

Grenfell Support **Scrutiny update: Q1 2026**

Bereaved & Survivors programme

August 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.

ፋይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተርጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ 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 April – June 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 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 April to June 2026. 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 the GPT's Q1 Monitoring Report, conversations with the GPT, and an ISF-hosted sensemaking session with Bereaved & Survivors on the 13th of July 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).

Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 7-12
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 13-14

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment – slides 15-27

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?

Q1 2026 summary scrutiny assessment

Scrutiny assessment overview

Based on the evidence we have reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) effectively delivered the Bereaved & Survivors programme in line with the agreed model and programme intention during Q1 2026/27.

This quarter, the GPT delivered more streamlined access to personal budgets, and made changes to the opt-in/opt-out policy for the next decision making window.

Summary of overall progress:

- During Q1 2026/27, on the Bereaved & Survivors programme, the GPT has continued to deliver personal budgets and dedicated service core support.
- The GPT has completed work to understand the impact of lump sum payments, looking back over the 12 months since the launch of the Future Years Personal Budget policy.
- Payments are still being made through the emergency route following the cyber attack, which adds extra risk of human error. The GPT has developed a policy for dealing with mistakes when they happen and is now communicating with those people affected by duplicate payments.
- The GPT continues to provide communication and updates about decisions and risks with Bereaved and Survivors.

Scrutiny assessment overview

Strengths:

- Strong commitment to transparency. The GPT has shown continued commitment to communicating about changes in the programme as well as any risks, and they are continuing to follow up with people who have not accessed their budgets.
- There is continued clear monitoring and reporting to the ISF on the progress of decision-making windows, payments, and service provision throughout the year.
- The GPT is focussing on understanding the impact of the support to date and proactively looking towards the 2028 transition. This means understanding what support is being used for and organising conversations with bereaved and survivors to reflect on what they need over the next two years.
- Complaints remain very low, with one complaint in Q1 of 26/27.

Key risks/issues:

- As the GPT has identified, there is still a risk of error with making payments via the emergency route.
- The GPT has also identified working with housing teams as a key area of importance over the next two years.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

Delivery, reach and impact	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 Q1 2026. The GPT has responded to the results of the annual survey, working to streamline access to personal budgets and changing the opt-out policy to allow people to opt out for the two remaining years as well as enabling children to opt in or opt out regardless of their parents' decision. The ISF is satisfied with the reach the GPT has achieved in supporting people to access the Bereaved & Survivors programme, which has now reached 99% of people eligible. The ISF is also satisfied that the programme is achieving impact, with a high percentage of people rating the personal budgets and core support 4 or 5 out of 5.
Complaints	The GPT has received 1 complaint in Q1 regarding eligibility which was partially upheld. The ISF is not concerned about complaints this quarter.

Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Expenditure	The ISF is satisfied that the expenditure for the Bereaved & Survivors programme remains in line with the programme intentions.
Reporting and transparency	The ISF is satisfied that the GPT has provided a detailed account of the support programme in their reporting this quarter. The GPT also continue to communicate on a regular basis with bereaved and survivors to maintain a transparent understanding of the programme's delivery and understand more about where people are not accessing support or not satisfied with the support that is available.
Restorative practice	The ISF is satisfied that the GPT continues to use restorative and relational practice in delivering the programme. In particular this quarter they have made plans for learning and developing their practice to support the wider council.
Monitoring	Overall, monitoring provided this quarter is providing the necessary insight needed.

Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

As part of the last round of scrutiny, the ISF asked to see further analysis of complaints and negative sentiments the GPT received in its survey data. The Q1 monitoring report provided by the GPT has provided further insight.

The ISF also requested more information to understand what the GPT is learning from its relational case studies and if/how the GPT's learning can support ongoing and wider council work. While the Q1 monitoring report has provided some insight, this is an area where the ISF would like to continue to see further information due to the particular value these case studies provide.

Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- We would like to understand next quarter what the GPT are learning from the relational support case studies and if/how the learning might support ongoing and wider council work.
- Updates on whether the forecast of lower than budgeted spend on the Core Team is accurate, and steps the GPT has taken to explore why this is the case if so. Plus whether decisions have been made about how any underspend will be reallocated.
- Information on developments around certain key issues, risks, and future priorities the GPT is currently considering: managing the possibility of not receiving bank details from some bereaved and survivors for personal budgets; addressing potential low annual survey response rates; creating opportunities for bereaved and survivors to be involved in post-2028 planning; the GPT's internal audit of the Core Team to inform potential staffing in 2027-8 and beyond, and; preparing for the final opt-in/opt-out window.

**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.
- 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 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.

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 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

Q1 2026 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 Q1.

- **Delivery of personal budgets:** The GPT was able to process all payment requests in April, without disruption following a two-week freeze period between 18th and 31st March. One continued challenge has been the GPT's reliance on an emergency payment process involving more manual processing than is standard, something highlighted in the previous round of scrutiny. In Q1 2026, this has continued, and the GPT has flagged the continued risk in human error. Access to personal budgets has also been improved through streamlining of the Online Solution platform used by bereaved and survivors, based on feedback from the previous annual survey shared by the GPT.
- **Delivery of lump sum payments:** The GPT processed all new requests from bereaved and survivors to access their future years' personal budget payments as a lump sum. The GPT provided clear explanations for the requests that were rejected as they had already been paid.
- **Delivery of Core Team support:** The GPT completed the majority of the requests raised with the Core Team in Q1 within the same period.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: delivery

Have challenges been addressed? How?

- As noted in the previous slide, the GPT has flagged the increased risk of human error due to using the emergency payment process. The GPT has informed the ISF that they and the Treasury Team have introduced additional controls to minimise human errors reoccurring.
- The GPT has also developed a policy for communicating and recovering overpayments which were reviewed and agreed by the Dedicated Service working group. **This policy, and the process through which it was developed with the Dedicated Service working group, demonstrates the GPT is taking considered steps to act transparently in addressing delivery challenges.**

Q1 2026 scrutiny: reach

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

- The ISF understands that 798 people are currently accessing the Dedicated Service. The largest proportions of these are people located in Kensington and Chelsea (57%), those who were immediately bereaved (21%), and those aged between 35–44 years old.
- In terms of detailed understanding of reach, **the ISF have asked the GPT for a more detailed breakdown of the 'other' ethnicity category in the demographic information provided**. This is something we understand will be provided in Q2.
- From the last annual survey, seven people said that they had not accessed personal budgets. Since then, two have accessed their personal budgets, and the other five were anonymous, so the GPT do not know if they have since started to access their personal budgets. However, the GPT are continuing targeted communications to those who have not accessed personal budgets.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: reach

What measures have you taken to improve reach?

- In the GPT's 2025 Dedicated Service survey, people who had not accessed parts of the service were asked why:
 - For personal budgets, responses focused on barriers caused by people's mental health, and having too much to deal with at the time when the funds were made available. The GPT also reports two individuals mentioned not having had the support to be able to access the funds online or not having set up their bank details. **The ISF understands that the GPT are making efforts to follow up with those who have struggled to access online platforms, and following up with those who have not set up their bank details.**
 - For lump sum payments, reasons given for not opting for lump sums were a preference for accessing funds as and when needed, including so as to reduce the risk of overspending. Others mentioned that they did not currently need the money, and wanting to retain flexibility for future needs, or because they were not yet ready to make a decision. **The ISF is encouraged to see that the GPT has said it will integrate this insight into their communications about the Future Years Personal Budget offer, to ensure they are mindful of the various personal reasons people might have for not applying for a lump sum.**
- The GPT has also reported that they have focused in Q1 on sharing targeted communications with people who have not yet accessed their budgets, as well as personalised contact for those living overseas. **The ISF commends the GPT's work in this area in particular the focus on ensuring people can make informed decisions based on all of the information.**

Q1 2026 scrutiny: impact

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

- The GPT has reported that a majority of people in the last quarter have rated the support they received highly when asked to evaluate this. 78% of those accessing personal budgets and 82% of those working with the Core Team gave a score of 4 or 5 out of 5.
- For personal budgets, the GPT reports that the largest uses people report from Q1 is using these budgets to support their health and wellbeing (71%) and access to leisure (36%). When asked how the funds will help through these activities, over half (59%) have told the GPT that it would support their recovery.
- For Core Team support, the GPT reports that just 3% of those whose support requests were completed in Q1 gave a score of 2 or lower when asked to evaluate the support. The GPT reports that these were requests related to features of the personal budget offer, which suggests that people's dissatisfaction is not with their experience of the Core Team itself. In terms of making a difference, the GPT reports that, when asked if they could complete their requested Core Team support task independently in the future, just under half answered 'yes' (47%). The remainder answered 'no' (29%) or were unsure (19%).

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 group.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: impact

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

- As the previous slides illustrate, the GPT report that a majority of bereaved and survivors accessing support through the personal budgets or Core Team are satisfied with the impact of the programme. Furthermore, the GPT have shared examples of adapting the programme to improve impact, such as developing the payments policy to address the risk of human error.
- **The ISF would like to continue to see the GPT make efforts to understand how impact can be improved for bereaved and survivors who have either expressed dissatisfaction with the programme, or who have highlighted barriers they are facing to receiving the full support they might wish to have. In some cases, the GPT may be limited in what they can do to further address the source of people's dissatisfaction, or barriers they face, and here we encourage GPT to be transparent with those concerned about the extent to which they can make further changes to the programme.**

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

- The main factor beyond the programme's remit that the GPT has reported is continuing to create a negative influence is the ongoing impact of the cyber-attack on the Council, and the resulting reliance on a partially manually-processed finance system which heightens the risk of human error. The GPT has communicated this to bereaved and survivors with transparency, and as noted earlier in this report, has developed a policy alongside the Dedicated Service working group.
- While this is positive to see, the ISF notes that some bereaved and survivors who attended the July sensemaking event expressed frustration at the Councils continued reference to the impacts of the cyber-attack, interpreting this as a deflection from taking responsibility for the continued negative impacts on the programme.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: complaints

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

The GPT has received 1 complaint in Q1 regarding eligibility which was partially upheld. The GPT also received confirmation that an earlier, separate complaint regarding eligibility for support was Not Upheld by the Local Government Ombudsman.

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

As the GPT received just 1 complaint in Q1, they have not reported any trends or patterns in complaints. There have been 7 previous 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 to date.

Q1 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? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?

- Based on the Q1 expenditure report, **the ISF is satisfied that the expenditure and predicted spend for the Bereaved & Survivors programme remains in line with the programme intentions.** It is important to note that the GPT has explained that the record of expenditure for Q1 shared with the ISF does not capture the most recent personal budget payments made using the emergency payment process resulting from the continued impacts of the cyber-attack. However, the GPT have informed the ISF that they are working with the Council's Finance team to ensure this is corrected, and they do not report any significant budget risks for the Dedicated Service resulting from this.
- The GPT has not reported any wider risks for the Dedicated Service. They have highlighted to the ISF that they have begun to plan for any changes to the Core Team before the start of next financial year, following the next support opt-in/opt-out window, however, they have not flagged that any risks inherent in this.
- The GPT report a slightly lower forecast expenditure on the Core Team than initially anticipated. The GPT report that any underspend will be held in reserves and used to support bereaved and survivors' transition beyond the end of the Dedicated Service in March 2028. In the next round of reporting, **the ISF would like to understand whether this changed forecast was borne out, what steps the GPT has taken to explore this, and whether any decisions have been made about reallocation of reserves.**

Q1 2026 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

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

- The ISF is satisfied that the GPT is providing people with clear, honest and timely information about the programme and decisions made regarding its delivery.
- This includes the annual report information provided to the Dedicated Service Working Group in May 2026, where attendees were given space to provide feedback and challenge, as well as an opportunity to help shape the GPT's policy updates on support opt-out and overpayments. Time was held too for attendees to discuss wider topics, including how the GPT should collaborate with Housing Services to improve their interactions with bereaved and survivors, and what planning should be done for support beyond 2028.
- The ISF has observed that information provided by the GPT at the Working Group, whilst comprehensive and transparent, can be a large volume with limited time for attendees to digest. There is always time for feedback and challenge at sessions observed, however there is a potential risk of people relying solely on their personal experiences and not being able to fully engage with the content of reports provided until after the sessions. The ISF understands that GPT colleagues are available for bereaved and survivors to speak with at any time after sessions, however, we would like to see more concise presentations in future sessions focused to enable more discussion about their content by attendees.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: restorative practice

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

In Q1, the GPT have continued to focused on supporting individuals guided by relational and restorative practice. For example, where people do not have financial capacity, personal budgets and support for accessing them is being transferred to statutory council services now, to allow for transition and support between now and 2028. In this way, proactively considering the people at the centre of the support is an example of the GPT and the Council acting to strengthen relationships and avoid unnecessary harm and need for restoration later on.

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

Delivery and monitoring of the programme is continually informed by restorative practice principles. In particular the GPT team have been continuing to capture learnings from their practice. In Q2 the GPT will be working to understand in more detail the work of the core team and how this links with wider learning to support the Council in delivering across other services.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: restorative practice

How can learning inform future practice and the wider council?

- At the time of writing, the ISF is beginning to explore with the GPT how it can, across all three of its programme strands, use its learning to inform wider practice across the Council. We will be able to provide further updates on this in the upcoming annual report.

Q1 2026 scrutiny: monitoring

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

- Overall the ISF feels the monitoring in this quarter is providing the necessary insight needed, with detailed information provided by the GPT across each aspect of the ISF's scrutiny interests.