

Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q1 2025

Community Support programme

August 2025



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk أو

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

ናይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተረጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk ርኽቡና።

Purpose

What is this: This document is the first Independent Scrutiny Function update on scrutiny of the Community programme. It provides a assessment on delivery of the Community programme from January – July 2025.

Overview

What is the Independent Scrutiny Function?

The Grenfell Support programme is being delivered by the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) and overseen by an Independent Scrutiny Function (ISF). The job of the ISF is to help ensure the Grenfell Support is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and the immediate local community near Grenfell Tower. Further information about the ISF and its appointment can be found [here](#).

What is the purpose of this document?

This document provides a summary of our scrutiny assessment on the delivery and monitoring of the Grenfell Community Support programme from January to June 2025. At this early stage, our assessment is based on a review of programme updates and monitoring plans from the GPT provided in late June 2025, supported by follow up conversations in July.

What are the contents of this document?

This document presents our scrutiny assessment according to our scrutiny framework (which you can see on slide 6). Additionally, this quarter we have provided feedback on a draft of the survey GPT are sharing with community members to gather their experiences of the Support programme so far.

Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 7-12
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 13-17

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment – slides 18-29

Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment, we reviewed the GPT's monitoring data against the following questions:

Delivery, reach and impact	Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? Who is accessing the programme and who is it not reaching? Is the programme having an impact and being adapted as required to improve impact?
Complaints	Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What learning/actions have been taken as a result?
Expenditure	Is expenditure for the programme as intended? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?
Reporting and transparency	Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?
Restorative practice	Are the GPT ensuring that the process of delivery and monitoring centres the perspectives and experiences of people accessing the programme? Is the delivery and monitoring of the programme informed by restorative practice?
Monitoring	Is the monitoring providing the necessary insight for the GPT to deliver and improve the programme?

Q1 2025 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny assessment overview (1)

Based on the evidence we have reviewed, as the ISF we are satisfied that the GPT is effectively delivering the Community programme in line with the model agreed through consultation.

Summary of overall progress (you can find out more in the GPT update [here](#))

The final community model approved by the RBKC Leadership team in December 2024 confirmed that in the first year the community model would include: annual wellbeing grants, free Kensington Leisure Centre (KLC) memberships, an Advocacy Team to support residents, a bespoke communications and engagement programme and a programme of community activities.

All areas of the programme have since been launched. Since January 2025, residents have been able to apply for support through online forms. They have been made aware of the support through flyers, emails, key resident groups and drop-in sessions with the GPT.

Scrutiny assessment overview (2)

Strengths:

- The GPT have set up robust monitoring processes, to monitor delivery of the programme.
- Structures like the Operational Steering Group drop-in sessions and outreach show an intention to involve residents in the delivery and monitoring of the programme.
- As part of the planned review the delivery team has included open questions about the future design of the wellbeing grant (e.g., regarding eligibility and level of support), which suggests a willingness to learn and adjust based on feedback.
- The GPT have been open and honest about implementation issues such as system transitions (e.g., a change in the Council's finance system) and resource constraints (e.g., available budget for the KLC membership), acknowledging how this might impact community members negatively.

Key risks/issues:

Uncertainty around the sustainability of some offers, such as KLC memberships, makes it vital that the community is kept well informed. Any changes or trade-offs need to be identified early and discussed with residents. The team recognises this and plans to strengthen communication, broaden engagement, and provide more outcome focused and accessible reporting in future.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact	<p>Implementation and delivery progress is in line with agreed plans. The key areas of success and challenge have been well documented. The GPT has incorporated feedback from us and the Operational Steering Group on its survey to gain community feedback to inform the design of support for year 2.</p> <p>We are satisfied with how the GPT have recorded the percentage of eligible people accessing the programme and how this varies by programme strand. The GPT have taken steps to improve the reach of the programme, including targeted door knocking that increased take-up among housing association households, regular drop-ins, and promotion through newsletters.</p> <p>The measures the GPT have proposed to assess whether the support is making a difference to people are well thought through. We would like to see more detail about how measures will be applied and implemented next quarter, as well as insights about delivery from staff.</p>
Complaints	<p>Complaints were low overall, but where raised they highlighted important considerations around process, clarity, and expectations.</p>
Expenditure	<p>We are working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on expenditure of the programme. In the next round of scrutiny we would like to see a detailed expenditure breakdown by programme, programme strand and an explanation for variances in expenditure against budget.</p>

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Reporting and transparency	The GPT has sent out a range of dedicated communications and also included information about the Education and Training programme in wider Bereaved and Survivors and Community updates. We will review communications and reporting in more detail in the next quarter.
Restorative practice	The GPT have evidenced how a restorative approach has informed their delivery, including a commitment to co-design and facilitation of the steering group by an external restorative practitioner. We encourage the GPT to transparently share with programme stakeholders how the steering group is involved in decision making, and opportunities for people not involved to input and shape the programme.
Monitoring	Monitoring was carried out regularly, capturing progress and identifying areas in need of attention. It is framed as a process of continuous learning rather than simple compliance, with data actively informing adaptation and improvement.

Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

Information we want to see immediately from the GPT (before next round of scrutiny)

We do not want to see any information from the GPT before the next round of scrutiny. We think enough information has been provided to come to a scrutiny assessment (slides 8–9).

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Further detail on which key issues have been considered by Operational Steering Group
- Reflection on the effectiveness of actions to increase awareness of the programme
- Detail on how satisfaction with the programme will be understood and measured
- Detail on the analysis th GPT will be doing to better understand impact
- More explicit records of operational decisions and programme developments that are based on the team's experience and day-to-day interactions with community members
- Reflections from people involved in the delivery of the programme on how well it is being delivered and whether it is having an impact

Sharing your views and staying in touch

Sharing your views and staying in touch

The monitoring and scrutiny arrangements aim to ensure the Grenfell Support programme is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and community members.

The ISF's monitoring and scrutiny updates will be shared with you via the GPT every quarter, but your voice is also crucial. To share your views on the programme's delivery and get involved in its scrutiny, you can:

- Provide direct feedback to the GPT by contacting FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk.
- Provide direct feedback to the ISF by emailing isf@involve.org.uk or calling 020 3745 4334.
- Participate in the collective scrutiny & reflection sessions. These are a dedicated sessions with the Council to help understand programme delivery so far, and identify changes needed to the programme (and beyond). There will be two collective scrutiny & reflection sessions a year on the Community programme, facilitated by the ISF. The ISF will be in touch prior to these with details about how to take part.

You can be involved as much or as little as you would like, and your involvement can vary at different points in the programme depending on your interest and capacity. There is **no** obligation to get involved in these scrutiny processes and your choice to participate or not will not affect your ability to access support.

Appendix: Q1 2025 Detailed scrutiny assessment

If you'd like more detail than provided in the above summary, please see the following slides for a more detailed assessment against each part of the scrutiny framework

Q1 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? What have been key areas of success and challenge?

The GPT report that the final Community model was agreed on 11th December 2024 and launched in January 2025. The GPT report that areas of success include the range of efforts to communicate and engage with eligible residents to ensure they are aware of the programme and the establishment of the Advocacy Team, which has been developing relationships with key partners so residents can be referred to the service. Key areas of challenge include initial delays in payments for some wellbeing grants, launching the Kensington Leisure Centre (KLC) memberships and the launch of community activities.

Based on evidence we have seen, our assessment is that delivery of the programme is in line with agreed plans. Key areas of success and challenge have been well documented.

Have challenges been addressed? How?

The GPT report that there are some issues regarding KLC memberships. These were initially issued as a six month trial to monitor take up, with this kept under review and communicated to households and the Operational Steering Group (OSG). We understand that this approach was communicated to eligible households and discussed with the OSG, but we would like to see further information on how the outcome of this review will be communicated and how future membership arrangements will be managed. We would like to see this addressed in the next round of scrutiny.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are impacting delivery (positively or negatively)? If so, what are they? How are these being recorded? Is anything being done to address these?

The GPT note the changeover of payment systems at the Council as a factor negatively impacting delivery, since it initially delayed the payment of wellbeing grants. They also note issues with KLC activating memberships as a factor beyond the programme's remit that is impacting delivery negatively.

We see that the GPT are trying to address these issues, by being clear with residents what external factors are negatively impacting programme delivery and why. It is positive that they recognise that even with transparent communication, residents have a right to still be frustrated with the delays in delivery.

Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for delivery:

In the next round of scrutiny, we would like to see reflections from delivery partners involved in delivering the programme. These reflections would give important insight, help build a fuller picture of how the programme is working in practice and highlight ways to improve how support is delivered in the future.

We would also like to see more explicit records of operational decisions and programme developments that are based on the team's experience and day-to-day interactions with community members.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: delivery – survey

We reviewed the GPT's draft survey that will be used to gain community feedback to inform operational decisions about the Community programme for year 2. Our feedback included that the survey would benefit from asking more open questions to better understand people's experiences of the programme as a whole. Specifically:

- There should be more focus on people's experience of accessing different aspects of the programme
- The survey should explore the reasons that community members aren't using the services or why they aren't meeting their needs
- Leading questions around the future of the programme need to be adapted to open questions that enable community members to provide honest and open feedback

Our feedback along with feedback from the Operational Steering Group has been incorporated. The GPT are planning to share the survey with community members soon.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: reach

What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme? How does access vary by programme strand?

The GPT report that 2017 people have applied for some form of support (data as of 11/06/2025). They indicate that almost all of these applications come from households who were living in the 500m radius of the Tower at the time of the tragedy.

We are satisfied with how the GPT have recorded the percentage of eligible people accessing the programme and how this varies by programme strand. It is clear and detailed.

Are there specific groups of people the programme isn't reaching? What is being done to understand this?

The GPT report that they have used the demographic data from applications to ensure the support is reaching a wide variety of people who are eligible to access the programme. They do not expand on the analysis they have done to understand what specific groups of people are not accessing the programme and why this might be. In the next round of scrutiny we would like the GPT to share a more explicit commentary on this.

What (if any) measures are being taken to improve reach? Why were these measures chosen? What has been the impact of these measures on reach?

The GPT have taken steps to improve the reach of the programme, including targeted door knocking that increased take-up among housing association households, regular drop-ins, and promotion through newsletters. Further work is underway with resident associations and plans for personalised letters to households who are yet to apply. In the next round of scrutiny, it would be valuable to understand how these efforts are supporting underrepresented groups to be actively included.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: impact

The GPT have only just started recording impact data, so reporting is limited at this time. This is to be expected since the programme is only just up and running.

What difference is the support making? What benefits has it enabled?

The GPT are just starting to collect and review data on the impact of the support. To date they have mainly received feedback on the impact from people accessing the Advocacy Team. They are also planning to explore other ways to gather information on how satisfied people are with the support.

We agree that finding other ways to understand how satisfied people are with the support will be helpful. It is important that there are a variety of ways for community members to feedback on their satisfaction with the programme and we would like to see evidence of this in the next round of scrutiny.

We are looking forward to seeing more impact data as it becomes available. In doing so, we encourage the GPT to identify themes in the qualitative data they collect in future rounds of scrutiny, and consider whether they could collect insights through formats like case studies to emphasise changes in impact over time. Finally, we want the GPT to consider comparing impact data to demographic benchmark data to better understand the differences in impact between underserved groups where possible.

Is there any difference in impact across the different programme strands or by demographic group? Why might this be?

It is too early for the GPT to answer this question.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: impact

Areas of improvement on the monitoring plans for impact:

We think that the GPT and other delivery partners should consider documenting their own reflections on the difference the support is making to people. We think delivery colleagues will have helpful additional insight into the impact of the programme.

Finally, the measures and analysis proposed to assess the difference the support is making could be better explained. We suggest incorporating comparative benchmarks, such as by demographic group, location or take up rates relative to the area population where possible. This would allow for a more nuanced understanding of how support is being accessed and where gaps might exist as this is not currently made explicit.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: complaints

How many complaints have been received? What proportion of these have been resolved (and in what timeframe)? What proportion of them have been escalated?

The GPT report have received eight stage 1 complaints about issues with KLC membership, eligibility for the support and the wellbeing grant. They have confirmed that these complaints will feed into the review of the Community programme.

In the next round of scrutiny, we would like the GPT to include how they intend to feed these complaints into delivery of the programme, i.e., what that process looks like and more explicit examples of when this has happened if relevant. However, we also note that feedback received will be incorporated into the programme review.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

Is expenditure and predicted spend for the programme as intended? What variances are there? Have any decisions been made to reallocate budget?

We are working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on expenditure of the programme. To date they have shared outturn data for the period 2024–25. We have asked that in the next round of scrutiny, they provide a detailed expenditure breakdown by programme, programme strand, and outline variances in expenditure against budget. Any variances should be explained in detail, noting how decisions to reallocate budget were made.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

What reporting and wider communications have been shared in the last quarter? What was shared (e.g. programme updates, invitations to engage in the programme, updates on decisions/opportunity to be involved in decisions)? How frequently?

The GPT have clearly explained the reporting mechanisms to community members and provided examples.

In the next round of scrutiny, we would like the GPT to think more about formatting – especially the use of headline summaries with links to more detail. This might help make any communications more accessible. We also would like to see the GPT reaching out to community members to get feedback on their reporting.

Finally, we understand that currently the GPT store digital communication on their Linktree. We think this Linktree is hard to navigate and suggest they find ways to support clearer navigation.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: restorative practice

How is the process of delivery (including reporting and complaints) and monitoring centering the perspectives and experiences of people eligible to access the programme?

The GPT reported on efforts to include resident voice in the delivery of the programme, through engagement of the Operational Steering Group (OSG) and quotes from community members from outreach activities. Future reporting would benefit from including more insights into complaints received, the actions taken in response, and any changes that resulted. Reporting on the follow through and impact of Advocacy Team cases, and how the support provided made a difference, would add meaningful context.

In future scrutiny rounds we would like to see more detail on how community members' voices inform delivery, including which key issues have been considered by the OSG and their sphere of influence, along with detail of the mechanisms used to gain wider community input.

How has restorative practice informed the delivery (including reporting and complaints) and monitoring approach?

The GPT has not reported explicitly on the restorative practices that have informed the delivery of the programme.

In future rounds of scrutiny we would like to see evidence of how dissatisfied community members' feedback has led to adaptations in delivery where relevant. We would also like to see more reflections from the GPT on how they are learning from engaging with community members and applying restorative principles.

Q1 2025 scrutiny: monitoring

Is the monitoring information and process giving the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme? What areas require more focus/improvement?

As the Community programme is only recently up and running we did not expect the GPT to report on whether the monitoring process is helpful, and how it is working well or not well. We expect this data to be included from the next quarterly cycle.