

You forwarded this message on 01/10/2008 08:10.

Helen Murray

From: Kinney Brian [Brian.Kinney3@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk] **Sent:** Tue 30/09/2008 17:21
To: Helen Murray
Cc: [REDACTED]; Harland Jerry
Subject: RE: Draft Letter - in case you want to reply
Attachments:

Helen

Thanks. Sorry for delay in replying but have been away from the office.

We (Reform Team) have just received Councillor Carter's letter and are working on it. Alas, the letter to Chief them of a change in the date of the regional workshops was issued last week [REDACTED] will send you a copy or get it out quickly and will now follow it up with a timeline and relevant papers for the workshops - in an attempt articulation. I think the reply to Councillor Carter will also serve as a reply to Peter Gilroy.

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Helen.Murray@lga.gov.uk [mailto:Helen.Murray@lga.gov.uk]
Sent: 26 September 2008 10:53 AM
To: Kinney Brian
Cc: Harland Jerry; Emma.Jenkins@lga.gov.uk
Subject: FW: Draft Letter - in case you want to reply

Brian

We discussed this whole issue with John last night. Like us, he is **very concerned** about lack of progress issuing the funding and lack of communication with local authorities post the agreement in July. So, he today to try to move things forward, otherwise he cannot see how UASC reform is deliverable in terms engagement.

In terms of the Gilroy letter, Councillor Paul Carter, Leader of Kent, has written to Liam Byrne flagging relation to the deal and questioning their ability to participate in the Reform programme. Therefore you needs to be much more diplomatic than the current draft. I would strongly suggest some words of apology of communication and delay on the funding; some appreciation of the difficulties this is causing; very clear about the timeline; and a much softer invitation to discuss the Reform programme directly with Kent. I revised draft if that would help.

Could we have sight of the letter you are planning to send to LA Chief Execs inviting them to the works

Thanks
Helen

From: Kinney Brian [mailto:Brian.Kinney3@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 September 2008 16:17
To: Emma Jenkins, LGA Policy; Harland Jerry
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Draft Letter

Emma

That's fine – thanks.

When discussing with John would you also, please, flag up that we are getting a very

rate to our proposed regional workshops, with some key authorities not wishing to engage discussions around setting up specialist authorities. We are writing round today to Ch Local Authorities advising them of new dates for the regional UASC workshops. I wonder if you think of a way of improving dialogue with LAs on the establishment of specialist authorities. How words how we can get them to the table to discuss capacity and costs? The alternative reform will be lost - with the benefits that everyone sees in the reforms not being realised.

Kind regards.

Brian

Brian Kinney

Director

UASC Reform Programme

UK Border Agency

2nd Floor, Block E, Whitgift Centre

CROYDON

Tel: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Emma.Jenkins@lga.gov.uk [mailto:Emma.Jenkins@lga.gov.uk]

Sent: 24 September 2008 3:36 PM

To: Kinney Brian; Harland Jerry

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE:

I'd like to run this past John but I'm unable to speak to him until COP tomorrow due to his availability something on Friday am instead?

Ditto the responses to the proposed timelines.

Kind regards,

Emma

From: [REDACTED]@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 September 2008 15:15
To: Emma Jenkins, LGA Policy
Cc: Kinney Brian; Harland Jerry
Subject:

Emma

Please see attached draft letter. Have you any comments – grateful for your re tomorrow.

[REDACTED]

PA to Brian Kinney

Director

UASC Reform Programme

UK Border Agency

2nd Floor, Block E

Croydon

T: [REDACTED]


[REDACTED]@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

This email and any files transmitted with it are private & solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom the addressed.


If you have received this email in error please return it address it came from telling them it is not for you and then delet your system.

This email message has been swept for computer viruses.

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service sup

 Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Helen Murray

From: Emma Jenkins, LGA Policy **Sent:** Fri 06/06/2008 12:40
To: [REDACTED]@dcf.gsi.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@dcf.gsi.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk;
 Helen Murray; John Ransford, Chief Executive; Brian.Kinney3@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@londoncouncils.gov.uk; Cooke, Zena; james.mackintosh@kent.gov.uk
Subject: Further analysis of PWC differences
Attachments:  PWC Comp.xls(21KB)

And here is the full analysis from James of the differences between the latest data and the PWC report.

[REDACTED] (via IGA)

From: [REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk [mailto:[REDACTED]@kent.gov.uk]
Sent: 06 June 2008 12:35
To: [REDACTED]@londoncouncils.gov.uk
Cc: Emma Jenkins, LGA Policy
Subject: RE: Care Leaver Costs 2007-08 and 2008-09

[REDACTED]

I have compared PWC report to recent submission and there is not a vast difference between the two.
 Kent has increased by £9k,
 Hillingdon has decreased by £670k
 Oxfordshire has increased by £266k (from headroom of £73k to shortfall of £193k)
 Solihull has increased by £114k

I will check with Oxfordshire and Solihull, but would guess that:
 Oxfordshire - more accurate calculation of their costs has increased costs and income has reduced to reflect amount of clients
 DCSF refused to pay for in 2006-07.

Solihull - unit costs have increased in last 6 months.

Attached is a summary showing changes from PWC report.
 Also revised summary with Oxfordshire's 2008-09 forecast.

Please give me a ring if you want to discuss.

Regards,
 [REDACTED]

Comparison of Asylum Spend by Local Authorities

18 + Year Old

	2007 - 2008		
	Kent	Oxfordshire	Hillingdon
Number of Clients at start of period	471	101	704
Number of Clients at end of period	545	111	786
Number of weeks support	24,440	5,408	32,819
Direct placement costs (£)	4,277,191	129,389	6,385,217
Direct non-placement costs (£)	524,925	432,000	892,596
Departmental/Corporate recharges (£)	150,099		438,665
TOTAL SPEND (£)	4,952,215	561,389	7,716,478
Grant Income	2,314,000	368,000	3,151,871
Other Income	-		1,100,000
TOTAL INCOME (£)	2,314,000	368,000	4,251,871
Funding Shortfall	2,638,215	193,389	3,464,606
UNIT COST (£ per week)	202.63	103.81	235.12
Funding Shortfall per PWC report	2,629,000	- 73,000	4,135,000
Increase/Decrease	9,215	266,389	- 670,394

Solihull	Total
97	1,373
114	1,556
5,928	68,595
710,173	11,501,970
227,256	2,076,777
241,459	830,223
1,178,888	14,408,970
462,800	6,296,671
	1,100,000
462,800	7,396,671
716,088	7,012,299
198.87	210.06
602,000	7,293,000
114,088	280,701