

City Funds Community Initiatives 1st Scoping Meeting Minutes

Time and Place: Monday 14th January 2019, 16:00-17:30, 1P04 City Hall Bristol BS1 5TR

Present: Sandra Meadows (Interim Chair), Taylor Meagher (Minute taker), Fiona Gilmour, Ed Rowberry, Ryan Munn, Stephen Le Fanu, Toby Howkins, Tim Temple, Diane Bunyan, Steve Sayers, Tom Renhard, Stella Judd, Ronnie Brown, Diane Robinson

Apologies: Andy Street, Joanna Holmes

- 1. Welcome & introductions**
- 2. Apologies**
- 3. Role of the scoping group**

SM informed the group of the structure of City Funds, the role of the Governing Board and each Funding Priority Group. We have 4 groups currently, No Child Goes Hungry (met 4 times and will have confirmed members in February), Economic Inclusion (have met twice and will have confirmed members in February), Community Initiatives (1st group today) and Environmental Transformation (adverts have gone out).

No overall 'theory of change' for City Funds as the groups cover such a wide array of initiatives. Each group can and should have its own theory of change, and the overarching theme is to reduce poverty and inequality in a sustainable and inclusive way.

It is very important to have a strong pipeline of organisations able to develop investable proposals suitable for City Funds - starting with some 'ready to go' projects and working to build capacity in organisations who are not quite ready.

In April City Funds is looking to have £10 million in investment from local and national funders. Community Initiatives, as with all other funding priority groups, will work to secure funding and finance for a specific strand. No Child Goes Hungry already has £180K in its own group.

4. CIFPG terms of reference

The objective for City Funds and all funding priority groups is to work collaboratively to attract and deploy grant and investment funding for projects that tackle poverty and inequality. Specific CIFPG objectives are two-fold; (a) focusses on eliciting proposals that include the use of a community asset (land or building) and (b) is broader and includes viable propositions that do not include a community asset. It was made clear that CIFPG is not limited to asset based proposals. SM has asked that everyone please gives feedback on the Terms of Reference so we can finalise them at the next meeting.

Action: All to provide feedback on ToR by 13th February 2019.

5. CIFPG skills and experience

We are looking to confirm 5 members, SM is acting as interim chair until a new chair is appointed once scoping is complete and ToR finalised. Membership can be flexible if we have more than 5 strong people wishing to go forward into the CIFPG.

6. Unpacking community initiatives

SM would like other people's thoughts on how we clearly articulate the opportunities being created through 'community initiatives' to partners and the wider sector – particularly grass-roots, community based organisations who may be less familiar with the territory of social investment and enterprise.

DR mentioned that there was already lots of work done on community initiatives and what it means; this is in the City Funds business plan.

Action: Taylor to share the Collaboration Agreement and Community Initiatives work in the business plan.

Action: All to provide feedback/comments on articulate the offer by next meeting.

As part of the development and support we need to be able to open-up the language.

Community Initiatives can mean helping the community. If we are overseeing great projects we need to be linking them up.

SM also informed the group that City Funds is about additionality (adding to rather than duplicating or replacing existing funding).

- There could be good initiatives but ones that aren't affecting poverty and inequality in a way that we want, how are we measuring it?
- We don't want to set up organisations to fail, how much support and mentoring are we providing? We would be helping organisations with business cases and sustainability. Projects should update us on a quarterly basis with a one pager or in person about what they have achieved.

Accountability wise we have grant money held by Quartet and investment money held by BBRC.

We are working with our potential investors to work on the overall theory of change for the fund that include the 4 FPGs. At the moment we are working on pulling together key organisations to discuss and agree how a successful fund would work (money in and out etc. additional funding) which is fairly straightforward.

We are also looking at social impact measurements. DB mentioned the need for this work to be aligned with BCC's Social Value Policy and the Social Value Act generally.

The FPG will need to inform the thinking on this, what it looks like for each individual FPG to be successful.

Is there a template we can develop to guide people into getting the information we need?

We should be clear this is not just a grant fund; any grants that are available via City Funds are only used to build capacity and skills ready for an investable proposition to be submitted. There are already process maps available to assist with investment readiness.

If we can start to align money better we are more likely to affect real change in the right places. Even if you had 3 different funders funding 3 similar projects across Bristol, we know they are being aligned by City Funds.

Something might not exist but be beneficial, it might be the case of 'who do we know that can do this'. We need to give everyone confidence that the money is going towards things that the community actually want. We need to ensure that decisions being made within the funding priority group actually reflect what our communities want.

We need to demonstrate that this initiative is owned by Bristol and that the funding priority group members are facilitating access and support.

Big Lottery Fund has a facilitating branch, Collaborate, which has data TT can share.

Action: Taylor to share the work plan from the Governing Board. Share with all FPGs.

Action: Tim to send Big Lottery Fund research to Taylor to distribute.

ER explained that an investment committee is planned for handling the risk, but City Funds will balance the investment and grant.

Some of this is public money so we will need to follow the appropriate processes. We need to bring local knowledge and data to the group and be proactive in the community so we can be the most effective. It's a different more collaborative way of working.

Action: Ed/Ryan to bring back some examples of investable projects Community Initiatives can use.

7. Future meetings dates

Taylor will send out a date for the next meeting- potentially the week commencing 18th February 2019.

Full list of actions:

Action: All to provide feedback on ToR by 13th February 2019

Action: Taylor to share the Collaboration Agreement and Community Initiatives work in the business plan.

Action: All to provide feedback/comments on articulating the offer by next meeting.

Action: Taylor to share the work plan from the Governing Board. Share with all FPGs.

Action: Tim to send Big Lottery Fund research to Taylor to distribute.

Action: Ed/Ryan to bring back some examples of investable projects Community Initiatives can use.