**City Funds Minutes**

**Time and Place:** Friday 4th September, 9-11am, Zoom meeting

**Attendees:** Andy Street (AS Chair), Sandra Meadows (SM), Edward Rowberry (ER), Ian Barrett (IB), Kevin Slocombe (KS), Sue Turner (ST), Anna Dent (AD), Lizzi Testani (LT), Sacha Korsec (SK), Lucy Gilbert (LG), Laura Martin (LM), Peter Morris, John Stienlet (JS)

**Apologies:** Ololade Adesanya (OA), Ryan Munn (RM), Jari Moate (JM), Ronnie Brown (RB), Hannah Young (HY)

1. **Apologies [AS]**
* AS welcomed everyone to the Zoom meeting, noted the apologies, and gave a special welcome to John Stienlet.
* ST introduced JS, noting the framework for JS’s role was established following PM’s work involving businesses, and the work completed earlier this year for pro bono support. The new role has been developed into a full-time post due to the combined funding from DCMS, Voscur, a philanthropist and Quartet. ST noted City Funds is extremely lucky to find JS, who has all the capabilities needed, and has done a similar role before, so is making quick progress. ST thanked everyone who has already met with JS for inductions.
* AS confirmed the next Governing Board meeting will be OA’s last meeting before leaving the Board and that today’s meeting is the last for IB and ST. AS thanked all for their continued, and excellent work over the past years and wished them well.
* Quartet is currently going through the recruitment process to replace ST’s position as CEO, AS is happy with the suggestion that RB covers ST’s role as the key Quartet representative on the City Funds Governing Board in the interim.
* AS raised the issue of losing Governing Board members and the potential opportunity to recruit new members in the context of diversity, equity and inclusion. AS suggested the remaining members have a separate meeting to discuss recruitment in more detail to ensure the Board is fit for purpose. All agreed.

**ACTION 1**: AS to organise a meeting with members regarding recruitment to the Governing Board before the next full Governing Board meeting.

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. LG noted an amendment under point 6, where HY is convening a meeting for the fundraising advisory board not the UGP.
* Previous actions were discussed, and the action log updated accordingly.
* PM commented that Appendix one sits outside of the Collaboration Agreement, setting out the principles of how FPG’s operate, and members need to review this in the context of the Collaboration Agreement to see how they work together, either as an addendum to the Collaboration Agreement or to discuss how it fits in with the relevant FPG schedule.
* AD reported attending the last One City Economy Board and confirmed there is a working group to develop the next draft of the economic recovery strategy and another workshop in 2 weeks’ time.

**ACTION 2:** LM to amend previous minutes.
**ACTION 3:** LM to remove completed actions from the Action Log.
**ACTION 4:** RM, AS and the fundraising advisory board to liaise with Phoebe Fenton (PF) on website updates, aiming to launch new website by 30 September.
**ACTION 5:** FPG three key priorities removed from action log, SK to contact FPG chairs if further input is required.
**ACTION 6:** PM to make LG’s suggested amendments to Appendix one and distribute to FPG chairs.
**ACTION 7:** Members have one week to send any final suggested amendments to Appendix one to PM before it is finalised.
**ACTION 8:** AS to add Appendix one in relation to the Collaboration Agreement to the agenda for the separate Governing Board members meeting.
**ACTION 9:** ER to confirm Victor’s attendance at the next Governing Board meeting to provide an update on the IAC and to present the quarterly report.

**Update on FPGs [FPG Chairs]**

SM - Community Initiatives

* There had been no meeting since the last Governing Board meeting.
* SM reported on a discussion with AS about the future of CIFPG and confirmed they are looking at reconvening the group in line with Appendix one and the purposes of the FPG. SM would like to continue discussions and connect with other FPG chairs; SM feels the CIFPG is rather more complicated than other FPG’s and this has impacted on progress to date. SM hopes to reach a resolution by the next Board meeting.

AD - Economic Inclusion

* AD noted the last EIFPG meeting was on 31st July and the main focus of the meeting was to provide feedback on the economic recovery strategy document.
* AD collated the feedback and shared this with Anesa Kritah (BCC Economic Development Manager), who is leading on the strategy. Anesa reported that the feedback was extremely useful. AD noted the positive link between the EIFPG and the wider work on economic recovery within the city through the One City Economy Board. AD hopes the feedback will be reflected in the first full draft which is expected to be released soon.
* There are currently no further meeting dates for the EIFPG, the next meeting will only be scheduled when there is something substantive to discuss due to busy workloads.

LT - Environmental Transformation

* The ETFPG met on 22nd July and agreed the new 6 monthly frequency will enable it to reflect on and share key developments with the Governing Board that might be useful in generating funding and/or making funding decisions.
* Key items discussed at the meeting included:
* The [One City Climate Strategy](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.bristolonecity.com_wp-2Dcontent_uploads_2020_02_one-2Dcity-2Dclimate-2Dstrategy.pdf&d=DwMFAw&c=7libWk6qxX9UStSY0S7v0BFgllVdq90dlT-QbmNawA8&r=CoKeA6ptOhSD9ZFWwX_J4B5PyPSF4fiLGTlJ2nB9Ujs&m=4OPluatdISdmWKL50OPk6LfBmAhbxuF87bISMMLVGHY&s=RzDByOOdOJiTYk_TepI-5R3qf0t9QqBWLQ6lIrLKnjU&e=) was released in February, which describes how Bristol can become carbon neutral by 2030. Key challenges and opportunities are in heat decarbonisation and transport system decarbonisation but the strategy also outlines in detail what’s required in relation to buildings, electricity, consumption and waste, business and the economy, public services, natural environment, food and infrastructure interdependencies.
* COVID-19 and its financial implications has brought challenges to the environmental sustainability sector - particularly impacting entry level opportunities and apprenticeships (reduced by 80%) - members are concerned this will negatively impact on the environmental sustainability’s diversity and equality - and exacerbate the sector’s existing lack of diversity. Members of the ETFPG are meeting to consider this risk in more detail.
* [Bristol declared an ecological emergency](https://news.bristol.gov.uk/news/bristol-declares-ecological-emergency) in February 2020. The One City Ecological Action plan is due to be released in September, which will call for 30% of Bristol’s land to be managed for wildlife. The group would like to highlight “creating appropriate biodiversity measures / indicators to track and support the city’s goal to become a nature-rich city” as a priority area for research.
* The Government has announced a [Green Homes Grant](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cse.org.uk_news_view_2482&d=DwMFAw&c=7libWk6qxX9UStSY0S7v0BFgllVdq90dlT-QbmNawA8&r=CoKeA6ptOhSD9ZFWwX_J4B5PyPSF4fiLGTlJ2nB9Ujs&m=4OPluatdISdmWKL50OPk6LfBmAhbxuF87bISMMLVGHY&s=kPz8lidzqZPJ4tCIgFoZnmo2gtFbcPgYt5AodwTumIw&e=) from September which promises that hundreds of thousands of homeowners will receive vouchers of up to £5,000 for energy-saving home improvements from September 2020. This may transform the economic viability of the retrofit sector.
* Suggested wording for inclusion in universal grant applications (LT is currently gathering feedback on these from ETFPG members):
* Please share details of the ways that your organisation or project lessens social inequalities in Bristol. This could be via existing policies or through delivery of the organisations’ or projects’ activities that empower underrepresented groups to influence project design or strategy or increases underrepresented groups’ access to economic opportunities, resources and/or quality of life. We’d also love to hear your plans for increasing efforts in this area.
* Please share details of the ways that your organisation or project has a positive environmental impact in Bristol. This could be via existing policies or through delivery of the organisations’ or projects’ activities that reduce carbon emissions or delivers biodiversity / nature benefits. We’d also love to hear your plans for increasing efforts in this area.

ST – NCGH

* ST reported there had been no meeting since the last Governing Board; the next meeting is anticipated late autumn. ST suggested the discussion of a new chair wait until the next meeting and that RB sits in on that next meeting.
* LG agreed to monitor the returning reports from the grants made earlier this year and to schedule the next meeting in line with this.
* AS noted food poverty is a critical issue and will continue to be so for this year and next and suggested an earlier meeting for NCGH would be beneficial and link in with the work SK/LG are doing with Knowle West Alliance.

**ACTION 10:** Key signatories to provide LT/ETFPG’s feedback on the universal grant applications to the IAC.
**ACTION 11:** LG to schedule the next NCGH meeting

1. **IAC Update [ER]**
* ER provided an update on behalf of JM and confirmed there will be a formal report from Victor Tettmar (chair of IAC) at the next Governing Board meeting in October.
* The IAC has not met since the last Governing Board due to the summer recess.
* JM and Sue Cooper (BBRC reprehensive on IAC) have been working on process improvement and turning the Centre for Thriving Places index into a decision-making tool. ER requested that FPG chairs ensure the information coming through FPG updates is factored into the decision-making tool before it is finalised and asked LT to send the ET feedback. If done right there will be a coherent framework connecting the Governing Board and FPG’s.
* The IAC will have an away day at the end of September (date to be confirmed), to make sure the IAC have a good understanding of how/when they should be funding versus the impact framework and Governing Board mandate etc. ER asked members who would like to feed into the away day agenda to email ER/JM.
* KS raised a concern that City Funds has not yet explored the decision-making process and has only looked at one IAC report. KS highlighted it would be useful for the Governing Board to feed into the away day for a more informed conversation to identify the key issues with the decision-making process. KS suggested the Governing Board meets to discuss what can be input to the away day.
* ER confirmed there could be a Governing Board item on the agenda for the away day.
* LG noted conversations with JM on how to use the tool at the assessment/pre-investment decision making stage and pointed out it is just a tool/metrics and it cannot be used to inform the entire decision-making process. LG confirmed the tool is almost ready for sign off, but City Funds need to find a way to feed in information as it changes; it needs to be dynamic, information sharing and to be used to influence decision making rather than relying on it as a static metric spreadsheet.
* AD referred to the December workshop and the discussion on the flow of information and how FPG’s could better support the IAC in terms of understanding the FPG priorities. AD doesn’t feel that this potential to strengthen a better understanding between FPG’s/IAC has been fully realised or resolved.
* KS noted the economic recovery report and the ecological impact report are both big players and there should be a discussion about how they impact on decision-making for investment in the City. The growing inequality gap is a large part of the economic recovery report and the impact of Covid has widened that inequality. KS does not want to delay getting money out or create investment obstacles but doesn’t feel comfortable that any of the work done in the FPG’s has really landed in the IAC and this needs to be discussed before the away day.
* All agreed these were valid points for continuous improvement.
* ER updated that the Local Access Partnership is progressing and there should be another pot of money hopefully available to the city from early 2021. The potential for the money to be used in enterprise development or blended finance could help fill a gap around inclusion and community, which may help address some of the FPG’s priorities.

**ACTION 12**: AS to add the IAC away day agenda to the Governing Board members meeting.

1. **Fundraising/Communications update & validate of privacy policy [SK]**
* SK has been working on the Comic Relief funding application. Quartet is not eligible to submit a funding application, as they are over the £10 million annual income limit. SK is waiting for final confirmation for City Funds but it is unlikely to be eligible as City Funds is not a foundation. SK is progressing a partnership to bid for Comic Relief funding with one member of the Knowle West Alliance to produce a programme on Children ‘survive and thrive’/NCGH in Knowle West to demonstrate how the local infrastructure developed by City Funds can produce systemic change in a place based area. SK has a meeting next week to see if the project can be set up in 20 days; SK will update on this at the next meeting.
* LG confirmed they are in early stage conversations with Knowle West Alliance (KWA), discussing how City Funds can add value. KWA was funded through the NCGH FPG to develop a community-led action plan around food, hunger and children and families’ nutrition, they are in the process of delivering on this. Covid has rendered some actions unnecessary, but KWA have plans to develop this over the next few months. The Comic Relief funding would be the next stage of the project which is community-led and based on a plan that residents initiate alongside local community groups. This fits well with the spirit of City Funds, but we need to determine what they need from us and if it’s a good fit.
* AS noted City Funds will need to work with one of the Alliance to ensure the charitable status box is ticked for funding.
* AS asked members if they see City Funds’ governance role to catalyse and fundraise on behalf of another entity? And if this aligns with the aims of City Funds?
* PM shared initial thoughts, that once a funding stream is identified as ineligible from the City Funds perspective but the project still has merit within the community, the emphasis should be to try and identify the organisation which would be eligible and hand it over to them to run. City Funds could then help the organisation find suitable resources through pro bono etc. and then step back, rather than run it on their behalf.
* SM stated this might be an opportunity for Voscur to provide some assistance through their funding development officer and the community outreach post that is key to liaising with various groups on the ground, and providing focused support to help navigate funding.
* ST agreed Voscur would be a good fit and stressed that City Funds should always ask what value are they adding by being in the middle; if they are not adding anything then City Funds should step away and let others work directly.
* AS agreed that we should help facilitate communication and for LG/SK to continue to gain clarity and to contact SM for additional support. A decision will be made regarding City Funds’ position after the meeting in two weeks.
* SK confirmed ongoing active discussions with BBC Children in Need, the Henry Smith charity and Comic Relief.
* SK suggested more time should be spent on national networks such as UKCF or the Association of Charitable Foundations in order to be identified in the landscape of funders.
* ST suggested focusing on systems change that could lead to funding, such as Lankelly Chase foundation.

**ACTION 13**: LG/SK meet with KWA, contact SM for additional support and gain more clarity on City Funds’ role.

1. **KPI Update [SK]**
* SK reported the KPI’s for July are the same for August, with one additional meeting with Lankelly Chase foundation.
1. **Unitary Grants Panel Update [LG]**
* The UGP has been focusing on the recruitment of the entity that will offer support to organisations to apply to the Health and Wellbeing Fund. Interviews were held two weeks ago. It has taken longer than anticipated, but the role has been provisionally offered to one organisation, although they have been asked to make ‘tweaks’ and potentially partner with another organisation on some aspects of the proposal. The UGP will announce and circulate the results of the decision as soon as possible.
* This delay has affected the launch date of the Health and Wellbeing Programme, which affects the UGP meeting schedule; they are hoping to launch the programme as soon as possible and hold the first panel meeting by the end of the year, potentially December, to provide enough time for applications and assessment.
* The work with the Care Forum is progressing; the UGP has recruited 5 expert citizens with an additional 5 interested. The Care Forum is running some initial training for the 5 expert citizens, including safeguarding training. There is a session scheduled for LG to meet with the expert citizens for introductions and to discuss the best way for them to work with the UGP. Finally, there will be a session on panel membership and processes. All the training will take place in September and October 2020.
* The final version of the Thriving Places Index metrics is now ready, along with the populated spreadsheet including all the figures, and a paper with recommendations for next steps. LG will circulate this to the Board shortly.
* Centre for Thriving Places is currently working on the happiness pulse: the online questionnaire that will go to the beneficiaries of the organisations that are supported, with standard questions and bespoke questions around behaviour change. LG/JM have seen the initial questions, the majority seem reasonable, but LG has made some comments for redrafts in line with FPG themes. The questions will be circulated to FPG chairs shortly. LG asked FPG chairs/members for feedback as soon as possible, but noted there would not be enough time for full FPG meetings.
* LG/SK met with Alice Evans the Director of Lankelly Chase; they are a foundation that specialises in systems change work. City Funds has discussed systems change as a central approach but has not had a specific session to discuss what it means or to confirm the approach. LG/SK have been reviewing this while looking at different funding streams, impact work and what makes City Funds different.
* LG fed back the meeting highlights that systems change is a process/approach, and there needs to be caution against focusing too much on the outcomes. Lankelly Chase began by looking at themselves, and their own processes, how they are reproducing the systems in the world that they might want to challenge and how they can do things differently, rather than an outward focus on supporting other people to change. Alice (Lankelly Chase) said it takes at least three years to establish this and then at least five years to see any difference based on the funding delivered, which is encouraging considering City Funds processes and progress already.
* LG/SK thought this could be an opportunity to reflect on City Funds’ processes, communication and the systems that City Funds wants to change and the barriers that need addressing.
* All agreed for Alice to attend a Governing Board session to hear about Lankelly Chase’s perspectives and experience of systems change work.
* ST suggest Victor might want to attend this session, which could start to move some of the IAC processes forward in this direction.
* SK suggested a two-stage approach for the systems change meeting, initially with the Governing Board then a second wider session for city stakeholders, investees and grantees. All agreed.
* AD confirmed EIFPG members’ willingness to be involved in meetings to discuss the meaning of systems change and how City Funds can be a different kind of funder.

**ACTION 14:** LG to circulate the final version of the Thriving Places Index and the happiness pulse questions for FPG chair feedback.

**ACTION 15:** LG to organise a session for Alice Evans, the Director of Lankelly Chase, and City Funds members.

1. **City Funds & Diversity, Equity and Inclusion [AS]**
* AS discussed the development of a clear statement for the City Funds website addressing diversity, equity and inclusion. The latest draft was circulated to members and had received some minor amendments.
* AS wanted to get the statement agreed and make sure all City Funds processes operate in line with the statement. The Board will need to reflect on how this is applied, including expanding the board membership and the impact on the IAC etc.
* LG agreed to amend some of the guidelines so they are clear on City Funds prioritisation and organisations demonstrating excellence. LG has been using City Funds as a singular, AS agreed City Funds is singular rather than plural.
* LT asked in light of posting the statement now, whether the statement should include the sentence ‘in light of the events of 2020’ or similar to make it more longer lived, and if it is posted with a time stamp the language might need changing.
* AD questioned the follow up actions after the statement. AS agreed we should be held to account and open to questions if we are not fully applying the statement.
* SM pointed out the word ‘strives’, and a personal connotation of the word seen as a struggle to change rather than an aim of what we want to achieve and suggested changing this word to ‘aims’. All agreed.
* LG shared a personal preference referring to using ‘continuing/continued’ twice and a perceived lack of humility in using this, saying City Funds are already doing everything right and will continue to; if this is taken out it shows City Funds are open to learning and changing.
* PM suggested changing to ‘we are restating our commitment to playing our part.’
* KS would like to keep one of the ‘continued’ in the statement, otherwise City Funds may be criticised for not thinking about this before and only just starting to think about this now, which is not true. KS also noted caring more about the action plan than the statement.
* PM agreed to review the statement, incorporating the minor suggested amendments and concluded that members were happy with the statement as it is, but if the minor amendments were made that would be good. All agreed.

**ACTION 16**: PM to make statement amendments and send to AS.

1. **Risk Register and operational plan [ER]**
* LM had not received any further updates to the risk register since the last meeting.
* ER highlighted R4 (Governance breakdown due to insufficient linkage between activities by the Funding Priority Groups, the Investment Committee and the Board), and suggested keeping this under close review.
* ER also highlighted R7 (Loss of key members of the Board i.e. dependence on grants champion (Sue Turner) and investments champion (Ed Rowbery)), noting there was a clear plan for this.
* There were no additional changes in relation to Covid added to the risk register.
* SK suggested the tension between emergency action and long term intervention as a risk related to Covid. ER confirmed City Funds is not about emergency action and there is a clear line between Quartet/Voscur/BCC emergency actions versus what City Funds would do, and this is out of scope. ST agreed, City Funds borrows from teams from other organisations, so would not be able to form a rapid response with teams on the ground.
* ER commented on the operational plan and asked for advice on this going forward. ST suggested this would be good to discuss when the new Board members had joined and work on a succinct operational plan, recognising the borrowing of resources from other organisations. AS agreed to raise this again later in the year.

**ACTION 17**: Operational plan to be included in December’s Board meeting when new members have joined.

1. **AOB**
* ST reported on conversations with Martin Parker at the university of Bristol about the university’s role as a civic university. AS confirmed City Funds main contact is Guy Orpen, but LG noted Martin was involved in conversations regarding the City Funds research project.
* AD will be meeting with Martin Parker to talk through his work on inclusive economy following FPG conversations and agreed to feedback on this.
* AS reported on a helpful observation from LG, suggesting there could be space for informal free flowing conversations alongside the rigid structure of formal governance meetings and suggested having a 20 minute section as part of the Board meeting (potentially picking a topic) for a free flowing conversation/debate.
* LG confirmed this came out of the conversation with Lankelly Chase on the importance of relationship building and the importance of this in systems change processes in breaking down barriers and how City Funds can overcome the structures that they want to challenge. This Board holds an incredibly talented group of people working on amazing things in the city but there is limited opportunity to hear about this, how members are feeling about City Funds or wider work, and to bring other aspects of work/lives into this space to get the best out of each other.
* PM suggested having the free flowing discussion at the beginning of the meeting, rather than the end when people are lower in energy.
* All agreed to trial this and for members to feedback if they don’t feel it’s working/adding value, noting the difficulty with Zoom meetings.
* IB thanked everyone and said it was a pleasure working with everyone on City Funds. IB will remain part of the ETFPG.
* ST thanked everyone for their friendship and support over the years and will stay in touch.
* All wished them well.
1. **Future meeting date [AS]**
* AS confirmed the meeting on hold for 10th September was cancelled and that the following meeting dates will stay in place:
* 8th October
* 12th November
* 10th December.

**ACTION 18**: LM to confirm attendance for the next meeting on 8th ctober and reschedule if numbers are low.