

# Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q4 2025

Bereaved & Survivors programme

May 2026



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، يرجى الاتصال بـ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk)

«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

This document is the fourth Independent Scrutiny Function update on scrutiny of the Bereaved & Survivors programme. It provides an 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 Support programme for bereaved and survivors 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 6). This quarter, we have drawn on insights from a review of the GPT's Q4 Monitoring Report and further conversations with the GPT.

# Contents

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

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment (slides 15-27)

# **Q4 2025 summary scrutiny assessment**

# Scrutiny framework

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

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? What are the key successes, challenges and learning from delivery? What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme? Who is the programme reaching, and who is it not reaching? What difference is the support making? Is impact different across strands or groups, and is the programme adapting to improve impact?
<b>Complaints</b>	How many complaints have been received? Are there any trends or patterns, and what learning/actions have been taken?
<b>Expenditure</b>	Is expenditure and predicted spend as intended? Have any variances or reallocations been recorded and justified?
<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	Is reporting and wider communication clear, honest and timely? What feedback has been received and what needs to change?
<b>Restorative practice</b>	How is GPT managing power dynamics and centring resident experience? How is restorative practice informing delivery, complaints, reporting and monitoring?
<b>Monitoring</b>	Is monitoring providing the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme? What further learning is emerging?

# Scrutiny assessment overview

**Based on the evidence we have reviewed, as the ISF we are satisfied that the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) effectively delivered the Bereaved & Survivors programme in line with the agreed model and programme intention during Q4 2025/26.** This quarter saw the GPT manage the impacts of the cyber incident to limit the effects on programme delivery, and make significant progress on working with other departments in RBKC to widen uptake of restorative practice.

## Summary of overall progress:

- During Q4 2025/26, on the Bereaved & Survivors programme the cyber incident had no notable effect on payment timings, and no-one missed payments.
- The Case Management System was integrated back into the service, with increased security. All opt-in opt out decisions have been reflected on the system, and first payments of personal budgets were made to individuals in April.
- Payments are still being made through the emergency route, which adds extra risk of human error. The GPT has developed a policy for dealing with mistakes when they happen.
- The GPT continues to provide communication and updates about decisions and risks with Bereaved and Survivors.
- The Dedicated Service and the GPT have made significant progress on working with other departments in RBKC, in particular Housing Needs and Housing Management. The Dedicated service is bringing oversight, reflection and challenge to progress cases, as well as feedback from Bereaved and Survivors to identify systemic issues. The GPT are doing proactive work to improve service standards and partnership working across these departments.

# Scrutiny assessment overview

## Strengths:

- Strong commitment to transparency. The GPT have shown continued commitment to communicating payment information and any ongoing implications of the cyber incident. Payments to bereaved and survivors were also unaffected this quarter.
- Continued clear monitoring and reporting to the ISF on the progress of decision-making windows, payments, and service provision throughout the year.
- Transparency about transition to the end of support over the next two years. Using reflective sessions with the Core Team to look at emerging patterns of support needs and thinking ahead to the final year of service.
- Complaints remain very low, with no complaints in Q4, and one complaint remaining open.

## Key risks/issues:

- As the GPT have identified, there is still a risk of error with making payments via the emergency route. We understand that the GPT is working on resolving this.

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	<p>Based on the information reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the Bereaved &amp; Survivors programme continued to be delivered in line with its overall purpose and intended model during Q4. The GPT has responded well to the continued impact of the cyber incident, ensuring that payment timelines and amounts were not impacted. While some human errors have occurred during this period, the GPT has communicated frequently and transparently and brought bereaved and survivors into discussions of managing this. The GPT has also had significant success in progressing their collaborations with the wider council, to support the wider uptake of restorative practice.</p> <p>The ISF is satisfied with the reach the GPT has achieved in supporting people to access the Bereaved &amp; Survivors programme, and has crucially improved its understanding of who is opting-in for support as the programme continues. The ISF is also satisfied that the programme is achieving the right impact. In particular, we commend the value of the qualitative data they have shared from the Core Team into the impacts of their support in Q4. This is exemplary and should be replicated in future reporting.</p>
<b>Complaints</b>	<p>The GPT has received no complaints in Q4 and the ISF has not discerned any patterns in earlier complaints that raise concerns.</p>

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Expenditure</b>	<p>The ISF is satisfied that the expenditure for the Bereaved &amp; Survivors programme remains in line with the programme intentions. The GPT has provided a clear explanation for a variance in the personal budget payments in 2025/26, and we are confident that they will be able to manage the programme's future spend. The ISF would like to understand if there are any plans on the use of reserves to support transition beyond the end of the current service in March 2028.</p>
<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	<p>The ISF are satisfied that the GPT has upheld consistent, respectful communications with the wider community in the last quarter, that have supported bereaved and survivors to maintain a transparent understanding of the programme's delivery.</p>
<b>Restorative practice</b>	<p>The ISF is confident that the GPT is continuing to develop effective ways of managing power dynamics in its delivery of the Bereaved &amp; Survivors programme, and are confident that restorative practice is deeply informing the delivery of the Bereaved &amp; Survivor programme more generally. The quality of reporting on the Core Team's support, as well as their work itself to widen uptake of restorative practice at RBKC, is especially strong.</p>
<b>Monitoring</b>	<p>The ISF feels the monitoring in this quarter is overall providing the necessary insight needed. The qualitative data is exemplary for understanding how bereaved and survivors are being supported and gives insight into how the GPT can support wider uptake of restorative practice at RBKC.</p>

# Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

The ISF did not ask for any further information for immediate response after the last round of scrutiny.

We said we would follow up about about how the GPT are acting on comments in the last annual survey for bereaved and survivors. In particular, we wanted to understand more about how the GPT are sharing their own learning about their way of working in the community, with wider council services.

We can see from the data this quarter that the GPT have made clear progress on working with the Housing Management and Housing Association teams, through bringing bereaved and survivors' feedback to joint meetings, and supporting the housing teams to identify systemic issues and progress cases.

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

- In the next quarter we would like to see further analysis of complaints and negative sentiments in the survey data.
- We see the relational case studies as a real strength this quarter. We would like to understand next quarter what the GPT are learning from these case studies and if/how the learning might support ongoing and wider council work.

**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). The ISF will be in touch prior to this with details about how to take part. The next B&S collective scrutiny & reflection session will be in August 2026.

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 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

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: delivery

Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans?

**Based on the information reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the Bereaved & Survivors programme continued to be delivered in line with its overall purpose and intended model during Q4.** The quarter was shaped by four areas of overall successful delivery activity:

- the continued management of the impact of the cyber-attack;
- addressing year 3 opt-in/opt-out decisions;
- a budget refresh for 2026/27 to reconcile all of the previous spend from 2025/26;
- working with the Housing Needs and Housing Management teams to improve service standards and partnership working.

A key challenge for the GPT has been the continued impact of the cyber incident on the back-end running of the Bereaved & Survivors programme, specifically on payments. There has been a reliance on manual processing of payments through the council emergency procedure which has led to some errors. At the same time, the GPT successfully ensured payment timelines and amounts were not impacted by the incident. The GPT has also continued to communicate frequently and transparently about the process of upcoming decision-making windows and any potential risks to payment timelines.

A further success has been the Dedicated Service and the GPT's closer working with Housing teams, around how the latter communicate with bereaved and survivors and how to have more understanding between teams on the options available to households facing challenges. The teams' intentions are to build on this work so as to eventually reduce the need for escalation by Dedicated Service workers to have bereaved and survivors' housing issues addressed.

Finally, two specific successes for the Core Team should be noted. Firstly, they have been able to address the backlog caused by being unable to access their case management system during winter 2025 as a result of the cyber incident. Once accessible, the team promptly updated the system with information recorded in the intervening period. Secondly, the Core Team has put in place an improved process for capturing support casework themes, enabling a more accurate and detailed understanding of those opting-in for their support.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: delivery

## Have challenges been addressed? How?

The main challenge to delivery the GPT has experienced has been from the continued impact of the cyber incident on processing payments. Some cases of human error during manual processing resulted in duplicate payments. In cases where there have been errors in payments, the GPT have developed a policy to communicate about and sort these errors and intend to involve bereaved and survivors in the development of this policy further. Aside from the continued impact of the cyber incident, the GPT has not raised further factors with the ISF beyond the programme's remit which are impacting delivery positively or negatively.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: reach

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

As the ISF's previous scrutiny has noted, we understand 100% of eligible people have now accessed the programme either through personal budgets or the core service. As of 31st March 2026, 388 people have made an application to access their personal budget as a lump sum payment. This represents 49% of those currently accessing the Dedicated Service. Of these, 96% have been approved and processed as of 31st March 2026. The 4% that were rejected were done so in accordance with the programme policy. The GPT has not reported difficulties in reaching specific groups of people in Q4.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: reach

## What measures have you taken to improve reach?

Across personal budget payments, lump sum payments, and the Core Team, the GPT has not reported challenges in reach across Q4, hence they have not highlighted measures taken to improve this further. The GPT have reported a reduction in personal budget payment requests in March 2026. However, they have explained this reflects people's personal budgets running out by the financial year end, rather than people not accessing their budget.

The GPT has made an important improvement in understanding reach when it comes to those who have opted-in for support. Specifically, the GPT report that a review in Q4 of cases previously categorised as 'other' in terms of the theme of the support has contributed to their understanding of these individuals.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: impact

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

Overall, we feel the GPT's latest report shows a strong commitment to detailing the nature of the impacts of support, providing a lot of insight into the areas where benefits are being felt:

- This quarter the GPT has continued to receive feedback on how people are using their personal budgets and how people rate their satisfaction with this service. Nearly all (91%) of those accessing their personal budgets rated their satisfaction as a 4/5 or 5/5. In terms of understanding the benefits, the largest proportion (54%) explained it will support their personal development.
- Data collected by the GPT on people's reasons for applying for lump sum payments, and how they felt these funds would help, shows a detailed picture of the benefits people feel these have enabled. The largest proportions (35%) of applicants either wanted the payment so as to simplify and have greater control over their access to funds, or to address their children's educational needs (33%). The largest proportions of applicants also explained that the funds would improve their planning, stability and help reduce their stress (27%), or give peace of mind, reduce anxiety, and support their recovery journeys.
- A noticeable strength of the GPT's reporting from Q4 is the level of information and analysis shared to understand the impacts of the Core Team's support. In particular, the GPT has shared details on their three forms of support requests: task-centered, solutions-focused, and relational strengths-based support. Across these they have provided examples that illustrate the Core Team is enabling a range of benefits. These are discussed further in the restorative practice section of this report.

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

The GPT have not reported significant differences in impact across the programme by demographic groups.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: impact

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

The GPT have not reported reason to believe the programme's impact needs to increase. However, the GPT has provided a very detailed level of information for Q4 regarding the impact of the Core Team's support. This allows for much more clarity about the extent to which the GPT alone can have a positive impact on the issues people seek support on, and to what extent wider council teams must play a role in addressing these issues.

This is reflected in the GPT's analysis of their support. For example, they highlight that 45% of their solution-focused support tasks were extended beyond their 6-week support window target, with the most common explanation being that they were waiting for a response from another service. **The GPT have reported on their efforts to work with wider council teams, and we are confident as the ISF that this approach to collaborative working will help increase the impact of the GPT's support for bereaved and survivors seeking the Core Team's support.**

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

The only factor beyond the programme's remit to continue to influence its impact negatively is the potential risk for human error in payment processing, as outlined in slide 17. However, as noted, the GPT have developed policy to communicate about and sort these errors and intend to involve bereaved and survivors in the development of this policy.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: complaints

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

The GPT report that no complaints were received in Q4. At the time of reporting, one earlier complaint regarding eligibility for support remains open, and is currently being reviewed by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

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

As there were no complaints in Q4, the GPT have not reported and trends or patterns here. There have been 7 complaints in total since the start of the programme, but there does not appear to be a pattern across these complaints based on the information the GPT has shared with the ISF.

# Q4 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? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?**

**Based on the Q4 expenditure report, the ISF is satisfied that the expenditure for the Bereaved & Survivors programme remains in line with the programme intentions.** The GPT has reported a significant variance when it comes to personal budget payments: an additional £3.23m of lump sum payments. However, the GPT note that they expected the outturn figure for the Bereaved & Survivors programme overall to exceed the in-year budget, because of the potential for people to choose to draw down their payments in a lump sum. This has been predicted by the GPT in earlier rounds of scrutiny. As before, the GPT has communicated it is confident it will be able to manage this additional spend through reserves, and as a result of the fact that expenditure will be lower in future years given some people receiving their payments as a lump sum.

The GPT do not anticipate any risks in the finances for its Core Team spending, nor any risks in relation to the Dedicated Service more generally.

The GPT have reported that there are no plans to reallocate funding from one element of the Bereaved & Survivor programme to another. They have reported that the slight underspend on the Core Team in 2025/26 will be held in reserves and be used to support effective transition beyond the end of the current service in March 2028. **The ISF would like the GPT to provide further details on any plans for the use of these funds in transitions in the future.**

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

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

**The ISF are satisfied that the GPT has upheld consistent, respectful communications with bereaved and survivors in the last quarter.** This includes new policy positions regarding those who choose to opt-out of the programme, and managing human error during manual processing of personal budget payments. It has also included communicating a planned payment freeze period in late March during the budget refresh, and the potential for payments to not be processed prior to the 2nd April bank holiday (a risk the GPT report did not arise in practice).

The GPT has not reported any feedback received on changes needed to improve its communications.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: restorative practice

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

**The ISF is confident that the GPT is continuing to develop effective ways of centring the perspectives and experience of those accessing the programme.** This is evident from the rich, qualitative Q4 reporting on the actions of the Core Team. For example, an anonymised case details how a Dedicated Service Worker sought an interpreter for face-to-face meetings, supporting the participation of a woman accessing their support. Here and elsewhere in the details provided of the Core Team's work there is a clear commitment to creating conditions that support open, honest, and two-way conversations between members of the public and the GPT.

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

**As above, the ISF is confident that restorative practice is deeply informing the delivery of the Bereaved & Survivor programme.** The GPT's reporting here is very strong in terms of providing examples and outlining the impacts this has had on residents and council staff.

As there have not been any complaints raised against the Bereaved & Survivor programme in Q4 it is not possible to say whether the GPT's complaints handling is similarly informed by a restorative approach. However, the declining complaints across 2025/26 suggests that there is broad satisfaction with how the GPT is approaching this part of the programme.

# Q4 2025 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 and where the GPT explicitly has stated it is working towards supporting wider restorative practice at the council. This includes:

- Attendance of the GPT in service escalation meetings with senior managers to resolve complex cases jointly and strengthening partnership working between Dedicated Service workers and wider services more generally;
- Working with other services to set out clear standards around communication and addressing delays in communications from other teams;
- Dedicated meetings focused on understanding the kinds of people who have opted-into support at this stage, to identify emerging patterns in support and how this might need to be reflected going forward;
- Identification of priority areas of support and their connections to other council teams and wider services and agencies (e.g., RBKC's housing and parking teams, or local schools and colleges);
- Attention to providing both practical advocacy, and relational and emotional support;
- A willingness to adapt support as needs change.

# Q4 2025 scrutiny: monitoring

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

**The ISF feels the monitoring approach taken by the GPT is overall providing the necessary insight needed to understand the delivery and areas of improvement for the programme.**

The survey, expenditure, and qualitative data shared with the ISF by the GPT supports all areas of the scrutiny framework to be considered in-depth. In particular, the Q4 qualitative data providing insight on the Core Team's support is exemplary as a means of better understanding the nature of the GPT's support for bereaved and survivors. It also provides vital insight for understanding what it means to make connections between this support and the wider uptake of restorative practice at RBKC.