

Template to be completed by regional lead after progress discussions

Regional lead to complete following discussion with local authority project lead. Discussion can be on a visit or by phone or email. See monitoring visits spread sheet. Completed template and any supporting / additional documents provided by LA should be saved in the LA's folder.

Edited questions can be sent to LA in advance of discussion but do not send whole form.

| | |
|---|---|
| Local Authority | North London Partnership – Islington is the lead LA |
| Project Name(s) | Migrant Rough Sleepers Employment and Accommodation project |
| Name/Project Role of LA interviewee | [REDACTED] |
| Project Dates* | October 2017 - Dec 2019 |
| Period covered by report | Q4 2017/18 |
| Date of Discussion | 27/03/2018 |
| Has the project made sufficient progress to allow the next year's payment to be made as planned?* | Yes |
| If not, set out issues / concerns and actions necessary before the payment can be made. | N/A |
| Date next report due to be completed | October 2018 |
| Completed by | [REDACTED] |

Set out project's initial success criteria / milestones / expected outputs / outcomes. These are included for reference and should be checked that they are robust enough at the start of the project and record success against outputs / targets as the project develops.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1) How is the project going? What has been achieved so far? Is there any evidence of the project having a positive impact on the community / making the resident community feel that migration is well-managed?

The project is largely on track against the timelines. The first of two project officers has been recruited, and started on 8th January 18, initially employed on a six month basis. In the first 3 months (Jan.- Mar. 18), the post holder has focused on initial scoping work, including:

- Identification of cohort via existing & additional outreach
- Identification of potential employers
- Identification of low cost accommodation
- Start working with eligible clients

The recruitment of a second project officer in line with the original proposals will be assessed following a review post six-months in June 18.

[REDACTED]

The first multi-agency Strategic Steering Group consisting of borough leads and Thames Reach met in March 2018 to review the project's progress. The group agreed that the project has started well, although it was noted that the recent extreme weather conditions had affected the project in terms of rough sleeping patterns.

Early Outcomes from the Project (8th January to 22nd March 18):

- No. informed about the project and risks of continued rough sleeping: 127
- No. engaging with the programme: 4
- No. moving into legitimate employment: 2
- No. assisted to find accommodation away from rough sleeping: 3
- No. signposted to ESOL classes: 1

2) What issues has the project faced so far? Have these been overcome? If so, how? Does the project anticipate any risks to delivery over the remainder of the project? What has been done to mitigate these?

Since the Thames Reach & Commonweal commissioned 'Research into the lives of Romanian migrant workers living on encampments in London' that took place in November 2016 and January 2017 - the recommendations from which this pilot is based – there has been a significant decrease in the number and patterns of EEA people rough sleeping within the outer London boroughs, together with large scale dispersal of encampments along the North Circular Road. CHAIN statistics show that the total of CEE rough sleepers within

Enfield, Haringey and Barnet in Q2 & 3 in 2016/17 totalled at 78, whilst the comparative total for the same period in 2017/18 totalled at 47.

The recent extreme cold weather has meant that there has been a decrease in the number of encampments for the cohort who may have slept out previously and are now living in overcrowded conditions in shared rooms, often for only £25-£30 a week. Feedback received from talking about the project with the client cohort is often that they would not be willing to pay any more than this for accommodation as they wish to send as much money home to assist their families as possible. They have also reported that they can receive more money from cash-in-hand work on the black market than regularised employment.

[REDACTED]

In addition, Thames Reach have found that insecurely housed clients within the CEE cohort are recently presenting with higher support needs, particularly those struggling with long-term substance misuse, meaning they are less work ready and suitable for independent living within the private rented sector.

It has also been reported that there is a significant level of mistrust amongst the cohort identified which is preventing engagement with Thames Reach. There is a belief that engagement with outreach services could lead to their details being shared with the Home Office and deportation.

Have you managed to overcome these? If so, how?

The project officer has had to be more creative with how clients are identified – i.e. rather than just identifying for encampments, more time is being spent looking in winter shelters, contacts made with SWEPs, homeless day centres, outside big box retailers for people waiting for work.

Leaflets are currently being produced by Thames Reach in Romanian and Polish to provide more information on the project for potential clients to take away, to allow them more time to consider the help that is on offer, perhaps at a later date. Additional lower-cost accommodation options such as guardianship schemes are being investigated in order to able to provide low cost accommodation options so that people could still afford to send money home, which is reported as being their main priority. As a result of some of the actions implemented above, there are now 4 clients engaging with the project.

Discussions are already taking place around refocusing the project on to working with clients with higher support needs, who could benefit from the associated voluntary reconnection for those who would have better life chances where they are near their support network. Efforts could also go into assisting clients into ESOL, which could be the first step to assisting into regularised employment at a later date, and increase their chances of community cohesion.

3) Have there been any changes since the beginning of the project? What are the reasons for this and what impact is it expected to have on project outcomes?

See above.

4) Has there been any change to the project's expected outputs / outcomes (listed above). If yes, include the changes in the list above and explain why the changes have been made.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5) Thematic Information: information to be gathered depends on project themes. Ask LA whether they would be interested in joining up with other areas that have a similar project to share early findings / best practice.

***Rough Sleeping:** how is the LA working with ICE on enforcement activity? Have there been any issues with ICE / police being unable to commit resources to the CMF activity, which has affected delivery? Have you been able to undertake the number of raids / inspections? Any case studies you can share?*

See above – ICE no longer engaging in any meaningful way. No incentive for elective rough sleepers to find alternative accommodation. There is a possibility that the LA will be unable to meet some of the initial targets set in light of lack of engagement from ICE, as there is now less incentive for people to move out of encampments and into legitimate accommodation. The initial targets that could be potentially affected are: a) the number moving into accommodation and away from rough sleeping, and b) the number moving into legitimate employment.

6) Funding – how is spend on the project going? Are there any changes in the financial forecast from the information contained in the application to the Fund?

Following the MHCLG site visit to Thames Reach's offices on 22nd Sept. 17, and previous separate discussions with [REDACTED], the spend profile was revised to reflect the later start date for the project going live in Q4 17/18 (as opposed to Q2 17/18 as set out in our bid). Effectively this means that the project will now operate up to Dec. 19.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

7) What are the current plans for evaluation? What baseline data are you using? What existing information do you have to be able to benchmark and show impacts at the end of the project e.g resident questionnaires, existing data on complaints from

residents on ASB? What outputs and outcomes are expected from the evaluation? Are plans on track?

Plan to commission an independent reviewer to evaluate the project from June 19. The aim is to complete this evaluation at the end of the CMF funding period, with lessons learnt shared with MHCLG and relevant partners.

8) What arrangements have been made for future progress reporting? This form should be completed every three to six months, with six months being the longest period between reporting but period could be shortened depending on forthcoming project milestones. When are first results expected? Discussion should include the project's plans for completion of the impact summary template within six months of the end of the project.

Recommend further monitoring in 6 months - initial results include above.

9) Is this a project that should be treated as best practice or where consideration should be given to rolling it out regionally / nationally? If so, is there anything else we need? Can the project provide case studies of examples of early success that can be shared with us or more widely? Or is there any evidence of approaches not working? Also a valuable form of learning.

See accompanying case study – including best practice.

10) Impact Summary: Check that the interviewee is aware of the impact summary when arranging the discussion. You may also want to cover the following points:

The LA have seen the impact summary and guidance and have no queries at this point.