



City Funds Governing Board Meeting

Friday 15th June 2018 14:00 – 16:00 at SLR Consulting, Brew House,
Jacob Street, BS2 0EQ

Present: Ololade Adesanya, Ian Barrett, Nishan Canagarajah, Sandra Meadows, Peter Morris, Ed Rowberry, Kevin Slocombe, Andy Street (Chair), Sue Turner

In attendance: Taylor Meagher, Di Robinson, Jo Sunderland, Catriona Tully, James Burrows (Big Society Capital)

Apologies:

1. Apologies

Ololade arrived later in the meeting & Nishan had to leave at 3:30pm.

2. New Declarations of Interest

Taylor is waiting on Nishan's Declaration form.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 18th May and actions arising

All actions complete with the exception of:

Action 1: Andy and Kevin to explore links with the City Office and City Funds so there is a clear process to ensure regular interface and communication. Outstanding.

Action 7: Andy to ask Sandra if she would like to write a draft Terms of Reference for Community Initiatives based on Sue's template. Outstanding.

Action 8: Kevin and Nishan to work with Nick Sturge to draft the Inclusive Employment Terms of Reference based on Sue's template. Meeting was arranged but apologies sent, meeting to be rescheduled by Taylor.

4. Closed Board session, Board members only.

Action 1: We should be recording in kind support provided (BCC, Taylor, and James Burrows) to be monitored by Taylor.

5. Feedback from One City Event / One City Approach Plan Update



Feedback to the Mayor's Office has been very positive and has re-energised people to become more engaged. The One City Approach is a key activity being funded by Bristol City Council to go to the end of December with Sue Milner and key City partners. One City Plan/approach has taken the full time of the City Office which wasn't the intended plan; the priority now is to get 2 or 3 people funded to manage the City Office. Second half of the City Gathering was felt to be very useful in seeing evidence of the One City Approach in practice. We can see the 7 priorities of the City Plan linked with our City Funds values. The goal is to have a clear plan by December 2018 to launch at the next City Gathering.

Key points from the discussion:

- Proposal to move the City Office outside of City Hall, this has been discussed internally.
- University is seconding staff into the City Office, could we do this from other organisations?
- How can we best get the business players involved?
- How does this Board fit into the overall governance of the One City Plan to be part of the system? (See Action Above for Andy and Kevin – can there be a formal link to One City Plan Governance)
- Some negative feedback from the event – some people didn't understand the City Funds, some questions raised were how much was in the pot, how you get money etc. By September 18th we need to be very specific on what the City Funds is and what we are delivering, and in particular the mechanics for raising and deploying money.
- It's important to Funders to see that this is real, and witness people being interested and engaging with the One City Approach. We need to be able to reach a wider audience and the actual public and avoid exclusivity.
- There is a danger that every City Gathering could be much of the same, although meeting every 6 months does refresh things and keeps people on track.
- Historically a lot of past strategic boards have followed their own agendas, and the Plan overarches all of these priorities and we need to keep changing the status quo. There is more work to be done on this.

6. Funding Priority Group composition / advertising and Terms of Reference

Significant progress needs to be made to select the Funding Group personnel and define terms of reference. We need to agree a completion date for these tasks. We need a good response from the City and to be able to show good progress by September.

Key points from the discussion:

- On September 19th we could invite interest from those wanting to join a Funding Priority Group, or we could set up 1 Group by then, with invitations to join the other 2.
- It's good to be ambitious but also realistic, it's better to complete progress on 1 Group and to show significant progress on another.



- The Funding Priority Groups need clear definition on what 'starting their work' means.
- Work needs to be started as soon as possible.
- For business related campaigning linked to No Child Goes Hungry, would it be helpful to start hooking the NCGH FPG with current pieces of work to have a narrow lens to start with? It's not about only having a democratic group but about who has the resources and experience to represent diverse aspects of the City.
- There is already a hunger programme in the City (Feeding Bristol) and so is the NCGH FPG really as far ahead as we think it is? There are conversations going on around the city that could quickly link with the City Funds. It's important to be honest with people and say this is what we have proposed but it can change.
- Draft NCGH should remove the BBRC representative from the Terms of Reference.
- The draft version of the Terms of Reference may be changed to reflect how the Board feels and what the aims of the Funds are; investment vs grant may be 5 years down the line, does this need to be clearer?
- Concern around engagement with business – there needs to be a single approach to avoid confusing the message.
- Business is initially likely to be focused more towards grants and therefore Quartet would lead. There's currently an oversupply of investment capital and a key priority of City Funds is to enable that investment to be more effectively deployed.
- We need to challenge ourselves with what we want from business, we aren't putting ourselves in their shoes - what do they want out of this? How do they want to get involved? We need to make them feel part of the process.
- With Feeding Bristol, businesses go to them because they see it's a key issue and they want to contribute. Support is through pro-bono time and volunteer time.
- Within the Terms of Reference we need to be transparent and say 'some needs are being met by Feeding Bristol and City Funds can improve the situation, or achieve greater progress by doing this'
- The key question is - what is different about the City Funds for each theme?
- It is the Board's role to determine the broad themes and then FPGs will do the detailed work. Ed and Sue can provide their knowledge on this.
- We will take comments on the Terms of Reference when they are drafted by the Lead Authors.

We have a complete draft Terms of Reference for No Child Goes Hungry, nothing for the other 2 groups. Full agreement that at least 1 group should be set up before September 19th with progress on another. Sandra is leading on Community Initiatives, Nishan and Kevin leading on Inclusive Employment, with Sue and Andy leading on No Child Goes Hungry. We need to advertise this widely and invite key players to apply. We also told all the applicants who didn't get onto the Governing Board that they could sit on a Funding Priority Group. We need a list of characteristics of who we want on each FPG so we can create an advert.



Action 2: Andy and Sue to go back and redraft NCGH Terms of Reference.

Action 3: Sandra, Kevin, Nishan to complete draft papers by Monday 2nd July and send to Taylor.

Action 4: Everyone to send a list of proposed FPG candidates to Taylor by 9th July.

7. Discussion paper on 'Additionality'

A brief paper has been drafted by Di & Cat in the context of the wider One City Approach and what added value looks like. A proposed City Funds statement of Principles created the following: "The City Funds will raise new, additional funding to support the extension of existing projects, where pace, scope and scale can be enhanced, and catalyse new strategic initiatives that address real need and achieve systemic change."

Key points from the discussion:

- Does 'scope and scale' have the room to show additionality, should we be more focused and just say we are a catalyst?
- The important thing is standing up to challenge; it needs to be fundamentally different.
- If we can take an existing project to make it more self-sustaining then that's the aim. It's not just about the new; it's about existing projects such as pushing small community projects into something more systematic.
- From an investor point of view, why are investors funding City Funds: We're putting our capital into City Funds because we believe there is an opportunity; by putting our money there we are helping projects become greater than the sum of their parts. Additionality has to achieve a higher bar of evidence for those existing projects, partly so you can see what they have done and what they are projecting and we can see the additional value that is being created.
- If we were to put funds into Feeding Bristol that might accelerate their work and help them do something better.
- A lot of these decisions will be judgment based, will grant money be best or is the only worthwhile change achieved through investment.
- We've signed up to 3 priority groups but we need to be open minded on possible future priority groups.

Action 5: Additionality paper to be edited by Di and Cat to reflect Board comments and sent out for consultation.

8. Communications Plan

Power Point sent out to the Board. Jo went through the Power Point to gather questions from the Board regarding the proposed areas of responsibility.

Key points from the discussion:



- Board has agreed to the current logo, branding, and strapline.
- The City Funds are launching and we need to be clear that these themes are testing the model and there will be more priorities in time.
- Guiding principles updated, points made to change 'to our city' to 'for our city' and 'co-design' changed to 'designed by and with' to lose the jargon.
- Twitter handle, we should lock down the handle but a decision needs to be made on who is managing this. Handle should be @cityfundbristol and # to reflect the handle.
- There is a BCC Social media policy that we can use.

Action 6: Taylor to lock down Twitter handle and run account.

9. Delivery and September Launch Plan (including resourcing plan)

We need to be clear on the next phase of work to September and key outcomes; Phase 1 was April to June. July to September comprises of a number of activities. There is a communications piece that needs to run alongside all the phases.

Key points from the discussion:

- Question regarding Phase 1, what is Voscur's Role, where do they fit? When this was designed 4-5 months ago we were working with Power to Change and they identified Locality as a key source of input. Sandra would be happier if it was explicit that Voscur be named as providing support.
- Consensus from the Board is that in principle they would like to explore the consultants' roles going forward; the Board needs to look into roles in more detail leading up to the launch, alongside the budget required.
- The Board hasn't seen the full output of the consultants' work and this will need to be shared.

Action 7: For Andy and Ed to finalise the scope for the next phase of work, in line with the closed Board discussion. For Ed to distribute the finalised Phase 1 report to Funders to the Board.

10. AOB

It was agreed that there would be no Strategic City Funds breakfast in July, and that we would wait until the launch in September. We need to manage expectations and we need to let people know why we are not meeting in July.

Action 8: Jo to ask Amie if we can invite all 82 people from the breakfast invite list to the Business West launch.

11. Future Meeting Dates

Next Board meeting scheduled for Thursday 12th July needs to be rescheduled due to conflicts.



Action 9: Taylor to push the next Board meeting by 1 week.