

 <p>h&f the low tax borough</p>	<p>London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p>CABINET</p> <p>24 JUNE 2013</p>
<p>PREVENT DELIVERY – DELEGATED AUTHORITY</p>	
<p>Report of the Leader, Councillor Nicholas Botterill, and the Cabinet Member for Residents Services, Councillor Greg Smith</p>	
<p>Open Report</p>	
<p>Classification: For Decision</p>	
<p>Key Decision: Yes</p>	
<p>Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Accountable Executive Director: Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</p>	
<p>Report Author: Rebecca Skellett, National Management Trainee, Prevent</p>	<p>Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 6250 E-mail: : rebecca.skellett@lbhf.gov.uk</p>

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report summarises the Home Office funding for the Tri-borough Prevent team across 2013/14 and requests delegated authority for the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance to sign off the Joint Home Office and Tri-borough Prevent Delivery Plan for 2013/14 - 2015/16 and associated H&F spend.
- 1.2. This recommendation follows a previous Cabinet report submission (dated 6 June 2012) where it was agreed that H&F should work with RBKC, WCC and the Home Office to develop a joint Prevent delivery plan.
- 1.3. Since the previous paper, Prevent is being delivered on a Tri-borough basis supported by a Tri-Borough Prevent Steering group which will oversee and scrutinise Prevent delivery.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1. That delegated authority be given to the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Residents Services, to sign off the use of external funding by the Home Office allocated to the borough for the Bi-borough's Prevent Programme across 2013/14 - 2015/16.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1. Home Office funding allocation provided to the Tri-borough Prevent team is to fund projects approved by the Home Secretary. The content of these projects is often based upon restricted information and existing independent engagement with the local voluntary sectors, and requires rapid 'in real time' decision making to ensure our work with the Police and Central government reflects local threats, vulnerabilities and risks.
- 3.2. This recommendation is in line with the need to protect the reputation and credibility of the Council's delivery partners.
- 3.3. Additionally, this decision will ensure that the Home Office funding is spent according to the project's terms and conditions and to ensure good reputational management.

4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 4.1. The Prevent Strategy forms part of CONTEST, the UK's Counter Terrorism Strategy. H&F is working closely with RBKC and WCC as well as the Home Office and the Metropolitan Police's SO15 (Counter Terrorism Command).
- 4.2. Implementation of the delivery plan will require some engagement and support from Council departments across the Tri-borough, particularly from Children's, Adult Social Care, HRD and ELRS. Where possible, Prevent seeks to support other Council agendas, e.g. the Family Recovery Project in White City.
- 4.3. The delivery plan is funded directly from the Office of Security and Counter Terrorism (OSCT) which is based in the Home Office.
- 4.4. H&F, RBKC and WCC are on the Government's priority list of 28 areas requiring targeted Prevent work aim to stop vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism.
- 4.5. Ring fenced funding is available to the 28 areas but with significant conditions and central monitoring
- 4.6. There are Home Office funded Prevent Coordinators in each of the 28 areas working closely with the Home Office and Special Branch. H&F and

RBKC share a joint Bi-Borough Prevent Coordinator whilst WCC has their own Prevent Coordinator.

4.7. The Bi-Borough Prevent Coordinator acts as chair of the London Prevent Network and attends the London Prevent Board as the representative of all London Prevent priority boroughs.

4.8. The Chief Executive of Westminster City Council is CELC Prevent lead, Chair of the London Prevent Board and, as chair, attends the National Prevent Oversight Board chaired by the Home Secretary.

4.9. **Overview of projects/ spend**

4.9.1. Following the December 2012 bidding round, the Minister approved 52 Prevent projects nationally all commencing in the financial year 2013/14 with a total spend of £1.9m. The Tri-borough Home Office ring fenced funding for this period accounts for 12.7% of the national Prevent project allocation.

4.9.2. It should be noted that Prevent funding is ring fenced and tightly monitored by the Home Office.

4.9.3. The Tri-borough Prevent team has increased in project capacity over the last two financial years with funding increasing by 153.6% between 2012/13 and 2013/14.

4.9.4. Where possible, we are also seeking to engage with authorities beyond the Tri-borough area with a recent project for 2013/14 recently approved in partnership with Wandsworth Borough Council.

4.9.5. Home Office Project funding across this period is summarised below;

Period	Total Home Office funding	Number of Projects
2013-14	£241,321.15	8 Tri-borough projects
2012-13	£95,146.00	5 Bi/Tri-borough projects

5. **PROPOSAL AND ISSUES**

5.1. Once the Home Secretary signs off Prevent funding and projects, LBHF receives funding in the form of grant payments from OSCT on behalf of the Home Office approximately every quarter for the duration of the project(s) spend.

5.2. As Prevent deals with some sensitive topics, the Prevent team is careful to uphold the reputation of partners, authorities and community members who all share a stake towards reducing the local threat of extremism. Characteristics we are particularly mindful of are summarised below;

5.3. Prevent work operates largely using **restricted information** from the Home Office, OSCT and from local intelligence profiles such as the

Counter Terrorism Local Profile (CTLP). It is therefore difficult to construct persuasive and accurate business cases to be presented to Cabinet and other decision making bodies when background information is classified.

- 5.4. Central to the work of Prevent is working with a **multitude of trusted partners** to foster community engagement. As a result of interaction with the Local Authority and the Prevent agenda, respective partners face reputational damage in their engagement with respective community members. It is in Prevent's best interest to ensure our partners gain maximum traction in their communities.
- 5.5. Due to the dynamic nature of Prevent work, it is critical that we are able to react and make **rapid decisions** to respond to issues in real-time.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 6.1. In order to ensure that restricted information is protected, that partners continue to be trusted and that Prevent can make quick decisions, officers recommend that delegated authority be granted to approve the use of Home Office funding across H&F.
- 6.2. Steps to ensure that well-informed partners are able to oversee and scrutinise the Tri-borough Prevent strategy have already been taken. Since the previous Cabinet Paper (June 2012), Prevent is now delivered through a Tri-borough team and supported by a Tri-Borough Prevent Steering Group which will ensure scrutiny of Prevent delivery is supplied by stakeholders best positioned to do so.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1. No consultation is required outside the departmental comments which follow.

8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. Equality implications are addressed during the pre-application, delivery and evaluation stages of a project's lifespan. The Home Office requires all projects to be monitored and assessed quarterly and bi-annually through their evaluation procedures ensuring any equality risks are mitigated.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. There are no direct legal implications for the purpose of this report.
- 9.2. Implications verified/completed by: Janette Mullins, Head of Litigation. Tel 020 8753 2744.

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. Ring-fenced grant funding of £0.241m has been made available to the tri-borough Prevent Team in 2013/14. As set in the report it is proposed that delegated authority be given to the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance, in consultation with the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Residents Services, to sign off the use of such funding. It is important that expenditure be contained within the grant made available and be properly accounted for by each Borough.
- 10.2. Implications verified/completed by: (Comments provided by Andrew Lord, Corporate Finance Ext 2531).

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1. There are no significant risks in regard to granting delegated authority to the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance. Steps to minimise risk ensure good reputational management have been taken by the Prevent team, including updating the relevant internal risk registers (corporate and project), OSCT performance evaluations, working in conjunction with relevant stakeholders (e.g. the Police) and regular reports to the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance.
- 11.2. Implications verified/completed by: (Michael Sloniowski, BiBorough Risk Manager Tel 020 8753 2587)

12. PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1. There are no procurement related implication regarding the recommendations contained within this paper
- 12.2. Implications verified/completed by: (Mark Cottis, e-Procurement Consultant, 020 8753 2757)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT**

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	The Revised Home Office Prevent Strategy	Pinakin Patel 020 8753 5727	FCS
2.	Cabinet Report Prevent Strategy Version 5.0 (6 June 2012)	Pinakin Patel 020 8753 5727	FCS