

Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q4 2026

Community Support programme

May 2026



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، يرجى الاتصال بـ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

«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.

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

Purpose

This document is the fourth Independent Scrutiny Function update on scrutiny of the Community Support programme. It provides a assessment on delivery of the programme from January – March 2026.

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 help ensure the Grenfell Support is 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 and monitoring of the Grenfell Community Support programme from January – March 2026.

What are the contents of this document?

This document presents our scrutiny assessment according to our scrutiny framework (which you can see on slide 7). This quarter, we have drawn on insights from a review of the GPT's Q4 Monitoring Report, the Grenfell Community Public Dashboard refreshed on 9th April 2026 and additional information on GCAT provided on 18th May 2026.

Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 7
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 8-14
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 15-16

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment (slides 17-31)

Q4 2026 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment, we reviewed 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	Is 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?

Scrutiny assessment overview (1)

Based on the evidence reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the GPT is continuing to deliver the Community Programme effectively during Q4, despite the ongoing operational impact of the cyber attack. The quarter shows clear progress in increasing programme reach, maintaining access through alternative routes, preparing for Year 2 delivery and beginning to develop the community activities offer.

The programme also demonstrates stronger monitoring maturity than in earlier quarters. The dashboard provides a more integrated picture of delivery, reach and usage and shows progress against earlier ISF feedback on demographic breakdowns, clearer categorisation and visibility of programme data.

Summary of overall progress:

- Community activities pilot developed: GPT responded to resident frustration about delays in the longer-term community activities programme by agreeing with the Operational Steering Group (OSG) to launch a four-month pilot. The pilot was shaped by feedback from the 2025 programme review and included a focus on wellbeing, group trips and creative activities.
- A final Y1 outreach campaign launched in early February ahead of the 17 March wellbeing grant cut-off generated 367 applications by the end of March. A targeted mail-out to 1664 residents achieved a 19.4% response rate, similar to the October campaign.
- Inclusive access measures continued: GPT used translation panels in nine community languages, produced full Arabic and Farsi translations for some residents identified through Housing Management data, and continued to accept applications by phone, at drop-ins and through home visits while online forms remained unavailable.
- Y2 planning progressed, but launch delayed: GPT reported that Y2 launch preparations continued, but full launch was delayed because Y1 applications needed to be closed and processed first, alongside the ongoing impact of the cyber-attack on systems and payment processes, residents were informed about the delay.

Scrutiny assessment overview (2)

- Delivery volumes increased: By the end of March, GPT reported **2328 wellbeing grants paid, 4882 gym memberships approved and 539 GCAT support interventions in Q4.**
- Reach improved: Programme reach among current area households increased to **53.6%**, up from **46.9% at the end of Q3.** The dashboard reports **54% of current area households** and **52% of time-of-tragedy households** having applied.
- Monitoring infrastructure strengthened: The dashboard now includes clearer views of GCAT activity, applications, reach, demographic breakdowns, gym usage and survey results. This reflects progress against earlier ISF feedback.

Strengths:

- The Q4 data shows a programme continuing to operate effectively under the ongoing effects of the cyber-attack while adapting routes of access to reduce barriers for residents. Phone applications, increased drop-in capacity and home visits have helped preserve access where online systems were not available.
- The final Year 1 campaign appears to have been effective. The 19.4% response rate and 367 applications generated following the early February mail out suggest that targeted communications, particularly when linked to a clear cut-off date, can support programme take up.
- The launch of the community activities pilot demonstrates responsiveness to resident frustration and an effort to ensure that an offer is made available while longer-term design work continues. The involvement of the OSG in shaping aspects of the process is positive.
- The dashboard provides a clearer and more accessible structure for understanding programme reach, GCAT activity, application patterns, demographic participation and service usage. This reflects progress against previous ISF feedback calling for a stronger monitoring infrastructure and clearer analytical presentation.

Scrutiny assessment overview (3)

- The use of dashboard data, survey findings and qualitative case studies in the monitoring report is positive. The report includes examples of outcomes from GCAT support, including repairs, crisis support and referrals to other services, helping to add lived-experience insight alongside quantitative data.

Key risks/issues:

- GPT reports that it no longer has access to Council Tax data to verify current addresses, creating a risk of payments being made to incorrect addresses if residents have moved and not informed the team. GPT has considered options and risk-assessed this as relatively low, choosing not to delay Year 2 payments further. The ISF will continue to follow how the planned September reconciliation is managed.
- The Q4 report notes that GCAT was designed to undertake short pieces of advocacy work, yet housing-related cases can involve long waiting times and complex system issues. GCAT has clarified that it is managing this through structured daily oversight, a task-and-finish model, dedicated casework time outside drop-ins and continuity for vulnerable residents where relationship-building is needed. The ISF sees this as an important area to continue monitoring to ensure this approach remains sustainable.
- The dashboard has improved substantively, but earlier ISF feedback called for accessibility testing with residents and clearer narrative alongside the data. GPT has advised that July is a realistic date for publication, with work needed to simplify the public version and test it with residents.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact	<p>GPT continued to deliver the Community Programme during Q4 despite significant operational constraints caused by the cyber-attack. The quarter was characterised by high demand linked to the Year 1 wellbeing grant cut-off date, ongoing manual and emergency processes, and the need to prepare for Year 2 while closing Year 1 applications. The programme's ability to remain responsive is a clear strength.</p> <p>Reach improved substantially during Q4, supported by the final Year 1 outreach campaign and continued use of alternative access routes while online systems were unavailable.</p> <p>The materials reviewed provide growing evidence that the programme is making a difference for residents. The monitoring report includes qualitative examples of GCAT support helping residents with housing repairs, crisis situations and access to wider services. The dashboard also provides service-use indicators, including intervention volumes, outcome ratings and gym membership patterns.</p>
Complaints	<p>GPT reports that two complaints were received in Q4. Both were responded to on time. The low number of complaints remains positive. However, the upheld eligibility complaint may contain useful learning about process clarity or communications, particularly as the programme moves into Year 2.</p>

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Expenditure	<p>The ISF is satisfied that the Community Support programme expenditure remains broadly in line with programme intentions. Key variances are mainly explained by timing, levels of take-up and the programme year not aligning neatly with the financial year.</p> <p>Wellbeing grant underspend is being retained for future years and will support the Year 2 grant increase.</p> <p>The small KLC overspend is being met through the unspent communications and engagement budget, as agreed through the programme review. The ISF notes a future risk of increased KLC costs in 2026/27 and will return to this in the next scrutiny round.</p>
Reporting and transparency	<p>There is evidence of continued transparent communication with residents during Q4. GPT wrote to residents when it became clear that the Year 2 process would not begin as originally anticipated, explaining the reasons for the delay. It also communicated the leisure centre membership extension to March 2027.</p> <p>The development of the dashboard is also a significant positive step in improving transparency. It presents richer programme information than in earlier quarters and helps move reporting beyond activity counts toward a more rounded picture of delivery, reach and usage. GPT has advised that July is a realistic date for publication of the public dashboard.</p>

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (3)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Restorative practice	<p>The Q4 materials provide some evidence of restorative practice in delivery. GPT's use of translated communications, non-digital application routes, home visits and face-to-face drop-ins reflects an effort to reduce barriers and respond to residents' circumstances. The decision to introduce a community activities pilot following resident frustration also demonstrates responsiveness to community experience.</p> <p>The report also notes that GPT and GCAT have participated in restorative practice training and found the opportunity to reflect and share experience valuable.</p> <p>The ISF notes that more substantive reflection on restorative practice may be taken forward through annual reporting and encourages GPT to continue identifying practical examples of how restorative principles are shaping delivery and monitoring in real time.</p>
Monitoring	<p>Monitoring has strengthened significantly in Q4, presenting an increasingly integrated evidence base. This is a positive development and demonstrates that GPT has acted on earlier ISF feedback to strengthen monitoring systems, add demographic insight, improve categorisation and better connect data to programme learning.</p> <p>The monitoring report also demonstrates a more reflective approach, identifying not only progress but also barriers and limitations, including trust issues among some residents, challenges in housing-related advocacy and the difficulty of capturing broader programme-wide impact.</p>

Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Learning from the community activities pilot, including resident feedback and how findings are shaping the longer-term programme.
- Evidence of how GPT is responding to lower gym membership activation and usage, including targeted communications for residents who have not requested or used memberships.
- Further update on KLC membership costs, including whether the forecast 2026/27 overspend risk has materialised and how options are being discussed with residents.
- Examples of how restorative practice training is informing delivery or decision-making.
- Ongoing evidence on how GCAT's structured case management approach is supporting complex and system-dependent housing cases.
- Further analysis of groups who may remain underrepresented in reach or benefit.
- Progress on sharing budget and expenditure information with residents on a six-monthly basis.
- Update on how conversations with residents will be taken forward about the use of interest accruing in reserves.

Sharing your views and staying in touch

Sharing your views and staying in touch

The monitoring and scrutiny arrangements aim to help 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.
- 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 community sensemaking & reflection sessions a year on the Community Support 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: Q4 2026 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

Q4 2026 scrutiny: delivery

Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans?

Based on the information reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the Community Programme continued to be delivered in line with its overall purpose and intended model during Q4. The quarter was shaped by three significant areas of delivery activity:

- the continued management of the impact of the cyber-attack;
- the final push to increase take-up of Year 1 wellbeing grants before the cut-off date;
- the development of the community activities pilot and preparation for Year 2 delivery.

A key success has been the GPT's ability to maintain delivery and adapt access routes despite the continued absence of an online application form. Applications have been taken by phone, at GCAT drop-ins and through home visits for residents unable to attend in person. This demonstrates flexibility and a strong focus on maintaining accessibility during disruption.

The decision to launch a four-month community activities pilot is also a positive development. The GPT reported that residents had expressed frustration with delays to the longer-term activities programme, and the pilot was agreed with the Operational Steering Group to ensure there was an offer in place while longer-term design work continued. This suggests the team is responding to resident feedback and attempting to balance delivery momentum with continued community involvement.

The most significant delivery challenges remain linked to the cyber-attack and its impact on systems, payments and Year 2 timescales. The GPT reports that closing Year 1 applications and processing outstanding payments took longer than anticipated, contributing to delay in launching Year 2 support. Residents were informed about this change in timing.

The ISF welcomes GPT's plan to review the community activities pilot using participant data, resident feedback, provider outcome reports and OSG involvement, so that learning can inform the longer-term programme design.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: delivery

Have challenges been addressed? How?

The Q4 report clearly records a number of operational challenges and describes the steps taken in response. These include:

- loss of online application functionality;
- pressure created by the Year 1 wellbeing grant deadline;
- delays in preparing the Year 2 launch;
- limitations in payment systems and data access following the cyber-attack.

The GPT has responded to these challenges through manual and alternative access processes, including telephone applications, greater drop-in capacity and home visits. The report also notes that additional communication was issued to residents when the Year 2 process could not begin as initially expected.

The report also identifies a specific operational risk around the inability to use Council Tax data to verify current addresses before Year 2 payments are made. GPT has advised that options were considered, including delaying payments or asking over 1,000 residents for additional proof of address. The chosen approach is to proceed with Year 2 payments using the available verification information, rather than delaying payments for residents, with a reconciliation exercise planned for September. GPT has advised that this approach was risk assessed as relatively low. **The ISF will continue to follow how the planned September reconciliation is managed.**

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are impacting delivery, positively or negatively?

The cyber-attack remains the most significant external factor affecting delivery. It has disrupted systems, delayed online processes, created additional manual work and affected the pace of Year 2 preparation. The report records these impacts clearly and explains the operational adaptations introduced as a result.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: delivery

The Q4 materials also highlight housing system pressures as a wider factor affecting GCAT delivery. The monitoring report notes that GCAT was designed to take on short pieces of work, but residents often present with complex and long-term housing issues that are difficult to resolve because of wider structural pressures such as limited property supply, temporary accommodation waiting times and complex housing needs processes.

GCAT has clarified that it manages the balance between short, high-turnaround interventions and more complex cases through a structured case management approach. This includes daily morning catch-ups to review active cases and allocate work fairly, a task-and-finish model to close completed actions and avoid dependency on one practitioner, continuity for vulnerable residents where trust-building is necessary, and dedicated time outside three weekly drop-ins to progress longer-term or complex casework.

The ISF welcomes this clarification and recognises the value of a structured approach. As GCAT continues to support some residents with more complex or longer-term issues, it may be helpful to develop internal criteria to support fair and consistent decision-making about the level and duration of support offered. This would also support transparency with residents about the scope of GCAT's role and what support can and cannot be provided (which also forms part of a restorative approach).

Where wider housing system issues are affecting residents' outcomes, the ISF will continue working with GCAT to understand the issues and learning emerging from casework. This will support the developed of an action plan for sharing relevant learning with housing teams and identifying where wider system responded may be needed.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: reach

Who is accessing the programme and who is it not reaching?

Reach continued to improve in Q4. The monitoring report states that 53.6% of households living in the area of support had accessed the programme by the end of Q4, up from 46.9% at the end of Q3. The dashboard similarly reports:

- 54% of current area households have applied;
- 52% of time-of-tragedy households have applied.

The dashboard also provides further breakdowns by programme strand, including applications, wellbeing grants, gym memberships and GCAT support. At the point of the dashboard refresh, it recorded:

- 3,245 applications submitted;
- 2,328 wellbeing grants paid;
- 4,882 gym memberships approved;
- 2,111 GCAT support interventions recorded.

The Q4 report suggests that the overall profile of individuals supported is broadly consistent with the demographic profile of the Notting Dale area. However, it also identifies that men and younger people are slightly underrepresented.

The report also shows that residents with a disability or long-term health condition and residents aged over 65 are less likely to request gym memberships. This is useful emerging insight. GPT has advised that it is exploring alternative or complementary wellbeing offers, including spa vouchers, with targeted communications planned for individuals who have not requested or used gym memberships. GPT also intends to undertake a broader review to understand barriers to gym membership take-up and usage.

It would be helpful for future reporting to set out how residents are involved in shaping these alternative offers, particularly where they are intended to respond to differences in access or benefit across age, disability or health status.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: reach

What measures have you taken to improve reach?

The most significant Q4 reach measure was the final Year 1 wellbeing grant campaign. In early February, GPT announced a 17 March cut-off date for Year 1 grant requests through the printed and digital newsletter and a targeted mail-out to 1,664 residents in social housing or identified as likely to be on lower incomes. The mail-out achieved a 19.4% response rate, in line with the previous October campaign, and the GPT reports that this generated 367 applications by the end of March.

The communication strategy was also adapted to address possible language barriers. GPT included a short translated message in the nine most spoken community languages explaining what the letter was about, and issued Arabic and Farsi versions of the letter after Housing Management data indicated that some residents speaking these languages had not yet applied.

The ISF views this as a positive and targeted approach to increasing reach. **The use of Housing Management data to identify language needs is useful, but future reporting could reflect on whether there are any remaining gaps in how language or access needs are routinely identified.**

Q4 2026 scrutiny: impact

Is the programme having an impact and being adapted as required to improve impact?

There are areas where impact could be strengthened or better understood.

The community activities pilot offers a clear opportunity to extend impact beyond grants, advocacy and leisure memberships. GPT has asked providers to report participant information, numbers, outcomes and impact, using their own evaluation methodologies. GPT also plans to conduct a short resident survey and produce its own generic evaluation, using provider information and involving the OSG. **The ISF welcomes this approach, while recognising that evaluation methods may vary depending on the activity.**

Further work is also needed to understand gym membership non-use and whether alternative wellbeing offers are needed for residents less likely to benefit from leisure centre access, including older residents and those with disabilities or long-term health conditions.

Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are influencing its impact, positively or negatively?

Wider housing system pressures appear to constrain the impact of GCAT support. GCAT's structured case management approach helps manage complex cases within the programme. The ISF is also working with GCAT to understand the issues and learning emerging from casework, with a view to sharing relevant learning with housing teams and developing an action plan for progressing this work. **The ISF will continue to seek understanding of how wider constraints are being tracked systematically and escalated beyond the programme where needed.**

Q4 2026 scrutiny: impact

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

The Q4 materials provide both quantitative and qualitative evidence of impact. The monitoring report includes resident case studies and quotations showing that GCAT support has helped residents with:

- housing repairs;
- crisis support;
- access to other services and referrals;
- practical problem-solving around complex issues.

The dashboard also presents indicators that help show the scale and experience of support. It records:

- 75% of GCAT actions rated 5 out of 5;
- 93% of actions completed.

The 2025 community survey data included in the dashboard also provides valuable evidence of resident experience, including satisfaction with wellbeing grants, leisure centre memberships, GCAT, newsletters and communications.

The ISF welcomes the continued use of qualitative evidence alongside dashboard metrics, as this helps bring to life the lived experience of people accessing the programme.

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

Housing-related GCAT interventions appear to receive lower satisfaction or outcome ratings than other forms of support. The Q4 notes indicate that housing interventions tend to have lower ratings than other themes. This may reflect wider housing system constraints, complexity of cases or resident expectations where the programme cannot directly control the outcome. GCAT's additional clarification on its structured case management approach is helpful context for understanding how these cases are being managed.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: complaints

How many complaints have been received? What proportion have been resolved, in what timeframe? What proportion have been escalated?

The GPT reports that two complaints were received in Q4:

- one relating to eligibility for the wellbeing grant, which was responded to on time and upheld;
- one relating to quality of support from GCAT, which was responded to on time and not upheld.

No escalations are reported in the Q4 material.

Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What actions have been taken as a result?

The GPT states that a full complaints analysis will be included in the annual report.

Given the low number of complaints in Q4, it may not be possible to identify clear trends. However, GPT has clarified that the upheld wellbeing grant eligibility complaint related to an issue in implementing the discretionary process. This has led to improved guidance for the team to help ensure the issue does not occur again.

Q4 2026 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?

Based on the Q4 expenditure report, the ISF is satisfied that the expenditure for the Community Support programme remains broadly in line with programme intentions. The main variances are explained by the timing of delivery, levels of take up and the fact the programme runs from January to December while financial reporting runs April to March.

Wellbeing grant expenditure remains below the original Year 1 budget. The Q4 report shows £444,150 expenditure in 2025/26, alongside £402,150 spent in Q4 of 2024/25, giving total Year 1 wellbeing grant expenditure as £846,300. The anticipated underspend on the Year 1 grant budget is still expected to be around £875k. This underspend is being retained for future years' wellbeing grants and, following the recent review, will support the increase in the Year 2 grant to £550.

KLC membership expenditure is slightly above budget, with Q4 outturn of £224,091 against a £200k budget. This overspend is being met from unspent communications and engagement budget, as agreed through the review. The ISF considers this reasonable and consistent with previous feedback from residents about maintaining the leisure centre offer.

GCAT expenditure is broadly in line with forecast, with Q4 outturn of £341,823 against a £350k budget.

There was no actual expenditure on community activities in 2025/26, although a £50k pilot was agreed in March 2026. This is because funding was allocated in March but actual expenditure took place in April/May 2026. **The ISF understand this is a timing issue, and will look for evidence in the next reporting round that spending reflects resident priorities.**

Q4 2026 scrutiny: expenditure

Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?

The main reallocation related to the communications and engagement budget. GPT reports that the unspent £100k communications and engagement budget will be invested in the KLC membership offer in 2025/26 and future years, as agreed through the review. The ISF considers this reallocation justified because it reflects resident feedback and supports the continuation of an offer that residents have valued.

The underspend on wellbeing grant is being reinvested in future years wellbeing grants rather than being repurposed elsewhere. This is positive and supports transparency, as the funding remains linked to its original purpose.

Looking ahead, the ISF notes a risk of greater KLC membership overspend in 2026/27 due to increasing take-up and a less advantageous agreement with KLC. GPT has committed to monitoring this closely and exploring options with the community once scale of the issue is clearer at the end of Q1. **The ISF will return to this in the next round of scrutiny.**

The ISF welcomes GPT's commitment to continue detailed quarterly expenditure reporting and to explore how budget information can be shared more effectively with the community on a six-monthly basis. Future reporting should also update residents on how conversations about the use of interest accruing in reserves will be taken forward.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?

GPT communicated the Q3 key monitoring headlines in its January newsletter. GPT intends to publish a Q4 update in the next newsletter, with plans to simplify the public version of the dashboard and test it with residents before publication. This responds to earlier ISF feedback recommending resident accessibility and usability testing, alongside narrative explanations to help readers interpret trends and changes. **The ISF welcomes this planned next step and will review progress in the next round of scrutiny.**

The GPT also communicated with residents about the delayed Year 2 launch when it became clear that the process could not begin on the anticipated timescale.

The extension of leisure centre memberships to March 2027 was also communicated to residents.

The GPT reports that routine monitoring updates have attracted only a small number of queries. However, updates relating to review survey findings, wellbeing grants and leisure centre memberships tend to generate more resident engagement.

GPT has advised that July is a realistic date for publishing the Community Dashboard on the website. Before publication, GPT plans to simplify the public version and test it with residents, as the current working dashboard has grown in size and complexity.

Earlier ISF feedback also recommended resident accessibility and usability testing of the dashboard, alongside narrative explanation to help readers interpret trends and changes. The ISF welcomes the plan to test the public version with residents ahead of publication.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: restorative practice

Does the programme centre the perspectives and experiences of people accessing the programme?

The GPT reports that both the Grenfell Partnerships Team and GCAT have participated in restorative practice training and that this has provided useful space for reflection. The report also states that the team seeks to be open when there are issues, acknowledge failings and communicate transparently with residents.

The team's flexible delivery approach during Q4 (including phone applications, community venue support, home visits and additional help for vulnerable residents at risk of missing out on the grant) also suggests an effort to reduce barriers and respond to residents' needs in a practical way.

The report further notes that draft templates for the community activities pilot were shared with the OSG for comment, and that the OSG was kept updated on progress and evaluation outcomes.

Is the delivery and monitoring of the programme informed by restorative practice?

GPT has reflected that restorative practice is demonstrated through its adaptations after the cyber-attack, support for residents with late applications, and efforts to respond to complaints quickly and with clear explanations. The continued development of monitoring and the dashboard also provides a stronger basis for sharing insight from resident feedback.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: restorative practice

How can learning inform future practice and the wider council?

This question will be explored in more detail in the annual report.

The Q4 material nevertheless suggests several areas where learning may be emerging, including:

- the value of non-digital access routes;
- the importance of trust-building with residents who remain reluctant to engage;
- the need to understand where wider housing system pressures limit programme impact;
- the usefulness of responsive interim solutions, such as the community activities pilot, when longer-term co-design takes time;
- the importance of responding quickly and transparently to complaints or concerns;
- the value of strengthening monitoring and dashboard insight so that resident feedback can inform delivery.

The ISF welcomes this developing learning and encourages GPT to continue identifying practical examples of how restorative practice is shaping decisions, communication and delivery in future reporting, including the annual report.

Q4 2026 scrutiny: monitoring

Is the monitoring information and process giving the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme?

The ISF considers that monitoring has strengthened significantly. The Q4 materials and dashboard provide a more comprehensive and usable evidence base than in earlier reporting rounds, allowing closer analysis of delivery, reach, demographics, satisfaction and activity trends.

The dashboard itself marks a clear improvement in monitoring infrastructure. This responds positively to previous ISF feedback calling for more integrated monitoring, richer demographic insight and clearer reporting categories.

The monitoring report identifies plans for evaluating the community activities pilot through participant data gathered by delivery organisations, a brief participant survey, outcome and impact information from provider evaluations.

GPT has advised that providers will submit reports using their own methodologies, with a focus on participant numbers, outcomes and impact for residents. GPT will also undertake its own generic evaluation using provider information and will involve the OSG in this process.

The ISF welcomes this approach and sees it as an opportunity to strengthen impact monitoring.

The ISF also notes that the next resident review will provide an opportunity to gather further satisfaction and impact information and to understand what residents think could be improved.