

# ***Greater London Provincial Council***

---

Thursday 14 October 2021: 11.30am approx. (or on the rising of the sides)

## Virtual Meeting via MS Teams

**Employers' Side:** Virtual Meeting via MS Teams 10.45am  
**Union Side:** Virtual Meeting via MS Teams 10.45am  
**Contact Officer:** Debbie Williams  
**Telephone:** 020 794 9964 **Email:** debbie.williams@londoncouncils.gov.uk

---

## Agenda item

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Listing of the membership of the GLPC as determined by Leaders Committee and Co-Secretaries of the GLPC** Attached
3. **Notes of previous meeting held on 18 May 2021 (note for information only)** Attached
4. **London Living Wage – Presentation and Summary of the Position in London** Attached  
  
**Presentation by Phoebe Devenish from Living Wage Foundation**
5. **Recap of Greater London Provincial Council and Greater London Employment Forum meeting items during last 12-15 months** Attached
6. **Local Government Pay Claim 2021** Attached
7. **Schedule of Outstanding Differences** Attached
8. **Any Other Business**
9. **Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday 17 May 2022** (Group meetings 10am and Joint Meeting 11.30am)

Helen Reynolds  
Union Side Secretary  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Congress House, Great Russell Street,  
LONDON WC1B 3LS  
Tel: 0845 3550845

**GLPC Representatives – 2021-22**

Steve Davies  
Employers' Side Secretary  
59 1/2 Southwark Street  
LONDON SE1 OAL  
Tel: 020-7934 9960

## **Borough**

| <b>Borough</b>     | <b>Rep</b>       | <b>Party</b> |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Barking & Dagenham | Sade Bright      | Lab          |
| Camden             | Daniel Beales    | Lab          |
| Croydon            | Callton Young    | Lab          |
| Enfield            | Nesil Caliskan   | Lab          |
| Greenwich          | Linda Perks      | Lab          |
| Hackney            | Carole Williams  | Lab          |
| Havering           | Robert Benham    | Con          |
| Hounslow           | Candice Atterton | Lab          |
| Hillingdon         | Douglas Mills    | Con          |
| Lewisham           | Amanda De Ryk    | Lab          |
| Sutton             | Richard Clifton  | LD           |
| Tower Hamlets      | Mayor John Biggs | Lab          |
| Waltham Forest     | Clyde Loakes     | Lab          |
| Wandsworth         | Guy Senior       | Con          |
| Westminster        | Rachel Robathan  | Con          |

## **UNISON**

Helen Reynolds (Secretary)  
Sean Fox  
Mary Lancaster  
Gloria Hanson  
Clara Mason  
Andrea Holden  
April Ashley  
Christine Lander  
Simon Steptoe

## **GMB - TBC**

Penny Robinson  
George Sharkey  
Donna Spicer  
Sonya Davis  
Vaughan West (Observer)

## **UNITE - TBC**

Gary Cummins  
Danny Hoggan  
Kath Smith  
Susan Matthews  
Jane Gosnell (Reserve)  
Onay Kasab

**GREATER LONDON PROVINCIAL COUNCIL MEETING**

The minutes of the Greater London Provincial Council Employers' Side Meeting held via MS Teams on Tuesday 18 May 2021

**PRESENT****Employers' Side**

|                       |                                  |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Cllr Alison Kelly     | London Borough of Camden         |
| Cllr Nesil Caliskan   | London Borough of Enfield        |
| Cllr Linda Perks      | Royal Borough of Greenwich       |
| Cllr Carole Williams  | London Borough of Hackney        |
| Cllr Candice Atterton | London Borough of Hounslow       |
| Cllr Amanda De Ryk    | London Borough of Lewisham       |
| Cllr Richard Clifton  | London Borough of Sutton         |
| Mayor John Biggs      | London Borough of Tower Hamlets  |
| Cllr Guy Senior       | London Borough of Wandsworth     |
| Cllr Clyde Loakes     | London Borough of Waltham Forest |
| Cllr Rachel Robathan  | City of Westminster              |

**Trade Union Side**

|                |        |
|----------------|--------|
| Helen Reynolds | UNISON |
| Gloria Hanson  | UNISON |
| April Ashley   | UNISON |
| Mary Lancaster | UNISON |
| Maggie Griffin | UNISON |
| Simon Steptoe  | UNISON |
| Donna Spicer   | UNISON |
| Clara Mason    | UNISON |
| George Sharkey | GMB    |
| Vaughan West   | GMB    |
| Sonya Davies   | GMB    |
| Donna Spicer   | GMB    |
| Gary Cummins   | Unite  |
| Neil Tasker    | Unite  |
| Henry Mott     | Unite  |

**Others in attendance**

|                 |                                     |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Steve Davies    | Employers' Side Secretary           |
| Debbie Williams | Regional Services Officer           |
| Ella Watson     | Labour Political Advisor            |
| Jade Appleton   | Conservative Political Advisor      |
| Daniel Houghton | Liberal Democrats Political Advisor |
| Julie Woods     | UNISON                              |

**Apologies for Absence**

1. Apologies were received from Cllr Danny Beales (Camden), Penny Robinson (GMB), Danny Hoggan (Unite) and Sean Fox (UNISON).

## **Local Government Pay Claims 2021 - Harry Honnor, LGA Senior Adviser**

2. Harry Honnor stated that colleagues will by now have seen that a pay offer was made on Friday 14 May by the National Employers. As a bit of background, the unions lodged their claim in mid-February 2021, following this all councils in England, Wales and Northern Ireland were consulted at pay briefings virtually during March 2021, which produced a higher attendance of members and officers than meeting in person so going forward pay briefings will be held virtually. The feedback from the 11 regional pay briefings were considered by the National Employers on 31 March 2021, who then had conversations with their political colleagues and reconvened on Friday 14 May 2021 where it was agreed to respond formally to the unions claim by making an offer of 1.5% on all pay points on the national pay spine as well as completing the ongoing Term Time Only Review on working arrangements which came to a grinding halt at the beginning of the pandemic but hoping to start conversations again fairly soon.
3. In response to non-pay elements of the unions claim the offer has been made to have discussions on agreeing a home working policy for councils, national programme of mental health support and a review of maternity/paternity arrangements within the Green Book.
4. These three items had some support from councils but the initial reason for seeking discussions is that there is little detail within the unions claim so we would like to sit down with the unions and see what they would like to review in the maternity scheme and home working support, which all councils currently have policies in place albeit in slightly different formats. If these policies are not being reviewed at present they soon will be for obvious reasons as going forward most councils are going for hybrid working.
5. The National Employers also responded to a few other elements in the unions claim with no support for a shorter working week with no loss of pay, flat rate minimum of 25 days annual leave and a nationally agreed home working allowance. Finally, the Term Time Only staff consisted of a few elements, the unions sought completion of the ongoing review, which the Employers have committed to but we have rejected job descriptions, pay banding and career paths as these elements are for local determination only.
6. The offer is on the table and our understanding is that the unions national committees are meeting in the next couple of weeks and we hope the unions will take up the proposals for discussions on the non-pay elements of the claim.
7. Mary Lancaster (UNISON) informed that UNISON's NJC are due to meet on Friday 21 May, and hopes that it will not be a surprise to the Employers that the pay offer will not be accepted. We welcome discussions around issues like term time, which we currently have endless amounts of case work which could be resolved quicker if the review had happened quicker, otherwise watch this space.
8. Gary Cummins (UNITE) stated that the initial reaction from Unite is disappointment and that an opportunity has been missed. In the last 14 months local authority workers have gone beyond what has been expected of them as well as losing members to the virus. To see our claim dismissed in such a manner is disappointing, there is no recognition of what has happened in the last 14 months, members have come the fore and served the country. The health service offer is also derisory. I am

confident to say that Unite will be rejecting the offer and would welcome the opportunity to sit down and have discussions with the Employers.

9. I myself am interested in the number of people who have come to me about the additional actual cost increase of working from home on their utility bills, which workers have had to find money for. The isolation factors as well have come from concrete cases. I am not suggesting the employer representatives here are the ones behind the drivers saying no but hopefully those here today go back and reflect on what I have said today.
10. The Chair stated that this was a National discussion to be had but through this Body it is good to look at the good practice we have learnt within authorities to support people in a working environment.
11. Vaughan West (GMB) stated that he had nothing to add to his union colleagues' views other than he tends to agree that the pay offer is likely to be rejected and will see if future talks can resolve this.

**London Local Government Finance Update – Ian Williams, Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources, Hackney and Chair of Society of London Treasurers**

12. Ian Williams highlighted the summary with the report which builds on his presentation to this Body in October 2020. Lots of developments since 2020 and the overarching figures show that boroughs are facing a London-wide funding gap of around £165m. However, much of this will not hit budgets until later years as it relates to tax losses. Not sure when and if fairer funding will happen which will also have financial consequences for London. There is uncertainty in London and across the country in estimating our financial position, with furlough finishing soon understanding how councils will pick this up financially is also a challenge.
13. The Chair stated that our biggest uncertainty is income from things like business rates, council tax reduction schemes and how many people facing unemployment will not be contributing. The one-year funding settlement brings uncertainty and pressure on our services but realise this item is on the agenda essentially as an information item.
14. Cllr Rachael Robathan (Westminster) reiterated that obviously there has been challenges over the last year but we are still remaining in a period of uncertainty so the Chair is absolutely right highlighting that we will operate with a question mark over the next few years to how we will recover.
15. The Chair stated that as London boroughs we are beating the drum very firmly, across all parties, for a decent fair funding settlement for London.
16. April Ashley (UNISON) asked when will boroughs receive the rest of the emergency funding?
17. Ian Williams responded that we have already received so many different tranches of emergency funding. We are currently compiling our returns for the first quarter which the HRMC will then verify. I am not aware of any further emergency tranches that councils will be given. There is no mention of any general grant coming to councils.
18. The Chair stated that if we all hit a crisis with people not paying business rates or council tax then we will have to go back and lobby government. A lot of uncertainty, a one-year pay settlement does not help as we do not know how much money we will

have next year. We are dependent on our collection funds around business rates and council taxes and there is a year lag on this currently.

19. Henry Mott (Unite) stated that the funding of £125 million towards domestic violence as we know is service for women nationally so assume this is not going to be received in one go. Also, have you and your colleagues demanded further funding from the government as this will have a higher impact on borough services following people working at home during the pandemic?
20. Ian responded that in terms of the items of funding through London Councils we are looking to compile evidence which will include domestic violence so we can argue the case for resources for this as well as other tranches.
21. Neil Tasker (Unite) asked about the way the funding was done, as part of the settlement, does it essentially cost more money to councils? We previously talked about reorganisations so does this form part of it?
22. Ian Williams responded that everyone from the employers' side would want to see local government get more than a one-year settlement, so we do not have to make short term decisions.
23. Neil Tasker (Unite) enquired if anyone had tried to put a cost on this?
24. Ian Williams responded that he is not aware that anyone has undertaken an exercise to see what a one-year or three-year settlement would look like. The case is always for a three-year settlement, only finding out what our finances will be a month or so before we need to respond is not helpful. We need announcements before the Christmas break, when we usually receive them.
25. Some of the rhetoric's have come to an end and from a councils point of view we face uncertainty, so the point in question is that every year we have to find £10 million savings which means we just keep snipping away at things. So, if eventually we get funding on long term care costs it could have quite a positive or negative impact on councils. There is a whole landscape of things we need to work on. If the economy picks up strongly then we will hopefully be in a better place next year.

The report was noted.

### **London Living Wage – Summary of the Position in London**

26. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary informed colleagues that we regularly give an update at these meetings on which councils are London Living Wage (LLW) employers. At present the London pay spines mean we are ahead of the LLW. We also have 23 London borough who are accredited LLW employers.
27. Mary Lancaster (UNISON) stated that this summary really needs to be a more detailed item around the LLW Foundation and what monitoring they are doing around the implementation of the accreditation. All our staff employed on the NJC pay spines we know are getting the LLW as a minimum but there are many authorities who have outsourced work in some shape or form and should have written in to their agreements when contracts are renewed that we recommend that they pay their employees the LLW. I know this is not happening in my authority, it has taken 10 years for us to get one contracted out service to pay their staff the LLW, the contract has been renewed 5 times over the 10 years and we have reported this and they are now digging.

28. We need to find out who claims to be paying the LLW and who is really paying it? Could this be something we take forward and get more detailed research done on what is or is not happening?
29. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary responded that he is happy to go back to boroughs and ask again. The basis of the accreditation is that the organisation should check that contracted out services are paying the LLW. It is my belief that the LLW Foundation has the responsibility so happy to invite them to attend a future meeting.
30. April Ashley (UNISON) stated that the unions would welcome a presentation from the LLW Foundation. For outsourced services in schools and academies payment of the LLW does not apply so would welcome a discussion on how councils are making sure contractors in schools are making sure they are paying the LLW.
31. Simon Steptoe (UNISON) stated that one group of employees who do not get the LLW are apprenticeships, there is an increasing number of councils that do pay the LLW, but some do not. All councils should be paying apprenticeships the same.
32. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary responded that there are a number of boroughs who pay the LLW but some pay the nationally set apprenticeship rate for their apprenticeships and informed colleagues that we are due to get an update report on apprenticeships at the Greater London Employment Forum (GLEF) meeting scheduled for 20 July 2021.

### **London Mayor's Good Work Standard – Summary on position across London**

33. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary informed that we had a presentation over a year ago from the GLA on the Mayor's Good Work Standard. On the back of this the unions asked for an update on which boroughs have or are applying for the Standard so have provided an update. We want to keep on top of this and get an indication of what boroughs are doing. A few boroughs were not able to take any work forward last year due to the pandemic, so it looks like in the summary that nineteen councils have not been doing too much.
34. Vaughan West (GMB) stated that it is useful to get an update, like the conversation on the LLW the issue for us is encouraging these issues with their supply chains and contractors especially when contracts come up for renewal. Boroughs should be encouraging them to seek accreditation.
35. Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden) stated that she was surprised to see that Camden are not part of the London Healthy Workplace Charter, it is intrinsically important that we should be hitting high standards.
36. The Chair responded that the fact that Camden are not accredited in this Standard does not mean that they are not a good council and that that are not already doing good work.
37. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary stated that this is not necessarily an excuse, but the Healthy Workplace Standard has been around for several years and some boroughs have moved on to other standards. Camden is an excellent authority for the Mayor's Good Work Standard and part of this is about having a good healthy

workplace, so it does not mean Camden are not doing a good piece of work on this already.

38. Cllr Alison Kelly (Camden) responded that she knows Camden are doing well but does not understand why we have not gone for the healthy workplace standard as it encourages councils to hit high standards.
39. Helen Reynolds, Staff Side Joint Secretary (UNISON) stated that she appreciates that boroughs have been dealing with more pressing things recently but would like to know who makes the decision on which boroughs reach the accreditation level? Notice on the summary that it states 'no response' from several boroughs but do we know if they applied for the standard or not achieved it? Would be useful to know. Also, when is the review process to the standard? Is it reviewed every 1-2 years?
40. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary responded we will go back to these boroughs and ask the question again. In terms of the review process I believe it is every 2-3 years.
41. Mary Lancaster (UNISON) raised that she noticed that diversity and inclusion issues are right at the bottom of the Good Work Standard and is surprised at this. Is sure that each pillar is seen equally but interested and shocked that this is on the last pillar. Also, what monitoring is going to happen in relation to this and if a London borough signs-up do they have to ensure that all their third parties and outsource services have a plan? People believe they are employed by the council, they do not necessarily understand that they work for a private organisation, as a council it is about sending out good positive messages about an employer so it is about the monitoring and commitment an authority has.
42. The Chair responded that this overlaps with Helen Reynold's point about accreditation and monitoring and asked that Steve gets clarification for a future meeting.
43. Gary Cummins (Unite) stated that he has been working in local government long enough to remember the introduction of Investors in People (IiP) and the workforce boroughs said they were investing in did not see any of this investment. Why standards may offer some reassurance to elected members that they are achieving something inside the workplace walls, they are not achieving in terms of the workforce so concerned this is happening again with the Healthy Workplace Charter. I do not think there has ever been any interactional discussions with team workers or the trade unions, so HR need to chase and check that these things are being delivered. The trade unions would like information provided on how these awards are being delivered, who gives the awards and when checks are made.
44. The Chair responded that for IiP there should be interviews with employee representatives as well as looking at policies and generic work so this is something, we should be anxious about if it is not happening.
45. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary stated that he takes on board the points the unions have raised. From an HR perspective just because they might find it difficult to apply some of these standards to the outsourced services does not mean that they should not look to get some recognition to the standards they apply to their own workforce, which I think is the approach they have taken. They would not want to hold off until they get outsourced services onboard.



## **London Healthy Workplace Charter – Summary of position across London**

- 46. Steve Davies, Employers Side Joint Secretary highlighted the summary had been provided on a request from the unions on what boroughs were doing on the London Healthy Workplace Charter.
- 47. It was noted that the London Boroughs of Richmond and Wandsworth are at Excellence Level not Achievement.

## **Schedule of Outstanding Differences**

- 48. It was noted that there are no outstanding differences.
- 49. April Ashley (UNISON) informed that there might be something in the pipeline and the Joint Secretaries had been made aware of this.

## **Any Other Business**

There was no further business.

## **Meeting concluded at 15:20pm**

## **Date of Next Meeting**

Thursday 14 October 2021  
Group meetings: 10am  
Employers' Side: 10.45am  
Joint meeting: 11.30am

## Greater London Provincial Council

### London Living Wage Summary

Item: 4

**Report by:** Steve Davies      **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers' Organisation

**Date:** 14 October 2021

**Contact Officer:** Steve Davies

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9964      **Email** [debbie.williams@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:debbie.williams@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

**Purpose:** To provide GLPC members with information on London Living Wage pay arrangements within London boroughs

#### Summary

All London boroughs including the City of London currently pay directly employed staff the minimum of the London Living Wage (LLW). Twenty three (23) boroughs including the City of London are accredited as Living Wage Employers.

The table in Annex A provides more detail about London boroughs commitments to applying the London Living Wage principles to their contractors and supply chain.

#### Introduction/ Background

1. The London Living Wage (LLW) is an hourly rate of pay, currently set at **£10.85 (2021)**. The rates are calculated annually by the Resolution Foundation and overseen by the Living Wage Commission, based on the best available evidence about living standards in London and the UK. The calculation reflects the high cost of living in the capital, giving a worker in London and their family enough to afford the essentials and to save.
2. Organisations must choose to pay their employees the London Living Wage – which is a higher pay rate than that they're required to pay by law.

3. To become an accredited Living Wage employer an organisation must confirm that they pay all of their directly employed staff the real Living Wage and have a plan in place for contracted staff. This applies to all staff over the age of 18 that work regularly on the organisations premises, including directly employed staff, contracted staff and subcontracted staff. If an employer is mid contract they may not be able to break the contract and implement the Living Wage. For those employers who require a plan for contracted staff the Living Wage Foundation offer a Phased Implementation approach.
4. The accreditation is confirmed by a signed licence between the Living Wage Foundation and the Employer. By signing the licence the employer agrees to ensure all relevant staff earn the real Living Wage. The Living Wage Foundation licences the employer to use the Living Wage Employer Mark. The licence is a legally binding document.
5. Living Wage Employers are encouraged to send out a communication to everyone they do business with letting them know they have committed to ensure all staff earn a real Living Wage and encourage them to consider doing the same. Accreditation does not require the supply chain to pay the Living Wage, unless they are regularly delivering service on your premises.

### **London boroughs**

6. Outlined on the attached table – Annex A - is a listing of London boroughs and identification of those paying the London Living Wage to directly employed staff and those accredited Living Wage employers committed to paying the London Living Wage to their contracted and sub contracted staff.
7. All 32 London boroughs and the City of London currently pay their directly employed staff the minimum of the London Living Wage (LLW). Twenty three (23) boroughs including the City of London are accredited as Living Wage Employers.

Annex A - listing of London boroughs paying the London Living Wage (LLW) to their staff and identification of arrangements in their contract/  
supply chain to pay the London Living Wage

| <b>Borough</b>     | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b>                 | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b> | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b>  |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Barking & Dagenham | Yes   | No                             | This is managed on a case by case basis.  | 1 contract for the supply of temporary/interim staff. This is a high value contract c£12-£14m per annum and therefore directly affects the pay levels of contract staff. Additional contracts are mandated in Children's services.      |
| Barnet             | Yes   | No                             | Yes.  | LLW is part of the standard tendering terms used in the majority of Barnet contracts. This includes the contractual framework for the provision of temporary staff, for whom rates have to match Council pay as per Agency Worker Regs. |
| Bexley             | Considered and will not be taking any action at this stage. | No                             | No  | None  |
| Brent              | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes   | Unknown   |
| Bromley            | Considered and will not be taking any action at this stage. | No                             | We don't specify what they should pay.  | None  |

| <b>Borough</b> | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b> | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b>  | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b>  |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Camden         | Yes   | Yes                            | The council considers the payment of the London Living Wage on a case by case basis to ensure that it can be justified on best value grounds. Where the payment of the London Living Wage is considered as providing overall better value to the Council specific terms and conditions on the London Living Wage are included in the contract.         | 344 contracts have been awarded inclusive of the London Living Wage since the commencement of the council's policy in July 2012.                              |
| Croydon        | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes, all Contracts Awarded in/after 2014 specify that providers must pay the London Living Wage.   | We have awarded over 200 contracts which specify paying the London Living Wage (this figure is based on the CCB reference numbers allocated to award reports) |
| Ealing         | Yes   | Yes                            | Dependent on the procurement. The Corporate Commitments "For all relevant procurements we will continue to request information on how the contractor will adhere to the LLW standard and share best practice to support delivery." All contracts with the value of £500k and above will be will discussed at a Joint Contracts Board which covers LLW. | Out of the contracts required to pay LLW - 272 currently do so.   |

| <b>Borough</b>       | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b> | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b>  | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b> |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Enfield              | Yes   | Yes                            | <p>To date where appropriate. In the future new contracts will have the following clauses;</p> <p>Precedent Short Form Contract for Services<br/> 4.5 The Supplier shall ensure that all Supplier Personnel are remunerated at an hourly rate of pay equal to or exceeding the current London Living Wage for the duration of their engagement in the delivery of the Services.</p> <p>Precedent Long Form Contract for Services<br/> 5.5 The Supplier shall ensure that all Supplier Personnel are remunerated at an hourly rate of pay equal to or exceeding the current London Living Wage for the duration of their engagement in the delivery of the Services.</p> <p>5.6 The Supplier shall implement any updated London Living Wage on or before 1st April in the year following notification of such updated London Living Wage.</p> <p>5.7 The Supplier shall ensure that any Sub-Contracts contain the equivalent provisions of clauses 5.5 and 5.6 and the equivalent definition of the London Living Wage as is in clause 1 (Definitions and Interpretation) of this Contract.</p> | This data is not available.  |
| Greenwich            | Yes   | Yes                            |  | We have 14 Childrens Services contracts where we pay LLW.  |
| Hackney              | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes  |  |
| Hammersmith & Fulham | Yes   | Yes                            |  |  |
| Haringey             | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes for all contracts above £50k and relevant contracts below £50k   | We do not record this information, but estimate 3,500 have a requirement to pay LLW                |
| Harrow               | Yes   | No                             |  |  |

| <b>Borough</b>       | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b>   | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b>  | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b>                         |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Havering             | Apply LLW allowance to ensure hourly basic pay is equal to the prevailing hourly LLW rate | No                             | No   | Only aware of one – managed service provider - Adecco contract   |
| Hillingdon           | Yes   | No                             |  |  |
| Hounslow             | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes, where the contract will employ staff to utilise the majority of their time for the London Borough of Hounslow   | Most contracts do not meet the requirement to specify it. At least 20 contain this clause.                                 |
| Islington            | Yes   | Yes                            | As a matter of policy, the London Living Wage must be considered on all contracts where the Citizen's UK accreditation criteria for contracts apply. LLW consideration is encouraged on all contracts, regardless of value. It is mandatory in our Rules that LLW be considered on all contracts with a spend of £5,000 or more whole life value. Where applicable, LLW is incorporated as a contract condition. | LLW is adopted on all relevant contracts insofar as this is permitted by law – this was approximately 98% upon last audit. |
| Kensington & Chelsea | Yes   | Yes                            | The Council requires providers to pay LLW for staff utilised fully to RBKC   | The Council requires all new contractors and re-let contracts to pay LLW   |
| Kingston/Sutton      | Yes   | Yes                            |  |  |

| <b>Borough</b> | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b> | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b>  | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b> |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Lambeth        | Yes   | Yes                            | Tender method statements need to identify that Lambeth are a Living Wage accredited organisation and that tenderers are encouraged to pay their staff the Living Wage. An Evaluation question will be included and scored (and weighted) based on the response received  | Currently have 303 contracts where LW is required.   |
| Lewisham       | Yes   | Yes                            | <p>The Council is in the process of updating its contracts register which will include information regarding payment of the LLW but we do not currently have this.</p> <p>However, the Council requests, in all its procurements, that bidders price the contract including and excluding the LLW. The Council must do this to comply with legal requirements to achieve Best Value under the Local Government Act 1999. The decision to award a contract based on LLW or not is made by the authorised decision maker. Since the Council has become a LLW employer and where there is an option between including or excluding the LLW the Council has awarded contracts on the basis of LLW.</p> |  |



| Borough             | LLW Payer to directly employed staff | Accredited LLW Employer | 1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?  | 2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Merton              | Yes                                  | No                      | <p>As a general rule, the London Borough of Merton does not specify that contractors must pay the LLW, only the statutory NLW and NMW.</p> <p>As things currently stand, it is not our intention to change this.</p> <p>There are however the odd exceptions, such as our contract via the SLWP for waste management and grounds maintenance.</p> |  |
| Newham              | Yes                                  | Yes                     | No  | Only aware of one – managed service provider - Adecco contract   |
| Redbridge           | Yes                                  | Yes                     | LBR are committed to paying the London Living Wage. This is reviewed on an annual basis in line with the Pay Policy statement.  | Procurement will be responding separately in regards contracts.  |
| Richmond/Wandsworth | Yes                                  | Yes                     | No  | Nil  |
| Southwark           | Yes                                  | Yes                     | Yes, since 2012. There is a presumption that the London Living Wage will apply to all new contracts for the provision of services or works, which are to be performed either on council premises, or in the Greater London area subject to Best Value considerations  | We do not currently hold the data in a format that would allow us to report on this  |
| Sutton              | Yes                                  | No                      |   |  |
| Tower Hamlets       | Yes                                  | Yes                     | YES, since 2013 all contracts have a clause in the T&C that require the payment of the LLW  | Currently 96% of our contracts include LLW 423 contracts   |
| Waltham Forest      | Yes                                  | Yes                     | Yes, when a contract is retendered it is a requirement that we specify London Living Wage where it meets the criteria set out by the Living Wage Foundation.  | It is not possible to give an accurate answer as this is a relatively new requirement for the council and some 'old' contracts may have already been paid above London Living Wage anyway. |

| <b>Borough</b> | <b>LLW Payer to directly employed staff</b> | <b>Accredited LLW Employer</b> | <b>1. Do you specify in Procurement contracts that providers must pay the London Living Wage?</b>  | <b>2. Approximately how many contracts do you have that specify paying the London Living Wage?</b>                                    |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Westminster    | Yes   | Yes                            | 09/21 - Yes, If a contract is in scope of the Living Wage Foundation threshold, the successful bidder will be required to comply with WCC Living wage policy and must contractually commit to this.  | 09/21 - We currently have 113 'Live' contracts in scope of London Living Wage where the Supplier are contractually committed to this. |
| City of London | Yes   | Yes                            | Yes, for those contracts which are relevant for payment of Living Wage in accordance with the terms set out in our Living Wage Accreditation license. That is, those contracts where contractor's staff will be a providing a service to the City on our premises which involves two or more hours of work in any given day in a week, for eight or more consecutive weeks in a year for contracts valued at £100,000 or above, our standard tender documentation states that it is the intention of the Authority not to contract any supplier who does not comply with the Living Wage Policy and Living Wage will form part of the evaluation criteria. If the bid information discloses that the bid does not allow for the tenderer's employees to be paid wage rates which meet or exceed the current published Living Wage rates, the bid will be disqualified. | Approximately 36 contracts plus all non-residential care/supported living contracts are compliant with the City's Living Wage policy. |



## Greater London Provincial Council

### Recap of Greater London Provincial Council and Greater London Employment Forum meetings during the last 12-15 months

Item: 5

**Report by:** Steve Davies      **Job title:** Head of London Regional Employers' Organisation

**Date:** 14 October 2021

**Contact Officer:** Steve Davies

**Telephone:** 020 7934 9964      **Email** [Steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk)

**Purpose:** To provide a summary report of the items that have been considered and discussed at Greater London Provincial Council and Greater London Employment Forum meetings during last 12-15 months.

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Summarised below is a listing of the issues/ items that have been discussed at this committee and the Greater London Employment Forum during the last twelve to fifteen months. It provides a useful reminder of the range of subject matters and issues that the London borough employer and union forum discuss during a committee cycle.

#### 2. Table of Items Discussed

- 2.1 Summary of items discussed. Note - due to the Coronavirus impact and response work in the early months of the pandemic, March to June 2020 a couple of the committee meetings were cancelled.

| Item reported                            | Summary of item discussed  |
|--|--|
| Collective Resilience Arrangements - How | The short report identified the actions and activities that the HR community undertook in the first 6 months of the Covid 19 |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| London boroughs supported the workforce during first 6 months of the Covid 19 pandemic from the end of March 2020 | pandemic to support our workforce, including deployment agreements with the unions to redeploy staff into needed support roles; guidance on resilience and wellbeing support for the workforce; the sharing of model template risk assessments, including service-based assessments as well as individual assessments for those in high risk groups.   |
| London Local Government Finance update  | <p>Information taken from Executive and Leaders Committee reports outlining the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic response on council budgets.</p> <p>The April 2021 MHCLG financial impact survey showed the overall impact across London boroughs in 2020-21 was estimated to be to £2.1 billion, with an estimated £1.1 billion in additional spending and £1 billion in lost income.</p> <p>Taking into account £1.9bn of funding and compensation received by London boroughs, it was estimated the London-wide funding gap would be around £165m.</p> |
| Mayors' Good Work Standard  | Information about the standard which aims to promote best employment practices amongst employers across London. The standard is broken down into four elements - Fair pay and conditions; Workplace wellbeing; Skills and progression; Diversity and recruitment. The report identified which London boroughs have achieved the standard and which ones are applying for it.   |
| London Healthy Workplace Award  | Report about the accreditation scheme led by the Mayor of London's Office and supported by Public Health England. It acts as a template for good practice and recognises London employers who invest in their employee's health and wellbeing. The report identified which London boroughs have achieved the award and which ones are applying for it.   |
| Apprenticeships update  | Apprenticeships information for the 2020-21 financial year. Data includes apprenticeship starts, completions, progression from apprenticeships and apprenticeship levy spend, as well as information on age, ethnicity, disability and level of apprenticeship.  |
| GMB Domestic Abuse Charter  | Presentation from GMB union on their charter designed to help organisations provide support to workers experiencing domestic abuse.  |
| London Pensions Collective Investment Vehicle (CIV)   | Information report providing an update on the performance and workforce arrangements in the London CIV.  |
| Restriction on Public Sector Exit Pay, the £95K exit Cap  | Information report about the position that boroughs are taking in relation to staff whose exit payments might be above the Cap until such time as the MHCLG consultation on changing the pension scheme is concluded. (Note, the government notified revocation of the regulations on 12 February 2021)  |
| Local Government and NHS Employment   | This reports the launch of an Employment Service Passport agreement for use between employers in the NHS and local   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Service Passport  | government to recognise accrued service for individuals that get jobs in each other's sector. Joint secretary advice has been developed and issued to London boroughs at the beginning of June 2021 and incorporated into the London Agreement. We will monitor uptake by individual London boroughs and report to GLEF or GPLC on a regular basis (at least once a year). |
| Pan London Tackling Racial Inequality Programme             | Information on the race equality initiatives that are being undertaken in boroughs across London to reduce inequality within the boroughs.   |
| Local Government Pay Claim 2021                             | Report on the unions pay claim for 2021  |
| Workplace support for Parents with premature or sick babies | Information report on the level of support and guidance that London boroughs are providing to parents with premature or sick babies in neonatal care.  |
| London Living Wage  | Summary of which London boroughs pay the London Living Wage and which are accredited as London Living Wage employers.  |

## Greater London Provincial Council

### Local Government Pay Claim 2021

Item: 6

|                         |                 |                   |  |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| <b>Report by:</b>       | Steve Davies    | <b>Job title:</b> | Head of London Regional Employers' Organisation  |
| <b>Date:</b>            | 14 October 2021 |                   |  |
| <b>Contact Officer:</b> | Steve Davies    |                   |  |
| <b>Telephone:</b>       | 020 7934 9964   | <b>Email</b>      | <a href="mailto:Steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk">Steve.davies@londoncouncils.gov.uk</a> |

**Purpose:** To report the latest position on the local government pay claims for 2021.

#### 1. Summary of the current position

1.1 On the 27 July the National Employers submitted an increased final pay offer as follows:

- **With effect from 1 April 2021, an increase of 2.75 per cent on NJC pay point 1**
- **With effect from 1 April 2021, an increase of 1.75 per cent on all NJC pay points 2 and above**
- **Completion of the outstanding work of the joint Term-Time Only review group**

1.2 The employers also considered the proposals on the three non-pay elements of their initial offer and hope joint discussions can begin on the basis of the following:

- Development of guidance on home working.
- Development of guidance of mental health support for all local authorities and school staff
- A joint review of the provisions in the Green Book for maternity / paternity / shared parental / adoption leave – the employers want to wait and see what the government proposals are on these provisions following its consultation in 2019 on these issues and plan to incorporate new statutory neo-natal leave and pay provisions into the Green Book.

- 1.3 The three local government unions (UNISON, GMB and Unite) swiftly rejected the final offer and confirmed that they will be conducting consultation ballots with their union members on the National Employers' final pay offer (incl the Craft final offer) which will run through to late Sep / early Oct. All three unions will be recommending that the pay offer[s] be rejected.
- 1.4 It is hoped that a verbal update to the meeting can be provided, assuming the union consultation ballot has run its course and the unions have formally notified the employers' side of the outcome.

## **2. Background Information**

- 2.1 The Trade Union Side lodged its pay claim on 15 February 2021. The claim seeks:
- A substantial increase with a minimum of 10% on all spinal column points
  - Introduction of a homeworking allowance for all staff who are working from home
  - A national minimum agreement on homeworking policies for all councils
  - A reduction of the working week to 35 hours with no loss of pay, and a reduction to 34 hours a week in London. Part-time staff to be given a choice of a pro rata reduction, or retaining the same hours and being paid a higher percentage of FTE
  - A minimum of 25 days annual leave, plus public holidays and statutory days, for all starting employees, plus an extra day holiday on all other holiday rates that depend on service
  - An agreement on a best practice national programme of mental health support for all local authorities and school staff
  - A joint review of job descriptions, routes for career developments and pay banding for school support staff, and completion of the outstanding work of the joint term-time only review group
  - A joint review of the provisions in the Green Book for maternity/paternity /shared parental/adoption leave
- 2.2 The National Employers' met on 18 February and agreed that they would not be in a position to respond to the unions' claim until after the elections on 6 May.
- 2.3 The National Employers met on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> May. They reached a decision to offer 1.5% across the board. They also rejected some aspects of the union's claim relating to a home working allowance, as well as no reduction to the hours of the working week and no increase to the minimum annual leave entitlement to 25 days.
- 2.4 The minimum annual leave entitlement in the National Agreement (Green Book) is currently 22 days plus 2 extra statutory days.
- 2.5 UNISON, GMB and Unite informed the Employers on Friday 21 May 2021 that the offer was not acceptable and asked the National Employers give consideration to making an improved offer.



- 2.6 The National Employers subsequently met and made their final offer on 27 July 2021.

### **3. Other Negotiating Groups**

#### **3.1 Chief Executives and Chief Officers**

- 3.2 The Chief Executives' lodged its pay claim for 2021 on 8 March. The claim seeks: "...a pay increase for all chief executives in April 2021 and subsequent years that is the same as the generality of local government staff. We have noted that the employers do not intend to make an offer in respect of staff covered by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services until after the elections on 6 May... We look forward to receiving the Employers' offer. If it is consistent with the claim set out above, it will not be necessary to convene a meeting of the Joint Negotiating Committee"
- 3.3 The JNC for Chief Officers lodged a claim on 31 March for 2021. They noted the claim for a substantial increase with a minimum of 10% on all spinal column points made by the Staff Side of the NJC for Local Government Services and expect parity of treatment for all local government employees.
- 3.4 The National Employers made a final offer on 27 July to both the chief officer and chief executive union sides of a pay increase of 1.5%.
- 3.5 The chief executives' union responded soon after the final offer to say that they were disappointed that equality of treatment with the generality of local government staff was not proposed, and they sought further explanation from the employers.

## **Greater London Provincial Council**

**14 October 2021**

**Item 7**

**List of differences and disputes as at October 2021**

**Outstanding cases**

**There are currently no outstanding differences and/or dispute cases.**

\*\*\*\*\*

There are currently no outstanding job evaluation appeals.