



**Ongo Homes
Resident Scrutiny Panel**

Investigation into

Anti Social Behaviour

(15th August 2023)

Contents Page

Section	Page (s)
Introduction	3
Scope	4
Background	4
Methodology	5
Findings	5
Conclusions	6
Recommendations	7

1.0. Introduction

- a. This report is a result of an investigation into how Ongo Homes manages Anti-social behaviour.
- b. The RSP (Resident Scrutiny Panel) started their investigation in February 2023.
- C Throughout the duration of the investigation, the RSP endeavoured to uphold the key principles relating to its scrutiny work, namely that the group would:
 - i. To work on behalf of Ongo Homes, the company and its tenants to ensure that Ongo provides services to the highest standard
 - ii. Provide an independent check and offer critical challenges to drive and influence improvements to standards, processes, performance, and time management.
 - iii. Ensure that Ongo embeds the National Regulatory Framework on the delivery of both organisational and local offers by monitoring and challenging these standards.
 - iv. Form an effective but independent part of the Governance structure within Ongo Homes, together with Community Voice (CV), Ongo Homes Board and the Executive Management Team (EMT)
 - v. Ensure that Ongo is a well-managed, viable organisation which places tenants at the heart of its business delivered through tenant led scrutiny and other involvement/

The RSPs decision to investigate Anti-social behaviour was taken from a choice of topics and themes provided for consideration by Ongo staff and CV. The investigation was to ensure that Ongo was conforming to national guidelines, offering Value for Money (VFM) and customer satisfaction for tenants.

The scrutiny panel made their decision independently of any outside influence.

The following people were involved in carrying out this investigation:

Scrutiny Panel Members

Tim Mills
Dawn Johnson
Eddie Stringer
Keith Lumbers
Stewart Pearson
Tracey Bain (new member joined part way through)

Supported By

Karen Cowan
Wendy Wolfe

2.0 Scope of the investigation

Only the following aspects were considered in the investigation:

- Desktop review of current policy & procedures
- Obtain understanding of the ASB process, i.e., what is classed as ASB (definition), what is Ongo's responsibility and what is not
- Which team is responsible for dealing with ASB and what process do they follow?
- What ASB reporting methods are available for tenants to use, and how do they know what these are?
- Is the MyHome app. fit for purpose for reporting ASB?
- When using the different methods to report ASB, are customers told what to expect in relation to the next steps, e.g., timescales etc.?
- Performance data, i.e., number of days to resolve an ASB case
- Customer satisfaction, i.e., satisfaction with the way their ASB case has been handled, complaints received etc.
- Benchmarking data, e.g. How does Ongo's performance compare to that of other Housing Associations?
- Research – Identify good practice at Ongo or elsewhere.
- When and how does Ongo work with the police on ASB cases

The following services and departments were involved in the investigation.

Customer Experience
Community Resolution
Tenancy Services

The following topics were not part of the scope for investigation.

- Perceived ASB
- Where Ongo has no responsibility for ASB

The RSP would like to thank and acknowledge valuable help and support of the following team members during this investigation.

Becky Johns (Customer Experience Manager), Fran Rhodes (Tenancy Services Manager), Paul Grimley (Community Resolution Team Leader), Jo Sylvester (Community Resolution Officer), Zara Coe (Triage Officer), Aaron Simpson-King (Customer Experience Team Leader).

And all other members of the Ongo family.

3.0 Background

As a Housing Association, Ongo has a remit to offer a safe and confidential way for tenants to report anti-social behaviour in their community.

Anti-social behaviour is a very long and detailed process that has many legal and social ramifications. Ongo must act within both the legal process and within the remit of the Housing Ombudsman.

The RSP decided to investigate this area to see if any improvements could be made.

4.0 Methodology

The RSP used the following fact-finding methods in order to identify Ongo's approach to anti-social behaviour, the implications, the variety of responses received, and the outcome of the different approaches taken:

4.1.1 Desktop consideration of:

Housing Ombudsman's policies recommendations on ASB
Ongo's Anti-social behaviour policy

4.1.2 Background presentations were given by the following Ongo staff.

Paul Grimley, Jo Sylvester, Zara Coe, Aaron Simpson-King

4.1.3 Various meetings were held by the RSP, minutes taken and distributed. Information and documents shared by email. A final meeting was held to discuss and agree the conclusions and formulate the recommendations.

5.0 Findings

The Government white paper and changes in powers for the Housing Ombudsman have led to the need for changes in both complaints and ASB policy.

Interviews with members of the ASB team have shown the panel that Ongo have embraced those changes and not only achieved goals set out by the Housing Ombudsman but excelled them to the point where the changes and new procedures are considered best practice.

The Scrutiny panel are confident that ASB is dealt with in an exemplary and timely manner within the constraints of legal processes and external agencies.

6.0 Conclusions

RSP is confident that they have met the brief/scope for this investigation.
Any relevant documentation, including policies and interviews are available upon request.

Number	Recommendation	Anticipated Outcome / Comments	Priority
1.	Acknowledge to tenant advising to us by written/digital communication within 48 hours that their ASB case has been logged and what will happen next and the timescale for next communication.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tenant assurance that their case has been received and will be put through the Ongo process = improved tenant satisfaction	High

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will result in reduction of waste calls to Ongo (tenant chasing for status update) = better value for money 	
2.	Each case to have an agreed timescale for tenant updates, e.g., monthly (to include if nothing has changed and why, to advise case moved from one department to another within Ongo, to advise case taken on by other agency and nothing Ongo can do at this time etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenant assurance that the case is still being followed up = improved tenant satisfaction • Will result in reduction of waste calls to Ongo (tenant chasing for status update) = better value for money 	High
3.	Identify costings per case over a set period of time so that the average cost can be calculated and used to identify good practice and VFM for the future.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying costings will provide a baseline going forward. This information can then be used for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) identifying comparisons of cost and process of similar ASB cases that can be used to influence efficiencies and improvements in the future = improved tenant satisfaction and better value for money b) benchmarking externally, identifying good practice or areas for further exploration = improved tenant satisfaction and better value for money 	Medium