

**Regeneration, Competitiveness and
Sustainable Development**

April 2004

Economic and Social Development

LONDON
ASSEMBLY
Economic and Social
Development
ECONOMICS

Regeneration, Competitiveness and Sustainable Development

April 2004

copyright

**Greater London Authority
April 2004**

Published by

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

enquiries **020 7983 4000**

minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN 1 85261 640 4

This document is printed on recycled paper

Chair's foreword



These days everyone talks the language of partnership and of the need to involve the private sector in tackling a wide range of public policy issues. The problem is the terms of engagement are often unclear, with public and private sector using different terminology and sometimes not understanding each other's fundamental objectives.

Some in the public sector see the role of business as helping to fund pre-determined priorities, but not in helping to agree those priorities within a jointly developed strategy and set of objectives. After all, we are democratically elected, they say.

Meanwhile some in the private sector are reluctant to get directly involved in wider economic and social development, happy to comment but not to go beyond activity that serves their immediate direct interest. We are for-profit entities, they say, and we pay enough taxes already.

The question underlying this scrutiny is to understand better the potential for public and private sectors working more closely together, going beyond consultation or end delivery. Many of the new regional strategies developed by the GLA over the last four years require active private sector participation at all stages if they are to be realised. At the same time, some private firms, especially the large ones, are the talking the language of corporate social responsibility and seeing the benefits of getting involved in a range of activities, many more local than regional as yet.

This scrutiny study seeks to find ways to close the gap in our regional economic and social development between need for involvement and the willingness to get involved – by explaining the concepts and potential, and by recommending practical mechanisms. Along the way, it makes the point that the public sector itself has some lessons to learn from private firms about managing its own mainstream operations in a way that will maximise the regenerative gains for London.

I am grateful for the very considerable participation in the work of this scrutiny over the last year by a broad range of interested parties from outside the GLA, and for colleagues on the Committee and in the Secretariat for supporting the process. Cross-sector working takes us out of the 'comfort zone' of our own organisations and perspectives, but the potential rewards are large. I hope this report contributes to that goal. Please let us know what you think.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Tuffrey', with a horizontal line underneath.

Mike Tuffrey
Chair of the Economic and Social Development Committee

The Economic and Social Development Committee

Membership

The Economic and Social Development Committee was established by the London Assembly on 10 April 2002. The membership of the Committee, agreed in May 2003, is:

Mike Tuffrey (Chair) – Liberal Democrat

Eric Ollerenshaw (Deputy Chair) – Conservative

Angie Bray – Conservative

Jennette Arnold – Labour

Nicky Gavron – Labour

Darren Johnson – Green

Terms of reference

The Committee's terms of reference are to examine and report on social and economic development matters of importance to Londoners and the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor as they relate to social and economic development issues, the London Development Agency and other Functional Bodies where appropriate. The Economic and Social Development Committee is particularly required to examine and report to the Assembly on the implementation and revision of the Economic Development Strategy.

Assembly Secretariat contacts:

Carmen Jack, Scrutiny Manager

carmen.jack@london.gov.uk

020 7983 6542

Katy Shaw, Committee Co-ordinator

katy.shaw@london.gov.uk

020 7983 4416

Denise Malcolm, Press Office

denise.malcolm@london.gov.uk

020 7983 4049

Table of contents

	page
Chair's Foreword	1
The Economic and Spatial Development Committee	2
Executive Summary	4
Chapter 1 Introduction	6
Chapter 2 The challenges	9
Chapter 3 The potential benefits	15
Chapter 4 Looking forward, and recommendations	19
Appendix 1 Notes of the round table discussion and delegates attending	24
Appendix 2 Workshop sessions and attendees	29
Appendix 3 Principles of Assembly scrutiny	32
Appendix 4 Orders and translations	33

Executive Summary

Private sector companies and some public sector agencies are increasingly adopting socially responsible business practices. The government, through the Department of Trade and Industry's Corporate Social Responsibility Unit, has been driving forward the agenda at a national level. In March 2001 the Unit published its first report – *Developing Corporate Social Responsibility in the UK* – which outlined the growing importance of corporate social responsibility, the government's involvement nationally and internationally, and the key areas where it intended to aid development including promoting good practice and joining up practice across government. The report was updated in May 2002.

In London the various regional strategies prepared by the Mayor, for example the Economic Development Strategy, the Energy Strategy and the Waste Strategy, seek to involve the private sector in achieving their goals. GLA functional bodies also work with the private sector. The London Development Agency for example has nationally as well as regionally determined responsibilities to enhance competitiveness, again dependent on the involvement of the private sector.

The terms '*organisational civic-mindedness*' and '*responsible competitiveness*' are used in this report to capture the essence of what our study set out to do – to examine how the private sector and (to a lesser extent) the public sector can directly contribute to London's long-term economic and social development through the way they run their mainstream operations.

Organisational civic-mindedness has the potential to generate significant benefits for London, particularly in areas such as education, developing skills and employability, promoting local economic development and enterprise through fostering smaller businesses (including black and minority ethnic businesses), tackling deprivation and social exclusion, conserving and enhancing the environment, and encouraging and supporting voluntary activity including by employees. There are already numerous initiatives addressing these issues, but most of them are relatively small-scale, local and limited in impact.

What is missing is the London-wide dimension. There are few genuinely pan-London initiatives, and even those that do exist tend to be schemes which are available for take-up right across London, but which in practice are concentrated in specific areas of need within it. At the same time, the growing body of London-wide policy initiatives, notably Mayoral strategies, have yet to harness the private sector in a systematic way and so realise the full potential of *organisational civic mindedness*.

This report seeks to capture the main points of the research undertaken over a period 15 months from January 2003 to March 2004. It considers the challenges for London and the untapped potential for the public and private sectors to directly contribute to London's long-term economic and social development needs through their mainstream operations. It makes practical recommendations on the potential role for the Mayor/GLA in enhancing the value of *organisational civic-mindedness* for London through exhortation and encouragement.

The report's recommendations identify five principal areas of activity that the GLA family/Mayor could undertake:

- leading by example
- defining an overall strategic framework
- promoting the concept of *organisational civic-mindedness*
- facilitation and guidance
- extending the impact

The report also identifies practical ways in which the Mayor/GLA can:

- engage the private sector more fully at a regional level
- better identify the correlation between the various GLA strategies so as to present a coherent picture of what input is required by its public and private sector partners
- leverage existing practice, networks and institutions in order to determine effective ways to deliver the regional strategies, especially through sector level initiatives
- monitor and report progress through a regular report on London's responsible competitiveness and a city-level index that could be benchmarked against other comparable cities.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The London Assembly's Economic and Social Development Committee (the Committee) is responsible for examining matters of importance to Greater London, particularly as they relate to economic development/wealth creation and social development in London.
- 1.2 In recent years it has been a nearly unanimous view among those involved in public policy and administration that the private sector has a crucial role to play in achieving economic, social and environmental goals. At the same time, many of those who run companies are willing to 'get involved' and prepared to play a wider role – overtly and formally in the large ones, more informally in the small ones. Such corporate social responsibility ranges from helping in local schools through volunteer reading schemes or work experience, to reducing environmental impacts and trying to eliminate child working and improve labour standards in extended supply chains overseas.
- 1.3 Arising from an initial discussion among interested parties (see Appendix 1), it became apparent that the creation of the new regional tier of government had created a 'gap' between these company practitioners in London and regional policy makers in the Greater London Authority (GLA) family.¹ The Committee wanted to explore the extent of the gap, the missed opportunities it represented and how it could be closed.

The scrutiny focus

- 1.4 The overall aims of the scrutiny were:
- To map the extent of private sector engagement in London's regeneration, through engagement in initiatives and through its own operations; and to identify and recommend ways to improve its impact.
 - To scope the potential for the public sector's mainstream operations to have more deliberate and strategic impact on economic and social regeneration in London.
 - To examine the extent to which the core Greater London Authority and functional bodies are considering the economic, social and environmental impacts of their own organisational activities and implementing CSR strategies.

The scrutiny process

- 1.5 The process adopted for this scrutiny went beyond the conventional route of formally inviting witnesses to make presentations to the Committee and answer questions in a public forum. A variety of other methods were used, including a survey, interviews, research and analysis, a discussion forum and several workshops (see Appendix 2). More than one hundred individuals and organisations were involved in the consultation.

¹ The GLA family comprises the GLA and the four functional bodies – London Development Agency, Metropolitan Police Authority, London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and Transport for London.

- 1.6 The scrutiny was conducted in three main phases. The initial scoping phase consisted of desk-based research culminating in a round table discussion with representatives from the public and private sectors, research and think-tank organisations. The key aim of the discussion held on 16 January 2003 was to identify the main issues and use these as a means of focusing our further study of the topic.
- 1.7 The second phase was a research-based project mapping current activity in both the public and private sectors in London and sharing lessons learned through two workshop sessions. The objectives for this phase of work were to:
- Research and map current activity, in both private and public sectors, and to develop a 'typology' to help in understanding its range and scope.
 - Identify the 'drivers' leading organisations to undertake such activity and principles of current good practice, together with case study examples.
 - Explore the scope for enhancing the level and impact of activity, and to make recommendations for the GLA 'family' to promote it.
- 1.8 The work was carried out by ProbusBNW, over a period of four months during April to July 2003. Two workshop sessions were held on 18 and 25 June, with delegates from a range of groups and bodies within the public and private sectors, including business-led bodies/partnerships, commercial organisations, funding/finance providers, voluntary organisations and government bodies. The Committee has received a 60-page report presenting the findings of this phase of the scrutiny.
- 1.9 The final phase of work, which concluded in March 2004, concentrated on presenting an overarching model of how key public and private sector stakeholders can take lessons learned from current local and sub-regional activity to develop an integrated regional approach which contributes to the long-term economic and social development of London. The Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability (AccountAbility) led on the final phase and presented interim findings to a workshop on 7 November 2003. The Committee has received a 70-page report presenting the findings of this phase of the scrutiny.

Context of the scrutiny

- 1.10 Private sector companies and some public sector agencies are increasingly adopting socially responsible business practices. The government, through the Department of Trade and Industry's Corporate Social Responsibility Unit, has been driving forward the agenda at a national level. In March 2001 the Unit published its first report – *Developing Corporate Social Responsibility in the UK* – which outlined the growing importance of corporate social responsibility, the government's involvement nationally and internationally and the key areas it intended to aid development including promoting good practice and joining up practice across government. The report was updated in May 2002.
- 1.11 The regional strategies prepared by the Mayor, for example the Economic Development Strategy, Energy Strategy and Waste Strategy, seek to involve the private sector. The London Development Agency (LDA) has nationally as well as regionally determined responsibilities to enhance competitiveness, again dependent on the involvement of the private sector.

Report contents

- 1.12 This report seeks to capture the main points of the research undertaken, focusing on the untapped potential for the public and private sectors to directly contribute to London's long-term economic and social development needs through their mainstream operations. In Chapter 2, we consider the challenges. In Chapter 3 we look at the potential benefits and examine what is happening elsewhere in the UK. Finally, in Chapter 4 we present our concluding thoughts and recommendations.
- 1.13 This report can only present a summary of the findings from the externally undertaken research. The detailed results of the research work undertaken by ProbusBNW and AccountAbility are available as separate reports, including their analysis, case study descriptions, the full recommendations made to the Committee and the listing of people and organisations interviewed.

2 The Challenges

Defining the scrutiny topic

- 2.1 The first challenge is in understanding exactly what we are driving at in framing the scrutiny topic; our research has shown that there is no single recognised phrase to describe it.²
- 2.2 The term corporate social responsibility (CSR) is increasingly used as a 'catch-all' phrase to define the activities that a business or organisation might engage in to achieve a sustained impact on the economic and social well-being of the immediate community it operates in, and sometimes further afield. But as the research carried out by ProbusBNW noted, CSR relates principally to the private sector. And even within that sector, a number of companies prefer other terms such as 'corporate responsibility', 'corporate citizenship' or 'corporate engagement'. Others view CSR as a component of the broader term of 'sustainable development' (which is also confusingly used by some interchangeably with or referring mainly to environmental aspects).
- 2.3 Among phrases used within London are 'putting something back into the community' or 'doing well by doing good' or 'a win-win approach' (benefiting both the organisation itself and the wider community). None of these terms has been much used of the public sector, reflecting doubts as to whether the concepts to which they relate apply in that sector.
- 2.4 ProbusBNW devised the term *organisational civic-mindedness* which they suggest encompasses the broad theme of CSR as applied to the private sector, and covers the range of activities in which the public sector could get involved in. The term can therefore be applied to activities ranging from corporate community involvement or charitable contributions, to recruitment and employment policies, product and service marketing and general business interaction.
- 2.5 In the second element of this study, namely the potential for a coherent and co-ordinated approach at a regional level, AccountAbility used the term *responsible competitiveness* to encapsulate the potential of these issues especially for the economic health of London. It found that corporate social responsibility has a direct relevance for economic and social development.
- 2.6 In reaching our conclusions, we have not sought to adopt a single defining term, whether corporate social responsibility or any other phrase, still less recommend one to others. This report therefore uses the key terms interchangeably. However it would be fair to say that *organisational civic-mindedness* as a contributor to *responsible competitiveness* at a regional level does capture the essence of the scope of this study - to examine how the public and private sectors can directly contribute to London's long-term economic and social development needs through their mainstream operations.

² Page 8 - ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

Maintaining London's competitiveness

- 2.7 In our recent scrutiny session on inward investment³ we received evidence of London's unique selling points and of its prominent role in the British and European economies. This point is reiterated by AccountAbility who confirmed that over the coming decades London will experience increasing tensions arising from the need to balance social justice, environmental sustainability and economic competitiveness.⁴ It is a point also picked up by the Mayor in his draft revised Economic Development Strategy where he says, "The challenges London faces are large-scale and complicated, demanding investment going well beyond the resources available to city government alone".⁵
- 2.8 The risk for government, business and civil society, in seeking to fulfil London's growth objectives, is that damaging side effects will arise in social or environmental areas. Failure to handle the sometimes conflicting pressures of economic, social and environmental development effectively will result in the long-run in declining competitiveness.

The geographical challenge

- 2.9 The research shows that the sheer size and diversity of London makes it a complex environment in which to make an impact through *organisational civic-mindedness*.⁶ Several of the large national and international businesses interviewed by ProbusBNW commented on the greater difficulty of deciding which issues or geographical areas to tackle in London, and how to make any tangible difference.
- 2.10 Intermediary and partnership organisations may face similar challenges if they seek to operate beyond local areas or individual boroughs. Relatively few such organisations have a genuine London-wide remit, and several interviewees mentioned a lack of effective London-wide support bodies. Further complications arise from the difficulties such bodies face in finding, attracting and retaining well-qualified staff, the shortage and cost of suitable premises, etc.
- 2.11 A great deal of CSR activity is focused within inner London. But there are gaps in the scale and coverage of CSR activity in certain other areas of the capital, mainly outer London and some parts of inner London boroughs, due to the relatively small number of large firms located in these areas. In some cases, there may also be artificial constraints arising from funding boundaries; for example, an education-business partnership project in the Pool of London Partnership area found more businesses wishing to become involved than there were schools available for them to partner.

³ The scrutiny session was held on 10 February 2004. See www.london.gov.uk/assembly for more information.

⁴ Page 6 – Sustainable Capital, March 2004

⁵ Foreword to the Economic Development Strategy

⁶ Page 42 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

Getting organisations involved

- 2.12 In order to help understand and categorise activity in this field, ProbusBNW developed a 'typology' based on three principal factors (see *Figure 1* below):
- **Why** activity is undertaken ('Drivers').
 - **How** organisations go about demonstrating civic-mindedness ('Forms of Activity').
 - **What** areas of concern they seek to address ('Issues').
- 2.13 This typology was initially based on the private sector, where the kinds of activity concerned seemed to be more developed or at least higher-profile. ProbusBNW then looked at which activities might also be appropriate for public sector (and other) organisations to consider. It should be noted that they did not specifically explore how the activities might apply to the 'third' (voluntary and community) sector, although it was clear from the workshops that many participants felt that their relevance should in principle extend to *all* organisations.

Figure 1: 'Typology' of Organisational Civic-Mindedness		
Organisational Civic Mindedness		Public Sector Relevance
Why?	Drivers	
	Purpose and values	(Yes)
	Stakeholder expectations	Yes
	Employment-related benefits	Yes
	Other business benefits	No
How?	Forms of Activity	
	Direct contributions	No*
	Support for employee activity	Yes <i>(but some exceptions)</i>
	Provision of employee time and skills	Yes <i>(but some exceptions)</i>
	Project management	Yes
	Joint initiatives and partnerships	Yes
	Strategic and policy-level engagement	(Yes)
	Mainstream activity (employment, procurement, environment, etc)	Yes
What?	Issue Areas	
	Arts and culture	(No)
	Education	Yes
	Employment and employability	Yes
	Enterprise	Yes
	Environment	Yes
	Health	Yes
	Social inclusion: – Addiction – Crime – Disability – Diversity – Fuel poverty – Homelessness – Housing, etc	Yes
* But non-financial (ie in-kind) contributions may be relevant		

Source: ProbusBNW, 2003 (adapted)

- 2.14 Although many of the drivers and forms of activity outlined in the table above are applicable across both private and public sectors, the research showed that there are also substantial differences between the sectors in terms of their approaches, aims, attitudes, methods of delivery, resourcing and criteria for success. This affects the ways in which organisations in each sector can be persuaded to get involved.⁷

Engaging the private sector

- 2.15 The private sector has a crucial role to play in achieving economic, social and environmental goals. Regional strategies prepared by the Mayor, such as the Economic Development Strategy, Energy Strategy and Waste Strategy, are dependent on the pooling of private sector resources with those of the public sector and civil society. The London Assembly, Greater London Authority and the functional bodies have neither the funds nor legislative powers to take the agenda forward without the additional resource.
- 2.16 Whilst organisations engaged in civic-minded activity (often large and well-known companies) can see the benefits to themselves, there remain a substantial number not yet persuaded, particularly among smaller organisations. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), including black and minority ethnic businesses (BMEs), can make significant contributions, but have need of specific, targeted support.

Engaging the public sector

- 2.17 Although it might be argued that the public sector's 'licence to operate' is directly granted or removed through the democratic process, this does not mean that public sector bodies can afford to be careless of their reputation and standing with key stakeholder groups. However there is little evidence to date of public sector bodies, with some exceptions, addressing questions of how to build and enhance their reputations, or what role *organisational civic-mindedness* could play in this, or what benefits it can bring to London as a whole. The absence of pressure in this area on public bodies from their peers or stakeholders, or indeed from the target-setting process, means that the scope for making an impact through civic-mindedness activity is largely being ignored.⁸
- 2.18 The majority of public bodies have yet to come to grips with CSR. The term is not used and the concept is being recognised only slowly, as there is still a widely held belief that public bodies are already carrying out social responsibility as part of their 'core job'. Nevertheless, environmental impacts, employment practices and procurement are areas where activity does take place. Most local authorities have a history of employment-related projects and diversity programmes. Current initiatives include the development of Modern Apprenticeship schemes targeting local 16-24 year-olds, for example in the boroughs of Wandsworth, Lewisham and Southwark.⁹
- 2.19 It is clear that the environmental and employment-related benefits of CSR are relevant to the public sector. Several of those interviewed by ProbusBNW

⁷ Page 28 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

⁸ Page 19 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

⁹ Page 32 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

commented on the difficulty of recruiting, motivating and retaining good staff, particularly in competition with private sector businesses offering a much more attractive package of remuneration and benefits, including support for employee volunteering.

Understanding London's needs

- 2.20 A critical question for London is 'what sorts of CSR make useful contributions to London's long-term economic and social development needs and how can these be supported?' Consultation conducted by AccountAbility revealed that the private sector finds it difficult to engage with the overall agenda because it finds the material that describes the specific strategic goals (waste, transport, economic development, biodiversity, etc) complex, scattered widely and difficult to apply to itself.
- 2.21 ProbusBNW's research found that the range of London needs which organisations in the public and private sectors could help to tackle is very wide. Included in their report is the following list of issue areas being addressed by businesses in London:
- arts and culture
 - education
 - employment and employability (including training)
 - enterprise
 - environment
 - health
 - social inclusion, including:
 - addiction
 - crime
 - disability
 - diversity
 - fuel poverty
 - homelessness
 - housing
- 2.22 With the possible exception of arts and culture (or at least those aspects which relate to high-profile marketing-led sponsorship of exhibitions, concerts, theatre performances, festivals, etc), we see no reason why public sector organisations should not consider a similar list of issues in deciding how to target their efforts. As with businesses, each organisation should decide for itself which issue areas are relevant to its own interests, activities and skills, and where it can 'make a difference'.¹⁰

Funding

- 2.23 The majority of organisations, both private and public sector, use a mixture of public and private sector funds to deliver organisational civic-mindedness activities. Many receive a mixture of Single Regeneration Budget (now the

¹⁰ Page 21 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

Single Programme), European Union, local and central government grants from a range of funders, including the London Development Agency, the Learning and Skills Council, local authorities and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister via the Government Office for London.

- 2.24 Such funding is often essential to kick-start new programmes, roll out existing programmes and unlock a substantially greater private sector contribution. ProbusBNW’s research showed that businesses felt that some public sector finance was needed to develop projects, whilst local authorities felt that in order for them to play a bigger role in this area, increased resources are needed.
- 2.25 Public, not-for-profit and intermediary bodies all expressed concern about the lack of adequate, consistent funding - too much bureaucracy, coupled with a drive to achieve short-term targets, meant that achieving long-term sustainability was difficult. The focus on short-term funding was also seen as contributing to the proliferation of new initiatives and of new intermediaries set up to deliver them. This also discourages longer-term sustainability by cutting off the source of funding for existing projects. Too often what has been learned is lost, which in turn impacts the effectiveness of roll-out.

Risks and opportunities

- 2.26 AccountAbility presented us with three scenarios to sketch out a spectrum of potential outcomes for London’s development in 2025. The aim was not to attempt to predict the future but to explore potential outcomes of different combinations of factors in the business and public policy environment. (See Figure 2 below) Notable in particular are the possible results of greater emphasis being placed by London government on voluntary partnerships with business.

Figure 2. Sustainable Development Scenarios for London 2025	
Greenhouse	London is a greenhouse for global business but has created significant social problems as a result. A focus on high-skill jobs has undermined the position of less economically ‘strategic’ groups. These are set to create supply side problems for key workers and low-skill business services, thus creating knock problems for large businesses themselves.
Unhappy Family	Institutional dysfunction has made the transaction costs of dealing with London’s infrastructure and government a significant disincentive to both business and civil society. Business feels no ownership of any vision for London. Global businesses are questioning whether London is their preferred European base. Civil society has become disillusioned with partnership models of working and is becoming increasingly critical of its outcomes.
Hive	Shared ownership of sustainable development strategies and the mutual development of mechanisms for applying them have strengthened business, civil society and government. While problems remain, the basic configuration of collaboration amongst the sectors has enabled the balancing of interests and the delivery of balanced growth solutions.

Source: AccountAbility, 2004

3 The Potential Benefits

Communicating London's Responsible Competitiveness

- 3.1 London has a significant opportunity to communicate itself as a sustainable capital, given the sophistication and quality of its corporate, public and civil society sectors in handling sustainable development. The opportunity to use this as the basis for benchmarking its own progress towards responsible competitiveness and for communicating this as an asset to prospective companies, employees and tourists is clear.
- 3.2 Elements of the picture are already in place, including:
- London First's *Triple Bottom Line Index for London*¹¹
 - Best Foot Forward's *City Limits* footprint analysis of Greater London¹²,
 - the London Sustainable Development Commission's *Sustainable Development Framework for London*,
 - the Mayor's State of the Environment Report for London – *Green Capital*¹³.
- 3.3 The challenge, as many of these reports recognise, is precisely to identify ways of dynamically demonstrating the interrelationship of social, environmental and economic effects within the city.

Generating benefits for London

- 3.4 *Organisational civic-mindedness* has the potential to generate significant benefits for London, particularly in areas such as education, developing skills and employability, promoting local economic development and enterprise through fostering smaller businesses (including black and minority ethnic businesses), tackling deprivation and social exclusion, conserving and enhancing the environment, and encouraging and supporting voluntary activity, including by employees. There are already numerous initiatives addressing these issues, but most of them are relatively small-scale, local and limited in impact.

The regional dimension

- 3.5 In their report¹⁴, ProbusBNW note that the most striking feature of the London-wide dimension of *organisational civic-mindedness* is its virtual absence. They confirm that there are few genuinely pan-London initiatives, and even those that do exist tend to be schemes which are available for take-up right across London, but which in practice are concentrated in specific areas of need within it – such as the Capital Cares volunteering initiative or some of the small business financing projects.
- 3.6 The scope for expanding the impact of volunteering is clear from comparing Capital Cares, which placed over 1,500 employee volunteers through its Action Days during 2002, with its counterpart in New York City, New York Cares, which

¹¹ London First Sustainability Unit, *A Triple Bottom Line for London – An index of London's Sustainability*, London First 2003

¹² More information available at www.citylimitslondon.com

¹³ Greater London Authority, *Green Capital*, GLA 2003. More information available at www.london.gov.uk

¹⁴ Page 43 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

mobilises more than 3,000 volunteers each month, with a total close to 20,000 each year.

- 3.7 ProbusBNW note that the activity in London resembles a jigsaw with numerous different players trying to complete separate parts, but with no one player having a clear picture of the whole puzzle. The impact of local organisational civic-mindedness initiatives could be enhanced by defining a strategic framework of needs and priorities across London, so that individual efforts are recognised as pieces that fit within the larger puzzle and contribute to the achievement of broader regional goals. The GLA is one of the few bodies with a true London-wide remit that could supply this overall view.

Mayoral strategies

- 3.8 *Organisational civic-mindedness* provides a crucial link and a pathway for the delivery of Mayoral strategies by offering:
- a way of engaging companies strategically in London's own sustainable development
 - evidence that companies collaborating with civil society partners are capable of delivering against diverse aspects of social or environmental responsibility
 - a method of linking London's broader sustainable development with its economic competitiveness.¹⁵
- 3.9 The heavy reliance on the private sector in tackling the conflicting pressures mentioned in the previous chapter¹⁶ creates both a significant risk and a significant opportunity. The strong emphasis on the voluntary and targeted interaction of London business, government and civil society to deliver a strategic vision of strengthening London's world-class status is workable if there is sufficient 'buy-in', co-ordinated action and a clear strategic framework within which to operate. Without these, there is a significant risk of failure.

The role of the public sector as an employer

- 3.10 Employment (including the provision of work experience placements) is one of the principal opportunity areas for the public sector.
- 3.11 Within the health sector, Workforce Development Confederations have been particularly active. Recognising the impact on services caused by the National Health Service's recruitment and retention problems, there has been a significant increase in the number of employment-related activities. Building on the NHS's 'Career Skills Escalator' concept, Trusts, individual hospitals and GP services have developed a number of innovative employment projects in partnership with local community organisations and others. Many of these programmes seek to increase the diversity of the workforce to reflect the local community.
- 3.12 One example can be seen in the *Access to Medicine* programme, managed by Guy's, King's and St Thomas' School of Medicine. (See Figure 3 below)

¹⁵ Page 9 – Sustainable Capital, March 2004 (adapted)

¹⁶ Paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8

Figure 3: Case Study – Access to Medicine

The Access to Medicine Project at Guy's, King's & St Thomas' (GKT) School of Medicine aims to increase the participation of educationally and socially disadvantaged students from inner London school in medicine and related careers. By extension it also seeks to train health professionals who better reflect the social and cultural diversity of the local population.

Funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Pool of London Partnership, the Reeve Foundation and the Damilola Taylor Trust, the project has developed outreach activities in partnership with schools, other agencies working with young people and NHS providers. By offering career taster days, coursework projects, lectures, mentoring and work experience schemes to young people, the access to Medicine programme has worked with nearly 900 pupils since 2001. Twenty-nine young people have successfully taken up places on the GKT Extended Medical Degree programme.

Procurement

- 3.13 Procurement and tendering processes were identified as having perhaps the greatest untapped potential for making significant impact.¹⁷ In addition to directly addressing issues of fair employment policies and practices, procurement can help provide the basis on which to tackle wider economic and social problems, such as poverty.
- 3.14 In September 2003, the Mayor published a report on the Procurement and Fair Employment Seminar, held in July 2003. The report details the progress made by the GLA in working towards the application of a fair employment policy in the service contracts that the organisation awards. A theme of the report is that the GLA's experience has a much wider application across the public sector to improve the terms and conditions of some of the lowest paid staff employed in public services. This approach extends beyond fair employment to the range of other corporate responsibility issues, including environmental impacts and the wider community contribution.

Public/private partnerships

- 3.15 AccountAbility's report examines the potential for addressing organisational civic mindedness within public/private partnerships. They suggest that the growing practice of corporate reporting on sustainability issues and the independent assurance of these reports can provide government with crucial insights into the accountability of companies tendering for public-private partnership contracts.
- 3.16 They do not propose that measures of corporate responsibility be requirements of any London government tendering processes, but instead, as with the Green Procurement Initiative¹⁸, that such factors should be seen as opportunities within tendering processes for bidders to demonstrate innovation and added value on this aspect of performance. AccountAbility also believe that making use of what many companies are *already* doing would provide government with

¹⁷ Page32 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

¹⁸ Green Procurement Initiative – The Mayor's Green Procurement Code launched in June 2003 is managed by London Remade. More information is available at www.london.gov.uk

greater security and insight into the risks associated with particular bidders and would also provide the public with greater security about the reliability of given contractors.

Examples from elsewhere

- 3.17 In commencing this scrutiny, the Committee was concerned that London might be falling behind practice elsewhere. For example, Yorkshire Forward¹⁹ in partnership with Business in the Community²⁰ has an advanced programme of CSR-generated activities, in which the efforts of local companies are rewarded with Awards for Excellence. One such recent winner was a Yorkshire company Elite Forwarders Ltd, who provides garment warehouse and distribution services.
- 3.18 When Elite was expanding its operation, it worked together with the West Leeds Family Learning Centre and the local job centre to target the neighbouring community and particularly the unemployed. Part of the deal was that local people were trained in the skills needed and offered a job conditional upon their satisfactory completion of the training programme. Three hundred new staff were required and 106 recruited through the programme – 46% of these had previously been unemployed for over 12 months. As a result the company has recruited a local workforce with the right skills and a strong loyalty to the company while also helping support the quality of life for those recruits and their families.²¹
- 3.19 Nationally, as previously mentioned, the DTI has an active programme to encourage corporate social responsibility and the UK government was the first in Europe to appoint a minister for CSR.²²
- 3.20 Outside the UK interest in corporate social responsibility also appears to be growing. For example CSR Europe's contribution to the Lisbon Summit in March 2000 on *Employment, economic reforms and social cohesion - for a Europe of innovation and knowledge* resulted in European Heads of State making a special appeal on CSR. The Summit resulted in a strategic goal for Europe being devised "to become the competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy is the world by 2010, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion".²³

¹⁹ Yorkshire Forward is the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Development Agency. For more information visit <http://www.yorkshire-forward.com>.

²⁰ Business in the Community is an independent business-led charity operating through a network of local business-led partnerships and global partners. For more information visit <http://www.bitc.org.uk>.

²¹ More information available at <http://www.bitc.org.uk>

²² More information available at <http://www.societyandbusiness.gov.uk/>

²³ CSR Europe More information is available at www.csreurope.org

4 Looking forward, and recommendations

- 4.1 The research undertaken indicates that *organisational civic-mindedness* at a regional level resulting in *responsible competitiveness* can generate significant benefits for London, particularly if a more 'joined-up' and ambitious approach is taken across the field. Many current initiatives are mainly local, small-scale and limited in impact, and often at an early stage in their development. There are thus relatively few examples of effective roll-out, replication or sustainability. Equally, there are few examples of London-wide (as opposed to local or national) activity.²⁴
- 4.2 The findings suggest that incentives in the form of recognition and increased access to contracts and tenders would be supported. But there is little support for greater regulation.²⁵

Making it happen

- 4.3 The GLA family could play an important part in enhancing the value of *organisational civic-mindedness* for London, through exhortation and encouragement as opposed to regulation. There are five principal areas of activity which the GLA family/Mayor could undertake and our recommendations are categorised under the following five headings:
- Leading by example (1)
 - Defining an overall strategic framework (2)
 - Promoting the concept of *organisational civic-mindedness* (3)
 - Facilitation and guidance (4)
 - Extending the impact (5)
- 4.4 More detailed suggestions on how the following recommendations might be implemented are available in ProbusBNW's report.²⁶

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Mayor/GLA family lead by example by actively engaging in civic-minded behaviour and aspiring to good practice, particularly in areas such as employment, procurement, environmental responsibility and support for employee volunteering.

²⁴ Page 51 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

²⁵ Page 51 – ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

²⁶ Pages 52 to 55 - ProbusBNW Phase 1 report, September 2003

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the Mayor/LDA take the lead in defining an overall strategic framework for *organisational civic-mindedness* in London, so that initiatives tackle genuine needs, complement each other, do not overlap or conflict, and together benefit London as a whole.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the Mayor/GLA family promote the concept of *organisational civic-mindedness*, so that organisations of all kinds across London are encouraged to consider becoming active in ways that will benefit the capital, and recognise the potential advantages of doing so.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the Mayor/LDA provide facilitation and guidance as appropriate, for example in the form of funding and other support for 'beacon' initiatives, information, training, advice on good practice, guidance on support and resources available, and recognition of success. There is a particular need for more consistent and reliable ways of assessing the impact of organisational civic-mindedness activities.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the GLA/LDA work with relevant organisations to extend the impact of existing initiatives: enhancing the benefits for London as a whole by providing specific support for extending, replicating or 'rolling out' successful local initiatives and fostering the development of intermediary bodies and resources to support civic-mindedness on a pan-London scale.

Engaging the private sector in a regional approach

4.5 The private sector has a crucial role to play in achieving economic, social and environmental goals. Regional strategies prepared by the Mayor, such as the Economic Development Strategy, Energy Strategy and Waste Strategy are dependent on the pooling of private sector resources with those of the public sector and civil society. The following recommendations identify practical ways in which the Mayor/GLA can:

- Engage the private sector more fully at a regional level (recommendation 6)
- Better identify the correlation between the Strategies to present a coherent picture of what input is required by its public and private sector partners (recommendation 7)

- Leverage existing practice, networks and institutions in order to determine effective ways to engage the private sector in *organisational civic-mindedness* and so contribute more to London's long-term economic and social development (recommendations 8 and 9)
- Explore the potential to include *organisational civic-mindedness* more in partnerships between the public and private sectors (recommendation 10)
- Help develop a practical basis for measuring progress and communicating London's responsible competitiveness through a regular index and report (recommendations 11 and 12)

4.6 Detailed background on the rationale behind these recommendations is available in AccountAbility's report.²⁷ In particular, the report identifies six industry sectors, such as financial services, where this approach may be most effective in achieving greater competitiveness. It also presents possible indicators for inclusion in a new London index of responsible competitiveness, drawing on experience from a nationally-based index in 2003 comprising some 50 countries.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the GLA should develop an engagement plan explicitly and specifically with business in the wake of the finalised Spatial Development Strategy, published in February 2004. This key strategy provides both the overarching vision and underpinning structure for the GLA and should be used to identify concrete areas where specific business sectors can both benefit and play a delivery role.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the GLA through the LDA should provide a summary of key sustainable development strategies; their relevance to business; the anticipated involvement of business; and references to the agencies and incentives providing support. In particular, this summary should identify where there are points of leverage to engage the following key sectors: financial services, the creative industries, transport and logistics, retail, the professional services and the tourism and leisure industries.

²⁷ Sustainable Capital, March 2004

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the London Business Board be invited to become the vehicle for a conversation on these issues between London government and leading business representative organisations on this subject (including London First, London CBI, and Chamber of Commerce). Its next meeting with the Mayor should include a review of business's strategic role in delivering sustainable development in London. Given London First's role in this group and its longstanding partnership with Business in the Community on corporate responsibility issues, we believe London First should provide a lead on this debate. The London Business Board should then take a view on the best way to continue enhancing corporate engagement, for example through sector groups around specific issues.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the London Sustainable Development Commission should be considered a key partner in developing the sustainable development components of resulting sector-specific engagement strategies.

Recommendation 10

We recommend that the LDA and other GLA bodies review, in conjunction with the Treasury, the value and scope for incorporating corporate responsibility criteria into public/private partnership tendering frameworks within London. This should be done with a view to helping the partnerships to enhance their risk profile and promote sustainable development through the development of:

- a. Additional but not obligatory bidding criteria that include evaluation of bidders' corporate responsibility profile.**
- b. Additional but not obligatory bidding criteria that offer bidders the opportunity to show how they would evaluate and report on the social, environmental and economic development impacts of the development should they be successful in tendering.**

Recommendation 11

We recommend that the GLA produce a regular Responsible Competitiveness Report for London to assess and highlight progress made by London government, business and civil society in achieving social, environmental and economic/business benefits, by drawing together the public sector, business and the voluntary sector in greater organisational civic-mindedness. This should build on and contribute to the London Sustainable Development Commission's emerging framework, and the Mayor's State of the Environment Report. It would also complement initiatives such as London First's triple bottom line assessment.

Recommendation 12

We recommend that the GLA explore the production of a Global Cities Responsible Competitiveness Index and promote comparisons of responsible competitiveness outcomes in key global cities and so enable policy makers to learn from experience elsewhere.

Appendix 1: Notes of the initial round table discussion and delegates attending

Notes of a Discussion on the Role of the Public and Private Sectors in Regeneration

Thursday, 16 January 2003 Room 1.2, City Hall

In attendance

Andrew Carter, One London

David Ratcliffe, Department of Trade and Industry

Fiona Wilson, London Development Agency

Heather Binning, Head of Business Development, Business Link

Helen Bishop, Head of Regeneration and Equalities, North Central London Workforce Development Confederation

Helen Florenco, London First

John Griffiths, Rocket Science UK Ltd

Julian Orum, New Economics Foundation

Justin Sacks, New Economics Foundation

Peter Davis, Deputy Chief Executive, Business in the Community

Simon Zadek, Chief Executive, Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility

Teresa Edmunds, Thames Gateway, Regeneration and Health Employment Links

Mike Tuffrey, Chair of the Economic and Social Development Committee, London Assembly

Carmen Jack, Scrutiny Manager, Economic and Social Development Committee

Teresa Young, Committee Co-ordinator, Economic and Social Development Committee

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Mike Tuffrey gave a brief explanation of the GLA and London Assembly's roles. The Economic and Social Development Committee had no executive powers but sought to make improvements by carefully analysing economic and social development issues, achieving a consensus about what should be done and making recommendations to appropriate people/ organisations.
- 1.2 Carmen Jack gave an overview of the scrutiny process. She explained that the Economic and Social Development Committee had a monitoring and review role in respect of the work of the LDA and scrutinising the Mayoral strategies, including the Economic Development Strategy. It also undertook specific scrutiny investigations into subjects which were of interest to Londoners.
- 1.3 The Chair commented that business had been working on corporate social responsibility (CSR) issues for some years and that the NHS and local authorities

were also beginning to look at those issues as well. However, that work might be missing at a regional level.

2. Comments of Attendees

- 2.1 Simon Zadek stated that he thought the change in CSR between the 1980s and the present time was that previously the public sector sought to influence and incentivise private sector behaviour to achieve regional and sector strategies; now many larger companies are themselves choosing to explore and manage aspects of social and environmental performance as part of their own strategies to benefit the business. So now the challenge at a market level is to link CSR to competitiveness. He cited the example of the footwear industry in Vietnam, where work was being undertaken to see how standards in the condition of employment of the workforce in the industry could be improved, while maintaining and enhancing competitiveness in export markets. He had finished work funded by the European Commission on looking at competitiveness at a regional level. The issue was to look at competitiveness at a structural level and then see how the public sector could be involved.
- 2.2 Peter Davies advised that in the Yorkshire area a three year programme had just been agreed with the Regional Development Agency (RDA) to make Yorkshire more competitive. They were building partnerships to address social issues such as low educational attainment, barriers to business competitiveness and diversity in the workforce. In Leicester relationships had been developing between the voluntary sector, the business community and local government to build city partnerships. Businesses in Leicester understood the link between CSR and competitiveness and were being linked to Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs).
- 2.3 Teresa Edmunds stated that Thames Gateway was looking at what the public health sector could do in respect of local economies. The European Commission had suggested that social clauses could be included in public sector contracts but Treasury Guidance was contradictory to that and hence the position needed to be clarified. Furthermore there was a conflict between the Department of Health policy because there was a move to have bigger contracts while talking about local procurement. Some local authorities were being bold and including social clauses in contracts but she was not aware of any health authorities which were doing that. The NHS was a major player in London, spending £1.2 billion; the question was how could the contracts be used to assist with CSR in the NHS.
- 2.4 Justin Sacks agreed that the NHS had the potential to be a massive local purchaser, for example, of food. Local authorities too were receivers of large amounts of funding and the question was how could that money be circulated in the local economy. Many local authorities wanted to improve their local communities but the procurement rules were complex and unclear. The New Economics Foundation has developed a tool to allow organisations to assess the multiplier effect of their spending on the local economy.
- 2.5 Andrew Carter drew attention to the lack of connections between economic social responsibility (ESR) and social cohesion. The ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) had undertaken studies in Bristol, Manchester, Liverpool and London. It had found in London that there was not much connectivity and that the dynamics of London meant that there was breakdown of social cohesion.

- 2.6 Helen Florenco advised that London First was involved with the NHS, pre-16 and post-16 education, equality and diversity and how it impacted on CSR. It was also looking at the unemployment and under employment of graduates from minority ethnic backgrounds. It worked with the GLA, LDA, Business in the Community and in other sectors such health, biotechnology and IT. There was some coherence amongst the emerging plethora of projects. London First could only plug the gap on coherence in small ways, as its funding was limited to membership fees. Its power came from having 300 of the 500 FTSE companies as members; companies which were powerful in their own right and had leverage to bring London into the national debate.
- 2.7 David Ratcliffe advised that Stephen Timms MP, the Minister for E-Commerce and Competitiveness, also has responsibility for CSR and social enterprise and is very supportive of the CSR agenda. The DTI co-ordinated policy on CSR across Whitehall and responses to campaigns and consultations on it. One of the priorities, which had been identified in the CSR Report 2002, was the regions and to look at whether good practice in one region could be applied to another. Thus the idea was to ensure that there were links in place. RDAs were accountable to the DTI, but the Office of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) was starting to look at whether CSR issues could be dealt with at a lower level.
- 2.8 Fiona Wilson advised that SEEDA (South East England Development Agency) was leading on the above issue among regional development agencies. The LDA included social inclusion as a cross cutting theme and a Tier 3 target. It had only just begun to look at the issue of CSR, and the NHS was of particular interest. The Government envisaged RDAs playing a major role in CSR. The LDA had just formulated its own draft plan on inter-organisational responsibilities in terms of working with developers and it was looking to pilot a project. It was also looking at the extent to which the LDA could provide a platform to congratulate business that had undertaken CSR.

The NHS in London

- 2.9 Helen Bishop stated that the NHS had recently been re-organised into 5 areas in London and so was still in a period of transition. "Capital Asset", a report produced by the LSE for the London Region two years ago, had mapped the size of the NHS and where staff came from. It had concluded that in terms of money and employment the NHS was bigger than the leisure industry in London.
- 2.10 Studies in the London Regional Office had shown that the NHS needs to grow by 30% in the next 10 years. The problem was that the NHS in London was training people who did not stay in London. Furthermore, 50% of GPs in London were likely to retire in the next 10 years. A more sustainable approach would be to work with local unemployed people who already had roots in London, as this was likely to lead to a more stable work force. At the present time the gaps were being plugged by overseas recruitment.
- 2.11 Helen Bishop was not sure if there had been any scoping of the NHS supply chain in London. NHS capital expenditure included smaller items such as GPs' premises as well as the NHS Trusts' big capital expenditure projects. There could be links with the private sector, for example, by building new GPs'

surgeries as part of other development schemes such as when a new supermarket is approved.

3. The contribution that CSR could make to regeneration

Among issues discussed were:

3.1 Building physical infrastructure

Strategic philanthropy / development that could contribute to London's economy.

3.2 Procurement

This could be an important means of achieving CSR. Tools for policy guidance and impact analysis would be very helpful.

3.3 Business strategy

The links between the business strategy level and economic competition level were important but there could be conflicts. There was a need to create competitive indices at a national and city level.

4. Other Comments

4.1 The group concluded that:

- Sustainable development has many complex relationships with competitiveness.
- The factors would be different for small and medium sized enterprises and big business.
- There was a tendency to refer to the private sector as one entity but there were differences in scale, and therefore different factors affecting private sector businesses
- Planning had a large role to play in regeneration.
- One issue is the damage to local communities from closure of banks, shops and post offices. NEF has done research into this ('Ghost Towns' report)
- Work undertaken in other European cities, such as those studied by The Copenhagen Centre, could inform the Committee's consideration of the subject.
- There was a need for clarification on the procurement rules and conflicts ironed out.
- How could sustainability be measured?
- There was a need to look at diversity and equalities issues.
- The NHS was relatively new to regeneration and could learn lessons from other organisations. Its contribution to regional development goes beyond ill health to include issues such as bed-blocking, care homes and the needs of older citizens.
- Education was important for conveying the positive aspects of CSR.
- Plans for Thames Gateway offered an opportunity to address these issues at the outset.

5. Objectives of the scrutiny

5.1 Following the discussion, the Chair suggested that the scrutiny could look at process/organisational issues and make recommendations, as appropriate, to other bodies. He suggested the following themes for the scrutiny of the role of the public and private sectors in regeneration.

- How the public sector and NHS is run internally, as the private and voluntary sectors had outstripped the public sector in their thinking on CSR issues.
- Mapping what is happening at a micro level, as many people might not be aware of all the good practices and initiatives. From that there could be better co-ordination at a local level.
- How all the work at a macro/ strategic level could be brought together to make an impact at a regional level, and the need for that thinking and work to be fed into the various Mayoral and GLA strategies.
- How the GLA functions and its internal housekeeping could be improved and have a greater impact by learning from private sector CSR practices.

Appendix 2: Workshop sessions and attendees

Workshop 1: 18 June 2003

Name	Position	Organisation
Dr John Sabapathy	Senior Research Manager	AccountAbility
Punam Kharbanda	Operations Manager	Brent Employer Partnership
Kate Cavelle	Community Development Manager	Deutsche Bank AG London
Liam Kane	Chief Executive	East London Business Alliance
Jennifer Gramolt	Group Sustainable Development Policy Manager	EDF Energy
James McGinlay	Deputy Chief Executive	Kings Cross Partnership
Mike Richardson	Chief Executive	London Accord
John Biggs	Member	London Assembly
Carmen Jack	Scrutiny Manager	London Assembly
Darren Johnson	Member	London Assembly
Eric Ollerenshaw	Member	London Assembly
Michael Tuffrey	Chair, Economic & Social Development Committee	London Assembly
Teresa Young	Committee Co-ordinator, Economic & Social Development Cttee	London Assembly
Fiona Wilson	Manager, Corporate Social Responsibility	London Development Agency
Rona Kiley	Director, Business and Education	London First
Dinah Cox	Head of Strategy	London Voluntary Service Council
Tony Travers	Director, Greater London Group	LSE
Jackie Spreckley	Head of Regional Affairs	LWT Holdings
Anne Wolfe	Senior Manager, Community Affairs	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Alastair Bruce	Director	ProbusBNW
Lorraine Lawson	Senior Consultant	ProbusBNW
Nick Tennant	Head of Media and Public Affairs	Thames Water
Mike Tyler	Director	Tower Hamlets Education Business Partnership

Workshop 2: 25 June 2003

Name	Position	Organisation
Dr John Sabapathy	Senior Research Manager	AccountAbility
Nina Tatana		AccountAbility
Henry Timms	Business Development Manager	Arts & Business
Penny Wrout		BBC London
Sian Owen	Research and Information Manager	Business Community Connections
Ron Crank	Network Development Manager	Business Link for London
Steve Workman	Economic Development Director	Central London Partnership
Bob Timms	Community Affairs Manager	Corporation of London
Louie Hartnett	London NHS Lead EU/Business Sector Partnership Development	Department of Health – London Region
Alison Lovegrove		EMF-CEMVO
Sophia Skyers	Policy Officer	EMF-CEMVO
Clare Vanstone	Authorisations Division	Financial Services Authority
Gavin Brown	Schools Liaison & Project Co-ordinator	GKT School of Medicine
Jane Lord	Head of Enterprise	Government Office for London
Sarah Hargreaves	Director	Haringey Sure Start
Peter Hirst	Principal Consultant	IDeA
Deborah McLean		Kings Cross Partnership
Pina Ardu	Assistant Scrutiny Manager	London Assembly
Jennette Arnold	Member	London Assembly
Carmen Jack	Scrutiny Manager	London Assembly
Darren Johnson	Member	London Assembly
Michael Tuffrey	Chair, Economic & Social Development Committee	London Assembly
Teresa Young	Committee Co-ordinator, Economic & Social Development Cttee	London Assembly
Fiona Wilson	Mgr, Corporate Social Responsibility	London Development Agency
Naomi Kingsley	Chief Executive	London Rebuilding Society
John Twitchen	Innovation Centre Manager	London Remade
Tony Travers	Director, Greater London Group	LSE
Julian Oram		New Economics Foundation
Rob Smith	Director of Finance	NHS North East London Workforce Development Confederation
Paul Pearce		Notting Hill Housing Group
Roz Spencer	Group Director for Neighbourhoods	Notting Hill Housing Group
Peter Thackwray	Chief Executive	oneLondon
Alastair Bruce	Director	ProbusBNW
Lorraine Lawson	Senior Consultant	ProbusBNW
Sandra Golding	Director	Social Enterprise London
Edward Telford	Corporate Officer	Thames21

Workshop 3: 7 November 2003

Name	Position	Organisation
Ninar Bhakri		Association of London Government
Punam Kharbanda	Operations Manager	Brent Employer Partnership
Ian Hagg		British Gas
Rob Grover		Business Link for London
Howard Sheppard		Canary Wharf Group
Mike Tuffrey	Chair, Economic and Social Development Committee	
Bob Timms		Corporation of London
Peter Welton		East London Business Alliance
Sarah Threlfall	Head of Public Service & Sustainable Development	EDF Energy
Penny Bramwell		Government Office for London
Pierre Coinde	Senior Performance and Projects Officer	Greater London Authority
Dr John Sabapathy	Senior Research Manager	Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability
James McGinlay	Deputy Chief Executive	Kings Cross Partnership
Carmen Jack	Scrutiny Manager	London Assembly
Zoe Davies	Research Officer	London Assembly
Tina Perfierement		London Remade
Penny Shepherd	Chief Executive	London Sustainability Exchange
Peter Thackwray	Chief Executive	OneLondon
Alastair Bruce	Director	ProbusBNW
Lorraine Lawson	Senior Associate	ProbusBNW

Appendix 3 Principles of Assembly scrutiny

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the London Assembly web page at www.london.gov.uk/assembly.

Appendix 4 Orders and translations

For further information on this report or to order a bound copy, please contact:

Carmen Jack, Scrutiny Manager
Assembly Secretariat,
Greater London Authority,
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA.

carmen.jack@london.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7983 6542

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100. You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:

www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/index.htm.

প্রসঙ্গিক প্রস্তুতকৃত প্রতিবেদন ও প্রতিবেদনের সংক্ষিপ্ত সারাংশের অন্যান্য ভাষায়, বড় আকারে বা ব্রিলে প্রিন্টে কপি করতে চাইলে ০২০ ৭৯৮৩ ৪১০০ এ ফোন করে জানতে পারুন। আপনি এখানে কপি করতে চাইলে: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Si usted o alguien de su conocimiento quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones de este informe en imprenta grande o Braille, o en su idioma, sin costo, favor nos contactar por teléfono no número 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em impressão grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

É você ou alguém de seu conhecimento que gostaria de receber uma cópia do resumo executivo e das recomendações desse relatório em impressão grande ou Braille, ou em sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou por e-mail em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ou por correio eletrônico em:

Si usted o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones de este informe en formato de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Si usted o alguien de su conocimiento quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones de este informe en formato de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansuwa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowa lowo yin fun eto yi

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqanid, uu doonaayo riuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo koolam iyo talooyinka ee waaweyn ama farta qolka madaaha la' hoga' talagalay, ama hoga' dawlada, ee helaash u ah, dadkan ragala soo xiriir telefoonka 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**