

New Dawn Project

Needing to be heard

- giving social housing tenants a stronger national voice

Richard Crossley

January 2012

Contents

Part 1: Background	Page 4
Part 2: Method	Page 8
Part 3: Results of our discussions with tenants	Page 9
Part 4: Views expressed by others in the sector	Page 13
Part 5: Moving forward	Page 15
Part 6: Conclusions and summary	Page 18
Appendix 1	Survey responses
Appendix 2	Principles and practices
Appendix 3	Structural options
Appendix 4	List of contributors from the sector

Terry Edis

In November last year the social housing sector mourned the death of Terry Edis – chair of the National Federation of Tenant Management Organisations, chair of WATMOS Community Homes and chair of Burrowes Street TMO. He was instrumental in turning Burrowes Street from a poorly managed unpopular estate into a well-run well-managed estate with a range of community activities.

Terry was also a key player in the setting up the National Tenant Voice. He was a member of the Project Group set up by the Communities and Local Government Department to develop the NTV, and later became a member of the NTV Council. When the New Dawn Project was set up, he represented the NFTMO on the Steering Group.

He was an inspiring leader of the organisations he chaired. He brought to the NTV development and the New Dawn project not only a wealth of experience, but also passion, a great sense of humour and an extraordinary humanity.

Part 1: Background

Reason for project

- 1.1 The New Dawn project followed the announcement in July 2010 that the government was no longer going to fund the National Tenant Voice (NTV). In his letter to members of the NTV Council, Housing Minister Grant Shapps said
- 1.2 *“We (the Minister and Michael Gelling, the chair of the NTV) went on to discuss the possibility of sustaining some of the very positive work that has taken place during the formation of the NTV. Michael explained how the NTV project had encouraged strong co-operation among the National Tenant Organisations (NTOs), and we talked also about the impressive commitment shown by the volunteers who form the Council and Board of the NTV. I agreed to Michael’s suggestion that he should explore urgently with the members of the NTV and with the NTOs whether any arrangements could be made to support continuation of some elements of the NTV. Any such arrangements would need to be consistent with my decision to cease funding the NTV (though it may be possible to consider some very limited additional funding for the NTOs, through the Tenant Empowerment Programme); it would also be necessary for any successor to the NTV to be independent of Government (and not an arm’s length body of any description).”*
- 1.3 Following this, the NTOs got together with Michael Gelling and Richard Crossley, then Chief Executive of the NTV, to discuss plans for submitting an application to the Tenant Empowerment Programme (TEP) for funding to allow an exploration of the options. The aims of the project and the setting up and personnel of the Steering Group were agreed by the Board of the NTV at its final meeting in August, and by the four NTOs.

Aims of project

- 1.4 The aim of the project was to produce a proposed new sustainable structure for a national tenant movement that will
- maximise tenant influence at national level
 - provide support to tenants and tenants’ organisations at local level
 - celebrate diversity within the sector and an ambition to ensure no-one is excluded
 - promote best practice from a tenant perspective
 - give opportunities to service providers and others to be part of the movement
- 1.5 The project was designed to allow all members of the NTV Council, plus members of the Boards of the NTOs, plus others, to input their ideas on what a successor body to the NTV, in the context of the overall national structure, might look like.

Current structures nationally

1.6 Currently there are four organisations under the loose umbrella of the National Tenant Organisations. These four, with a brief description, are as follows:

<p>Confederation of Co-operative Housing (CCH)</p>	<p>CCH was formed in 1993 as the representative body for co-operative and mutual housing. Its membership is open to all housing co-operatives, community-controlled housing organisations, relevant support organisations, regional federations of housing co-ops, and any other organisation that supports co-operative housing.</p> <p>It is governed by a General Council made up of regional representatives from each region.</p> <p>CCH's income comes from consultancy and training services, conferences and seminars and membership. It does not employ any permanent full time staff, delivering contracts through use of associate staff.</p>
<p>National Federation of Tenant Management Organisations (NFTMO)</p>	<p>The NFTMO was founded in 1992 and represents tenant management co-ops, estate management boards and other forms of tenant management organisations in the council and housing association sector.</p> <p>It is governed by an executive committee of 21.</p> <p>The organisation is funded through a combination of membership fees, conference/training income, advertising, and fees for services. Some of those services underpin the statutory Right to Manage and are paid for by Government through the Tenant Empowerment Programme. It has one part-time employee.</p>
<p>Tenants and Residents Organisations of England (TAROE)</p>	<p>TAROE was founded in 1997 bringing into one body the former National Tenants Organisation (NTO) and the former National Tenants and Residents Federation (NTRF) - to represent tenants from social housing across England. Membership is open to tenants in England: regional bodies, tenant federations, tenant and resident associations, and individual tenants.</p> <p>It is governed by a Board of Management of 12 tenant members plus 3 non-tenant co-optees, and currently has two members of staff.</p> <p>TAROE draws its income from a range of sources, including the government's Tenant Empowerment Programme (linked to specific outcomes), partnership contracts, and training and consultancy services.</p>
<p>Tenant Participation Advisory Service (TPAS)</p>	<p>TPAS was formed in 1988 to promote excellence in tenant and resident involvement. It is a membership body which supports its national policy work through social enterprise activities. Membership is open to tenant and resident groups, and to landlords who support the aims of tenant and resident involvement.</p> <p>TPAS is governed by a Board of 5 tenant directors and 5 landlord directors. The annually elected Chair rotates between tenant and</p>

	<p>provider directors. It has six regional committees made up of tenant and provider representatives. These are elected from its membership.</p> <p>Its income comes primarily from membership, tenant-focussed consultancy and training services, landlord and contractor accreditation, and an annual tenant conference. TPAS employs 19 people.</p>
--	--

NTV Council

- 1.7 The NTV Council was an important part of the structure of the NTV. It was set up as a 50¹-strong policy forum to discuss and debate housing policies, and advise the government accordingly. 20 of its number were nominated by the NTOs and by regional tenants' organisations: 30 were recruited via an open recruitment campaign. The tenant members of NTV Board were recruited from the NTV Council.
- 1.8 It was a unique body, and its potential strength lay in its mix of experienced national activists and others new to the national stage but recruited for their skills and experience, its mix of tenants from different tenures and house types, and its wide geographical coverage.

Other organisations

- 1.7 There are other organisations working nationally on issues relating to social housing tenants. Defend Council Housing is a campaigning organisation of trade unions, tenants, some MPs and others. It campaigns for council housing, and came into being to oppose stock transfer to housing associations and transfer of management to ALMOs, and to campaign for resourcing of council housing. It is now involved in the Housing Emergency campaign to oppose recent government proposals on social housing.
- 1.8 Shelter, the housing and homeless charity, campaigns on social housing issues.

Current structures regionally and locally

- 1.9 At a local level there are hundreds of tenants and residents associations, tenant forums, tenant panels and other similar organisations. Some of these are formed and run by tenants without support from their landlord, some are formed and run by tenants with support from the landlord, and others are formed by the landlord.
- 1.10 In some areas, tenants groups get together – with or without the support of the landlord and/or local authority – to form federations. In some areas tenants'

¹ 4 tenants (3 recruited, 1 nominated) were unable to take up their posts because of health issues or caring responsibilities. 2 of these were substituted from a reserve pool, making a total of 48 NTV Council members when the NTV funding was withdrawn

organisations have got together to form sub-regional federations, sharing information and providing mutual support. Some landlords that operate in more than one region also support federations of tenants groups that operate within their organisation.

- 1.11 In some regions, groups have got together to form regional groups. Again, sometimes this is done by tenants themselves, and in other places regional groups are supported by landlords. In one region the regional organisation was set up with support from the government office of the region as well as landlords. A combination of lack of funding and fewer housing decisions being made at regional level has meant that there are currently very few fully-functioning regional tenants' organisations.
- 1.12 The New Dawn project has focused on the functions and structures of tenants organisations at the national level. But when reflecting on the role and outreach of national organisations, we recognise the crucial importance of organisations at regional, sub-regional, district and local / neighbourhood levels.

Management of the project

- 1.13 The NTV Board and the NTOs agreed the project would be managed by a Steering Group made up of one from each of the four NTOs, plus Michael Gelling (as chair of the NTV and as the person who had negotiated the funding for the project with the Minister), plus a recruited tenant from the NTV Council who was not on the NTV Board. The people on the Steering Group were:
- Nic Bliss – chair of CCH
 - Cora Carter – then chair of TAROE
 - Terry Edis – chair of NFTMO
 - Pam Mclvor – NTV Council member
 - Michelle Reid – Chief Executive of TPAS
 - Michael Gelling
- 1.14 The Steering Group agreed a project plan and work plan. The application for TEP funding was made by TPAS on behalf of the Steering Group, and the Steering Group appointed Richard Crossley to carry out the work on behalf of the Steering Group and act as project advisor.

Part 2: Method

- 2.1 The **first phase** of the project involved gathering the views and ideas from as many members of the NTV Council as possible plus the Board or equivalent in the NTOs. This was done through an on-line questionnaire, meetings and individual discussions.
- 2.2 The findings were fully documented in a discussion paper. The discussion paper used the responses from Phase 1 to set out:
 - proposed principles and practices that should be embraced by any national structure
 - four options, plus a “do nothing” option, of structures that could embrace the key principles and practices
 - a look at possible funding for the options
- 2.3 The **second phase** involved a second round of meetings with NTV Council members, further discussions with NTOs, and discussions with others in the sector.
- 2.4 The NTV Council members’ meetings were based around the discussion paper. Council members added to and refined the principles and practices. They then ranked each of the options against the principles and practices.
- 2.5 The NTOs sent in written responses to the discussion paper.
- 2.6 The **third phase** involved work with the NTOs to enable them to take forward the outcomes of the earlier work. In addition to NTO representatives meetings, the co-ordinator facilitated a workshop of key NTO representatives, and a workshop that involved governing body members of all the NTOs. This was the first time the governing bodies had got together.

Part 3: Results of our discussions with tenants

3.1 The results of the phase 1 survey of NTV Council members and members of governing bodies of NTOs are shown as Appendix 1.

Functions of national organisations

3.2 Most who responded to the survey thought the top priority functions of national organisations were:

- commenting on national policies
- lobbying government and other policy-makers
- producing policy ideas.

3.3 Of the possible functions listed, 'organising campaigns' had the lowest votes. The priorities were similar for NTO members and NTV Council members.

3.4 The first round of meetings with NTV Council members affirmed the views expressed in the survey. Most people saw that influencing national policy and practice by commenting on policies and lobbying policy-makers was the core function.

3.5 In several meetings we had a lengthy discussion on what was meant by the term 'lobbying'. It was almost universally accepted that it wasn't the function of national tenants' organisations to organise campaigns that involved demonstrations (the meetings took place at the time when student demonstrations against the proposed rises in university fees were taking place). Lobbying was seen as seeking influence through discussion and persuasion.

3.6 Most mentioned that disseminating information to tenants and tenants' groups, and receiving information back, was crucial to achieving the aim of influencing policy-makers. It will ensure that arguments will be backed by evidence from tenants.

3.7 Some saw research as a crucial part of this evidence, whilst others did not feel that research was a core function. Some said it is unlikely that national organisations will have the resources to commission research, and therefore research will not be a priority. Others saw the gathering of evidence from tenants as a form of research that may on occasions be backed up by commissioned research if resources permitted.

3.8 Most said that developing policy ideas was a core function, though some did not see this as a top priority.

3.9 Giving advice to tenants and tenants' groups, and assisting groups / networks to form was not seen as a priority. Some saw educating housing providers as being a key bi-product of the work of national organisations, if not a core function. Others didn't see this as a priority.

- 3.10 Linking the work to co-regulation / tenant scrutiny / local offers was seen as important, as was setting standards, benchmarking, publicising good practice. Other ideas included the importance of training of tenants taking on roles nationally, and raising public awareness about the sector and the issues it faces.

Principles and practices

- 3.11 A discussion document from the survey and first round of meetings set out the principles and practices that people would like to see from national organisation. These were refined by NTOs and NTV Council members in the second phase meetings. The principles and practices form Appendix 2.

Structures

- 3.12 In the initial survey we asked an open question on what **changes are needed** to current structures for the roles that people saw as important to be most effectively carried out. The single most common theme was the need for a united voice at national level, many saying this should be a single united voice.
- 3.13 The discussions that followed the survey recognised that CCH and the NFTMO are organisations representing tenants in a particular part of the social housing sector, and that there was value in having this specialist representation nationally.
- 3.14 The discussion document included 5 options (including a stay-as-we-are option) developed by the Steering Group following the first round of discussions. These were used as the basis for discussion in the second round of discussions. The 5 options are presented in Appendix 3.

Preferred options

- 3.15 In the second round of meetings with NTV Council members, members were asked to take each of the principles and practices and rank these according to the likelihood of them being delivered by each option.
- 3.16 The exercise showed a wide range of views on which options are most likely to deliver the desired principles and practices. Option 4 - creating a new organisation - confirmed the desires for unity shown in the survey and the first phase of the project as being the option most likely to deliver what people wanted.
- 3.17 The NTOs were split on their preferred option(s). One preferred option 5 (stay as you are) with TAROE supported to take on the role of fulfilling the principles and practices, and NTV Council members encouraged to get involved in TAROE. Another preferred Option 4, or a variation of this based on individual membership. Another supported the further exploration of Option 4, provided that it would be a tenant and landlord organisation.

Policy Forum

- 3.18 Whilst most NTV Council members and some NTOs expressed a view that Option 4 – a new over-arching organisation - would best deliver what is required, most people were realistic enough to realise that this was a long term aspiration. They recognised that there would be challenges and risks involved in at least two existing organisations becoming one. Some Council members and one NTO therefore saw Option 2 – a policy forum as part of an existing organisation – as a realistic option that could be established relatively quickly.

Funding

- 3.19 There was a recognition that with central government saying it was not going to provide any core funding for national tenants organisations, then funding for organisations to have influence at national level is going to have to come primarily from the social housing sector.
- 3.20 In the survey, the most common response to the open question on funding was that a national structure should be funded from social housing providers based on an amount per tenancy. Some felt this should be voluntary, others compulsory. The discussions in Phase 1 of the project reinforced this. There were interesting debates about the need for tenants to at least know, and preferably have a say, in whether or not a provider contributes to this. Currently few tenants are consulted on whether or not the provider contributes to a range of national organisations. Nor do tenants get information back on the value to the organisation of such a contribution. Many were of the view that this should be a requirement of funding of national tenant organisation(s).
- 3.21 Tenants also recognised that funding from providers would not be given unconditionally. If a contribution was voluntary tenants' organisations would at least have to demonstrate what a provider would gain from contributing, be it in the way of services, opportunities to contribute and / or a clear demonstration that it is in the interests of tenants.
- 3.22 Many tenants referred to a contribution to national tenant organisations as a 'levy'. Some providers interpreted this as an addition on rents collected by the landlord. Later discussions confirmed that most saw the contribution coming from existing rents and not an addition on rents. To avoid confusion the term 'contribution' rather than 'levy' should be used.
- 3.23 With approximately 4 million social housing tenancies, a contribution based on 1p per tenancy per week, 50p per tenancy per year, would give a total of around £2m per annum.

Other possible sources of funding

3.24 There were lots of ideas in the discussions about other sources of funding. These included:

- other organisations such as contractors, surveyors, suppliers, consultancy firms that make money out of the social rented sector
- social enterprise – the selling of certain services such as training, consultation and accreditation
- grants or contracts from government and others to deliver specific programmes or pieces of work
- foundations and charities

Part 4: Views of others in the sector

- 4.1 Throughout the project we held discussions with a range of people within the social housing sector. Some of these had been involved in the NTV either on the Accountability Committee, on the project group that advised on setting it up, or as independent members of the NTV Board. Others were from sector agencies and social housing providers. A list of those who gave views forms Appendix 4. Most of the views expressed were the views of the individuals we spoke with, and did not necessarily represent the views of their organisation.
- 4.2 We asked people
- what they saw as the role of national tenants' organisations
 - whether they saw these being carried out adequately by currently arrangements
 - what might need to change to ensure they are carried out
 - whether there is a role for something like the NTV Council – a policy forum of tenants drawn from around the country
 - their thoughts on how such an organisation might be funded
- 4.3 On the role of national organisations, all were of the view that it was important that tenants had a much stronger voice at national level, and most thought that the voice would be stronger if it was coming from one place. Some expressed the view that it is much better when tenants are speaking for tenants, and was aware that decision-makers had commented that often it is others speaking on behalf of tenants.
- 4.4 Many did not see current arrangements giving an adequate voice for tenants. Some saw this as a result of inadequate funding and some were not aware of what the current organisations did. Several mentioned that it was confusing having so many organisations nationally.
- 4.5 Many spoke of the need to ensure that those that have in the past consistently been without a voice are represented in some way. This would require a structure and methodology that gives credibility to an advocacy role.
- 4.6 The idea of a policy forum similar to the NTV Council was thought to be of value as part of a bigger structure. It would enable a wider body of tenants to contribute relatively quickly and easily to national debate. Those who had been independent members of the NTV Board were generally positive about the NTV Council, but recognised that much more development was needed for people to understand their roles.
- 4.7 On funding there was recognition that currently and for the foreseeable future, direct government funding will not be forthcoming. Some suggested that there may be opportunities for income from social research organisations and from foundations. Most thought that money could and should come from the sector,

either in the form of a membership or affiliation fee, or from a levy of some sort. Most said that this would need to come with an “offer” on products, on providing examples of best practice, and of helping tenants to be more effective locally. For many this latter point was thought to be crucial.

Part 5: Moving forward

- 5.1 Those involved in the NTV, those we talked to from the social housing sector, and a people involved at governance level in NTOs, are mostly of the view that tenants do need a voice at national level, and in the light of the stopping of the NTV funding this needs to be a stronger and more united voice than is currently the case.
- 5.2 However, most people were realistic enough to know that a single unified structure that incorporates the principles and practices that tenants want to see will not be easy, and if it did come about would take time to develop.
- 5.3 Our view is that establishing the principles and practices that the organisation(s) abide by is more important than the number of organisations, or structures of those organisations is. The New Dawn project deliberately sought agreement on the principles and practices before considering structures, and the principles and practices set out in Appendix 2 of this report have emerged from discussions with tenants from the NTV Council, tenants involved in the NTOs, and others in the sector. These must be at the heart of any national tenant structure, whatever that structure might be.
- 5.4 When we came to discuss structures most people – tenants and others within the sector – were of the view that the current structures are not the best way to deliver the principles and practices. However most recognised that we are where we are, and that moving from the current structures to a new structure will inevitably take time.
- 5.5 As highlighted in Section 3, many people recognise that CCH and NFTMO represent tenants from particular sections of the social housing sector, and as such should remain independent organisations representing those parts of the sector. In future there may be other groups of tenants in particular types of properties or in particular circumstances who wish to form a national organisation. Any structure will need flexibility to allow any such groups to be part of the overall national structure provided they support the values and aims of the overall structure
- 5.6 Inevitably the discussions then focussed on TPAS and TAROE as national organisations representing the interests of all social housing tenants. Even though we were speaking with activists and others with a keen interest in tenant involvement, many were unaware of the roles the organisations fulfil nationally.
- 5.7 For example, few people we spoke with were aware of the key differences between TAROE and TPAS, despite the fact that both are national organisations, both have tenants and tenants' organisations as members, and both campaign for what is best for social housing tenants.

- 5.8 But each has a very distinct history, and those histories have led them to being organisations with fundamental differences. TPAS is a tenant and landlord organisation, set up initially with government support to promote excellence in tenant and resident involvement. It employs 19 staff and its governing body has equal numbers of tenants and landlords. TAROE was formed by tenants from a merger of two national tenants' organisations. Though it welcomes support from landlords and others, it is a tenant organisation with a tenant-majority governing body. It employs 2 staff, and is always keen to be represented publicly by tenants rather than by staff or others. TPAS is proud of being a tenant and landlord organisation: TAROE is proud of being a tenant organisation.
- 5.9 TAROE and TPAS work closely with each other, on bilateral projects as well as within the NTOs structure. In terms of delivering on the principle and practices, this is more important than the issue of the number of organisations.

National Tenant Organisations

- 5.10 The NTOs – CCH, NFTMO, TAROE and TPAS - have operated for a few years now under a loose partnership arrangement. This has served them well. Representatives from each NTO meet when required and they have undertaken a number of projects together. Each NTO has its own governance and decision-making arrangements, and all recognise that nothing can be undertaken in the name of the NTOs without each NTO agreeing. Whilst it is a relatively small number of people who meet under the NTO umbrella (typically 7 or 8 people), the representatives do feed back to their respective governing bodies.
- 5.11 Following the Phase 2 discussions the NTOs took on board the idea of a policy forum to help deliver the principles and practices. They agreed that rather than one of the existing NTOs developing the forum, it would be more effective if it was developed by the NTOs collectively. They recognised that this presented challenges to the partnership and the way they conduct business.
- 5.12 The NTOs developed an “offer” to be put to NTV Council members, for the NTOs to set up a policy forum with the NTV Council members eligible for membership. The forum would be primarily electronic, with members invited to comment on policy issues and participate in virtual working groups. If funds were available, the NTOs would organise occasional policy events with the board members of the NTOs. The offer made it clear that the policy forum would have to be an NTO policy forum, to avoid any comprehension of creating a separate organisation, something clearly not wanted by those we held discussions with.
- 5.13 The NTOs have recently taken on national commissions for the TSA and the government on matters of interest to tenants. This, and the decision to set up a

policy forum, has necessitated the NTOs looking at their collective decision-making, communication and accountability structures in order to develop efficient and accountable ways of working collectively, without compromising the integrity of the governance arrangements of each individual organisation.

- 5.14 The New Dawn project has been able to help with this. The New Dawn co-ordinator facilitated a workshop of NTO members to explore options for organisation and communication. And members of the four governing bodies met together for the first time to discuss how the organisations can better work together, better communicate with each other and the wider world, and how they can collectively exert influence on decision-makers.
- 5.15 All this will help the NTOs take up the challenge of developing the New Dawn vision, of which the policy forum will be a key part. They have agreed how they will manage the forum, and terms of reference and a protocol for its operation.
- 5.16 Their challenge will be to develop and grow the forum so that it has a genuine and meaningful role in helping to get across to government and others policy ideas and the impacts of policies on tenants. Ideally the forum will grow alongside a developing NTO partnership that will continue to increase tenant input into policy discussions and debates.

Resources

- 5.17 The policy forum has been designed to operate at a minimum level on limited resources. But it is unrealistic to expect it to grow, and for the NTOs to develop the vision set out in this paper without additional resources. For example, the recent meeting of the boards of the NTOs cost each NTO around £1000 just in travel and subsistence costs. In the current climate none of the NTOs have the resources for this to happen on anything other than a very occasional basis.
- 5.18 There is recognition in the sector that the sector itself should make funding available for tenants to have a voice at national level. In the consultation we carried out, a payment of an amount per tenancy to support influence at national level was supported by an overwhelming majority of those consulted. Just 1p per tenancy per week would give a budget more than the original budget of the NTV. This will need to be explored further.

Part 6: Conclusions and Summary

- 6.1 This is a difficult time for tenants' organisations nationally. The National Tenant Voice, having overcome some initial scepticism, was welcomed by many tenants as an opportunity to improve things for social housing tenants by increasing tenant influence at policy level. It was also seen as a chance to broaden the opportunities for tenant input into national debates, particularly amongst groups of traditionally under-represented tenants, and to support existing national organisations. Its Council of 50 was a unique blend of tenants from national and regional organisations and tenants who were new to the national stage; tenants who were active locally and tenants not that active. All had an abundance of skills and experience to offer.
- 6.2 Once the funding was withdrawn and the NTV was no longer a non-departmental public body, the NTV Council could not fulfil the purpose for which it was brought together. It could not develop as envisaged, and it did not have a mandate for any other activities. For most of the Council members the news was devastating, and for two groups of people it was particularly so. Members from the National Tenant Organisations, and other tenants, saw the organisation they had worked hard to create for 2 – 3 years unable to come to fruition. And tenants who had been through a lengthy recruitment process saw their opportunity to influence policies at the national level taken away from them before it had a chance to develop.
- 6.3 The work of the National Tenant Organisations will go on. In the last 4 or 5 years they have begun to work together more than ever before. Initially TAROE, NFTMO and CCH came together, and were instrumental in designing the NTV. More recently TPAS has joined the NTOs despite it being a tenant and landlord organisation. All this has created a stronger and more united voice for tenants than has been seen before.
- 6.4 The NTOs acknowledge that in many corners of the country even active tenants are not aware of the existence of any of these organisations, let alone aware of what they do and how they operate. Our survey demonstrated this. Where tenants are aware of the NTOs, that knowledge is often based on a particular experience of an organisation – either positive or negative.
- 6.5 This lack of reach to many tenants is a direct result of the limited resources that have been available to national organisations. TAROE, CCH and NFTMO function mainly on the voluntary efforts of individuals, all of whom also keep in touch with the grass roots through involvement in local organisations as well as running the national organisation. TPAS relies on its membership base and voluntary regional committees to connect to localities.
- 6.6 It is common for organisations that depend on voluntary effort to face criticism that they are not representing people properly, or that they are not doing things correctly, or that they must be doing what they are doing for personal gain. This has

been particularly true in the tenant movement, and has been witnessed at local level as well as regional and national levels. In such a climate of suspicion it's remarkable that so much has been achieved.

- 6.7 The New Dawn project has been an opportunity to look at a vision for tenants to have influence at national level. Whilst some we have spoken with have said how there is now a stronger focus on 'localism' rather than national policies, no-one denies the need for tenants to have a strong voice heard at national level. The project has sought a rationale for this, and at the principles and practices for this voice to be effective.
- 6.8 We have discussed the merits of creating a new organisation that will bring together the best parts of current organisations. This may become a reality sometime in the future. But we recognise that any organisation is a collection of individuals brought together with some common bond, and the structure is less important than having individuals with a common vision, committing their time and effort to make things work and to reach out to others. The project has therefore worked with the NTOs to assist them in becoming more effective as a partnership, and to develop the principles and practices identified by the New Dawn project. The NTOs are working to develop their collective identity and improve communications between themselves and to the outside world. And they have taken on the task of setting up a policy forum based initially on NTV Council members. Given the resources currently available this will only be able to grow slowly.
- 6.9 There is a lot of work still to be done, and a lot of detail to be worked out. People will have different views about what a national organisational structure should look like, and how people get to particular positions. But we believe key principles and practices could become real if everyone chooses to work towards that aim. For many years national tenants' organisations have suffered from a lack of support for those that have chosen to put themselves forward. Of course organisations have been far from perfect, but too often people have been quick to criticise rather than constructively support. That willingness to constructively support that will be vital in taking things forward
- 6.10 Finally, the work of growing a more effective national voice for tenants that can ensure that tenants have access to decision-makers alongside the NHF, CIH, LGA and others, will only happen if some resources are made available. Such resources will enable tenants to have face to face debate and discussions, as well as fund work to reach out to tenants currently without a voice. We have one firm offer of financial support from a provider in developing the vision. We hope that this will inspire others who believe that social housing tenants should have a stronger national voice to do the same.

Appendix 1

Survey responses

Which of the following roles do you think are important for tenants' organisations nationally? Indicate all those you think are important. Leave all blank if you do not think any are important.

	Total No.	% Total	NTV Council %	Nominated Council %	Recruited Council %
Comment on national housing policies from government and others	62	98	100	100	100
Lobby government and other policy-makers	59	94	100	100	90
Produce policy ideas based on a cross-section of tenant viewpoints	58	92	97	100	100
Receive information from tenants and tenants' organisations	57	90	89	93	85
Provide a national forum for tenants to network with each other	56	89	83	80	80
Give advice to tenants and tenants' organisations	52	82	83	100	70
Educate housing providers	52	82	83	73	90
Disseminate information to tenants and tenants' organisations	52	82	86	93	80
Organise campaigns	37	59	63	60	65

Please list any other roles you think are important (responses in *italics* are from NTV Council members)

Influencing Government and others

- *To disseminate information FROM tenants and tenant organisations; it's one thing to receive it but the important part is passing it on to the appropriate people.*
- *To make sure the voices (and needs) of all tenants are heard - not just those who are active in the tenants movement*
- To organise yearly Conferences where Government Policies [with appropriate ministers invited] can be discussed and a unified tenants' voice can be developed in response
- To assist government to set truly representative housing policy, in a manageable and timetabled manner

- *I am not sure what the phrase lobby Government and others means. If it means seeking to engage in constructive and rational debate based on an objective knowledge of tenant issues - all for that. If it means subjectively promoting particular views of what tenants want without much in terms of an evidence base - then not really for that.*
- To attempt to present a unified tenants voice to government.
- *To join civil servants within working groups*
- Make sure they keep an eye on RSLs and the National Housing Federation who are the main opponent of tenants' rights,
- To champion the rights of tenants and to eradicate negative perceptions.
- *To have regular discussions with the govt., HCA & CLG on social housing & related place-based issues*

Support for tenants and tenants' organisations

- To provide training for tenants so they are equipped for full involvement
- To act as a liaison between tenant and landlord where there is no local organisation to do so.
- To help set up tenants organisations where there are none.
- To provide opportunities for tenants to learn and update their skills base.
- *Develop tenant representation/ groups in those regions where it does not exist effectively -South east, south and southwest. Current system just provides views of some tenants in the North and Midlands*
- *Provide support for those groups in development*
- *Work closely with HACT on their projects aimed at encouraging social and community enterprise*
- *Capacity building*
- To offer support to other organisations
- *Provide training on policy development*
- *Develop mentoring for those who wish to make the step up*
- *LISTEN to tenants and to each other. No backbiting or public disagreements*
- *Take on an advocacy role*
- *Benchmarking Club that provides information on tenant centred needs*

Good practice

- To bring together housing providers to network and share best practice in supporting and involving tenants
- *The capturing and sharing of best practice around tenant empowerment nationally to enable benchmarking*
- *The capture and sharing of bad practice around tenant empowerment nationally in order to name and shame poor housing providers*
- *To identify best practise within the sector for tenants to consider*
- To give advice to housing providers

Organisation

- As a National Tenants Organisation to become a Union and affiliate with the workers Unions in order to gain as strong a collective voice as possible
- I would like to see the NTOs include residents of RPs in their roles. This group of people often get left out however they do pay service charges/rent (shared owners). Also licensees who live in hostels owned and run by RPs. This I believe would cover all categories within RP's "tenants"
- To be a single authoritative voice for the tenants movement
- To give value for money for any membership fees charged
- *Good leadership*
- *To provide coherent policy strategies*
- *To speak with a united voice*
- To enable national tenant bodies to talk to each other
- communication
- *Have a good website with easy access*
- To form links with other Mutuels and like- minded organisations outside the sector e.g. Building Societies

Outreach

- *To listen and advocate for those tenants unable to contribute at current levels available. To be a voice for the unheard*
- To publically speak at any or all events that may promote the tenants view
- *Provide information and inspiration to young people*
- To ensure the 'unheard' give voice through NTV research etc.

- *Listen to tenants*

Research

- *To proactively research housing issues and release policy proposals ahead of other organisations, especially the government*
- Research into housing related issues.
- *To be seen as the leading body for all aspects affecting tenants*
- *Research both legislation and tenants views*
- *To research and bring about implementation of best practice*
- To carry out research

Specific campaigns

- *To raise the awareness of the role social housing tenants play in subsidising the Housing Benefit Bill for private tenants, private homeowners and how the taxes of tenants are subsidising the mortgage recovery scheme.*
- *To campaign to reduce the stigma attached to social housing tenants and raise awareness that there are as many, if not more homeowners that responsible for ASB and creating run down areas on housing estates.*
- *To link with adult education to promote inclusivity in the digital & ICT age for socially and economically disadvantaged adults.*

General

- *To work diligently ensure that the social tenants' rights to continue to live in, raise their families in and contribute to building and enhancing their communities is recognised as a basic human right and therefore the right to have security of tenure.*
- *To work diligently to ensure the right of all social housing tenants to a decent standard of housing.*
- *To keep personal things out of the NTV. All I want to do is the original remit that was given, to talk over and about all housing aspects that affect TENANTS now and in the future, to give an informed view which as a TENANT for my whole life with the military, local authority and housing association i think i have an informed view. I am fed up with people's personal battles this is about all Tenants where ever they are or where they come from. WE MUST MAKE THIS WORK and we need to get politicians on board so we can make them aware of how it really is if you have a bad landlord or a bad community to live in.*

Of those roles you think are important for a tenants' organisation nationally, please put them in order of priority: 1 for top priority, 2 second etc.

	No.	%
Comment on national housing policies from government and others	62	98
Lobby government and other policy-makers	59	94
Produce policy ideas based on a cross-section of tenant viewpoints	58	92
Receive information from tenants and tenants' organisations	57	90
Provide a national forum for tenants to network with each other	56	89
Give advice to tenants and tenants' organisations	52	82
Educate housing providers	52	82
Disseminate information to tenants and tenants' organisations	52	82
Organise campaigns	37	59

	Top priority	In top three	In NTV Council top 3
Comment on national housing policies from government and others	24	44 (70%)	25 (76%)
Lobby government and other policy-makers	14	37 (59%)	19 (58%)
Produce policy ideas based on a cross-section of tenant viewpoints	5	22 (35%)	11 (33%)
Receive information from tenants and tenants' organisations	6	24 (38%)	15 (45%)
Give advice to tenants and tenants' organisations	8	17 (27%)	6 (18%)

Educate housing providers	3	13 (21%)	6 (18%)
Disseminate information to tenants and tenants' organisations	7	24 (38%)	10 (30%)
Organise campaigns	1	10 (16%)	4 (12%)

In your view, which of the named functions are currently carried out by existing organisations? Please choose an option for every function.

All numbers are % of those who responded

	<u>CCH</u>			<u>NFTMO</u>			<u>NTV</u>			<u>TAROE</u>			<u>TPAS</u>		
	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>DK</u>
<u>Comment on national housing policies from government and others</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Lobby government and other policy-makers</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Produce policy ideas based on a cross-section of tenant viewpoints</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>Receive information from tenants and tenants' organisations</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Give advice to tenants and tenants' organisations</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19</u>

<u>Educate housing providers</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Disseminate information to tenants and tenants' organisations</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Organise campaigns</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>44</u>
<u>Other</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>15</u>

In your view what changes are needed to current structures for the roles to be most effectively carried out? (Responses in blue are from NTV Council members)

One voice / working together

- For current NTOs to work together in order for the Government to take them seriously. Speak with one voice.
- All the NTO's should come together under one national organisation but retain their own identities within this.
- More and better joint working of the 4 NTO's to give tenants a united voice; there is no need for a 5th NTO.
- *There needs to be a united voice of all tenant organisations; this needs to wholeheartedly echo the views and feelings of tenants nationwide. This should have been done through the NTV, its Council and its Board but events have overtaken us and the Council and its members are now scattered to the four winds. At this point I cannot say I hold out much hope of the New Dawn Project being able to represent all tenants; I think the NTC could have because its membership was so diverse but it seems that the new project has taken over and apart from a splinter group which meets in London from time to time the rest of us have very little to say in the matter, Yes, I am aware that there has been the odd meeting held up in the North of England but the notification for them has been so short that many of us could not get there. Personally I feel I am in limbo; people from my area expect me to represent them, they look to me to act as a conduit of information from and to them - but how and where am I supposed to do this? I am at present one very disillusioned tenant rep and I freely admit it.*
- *Either TAROE needs to completely reform its way of operation to be an effective single national voice for all tenants or we need an organisation that does.*
- The current structures need to work together and bury their differences and speak with one voice

- *However the overarching tenant organisation should be NEW AND FRESH, dynamic, fully representative of ALL tenants in the country, with a robust business plan and communications with tenants strategy. It should be run as a social enterprise or CIC with its first members/directors elected/selected by the whole of the NTC and be mostly tenants with some independents (similar to the NTV Board). Process to be agreed by full Council, which is representative of all NTO's and recruited tenants, and NOT BY A FEW INDIVIDUALS.*
- *There is a wealth of excellent skills on the NTV not being used. We have to move away from being a hierarchal 'civil service' type organisation*
- *We need a joined up approach to reflect the changing political platform. Tenants' rights are being taken away and the national organisation (apart from defend council housing) have sat back and not taken the lead to organise the tenant movement. The movement needs a complete overhaul, too much influence by too few people, mainly based in the North. We need to create a regional structure where tenants can easily join together to tackle the cuts in their own local area. Localism and big society will rely in tenants being actively involved; we need one tenant movement to unite tenants across the country, as the attack is on all not just one area.*
- *There needs to be one national tenant organisation in England representing tenants from all tenures (even the private sector) making it easier for ALL tenants to understand and maximising the resources of all the existing bodies*
- *To work together to make us one voice*
- *The solution is simple in theory but would be difficult in practise, do away with all existing bodies National and Regional, invest in developing 9 strong regional committees and let them nominate two members each to a National Tenants Voice.*
- *At present there is duplication of effort and too much focus on what sort of tenant are / what type of landlord you have; a single organisation that champions tenants' rights and engages with policy makers would be a significant step forward.*
- *I can't comment on the structures of the NTOs as I don't know how they are set up. However what I do think needs to change is the in-fighting between them. Tenant organisations need to speak with a unified voice, and whilst this must reflect the diversity of views, this should be a strength not a weakness.*
- *From an independent viewpoint TPAS delivers more effectively than the other organisations and could be used as a hosting organisation for a new model*
- *A few words come to mind, minus and plus - Duplication, incoherence and opacity: Skills, knowledge and capacity. With these in mind I think a restructuring and rationalising exercise, if all parties were willing, could produce what tenants need to address the 'new reality' of a new government that has already produced incoherent housing policy without the benefit of speaking to us.*
- *One powerful voice speaking to government on those subjects that impact on tenants from information garnered from tenants nationally by the myriad of small groups that exist NO MATTER HOW SMALL.*

- *There needs to be a defined role for each organisation, e.g. they should specialise in their dominant field of expertise and come together under a united umbrella organisation to perform lobbying/campaigning actions. The best of resources should be taken from each organisation and represented through one coherent 'media and government lobbying' voice.*
- *Most importantly of all is that we get rid of duplication to enable the use of maximum resources for innovation.*
- *Tenants need to work in partnership with each other. No them and us and those seeking the limelight or with their own agenda*
- *Everybody pulling together without egos getting in the way*

Elected voice

- *The voice of elected representatives is far more powerful than any sounding board, as it the voice of their membership.*
- *There should be one single ELECTED umbrella national tenants' body. Emphatically neither TPAS nor TAROE currently performs such a role. Whilst there is no objection to any of the so-called 'national tenants' organisations' continuing they are all self-appointed and so should be self-funded. Social housing residents in the UK need an impartial national representative body (preferably with a federal structure which TAROE lacks) which they can trust.*

Organisational matters

- *Interactive website with national and local links.
Membership, with small annual fee to fund admin.
Regional fora with a chair, co-chair and secretary function each, chosen by open election.
Quarterly national meetings; monthly or six-weekly local ones with core groups interacting between estates, TA's etc.
Transparency & accountability.
Only paid staff to be admin workers with experts bought in only if a consensus decides it's needed.
NTV Skills audit and then skills acknowledged and used.
Lobbying timetable drawn up and training between tenants developed.
More women and people under 50 actively recruited.*
- *Structured meetings of NTC members to work on policy issues, press statements etc. with a formal structure around motions, debates, voting etc.
Clearer more formalised links between working groups -to be formed by democratic process -including experience of members.
Clearer more formalised links between the executive and the membership -with formalised accountability.
More frequent regional meetings to feed in to quarterly full meetings - information transfer between groups by internet/email in between.*

- Publicity campaign re social housing.
- NTV as was conceived
- Not much really, the TSA is no more but I think the NTV proved itself to be very popular with tenants, it is proven that tenants that have a voice and feel that they have a purpose are better tenants. The NTV gave them that position, it allowed government to contact one body and say "What do you think of this?" rather than having to approach several different bodies. Though each of them has a purpose, it has no duty to report to the government whereas NTV does as it is funded by them and will probably relish the opportunity.
- Some form of NTV to carry on.
- *NTV needs to be re-established*
- The NTV council provided a representative and cross-cutting forum through which tenants could engage in the roles outlined above, the board needed to be given a chance to perform its role, but I am confident that it had the ability to do this.
- I see no reason for not trying to get the original concept funded. NTV was set up after much thought and consultation. The key thing is to get it funded not talk about an alternative

Existing organisations

- The four National Organisations, in consultation with the recognised regions need to consult with the minister and others to point out the importance of joint bodies reflecting tenants' views throughout the country.
- Ensure an efficient way of communicating between the organisations so that they become self-supporting
- *As a fairly new leaseholder I feel completely disempowered by my housing association freeholder and don't know where I can go to get my voice heard - the bad practice I have personally witnessed has been shocking and if the government is serious about encouraging mixed tenure I believe that the voice of leaseholders and freeholders within the social housing sector can be used for good.*
- *Established co productive working relationship with established organisations, each organisation to have a role and purpose so as not to replicate work currently being undertaken, so as to produce cost effective positive outcomes for tenants nationally, and to be able to prove our worth. A mechanism for easy and efficient communications between members.*
- *Current structure is fine and can be made to work.*
- *Knowledge management, Information sharing, Robust Communication, Financial viability
Value for money*
- NTV needs to be conduit through which communication between tenants, tenant organisations and the power holders is conducted. The NTV is needed to act as advisor to CLG, Audit Commission, HCA, CIH, NHF etc. on policy issues and proposals.

- *Existing NTOs need to talk to each other properly and constructively, meaning that it is not just the national committees of these organisations who meet each other.*
- *CCH and NFTMO are relatively small member organisations dealing with niche markets, they should be allowed to continue but their influence at national level is disproportionate to their numbers and should be limited to a degree. TPAS are seen as having a conflict of interest by being both a tenant and landlord organisation so questions will be asked about some of their decisions. TAROE whilst claiming to be the national representatives are a somewhat anonymous bunch who the vast majority of tenants have no knowledge of. The regional bodies have been allowed on the whole to wither on the vine due to lack of support and funding from the government and from landlords.*

Other views

- Consolidarity. A common goal. Co-operativism. A simple, basic plan of action which is networked and unified through as many socially structured organisations as possible, locally, nationally, internationally.
Ideally, a massive cooperatively based union for worker/tenant needs based around a fair standard for their quality of life in housing and work.
- The idea of 1 national tenant organisation is not a wholly good thing from the co-operative housing point of view. Housing co-ops are only a small part of the social housing stock, so there is always a danger that their differing outlook and needs would be irrelevant to an organisation dominated by reps from other social housing sectors. In addition, assuming that government will, if such an organisation exists, find it easier, and sufficient, for its purposes, to focus on speaking to it, rather than bothering to talk to a number of other organisations. The co-op housing voice could again be lost. The other danger for CCH and the housing co-op model, is that they become identified as wholly interested in, and part of, the social housing sector for many people.
- *I was nominated by XXXX and when the Housing Minister closed down his NTV organisation the Executive of XXXX decided that we would no longer support a top down national body. We therefore suggest that we all work with existing tenant involvement out there to create a bottom up approach that develops into something tenants want. It is considered by us that the New Dawn proposal will waste valuable resources that can be used in a more productive way.*
- *NFTMO and CCH effectively service their own constituencies and should continue to do so working with a national tenants organisation.*
- Those selected or elected, ideally both should focus on their tasks as defined by their electorate. It was deemed that the NTV had members that were out for self-aggrandisement and that does not lead to a team that focuses on the issues.
- *Current structure in England does not represent the views of most of the tenants - TAROE board is all Yorkshire, Derbyshire except for 2 members. CCH is just for co-operatives and probably does a reasonable job. NFTMO's - How many are there - and where are they geographically? TPAS biggest contribution is thru consultancy and conferences which are good.*

- NTV was setup because no one organisation undertook the roles and did not represent the majority of the 8million plus social housing tenants - in terms of tenure and geography - hence Cave recommendations.
- *There's an assumption that I know any of the existing tenants organisations and their work - I don't!*
- *More resources to help tenants have a full and active role*
- *More dialogue between policy makers and tenants*
- *Need to meet face-to-face as well as by post and email*
- The current Tenants Voice Structure is Byzantine and lacks transparency. A more simple and open structure would be better. Remember that the centre of policy making and power is in London not Leeds or Manchester.
- *The existence of the New Dawn project.*
- *for an organisation not to be in fear of its future if it does not agree with gov policy*
- *to have housing minister who wants the job for the right reasons, not just as a stepping stone to move on. What a mess Housing would be in if all Housing Executives were to do the same and they were all 5 minute wonders.*
- *A Housing Minister that is happy to listen to the people that have the first hand information on social housing.*

A way of reaching others

- *Something needs to be done to reach out to those tenants and tenants organisation who are completely disconnected from current national structures*

Specialist organisations

- Both CCH and NFTMO will probably need to continue to meet the specific needs of their members with specific tenures.

Localism

- Any new structures must be, or at least appear to government to be locally rooted as well as national. It should be a network of local organisations rather than a 'National' organisation. It is more likely to be looked upon favourably by government if it is in line with the government's localism agenda.
- *It is necessary to co-opt members into regional Tenants organisations so there is continual dialogue with tenants and social landlords*

Think tank. (from CCH submission)

Structure for the new organisation - the new organisation should be governed by a board of management that includes tenant members but not exclusively so. It should have a tenant chair - agreed for a fixed period (possibly three years). It is important to note that the board of management will need a strong “business” focus in order to survive and present the case for tenants in a difficult environment. The initial board of management should be drawn from current structures to ensure continuity from current arrangements.

The importance of the National Tenant Organisation grouping - we particularly stress the need to not underestimate the importance of the 4 National Tenant Organisation grouping, which has, for the first time in England, enabled a coherent, unified and sustainable tenant framework able to have constructive dialogue with Government and others on behalf of tenants. This framework has not just happened – it has required careful development over a period of about three years, and - particularly at a time of considerable potential change in the tenant sector – it is vital that the coherence of this framework is not lost or damaged.

Activities of the new organisation - the new organisation should have three “arms” (all controlled by the governing Board):

- trading operations – a part of the organisation that carries out contracted and other work with tenants, landlords and other bodies.
- membership - the membership of this single body should include tenants’ organisations, tenant organisations affiliating through landlords, individual tenants, landlords and other affiliate organisations. There should be a strong tenant focused statement that all members are required to support as a condition of membership.
- the tenant constituency – a part of the organisation that aims to replicate the intended tenant communication work of the National Tenant Voice – within the resources available to the organisation. This arm of the organisation should seek to enable tenants to participate in dialogue and debate about tenant issues, and formulate tenant policy and strategy. Maintaining the National Tenant Council as a policy forum within this structure could be an initial option.

The exact legal arrangements for the new organisation (particularly the relationship between trading and non-trading functions) would need further exploration.

National Tenant Voice functions – the NTV listed 4 functions it intended to carry out – advocacy, research, communications & supporting the tenant movement. All of these functions should now become the responsibility of the new organisation – directed through its board – but involving tenants wherever possible and appropriate from other parts of the structure (particularly in relation to communications and advocacy).

If you have any thoughts on how the functions that you see as important might be funded please set them out here. Again, please be as brief as possible.

Subscriptions / membership	8
Sponsorship /contractors / suppliers / NHF / donations	8
A magazine supported by advertising revenue	1
Fees for conferences /exhibitions	2
Levy Landlords – through rents, either voluntary or statutory	20
Membership fees	2
Grants / lottery / charities etc.	6
Working in partnership with others	1
Social enterprise	5
Fundraising strategy group	3
Government (including TEG) – as part of Big Society	7

Appendix 2

Key principles and practices desired of national tenants' organisations - as developed by National Tenants Organisations and former members of the NTV Council

Principles

Unity	there needs to be a unity of vision and purpose, presenting a united voice for tenants
Efficiency	best use made of collective resources, avoiding duplication
Supportive culture	individuals and organisations respect and support each other
Inclusive	the organisation(s) are proactive in ensuring that all tenants can play an active role and particular efforts made to reach those whose voices are seldom heard
Accountability and transparency	those in leadership roles are open and accountable to tenants in some way
Partnership	the organisation(s) to work in partnership with all organisations, including housing providers, that support tenants having influence in policy and practice
Learning	the organisation(s) to encourage learning and development for its leaders, staff and members
Independence	The organisation(s) to be able to act as it sees fit, independent of other organisations and funders
Outward looking	To other sectors and services as well as all parts of the country

Practices

Housing policy formulation	A clear and understood mechanism for establishing tenants' views on policies and reporting those views to policy-makers
Presenting to policy-makers	Presentation to policy-makers to be done where possible by tenants, based on the policy formulations of the organisation(s)
Disseminating information to tenants	As many methods as possible to be used to ensure that all tenants who want can have access to information about the organisation(s), about how to get involved, about housing policies and initiatives and how they can input to them
Receiving information from tenants	As many methods as possible to be used to ensure that all tenants who want can contribute to the organisation. In particular this will apply to policy formulation, so that this is based as far as possible on tenants' experiences
Involvement of providers	A clear and defined role for providers who support the aims of the organisation(s)
National strategies for shaping policy	Clear national (and regional) strategies for shaping opinions of key policy-makers based on evidence
Challenging	Constructively challenging to providers and policy-makers

Appendix 3 Structural options for national tenant organisation

Option 1: keep the current organisations as they are and develop a separate policy forum along the lines of the NTV Council

- 3.19 This option would leave current organisations as they are to develop as they wish, but develops a separate housing policy forum along the lines of the NTV Council. Some organisational structure and governance arrangements would be needed, as well as a mechanism for refreshing the membership of the forum.
- 3.20 This option could happen without the involvement of current organisations. A ‘virtual’ policy forum could be developed with minimum resources.
- 3.21 The disadvantages are that it would not address the need for unity as expressed by many in the consultation – thus adding to the confusion already experienced by tenants of so many national organisations. It is difficult to see how a separate policy forum could develop without becoming a rival of TAROE and TPAS, and that potential rivalry could prevent coherent messages being sent to policy makers and practitioners.
- 3.22 The forum would need funding to be able to meet, and to go through any processes of recruiting new tenants. Though some funding may be obtained to help set up such a body, it is unlikely that long-term funding would be achieved, and it is almost certain that any such funding would take from existing funding. There is a serious risk of this option in the long term reducing the total resources available for tenants at national level.

Option 2: create a policy forum along the lines of the NTV Council within an existing organisation

- 3.23 This option incorporates a policy forum within one of the existing national tenants’ organisations. The logical choices would be TPAS or TAROE.
- 3.24 The main advantage of this option is that no new organisation is required. If done properly it would enhance the organisation, and could be done quickly and with minimal resources at least in the short term.
- 3.25 TAROE is a tenant led organisation, with a national reach, and the creation of a policy forum within its structure could enhance its reputation and give greater credibility to its voice.
- 3.26 TPAS could set up a national policy forum relatively quickly and easily within the current structures of the organisation. It could fit well with its extensive membership and regional structure, which already includes 24 meetings per year across England.
- 3.27 There are possible drawbacks attached to the option in general, and to each organisational option in particular. Some current members of the NTV Council, for differing reasons, may be unhappy about joining an existing organisation. Some may feel they would not have enough direct say in the development of the forum, and in the overall development of the organisation.
- 3.28 If the forum was located within TAROE it is likely that there would need to be some changes to TAROE’s structure to ensure that the forum was an integral part of the organisation. If it

was located in TPAS there may be some people who would be unhappy about being part of a tenant / landlord body rather than a tenant-led one.

Option 3: create a congress or federal structure

- 3.29 This option would leave existing organisations more or less as they are, but would create a congress. A congress is a formal meeting of independent organisations, set up to give a united voice but not infringing on the independence of those organisations.
- 3.30 A congress could enable tenants to have a strong national voice. It could include organisations currently not part of the NTO structure; campaigning organisations such as Defend Council Housing, organisations that have an interest in social housing tenants such as Shelter, and possibly regional tenants' organisations. It could provide a space to resolve differences that historically have divided the tenant movement.
- 3.31 It would require some organisational structure to set up and run, with the associated personnel and financial resource implications. Instead of helping resolve differences, it could become a place for intensifying rivalries and creating further discourse.
- 3.32 A congress could be set up in conjunction with other models, particularly options 1, 2 and 5.

Option 4: a new organisation replacing one or more of existing organisations

- 3.33 This option would look to create something akin to what most people in the consultation so far saw as the ideal structure to deliver what is seen as needed. It would be a new organisation, building on and retaining the best of existing organisations. In essence it could be a merging of TPAS, TAROE and the NTV Council.
- 3.34 It would be possible to create a new organisation to replace two out of the three, perhaps leaving either TPAS or TAROE in its current form. This may be worth exploring in more detail should the option of merging all three bodies not be practical.
- 3.35 The advantage of creating a new organisation is it could provide a single and therefore more coherent voice, and thus be more effective at influencing policy-makers and providers. It would be easier for tenants to understand and engage with than any other option. Given the broad consensus on desired principles and practices, a new organisation would present an opportunity to develop these from the outset. And perhaps most importantly, it is an option that has the potential to attract the greatest amount of funding from the sector.
- 3.36 Whilst this is the option that most people in the consultation said was the ideal way of delivering what is needed, the challenges would be in moving from where we are now to such an organisation: we are not starting with a blank sheet of paper.
- 3.37 Inevitably there will be loyalty to organisations that have operated for a number of years (over 20 years in the case of TPAS). It will be surprising if there is not a resistance to doing away with these organisations – albeit hopefully taking the best of both into the new organisation – not just from the Boards, but from the memberships.

- 3.38 Both TPAS and TAROE employ staff, with TPAS having 19 on their payroll. Staff who enjoy working for an organisation are also going to be concerned about the implications of merging into a new organisation. The involvement of staff in the decision-making processes and their successful transfer into any new organisation would be crucial to the success of this option.
- 3.39 There are differences in philosophy and operation between TPAS and TAROE, arising from their different geneses. For example, whilst TPAS exists to promote excellence in tenant and resident involvement and empowerment, it has for many years adopted a ‘co-regulation’ approach with landlords and tenants involved in the structure of the organisation, and elected in equal numbers on their Board. With a staff team of 19, its executive plays an important role. TAROE prides itself and gains strength from being a tenant-led organisation in its governance as well as its operation. These factors would need to be addressed in any proposed new structure.
- 3.40 The consultation produced many different ideas on the ideal structure of an organisation, so these too would have to be worked through.
- 3.41 Whilst this option seems to present the best option for long term sustainable financing from the sector, there will be particular risks for TPAS in the short term. They derive funding from the sector, a proportion of which is membership subscription paid by providers. In a time of financial constraints providers could decide to await the outcome of discussions on this option before committing funding.

Option 5: leave things as they are

- 3.42 We should also consider a ‘do nothing’ option.
- 3.43 This would disappoint many tenants, and would be seen as a missed opportunity to build on the work done in creating the NTV and to increase tenant involvement and influence at national level.
- 3.44 There is a chance that if nothing is done, some NTV Council members will try and set something up themselves. This is unlikely to attract many NTV Council members, and it is unlikely to be sustainable in the long run. It would have all the disadvantages of Option 1.

Appendix 4: Contributors from the Housing Sector

Harriet Baldwin	HCA
Trevor Bell	Co-ordinator NFTMO and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Stephen Bright	Finance Director and former NTV Board member
Tom Crawshaw	TSA
Professor Tony Crook	University of Sheffield and former NTV Board member
Sarah Davis	CIH and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Graeme Foster	TSA
Geraldine Howley	Chief Executive, Incommunities
Alison Hopkins	Consumer Focus and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Steve Hilditch	Former chair of NTV Project Group
Martyn Kingsford	Policy advisor to TAROE and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Blase Lambert	CCH and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Robin Lawler	Chief Executive, Northwards Housing
Nigel Long	TPAS staff member and member of NTV Accountability Committee
Kurshida Mirza	HCA
Samantha Mcgrady	Housemark
Adrian Moran	HCA
Robert Nettleton	Chief Executive Coastline Housing
Macc Pescatore	Accountant and former NTV Board member
Dinah Roake	HCA
Maggie Shannon	Director of Performance and Innovation, Great Places Housing Group and former NTV Board member
Gwyneth Taylor	NFA
Karl Tuplin	HCA
Martin Wheatley	LGA
Helen Williams	NHF

Andrew Young	NHS Trust Director and former NTV Board member
Ian Youll	Board member Livin and former NTV Board member