

<b>Item No:</b> 1	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2003	<b>Meeting Name:</b> OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
<b>Report Title:</b>		Call-In: Funding for Southwark Group of Tenants Organisation (SGTO).	
<b>Ward(s) or Group affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Corporate Strategy	

### RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Committee considers a call-in request relating to a decision taken by the Executive on 7th October 2003 in respect of funding for Southwark Group of Tenants Organisations (SGTO).

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On 7th October 2003 the Executive considered item 20 from the Strategic Director of Housing (Appendix A) and the following decisions were made:
  1. That interim funding up to £6,000, from the Tenant Fund to Southwark Group of Tenant Organisations be agreed subject to monthly expenditure reports being submitted to the Strategic Director of Housing and a more detailed breakdown of the estimated costs of postage.
  2. That the Executive will not be minded to agree any further funding for Southwark Group of Tenant Organisation until substantial progress can be made on agreeing the draft vision for the Best Value Review of Tenant and Resident Involvement and the Tenant Fund.
3. On 14th October 2003 the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Kim Humphreys, and three members of the Committee (Councillors Dora Dixon-Fyle, John Friary and Andy Simmons) called-in this decision.

The reasons given for the call-in were as follows:

"Wording of decision 2 is vague, i.e. what does "substantial" mean? This was not in line with what was agreed with Tenant Council and Tenant Management Committee (TMC)".

4. Previous reports/minutes relating to this item are attached as follows, i.e.

**Appendix A:** Executive report: Funding for Southwark Group of Tenants Organisation (SGTO):

**Appendix B:** Executive minutes 9th September 2003:

## **Appendix C: Call-In request.**

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

5. Requests for call-in should normally only be made if there is evidence that the Executive *[or officer to whom responsibility for that decision was delegated]* did not take a decision in accordance with the principles of decision making as set out in the Constitution:
  - (a) Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the outcome)
  - (b) Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from Officers
  - (c) Respect for human rights
  - (d) Presumption in favour of openness
  - (e) Clarity of aims and desired outcomes
  - (f) The link between strategy and implementation must be maintained
  - (g) Decision-making generally, whether by individual Officers, individual Executive Members or the Executive collectively, should have reference to the policy framework and be in accordance with the budget
6. The Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules require the Committee to consider any call-in request and in particular whether or not the decision might be contrary to the policy framework or not wholly in accordance with the budget. Advice should be sought from appropriate Chief Officers including the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer.
7. If, having considered the decision and all relevant advice, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee is still concerned about it, then it may either:
  - refer it back to the decision-making body *[or officer to whom responsibility for that decision was delegated]* for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns; or
  - refer the matter to Council Assembly if the decision is deemed to be outside the policy and budget framework.
8. The Members of the Executive with relevant portfolio responsibilities have been advised of this meeting.

### **LEGAL & FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. Rule 18.6 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules requires a call-in request to be signed by the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee plus three members of the Committee; the call-in request has been validly made in accordance with this rule. Rule 18.2 which sets out the circumstances in which call-in requests should normally be made is reflected in

paragraph 6 of this report. The decision of the Strategic Director of Housing is not contrary to the policy framework and accords with the budget.