



**MINUTES OF THE LONDON RESIDENT PANEL MEETING  
HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2020  
VIRTUAL MEETING VIA TEAMS 6:30PM**

<b>PRESENT</b>	FH	London Panel Chair and Customer Services Committee Member
	RT	London Panel Member
	RR	London Panel Member and Chair of Continuous Improvement Panel
	BM	London Panel Member
	IA	London Panel Member
	WS	London Panel Member
	SS	London Panel Member
	CJ	London Panel Member
	AS	London Panel Member
<b>IN ATTENDANCE</b>	MM	Head of Resident Engagement & Customer Insight Executive Director of Business Performance and Partnerships
	JR	
	TK	Executive Director of Governance
	SH	Resident Engagement Officer
	EB	Director of Building Safety Project Team
	CC	Business Performance and Partnerships Graduate
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	AP	London Panel Member
	DL	London Panel Member
	GK	London Panel Member
	TB	London Panel Member
	JM	Complaints Manager
<b>NOT PRESENT</b>	VL	London Panel Member
<b>MINUTE TAKER</b>	SH	Resident Engagement Officer

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.01	SH reminds panel members the meeting would be recorded, for the purpose of the minutes, and destroyed upon approval from the Chair.	
1.02	FH welcomed the panel and wished everyone a happy new year. Reminds attendees to mute when not speaking and to raise hand to speak or type in the chat.	
1.03	RT unable to view incoming videos due to technical issues. SH introduced all attendees.	

1.04	Apologies from AP, DL, GK, TB, JM. SS,WS joined Ag.04	
<b>2</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
2.01	There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Matters arising – Action Log</b>	
3.01	FH went through the action log in summary and noted due to Ag.04 there would be additional time needed for items to have in depth discussion.	
3.02	Items 3.05, 4.02 Complete	
3.03	<b>5.08 Not complete – MM to follow up for affordability paper to be shared with FH from Research and Policy Team.</b>	<b>MM</b>
3.04	5.13 – Not discussed. FH to email Research and Policy Team for further discussion regarding affordability paper.	
3.05	<b>6.15 – No further update regarding downsizing communications. SH to follow up with Resident Engagement Team following previous meeting.</b>	<b>SH</b>
3.06	<b>6.21 Not complete – MM to follow up with Research and Policy Team.</b>	<b>MM</b>
3.07	7.05 Complete	
3.08	<b>7.13 – No further update regarding requesting support by putting up notices in communal areas. MM to follow up with Neighbourhood and Asset Management.</b>	<b>MM</b>
3.09	Items 8.04 and 10.06 complete.	
3.10	11.03 - RT advised minutes regarding this action were misinterpreted for accuracy. RT corrected *RT hadn't received calls back when engaging with Queuebuster through the contact centre*. Correction – the option to request a call back does not work on RT's phone – has tried many times using the option but it hasn't worked.	
3.11	MM apologised for minutes being inaccurate of this specific conversation - noted update on action log mentioned this could be due to a withheld number as MM had queried with the Head of Customer Contact Centre.	
3.12	RT clarified a conversation with a Customer Service Advisor on 18 January 2021 confirmed RT's number was visible.	

3.13	<b>MM to discuss 11.03 with Contact Centre to look into the matter as it may be something unknown to Network Homes affecting other residents. Will contact RT following the meeting.</b>	<b>MM</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Ag.04 Building Safety</b>	
4.01	FH welcomed TK.	
4.02	TK advised paper would be presented with support from JR and EB. TK provided introduction of paper in collaboration regarding recovery of 100% of costs to shared owners and leaseholders for Building Safety remedial works as a result of changes to the criteria for eligibility of the government building safety fund.	
4.03	TK apologised for long and complex paper but Network Homes wanted Local Resident Panels to have full sight of the matter, the buildings affected and the matters for Panel's consideration to make an informed decision.	
4.04	Report taken as read. A supplementary document of comments from Chair of Herts and Outer London Resident Panel, Chair of London Panel, SW9 Board Chair and Chair of Customer Services Committee was provided to Local Panel Members 08 January 2021 following a special meeting. The Chairs of the Local Panels are also Customer Service Committee (CSC) Members.	
4.05	TK noted the comments from the Panel Chairs are this is an unfair decision as is Network Homes' stance and being pushed back against Government so wanted to provide further options and give insight as to the change.	
4.06	TK advised following the review of options by the Local Resident Panels the decision would go to the Investment Committee, as an authorized delegate of the Board, to make a decision on the way forward. Local Panel Chairs will be invited to a Special Investment Committee meeting in February to have full visibility of the discussion to move forward on the matter. It is possible the decision may be escalated to the Network Homes Board due the serious nature of the matter.	
4.07	TK recognised on behalf of Network Homes this decision is not fair to shared owners in respect of their equity from a business or sector perspective however shared owners leases do specify they are liable for 100% of costs irrespective of the equity share.	
4.08	TK acknowledged the fairness of the shared ownership model may arise during this agenda item and welcomed the discussion but drew particular attention to the purpose of the item to be to discuss the options set forth in the paper to support residents during this.	

4.09	TK confirmed resident recharge is a last resort after exhausting all possible avenues prior such as taking action against developers, pursuing legal action, claiming against insurance and warranties and/or applying to Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Building Safety Fund. Network Homes are hopeful to receive support from MHCLG with these costs.	
4.10	TK advised from a legal position the default is shared owners agree to 100% of costs. This is also the course for other members of the G15*. Further advised if Network Homes were to change strategy in this decision it would therefore be breaking away from the G15 which could reduce necessary pressure on government to provide further support. <i>(12 Largest Social Housing providers in London <a href="https://q15.london/who-we-are/our-members">https://q15.london/who-we-are/our-members</a>)</i>	
4.11	TK advised Network Homes has already spent a significant amount of money on remediation works for Building Safety without recharge and has significantly impacted Network Homes financial position and won't be affordable for the business. A decision has been made to not seek dispensation now for the costs of the works but has given rise to the fact legally Network Homes can pass the costs on.	
4.12	The legal advice throughout the course of this matter has specified under Network Homes' obligation as a social/ affordable housing provide are under a charitable obligation to charge leaseholders and shared owners under their contract as costs are legally chargeable to them.	
4.13	TK further explained if Network Homes were to subsidise certain matters Network Homes could be accused or referred to the Regulator of Social Housing for acting beyond the powers of our charitable objectives.	
4.14	TK further explained – all of Network Homes' income comes from rent and service charges, not from other avenues. In using funds from rent and service charge for leaseholder/ shared owner building safety costs, allocations for expenditure would have to be moved from other areas of the business e.g maintenance of housing and/or development of new affordable housing.	
4.15	TK informed Panel Members one of the ways in which Network are moving to support residents through this is having invested to get a Consumer Credit License. This means Network Homes can offer interest free loans to residents affected we are asking for this money from. This will be through consultation with the person affected following an affordability assessment.	
4.16	The full costs are yet to be calculated but currently underway.	

4.17	TK explained Network Homes would be covering the costs of arranging the credit agreements and the longer term repayment arrangements.	
4.18	Different to a bank, the interest free loan would be means tested on the financial situation of the person affected, over an agreed period and affordable payment plan. Network Homes would carry the risk on this amount with no legal charge.	
4.19	<p>“TK explained that a legal charge is registered to protect a mortgage loan. The “owner” of legal charge (e.g Network Homes) has a power of sale should the mortgage payments not be maintained. The licence that had been obtained by Network Homes did not enable us to register a charge against the credit arrangements being offered and so, this would be a credit agreement only. If the leaseholder subsequently sought to sell their home without having paid back the amount, Network would seek recovery of any amounts owed from the proceeds of sale. Further, that the credit arrangement would be interest free, which was a better deal than most would be able to get from their bank or building society, but if any leaseholder failed to make their payments, interest then may be charged. Network is subsidising the costs of these credit arrangements in terms of their being interest free and there being no charge to leaseholders utilising them.”</p>	
4.20	TK confirmed there would be no legal charge for interest free loan support for Building Safety recharges.	
4.21	<p>TK advised the options for discussion by the Panel could be looked at in conjunction or independently of the move forward. The feedback from the Special Chairs’ Meeting and Hertford Resident Panel Meeting, 08 January and 11 January 2021 respectively, were in favour of a cap and/or reverse staircasing as options to take back to the Investment Committee.</p> <p><i>Reverse staircasing would be Network Homes buying back equity in the property from a shared owner.</i></p>	
4.22	EB added context of Building Safety pressures and sector priorities following the Grenfell Tragedy. Further explained the impact of Advice Notices and the Cladding External Wall System (EWS1) is having on homeowners or those looking to buy, due to restrictions from lenders without assurances of building safety from the EWS1 certificates.	
4.23	EB explained EWS1 applies to buildings over 18 metres however some lenders are going against government advice and requesting this assurance from buildings below 18 metres which has therefore. EB clarified there is no financial support from MHCLG for buildings under 18metres if there are building safety issues.	

4.24	EB further explained the categories of prioritising remediation work in buildings based on height and risk.	
4.25	<p>EB explained the stance initially set by the Fire Remediation Strategy Group (FRSG) March 2020 was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not charge tenants for costs associated to building safety works</li> <li>• Charge shared owners on the basis of the percentage of equity they own in a property</li> <li>• Charge leaseholders 100% of the cost.</li> </ul>	
4.26	This has now changed to bring shared owners into scope of 100% charge due to there being far more buildings for Network Homes to pay for Building Safety works where there is no financial support for buildings under 18metres. There is also a legal contract to do so.	
4.27	FH queried how further funding becoming available affects the decision of Network Homes to change from equity-based charges to 100%.	
4.28	EB clarified the fund, for building over 18m only, would mean Network Homes could reclaim all the expenditure it would pass to residents. If Network Homes charged shared owners e.g 40%, we would only be eligible to reclaim 40% of costs from the building safety fund. This would therefore mean 60% of costs would need to be paid by Network Homes.	
4.29	BM queried why developer’s negligence, through use of incorrect materials and other building safety failures, isn’t being addressed rather than being passed on to leaseholders and shared owners.	
4.30	TK confirmed wherever possible developers are being pursued through legal action, warranties and insurance where available. Challenges are where buildings over a certain age or where the developer has gone bust, or may go bust for whatever reason – there would be no other option but to recharge. TK clarified this is a last resort and would be looked at on a scheme by scheme basis.	
4.31	TK also noted the growing pressure in the media for private developers to be held accountable for the costs from their profits.	
4.32	JR added Network Homes have been proactive with action. There is growing pressure from the housing sector on developers and government. There is a balance of effectively managing the relationship with organisations in taking aggressive action against them but also working with them to put the matter right. Network Homes are being firm with pressure with some success.	
4.33	JR noted how far wide the issue is across the country as a systemic issue, rather than one or two developers, there is more scope for developers to use a get out clause of unclear building regulations set by the government.	

	<p>The government is now trying to correct building regulations in retrospect and addressing building control failures which have previously been set by outsourced regulators, likely for budget purposes therefore making the guidance not fit for purpose. JR expressed his passionate dissatisfaction for the awful manufacturers behaviour in hiding information through the Grenfell inquiry.</p>	
4.34	<p>JR mentioned there being growing pressure and support for there to be a developer's levy implemented where new homes' being built profits would contribute to the current costs but the value of this is yet to be known. Noted some may see this as unfair for new developers to pay for previous organisations issues potentially making it harder for new homes, which we need a lot of, to be built.</p>	
4.35	<p>FH queried the timeframe of when these costs would be due and when Network Homes know the full extent of them and the likely impact on residents.</p>	
4.36	<p>BM asked what is in place or what is being done to stop developers and contractors to moving between different organisations in the housing sector continue to underperform and negatively impact the residents as the recipients of the service. Expressed dissatisfaction with Wates.</p>	
4.37	<p>EB responded that Network Homes actively engage with contractors such as Wates to manage performance for improvements.</p>	
4.38	<p>EB added there is difficulty with making claims with insurance companies for the significant amounts of money being claimed for works therefore increasingly challenging to get the appropriate parties to accept liability.</p>	
4.39	<p>EB added there is a lot of work required to challenge warranty companies who have given clients a level of comfortability but not honouring paying out money owed.</p>	
4.40	<p>EB and FH drew attention to the panel being proposed options to comment on.</p>	
4.41	<p>FH asked for clarity on the possible solution of a cap for buildings.</p>	
4.42	<p>TK corrected the cap is based on the cost, still being worked out, and affordability test for the residents involved. Leaseholders and shared owners would need to be notified by way of a Section 20 notice* for the costs in advance so anticipate this should be ready in the next few months.</p>	
	<p><i>*If the cost of major works will exceed the sum of £250 for any one leaseholder, then the landlord is required to consult with tenants under section 20. A section 20 notice (S20) is a notice to tell you that we intend to carry out work or provide a service that leaseholders will have to pay towards. We must serve a S20 on any leaseholder who will be affected by the work or receive the service.</i></p>	

4.43	TK further clarified once the resident has received information about their costs they'll be given detail to contact Network Homes to discuss the course of action suitable for them and based on affordability a potential cap. The affordability needs to be based on an assessment for each person to take into account for where there could be leaseholders subletting their home and potentially owning several properties of which they also sublet – it is unlikely they will be eligible for the potential cap due to multiple streams of revenue.	
4.44	FH agreed this could be seen as the cost of the hypothetical leaseholder doing business in comparison to a shared owner or couple where the housing model was the only affordable option for them the costs wouldn't be as affordable for them.	
4.45	RR queried where shared owners who may have bought the smallest share in their home are more likely to be significantly affected. The legal costs in taking action against shared owners to recoup money could potentially be significant for Network Homes resulting in less follow up for the actual costs. Are there insurance policies Network Homes could use to cover this or as an additional cost.	
4.46	TK confirmed currently Network Homes are covering the costs of litigation investigations and legal costs for action however Network could seek a dispensation to seek to recover the costs from leaseholders and shared owners in the future if Network Homes choose to but it isn't currently the intention.	
4.47	JR echoed EB's comments relating to NHBC, as an insurer, where they provide a policy effectively saying there won't be problems with the homes within the first 10 years so if something goes wrong in that period the policy gives the person the right to claim against the policy. The issue is, where the insurance was sold as being near certain the policy would protect the owner – under these circumstances it isn't cast iron.	
4.48	RR queried the figure of £16.4million mentioned in the paper.	
4.49	EB clarified this is the estimated cost for buildings over 18metres. Reiterated there is no funding available for building safety remediation works under 18 metres.	
4.50	EB referenced a 20 year old building, above 18 metres, in Network Homes portfolio where there are no further avenues to investigate to reclaim the funds from e.g warranty, developer, contractor or architect etc.	
4.51	EB commented shared his personal views on how the sector and government could hold developers accountable but acknowledged there is uncertainty surrounding this.	



4.52	FH agreed due to the uncertainty around timescales and potential costs to individuals it makes it much harder for the panel to share their views and asked for timelines.	
4.53	EB referenced a query about section 106 homes, where Network have purchased from another organisation as the leaseholder rather than the owner it makes it harder to make decisions.	
4.54	RR expressed confusion linked to the content of the report where there didn't seem to be clear guidance on homes from 11 to 18 metres in having mandatory remediation works carried out to them.	
4.55	JR clarified the summary Advice Notice says to consider all buildings and take a priority approach based on height, level of cladding, what's on the buildings, how they are built and who lives in them. There is new legislation incoming as the Draft Building Safety Bill which will bring in a new regulator who will set forth a new suite of expectations which may only apply to buildings over 18 metres.	
4.56	EB and JR explained there has been a lot of work with RICS, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, in relation to mortgages where lenders actions have left people unable to move or sell their homes as a result of calling for EWS1 forms where they aren't necessary. JR is hopeful with RICS guidance to lenders, buildings with low amounts of cladding or balconies without flammable materials, stacked on top of each other and below 6 storeys won't need the EWS1 form, will be accepted. This in turn would help move the lending market along. If buildings are under 4 storeys without ACM cladding they wouldn't need to be confirmed with an EWS1.	
4.57	RR queried why storeys rather than building height. JR responded this is due to RICS stating it is easier to count floors and there being uncertainty in where you measure from for 4 storeys e.g from the made ground vs base level of excavation, ground floor level of the top flat or to the ceiling of the top flat, sometimes above which causes much more confusion.	
4.58	JR shared for the first 4 buildings Network Homes have taken through remedial works there is more of an understanding of the costs and are hopeful the funding will come from the government which is positive news as we won't need to recharge leaseholders for them. The future plans are unknown but estimate September as a date to have more understanding of the next sites to take through the process.	
4.59	FH said there are a lot of questions linked to the paper to consider for the panel to offer views on the options which are difficult to offer views on due to the timescale and costs not yet being available or how many people will be affected. FH asked Panel for comments.	
4.61	EB pressed for views as there will be a section 106 block coming due in the next 3 to 6 months.	

4.62	RR and FH queried if people were to reverse staircase what the value of this would be based on e.g current market value which may be impacted by this current issue.	
4.63	EB and TK clarified it would be market valuation from a framework of Valuers but timing would be taken into consideration dependent on the works required but Network Homes wouldn't want to gain from there being issues at a property through this process but be fair and equitable. It is likely the cost of the defect would be taken into consideration.	
4.64	JR explained a market valuation of property worth £200,000 with an immediate bill for works due of £50,000 would be valued at £150,000 as in comparison to another similar home that doesn't require works it would be valued as less.	
4.65	FH queried if this would mean the basis for the reverse staircasing would be based on the share of the property.	
4.66	JR clarified it would be equity based but requires more cash from Network Homes as rather than bearing half the cost of the remediation works, Network Homes would also need to buy out the shared owners equity.	
4.67	JR explained the financial impact building safety works for rented homes has resulted in cyclical bathroom, kitchen and external decorations programs to be delayed. If there are more costs required, it would further impact maintenance budgets and the potential to build new homes.	
4.68	RR asked if the market valuation comes back as higher than the shared owner purchased the property for, would Network make an equity based share of the profits.	
4.69	No response but Network Homes had noted prior to the question this option would be based on Market value.	
4.69	FH noted the length of time spent on the agenda item with several agenda items for further discussion still remaining at 7.30PM.	
4.70	EB added there were still uncertainties from government decisions or actions expected in the coming months that may impact the panel's view and questioned the timing of the decision.	
4.71	SH drew attention to the time lapsed with several other agenda items and suggested panel members who had further questions and comments to send an email after the meeting for Network Homes to collate and respond to before the Investment Committee meeting. FH agreed.	
4.72	<b>Panel Members to send questions or comments on the paper and vote for an option via email following meeting.</b>	<b>Panel Members</b>

4.73	BM queried the focus on shared owners in comparison to leaseholders who would be in a similar challenging position.	
4.74	TK clarified the legal position for leaseholders is much clearer than Network Homes as a charitable organisation would not be able to subsidise charges specified in a legal contract to charge 100% for. In doing so it would be acting against the organisation's charitable objective to subsidise the costs which would be unparalleled across the sector and could bring Network Homes into question with the Regulator of Social Housing.	
4.75	BM clarified it's understandable for this view and wouldn't expect Network Homes to subsidise costs for leaseholders but emphasised the support and pressure needs to be put on government to help.	
4.76	JR agreed. Added, based on the concern of the government there seems to be much more support for leaseholders and shared owners' costs over small housing associations and their tenants. JR anticipates a prolonged period of uncertainty.	
4.77	FH drew a close to the agenda item further encouraging panel members to send their questions and noted the item for discussion for meetings in the future.	
4.78	FH and MM clarified the meeting duration is 6.30PM to 8.30PM	
<b>5</b>	<b>Network Homes Heat Charges</b>	
5.01	FH introduced TK to table the report and queried the role of Insite as a contractor.	
5.02	TK introduced the paper as being the first step in a project to review Network Homes Heat networks with a specialist to look at the full suite of heat networks in which Network Homes provide the pipework and structure of the heating.	
5.03	Network Homes have identified there has not been charging for this service unlike other housing associations. TK noted the charge isn't as significant as the previous agenda item but respected the matter isn't insignificant and the business appreciate this. In light of transparency want to share the information of how we communicate the change to wider residents with the local panels.	
5.04	TK advised the reason for implementing the charge now is due to better management of the process identifying costs Network Homes are entitled to charge for.	
5.05	TK added the letter included for panel to review is a third draft following feedback from Herts and Outer London Panel the week prior, to include	

	<p>further detail of 'why now' and further support for those who are experiencing short term financial hardship.</p>	
5.06	<p>TK specifically requested comments on the letter to communicate the charge to residents affected. Explained the decision to implement the charge has been made already and opted for lower end of 10 pence, however welcomed panel to discuss further.</p>	
5.07	<p>FH asked for clarification of Insite's role, as a billing agent.</p>	
5.08	<p>TK confirmed Insite act as a billing agent on behalf of Network Homes to read the meters and carry out the administration of the heat network. The cost would be included on the bill as a standing charge showing as an extra line per Network Homes' instruction. This is the same for heat providers, (acting as owners of the heat network) where the item is normally shown as a separate line as a standing charge.</p>	
5.09	<p>Further clarified the heat network standing charge is for the provision of the pipes, the building and structure of the network. Service charge is for the maintenance of the networks.</p>	
5.10	<p>RT asked for clarification on how many times someone can access the charitable fund - TK confirmed residents can access more than once for short term support. Further explained the access to the fund would be based on an assessment. If it is found the resident is accessing the fund repeatedly for the same thing then there would be need to be further discussion and would then have to be refused.</p>	
5.10	<p>RR asked if the £36 annual charge is for all buildings. TK clarified it is for the buildings specified in the report, where the heat infrastructure is owned by Network Homes. This will be in two phases from 1 February and 1 April 2021.</p>	
5.11	<p>FH asked if there will be future schemes that will be affected</p>	
5.12	<p>TK advised there is a project to look into energy management which could bring other schemes into scope but this is not yet known.</p>	
5.13	<p>JR added residents would know if they're included in this charge if they live in a property where they are informed of being tied into Insite rather than being able to select providers.</p>	
5.14	<p>FH asked if schemes that may come up in the future would be treated in the same way.</p>	
5.15	<p>TK unable to confirm but advised this is the intention. Where Network Homes recognises it had been losing money on services it is providing and</p>	

	not recovering it – the business has an affordable housing duty to pass the costs on. At present the homes in the report are those identified right now.	
5.16	FH asked if there would be a further look into utility charges where some contractors may be charging excessive amounts.	
5.17	TK confirmed it is something the business are looking into and seeing how they can support in the future. The team member employed specifically for this project is on a fixed term contract solely to review heat networks for now.	
5.18	BM suggested ensuring residents are aware of this change in the form of a letter.	
5.19	FH and TK clarified the letter has been provided on page 36 for approval.	
5.20	FH commented the letter made sense and looked okay is it provides the information. There were no other comments from Panel Members.	
5.21	Members thanked TK for her presence.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Housing Ombudsman Self-Assessment.</b>	
6.01	JR presented on behalf of JM due to sickness.	
6.02	JR explained the Housing Ombudsman has been working to increase their strength as the backstop for residents who escalate complaints to them by introducing a new complaint handling code to have significantly tougher expectations during the complaints process than were previously in place. One of the requirements is for Landlords to complete a self-assessment every 12 months. Completed assessment included in papers.	
6.03	JR noted based on the assessment, Network Homes are in a good place and only needed to update a few words in the complaints handling policy but with a goal to do further work in the future.	
6.04	Going forward Network Homes would like to involve resident panels in the process of undertaking the self assessment and this paper is presented to ask for volunteers and find how residents would like to be involved. JR clarified the challenge would be, due to the self-assessment being based on the organisations annual data – the activity would need to be carried out at the end of the calendar year.	
6.05	JR added the approach to the assessment could be discussed at an earlier time. Suggestions for a meeting outside of the panel schedule, or bringing the data to October meetings early in the process and asked for ideas.	

6.06	FH suggested using a rolling 12-month approach as a placeholder to review. JR thanked for the suggestion.	
6.07	FH queried the areas highlighted on the self-assessment highlighted orange.	
6.08	JR was unsure why there are some areas highlighted orange as they have been filled out, suggested this may be pulled through from the Ombudsman's template.	
6.09	<b>SH to speak to JM to clarify the meaning of columns highlighted orange on self-assessment.</b>	<b>SH</b>
6.10	JR explained the next part of the paper is to ask residents to be involved in reviewing the Habitual Complainants Policy.	
6.11	FH advised he has put his name down to be involved already. RR also to be involved.	
6.12	RT interested in being involved and asked what reasonable adjustment means in regards to complaints, noting the difference in meaning when referring to equality and diversity.	
6.13	JR clarified Network Homes had some discussion on this term also as it was slightly ambiguous but interpreted this as how the complaints are received through different methods rather than only being through a written letter format e.g verbally or in a different language.	
6.14	RT suggested including more clarity of the explanation for 10.3 on the form. FH seconded this.	
6.15	JR advised the form is from the Ombudsman but could include more clarity in how we Network Homes have interpreted the form in it's response.	
6.16	<b>Complaints Team to add further context to 10.3 on annual review as to how 'reasonable adjustment' has been interpreted going forward.</b>	<b>JM</b>
6.17	No further comments were made by Panel Members.	
6.18	JR mentioned the complaints monitoring report is shared whenever available through the year via email, rather than only presented at meetings.	
6.19	FH recognised it was useful to see the complaints information in a timely manner makes the data more relevant and requested the report to be added to OnBoard as an appendix.	
6.20	<b>SH agreed to include complaints monitoring report as an item each time as an item not to be discussed.</b>	<b>R.E Team</b>

7	Lessons Learnt Lectures	
7.01	JR presented the report. Taken as read.	
7.02	JR explained the paper is to have opportunities to drill down into complaints and share the learning with teams throughout the business, including Board Members and residents.	
7.03	JR acknowledged attendance may not be suitable for everyone, but we could make the presentation available and a recording of the presentation, including a one-page note summarising the content on the website, with a summary.	
7.04	The trigger would initiate a presentation by a senior manager to explain what happened, what went wrong, what can we learn and what can be done to resolve the issue in the future through this process. Board Members involved residents and staff would be invited for transparency and the business will be encouraged to see this in the spirit of learning rather than defensively. JR will be leading on the first ones.	
7.05	JR explained the report is discussing having a trigger for where the Housing Ombudsman has given an adverse decision to a complaint against Network Homes, where complaints affect a significant number of people, upheld stage 2 complaints or control failures.	
7.06	JR added if 100 residents were affected by an issue this would also be a trigger. This figure was questioned by the Herts and Outer London Panel.	
7.07	JR also informed panel if there was a control failure, i.e where a process hasn't been followed, the Area Manager would need to justify why a lesson learnt lecture is not needed. This decision could be overruled.	
7.08	JR wants this to be engaged with positively by the business in the spirit of learning, where colleagues can make suggestions for review as well residents.	
7.09	JR further explained the proposal has been shared for comments and received positively by the Herts Panel so following this meeting the paper would go to the Executive Leadership Team and allow the business to trial the roll out.	
7.10	FH agreed the idea is positive and would need to be implemented carefully and would need involvement from residents to ensure the decisions led by the complaints team are considerate. Panels having oversight of the complaints monitoring report would help influence this.	

7.11	RT thinks the proposal is a brilliant idea. Further asked if the complaints panels could have residents involved.	<b>Panel Members</b>
7.12	JR advised Network Homes now has a 2-stage complaint process. Stage one complaints are responded to by the area's Manager and then the second stage complaints are investigated by the Complaints Team and signed off by JR.	
7.13	JR agreed with FH suggestion to enable panels to have a steer on areas for review which would need to be supported with transparency for panels to have greater understanding of what else has happened in the business to make informed decisions.	
7.14	FH and JR further explained the third stage is by going to the Housing Ombudsman and having a 2-stage process is seen as best practice as an independent view of the matter is more useful and more timely.	
7.15	<b>JR is open to suggestions to the name of the sessions if lectures is seen at too negative. Panel Members can suggest names.</b>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Continuous Improvement Panel Update</b>	
8.01	The report was tabled. MM summarised the paper to explain following a proposal from the Executive Director of Customer Services to reprioritise a scrutiny into 'Contract Management of the day to day repairs service' to take place in February 2021 instead of May 2021.	
8.02	The Continuous Improvement Panel (CIP) approved the change and recruitment has now started with 6 people expressing interest to be involved. If all CIP members take part there will be 11 people involved in the Sprint groups.	
8.03	MM ask RR, as Chair of Continuous Improvement Panel, if she wanted to add anything.	
8.04	RR further updated she had made contact with the other Continuous Improvement Panel Members to confirm their involvement and to contact previously involved residents. Explained the Panel are trying to set up a Whatsapp group, but she has not received all numbers to do so.	
8.05	SH confirmed she had responded to RR about contacting previously involved Sprint Group Members and would contact newly interested residents following Big Conversation. Cross referencing is required with the previous residents who registered to be involved in the Panels to confirm if they are still Network Homes residents so will take longer but will be complete but is in hand.	



8.06	<b>SH to contact residents regarding review.</b>	<b>SH</b>
8.07	FH asked if the project FH and TB will be involved in about contract extension is separate to the sprint. MM confirmed they are separate.	
8.08	FH queried if the sprint would inform the decision and contracts management going forward. MM confirmed.	
8.09	<b>MM to clarify date of Wates contract extension meeting to FH.</b>	<b>MM</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Network Homes Performance Report</b>	
9.01	The report was tabled and presented by JR.	
9.02	JR clarified the report shared is the same report that goes to Board and the Executive Leadership Team.	
9.03	JR highlighted gas safety servicing being at impressive rate of 100% considering there being government induced lockdowns and where people are reluctant to allow people into their homes. The gas service contractors have been putting in extra precautions to keep people safe which has been successful.	
9.04	JR noted the report includes all key performance indicators rather than tailored specifically for Panel. Asked Panel for suggestions they're more interested in or if Panel would rather Network Homes select areas to report on that we think may be of interest to residents.	
9.05	FH suggested being able to use the KPI's alongside the lessons learnt lectures to determine the areas panel should be looking into. Added the panel don't want to go over the same thing too many times in different ways. FH was happy for Network Homes to select a KPI's.	
9.06	No other comments were made by Panel Members.	
9.07	<b>FH asked for there to be the before and after of the performance monitoring when the areas seen as resident focus KPI's to note the difference</b>	<b>JR</b>
9.08	FH added also commented staff sickness, although is important, isn't relevant to the panels.	
9.09	FH selected CSC as the next deep dive as there may be issues if Queuebuster doesn't work for everyone and if so, there are potentially	

	issues impacting the KPIs therefore skewing the data. It would be good to know if Network Homes are falling at the first hurdle.	
9.10	RR echoed this thinking for CSC to be the next deep dive. There were no further comments from Panel Members on the report.	
9.11	FH added a question regarding the customer portal in relation to how many people have access.	
9.12	JR advised, as at end of October 2020, 3000 people have been registered but not much further improvement. There will be a renewed push to have people register and actively use the portal as it now has the opportunity for people to book their own repairs.	
9.13	FH echoed JR's point that communications disjointed from the portal itself could give rise to people forgetting it is available to use the product and therefore defaulting to calling the customer service centre or sending an email.	
9.14	IA asked for clarification of the process in residents registering for the portal and if they're able to proactive register themselves or if they must wait for information from Network Homes.	
9.15	SH clarified general rented residents receive their unique references via the post in a phased approach to onboarding. They then receive a second letter with a password to set up the account for better data protection.	
9.16	IA queried the eligibility of the portal for leaseholders and shared owners.	
9.17	SH explained at present the functionality is not yet available due to differing systems that enable the information to pull through which the organisation are committed to rectifying and making the portal available to leaseholders.	
9.18	IA queried the timeframe for this to be possible.	
9.19	<b>SH or MM unable to confirm but will provide an update upon speaking to the Business Transformation team. SH to find out timeline of customer portal project for leaseholders and shared owners to be included in scope.</b>	<b>SH/MM</b>
9.20	<b>SH or MM to query with Business Transformation team if residents can proactively sign up to the portal and if not, why are they unable to.</b>	<b>SH/MM</b>
9.21	RR explained a recent interaction with the Customer Service Centre where the Advisor was unaware of this difference and required rerouting to other members of staff with a call back arranged. RR added the process if someone is unable to remember their password, they will be sent an encrypted message which may be challenging for older residents or people less confident with technology.	
9.22	FH echoed the accessibility of the service.	

9.23	MM acknowledged the challenge but emphasised the purpose is for security reasons where the person will be accessing their rent account and personal details. Explained there will be additional training to Older Persons Scheme Managers to fully support older residents and further to see how we can support residents not in older persons schemes more widely.	
9.24	SH added following the Big Conversation consultation, digital inclusion is an area we noticed needs further attention so the Resident Engagement Team will work with other areas of the business to see how we Network Homes can support.	
9.25	FH reiterated the Customer Service Centre need to be apprised of all new initiatives and information being shared with residents proactively as if they are unaware of important information, people will have a dissatisfactory experience from the start therefore making it more difficult to reach targets.	
9.26	SH advised CSAs should be aware of initiatives as they have regular updates and toolbox talks via Microsoft Teams.	
9.27	<b>SH to send Customer Service Team Leaders a request to ensure CSAs are aware of portal updates and differences with leaseholders and shared owners.</b>	SH
9.28	RR also added she had a building safety query linked to cladding, but the CSA was unable to answer. The query was something colleagues should proactively be aware of. RR asked if there has been any training delivered to Customer Service Advisors about cladding and other information following further news in the media.	
9.29	JR confirmed staff had been given training some time ago when the initial letters went to people who are affected which may have been a year ago. It is possible the advisor wasn't employed by Network Homes at this stage.	
9.30	JR emphasised training is a priority for Network Homes staff and continues during working remotely.	
9.31	SH added an in-depth building safety update was provided to the business week commencing 4 January 2020, via a Lunch and Learn session which was attended by 86 people and received positive feedback. The session detailed a lot of information the panel has received was recorded and shared on the intranet for those unable to attend which is more difficult for customer service centre due to the way their work is scheduled.	
9.32	<b>SH to send Customer Service Team Leaders a request to ensure CSAs are aware of building safety updates.</b>	SH
9.33	FH acknowledged the information shared in a variety of ways is positive but must be consistent and regular to ensure all colleagues are aware irrespective of their length of service.	

10	Panel business	
10.01	No matters sent to FH by Panel. Additional papers taken as read.	
10.02	MM explained resident contact project being led by Elizabeth Lill. This is a project to call residents who've recently had a repair works order completed on system for feedback with a personal touch due to resident welfare contact calls made 2020 being well received. The pilot will take place from week commencing 18 January 2021 to see how residents engage with the concept. If positive, this will roll out more widely.	
10.03	MM added the pilot consists of 4 members of staff to complete calls to residents until 18 February 2021 and then evaluate the responses and value of the project for residents.	
10.04	MM confirmed to FH the calls would sit alongside existing customer satisfaction mechanisms and to act quickly if the resident's repair hasn't been completed to a satisfactory standard or even at all.	
10.05	FH noted there could be a lot more value for residents from these calls which may leave them feeling short changed if their experience was indeed unsatisfactory.	
10.06	MM acknowledged this and will take it into consideration upon review of the pilot with resident feedback.	
10.07	RT mentioned she hasn't received any customer satisfaction calls, like she used to in the past 4 to 5 years and queried if they still take place. FH also hasn't received calls.	
10.08	JR confirmed the calls do still take place, after repairs there should be a call from Voluntas and asked if they want to give feedback to Bright Navigator after each customer service call.	
10.09	RT confirmed she receives feedback opportunities for customer service centre but nothing for repairs. BM confirmed she received calls.	
10.10	MM advised the repairs calls are done on a sample percentage basis so once they meet the quota, they wouldn't make any further calls. MM and JR mentioned 20% of calls but need to confirm.	
10.11	<b>MM to confirm percentage of sample for repairs surveyed and what this volume would equate to. Would like details for the past 5 years of calls made and replied to.</b>	<b>MM</b>
10.12	FH reminded members to send feedback regarding Building Safety Paper per Agenda Item 4.	

10.13	BM advised TB unable to join meeting for technical reasons.	
10.14	<b>SH to contact TB about tech issues in not being able to join the meeting.</b>	<b>SH</b>
10.15	FH raised concerns of people being unable to join meetings and expressed he has also had challenges previously. Suggested a test meeting the day before or the day of the meetings to help.	
10.16	MM confirmed there have been offers for tests previously by SH but not with much take up but could arrange if the panel wanted.	
10.17	SH clarified over 3 sessions for London and Hertford Panels there had been 4 people attend.	
10.18	FH responded if there isn't much take up it may not be an effective use of peoples' time and unsure of further suggestions.	
10.19	SH advised the panel invitation usually has links for help and details to contact the team if any further support is needed in advance, but no responses or requests have been made.	
10.20	JR also suggested clicking the teams link in advance as people could test the functions independently.	
10.21	<b>Resident Engagement Team to turn off lobby for Teams Meetings so panel members can test the meeting links in advance of each meeting.</b>	<b>SH</b>
10.22	<b>SH to book a test session inviting panel members within next 3 months and if no response cancel session as per FH.</b>	<b>SH</b>
10.23	FH further requested panel send comments regarding Building Safety Paper. Thanked Network Staff and Panel Members for their attendance.	
10.24	SH confirmed recording stopped and meeting closed at 8.37PM	
	<b>Next Meeting Scheduled for 20 April 2021</b>	
<b>11</b>	<b>Minutes from the meeting of 13 October 2020 - For information – not to be discussed unless so requested</b>	
11.01	No comments were made	
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Social Housing White Paper - For information – not to be discussed unless so requested</b>	
12.01	There were no comments	
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Resident Engagement Update - For information – not to be discussed unless so requested</b>	

<b>13.01</b>	There were no comments	
<b>14.0</b>	<b>ASB Policy - <i>For information – not to be discussed unless so requested</i></b>	
<b>14.01</b>	There were no comments	

Chair .....

Date.....