identified to make sure their section 106 aspirations are deliverable, that the community infrastructures are tight and robust so when an opportunity is circulated all the organisations are alerted. That it is relatively seamless and texts are made and we can put forward our best candidates. It is a pretty complicated matter. I agree that there is a lot of work to be done but it certainly needs to start with the dialogue. It needs to start with us being able to respond to employer needs, like 106 aspirations, but how easy is it for employer A to access individuals to start tomorrow or next week with the correct checks? That is a pretty chunky question.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training Links, Community Links): We were talking about ELBA earlier and ELBA is a very good example for organisations like us that make that link between building a trusting relationship from our point of contact on the front line, through to preparing somebody that is actually exactly what the employer requires and dealing with an organisation that already has those links. I think there is a very good example there of how you can make it work.

Andrew Boff (AM): ELBA is an astonishingly well-resourced organisation. I have been to some of your presentations. It is astonishing, totally impressive, may I say; big bucks going into it in order to get that working. We went on a visit to Workplace to see how people were working on providing those life skills or encouraging life skills amongst job applicants who had perhaps been out of work for a long period. That too was incredibly well resourced, very highly resourced. How can we do this at a lower level because those kinds of resources are not going to be available in the future? To be honest they were not even available in the past. What is the long-term solution that is a sustainable solution for getting people who are in East London into East London jobs?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): I do not know that the ELBA Employment Skills Programme is astonishingly resourced. As I said, we are a team of ten, public sector funded, and actually what we do is speak to employers. We are a facilitator talking to employers about employment and skills, and actually that is a relatively cheap model to be replicated because all we do is drive it home and try to hide the wiring. So as long as there is an opportunity, working with the multitude of different projects - Community Links or Workplace - and I appreciate yes, Workplace is a very different model financially etc. But in terms of the dialogue with employers, that is not free of course but cheap by comparison. It is just ensuring that they are aware of their responsibilities and how to make their obligations real in the community, and making it as easy as possible for them. I guess acknowledging that it is not as simple as advertising an opportunity locally and receiving 150 good local applicants ready; it is not as simple as that yet in East London. So continuing that dialogue where it is balanced so employers know that the opportunities are going locally but you may need to be a bit more flexible with our candidates particularly the harder to help groups. That to me is something that can be scaled up, not to an unlimited extent, but certainly the dialogue with the new employers relating to the Games just needs to be expanded upon.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): I would just like to come with a slightly different point. I do understand that there are huge numbers of organisations doing everything they possibly can but with resources being very scarce and likely to get much more scarce, my concerns is that the regeneration of the East End will become another Canary Wharf which is hugely successful, very, very well run - an inspiration in many ways - but is not really benefiting local people and the sort of local people we are talking about; the ones without the skills. It seems to me that the only way that we are ever going to get to a stage which Andrew was describing earlier is for it to be almost part of an employers contractual obligation in order to take people with low skills and almost that part of that is that they have to fund in some way getting the people up to a certain skill level. I think Roger just touched on what I thought could have been quite a breakthrough idea when he said there are ways around legislation in how you can do this. I just cannot see, and I think we are fooling ourselves if we are going to say LOCOG want to make sure that this is the most amazing Games in terms of leaving a lasting legacy, people on the ground want to make sure that all these people without the skills are going to get them, but unless somebody puts some money in the pot, as far as I can see it just is not going to happen. Speaking to employers and reminding of their obligations I do not actually think is going to do it.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Borough Unit): Here is a number to play with. Our modelling of the Inner East London economy over the next 20 years makes it clear that if we are successful in reducing levels of unemployment to where we are in the London average, and if we are successful as a result of that in increasing people's skills levels, then the likely positive contribution to the Exchequer is somewhere around £4.5 billion a year. That is different from the contribution to the wider economy. That is just about switching from an excessive dependence on benefits into a significant increase in tax revenues; so you are balancing those two up together. Although I think I accept that employers have got a lot more to do, that is such an important prize in terms of national finances that we may not quite be at the end of saying it is all going to be gloomy and hopeless because there is no more money. Those are the kinds of things which justify some further investment in making the system work.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): I totally agree but that is the same argument as saying if people change their lifestyles the National Health would save shed-loads of money and there would be money for using it on better things. The difficulty is you have to have some upfront funding and I cannot see where this upfront funding is going to come from because in order to get the changes, and I totally with everything you said, you have to put the money up front and I do not know where that money is going to come from. I would be really interested in hearing from the others. You are absolutely at the coalface. Where do you think you are going to get these people into jobs if there is no money to give them the sort of training that you have all said is needed? The volunteers are not getting all of the opportunities. Your people are not getting feedback on trying to become security guards, and so on and so forth. I cannot see how it is going to work and I think we are just kidding ourselves but I would be interested in your views.

Len Duvall (Chair): A very quick point and then I think we have to bring this session to a close unfortunately. It could go on all day.

John Biggs (AM): I am afraid you do go on all day, Chair.

Len Duvall (Chair): Are there any further comments from you on those points?

Julie Hutchinson (Programme Director, Employment and Skills, ELBA): Just on that point, in terms of serious attention by private sector into corporate social responsibility. Looking at the models in which they invest huge resources to recruiting their talent pool from universities and other institutions, if they are really going to take the Comprehensive Spending Review seriously and look at long-term then they also want to be applying the same sort of approach to building their apprenticeships or their access points to work for people with no or low skills. There are conversations I am sure that could be had which would facilitate looking at the benefit in the long-term to the employer as well as the benefit to the individual so it is mutually encouraging for people to look at that kind of model.

Jonny Boux (Head of Employment and Training, Community Links): I think just to add to that, I think there are ways. Put like that it feels quite bleak but I think it is up to the voluntary sector and the stakeholders working with the voluntary sector to be creative about this. One of the things that we are focussing on in Community Links is something called the Social Impact Bond which, although in its infancy, is a way of looking at the savings you make in the long-term and working with the private sector to, in a sense, borrow that money and pay back in the future. So working very closely with the private sector and with employers may take time but it is one potential answer.

Lindsey Donoghue (Employment Manager, Bromley by Bow): We are working in partnership with Community Links on that but also something we have a strong history of at Bromley-by-Bow Centre is social enterprises and something we are looking at is exactly what you mentioned: all these Canary Wharf employers. We have been providing staff to local employers for years effectively a free service and actually should we be charging for this service. That is what we are starting to look at. It is a huge shift but actually the money needs to come from somewhere.

Dee Doocey (Deputy Chair): It needs to come from the employers.

Len Duvall (Chair): Thank you very much for the way you have answered our questions. We will be writing to you with some follow-up questions. Thank you for all your hard work. We went on a visit last week and we were impressed by a number of examples of good practice. We were very grateful in terms of your professionalism and hard work, and your contribution particularly in terms of the community centre. Thank you very much for the picture at the end on the balanced boroughs because it is something we do not quite get a feel of in terms of individual borough's work but actually when they come to work collectively.

Roger Taylor (Director, Olympic Host Borough Unit): It has been a pleasure.