

## **Enabling the Voluntary, community & social enterprise sector grant**

### **Introduction**

Bristol City Council understands the vital role of voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations in the life of the city. For the city council to achieve its ambitions and meet its challenges we need community, voluntary and social enterprise to thrive. Bristol has the track record, passion, skills, resources, experience and knowledge to meet the challenge.

The VCSE sector is incredibly diverse. There are large organisations with paid staff teams and buildings and small groups of citizens doing things they care about with little or no funding. These organisations are part of a delicate community ecosystem which needs to be nurtured. Ultimately, the power comes from Bristolians organising, problem solving and taking collective action to improve lives and build resilient communities.

VCSE organisations play a key role in redressing disadvantage and inequality; delivering often innovative and niche services; promoting inclusion; strengthening voice and influence; and enabling social action.

The council is committed to strengthening the VCSE sector by adding value to its collective assets and enabling it to build a more sustainable future in changing and often challenging circumstances.

The City Council understands the VCSE is working within a whole city system with public and private sectors and citizens and communities. To get the best outcomes we aim to nurture respectful, trusting and collaborative working relationships where there is mutual encouragement and supportive challenge.

### **1. The proposed approach to commissioning 2020-2024**

The council's investment in the Enabling the VCSE sector grant will contribute to:

- Powerful, thriving communities
- Strong, long term vision and leadership of the sector
- A city plan and approach that reflects the diversity and creativity of the city.

#### **1.1 Ways of Working: our Principles**

It is important that support for the VCSE is not an end in itself but is about building the capacity of the sector in order to improve outcomes for people and communities.

The following community development principles will underpin the approach:

- Equity & Inclusion
- Place based
- Asset based
- Citizen-led
- Relational

## **Equity & Inclusion**

Equity means recognising systemic inequality – there is not a level playing field and so it's appropriate to take positive action to address the balance and achieve equity of outcome. Inclusion means removing cultural, physical and attitudinal barriers so that everyone is welcome and able to participate as equals.

The Enabling the VCSE Grant will:

- Take positive action to address systemic disadvantage and exclusion
- Remove barriers to participation, welcoming in the people who tend to be excluded and under-represented
- Support organisations to build on their practice and policies

## **Place-based**

Bristol is one city with many neighbourhoods. Place based means working 'bottom-up' in a way which is appropriate to the unique dynamics, demographics and environment of the local area. It is about recognising the importance of supporting and nurturing neighbourhood communities in building a resilient city.

The Enabling the VCSE Grant will:

- Strengthen neighbourhood organisations and working
- Encourage connections and collaboration between VCSE organisations
- Contribute to a one city approach

## **Asset-based**

Asset-based means recognising and building on the inherent assets of people and communities and making the best use of skills, experience, resources, positive relationships, things and physical assets that already exist. Asset-based is a counter to deficit-based which starts with everything that is wrong. Asset –based is not about denying there are challenges but starts with the enormous potential of citizens and communities to build their own solutions.

The Enabling the VCSE Grant will:

- Tap into the skills, knowledge, expertise and energy of the sector to build capacity and leadership
- Encourage exchange of assets e.g. skills and knowledge
- Enable VCSE organisations to make best use of the city's diverse resources

## **Citizen-led**

Citizen-led means that the people of Bristol have the ability and desire to take action on the things they care about and we are supporting their lead. Citizen action is at the heart of most VCSE organisations through membership, trustees, volunteers and activists.

The Enabling the VCSE Grant will:

- Support organisations to encourage and enable citizen-led action
- Provide easily accessible support to community groups particularly those with no paid workers.

**Relational**

Relational is about building connections between people so they can take action on the things that matter to them – whether this is residents, community groups or paid workers. It is about building strong working relationships of trust within the sector, with the communities they are part of and with the council and other partners. It recognises that by investing in building connections we all benefit.

The Enabling the VCSE Grant will:

- Encourage organisations to build connections between neighbours and people with shared interests.
- Foster a culture of strong and collaborative relationships between groups and with partners.

**1.2 Priorities for the Enabling the VCSE Sector Support Grant**

- i. Enable confident leadership and influence so that the VCSE sector, in all its diversity, can:
  - play a full part in shaping and achieving the ambition of the city set out in the One City Plan
  - influence and shape the Enabling the VCSE Grant so that it responds to the changing priorities of the sector and has maximum impact
  - take positive action to address systemic disadvantage
- ii. Create the conditions so that organisations are more able to share assets (time, skills, knowledge, experience, money, buildings etc.) and produce collective solutions to shared problems.
- iii. Build on the existing business skills and capacity for enterprise. This includes supporting VCSE to access grant funding, find new sources of funding, earned income, income generation and management of assets.
- iv. Build on the VCSE's capacity to develop, respond to change and problem-solve through a city offer which will include;
  - organisations that are led by equalities groups <sup>(1)</sup>
  - neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest disadvantage
  - smaller and emerging community groups
- v. Support the VCSE sector by accessing local, regional and national assets including; funding and investment opportunities, skills, knowledge, private sector support, data, policy and practice

---

<sup>1</sup> women; Black, Asian, and minority ethnic people (BAME); young people and children; older people; disabled people; lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered people (LGBT+); people from different faith groups

### **1.3 Knowing the sector**

Applicants will need to demonstrate they understand the priorities and concerns of the sector and have experience of delivering support to VCSE groups. This will inform proposals making the most effective use of the resources available.

*Change for Good* report sets out a case for investment in VCSE infrastructure support that requires that “Infrastructure must prove capable of ‘redesigning’ itself to meet changing demand”.

Grant recipient(s) will need to demonstrate:

- What support is best delivered city wide, to enable maximum impact across the city and with minimal duplication.
- What support is best delivered at a more local level to enable support for organisations and communities of specific place and interest.
- How resources can be used to enable flexible, innovative and bespoke support that can adapt quickly to changing priorities.

### **1.4 Proposals**

BCC grant investment is part of the picture in Bristol. There are other organisations supporting and investing in the development of the VCSE sector. Proposals will need to demonstrate how, through strategic and operational collaboration, they will deliver long term capacity building and sustainability and enable the sector to be effective leaders in the one city approach.

### **1.5. Additional social benefits**

Grant recipients will be required to demonstrate additional social benefit from the grant investment.

### **1.6 Timetable**

	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
Cabinet decision	3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2019	
Grant opportunity published	16 <sup>th</sup> December 2019	
Grant deadline		May '20
Grants evaluation	May '20	June '20
Grants decision communicated to applicants		June '20
Decommissioning protocol (if required)	July 2020	Sept 2020
Implementation phase	July 2020	Sept 2020
Commencement of new period of grant funding	1 <sup>st</sup> October 2020	-

## 2. Commissioning options considered:

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Recommission as is (grant)	<p>Recognises that expertise in VCSE support lies in the VCSE sector</p> <p>Consistent with the asset-based approach</p> <p>Assists the organisation to meet the organisation's objectives because these are aligned with the Council's aims and objectives</p> <p>Enables flexibility in shaping and amending how funding is used by negotiation</p> <p>Allows for claw back of unspent funds.</p> <p>Additional social benefits are created</p>	<p>Care needed to develop clear activities and targets with grant recipient(s) so that meaningful progress is described.</p> <p>Benefits from a close grant monitoring working relationship and so requires capacity to support ongoing relationship.</p> <p>Less control for BCC in determining activity</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Recommended</b> – empowers the sector to develop proposals to address priorities in the context of the corporate plan	
2. Specify a service to be commissioned (contract)	<p>Allows for a detailed specification of expected performance</p> <p>Allows for remedies in event of non-performance</p> <p>Additional social benefits are created</p>	<p>Places council in position of 'purchasing' a set of services on behalf of VCSE.</p> <p>More difficult to lever in additional funds to add value</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Not recommended</b> - Council not setting out to define the support VCSE needs but is looking to the expertise in the sector to propose against our principles and priorities	
3. Rationalise	<p>Savings</p> <p>Budget invested in VCSE in other ways</p>	<p>Approach is unsustainable.</p> <p>Impact of sustained investment and capacity building lost to city.</p>

	<b>Option</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
		Could lead to new innovations & collaborations	Decline in capacity, sustainability, funding and influence of sector  Reduced additional social benefits are created.
	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Not recommended</b> - Unsustainable long term impact on resilience and development of the sector	
4.	De-commission	Savings  Budget invested in VCSE in others ways	Significant decline in capacity, sustainability, funding and influence of sector.  Increasing pressure on statutory services  Mechanism for VCSE participation and representation lost.  VCSE organisations close due to lack of support at critical time  Impact of sustained investment and capacity building lost to city  Risk of decline in external income brought into city by effective VCSE groups
	<b>Conclusion</b>	Not proposed because disadvantages outweigh any advantage	

### 3. Background

#### 3.1 Changing landscape and strategic drivers

**Council Corporate Strategy:** The Council recognises the VCSE as a key partner in its 2018-2023 Corporate Strategy:

*"Bristol's diverse and creative community and voluntary sector is one of the city's great assets....We need to work closely together in the spirit of constructive support and challenge, maintaining a sector which is strong and sustainable in its own right."* At the same time the strategy also sets out the need to deliver savings and to transform what the council is here to do. The council's relationship with community organisations is key to this.

**One City Plan:** The Plan sets out ambitious targets for the future of Bristol, decade by decade up to 2050 to make Bristol fair, healthy and sustainable with reduced inequality. The City Office and plan reflects a new approach to city governance where the VCSE are a key partner.

**City Fund:** will be deploying £10 million in loan and equity capital to organisations using income-generating models to solve some of the most entrenched problems in our city. Applications for investment will be open in 2019.

**VCSE Strategy:** Into a New Era 2019-2029, led by Voscur. This sets out 6 key objectives for development of the VCSE sector: distributed Leadership; financial independence (commercial approach); improved data and information; independent voice; increased collaboration, partnership and cohesion; greater resilience and adaptability.

**Technology:** Technology is advancing at pace. Many VCSE organisations struggle to access know how and find the capacity to fully utilise the opportunities available or the innovation that is possible. The Institute of Voluntary Action Research [Start Somewhere](#): '*Key findings from an exploratory study into making technology imaginable and usable for small voluntary organisations*', makes a number of suggestions for improving infrastructure support in this area.

**BCC Social Value policy** assesses all tenders for council contracts against the social value they are offering the city. Support to the VCSE is one way for them to demonstrate social value. In addition BCC has a target of 40% of all procurement being from VCSE/SME which opens up opportunities for the sector ...

**Community Development** is the process of building thriving communities and is increasingly understood to be vital in transforming the relationships between citizens, communities and institutions. It is about growing the power of people. Asset Based Community Development reminds us that communities have inherent assets including people's skills, knowledge and ideas which are too often overlooked.

**Community Anchor Organisations** '*are community led, independent of the council and other bodies and tend to be multi-purpose, often managing community buildings and other assets, operating as social enterprises and surviving through generating a diversity of income streams*' (Quartet Community Foundation report, 2017). The report identifies CAO's as having an increasingly important role as a vehicle for investment, delivery of services and activities at a neighbourhood level.

**Power to Change by Black South-West Network, September 2018** This report identifies "*the impact of austerity and the black, Asian, minority ethnic (BAME) sector's disconnect from power.*" and "*a need for strategic investment and infrastructure support to effect positive change within the sector*". Recommendations include actions around equitable funding; supporting connectivity in the BAME sector; intensive capacity building and support for asset transfer.

Greater distance between VCSE and the public sector: a number of important parts of the public sector now have wider geographic footprints (e.g. West of England Combine Authority; Avon and Somerset Police and Crime Commissioner; the merger of three into one Bristol, North Somerset and South Glos. Clinical Commissioning Group. These changes make direct relationships through partnerships, contracts and grant investment less easy, particularly for smaller, community-based VCSE organisations.

The impact of austerity and pressure on public services: The reduction of services and support resulting from reduced public sector budget is felt in Bristol's most disadvantaged neighbourhoods and communities. This impact is increasingly felt by VCSE organisations. For example, organisations receiving Bristol Impact Fund reported seeing more people than expected with high support needs and in states of crisis.

Major funding programmes closing/reducing: Golden Key, Bristol Ageing Better, Building Better Opportunities, Social Enterprise Innovation Programme.

### 3.2 Background to the proposed approach to commissioning VCSE support

The council has taken note of the [\*\*Bristol VCSE Strategy: Into a New Era 2019-2029\*\*](#) and the [\*\*'Change for Good\*\*](#) Report of the Independent Commission on the future of local infrastructure (January 2015)'

**Change for Good**, a report commissioned by the National Association for Voluntary and Community Action (NAVCA) focused on how infrastructure support is funded and delivered in a landscape of recession and reduced local authority funding. The report recognises:

*"The infrastructure of the future is likely to be a much leaner enabler, broker and catalyst rather than necessarily a deliverer." The Report recommends that 'future investment needs to deliver capacity by unlocking social capital and leverage'; and that 'Infrastructure bodies must be relationship builders and brokers capable of levering resources'.*

We understand this to mean that our grant funding should be used to unlock resources of many kinds and deepen the supportive co-operation between the VCSE and other sectors within and outside the city.

[\*\*The Value of Small\*\*](#) June 2018 Institute for Voluntary Action Research (IVAR) report supports the focus on the community-building principles underpinning the Enabling the VCSE support grant. This research concluded that small and medium-sized charities ('SMC's' with annual incomes between £10,000 and £1 million) 'are a vital part of everyday life in communities across England and Wales'. They are identified as bringing distinctive contributions at a local level in terms of their:

- Service offer: as first responders to emerging needs; safe spaces to access services; promoting inclusion and belonging
- Approach: person-centred and responsive; trusted, long-term presence; having an open door; quick, responsive decision-making
- Position: within the wider ecosystem of providers, they support reach through their

networks and relationships; play a stabilising role at a local level and support people to navigate crises and pressing issues through their advocacy work

The report recommends strategic actions to support small and medium-sized charities by public sector bodies, including provision of grants; enabling SMCs to access public contracts flexibly and the social value that small and medium-sized charities bring needs to be better expressed and accounted for through commissioning processes.

This research notes 'Importantly, many stakeholders and SMCs spoke of the crucial role of an **effective local infrastructure organisation in facilitating** ... area and organisational responses'

The Locality report [\*\*Powerful Communities, Strong Economies\*\*](#) (2017) emphasises how resilient economies in local deprived communities can be supported to thrive by embedding an Economic Resilience Framework organised around 7 characteristics.

4 principles guide this framework:

- It is citizen-centric
- It is place-based
- It is dynamic
- It is collaborative

#### **4. Online Consultation, Consultation events and written feedback: Comments and responses and amendments made**

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
<b>1.</b>	<b>Current landscape and strategic drivers</b>		
1.1	changes in the public sector has affected the operating environment for VCSE organisations, with many experiencing greater distance from previously connected public sector organisations. Several important parts of the public sector (examples: West of England Combined Authority; Avon and Somerset Police and Crime Commissioner; the merger of three into one (Bristol, North Somerset and South Glos) Clinical Commissioning Group) now have a wider geographic footprint than their predecessors and this impacts on relationships with the VCSE sector. These changes make direct relationships through partnerships, contracts and grant	Distance between VCSE and public sector services has increased	Comment noted and now included in this section in the Background paper as part of the current landscape and strategic drivers.

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	investment less likely, particularly for our smaller, community-based VCSE organisations. We believe this important context needs to be considered in the commissioning plan		
1.2	Include in 'landscape' section changes in strategic influences should include Public Services are more distant and services have to cover wider areas. (public service shrinking).	Distance between VCSE and public sector services has increased	
1.3	Are we accepting the Quartet definition of a community anchor organisation? What about key organisation who aren't defined as that?	Anchor organisations	Proposal uses the description in the Quartet Community Foundation report, 2017. We recognise that this is an evolving debate and remain open to new concepts from within the VCSE sector
1.4	How the council is held accountable for some of this. Looking at the priorities and principals. Voscur have tried to be involved in the One City plan and found that difficult. So is it a two way responsibility?	BCC needs to change	Background document amended to reflect this point: 'The City Council understands the VCSE is working within a whole city system with public and private sectors and citizens and communities. To get the best outcomes we aim to nurture respectful, trusting and collaborative working relationships where there is mutual encouragement and supportive challenge. 'And Relational principle expanded to include 'It is about building strong working relationships of trust within the sector, with the communities they are part of and with the council and other partners. It recognises that by investing in building connections we all benefit'
1.5	o Local political issues including upcoming whole council and mayoral election in May 2020	Political change	Comment noted
	Commissioning v Grants	Accessing contract	Comment noted. See Priorities which have been
1.6	• The amount that is available to		

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	<p>VCSE's who can bid for council contracts dwarfs the amount given in grants. e.g. MAPS, Targeted Youth Services. Because of this organisations make themselves more attractive to BCC and other commissioning bodies - this major driver in the city</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some organisations are more able to do this than others, which can lead to smaller VCSE's missing out</li> </ul>	opportunities	amended
1.7	the language we use: 'co-creating change' - not just volunteering, social engagement, participation – this term is less hierarchical and reflects the changing culture within the sector. people doing things	Language and terminology	Background document amended to reflect this point
1.8	Concerns raised over 'chronic' lack of funding and increasing costs for VCSE sector, especially grass-roots and equalities organisations. Concern over VCSE orgs having to pick up pieces from central services being hit by funding cuts but not having resources themselves. An increase in demand is being met with a cut in resources.	Funding pressure on VCSE	Comment noted
<b>2.</b>	<b>Ways of Working: 5 community-building principles</b>		
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Citizen-led</b>		
2.1.1	<p>better VCS support itself doesn't try to deliver citizen-led, but support VCS orgs to be citizen-led</p> <p>Misplaced – VCSE support not about individual citizens</p> <p>Good thing – how will council distribute power &amp; resource to truly empower – participatory citizenship</p> <p>Supporting peoples voice most important role of VCSE sector – making sure resident voices are the driver of what happens in locality</p> <p>Re-think citizen led? Needs to be sharper, clearer and more appropriate, more directed at the context that we are discussing – too much of a focus on individuals</p>	Role of VCSE in enabling citizen-led	Principle has been re-worded to clarify: 'Support organisations to encourage and enable citizen-led action'. Clarifies that the grant is about supporting VCSE organisations, not individual citizens

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	Individual v representation of the individual? Is citizen led practical?		
2.1.2	We would appreciate clarification on the intended beneficiaries of the 'Enabling the VCSE sector' such as which forms of organisation will be eligible for the new service?	Eligibility for 'Enabling the VCSE sector' support	
2.1.3	ABCD – this model relies on a lot of assumptions, which are then addressed in the bid, but ABCD is not always practical in terms of implementation and meaningful and long lasting outcomes.	Asset based approaches	
2.1.4	Only focusing on 'bottom-up' risks losing sight of bigger picture; VCSE needs strategic overview	VCSE strategic oversight	
2.1.5	Move towards communities supporting themselves, philosophy is supported but reality is that certain communities won't be able to do that - honest assessments of communities' ability and willingness to support themselves are not undertaken. The more ingrained poverty and deprivation is in a community the less able they are to develop ABCD – there are too many issues to deal with already - too complex, some people need professional support.	Impact of deprivation	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Inclusive</b>		
2.2.1	better to support equalities-led organisations in collaboration with provider to work across the VCSE rather than this role only to sit with the grant recipient  Inclusion often needs city-wide approach as systemic disadvantage cross-cutting  clarification about those that 'tend to be excluded'.	Improving inclusivity	Comments noted. Grant proposal acknowledges 'Grant recipient(s) will need to demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What support is best delivered city wide, to enable maximum impact across the city and with minimal duplication' (1.3)</li></ul>
2.2.2	Equity: include within this principle – equitable outcomes as focus, taking account of marginalisation and exclusion of deprived communities  Equity: needs to be stated as a principle – recognises systematic nature of inequality and effort to achieve a level playing field	Equity, not just inclusion	Comments noted. Principle amended to read: ' <b>Equity &amp; Inclusion</b> Equity means recognising systemic inequality – there is not a level playing field and so it's appropriate to take positive action to

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	<p>This is problematic. Inclusion is unequitable and excludes those are disadvantaged and marginalised. Inclusivity is not nuanced. Equitable would be a more appropriate principle</p> <p>Equity allows for a focus on race; you can look at the development of communities and VCSE's, but on their own terms and in their own way.</p>		<p>address the balance and achieve equity of outcome. Inclusion means removing cultural, physical and attitudinal barriers so that everyone is welcome and able to participate as equal</p>
2.2.3	<p>Yes, but don't exclude universality – wouldn't want to see only targeted provision</p>	Eligibility for 'Enabling the VCSE sector' support	<p>Comments noted: Proposal amended at 1.2 to read iv. Build on the VCSE's capacity to develop, respond to change and problem-solve <b>through a city offer which will include</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• organisations that are led by equalities groups ( )</li> <li>• neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest disadvantage</li> <li>• smaller and emerging community groups '</li> </ul>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Asset based</b>		
2.3.1	<p>need to enable VCSE to increase the profitability of assets – income generation</p> <p>Some organisations have an asset that is so underused it makes it a burden.</p>	Using physical assets	<p>Comments noted. Will be shared with applicant organisation(s)</p>
2.3.2	<p>Only using local assets risks excluding useful outside, external skills</p> <p>ABCD usually focused on individuals – VCSE support needs to work with organisations, not individuals</p>	Clarifying asset-based in VCSE context	<p>Comments noted. See 2.1.1 above</p>
2.3.3	<p>the asset base in some areas and communities is limited and may present development challenges after decades of disadvantage and inequality. So, while the principle may apply in organisational settings, the wider context may present limiting factors that need to be taken into account.</p>	Impact of deprivation	<p>Comments noted. See Priority iv point: '• neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest disadvantage'</p>
2.3.4	Need better definition of 'collective	leadership	Comments noted

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	'leadership'		
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Relational</b>		
2.4.1	access to public boards for VCSE representatives Important VCSE support org(s) have strong voice at 'top table' Collaboration between VCSE organisations needed to achieve collective strength and to deliver this – one organisation can't do this on their own effectively Culture of collaboration with council: should be culture within the council and VCSE – but not VCSE support org(s) being VCSE rep but supporting the sector to collaborate and represent itself	Strong VCSE voice	Comments noted.
2.4.2	Relationship with BCC is fragmented Culture of collaboration with council: should be culture within the council and VCSE	BCC needs to change	Comments noted. See 1.4 above
2.4.3	The 5 principles do not read like principles. They are skills. We should be focusing on relationships and trust. There is a lack of trust; BAME community does not trust BCC because of the lack of accountability. Voscur have lost trust because they have not delivered.	Trust issues	Comments noted. This principle sets out 'It is about building strong working relationships of trust within the sector, with the communities they are part of and with the council and other partners. It recognises that by investing in building connections we all benefit.'
2.4.4	there are challenges to fostering and developing collaboration and partnership which can make it resource intensive and we would suggest this needs taking into account within service expectations.	Collaboration issues	Comments noted.
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Place-based</b>		
2.5.1	If focused on specific geographies – place – how does strategic view of needs across city get seen? Inclusion often needs city-wide approach as systemic disadvantage cross-cutting What about work that isn't place-based but enhanced place-based approaches? Single point of delivery	VCSE strategic oversight	Comments noted. Priorities include: 'i. Enable confident leadership and influence so that the VCSE sector, in all its diversity, can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• play a full part in shaping and achieving the ambition of the city set out</li></ul>

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	<p>can minimise waste and enhance quality assurance.</p> <p>This emphasis risks losing a more strategic view. Organisations at local level need strategic, bigger picture and to have national/regional insights - and VCSE support needs to be informed to support policy influencing – resource this.</p> <p>Vol groups need to have a wider view of community than your immediate ‘patch’</p>		<p>in the One City Plan . &amp;</p> <p>1.3 Grant recipient(s) will need to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What support is best delivered city wide, to enable maximum impact across the city and with minimal duplication.</li> </ul>
2.5.2	<p>Whole neighbourhood approach to development by voluntary sector. Economic development and making sure communities benefit from employment</p> <p>Communities beginning to take charge of what they want their neighbourhoods to look like.- people as drivers – what's the relationship between VCSE support and those kind of locality approaches where VCSE is an element in a more diverse shared approach?</p> <p>Where does Vol sector infrastructure interface between resident power and more organised VCSE sector. How does VCSE sector support people as the driver.</p> <p>These communities based support are required but they need to be community led.</p>	Improving place based approach	Comments noted.
2.5.3	<p>Replace this term with ‘community-based’ to include communities of interest, not just geographical communities</p> <p>Some communities not place based but experience-based/culturally based – principles should recognise this</p> <p>ensure that organisations serving and supporting communities of interest/practice are also included.</p> <p>Concerns raised over ‘place-based’ principle being too geography centric; potential for freezing out equalities groups</p> <p>Community Based as well as place</p>	Place based – fit with communities of interest?	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Amendments made to Priorities. See 1.2 above</p>

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	based (well supported by the room) – doesn't reflect the fact that BAME populations exist outside of St Pauls		
2.5.4	Disconnect between what Voscur is doing and the funding it receives.	Comment on current Infrastructure service	Comments noted
	You would expect the cut in funding to be higher, given the significant decrease in support and visibility of Voscur.		
	Networks, which were of real value, have disappeared.		
<b>2.6</b>	<b>General comments</b>		
	Principle around evidence-based? National, international research and local research		Priority v amended (1.2): v. Support the VCSE sector by accessing local, regional and national assets including; funding and investment opportunities, skills, knowledge, private sector support, data, <b>policy and practice</b>
	Needs more focus on purpose of the infrastructure grant		
	Agree but hangs on which groups are empowered and how 'citizen-led' is interpreted		
	Poor presentation – jargon not plain English and too long		
	Well considered and concisely communicated		
	Agree in principle but just noble words, no substance – we've not had any real support from BCC in many years		
	Will have to be very different to the current model		
	Current grant doesn't do any of this		
	Agree – but time and effort to build resource in communities that are harder to engage: that effort should be considered		
	Delivering these principles will require a level of learning and development across the sector.		
	Jargon a big barrier – could VCSE be replaced by something like '3rd sector'		
<b>3.</b>	<b>The council's proposed priorities</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Maximise strong relationships between VCSE organisations so that VCSEs may share</b>		

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	<b>each other's assets (time, skills, knowledge, experience , money, buildings etc.) and produce collective solutions to shared problems</b>		
3.1.1	<p>Facilitating and maximising good use of existing resources – doesn't add anything new</p> <p>Sharing resources – orgs don't have spare resources they can share</p> <p>Assumption of considerable assets to share – doubt this is actually the case</p> <p>Strong relationships: needs to go beyond tokenistic networks: make sure diverse organisations are included and sharing is more effective</p> <p>Ask of organisations needs to be proportionate – expect more of larger orgs and less of smaller ones</p> <p>Larger VSCEs should engage with smaller VSCEs and community groups to co-produce policy, strategy and service provision</p> <p>There is some of that already happening, Knowle West Alliance.</p> <p>There is a move towards a consultancy model where smaller charities hire another organisations fund raiser for a couple of days to kick start it. A possible income generator.</p> <p>It is a hard balance to ensure that by sharing skills you aren't losing out on funding. They do offer funding workshops. Collaboration is key</p>	Resource sharing	Comments noted
3.1.2	<p>Achieve change in how infrastructure support is organised by facilitating a collegiate approach, focusing on the strengths of each partner</p> <p>BSWN would like to be a partner to deliver into a framework</p>	Collaboration to build Enabling VCSE support	Comments noted
3.1.3	<p>Most of VCSE not able to 'earn income' – should be more support to obtain grants. Focus on earned income for larger VCSE organisations and smaller ones with marketable provision that is a priority</p> <p>Enterprise not always possible as means of addressing poverty issues, for example; State support and charity support essential and needs to be supported.</p>	Funding and sustainability	Comments noted. Priority iii amended to: 'Build on the existing business skills and capacity for enterprise. This includes supporting VCSE to access grant funding, find new sources of funding, earned income, income generation and management of assets.'

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
3.1.4	<p>Council needs to understand how long <b>collaboration</b> takes to form and increased central costs of this; tension between working together and innate competition and desire of organisations to retain their identity; sensitive commercial information</p> <p>Recognise costs and limitations of collaboration</p> <p>Cost of collaboration can squeeze out smaller organisations</p> <p>Collaboration has costs – needs to be resourced</p> <p>Understand co-operative approach but ability to dedicate time to networks and speculative partnerships is hard to achieve – clear objectives for collaboration needed to be effective</p> <p>Delivery in the context of a community assets agenda can attract multiple organisations into collaborative working arrangements that tackle multiple needs and achieve diverse outcomes with one key intervention</p> <p>There is some of that already happening, Knowle West Alliance.</p> <p>When VCSE's have no capacity they cannot be collaborative, don't have time or money to meet, often only 1 person. Initially collaboration means lost income.</p> <p>when orgs collaborate there are number of risks – need to mitigate these as much as possible; time and trust but also firm commitment; Don't want to oversee/surrender uniqueness</p>	Collaboration issues	<p>Comments noted. Proposal amended to read: 1.4 'Proposals will need to demonstrate how, through strategic and operational collaboration, they will deliver long term capacity building and sustainability and deliver the leadership roles in the city'</p> <p>The commissioning process has been extended by 12 weeks so that relevant connections can be made</p>
3.1.5	Community accountability – support orgs on how to achieve it	Community accountability	Comments noted.
3.1.6	Develop networks	Support networking	Comments noted.
	Support Peer networking		
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Strengthen the VCSE's capacity to be enterprising and business-like. This would include supporting VCSEs to find new sources of funding and earned income</b>		
3.2.1	<p>Train new organisations in good practice – more emphasis</p> <p>governance</p> <p>Support to VCSE to do business with</p>	Increasing effectiveness	Comments noted.

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	<p>council to strengthen business models</p> <p>Fundraising support: Good but not sure it's the role of VCSE support org(s)</p> <p>Skills and resources to do VCSE work welcome</p> <p>Most important priority is to support VSCE organisations to deliver benefits to their users</p> <p>Quality of delivery should be key priority – scaled for smaller organisations so they're not disadvantaged. Problem some orgs can produce good-sounding bids but don't necessarily deliver; ?support good delivery orgs to be able to express their impact more effectively?</p> <p>BAME VCSE: prioritise asset utilisation and maintenance and development of existing community assets, over asset transfer – build capacity to enable sustainable asset transfer in future</p> <p>BSWN: strengthen this priority to include references to community assets to support financial sustainability</p> <p>board members need to understand their role, how this differs from operational work</p>		
3.2.2	<p>Fantasy VCSE can earn income it needs. We're not businesses</p> <p>Aiming to get us all independent of grants hugely problematic – but we should all be improving how we operate the business aspects of our organisations</p> <p>Lots of SMEs fail in first 5 years anyway – 70% in first 10 years, so operating as businesses in itself doesn't ensure sustainability. Grants are extremely important part of social aspects of VCSEs</p> <p>Core funding is disappearing and smaller innovative groups with it</p> <p>Loss of golden key and other funding streams mean we need large</p>	Funding and sustainability	<p>Priority amended to read:</p> <p>'iii. Build on the existing business skills and capacity for enterprise. This includes supporting VCSE to access grant funding, find new sources of funding, earned income, income generation and management of assets.</p>

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	<p>organisations to leverage funding in to the city – focusing resource on enabling larger orgs to do this will support the ecosystem of the VCSE sector</p> <p>Sustainability? Focus on this should be clearer</p> <p>There is a focus on earned income, but most of the services we deliver do not, by their very nature, generate income.</p>		
3.2.3	<p>BAME VCSE: prioritise asset utilisation and maintenance and development of existing community assets, over asset transfer – build capacity to enable sustainable asset transfer in future</p> <p>BSWN: strengthen this priority to include references to community assets to support financial sustainability</p>	BAME needs	Comment noted
3.2.4	Enterprising and business-like – sounds competitive and about cost/benefit; undermines values-led ethos of VCSE; undermines collaboration and community and co-operation in sector	VCSE ethos	Comment noted. See 3.2.5 below
3.2.5	Patronising to those that are; business-like will not serve those people with support needs	Language and terminology	Comment noted. Priority amended to read: 'iii. Build on the existing business skills and capacity for enterprise. This includes supporting VCSE to access grant funding, find new sources of funding, earned income, income generation and management of assets.'
3.2.6	Phone support of Voscur and Quartet has been invaluable this year to help identify where to put limited time into applications	Comment on current Infrastructure service	
3.3	<b>Strengthen the capacity of the VCSE sector to respond to change, with a clear focus on</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• organisations that are led by equalities groups</li> <li>• neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest inequality</li> <li>• smaller and emerging community groups</li> </ul>		
3.3.1	Good to have this Potentially, the current eligibility criteria would mean that the service	Priorities for the grant	Priority now amended: iv. Build on the VCSE's capacity to develop,

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	would have to prioritise: equalities orgs (not high performers), orgs from disadvantaged neighbourhoods (often sparse or dysfunctional in areas with few assets) and start-ups. This would exclude: non-equalities led (99% of sector); organisations in 25 of the cities' wards (most of the sector); any orgs that are established (most of the sector). Clarifying the approach in relation to the intersections of these priorities, and the inverse relation between input to 'fragile' orgs and impact, would be helpful. Without this, the prioritisation has the potential to be a major and controversial challenge.		<p>respond to change and problem-solve <b>through a city offer which will include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• organisations that are led by equalities groups ( )</li> <li>• neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest disadvantage</li> <li>• smaller and emerging community groups</li> </ul> <p>A universal offer is understood. BCC is also asking for a clear element within the universal offer for the three categories set out.</p> <p>The term 'strongly-led' has been removed to eliminate the confusion highlighted</p>
	'strongly led' - does this mean 'led mostly by those from this equality group' or 'well led' as an assessment of quality? If the latter, we are unclear on the application of this as an eligibility criteria, given the fundamental focus on equalities groups		
	Priority 3 says that it should be targeted, but groups mentioned is about 90% of the voluntary sector		
	Feels like there is a strong push towards targeting resources to needs- that is spot on. Needs to about the most marginalised.		
	- Supportive of focus on equalities groups		
	Tension raised between supporting new charities to spring up to help support unreached people groups v supporting existing charities to do this.		
	Why smaller and emerging groups?		
3.3.2	Faith: different faith communities experience different levels of disadvantage; BAME led; Muslims; minority faith groups more than white-led Christian	BAME needs	Comments noted. BME organisations needs for bespoke, culturally appropriate service provision and emphasis on equity of outcome will be passed on to organisations applying for the grant and explored at application.
	Tackle disparity in obtaining funding for BAME groups from mainly white panels which don't understand BAME communities		

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	<p>Prioritise specific areas of inequality – communities of Black African descent to produce more equitable outcomes for these communities</p> <p>BAME-led groups needs adequate resources and asset base to raise its own resources</p> <p>BAME-led organisations need investment into a network to meet regularly and network with local funders towards common goals</p> <p>Increase resource for BAME community outreach, community organising and capacity building/mentoring – prioritise BAME-led anchor-type organisations</p> <p>Acknowledge unfairness in current funding and investment for BAME organisations and deliver level playing field for BAME –led organisations</p> <p>Infrastructure bodies define outcomes for transformative change within BAME context – driven by what organisations need and want</p> <p>Need for bespoke support delivered by an organisation that understands black culture, and the differences, distinctiveness and specific challenges that face black VCSE's.</p> <p>We want someone to understand what it is like being a BAME organisation. Not just about being black, but its about understanding the black mandate.</p> <p>A BAME VCSE reads and interprets a grant opportunity differently to the grant maker. The grant maker may have cultural assumptions which put barriers in the way of BAME VCSE's, meaning they are unable to access funds.</p> <p>BCC &amp; Voscur use language that conceals the different identities of BAME organisations and people, including using the word BAME. Not all BAME people are the same; different needs, challenges, identities.</p>		

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	Need for specific support for BAME organisations – a new approach is needed – Voscur's hasn't worked  Orgs should represent the communities they currently serve – board of trustee, staff members should have a deep understanding of what it is like to operate as a black VCSE		
3.3.3	Intersectionality needs to be covered  Socio-economic disadvantage needs to be picked up and health inequalities  Prioritise race equality and systems change work – change leadership and social impact programmes  BCC & Voscur use language that conceals the different identities of BAME organisations and people, including using the word BAME. Not all BAME people are the same; different needs, challenges, identities.	Supporting equality	Comments noted.
3.3.4	Need diverse range of VCSEs to support diverse communities – not single, large organisations alone	diversity of VCSE eco-system	Comments noted.
3.3.5	The focus on neighbourhoods/places may result in unintentional barriers for organisations serving communities of practice/interest who may, as a result, feel excluded. While that may be a justified prioritisation, it would be helpful if this could be supported with evidence of differing needs in the consultation plan.	Place based – fit with communities of interest?	Comments noted. Place-based is on principle; Equity & Inclusion also requires: 'Take positive action to address systemic disadvantage and exclusion'. A city-wide approach is part of that where required to take positive action
3.3.6	Support org needs to reflect community and be able to understand challenges – deliver bespoke package of support to that org  Level of support is not appropriate, not able to offer enough support (especially during the bid application process)  Need a broker – don't have time or capacity to be our own brokers  General feeling that VCSE's have to go to Voscur, rather than Voscur	nature of support available	Comments noted.

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	reaching out to VCSE's.		
3.3.7	<p>Support smaller grassroots organisations to compete for resources and grants which don't have capacity of larger organisations</p> <p>Focus on training, capacity building information and networking for smaller group, grassroots groups</p>	Smaller organisation needs	<p>Comments noted. This is addressed in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• organisations that are led by equalities groups</li> <li>• neighbourhoods and places experiencing greatest disadvantage</li> <li>• smaller and emerging community groups</li> </ul>
3.3.8	but VOSCUR charge for these support services and small organisations can't afford it. They also charge small and large organisations the same fee.	Free support vs charges	Comments noted.
3.3.9	<p>Promoting ability of VCSE to respond to change - ?patronising? VCSE is good at innovation &amp; problem solving</p> <p>Need to specify mental health, not easily identified under disability;</p> <p>'neighbourhoods and places' and 'greatest inequality' – further clarification of these terms would be helpful</p>	Language and terminology	<p>Comments noted. Priority wording amended to:</p> <p><b>iv. Build on the VCSE's capacity to develop, respond to change and problem-solve through a city offer</b></p>
3.4	<p><b>Facilitate confident leadership and influence so that the VCSE sector, in all its diversity, can:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• play a full part in shaping and achieving the ambition of the city set out in the One City Plan</li> <li>• influence and shape the council's future Enabling the VCSE Grant so that it has maximum impact</li> </ul>		
3.4.1	<p>Support feeding into national/international good practice</p> <p>Support representation of the VCSE in decision-making structures</p> <p>Good to have this</p> <p>Resourcing participation on influencing One City Plan – lack of resources much bigger barrier than lack of confidence</p> <p>Wider point about BAME organisations not having the ear of decision makers/funders</p> <p>Funders are always looking for something new</p>	Influence, shaping policy and practice	Comments noted
	Looking for new projects/innovative - sometimes you need continuation of current services, not everything needs to be new. Change in mood		

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	amongst funders but still some work to be done.		
	If we give more voice and influence to VCSE we might see these changes		
3.4.2	Connection to grassroots base and member ship needed  Small grassroots organisations need confidence involvement will lead to progress to invest their time	Engaging the sector	Comments noted. Priority i. Enable confident leadership and influence so that the VCSE sector, in all its diversity, can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•play a full part in shaping and achieving the ambition of the city set out in the One City Plan</li><li>•influence and shape the Enabling the VCSE Grant so that it responds to the changing priorities of the sector and has maximum impact</li></ul>
	Need investment and development funding to develop new ideas and projects with members' involvement  if we want/need strong leadership from the VCSE, larger organisations are needed to develop and provide a coordination point for this		
	There is a lack of accountability. Grant Recipient needs to be able to evidence the impact its services are having		
3.4.3	Strong leadership and guiding role needed	Leadership	Comments noted.
3.4.4	Wider point about BAME organisations not having the ear of decision makers/funders	BAME needs	Comments noted.
3.4.5	Statutory sector has to engage with VCSE sector meaningfully and actively	BCC needs to change	Comments noted. See 1.1 Relational principle above
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Support the VCSE sector by accessing local, regional and national wealth, such as funding and investment opportunities, and other assets, such as skills and knowledge.</b>		
3.5.1	Need investment and development funding to develop new ideas and projects with members' involvement	Influence, shaping policy and practice	v.Support the VCSE sector by accessing local, regional and national assets including; funding and investment opportunities, skills, knowledge, private sector support, data, policy and practice
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Other Priorities</b>		
	What isn't in the document at the moment is the concept of challenge as part of the role of infrastructure managing challenge- critical friend?! Possible in Priorities		Comments noted.
	- Focus on capacity building, leadership and collaboration within the sector		Comments noted.
<b>3.7</b>	<b>General comments</b>		
	Has air of BCC walking away from VCSE and merely being a		Comments noted. Intention is to for BCC to

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	facilitator/enabler.		play an active role in grant monitoring and be an active contributor
	Seems entrenched view of VCSE behind this strategy: as unenterprising; resistant to change; lacking the will to work together; reliant on local authority support. Want a more positive model that acknowledges sector's diversity and has a more asset-based approach to support sector		Comments noted. See amendments to Principles and Priorities above
	BSWN: maximum flexibility and clarity about performance is needed		Comments noted
	Current outcomes are flexible but vague: future funding proposals should request tangible outcomes which are known to be needed, measurable and will make a transformative difference		Online survey also identified specific support needs for different sized VCSE organisations
	Need to connect strategy and delivery in each priority:		Comments noted
	Take this opportunity to review to not repeat the past		Comments noted
	Enable infrastructure bodies to work strategically and become vehicles that can facilitate the investment into dynamic and capable delivery organisations		Comments noted
	Clarity		Comments noted
	What do we mean by equalities led groups?		Definitions set out in Background document
	What do we mean by collaboration?		
	Jargon a big barrier – could VCSE be replaced by something like '3rd sector'		Comments noted
<b>4</b>	<b>Our Funding Approach</b>		
4.1	We recognise the intention to enable bidders to develop their collaborative approaches by building time into the process. We noted during the consultation meetings that the council offered to provide facilitation of collaborations – and would be concerned about the impartiality and fairness of such an offer.	Collaboration issues	Comments noted  Any facilitation of collaboration would be by an external, independent facilitator, if offered.  Proposal has been amended from 'We will require a collaborative approach' to 'Proposals will need to demonstrate
	Collaborative arrangements are more challenging. Could become more bureaucratic than delivery.		

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	<p>BIF collaborations have shown that sometimes when collaboration is involved a lot of the focus can go into the collaboration rather than delivery. So it can effect capacity within the sector and reduce innovation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration</li> </ul> <p>concern raised over time being spent brokering collaboration that may well end up in further cuts and energy wasted. Reference to Youth Organisation contract; small organisations wasted a lot of time trying to be involved in conversation around collaboration.</p> <p>Can extra resources/finances will made available to help with collaboration brokering process.</p> <p>VCSEs distinctive identity and ways of doing things We shouldn't force VCSE'S to collaborate where there is no natural synergy.</p> <p>3rd sector may not want to collaborate, and they don't have to sing from the same hymn sheet</p> <p>Struggle to get meaningful collaboration. Collaboration in name only, people just playing the game to get funding.</p> <p>3 months not long enough for focused, principled partnership working</p> <p>Partnerships sometimes work the other way and orgs drag each other down</p> <p>Collaboration and partnership are not the same thing</p> <p>vast majority of small organisations do not have paid staff to manage functions meaning merging/partnering with other organisations becomes difficult.</p>		<p>how, through strategic and operational collaboration, they will deliver long term capacity building and sustainability and deliver the leadership roles in the city. Responses from grant applicants will be assessed for how they have built a collaborative approach.</p> <p>3 month period in commissioning timetable to allow collaboration. Proposal has given notice from July 2019 of collaborative focus for this commissioning</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to be clear about tender award process – will points be awarded to bids which are collaborative?</li> </ul> <p>need to ensure that any partnership agreements are not tokenistic and we</p>		

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	need to ensure that any partner organisations are sharing resources fairly.		
4.2	Always advocate getting people out into community anchor organisations – support often central and actually having it based in the community so that the approach is more collaborative in the beginning then its more empowering to communities.	Community based support	Comments noted
	Not all groups want to be constituted formally, but some do. Need a locally based hub that will take the groups that do want to constitute through that process.		
	A local offer plugged into a central view.		
	Funding info best delivered at a local level. As the resources in terms of knowledge and experience (staff) and need will be different at a local level. However more corporate offer would be best done more centrally and co-ordinated.		
4.3	Community Anchor organisations: During the consultation process for the development of the VCSE Strategy for Bristol, we learned of the concerns of some of those organisations (considered as CAO's) regarding what they felt was the imposition of 'others agendas' and pressure to conform to a model or concept which further stretches their resources. There is no doubt that there are key and very effective organisations sitting within a number of communities across Bristol whose 'community reach', knowledge and service delivery will play an important role in the future delivery of the service. However, we believe that a more co-design approach to working with 'CAO's' will not only embed support for a new, collaborative delivery model, but will also enable a more strategic approach through which the VCSE sector can more effectively contribute to citywide	Community Anchor organisations	Comments noted

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	challenges. Without putting 'all the eggs in one basket' the recommissioned service has an opportunity to implement a new approach to increase capacity by unlocking the social capital and leverage ability of CAO's in a way that does not unduly challenge or compete with their existing business.		
4.3	Why not then just give the grant back to VOSCUR and clarify changes? - Tension within approach which needs to be addressed: How are the priorities and principles linked in with the CCG and its wider footprint	Funding Approach	BCC wishes to commission a new approach; CCG is a fund contributor into the grant
4.4	One size fits all approach is problematic. It invisibilises and homogenises people. No attempt is made to meet the needs of individual communities.		
4.5	Quality of provision needs to be measured.	Quality Assurance	
4.6	Shared view that word infrastructure adds recognition of what VCSE do (rather than a rather 'fluffy' word like enabling)	Language and terminology	
4.7	We recommend that the final commissioning plan includes the standard consideration of TUPE and for commissioners to make available existing workforce information to bidders.	TUPE	Comments noted. It will include this information
4.8	We recommend that the final commissioning plan includes more details on the assessment method for grant applications and that the process includes an interview as part of the assessment.	Grant Assessment methods	Comments noted.
4.9	We note from the consultation document that the council intends to run a grant process. If the chosen process results in contracts through procurement, it would include a post-notification standstill (Alcatel) minimum period of 10 days. We would ask that a similar appeal period be incorporated into the grant process	Post notification stand-still	Comments noted.

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
4.10	<p>However, UK economy and society in general, and the sector particularly, has undergone unprecedented change in the years since publication as a result of austerity and the consequent pressure (reducing) public services. This has led to a disproportionately negative impact on the lives of many of our most vulnerable citizens and communities. This, together with the unstable political environment (Brexit) and a rise in the complexity of needs for individuals and communities, demands not only a dynamic and innovative response from the sector but also a wider view of its challenges, needs and opportunities. For example, we believe that the IVAR research report - 'The Value of Small' (June 2018) – provides up to date insight and analysis from the important perspective of small and medium sized charities, which would add to the evidence base for the recommissioning of the service. Additionally, Locality reports and briefings under the 'Keep It Local' campaign such as 'Powerful Communities, Strong Economies' (Nov 2017) also provide more up to date insight, knowledge and information relevant to supporting asset based development and locality based infrastructure support.</p>	Background research suggestions	Comments noted. Background information included in revised proposal.
5.	<b>Centralised delivery ideas</b>		
5.1	<p>Job opportunities and vol opportunities Networking, communication. Policy briefing's Knowledge sharing Some role for a central for funding National decision making Horizon scanning, strategy/leadership. As funding pots get done at a city wide level – eg youth funding there is a central role for brokering those so smaller ones don't lose out</p>	Centralised service provision	Comments noted.

	Comments/themes	categories	Proposal responses & amendments
	Brokering in business support: Voscur are enablers for that or would be useful for someone to have that role centrally. Pro bono would be useful at a corporate level. City voice and leadership (although this needs to be distributed amongst localities as well)		
5.2	One size fits all approach is problematic. It invisibilises and homogenises people. No attempt is made to meet the needs of individual communities.  The mainstreaming of support offered to BAME orgs led to loss of focus on racial equity, which has had significant negative impacts on BAME VCSE's.  Mainstreaming of support = mainstreaming of gatekeepers to support who aren't willing to be different. They hold the glass ceiling in place.	BAME needs	Comments noted.
5.3	Online might also be difficult as it assumes that people have those skills when they don't	Digital offer	Comments noted. Digital provision and technology is the focus of VCSE development – see 'Start Somewhere' report
<b>6.</b>	<b>Local delivery</b>		
6.1	Voice for each locality/wards  Need to recognise the differences in the support that is required to meet the needs of different localities	Localised service provision	Comments noted.
<b>7</b>	<b>Internal Stakeholders comments</b>		
	Need to be careful about conflict around one organisation being funded to fund other organisations who might be in competition for funding; we should be thinking about an 'ethical wall' / enabling partnerships to avoid competition.		Comments noted.
	Important to work together and have a body which is going to facilitate discussions and opportunities with the VCSE sector.		Comments noted.
	Need to think about how we boost the conversation between		Comments noted.

	<b>Comments/themes</b>	<b>categories</b>	<b>Proposal responses &amp; amendments</b>
	stakeholders		
	Important to be explicit about prospective bid winners and how they will engage in conversations with commissioners and other key areas of BCC.		Comments noted.
	Having an interview helps to add more accountability and robustness to the process		Comments noted.
<b>8</b>	<b>Councillors comments</b>		
	Too many organisations might make a partnership unmanageable – but this will be for the sector to work out when putting together a bid		Comments noted.
	There does need to be clarity as to what needs to be city wide and what can be done in certain patches – clarity should help avoid duplication. This will be up for the sector to work out during bid design phase		Comments noted.
	There is an element of additionality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the city gets for BCC funding money</li> <li>• What city gets for funding that Grant recipient has leveraged in to the city</li> </ul>		Comments noted.
	Role of the Grant Recipient to broker those relationships to ensure that skills and expertise (the offer) is spread across the city <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E.g. community plans, which started in one patch of north Bristol spread across the north of the city.</li> <li>• Sharing of learning of work that is currently being done across communities by creating opportunities for relationships to be built</li> </ul>		Comments noted.