**City Funds Minutes**

**Time and Place:** Tuesday 21st July, 2-4pm, Zoom meeting

**Attendees:** Andy Street (AS Chair), Sandra Meadows (SM), Edward Rowberry (ER), Kevin Slocombe (KS), Sue Turner (ST), Anna Dent (AD), Lizzi Testani (LT), Jari Moate (JM), Sacha Korsec (SK), Hannah Young (HY) Ololade Adesanya, Lucy Gilbert, Laura Martin\*, Ryan Munn, Lisa Müller

**Apologies:** Ian Barrett, Peter Morris

1. **Apologies [AS]**
* AS welcomed everyone to the Zoom meeting, noted the apologies and informed everyone that Lisa Müller (Centre for Thriving Places) would be joining the meeting at 2.45pm for item 7, and SM would be joining the meeting at 3pm.
1. **New Declarations of interest [AS]**
* No new declarations of interest to report.
1. **Minutes of previous meeting and action log [AS]**
* The Board reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. LT noted an amendment under item 4 - "*Three additional members have joined the FPG and there is hope that more will join*." And suggested amending to "*Three members of the ET FPG have joined the Unitary Grants Panel.”*
* Previous actions were discussed, and the action log updated accordingly

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

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

1. **Update on FPGs [FPG Chairs]**

LT - Environmental Transformation
* LT stated there had been no meeting since the last Governing Board meeting, but there was an Environmental Transformation FPG meeting scheduled for 22nd July.

AD - Economic Inclusion

* AD noted the last Economic Inclusion FPG meeting was on 22nd June and the next meeting is scheduled for 31st July.
* The main focus of the last meeting was to discuss if the Economic Inclusion priorities needed to change as a result of Covid-19. This was a useful discussion for members to input from the organisations they work for; some pointed to new priorities but the majority highlighted existing issues that had been exacerbated by Covid-19. No firm conclusions were drawn, as decisions will be made in conjunction with the One City Economic Recovery Plan.
* AD also noted the need to be more explicit on what inequalities already exist within the priority areas, communities, individuals, households and businesses - for example BAME communities. Consider inviting applications that are more explicit in addressing inequalities.

ST – NCGH

* ST stated there had been no meeting since the last Governing Board meeting.
* ST reported they would meet with Feeding Bristol, regarding deployment of funding.

Community Initiatives

* There had been no meeting since the last Governing Board meeting.
* SM had discussed with AS the possible need to identify a deputy for the chair position.

**ACTION 3**: AD to follow up again with Anesa Kritah regarding joining up with the One City Economy Board.

**ACTION 4**: SM and AS to firm up on deputising role for the Community Initiatives FPG.

1. **IAC Update [JM]**
* The IAC met last week and approved the largest single investment to date; £1 million will go to a Community Initiatives themed project, once the agreement is signed. JM will share further details in due course.
* The IAC will now take a summer break and return in September. When they return there will be a review to make sure they are making good decisions.
* The total funds committed to date are approximately £1.8 million.
1. **Fundraising & Communications update [SK]**
* SK reported that templates and letter headers would be circulated soon with the updated brand guidelines.
* SK relayed the results of the fundraising event on 24th June; it was a great success - all invited organisations attended the event. Following the event SK is in active communication with The Henry Smith Charity, BBC Children In Need and Comic Relief.
* One application is in process with Comic Relief led by David Barclay; the deadline is 28th August and the maximum City Funds can apply for is £600,000.
* SK would now like to follow up on discussions to join up funding applications with the City Office, the One City Plan and City Funds, to show how the economic recovery strategy is working hand in hand with all Bristol stakeholders. SK and LG will be meeting with Andrea Dell, Annabel Smith and David Barclay from the City Office; AS and ER from City Funds are invited to attend the meeting.
* There are three options going forward: 1. Deciding which tool to use; 2. Channelling resources; and 3. Creating a joined-up approach for achieving systemic change.
* Funding infrastructure for systemic change would involve university research, supporting accessibility for groups to apply, and inclusivity for people with lived experience.
* The Health and Wellbeing Fund project is being led by Quartet. There is the option in future potentially to enter into a more collaborative approach with national partners where they pick a City Funds priority to support and then work together to achieve the long-term goal.
* SK will circulate a roadmap, detailing the options for the Board to comment on.
* ST confirmed that SK had listened to experts in fundraising and had thought hard about the different options so as to create a menu of tools for City Funds to discuss and pick from.
* HY noted the fundraising advisory board would be meeting on 12th August to discuss the Comic Relief proposal and help SK put this together.
* ER thanked SK, and supported the conversations and collaboration with the City Office.
* SK and LG will be having regular meetings with Andrea Dell from the City Office, and Andrea is invited to join the UGP meetings.
* As a new chair LT also asked for clarity on how FPG’s influence/determine what is funded and whether FPG’s should be more reactive or proactive?
* ER noted that he had previously circulated a Board paper outlining how this fits together, confirming the role of FPG’s with a clear link to the UGP. ER agreed to share the paper with LT.
* AS confirmed FPG’s role is to understand issues in the city, research target investments and funding.
* AS thanked SK for his work and offered support from the key signatories if needed.

**ACTION 5**: SK to circulate the roadmap, detailing the options for the Board to comment on.

**ACTION 6**: ER to share FPG paper with LT.

1. **Centre for Thriving Places Impact Work update [LG / Lisa Müller]**
* LG explained the paper focuses on the impact aims of City Funds and links with the City Office’s overview of themes.
* LM listed the aims, domains and subdomains, which match themes and indicators from the One City Plan, noting equality and inclusion are issues that cut across all themes and so will be reported on separately. Equality in health works across different themes, for reporting purposes they have been pulled out to score against headline aims. The themes, domains and subdomains are baselines; the score values can be continued to show progress for Bristol compared to the rest of UK.
* The Thriving Places Index uses national and local data, including BCC data and the local Quality of Life survey, using percentage scoring where Bristol sits nationally, although secondary data sources cannot be guaranteed. LG noted they had become stakeholders for specific questions in the quality of life survey.
* Over time they hope to set values, collected against target values, to compare how Bristol is doing against other local authorities and against its own targets, and if possible, how this can then be related back to specific projects. This would enable City Funds to see quickly what performance against the Sustainable Development Goals is and what indicators are relevant to FPG’s.
* The One City targets may change each year, and the indicators can change targets. JM and LG will be testing this in the funding decision making process and hope to map what decisions are likely to influence most, and from this to make more informed decisions on funding and impact.
* Thriving Places are developing a primary data collection tool through the ‘happiness pulse survey’, an individual wellbeing survey which asks people about general wellbeing and looks at behaviour change; e.g. on the key issues such as environment, health, social inclusion, people’s sense of inclusion. The draft versions of the questions are almost ready for feedback. This will be answered by beneficiaries of the programmes and there will be a pre- and post-project survey, which should strengthen indicators.
* AD asked a few questions:
1. Will the full list of indicators be tracked for the whole of the time City Funds is in existence? LM confirmed ‘yes’, but some indicators are only tracked every 5 years, for example, tree cover.
2. How many indicators will have an impact, will this be done by the IAC? LM noted the first stage is for the information to be tracked and there will then most likely be an assessment stage in conversation with the IAC or FPG members.
3. Is there a way to administer the happiness pulse that is not on-line so as to cater for digital exclusion? LM confirmed there is a paper version of the questionnaire, however, printing and adding the data is not included.
* KS questioned if this is an overreach for City Funds. There is an incredible level of data here and City Funds alone will not solve all the issues. In reality City Funds should focus on a limited number of issues, how does the index work if 60% of indicators are not affected by City Funds?
* LM agreed the ambition goes beyond 5 years, and this is where LG and JM’s work will help. In order to have impact the focus needs to be on specific areas that will have more impact, there is a lot of scope in the system. Centre for Thriving Places need to know for example, if 80% of funding is focused on 4 subdomains; this is crucial data.
* SK had two questions of LM:
1. Would it be advisable to train teams to use the tools, and should funding be included in bids for development and use of the tool, to make it available and free to all grantee/investees? LM confirmed the accompanying Word document with instructions should suffice.
2. Is there a one-page document to show partners the development tools? LG confirmed there is an Executive Summary of the overall tool which should suffice.
* ER suggested that a practical Word document with different types of instructions for different people’s usage, including FPG’s/grants managers, would be helpful.
* AS asked when this can be launched? LG stated they are trying to work that out and would be meeting with ER and the team on Thursday (23rd July), with Phase 1 of the evaluation document complete by August.
* Members were invited to email LG if they had any further questions.

**ACTION 7**: LG to share Executive Summary of the overall tool with SK.

1. **Unitary Grants Panel Update [ST/SK]**
* The UGP had not met since the last update. In the first meeting they reviewed the TOR and draft guidelines which were circulated to the Board today.
* Sally Hogg agreed to be Chair for the current funding round, and we have advertised for a partner organisation to provide direct support to potential applicant organisations.
* There has been a lot of interest so far, and interviews will start week commencing 10th August, with the programme starting as soon as possible. The first panel decision meeting will be towards the end of October.
* People with lived experience of health issues will be invited to join the panel, there has been a lot of interest, initially 4-5 will join the panel and the UGP will discuss how to work with others and how to input into training etc.
* The Board were invited to contact LG if they had any further questions.
1. **City Funds & Diversity, Equity and Inclusion [AS]**
* Phoebe Fenton had circulated the draft statement; PM and LT had suggested minor changes and SM provided helpful thoughts/observations. AS suggested the Board take the statement way to review and come back with comments and PF will circulate the final version next week.
* ST noted City Funds should be clear in what they are doing going forward and that this is not seen as a delayed response to the issue.
* SM agreed with ST, stating what happened in Bristol is a catalyst but not the main thing, it’s an ongoing long-term issue and it is really good for people to recognise who is supportive.
* AD asked if the statement is to be underpinned by specific actions and if there is a programme of actions going forward?
* AS confirmed the aim is to have a statement in place and to then ensure there is an overview of all City Funds processes undertaken to ensure they are in line with the statement. AS will work on this offline with the key signatories, and then bring it back to the Board.
* SM stated it should be about how City Funds tackles equality overall and be more open and transparent about what City Funds does.
* LT commented that the statement looks at the governance and processes and noted it is on the Environmental Transformation FPG agenda to discuss systemic injustice, being diversity positive, and furthering the notion that everyone deserves access to a bright future.
* LG commented that if the statement references prioritising people facing multiple disadvantages there needs to be transparent and clear guidelines on our priorities and decision-making.
* SM suggested a simpler way to approach this offline; agreeing the need to be clear but not to be overcomplicated.
* AS concluded the statement is there to help City Funds identify more investments, not make JM’s and the IAC’s job harder.

**ACTOIN 8**: All to review and send feedback to AS.

1. **Local Access [DR]**
* DR shared the Local Access Partnership (LAP) presentation, noting the core partners: BBRC, BSWN, Voscur, the School for Social Entrepreneurs and Quartet.
* The LAP is a national programme, including 6 places: Bristol; Bradford; Gainsborough; Greater Manchester; Southwark; Hartlepool, Redcar & Cleveland, with the purpose of proving place-based blended finance to help build more inclusive social economies; i.e. developing social enterprises and social markets. The funding pot is £33m over 10 years split between the six places.
* Bristol’s original vision and proposal was to challenge inequality and build ownership. Shifting from ‘seeking help’ to ‘securing resources’, increasing diversity and coordination. The outcome is to create a more diverse and inclusive social economy. Bristol received £1.8 million for blended grant and £900k for enterprise development.
* The principles and priorities are to focus exclusively on charities and social enterprises led by or working with BAME and disadvantaged communities, social purpose organisations (not local businesses with social by-products), building collaboration with frontline organisations with an iterative approach of test phases and learning.
* The progress to date includes the initial partnership of five infrastructure organisations that developed the bid having translated the original bid into 4 proposed pilot projects (detailed in the slides) to connect enterprise development and social finance and they have now put in place detailed plans for first two years.
* The pipeline will develop the market for social investment in social purpose, with the blended grant not restricted but with purposeful and clear alignment with thematic focuses. LAP will work with LG and the City Funds UGP.
* DR’s role will end in September 2020.
1. **Risk Register and operational plan [ER]**
* LM\* circulated the updated Risk Register prior to the meeting, and agreed to log the updates going forward.

**ACTION 9:** All to provide LM\*/AS with feedback on the Risk Register and suggest any changes or additions.

1. **AOB**
* AS noted that OA had announced that she would be stepping down from the Board due to growing professional commitments and busy family life. OA hopes to continue to connect with City Funds members in various capacities.
* AS thanked OA for her significant wisdom and advice, noting the Board will need to replace talent with talent when looking to replace OA and ST.
1. **Future meeting date [AS]**
* LM\*/AS to discuss the meeting sequence offline.