



**MINUTES OF THE LONDON RESIDENT PANEL MEETING  
HELD ON 19 JANUARY 2021  
VIRTUAL MEETING VIA TEAMS**

<b>PRESENT</b>	PL ZH AD Cllr CR Cllr SR JJH MS	Chair and Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member
<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	Maria Moriarty (MM) JR  JM TK DG AT Shauna Hutchinson	Head of Resident Engagement & Customer Insight Executive Director of Business Performance and Partnerships Complaints Manager Executive Director of Governance Executive Director of Development Complaints Officer Resident Engagement Officer
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	CC IQ	Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member
<b>NOT PRESENT</b>	BS LC DC	Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member Hertford Panel Member
<b>MINUTE TAKER</b>	Shauna Hutchinson	Resident Engagement Officer

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.01	The Chair welcomed the attendees and Councillor SR, Trinity Ward taking over from Councillor PB.	
1.02	Apologies were received from IQ. CC is unable to join at present due to reduced capacity as a result of role the pandemic.	
1.03	<b>PL to pass on well wishes and request from contact on behalf of MM</b>	<b>PL</b>
1.04	MM confirmed invitation to the Panel Meeting for Gabriel Codjoe, Jackie Trundell, Elizabeth Lill, Tracy Hanks and Crystal Nicholson was for information only and opportunity to observe.	
1.05	PL noted 4 reports of significant interest to the resident panel.	

<b>2</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
2.01	Due to content of Ag.04 Building Safety, PL as a shared owner – although not in a block affected by the content, expressed an interest in the paper but not a conflict.	
2.02	No further declarations of interest were received.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Matters arising – Action Log</b>	
3.01	As per Action Log – item 3.02 is in hand with Jackie Trundell, Head of Neighbourhood Management (Hertford) and CR as an ongoing matter.	
3.02	3.04 Complete – any feedback DC had been incorporated into the meeting	
3.03	4.02, 4.10, 4.11, 4.13, 4.14, 4.18 all related to the Rent Increase proposal presented by Michael Thorne. All comments incorporated to the Network Homes Board Meeting held in November 2020. Complete	
3.04	5.06 ZH feedback regarding lettings and allocations policy fed into paper. Complete	
3.05	6.05 and 6.07 related to Anti Social Behaviour case for ZH – responded to outside of panels. Complete	
3.06	6.11 No comments from Panel members regarding ASB toolkit. Panel Members are still able to share their feedback.	
3.07	7.01 No response from 3 Panel Members for self assessment – survey now closed but if any members require further support or training MM advised to contact the Resident Engagement Team. Complete	
3.08	9.02 Tabled by JR for 11 01 2021 Ag.09. Complete	
3.09	12.02 Complete as per action 4.18	
3.10	13.02 Complete – MM provided panel with report via email on 11 01 2021.	
3.11	14.01 Complete – DC feedback has been incorporated into documents.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Building safety</b>	
4.01	The report was tabled by TK. Report taken as read. A supplementary document of comments from Chair of Herts and Outer London Resident Panel, Chair of London Panel, SW9 Board Chair and Chair of Customer Services Committee was provided to Local Panel Members 08 January 2021 following a special meeting. The Chairs of the Local Panels are also Customer Service Committee (CSC) Members.	

4.02	PL encouraged in depth discussion suggesting flexibility of timeframe allocated on agenda for a full review of content.	
4.03	TK provided introduction of paper in collaboration with DG, regarding recovery of 100% of costs to shared owners and leaseholders for Building Safety remedial works as a result of changes to the criteria for eligibility of the government building safety fund. TK confirmed resident recharge is a last resort after exhausting all possible avenues prior such as taking action against developers, pursuing legal action, claiming against insurance and warranties and/or applying to Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Building Safety Fund.	
4.04	TK noted the comments from the Panel Chairs are this is an unfair decision as is Network Homes' stance and being pushed back against Government so wanted to provide further options and give insight as to the change.	
4.05	TK advised from a legal position the default is shared owners agree to 100% of costs. This is also the course for other members of the G15. ( <i>12 Largest Social Housing providers in London</i> <a href="https://q15.london/who-we-are/our-members">https://q15.london/who-we-are/our-members</a> ) Reiterated this is a last resort and would only be pursued if pressure on the MHCLG has not worked resulting in rejection of an application for the building safety fund with no other options.	
4.06	TK advised Network Homes has already spent a substantial amount on for Building Safety without recharge and has significantly impacted Network Homes financial position and won't be affordable for the business and won't be affordable for smaller housing associations.	
4.07	TK is liaising with Peter Benz, Executive Director of Finance, to provide figures of what the total building safety costs could look like to then be able to share.	
4.08	<b>TK to share financial impact data of the affordability of the Building Safety costs when available, as per request of Panel Chairs.</b>	TK
4.09	The legal advice throughout the course of this matter has specified under Network Homes' obligation as a social/ affordable housing provide are under a charitable obligation to charge leaseholders and shared owners under their contract as costs are legally chargeable to them.	
4.10	TK further explained if Network Homes were to subsidise certain matters Network Homes could be accused or referred to the Regulator of Social Housing for acting beyond the powers of our charitable objectives.	
4.11	TK further explained – all of Network Homes' income comes from rent and service charges, not from other avenues. In using funds from rent	

	and service charge for leaseholder/ shared owner building safety costs, allocations for expenditure would have to be moved from other areas of the business e.g maintenance of housing and/or development of new affordable housing.	
4.12	TK informed Panel Members one of the ways in which Network are moving to support residents through this is having invested to get a Consumer Credit License. This means Network Homes can offer interest free loans to residents we are asking for this money from.	
4.13	Different to a bank, the interest free loan would be means tested on the financial situation of the person affected, over an agreed period and affordable payment plan. Network Homes would carry the risk on this amount with no legal charge.	
4.14	“TK explained that a legal charge is registered to protect a mortgage loan. The owner of legal charge has a power of sale should the mortgage payments not be maintained. The licence that had been obtained by Network Homes did not enable us to register a charge against the credit arrangements being offered and so, this would be a credit agreement only. If the leaseholder subsequently sought to sell their home without having paid back the amount, Network would seek recovery of any amounts owed from the proceeds of sale. Further, that the credit arrangement would be interest free, which was a better deal than most would be able to get from their bank or building society, but if any leaseholder failed to make their payments, interest then may be charged. Network is subsidising the costs of these credit arrangements in terms of their being interest free and there being no charge to leaseholders utilising them.”	
4.15	<b>TK to email SH with full detail of explanation to include in emails due to technical difficulty impacting audio.</b>	<b>TK</b>
4.16	TK confirmed there would be no legal charge for interest free loan support for Building Safety recharges.	
4.17	DG highlighted the paper is for discussion and no decisions will be made until considering all views from the Local Resident Panels and SW9 Resident Board. The Panel Chairs will then convene with the Network Homes Investment Committee to review the issue in further detail and the potential options.	
4.18	DG added further context explaining when the initial decision for equity based charges was made, in March 2020, the focus was on tall buildings but following the pressure from MHCLG to rescope buildings for review, the remit has expanded to further 80 sites to survey. The majority of	

	<p>buildings are in London with one high rise block (over 18m) in Watford affected. The homes affected in Herts region are medium rise.</p>	
4.19	<p>DG advised the views of all residents is required as whichever decision is made will have future implications on all residents. Further explained if diverting funds to cover/ subsidise building safety costs for leaseholders and shared owners it would impact the asset management programs and future developments of affordable housing. These decisions will be held by Board.</p>	
4.20	<p>DG updated panel there are low risk blocks, with surveys required of cavity walls and fire stopping rather than cladding issues which may be making leaseholders and shared owners anxious about cost.</p>	
4.21	<p>DG acknowledged the uncertainty for leaseholders shared owners at this time as a result of further requests from lenders for EWS1 forms being made in instances where not necessarily required despite government guidance that it isn't required for blocks under 18 metres or where there is less than 25% of the external façade cladded.  <a href="https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/the-external-wall-fire-review-process-ews/">(https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/the-external-wall-fire-review-process-ews/)</a></p>	
4.22	<p>DG referenced articles in The Daily Mail and The Times national campaigns to address the issue and bring awareness to MP's about the uncertainty this brings to leaseholders and shared owners affected across the country.</p>	
4.23	<p>PL referenced the Inside Housing article shared with the Panel where it expresses MPs are against the calls to charge leaseholders and shared owners. PL added further context there are major delays to issuing EWS1 forms due to limited number of people qualified to sign these off.  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-steps-in-to-help-homeowners-caught-up-in-ews1-process">https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-steps-in-to-help-homeowners-caught-up-in-ews1-process</a></p>	
4.24	<p>PL mentioned the amount of building safety works required is unknown. It may be unattractive for future homeowners for shared ownership and leasehold to be the route for them. Also asked if homes are worthless without the EWS1 forms.</p>	
4.25	<p>DG responded DG - national forecast of cost is £15 billion. Government are providing £1.6 billion but recourse being chased with developers where they are still trading as an option.</p>	
4.26	<p>All new Network Homes properties in the pipeline should be covered with the assurance and EWS1 form in line with technical regulation changes going forward at handover stage.</p>	

4.27	Due to the limited number of fire engineers qualified to sign EWS1 forms off there have been cases where peoples' homes are being valued at 0. This would be unknown for homes paid for in cash where a mortgage isn't required.	
4.28	A lot of lobbying is underway with campaigners and groups to push back against the limited support from government. DG informed of cases where residents are sending letters to their locals MPs as the local resident voice is essential.	
4.29	CR acknowledged the need for resident voice and support from local constituencies.	
4.30	ZH noted TK said this isn't affordable for Network Homes so obviously would be the same for residents in general rented social housing properties. ZH asked if this would apply to general rented residents.	
4.31	ZH added the situation could cause shared owners and leaseholders to bankrupt or could end up in social housing as a vicious cycle. Some organisations may not even be able to pay and some developers have gone bust.	
4.32	ZH asked if there will be a team for each scheme affected to have meaningful communication about the situation for effective support and clarity on the situation.	
4.33	ZH referenced a specific block with building safety issues identified in the paper, with all general rented social housing residents querying how the costs would be financed.  ZH asked how much Network Homes are willing to push and influence government to change their stance on the amount of support they'll deliver. Network Homes need to fully support the resident view on this matter.	
4.34	TK responded there will be an impact on social housing across the sector. Legally there would be a case by case basis if we're unable to use insurance and warranties to cover building safety costs. As a last resort we'd look into how we can support residents with the interest free loans and affordable payment plans wherever possible. If the costs impact residents to the point of financial hardship, Network Homes Welfare and Debt Advisors would be able to support. This team is currently expanding to provide sufficient support.	
4.35	TK added one of the options suggested in the paper is a cap on the amount to reclaim from shared owners and leaseholders. This option has	

	not been full explored yet but could support residents on a case by case once more work has been done to consider this.	
4.36	TK responded to query regarding pressure and support from Network Homes. Helen Evans, Chief Executive and Chair of G15 alongside JR, Executive Director of Business Performance and Partnerships have been active in public forums to lobby government but noted the resident voice is extremely powerful in these situations. TK gave an example of 30 residents writing to their local MPs for one on one viewpoints would also carry a lot of weight in addition to Network Homes lobbying.	
4.37	DG advised for Network Homes rented homes there is a £16.1 Million provision now in place to cover the building safety costs whereas leasehold and shared owner costs would normally be pro-rated.	
4.38	DG confirmed there is a Building Safety team, which was initially more technical but changed to incorporate resident focused teams. The team is specifically responsible for liaising with those affected with a tailored approach for each scheme e.g adapting written communication, site visits to facilitate or support through disruptive activities, one on one meetings through lockdown, regular newsletters and fortnightly webinars.	
4.39	DG added there is a need for wider surveys to be conducted so initially there will be generic communication with each project then receiving tailored communications specific to each scheme and the Resident Liaison Officers.	
4.40	ZH commented Network Homes need to stand up not only to apportion blame but hold the relevant parties accountable for failings. Network Homes must also consider the current pandemic where job security and peoples' financial situation is already under strain or at risk.	
4.41	PL queried the recourse to developers in particular where buildings are relatively young e.g 10 years. Queried Network Homes' duty of care and support to people whose homes are no longer viable such as selling shares or the whole property as the worst case scenario.	
4.42	PL asked if Network Homes benefit once the works complete on a property if the value goes up.	
4.43	DG advised the homes affected with Aluminium Composite Cladding (ACM) the same as that used on Grenfell Tower has been resolved via funding from the government with no cost to Leaseholders. The last block affected in Stockwell, is 1 month away from completion of receiving its EWS1. DG referenced one recently completed block where the estimated cost to Leaseholders is approximately £8000.	

4.44	<b>DG to provide sufficient data/ estimates to panels to support effective consultation.</b>	<b>DG</b>	
4.45	DG questioned panel members on their views of a cap and what this should look like e.g £10,000 to £12,000 as a capping structure unlike where other organisations have mentioned £100,000 which would be completely outside of peoples' remit.		
4.46	DG also mentioned there is a campaign in the media and on social media implement a Developers Levy to contribute to the Building Safety costs.		
4.47	CR queried if the cap would be based on property value, size of the property resident affordability or a standard approach to all.		
4.48	CR expressed exploring a cap seems like Network Homes are bending over backwards to find various ways support residents but then where would this leave the business in danger with debt itself?		
4.49	TK clarified there hasn't been a decision made on a cap as yet, it is for discussion with the panels. Based on the fact Network Homes wouldn't be able to apply a legal charge for these costs the route, if taken, would be purely based on an individual basis with affordability of payment plans.		
4.50	TK added the likelihood of property value increasing after completing works is unlikely, the only potential benefit would be renewed warranties.		
4.51	CR added the difficulty for people who have high outgoings as shared owners with a percentage of equity and rent would then be under significant strain even if with low equity. Shared ownership would become an increasingly grey area.		
4.52	DG Average equity of shared owners is 40% but some people do staircase to the full 100% to be a leaseholder.		
4.53	PL noted change of Network Homes' stance from equity-based apportioning to 100% cost as standard. PL referenced Inside Housing article from papers shared where a mention of potential 10-year credit line would impact residents for these costs adding further strain.		
4.54	DG responded the variety options shared with the panels would be the discussion points to mitigate the impact however possible.		
4.55	DG confirmed Full consultation to be reviewed after London Panel and SW9 Board meeting in the coming weeks.		



4.56	<b>PL requested full detail for this topic to be noted and shared further by SH as notetaker.</b>	<b>SH</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Network Heat Charge</b>	
5.01	The report was tabled by TK. Taken as read.	
5.02	TK introduced the paper as being the first step in a project to review Network Homes Heat networks with a specialist to look at the full suite of heat networks in which Network Homes provide the pipework and structure of the heating.	
5.03	Network Homes have identified there has not been charging for this service unlike other housing associations, and in light of transparency want to share the information of how we communicate the change to wider residents with the local panels.	
5.04	TK added further context that the charge being implemented would not cover the costs of what Network Homes are currently paying as housing provider for heat networks. There is work still currently being work undertaken to calculate the full cost of what Network Homes are paying.	
5.05	The charge put forward is the lower end currently 10 pence.	
5.06	Total of 1267 properties affected in the paper.	
5.07	ZH asked if there are any homes where people are being charged 100% of building safety.	
5.08	TK checked and said there are some and this is a risk but at present these are ones where we are actively engaging with the developers to reclaim the building safety costs as the first point of action.	
5.09	ZH queried why this decision is made at this current time and what will the money be put towards in terms of an additional service the residents will receive.	
5.10	ZH noted this decision isn't bringing any positivity to residents and being able to share where the money is going would be better for residents to see the benefit of a charge being implemented. ZH added personal experience of not being aware her gas and electricity provider had a daily standing charge and so chose to move to a provider who didn't have one. As a consumer people will always look for the best deal which wouldn't be possible to identify here.	

5.11	<b>TK acknowledged further detail could be provided in the letter to cover the items ‘why now’ and ‘what will the money be put towards’. Will edit communications accordingly.</b>	
5.12	PL asked if the letter had been shared with the Readers Group.	
5.13	TK advised the letter is being shared with the Local Resident Panels as the first resident contact and could be shared thereafter.	
5.14	PL asked if there are other organisations in the G15 doing this	
5.15	TK confirmed there are several other organisations that apply a heat networks charge.	
5.16	PL asked if this is a new charge or an increase. TK clarified it is a new charge.	
5.17	CR queried why the charge is being implemented at this present time.	
5.18	TK explained the changes are a result of improved and necessary scrutiny of costs at Network Homes. This was identified as an area we are making a loss on and incorrectly not charging for a provision where we should be and should have been implemented in the past.	
5.19	ZH queried what the cost will pay for e.g maintenance, how often will the network be serviced to be a benefit to the resident.	
5.20	TK clarified the charge is different to service charge as is to contribute to the base capital cost of the provision of the pipes, the provision of the service, the administration and the structure.	
5.21	ZH added for a cost of £36 a year the detail needs to be much clearer in the letter and elaborate on what the cost goes towards particularly in cases where the gas and electric meter cupboards are in a state of disrepair. ZH would like to see what money is being spent on for properties specifically as this would be beneficial for residents to understand.	
5.22	PL queried how long the charge would be in place for and would the income be used for other aspects of infrastructure. TK clarified the money would continually be used to contribute to the cost of providing the heat network and reiterated all Network Homes income is reinvested to continue providing services.	
5.23	TK added this would only cease to be an ongoing cost if there was a business decision in the future to remove the charge.	
5.24		

5.25	PL asked if the charge to these 1267 properties would only be used for the infrastructure of heat networks of those affected sites. TK confirmed this charge is for eligible schemes but added other schemes would be under review in the future to identify a different charge.	TK
5.26	AD asked if the energy provider can increase the standard charges. TK responded this is the base structure rather than to the provider, Insite Energy, so Network Homes wouldn't have control over their supplier's energy charges but the bill for the heat network charge would be through the provider based on Network Homes' instruction. They are separate charges.	
5.27	AD asked if the supplier were to change the cost of the charge would it be passed onto the resident. TK clarified as Network Homes are instructing them of the charge it would remain at 10 pence for the future. If the business decision to change this arises in the future, the instruction to Insite Energy, would therefore change.	
5.28	SH mentioned charitable fund available to support people in financial hardship not as a means to pay for services but to see how we can further help people outside of their housing services - ZH, AD, PL suggested sharing this again as something positive within the letter.	
5.29	<b>TK to update letter with further feedback of charitable fund.</b>	
6	<b>Housing Ombudsman Self-Assessment</b>	
6.01	The report was tabled. Paper taken as read.	
6.02	JM discussed the Housing Ombudsman's new guidance for housing providers to investigate, resolve and learn from complaints. Network Homes have signed up to the new complaint handling code and have a goal to value complaints learning.	
6.03	JM advised ongoing changes to the internal policies and procedures meant the business was prepared for the implementation of the new complaint handling code.	
6.04	JM informed panel, the code is something all housing providers and councils are expected to sign up to. And to ensure compliance must self-certify that the policies and procedures meet the expectations of the code.	
6.05	JM confirmed Network Homes have recently completed this, as we must certify our compliance every 12 months.	

6.06	JM requested panel members be involved in the self-assessment and certification process alongside the management team to complete the review each year. This would entail challenging the business to ensure improvements are identified and suggested through the process. Due 31 December 2021.	
6.07	Discussed self-certification and sign up to the code and discuss future self-certification along with the quarterly updates. Will share his contact details thereafter	
6.08	JM explained the new definition of vexatious and habitual complainant and what the impact of this is. Residents who contact excessively impacting Network Homes to tend to other queries requiring more attention or where the outcome of a complaint will not be accepted. Habitual complainants may also be rude or aggressive making it counter-productive to engage with them.	
6.09	The policy hasn't been updated since 2016. A review was conducted in October 2019 but the changes were rejected and therefore the suggestions were not implemented. JM is now reviewing this and requested resident involvement from the panel to help determine which behaviour would be classed as habitual complainants.	
6.10	JM noted habitual complainants could sometimes be sensitive where they have continued to contact following their complaint not being upheld by the Housing Ombudsman.	
6.11	<b>Panel Members to contact Resident Engagement Team to express interest for involvement in the self - assessment process and the Habitual Complaints Process. R.E. Team to then share with JM.</b>	<b>Panel Members</b>
6.12	JM noted the quarterly reviews of complaints are very simple and the panel have asked for more value in the content by being able to select further topics to delve into. The reports will also contain the You Said, We Did ad lessons learnt reviews every other quarter.	
6.13	<b>JM to share the quarterly complaints data.</b>	<b>JM</b>
6.14	PL asked who currently reviews the habitual complainants for the business.	
6.15	JM advised this responsibility sits within each team - the central policies e.g complaints, habitual complainant and compensation policy are managed by the Complaints team but each team is managing their habitual complainants slightly differently. Each policy should be reviewed every three years as a minimum.	

6.16	JM met with Phillip Mears to understand why the suggested changes hadn't been taken forward in October 2019 and the reason was due to limited capacity but confirmed the policy was still fit for purpose and working at the time.	R.E. Team
6.17	Changes suggested were credible and will be reviewed to see how they can be implemented now but will also look at new ideas to improve the policy and then follow the approval process with JR and management team.	
6.18	PL asked if complaints overviews are shared with the Board. JM confirmed in depth information does go to the Executive Leadership Team with case reviews of Ombudsman complaints. JR confirmed there is also a regular report to Customer Services Committee which has Board Members on it.	
6.19	<b>PL asked for Resident engagement to facilitate resident involvement on the upcoming complaints projects.</b>	
6.20	PL commented his goal is support to reduction of failures and complaints - queried the compensation paid for missed appointments is low when taking into consideration if people lose a days wages for work.	
6.21	JM confirmed in line with Housing Ombudsman guidance Network Homes don't reimburse for loss of earnings. The resolution should be to resolve the issue and the compensation is a token gesture to acknowledge the inconvenience of having to chase, put in a complaint and the residents' administration of this.	
<b>7</b>	<b>Lessons Learnt Lectures</b>	
7.01	The report was tabled by JR and taken as read.	JR
7.02	JR explained the paper is to have opportunities to drill down into complaints and share the learning with teams throughout the business and residents.	
7.03	<b>JR requested suggestions for names of the reviews of closed cases.</b>	
7.04	JR explained the report is discussing having a trigger for where the Housing Ombudsman has given an adverse decision to a complaint against Network Homes, where complaints affect a significant number of people, upheld stage 2 complaints or control failures.	
7.05	The trigger would initiate a presentation by a senior manager to explain what happened, what went wrong, what can we learn and what can be done to resolve the issue in the future through this process. Board Members, involved residents and staff would be invited.	

7.06	JR acknowledged attendance may not be suitable for everyone but we could make the presentation available and a recording of the presentation, including a one page note summarising the content on the website.	
7.07	The paper is for discussion and then comments will be fed back to the Executive Leadership Team for approval.	
7.08	AD asked how the presentations would be triggered - JR confirmed one of the triggers would be where the housing ombudsman rules against Network Homes in a complaint as this would be deemed a serious failure. There would be an immediate trigger if an issue negatively affects 100 tenants or leaseholders. Managers could request a review as well as the Complaints Team. If there is a control failure the area manager would need to demonstrate why there shouldn't be a review of the matter but the senior or executive management team could overturn the decision. A resident could also trigger a presentation but would need to be informed the complaints must follow the formal complaint journey first.	
7.09	ZH asked why the chosen figure for people affected is 100.	
7.10	JR advised the number needed to be high enough to note a failure but also not too low to be unattainable to do assessments of. JR initial suggestion was 250 but MM suggested 100 is still significant and likely to be more than one block but could also identify recurring issues.	
7.11	PL suggested adding serious failures where it affects a low number of people to widen the remit for lessons learnt for Network	
7.12	PL asked how many presentations would there be in a year. JR responded Network Homes is aiming for one a month as a reasonable spacing. This will help to engage with the business but would be able to adapt if a major failure arose. There is a need to programme the reviews through the year but also incorporate sporadic cases.	
7.13	<b>PL requested examples of how the lessons learnt lectures would work.</b>	<b>JR</b>
7.14	ZH asked how would Network Homes ensure all directorates receive the information.	
7.15	SH responded we would communicate to teams in a variety of ways and have opportunities to include some content in monthly corporate briefings. JR mentioned senior managers meet fortnightly so they should also cascade the information down to their teams.	

7.16	MM explained there is also an 'Innovate To Improve Project' working alongside the reviews to keep colleagues aware of ways of recording required business changes. The project aim is to have a central service improvement plan for teams to learn from each other and have transparency on changes through the business.	
7.17	JM added there are also meetings every four weeks for high profile cases which do not have to be formal complaints to identify lessons learnt during this process as well.	
7.18	PL acknowledged the various routes of lessons learnt are positive for continuous improvement at Network Homes.	
7.19	PL expressed interest to be involved in the lessons learnt presentations.	
<b>8</b>	<b>Continuous Improvement Panel update</b>	
8.01	<p>The report was tabled. MM summarised the paper to explain following a proposal from the Executive Director of Customer Services to reprioritise a scrutiny into 'Contract Management of the day to day repairs service' to take place in February 2021 instead of May 2021.</p> <p>The Continuous Improvement Panel (CIP) approved the change and recruitment has now started with 6 people expressing interest to be involved. If all CIP members take part there will be 11 people involved in the Sprint groups.</p>	
8.02	<p>PL asked MM to explain the difference between a Sprint Group and Task and Finish group for new members to the panel. MM explained the difference is instead of 12-16 weeks to complete a review, a Sprint Group would be over 2 days. The Continuous Improvement Panel commission scrutiny and can choose which reviews to take part in. Their role is to hold us to account to implement the changes.</p> <p><a href="https://www.networkhomes.org.uk/get-involved/continuous-improvement-panel/">https://www.networkhomes.org.uk/get-involved/continuous-improvement-panel/</a></p>	
8.03	<p>The upcoming review is set to be 4 half days with senior managers and contract managers to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the policies and procedures</li> <li>• how residents are impacted</li> <li>• how we can adapt the service</li> <li>• content of communication</li> <li>• quality assurance mechanisms</li> <li>• training for contractors</li> </ul>	

8.04	PL asked if the scrutiny schedule needs reviewing or redistributing to request further involvement. MM responded the scrutiny matrix and calendar included in the papers is the most up to date and outlines the CIP focus for the next 2 to 3 years. Local panels can request items be reviewed by CIP.	
8.05	SH explained next steps for recruitment following the Big Conversation consultation is to contact anyone who may have expressed an interest in being involved in the Continuous Improvement Panel, particularly Hertford region due to low take up in this area in comparison to London region. The CIP Chair has also suggested the Resident Engagement team reinitiate contact with people who previously signed up to be a panel member in 2019 in the next few weeks. The information was also posted on the website and in the most recent newsletter.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Network Homes Performance Report</b>	
9.01	The report was tabled and presented by JR.	
9.02	JR clarified the report shared is the same report that goes to Board and the Executive Leadership Team as there was no suggestion for a more in-depth review from the Panel per meeting actions. The last in-depth analysis was conducted for the voids business area.	
9.03	<b>JR asked if Panel would like to suggest areas for a deep dive or are Panel open to Network selecting areas. JR highlighted Contact Centre calls and gas safety servicing as being below the target performance.</b>	<b>Panel Members</b>
9.04	<b>JR noted the report is all key performance indicators rather than tailored specifically for Panel. Asked Panel for suggestions they're more interested in or if Panel would rather Network Homes select areas to report on that we think may be of interest to residents.</b>	<b>Panel Members</b>
9.05	PL happy for Network to select business areas. PL asked other panel members if any objections. None received. PL confirmed Network could select areas for in depth performance review.	
9.06	JR noted the fall in the complaints response performance average has been impacted significantly by lower performance in September 2020. Concerted effort being made to improve this average for the financial year but due to the September complaint volume being much higher it would take more time to improve this.	
9.07	PL queried the colour coding of green and red on the report. JR clarified red is a reduction in performance from the previous month and year to date, green is an improvement.	



9.08	<b>ZH queried if possible to separate performance between data London and Herts region to identify significant differences or areas of improvement.</b>	<b>JR</b>
9.09	<b>JR to clarify to ZH if planned maintenance satisfaction is included in repairs satisfaction</b>	<b>JR</b>
9.10	PL queried if the panel can receive commentary about the performance including further diagrams. JR confirmed they had been included as an appendix for Ag.09 via OnBoard. PL confirmed it was provided.	
9.11	PL to share further feedback via email following further scrutiny.	
9.12	<b>SH to email performance report for greater accessibility into report.</b>	<b>SH</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Panel Business</b>	
10.01	MM explained resident contact project being led by Elizabeth Lill. This is a project to call residents who've recently had a repair works order completed on system for feedback with a personal touch. The pilot will take place from week commencing 18 January 2021 to see how residents engage with the concept. If positive, this will roll out more widely.	
10.02	PL agrees the project sounds like a good initiative	
10.03	Cllr SR queried which team is responsible for fire safety related maintenance in communal areas of blocks. SH advised the Fire Safety and Asbestos Compliance Team are responsible for monitoring this and actioning resident reports, undertake site visits and fire risk assessments.	
10.04	<b>SH requested SR email her for follow up to discuss specific query.</b>	<b>SH</b>
10.05	MM clarified which teams the Network Homes staff present were representing. Colleagues representing different areas would attend for each meeting dependent on the meeting agenda.	
10.06	JR added as the Panel covers all of Network Homes resident activities, questions regarding any matter could be asked and the teams would co-ordinate a response as actions.	
10.07	PL thanked all panel members for their contribution the Network Homes colleagues and noted the in-depth discussions held around papers presented.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Minutes from the meeting of 06 October 2020</b> <i>For Information, not to be discussed unless so requested</i>	
11.01	No comments from panel members	

<b>12</b>	<b>Social Housing White Paper</b> <i>For Information, not to be discussed unless so requested</i>	
12.01	No comments from panel members	
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Resident Engagement Update</b>	
13.01	No comments from panel members	
<b>14.0</b>	<b>ASB Policy</b>	
14.01	No comments from panel members	

...(Via email) Phil Lyon.....

.....18 January 2021.....

Chair

Date