

## Minutes of the London Strategic Migration Partnership Board meeting

27 May 2009

City Hall

### Present:

#### Board members

RB	Richard Barnes	Deputy Mayor of London (chair)
HH	Hugh Harris	London First
CH	Chris Hayes	Director, Government Office for London
MR	Mike Reed	Deputy Director, Migration Policy, Department of Communities and Local Government
LH	Laurie Heselden	SERTUC (South East Regional TUC)
PP	Paul Plant, for Simon Tanner	NHS, London
DC	Donna Covey	Refugee Council
NA	Noeleen Adams	Third Sector Alliance
	Tony Smith	Regional Director, UK Border Agency
BP	Belinda Porich	Operational head, National Housing Federation
KP	Kathy Prior	Job Centre Plus
DK	Davinder Kumar	MRAP
SA	Simin Azimi	MRAP
YT	Yeukai Taruvinga	MRAP
SF	Sharon Flannery	UKBA
AB	Arun Batra for Sarah Ebanja	LDA

### Apologies:

AW	Alan Wood	Association of London Directors of Children Services
MC	Cllr Merrick Cockell	Chair, London Councils
JS	Cllr Jason Stacey	London Councils

### GLA:

WL	Wayne Lawley	Deputy Mayor's Office
JJ	Jeff Jacobs	Director, Communities and Intelligence
MD	Muge Dindjer	Joint Acting Head of Social Inclusion and Health
JW	Jon Williams	Principal Policy Officer, Immigration and Asylum
RS	Roudy Shafie	Senior Policy Officer, Immigration and Asylum
DW	Dick Williams	Senior Policy Officer, Immigration and Asylum
AM	Amna Mahmoud	Policy Officer, Immigration and Asylum

## Minutes

### Agenda items' discussion

### Actions

#### 1. Welcome and introduction

1.1 RB welcomed the board members to the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and invited them to introduce themselves. He welcomed the Community members.

1.2 RB noted the apologies.

## **2. Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

## **3. LSMP Terms of Reference and Board Membership**

The Terms of Reference were agreed.

## **4. Data on migrants report**

**RB** introduced John Hollis, Demographic Consultant, GLA to present a report on Data on Migrants.

4.1 **JH** presented his report and answered the questions raised.

### **4.2 Q&A/ comments:**

**AB** asked if the data captures evidence across sectors.

**JH** said that data does not provide this information. Work registration scheme shows what sector the people work in, but It is applicable to EU workers only. National Insurance data does not show this information. He suggested that DWP might be able to help understand this kind of information.

**RB** asked if there is any data on the people who leave the country.

**JH** replied that there is no data available, and that there is also the issue of secondary movement and short-term stay (less than a year), which are not captured.

**TS** commented that by 2015 UKBA would have 100% data on exit controls through the e-borders scheme. He acknowledged the need to work closely with sea carriers and rail services.

**CH** commented that there is a risk that the data may be unreliable, not knowing the numbers of the people who leave the country.

**MR** said that DCLG has interest in this issue because of settlement and housing, and that they are working on sharing the ministerial source of information.

**RB** commented that there is a need to map where the community networks and the jobs are.

**RB** suggested that for future reports, officers to talk to DCLG and UKBA before presenting them to the partnership.

**RB** requested that the Board accept the recommendations.

## **5. Report on ESOL**

**RB** invited Roudy Shafie to present a report on ESOL.

5.1 **RS** presented her report on ESOL and answered the questions. Presentation attached.

### **5.2 Q&A/ comments:**

**RB** commented that ESOL is patchy and not necessary accessible when needed. He added that the courses are not accessible and vocational courses override those needed for integration e.g. for citizenship. He asked whether there is ring fenced funding?

**SA** pointed out the following problems with ESOL provision:

**Next data update report to incorporate data from UKBA and DCLG**

**Recommendations agreed**

- Funders and providers assume what the needs are rather than engage in discussion with RCOs.
- ESOL provision is not co-ordinated, which may waste public money. Users, providers, funders and employers all need to be involved in a coordinated way.
- Embedded ESOL may not work if the basic need for ESOL is not met e.g. vocational training for childcare may not work if the candidates have no English knowledge.
- Some Refugee Community Organisations (RCOs) are ESOL providers. However, there is no funding to RCOs to enable them to meet the accreditation requirement. This leaves the certificate issued to learners meaningless. So the learners move from one class to another without being able to participate in society, talk to their children or get a job.

**DC** said that DIUS policy is better now for Refugees and Asylum Seekers. However, she raised the following points:

- There are high numbers of asylum seekers in London who receive subsistence only support and do not appear in the statistics. They need to have access to ESOL
- Most asylum seekers are overqualified but are not allowed to work.
- There are also some refugees who got limited leave to stay and will be due for citizenship by 2010. They need ESOL for the Citizenship test.

**DC to share the figures**

**DC** called for London to follow Wales and Scotland in supporting integration from day one.

**HH** shared his experience being on the MIF Assessment Panel commented that ESOL was a common theme from the boroughs. He stressed that there is a lot of information, which is not known to the boroughs e.g. what Refugee Council does.

**RB** asked about who funds ESOL and who monitors the quality?

**All** members agreed that there is a problem with ESOL co-ordination and monitoring in general.

**DK** highlighted that ESOL for EU workers needs to be considered as well.

**CH & PP** informed the meeting that the joint needs assessment looks at health and social care and does not include language assessment.

**YT** highlighted the fact that asylum seekers are not allowed to work but need ESOL for integration.

The Board agreed the recommendations.

**Recommendations to be taken forward by GLA**

**Recommendations agreed**

## **6. Ending Rough Sleeping in London: Issues, Actions and the LSMP Role**

**RB** invited Dick Williams to present a report on Rough Sleeping in London.

6.1 **DW** presented his report and answered the questions. Presentation attached.

### **6.2 Q&A/ comments:**

**LH** asked about the length of time people were sleeping rough.

**DW** explained that there are outreach teams in the boroughs who look at who appears once, regularly or constantly sleeping rough and make their

assessments.

**PP** commented that rough sleeping is an important challenge for NHS as it affects mental and physical health, links to addiction and there are also issues around duty of care and access. He informed the meeting that rough sleepers had a life expectancy of 38 years.

**TS** supported the recommended action on Case Resolution, citing the risk of resolved cases becoming rough sleepers whether they need to be deported or granted status. If they were granted status, UKBA support would be withdrawn. He confirmed that there were limited enforcement options for EU nationals but pointed out that even a small number of rough sleepers had a high impact.

**DC** highlighted that Asylum support partnership produced a detailed figures for destitution in London and how they drift back to London after their dispersal.

**RB** shared his experience visiting a project in North London dealing with 750 resolved cases, who were destitute. He commented that they may not be classified as rough sleepers but they sleep on the floors of their community members.

**LH** suggested that it might be useful to assess the risks in the current economic environment. He also mentioned that here is a large group who is at risk but not been identified by any body.

**MD** suggested a pilot which would identify what it would take to improve the offer to the 60 or so A10 rough sleepers and work with different government departments to reshape the policies as a one-year pilot.. She suggested mapping what is already out there as a starting point.

The Board agreed the recommendations and added the scoping of the pilot described above.

**GLA to take forward the recommendations**

## **7. Migration Advisory Committee report**

7.1 **RS** presented a report.

**RB** commented that it was late in the life cycle of a recession to review the Points Based System now.

**TS** commented that this group could influence the policy.

7.2 NHS London, London First, SERTUC, LDA and DM from MRAP volunteered to share their evidence with the GLA for the Mayor's response.

**GLA to draft response with input from named partners**

## **8. AOB**

8.1 Bid to Migration Impacts Fund

**MD** informed the members that the GLA put a bid for MIF in partnership with three boroughs coming in as pilots to meet the information needs of migrants and their advisers.

**CH** informed the members of the progress of the MIF

8.2 Update on *London Enriched*

**MD** updated the members of the progress so far. She stated that the redrafted strategy was currently going through GLA internal processes and would go back out to LSMP members for one final look before the launch.

**RB** thanked the members for their contribution and closed the meeting.