**City Funds Minutes**

**Time and Place:** Thursday 14 May, 2-4pm, Zoom meeting

**Present:** Andy Street (Chair), Anna Dent, Ed Rowberry, Hannah Young, Kevin Slocombe, Lucy Gilbert, Ololade Adesanya, Peter Morris, Sandra Meadows, Sue Turner

**Attending:** Jari Moate, Laura Martin, Sacha Korsec

**Apologies:** Ian Barrett, Lizzi Testani

1. **Apologies [Andy]**

* Andy welcomed everyone to the Zoom meeting and noted the apologies

1. **New Declarations of interest [Andy]**

* There were no new declarations of interest

1. **Minutes of previous meeting and action log [Andy]**

* The Board reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting and noted two amendments:
* Lucy, noted in the NCGH update the meeting was in person not on Zoom and also suggested an amendment to point 9 – collating information from other surveys, rather than conducting new research
* Peter noted in point 8 under structure and governance the wording in relation to ‘transformational change’ was agreed in emails after the meeting, not during
* Previous actions were discussed, and the Action Log updated accordingly

**ACTION 1:** Laura to amend previous minutes

**ACTION 2:** Laura to remove completed actions from the Action Log

**ACTION 3:** Laura to follow up with FPG Chairs to seek approval for previous FPG meeting minutes to be published on the website and send these to Sacha, along with the Governing Board minutes (already reviewed and approved by Andy for publication on the website)

1. **Update on FPGs [FPG Chairs]**  
     
   Sue – NCGH

* All the grant awardees from the last round have delayed their projects to focus on emergency Covid-19 actions. They will keep the grant in reserve for the future. Lucy is in close contact with all groups to offer support. We will have an update on stories in autumn 2020.
* The Unitary Grants Panel has been joined by 2 members from NCGH, 2 from Economic Inclusion and Lizzie Testani from Environmental Transformation. We now need 2 volunteers from Community Initiatives. We have c.£700,000 of grant funding for health and wellbeing related projects across all funding priorities to use, and plan to have the first Panel meeting before the end of May. We are aiming to start the application process by June/July.

Sandra – Community Initiatives

* Sandra confirmed the Community Initiatives FPG would be putting nominations forward for the Unitary Grants Panel next week.
* Sandra reported that the Community Initiatives FPG is in need of a fresh start, reviewing the membership of the Group and the proposed changes to the role and function of FPG’s. The FPG is due to meet after the Governing Board meeting to discuss membership and future ways of working.
* Sandra expressed concerns regarding capacity for the research element of the FPG role and confirmed that this could not be achieved without additional resources.
* As Chair of the FPG holding the body of work, Sandra questioned how the research could be delivered and reported on each year. This is a common concern across all FPG’s.
* Ed agreed this was a valid point and the resourcing needs to be thought through carefully. Ed proposed a few options: if there was a budget City Funds could employ a researcher; we could possibly source pro bono support; we could partner with the universities; or engage members’ networks, for example the member from BSWN could connect the FPG with the right people at a strategic level.
* Andy agreed resourcing was a key point and reflected on the fact that the NCGH FPG had benefited from university research support in the past.

Anna - Economic Inclusion

* Anna reported that the Economic Inclusion FPG has initiated a lead partnership with Bristol University Doctoral Training College to organise placements for students. Anna suggested this could be packaged up as a City Funds research call and could be a really fruitful way to gauge expertise. However, there are two caveats: we can’t guarantee that a student will have the right area of interest and focus to address what we need; secondly, we would need to ensure there is a ‘host’ for the student and some level of supervision. Although it is not feasible to physically ‘host’ in the current circumstances, Anna is pursuing this as having good potential.
* The Economic Inclusion FPG met by Zoom on 11th May, Anna agreed with Sandra that there was a concern regarding membership and resources, with only two other members actually attending the last meeting. At the meeting the FPG role and function proposal received a broadly positive response, and the research deemed valuable, but there were questions about how this could be delivered. Anna noted she did not want to sign up for research that the Economic Inclusion FPG could not deliver. Anna expressed the conundrum that the role of FPG’s needs to be firmed up to keep members engaged, but that members need to attend meetings to enable this.
* Andy questioned if there was capacity to shape research at a strategic level and suggested a conversation with Ed to see if there could be a link developed between the Governing Board and research institutions.
* Ed confirmed there is a current University of Bristol programme, working with SME’s and students who are about to graduate, and that there was interest from someone who had previously worked for the City Office. Ed asked if this could be the sort of person FPG’s would be looking for - a bright, capable researcher with a clear brief.
* Sandra agreed this could be a welcome offer.
* Lucy commented it would be helpful to collate the research needs for each FPG to see if there are any synergies and potential for securing extra funding.
* Sacha agreed this could be a legitimate ‘ask’ for funders, and it could be included within core costs.
* Ololade agreed that investigating funding for combined research was a good idea, utilising the FPGs’ insights and skill to set the research brief.
* At the last Economic Inclusion FPG meeting Anna and members had an initial discussion about what Covid-19 means for the FPG priorities. Members were not in a position to draw conclusions due to the changing situation and limited attendance, but this is on the agenda to pick up at the next meeting. Anna questioned if changes to the FPG priorities could be made and what the procedure would be?
* Peter said he would need to confirm this but believes the terms of reference for FPG’s are approved by the Governing Board, and any changes should come back to this Board for approval. Peter suggested the Board should be responsive to this.
* Andy suggested there could/should be a link between the Economic Inclusion FPG and the Economy Board who are currently reviewing how best to address the recovery phase.
* Andy agreed that the issues raised regarding resources will be taken as an action so as to provide more clarity before the June FPG meeting, to offer reassurance.
* Kevin agreed the research should sit with the economic recovery process and suggested engaging with the Centre for Progressive Policy as a good resource.

**ACTION 4**: Andy and key members to work on clarity for FPG resourcing before the June meeting

**ACTION 5**: Kevin to provide Anna with a contact for the Centre for Progressive Policy

**ACTION 6**: Anna to work with Lucy regarding collated research   
  
Lizzi - Environmental Transformation

* Andy announced Lizzi Testani as the new Chair of the Environmental Transformation FPG. The next Environmental Transformation FPG meeting will be on 27th May.

1. **IAC Update [Jari]**

* Jari reported a busy month for the IAC, noting that Covid-19 had not slowed down their progress. There are four proposals currently under legal review, totalling £700,000 across all impact themes (excluding NCGH).
* The first social impact investment with *Talking Money* totalling £150,000, has been completed, and was now in the public arena. The IAC enjoyed working with them and noted their significant growth in demand during this period.
* The IAC met on 12th May to discuss two cases: 1) a large potential direct investment into a community initiative and 2) a smaller ‘C19 Bursary’ scheme to be financed using patient capital investing into a cohort of current investees working together on C19 responses in the health and personal finance space.
* The pipeline visibility looking forward has not changed since Covid-19; it remains 2-3 months, with last minute applications. However, applicants are looking forward and preparing for 6-9 months ahead.
* We are currently reviewing applications for Environmental Transformation and Community Initiatives, with an additional application on health and wellbeing; in total there is in excess of £1 million of potential investment in process.
* We are about to go through our 6-monthly review process with investors (led by Big Society Capital).
* Lucy is reviewing impact measures and progress with the Centre for Thriving Places and we remain confident that we will achieve a good outcome from this work.

1. **Fundraising update – Sacha**

Sacha outlined the key market and communications strategy:

1. Create a strong and connected brand
2. Utilise tools, such as social media, newsletters and the website
3. Support applicants’ journey
4. Create material for a video
5. Create a message of added value at local and national level

Sacha set out the fundraising goals to cover core costs, research capacity, secure grants for all FPG’s, gain resources for the pro-bono service and have resources in place to deliver impact and resilience for City Funds.

* The fundraising budget is £35,000; the main expenditure items are the website, CRM and database, marketing materials (including video) and events.
* The minimum trusts and foundations income level has been set at £104,700 for the grant programmes and £26,100 to cover core costs.
* The minimum fundraising target is £145,800 and includes also £10,000 from corporates and £5,000 from HNWI and other contributions, leading to an overall deficit of £38,000 for the Quartet Community Foundation side of the City Funds project.
* The first target will be trusts and foundations, channelling resources to have long term impact in Bristol, providing tailored accessible solutions and pioneering city-wide collaboration.
* We are in a good position to apply to trusts and foundations; however, they do not usually fund other grant panels. We need a clear, senior level strategy detailing our approach to coordination with other Covid-19 recovery plans. To do this we need to know what kind of reporting we can provide, and require a one to one relationship. Sacha proposed an online event with 10 senior fundraising executives.
* The second target will be local businesses; we need more infrastructure to support this journey on and offline. For example, the website and related analytics, social media and LinkedIn presence to develop an effective corporate engagement programme. Sacha asked the Board to identify sector leaders for early meetings; for example, digital champions of Bristol that have survived during this crisis and are able to contribute. Sacha also suggested holding an event to celebrate the positive impact of City Funds after the crisis.
* Achievements to date include:
  + 9 Trusts and Foundations contacted with some positive leads (BBC CIN, Comic Relief)
  + 1 business partner willing to fundraise for us (before Covid-19)
  + 1 member of the IAC willing to help
* Update on renewing website:
* Web-agency identified to develop a new website (FIASCO)
* Expected delivery in August
* Modular and progressive approach focused on key priorities
* In line with brand values
* The Board agreed an event in June was a good idea but noted there would need to be contact with senior fundraising executives prior to the event to warm them up.   
  Peter asked how this links to the City Funds recovery phase paper (point 7 below), and if we are talking to the same organisations?
* Andy confirmed that this is a discreet project focusing on Bristol, and that Sue’s Quartet paper provides a broader overview for the West of England.
* Hannah questioned funding ring-fencing and reporting in the fundraising advisory board. Hannah expressed the challenges with ring-fencing each pot of money and directing this to areas that City Funds wants to work in.
* All agreed that funding needs to fit into the City Funds remit and priorities.

**ACTION 7**: Hannah and Lucy to discuss monitoring

1. **Quartet recovery plan / City Funds recovery phase – Sue**

* Sue discussed the extent to which the West of England paper links in with City Funds. The projected brief summary figures for West of England are:  
     
  1. £10 million stabilisation funds

2. £10 million for key infrastructure organisations for up to three years

3. £6 million for vulnerable groups that need extra support

4. £4 million for local action in communities

* The figures are region-wide, with approximately 60-70% going to Bristol; this is being considered by a number of organisations. City Funds has a big role to play, particularly in relation to 1. and 4. above. The question for the Board is what we see City Funds’ role being in raising and deploying these funds, so we can withstand future storms.
* Peter noted the importance to have agreed criteria for who we can and cannot support. Some groups and businesses will not recover; we do not want money wasted. Clear criteria will also give confidence to donors, by ensuring we have a rigorous process in place.
* Sue noted that the Unitary Grants Panel will be looking at the criteria and undertaking due diligence to make sure that money is not wasted; however, we cannot be completely risk averse.
* Sandra questioned how the approach would deal with systemic inequality, where certain organisations don’t fit the current structure and therefore often get overlooked for funding. If this is not addressed it will not open up the market and as a result prevent some groups that City Funds want to support from accessing money.
* Lucy agreed with Sandra and cited the Quartet focused approach for putting stabilisation funding at the beginning, so we are not choosing who should and shouldn’t survive at the start of the process. The stabilisation phase gives groups the time to become more resilient.
* Hannah highlighted a potential weakness in the lack of feedback to unsuccessful applicants, who would struggle to understand the areas they need to build on. She suggested thinking about ways to strengthen applications and help applicants through the process. Sue agreed to the Unitary Grants Panel discussing this issue further.
* Andy asked if Governing Board members were happy with the four-point strategy, and particularly the role for City Funds to be involved in securing significant sums of money, bringing the city together.
* Ed agreed this was an excellent paper and suggested input from Hannah and Sacha regarding the fundraising strategy needed.
* Sandra agreed to feedback offline.
* All agreed with the paper’s principles, and to feedback to Sue in the next few days rather than wait for the next Board meeting.

**ACTION 8**: Sue to liaise with Hannah and Sacha regarding the fundraising strategy.

**ACTION 9**: Sandra to feedback offline.

1. **City Funds Investment Research [Ed]**

* Ed noted that any investment will take into account the recovery plan and connect with the research Lucy is leading on with the Centre for Thriving Places, and the Economy Board.
* The question for the investment fund post Covid-19 is where should the £10 million and Local Access funding be directed and in what form of product? For example, debt or equity, what are the timescales, what is the risk appetite and what is the pricing model? There may be some gaps in the existing FPG’s; we need to review this within the context of the new environment.
* Sue Cooper has committed time to lead work on this with a modest budget agreed with Local Access funding. The paper is expected to be ready by mid-July for the attention of the Governing Board (for the August Board meeting).
* We have had advanced conversations with Sally Britton, who has been commissioned as an associate to lead the work. Sally is an expert in the sector and will be supported by Reuben Coulter. Sally and Rueben may both become Governing Board members in the future, but since this is not happening now, we do not see any conflict of interest. If they do join the Board in due course, they will have had good insight into the role and workings of City Funds.

**ACTION 10:** Ed to circulate the two-page terms of reference to the Board for comment.

1. **Pro Bono Update – Sue / Peter**

* The first report written by Di Robertson was discussed at the last meeting, however wider distribution was not agreed.
* The modified version of the report offering a pro bono update was circulated in advance of the meeting. Peter asked the Board if they now agreed to wider distribution of this paper, e.g. to the Bristol pro bono group
* Peter, Sue, Andy, Ed and Rick Sturge met on 22nd April to discuss options for a pro bono service in the recovery phase. Sue has confirmed funding for a three days per week role to support a pro bono hub. Peter now asking for Board feedback.
* Sandra noted she would like Voscur to continue to play a role in pro bono support, and will talk with Sue offline. Sandra agreed this is needed now and could link across sectors, strategic groups and contribute to city-wide recovery for a more meaningful approach.
* Kevin agreed City Funds should link with strategic groups in the recovery phase.
* Ed supported the pro bono proposal and noted a systemic approach would lead to a stronger fundraising approach.
* Anna and Ololade both supported this paper and agreed it was helpful.
* Sue discussed High Sheriff, John Manley’s idea on how technology can be used with pro bono support, for the social sector organisations that really need it, and asked for the Board’s perspective. If agreed, the next step would be to draw up a draft of what is needed, and make this a reality.
* Hannah questioned if there are any operational plans for the brokerage service, and whether this needs to be included on the website soon, or if it should sit somewhere else.
* Sue commented, and Hannah agreed, that there are many existing brokerage organisations that could support this rather than creating something new, which would be very expensive to maintain.
* Andy concluded that all supported this paper and Sue/Sandra will meet offline.

**ACTION 11**: Sue/Sandra to meet offline

1. **Risk Register and operational plan [Ololade/Ed]**

* Ololade presented the Risk Register, which now included the suggested impact of Covid-19 on all risks, with an additional key and column to track changes.
* Ololade asked the Board for feedback on the Risk Register.
* All agreed the obvious risks had been listed.
* Kevin agreed the loss of Board members is a high risk that the Board should consider carefully.
* Peter questioned if there was an audit trail to record/track the changes to the Risk Register. Ololade confirmed the Risk Register was updated monthly and that all changes could be traced over time with an audit trail.

1. **AOB**

* There were no items for AOB

1. **Future meeting date [Andy]**

* Thursday 11th June, 14:00-16:00