

---

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee - 22 June 2017

**Subject:** Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector Funding

**Report of:** Deputy Chief Executive, Growth and Neighbourhoods  
Strategic Director, Adult Social Services

---

**Summary**

This report updates Members on how the Council is developing its approach to funding the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Sector. It asks for Members' views on the proposed model for future funding.

**Recommendations**

Members are asked for their views on the funding model put forward by the MCC/CCG/VCS co-design group.

---

**Wards Affected:** All

---

**Contact Officers:**

Name: Liz Goodger  
Position: Strategic Commissioning Manager  
Telephone: 0161 234 1285  
E-mail: l.goodger@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Nicole Joseph  
Position: VCS Development Manager  
Telephone:  
E-mail: n.joseph@manchester.gov.uk

**Background documents (available for public inspection):**

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee 4th January 2017 Item 6 Part 2<sup>1</sup>  
Our Manchester VCS Funding Consultation Summary<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>

[http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/22332/6\\_part\\_two\\_%E2%80%93\\_our\\_manchester\\_voluntary\\_and\\_community\\_sector\\_funding](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/22332/6_part_two_%E2%80%93_our_manchester_voluntary_and_community_sector_funding)

<sup>2</sup>

[https://www.manchestercommunitycentral.org/sites/manchestercommunitycentral.co.uk/files/Our%20Manchester%20VCS%20Funding%20Consultation%20Summary%20Apr%202017\\_0.pdf](https://www.manchestercommunitycentral.org/sites/manchestercommunitycentral.co.uk/files/Our%20Manchester%20VCS%20Funding%20Consultation%20Summary%20Apr%202017_0.pdf)

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Last summer the City Council committed to a co-design process<sup>3</sup> with representatives from the voluntary sector, and the Clinical Commissioning Groups. The purpose of this process was to design a new way of investing in the voluntary sector which would support the Our Manchester approach by helping the sector to be stronger and more resilient.
- 1.2 The task for the co-design group was to generate options for future VCS funding, for wider consultation. The group has put significant time into this work, on a voluntary basis.
- 1.3 In January 2017, Members of this Committee received a report on the process so far and commented on a draft consultation paper. Since then the consultation has been undertaken and the co-design group has used the results to develop a draft funding model.
- 1.4 One of the 'we wills' in the Our Manchester Strategy is:

**Continue to work with the voluntary and community sector to find new ways of reaching those communities that remain untouched by Manchester's success, creating resilient and vibrant communities of people.**

The fundamental purpose of this work is to make that commitment real and in doing so support community resilience and cohesion.

## 2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Council currently has 15 voluntary sector grant funding streams. We also fund the voluntary sector through contracts to provide a range of services. In addition, we fund a voluntary sector (infrastructure) support service to run a volunteer centre, provide capacity building support to VCS groups and represent the sector on strategic bodies.
- 2.2 Much of this existing funding pays for work based in communities and broadly fits into a model of neighbourhood services: Good Neighbours groups working with older people, carers' organisations working with different communities, community associations providing activities across age ranges. Some other work, such as equalities, is focussed on communities of identity rather than place.
- 2.3 On 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016 the City Council agreed to extend most of the existing VCS grants and some contracts until the end of March 2017. In November 2016 we indicated to existing funded groups our intention to extend current arrangements again, until the end of September 2017, to allow this redesign process to be

---

<sup>3</sup> More information about the co-design process can be found here:  
<https://www.manchestercommunitycentral.org/policy-and-influence/our-manchester-vcs-funding-co-design-group>

completed and in March wrote to all groups to notify them that this extension would be for 9 rather than 6 months – until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2017.

2.4 Not all Council funding to the VCS is included in this new approach. VCS organisations large and small provide a broad range of specified services under contract, sometimes alongside private providers e.g. supported housing, this funding is not included, and neither is Neighbourhood Investment Funding The following is included at present, further funding could be added in due course:

- Equalities funding programme
- Health and wellbeing grants
- VCS mental health contracts
- Carers' groups contracts
- Community association grants
- Voluntary sector support (infrastructure)
- Some small miscellaneous VCS contracts

2.5 Discussions are continuing as to the connections between this funding and the emerging Single Commissioning Function: Manchester Health and Care Commissioning - MHCC. (MCC and the Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group). Health colleagues are very supportive of our approach and are looking at how we can practically align funding, particularly where we are funding the same organisations. At the time of writing, a proposal to include some CCG funding streams in the Our Manchester VCS Fund has been considered by the MHCC Executive Committee and follow up work is underway. There should also be opportunities in future to align this funding with that of other local funders, such as housing providers.

2.6 The co-design group is made up of colleagues from the voluntary sector, the City Council and the CCGs. Macc, our voluntary sector infrastructure organisation organised the voluntary sector membership. Full details of the membership of the co-design group, including email addresses, were published on Macc's website at the start of the process. Notes of each of the co-design group's first four meetings were also published after each had taken place. All of our funded voluntary sector groups, and everyone who attended our workshops in the summer, were sent a link to the relevant page on the website.

### 3.0 Consultation

3.1 At the January 2017 meeting of this Committee, Members reviewed and commented on a draft consultation paper which proposed different options for the future of both VCS funding and the infrastructure service. This paper was then further refined and placed on the Council's and Macc's websites. All of our funded groups were notified and the wider VCS community was alerted via Twitter and through Macc's popular weekly e-bulletin. There were 78 individual responses to the online survey which was open between 5th January and 12<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

- 3.2 As requested by Members, towards the end of the consultation period, we also ran three workshops in the North, South and city centre (6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017). These workshops were very well attended and generated a very high level of discussion and engagement. VCS members of the co-design group co-presented at the workshop and all co-design group members facilitated table discussions. Members of the co-design group also attended the Age Friendly Manchester Board and the Good Neighbours network meeting.
- 3.3 A paper detailing the views, comments and suggestions received has been published on Macc's website and is appended to this report.
- 3.4 The co-design group has received representations from various groups and categories of groups included in the above list arguing that their funding should either be excluded from the fund, or ring-fenced within it. In particular, some of the organisations funded to support carers are concerned that support to carers (which falls under the Care Act) may be diminished by rolling this funding into a larger pot. Carers are also gaining more prominence in GM work. This issue was highlighted late in the process. Members views on this point would be very welcome.

#### 4.0 Model design

- 4.1 Following the close of the consultation the co-design group reconvened and has continued to meet regularly. A group of officers has been meeting weekly, with Macc's Strategic Lead (Commissioning) to work through the detail of the design of the new funding model, which has then been taken to the co-design group for discussion.
- 4.2 The overall aim of the new grant programme is to support the Our Manchester strategy. The co-design group recognises how central the voluntary sector is to delivering Our Manchester and how many organisations are already doing so. So this programme is focussed on the need to **support a thriving, resilient, effective and sustainable voluntary and community sector in Manchester** with funding that is equitably distributed across geographical communities and across communities of identity and operates in accordance with Our Manchester principles.
- 4.3 To meet this overall aim effectively and to respond properly to the consultation, the co-design group felt a very different kind of funding model was required. This model is unlike traditional grant programmes the Council has run in the past and is different from those of many other funders. Fundamentally it is focussed on investing in strong organisations which properly involve Manchester people in their work and organisation. It trusts these organisations to tell us how they can support Our Manchester rather than dictating narrow outputs. As well as being in line with the consultation responses, this approach addresses aspirations for our funding expressed for some time by the wider voluntary sector and Members of the Council.

## 5.0 Proposed model

- 5.1 The grant programme will consist of 2 rounds. The total available for the 2 rounds is £2,957,054 each year for three years, less the amount agreed for the infrastructure contract, plus the amount agreed by the MHCC Executive Committee, as set out in paragraph 2.5. This figure is the total of the budgets in paragraph 2.4, meaning there is no reduction in our support to the sector through this route.
- 5.2 Round 1 – General Fund. The aim of this fund is to support the voluntary and community sector in Manchester to carry out the activities that they identify as being most effective in meeting the aims of the Our Manchester Strategy. Applicants will identify their own outcomes to meet one or more of the aims of the Our Manchester Strategy.
- 5.3 This General Fund will fund the following activities:
- 1) Direct services
  - 2) Influencing Change
  - 3) Networking and Partnership Support
- 5.4 Organisations can apply to carry out one, two or all of these activities. If there are geographical communities or communities of identity where there are no applications or applications of insufficient quality, money will be set aside from the general fund (and/or the Our Manchester Investment Fund) for targeted funding to address gaps. The general fund will be split into two sizes of grant both of which will be allocated for a period of three years:
- 1) Between £15,000 and £60,000 over the life of the grant (£5,000 to £20,000 a year) and
  - 2) Between £60,000 and £300,000 - except where the organisation is presently funded above £300k (£20,000-£100,000 a year).
- 5.5 Organisations can apply for one grant only. Only organisations already receiving over £100,000 a year can apply for grants over £100,000. If successful, organisations will receive the full amount that they request except in exceptional circumstances. Organisations already receiving grant funding from Manchester City Council can apply for an increased amount of funding, but should bear in mind the total size of the funding pot is not increasing.
- 5.6 Round 2 – Targeted Fund. This funding will only be offered to organisations successful in their application to the General Fund. The prospectus for this fund will specify which geographical communities and communities of identity are to be targeted, based on gaps identified when the General Fund was awarded. The amount in this fund will depend on how many and what type of gaps are identified. As well as reserving some funding from the General Fund we may also be able to use the Our Manchester Investment Fund for this purpose.
- 5.7 The aim of this fund is stimulate the development of community and voluntary sector activity by people who live or work within a geographical community or

who are part of a community of identity. Grants will be between £15,000 and £60,000 (in total) for up to 3 years.

5.8 The following criteria will be used to assess applications to the General Fund. Detailed definitions for each of these and how they will be assessed are being finalised up by the co-design group. Assessments will be proportionate to the amount applied for.

- **Success:** organisations must be able to demonstrate a record of success in working with Manchester citizens. The intention is that the activities for which organisations are funded are based on the organisation's strengths, knowledge and experience, not necessarily that they continue to carry out the same activities
- **Diversity of Income:** income from a range of sources makes an important contribution to the resilience and sustainability of organisations. The aim of this Fund is that all organisations who receive funding should have a significant proportion of their funding for working with Manchester citizens from income streams other than Manchester City Council. Where organisations have relatively small amounts of funding from sources other than the Council there will be an expectation that they grow this amount over the period of the grant if they are to be considered for further funding.
- **Well-run organisations:** organisations must have:
  - Adequate governance including a functioning board and key policies that are up-to-date
  - Up to date accounts that demonstrate financial solvency
  - Staff with the appropriate skills to carry out their activities
  - A reasonably clear development strategy (not necessarily written) and examples of how the development strategy has informed the activities of the organisation
  - Methods of collecting and acting on stakeholder feedback
- **Added value:** organisations should aim to increase the overall social, environmental and economic benefit of their organisations to Manchester citizens. They should have in place, or be willing to develop during the funding period, mechanisms to assess and develop the overall social, environmental and economic benefit of some of their organisations' activities.
- **Involvement of Manchester citizens:** a strong focus of this Fund is to use and build on the strengths, capacities and knowledge of Manchester citizens. All organisations that apply must be able to evidence a significant level of voluntary donation of time by Manchester citizens and Manchester citizens involved in the governance of work being carried out in the city.
- **Strength-based approach:** another strong theme of this Fund is to support organisations that listen to and understand the complex lives of people that

directly benefit from the activities of their organisations and that carry out activities in a way that builds on the skills, abilities, knowledge, connections and capacities of those people.

- **Collaboration:** All organisations must be able to demonstrate a significant level of collaboration with organisations working in Manchester, relevant to the activities they carry out. This must include other VCSE organisations. It may also include collaboration with public and private sector organisations.
- **Value for money:** The value for money that a project delivers will be assessed against its total contribution to both the aims and objectives. Bids will not be assessed against one another but they will be assessed for unreasonable costs.

#### 5.9 Key features of the fund:

- Neighbourhoods and Communities of Identity: the aim of this Fund is, given the limited size of the fund and other practical limitations, to ensure all neighbourhoods and all communities of identity are served.
- Maintaining and Developing Manchester's Voluntary Sector: the aim of this funding programme is to support steady and continuing development by the sector over the period of the programme. In order to do this it is anticipated that:
  - The average size of grants will increase, though some organisations funded presently may receive less
  - The funding programme will support fewer VCSE organisations than at present
  - A high percentage of the organisations funded through the new funding programme will be organisations that are at present receiving funding, as large numbers of organisations losing funding would mean damaging disruption. However, organisations that do not meet the criteria will not be funded.
  - The large majority of the funding will be spent on direct services and less on Influencing Change and Networking and Partnership Support, roughly in line with present spending.
- Programme Governance: the Fund will be overseen by a programme board whose role will include to:
  - check that the selection process has been carried out robustly and if so to agree the recommendations of the selection panel, receive regular reports on the progress of the funding programme
  - oversee the preparation of and review a Programme Annual Report made available to all interested stakeholders
  - commission and consider the results of evaluations of the programme

- check the funding programme is being carried out in accordance with the programme design.
- promote and celebrate the achievements of the funding programme.
- Relationship between funded organisations and Manchester City Council: is one of partnership with rights and responsibilities on both sides. The aim is to work together to maximise the effectiveness of voluntary and community sector organisations in meeting the aims of the Fund.
- Proportionality: the greater the amount of funding applied for and awarded, the more requirements there will be in terms of application and ongoing monitoring information.

5.10 General Fund Application and Decision-making Process: The General Fund will be launched formally at a public meeting and advertised widely. Application will be by form using a modified version of the standard grant documentation co-designed with the voluntary sector in 2014. Applicants will have 6 weeks to complete their application. Support workshops will be run by the infrastructure organisation to assist organisations to understand the priorities of the Fund, design their proposal and fill in the application form.

5.11 There will be one selection panel which will assess all bids. An initial sift will weed out bids that do not meet minimum criteria. The panel will use the General Fund selection criteria to rank applications. Following ranking the panel will balance the programme to make sure funding is equitably distributed across neighbourhoods and across communities of identity and to avoid damaging disruption to the VCSE sector by withdrawing funding from large numbers of organisations that are presently funded.

5.12 As part of initial discussions about a closer working relationship with the Big Lottery Fund, we have agreed it would be helpful if a Lottery funding officer were to be present at the selection panel meeting. Their purpose would be to identify applications which closely align with the strategic aims of the Lottery.

5.13 As above, a Programme Board will assess whether the selection process has been carried out with rigour and robustness and in accordance with the criteria. The Programme Board may accept the recommendations of the selection panel, or request the selection panel reconsider part of the allocation and ask them to resubmit it to the Board for approval.

5.14 Membership of both the selection panel and programme board have yet to be agreed. It is likely that a broad range of Council officers and external partners will be involved, including voluntary sector participation.

## **6.0 Infrastructure service**

6.1 The co-design group started with the model design. As the infrastructure service is part of this overall programme, the aim of the service is to support a thriving,



resilient, effective and sustainable voluntary and community sector in Manchester priorities and principles of the programme.

- 6.2 The co-design group (less the facilitator from Macc) has agreed some outline principles for the future infrastructure contract.
- 6.3 When the infrastructure contract was let in August 2013 it was let as a three year contract with the option to extend for a further 2 years. Given that we need the current provider to support the voluntary sector through this period of change, this report proposes extending the provider's contract to the end of this period (31.8.2018) to allow stability during this period of change.
- 6.4 We will continue to work with the sector over the latter part of 2017 to co-design the future specification for this contract, which will be retendered next year. In the meantime the infrastructure provider will run workshops to support people applying for the Our Manchester VCS funding and work with the new Programme Team (below) to embed these new arrangements.

## **7.0 Programme team**

- 7.1 One of the strongest messages to come from our online and face to face consultation with the voluntary sector is that organisations really value the relationship they have built with Council officers. To realise the full benefits of our changed approach to investing in the voluntary sector, the Council needs to ensure it sufficiently resources the management of this programme.
- 7.2 Feedback from colleagues in Internal Audit confirms the need for closer and more co-ordinated management of our VCS grant funding to assure ourselves that Council funding is going to organisations with effective financial controls, management and governance.
- 7.3 Interest in the programme from health and Lottery colleagues indicates that this model could potentially also be attractive to other funders who wish to support the City's voluntary sector. We need the resources to explore and realise these opportunities.
- 7.4 We are proposing the creation of a new programme team to support the Our Manchester VCS Funding Programme. As well as the practical work of programme administration and managing the infrastructure contract, this new team will work to build relationships with and between funded groups, will work closely with the Our Manchester team and will also work to realise wider opportunities to increase funding to Manchester's voluntary sector. There is an urgent need to put this team in place before the programme is launched.

## **8.0 Next steps**

- 8.1 Members are asked to comment on both the proposed funding model. A revised proposal will then be submitted to the Executive for approval.

- 8.2 Subject to approval, work will continue on the detail of the prospectus, application and decision making process. We are aiming for the scheme to open to application from the start of September, with decisions being taken and groups notified by early December 2017, with new funding agreements running from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018. This means groups will have 6 weeks to apply for funding and will have a minimum of 3 months' notice of funding decisions. Timescales have slipped slightly from our original intention because of the General Election.

# Consultation Report

**APRIL 2017**

## Introduction

This report is a summary of the results of a consultation carried out by Manchester City Council, with the support of Macc, concerning proposals for funding for voluntary and community sector organisations in Manchester.

The aim of the consultation was to assist a co-design group made up of representatives from the voluntary and community sector, Manchester City Council and Manchester Clinical Commissioning Groups to improve and build on an initial set of proposals.

The consultation consisted of 3 workshops, 1 individual consultation meeting, 1 submission and 78 individual responses to an online survey.

The online survey did not produce robust statistics as there were insufficient respondents and the respondents were self-selected so numbers quoted in this report are of limited reliability. Many respondents made detailed comments explaining their preferences and making suggestions for how to improve the proposals. It is these comments that form the bulk of this report.

Our thanks to everyone who contributed and our apologies to anyone whose comments are not featured in this report.

Every attempt has been made to include key points but some comments have been left out for the sake of brevity. Many of the comments included were made by one or a small number of respondents. Where there was a large number of comments making the same point this has been indicated.

This report is structured in the same order as the online consultation.

## Priorities

The consultation asked for views on the suggested priorities for voluntary and community sector funding.

- Strong relationships with other public bodies and voluntary and community sector organisations
- Strong relationships between voluntary and community sector and businesses
- Working together
- A range of funding
- Fair funding for different places and 'communities of identity'
- Funding for both large and small organisations
- Well governed organisations
- Continuous learning and improvement
- Infrastructure support

## Response

92% strongly agreed or agreed with the priorities.

There was a high level of support expressed for the priorities of:

- Working together
- Funding for both large and small organisations (with an emphasis on funding small organisations)
- Strong relationships with other public bodies (with an emphasis on the relationship with Manchester City Council)

The following additional priorities were suggested:

- Success in improving the number and quality of volunteering opportunities

### **Principles**

The consultation asked for views on the suggested principles to follow when deciding who to give funding to:

- Proportionality
- Long-term funding
- Proportion of income
- Open procedures
- Funding for both running costs and direct services
- Available to both large and small organisations
- Encourage Manchester-based organisations
- Building on strengths
- Building on success
- Continuous learning and improvement

### **Response**

91% strongly agreed or agreed with the principles.

There was a high level of support expressed for the principles of:

- Long-term funding
- Funding for both running costs and direct services
- Encourage Manchester-based organisations
- Building on strengths
- Available to both large and small organisations (with an emphasis on funding for smaller organisations)

The following additional principles were suggested:

- Funding should be seen as investment: what will be the return i.e. social employment environmental.
- Involvement of volunteers
- Organisation's contribution towards key city agendas.

### **Funding Options**

The consultation asked for views on two different funding schemes.

**Option 1 - Strategic neighbourhood grants and strategic equality grants**  
We will only provide part of an organisation's funding.  
Funding will be for three to five years.

We will give grants to:

- one or two organisations in each neighbourhood
- a few equality organisations that represent communities of identity, though not necessarily covering all of them.

Organisations we fund will:

- develop and maintain strong relationships with the other organisations in their neighbourhood or community
- pass on some funding to other groups in their neighbourhood or community
- need to show their track record in working well with other organisations.

### **Option 2- Single grant pot**

There will one pot of money for all the grants we give.

There will be large and medium grants.

Large grants will last for three years.

There will be a range of types of work that organisations can apply for funding to do.

We will use our current grant process for applying but will add in more strength-based questions.

We will encourage organisations to work together but not force them.

We will encourage private and public organisations to talk and work with each other.

We will favour Manchester-based organisations.

The amount of money that organisations get could reduce each year.

### **Response**

26% preferred model 1, 57% preferred model 2, 17% didn't prefer either model.

Many of the people who commented suggested changes that incorporated parts of both models.

A common opinion was that Option 1 might be preferable but it would take a period of development before the VCS was ready for it and that it would require considerably more funding in order to cover all neighbourhoods.

The main reasons offered for supporting option 1 were:

- A better focus on the particular and different needs of each neighbourhood
- A greater focus on disadvantaged communities
- Better knowledge of neighbourhoods
- Better coordination of services
- Better collaboration
- Better to fund a few organisations well so that they are sustainable
- Enables organisation to focus on bringing in additional income
- More ability to create a platform where organisations can voice their opinions and needs
- Favours smaller organisations

- More strategic
- Anxiety that large organisations will dominate a single fund as suggested in Option 2

The main reasons offered for supporting option 2 were:

- Less of a restructure
- Favours smaller groups
- Fairer as everyone has equal chance
- Simpler
- More flexible
- A lack of strong strategic orgs that would be needed for Option 1
- Larger orgs will not share funds with smaller groups
- Option 1 may lead to enforced collaboration that will not work
- Option 1 could be a closed shop
- Better is organisations have direct relationship with council without intermediate level
- Option 1 adds in a layer of cost

There was strong opinion from many respondents that:

- Tapering of grants is a bad idea.
- Larger organisations passing on funding to smaller organisations is fraught with difficulties and should not be done.

### **Infrastructure**

The consultation asked for views on 2 options for providing infrastructure support.

#### **Option 1 - Manchester-wide option**

Some or all of this support will continue to be provided Manchester-wide.

#### **Option 2 - Infrastructure support provided through larger organisations**

Some or all support will be provided within organisations working in North, Central and South Manchester or at a neighbourhood level. This would be part of their funding agreement.

### **Response**

75% of respondents preferred option 1, 25% of respondents preferred option 2.

The main reasons offered for supporting Option 1 were:

- Economies of scale
- Expertise
- Impartiality
- Works at the moment
- Consistency
- Quality
- Difficult to have similar level of specialism/expertise/consistency at neighbourhood level

- More cost effective
- More effective voice and representation
- Can provide data across Manchester

The main reasons offered for supporting Option 1 were:

- Understanding of locality strength and weaknesses
- More responsive to local issues
- Different areas have different needs
- Central provision doesn't have the reach
- More effective in developing resources in the community

### **Commentary**

This section is a selection from the wide range of issues that respondents raised about the priorities, principles and funding options.

### **Devil in the detail**

Many of the principles and priorities are complex in practice and need to be applied in different ways to different sizes and types of organisations. A one size fits all approach will not work e.g. diversity of income works for large organisations but not for small. There needs to be clarity on what the principles or priorities mean and how they will be measured e. what does "success" mean, what does "strength-based" mean.

### **Neighbourhoods**

If funding by neighbourhoods, what is meant by a neighbourhood. Is it an artificial neighbourhood such as ward boundaries or is it a natural neighbourhood based in relationship, trust and a history of collective working.

Deprived areas should receive a larger amount of funding but the assets already in an area need to be taken into account.

### **The Relationship between Larger Organisations and Smaller Organisations**

There is a danger of larger organisations exploiting smaller organisations and there need to be sufficient safeguards in place to prevent that happening including feedback directly from the smaller organisations to the grant-maker.

Larger organisations can play a role in organising hubs or networks of organisations, in acting as a lead contractor, in sharing expertise, in supporting smaller organisation to develop. This role needs to be recognised and funded.

### **The Relationship between Manchester City Council and Organisations that receive grants**

Grant funding for VSOs should be seen as an investment. Good relationships with designated officers, based on mutual trust are essential. Monitoring information collected by Manchester City Council should be used.

Continuation funding when the funding period is due to end should be organised in good time so that there is never a situation in which VSOs have to issue redundancy notices just in case they don't receive funding.

MCC should consider how they can use all their resources in support VSOs including: workforce development; legal services; human resources; policy.

### **Support for Organisations.**

Respondents identified a wide range of support that they needed including:

- Shared marketing
- Assistance in working with the private sector
- Finding other funding
- Training and workforce development
- Connecting city-wide organisations to neighbourhood organisations
- Connection organisations within neighbourhoods together
- Capacity building
- Mechanisms for sharing
- Understanding the implications of legislation

Some respondents suggested the level of infrastructure funding should be decreased.

There were also comments about which organisations were best placed to carry out certain infrastructure functions e.g. specialist support on the needs of equality groups, and whether some infrastructure functions were better carried out at a neighbourhood level.

### **Some other selected comments**

Participatory budgeting could be explored as a means of deciding which organisations are awarded funding.

Some of the grant pot should be set aside to allow flexibility to fund emergencies or new and innovative ideas

Successful fundraising could be rewarded e.g. with matched funding

The main priority in awarding funding should be meeting the needs of communities and then other aspects of the organisation.

In deciding who gets funding Manchester City Council should seek feedback from councillors and other stakeholders.

N.R. Apr 2017