

Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee

10am, Tuesday, 25 February 2014

Review of Council Grants to Third Parties 2013/14: Final Report – referral from the Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee

Item number	7.1(a)
Report number	
Wards	All

Links

Coalition pledges	See attached report
Council outcomes	See attached report
Single Outcome Agreement	See attached report

Carol Campbell

Head of Legal, Risk and Compliance

Contact: Jane Lockhart, Committee Officer

E-mail: jane.lockhart@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 529 4226

Contact: Susan Weir, Assistant Committee Officer

E-mail: susan.weir@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 529 4107

Terms of Referral

Review of Council Grants to Third Parties 2013/14: Final Report

Terms of referral

The Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee on 11 February 2014 considered a report which provided the up-to-date position on the review of grants to third parties during 2013/14, and proposed a new policy framework with a completion date of April 2016.

The Committee heard a deputation from Ruth Campbell (COMAS) and Ella Simpson, (EVOC). The deputation highlighted areas of concern they had in regard to the report. Some of their concerns included:

- (a) That more information was required on the intentions of the report.
- (b) That relations with the third sector (other than financial) needed to be improved.
- (c) Help was required to enable more organisations to be more fundable.
- (d) New ways of resourcing money needed to be found.
- (e) Help was needed to diversify funding.
- (f) There was no third sector strategy or vision.

The Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee agreed:

- 1) To thank Council staff and the voluntary sector for their input to this process and ongoing engagement.
- 2) To welcome and note the further contributions and comments on the report from Ruth Campbell (COMAS), Ella Simpson (EVOC) and the LAYC Chairs' Group through Ian Boardman.
- 3) To commit to further dialogue with them and other voluntary sector groups in making further progress with this area of work.
- 4) To agree the recommendations in the report as the way forward for future grant-giving in the Council:-
 - (a) To approve the policy framework to align grants to third parties resources to meet commissioning, strategic plan and capital coalition pledge priorities.
 - (b) To approve the transfer of responsibility for developing future grant programmes and making grant awards to executive committees and policy development sub-committees.
 - (c) To note that the implementation of the review would be included as part of the BOLD (Better Outcomes Leaner Delivery) programme.

- (d) To note that a report on the state of the third sector, cultural and sporting bodies and their contribution to the city, relationship with the Council and overall level of Council investment and other support, would be presented annually to the Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee.
 - (e) To refer the report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for noting.
- 5) To note that the way forward fully respected Voluntary Sector Compact principles and values; and
 - 6) To welcome the commitment that future grants schemes would be co-produced with providers, neighbourhood partnerships, communities and users, in line with the Capital Coalition framework.

For decision/action

- 1) The Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee has referred the attached report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for noting.
- 2) To note that full Council approval will be required for the transfer of responsibility for developing future grant programmes and making grant awards.
- 3) If agreed, procedural standing orders and committee terms of reference will require to be adjusted accordingly. It is proposed that authority be delegated to the Director of Corporate Governance to take such actions and make such adjustments as he may consider necessary to implement this decision.

Background reading / external references

Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee 11 February 2014.

Links

Coalition pledges	See attached report
Council outcomes	See attached report
Single Outcome Agreement	See attached report
Appendices	Report by the Director of Corporate Governance

Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee

10.00am, Tuesday 11 February 2014

Review of Council Grants to Third Parties 2013/14: Final Report

Item number	7.2
Report number	
Wards	All

Links

Coalition pledges	P1, P7, P12, P24, P31, P33, P36 and P42
Council outcomes	CO1, CO2, CO3, CO4, CO6, CO8, CO9, CO10, CO11, CO12, CO14, CO20, CO23, CO26 and CO27
Single Outcome Agreement	SO1, SO2, SO3 and SO4

Alastair D Maclean

Director of Corporate Governance

Contact:

Nick Croft – Corporate Policy and Strategy Manager

Email: nick.croft@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel: 0131 469 3726

Euan Renton – Corporate Policy and Strategy Team

Email: euan.renton@edinburgh.gov.uk; Tel: 0131 469 3981

Executive summary

Review of Council Grants to Third Parties 2013/14: Final Report

Summary

This report responds to the Capital Coalition motion at the Council Budget meeting of 7 February 2013 which agreed to "... a review of the grants to third parties process during 2013/14, conducted in partnership with third sector stakeholders, to ensure financial stability for organisations and value for money for the Council".

Members are asked to note progress on this matter and to approve a policy framework to address this motion with a completion date of April 2016.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

1. approves the policy framework to align grants to third parties resources to meet commissioning, strategic plan and capital coalition pledge priorities;
2. approves the transfer of responsibility for developing future grant programmes and making grant awards to executive committees and policy development sub committees;
3. notes that the implementation of the review will be included as part of the BOLD programme;
4. notes that a report on the state of the third sector, cultural and sporting bodies and their contribution to the city, relationship with the Council and overall level of Council investment and other support will be presented annually to this Committee; and
5. refers this report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for noting.

Measures of success

The success of the review will be measured by an:

- improvement in the delivery of grant agreement objectives;
- improvement in satisfaction with grant funded services;
- improvement in satisfaction with the Council's grant to third parties arrangements;
- improve Council governance arrangements; and

- improved sustainability of third party grant recipients.

Financial impact

There are no direct financial implications arising from the review. However, the new arrangements should lead to improved value for money. In addition, the need to find efficiencies and savings as a result of developing new programmes for grants to third parties investment should contribute to the budget development process for 2015/16 onwards.

Equalities impact

The development and implementation of a new framework will assist the Council to deliver key equality and rights outcomes, and meet the public sector equality duties to advance equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and foster good relations. All changes will be subject to an equality and rights impact assessment, and due regard will be paid to the recommendations.

Sustainability impact

The review will contribute to Council efforts in support of the city's sustainable development objectives, in particular the advancement of vibrant flourishing communities, social and economic wellbeing and an efficient and effectively managed city.

The review will also encourage support organisations to consider issues of operational and financial sustainability, in particular to consider Council investment as a contribution towards broader income generation efforts.

Consultation and engagement

Council Review of Grants to Third Parties - Compact Partnership Board – 1 March 2013.

[Meeting of the Communities and Neighbourhoods Policy Development and Review Sub Committee on 4 June 2013.](#)

Meetings of the Compact's Council Grants to Third Parties Reference Group – June to October 2013.

Release of approved Council Grants to Third Parties Review Scope and Remit on the Council website and linked to the Compact and Third Sector Interface websites - early July 2013.

Grants Review Survey for current grant recipients and non-recipients – July/August 2013.

[Report to the meeting of the Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee](#) – 24 September 2013.

[Report on the review specifically addressing Culture and Sport Clients made to the meeting of the Culture and Sport Committee](#) – 22 October 2013.

Engagement sessions on the review, components and way forward – November and December 2013.

Background reading / external references

Courage to Collaborate - <http://www.evoc.org.uk/document/courage-to-collaborate>

[Council Grants to Third Parties: Proposals for Expenditure 2013/14](#) – Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, 26 February 2013

[Report on Review of Council Grants to Third Parties](#) to Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee, 28 June 2013.

[Update Report on Review of Council Grants to Third Parties](#) to Communities and Neighbourhoods Committee, 24 September 2013.

Review of Council Grants to Third Parties 2013/14: Final Report

1. Background

- 1.1 The Council Budget Meeting of 7 February 2013 agreed to "... a review of the grants to third parties process during 2013/14, conducted in partnership with third sector stakeholders, to ensure financial stability for organisations and value for money for the Council".
- 1.2 Subsequent reports to this Committee on 28 June and 24 September 2013 have set out the governance arrangements, remit and scope of the review and broad proposals for change. The proposals have been subject to further discussion internally and engagement with the third sector cultural and sporting bodies.
- 1.3 In addition, the Culture and Sport Committee at its meeting on 22 October received a report detailing the direction of travel for cultural and sporting grants in the light of developments in this review.
- 1.4 This report provides members with an update on this matter and seeks approval for a policy framework with a completion date of April 2016.

2. Main report

- 2.1 Although the Council's provision of grants delivers results in line with the targets set there are key challenges in the existing arrangements, being:
 - increasing levels of need resulting from demographic trends such as a growing city population with an older age profile;
 - the need to adapt to changing priorities and focus on outcomes related to pledge commitments, strategic priorities, commissioning plans and prevention – e.g. through the move to personalised and self directed support;
 - a projected Council funding shortfall; and
 - identifying an equitable way to deal with funding applications, that will require modifications to the current pattern of investment.
- 2.2 The previous reports to committee have presented a number of proposals and these have been subject to further discussion within the Council and engagement with third sector, cultural and sporting organisations.

Proposals for Change and a New Policy Framework for Grants to Third Parties

Executive Committees and Policy development Sub Committees Develop a Number of Themed Grants Programmes

- 2.3 It is proposed that relevant executive committees and policy development sub committees would develop new grant programmes, and associated priorities and assessment criteria, based on the themes which are described below. These which would be developed with community planning stakeholders, with a focus on third sector, sporting and cultural organisations, as implementation of the policy framework progresses. Indicative themes for new grant programmes currently include:
- promoting health and wellbeing, and reducing inequality for older people and adults affected by poor health and disability issues;
 - supporting disadvantaged children and families, and providing early intervention and services for vulnerable young people;
 - encouraging participation and improving access to sport and the arts;
 - assisting young people and other groups having difficulty with finding work; and
 - preserving the environment, built and natural heritage.
- 2.4 These proposed new programmes would enable grants to be better aligned with council strategic priorities, commissioning plans, pledge commitments and the prevention agenda.
- 2.5 In addition, it would also allow members better oversight and scrutiny of grants provision, and enable them to see the connections between grants investment and other service developments.
- 2.6 It is proposed that information on new programmes would be advertised through a 'one stop shop' portal on the Council's website, which would link to other funding sources in the Council, and other external funders. It is also proposed that officers managing new grant programmes would participate in the 'meet the funders' events, organised by the Local Community Planning Team.
- 2.7 It should be noted that the development and implementation of new grant programmes as well as the further development of commissioning approaches will likely lead to a change in the pattern of investment. In this regard, and as part of the implementation of the policy framework, a disinvestment protocol will be developed from existing practices to ensure that Council does all it can to mitigate potential negative impacts from disinvestment on service users.
- ### Three Year Time Limited Funding Agreements
- 2.8 Awarding grants, typically for three year periods, would be of significant benefit to the financial stability of funded organisations, though this would be dependant on the normal annual budget setting process.

2.9 It is anticipated that the delivery of Council outcomes would be improved, as the new programmes will be more closely aligned to pledge commitments, commissioning plans and council strategic priorities.

2.10 Grant monitoring activities will focus on a thorough pre-award assessment, with a comprehensive project evaluation report on conclusion of the three year award. Interim assessments will be completed as necessary

Develop a small number of Strategic Partners

2.11 This proposal, which would provide longer term, possibly five year funding, to organisations with a sector wide reach and influence, has attracted mixed comments. On the one hand these have affirmed the positive role such bodies could take supporting implementation of the new policy framework, improving cooperative working, capacity building in the sector. On the other, there are concerns about the selection criteria which would be applied to such organisations. It is therefore proposed that the opportunity of establishing strategic partners should be carefully considered in the development of new grant programmes.

Improve Corporate Coordination of Grants to Third Parties

2.12 This proposal would ensure common standards and approaches apply across all new grant programmes, including:

- standard design of grant application forms;
- 'one stop shop' portal for all grants information;
- the development of consistent, efficient and effective means of grant assessments, monitoring and evaluation reporting;
- common approach to disinvestment policy;
- strengthening the grants to third parties officer group in the Council, and the grants to third parties reference group aligned to the COMPACT Partnership; and
- the submission of an annual report that records all Council investment and support for the third sector in the early autumn of each year to this committee.

Identify the financial value of all forms of third party Council support

2.13 In addition to grants to third parties, the Council also provides support to third parties through concessionary lets, staff secondments, community learning and development support, access to buildings and in other ways. It is proposed that in future, proposals for new grant programme awards will refer to all forms of Council support.

2.14 With regard to concessionary lets, the Council is currently reviewing the policy (a report entitled Policy: Leasing Council Land and Buildings at Less than Market Value is being considered at the Communities and Neighbourhoods Policy development Sub Committee today). Organisations in receipt of concessionary

lets will feature as part of the information provided to members seeking approval for grant awards.

Encourage Resource Efficiency, Income Diversification and Adoption of Council Policies

- 2.15 The development of new grant programmes will seek to develop the financial sustainability of organisations through encouraging:
- further diversification of income sources;
 - maximising trading opportunities and encouraging links to social enterprises and cooperative organisational models; and
 - encouraging the formation of third sector consortia, business partnerships and shared services and co-location.
- 2.16 A key area of development within new grant programmes will be the need to encourage alignment with a range of key council policies and strategies. Prominent amongst these will be equalities and rights, poverty and inequality, sustainability, community planning, balance of care, prevention, cultural policy, and adoption where possible and practicable, of the Living Wage.

Third Parties Engagement Responses

- 2.17 The views of third sector, cultural and sporting bodies about the proposals have been sought throughout the period of the review. Most recently this has been through a series of engagement meetings reported in Appendix 1 and in an online survey undertaken in early December 2013, reported in Appendix 2.
- 2.18 Sector engagement has produced generally positive support for the change proposals described above. Key message coming forward from this engagement are that:
- Council grants are seen as especially important to organisations as they are fundamental to levering in funding from other sources; and
 - Organisations from the third sector are keen to be involved in the development of new grant programmes.
- 2.19 In relation to the online survey, 52 responses were received and a summary of responses are provided below at table 1.

Table1: Third Party Responses to Online Survey, December 2013

Consultation Proposal for	Percentage of support/ strong support
Discrete new grant programmes	86%
3 year funding as standard	94%

Identify the full financial value of Council support	76%
Establish Strategic Partners	76%
Consider Implementing the Living Wage	94%
Encourage maximisation of income and trading opportunities	73%
Encourage the sector to co-operate, work in partnership etc.	88%

2.20 Although the change proposals were well received and supported the consultation exercise also identified a number of areas that will require careful and sensitive handling including:

- establishing proportionate and effective assessment and monitoring arrangements;
- ensuring that an emphasis on innovation does not effect existing productive structures/organisation; and
- ensuring that projects/organisations that address cross cutting themes, or deliver outcomes in a more holistic manner, are not unnecessarily disadvantaged.

Implementation and Transitional Arrangements

- 2.21 The length of time it will take to create new grant programmes, enable effected organisations to engage in the development of them, and ensure that any negative impacts on organisations and service users are mitigated, should not be underestimated. Therefore, it is proposed that all new grant programmes be developed, launched and approval for awards sought over a two year period up to 1 April 2016.
- 2.22 The implementation lead-in period will also enable the development of new programmes to better align with the health and social care integration plan and strategic commissioning plan, personalisation programme outcomes, and any recommendations from the BOLD (Better Outcomes from Leaner Delivery) Group. Indeed, the implementation of the review will be included as part of the BOLD programme.
- 2.23 The responsibility for developing new grant programmes, determining new priorities, making awards and monitoring performance would sit with relevant executive committees and policy development sub committees.
- 2.24 A key principle going forward will be the need to co-produce new grant programmes in partnership with third sector, cultural and sporting organisations.
- 2.25 The existing practices relating to disinvestment will be reviewed to ensure minimum disruption to service users should Council funding reduce.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee:
- 3.1.1 approves the policy framework to align grant resources to meet commissioning, strategic plan and capital coalition pledge priorities;
 - 3.1.2 approves the transfer of responsibility for developing future grant programmes and making grant awards to executive committees and policy development sub committees;
 - 3.1.3 notes that the implementation of the review will be included as part of the BOLD programme;
 - 3.1.4 notes that a report on the state of the third sector, cultural and sporting bodies and their contribution to the city, relationship with the Council and overall level of Council investment and other support will be presented annually to this Committee; and
 - 3.1.5 refers this report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee for noting.

Alastair D Maclean

Director of Corporate Governance

Links

Coalition pledges

P1 - Increase support for vulnerable children, including help for families so that fewer go into care
P7 – Further develop the Edinburgh Guarantee to improve work prospects for school leavers
P12 - Work with health, police and third sector agencies to expand existing and effective drug and alcohol treatment programmes
P24 – Maintain and embrace support for our world-famous festivals and events
P31 – Maintain our city’s reputation as the cultural capital of the world by continuing to support and invest in our cultural infrastructure
P33 – Strengthen Neighbourhood Partnerships and further involve local people in decisions on how Council resources are used
P36 – Develop improved partnership working across the Capital and with the voluntary sector to build on the “Total Craigroyston” model
P42 – Continue to support and invest in our sporting infrastructure

Council outcomes

CO1 – Our children have the best start in life, are able to make and sustain relationships and are ready to succeed
CO2 - Our children and young people are successful

learners, confident individuals and responsible citizens making a positive contribution to their communities

CO3 – Our children and young people at risk, or with a disability, have improved life chances

CO4 – Our children and young people are physically and emotionally healthy

CO6 – Our children and young people's outcomes are not undermined by poverty and inequality

CO8 - Edinburgh's economy creates and sustains job opportunities

CO9 – Edinburgh residents are able to access job opportunities

CO10 - Improved health and reduced inequalities

CO11 - Preventative and personalised support in place

CO12 – Edinburgh's carers are supported

CO14 – Communities have the capacity to help support people

CO20 – Culture, sport and major events – Edinburgh continues to be a leading cultural city where culture and sport play a central role in the lives and future of citizens

CO23 - Well engaged and well informed - communities and individuals are empowered and supported to improve local outcomes and foster a sense of community

CO26 - The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives

CO27 - The Council supports, invests in and develops our people

Single Outcome Agreement

SO1 - Edinburgh's economy delivers increased investment, jobs and opportunities for all

SO2 - Edinburgh's citizens experience improved health and wellbeing, with reduced inequalities in health

SO3 - Edinburgh's children and young people enjoy their childhood and fulfil their potential

SO4 - Edinburgh's communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric

Appendices

1 – Issues Recorded at Review Engagement Events

2 - Third Parties Responses to Review Proposals Survey

Issues Recorded at Review Engagement Events

Tuesday 26 November - EVOC Conference

- General support for broad proposals;
- Concern re the “dictat” for co-location/innovation etc – may stifle choice/creativity/localism;
- Caution re the challenges H&SC integration with NHS will pose;
- Desire for Funding Pot/Support to encourage innovation – eg consortia, shared services, transition etc;
- What is the trigger to decide between grant vs. contract/commissioning?;
- Issue of leverage realised from CEC grant funding (Cncl grants really valuable in obtaining funding from other sources:

Tuesday 3 Dec - AM – Engagement Event at EVOC

- General support for broad proposals;
- How does the performance of grant recipients compare to that of contract/commissioning performance?
- Concern re the ability to really address early intervention;
- Level of scrutiny of grant funding is disproportionate – suggest robust pre-award scrutiny and project end reporting – and a lighter touch during (like the Big Lottery);
- Recognition of the leverage CEC funding allows – both in additional funding and the other funding streams that are then more easily accessed;
- CEC funding provides a “Quality Endorsement” – reputational;
- Comfortable with 3 year funding as norm – but what about an emergency fund for new (short term) priorities;
- Funding Pot/Support to encourage innovation – eg consortia, shared services, transition etc;
- Change the term Grant to Investment;
- Consider Social Return on Investment;
- Suggest that awarding grants/monitoring thereof to community groups may benefit from “local soundings” re performance/impact/relevance etc;
- Concern re the benefits re co-location – loss of local dimension.

Tuesday 3 Dec - PM – Engagement Event at VCE

- General support for broad proposals
- Concern that 3rd Party Groups will become funding led and not community need lead if review results in radical changes specs/priorities;

- CEC funding – tho' perhaps modest – can unlock access to other funding streams – which allows more than the core activities to be delivered;
- Need to be clear that Strategic Partners does not imply subordination of smaller orgs to larger players in the sector;
- Concern that 5 themes may limit the adoption/addressing of cross cutting themes, leading to more silos.

Thursday 5 Dec - AM – Engagement Event at EVOC

- General support for broad proposals
- Some support for Strat Partners as they could then be a useful tool to engage with CEC to identify priorities and improve:
 - Co-production;
 - Tackling emergencies;
 - Sector/Officer/Political engagement;
- Concern at the prescriptive nature of the indicative themes;
- Request for major sector engagement with politicians – in and around the review process;

Thursday 5 Dec – PM – Engagement Event at VCE

- Current system of grant awards is not equitable to those who are not funded
- Obtaining Council funding worth more than the money – badge of quality assurance and helps getting other funding
- Can the Council support making third sector property DDA compliant?
- What is the Council doing in contracting terms to encourage the application of the living wage ?
- Council grant monitoring is excessive and not very effective.

Third Parties Responses to Review Proposals Survey –Nov/Dec 2013

52 Third Party Organisations responded to the Council's Online Survey. Not every respondent gave an answer to every question.

Views about the creation of a number of committee directed new grant programmes

Which of the following statements best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	42.9%	21
I support the proposal	42.9%	21
I oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
I strongly oppose the proposal	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	12.2%	6
Are there any other comments you wish to make		13
<i>answered question</i>		49

Comments made relating to this issue

1	It should be demonstrated that each year funding will be made available for the best of any new projects and ideas that are innovative which have been assessed for their potential to deliver results initially and in the future.
2	There appears to be nothing to indicate support for work with children and young people who are not disadvantaged
3	I am interested in the links that exist between health and employability. If the "work" related outcomes recognise the progress and milestones achieved on the way to the overall goal, that would be helpful. So rather than agencies being funded simply to support someone into a job, there is an awareness of the journey and be willing to consider a generous time frame. This would be supportive for the agencies and for the people using the service. Also perhaps consider providing support in sustaining the job for an agreed time period after securing employment.
4	We are particularly pleased to note that encouraging participation and access to the arts is a priority. This marks a move towards clarity over where funds for this should come from, which has been confusing for us in recent years.
5	I would like to be kept in the loop as to future funding opportunities for projects promoting health and well being - could I be added to the appropriate mailing list?
6	There is considerable danger is establishing absolutes as they fail to recognise the critical importance of building trust, relationships etc. An example being a young person who attends a regular youth work provision within which they then are supported into say a short term employability course, has a far greater chance of sustaining the benefit of the programme than had they gone into it and back out. These bullet points suggest unless you are specifically working to these outcomes then the Council will not fund or support universal services. It should not be an either or as previously supported by a Tom Woods report which articulated the importance of providing both universal and targeted rather than either or as evidenced as people move out of intense support where do they then go to?
7	I don't think there has been sufficient information provided on the rationale for the proposal or any review of alternative proposals considered and why these were rejected - if alternative proposals were not considered, why not?

8	While supporting the thrust of the proposals, I think that none of us seeing it being easy or necessarily straight-forward. Good will, understanding, transparency, flexibility and effort in building relationships will be needed if they are to work. It is important for us all to remember that, if we get it wrong, the real losers out of this are the people whom we are trying to help.
9	One of the key aspects of this funding is the support offered to disadvantaged children and families it has been an opportunity to enable families to engage in activities that are beyond their means.
10	I cannot imagine that anyone would dispute any of the proposed grant programmes outlined above. The difficult thing is not to list what's needed but to ensure that the delivery of the programmes offers the best means by which to achieve these goals.
11	As an organisation we are constantly required to be 'innovative' and attend events and fill out forms. I feel that this has taken too much of our time. Our service seems to 'tick all the boxes' but we do not seem to be rewarded in terms of additional funding when we are in extreme need of support.
12	Robust monitoring and evaluation is crucial to work out which of the current grant recipients continue to receive a grant and which agencies don't. This needs to be done with lots of manpower from the council in terms of visits to our project regular feedback from service users/ partner agencies and families this is key hearing the voices of the local people in the community who are affected by the services and whose lives are often changed from the input and consistency of local grass roots services.
13	I think reducing inequalities in general is really important, though I agree older people are particularly vulnerable. I think community building and cultural bridging also deserve a mention. Although I appreciate we need to be innovative I don't feel that services which are tried and tested over the years should be considered less valuable or important.

Views about 3 year funding

Which of the following statements best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	52.0%	26
I support the proposal	42.0%	21
I oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
I strongly oppose the proposal	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	4.0%	2
Are there any other comments you wish to make		17
<i>answered question</i>		50

Comments made relating to this issue

1	unclear on definition of 'discrete' grant funding programmes. However we strongly support 3 year funding, subject to annual monitoring.
2	If the proposal is to award blocks of grants to all applicants in a three year cycle - with no new funding within the intervening years then this may act as a disincentive. However, if there is some sort of staggered programme such that grants shall be available each year to new applicants then there may be an advantage to the added stability and security.
3	The reintroduction of this will enable organisations to plan efficiently and be able to bid to other funders with secure knowledge of funding in place
4	Three years is realistic and yet organisations such as The Big Lottery will support up to 5 years.

5	We have received annual funding to date which causes uncertainty and instability in small organisations such as ours and makes it difficult to lever in match funding. 3 year awards will reduce administration and greatly increase stability and productivity.
6	Three year funding would give stability and be helpful when applying for additional external funding.
7	Discrete funding programmes allows experts in each area to decide to whom to award funding. 3 year grants enable organisations to carry out longer term interventions although it would be best for grants to be made on a rolling basis, i.e funds available each year for a 3 year period.
8	Like many in the sector I would wish a 5 year award subject to review every say 3 years but understand the current constraints on Council's in doing so.
9	Although I support this for 'grant programmes' there should be a clear statement from the Council about how it deals with core funding. A three year cycle is too short for core funding and this should be five year funding, with sufficiently robust reviews at 3 years to disinvest if there is serious underperformance.
10	Being innovative, and making things new, needs to be looked at with a sense of reality. The reality is that a lot of vital work is done which does not change radically from year to year. basic core values such as care and commitment need to be valued.
11	Funding need to have more stability and sustainability especially when working with vulnerable groups that can be hard to reach and engage
12	Being able to build a project over a number of years is far preferable to many one-off short-term events. The monitoring is of major importance to the overall impact of the project.
13	This will support forward planning for the organisations that receive the funding. However, will the funding be attached to one department or service? What if the organisation's activities support a range of CEC aims and objectives?
14	Perhaps there should be a bit more personal support to identify relevant projects rather than making all voluntary organisations spend huge amounts of time.
15	This will be tighter monitoring and three / 5 years is a good time for a grant funded programme to exist it enables organisations to plan and be prepared to look to external funders for different pieces of project work .
16	This makes far more sense considering the fact that grants are often fairly substantial. It is also more supportive of management committees who invest a lot of time and are required to take a longer term approach. At the moment we have the slightly ridiculous situation of one member of staff having the comfort of a three year funding agreement while all his colleagues including his manager have only one year funding agreements and the shortest lease for our property we could negotiate is ten years. It does cause anxieties for some staff and has implications for recruitment of staff and Directors.
17	As one of Edinburgh's twelve festivals, I strongly support the proposal that CEC make grant commitments that extend beyond a single year - this is invaluable in allowing us to plan ahead, as well as to draw down match funding. What is NOT clear from your proposals is whether you are proposing a finite term of three years for grants. This is something I would strongly oppose - CEC's support for the festival is essential to our long terms sustainability.

Views about identifying the full financial value of Council support (inc. concessionary lets)

Which of the following statements best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	18.0%	9
I support the proposal	58.0%	29
I oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
I strongly oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
Don't know / I have no clear view	20.0%	10
Are there any other comments you wish to make about the proposal		17

Comments made relating to this issue

1	We think it is important to take into account the true cost of a project including concessionary lets etc.
2	In our case the support to the core organisation would be significantly different if the aggregate of local groups in terms of rates relief and school lets were included, yet they are specifically banned from the grant process. This seems to be inconsistent
3	It is useful for Edinburgh residents to know this information, as long as it is not an administrative challenge for small organisations to calculate this and it is not used as a reason for reducing direct funds paid for services.
4	It is important that this is transparent as third parties often do not have a choice as to where they are housed and usually no knowledge of the comparative cost. Sometimes there is no choice for a cheaper option and this should not penalise potential recipients who still need funds to deliver services.
5	This is dependent on the purpose behind doing this. If its a better means to monitor the degree of support provided then fine but if its an attempt to reduce either the in kind support by increasing charges or reducing the level of grant aid correspondingly then we would have real concerns. In order to offer a balanced view you would also need to ascertain what added value the organisation brought in via other funding, volunteer effort, social impact etc.
6	What the Council needs to do is ADD to the CASH VALUE of its support with better deals on lets, rate relief etc. so that the Council's cash support has maximum impact. With this statement the Council could reduce its cash contribution to organisations; if this is not the intention then a clear statement to this effect is needed.
7	We work out in the community and so concessionary rates would enable us to meet clients and be more accessible in the city.
8	Our service is based at WGH, hence some of the running cost is paid by the Clinical Genetics Dept.
9	The rationale here is fine. I wonder, though, if it needs to be balanced with the transparency of showing the CEC cost for providing the comparable services? If outsourcing saves money, that is a relevant piece of information, is it not?
10	greater financial value and support can only enhance the sharing of core resources
11	Yes, it is important to be able to show clearly the full support being given
12	The reasoning behind this proposal is not explained.
13	The flip side of this is that CEC absolutely MUST recognise the full value of the third party brings to CEC - for example, we receive a grant of c£45,000, yet we bring in a base of £215,000 of work for CEC, plus all the capital we raise for projects supporting CEC (about double that again).
14	I think it is difficult to quantify many aspects of our work. Even those that are measurable (such as keeping children from being Looked After) don't seem to be rewarded. Sorry for the disillusionment!

15	I am unsure of how effective this will be as so many organisations pay a peppercorn rent for their building for example and have done for many years, but organisations still have to pay for all the repairs and upkeep. If the council are to put a value on it will they be willing to pay for roof repairs, damage to gutters, painting outside the building external up keep e.g grass maintenance.
16	I would also encourage the Council to assess the leverage that the Third Party Grant can make in terms of bringing other funds into an organisation
17	I would want more information on how CEC would propose arriving at this figure before I could respond. I would also want more information on how this would sit in relation to CEC's own income generation ambitions/targets. As a festival receiving a small cash grant from CEC (£10,333), we are frequently asked by different departments in CEC to pay charges for use of CEC owned spaces/sites for delivery of core festival programme which is entirely free at the point of access. It seems entirely counterintuitive to me that we should be awarded a grant of £10,333 by one department of CEC, and then be asked to pay e.g. Hire Charges of £500 per night, for example, to deliver programme which is entirely free to the end user, and does not generate income for our organisation.

Views about Identifying Strategic Partners

Which of the following statements best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	28.6%	14
I support the proposal	46.9%	23
I oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
I strongly oppose the proposal	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	22.4%	11
Are there any other comments you wish to make about the proposal		16
<i>answered question</i>		49

Comments made relating to this issue

1	This would be useful for an organisation such as ourselves who carries out the majority of our work in partnership. However, we would be concerned if funding was reduced to organisations providing direct services to cover increased costs to these supporting organisations.
2	I am not sure about what this proposal really means. If the idea is to fund umbrella organisations then we need to remember they do not provide front line services and these are the services that are increasingly stretched. Some capacity building can be found externally through organisations like 'Pilotlight' who use Employee Assisted Volunteering by recruiting senior managers from the private sector and this is added value to the voluntary sector.
3	3 years is a sufficiently long period of time, especially if third parties can apply again to continue work. 5 year funding may prevent new organisations or projects from receiving funding.
4	As long as smaller organisations are not excluded from this process. Smaller organisations can have more expert knowledge.
5	as long as they are truly able to represent other organisations in that sector
6	The idea of establishing 'anchor organisations' has some merit but we need to be clear and careful who's defined as being 'strategic'. There would need to be a very transparent process to identify such and avoid only those as such as those gaining this status.

7	I think this idea has merits but with no clear third sector strategy, it is not clear what kind of organisation would be considered 'strategic'. The bullet points above could apply to almost any organisation and to move forward with this there would need to be a clear, open and transparent process by which organisations apply to become a 'strategic' organisation with very clear criteria for performance and contribution to the City.
8	The partnership arrangement would be much more beneficial to us and we would be able to fully support partners - this type of work really needs partnership arrangements for multidisciplinary support and awareness to survivors of complex trauma from childhoods in care, as would the stability of 5 year funding which would support complex trauma work
9	Our service is unique and at I am not sure we have enough projects to have a representation at a strategic level.
10	I am sorry, but we are struggling to understand exactly what the proposal is here, and what is the value to be gained. It might be a good idea, but needs further explanation. Some examples might help. Also, what would be the knock-on financial hit to other groups - assuming the strategic partners are not being funded separately?
11	Makes good sense
12	The concept of strategic partners makes sense, but I would like to see the criteria including recognition for relative and sustained impact on a sector.
13	It is quite hard for smaller organisations to innovate - this requires capacity and headspace, as well as organisational change and development. Where there is the requirement for such action, we would urge a higher level of funding to recognise the extra pressures this will place on the organisation.
14	We have done extremely well with Scottish Government funding but we have struggled with local authority funding. I feel that the resources seem to be committed. Sorry again, but I have spent so much time filling out forms and attending events with no benefits to us.
15	I think this would be a good opportunity for organisations like ourselves to become a strategic partner and being able to improve on our innovative projects and ways of working and being a support to other local projects and partners.
16	I am not sure how these partners would be identified.

Views on Encouraging the Application of the Living Wage

Which of the following statements best describes your view of this position?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support this position	54.0%	27
I support this position	40.0%	20
I oppose this position	6.0%	3
I strongly oppose this position	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		50

Views on Encouraging the maximisation of income and trading opportunities

Which of the following best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	24.5%	12
I support the proposal	49.0%	24
I oppose the proposal	4.1%	2
I strongly oppose the proposal	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	22.4%	11
<i>answered question</i>		49

Views on Encourage the sector to co-operate, work in partnership and share resources as much as possible

Which of the following best describes your view of this proposal?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I strongly support the proposal	50.0%	25
I support the proposal	38.0%	19
I oppose the proposal	2.0%	1
I strongly oppose the proposal	0.0%	0
Don't know / I have no clear view	10.0%	5
<i>answered question</i>		50

Other comments made about the Review

1	We support the living wage however this can only be factored in if additional or adequate funds are available as it is currently unaffordable. We feel there is insufficient information for us to best describe our view of this proposal but are clear that currently charities adhere to innovative practices and the creation of partnerships to provide good value. We fear that small, specialised and local charities may not be represented fairly under a strategic role given that small charities often have insufficient time and money for involvement. We fear that innovation needs to take account of current projects that work effectively and are in high demand as there is a limited number of times to re-invent the wheel.
2	I think it is important to consider a better understanding of food and where it comes from within the theme health & wellbeing
3	We are interested to follow developments into the move towards more participation activity in Cultural organisations. We feel that this activity is spread across a variety of departments at present and would welcome one CEC team that dealt with this fund, preferably with one member of CEC staff with this role.
4	The proposals are broad in their range of potential achievements. Currently services through the 3rd sector are meeting most of those needs . I think it will be interesting to see if new and inovative ideas are taken on .
5	I strongly support proposal 7 but also feel that provision needs to be affordable for vulnerable families.
6	It is vital that funding is made on a case by case basis rather than as it has appeared to be til now re-funding the same organisations. It needs to be dynamic and able to react to changes in council and Scottish government priorities and to be accountable.
7	Smaller niche organisations are often excluded in favour of large organisations with a high profile. It would be disappointing if these people got the 3 or 5 years funding and the specialist services, who regularly co produce with others, were to disappear.
8	would hope that any monitoring is able to capture what really happens in a project, and doesn't just rely on self monitoring or crude figures.
9	Decisions regarding future funding are made too near the financial year end, leaving too little time for planning or exiting. This leads to unnecessary insecurity for jobs and projects.
10	Some of the proposals do not lend themselves to the tick boxes as provided and for Q6 and Q7 these are highly laudable but raise issues critical in themselves in seeking to address these so its not as simple as saying we support them.
11	Feeling very anxious on the review, would like to have more information on different stages.
12	Many voluntary organisations have a mix of CEC funding and private funding. Both are needed to exist. This, and the implications of CEC change, need to be considered. For example, offering a living wage means taking private funders along with that as well.
13	the current culture around the third sector has been one of competitiveness and has led to many quality projects not working in partnership in a holistic approach to development and support. Preventative support and creativity of approach on a sustainable basis incorporating social enterprise is the way forward. the processes and systems need to change to reflect this
14	Council grants have been key to ensuring equity for children and families in need of support and have enabled access to funding to support successful initiatives
15	Monitoring - in the past this has been very heavy and somewhat meaningless - the reams of paper completed have probably not been referred back to once. Meaningful reporting which is then used by CEC to help demonstrate and share best practice amongst supported organisations could be of assistance. Value - there are cases where third parties can bring real value to CEC through service provision - it would be great if CEC was open to this

16	I think there is too much emphasis on partnership working. Joint working often causes great strain because our organisations have different values and management structures. We really appreciate our funding from the City. I am just concerned that more reviews will not result in secure funding for our organisation even though we seem to do everything that has been prioritised.
17	I feel there has been quite a delay on this process and this can be frustrating but I equally understand that it is a huge task. I think the better informed you can keep the third sector the easier it will become in terms of closer partnership working. I look forward to a different system and welcome the opportunity of organisations that meet the criteria having a 5 year grant and in terms of staff motivation, sustainability, forward planning this is really powerful. Thanks
18	I appreciate being invited to take part in this.
19	In response to question 7 - while we all acknowledge that it is important that cultural organisations seek to diversify income streams as much as possible, I think that there is a balance to be struck between ensuring that we as organisations are encouraging investment from other avenues, and ensuring that our activities remain accessible to those for whom a ticket price might be a barrier to access.
20	We would love to be able to help in any way as far as childcare is concerned.