

Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q2 2025

Bereaved & Survivors programme

November 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.

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

Purpose

This document is the second Independent Scrutiny Function update on the Bereaved & Survivors programme. It provides an assessment on the implementation of the Bereaved & Survivors programme from July – September 2025.

Previous scrutiny reports can be accessed [here](#).

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 community members. 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 Bereaved & Survivors programme from July to September 2025. Our assessment is completed according to our scrutiny framework which you can see on slide 6. This quarter, we have drawn on insights from a review of GPT's Quarter 2 monitoring report, the Grenfell Bereaved & Survivors Programme annual survey, a meeting with the Dedicated Service Team on 21st October, and the ISF-hosted sensemaking event on 13th of November.

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 7-11
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 12-13

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment – slides 14-25

Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment we review 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?

Q2 2025 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny assessment overview

Based on the evidence we have reviewed, as the ISF we are satisfied that the GPT has, between July and September, continued to effectively deliver the Bereaved & Survivors programme in line with the agreed model.

Summary of overall progress (You can find out more in the GPT's update on the support service [here](#).)

We can see that the GPT has continued to deliver the two key strands of the Bereaved and Survivor programme: personal budgets and the new core support service. We understand that the GPT have made progress in key areas related to payments of personal budgets, lump sum payment requests, and developing and delivering the first annual survey.

Strengths

- The GPT has created opportunities for feedback for bereaved and survivors through the implementation working group, which meets quarterly. This will be continuing and is open to all bereaved and survivors. The GPT is also directly listening to bereaved and survivors through the Dedicated Service workers.
- The GPT has delivered a first annual survey, which gathered significant feedback from bereaved and survivors, and reported on what changes they will be making as a result of people's feedback.
- The GPT are beginning to reflect internally and with bereaved and survivors about what the end of the support looks like and how they can best support people with a transition.

Key risks/issues:

- The GPT have raised concerns about capacity within the Dedicated Service team. The GPT expect potentially a higher proportion of children opting out, which will mean a reduction in budget, and therefore staffing, but not necessarily a reduction in cases. The GPT are planning in advance to clearly communicate any changes after the opt in/out window, in particular for any changes to people's support workers as a result of reduction in capacity.
- We do not see any current risks/issues in the GPT's monitoring approach.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact	Implementation and delivery progress is in line with agreed plans. Reach has increased and key transitions such as the transition to payments into bank accounts have been implemented. Where there have been challenges, communication with bereaved and survivors appears to have been transparent.
Complaints	We understand that there have been a small number of complaints over Q1 and Q2 support. We would like to understand from the GPT the nature of the complaints and what learning is coming through resolving them.
Expenditure	We have received financial information about expenditure across the Bereaved & Survivors programme. We are satisfied that expenditure and predicted spend is as intended for the delivery of the programme.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Reporting and transparency	The GPT is in direct communication via email with all bereaved and survivors and via the Dedicated Service workers where people have opted in for this support.
Restorative practice	The GPT have evidenced how a restorative approach has informed their delivery. We have also seen comments from bereaved and survivors about the need for the GPT to share their way of working with the wider council, and for the Council in turn to adopt these ways of working. We see this as very positive feedback.
Monitoring	Monitoring data shared with us this quarter has been more clear and comprehensive than in Q1.

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 a scrutiny assessment (slide 8-10).

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- More information about the nature of people's disagreement or dissatisfaction with elements of the programme as outlined in the survey. We would like to understand what the GPT is learning from the 10-25% of people responding "not in agreement" or "not satisfied" to some of the questions on the annual survey.
- We have seen some of the negative feedback that was shared, and we would like to understand if all of those who say they disagree or are dissatisfied are able to voice why.
- Information about the GPT's ideas on how to act on comments in the survey about sharing learning of their way of working with wider council services.

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 DedicatedServiceEnqs@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 GPT to help understand programme delivery so far, and identify changes needed to the programme (and beyond). There will be two collective scrutiny & reflection sessions per year on the Bereaved and Survivors programme, facilitated by the ISF. The ISF will be in touch prior to this 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: Q2 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

Q2 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 has continued to deliver the two key strands of the Bereaved and Survivor programme: personal budgets and the new core support service. We understand that the GPT have made key decisions relating to three areas of work:

- Transitioned from prepaid cards to payment direct into bank accounts
- Implemented a lump sum payment process from the 1st of July, where bereaved & survivors have been able to apply for future years personal budgets as a lump sum. This has so far received 312 applications.
- Opened the first annual Dedicated Service survey, developed with feedback from the Dedicated Service working group. The survey closed on the 2nd of November.

Up to October 2025 we can see that 87% of eligible individuals have requested personal budget for 2024/25 and 2025/26. For the 13% who have not used any of their budgets we understand that the GPT is working to understand why this is the case, mainly through the results of the 2025 annual survey.

Have challenges been addressed? How?

There is evidence in the data to show that the GPT are responding to challenges with the service in response to feedback. For example, acknowledging the slow speed of transfer to bank accounts and the challenges that this caused for people, and clearly communicating the process and when people should expect payments.

Q2 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Have any challenges or any risks been identified? How are these being addressed?

Risk to staffing levels in the next opt-out window

The GPT expect potentially a higher proportion of children opting out, which will mean a reduction in staffing but not necessarily a reduction in cases. The GPT expect changes to staff, and this will mean some people changing worker. To manage this, the team will be monitoring the data on choices, so that they ensure a smooth transition with clear communication to families so that they know if and when the change is coming.

Potential low response to the survey

The GPT are concerned about a potential low response rate to the first annual survey, particularly from those who have opted out of the dedicated support service. To address this risk, and in the hope of receiving at least a 10% response rate for the survey, the GPT are sending out reminder emails twice per week, and staff are speaking to families they are working with. The GPT will also be actively engaging with individuals who have opted out to gain their views about the support programme.

Bank accounts set up

During the set up of nominated bank accounts and closure of prepaid cards there is a risk that 100% of bank accounts will not be set up in time and that 100% of balances may not be removed from prepaid cards. The GPT will be working closely with individuals and with Grenfell Finance to discuss options available.

Q2 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?

No factors beyond the programmes remit are reported this quarter in delivery.

However, we understand that there are issues being identified by bereaved and survivors with broader council services, in particular within housing and parking. We would like to see more information about this in the next scrutiny update. In particular as issues identified could affect people in their transition to using broader council services when the GPT support service comes to an end in 2028.

Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for delivery:

We understand that the vast majority of bereaved and survivors are satisfied with the service, particularly from the Q2 monitoring data. We can see that the GPT are using feedback about challenges to improve the support.

Where people are dissatisfied, we would like the GPT to share how they are responding to this. For example, through communications or response to the specific challenges mentioned. We understand that given the small number of complaints and dissatisfaction this may not result in changes to the ways of working. However, we would like to ensure that there is some action taken to respond to or address the dissatisfaction where appropriate.

Q2 2025 scrutiny: reach

What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme?

We understand that 100% of eligible people have now accessed the programme either through personal budgets or the core service. We have seen data detailing the progress that GPT are making on paying out personal budgets through lump sums and budget requests.

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

We see from the data that 87% of eligible people have made a personal budget request in this financial year. 13% have not used any of their 2024/25 and 2025/26 budgets. The GPT are looking into reasons for people not accessing their budgets. Some people are saving budgets for specific future costs such as university fees. Others don't want to use their budgets. The ISF would like to understand why some people don't want to use their budgets, and we understand that this is a question in the annual survey.

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 are accessing support, unless they did not wish to be contacted by the GPT. We understand that a route is still open for those who did not want to be contacted to, in future, identify themselves, and be considered for eligibility.

Q2 2025 scrutiny: impact

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

The GPT are continuing to collect and review data on the impact of the support. This quarter the GPT have continued to receive 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.

In addition to this the annual survey shows a broad range of data about the impact of personal budgets and lump sum payments for the 110 bereaved and survivors who responded. There is a large amount of data shared with us about the positive impacts and also the challenges and negative responses to the support.

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

We have seen demographic data for, age, gender, and location. We understand from the GPT that people from different demographics across the borough are all accessing the service, and that there is no measurable difference in impact across groups. The GPT report that people have been able to access the programme equally regardless of their demographics. We have seen limited data about the impact across ethnic backgrounds as this is a demographic category that people chose whether or not to share in the annual survey, and the majority of people preferred not to share this.

We feel it is reasonable that people should not have to share this data publicly, however we would like to understand from the GPT if, in their internally held data, they see any differences in impact. In particular any barriers to accessing the support across ethnicities in the borough. We understand that this information will be available to us in the next quarter.

Q2 2025 scrutiny: impact

Reflective sessions held by GPT colleagues

We understand that with the changes to the Dedicated Service, individual team members have increased caseloads. This has led to a feeling for some staff that they are not able to respond as effectively, or not able to spend as much time with each person as in the previous service, and they feel they are not doing enough sometimes.

Some team members feel that it is more challenging to move issues forwards currently, compared with 3-4 years ago.

Team members are also concerned about how to support bereaved and survivors to prepare for the ending of the service in 2028.

Areas of improvement on the monitoring plans for impact:

In the survey there were several areas with 10-25% of people either neutral, disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with some of the statements. It was not clear from the survey data the reasons behind these disagreements. The GPT have committed to doing further analysis to understand the reasons behind these ratings of parts of the support and we would like to see this information in the next round of scrutiny.

Q2 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 6 complaints over Q1 and Q2 support. Five of these complaints have been resolved, three not upheld and two partially upheld. One complaint is still open with a decision to be made.

We understand that the GPT are going to provide more information, on the nature of the complaints and what learning is coming through resolving them, in the next quarters' report.

Q2 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

The Grenfell Support Programme is subject to usual council expenditure and budget monitoring and oversight, and an annual external audit. The role of the ISF is to decide whether, overall, expenditure for the programme is as intended, and whether significant changes in expenditure have been recorded and justified.

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

We have received financial information about expenditure across the Bereaved & Survivors programme. We are satisfied that expenditure and predicted spend is as intended for the delivery of the programme as per the consultation outcome.

We understand that for personal budgets funding, the in-year budget has been exceeded for 2025/26. However, we note that the GPT has the funding held in reserves to manage the forecast spend for this year and do not see any significant risks.

We also see that the overall budget is being spent as intended and the large budget spend this year is in direct response to requests from bereaved and survivors to access their past, current and future years' spends. We see this as expected given the commitments made in the programme.

We understand that the Dedicated Service spend is forecast within budget for this year, and that the GPT see no significant risks in relation to this budget.

Q2 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?

Since our first report, the GPT have continued to report updates to bereaved and survivors through direct email communication.

We understand that the Implementation Working Group, which finished in July, has requested to continue their work to provide feedback and challenge to the Dedicated Service between now and 2028. We understand that the group is open to new members joining and that some people have expressed interest in joining. We can see a benefit of the group continuing to meet to provide feedback and challenge to the GPT. We recommend that the purpose of the group and ToR is reviewed and communicated regularly as the programme progresses to ensure it is relevant, and has a clear, transparent remit.

In addition, we have been to meetings with the GPT and bereaved and survivors where we have seen examples of clearly communicating programme updates and creating opportunities for asking questions and challenging the GPT on the data. We would like to see the GPT share data in advance of these meetings, where possible, so that people have a chance to digest data ahead of time.

Q2 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 continue to be clear in their justifications for decision-making, and in adapting the programme in line with the views of bereaved and survivors around the Dedicated Service. For example there are clear actions and next steps from the results of the annual survey where the GPT are directly responding to bereaved and survivors feedback.

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

The GPT continue to address feedback from complaints and informal communications. In the next round of scrutiny we would like to understand more about what insights are coming out of complaints and how these are being incorporated into delivery.

In this quarter we have seen the GPT's internal practice of reflection identify some potential future challenges about the service ending in 2028 and we see the GPT planning for how to address these challenges. We would like an update in the next quarter of where this work is going. We understand that there are several challenges with wider council services, and services outside of the Council's remit. These challenges, in housing and parking in particular, are raising concerns due to the inability of GPT to address them, given their remit.

We have seen feedback from bereaved and survivors about the importance of the wider council learning from the GPT's good practice. We would like to see how the GPT is raising these issues with the wider council and what the next steps are for this learning to be shared. This will inform work that the ISF and the GPT will undertake in the new year to gather and share insights and practice from the programme that are relevant to the Council and wider partners.

Q2 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 delivering personal budgets and the core service.

In the next round of scrutiny we would like to understand more about links with wider council services and how the data from this support programme can inform improvements more widely. As mentioned in our previous report we still 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.