

Appendix 3: Information event feedback

Summary of feedback from the Third Sector information event – Tuesday 17th July 2012

Responses provided by;
Councillor David Perry (DP); Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director Community Health and Well-Being (PN), Marianne Locke,
Divisional Director Community and Culture (ML)

Contributor	Comment	Response
CAB	Will there be any other opportunities for commissioning?	(PN) There are likely to be other commissioning opportunities across the Council for example, in Adults and Housing, Children's etc. The event today is only describing the process for the main grants budget.
CAB	This process will close the CAB.	(PN) The draft core outcomes will be adopted across the Council. For example the outcome around worklessness will also be used to commission services in other Council areas.
Howard Bluston	Other organisations that offer funding will be able to sign-post to other funders.	(ML) The Council will ensure that support is available to sign-post organisations to other sources of funding.
Harrow Mencap	Grants used to give core funding to some organisations - this process shifts that. It moves away from providing core funding through grants so that the funds are used to deliver strategic outcomes.	
Cllr Mrinal Choudhury	Will the £600k be divided between outcomes based grants and small grants?	(ML) Yes the Council is still considering what that split might be. (DP) Council is minded to put more money in to small grants.
Cllr Mrinal Choudhury	How many groups will each relationship manager be responsible for?	(PN) There is a pool of officers in Adults and Housing and Children's, relationship managers could come from all directorates. We welcome a dialogue on how we make this work.
Harrow Mencap	If an organisation is only able to apply once there might be an impact on value for money. Also need to consider the ceiling on turnover, do we know what the make up of the sector is? It could be that	

Appendix 3: Information event feedback

	an organisation's funding is coming to an end which would then make them eligible to apply. Need to look at these nuances.	
Age UK	Has the money for a CVS been included in outcome 5?	(ML) Yes this could be ring-fenced. This needs further discussion with the Interim CVS board.
Harrow Shopmobility	Will the draft evaluation criteria be sent round?	(ML) Yes
Harrow Shopmobility	Filling in application forms takes a long time. Will the Council send these forms to other organisations that the organisation might want to work in partnership with?	(ML) We are trying to make the process as less onerous as possible. Organisations can use the information they put in to the application form for other applications. Other organisations are unlikely to accept our application form. £50,000 is a significant amount of money so it is worth putting the effort in to the application.
(HAD)	Although the principle of the grant being tapered is a good one, some organisations may not be able to raise additional funding very easily. How absolute will this be?	(ML) This is standard practice amongst many other funders. Support will be available to assist organisations with fundraising. Support with fundraising is already available through the Interim CVS service.
Harrow Heritage Trust	The HHT gives money to schools eg. Opera in Schools, this doesn't appear to be covered in the proposals will this type of activity be dropped?	(ML) the proposed themes and outcomes do not include any related to Children and Young People as funding for this area is covered by other Council departments. The type of activity described could be covered under outcome 4. (DP) Overall there are 21 core outcomes, these have been narrowed down to seven for this process. Those that are not covered here are supported by other Council departments. We need a process that allows us to distribute funds to areas not already covered by other departments, we get £2m worth of requests.
Capable Communities	If we apply as part of a consortium, can we still also apply on our own?	(ML) We are happy to hear your views on this.
Capable Communities	Will these principles apply across other Council departments eg. Is the principle of over £50,000 applied in other Council areas?	(ML) We can not guarantee that all of these principles will apply in other areas eg. Guaranteeing the protection of the budget.

Appendix 3: Information event feedback

		(PN) Where it makes sense to apply these principles they will be applied eg. Core outcomes
Harrow Mencap	Why is the principle of value for money only applied where organisations are funded by more than one department. Value for money is a good principle.	(ML) Value for money will be used as part of the evaluation criteria for all submissions.
Harrow Homestart	Some things can't be assessed in monetary terms?	(ML) We would be looking to see that proposals can be delivered within the costs outlined. This would be based on our understanding of the costs for certain items.
Harrow Mencap	Value for money should be based on realistic costs. It should be clear how this will be measured.	
Harrow Athletics	On the whole we like the look of the process and have empathy for the cap on the outcomes. We can see that there are some key essential services eg. CAB. We welcome a simplified application form.	
HAD	Perhaps a strategic decision should be made about which services need protecting and should not be part of the process or have their funds tapered. On the application form, how will organisations evidence soft outcomes? Organisations will need help to complete the form and help to work jointly on similar aims/clients.	

Appendix 3: Information event feedback

Summary feedback from group exercise

- Organisations should submit one application either large or small. If a group has received funding for three years they should not be able to apply in the fourth year. Organisations should receive good feedback as to why their applications fail.
- Clarification needed on partnership applications, eg. If you are the lead organisation on one application does that mean you can not put in a second application as a single organisation?
- We welcome the move to three year funding, although caution that funders are reluctant to replace local authority funding.
- There are concerns about how the proposal for relationship managers will work. If people are doing other jobs how will they fit this in? Will they know the groups they are working with? Will there be one point of accountability? Who will all these officers be responsible to?
- There are concerns about the tapering of the grant over three years.
- Clarification needed on what constitutes partnerships? What about organisations where there are sub-committees?

Table 1

- Relationship Managers: will it be a named person? What about cover arrangements, transitions, availability, consistency, matching them to groups, knowledge of groups, hierarchy of accountability? Capacity of RM's to do the job properly.
- How will the split of funds work - is this too ambitious? Potential for increasing numbers of applications to the same value pot.
- How do we find out about what and when these other funding streams might become available?
- Clarity as to what constitutes an organisation e.g. subsidiaries consortia or partnerships?
- Understanding funding for services that are ongoing. Good to move to three year funding.

Table 2

- Can a lead organisation on one bid also be part of another bid? If no, this would discourage partnerships.
- If eventually all goes commission-based could have adverse effect on small organisations.
- Long term grants tapering could cause problems for getting grants from other organisations. Funders reluctant to replace LA funding.
- Welcome 3 year grants.
- Do the long – term grants reduce the pot for subsequent years (how)?
- Appeals process. There should be one or at least feedback.
- True outcomes should not measure process used by organisation.
- Decide which services need protection (not organisations), and these should be exempt from tapering funding (or subject to a different process?)

Appendix 3: Information event feedback

- Clear and precise form needed to ensure organisations give correct relevant information, also need support to help organisations evidence outcomes, especially 'soft' outcomes.
- Organisations should be helped towards joint working on similar aims with similar clients so as not to duplicate work and maximise use of available funds.

Table 3

- Draft core outcomes look good
- Caps on funding could damage core community services e.g. CAB
- Simplified Small Grants application form e.g. less volumn
- Small Grants Cap of £5K is welcomed
- Turnover of £50K is welcomed.
- Is 50K limit the right limit?

Table 4

- Turnover of organisations changes year on year – Council should have option to refer organisations from larger to smaller if a good proposal?
- Will it cover revenue/capital costs?
- Mixed opinions on whether there should be a limit – guidelines on who can/should apply should be given.
- How sustainable are the projects that are funded with small grants
- Guidelines about applying for 3 years should be given. How will the grant reduce each year or should it remain at 50K?
- Should organisations be allowed to apply for the same thing each year?
- What happens in Year 4? – Can you re-apply after 3 years?
- Some weighting should be reflected in the evaluation criteria eg. Sustainability
- What is the possibility of money being there for the 3 years?
- Consortia – if can only apply once - will it stop larger organisations pairing with smaller organisations? => Can consortia's be seen as a separate organisation?
- Feedback should be given on why you fail => other funders don't have appeals/if good feedback is given – don't necessarily need appeals process.
- What about the involvement from public health and other relevant departments?
- Only 1 application (per organisation) between both large and small grants should be allowed.
- Element of campaigning should be included – eg. campaigning for services