

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday 15 April 2013
7.00 pm
160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
4.	Minutes Minutes of the open sections of the meetings held on 4 February and 11 March.	1 - 13

Contact

Peter Roberts on 020 7525 4350 or email: peter.roberts@southwark.gov.uk

Date: 8 April 2013



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Monday 4 February 2013 at 7.00 pm at 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)
Councillor Dan Garfield (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Neil Coyle
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Mark Williams

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Claire Hickson, Cabinet Member, Communities & Economic Development

OFFICER SUPPORT: Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny
Dominic Cain, Assistant Director (Revenues & Benefits)
Norman Coombe, Legal Services
Graeme Gordon, Head of Corporate Strategy
Trefor Henman, Principal Strategy Officer, Chief Executive's Department
David Markham, Head of Major Works
Ferenc Morath, Investment Manager, Housing & Community Services
Duncan Whitfield, Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services
Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were no late items.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings of the committee held on 12 November and 3 and 10 December 2012 be agreed as a true and accurate record.

5. CABINET MEMBER INTERVIEW: COUNCILLOR CLAIRE HICKSON, COMMUNITIES & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic wellbeing strategy

5.1 Councillor Claire Hickson, cabinet member, communities and economic development, reported that the economic wellbeing strategy had been agreed in November.

Plans for the future of adult education

5.2 In response to questions, Councillor Hickson indicated that she had been looking seriously at adult learning and particularly at the issue of repeat learner fees.

The community restoration fund/business engagement

5.3 Councillor Hickson stated that she was exploring whether the fund could continue beyond its original life of one year. She had been talking to Councillor Richard Livingstone, cabinet member for finance, resources and community safety, about the possibility of continued funding. Councillor Hickson confirmed that allocation of funding had been made by individual cabinet member decision. Discussions about targets had been held with the recipients of funding and regular review meetings took place. The strategic director of finance and corporate services added that a progress report on the community restoration fund and the youth fund had been submitted to the February cabinet meeting.

5.4 A member of the committee asked Councillor Hickson what she was doing as a cabinet member to encourage sensible borrowing. Councillor Hickson was aware that some councils offered credit union packages to new social tenants and was also aware of campaigns to publicise the problems of pay-day loans. Southwark was looking at how it could best work with credit unions. Currently, until central government changed the law, the council could only deal with the number of pay day loans companies through the use of planning law.

- 5.5 A member asked whether specific sectors of the economy were performing well in Southwark. Councillor Hickson responded that the council's main concern continued to be the long-term unemployed. The council was talking to Job Centre Plus about plans to support long term unemployed young people. The council was keen to ensure links between businesses and schools and further and adult education. It was crucial that young people, schools and career services understood where job opportunities existed. Councillor Hickson also emphasised how important it was to promote the setting up of businesses. A member referred to a council which offered spare office space to businesses that were starting up. Councillor Hickson stated that this was being explored along with how to support businesses to move on and the start up of social enterprises. In response to a question, Councillor Hickson offered to circulate a briefing about the council's status as a fair trade borough and how this related to economic development.
- 5.6 The chair asked what the council could do to influence the viability of the high street, for instance along Walworth Road where local businesses were anxious about footfall. Councillor Hickson explained that the approach needed to be cross-departmental. The planning department had fairly limited powers. Business networks could promote local areas. Investment was needed and Southwark needed to be effectively promoted as a destination. In the chair's view, Southwark was a big landowner and should be able to achieve things. She was concerned that other boroughs took a more active approach, actively working with private owners and landlords and particularly in respect of empty units. Councillor Hickson emphasised that the council was not in the position to buy up large parts of the borough's high streets. In response to a further question she took the view that it was important to promote the strengths of local areas. Meetings were being held with the local Chamber of Commerce to determine what businesses wanted from the council. Councillor Neil Coyle declared that he had deputised at a meeting with the Chamber of Commerce.
- 5.7 A member asked whether more of the economic wellbeing budget would be devolved to the voluntary sector and whether funding would be allocated to particular areas of the borough. Councillor Hickson agreed that the council needed to work more closely with the third sector, particularly in terms of commissioning. Opportunities for local people needed to be promoted and the borough needed to be talked up.

Community Councils

- 5.8 Councillor Hickson stated that there were no plans to change the powers of the community councils. She drew attention to the cabinet's agreed future approach to community engagement and to the increase in revenue funding for cleaner, greener, safer projects. In respect of appointment of primary school governors, Councillor Hickson took the view that there was not much public engagement with the appointments and that councillors had many other opportunities to engage with local schools.
- 5.9 A member challenged the £40k budget saving to be achieved in respect of community councils and that the community councils needed additional funding in order to increase public engagement and participation. Councillor Hickson

stressed that the £40k saving was part of the budget cuts that the council needed to make and that the department was taking action in respect of the concerns raised by the Democracy Commission, including piloting new website resources.

Other issues

- 5.10 Members were concerned at the budget proposal to cut £56k from independent legal support. Councillor Hickson assured members that the discussion at the budget scrutiny meeting had been noted. The chair stated that the committee's comments on the budget as a whole would be agreed later in the meeting.

6. DRAPER HOUSE - UPDATE

- 6.1 Dave Markham, Head of Major Works, briefed the committee in respect of works at Draper House. He outlined the history of the works, including freehold and land ownership problems, performance issues and action taken by the council. He also referred to a health and safety incident which had occurred in November. Ferenc Morath, investment manager, explained the action that had been taken in order to improve communication with residents.
- 6.2 The chair expressed her concern at the standard of a meeting that she had attended between officers and residents. She also stressed that problems had been arising long before the incident in November. The standard of work was poor and resident dissatisfaction was high. The chair asked how the £35k bill to leaseholders could be justified and took the view that problems were not only the responsibility of the contractors but also of the council in terms of contract management.
- 6.3 The chair of the housing, environment, transport and community safety scrutiny sub-committee proposed that the sub-committee carry out a brief scrutiny into the works at Draper House, collecting evidence from officers and local residents and councillors. He also asked whether performance management and training were in place to ensure mistakes in contract management were not made. The investment manager underlined that Draper House was an extremely complicated scheme with difficult access issues. The head of major works added that more experienced teams were allocated to the more complicated schemes. The culture in teams was changing.
- 6.4 A member stressed that residents at Draper House had raised potential difficulties before works had begun and appeared not to have been listened to. He asked whether the council had sufficient resources to manage contracts. The head of major works responded that the council now had experienced project managers who were able to make a big difference and that consultancy firms were employed to fill any gaps. The investment manager referred to the Putting Residents First consultancy scheme which had increased the involvement of residents.

RESOLVED:

That the housing, environment, transport and community safety scrutiny sub-committee undertake a brief review of works at Draper House.

7. WELFARE REFORM - BRIEFING

- 7.1 Dominic Cain, assistant director (revenues and benefits), and Trefor Henman, principal strategy officer, briefed the committee on welfare reform.
- 7.2 In response to questions, the assistant director explained that the council was liaising with Community Action Southwark, CAB and SLaM to determine the groups that were being referred to the Social Fund. Data was not as detailed as officers would like. The council was also working with Family Mosaic to explore the possible effects of direct payments. Some members felt that it would be important to achieve economies of scale in a new system and to source goods locally. The assistant director reported that a number of local authorities used a national supplier but that Southwark would like to develop a local scheme and was consulting local voluntary sector organisations. Members asked for clarification about information that DWP had not yet provided in respect of the Social Fund. The assistant director explained that this information would be helpful in terms of capacity building around types of services. The cabinet had lobbied the appropriate minister but it was unclear whether or not data was available.
- 7.3 Members were concerned about the impact of universal credit. The principal strategy officer explained that the possibility of a transitional payment to bridge the gap until monthly payments began was being explored. In response to further questions, he explained that in terms of the bedroom tax there was transitional protection in the cases of bereavement and job loss.
- 7.4 Members were also concerned at the shift to web-based systems. The principal strategy officer explained that officers were aware of the need to up-skill residents so that they could access the relevant websites. Work was ongoing and might include assisted self-service at one-stop shops and service points.
- 7.5 Members highlighted the results of the pilots of direct payment of housing benefits which seemed to suggest an increase in arrears. Members also emphasised that groups such as vulnerable adults would be more affected by the new system, perhaps particularly by the introduction of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, and asked whether any action had been taken to identify people at risk. The assistant director explained that letters had been sent to twenty-four thousand people but that there had been a very small response. The council was attempting to profile those families and individuals that would be most affected and was working with the voluntary sector to ensure that as much information and advice as possible was made available.
- 7.6 Members drew attention to reports in the press that suggested problems with IT and that the implementation of universal credit might be delayed. The assistant director responded that there was a lot of positivity around the programme but that the IT system had to be very robust in order to support the hugely complex changes that were proposed.
- 7.7 The principal strategy officer clarified that the discretionary housing benefit was additional ring-fenced funding which would apply to particular households. Southwark's policy was being refreshed to anticipate the likely need. He also

outlined action being taken to target people who would be affected by the “bedroom tax” and might need help in down-sizing their properties.

- 7.8 Members asked what work the council was undertaking to alert residents to changes to the Disability Living Allowance (DLA). The principal strategy officer stated that a lot of work was being done through the Rightfully Yours benefits advice service. In terms of the DLA, the council was aiming to provide one-to-one advice tailored to the individual household.
- 7.9 Members highlighted the need to actively work with care-leavers effected by the welfare reform. The assistant director indicated that he would ask the relevant officers for a written briefing on this.

RESOLVED:

1. That officers be thanked for their briefing and be requested to circulate the written briefing to all members for information.
2. That officers be asked to provide an update in six months.
3. That Children’s Services be asked to provide a briefing note about the impact of welfare reform on children leaving care and whether the council is actively working with them to mitigate this.

8. BUDGET SCRUTINY FOLLOW-UP

- 8.1 Councillor Mark Williams declared an interest in respect of the response to question 15, as an employee of the Greater London Assembly. In response to questions arising, the strategic director of finance and corporate services offered to circulate further information about any ongoing funding of Passage Faith Group soup runs and about the error made in respect of the description of the £100k saving.
- 8.2 A member asked whether the £1.12m additional discretionary housing benefit would be rolled forward into next year (question 16). The strategic director of finance and corporate services explained that at this stage it was only guaranteed for one year. A member asked whether this money was ring-fenced and stressed that a number of disabled people and foster carers would be affected. The strategic director confirmed that it was ring-fenced and that officers were reviewing existing policies. In response to a further question the strategic director offered to expand on work with the UK Borders Agency (question 2 in the report).
- 8.3 Members sought clarification on the risks from NNDR evaluation appeals (question 6). Dominic Cain, assistant director (revenues & benefits), reported that 1,400 appeals were outstanding with the value of appeals being up to half the total rateable value. Members felt that this should be pursued rigorously with the Valuation Office Agency.
- 8.4 A member remained unsatisfied with the answer to question 13 about savings to the adaptations repairs budget. The strategic director of finance and corporate

services confirmed that the £15k saving was not being drawn from the cost of adaptations but related to administrative costs.

- 8.5 Some members were concerned that the children's and social services departments were receiving cuts in funding. The strategic director emphasised that 2013/14 could not be looked at in isolation and that reductions in posts did not necessarily lead to redundancies. Changes to the Early Intervention Grant had put pressure on children's services and the council needed to do all that it could to protect front line services.
- 8.6 The committee considered the evidence that it had received at its earlier budget scrutiny meeting, and the responses to the questions raised at that meeting, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet monitors on an ongoing basis the impact of welfare and legal aid reform on families and individuals in the borough.
2. That Cabinet rigorously monitors the values and outcomes of funding spent on public health.
3. That Cabinet monitors the implementation of agreed Cleaner, Greener, Safer projects, investigates any backlog that has developed and make available best practice guidance across the borough (focussing specifically on self-delivery projects).
4. Overview & Scrutiny Committee is greatly concerned about the lack of information on the likely effect on Southwark of the new Business Rate mechanism and the apparent inability of the Valuation Office Agency either to provide accurate statistics or to process appeals in a timely way. The committee urges the Cabinet to press as strongly as possible for this situation to be addressed by the VOA and HM Revenue and Customs in the light of the great uncertainty caused to this and other local authorities when setting revenue budgets.
5. Overview & Scrutiny Committee is concerned about the information on no recourse to public funds issues in paragraph 97 of the report to cabinet on 29 January 2013 and urges cabinet to set up rigorous monitoring processes and continue liaison and lobbying with the Border Agency and other relevant bodies.
6. That the Cabinet seeks further information and reassurance that the saving of £55K relating to a reduction in advice services commissioning on the re-procurement of the contract will not impact on front line services (Housing & Community Services - Community Engagement).
7. That Cabinet be asked to investigate reducing the pressure on the planning enforcement budget by the use of Section 106 funding.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm



OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Monday 11 March 2013 at 7.00 pm at 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)
Councillor Dan Garfield (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Neil Coyle
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Gavin Edwards
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Paul Noblet
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor The Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole
Councillor Mark Williams

OFFICER SUPPORT: Norman Coombe, Legal Services
Angela D'Urso, Business Manager, Housing & Community Services
Paul Jeffery, Gypsies & Travellers Officer
Paul Langford, Head of Operations, Housing & Community Services
Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were no late items of business.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2013 be agreed as an accurate record.

5. A NEW WRITTEN STATEMENT (AGREEMENT) FOR COUNCIL GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES - UPDATE

- 5.1 Paul Langford, head of operations, and Angela D'Urso, business manager, housing & community services, introduced the report. The business manager highlighted action taken since the call-in meeting in respect of fire safety, animals and benefits. She also reported that officers had visited the sites with representatives from Blackfriars Advice Centre. The chair asked why specialist advocacy services had been engaged rather than commissioning Southwark Travellers' Action Group (STAG). The business manager assured the committee that STAG was fully involved and the STAG representative at the meeting explained that Blackfriars had an outreach budget which was made use of in this case.
- 5.2 The business manager went on to confirm that the issue of number of weeks temporary absence from the site had been amended from six to eight weeks (paragraph 10 of the express terms of agreement). Throughout the agreement it had been made clear that officers would support residents needing to make applications in writing. Officers would also support requirements around fire safety (paragraph 5). The business manager explained that further amendments were needed, including rewording of clauses in respect of running business from the site, support for physical adaptations and removal of the ban on breeding of dogs. She explained that the consultation would end on 28 March and that this would be followed by an individual cabinet member decision.
- 5.3 The chair drew attention to paragraph 15 of the report and the committee's previous recommendation that the agreement be amended to allow Gypsies and Travellers eight weeks away from their site before requiring agreement from the council. She sought assurance that the agreement would be amended to a minimum of eight weeks. The business manager confirmed this to be the case and that the council was consulting on a maximum period.
- 5.4 The chair invited Mr Archie Utley, the STAG representative, to comment on the draft agreement and consultation. Mr Utley stated that the consultation had been much better and that STAG had submitted extensive comments. He highlighted paragraph 4.4 of the agreement which in STAG's view should relate only to living on the site and not to staying. The business manager confirmed that this would be amended.
- 5.5 Mr Utley raised STAG's concerns about overcrowding on sites. He said that in the 1990s Southwark had promised a new ten-pitch site but instead a temporary five-pitch site had become permanent. The number of pitches was well below the target set in 2000. STAG was concerned that currently extra family members were

living in caravans on the site at Springside Close but that they would not be able to sign the agreement. The business manager explained that this could be dealt with if the family members were children of tenants. The head of operations commented that site provision fell within the remits of planning and regeneration but that he would welcome discussions at strategic level. The business manager added that Southwark was working with other South East London boroughs to address the issue. Members felt that the consultation on the recommendations coming out of the Housing Commission should include the needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

- 5.6 Mr Utley outlined STAG's concerns that the restrictions on animals roaming sites be amended, particularly in view of sites where there were no external areas that were not communal. The business manager emphasised that the important issue was that animals be restrained at times when contractors were on site. Officers were looking at how the requirement in respect of animals roaming could be amended. In response to a member's questions, the business manager confirmed that nuisance dogs could be dealt with under existing powers relating to anti-social or criminal behaviour.
- 5.7 STAG was also concerned at proposals to introduce payment of water rates, in the context of changes in benefits and also that there would be disparity between old and new agreements. The council would continue to consult on this issue. A member asked whether work was being carried out to identify families who would be affected by benefit changes and the proposals for direct payment. The head of operations responded that the council was looking to put forward Gypsies and Travellers as a group to be exempted.
- 5.8 Members felt that parts of the agreement were in need of written explanations in plain English. The business manager responded that these could be added to the glossary and emphasised that the consultation had been undertaken in face-to-face visits to sites.
- 5.9 Members acknowledged the important part played by STAG in drafting the new agreement and were concerned that STAG continue to be resourced. Mr Utley explained that STAG was funded on an annual basis by the Irish Government and only had funding until the end of July. A member suggested that the council might look at whether it could make use of its re-commissioning of advice services in order to fund STAG.

RESOLVED:

1. That the actions taken and commitments made following on from the call-in of the Individual Decision Making (IDM) report relating to a new written agreement for Gypsies and Travellers be noted.
2. That the actions taken and future actions to be taken following on from further review of the new written agreement for Gypsies and Travellers be noted.
3. That the next steps, including dates for the revised IDM, be noted.
4. That officers' intention to amend paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the new

agreement be noted.

5. In view of overcrowding on sites that it be recommended that the consultation due to be launched into the future of housing provision in the borough include future provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites and that these groups be formally consulted.
6. That cabinet explores funding for Southwark Travellers Action Group so that they can maintain their services, the committee firmly believes that the services provided by STAG save the council money.

[Note: Councillor Toby Eckersley requested that his vote against resolution 4 be recorded.]

6. MATERNAL HEALTH & EARLY YEARS: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS (FINAL REPORT, HEALTH, ADULT SOCIAL CARE, COMMUNITIES & CITIZENSHIP SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE)

- 6.1 Councillor Mark Williams, chair of health, adult social care, communities & citizenship scrutiny sub-committee, introduced the final scrutiny report. He drew attention to a further recommendation relating to the future funding of STAG which had been omitted in error:

“That cabinet explores funding for Southwark Travellers Action Group so that they can maintain their services, the sub-committee firmly believes that the services provided by STAG save the council money”

- 6.2 In response to questions from members, Councillor Williams stressed that although Gypsies and Travellers were a very small percentage of the borough’s population their needs still had to be addressed.
- 6.3 The committee thanked the sub-committee for its work and

RESOLVED:

That the report be submitted to cabinet for its consideration.

7. TRA HALLS AND COMMUNAL ROOMS (FINAL REPORT, HOUSING, ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE)

- 7.1 Councillor Gavin Edwards, chair of the housing, environment, transport & community safety scrutiny sub-committee, introduced the final scrutiny report.
- 7.2 In response to members’ concerns about the introduction of a fair rents system, Councillor Edwards explained that the aim was a system where all tenants’ and residents’ associations (TRAs) paid something but that overall the amount of income to the council would not increase.

- 7.3 A member questioned the recommendation that under-used halls be converted into homes (recommendation 9), suggesting that there may be good reasons why halls were not more used. He also raised concerns in respect of the recommendation that halls be converted into homes where the TRA was defunct (recommendation 10), pointing out that TRAs may be in abeyance for a number of years but then be re-formed at which point they would need a hall. The council had a responsibility to keep the facility available. Councillor Edwards indicated that recommendations 9 and 10 could be amended to address these concerns. A member wondered whether there could be a requirement for new build to include the provision of community space. Another member stressed that where community facilities existed before demolition of council housing then these should be replaced in any new development.
- 7.3 A member emphasised that where halls were hired out this should only be after the applicant had formally agreed to specific regulations and procedures. Councillor Edwards reported that the Tenants' Halls Working Party was developing a standard hire agreement. Another member hoped that this work would also address issues such as insurance cover. A member asked whether under-use of a hall might relate to, for instance, lack of sound-proofing. It was suggested that effective regulations and good management usually solved any noise issues.
- 7.4 Members welcomed recommendations 12 to 14, giving examples of incidences of fraud which had in the past been difficult to deal with.
- 7.5 Members identified facilities which were not listed in the table of TRA halls, including Lettsom Hall and facilities on the Glebe and East Dulwich Grove estates. They also hoped that the membership of the Tenants Halls Working Party would be kept up to date to represent all area forums.
- 7.6 The committee thanked the sub-committee for its work and

RESOLVED:

That, subject to appropriate amendments to recommendations 9 and 10, the report be submitted to cabinet for its consideration.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2012-13****AGENDA DISTRIBUTION LIST (OPEN)****NOTE:** Original held by Scrutiny Team; all amendments/queries to Peter Roberts Tel: 020 7525 4350

Name	No of copies	Name	No of copies
OSC Members		Council Officers	
Councillor Catherine Bowman (Chair)	1	Eleanor Kelly, Chief Executive	1
Councillor Dan Garfield (Vice-Chair)	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Neil Coyle	1	Norman Coombe, Legal Services	1
Councillor Toby Eckersley	1	Ian Millichap, Constitutional Team Manager	1
Councillor Gavin Edwards	1	Chris Page, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor David Hubber	1	Alex Doel, Labour Political Assistant	1
Councillor Lorraine Lauder	1	William Summers, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Councillor David Noakes	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor Paul Noblet	1		
Councillor Right Revd Emmanuel Oyewole	1		
Councillor Mark Williams	1		
Reserves			
Councillor Kevin Ahern	1		
Councillor James Barber	1		
Councillor Nick Dolezal	1		
Councillor Rebecca Lury	1	Total:	
Councillor Tim McNally	1	Dated: January 2013	49
Councillor Abdul Mohamed	1		
Councillor Lisa Rajan	1		
Councillor Lewis Robinson	1		
Councillor Martin Seaton	1		
Councillor Cleo Soanes	1		
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton	1		
Education Representatives on OSC			
Revd Nicholas Elder	1		
Colin Elliott	1		
Leticia Ojeda	1		
Cabinet Members			
Councillor Peter John (Council Leader)	1		
Councillor Ian Wingfield (Deputy Leader)	1		
Councillor Claire Hickson	1		
Councillor Richard Livingstone	1		
Councillor Veronica Ward	1		
Other Members [on request]			
Councillor Anood Al-Samerai	1		