MDA No.: 1482

Title: COVID-19: London's recovery three years on

1. Executive Summary

1.1 At the GLA Oversight Committee meeting on 2 February 2023 the Committee resolved that:

That authority be delegated to the Chair in consultation with the Deputy Chairman, and party Group Leaders to agree any output arising from the discussion.

1.2 Following consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Lead Members, the Chair agreed the Committee's letter to the Mayor of London and Councillor Georgia Gould, Chair, London Councils on COVID-19: London's recovery three years on, as attached at **Appendix 1**.

2. Decision

3.1 That the Chair agrees the Committee's letter to the Mayor of London and Councillor Georgia Gould, Chair, London Councils on COVID-19: London's recovery three years on, as attached at Appendix 1.

Assembly Member

I confirm that I do not have any disclosable pecuniary interests in the proposed decision and take the decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct for elected Members of the Authority.

The above request has my approval.

Signature:

Printed Name: Léonie Cooper AM, Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee

popula logue

Date: 9 March 2023

3. Decision by an Assembly Member under Delegated Authority

Background and proposed next steps:

- 3.1 The terms of reference for this investigation were agreed by the Chair, in consultation with relevant party Lead Group Members and Deputy Chairman, on date 19 January 2023 under the standing authority granted to Chairs of Committees and Sub-Committees. Officers confirm that the letter and its recommendations fall within these terms of reference.
- 3.2 The exercise of delegated authority approving the letter will be formally noted at the GLA Oversight Committee's next appropriate meeting.

Experientos

Confirmation that appropriate delegated authority exists for this decision:

Signature (Committee Services):

Printed Name: Davena Toyinbo

Date: 20 February 2023

Telephone Number: 07521 266519

Financial Implications: NOT REQUIRED

Note: Finance comments and signature are required only where there are financial implications arising or the potential for financial implications.

Signature (Finance): Not Required

Printed Name:

Date:

Telephone Number:

Legal Implications:

The Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee has the power to make the decision set out in this report.

Signature (Legal):

Printed Name: Emma Strain, Monitoring Officer

Date: 21 February 2023

Telephone Number: 020 7983 6550

Supporting Detail / List of Consultees:

- Susan Hall AM
- Caroline Russell AM
- Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

4. Public Access to Information

- 4.1 Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the FoIA, or the EIR and will be made available on the GLA Website, usually within one working day of approval.
- 4.2 If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision (for example, to complete a procurement process), it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary.
- 4.3 **Note**: this form (Part 1) will either be published within one working day after it has been approved or on the defer date.

Part 1 - Deferral:

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? NO

If yes, until what date:

Part 2 - Sensitive Information:

Only the facts or advice that would be exempt from disclosure under FoIA or EIR should be included in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

Is there a part 2 form? NO

Lead Officer / Author

Signature: L.Rigg

Printed Name: Luke Rigg

Job Title: Policy Adviser

Date: 20 February 2023

Telephone Number: 07511 782731

Countersigned by Executive Director:

Signature: Me-

Printed Name: Helen Ewen

Date: 09/03/2023

Telephone Number: 07729 108986

LONDONASSEMBLY

City Hall Kamal Chunchie Way London E16 1ZE

Tel: 020 7983 4000 www.london.gov.uk



Leonie Cooper AM

Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee

Sadiq Khan Mayor of London Greater London Authority

Cllr Georgia Gould Chair, London Councils

9 March 2023

COVID-19: London's recovery three years on

Dear Sadiq and Georgia, I hope you are both well.

As you may be aware, earlier this year the GLA Oversight Committee launched an investigation into the London Recovery Programme and the London Recovery Board. The Committee met on 2nd February, just a few days after the three year anniversary of the World Health Organisation's decision to declare COVID-19 a global pandemic. The Committee, therefore, felt it was a natural opportunity to take stock of London's response to COVID-19. The purpose of this meeting was to examine the impact of the Recovery Programme and the Recovery Board, as well as discuss the plans for London's future partnership arrangements.

Several Recovery Board representatives gave evidence to the Committee. The Committee heard from GLA staff and the Chief Executive of London Councils, the London Policy Representative of the Federation of Small Businesses, the Executive Director of Performance at NHS England, and the Chief Executive of Kensington and Chelsea Social Council.

This letter summarises the Committee's findings and recommendations, which were informed by the evidence given to the Committee during its investigation, as well as by research.

The Committee welcomes the progress the Recovery Board has made since its inception in 2020, particularly with regard to the development of relationships and working arrangements with

partners across the capital. It is clear that the desire to recover from the pandemic created a shared sense of purpose, which helped the Recovery Board tackle structural inequalities by driving forward important initiatives, such as the Anchor Institutions Network, Building a Fairer City Plan and the Economic Recovery Framework.

The Committee was encouraged to hear at length from partners about the value added by the Recovery Board and the benefits it has brought to partnership working in London. The Committee heard that, through the Recovery Board, the GLA and London Councils had developed stronger, more mature relationships with partners, which will make them better prepared to deal with future emergencies in the capital. The Committee also heard that the cochairing arrangements between the GLA and London Councils had created joint ownership of the overall Recovery Programme. The Committee welcomes these positive developments.

The Committee heard that the Recovery Board is soon to transition to a new partnership arrangement, which is expected to be broader in remit, focus on a smaller number of more challenging issues, and use the working title 'London Partnership Board'. It is important that the GLA and London Councils, as co-chairs of the Recovery Board, learn the lessons of partnership working over the last three years to maximise the impact of the London Partnership Board.

In this context, the Committee wishes to express the following concerns about the proposals for new partnership arrangements and seek reassurances from both the GLA and London Councils.

The Committee is concerned about the impact of the GLA's proposal to allocate just £200,000 in annual funding to the programme team supporting the London Partnership Board.

This represents a two thirds reduction in funding when compared to the money allocated in 2022-23, which is £600,000. During the investigation, GLA officials stated they were confident such a funding reduction would not impact the delivery of the London Partnership Board. GLA officials also stated the change in funding reflected a desire to embed the partnership work programme in GLA teams and partner organisations rather than in a separate team.¹

Whilst it acknowledges the anticipated benefits of transitioning to this arrangement, the Committee is concerned that there remains a significant risk that the funding reduction will result in less support for the London Partnership Board. The Committee has not seen information about how the London Partnership Board will be supported by other partner organisations beyond the GLA and from whom it will receive support.

More generally, the absence of an overarching organogram that describes the relative roles and responsibilities of organisations contributing to the Recovery Board have exacerbated the Committee's concerns about the future partnership arrangements.

Recommendation 1: That the GLA and London Councils should publish information about the resources allocated to the London Partnership Board, including partner contributions, and how the use and performance of these resources will be measured.

¹ GLA Oversight Committee 2 February 2023 <u>Draft Transcript</u>

Recommendation 2: That the GLA and London Councils should publish an organogram of the London Partnership Board that describes the roles and responsibilities of contributing organisations.

The Committee believes that responding to the cost of living crisis should be a major priority of the London Partnership Board.

The Committee strongly welcomes the GLA and London Councils' proposal to focus on a smaller number of more challenging issues in the London Partnership Board as this will enable an effective partnership response, that achieves tangible outcomes for Londoners.

During the investigation, partners suggested particular areas of focus for the London Partnership Board, including housing, homelessness, crime and security. However, the Committee believes the new Board risks duplicating efforts already being undertaken by other well-established partnerships in attempting to tackle deep-rooted, longstanding policy issues in London.

The Committee heard evidence from GLA officials that the risk of duplicating work was being managed and mitigated for the reasons the Committee has already identified. Officials stated that work was ongoing to ensure the new Board would have a clear and distinct remit from other Partnership Boards in the capital. Nevertheless, the Committee still has concerns about duplication and is unconvinced that the new Board would add value to the existing partnership responses to policy issues such as housing, homelessness, crime and security. The Committee believes the London Partnership Board would be more effective and achieve greater impact if it focused on emerging, cross-cutting issues, such as the cost of living crisis, as well as continuing to prioritise addressing structural inequalities.

Recommendation 3: The London Partnership Board should prioritise addressing the cost of living crisis and structural inequalities in its work programme, whilst avoiding any duplication of work.

<u>There is a lack of clarity about the role of the Recovery Missions in the new partnership arrangements.</u>

The GLA's decision to take a Recovery Mission-based approach has clearly helped partners to focus around a Grand Mission to recover from COVID-19, a shared goal that required a partnership response. The Committee heard that the task-and-finish group process that sat underneath each Recovery Mission allowed partner voices to be heard and shape the development of the Missions, and allowed flexibility and immediate action to be taken, and this was both welcome and effective.

It is less clear what role the Recovery Missions will play in the new partnership arrangements. Whilst GLA officials confirmed at the Committee's meeting that the Missions would remain in place for the foreseeable future, it is not clear how they will interact with the London Partnership Board and its work programme, which is likely to have a different focus to that of the Recovery Mission Framework. This issue needs to be clarified before the new Board is established.

Recommendation 4: The GLA should clarify the role of the Recovery Missions in the context of the new partnership arrangements and commit to the London Partnership Board regularly publishing performance metrics.

The Committee also heard during its investigation that the Recovery Missions with an economic focus had been easier to define as their delivery plans and performance measures were more easily developed and measured. In contrast, it was more challenging to define the Recovery Missions with non-economic focus, such as those Missions covering community and personcentred outcomes. Any new partnership arrangement must lead to improvements in the development of specific outcomes for non-economic Recovery Missions.

Recommendation 5: The GLA should further define the outcomes for its non-economic focused Recovery Missions.

The London Assembly has an important role to play in overseeing and scrutinising the London Partnership Board, its work programme and the Recovery Missions.

The Committee's investigation has identified the complex partnership and governance arrangements that sit beneath the Recovery Programme and Board. The Committee welcomes partners' desire not to pursue governance reforms as they risk utilising valuable resource that could otherwise be focused on delivering the partnership's work programme.

However, the Committee believes there needs to be a clear framework through which the London Partnership Board and its work programme can be overseen and scrutinised. In parallel, the Recovery Missions should be scrutinised thematically through meetings of the relevant London Assembly Committees.

The Committee believes the London Assembly is the most appropriate body to fulfil this function in the context of its pan-London strategic role, democratic legitimacy, and relationship with the Mayor of London and London Councils.

Recommendation 6: The GLA should commit to reporting to a London Assembly Plenary meeting on an annual basis and through the relevant Committees to explain the London Partnership Board's progress.

I would be grateful if you could respond to the Committee's letter by **6 April 2023**. Please copy Paul Goodchild, Principal Committee Manager, into your response via the following email address: paul.goodchild@london.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Leonie Cooper AM

Somie Cogne

Chair of the GLA Oversight Committee