

# Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q1 2025

Bereaved and Survivors programme

August 2025



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) أو

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk)

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

ናይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተረጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) ርኽቡና።

# Purpose

**What is this:** This document is the first Independent Scrutiny Function update on the scrutiny of the Bereaved and Survivors programme. It provides a scrutiny assessment on the delivery of the programme from January – June 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 provide scrutiny (external review, challenge and advice) to help ensure the Grenfell Support programme is being 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 of the Grenfell Support Bereaved and Survivors programme from January to June 2025 and monitoring of the programme. 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).

# Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 8–9
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 13–17

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment – slides 18–28

# Scrutiny framework

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

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	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?
<b>Complaints</b>	Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What learning/actions have been taken as a result?
<b>Expenditure</b>	Is expenditure for the programme as intended? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?
<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?
<b>Restorative practice</b>	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?
<b>Monitoring</b>	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 Bereaved and Survivor programme in line with the model agreed through consultation.**

**Summary of overall progress** (You can find out more on the GPT Linktree [here](#) and [here](#).)

The final bereaved and survivor model approved by the RBKC Leadership team in December 2024 confirmed that the programme would include: new personal budgets based on individual experiences and a choice to opt-in or opt-out of the core team support services. Since June 2024, bereaved and survivors have been able to opt-in or opt-out of core support services and have received their personal budgets. All eligible bereaved and survivors were contacted individually and have been made aware of the options for support.

Since January 2025, there has been ongoing delivery of personal budgets and core team support. Key areas of progress are:

- Additional support has been made available for survivors who escaped the Tower before 2am (Jan 2025 – March 2025)
- A new payments process has been designed (Dec 2024 – July 2025)
- A process for applying for future year's personal budgets in advance has been implemented (July 2025)

# Scrutiny assessment overview (2)

## Strengths:

- The GPT have provided monitoring information with lots of detail about how programme implementation was carried out. This helps show how the GPT are working to ensure equity and accessibility.
- We have seen detailed examples of how the GPT are ensuring that people can participate in how the programme is implemented, for example how the implementation group has been run.
- The GPT have also shown examples of restorative practice, for example, through clear communication about the boundaries set by the consultation, through listening to bereaved and survivors about dates for opt-in and opt-out windows, and the adjustment allowing people to stay with their original key workers.
- The GPT are also being clear about how they are supporting continued input of bereaved and survivors, through one-to-one conversations and open hybrid meetings.

**Key risks/issues:** There have been some complaints about changes to personal budgets and it will be important for the GPT and the wider council to continue to engage with residents in a restorative manner around these.

As the support programme continues, there is a risk that some bereaved and survivors (particularly those who have opted out of support) will ask for additional support to navigate the system. The GPT team will need to find a balance between preserving the integrity of the opt-in/opt-out arrangements, while also supporting contact between the wider council and bereaved and survivors where people want that.

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	The data provided by the GPT is sufficient for the ISF to assess that delivery is in line with agreed plans as per the final outcome of the consultation. We can see that the GPT have delivered on and progressed the two key strands of the Bereaved and Survivor programme: personal budgets have been allocated to all eligible individuals who are in contact with GPT, based on their experience. The new core support service has also been set up
<b>Complaints</b>	We understand that there have been a small number of complaints which have been addressed through one-to-one conversations. For the next round of scrutiny we would like to know more about the specific number of complaints, what stage they are at, length of time for resolution, and any trends and learnings emerging.
<b>Expenditure</b>	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 and an explanation for variances in expenditure against budget.

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	The GPT have clearly explained the formal communication and reporting mechanisms to bereaved and survivors. We have seen several examples of clear and transparent communication where the GPT have provided explanations as to why certain decisions are made, and taken on feedback from bereaved and survivors.
<b>Restorative practice</b>	There are several examples of the GPT being restorative in their delivery. This includes being clear in their explanations of decision-making, and in adapting the programme in line with the views of bereaved and survivors around the dedicated service. We would like to understand more about how the GPT and the wider Council are addressing the complaints from Grenfell Walk residents.
<b>Monitoring</b>	So far the monitoring is supporting the GPT to collect sufficient data to assess how the programme is running, including setting up new personal budgets and the new core service. We would like to understand more about plans to monitor core service use, and where this links in with wider council services.

# Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

## Information we want to see immediately from the GPT (i.e., before the 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 reach a scrutiny assessment (slides 8–9).

## Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Reflections from people involved in the delivery of the programme on how well it is being delivered and whether it is having an impact.
- More explicit records of operational decisions and programme developments that are based on the team's experience and day-to-day interactions with bereaved and survivors.
- More detail on how the GPT intend to capture and apply feedback from the core service, particularly in relation to sharing learning with the wider council.
- Detail on how satisfaction with the programme will be understood and measured.
- More clarity on how data is collected and presented, in particular more detail is needed on people's perceptions of the impact of the programme's implementation. We understand that this data will be mainly from the annual survey, with higher response rates expected from people who have opted in.

**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](mailto:FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk).
- Provide direct feedback to the ISF by emailing [isf@involve.org.uk](mailto: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 Bereaved and Survivors 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 data provided by the GPT is sufficient for the ISF to assess that delivery is in line with agreed plans as per the final outcome of the consultation.

We can see that the GPT have delivered on and progressed the two key strands of the Bereaved and Survivor programme: personal budgets have been allocated to all eligible individuals who are in contact with GPT, based on their experience, and the new core support service has been set up. The GPT have been working with the implementation group since September 2024 to oversee key areas of the final model including designing the new payments process, agreeing pay policy and process for future years' payments, reviewing the opt-in/opt-out policy and process, and reviewing work of the core team.

## **Have challenges been addressed? How?**

There is evidence in the data to show that the GPT are adapting the support in response to feedback. For example, shifting communications and deadlines for responses from bereaved and survivors so that they don't conflict with the inquiry dates, and enabling people to keep existing key workers.

# 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 delays the payment of support directly into bank accounts. The GPT mitigated this challenge by continuing to make payments to prepaid cards until July 2025.

## **Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for delivery:**

- In the next round of scrutiny we would like to see a continuation of the current data collection about reach and access to the bereaved and survivors support.
- We would also like to understand where there are challenges in delivery outside of the GPT's remit, and how these are being recorded and highlighted to the wider Council.
- We would like to understand the GPT's rationale for what data they might need to collect in future and what data they might no longer need to collect.

# Q1 2025 scrutiny: reach

## **What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme?**

Data has been provided on numbers of people opting-in and out and those who haven't yet accessed support. We can see that the GPT have worked to contact all people who are eligible and have provided clear explanations as to what stage people are at in accessing support. There is clear data about what has been completed so far and what is in progress on personal budgets, dedicated service set up, and additional support budgets.

## **Are there specific groups of people the programme isn't reaching? What work has been done to understand this?**

The GPT were provided with a list of bereaved and survivors that could be eligible for support and who were not accessing the previous service. The GPT reached out to these individuals, via the lawyers, to explain what support was available to them and ask if they wanted to access it. Everyone came forward for support apart from four individuals, who had not given their lawyers consent for GPT to contact them. These people can still come forward in future and a decision would be made as to whether they could access support based on any extenuating circumstances having not come forward before the 31st of March 2025.

## **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?**

There are no other issues reported on reach. All those eligible for support (apart from the four mentioned above) are either accessing support or in the final stages of being set up to access support through personal budgets and core support where they are opting in.

# Q1 2025 scrutiny: impact

## **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 how people are using their personal budgets (via collecting theme areas) and how people would rate the outcome on a scale of 1-5.

We understand, and feel it is appropriate, that for the Bereaved and Survivors programme there will be less data collected when compared with the Community and Education and Training programmes, in particular for those who are receiving personal budgets and have opted-out of core support. For those who have opted-in for support we are looking forward to seeing more information about what data the GPT is collecting and why, what they are learning from the data, and how the GPT and the wider Council plan to act on this data.

## **Is there any difference in impact across the different programme strands or by demographic group? Why so?**

We don't currently have enough information to assess this. However, we understand that the GPT will have this data in the next round of scrutiny. We understand that the GPT is looking at the difference in impact across demographic and also cohort groups, and in particular the impact of advance personal budget payments (which were introduced in July). In the next round of scrutiny we would like to understand what the GPT is learning from this data.

# Q1 2025 scrutiny: impact

## **Areas of improvement on the monitoring plans for impact:**

There is currently limited data about the impact of the programme so far – which is to be expected at this early stage in the programme. We can see that the GPT is collecting data around what people are using their budgets for. We expect that there will be more impact data available from the annual survey in September/October 2025.

We would like to understand the purpose of some of the data about how funds are being used, why this is being collected, what the GPT are learning from it, and how they plan to act on it.

We think that the GPT and dedicated service colleagues should collectively reflect on and document their own observations about the difference the support is making to people and identify implications for the wider council – during and beyond the Grenfell Support programme.

# 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?**

We understand that there have been a small number of complaints about eligibility for personal budgets, and additionally some people who are not satisfied with casework support.

In the next round of scrutiny, we would like to know more about the specific number of complaints, what stage they are at, length of time for resolution, and any trends and learning that is emerging.

# Q1 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

**Is expenditure and predicted spend for the programme as intended? What variances are there?**

We are working with the GPT to find the best way for them to report on expenditure of the programme. 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.

# 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 formal reporting mechanisms to bereaved and survivors. We understand that through the implementation working group slides are shared with key data about the programme. This data is then uploaded to Linktree. We also understand that the GPT are in direct email communication with all bereaved and survivors.

In addition we have been provided information about informal feedback and communication with bereaved and survivors, and we can see several examples of clear and transparent communication. This includes the GPT providing explanations as to why certain decisions are made, and taking on feedback from bereaved and survivors about the dedicated service and implementing changes.

Examples of transparent communication that we have seen are: the decision making around additional support for survivors who escaped the tower before 2am, the communication for decision-making windows for people to opt-in and opt-out of support, and creating opportunities to ask questions and meet with the core team.

# 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?**

There are several examples of the GPT being restorative in their delivery. This includes being clear in their explanations of decision-making, and in adapting the programme in line with the views of bereaved and survivors around the dedicated service.

We understand that former Grenfell Walk residents have lodged complaints and have been in conversation with the GPT and the wider Council including a meeting with the Chief Executive. We recognise these conversations are ongoing and will continue to monitor this in our scrutiny role. It is an important opportunity to demonstrate the ability of the wider Council to respond in a restorative way to a decision that was made through the consultation.

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

The GPT have given us several examples of using restorative practice in the implementation of the Bereaved and Survivors programme. These include:

- Being clear about their rationale for where people are placed in cohorts, and the need to stick to the final model as agreed in the consultation.
- Moving the decision-making window from September to October.
- Listening to concerns about key workers and enabling people to keep their existing key worker.
- Creating the opportunity to opt-back-in, provided people return the equivalent amount of personal budget.

In the next round of scrutiny we would like to understand what impact the GPT and dedicated service team feel these decisions are making on the relationships between residents and the Council.

# 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?**

So far the monitoring is supporting the GPT to collect sufficient data to assess how the programme is running, including setting up new personal budgets and the new core service.

In the next round of scrutiny we would like to understand more about their plans to monitor how the core service is being used and where it links in with wider council services. We see this as crucial to enabling a restorative approach over the longer term, by ensuring that people can effectively access support within wider council services, so that there is minimal negative impact once this support ends.