

Appendix F – BIF 3 Consultation Findings & Response

Thank you to everyone who took the time to respond to the consultation survey and attend meetings and events.

The consultation survey and events received a good level of response. A total of 95 people responded to the survey compared to 88 for the Bristol Impact Fund 2 (BIF2) survey carried out in late 2020. The consultation data showed that higher numbers of Disabled people, LGBTQ+ people, people from Black and minoritised ethnic communities and people who consider themselves to have a gender identity different from their sex recorded at birth responded compared with their proportion in the Bristol population. Fewer younger people and fewer men responded compared with their proportion in the Bristol population; however, organisations that work with young people did give their views. There was an improvement in the diversity of respondents compared with the BIF2 consultation.

Overall, the survey responses show a high level of support for the proposed approach which builds on what already exists.

Having reviewed all the feedback some broad themes emerge. Some of them are about clarity and communication while others are suggestions to amend the proposals. These are summarised below together with the response.

Summary of issues raised	Amendments to Proposal and responses
BIF3 Strategic Framework	
<p>Comments highlighted the need to simplify the strategic framework and in particular to make clearer the link between the priorities and the impacts and outcomes.</p> <p>Some also valued keeping some flexibility and striking the right balance between providing structure without being overly prescriptive.</p>	<p>The BIF 3 grant prospectus has been amended to clarify the relevance of the priorities and how they relate to other elements of the strategic framework.</p> <p>The infographic has been simplified.</p> <p>The grant prospectus explains that priorities are themes or areas of work and gives examples of the type of activity BIF funds.</p> <p>In the detailed guidance document for applicants two fictional examples of grant funded work will be included linking priorities, outcomes and impacts.</p> <p>It is important BIF operates within a clear strategic framework and can show impact. It has been developed in such a way that the outcomes are open and give scope for a whole range of activities and approaches. However, it is expected that the framework will evolve. The grant prospectus has been amended so that applicants can propose a new outcome where it is clear none of the BIF 3 outcomes will work and there is a strong case for creating a new one.</p>

<p>Some reticence about proposed <i>Impact 4: City decision-making is influenced through community involvement</i>, questioning how achievable this was and highlighting the need for additional support mechanisms to make it feasible.</p>	<p>It can be challenging for communities to influence city decision-making or feel that they can. However, some organisations funded BIF2 have successfully done it. There are plenty of examples of VCSE organisations connecting community members to decision-makers and campaigning to bring about policy changes. To address this the City Council will build in opportunities to learn from each other and together about how to influence decision making.</p>
<p>Some concerns that having a menu of standard indicators would be overly prescriptive, not be able to capture the diverse range of work funded, and therefore flexibility was needed.</p>	<p>Under BIF2 the evaluation framework and learning programme have been co-designed with funded partners. BIF 3 will take the same approach to continue to evolve the set of standard indicators so it is not a constraint.</p>
<p>Most respondents supported the prioritise. However, there were some concerns about the priorities being too broad, being incoherent, or about the need to include other things such as racial justice, climate justice or a stronger focus on digital inclusion.</p>	<p>Priorities are like themes or areas of work. Many people find it helpful to have them, to give an idea of the type of activity BIF will fund.</p> <p>Within the context of what the fund is trying to achieve - empower communities, address inequity – the most important thing is that the funded work responds to priorities that are identified by communities themselves. The grant prospectus has been amended to make this more explicit.</p>
<p>Several comments related to the need to have a stronger focus on tackling poverty in the strategic framework and funding priorities, given the current context of rising cost of living pressures.</p>	<p>The core purpose of BIF is to empower communities and address inequity including those most deprived according to the index of multiple deprivation. Poverty is the result of inequity and a cause of inequity. Action to address the impact of poverty on communities is integral to building economic resilience and community wealth. The grant prospectus has been amended to make it more explicit that building economic resilience and community wealth includes anti-poverty work, particularly collective action to tackle and prevent poverty crisis.</p>
<p>Proposed <i>Impact 3: Thriving, more resilient and diverse VCSE ecosystem</i> – some confusion that this relates to the Enabling the VCSE sector work carried out by infrastructure organisations such as Voscur and Black South West Network</p>	<p>The grant prospectus has been amended to make it clear that this is not funding for infrastructure organisations. BIF3 funding is primarily for activities which build communities and grow their power. Strong community and voluntary organisations enable this to happen. The BIF grant funding helps organisations to</p>

	become stronger by involving a wider network of people and growing their collaboration and partnership.
Funding approach	
The majority of survey responses agreed with the proposal to increase the upper limits of small, medium and large grants by 10%. Comments were fairly evenly split between people preferring smaller grants made to more organisations and those preferring larger grants made to fewer organisations.	There is support for the proposal to increase upper limits by 10%. However, it is important to note there is no guarantee successful applicants will receive the maximum amount. Under BIF2, on average grants have been 80% of the maximum amount.
There was overall support to extend the duration of small grants from 18 months to two years.	No changes made to proposal.
Hate crime and discrimination	
A majority of survey respondents agreed with maintaining a ringfenced amount for hate crime. There were mixed views on the proposal to increase the ring fence by 10% with no overall agreement. A number of people commented on the need for greater emphasis on prevention.	The ring fence for hate crime will be maintained reflecting the strategic importance of hate crime and discrimination support. It is proposed not to increase it by a further 10%. This takes account of the range of views including those who want to see a greater emphasis on prevention and increases the amount of funding for medium and large grants to support community building and preventative work. It is expected that all BIF funded work contributes to community cohesion and building stronger communities.
Other comments received on hate crime support highlighted the need to make sure we include language on tackling 'discrimination' too.	The grant prospectus has been edited to refer to work which tackles hate crime and discrimination.
Evaluation and learning	
A majority of survey responses supported a budget of 4% for evaluation and learning. However, some concerns were raised that £320,000 represents too large a budget for evaluation and that there are better ways to use that budget or measure impact.	A ring fence for evaluation and learning is being maintained. Changes have been made to the grant prospectus to reduce the budget for evaluation. Please see grant prospectus for details. We are committed to taking an asset-based approach, building on what we have already and working with funded organisations to find creative ways to measure impact.
Equity and inclusion	
There were a small number of comments about people who are not part of 'a community' -	It is understood that many people feel disconnected and excluded from community life

<p>People experiencing the greatest inequality may not feel part of communities. Concerns about the capacity of most excluded communities to self-organise/take action on own issues.</p>	<p>- this may be the community where they live or other community. However, it is vitally important for health, wellbeing, community cohesion and tackling inequity to find ways to nurture the connections which empower and sustain us for the long term. BIF recognises that some communities need resources and backing to make this happen. The Ways of Working are about recognising this and helping to facilitate those connections. Under BIF2 communities most impacted by discrimination and inequality are organising, have ambitions and need backing, support and resources. This can be the critical first step to greater empowerment, people to people connections and participation with communities. It can lead to building of alliances and peer support which BIF3 is here to support.</p>
<p>The importance of accessibility for social inclusion, particularly for Disabled people</p>	<p>Bristol City Council follows the Social Model of Disability and recognise that people are Disabled by the barriers in society. BIF funding focuses on removing barriers to enable the full participation and inclusion of all community members. Organisations receiving BIF 3 funding must work within the social model of disability to be accessible and take practice positive action to remove barriers to participation these might be environmental, cultural or attitudes. The prospectus has been amended to make this explicit. Access also relates to other communities. BIF 3 is about inclusion and equity and all funded groups are expected to understand barriers to participation and take positive action to remove and address them.</p>
<p>A lack of reference in the proposals to LGBTQ+ people as a group facing inequity</p>	<p>BIF is about addressing inequity. This includes the inequity experienced by LGBTQ+ communities. It is regrettable this was not clear from the consultation. The grant prospectus has been updated to make this clear.</p>
<p>Application process and support</p>	
<p>Several requests were made for a two-stage application process, to lighten the load on VCSE applicants and avoid them having to put a lot of time and energy into a proposal that doesn't get funded.</p>	<p>The rationale for this is understood. However, BCC decision making processes mean it is not possible to run a two-stage process at this time. This would require two committee decisions which would significantly extend the decision-making timeline. The timeline does not allow for this. VCSE organisations put a huge amount of time and effort into developing grant applications and it is frustrating when these are not</p>

	<p>successful.</p> <p>The Community Resources team will work to make the application form accessible, with the right amount of information to support robust decision-making.</p> <p>VCSE organisations working in the same community are encouraged to share information and develop collaborate bids where possible, to reduce competition.</p> <p>Bristol City Council is part of the Bristol Funders Network and will work with its members to find additional sources of funding for bids not successful under BIF3.</p>
<p>Request for support with applications particularly for smaller and equalities-led groups and help with collaborations</p>	<p>The Community Resources team is working with Voscur, Black South West Network and other partners to put together a programme of support to the sector.</p>