

Scrutiny call-in request form

This form is to be used when requesting a call-in. It has been created to elicit the required information, and to provide an audit trail of the process.

Requesting a call-in

To request a call-in, please complete section 1 and arrange for the form to be countersigned by four other members of the council and email to scrutinyteam2@southwark.gov.uk before the end of the scrutiny call-in period indicated on the decision notification issued by the constitutional team.

SECTION 1

1. Title of decision to be called in, and decision taker

Decision title:	Decision taker:
Gateway 1 Housing – Procurement Support and Supply Chain Management System	Cabinet

2. Have you [applicable to all councillors requesting the call-in] participated in taking the decision?

(Yes/No): No

Note: A member who participates in taking an executive decision shall not sign a call-in request on the same decision (thus avoiding any conflict of interests).

3. Does the request for call-in relate to a single recommendation in the report or the whole report?

Please specify: Whole report

4. Which of the principles of decision making in Article 1.3 of the constitution have failed to be applied? (see scrutiny call-in guidance for explanation)

Mark all that you believe have failed to be applied and state reasons:

Decision making principle:	Failed to be applied? (mark with an X)
<p>(a) The link between strategy and implementation must be maintained</p> <p>Reason: The report makes reference to the Southwark 2030 commitments to offering value for money, openness and accountability. There is no guarantee that this decision will generate savings for the council or provide value for money – and indeed, it could represent an additional cost given the fee charged by Plentific to the council and to the contractors (who will pass it on to the council). Actual costs are not knowable. The report also anticipates delivering the relationship with Plentific with no additional back-office staff resources – this unclear in itself and the report does not explain how it will be achieved. The Strategic Director of Resources notes the governance challenge (p.100) posed by this transformation of contract management processes. Given recent challenges in contract management, the risk seems serious.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>(b) Decision making generally, whether by individual officers, individual cabinet members or the cabinet collectively, should have reference to the policy framework</p> <p>Reason:</p>	
<p>(c) Respect for human rights, law, probity and the constitution</p> <p>Reason:</p>	

<p>(d) reasonable and proportionate consultation</p> <p>Reason: As this is a significant development in the management of our repairs service, there should be have been some degree of wider stakeholder consultation. We are committed to a resident-led approach to improving repairs, but the report makes no mention of any consultation with residents in this decision.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>(e) the taking of reasonable and appropriate professional advice from officers</p> <p>Reason:</p>	
<p>(f) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome)</p> <p>Reason: Above-mentioned concerns around value for money and financial risk apply here also. We do not know exactly what if any savings this will generate, and whether it will provide an improved repairs service, but it is a significant change that will place integration and governance challenges on the Housing department, at a time when its budget is under strain. It is a major change, with significant risk, that the report does not justify – and the alternative of procuring existing suppliers is not explored or assessed in any detail.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>(g) a presumption in favour of openness</p> <p>Reason:</p>	
<p>(h) clarity of aims and desired outcomes, including of the options considered</p> <p>Reason:</p>	

i) consideration of the likely climate consequences and the likely equality (including socio-economic disadvantage and health inequality) consequences of the relevant decision and therefore reports for decision should include advice from officers of the likely climate and equality impacts of the decision

Reason:

5. Is the decision believed to be outside the policy or budget framework

(Yes / No): No

Signatures of those members requesting the call-in of the decision:

Note: each member must insert his or her name in the table below. A separate email from the member communicating support for the call-in is sufficient, but should be evidenced upon submission of the form.

- 1) Councillor Sam Foster
- 2) Councillor Reginald Popoola
- 3) Councillor Laura Johnson
- 4) Councillor Sabina Emmanuel
- 5) Councillor Suzanne Abachor

Section 2

To be completed by Head of Scrutiny (or officer of the scrutiny team)

6. Does the request meet the Call-in threshold? (All must apply for threshold to be met):	Mark with an X
(a) Five members of the council have requested the decision be called-in ¹ .	x
(b) A member who has participated in taking the executive decision has not signed a call-in request on the same decision.	x
(c) Evidence that the decision maker did not take the decision in accordance with the principles of decision making as set out in Article 1.3 of the constitution has been provided.	x
(d) The request has stated whether the members believe that the decision is outside the policy or budget framework.	x

7. Request for call-in considered valid?

(Yes / No): Yes

Reasons:

I consider that there are sufficient grounds provided to warrant the request for call-in, as detailed in section 1 above (a, d and f). The call-in will allow for the overview and scrutiny committee to seek

¹This can include education representatives (for the purpose of education decisions only)

clarification on issues around consultation, and the opportunity to explore the risks highlighted in the request, which have been arrived at from information contained in the decision making report.

Signed: Everton Roberts, Head of Scrutiny

Date: 25 October 2024

Note: If the call-in is considered to be valid, the scrutiny officer shall notify the decision taker and the relevant chief officer, who shall suspend implementation of the decision. The scrutiny officer shall a) refer the called-in decision to the next meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee, if that meeting is within ten clear working days of the receipt of the call-in request, or b) call an extraordinary meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee to consider the called-in decision, to take place as soon as possible and in any case within ten clear working days of the call-in request, or c) if appropriate arrange an extraordinary meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee to consider the matter outside the normal timetable, unless in the view of the monitoring officer and/or the chief finance officer, in consultation with the relevant chief officer, the matter cannot wait and in which case it shall be considered in accordance with the timescale set out above.

Invalid Call-in Request

Where a call-in has been ruled invalid by the scrutiny officer, a request can be made by those requesting call-in for the monitoring officer to review the ruling. The request shall be made by 4pm on the second working day after the day of the notification of the decision by the scrutiny officer.

In the event of dispute, the decision of the monitoring officer shall be final.

Request for review of scrutiny officer ruling. Please send this form to Doreen Forrester-Brown, Monitoring Officer by 4pm, @ date

(Email: Doreen.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk)

Section 3

To be completed by the monitoring officer upon receipt of request for review

I have reviewed the grounds for call-in and reasons given for an invalid request and conclude that the request for call-in is (Valid / Invalid)

Reasons:

Doreen Forrester-Brown, Monitoring Officer

Dated: