

**Homes for Islington  
Tenant Management Forum**

**Minutes of 24<sup>th</sup> January 2008**

Present:	Richard Smith (RS)	Halfmoon Co-op TMO (Chair)
	Tony Fernandes (TF)	Redbrick & Quaker Court
	K Ramkissoon	Arch Elm
	H. Samuel	Arch Elm
	Sharon Buglioni	Newberry Co-op
	Barbara Price	Newberry Co-op
	Dave Gasgoine	Newberry Co-op
	Dave Frankel	Harry Weston
	Trish Hayes	Charteris
	L Welland	Elthorne 1 <sup>st</sup> .
	L Costantino	Brooke Park

HFI Officers

Anthony Jonas (AJ)	Performance Manager
Peter Sutton (PS)	<a href="#">Tenant Management MO</a> Manager
Dulal Ahmed (DA)	Tenant Management Team (Minutes)

Items	Issues	Actions
<b>1.</b> 1.1	<b>Apologies for absence</b> Tom Kane (Taverner & Peckett), Stella Ilo (Hornsey Lane), Mary Nicolau (Hornsey Lane), Alex Scorgie (Bermeton),	
<b>2</b> 2.1	<b>Accuracy</b> The minutes of the last meeting 21 <sup>st</sup> November 2007 were agreed to be a true record.	
2.1.1	<b>Matters arising from minutes of 21/11/07</b> HFI Business Plan 2008/13 AJ confirmed the TMOs were not contacted to contribute to HFI's Business Plan 2008/13 but agreed that the TMOs would be involved in the consultation process for 2008/09.	AJ
<b>3.</b> 3.1	<b>Report back from TMO representative on HFI's CSSB and issues for the next CSSB</b> TK report was noted.	
<b>4.</b> 4.1  4.1.1	<b>Proposals to revise the Tenant Management Forum</b> AJ presented the paper on the proposals to revise the Tenant Management for discussion.  He said the Tenant Management Team would like to receive your comments back on the proposals and it needs to be discussed by the TMO/C boards and representations made to your Tenant Management Officer <del>before 31 January 2008</del> in order to be considered at the next TMF on 17 March 2008.	ALL TMO/C

<p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>4.1.6</p> <p>4.1.7</p> <p>4.1.8</p> <p>4.1.9</p> <p>4.2.0</p>	<p>DF said the proposal to have a manager’s meeting without a committee member was not a good idea.</p> <p>LC agreed and said it would deter committee members to attend meetings without the TMO manager, HFI need to remember that committee members attend meetings voluntarily in their own time and having separate meetings would not appeal to them.</p> <p>RS said it was good proposal to have a separate manager’s meeting to discuss day to day operational issues because managers cannot decide policy decisions consulted at the Tenant Management Forum.</p> <p>TC said to start committee meetings for TMO board members at 6.30 pm was too early and most voluntary board members would prefer to come to meetings beginning at 7.00 or 7.30 pm. There was a general consensus against bringing forward the meeting time to 6.30 pm.</p> <p>TF said it was unclear to him on the terms of reference for the revised Tenant Management Forum and the proposed new TMO Managers Forum.</p> <p>AJ said the Managers Forum would consider operational agenda items for discussion relating to how TMO’s work with HFI to deliver services to Islington residents. The briefing session on Voids in July 2007 was an example where HFI operational managers and TMO managers worked <u>well</u> together.</p> <p>HS said it was a good idea to keep a committee members forum but felt new committee members needed the TMO managers present to bridge the gap between HFI and their organisations. She suggested it should be made mandatory for a TMO manager and a representative from the TMO attend the TMF meeting instead of holding separate meetings.</p> <p>DF agreed with the proposal made by HS.</p> <p>TC said another view would be to allow ordinary residents from attending forum meetings. A general discussion was held and the members felt although it was good idea it would be difficult to achieve when committee members generally do not attend meetings.</p>	<p> </p> <p>PS</p> <p> </p> <p> </p> <p> </p>
<p><b>5.</b></p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.1.1</p>	<p><b>Employment KLOE for TMOs</b></p> <p>PS presented the paper for discussion on the employment KLOE trialled by some tenant management organisations.</p> <p>The key issues flagged in the <a href="#">pilot study</a> <del>that</del> <a href="#">suggested how that</a> TMO/C’s may need guidance on <del>were</del>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRB checks</li> <li>• DSE checks</li> <li>• flexible working arrangements</li> </ul>	<p> </p>

5.1.2	TMOs achieving 3 diamonds would be monitored on the proposed Employment KLOE once a year, unless any serious concerns come to light during the year.	
5.1.3	PS said feedback from the tenant management committees not taking part in the KLOE pilot were still welcome and would be taken into account in the next report to the CSSB in February 2008.	
5.1.4	TC said have all the TMO committees said they like the Employment KLOE and has anyone other than the 3 organisations taking part in the pilot responded on its usefulness to committees on their legal responsibilities as employers.	
5.1.5	AJ said if TMO committees fail to respond on time within the consultation period then the Tenant Management Team cannot take on board their opinions into account.	
5.1.6	PS said the Tenant Management Team did not receive feedback from individual TMOs outside of the pilot group.	
5.1.7	LS said 3 out of the 25 TMOs was not the majority view <del>to be perceived by HFI of TMOs</del> and the wider point of consultation was to invite the opinions of others to consider. <del>With HFI have</del> introducing new monitoring forms and policies to committee members <del>to consider the reader may be unfamiliar with t who may unfamiliar with the language used with these reports</del> <del>she wording, therefore</del> writing reports in plain English was <del>encouraged especially to target new members to empower them participate at this committee essential tee level</del>	AJ
5.1.8	<del>In addition, I. Additionally,</del> circulating papers to committee members in person rather than <del>co-ordinating papers through</del> the TMO Manager would provide committee members <del>extra</del> time to read papers. <del>in advance.</del>	
5.1.9	LC said HFI management papers are normally circulated by the TMO Manager because they record the personal home addresses of TMO committee members.	
5.2.0	LS said will the TMT listen to comments if all TMOs carried out a self assessment health check on their organisations.	ALL TMO/C
<u>5.2.1</u>	PS encouraged TMO managers to present the draft Employment KLOE to their committees and to provide their feedback to us by 31 January 2008. He reiterated how their views will be reported to the CSSB in February.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Proposals to revise the arrangements for monitoring TMOs</b>	
6.1	PS outlined the paper for discussion and asked for comments from the members.	

6.1.2	It was noted that BVMO are part through evaluating the monitoring and revised KLOE's and will sharing their feedback with HFI in due course.	
6.1.3	TF said the KLOE's are not in our management agreement and TMOs feel the procedure has become too onerous and an additional layer to monitor TMO's. They are not in principle against monitoring but HFI are working outside the management agreement of the tenant management organisations.	
6.1.4	AJ said the current monitoring regime was not another layer of bureaucracy and TMO/C should really be monitoring themselves and regularly submitting performance reports to their management committees. The KLOE standards are there to assess and assist you to meet the minimum requirements in your management agreement and they recognise how well your organisations manage Governance and Financial Management within your small businesses.	
6.1.5	TF said TMOs will supply the performance indicators requested in the management agreement but the extra round of monitoring was becoming a burden on the resources for small organisations when the monitoring visits with the Tenant Management Officer last up to 3 hours. He liked the proposals in the paper of stream lining the amount of information to be requested only once and adopting a checklist to be completed by the Tenant Management Officer rather than the existing monitoring form.	
6.1.6	RS said there was a 29 checklist in the new management agreement and in the revised KLOE's there are over 100 questions and some are duplicated.	
6.1.7	TC said the revised KLOE go beyond the management agreement, they are time consuming, intrusive and TMO's have questioned the drive behind the monitoring regime. HFI are always checking TMOs and the extra work it generates was not benefiting the residents and helping TMOs deliver the services they want. TMOs are like small business organisations and the experience of the revised monitoring regime so far was a step too far. TMOs want to comply with the management agreement and relevant legislation but HFI are collecting ticks in their boxes to satisfy the Audit Commission. Cutting allowances is a risk to our business.	
6.1.8	DF said the indicators on rent arrears performance was made worse in the revised performance indicators (PI). TMC collect rents and pay the council back every quarter on time. TMC's in general are not against arrears reporting but the new PI's were rolled out without any training how to complete the revised forms and we question the relevance of collecting some of the revised PIs for example how many hours did it take to complete a non urgent repair, such questions are becoming too onerous for TMC to collect and report to HFI so why do it.	AJ PS
6.1.9	AJ said TMOs <del>are</del> cannot be treated as small private businesses because they receive public money, provide services to council residents and have obligations to residents including leaseholders on providing these services retained by the TMO.	
6.2.0	LS said what happens when a TMO was found to be in breach of their	

	agreement and not complying with housing and finance regulations.	
6.2.1	AJ said the TMT would talk with the <a href="#">TMO</a> Board to adopt an action plan and a timeframe to bring everything back in order again. There are provisions in the management agreement available to the council to exercise for instance a breach or warning notice if the TMO continues to fail to perform or carry out its obligations under its management agreement. It was rarely necessary and would be decided as a last resort.	
6.2.2	TC said he acknowledged that TMOs were public funded but are delivering value for money for their residents for example on caretaking services they are operating on smaller budgets and delivering higher standards than HFI.	
6.2.3	TF said TMOs accept monitoring reporting was part of their management agreement but the type of monitoring proposed by HFI was ridiculous and the collection of performance indicators by the TMT are meaningless to the TMOs without an explanation on their meaning. TMOs need to be consulted and agree on the PIs to be collected in the future, additionally, HFI need to provide a report to the TMOs on their performance as a requirement in the management agreement.	PS
6.3.3	TF put forward the motion that for the time being PIs are kept to the management agreement and TMO/C complete HFI's monitoring forms used before the revised forms were introduced in November. A meeting needs to be arranged with HFI to agree on the revised performance indicators to challenge these inconsistencies.	 PS TMO/C
6.3.4	Presently, HFI are applying a one size fit approach to all the TMO/C organisations forgetting they are different types, sizes and work differently. Small TMOs face the same amount of monitoring as a big TMO but receive less funding towards their committee members from the Council. The TMT provide reports and proposals to the TMF for consultation but you have accepted attendance by committee members was low. You therefore avoid sitting down with the TMO/C boards and implement reports by default.	
6.3.5	TC seconded this motion and the general body of the meeting agreed to the proposal by TF.	
6.3.6	PS suggested the TMO managers establish a working party to review the monitoring forms/performance indicators and submit their proposals to him before April to allow the TMT to reflect on their suggestions. It was agreed by all.	PS   ALL TMO/C
<b>7.0</b>	<b>HFI Tenant Management Manager's Report</b>	
7.1	PS introduced his paper for discussion.	
7.1.1	<u>Caretaking standards</u>	

7.1.2	16 out of 235 TMO/C scored worse than HFI on caretaking standards for the whole of 2007. PS suggested those TMO/C need to incorporate HFI's assessment criteria into their cleaning tasks and estate inspections to raise their caretaking standards for 2008.	ALL TMO/C
7.1.3	It was said the Performance Team work for HFI and are not perceived to be impartial, HFI staff are monitoring HFI staff and it was not regarded as completely independent.	
7.1.4	PS said Area Managers are equally upset with the Performance Team when their area offices scored low caretaking scores compared to their peers.	
7.1.5	PS confirmed the procedure for TMO/C to follow in a dispute on the caretaking assessment against their estate. They must contact their Tenant Management Officer and outline their reasons to be considered by the Performance Team. It was noted by all.	ALL TMO/C
7.1.6	<u>Internal HFI phones in TMO offices</u>	
7.1.7	It was noted.	
7.1.8	<u>GERDA keys</u>	
7.1.9	The members said they were concerned with HFI's decision to restrict Gerda keys to TMO/C to carryout their retained responsibilities on their estates. They asked if additional keys can be supplied to TMO/C with existing keys. This was noted.	PS 
7.2.0	<u>Potential violent residents</u>	
7.2.1	It was noted and welcomed by all.	
7.2.2	<u>Finances</u>	
7.2.3	It was noted.	
7.2.4	TF said was it true that the estimated service charges for leaseholders will be used to calculate the TMO allowances in 2008/09.	
7.2.5	PS said the leasehold estimates will be adjusted to reflect the actual expenditure later on in the year.	
7.2.6	<u>Training</u>	
7.2.7	The complaints training date was noted to take place on 29 <sup>th</sup> March 2008.	
7.2.8	The On-line Diversity and Equalities training will be rolled out in February/March.	PS
7.2.9	TMC asked the TMT to provide them with a training plan format acceptable to the TMT. It was noted.	PS

7.3.0	The TMO/C managers said they are willing to procure a training programme together in order to achieve best value savings.	TMO/C
7.3.1	<u>Customer Care and Diversity</u>	
7.3.2	It was noted.	
7.3.3.	<u>Managers Briefing</u>	
7.3.4	The TMF welcomed the manager's briefing paper as a regular new report. New agenda items for discussion in future meetings would be rent arrears, inter <u>estate</u> transfers, etc.	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Open Forum</b>	
8.1	DF said the Harry Weston Decent Homes feasibility study had insufficient detail for his Board to take on major works.	
8.1.1	AJ said the report DF was referring to was an initial feasibility study to decide the types of works required generally for the decent homes programme and its estimated cost but it was not the final report. However he agreed to investigate whether a detailed report was subsequently commissioned and available for Harry Weston.	AJ
8.1.2	DF said he saw a Savills report and it was more detailed than the feasibility study talked about therefore would AJ supply him the contact details of the feasibility study author. He agreed to take this back but to compare the two reports served no comparison because the feasibility study was not a detailed report.	AJ
8.1.3	LW said the Decent Homes survey commissioned on Elthorne Estate failed to include the skylight windows in the Decent Homes Programme therefore DF was right to be concerned on the accuracy of the reports commissioned by HFI. Also, the Co-op was not consulted on the programme of works on their estate and to include replacement items when the contacts have started was difficult to negotiate because of budget restrictions.	
8.1.4	AJ agreed to refer DF to the appropriate officer in the major works team to discuss his concerns.	AJ
<b>9.</b>	<b>Consultative Panel Reports</b>	
9.1	<u>Housing Revenue Account: Review of Rents, Fees and Charges for 2008/09</u>	
9.1.1	AJ presented the paper to the members for discussion and comment.	
9.1.2	3.8 The panel said it was concerned with the rent level increase was twice the rate of inflation and was this affordable for Islington residents. It was noted.	AJ
9.1.3	4.1.12 The panel reviewed the revised district heating and hot water charges and <u>said-asked-have-whether</u> residents been informed of these	AJ

	changes and will housing benefit pay the liability for these proposed increases in housing costs for low income households eligible for support. It was noted. <u>AJ said HFI would be writing to tenants informing them of proposed changes in rents and charges.</u>	
9.1.4	4.2.2 The panel noted the revised charges to Parking Penalty Charges in 2008/09.	
9.1.5	4.3.1 The panel noted the proposed increase in Caretaking and Estate Services in 2008/09.	
9.1.6	4.3.2 The panel noted the inflation increase to the Refund policy in 2008/09.	
9.1.7	<u>Developing Islington Housing Strategy 2008-2012</u>	
9.1.8	The report was noted. No comments.	
9.1.9	<u>Consultative Panels Compact and Estate Security</u>	
9.2.0	The report was noted. No comments.	
9.2.1	<u>Disposal of Land Managed by HFI</u>	
9.2.2	The report was noted. No comments.	
9.2.3	<u>HFI and Consultative Panel update.</u>	
9.2.4	The report was noted. No comments.	
9.2.5	<u>Decision Items at last Board and Sub-Boards</u>	
9.2.6	The report was noted. No comments.	
9.2.7	<u>Forward Plan.</u>	
9.2.8	The report was noted. No comments.	
<b>10</b>	<b>AOB</b> None.	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b> Monday 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2008 - Refreshments 7pm Meeting: 7.30pm-9pm Venue: <a href="#">Miranda TMO Community Hall Henfield Close London N19 3UL???</a>	