

City Funds Governing Board Minutes

Time and Place: Thursday 11th April 2019, 1400-1600, 1P08, City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Present: Andy Street (Chair), Ian Barrett, Nishan Canagarajah, Peter Morris, Ed Rowberry, Sue Turner

In attendance: Taylor Meagher, Ryan Munn, Claire Fenner

Apologies: Ololade Adesanya, Sandra Meadows, Kevin Slocombe

1. **Apologies**
2. **Declarations of interest**
3. **Minutes of previous meeting and actions log**

Change to minutes - Theory of Change is not a still document; it needs to evolve over time.

Action: Taylor to talk to ICT and Peter re the cookie policy as Reg123 not responding.

Action: General catch up of 4 FPG chairs 20 mins before the next Board meeting.

Action: Taylor and Ryan to send out a City Funds update to all stakeholders.

Action: Ryan to send out the investment project list to the Board. Ryan needs to write what the projects are about and then distribute via Taylor.

4. Update on Local Access Programme (LAP)

BBRC has retained Di Robinson to lead on this. The programme sent through details of what was required, and there has been an informational phone call that only Bristol joined in on (there was another date for a call which other bidders connected with). City Office may be a potential lead organisation for Bristol. The risk is Bristol may be seen as 'wealthy' and not in need of the money. The LAP can provide a £10K grant to work on the application process.

5. Update on business engagement

Peter and Andy met with Rick Sturge on the 4th April. Rick has made contact with 25 businesses to interest them in a pilot group. Peter and Andy are going to identify the core businesses and hopefully this will be set up by end of May. When we shortlist City Funds projects, we should be able to give businesses a list of those projects and what skills and support we may need from them. We need to flesh out what we need from the group over the next month. Peter will lead on this. Peter will speak to Sue to see if Emma Gregory (Quartet) can help in providing support a couple of days each week. Rick will put Peter in touch with Capita and other 'tech' businesses.

Action: Peter to engage with Nishan on the business engagement work stream.

6. Update on each FPG

Theory of Change will be approved at the next meeting. The research paper will be finalised in the next couple of weeks. Aligned funding has gone to one project so far. Next FPG meeting will discuss grant guidelines and the fundraising campaign. It hasn't been resolved what each FPG will be doing and how the fundraising campaigns will work. We need to use the DCMS money to hire an expert to bring this together.

What does 'aligned funding' mean? The same conversation occurred in the Community Initiatives FPG meeting. If money comes through to Quartet, they are in charge of the funds, if the money is sent to City Funds directly through Quartet, the FPG is in charge. Further discussion and clarity is required on this.

The TOR has been signed off, and all the original 'scoping' members want to be on the Group. They discussed research and Ryan is leading on the development of a research brief. Discussed metrics and the Group want to ensure they are chosen correctly.

Action: Taylor to share ET FPG member names and data analysis with the Board.

Economic Inclusion has a signed-off Group and ToR. They are breaking into smaller groups to gather research and once they have a researcher in place they can gather this all together into a report and develop a Theory of Change document. Peter suggested business can be involved in providing work experience. We don't want to just repeat work and be a channel for work experience. If this needs to be transformational and additional we may need to create a different route to the market.

Community Initiatives has agreed its membership and Di Robinson needs to add outcomes to the ToR for it to be signed off. They have concerns with the communications and how to get the City Funds and FPG message across clearly to the public. A public fundraising campaign would be welcomed, but only if it is coordinated at Board level so it doesn't clash.

Andy expressed some concerns that we aren't yet engaging with the public and giving them a chance to be a part of City Funds. CAF funding will give us the ability to develop a high-level fundraising strategy. It may be confusing for some people with the City Funds brand being both grant and investment.

7. Draft marketing plan

We don't yet have a clear marketing plan. A PR agency needs to be appointed in the next couple of weeks to take this forward. There is some confusion on the marketing plan vs comms plan. The NCGH FPG can show what we have done with 'aligned funding'. Quartet looks for projects to fund, it isn't an open application process. Ed will look to get some Power to Change money to create some aligned funding for Community Initiatives.

Action: Ryan, Sue, and Kevin to create a PR brief with Board members and send it through to selected PR firms. Quartet will be the organisation hiring the PR agency.

We need to manage expectations for the launch in July. The launch message needs to be; give us money, help to identify the projects we can give money to, and information on how to work with us. DCMS money can be used for the launch, with matched funding from BBRC.

[This information has been redacted as it is commercially sensitive]

8. Draft comms plan

This item was skipped as the marketing/comms was discussed in the previous item.

9. Draft operational plan

This is presented as a first draft and there are clear gaps in the document. The aim of the document is to identify where the money is going, but we need a clear customer focus. We have current administration support in place but this isn't sustainable.

Action: Issue of 1st diagram to be addressed as lack of involvement from FPGs on grant.

10. Draft impact metrics framework

Peter suggested losing "eco-system" and replacing with "approach".

Action: Board to read the metrics framework and provide comments.

11. Distributing funds before launch and associated risks

The environmental FPG don't agree with the way that a pipeline of projects has been developed prior to the launch. Projects are appearing to be handpicked when the assumption had been made that projects would be identified through a public appeal.

We aren't currently using City Funds money for grant or investment. NCGH is using aligned funding and this would have happened without City Funds. BBRC has earmarked projects to get them ready for the launch. We need to communicate that projects are in the mix but funds have not yet been identified. We should describe what the project is trying to achieve.

12. Theory of Change approval

"Those in the city to respond" isn't very clear, could provide some clarity on that point.

Action: Taylor to send updated ToC to Board to receive written approval from all.

13. AOB

We need to ensure we either cut agenda items at the next meeting or meet for longer in order to cover issues in sufficient detail.

14. Future meeting dates

Thursday 9th May 14:00-16:00