

**Minutes of Harrow Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Forum  
held on 23rd March 2015, 10:00 – 12:00 hrs  
Venue: Committee Room 1&2, Harrow Civic Centre, Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2XY**

<b>Attendance:</b>				
<b>Member</b>	<b>Abreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Abreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Forum Role</b>
Terry Revill	TR	Flash Musicals	FM	
Julian Maw	JM	Hatch End Association	HEA	
Ilias Kostalas	IK	Kids Can Achieve	KCA	
Dan Burke	DB	Ignite Trust	IT	
Angela Hook	AH	Friends of Bob Lawrence Library	FBLL	
Stuart Dashwood	SD	Carramea Community Resource Centre	CCRC	
Pushpa Hargovan	PH	Harrow Shopmobility	HS	
Tajinder Nijjar	TN	Harrow Citizen's Advice Bureau	HCAB	
Avani Modasia	AM	Age UK Harrow	AUH	VCS Representative
Linda Robinson	LR	Friends Of Bentley Priory Nature Reserve	FBPNR	Co-opted VCS Representative
John Hunter	JH	Crossroads Care Harrow	CCH	
Cllr Pamela Fitzpatrick	PF	Harrow Law Centre	HLC	
Gilly Chowdry	GC	Home-Start Barnet	HSB	
Jan Irwin	JI	Harrow Domestic & Sexual Violence Forum	HDSVF	
Gerry Devine	GD	Harrow Community Transport	HCT	
Hassan Khalief	HK	Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary Organisations	HASVO	
Sarah Kersey	SK	Harrow's Happiness Campaign	HHC	
Julie Browne	JB	Asperger's Syndrome Access to Provision	ASAP	Forum Chair / Co-opted VCS Representative
Jenny Stephany	JS	Positive Connections	PC	

<b>... continued Attendance</b>				
<b>Member</b>	<b>Abbreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Member Organisation</b>	<b>Abbreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Forum Role</b>
Deven Pillay	DP	Harrow Mencap	HM	VCS Representative
Robin Webb	RW	St Luke's Hospice	SLH	
Nana Asante	NA	The A-Connexion's Advocacy & Advice	TAAA	
Elizabeth Hugo	EH	ASAP Harrow – Asperger's Syndrome Access to Provision	ASAP	
Alex Buckmire	AB	Voluntary Action Harrow Co-operative	VAHC	Minute Taker

<b>Apologies:</b>				
<b>Member</b>	<b>Abbreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Member Organisation</b>	<b>Abbreviation in minutes</b>	<b>Forum Role</b>
Steve Porter	SP	Third Sector Potential CIC	TSP	VCS Representative
Rachel Wright	RWr	Voluntary Action Harrow Co-operative	VAHC	
Eileen Martell	EM	HOPE Harrow	HH	
John Seymour	JSe	Friends For Friends	FFF	
Tony O'Hara	TOH	Carramea Community Resource Centre	CCRC	
Moti Lal Thapa	MLT	The National Gurkha Veterans' Association	TNGVA	
Lakhvir Randhawa	LRa	EACH Counselling & Support	EACH	
Russell Sutcliffe	RS	Individual		

<b>Item</b>	<b>Minutes</b>	<b>Action by whom</b>	<b>Action by when</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome, Introductions, Apologies &amp; Conflict of Interest (Agenda Item 1)</b>		
1.1	JB welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made and apologies noted.		

1.2	Conflict of interest declared: PF said she might have a conflict of interest depending on what comes up on the agenda, and is happy to leave if required. JH stated he had strong reservations about having any Councillors at this meeting. GD disagreed and thought Councillors can also represent the voluntary and community sector, and said if there is a conflict of interest she can be asked to leave. JB concluded that Councillors have been involved in the sector for years and it is about managing that.		
1.2.1	PF stated everything said would remain confidential.		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of last meeting (VCS Forum (19.01.15)) (Agenda Item 2)</b>		
2.1	Minutes approved as accurate.		
2.2	On item 4.1.3 - DP stated that the findings have not been discussed regarding the Health & Wellbeing Board. Regarding the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) DP has spoken to Jake Furlon regarding the issues. DP has raised the lack of engagement with the Council Leader and the Portfolio Holder. What DP has been told verbally is that they are struggling to find a date with the Clinical Commissioning Group Hierarchy and the Council for a summit expecting 100 representatives. They intended to get residents and users of services engaged in the process.		
2.2.1	On item 4.1.7 - JB asked if we had heard anything back from Councillor Sue Anderson (SA). DP had not received anything.		
2.2.2	On item 4.2.1 - JB asked if anyone went to the Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) on the 28 <sup>th</sup> January. PF went to one but was not sure about the date. JB thought the plan was to hold more meetings. DP suggested that they were going to discuss at Cabinet. PF stated the Cabinet meeting was last week (19.03.2015).		
<b>Action</b>	<b>JB to get back to SA on the general engagement of the sector, EQIA and the information regarding the SLA's.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
2.2.3	On item 5 - DP has found out there is due to be a transition period of three months and the changes will be made after the three months. AM stated that this was agreed at the last Cabinet meeting. JM confirmed and stated that what was said that the groups will face cuts after the three months. DP said after the Cabinet meeting they will start to engage but there is a call-in period to challenge the proposals.		
2.2.4	On item 5 - PF stated that HLC currently has a judicial review in process about the cuts to the voluntary sector which was sent before Cabinet. The response back was that it was premature as Cabinet had not made its decision. Now Cabinet has made its decision they will now progress. JI asked what the judicial review was for. PF		

	<p>stated she does not know the exact details as she has separated herself from the process. If attendees would like more information about this they can contact: Sebastian Lettouche (<a href="mailto:info@harrowlawcentre.org.uk">info@harrowlawcentre.org.uk</a>). DP stated his understanding is that an individual can only register a judicial review and it was based on a flawed consultation process. JS asked if it would be appropriate for someone to find out more.</p>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>JB agreed to find out more from Sebastian Lettouche from Harrow Law Centre.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
2.2.5	JB stated from conversations at meetings that there seemed to be some confusion about the Localism and Social Value Act. DP confirmed there was a need to develop understanding on these terms and how to use them.		
2.2.6	On item 5.6.1 - JB stated this was done. AB stated it had not been done as after this action point was recorded it was then agreed not to follow this course of action.		
2.2.6.1	DP stated it was an issue that the Forum should discuss and come up with ways on how to make decisions. JB asked if SA is part of the VCS or just a Portfolio Holder. AM stated a Portfolio Holder as she cannot sit on any VCS organisations. JB was not sure of the difference between a Councillor and someone representing the VCS, and a Portfolio Holder and not representing the VCS. PF stated that SA is a decision maker for the VCS, but there could still be a conflict for any Councillor and they should declare any interest.		
2.2.6.2	DP stated the Leader of the Council, Chief Executive and Portfolio Holder are also confused by it and the VCS Reps are trying to work through the issues together. PF stated it is not just to do with Councillors but regards individuals having multiple roles so protocol needs to be reviewed. LR stated this will come up in Agenda Item 4.3.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Protocol on multiple roles to be discussed at the next meeting.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
2.2.7	JB stated the meetings between the Reps and the Leaders of the council have started. The dates have been circulated and this should be 6 times a year.		
2.2.8	On item 9.3 - LR, RWR and RS did get together to discuss <a href="#">Harrow Community Network</a> and a document was produced. Due to RWR's absence this could not be discussed further at this Forum meeting.		
<b>3.</b>	<b>Reps Update (Agenda Item 3)</b>		
3.1	AM stated Harrow Community Action (HCA) had its first Annual General Meeting (AGM). There was a speaker from Interlink, a		

	<p>Jewish Consortium, and it was said it is positive that Harrow has got something in place. HCA has not applied for any attentional tenders beyond the one for Third Sector Services one but it can be used as a vehicle for small or big tenders for all the VCS. She also stated some of the difficulties. HCA is a bit different as it uses the DESTA model which enables all groups to get involved. AM stated that questions were raised about the finances of HCA. LR asked if most of the members attended. AM said no and that attendance was not that high. LR asked how many members HCA has. AB confirmed it was 27. JS said attendance could have been affected by the wrong address being sent round. DP and JS stated this was the Council's mistake.</p>		
3.2	<p>DP stated the summit in January was attended by 30 groups and it was about funding. Since the meeting individuals surgeries have been set up. AM said that the Social Value Act and the Localism Act were discussed. LR stated she was disappointed that these were not put on the agenda. AM stated these were not workshops and it came out of how people plan to challenge the Council.</p>		
3.2.1 & Note	<p><a href="#"><u>JB confirmed the next Summit is on the 18<sup>th</sup> April from 10am to 2pm at Harrow Council in the Members Lounge.</u></a> – <i>This link will take you to the newsletter which was sent through Harrow Community Action, and contains an Agenda for the Summit.</i></p>		
3.2.1.1	<p>LR queried who has organised this. DP answered it was arranged on behalf of the sector and the Reps have organised it. JM said it should be the Forum; LR agreed. JM asked who the VCS Reps are representing. LR asked for future events like this invitations should go out from the Forum and not the VCS Reps.</p>		
3.2.1.2	<p>DP queried what the Forum is and who the members are. In the past the Forum was a separate entity from the VCS Reps. DP said that a method of engaging has been missing and this Forum meeting has been one of the best attended of the last three or four years. There have been meetings from the forum with only five people so Reps took the initiative to hold summits. When the Forum is constituted this might be different. AB stated that VAHC have put a lot of work into the Forum to increase the number of people coming and it has maintained a higher level of attendance. DP stated AB was not the only person to put work in. AB replied he knew that but it was not a fair reflection to say nobody has been attending when the last meetings have had high numbers of people repeatedly attending. AB stated this showed that people are willing to spend time to develop this. DP stated he has been to every Forum meeting and a lot has been put into the constitution and it is great that people are attending. DP stated it is not good to pretend that it reflects the diversity of the VCS, as this is something we're working towards. A lot of people have put in a lot of time over many years in the sector not just the last year. DP thanked AB for his work in developing that.</p>		

	<p>AB clarified that comments saying the Forum has not been well attended recently do not help. DP stated he had said over the last few years. JB concluded that Forum notoriously had not been well attended and it was brilliant to see so many people at the Forum, and hoped that people's reasons for coming was that people are interested in the constitution and its setup. Until it is formalised VCS Reps are in the role to represent the whole sector and this will change. LR stated she appreciated what AB had said but we were getting away from the point.</p>		
3.2.1.3	<p>LR wanted any future news about the VCS to be sent on behalf of the Forum not any nebulous Representatives. LR stated she was not at the meeting when the Summit was decided on and she objects that it is made by the VCS Reps.</p>		
3.2.1.4	<p>JS stated the principle of having periodic summits to involve the VCS sector is a good thing and is a good basis to get more of the VCS engaged.</p>		
3.3	<p>DP stated Hope Not Hate (HNN) was discussed at the last Summit, and the purpose was to discuss about recognising the value of the VCS. PF stated she went to meetings and the purpose is to get people to vote. They are currently looking for storage for their newsletters and if anyone knew anywhere to get in touch with HNN. LR stated Manpreet Chokar (MC) from HNN has attended the Forum and her aim is primarily to get people to vote. LR asked if anyone had realised that the electoral role in this borough has gone down by 7,000 due to the changes. HNN are trying to target ethnic minorities to make them aware of the changes, so are trying to engage with the VCS. LR said this is only a small part of what MC is trying to do. NA stated she has information about the electoral role and the cut-off date to register is the 20<sup>th</sup> April, but it was not advised to wait until then. The council are releasing the register on the 1<sup>st</sup> April so it is better to do this before and check if you are on it and not to rely that you are on it. LR stated it's not as easy as it sounds, because of the documents required. LR thought many people might be frozen out. NA stated it is in all our interest to make sure our voices are heard.</p>		
3.4	<p>Agenda item 3.4 deferred to next meeting due to absence of SP.</p>		
3.5	<p>JB stated that VCS Reps met with the CEO &amp; Leader. They talked about having councillors as trustees and are working with them on how best to approach this. SK stated there is guidance on the Charity Commission website.</p>		
<b>Action</b>	<p><b>Distribute Charity Commission Guidance</b> - Local authorities as charity trustees Charity Commission Guidance:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authorities-as-charity-trustees">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authorities-as-charity-trustees</a></p>	<b>AB</b>	

3.5.1	JB stated they also talked about the terms of reference, but this was not confirmed as things could change with a change in VCS Reps.		
3.5.2	JB stated there was a lot of talk about co-production and how the Council gets involved with the VCS before consultations and it was agreed a framework would be generated.		
3.5.3	JB said they are going to invite council officers to the summit to see the strength of the sector.		
3.6	JB said that the document (titled: HVCS Non-Executive Member) on the Council's offer of a nonvoting Cabinet member unfortunately could not be sent out electronically. LR had got an electronic copy and had asked AB to send out. JB, AM and DP were not aware there was an electronic copy. DP stated that JB's document was a concise version. LR was not happy with that document.		
<b>Note</b>	<i>The official document '<a href="#">Harrow Voluntary &amp; Community Sector - Appointment Process for Non-Executive Member on Cabinet [PDF]</a>' that LR had bought copies of was used for the meeting.</i>		
3.6.1	JB stated this is what Harrow Council has given them and described some of the governance and procedure set out in the document.		
3.6.2	AB suggested that before the document was discussed the Forum can consider if this is actually what Forum wants, as he was 100% against this. PF agreed to a discussion on whether or not this is something Forum wants. PF has had a discussion about this with others at HLC and if there was a VCS Representative on Cabinet they would withdraw membership from everything as it will make it very hard to challenge future decisions at the council, even if it is non-voting. This is because a lot of the problems are about not engaging properly and the responsibility would fall on the VCS Member. It would also make it hard for the VCS to be involved in call-ins of decisions. PF agreed with AB that she could not see any benefits. PF questioned whether it is the organisation that is sitting or the individual, and it could put that person or organisation in a difficult position. PF said it needs a lot of thought and wondered if we are being drawn in and would face later challenges as there were a lot of negatives. PF reaffirmed that if there is a VCS Representative on Cabinet they will have to withdraw from everything involved with the VCS representing HLC's views and if any VCS group contacted us to challenge something the group would not be able to do that.		
3.6.3	JI stated there would be a collective responsibility and did not know how the Forum could do that, and the Forum should not walk into it blindly.		
3.6.4	NA agreed we should discuss it and suggested we should mention the advantages. The advantage is you get the detailed papers and		

	<p>the opportunity to respond beyond the 15 minutes allocated at Cabinet meetings. Being on Cabinet you can dispute things which might be untrue. NA suggested minutes could be used as evidence and whilst there are drawbacks there are also advantages.</p>		
3.6.5	<p>HK stated that the Council and VCS aims are to improve the lives of the community in Harrow, and it was better to be inside than outside. HK believes the advantages outweigh the negatives and the representatives of the Forum should also be represented on Cabinet.</p>		
3.6.6	<p>SK said from listening to PF this is something the Forum should really be thinking hard about and should be talked about wider than the people who attend these meetings. SK asked what the VCS Reps have been saying and if they have been asking people who do not attend this meeting. JB said they have not at the moment.</p>		
3.6.7	<p>GD did not have a view one way or the other. GD thought it was disturbing to think there could be legal implications for anyone that could be a VCS Representative on Cabinet. GD stated the person would need a lot of time to go through all the papers.</p>		
3.6.8	<p>PF stated that having the opposition Party on Cabinet in that position in the past was very different to having a VCS Representative on Cabinet. PF said that VCS groups appointing someone in this position, is effectively removing the chance for VCS and service users from judicial review or challenging decisions in the future. PF stated there are 3 public lawyers in HLC that have said it will cause a problem. PF questioned if it should be up to Forum attendees to make choices on the wider VCS without considering the wider implications. PF stated, as far as she could see, VCS cannot take briefing papers in a legal case as they might be signed up to a confidentiality agreement and one could not say they were part of the decision making process but still disagree with the action as they would have had their opportunity but were not able to persuade people. NA said they would not have a vote. PF suggested this does not matter.</p>		
3.6.9	<p>PF stated this comprises HLC on the VCS cuts, policy and procedure and will also have an effect on poor people. PF gave the example that the usual argument for judicial review is that people have not been consulted properly. If a VCS Representative was on the Cabinet and their job was to report back to the VCS and the VCS group was responsible for consulting its service users. PF questioned how HLC can then make the argument it has not been consulted on. PF stated this makes it very difficult and HLC will withdraw. PF said the topic needs to be considered much more widely than the Forum.</p>		
3.6.10	<p>JM stated that in the health service the Clinical Commissioning Group</p>		

	<p>(CCG) have a board that makes commissioning decisions that impact on resident's health. Healthwatch has a seat on that board which is speaking but non-voting. JM said that it has never been difficult to go against the decisions of their local CCG. The duty of Healthwatch is to inform the CCG's decision of something they have missed or an error. JM thought there were similarities here with the VCS Representative having a seat on Cabinet. JM stated the advantage could be good for the image but questioned the point of just speaking and appearing to side with one political faction or the other. JM said the papers at the last Cabinet were nearly 1500 pages long and questioned if anyone reads it. JM stated whilst Cabinet is the ultimate 'stamp' he does not reckon that is where the decisions are made. In reference to the document JM said there was nothing about reporting back and the main thing was that the information has to be sent from the VCS. JM stated he would not be involved.</p>		
3.6.11	<p>JH was worried that some papers were available to some Cabinet members and not others. JH assumed all papers that are available at Cabinet are available to all of the public. JH said this was a serious issue that we might become party to a group that keep things secret to a party that has elected them. NA stated there are papers by law which the council does not have to share and only members of Council get them. NA said this is a decision for the Forum and does not care either way, but what you do get by sitting at the table is a chance to intervene which can be recorded. JH asked will these papers be available to the VCS Representative on Cabinet. The Forum stated yes and referenced page 3 on the 'Harrow Voluntary &amp; Community Sector - Appointment Process for Non-Executive Member on Cabinet' document. RW stated a confidentiality agreement has to be signed. JH said that this meant it cannot be shared with anyone else in a democratic basis with the people who elected these representatives to form a Cabinet. JH believed the Forum should have nothing to do with it whatsoever and it would be a 'stain on our integrity'.</p>		
3.6.12	<p>LR agrees with JH and went through the history. The Labour group put it in their manifesto at the last minute as when David Perry had a seat under Susan Hall's administration he was supposed to offer her the same but reneged on that and chose to give it to the VCS instead. LR brought this up at the HCA launch (2014) where she asked Sue Anderson (SA) how she thought they would appoint such a person. LR stated SA would engage the whole VCS. LR would rather see Cllr Susan Hall stand as she has a mandate from the electorate in Harrow as the Conservative Party got more votes in the borough. LR could not imagine who could fill this position and would not want to be part of it.</p>		
3.6.13	<p>AM stated this discussion was made months ago but not in so much detail and suggested producing a pros and cons list.</p>		

3.6.14	TN stated there is huge ambiguity and that the pros and cons need to be considered. TN would be against if it is going to disarm the VCS against legally challenging the Council.		
3.6.15	PH was similarly minded particularly considering it was a remunerated post which would make the position difficult for the person to say something.		
3.6.16	SD was on the fence but slightly against it and would like more details.		
3.6.17	EH thought Harrow Council's motive was to say they have engaged with the VCS and is a tick box exercise. EH stated there is not much description in the document as to what a VCS Representative can actually do.		
3.6.18	NA said this was not about power which comes from the electoral box, but is about whether the VCS want to influence decisions. NA thought AM's idea of a pro and cons document would be good. NA suggested that we seek further legal advice other than HLC to get another opinion.		
3.6.19	JB stated we could always put it back to them and go back with options. PF stated that at Cabinet, David Perry said that VCS Reps were very supportive of this. PF was concerned about this. LR stated in the meeting with Marianne Locke, Cllr David Perry and Cllr Sue Anderson that she was definitely not supportive. PF asked how they got that impression. LR answered that they wanted to listen to the other four. AM stated she was not at the meeting. DP said when this was discussed at a previous meeting people were for it.		
3.6.20	AN said if we do not know what is going on we will miss out and would be interested in knowing the pros and the cons.		
3.6.21	TR thought being on the Cabinet could be a poisoned chalice for the individual or organisation. If the role is non-voting they do not take notice. TR agreed this is a tick box exercise and said Susan Hall on Cabinet brought up some good points which Cabinet had not listen to.		
3.6.22	DB agreed with TR's point.		
3.6.23	IK said there needs to be more discussion.		
3.6.24	RW said as a VCS we are always after a bigger voice and whilst it might not be exactly right there is an offer to have a conversation. The Forum should seek legal advice to ensure any actions do not affect local Judicial reviews. RW stated this is only a proposal we could go back and ask for a vote. JH questioned what happened to democracy. RW responded as to what is the best way to have a		

	<p>voice, if this is not the way what do we go back with. RW doesn't think we should dismiss, but also thinks we could consider remuneration.</p>		
3.6.25	<p>DP stated the example of the Grants Advisory Panel where he could challenge the Council and has never stopped HM campaigning for the issues they support. DP said this came about from engagement from the Labour group meetings which were attended by other voluntary and community sector groups. DP thought the issue about judicial reviews was a red herring. DP stated this is one way which we could influence agenda through co-design. Politicians will always tick boxes and this doesn't mean we can try and change their mind-set and engage. DP mentioned examples of influence such as Healthwatch influences on the Clinical Commissioning Group which is making a huge difference for the voice of the user and sector. DP fully supports it.</p>		
3.6.26	<p>JS said that there is a need for ongoing engagement and need to look at the pros and cons. JS questioned where this person fits within the Forum and the VCS, as well as the information they were required to give. JS thought the model to look at from JM could be good. As stated the term "Non-Executive Member" was not the right term. JS said she was uncomfortable about the payment and we should look at the hidden agenda and be careful.</p>		
3.6.27	<p>AB said it scares him when he hears PF will have to step down as he does not think this should discourage any single VCS group to come to the Forum and have a represented voice. AB stated this is an impossible role stating that a Councillor has a Ward to look after a VCS Representative has every single VCS group &amp; issue to look after. AB said we do not know how to engage with the whole VCS and questioned how one person is going to do it. AB said that this is also a top-down approach and not something we have asked for. DP and NA disagreed. AB stated he has looked through previous minutes and there is no mention of this. AB concluded he hopes whatever is decided is sector-wide and not just down to the Forum.</p>		
3.6.28	<p>Jl said the problem was that there is no way to feed in and it is not possible for one person. Jl suggested the question should be what mechanisms we can use. AB agreed and asked what the difference is between a VCS Representative on Cabinet and a VCS Rep. AB stated the purpose of a VCS Rep are to take issue from groups and challenge the Council. AB thought it was duplicating. Jl reaffirmed that we need to see what mechanisms are available and this was not useful for us. AB suggested at looking at different sectors. Jl stated this was where the Harrow Strategic Partnership was useful. DP said it did not change anything. Jl said this was a difficult question.</p>		
3.6.29	<p>PF stated even if another legal professional says this is possible this does not mean HLC will get involved. This will make things harder</p>		

	for judicial reviews and it is not a red herring. LR asked if it might discourage other organisations from the Forum. PF answered that some might not know all the implications and explained the scenario if Cabinet made a decision which was terrible, that person would be harangued. PF stated she agreed with AB and was not sure of the difference and the right place is for the opposition. PF reaffirmed that HLC would withdraw. DP asked what PF would withdraw from. DP stated the Labour party engaged with VCS groups and they wanted this. The Labour Party could turn round and ask the wider sector and not the forum. PF said she would not have a problem with this as they would not be representing the HLC.		
3.6.30	PH suggested we could look at other boroughs. Forum replied this has not happened before.		
3.6.31	TR reiterated that there is a poisoned chalice and most voluntary groups will not understand it.		
3.6.32	JB proposed a pros and cons document is produced. AB suggested before we do that can the VCS ask questions about this and put them into a document. DP suggested that once we have done that we ask the whole sector.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>To combine the <a href="#">‘Harrow Voluntary &amp; Community Sector - Appointment Process for Non-Executive Member on Cabinet’</a> and ‘HVCS Non-Executive Member on Cabinet’ documents.</b>	<b>AB, JB</b>	
<b>Action</b>	<b>Ask people for their comments, questions, pros and cons about the document.</b>	<b>AB</b>	
3.6.33	DP thought as VCS Reps they need to take the lead as they represent a wider constituency than the Forum. JB said it will go out to everyone. JS suggested at the end of this document that if the suggestion is not in favour of the proposal for inputters to state why and other mechanisms.		
3.6.34	TR stated if this going out to all it needs to be detailed and the background included.		
3.6.35	RW asked when it will come back for a decision. JB responded the 18 <sup>th</sup> April at the next Summit would be the next opportunity. DP said VCS Reps need to go back to the Leader of the Council.		
3.6.36	AN said it would be helpful to explain abbreviations and acronyms.		
3.6.37	TN wanted clarification that the Summit on the 18 <sup>th</sup> is going to clear up the governance of the Reps and this Forum. JB said the constitution should clear that up; the problem was at the moment VCS Representatives are representing the whole sector. DP queried how this can be changed without a membership of the Forum and		

<p><b>3.6.37.1</b></p> <p><b>3.6.38</b></p>	<p>how a small number of people can represent the views of the VCS.</p> <p>JB said it is going out to everyone. DP expressed a concern. JH wanted to know what JB meant by everyone and queried if it was the 174 that received money from the Cabinet. AB said no it was going through the HCA mailing list which was a mixture of organisations. JB said everything will go there until the 1<sup>st</sup> June.</p> <p>AB asked if the Forum should be looking at membership agreement before doing any groundwork so the Forum could have accountability and better governance. JB reaffirmed this has been discussed and the timescale would be too long.</p>		
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p>	<p><b>Constituted Forum (Agenda Item 4)</b></p> <p>LR explained there were two sets of responsibilities given out. One was given to LR and SK to produce documents for the roles and responsibilities and election procedure for Chair and Vice-Chair, the other was for JB, GD, Alan Voda and JS to look at the VCS Reps roles and responsibilities and election procedure. This would be for the same management board of the constituted Forum. The management board will consist of a Chair, Two Vice Chairs and up to 5 representatives. This was split into two because elections of the representative are to be every two years and the Chair and Vice-Chair to be elected every year. LR and SK produced their document with the intention that the new Chair is not going to be a VCS Rep.</p> <p>LR stated that at the moment the VCS Reps get an allowance from the Council via HCA. LR stated the future is very unclear about any funding to mimic this. JS asked what the allowance is. JB stated it is £1200 for each 5 VCS Rep organisation.</p> <p>LR stated she and SK put together the document with a nomination form. LR and SK saw a problem that if nominations are going to be made at the same time for the Chair and Vice-Chair, it is possible that someone might want to stand for both roles which could lead to more applications for Chairs and fewer applications for Vice-Chairs. They did not want the people who applied for Chair to be withdrawn from becoming a Vice-Chair so tried to design a way to rectify this. It was agreed that nominations could be made for either positions or just one, but the nominations would have to be done with agreement from their own organisation and support from two other organisations. For voting, the Chairs' votes will be counted first and once a Chair has been decided, on a decision on Vice Chair will be made and this will take into consideration any votes from the Chairs' election through preference voting.</p> <p>AB wanted clarification on which procedure we were using, LR's and SK's or JB's (the one presented at the Forum). LR stated the other group went the other way leading to the difference in documents.</p>		

4.2	JS asked for clarification and which document was more important. JS suggested it was the Reps Roles & Responsibilities Document.		
4.2.1	JB asked people's thoughts on the Reps Roles & Responsibilities document. JH was unhappy with the word representative and thought they should be Managers. SK said there has been a lengthy consultation.		
4.2.2	JS questioned what happens if there is a choice to be present or absent to a meeting, can the person send the Chair, Vice-Chair or another Representative. SK said yes. AB confirmed but the person would not have a vote. JS said that it was important to state in the Reps Roles & Responsibilities document that all meetings will be covered.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>To add that VCS representatives can send a representative if unable to attend a meeting and refer to the clause.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
4.2.3	JM queried why the VCS Representatives duties are for the Forum to have familiarity with the Forum's constitution, policies and procedures. JB stated they will be on the Management Board so they would have that responsibility.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>To add 'as a board member' to that bullet point</b>	<b>JB</b>	
4.2.4	JB asked if the same ballot paper could be used for the Vice Chair and Chair with people voting three times. LR stated a problem might be some people might not be willing to put themselves for both of the roles. NA thought LR's procedure sounded better.		
4.2.5	LR stated that there needs to be consideration on the VCS Representative ballot paper that at least 50% of groups must be from small groups.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Bring voting papers together.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
4.2.6	AB asked for timescales. JB said: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Today: Agree Roles &amp; Responsibilities of election process</li> <li>- 30<sup>th</sup> March: Nomination/Voting papers send out</li> <li>- 18<sup>th</sup> April: Summit</li> <li>- 24<sup>th</sup> April: Final date for nominations</li> <li>- 1<sup>st</sup> May: Voting papers go out</li> <li>- 22<sup>nd</sup> May: Voting closes</li> <li>- 1<sup>st</sup> June: Chair, Vice-Chair &amp; Reps announced and appointed</li> </ul>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>Send out final constitution, roles and responsibility for both, nomination papers for both and timescales.</b>	<b>AB</b>	
4.3	JB suggested that the policies and procedures should be considered by the Management Board of the constituted Forum. LR agreed.		

<b>5.</b>	<b>Updates On Cuts And Consultations (Agenda Item 5)</b>		
5.1	JB stated letters are going out and another invitation to a budget consultation is to be sent out.		
<b>Action</b>	<b>JB to ask DP to email out an update with timescales.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Pledge To 'Keep Volunteering Voluntary' (Agenda Item 6)</b>		
6.1	AB shared the leaflets about Keeping Volunteering Voluntary.		
6.2	LR encouraged groups to sign up to the Keep Volunteering Voluntary Pledge.		
<b>Note</b>	<i>Keep Volunteering Voluntary Information: Website: <a href="http://www.keepvolunteeringvoluntary.net">www.keepvolunteeringvoluntary.net</a> Pledge Sign-Up: <a href="http://www.keepvolunteeringvoluntary.net/signup">www.keepvolunteeringvoluntary.net/signup</a></i>		
<b>7.</b>	<b>Splitting Co-ordination Newsletter (Agenda Item 7)</b>		
7.1	Deferred to next meeting.		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Communications, Brand and Identity (Agenda Item 8)</b>		
<b>8.1</b>	Deferred to next meeting.		
<b>9.</b>	<b>AOB (Agenda Item 9)</b>		
9.1	TR suggested having two people representing the VCS on Cabinet. JB reiterated a document will be sent round where comments can be inputted.		
<b>10.</b>	<b>Date of next meetings</b>		
10.1	All meetings to be held 10am – 12pm at Committee Room 1 & 2, Harrow Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st June 2015</li> <li>• 27th July 2015</li> <li>• 28th September 2015</li> <li>• 30th November 2015</li> </ul>		
	<b>Meeting closed at 12:12</b>		