

Environmental Transformation FPG Meeting Minutes

Time and Place: 15.30-17.00, Wednesday 22 July, Zoom meeting

Present: Janine Michael (JM), Roy Kareem (RK), David White (DW), Lizzi Testani (LT) (Chair), Sue Turner (ST), Savita Willmott (SW), Laura Martin (LM) (Minute Taker), Sacha Korsek (SK), Lucy Gilbert (LG), Emma Burlow (EB)

Apologies: Ian Barrett (IB), Ryan Munn (JM), Jari Moate (JM*), Philip Stott (PS)

1. Welcome and apologies

- LT welcomed everyone to the Zoom meeting and noted the apologies.

2. Minutes of previous meeting and actions log

- The Board reviewed and approved the minutes from the previous meeting.
- There were no outstanding actions.
- EB had not received the Ashden Climate Action Co-Benefits toolkit.
- LT noted Bristol community health funding has increased to £1.4-5 million.

ACTION 1: LT to re-send Ashden Climate Action Co-Benefits toolkit to EB

3. Declarations of interest

- No new declarations of interest to report.

4. Grants /funding update

- LT noted when new funding or investment has been awarded and publicly announced, the governing board and FPG chairs will be notified, and this will be shared with FPG members.
- SK confirmed the city funds resources will be concentrating on fundraising, applying to trusts and foundations.
- SK fed back on June's fundraising event. The event initiated conversations to convince national foundations and find grounds to collaborate, with the support of the board, Marvin, Sandra, Yvonne Stevens and Roni brown.
- There was a positive response to the invitations and a good line up including Chief Constable Andy Marsh, Comic Relief, South West Lloyds Bank, BBC children in need.
- 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 reported there is now a clearer set of infrastructure tools for bespoke investment and lived experience represented on the UGP to provide a bottom up and top down approach.
- LT noted the governing board discussed how it would reflect on events and issues raised over the last few months with a statement on racial justice. The governing board are committed to reviewing the governance and processes of city funds to make sure

barriers or biases towards certain groups are removed through the application process and makeup of the governance board and FPG's.

- There have been a few Investment awards, one in relation to the environmental transformation FPG, a community energy project - Ambition Laurence Weston, which received funding from city funds and WECA to build a community owned wind turbine in Laurence Weston.
- This new investment in Ambition Laurence Weston is an example of financial structuring for a community centre and neighbourhood. The wind turbine will bring clean electricity and build financial resilience for the community centre and neighbourhood, which would be protected from market downturn.
- Members asked if other similar proposals would be welcome to apply to city funds and would it be useful flag any complications with the process. This question was noted for JM* to answer.
- LG agreed it would be good to build in a feedback loop mechanism to report on issues / sticking points in the process.
- DW was delighted the wind turbine application was successful; if government approves it will be the largest wind turbine in the UK. There has been a lot of success for community energy programmes and city leap are in conversation with other community energy groups. David Tudgey, Project Development Manager, Bristol Energy Network did a huge amount of pro bono work to support the community energy projects in Laurence Weston. Members questioned how other community groups could get far enough along the process, for funders to agree to support.
- JM reported that RM met with community energy activists to develop the thinking around community energy propagator, how to you develop the dedicated time, technology and knowledge to get through the planning process. RM is involved in the discussion model and what role city funds might play alongside city leap. There is no business plan or solution at this stage but there is an idea for a model.
- LT and JM recognised the Ambition Laurence Weston project comes at the end of many years of community development with various investments along the way, which could be a potential barrier for other projects like Ambition Lawrence Weston's to come forward.
- ST noted Quartet's support for community development plans as building blocks. Ambition Laurence Weston had 20 years of development, if there is no support; it is hard to pull this work together.
- EB asked the exact length of time Ambition Laurence Weston took to get to this point, and agreed to raise this with JM at the next meeting.

ACTION 2: LT to share latest announcements of new funding or investment with FPG members.

ACTION 3: JM* to confirm if other community energy proposals would be welcome to apply to city funds and if it would be useful to flag any complications with the process.

ACTION 4: JM* to confirm the exact length of time Ambition Laurence Weston took to get to this point.

5. City Funds / FPG's Function & Form Update

- LT reported feeding back to the governing board on members comments for the formalisation of form and function of FPG's.
- LT discussed how city funds can achieve transformational change at three levels: 1) by providing finance and advice to help organisations, 2) supporting sustainable organisations that have the capability to change the way our local system functions to address priorities we have identified, this would 3) generate stories of transformational change that expand and inspire place-based action.
- LT highlighted the '*Role of FPG's*' section of the governing board paper for members to read – carrying out research, selecting a smaller number of themes, recommending organisations/projects, spotting opportunities for collaboration, providing checklists of questions. LT noted the governing board has invited FPG chairs to comment on whether FPGs plan to align with the relevant One City board (in this case the One City Environment Board).
- SW asked what the rationale is to align with the One City board.
- Members concluded that there would be natural cross-pollination because SW & IB are represented on the One City Environment Board.
- LT presented the Centre for Thriving Places impact spreadsheet, which includes the ETFPG theory of change
- JM questioned how reduced waste would be measured via indicators
- LT noted the theory of change reduced waste output may need refreshing.
- EB noted a gap around commercial waste because the focus is on household waste, but the vast majority of waste is commercial and this shouldn't be ignored. Defra report on the UK statistics on commercial waste, but possibly not at local level. EB agreed to review this
- SW asked if electric vehicles and traffic level would be included in the filtering of the spreadsheet and if the long list of indicators would require regular data collection at a Bristol level.
- DJ asked for the source of the key performance indicators and suggested a conversation with Kate Cole at BCC.
- LT confirmed that Centre for Thriving Places aim to measure transformational change achieved via city funds.
- SW confirmed the Bristol quality of life uses national data and the spreadsheet shows where the data comes from.
- SW asked if city funds would review the list and check progress on the percentage of greenhouse emissions per capita and overarching co2 emissions.
- LG confirmed city funds will need to show applicants a list of indicators so they are aware of what we're measuring. LG flagged a tab on the spreadsheet showing indicators the FPG's had asked for but Centre for Thriving Places had not been able to source, including bio diversity and invited members to get in touch if they know of robust metrics for this.
- All agreed to review/comment on the impact spreadsheet and feedback any glaring omissions or recommend suitable measures that are publicly available or routinely measured in the city. LT thanked JM and EB for working with Lisa.

- All agreed theory of change outputs could be improved, to capture more what this FPG is aiming for. (See google doc for suggested amends).
- JM noted the last outcome listed (Increased area of natural/ semi-natural networks of green and blue spaces that maintain and / or enhance ecosystem services) is very long, unfocused and difficult to understand
- SW suggested the outcome is about habitats and perhaps came from IB. SW also commented if we had a great project to demonstrate bio-diversity, the evidence baseline for bio-diversity is not there.
- IB and SW are working on an action plan for the ecological plan in the city, including BCC and partners.
- LG confirmed there is a series of changes going into the metrics, and working with No Child Goes Hungry theory of change showed some gaps, if members can find gaps as soon as possible then Centre for Thriving Places can implement changes quickly.
- SK stressed the importance of the questions and potential use as guidance for funding applications and finance projects in line with priorities.
- LG flagged that none of the examples given relate to the communities enjoyment of the natural world and asked if this was deliberate or if it could be considered?
- LT asked members if there had been previous conversations on this and stated that the upcoming ecological emergency strategy will highlight link between nature and communities. .
- LT also asked members since the last meeting if any relevant or time-critical Environmental transformation opportunities had arisen. Notable developments will be collected by ET FPG and shared with governing board after each regular meeting.
- RK pointed out the UGP had flagged diversity following BLM protests and the potential requirement for applicants to demonstrate diversity of boards and questioned the FPG's position on this and if it would be useful to build diversity into the application/review process. This approach has not been implemented universally across all city funds applications, but this FPG could recommend and support this.
- SW agreed it seemed straight forward to ensure city funds addresses inequality rather than perpetuates them, and to ask how projects are addressing environmental inequality but warned that the approach should not be too restrictive. This an opportunity for city funds to collate qualitative information about its impact.
- SK confirmed there will be an environmental inclusion page on the new city funds website and that if members would like to stress the link with environment and diversity this can be expressed on the page.
- LT asked if FPG members would like to offer any guidance to city funds governing board for universal use in investment decisions. LT has shared some suggested wording for use in all grant applications via a google doc for FPG members to comment on.
- JM stressed the importance for ETFPG to be inclusive and noted the environmental sector as a whole does have an issue with BAME representation; it is a wider city funds board responsibility to be aware of this too.
- SW noted it is not just about the inclusivity and design or reach of projects, it needs to include beneficiaries.

- LT asked if there are any gaps members would like to address within the demographic of Bristol to represent in this group.
- SW raised a concern that environmental sector is shrinking due to resources, and it is hard to change the makeup if it is shirking, SK was also concerned with the number of entry level roles and asked if there is an opportunity for the environmental sector to make use of apprenticeships schemes. Part of this FPG's remit includes research; creating funded accessible positions could be a discussion for governing board.
- RK noted in 2020 there has been a 70% drop in apprenticeships and a potential lost generation of entry level positions. RK agreed with SW it could be a useful idea to develop entry level positions and RK has a network to support this.
- LT suggested entry level positions could lead into universal investment opportunities and indicators, for Black and Green Ambassadors and focus on BAME environmental issues.
- EB noted a report calling for oil and gas boilers to be banned, and asked how to support the direction of travel, similar to the comms to ban single use plastic bags.
- SW agreed, this FPG needs to decide how it relates to transformational changes for Bristol. There needs to be a local work force of trained and accredited people ready for the announcement of green homes grants.
- SK noted that Phoebe Fenton has created a section on the new city funds website for members to share news and relevant resources for transformational change.

ACTION 5: All agreed to review/comment on the ETFG's theory of change outcomes, notable developments from last 6 months and suggested wording for use in universal applications (via google doc) and Centre for Thriving Places impact spreadsheet and feedback any glaring omissions or recommend suitable measures that are publicly available or routinely measured in the city.

ACTION 6: SW to ask IB for confirmation if habitats and bio-diversity are combined on the Centre for Thriving Places impact spreadsheet (Increased area of natural/ semi-natural networks of green and blue spaces that maintain and / or enhance ecosystem services).

ACTION 7: IB and SW to discuss the link to the ecological emergency strategy and circulate the final version for review.

ACTION 8: SW and RK to discuss the development of entry level positions in the environmental sector.

ACTION 9: All members' feedback on opportunities at the 6 monthly meeting, ready to share key changes or issues for the last quarter to the governing board.

6. Unitary Grants Panel

- RK confirmed the Bristol community health pot is now £1.4 million and they have outlined what they want the funding to go toward. In the initial meeting the panel confirmed the guidelines, agreed what size grants to give and how they will be given out. The UGP agreed to set a maximum grant of £20,000 per year for up to two years, however, the average grants awarded are usually £5,000-10,000 per year. The panel discussed the terms of reference; Quartet mentioned supporting a 6 month care forum to recruit people with lived experience to join decision panels. If successful the programme will be rolled

out across the city. The grants panel consists of people with mixed experience and it was a good opportunity to gain an overview of city funds processes.

- LT will notify members when the guidance is launched and the funding round is open and highlighted a line stating that funding is available for health and wellbeing organisations to improve their environmental impact. LT asked members to promote this to health and wellbeing organisations they may work with and encourage them to apply.
- EB noted finding it difficult to tune into the initial UGP meeting as it was out of EB's subject area.
- LG asked for feedback from EB and RK to make the process/information more digestible and bring a wider range of people together.
- LT thanked EB and RK for attending.

ACTION 10: EB and RK to feedback to LG on their experience of the initial UGP meeting.

7. Diversity and Inclusion

- All agreed to bring this item back to the next meeting, and in meantime to work with the Black and Green Ambassadors for Bristol.

8. AOB

- EB sits on the board for Severnet Avonmouth and would like to support their application to city funds; EB questioned how this would work with conflict of interest?
- ST referred to the NCGH process, noting as long as it is done in an open and transparent manner, members can offer their expertise.
- LG confirmed for members of the UGP, they would not be involved in the vote.
- All agreed EB could support the Severnet Avonmouth application and sit out of meetings when the application was discussed.

9. Date for next meeting

- All agreed to meet in 6 months, if no urgent matter arises.