

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Section A: The Strategic Partners Fund will target funding to parts of the borough and equalities groups that have the highest need. This will in part be informed by the data contained in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation and eight investment zones based on that data. The Indices are produced every few years by central government and measure very local deprivation in terms of crime, employment, living environment, health and disability, barriers to housing and services, income, and education skills and training.

Q1: Do you agree that funding should be targeted to where the need is across the borough?

- Of course funding should be targeted at need. However need is not a simple measure, particular place or geographic location. Need is particular to the people who are experiencing it e.g. work (or lack of it), family, support networks, health or social centres, finances, language, housing, childcare, schools, etc.
- So, in principle, whilst investment should always be linked to needs, a broad brush approach like this will not necessarily deliver better outcomes for Camden (x2)
- How is need being defined and measured?
- Is the use of IMD enough? Does it cover all of the areas we want to take into account? If not, how can this be achieved?
- Is it geographical or related to a specific individual/group or community?
- If need is defined on a geographical basis what will happen to people who are in great need but live in an affluent area i.e. pockets of deprivation?
- How will the Council prioritise between the various needs?
- Who will do the prioritisation?
- What measures of deprivation will be targeted?
- Where does prevention sit in relation to the emphasis on need? Prevention can stop a need from developing or mitigate the impact, see the Resilient Families programme.

- Consideration also needs to be given to the data on health and wellbeing used by the Camden Clinical Commissioning Board, Public Health and other key players.

- Yes funding should be based on needs. It would be useful for Camden Council to define what it means by need. In the previous outcomes, based funding programme Camden Council also funded based on needs. It would be useful to find out whether from the needs had reduced as a result of Camden's previous funding programme. How will Camden Council define and target need apart from looking at the indices of multiple deprivation. Will it link in to other areas such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment? We need to ensure grants are not given where other departments have been responsible in the past. For example if CSF gave X charity 50k for schools work and decide not to base on the new VCS funding – this will be to the detriment of groups not receiving much funding outside of VCS grants.
- In principle yes, however this is not an easy question to answer in the way that it is phrased. Need does not relate to location but to individuals. The

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

majority of people move throughout the borough to locations where they have an interest e.g. social centres, schools, work and public services. If the aim is to deliver better outcomes for Camden then focussing on geographical initiatives may not necessarily produce this. The definitions of what 'needs' are also require looking and who is best placed to deliver interventions – irrespective of geographical location.

- Difficult to answer depending on how you mean “targeted to where” – Need is not something that is particular to places, need is particular to people and people of course have areas of interest over and above the place where they live (e.g., location of schools, work, relatives, social centres, etc. all factor in). As such, a lot should depend on what people one is trying to support and around what specific needs. Need is also not a simple measure, but again particular to specific issues. E.g., does the IMD account for homelessness, or victims of domestic violence fleeing home (with their children)? In principle, investment should always be linked to needs, but also has to take into consideration the intervention proposed, the capacity to deliver the intervention, as well as the complex nature of what “need” is. A broad brush approach like this will not necessarily deliver better outcomes for Camden.
- There is evidence of need in one form or another across the whole borough – hence the current LSOA status. Whilst need can be based on location, it can also be influenced by it. Need is particular to the people who are experiencing it e.g. work (or lack of it), family, support networks, health or social centres, finances, language, housing, childcare, schools, etc.), and this can be over and above the place where they live. As such, a lot depends on what people or set of needs Camden is trying to support and what outcomes any funding will help address. Need is also not a simple measure, but again particular to specific issues. It is unclear which set of needs would have priority when assessing and allocating funding. In principle, investment should always be linked to needs, but also has to take into consideration the intervention proposed, the capacity to deliver the intervention, as well as the complex nature of what “need” is. A broad brush approach like this will not necessarily deliver better outcomes for Camden and could end up creating both funded silos and at the same time potential sterile areas lacking in support to address need. Investment to meet “need” should have a long term vision with clear and transparent rationale and an over-arching strategy.
- No - Assuming that “targeted to where” means “in geographical areas the IMD indicates need in”. Need is not something that is particular to places, need is particular to people and people of course have areas of interest over and above the place where they live (e.g., location of schools, work, relatives, social centres, etc. all factor in). The profile of people in an area can change and of course one could “achieve” a lot simply by relying on gentrification. I would expect that is not an ambition Camden Labour councillors have. In terms of targeting funding this depends on what people one is trying to support and around what specific needs one is talking about. As the multiple categories in the IMD show need is complex and particular to specific issues. The IMD does not cover everything though (nor claims to) - E.g., does the IMD account for homelessness, or victims of domestic violence fleeing home (with their children)? In principle, investment should always be linked to needs. But this cannot be seen independent of the specific intervention proposed, the local capacity to deliver the intervention, as well as how different needs interact with each other (e.g. employment and health). A broad brush approach like this will not necessarily deliver better outcomes for

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Camden. It also does not articulate priorities between different needs. Given as the priorities of the Camden plan do not address all needs equally (nor is it likely that they could) priorities for this fund need to be made transparent also. One final issue is this approach does not take **prevention** into account. An area where at present prevention is being practiced would appear to have less need, but of course that would be due to the intervention itself. Defunding that would see things change but of course e.g. the IMD would not pick up on that change to inform policy. Preventing the growth of additional future need must be a part of the strategy as resources are shrinking, simply to assure we do not get overwhelmed by demand

- Targeting funding to areas of highest need according to the IMD data is logical but risks omitting those not thrown up as most in need by the data. Groups with the potential for change, to improve their circumstances, those not in the 'most deprived' risk losing essential support that may prevent them from needing greater support, in future, at an increased cost to the Council. VCS groups, on the ground, will have a greater holistic view of need and are better able to address it.
- Given the area of operation for Somers Town Community Association this approach would seem to work in our favour, within this approach we have however assumed certain linkages inclusive of: A. that this change shift is intended to be linked to the Neighbourhood profile work. B. There by working to ensure that need is more finely reflected in terms of funding apportionment, That this will be harmonised with the use of open data and data sharing All of which will combined will offset any concerns as to the geographical placement of funds as this will enable a larger pool of information/data/stat's to be drawn into the equation and ultimately the decision making process. This combination of mechanisms will also ensure cohesion, avoid duplication and ensure a greater reach, whilst reducing costs.

Q2: Are there factors other than the Indices of Multiple Deprivation we should take into account when either determining need or allocating funding?

- Funding is needed for community development
- It might be worth investigating other possible 'partner organisations' specifically faith groups? Can space be used in churches etc. that might save money in space rental costs, plus be a way of connecting communities that aren't already interacting? This would also be good to break down preconceptions and barriers.
- I think you need to look historically at an area as well if it's always had issues and things have not improved why not? What are the barriers?
- If another area in Camden was always doing well and it started having issues for example, of unemployment, crime or anti-social behaviour - this should be taken into consideration as this could be easily overlooked and the situation could escalate.
- Yes what groups are cost effective and have running costs of less than 2% which Highgate Newtown Community Centre does. Contracts should go to groups that have cut costs and deliver
- Allocating funding: Organisation governance, track record (or business plan/potential for new organisations), quality as well as quantity of results, able to work effectively with the council without requiring too much supervision/council time
- Yes, there are. Look at existing and potential service provision from private/philanthropic companies, charities and religious organisations to

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

prevent duplication of effort and wasted resources, council and other. Look at provision outside the borough that people can easily reach and use. Look at the fitness of organisations, their governance, leadership and results

- Absolutely - connection is as important as income. People's social opportunities - and their ability to develop resilience, networks and support - should be as prominent in decision making as finance.
- Any recent changes in the area, depends how up to date the Indices are.
- As long as they are truly reflective of the area we serve - which does not always fit neat boundaries. Can we get down to super output areas (is it small scale?)
- Other inequalities which affect young people (and likely to apply to other groups also) are not included in the Index, for example;
 - lack of opportunity to play an active role in the community/ have their voices heard
 - discrimination; negative image held by many / widespread negative stereotyping
 - lack of access to open space; not in the Index and also some parts of Camden have particular severe shortages

Some groups are more likely to be especially exposed to inequalities identified by the Multiple Index (for instance young people and crime) but it can be very hard for voluntary organisations to find evidence of this on a local level

- We do not think that there are other main factors which have not been included in the Indices. However, the Council should consider to review the way of the existing service provision which is dominated by private companies and take a new way of service provision that will support community-led small organisations which are closer to the majority of the beneficiaries to participate equally, in the social, health and educational service provisions
- Language barriers and culture based restrictions; women are not allowed or do not want to learn in the same class as men.
- There should be more emphasis on communities that suffer many problems such as refugee and asylum seekers.
- Sometimes that sort of data's not fast enough to reflect reality so you ought to reserve some funds, for example for known areas that have taken in loads of refugees or have become suddenly poorer for some reason. It may also be that there are a couple of issues you want to work on borough-wide. So I'd say generally use the IMDs but also be a bit subtler than that.
- We think that there are other main factors which have not been included in the Indices. For community organisations, we work with people who find that gender, language and culture can act as barriers because this makes communication difficult; so using the same indices all the time means that communities still find it difficult to integrate with wider society. Measuring deprivation needs to have other indicators.
- The existing service provision is dominated by private companies and they do not address the needs of the diverse communities in each of the investment zone. They are more costly and often miss their target populations. Community -led small organisations are closer to the majority of the beneficiaries to participate equally, in the social, health and educational service provisions
- Consider how funds have been spent in the past. Some projects are "icing on the cake" e.g. dinner-party cookery for people living on the breadline. Christmas approaches and they have no idea how to cook a roast, make use of leftovers, cook on a budget to feed a family or shop for bargains

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Of course funding should be targeted at need. However need is not a simple measure, particular place or geographic location. Need is particular to the people who are experiencing it e.g. work (or lack of it), family, support networks, health or social centres, finances, language, housing, childcare, schools, etc. So, in principle, whilst investment should always be linked to needs, a broad brush approach like this will not necessarily deliver better outcomes for Camden. Whilst that Indices of Multiple Deprivation are a valuable resource, used alone they are somewhat shallow, they need to be used alongside other information/data sources such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Community Investment Programme; the Community Safety strategy; health & education profiles etc.
- Yes, local intelligence and soft information, which sometimes is not picked up via the indices. Feedback from local people and information about crime.
- JSNA, User feedback on services that are important to them
- You should talk to the community centres, local councillors and other people working at grass roots level to gather information.
- Do the indices take on board cultural and language issues? That should be a key factor too especially in respect of welfare changes, benefits and advice. Local community centres also have a lot of data about the socially excluded groups which even the governments data collectors probably can't reach as they are so called hard to reach groups
- Use data from local community organisations
- Local community information from organisations and ward councillors
- Whilst that Indices of Multiple Deprivation are a valuable resource, used alone they are somewhat shallow, they need to be used alongside other information/data sources such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Community Investment Programme; the Community Safety strategy; health & education profiles etc. (x2)
- Q1 is too simplistic. We agree that resources should be targeted but do not believe this can be done (AS ASSUMED) on a purely geographical basis. People move across geographical boundaries and e.g. use a community centre in Kilburn while living in St Pancras, or vice versa.
- I partly agree about question 1 but it depends on what evidence you use to assess the level of deprivation. The IMD does not totally identify all the needs and you should also talk to and gather information from ward councillors and other people like the GPs, and Community Centres, advice centres who support the most disadvantaged and socially isolated people.
- We have heard a lot about resilient and cohesive communities and how central they will be to well-being in the context of the ongoing cuts in public funding. Resilient and cohesive communities also require active and involved citizens. It is important that resilience, active citizenship and the infrastructure needed to support this is also taken into account when determining need and allocating funding.
- Here a potentially exclusive focus on investing in need carries the danger of undermining social interaction, association and activity across geographical and communities of interest. It is this weaving together of the richness of civil society in Camden that is central to building community cohesion and resilience. This needs to be reflected in the criteria selected for funding.
- Investing in the meeting of need also has to have a long term vision. How can the Camden pound be effectively used to enable community commissioning and delivery to happen e.g. pathways to employment for local people volunteering, neighbourhood commissioning.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- The long term vision also has to be on resilient and cohesive communities and not just on service provision. The focus on service provision is a very traditional view of the role of the voluntary and community sector. The sector also has key roles to play in developing social cohesion and cohesive communities, enabling local residents to take responsibility for their health, economic contribution, welfare and sense of community and voice.
- Equality strands. Mental health. Older people. Social isolation. Data from other Council departments CSF number of child protection, youth offending data, schools data, Housing and adult social care data etc.
- The IMDs are useful guide to need in area. However LSOAs need to be taken into account as well. Camden's communities are diverse and mixed, and not limited geographically. The IMDs are more useful when they are broken down in terms of targeting intervention. Broadly speaking the IMDs should be used to drive a specific data-driven response not as a formula for how much investment an area should receive. The council should use data from as wide a range of sources as possible including its own and that of its strategic partners (e.g. community centres). This will allow Camden to define specific needs in a more targeted and detailed fashion.
- IMD are an important element of establishing 'need' but woefully inadequate without multiple other measures. It should also be noted that the phrasing of Q1 is unhelpful: what does 'need' mean? What type of need? If this had been unpacked it would be easier to answer which other factors apply. However, there are many wider factors. Projection figures across a range of areas: birth rates, mental health rates, population growth and so on, all play an important role. IMD figures are helpful but outdated as soon as they are published. A more dynamic, real-time assessment of need is required. IMD will not capture emergent areas or issues of anti-social behaviour, for example, or other challenges which are impermanent such as homelessness and rough sleeping. IMD also seeks to diagnose need only at the point of cure rather than prevention. In short, IMD can play a role in establishing need but it will leave services responding to limited issues, in isolation, often after the event. A more dynamic collection of soft and hard data is required, pooled from across residents, organisations and the Council
- What about pockets of deprivation in otherwise affluent areas. Consideration needs to be given to how LBC will prioritise amongst the various needs? And what will happen if what an organisation does does not fall into one of these areas? Consideration also needs to be given to the data on health and wellbeing used by the Camden Clinical Commissioning Board, Public Health and other key players.
- We think that as well as the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, the council needs to consider that there are many local areas in the Borough that do not fall under the "deprived" status, but in which a number of people living in poverty, hardship, and facing a number social problems live, so the Council needs to also take this into consideration when determining the allocation of funding. E.g. BSC works on borough wide Somali community and BMER
- We do support funding should target deprived areas. However, we need to understand some communities including the Somali community live more deprived zones or neighbourhoods with utmost inequality. Therefore, you should take into account prioritizing their needs when you are allocating the funding.
- Views of local members, residents and services working in local areas
- That there are people that live in so called non-deprived areas that have specific employment, housing and health/disability needs that do not have

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

access to services that would be otherwise available in areas of multiple deprivation. Sometimes it can be harder for families on low incomes in 'wealthy' areas as they do not have the access to the many agencies/services in other areas and have to travel long distances to do so. Obviously, more investment is needed in areas of multiple deprivation but is important to maintain some services in all areas

- Recent austerities measures have impacted to a greater extent on women's services (women's services 31% reduction of services, compared to overall reduction in services of 27%).
- This is particularly difficult considering that Camden's communities are very mixed, with poverty existing side by side with wealth, and that boundaries outlined in LSOA's don't reflect the real communities and their movements. Furthermore, the index focuses on relative measures, not absolute numbers-- if in an area of 1,000 there are 10 people in need, the need is not the same as for 100 people living in an area of 10,000 though it's the same percentage. As such, the council should be using data from a much wider range of sources, as well as its own data and that of its strategic partners such as community centres, ward councillors etc. to more closely define specific needs.
- To say that one area is deprived and one area is not doesn't work in practice.
- Also people in London do tend to move around, population isn't static.
- The cross department effect should also be taken into consideration. For example a charity which receives assistance from several departments e.g. rent relief & community grants. The loss of funding from multiple departments at the same time may cause the charity in question to collapse
- The main problem with a definitive answer to question 1 is defining the need. I do not know how good the Indices of Multiple Deprivation are and therefore cannot fully comment on how good they are to determine levels of need but I do know that my ward Councillors and Community Centres in King's Cross and Bloomsbury have a good understanding of what the needs are for the area. They see a lot of people in their surgeries or information, advice and guidance sessions who have various forms of need including language and cultural needs which the Indices of Multiple Deprivation does not seem to take into account.
- I agree with using the indices of multiple deprivation but feel that there should be more support for groups who are isolated and disenfranchised, which may require more support such as BME groups. Multiple deprivation is a key indicator but doesn't really look into the depths of need and current support structure which exists.
- Yes. Whilst the IMD does provide some useful identification of "deprivation", particularly in the breakdown of specific categories, this should not on its own be used as a method for assessing how much investment is made in an area by use of an unclear formula. Camden's communities are very mixed, with poverty often existing side by side with wealth. However, the deprivation in those individual neighbourhoods can be accumulatively and equally as sharp as those in a more clustered area, and sometimes run the risk of being more deprived due to less access to services to address those needs.
- Camden should be using data from a much wider range of sources such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Camden's own data, Health & Education profiles, community safety, CCG, and other benefits related information. However, feedback from existing strategic VCS partners – (e.g. community centres) - can give vital indications and insight as to the "live" experience of Camden's citizens, and help to identify less visible and

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

emerging need, often with a more immediate response solution. This can also mitigate against more costly intervention by Camden at a later stage. There seems little consideration of future forecasting. Many parts of Camden are facing intense redevelopment, and the increased "need" to ensure these enlarged communities have the means to maintain well-being and cohesion also needs to be factored in. It is important not to lose sight of the priorities and aspirations of the Camden Plan which applies to all citizens, and which puts great emphasis on fostering resilient and cohesive communities. Therefore when determining "need", it is also equally important that funding allocations take into account the community capacity to be strong and resilient. This will be hard to achieve without a strong community infrastructure. Successful regeneration has shown that the strongest communities are mixed communities with a connected and supportive infrastructure.

- Yes/no for question 1 as it depends on how you determine the need. We have very high need in King's Cross. Will we get increased funding?
- Looking at the IMD is an important starting point as it identifies multiple aspects of need. Everyone has some element of need that is not being met however the accumulative impact of deprivation can be crippling. Also issues such as support networks, language, being able to get from place to place. Are the current statutory systems of support joined up enough to look at a holistic approach to client need? Camden's own data should be used as well as information from partners.
- Yes, but how do you determine who to fund? If previously an area has not been funded, the work to change that will take time to build trust and engage those you seek to reach with increased funding, how you will support the work that historically missed out some areas. It is key that organisations that have proven track record in meeting need and identifying are able to access funding. It is also important to note that all groups the fit inequalities strand and are seen as key in the IMD have access to mainstream as the role is to get people using all available services, not keeping them in VCS. Therefore all departments have a role to play not just VCS. It is also important to let the need and changes you hope to get influence how you make decisions not just the powerful and loud voices who can shout for their interests more. For some VCS the live and work in Camden so the impact is not only a work impact it is also the life they have in their community and there needs to be awareness that officers who commute into Camden may not know as much as officers who live and work in Camden so they should be able to help you determine needs also. Not just the statistics and data, same can be said for VCS and the specialist community groups. Your sources of reference has to be broad to really map needs and what it is like for people in Camden that are not wealthy. Do VCS have the ability to help define targets as some of the knowledge is held already in the VCS? Data to determine need should be available from CFS, HASC and schools CCG etc. not just the third sector data. Will you be able to get data from the other agencies like the police? YOS teams and local activists?
- Social exclusion/barriers to community involvement/low thresholds of expectation around achievement and aspiration There are parents with a learning disability or young disabled people or families struggling with hardship who would benefit from borough wide responses which are based on a value-based commitment to reaching out to all parts of Camden's communities - they may not be quite "in crisis" but there is a wholesale waste of human potential going on. NB there's a problem with just saying health and

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

disability - need to be specific about what is being addressed here e.g. barriers to community participation

- The eight zones set up to target funding where there is greatest need could cause areas where there are small pockets of deprivation within a zone that scores well overall to lose out and this needs to be addressed.
- Equality of opportunity; Discrimination and harassment
- Yes - the high rates of deprivation within specific groups which often require tailored and specialist interventions to effectively engage and support - in our case vulnerable women (women offenders and women at risk of offending).
- Current and future demographic profile of the area and existing provision. The need to create "local" strategic plans *regeneration/development of areas and increase/change in demand for services Impact of planned and future welfare cuts *Impact of cumulative, planned and future funding cuts to local VCSO's services *IMD based on last year's figures - also need current and future forecasted levels and areas of deprivation and need *Camden very mixed with wealth and poverty side by side in streets and localities boundaries outlined in LSOA's don't reflect the real communities and their movements *Whilst that Indices of Multiple Deprivation are a valuable resource, used alone they are somewhat shallow, they need to be used alongside other information/data sources such as the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, Community Investment Programme; the Community Safety strategy; health & education profiles etc. and that of its strategic partners such as community centres, to more closely define specific needs *aims & outcomes of the Camden Plan *data on how preventative services save money long term *Investing in the meeting of need also needs to have a long term vision. How can the Camden pound be effectively used to enable community commissioning and delivery to happen organisation's current and track record of delivering successful services to those most in need organisations success, track record and ability to maximise Income generation aside from Camden's core grants and commissioning. Funding and contracts need to ensure social value and social capital are intrinsic criteria.
- Funding should be targeted to individual need. You cannot tag to one specific area. Most of all the areas are diverse and are changing as a result of the regeneration project which is paving the way for middle class people to move into newly built homes. One cannot have a broad brush approach.3) to make better outcomes we must invest on individuals and families. 1) The indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is not updated regularly and can be very broad, we need to use stats from JSNA, CIP, CSS and HWBS2) LBC should use data from locally based organisation to give a clearer picture from the ground up. The data collected by safer neighbourhood teams is an example of how local crime can fluctuate every month in an area. The burglary in this area dropped by 60% because one person was successfully incarcerated. Therefore need in the area can change but need on an individual/family will to be prioritised. What needs to be done for that individual when released from prison? - Failure to do anything will resort to repeat to an increase of burglary in the area. Please note- this is only one example.
- Once need is determined, it would be advisable to consider how well that need is already being met, or whether there are effective local or regional investments into addressing that need. Allocation of funding should be based on a significant gap in service provision or interventions to address that particular need.
- While the IMDB provides rough guidelines into which areas face certain challenges, the aggregate of multiple deprivation is not a good means of

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

targeting specific needs. The individual areas of need the IMDB breaks down into are a slightly better way of targeting intervention, but should be used to drive a specific data-driven response, not as a yardstick for how much investment is made in an area by some kind of formula. This is particularly difficult considering that Camden's communities are very mixed, with poverty existing side by side with wealth, and that boundaries outlined in LSOA's don't reflect the real communities and their movements. Furthermore, the index focuses on relative measures, not absolute numbers--if in an area of 1,000 there are 10 people in need, the need is not the same as for 100 people living in an area of 10,000 though it's the same percentage. As such, the council should be using data from a much wider range of sources, as well as its own data and that of its strategic partners such as community centres and local councillors, to more closely define specific needs.

- When looking at the details, the data that makes up the IMD provides guidelines into which areas face complex challenges. However the aggregate of multiple deprivation is not a good means of targeting specific needs or of shaping the quality of interventions. Although of course community associations like us are probably the closest thing Camden has in terms of working with the full range of needs in an area, the majority of interventions will focus on a specific challenge a community is facing. The individual areas of need the IMD breaks down into can help inform thinking about targeting interventions, but should be used to drive a specific data-driven response, not as a yardstick for how much investment is made in an area by some kind of formula. This is particularly difficult considering that Camden's communities are very mixed, with poverty existing side by side with wealth, and that boundaries outlined in LSOA's don't reflect the real communities and their movements. Furthermore, the index focuses on relative measures, not absolute numbers--if in an area of 1,000 there are 10 people in need, the need is not the same as for 100 people living in an area of 10,000 though it's the same percentage. As such, the council should be using data from a much wider range of sources, as well as its own data and that of its strategic partners such as community centres, to more closely define specific needs. Working with local people will be key to this, but Camden will not have the capacity to be as close to communities as it needs to in order to do this. That is why you need to support Community Associations to be your strategic local partners, with a clear remit to identify and respond to local needs. This should come with additional links into decision making, e.g. such as community commissioning.
- Targeting funding to areas of highest need according to the IMD data is logical but risks omitting those not thrown up as most in need by the data. Groups with the potential for change, to improve their circumstances, those not in the 'most deprived' risk losing essential support that may prevent them from needing greater support, in future, at an increased cost to the Council. VCS groups, on the ground, will have a greater holistic view of need and are better able to address it.
- Experience and existing understanding of locality based organisations in the VCS and statutory services - Social mobility and movement mapping across the borough should be looked at, as should the draw of certain services (Coram's Fields for instance is based in arguably one of the more affluent parts of the borough however, it attracts people from right across the borough and even across London. Volume of access and understanding where people come from should be a key consideration; Ability to deliver high quality services should be an essential consideration in that, if a service is needed

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

but local providers are not equipped to deliver the quality of provision to meet that need, looking further afield for this resource should be looked at.- Consideration should also be given to the fact that some organisations have the facilities and resources to deliver multiple objectives and that these organisations are in a strong position to become hubs for delivery. I.e. if an organisation is identified as being the best one to deliver a particular service but their location doesn't work well in terms of access. Brokering collaborative agreements between more hub type spaces such as Coram's and the specialist organisations may enable quality deliver to take place in the most accessible places

- Keep in mind that some people/groups have less support - even if the official level of deprivation is the same
- As well as taking into account levels of deprivation generally it is useful to consider the various “domains of deprivation” so as to understand which groups, in which areas, are most in need of support and funding. The Indices of Multiple Deprivation are often divided into different target areas, so that the type of deprivation in each area can be understood, such as
 - Indices of Multiple Deprivation affecting children and
 - Indices of Multiple Deprivation affecting the elderly
 - Income deprivation
 - Employment deprivation
 - Crime
 - Education, Skills and Training Deprivation
 - Health Deprivation and Disability
 - Barriers to Housing and Services
 - Living Environment Deprivation

Somers Town, for instance, is in the 1st centile of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation affecting Children (IMDAC 2015). This is why at Scene & Heard we focus our work on this area of high need, delivering services for the children of Somers Town. In addition, there is no other organisation in Somers Town delivering such mentoring services or partnership work with local schools. The need for our work in Somers Town is, therefore, undeniable. In order to properly assess the need for funding across the Borough it would be useful to define the ‘domain’ of deprivation in each area – housing, the elderly, children, employment, health etc.. This need should be considered alongside what services are or are not available in that area. By developing a detailed map of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation whilst also developing a map of the services provided by the Voluntary and Community Sector and other providers in the Borough, you will be able to target the right services to the right places. If the organisation requesting funding is ‘filling a gap’ in community provision that targets an area highlighted in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, then the final factor to consider is the ability of that organisation to deliver work that makes an ongoing and positive difference to the lives of Camden residents. Scene & Heard’s experience in Somers Town demonstrates that success will be achieved when organisations have strong links into the community, have a long term approach and have expert staff who will inspire the trust of that community.

- Concentrations of specific inequalities
- In addition to using the IMD data in determining need and allocating funding the Council should also use data from Ward Councillors’ surgeries and VCS organisations, which will also show the capacity to effect change in the area and the projected long term impact of the funding.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- As per question 1 the IMD is a starting point, but the untapped potential is the data that is held in silos' and the untapped potential this offers e.g. the work in the complex families' team and in the delivery of the Somers Town Job Hub. The sharing of information will also enable the crossing of geographical boundaries

Q3: Do you have any comments on the eight investment zones? (See map in Appendix A)

- I think that it is good to be targeting different areas within the borough and it's not concentrated in one area or a particular part of the borough
- Yes why have them, You need to invest in groups that offer best value for money
- They look sensible to me. I'm assuming that the smaller areas have higher deprivation - if so, it makes sense that support is more locally focused in those areas.
- Only that 'zones' isn't the approach to take. While location can be a factor in decision-making for some, it's more important to have access at any reasonable distance to the services you need/want. Where people live on boundaries (zone, borough, city, nation), the approach becomes either unnecessarily complicated and frustrating, or irrelevant.
- It's hard to break Camden into completely siloed 'villages'; people interact across borders within as well as across boroughs. As a rule these villages are fair. Support should be mixed between groups which can provide 'buildings' in local areas and others which can work across those 'buildings', deploying skills and people from across the whole borough and indeed beyond.
- We are based in Somers Town, which is an area of very high need, so would say that this area should be a high priority.
- It divides up Kilburn between West Hampstead and Kilburn Priory - which is not really helpful for us.
- consideration needs to be given to pockets of disadvantage within zones
- We have no objection and comment, as our community is based in the one of the eight investment zones.
- There are some area very poor and need more support than other, and do not have any community centres or space to help them because of their language barriers. For example Kilburn Priory has a massive mix of refugees and asylum seeker who do not speak English and have major housing, employment training and they do need someone from their own community to support and advise them directly. A Supplementary school for example is a place parents can trust and explain what the needs are.
- We do need to numbers the eight zones in terms of needs and facilities, Barriers or lack of training and education and overcrowding are lead crime, unemployment and poor health. Have to study each zone separately in every community.
- The Somali community in Camden is scattered all over Camden and not concentrated in one geographic place or Zone. The needs for this community are very great and they miss out many development initiatives. Their needs should be addressed according to their needs.
- Out of the eight investment zones, there are some very poor and needy areas that need more support than others. For some communities there are

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

established centres for the community families to access support, advice and information. The Afghan, Albanian and Arab communities are growing, particularly in Kentish Town, Kilburn and Kings Cross areas yet the only space to meet and support them is in Chalk Farm. On the borders of the South and South West zones, there are pockets of severe deprivation particularly in the Somali and Bengali communities, such as Euston Square and without strong community organisations, this will lead to further poverty, greater isolation and alienation from society, leading to greater crime, higher unemployment and poor health. Camden has a massive mix of refugee communities who do not speak English and have major housing, employment/training issues and they need someone from their own community to support and advise them directly. Our communities run supplementary schools that offer a 'safe' place where parents can trust and understand how to help themselves, so to build a secure Camden the community-led organisations need to have a recognised source of funding to meet community needs.

- Difficult to comment as the categories are very general and wide-ranging
- Maps in and of themselves are inoffensive tools – it's how they are used is the issue. We believe there are significant conversations to be had before we feel able to comment. For e.g. within the Central Area there are LSOAs that range from the 2% most deprived in terms of income affecting children to the 40% most affluent
- There aren't enough investment zones. The zones are too big and people do not go very far from where they live especially if they are disadvantaged or have additional needs
- Camden is a very big place with lots of polarization. I agree that funding should support the most needy but 8 does not seem to be enough. The zones are too big
- Not enough
- They are too large
- Maps in and of themselves are inoffensive tools – it's how they are used is the issue. We believe there are significant conversations to be had before we feel able to comment. For e.g. within the Central Area there are LSOAs that range from the 2% most deprived in terms of income affecting children to the 40% most affluent. (x3)
- Eight geographical zones appears to create a lot more admin and hence cost that could be better used in front line services. Eight zones cannot cater for people or issues that move across zones. The size of zones will become disproportionate if /when there are future boundary changes and high need areas come into (or move out of) the borough
- I'm not sure how the 8 zones link in to the level of funding. I'm not sure how the zones work and why they have been selected as such. * does not seem to be enough. Why make new zones when we already have specific areas like wards? The zones seem too big. You could still provide funding based on the specific needs on a ward basis.
- How have the neighbourhoods and the investment zones been defined? It is important to know and understand the rationale for the new investment zones and the compelling reasons for the introduction of a new way of defining need within the borough. The existing body of data collected and analysed by ward, census, JSNA is commonly used by voluntary organisations and community groups to direct resources. Given this situation, the investment zones must reflect this pre-existing intelligence to reduce cost and time involved in adapting to a new way of identifying and resourcing need.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Is it wasteful and confusing to create new geographical areas and then to map data onto those areas?
- It will be difficult for groups to map their own data and evidence onto these areas.
- The creation of new neighbourhood and investment areas with data to match gives the Council a monopoly on information as voluntary and community groups will not have the resources to create comparable data. An explanation of plans in place to share this intelligence with the voluntary and community sector is essential to the effective joint working between the sector and statutory service providers.
- Has the Council got the resources to keep this new data set up to date?
- Why not continue to use wards, the census, JSNA etc. documents and data that everyone is familiar with?
- The current neighbourhoods do not correspond to wards or other established areas used by the Council and other statutory partners. Will this not lead to confusion?
- There are some issues with regard to accuracy of the figures and the areas being given to organisations
- More funding for zones with the highest level of need. The 5 most deprived wards Kings Cross and Somers Town, Kentish Town, Kilburn and Gospel Oak should receive more funding. Can funding be spread over the zones? Acknowledgement of pan geographic work. If you are based in one zone your funding needs to reflect the work carried out across the borough.
- We would like a clearer rationale behind why these zones have been chosen and the purpose of them. There is some concern that these have been created without understanding other areas such as District Management Committee Boundaries or Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries. We have two broad concerns with the zones; There is need outside them which may be unmet
They are too broad and don't reflect people's perception of areas in Camden.
- The premise and creation of investment zones appears at the first instance highly problematic and unaccountable. Comments are made about how they have been created but they appear entirely arbitrary. They appear to have the capacity to bring greater fragmentation which is ironic in light of the Council's excellent work on systems thinking. Furthermore, how need is assessed in the context of these zones gives rise to deep questions and concerns. People live, play, learn and work in different areas and cross these boundaries on a regular basis. The notion that people do not travel is simply not true: and the most effective place-based initiatives have porous boundaries. Organisations and services also operate across these zones. The principles of zoning or area-based approaches is not a bad one in itself but it will frame the borough and the response to the challenges the local authority, to tackle in a more fragmented, siloed way. This might be a more effective tool in ensuring the appropriate geographical and needs-based allocation of funding rather than as public way that encourages organisations to limit their activity. If it becomes the latter, it will be a step backwards from learning over the past decade.
- Why not continue to use wards, the census, JSNA etc. documents and data that everyone is familiar with? The current neighbourhoods do not correspond to wards or other established areas used by the Council and other statutory partners. Will this not lead to confusion?
- We think the eight investment zones are good framework that can ensure that services reach those most in need. However we would want to ensure the

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

way the data has been collected has missed out a number of those most in need in the Borough, many of whom have language Barrier that deter them from engaging. As an Organisation our work would fall under a number of the zones, and we would seek to continue providing these services under the investment zones

- Not at moment but need to keep in mind the eight investment zone could change at any time.
- I don't understand the reason for spending LBC resources on creating these new geographical areas and then to map data into them. As a smallish voluntary organisation we do not have independent access to the newly formatted information/areas, nor do we have the resources to research them. We are a small borough wide organisation, working with low-income women experiencing trauma and other challenging life situations from all over Camden. Not having to fragment our services along further geographical lines would help us using our scarce resources to best effect.
- There is only one investment zone south of the Euston Road and this is such a large area with so much deprivation and so many disadvantaged communities of need. It is unclear what purpose these zones serve. If the plan is to allocate a certain proportion of funding to these areas the concept is deeply flawed. The areas are larger than the neighbourhoods individuals identify with and do not overlap with other areas such as District Management Committee boundaries, or NHS/Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries. So introducing these investment zones will likely introduce unnecessary complications without clear benefit identified. Please see concerns about the forced creation of partnerships below.
- I am concerned about the money taken to pay wages for those needing to administer 8 zones instead of just having one zone.
- Need to see detail i.e. street level of where dividing lines between the zones are to properly assess.
- The zones are too big. Our members are mainly older people and they have different levels of need and they come to the Marchmont Community Centre where we have a social session for them every second Tuesday of the month. In your diagram you only have one investment zone south of the Euston Road but that is such a big area.
- There should be a great emphasis on less economically developed areas as opposed to more socially deprived neighbourhoods with higher rates of unemployment, and crime and less access to services. Despite there being eight investment zones I feel a greater emphasis would need to be placed in where the need exists.
- These investment "zones" have been introduced by Camden but it is unclear as to their real purpose other than for potential funding allocations. There are also newly created, data-related "neighbourhoods". The newly created "West Hampstead Neighbourhood" seems to take in a large swathe of the Kilburn Ward. However, whilst the data can certainly be useful, when applying other "data" based on Ward boundaries (reference Question 2), there may be distinct differences which could distort profiling and needs assessment when applying it within the "zones". Many VCS organisations will provide services and support to communities outside their "zones" which may create problems when applications are submitted
- Not enough zones
- Yes - do not understand why these are being used. As a charity we have a designated area of need and a commitment to target those most in need. Other people will use our services and this is good as it creates a mixed

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

economy but it has to be realised that people from affluent areas will likely have networks and support, e.g. nannies, disposable income which gives them choice, be well educated and be able to articulate their needs. The current zones mix the figures of those that are in need and those who are not in need which is contrary to what the funding suggests it aims to do which is to target those most in need.

- How will funding reflect work by groups done across the zones, how will small groups continue to do this work if space hire and rent becomes an added cost that may prevent cross zone working? Is there scope to influence zone change if funding is 7 years and perhaps needs change in some areas due to welfare reforms or gentrification etc.?
- It is acknowledged the funds are likely to be distributed based on need. I would also want to see it distributed based on access to assets. For example where 2 zones has competing bids in each and one bid has access to vast amounts of trust or foundation support and the other does not it would be unfair to treat both equally. Access to other resources must be taken into account to keep it realistic even if on the surface it looks disproportionate - e.g. there are some (such as LGBT) issues that are extremely unpopular to fund and therefore our access to other sources (despite strong attempts) is more limited than that of a community centre or faith based charity. This is also true of assets e.g. space, long term commissions etc.
- No - other than the point above that many organisations undertake important and effective work with beneficiaries from across the borough, and that tailored support is needed for specific target groups experiencing disadvantage and deprivation. Our understanding is that the Council is planning on including this focus in the final funding plan, and this is something we strongly support.
- The creation of eight investment zones is in itself uncontroversial. However, it would depend on how these zones would form the basis of future funding. For example, we would not agree that resources be allocated equally to each zone irrespective of need. The expectation would be that the use of investment zoning would be more administrative in its function.
- It is unclear what purpose of these zones is served. If the plan is to allocate a certain proportion of funding to these areas the concept is deeply flawed. E.g., the South locality has one of the most deprived LSOAs around the Bourne Estate, but that doesn't necessarily mean that investment in neighbouring Bloomsbury will support outcomes to it. The areas are also larger than the neighbourhoods individuals identify with and do not overlap with other areas such as District Management Committee boundaries, or NHS/Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries. So introducing these investment zones will likely introduce unnecessary complications without clear benefit identified. Please see concerns about the forced creation of partnerships below.
- It is unclear on what basis these zones have been drawn up. So far as CCs are concerned there is a "local" community based primarily on geography. Thus, for example, many young people will not go out of "their" area, similarly for mothers with young children. Whilst the principle is fine it is unclear what advice was taken from those on the ground. The purpose of the new zones are unclear some zones are larger areas than local communities relate to. They are different to current housing & health boundaries - difficult to identify areas of need within overlap zones. It undermines and undervalues all other research that was done in the area.
 - It adds significant confusion.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- A researcher doesn't use a single source of evidence to make a business case or to justify an argument.

There was no need to reduce the areas into 8 zones – other than to make it easier for people at the top who have little clue on what it is actually like in the community.

This will conflict with stats from JSNA, HWBS, CIP, CSS; several research conducted by universities, think tanks, national charity groups

It creates another division in the community. You will have organisations working in a community they understood historically to be defined by a particular ward/neighbourhood but now earmarked under a new zone alienating them from the community they have known for many decades. I think this hasn't been thought through carefully.

- It is unclear what the purpose of these zones is. If the plan is to allocate a pre-determined proportion of funding to each areas (e.g. based on the IMD) the concept is deeply flawed. E.g., the South locality has one of the most deprived LSOAs around the Bourne Estate, but that doesn't necessarily mean that investment in neighbouring Bloomsbury will support outcomes to it. Even if the aim is to map investment the map is too general and needs to take ALL sources of funding into account, from public donations and corporate volunteering to sponsorship, grants and commissioning. The areas are also larger than the neighbourhoods individuals identify with and are generally not coterminous other areas such as District Management Committee boundaries (with the exception of Holborn), or NHS/Clinical Commissioning Group boundaries. So introducing these investment zones will likely introduce unnecessary complications and cost without a clearly identified benefit. There are also practical questions around how the data on the neighbourhoods that make up the investment zones will be kept up to date and how organisations can pull together data for the specific areas they serve. Only if more work is aligned into these boundaries will there be the sustainable impetus to keep these up to date and useful. Finally, there is a concern it could lead to a forced top-down creation of partnerships which we address further below.
- We believe the key is the Neighbourhood profiling and working together to ensure that the model of approach is challenged, developed and adopted, and that cohesion of approach is at its heart
- Even with the zoning there will be huge diversity of need within each investment zone, with areas of deprivation existing alongside pockets of affluence. It would be interesting to consider how Camden could encourage the more affluent residents of the Borough to engage with their community and support those suffering deprivation. At Scene & Heard this is done via a successful volunteering programme, bringing people with diverse backgrounds and experience together, encouraging cohesion and understanding. Scene & Heard's success over the past 16 years of working in Somers Town has demonstrated that the most effective partnerships are sharply focused on one area of particular need; in our case the needs of children affected by deprivation, addressing their educational attainment, engagement, access to cultural opportunities and community cohesion. By developing in-depth relationships within a specific locality it is possible to make a meaningful difference to that community, positively affecting aspirations and achievement
- Impossible to comment on without knowing the basis on which they were drawn up and the boundaries of the neighbourhoods Camden has identified.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

At first sight the rationale for the central area (into which we fall) is hard to fathom.

- Map in the appendix is very hard to use. Unclear where our project falls because it looks like we might fall on the border. You need a more detailed map
- For us we would be keen to see how the areas were chosen, so that we might better understand the thinking behind the approach and what this actually means in terms of delivering to our users. We would also want to see that there was connectivity with existing areas of identified delivery e.g. DMC, Neighbourhood Areas, CCG; as it would not be conducive to anybody, if it proved counterproductive. We would also not want to see an added level of complexity in terms of delivery i.e. who can and cannot access our services or indeed that the Monitoring & Evaluation requirements became over burdensome

Q4: Any further comments?

- Please provide funding to sustain deprived communities
- I don't like how Q1 is written as a leading question. I think the results you get to this question may well be biased by that.
- The balance between long term strategic partnerships and lower hanging 'project', 'theme' or 'local' funding is excellent in my view. It provides the VCS with the security it needs to focus on specific problems which will come and go in a rapidly changing world. It's a very smart approach.
- Often question the need for VCS to have to waste time to research and provide evidence of obvious needs, which we know the council are already aware of. Of course, if we do not evidence needs, then we would do so at our own risk (risk of assessors are not aware of the existing evidence of need) but we should not be automatically be penalised for failing to provide evidence of need as a general rule
- Multiple Deprivation Indices are area rather people oriented therefore people who have additional barriers are not evident in the indices and there is a need to understanding the needs of specific communities
- This is a start. The best way to deal with community issues is to reach the communities themselves. Having the zones will help but by itself it is not enough
- Camden is clearly seeking to inform its decision -making through the use of neighbourhood statistics. However by restricting its decisions to IMD statistics and not also capturing the vast array of additional evidence based information and complete sets of neighbourhood data, asset maps etc. it is missing an opportunity to be really creative with its decision making. Camden's own evaluation shows that residents benefit from its investment in the voluntary sector. While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, Camden must also focus on creating cohesive communities, investment needs to ensure that this is achieved in an integrated & cohesive way, not creating service silos or ghettos.
- It is not clear what you mean by using IMD to allocate funding via the 8 zones, since the 8 zones cover the whole borough. Does this really mean that some zones will receive more funding than others, based on average deprivation within them? If so, this ought to have been stated explicitly, as it's not clear from the wording of the consultation. In my view there are significant risks of

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

using a purely area -based average of deprivation to allocate funding. I think an argument can be made that it is actually harder to be poor in a wealthier area, and therefore that the needs of deprived people in richer parts of the borough may be greater (though there are fewer of them). There are also needs which may not be geographically specific. I agree that it is sensible to target resources towards the areas of greatest need, but I don't believe these areas can always be defined geographically

- More funds should be put in the strategic partners fund if you want to make a real difference. The community centres in our area, King's Cross Neighbourhood centre, Chadswell Healthy Living Centre and Marchmont Community Centre provide excellent services for the community and they should not be charged rent. We, as users, are very concerned that any money they have to pay towards rent to the council will be taken away from service delivery and this is not good use of funds. the council should give peppercorn rent leases to these organisations
- I do not agree with the community centres being forced to pay rents. Our local community centres in King's Cross help the most needy people and they work with the Somali, Bangladeshi, Chinese, refugee and white communities. If they are charged rent for their premises then they will not be able to provide services for us. Rents are very high in Camden. They should get their centres rent free to help us disadvantaged people.
- Organisations in Camden who are in Camden properties and provide services for disadvantaged and vulnerable communities should not be charged rent for their centres. The amount of money for the strategic partners fund should be increased. There isn't enough allocated to it.
- The community centres should not be charged rent for their premises if they are owned by the council and they are providing services to Camden residents that help to achieve the Camden Plan outcomes. We use the premises of KCBNA to help our user members who are trying to overcome their habits of using different forms of narcotics. If KCBNA is forced to pay rent then we will have to pay high rents and our user members can't afford that and will not be able to get help to overcome their bad habits. That on the long term will cost more for the Council and NHS. I am aware of about 50 organisations that use KCBNA premises to support their work with vulnerable and disadvantaged communities and members of our community.
- Camden is clearly seeking to inform its decision-making through the use of neighbourhood statistics. However by restricting its decisions to IND statistics and not also capturing the vast array of additional evidence based information and complete sets of neighbourhood data, asset maps etc. it is missing an opportunity to be really creative with its decision making. Camden's own evaluation shows that residents benefit from its investment in the voluntary sector. While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, Camden must also focus on creating cohesive communities, investment needs to ensure that this is achieved in an integrated & cohesive way, not creating service silos or ghettos.(x3)
- The Voluntary and Community sector in Camden is very strong and provide a lot of preventative support to the disadvantaged and vulnerable communities on top of the other services that help people in need. They also raise millions of pounds of additional funds to support the people of Camden and the small funding and rent relief they get acts as a foundation for them to attract the additional funding. I do not think Camden council should start charging rents for the organisations in Camden council properties especially as they organisations help to support Camden Council's key outcomes.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- It appears that in creating the neighbourhood and investment zones and mapping the levels of investment the Council made has only referenced the money invested by the Council. Is this the case? If so, to obtain maximum return on the decreasing public sector pot it would seem essential to map on the investment and impact of other key players into these neighbourhoods and investment zones.
- (joint) If we are not here, some people will not be able to access mainstream or any services as help to remove the barriers they have. Specialist organisations act as a bridge and also assess impact of changes on the hardest to reach for mainstream, this work needs funding to sustain and without understanding of the impact of service delivery on the most vulnerable or equalities groups, services do not react or change to meet their ongoing needs.
- Using data and statistics to inform decision making and drive policy is a good practice. However the data proposed in the consultation needs to be bolstered and cross referenced with asset mapping and the complete set of neighbourhood data. In addition to this, there should be consultation on the neighbourhood boundaries and if possible where people access services presently. There is little point in reinventing the wheel and defunding organisations which serve need to move similar services elsewhere. Camden has a wealth of information and evaluation on the local community benefit from its investment in the voluntary sector already.
- It appears that in creating the neighbourhood and investment zones and mapping the levels of investment made has only referenced the money invested by the Council. Is this the case? If so, to obtain maximum return on the decreasing public sector pot it would seem essential to map on the investment and impact of other key players into these neighbourhoods and investment zones.
- The rent relief (£17.5k/year) we have received from LBC has been invaluable in supporting our core and services. And it has enabled us to bring new money into the borough, because we could show it as match funding, making us far more viable to Trusts and other potential partners. One example: £17.5k/year from LBC currently attracts £86k/year from Big Lottery Fund = 5 times the amount LBC put in. This enables us to work with 80 women carers and those who have experienced domestic violence and rape each year - as well as delivering outreach and health promotional events to a larger community of local women.
- This is replicated across the voluntary sector; with resources being as scarce as they are/will be, we can provide excellent return for LBC investment
- It is laudable that Camden is seeking to inform its decision-making through the use of neighbourhood statistics. However, for investment to be properly targeted this should be linked with asset mapping, and the complete set of neighbourhood data. In its current form there will still need to be considerable individual judgement applied to interpreting their relevance for individual proposed projects. Moreover, there needs to be more consultation as to the boundaries of neighbourhoods and how these might overlap (as the proposed neighbourhood areas partly already do). The council's own evaluation shows that a significant proportion of the local community benefit from its investment in the voluntary sector. While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, one of the things Camden needs is cohesive communities, so investment must ensure that this is done in an integrated way, not creating service silos or ghettos.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- We use the Marchmont Community Centre which is one of King's Cross Brunswick Neighbourhood Association's (KCB) Community Centres. They charge us very low rent which wouldn't even fully cover the cost of utility bills plus cleaning etc. we are very concerned that Camden Council is looking at charging market value rents for Community Centres. KCB does not have the money to pay for market value rents and they will have to charge the user groups like us. Our older people do not have the money to cover commercial rents and they will stop coming to our activity and will be left socially isolated at home. The services that are provided from the Community Centres help to support the disadvantaged communities and should be supported by Camden. We do not think Camden should charge market value rents for their premises that are used by Community Centres.
- For years small organisations without support from Camden council from core funding, rent relief and who are not community centres have survived and flourished and have become more resilient during this tough climate, they have learnt to adapt and become sustainable, to become more cost effective and most importantly to compete to look at best value for money and to push why we are best placed to support the community and its needs.
- The council's own evaluation shows that a significant proportion of the local community benefits from its investment in the voluntary sector. While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, one of the things Camden needs is cohesive communities, so investment must ensure that this is done in an integrated way, not creating service silos or ghettos. Harnessing local community assets must be factored in to build strong communities which also help address needs. Effective use of a range of skills within the community is essential to achieve this.
- We are very concerned about the proposal to charge market value rents for council premises used by voluntary sector. We use King's Cross Brunswick Neighbourhood Association's (KCB) Chadswell Healthy Living Centre for our Bengali lunch club and gym. They do not charge us. We have lots of older Bengali men and women who would not use any other gyms or go to other lunch clubs. If we have to pay for the use of the Centre then none of our user members will come. Most of them are pensioners or unemployed and do not have much money
- Do not understand why it is suggested that it does not matter where we are based if it is then suggested that as organisations we need to target those most in need and areas of deprivation? As charities are objects define an area of need because those are the communities we were set up to support.
- Is investment seen to be based on buildings or work done in the communities? How will you balance the needs to large communities of interest that have historically been based in all the zones but access support from organisations based away from their zone of residence.
- Camden needs to recognise existing models of good and best practice - not necessarily on a competitive funding model but just to pull them out and see what "assets" the borough has that exist now in terms of service delivery. There is a constant need to reinvent the wheel which is deeply frustrating
- Whilst a partnership approach is obvious the realities of achieving one is not taken into account. When resources are limited and competition encouraged by LBC the process of achievement is complex. In Gospel Oak the attempt to create a partnership board has got precisely nowhere over a period of 5 years. QCCA does to a large extent fill this role already. It needs to be acknowledged that the costs and time needed will be considerable and requires time and LBC support

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- For investment to be properly targeted IMD & other Camden stats should be linked with asset mapping, and the complete set of neighbourhood data.
- considerable individual judgement will be relied on in interpreting their relevance for individual proposed projects. The consultation document only deals with the Third Sector Pot. There is no detail of how this relates to Adult Social Care with £16 million in cuts or to Children Schools and Families where the funding for drop ins has been cut and organisations are left with £100,000 total across the borough There needs to be more consultation as to the boundaries of neighbourhoods and how these might overlap (as the proposed neighbourhood areas partly already do). While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, one of the things Camden needs is cohesive communities, so investment must ensure that this is done in an integrated way, not creating service silos or ghettos Why is the financial leverage of the voluntary and community sector not referred to in the document? The Council has stated in the past that this comes to £200 million. This level of leverage will be put in jeopardy by any cuts to core funding.
- It appears to be a deliberate attempt to change the deprivation stats of areas by evenly balancing it with middle class communities. This will create silos in communities and provide an inaccurate reflection of need in Camden.
 - This will make the case for 'need' in a particular area very weak.
- It is laudable that Camden is seeking to inform its decision-making through the use of neighbourhood statistics. However, for investment to be properly targeted this should be linked with asset mapping, and the complete set of neighbourhood data. In its current form there will still need to be considerable individual judgement applied to interpreting their relevance for individual proposed projects. Moreover, there needs to be more consultation as to the boundaries of neighbourhoods and how these might overlap (as the proposed neighbourhood areas partly already do). The council's own evaluation shows that a significant proportion of the local community benefit from its investment in the voluntary sector. While particular support should be focussed on those most in need, one of the things Camden needs is cohesive communities, so investment must ensure that this is done in an integrated way, not creating service silos or ghettos. It is laudable that Camden is seeking to inform its decision-making through the use of neighbourhood statistics. However, for investment to be properly targeted this should be linked with asset mapping, and the complete set of neighbourhood data. In its current form there will still need to be considerable individual judgement applied to interpreting their relevance for specific proposed projects without clear transparent criteria. Moreover the information needs to be kept up to date and needs to be "owned" by local people, feeding into the community needs assessment process as per our suggestion above. It is also clear there needs to be more consultation as to the boundaries of neighbourhoods and how these might overlap (as the proposed neighbourhood areas partly already do). The council's own evaluation shows the broad range of residents including the most vulnerable who benefit from the investment Camden has made in the voluntary sector. Any changes in investment to the sector need to take into account where the most difference can be made with the available investment. It seems clear that investment in the VCS, both in terms of attracting additional resources and in terms of direct impact, is extremely cost-effective in delivering the Camden Plan. Finally, while we understand that particular support should be focussed on those most in need, one of the things Camden needs is cohesive communities, that separate funding can undermine. Investment must ensure an integrated approach that avoids

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

service silos or ghettos. This also links with the abovementioned need for prevention and lowering the level of need in the community sustainably. Services are not the solution in and of themselves – we need to invest in those who build resilient communities.

- As noted in Q1, the targeting of areas of need is logical but cannot be done in isolation and must not ignore the wealth of knowledge that the VCS has of the actual needs in the borough. The Councils decision should therefore be informed by more than the IMD data
- We believe the key is the Neighbourhood profiling and working together to ensure that the model of approach is challenged, developed and adopted, and that cohesion of approach is at its heart
- Established charities and voluntary groups have a solid base of knowledge about the localities that they serve in Camden. It would be useful to map who is doing what – how many groups exist in each area serving the different interest groups and those suffering deprivation. Mapping the services that are being delivered would help highlight gaps in provision and support the development of partnerships, as everyone can see who is working in their area. Ultimately this would foster the broadest possible range of activities for our diverse Camden communities and encourage integration of the Voluntary and Community Sector
- Confusing; How many people know about the 8 zones and the research that that they are based on? Not fair or transparent;;Need explanation of zones in easy read; Most people with a learning disability live in Somers Town;The Council should give money to areas that need more support and where they have people who are more disadvantaged like Somers Town;It is difficult to say if you do not know the true statistics; deprivation and inequalities.

Section B: To be Strategic Partners, organisations or partnerships would need to show why they are best placed to deliver outcomes around inequalities, either at a local level or at a thematic, borough-wide level. At local level, Organisations or partnerships would need to support and strengthen one of the eight investment zones, providing space for delivery of community services, having reach into marginalized communities, promoting inclusion, and attracting inward investment. At thematic, borough-wide level, Organisations or partnerships would work across Camden to address one or more of the following equalities characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, or sexual orientation, or the needs of socially marginalized groups.

Q1: Do you think this funding proposal will tackle inequalities in Camden?

- Yes (x2 responses)
- I think it can tackle inequalities but what I have learnt about working with the voluntary and community sectors, is that you have to work in partnership and be willing to share resources and ideas.
- Free independent groups can work well and not all groups should be seen like C4
- Yes, I think any proposal which specifically allocates funding to organisations tackling the inequality issues mentioned should have an effect and help to

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

tackle inequalities. However "tackle" is a broad term and doesn't necessarily even mean "make the situation better than it is now" (although I hope this turns out to be the case!)

- It's impossible to say! What a question... The list above of 'equalities characteristics' is very uneven, but perhaps you address them in a priority order which makes sense, starting with the most vulnerable and acknowledging that there are then individuals differences and cases where people have more than one of your characteristics..
- Yes, absolutely. It's important that the council and/or don't fall into the trap of assuming that general inequalities such as those listed above are Camden's only inequalities. Connection and class are two areas which need more focus in my view. In this world so much depends not on what you know or even who you are but who you know. That should be born in mind, and the sharing of time, personality, resource and networks is as important in tackling inequality as any single-dimension such as age, gender, etc.
- Yes, by targeting resources most effectively
- Funding reductions mean that however rational and targeted, the impact is likely to be limited - but within that some progress will be made.
- Inequalities which affect young people (and likely to apply to other groups also) are often not recognised and listed among list of inequalities;
 - lack of opportunity to play an active role in the community
 - lack of opportunity to have their voices heard
 - discrimination; negative image held by many / widespread negative stereotyping
 - lack of access to open space; not in the Index and also some parts of Camden have particular severe shortages
- We think the funding proposal will tackle inequalities in Camden, if the proposal will mobilise effectively all small community groups in the process of planning, delivering and evaluating of the investment projects.
- Yes, the best way to deal with community issues to reach/access the community itself. Camden residences are from different background and different religion. Camden by forming partner with supplementary schools and communities has already taken the first step. Families trust their own communities and can communicate better with them. The way the community leaders talk and deal with the local residence is different from the way main stream schools and government does.
- Yes, if it is targeted rightly to the needy communities.
- It will if you measure that inequality in Camden and report publicly on it. Then we can respond to that with ideas.
- We think the funding proposal will tackle inequalities in Camden, if the proposal will mobilise effectively all small community groups in the process of planning, delivering and evaluating of the investment projects
- No. Hate Crime exists because you cannot force people to like or even tolerate each other. They still shout at others' protected characteristics
- No. Whilst it will go a little way to address some of the issues there is not enough information/clarification in the proposal to make any real judgment on the potential success or otherwise of this proposal.
- Not on their own - these principles are too broad to be enough to guarantee inequalities will be reduced
- No because the process to deliver is far too structured and to deliver real change it is about re-education, and doing things differently. Also vested interest groups are well organised and therefore tend to "know how" to play the game as opposed to groups who truly can make a difference

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- I think you need to consider that voluntary/community organisations do not have the governance infrastructure like NHS/LAs do so you need to work with them to help shape the way things need to be done. Outcomes and what they mean are not so easily understood by everyone - you will need to offer support, training and guidance
- Depends on how the funds are allocated. The cuts to the budget will mean that the impact will not be as good
- If the funding is given to the right organisations with local knowledge, experience and contacts
- Yes if given to the organisations with the right experience and skills
- It can do if the funding is given to the right organisations with the necessary experience and track record. An organisation like KCBNA is ideally located within an area of high need and has the necessary experience, staffing and governance to make a real difference in tackling inequality if it was given the right level of funding and if they didn't have to pay a lot of that funding towards commercial rents
- No. Whilst it will go a little way to address some of the issues there is not enough information/clarification in the proposal to make any real judgment on the potential success or otherwise of this proposal (x3)
- We think it will help but is not the best way of using resources or challenging inequality. See answer to Q 1, 2 and 3.
- The inequalities in Camden are growing because of the various cuts that are being made by this government. The voluntary sector in Camden has helped to reach out to the most vulnerable people in our communities and support them. The proposed cuts and withdrawal of rent relief will hamper the ability of organisations to tackle inequalities. As someone who used to work in the voluntary and community sector I am aware that funding for rents is much harder to raise whereas the ability to show rent relief as match funding attracts funding from the charity sector.
- This is a 'top down' approach that marginalises grass roots organisations and it is not clear how it will address equalities issues.
- An Equalities Impact Assessment should have been done in time to inform the consultation.
- Partnership is often not between equals – time and energy is spent and there is a risk that the small organisations and their clients and communities do not end up benefitting.
- There is a very short time to develop partnerships
- The obsession with 'partnership' should be challenged. Individual organisations' already work in partnership with their members – local Camden residents. These are independent and democratically controlled organisations. How do the views of these people feed into the outcomes on inequalities?
- The proposed structure comes over as being dictated by the Council.
- How do communities of interest that are spread borough wide have the resources to get involved with multiple partnerships to deliver objectives?
- There will be a lot of hard work in bringing a partnership together – time that many smaller organisations may not have.
- What about building on existing strategic partnerships such as Health and Well Being Board, Children's Trust, Employability Network, Ageing Better Partnership?
- How do Youth Hubs fit into this?
- How does the Resilient Families programme fit into this?

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Where do supplementary schools fit?
- Yes if the correct organisations are funded and you have a wide variety of groups who are able to reach the hard to reach groups and communities and can provide a seamless, holistic community based approach understanding the equality strands. Our issue is access and our users not able to access mainstream services because of language barriers and not knowing how to navigate the system. Will funding be provide to help people tackle these barriers? Those seeking funding will need to demonstrate a track record of reaching their community. This will avoid groups chasing funding due to the core equalities needs. This is specifically relevant to groups with excellent reach but no physical assets e.g. space. The issue is also the lack of engagement and community understanding from professionals, this can be made more difficult if council departments cut services they provide, leading to more need as hard to reach continue to be outside reach. Funding the specialist organisations and having affordable spaces to work will help deliver work that tackles inequality.
- There is a lack of detail relating to the fund. Having said this, there is a considerable reduction in the amount of investment particularly in direct service delivery. This will have a negative impact. As a Community Centre, we subsidise rent to organisations and individuals which tackle inequalities in Swiss Cottage. In addition to this, we have direct services which do the same. If our grant is reduced and we have to pay a market rent we will not be able to do tackle inequalities in the same way. Rent relief does not exist in any material form. It is a paper transfer from the CTS team either to property or to the central budget of Camden. Although it is staying at the same level, it remains a real issue that there is the potential that some organisations will be hit with the loss of both grants and rent relief. It is astonishing that buildings which were built with Section 106 money for community use should be charged a market rent from Camden. This is an overview of the funding changes in the last 2 years:

	2015/16	2014/15
Equalities and Cohesion Fund	£800,000	£1,590,000
Innovation and Development Fund	£60,000	£422,000
Volunteering, Giving and Exchange Fund:	0	£84,000
Volunteering Small Grants	0	£80,000
so-called "Rent relief"	£1,000,000	£1,000,000
Community Centres Fund	£1,000,000	£1,165,000.00
Open Spaces for Young People Fund	£300,000	£300,000
Subtotal of funds now rolled into Strategic Partnership Fund	£3,160,000	£4,641,000
Discretionary Rate Relief	£50,000	£50,000

Camden Council and Camden’s Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Organisation and Market Development support by the team	£50,000	£50,000
Organisation and Market Development support by VAC and VCC:	£286,000	£286,000
London Councils Grants Scheme	£245,000	£245,000
Advice:	£1,212,000	£1,130,000
TOTAL	£5,003,000	£6,402,000

The cost of the CTS team is not included above but previous data provided by Camden would suggest it at around £800k (to be reduced to £600k). If the figures above are correct then there is at least a reduction of £1.641 million in terms of direct service delivery. This can't help but have negative impacts on the sector and Camden residents. (x2)

- Taking a strategic approach is enormously important: the risk faced by the local authority is that if the approach is not implemented correctly from the outset -which is extremely unlikely in any new initiative - it will undo a lot of the excellent work that already happens. Without being clear on what the local authority's inequalities priorities are - there is a thematic list but no more detail - it is difficult to know whether taking the same approach across the board is likely to be a success, but given the difference in equalities areas and the alternative approaches required, this seems unlikely. There are certain suggestions made in the Section B blurb, such as requiring Strategic Partners to provide 'space for delivery of community services' and 'attracting inward investment'. These are sensible and laudable priorities, but the devil is in the detail. Is space to be provided for free, in which case is the ability to attract additional income (or 'inward investment', not inhibited? How much will the local authority seek to micro-manage versus empowering organisations to maximise the use of this resource. And how much will the borough lose by doing this, because there is no space for innovation or new projects? There is a larger question, not answered adequately by the evaluation, about how reflective the local authority's investment programme has been at any rate in reducing inequalities through its funding programme. There is a focus on activities and outputs in these criteria, despite wider talk of an outcomes-based approach.
- What about building on existing strategic partnerships such as Health and Well Being Board, Children’s Trust, Employability Network? How do Youth Hubs fit into this? This appears to be a ‘top down’ approach that marginalises grass roots organisations many of which are tackling equalities issues. The proposed structure comes over as being dictated by the Council. There will be a lot of hard work in bringing a partnership together – time that many smaller organisations may not have.
- Yes, as it may tackle Camden's historic funding distribution based on 2 organisations categories in relation to size, Small and Big. Which only distributed big funding for the big organisations and small for small ones, based on historic or previous relationships, but this was to the detriment of Camden's population, as the bigger organisations would win the funding but use the community roots of the smaller organisations to actually reach the

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

targeted people they claimed to be delivering a service, as they did not have the base in these communities to reach them themselves. This has detrimentally kept small organisations stagnant to growth, while seeing an increase in the need of the people, and the inequalities, hardships and social issues they face. BSC is in the category of small organisation for over 20 years.

- We commend the new consultation as acknowledging the lack of core funding support towards equality groups. Therefore, we trust this funding proposal will tackle inequalities in Camden unless Camden face huge pressure from community groups.
- There are no absolutes but we would concur with these principles to show how partners are addressing need. Collaborative working is also critical to maximise opportunities and value for money.
- LBC is facing an enormous challenge, making insufficient resources stretch across such a wide remit. Whatever the outcome, most voluntary sector organisations are already having to cope with less and less income - and so it is vital for our (individual and collective) survival that the application process is as simple and straight forward as it can be.
- The impact on inequalities is difficult to assess given the lack of detail of the fund. While fund design is important (and of course refers to inequalities), one cannot pretend that level of investment will not also be a key determinant of the impact of any intervention. Camden Council also has a lack of understanding of the added value that rent relief brings. Most community centres in Camden that get rent relief bring in hundreds if not millions of pounds of additional funding to support the residents of Camden and implement the outcomes of the Camden Plan. They also provide free space or at very low cost to smaller organisations and charities who cannot afford to pay rent. KCB provides free and low cost office and hall space for 35 smaller organisations or groups. Some of these groups will not be able to function if they are forced to pay proportion market value rent, which is what the council is suggesting organisations should pay. The rent relief is shown as match funding and helps to attract additional funding. KCB works with the Bangladeshi, Chinese, Somali, Refugee and indigenous white community in King's Cross and surrounding areas and as such has 3 centres that are fully utilised by providing free services for the community from 10-5pm Monday to Friday. If KCB is forced to pay market value or 65% market value rent for the 3 premises then it may be forced to close 1 community centre and charge for its services. These are very tough times for the disadvantaged communities especially with the welfare changes and the proposal to cut tax credits. The families from BAMER communities and others will not be able to afford to pay for the services and will not doubt be excluded and suffer in silence. Camden Council must think again about the rent charges and the cumulative impact of this on top of the proposed cuts!!!
- It certainly is a start but concerns around it.
- Possibly but it's too early to tell with this change of approach will work
- Inequalities are growing because of the cuts that are being made by this government and it is hard to see how a reduction in funding for the Voluntary and Community Sector and charge market value rents for council properties that are used by community groups will tackle the growing levels of inequalities. I fear that inequalities will get worse because of the withdrawal of rent relief and reduction in funding to the voluntary and community sector.
- I do believe this will tackle inequalities in Camden as it will aim to support community organisations which are best placed to be strategic partners, to

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

tackle inequalities and support marginalised groups and deliver shared outcomes. The problem is not that Camden council hasn't supported disadvantaged community groups but that it has not done so proportionally often neglecting those groups who require the most support and who are socially marginalised. A further analysis needs to be done to address the needs as opposed to just working with existing partners to address a generic outcome

- No". It may help tackle some, but without an Equalities Impact Assessment being undertaken, it is difficult to assess given the lack of detail of the fund. While fund design is important, the eventual level of investment will also affect the outcome of any intervention. As the proposed level of funding is likely to lead overall to a reduction in direct service delivery, the overall impact will be compromised, especially if the accumulative effect of cuts from other departments is factored in. Other factors such as eventual payment of rents by some VCS organisations trying to address inequality, could further compromise the funding's effectiveness.
- The currently funded 17 Community Centres do provide strategically-placed bases to help address inequality or respond to deprivation, and were regarded as strategic neighbourhood hubs for Camden to assist in achieving such aims. Many also provide affordable bases for those VCS (often smaller) organisations working with target groups which help address inequality. The encouragement on formation of larger partnerships could end up taking funding and resources away from those individual organisations which have the most impact on the day-to-day equality of life experience for the most vulnerable. It may be better to focus on encouraging existing successful individual VCS organisations to work in closer partnership rather than creating new ones with this fund. This is in fact the case with many already. Effective partnerships will rely on effective and strong individual partners in the first place.
- I think it will make things worse if you charge market value rents and reduce level of funding. It will close community centres and other small groups like ours. Inequality will further increase and the gap will be bigger
- Equalities should core to all the funding themes. There is much to be said about supporting communities of interest or themes as traditionally communities of interest have not been adequately supported or funded and resources given to main stream organisations who have paid lip service to these communities. Today there is more joined up working on the ground and as long as the two strands provide a platform for collaboration and co working and does not act to departmentalise the work it could be positive. Also people cannot be departmentalised people whatever their background or persuasion are going to use range of services and undertake a range of activities
- To be effective an organisation would need to cover most of the themes as their service users may fit into more than one theme. If building and access to space is an issue for some groups that have already shown the importance of their work, have you factored in how the planned changes to funding will impact them in the future? How can you insure small groups are not the victims of rent relief negotiations and are able to work in a way that allows their community and those they support become mainstream service users? Socially marginalised groups need time and expert work to make changes happen, how will you determine who is best placed to deliver this work if organisations are not able to apply due to limitations they have in their size and capacity to bid for contracts and attend meetings? Professionals in link council departments need to understand the role of VCS and they need to

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

fund work as well, to insure equalities targets are met, engagement is a big issue and over or under representation of marginalised groups in MH or CP cases and settings leads to institutional inequalities, this impacts the work of VCS and therefore commissioners need to factor the VCS and its ability to support Camden departments needs proper funding and thinking.

- It's a little unfair to have to give just a Yes or No response here - I broadly do agree but there's a lack of recognition that Camden has some VCS organisations -Elfrida Rathbone Camden being one of them, who have worked very effectively to bring in funding and create responses to borough wide issues such as needs of families with complex and multiple problems. We have done that by merging traditional casework skills with groupwork and community development approaches involving peer support and bringing service users together. That approach does not fit into a neighbourhood model but at the moment family support and poverty/hardship are not explicitly named as opportunities where ERC become a Strategic Partner and we feel these areas of need should be, Disability is, which is something we support but Camden needs to be more explicit about supporting the INCLUSION of disabled people - recognising the human cost of people sitting at home and not participating in their communities. Rather than a narrow focus on jobs there needs to be broad support on a range of ways to help bring disabled people into community life which includes but is not solely focused on employability - volunteering and leisure opportunities are two such approaches.
- Receiving core funding to equality groups falling under protected characteristics will: 1, Allow for the extensive work we do for all council and policy departments around LGBT which are very rarely linked to a specific project fund 2. Prevent the Council spending considerably more money than if they funded us to meet their legal objectives (we are a very cheap and efficient way of meeting what could cost hundreds of thousands for experts in each council department) 3. Allow us to focus on access to existing services so not to reinvent the wheel give us some security to get external sources of funding 4. Acknowledge that LGBT is very unpopular to fund and is getting worse. For example Trust for London recently put out a note to the Government Equalities Office saying it would only fund one lgbt org in London next year - this is common and will destroy us - The latest research from the Mayor of London (Centred Almanac on VCS LGBT funding 2014) - puts the LGBT voluntary sector as receiving 0.03% of VCS funds in the UK and 0.06% of all VCS funds available to London. This is the total for all LGBT work. It acknowledges this could be cut by half (0.015 and 0.03% respectively). Only big organisations such as Stonewall and Age UK's lgbt work can survive this without core funding from local sources. I do not see this as special treatment but a historic reality.
- While this information is useful, it is difficult to know the final impact until we know what needs will be prioritised. There is of course great complexity within many of these equalities characteristics - for example we presume the category 'sex' will include a strong focus on women's needs, victims of domestic and sexual violence, and that 'socially marginalised groups' will include individuals coping with mental health and substance misuse issues and unequal access to education and employment. We want to ensure there is a commitment to meeting the needs of vulnerable women - a target group which has been disproportionately affected by the financial climate, austerity and a variety of other changes in recent years. The need for bespoke and specialist services for this target group has been widely evidenced, but

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

statutory funding for this work has steadily dwindled - leading to a significant decrease in vital services. Simultaneously (and consequentially) there has been a steady increase in the level of need amongst vulnerable women. For example, Clean Break has seen the number of women accessing its Education Programme increase by 80% in the last four years, and those women are presenting with significantly greater and more complex needs. This is an experience echoed throughout the sector (for example as evidenced in Clinks' 2014 report 'Who Cares?'). It is vital that we are able to support the most vulnerable women to overcome often significant and complex challenges. A wealth of evidence demonstrates that effective and specialist support to this target group not only transforms these women's lives, but has a powerful impact on our communities, and particularly on the life chances of the next generation. It also saves a lot of money - for example New Philanthropy Capital estimates that for every £1 invested in Clean Break £4.57 is saved from the public purse solely through reduced costs associated with reoffending (and not, for example, including savings associated with not placing children in care, or reduced women's support needs). We therefore want to ensure that women's needs remain at the top of Camden's agenda moving forwards.

- My name is Trudy and I am a volunteer with Camden LGBT Forum. Forgive me as I am unsure to the meaning of many of these questions but wanted to have my say! I am here now with 6 local LGBT friends and we saw this link in the news. We wanted to write as a team to say that we are worried about the future of Camden LGBT - none of us would be living content lives without their support over the years. I would have left the Borough. Natasha was suicidal and John was experiencing so much hate crime he didn't know what to do. Peter states that the Borough is a model of treatment to LGBT residents because of the forum's work across the Borough - this is even more true of transsexual issues - we are a beacon! We have all become fully engaged members of the Forum and I am proud to volunteer for them. I worry about all the cuts and can't say I understand it all. We wanted to let you know that we need the Forum to be funded as without them I don't know where any of us would be (some not alive I dare say). Thank you for listening. Trudy (butch lesbian who came out of the closet later in life thanks to the Forum!)
- The document concentrates on specific inequalities to the exclusion of others such as education, employment and mental health. These three alone involve far more individuals than many of those quoted. No reference is made to the impact of the graph of doom and the wide cuts to services. This includes the impending pauperisation of many families arising from benefit cuts
- The impact on inequalities is difficult to assess given the lack of detail of the fund. The level of investment will also be a key determinant of impact. Reduced funding may negate impact overall. Detailed breakdown of the current budget and the proposed budget needs to be produced. Currently the figures do not seem to add up. The budget was £6 million in 20012/12 and now £5.8 million. This overview is hard to apply to the narrative provided so far. Requests asking to clarify this have so far resulted in variable responses, none of which fully add up. The cost of the CTS team is not included but understood to be around £800k.the proposed figure of £1.5 to £2 Million appears to be a reduction of £2.641 Million in terms of direct service delivery. Even factoring in the Impact Fund, it would be a reduction of £1.641 Million, meaning that all bar £59k of the cuts are hitting direct service delivery – again not squaring with the narrative about efficiency and refocusing of the CTS team in the consultation paper.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- No It will not address issues of inequalities, The council were struggling to deal it with when it had more money how could it make any difference now with a significantly reduced budget and when it refuses to change its culture and policy. Why does it take the same team to manage a reduced budget? How can you justify £800k for the CTS team to manage a budget of £2.1M (excluding rent relief & other fixed deductions)? - Until it appreciates and supports the VCS by empowering it, this proposal will not tackle the inequalities in Camden
- The impact on inequalities is difficult to assess given the lack of detail of the fund. While fund design is important (and of course refers to inequalities), one cannot pretend that level of investment will not also be a key determinant of the impact of any intervention. The proposed level of funding is a considerable reduction in direct service delivery and it is likely the overall impact of this reduction on equalities will be negative.
- Without further details we cannot properly assess the impact on inequalities of this funding. Although fund design is important (and of course refers to inequalities), one cannot ignore the impact of levels of investment altogether. The proposed level of funding is a considerable reduction in direct service delivery and consequently it is likely the overall impact of this reduction on equalities will be negative compared to existing spend.
- To determine this we need more information on the detail of the fund, but again it must very much be a learning curve; with enshrined in its delivery a willingness to listen, be responsive and change if it is determined that it does not tackle inequalities as it is tasked with doing
- The model should provide an equal balance of local delivery and borough wide delivery, commissioning should consider very carefully how the borough wide model interacts with the local model and where duplication may appear, mitigating against this
- It has the potential, but of course it's all in the execution
- The Camden Plan articulates challenges for the Borough very well and highlights priorities for support and development. The work with the Voluntary and Community Sector should echo these priorities to ensure the best possible impact is made with available (if limited) funding.

The above "thematic list" does not seem to echo Camden's priorities nor does it seem to link with tackling Multiple Deprivation. It is more a list of niche interest groups. Camden should focus its Voluntary and Community Sector expenditure on the key needs identified by its own Equality Taskforce, namely: employment, educational attainment, and suitable and affordable housing. These are Camden's identified priorities. The Camden Plan is a good plan. Do not get side-tracked or put the Community and Voluntary Sector funding in a separate silo – integrate it into the Plan to maximise the impact of the VCS funding.

- Impossible to comment on without knowing the basis on which they were drawn up and the boundaries of the neighbourhoods Camden has identified. At first sight the rationale for the central area (into which we fall) is hard to fathom

Q2: we are open to receiving applications from both individual organisations and partnerships. What are some of the issues we need to consider here?

- both needs to be considered;

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- That the funding is equal to need, not the size of the organisation or partnership. There would need to be a balance so the money would neither be absorbed entirely in administration or restrictive to the organisation in putting the money where it would best impact the people being cared for i.e. staffing costs
- I think you'd have to consider what already exists in the area and that it's not a duplication of services and how they specifically going to meet the wider issues within the borough and are sensitive to the needs of others.
- 2% admin running costs like HNCC; Lean and streamlined organizations; Camden and match funding private sector; Governance and a charity reserves; Independent groups that support Camden
- Too many cooks can be a problem. In my experience it works best if one organisation is the lead partner who fronts the relationship with the client (i.e. the council) such that there is a lead project. Partnerships are difficult. It takes time to form good partnership and build trust. Good communication between partners is very important.
- Partnership work is hard, and some of the best partnership work I've been involved in has happened organically and informally - and allowed to evolve in such away over time. Forced partnerships almost always fail. They are uncomfortable. The Council should encourage but not force partnerships.
- Both applications from individual organisations and partnerships should be treated equally. Partnerships can be good for some work, not for all.
- It seems more logical to look for partnerships to look at impact across an investment zone, but that may not be easy - and if some organisations bid alone and others group together it may be hard to compare the two
- Included in the list of outcomes of what Strategic partners would need to show (p10 of printed consultation paper), in addition to 'acting as a voice for a community', also include something about strategic partners 'needing to support service users in having their voice heard and enabling them to play a more active role in shaping and delivery services'. In this respect, assessors should take into account the level of participation achieved (egg ranging from 'consultation' to 'a service designed and delivered by users').
- In principle, it is good to make applications open to both individual organisations and partnerships, but partnerships should get more favour for the funding applications, because working in partnership can make great contributions to the communities at large by sharing resources, skills and community spirits. This will also promote equality and reduce competition between the communities.
- As a provider I would like you to run consultation for big and small groups and explain to them that they have to share space and resource with each other. Big organisations with full funded (community centres) should share space at the weekends and during holidays or the time they do not use their facilities.
- Applications from individual organisations need more supervising and support in terms of delivering projects, whereas partnerships can join up together and use all the resources available
- There is a need to give chance to smaller and unfunded organisations like ours (Somali Elderly and Disabled Centre)
- Make the process of application very transparent and as simple as possible. Give us genuine people to talk to about it. Pay for second stage of application process, as you did for the Innovation and Development Fund. We still spent about 3 times as much time on it as you paid for, but it made a huge difference and meant that we could be much more proactive about developing our business case and partnerships - so it matched Camden better.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- In principle, it is good to make applications open to both individual organisations and partnerships, but partnerships should get more favour for the funding applications, because working in partnership can make great contributions to the communities at large by sharing resources, skills and community spirits/cohesion. This will also promote equality and reduce competition between the communities
- You will need to look further than the rubber stamp of "Excellence" and "Outstanding" results
- It has been our experience that creating meaningful partnerships is, at best, an arduous task. Overlay the task of creating partnerships with different legalities & fiscal accountabilities, differences in organisational capacity, culture & policy; different values, delivery models & and measures of success (or otherwise) & a myriad of other organisational differences. With these and other organisational issues we believe that to attempt to develop meaningful partnerships in the time allocated is a recipe for chaos
- Give "untried and tested" organisations and groups the opportunity to be part of the picture, and their delivery could be as an alliance of small organisations working as a collective.
- Look into the history of the organisations and ensure that they have a proven track record and have track record of raising additional funding on top of the funds the council gives
- Ensure that the organisations funded have a proven record of working with the disadvantaged groups and individuals
- The organisation's history, experience etc.
- Governing, experience and credibility of the organisations and partnerships.
- It has been our experience that creating meaningful partnerships is, at best, an arduous task. Overlay the task of creating partnerships with different legalities & fiscal accountabilities, differences in organisational capacity, culture & policy; different values, delivery models & and measures of success (or otherwise) & a myriad of other organisational differences. With these and other organisational issues we believe that to attempt to develop meaningful partnerships in the time allocated is a recipe for chaos.(x3)
- Opening to individual organisations is likely to produce the most benefit as partnership is notoriously difficult to manage, especially when introduced at high speed. It may be a way of maximising contributions over a longer time scale e.g. by merging two organisations or their proposed projects.
- There may not be many partnerships that work across the zones that you are highlighting. There's not enough time to set up effective partnerships with the timescales that are being suggested. A good partnership takes a lot of work to set up and develop.
- The potential marginalisation of smaller organisations. There is concern that smaller organisations will not be robust enough to take part in and contribute to a strategic partnership. Experience has shown that setting up partnerships takes time. Smaller organisations do not have the time to commit as they are stretched already. The Council should consider how it can help overcome this barrier e.g. supporting the rolling out of an SPV set up to enable small organisations to become delivery partners in a large contract.
- **Rent.** A number of organisations are funded by the Council to deliver services but do not currently receive funds from the pot held by Culture and Environment but they do receive rent relief. To gain access to core funding towards the cost of rent, it appears that they will have to apply for funding for a piece of work that meets the outcomes set for the Strategic Partners Fund though the work is funded by Children's Schools and Families or Adult Social

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Care. This seems to be a cumbersome way in which to deal with the rent issue. Should a proportion of the rent subsidy be transferred to Children's Schools and Families and Adult Social Care to distribute directly to current providers?

- For organisations that are not successful in their bid to the Strategic Partners Fund transitional support towards covering the cost of the rent may be available on a case by case basis for up to three years. There is a danger that an organisation funded to deliver services by Children's Schools and Families and Adult Social Care may not be able to do so because of the financial pressures caused by the burden of rent payments. Is there a need for more thinking on how this issue should be dealt with?
- Organisational cultural. Transparency. Fairness. Equality in the partnership and other partners not being used. Partnership conflict/ dominate partner. Time. Dominate partner not taking any of the risk of delivery. Avoiding token partnerships based on 'squeezing' its remit to fit funding goals. Avoid partnerships where one takes core funding and the other purely on meeting outputs – this changes the risk profile. Smaller partners may be best to lead but are side-lined by bigger organisations
- The principle of receiving applications from partnerships is fine. However new partnerships will most likely not be formed in the proposed Timeframe from Camden. Additionally, organisations may have to reassess their geographical reach to fit into one of the investment zones. This could be extremely divisive. Partnerships seem to be a good idea in theory; however their formation can create additional lines of accountability, management and stakeholders.
- It may be beneficial to create pots for both individual organisations and partnerships, perhaps with some overlap to give the local authority flexibility in decision-making. However, given that a mix of individual and partnership approaches are likely to be required to deliver against different priorities, the local authority should be seeking honest bids rather than bids of convenience that simply seek to secure funds without delivering outcomes. The reality is that there is no objective, universal formula for assessing funding applications without being pulled into assessments that undermine the trust that the local authority and organisations seek to have. Whether the local authority is free to be honest about this or not is a difficult question. The most significant challenge in this area is that across much of the sector, the sense of competition and desperation remains. This is not to say that that is right, but that organisations feel obligations to their local communities, volunteers and staff that are understandable and legitimate. With an unprecedented number of charities facing closure (between 20-25%) there is a real risk that organisations will seek to game the system. This is the most difficult barrier to overcome. It is also why the focus of this consultation on funding is so damaging and problematic: it reinforces the sense that money is the key determinant of the relationship.
- The Council should consider how it will help smaller organisations to take part in this process.
- Issues that need to be considered in regards to partnerships are:
 - that there's equal footing between the partners
 - that partners are developing skills and understanding that benefit the partnerships work in all aspects
 - that the partnership is focused on positive outcomes
- We have been delivering a range of services to the Somali community that is now the second largest ethnic minority group in Camden. We have witnessed the resilience and potential of the Somali community; the hope and promise of

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

the young who are capable of fulfilling great achievements and the hardiness and spirit of the elder community. However, compared to other black and ethnic minority communities, Somalis are in a worse position and facing enormous inequality. Our community has significant unemployment levels and low paid employment is common. Indeed the Economist Magazine reported that members of the Somali community are amongst the poorest, least educated with the highest level of unemployment in Britain leading to poor economic outcomes. A good example is the lack of visibility of Somali employees in better-paid jobs in Camden Council itself. Our local authority has more than four thousand members of staff but unfortunately only seven of them are of Somali origin. More than 50% of British Somalis and over 64% Camden Somalis rent from local councils, the highest proportion of any BME community in Britain. The majority of households are single-parent; usually single mothers, who are currently affected by the government's welfare reforms. In terms of education, over 80% of Somali-speaking pupils qualify for free school meals and have one of the highest rates of school exclusion and truancy. Furthermore, the Somali community's inequality has not been witnessed in opportunities and academic achievements alone but has also been experienced in access to health services. Therefore, we recognise that there is still much to be done to support the Somali community and equality groups in Camden. We believe Camden needs to consider to treat communities equally in recognition of the dire needs. Also a matter of equality and investment in communities of interest which would be seen in other groups but not currently in the Somali community. For that reasons, Camden Council must consider the use of existing buildings, core funding and how communities of interest have fair access to them

- Partnerships are ultimately about people so we need to consider governance, financial viability and sustainability, history of collaborative working and track records on meeting funded outcomes
- That partnerships do not become too large and cumbersome at the detriment of small specific local organisations with their knowledge of the local community
- We are a small but borough wide organisation providing services to one 'socially marginalised' group, women on low income also facing a whole range of issues across a number of the target areas (age, disability, chronic health issues, maternity, sexual orientation, abuse, trauma, lack of education/volunteering/job opportunities, etc.).
- The principle is fine. The timescales are such that forming new, fully functional partnerships in the timeframe is highly unlikely. There is some concern that Organisations will be expected to shape their geographical reach to one of the investment zones. While we have been told at the consultation meeting this was not intended we need to formally note that this would be extremely divisive. Similarly, forcing partnerships along the lines of "we will fund only one organisation in this investment zone" would decrease incentives for community-based organisations to engage with the programme. Finally there needs to be consideration given to the multiple lines of accountability that would be involved once you have multiple boards, communities and other stakeholders
- Individual organisations many not have the resources that partnerships may have, however that doesn't mean to say that they are not the best to meet that need. Partnerships may also take more time to manage, spending time in meetings instead to actually doing the work.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Resources to enable applications to be made may not be equal. Those organisations with constraints on staff and expertise in grant applications should not be penalised.
- You should take into account the history of the organisations and their track record, governance structures and ability to deliver.
- I feel some of the issues which need to be considered is that there might be a possible skills gap when individual organisations submit an application, the quality may not be as advanced as existing partnership organisations. It would be a shame that their lack of capacity would hinder them from seeking funding to support or address a real social issue which occurs locally. Possible workshop or training is required to minimise the skill gap and to increase a better chance for small organisation which may not have the capacity
- The timescales are such that forming new, fully functional partnerships in the timeframe is highly unlikely. There is also some concern that organisations will be expected to shape their geographical reach to one of the investment zones, which could end up being counter-productive and divisive.
- Forming really successful partnerships relies on equal “buy-in” from the outset. Whilst 15 funded community centres in Camden have formed an official consortium (C4) it has taken a lot of time and energy to set this up, and relies on a great deal of professional input and a range of skills to take on such an undertaking. Without more clarity and discussion, the benefit of larger partnerships against the potential loss of some key individual organisations delivering effective intervention to address need within a community of interest or neighbourhood, could end up being counter-productive. There is also the issue of – what happens if one organisation receives funding from more than one partnership, or applies as both an individual organisation and a partner member – will they be doubly funded at the expense of losing another valued VCS organisation?
- Organisations like KCB have experience and good record of achieving outcomes. You should ensure that only organisations from Camden that have good governance and record of achievement are given funding. 7 year funding seems very long if an organisation does not do well
- For partnership bids the run in time is too short. Were partnerships exist consideration would need to be given to providing core investment for the partnership as well as the individual organisations. Currently C4 operated because each of the partners has core funding.
- Partnerships need to be accountable, equal and fair. Individuals should not be labelled small groups and specialists therefore continuing historic poor funding of good organisations that can deliver and grow. Opportunity for good capacity building needs to be one of the core roles of third sector work and it also needs to be equal in delivering this; currently this is not the case and has been difficult to have equal access to information and support for some groups. Communication should be easy and issues be flagged early to safeguard partners from partnership breakdown. If they do breakdown, plans to support the communities we support so services continue should be in place.
- Formal partnerships can be very difficult and the local authority should stop talking about them as if they were some universal panacea without the contribution of development time and funding to make them work. I think it's much better to think about how LBC can develop EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION - in the past I have seen LBC put money into projects/services which duplicate or don't link very well with similar other

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

projects in the borough. I value diversity but residents benefit most from services which are joined up and funding allocation should be lined to this - collaboration is a skill and organisations which do this well should be rewarded for it (e.g. ERC/Camden Futures Wider Referral Network)

- There are partners with full time partnership or funding officers. Smaller groups like us do not have this. We would like to avoid uneven splits - not simply in funding but in terms of results. E.g. I have already had some community centres pre-empt the funding decisions and approach me to ask if we would partner with them. They all say that they will take core funding and ours would be on results. This is unsustainable and very unfair as we would take the risk and they would simply 'administer'. I am often said that our benefit comes from the use of their space. This is not enough. There is no point having space without staff. I am often told that the community centres would stop giving small groups like ours free space. I can assure you that I have met every community centre in Camden – and although I am a great fan - none give us a room for free - even for an hour. I get my rooms from commercial and statutory partners.
- Establishing and managing effective partnerships requires an investment of often significant time and resources. The capacity and resources needed to develop and manage a partnership should be taken into account – particularly if partnerships became a requirement in any way.
- Ensure an open and transparent system with clear criteria and processes with a detailed timetable. 2. Requests for information from LBC should be reduced to the minimum possible and use made of documents already sent to LBC 3. Ensure a level playing field over such matters as rents. Thus an organisation required to pay rent cannot compete with one which has a peppercorn rent 4. Track record, governance and sustainability. 4. Coverage of population of area of benefit (organisation not merely focussed on one or two groups. The specific areas of need in the area of benefit and the links to these.
- What are the benefits & advantages of partnerships? Do they actually outweigh the disadvantages and challenges; partnerships are time and resource intensive. What resources does Camden have to help create and crucially maintain partnerships?; very little time between January and April to set up.; The timescales are such that forming new, fully functional partnerships in the timeframe is highly unlikely; creating and maintaining meaningful partnerships is, at best, an arduous task. overlay the task of creating partnerships with different legalities & fiscal accountabilities, differences in organisational capacity, culture & policy; different values, delivery models & and measures of success (or otherwise) & a myriad of other organisational differences; difficult for borough wide organisations to be involved in multiple "zone" partnerships balancing and integrating several organisations systems, policies aims, objectives etc. to an agreed and shared consensus the multiple lines of accountability that would be involved once you have multiple boards, communities and other stakeholders the equality of partners in decision making and input of time and resources *. There is some concern that organisations will be expected to shape their geographical reach to one of the investment zones. While we have been told at the consultation meeting this was not intended we need to formally note that this would be extremely divisive. Similarly, forcing partnerships along the lines of “we will fund only one organisation in this investment zone” would decrease incentives for community-based organisations to engage with the programme. A number of organisations that are not funded through the pot held by Culture and Environment do receive rent relief. To gain access to core funding towards the

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

cost of rent, it appears that they will have to apply for funding for a piece of work that meets the outcomes set for the Strategic Partners Fund even though the work is currently funded by Children Schools and Families or Adult Social Care. If this is the case this seems to be a very cumbersome way in which to deal with the rent subsidy issue. Should a proportion of the rent subsidy be transferred to Children Schools and Families and Adult Health and Social Care to distribute directly to current providers? For those organisations that are not successful in their bid to the Strategic Partners fund transitional support towards covering the cost of the rent may be available on a case by case basis for up to three years. Here there is a danger that an organisation funded to deliver services by Children's Schools and Families and Adult Social Care may not be able to do so because of the financial pressures caused by the burden of rent payments. Is there a need for more thinking on how this issue should be dealt with?

- In relation to community centres fund, it would be difficult to manage joint bids (partnership) from a cluster of organisation taking a share of a very small pot which would make it difficult to achieve any outcomes. If a leading organisation leads and delivers the outcomes framework and works in partnership with other organisations to add value then it would work. Unless there are agreed mergers and formal collaborative arrangement there is real danger of failure. Partnership should be defined. Shaping geographical reach to one of the investment zones is a big concern
- It would be great for Council support to help equality groups form partnerships with local authority commissioners e.g. Public Health or CCG, Adult social care, Children schools and families etc. unlike many groups we do a lot of work for them but have received not a penny. It is difficult to get past the bureaucracy and hierarchy and they only say they don't have any money. It would be really helpful for support around this.
- Not on its own. It would have to be part of a wider strategy. It's very limited and the expectations of the council on what we would actually be doing are unclear. The Q&As say that an outcome framework would be set for each priority area and indicators set. So none of this is clear yet.
- What would be the basis for the council deciding between individual organisations and partnerships? It would help if the council was clearer about its preference and what would be the deciding factors. How would the council want to manage funding to partnerships? Who would be the legal entity receiving the money? The Q&A explains that there would be two rounds of bidding, the first for existing organisations and partnerships and the second for new partnerships. How would this work? If an organisation got funding in the first round but became part of a new partnership could they be involved in a bid in the second round? A decision on funding allocation should be on the basis of assessed ability of the applicant to deliver on specific objectives. Although track record is a useful indicator in some respects, their ability should be assessed on whether they can demonstrate that their approach, whether as a partnership or as an individual organisation would achieve the necessary outcome in the most effective, efficient and economical way. Therefore, partnerships should be able to demonstrate that they are about more than volume, and that each partner has a role to play/adds value.
- The principle is fine. The timescales are such that forming new, fully functional partnerships in the timeframe is highly unlikely. There is some concern that organisations will be expected to shape their geographical reach to one of the investment zones. While we have been told at the consultation meeting this was not intended we need to formally note that this would be extremely

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

divisive. Similarly, forcing partnerships along the lines of "we will fund only one organisation in this investment zone" would decrease incentives for community-based organisations to engage with the programme. Finally there needs to be consideration given to the multiple lines of accountability that would be involved once you have multiple boards, communities and other stakeholders.

- Track record, ability to deliver, robust accounting and reporting structures, documentation, reach into the community.
- The principle is fine. The timescales are such that forming new, fully functional partnerships in the timeframe is highly unlikely. There is some concern that organisations will be expected to shape their geographical reach to one of the investment zones. While we have been told at the consultation meeting this was not intended we need to formally note that this would be extremely divisive. Similarly, forcing partnerships along the lines of "we will fund only one organisation in this investment zone" would decrease incentives for community-based organisations to engage with the programme. Genuine local community based working cannot cover a whole investment zones. Finally there needs to be consideration given to the multiple lines of accountability that would be involved once you have multiple boards, communities and other stakeholders. Particularly where a partnership constitutes there then need to be allowances made for members to become sub-contractors etc. without losing the ability to hold parties legally responsible
- The funding proposal represents a considerable level of cuts which will adversely affect the services provided by VCS organisations and reduce their ability to tackle inequalities in Camden. Inequalities will be addressed but not as effectively as it should be.
- Effective and Sustainable Partnerships take time to put together and develop and the stated time lines for the application process may prohibit the very outcome you wish to reach and instead provide you with Hastily put together partnerships, that are pulled together so as to be able to apply for funding, but ultimately prove unable to deliver and therefore require further Local Authority time and resources to resolve the issues and deliver on stated targets/aims/outputs
- Larger pre-existing partnerships holding sway and smaller grassroots groups left out The key here will be preparatory ground work and using the Local Authority resources to go out into the potential investment zones and Map the potential partnerships either existing or otherwise and then Put in the time and support ahead of the process so as to get them fit for purpose so to speak ahead of the application process
- Larger partnerships run a greater risk of coming up against a variety of challenges, partnerships need to be well focused and organisations need to have clear roles, responsibilities in place to work effectively Only funding individual organisations may result in increasingly fragmented services. Only individual organisations with a strong track record of partnership/collaboration, strategic expertise and high quality reputation across the borough should receive funding directly, otherwise effective collaboration is unlikely to happen
- I think they should be weighed equally and no preference given to partnerships just because that seems to be a popular idea at the moment. Our organization partners across boroughs quite effectively, bringing better service to Camden.
- Number of voluntary organisations in the Borough already work in partnerships in their communities and it would be good if this programme

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

could reward the successes of existing partnerships as well as encouraging the development of new ones. It is not clear at this stage whether the funding would apply to existing partnership work, or is it reserved solely for new initiatives? It should also be recognised that small organisations who deliver grassroots community work have very limited staff resources and, whilst partnership work has clear benefits for some organisations, it may not always be possible for those focussing on delivering services to commit time to developing partnership work. Partnerships between charities are not always straightforward to form from a governance and staffing point of view. It would be a shame to penalise such organisations by prioritising partnerships over the actual benefits of the work. The funding should be directed to those who have the capacity to deliver, with the most appropriate skill set and a strong track record. If working in partnership deepens and widens the benefits for residents then it is clearly of value but some organisations may deliver sterling work without initiating a new partnership.

- We are already in a partnership with QCCA. Unclear whether we are supposed to develop other formal partnerships with organisations interested in specific areas of the work we do (e.g. those interested in youth health). Small organisations have limited staff/ trustee time to devote to this sort of work, so checklists, glossary, and model agreements would be useful.
- Avoiding all unnecessary bureaucratic policies and processes; Use community expertise based on real life experience. ;Fair and transparent Sharing resources; Respect for each other; Big groups should not bully other groups; Small organisations need support from bigger groups; Bigger groups should share resources; Partnerships are good but the Council should not put all groups for people with LD in one big building; Camden People First like having their own building.

Q3: What support if any would you need from the council in order to be able to form a partnership?

- professional support would be better
- more engagement with faith communities to that go beyond geographical location and gather communities that aren't restricted by ward and borough boundaries, we may have unique resources and people. As a church we have assets but struggle to know the local needs and the level of trust is understandably low from outside groups. How do we develop good practice?
- As I work for the council, I would see it from the other perspective that organisations would like support and advice from council and are open to the needs of all areas of the local community
- That Camden work 50.50 shared partnership; Camden reviews any groups running costs; Camden only invests in groups that are growing and have no cuts planned; Camden invests in groups that have made difficult choices and now are stable.
- Opportunities to meet potential partners, long before you expect them to start delivering services together, so there is time to build up trust and agree potential terms etc. Perhaps a directory of potential partners where organisations can provide the info that others need to do due diligence on them and networking events/ mailing lists where organisations can start a dialogue. Perhaps Camden could even take the lead on identifying potential partners which they might want to see working together, and do the introductions (partner matchmaking!)

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Very little - as above, informal and organic partnerships have proven the most valuable I know.
- Possibly help in drawing up a partnership agreement
- When the first round of bids are received - maybe an indicator bid round - Camden Council should bring bidders together and recommend/enable partnerships. The Council should also reassure people that partnership bids will require funding at a realistic level to support multi-centre working and larger staff core teams.' Opening the doors' will be more complex and more expensive than single site
- Partnerships should be welcomed but not forced upon organisations. Many smaller organisations doing excellent work would otherwise lose out to more established organisations/ organisations with more political clout. Also this funding round is meant to challenge the status quo and historic funding arrangements. After bids have been received LBC could act as a broker with officers meeting shortlisted bidders to see how groups could work more closely together where there is an overlap between quality bids.
- In order to be able to form a partnership, we need limited financial support for: 1) consultations and discussions within the community members, 2) running trainings on how to set up a partnership and how to work in partnership for community coordinators/organisers, and 3) preparing governing document for the partnership. In fact, we have already been working in partnership/consortium with 10 community organisations, although the Partnership/Consortium has not been registered with legal regulators and has no legally binding governing document
- We need space resources, and someone to pay for our expenses. We want a community centre to share with more than one small organisation
- We are already part of Camden Supplementary Schools' forum. We have partnership with 18 other schools in Camden. We need space to run our meetings and pay for the cost of running meetings.
- Support with creating or adopting partnership agreement that is fair for both/all partners. Also providing support on capacity building, infrastructure support and staff development.
- Networking opportunities are useful. Time spent getting to know people and working with them in small ways before trying bigger moves. So funding pilot projects is great.
- In order to be able to form a partnership, we need limited financial support for: consultations and discussions within the community members, 2) running trainings on how to set up a partnership and how to work in partnership for community coordinators/organisers, and 3) preparing governing documents for the partnership. In fact, we have already been working in partnership/consortium with 10 community organisations, although the Partnership/Consortium has not been registered with legal regulators and has no legally binding governing document currently.
- Financial, HR, Legal Services
- Partnership development would need considerable legal, strategic & practical support in terms of developing a working MoU, partners' agreement and, potentially incorporation
- I think the tendering process often puts organisations into competition with each other, which can make it hard to collaborate.
- Administrative, coaching and mentoring of their leaders
- I am a resident and service user.
- None I'm a service user

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Partnership development would need considerable legal, strategic & practical support in terms of developing a working MoU, partners' agreement and, potentially, incorporation. (x3)
- Clear lead roles. Recognition of what it costs to lead, i.e. not just in cash but also in time required to develop agreements, coordinate decision making etc.....especially as each VCS organisation has its own governing body, its own timescales, its own aims etc., much of which is framed within legally binding constitutions. Help for smaller organisations who often do not have the infrastructure to make partnership leaders and can get left out of this process.
- Recognition and resourcing for the time and commitment involved in creating and managing partnerships.
- Fair distribution of risk between partnerships and the Council.
- Cross departmental working across the Council.
- Governance support. Conflict management. Monitoring. Sounding board
- Creating workable partnerships takes a considerable amount of time and resources. As a member of C4, Swiss Cottage has experience of setting this up including; partners' agreement, Memorandum of Understandings and Incorporation
- The local authority needs to create the space and convene a conversation which allows a partnership to form, and to do so around a common agenda. This is a challenging undertaking, as partnerships motivated by funding can be fraught with complications. In partnership terms, the local authority - whether directly through its team or additional resource - should provide expertise around areas which partnerships need to explore, for example communication, data collection, information-sharing, impact measurement and so on.
- Recognition and resourcing for the time and commitment involved in creating and managing partnerships.
- As a smaller organisation it is important for us to ensure small organisations get support enabling us to form equal partnerships, where there is transparency and the funding is shared proportionally. We really need the Council to challenge larger organisations and community centres claiming that they are serving certain communities in order to deviate inclusion funding and to over shadow smaller community organisations that have a base in the grass roots of these communities. In practice those larger organisations and community centres seek the help of the smaller ones in order to meet their funding outcomes. This is an example of a shadow partnership work
- We need acknowledgement that the work this community needs to make changes in life outcomes will happen when the local authority and our organisations continue to work together as partners. However, in order to form better and sustainable partnerships we need invest expertise and resources.
- Most of us have existing agreements in place
- guidance and monitoring
- Our core staff team does - at present - have little capacity to follow up on any 'top-down' suggested partnerships where there is no guarantee that such projects would be adequately funded. We already work in partnership with many agencies, our funders, our contractors, referral agencies, other organisations with similar remits or in similar areas, wider voluntary sector forums and - last but not least - the people we are aiming to provide a service for. We are all too aware that LBC resources are scarce and that there are likely to be more cuts to overall services. I feel what would help us in these circumstances would be a strong, well-resourced infrastructure support

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

agency (i.e. VAC) - outside of LBC. With regards to resources from the corporate sector, we would benefit from LBC staff and elected councillors - pro-actively pursuing some of the big local companies at the top senior level with the aim to attracting actual cash. We've had two very good experiences with local companies coming and helping us with decorating and up-skilling with some of our IT. But we would need LBC to trail-blaze the path to the top of those organisations where the decisions are made about real money

- Partnership would need considerable support in terms of developing a working MoU, partners' agreement, and potentially even incorporation. As our experience shows with C4, it is not straightforward even when other organisations have aligned values. This is unlikely to lead to fully formed effective partnerships in the period outlined. Camden Council provided initial support to set up Camden Community Centre's Consortium (C4) but then it stopped providing any additional support to help it build the foundation to be able to run effectively as a consortium or partnership. If the Council provided a support worker for C4 and help with negotiations with key partners like Camden Clinical Commissioning Group and other council departments then it may be possible for these partnerships to raise additional funding through commissioning or grants and support the council to fulfil its Camden Plan objectives and other health and social outcomes
- Strong leadership. Take into account the way individual organisations are run, e.g. charities have their own guidelines
- It would be helpful for the council to have some mechanism of finding / matching up organisations with compatible aims.
- Partnership will only exist when there is room to manoeuvre and support the stance of unrestricted funding, as it empowers community organisation to lead and taking a bigger responsibility when it comes to directing finance. Also with partners there should be more than just financial benefit there should be great collaboration and more stakeholder interest from community groups when directing the strategic outcomes of the local authority.
- As our experience shows with C4, it is not straightforward even when other organisations have aligned values. Any support is unlikely to lead to fully formed effective partnerships in the period outlined. There were concerns expressed about this timescale and approach from the beginning, and so this part of the proposed funding should really have more consideration before any funding decisions are made. Again, successful partnerships will rely on the individual component partners being sustainable for effective, long-term impact.
- We need funding, advice and guidance
- Capacity building, facilitation and brokerage of partnerships, networking, good VCS support organisation that do not also tender for the same contracts we do. Smaller groups may at times be the best placed to lead partnership work, but can be side-lined for larger orgs, how do we manage this and identify if it happens?
- Funding for partnership development (along the lines of model used by Big Lottery) or in-kind support - e.g. facilitation of discussions between potential partners
- Only core funding can help us do this. And we will do it more efficiently and cheaply than anyone else.
- We do this quite well. I often get utilised by Council departments to represent all equality groups (I agree as it's our way of getting the LGBT angle on the agenda). For example with the new hate crime work in Community Safety no other equality rep has ever turned up despite the highest level of invites. We

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

should be acknowledged for this experience as we connect well with other groups and communities but they are unable or unwilling to formerly represent. Funding us to liaise and represent could be an option as we do it well and with the other groups' consent.

- In previous experience of establishing and managing partnerships the kind of support we have needed has included models of partnership agreements and expert legal advice. We think organisations would also benefit from support (i.e. people) to help facilitate the process of partnership building amongst organisations.
- Support for existing organisations already in this role rather than partisan support for other groups 2. Acknowledgement that on the ground groups possess the necessary knowledge and experience considerable support & resources to set up, develop, facilitate and maintain workable partnership agreements and potentially incorporation as a charity, ltd company or CIC. This is not feasible in the current time line. Financial and infrastructure support from an independent consultancy firm
 - Developing a partnership takes a lot of energy, time, and money to develop.
 - Aligning values, policies, objectives, mission statement and agreeing MoU / partnership agreement and opening bank accounts, getting incorporated could take 2-3 years. C4 is good case study.
- This is only one aspect of the additional demands this whole strategy places on a voluntary sector which is increasingly finding it difficult to resource what it currently does. The council needs to think across the piece how it intends to assist the VCS in meeting these demands. Specifically on this, the council needs to be explicit in its criteria for 'why partnerships' and about why partnerships might be more successful at delivering whatever it is the council wants. Also we need transparency from the council about whether it has any preferred partnerships in mind. We don't want a forced marriage approach. In recent years, there has been a forced approach where organisations have felt pressured to join very unnatural partnership on the assumption that they would miss out on funding and other opportunities otherwise. The Community Centres' Consortium is one such example, now being dominated by the agenda of the few as the others didn't buy into the concept and therefore are silent passengers in the journey.
- C4 was initially supported by Camden Council to set up as a partnership and we couple of years in we are still agreeing the legal structures. As our experience shows with C4, it is not straightforward even when organisations have aligned values. It is unlikely that you will have effective partnerships within this short times scale. It would be better to support the existing partnerships to work more effectively.
- From our experience of forming C4 has shown it is not straightforward even when other organisations have aligned values and a great track record of working with each other. Partnerships would need considerable support in terms of developing a working MoU, partners' agreement, and potentially even incorporating. This is unlikely to lead to fully formed effective partnerships in the period outlined and even longer term is not easy. However, LBC may be the wrong body to drive this and perhaps should focus its energy internally - the biggest gain in terms of partnerships would be one that links the VCS effectively with all departments in the LBC. Similarly some measures currently proposed threaten partnership working, e.g. the introduction of market rents, as they will limit the ability on strategic partners to support other smaller organisations

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Where the Council decides to only fund one organisation in a particular area it will force the formation of partnerships which, in the limited time available, is likely to be focused on fitting services to 'get funding' rather than the provision of the unique essential service that each partner can independently provide. The Council should consider this when deciding that funding is limited to an organisation and thus forcing partnerships
- This will pretty much be determined by the existing partnerships and potential partnerships in each area and where they are at in the process of their development.
- Very little but there may be organisations that we are not aware of that would be able to add significant value, highlighting and introducing us to these organisations will in all likelihood prove sufficient
- Partnerships need to be mutually beneficial. Networking events are helpful, but partnerships cannot be forced
- At Scene & Heard all of our work stems from partnerships – with schools, with community groups, venues, volunteers and, most importantly, with the children we mentor. Our partnerships make us successful. But it should be noted that these partner relationships have grown out of our long term commitment to Camden communities and Somers Town in particular – delivering high quality work within our local community for over 16 years. Partnerships take time to develop and a dedicated staff to build and maximise their potential.
- We are already in a partnership with QCCA. Unclear whether we are supposed to develop other formal partnerships with organisations interested in specific areas of the work we do (e.g. those interested in youth health). Small organisations have limited staff/ trustee time to devote to this sort of work, so checklists, glossary, and model agreements would be useful
- At the best of times partnerships can be complicated bodies. If this was to happen, support from the Council should be in the form of detailed partnership agreements which include management of service allocation and finances. However, the need for partnerships should be organic not forced

Q4: We value the input and experience of the sector in informing Council policy and strategy. What more could the council do in order for you to be able to do that?

- Better and more communication (X2responses)
- Use less jargon
- Been difficult to assimilate – need to bear this in mind if want to engage with new organisations
- think you'd have to engage with sector and have open lines of communication so that the strategy and policy reflects the wider community and is useful to all sectors within the community
- You already do a great job
- Ask for ballpark estimates for what a project will cost before putting a project out to tender Consult (as Camden is indeed good at doing) on policies with groups who will likely be involved in delivering related services Perhaps hold review day workshops where groups can get together with Camden council and comment on what is and isn't working about current policy/strategy

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- I don't really know what you do now; do you talk to trustees? Embed members and officers in all boards? Is there a mechanism like this survey for development of all policies and strategies? Can you target requests based on topic and expertise?
- I think the occasional meetings and workshops are at just the right level. The Council is not too pervasive (as are many sector organisations such as the Big Lottery) and generally allow us to get on with our work. That's important. But there are also forums for debate (such as this consultation) and strong personal relationships between leaders in the VCS and leaders and officers in the Council. It's a good balance
- The meetings about the voluntary sector strategy were good. However, for small organisations there is a limit in how often we can send people to meetings.
- Offer networking opportunities and support to ensure that they get a fair deal.
- The idea of a sector advisory council is a good one - alternatively people will offer more in specialist areas - e.g. social services, adult services, children and young people, mental health etc.
- Valuing the input and experience of the sector in informing Council policy and strategy is not enough for voluntary community organisations to answer their equality issues. The Council should facilitate a new mechanism for the involvement of the communities in its all strategic activities. The Council should involve small community-led organisations by: 1) organising and forming a partnership, 2) developing their organisational capacity that enables them to participate in planning, delivering and evaluating the projects and policies of the Council, and 3) providing the required material and financial resources
- Council can arrange meetings at least once a year to discuss all the input and experiences available and providing experts from the sector to share more experiences and information.
- We are fully aware of Camden policies and procedures. We know what are ask to do and what
- Informing us to take part consultation meetings or online input
- You're pretty good!
- Valuing the input and experience of the sector in informing Council policy and strategy is not enough for voluntary community organisations to answer their equality issues. The Council should facilitate a new mechanism for the involvement of the communities in all its strategic activities. The Council should involve small community -led organisations by: supporting us in organising and forming a partnership, by developing organisational capacity that enables training for participation in planning, delivering and evaluating the projects on behalf of the Council, and providing the required material and financial resources, such as access to venues (empty council properties) to act as central points for communities to recognise and value as a source of support for them
- Investigate the daily business of organisations who are continually flooded with complaints, regardless of the individuals or groups making the complaints. The elderly often complain of abuse, for example
- The plethora of skills within our sector could be the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. The Community Centres Forum went some way to achieving a better sharing of experience across both sectors. The experience could be much enhanced by re-establishing this forum & encouraging decision makers & influencers from other Camden departments to engage with the process

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Make the effort for the input to be understood aka plain English no jargon and buzz words/phrases e.g. keep it real!!
- Listen effectively to what the sector is saying. As a resident my organisation KCBNA has consulted with me and the other users and they have fed this back to the council but most of the times it appears that the council is not listening to what is being said
- I am a user member and I think the council should work with sector.
- Provide more support
- The plethora of skills within our sector could be the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. The Community Centres Forum went some way to achieving a better sharing of experience across both sectors. The experience could be much enhanced by re-establishing this forum & encouraging decision makers & influencers from other Camden departments to engage with the process. (x3)
- Support the VCS to engage and listen to what they say not just do it as a paper exercise
- To provide feedback and evidence of how the input made has or has not influenced the Council's thinking. (One faith based forum that gave input into the engagement process decided not to meet to discuss the consultation paper because there was no evidence or indication that what they said during the engagement phase had been considered and taken on board).
- (Joint) Listen and work collaboratively with the community and voluntary sector and transparency. Provide core funding for this very important remit. It will save vast sums in the long term. Equality in communication as currently some groups are given a forum for themselves which leaves others at a disadvantage, also some of the new and emerging voices have no avenue to share their experience
- Officers and Cabinet members from Camden Council have talked about co-production principles at various stages over the past 5 years. There has been some work from the CTS team to this end for example in setting up the Community Centres' Forum. However there were issues with this as members from other departments have not shown equivalent buy-in. The experience of dealing with different departments shows that 'community-led' commissioning and interdepartmental working within Camden has not been that effective. Examples of this include; the renewal of rents, dealings with Property & Finance and some of the tender processes. The sector will find it increasingly difficult to engage with the council on these matters if it loses core funding and capacity
- There have been some interesting events and attempts made to encourage learning and sharing across the sector, although often this is difficult because organisations struggle to change and can feel insecure in learning from their peers. However, using existing forums and relationships within the sector to do this can be a good way in, for example the area partnerships for youth work or the community centres consortium
- To provide feedback and evidence of how the input made has or has not influenced the Council's thinking.
- We believe Camden Council does well in areas of setting policies and strategies, but smaller organisations need Council support for outreach and advocacy representatives in their organisation, as smaller organisations don't always have the capacity and resources to attend all meetings and consultations, even though their contribution is much needed to help inform the council's policy and strategy. E.g. at BSC only the full time staff or director is responsible the one who should attend all local strategic and council

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

meetings and forums as well other voluntary and community networks, that certainly overstretches the staff time and its unhealthy for the organisation's development

- Camden historically and commendably recognised the importance of supporting specific ethnic communities/organisations through the provision of council properties that attract rent relief and core funding for community centre based activities and services. Therefore, current changes to rent relief or core funding and the use of existing buildings needs consideration when looking at equality organisations
- Council mechanisms for consultation and engagement seem to work. Thematic based service partnerships are important enabling key stakeholders, service users and residents to participate.
- LBC to support a strong independent infra-structure agency for the voluntary sector (i.e. VAC); Pay voluntary organisations for their experience and their time spent; Reporting back to the voluntary sector about where our comments have informed policy,
- This is a key principle – co-design and drawing on the vast expertise of the local community and its organisations holds the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. The principle of the Camden Community Centres Forum was a positive one, but in terms of buy-in from other departments it failed to deliver. There is a key role for the CTS team to help create the correct reach for community organisations across all over Camden and with other departments, and so far no strategy is being presented for how the CTS team will achieve this goal, which was outlined in the last funding round (but not delivered). There need to be simple and transparent processes for how ideas can come from the community and change matters on the ground. Often the process is too slow (e.g., as shown in discussions around social prescription, changes to referral processes) and not transparent. A key point, though, is that organisations can only engage in this way if they are core funded and have the capacity to engage
- Help and understanding for smaller organisations who may not have the resources of the larger ones and so cannot compete
- An internet forum
- We do not want to for partnerships. They are very time consuming and do not always end up offering much extra outcomes.
- I feel you need to hire more outcome development officers, as they are the people on the ground who are the link between the local authority and community organisations. I understand that these are tough times for all LA however we need to ensure that the cuts don't effect these valuable front line staff.
- Genuine co-design between the VCS and Camden can be invaluable in creating innovation and even efficiency savings. The sector holds a wide range of skills and has “connect” to the community which is not always used to best advantage. The principle of the Camden Community Centres Forum was a positive one, but in terms of buy-in from other departments it failed to deliver. There may be advantages to recreating this. The possibility of developing training or shared Camden/VCS partner workshops to look at ways of shaping policy using the skills of the sector could be explored further including on issues of commissioning and tendering potential. Some experiences of VCS organisations working successfully with other Council Department is not always shared or brought back to the CTS team to best advantage to demonstrate achievement of outcomes against the Camden Plan.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Provide capacity building support for small organisations like us to be able to input to support the council's policy and strategy.
- Actually listen and take on board the input received rather than saying no it cannot be this way. A good example is the issue of rent and leases this has been an on-going issue for at least the last 30 years
- Make it easier to communicate, make it a transparent process that all can access, currently you have different forums run by VAC and others, this is not inclusive if you have different meetings for different groups so into everyone is invited to some and others are at everything. You can risk it becoming a forum of the usual suspects.
- Action in words? I hear a lot about LBC valuing input of VCS but evidence is thin on the ground. E.g. Strategic Commissioning and Procurement Board - why not have some VCS input into that? Commissioning in the borough appears to be in a real tangle in some instances and the VCS is on the receiving end of much of
- that - why not use the insight of some VCS members (I volunteer). Note that VAC do a brilliant job but as they can't draw on the formal network meetings which used to exist they shouldn't be relied on as the sole perspective of the VCS particularly in respect of direct service delivery.
- Only core funding can help us do this. And we will do it more efficiently and cheaply than anyone else.
- 1. Ensure a joined up LBC approach to relationships with the sector. 2. Develop a partnership relationship with the sector rather than the present one based on colonialism and control 3. Ensure that officers producing reports on topics/areas consult people with knowledge of the topic/area BEFORE completing the report. 4 See the VCS as part of an overall, cohesive and coherent plan across LBC and locally, rather than as at present merely an "add on" 6. Acknowledge that VCS brings in £230 m charity funding to the borough and tens of thousands of voluntary hour
- reflect our input more accurately and objectively in consultations, reports and policy have VCS representatives with full voting rights on all key Camden partnerships and steering groups etc. organisations can only engage in this way if they are core funded and have the capacity to engage the principle of the Camden Community Centres Forum was a positive one, but in terms of buy-in from other departments it failed to deliver. *The plethora of skills within our sector could be the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. The Community Centres Forum went some way to achieving a better sharing of experience across both sectors. The experience could be much enhanced by re-establishing this forum & encouraging decision makers & influencers
- from other Camden departments to engage with the process there is a key role for the CTS team to help create the correct reach for community organisations across all over Camden and with other departments, and so far no strategy is being presented for how the CTS team will achieve this goal, which was outlined in the last funding round (but not delivered). *there need to be simple and transparent processes for how ideas can come from the community and change matters on the ground. Often the process is too slow (e.g., as shown in discussions around social prescription, changes to referral processes) and not transparent.
- Co-design and co-production. We have heard this rhetoric before but never in practice. It needs to be implemented – no point saying what we want to hear without any action.
 - LBC need to draw on the vast expertise of the local community and wider VS.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Need to have regular VCISO/Community centres forum – can't see why the CCF was scrapped.
- Need to define the role of the CTS team. We have never used or were offered any support real support.
- Camden Council continues to proactively engage with VSOs to inform and develop its work, and this is something we value. The consultation events have been helpful and events such as these are a good way to engage with the Council. The one change would be it would be good if some of these events could be a little shorter, as we want to make sure key staff can attend and it can sometimes be difficult to find the time to do this.
- Organisations need to be engaged at the earliest possible stage to have any impact and the parameters of what they can influence need to be clear. Also, the council must recognise that this is another resource burden on increasingly fragile organisations and needs to consider how best it can support this.
- This is a key principle – co-design and drawing on the vast expertise of the local community and its organisations holds the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. The principle of the Camden Community Centres Forum was a positive one, but in terms of buy-in from other departments it failed to deliver. There is a key role for the CTS team to help create the correct reach for community organisations across all over Camden and with other departments, and so far no strategy is being presented for how the CTS team will achieve this goal, which was outlined in the last funding round (but not delivered). There need to be simple and transparent processes for how ideas can come from the community and change matters on the ground. Often the process is too slow (e.g., as shown in discussions around social prescription, changes to referral processes) and not transparent. A key point, though, is that organisations can only engage in this way if they are core funded and have the capacity to engage. Co-design and drawing on the vast expertise of the local community and its organisations holds the key to unlocking great efficiency savings for Camden. This has to build on good work already done. The Camden Community Centres Forum was based on a positive principle, but in terms of buy-in from other departments it failed to deliver. Based on this learning there is a key role for the CTS team to help create the correct reach for community organisations across all Camden departments. Given as this goal was outlined in the last funding round (but not delivered) it is unfortunate that the consultation present no strategy for how the CTS team will succeed this time. After all - impact on policy and strategy has to be linked up across departments. E.g. at a small organisation like HCA has to maintain relationships with multiple officers covering health, adult social care, sports, CTS and Children Schools and Families. This takes a lot of resource and could be done more efficiently if Camden itself was working a joined up way. This requires support at the cabinet level, across portfolios, as well as a voluntary sector champion. There need to be simple and transparent processes for how ideas can come from the community and change matters on the ground. Often the process is too slow (e.g., as shown in discussions around social prescription, changes to referral processes) and not transparent. E.g. it is unclear how the engagement process (with a clear rejection of C and D) ended up delivering a consultation paper where nearly 20% of available funding is proposed as being invested in that way. A key additional point is that organisations can only engage in this if they are core funded and have the capacity to engage.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- The sector provides valuable services that saves the Council money both immediately and in the long term. In order for the Council to truly gain value from the sector's knowledge and experience, informing their policy and strategy, the sector needs to be properly funded. This would allow them the security to attract other funding and deliver more services. The Council should therefore ensure they fund core costs including rent.
- For all of us as we move forward working together both in terms of strategy and delivery is essential, but unless there is buy in across all departments and a genuine understanding of what and how the VCS can help the impact of this will remain limited
- Consultations carried out within appropriate timescales suffices, working closely with VAC is also very beneficial, particularly when trying to reach some of the smaller organisations in the borough. The council needs to be clear about their plans before consulting, if they are too vague, the sector won't have the opportunity to input properly
- Council officers and members need to come out and see our projects in action, talk to people delivering and receiving services. That will always be more effective than meetings
- The Consultation sessions that Camden presents are good and well run. However, there is a danger that they are attended by people who are predisposed/open to attending such sessions and inputting into research. Are you reaching all the voluntary organisations in the Borough? Can you rely on them to come to you? At Scene & Heard we know that groups of the community we work with are "hard to reach" and, by definition, we therefore cannot expect them to come to us. So, we go to them. We visit community groups, schools, even homes so that we can reach those who may otherwise slip under the radar. Could the Camden VCS team do more to visit the communities that they represent – to visit projects and voluntary organisations and see work in action? Seek out the people and groups that do not feel the consultation sessions are "for them" and give them another way to input into what is going on in their Borough.
- Non-time consuming way of contributing experience. Greater understanding by all Council departments of how the voluntary sector works, particularly the responsibilities of trustees and the 'standard' requirements of external funders. Examples include the need for prudence, the short term non - guaranteed nature of much funding; the length of guaranteed occupancy needed to trigger capital grants, and the slender overhead costs funders demand.
- Come to their meetings; Listen to their concerns; Provide training to smaller organisations; work closely with small organisations; 2 way communication – council share with groups what is happening

Q5: What can we do to support small organisations to be involved in partnerships?

- need extra support for small organisations
- Engage with them and let them know about the different organisations in voluntary and community sector- have monthly or quarterly meetings. Find out from them what would make it easier for them to be involved in partnerships and what would work best for them.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Get involved on the ground do a report on any group weakness and good points use this as a base line for any investment
- Partnerships are difficult- in particular support is needed in finding a potential partner (or being found by one) that they can work on good terms with.
- If they're too small to function adequately, I wouldn't bother. If a partnership is the way to go, they'll get there without you.
- In some ways, get out of the way. Continue to bring organisations together through major strategic consultations and occasional networking or discussion groups particularly to inform the "projects" based area of this new plan. But generally don't put too much on the tables of individual VCS organisations, which are already so stretched.
- Offer networking opportunities and support to ensure that they get a fair deal.
- At the outline/indicative bid stage (see above) employ facilitators and emphasise the importance of involving small orgs.
- The Council can support small organisations to be involved in partnership in the following ways; holding consultation meetings within the communities to explain the benefits of working in partnership; 2) providing capacity-building training for community coordinators and organisers; 3) providing proper partnership guidelines and the legal framework, and 4) providing limited material and financial support towards the formation of the partnership.
- Make it possible for the small group to unite with each other. For example 5-10 small organisations can form a forum.
- Recognize their state. Give them training. Introduce them to other small and big groups. Be flexible with them and so on.
- Bigger organisations do not voluntarily like to form partnership with smaller ones and when they need to form a partnership out of necessity that they undermine the smaller organisations. Therefore, the council should to be involved and should advocate for the smaller organisations.
- Provide funds and be open to risk - small organisations tend to be risky, but the gain is high too because generally they are run on a shoestring so good value! Provide networking opportunities where we can genuinely get to know each other. The volunteering services (UCL's and CVV) know how to do this.
- The Council can support small organisations to be involved in partnership in the following ways. 1) holding consultation meetings within the communities to explain the benefits of working in partnership; 2) providing capacity -building training for community coordinators and organisers; 3) providing proper partnership guidelines and the legal framework, and 4) providing limited material and financial support towards the formation of the partnership.
- It is important that the Council recognise our state and current situation such as recognising our contribution to the increased attainment of children from our communities through our supplementary school provision.
- Providing experts from across the sectors to share more experiences and information will help us build a strong partnership, making it possible for the smaller community groups to unite with each other.
- Consider staffing requirements as many small organisations cannot spare the time for extra Council meetings.
- Small by whose definition? Partnerships with whom? Each other? Larger organisation or Camden itself? Each of these questions will have different answer but all be based around building skills, capacity & managing expectations
- Provide the expertise to support their development and that does not mean "taking over"

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Unfortunately small organisations do not have the capacity to survive in this current tough times and it's better to support the larger ones rather than take funds away from them and put them at risk too
- support them to build a foundation and be more stable
- Support them with advice and guidance
- We need more resources, funding and guidance
- Small by whose definition? Partnerships with whom? Each other? Larger organisation or Camden itself? Each of these questions will have different answer but all be based around building skills, capacity & managing expectations.(x3)
- Provide premises for meetings and some advice to organisations linked to ours (a community centre)but also need to stress that providing premises costs/hosting meetings money and time that we do not have much of.so, also it would be very difficult to know where and whether to refer people to other community organisations which might be more appropriate but where we aren't the decision makers
- Support them with infrastructure support and training to be able to engage in partnership work
- One of the key challenges identified in the engagement process was small organisations being unnoticed.
- The Council is a funder and is therefore not ideally situated to provide support. This needs to be provided by an independent organisation which would provide the following:
 - Brokering relationships to enable people and organisations to come together, within and across sectors and boroughs.
 - Linking larger organisations to smaller ones to provide support and 'shelter'.
 - Brokering partnerships and consortiums.
 - Helping organisations find the right partner/s.
 - Provision of model agreements and other back office materials.
 - Information on the different models that exist and the pros and cons.
 - Setting up of Special Purpose Vehicle to enable small organisations to bid successfully with other to deliver some aspects of larger grant aid agreements/contracts.
 - Fund to enable small organisations to back fill and meet the expenses of attending meetings.
 - Governance support. Capacity building support. Insure they are not blocked by larger consortiums and organisations. Rent relief issue does not result in non-building holding groups being charged to cover the cost of change in rent relief; we need affordable spaces to work, not to be forced to find a building to take over.
- The definition here is not necessarily clear – by 'small' what threshold is this, is it in comparison to larger organisations. The way the question is posed is that smaller organisations wish to be involved in partnerships; however it needs to be clear where the impetus for this is coming from – is it so that Camden can interact with them more easily? Partnerships take time to form, working practices and relationships to evolve and need to come from genuine need and desire of partner organisations and people to work together. If the purpose is to allow smaller organisations to bid for tenders etc. then this aim is laudable. However it might be that Camden is not best placed and there may be expertise that can be brought in from outside
- This is a difficult challenge where there is a focus on larger strategic partners or broader themes (or geographical areas). Providing a basic level of core

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

funding, with an expectation that there is engagement (from all partners), in strategic forums could be a way of doing this. Another approach could be to incentivise partnerships around the diversity of their memberships but this too can be difficult to assess and emotive if not done well. There are few ways of fostering good partnerships beyond positive, collaborative leadership

- The Council should define what it means by a small organisation. Also the Council should turn to/fund organisations like West Euston Partnership and the VAC to provide independent support to small organisations
- The council needs to encourage and develop equal opportunity strategy amongst organisations to work in partnership. We also think the council needs to develop a strategy to monitor that funded partners have equal footing over their partnership work, and that a larger organisation isn't dominating over a smaller one.
- Supporting small organisations is vital in order to achieve resilience and cohesive communities. Therefore, involving into the decision making process and providing core funding will enable them to get involved in partnerships without feeling isolated or left behind
- Capacity building opportunities and measures to improve governance in smaller organisations
- Provide assistance from experienced council officers to help organisations be involved in partnerships as many small organisations are understaffed
- Allow us to decide what partnerships would serve our aims and objectives - and our (potential and existing) service users best, The voluntary sector's bloodline are the grass-roots and the partnerships which grow out of that; please do not destroy those processes by imposing a 'false' structure from the top. It takes time (and resources) to build real, meaningful partnerships with other organisations,
- 1. Allow us to decide what partnerships would serve our aims and objectives - and our (potential and existing) service users best, 2. The voluntary sector's bloodline are the grass-roots and the partnerships which grow out of that; please do not destroy those processes by imposing a 'false' structure from the top,3.It takes time (and resources) to build real, meaningful partnerships with other organisations
- It is unclear whether you mean supporting small organisations being involved in partnerships with each other or with larger organisations. Both have particular difficulties – the former would compound a lack of core capacity, whereas the latter could raise issues around balanced decision-making. It is unclear whether Camden have the in-house expertise and perhaps should draw in expertise from voluntary organisations that have gone through this process in Camden or in other boroughs. As above, this is a process that will take time and resources, and of course, will on the part of everyone involved. Really, Camden would need to put forward a concrete idea of where they believe partnerships would need to be established and who they would expect to be involved with that. This should then be consulted on over time. It would have been helpful if this had been included in the consultation
- Advice to organisations, hiring our rooms for those meetings (provides income for struggling organisations), help for where to refer people when we are unable to assist them.
- Publicise what organisations are looking for partners or have a central internet database into which organisations enter details of requirements and other organisations can browse
- Provide training, advice support and guidance. capacity building funds would be good.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Training and capacity building better inclusion and support for small organisations better outreach and more involvement.
- It depends on whether this refers to small organisations being involved in partnerships with each other or with larger organisations, or taking their part in borough-wide partnerships. All have different considerations and depends on the individual organisations aims, capacity and stage of development. There should be support for both formative and established smaller organisations to develop, and be enabled to have their voice heard and needs responded to. This goes back to the question of offering a range of infrastructural and individual support, at a local or borough wide level. It is unclear whether Camden have the in-house expertise and are the most appropriate to do this. It may be once again better to draw in expertise from voluntary organisations, large and medium sized, to assist with this. Certainly a forum to enable such VCS organisations to interact and be heard could be developed.
- Help them to build their foundation and develop their capacity.
- Provide small groups with core funding. It does not sit well for a large organisation like Camden Council not to meet the exacting equalities standards that it expects from the groups it funds when in own practice it does not meet them when it comes to the way it funds small groups and groups of interest. It puts large demands on small organisation and expects them to engage in partnerships and attend meetings while refusing to provide them with core funding only offering project funding, this is a discriminatory practice.
- We should be able to attend any and every meeting that is important, some will be out of work hours some during the day, we need to take into account that some organisations have hardly any staff free to attend multiple meetings in a week so some council coordination of key meetings so we are not over pushed to attend, also locations of meetings seem to create expense as a lot of travel for organisations based in the north or from the south going to events in the north, maybe move the meetings around so we don't all have to travel to the opposite side of Camden every time there is a meeting. Cost of setting up partnerships has to be met perhaps? again a capacity building task maybe involved as some groups may not know about the process and what it involves?
- From my perspective Camden has had a good track record of facilitating groups to make direct contact with each other and this should continue. Also note need for development support previously mentioned
- Discuss with strategic partners what incentives might be available. 2. Provide data relevant to both including sources of funding from charitable sources 3. Where there are several such organisations covering the same topic attempt to get amalgamations. 4 Advise such organisations of LBC sources of funding e.g. via DMCs and HRA. 5. Help to organise meetings of commercial sponsors who can support such organisations
- provide the resources necessary, facilitate and develop; arrange networking events where ideas and resources can be pooled; have a small organisation rep elected by the borough wide organisations to attend meetings, consultations etc. All small organisations could contribute to the costs of this; be clear about why partnerships are being formed, the long term benefits (if any) in light of the shorter term investment of time and resources small by whose definition? Partnerships with whom? Each other? Larger organisation or Camden itself? Each of these questions will have different answer but all be based around building skills, capacity & managing expectations.
- It almost appears to be a backward strategy, at the start of the recession and Camden's funding cuts, many small organisations closed down, this was also

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

due to more lengthy and bureaucratic processes where they couldn't pass the PQQ stage.

- Now LBC is starving out the organisations that have successfully survived the cuts thus far. The existing organisations have acquired the skills to understand LBC's/ external funders' language. What is being done to sustain that? Or are these organisations no longer needed?
- Small organisations needs to be supported and nurtured by med/large organisations- but investments would need to be made to harness that. What outcomes are LBC trying to achieve- needs to be defined. Is there a role for the CTS team? Caution needs to be applied to reduce division
- Facilitating discussions; providing independent advice re structures and legalities; minimising waste in the sense of being clear about how far the council is likely to support a proposed partnership (understanding that it can't make prior commitments but could say if it thought a proposed partnership wasn't going to go anywhere). Many smaller organisations are still fighting for survival, scraping small pots of funding from various sources. They don't understand the purpose or benefit of partnership and don't have the capacity, either in terms of resources or understanding, to think strategically. There is still a fear of competition and duplication. There is still a lot of work to be done about building the capacity of these organisations and helping them understand what development looks like for them. Some need help to decide whether they want to stay small and perfectly formed, or whether they want to grow and expand. Until they make this decision for themselves, they will not be able to think about or understand the concept of partnerships. The Council should invest in lower level capacity building. Once small organisations develop a vision, they will understand the role of partnerships.
- It is unclear whether you mean supporting small organisations being involved in partnerships with each other or with larger organisations. Both have particular difficulties – the former would compound a lack of core capacity, whereas the latter could raise issues around balanced decision-making. It is unclear whether Camden have the in-house expertise and perhaps should draw in expertise from voluntary organisations that have gone through this process in Camden or in other boroughs. As above, this is a process that will take time and resources, and of course, will on the part of everyone involved. Really, Camden would need to put forward a concrete idea of where they believe partnerships would need to be established and who they would expect to be involved with that. This should then be consulted on over time. It would have been helpful if this had been included in the consultation. Firstly, it would be helpful to see how Camden defines "small". By most definitions HCA is a small grass-roots organisation, but we know (from our partners) that there of course are many smaller voluntary organisations (including those with only volunteers).Second, it is unclear whether you mean supporting small organisations being involved in partnerships with each other or with larger organisations. Both have particular difficulties – the former would compound a lack of core capacity, whereas the latter could raise issues around balanced decision-making. It is unclear whether Camden have the in-house expertise and perhaps should draw in expertise from voluntary organisations that have gone through this process in Camden or in other boroughs. As above, this is a process that will take time and resources and of course, will on the part of everyone involved. Really, Camden would need to put forward a concrete idea of where they believe partnerships would need to be established and who they would expect to be involved with that. This should then be consulted

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

on over time. It would have been helpful if this had been included in the consultation. There needs to be a clear rationale that assures that the money invested into is value for money, i.e. that the long term benefits for communities are greater than spending this resource elsewhere.

- The issues raised in Q3 refers. In addition small organisations will lack capacity and this will make partnership working more difficult
- Small organisations are incredibly resilient, operate with massive amounts of good will, volunteer time and often a wing and a pray, but what they lack can often be found in larger VCS organisations. This lack of connection was brought home to us at one of the consultation events that I and my team attended, when it was clear that what STCA had was space, but lacked staff to deliver on key need areas due to funding cuts, but what these smaller groups had was the staff/volunteers and user groups but no space. The opportunities here obvious to see, but there is a disconnect that needs be overcome.
- It is important to recognise that it is not always appropriate for small organisations to be seeking out new partners – sometimes they must focus on the delivery of work to benefit the community now. Some organisations may work more organically, developing informal partnerships, whilst others may have more formal arrangements. What is key is that the approach to partnership work is appropriate to the organisations involved and that any new partnerships are created to maximise benefits for the community.
- Small organisations with limited resources will have to see specific advantages in spending scarce trustee or staff time in partnership involvement which can be complicated to negotiate and maintain.
- Partnerships are even harder for very small organizations because staff are needed onsite, rather than out at meetings.
- Better understanding of the needs of small organisations; Need to know different groups provide different services; Need not to talk down to partners No partner should feel threatened or intimidated; More support for organisations that have trustees that are also service users; Support vulnerable disabled organisations; Support from staff; Training; Good resources; Good advocacy services; Sharing experiences and knowledge

Q6: How can we help smaller equalities groups to connect with one another?

- networking with organisations
- Faith groups aren't at the top of the list, but I do believe we have resources that could be helpful to local social care and engagement, although we may not have the professionals. we are probably already engaged pastorally with smaller equalities groups
- Engage with them and let them know about the different organisations in voluntary and community sector- have monthly or quarterly meetings. Find out from them what would make it easier for them to be involved in partnerships and what would work best for them.
- You already do
- Opportunities to meet potential partners, long before you expect them to start delivering services together, so there is time to build up trust and agree potential terms etc. Perhaps a directory of potential partners where organisations can provide the info that others need to do due diligence on them and networking events/ mailing lists where organisations can start a dialogue. Perhaps Camden could even take the lead on identifying potential partners which they might want to see working together, and do the introductions (partner matchmaking!)

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Why would they, anyway?
- Allow the 'market' to take its course: support the strongest organisations but be happy to allow mergers and partnerships that could save the VCS organisations and the Council money in the long term. Organisations should work from the same buildings, with "hub" spaces in the borough encouraged and supported.
- Possibly through online forums, arranging networking events
- focus on the outcomes and goals
- The right way to help smaller equalities groups for connecting with one another is to organise them under the partnership mechanism. If groups get together and work in partnership, they will have opportunities to discuss and communicate with one another, and share skills, experience and resources that can help each group to deliver effectively a range of services to their clients.
- Make it possible for them to share information, ways of delivery services and training
- Form a forum. Organize meeting in different local areas in different time. Provide translators.
- To form network groups or forums where they can share their ideas and experiences and exchange information.
- The right way to help smaller equalities groups for connecting with one another is to organise them under the partnership mechanism. If groups get together and work in partnership, they will have opportunities to discuss and communicate with one another, and share skills, experience and resources that can help each group to deliver effectively a range of services to their clients.
- IT
- Again we believe the starting point will be around skills, capacity & managing expectations. Then perhaps a forum based on the Community Centres Forum to disseminate information, support issue based discussion, exchange of ideas & gathering of support.
- Be the conduit of change and development, and most of all "listen
- Provide events where they can all come together and network. I think organisations are more effective when they work with all sections of the community rather than just one group!
- Organise networking events
- Organise events for them to come together
- More networking events
- Again we believe the starting point will be around skills, capacity & managing expectations. Then perhaps a forum based on the Community Centres Forum to disseminate information, support issue based discussion, exchange of ideas & gathering of support. (x3)
- Link them to larger bodies and/or a borough wide approach.
- Organise more networking events and opportunities for the groups to come together.
- VAC - Initially small networking events to which targeted groups and individuals are invited. A co-produced development plan would need to be produced to underpin and support networking, including an agreement on what is meant by 'smaller equalities groups' and the relationship they wish to develop with the larger players. This work will need to be independently resourced.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- (Joint) Information and networking opportunities. You facilitate networks, but that the cost for networking is factored into the funding pot.
- We are not clear on the thinking behind this. There seems to be the implication that the groups are not already connecting. This may be the case; however there are some well-known formal networks of equalities groups. Camden does some good work already in this respect and potentially updating/formalising the information on these groups – i.e. an overview of the registered charities and unincorporated bodies working in this area would be useful. Cindex exists but there needs to be something else for this purpose.
- To a degree in the same ways as those above. However, taking cross-borough thematic approaches could help. The key question is the degree to which one sees smaller equalities groups as working to improve equalities outcomes independently or to improve and influence the practice of larger organisations.
- Initially small networking events to which targeted groups and individuals are invited. Also what is meant by 'smaller equalities groups'? This work will need to be independently resourced.
- The council can help smaller equalities by supporting their capacity building and providing adequate resources enabling them to work together, support each other, and advocate for their community interests and have a collective voice.
- Smaller equalities groups deserve to commend their contributions towards education and empowerment. Therefore, providing the necessary resources will enable them to connect one another
- Better use of fora and networks.
- By providing help with basic core funding, which will result in greater capacity to look beyond the survival of one's own organisation, 2. By supporting a strong infra-structure organisation (as already mentioned above It is unclear whether here you are asking about mergers between organisations, creating networks, or even whether you intend to, e.g., fund one partnership/organisation working on any one equalities issue. As above, details need to be provided of what Camden is thinking. At minimum, an overview of the registered charities either based in or working in Camden, and what they do, would be a start. However, there are also unincorporated bodies and bodies that are not registered charities that are relevant (including, e.g., Tenants' and Residents' Associations).
- Forum for us to meet each other and exchange ideas, advice sessions, links to larger organisations
- Better use of the internet and social media
- Provide them with opportunities to engage with each other.
- There needs to be better access to services for smaller groups who may find it difficult to gain access to funding or maybe unaware of upcoming support. Also more joint funding to push community organisations to work together and in partnership rather than seeing each other as competitors
- Again it is about Camden thinking clearly about providing capacity support and network opportunities, and about the existence of cohesive communities to foster "connection" and equality of opportunity. Providing clear information to such organisations on how to connect is key. Again a forum based on the Community Centres Forum to disseminate information, relevant issue-based discussion, exchange of ideas & gathering of support
- We are an equality group and enjoy going to networking events. Council should have more networking events.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- As above, but I am sure small groups will have much they would want to input on their own accord funding this, clear purpose for the process, clarity of Camden goals for this? Being small is not the issue, it is knowing what is worth your time and what is not, clearly some of us have made time to do this over the years, but until people knew us (CSCC) and we attended, no one wanted to hear about the issues we work with, it should not be so hard for small groups to share their knowledge and experience, but it has been historically and it take a lot of fighting and advocacy and networking to change perception- when it did not need to be so that difficult in future. Partnership has to be two way, including with the council, maybe you should ask smaller groups more often this type of question and develop a plan from more detailed conversations and mapping work. We think more research is needed outside this consultation, to focus on equalities groups and their needs to establish how we engage and work with the communities and organisations
- 1. Survey what exists 2. Arrange a series of meetings to try to bring about amalgamations
- arrange networking/training events; * arrange and facilitate workshops to encourage enable connectivity; * produce up to date listings of all smaller equalities groups including legal status, contact details and brief summary of their aims, objectives and planned outcomes; * continue rent relief to organisations so that they can continue to offer highly subsidised/core cost rental space for groups to meet, engage, network and deliver their services;* assessment of skills, capacity & managing expectations. Then perhaps a forum based on the Community Centres Forum to disseminate information, support issue based discussion, exchange of ideas & gathering of support
- Secure more funding/investment - Provide incentive to med/large organisations to nurture/accommodate small organisations
- There is still a role for VAC, but questions need to be asked about how relevant VAC still is in Camden. Other than managing networks, what does it offer small community groups and organisations? Smaller equalities groups need to be better organised, but that needs to be self-led and self-managed, otherwise they will struggle to think and act independently.
- It is unclear whether here you are asking about mergers between organisations, creating networks, or even whether you intend to, e.g., fund one partnership/organisation working on any one equalities issue. As above, details need to be provided of what Camden is thinking. At minimum, an overview of the registered charities either based in or working in Camden, and what they do, would be a start. However, there are also unincorporated bodies and bodies that are not registered charities that are relevant (including, e.g., Tenants' and Residents' Associations).
- As above – it would be helpful to have clear definitions. It is unclear whether here you are asking about mergers between organisations, creating networks, or even whether you intend to, e.g., fund one partnership/organisation working on any one equalities issue. As above, details need to be provided of what Camden is thinking. At minimum, an overview of the registered charities either based in or working in Camden, and what they do, would be a start. However, there are also unincorporated bodies and bodies that are not registered charities that are relevant (including, e.g., Tenants' and Residents' Associations).
- There also needs to be a recognition that equalities issues are not the sole domain of equalities groups and the smaller groups need to be tied into the workings of other organisations such as community associations. Just as we should work with them, there should be an expectation that everyone works

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

together. That said – one has to be careful to claim representation, particularly where organisations have capacity issues.

- Mapping of what is available in Camden would be a start and this could be followed by networking opportunities.
- There is a role for the Council or a Strategic Partner to act as a broker, so as to bring groups together so as to resolve that disconnect an connect need with opportunity or asset/resource
- Service mapping the VCS would be incredibly helpful albeit very challenging due to the ever changing landscape. Knowing who and where people are, particularly outside of the locality is a useful piece of information to have. Grouping services through this process in terms of the specialist areas that they work in e.g. disability
- Groups will connect over shared services and user groups - not over generalities like "equalities
- It would be helpful if the VCS could facilitate good communications and networking between Camden's voluntary and charity organisations, possibly through regular events, online and through printed materials. Organisations who have a long and successful track record of working in the Borough are experts in their field. The VCS team should know such expert providers and be able to call upon their expertise to inform policy decisions as well as to help new practitioners as they set up, or talk to key organisations across the Borough, sharing local knowledge and experience. This expertise would be easier to access if there was a Camden "Map" of Service Providers.
- Facilitate intergroup discussion. Make funding conditional on connection.
- Scene & Heard has been a constant presence in its local community for nearly two decades. We are an example of best practice within the charity sector, as recognised by our Queen's Award for Voluntary Service. We always welcome opportunities to share our skills and expertise and increase understanding of the benefits of mentoring children and how our way of working helps children suffering deprivation. It would be useful to establish and keep an up-to-date online network of Voluntary and Community organisations and continue to develop programme of events which bring local organisations together. It would be very encouraging if Camden could offer more opportunities for groups to publicise their work through Camden Council and the VCS network.
- Better understanding of the needs of small organisations; Need to know different groups provide different services; Need not to talk down to partners; No partner should feel threatened or intimidated; More support for organisations that have trustees that are also service users; Support vulnerable disabled organisations; Support from staff; Training; Good resources; Good advocacy services; Sharing experiences and knowledge

Q7: Do you think that there should be a cap on the maximum amount that any one organisation can receive from the Strategic Partners Fund?

- no cap (x 16 responses)
- If the system is based on need and the funding is to be distributed accordingly I'm not sure I see the need to cap the maximum amount as it would be 'self-policing' however there is wisdom in capping to ensure fairness
- Yes, I think there should be a limit and to be fair to all organisations and groups in the best way possible

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Yes and 30% any group should be made to raise from private funding. If you give all funding you create lazy centre teams who do not have to bother to go out to business and find funds
- Tough one. I think if an organisation is delivering services consistently well and making an impactful difference to high priority equality areas then there shouldn't be an arbitrary cap on how much they can receive. However this has to be balanced against giving opportunities to potential new Strategic Partners who could potentially do an equally great job given the chance (esp. smaller orgs). But then the number of Strategic Partners has to be balanced against the costs of administering the fund to multiple partners! In practice I wouldn't want to see only a small number of organisations (e.g. 2 or 3) receiving the whole fund.
- Possibly, how can I say? So long as someone is doing something right, it doesn't matter who or what they are.
- You put it in the policy, you're wedded to it. Maybe have an idea of, rather than an express commitment to, a maximum allowance but allow one or two major strategic partners or partnerships to benefit from longer term or higher value investments
- Yes, should involve a wide spread of organisations
- Probably yes - as a guide to scale of bid - but see comment above - partnerships will require more than single organisation bids,
- Yes the fund should recognise the work of smaller organisations and aim to spread support. Also, the fund should try to resist political pressure from members trying to protect the interests of established organisations which have been receiving core funding/ free accommodation for decades from Camden but have done poorly in terms of preparing themselves for the recession and not sought outside funding. The fund should not be used to prop up such organisations at this late stage as they have had years to prepare themselves. We all face tough times but by now viable organisations should be in a position to demonstrate that a significant proportion of their funding is non LBC based.
- In fact, there should a cap on the maximum amount, but if small community organisations are organised and work in partnership in their local areas, they will have a chance to share a fair amount of money from the Strategic Partners Fund. The Council therefore should provide material and financial supports to all small organisations to be organised in the form of partnership in their areas and with organisations that have common objectives
- There should be limit to cap the larger well-funded organisations to give a chance to small ones.
- Hmm. Maybe not on the amount but on the proportion of what you have? Tricky, but I think if anyone got more than half it would be bad, or if it all went to three organisations.... I'd say make sure there's a good range of grant amounts.
- In fact, there should a cap on the maximum amount, but if small community organisations are organised and work in partnership in their local areas, they will have a chance to share a fair amount of money from the Strategic Partners Fund. The Council therefore should provide material and financial supports to all small organisations to be organised in the form of partnership in their areas and with organisations that have common objectives
- yes or the larger organisations will shout the loudest
- Yes as this would mean coming together could generate more funds for them
- No in fact I think the overall amount should be more if it is to make a real difference

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- No it depends on what communities they work with and the level of need.
- **Tier One.** Large grants. £50,000 and over per year. **Tier Two.** Development investment for smaller initiatives with grants up to £25,000 per year.
- Absolutely, so enough to go round for smaller partnerships as well as larger partnerships. But also do not fund a small group a very small amount if they have been realistic about the cost they have to deliver quality work. Funding should be made using determining factors such as ability to identify need and deliver, not historical relationships and ways of working that may not reflect the need in Camden today. Although this will depend on the cap. There is still work (ego LGBT or learning difficulties– only 0.01 of charitable monies were given to LGBT groups in London in recent times –source Centred policy document on funding -2014) that is very unpopular in terms of funding. Also where trusts and foundations do give they prefer to give to big groups or those that are first tier.
- No. Broadly speaking, a cap would seem arbitrary and would mitigate against partnership applications. In addition to this, any loss of rent relief may necessitate organisations applying for more from the Strategic Partners Fund. Having said this, we do not think that Camden should pursue a model of funding a few organisations by large amounts.
- I think this is difficult to say without additional information but the principle that funds need to be distributed across the borough in order to deliver outcomes suggests there would be a cap of some description. However, whereas more diffuse partnerships might be effective in one area, a smaller group or even single players might be required to play a larger role elsewhere so this variation needs to be accommodated
- Large grants. £50,000 plus per year. Development investment for smaller initiatives with grants up to £25,000 per year. However, this should not be too prescriptive with some grants falling between the two.
- Yes, we think there should be a cap on the maximum amount, and the cap should be based on the level of needs. We think a cap will allow more organisations to benefit from the investment and ensure a wider number of people in the Community are effectively serviced under more organisations. It will also ensure greater equality of opportunity between smaller and larger organisations hoping for the investment.
- Not necessarily but we need to consider equally for each organisation regardless their size, premises and location. And strong recognition should be given the equality organisations who don't benefit current relief and core funding.
- Yes. If funding is for seven years it's important that there is a proportionate spread of funding across the sector. It's also important so that emerging needs can be addressed and new services are able to develop. This leads to better long term collaboration between agencies.
- Yes, otherwise organisations can become too large, cumbersome and inefficient at the detriment of other organisations
- Yes, if only to allow the smaller organisations the opportunity of some income.
- No. Particularly if there are partnerships involved or organisations of different size, a cap would be arbitrary, unless there are legal procurement reasons that would create a limit. If there are such limits it would make the decision to include paying rent to Camden in the core strategic funding even more problematic. It would also disadvantage organisations that run facilities in more expensive areas and as such have higher core costs
- Yes although level this should be set at is unclear.
- No

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- No, I think funding should be given on the need and look at the best organisation to address this needs as opposed to funding an organisation for the sake of it. I feel organisations need to become more like businesses and will need to justify value for money and explain why they are best placed to do so. what is the Unique selling point what makes them different from other organisations
- No. Imposing a cap could be somewhat arbitrary at this stage, especially when considering individual as opposed to possible partnership applications. For those VCS organisations potentially facing loss of rent relief, the question of whether we include an amount for rent is unclear but could lead to higher bids to make provision for such a possibility.
- It has been suggested that a minimum amount of £50K would be allocated for investment in larger individual VCS strategic partner organisations, and a lower amount of £25k for development investment for smaller ones, but this has not been included within the consultation document. Under the last funding round, there was more transparency and clarity from the outset on funding available for community centres and other specific areas and therefore a cap was more feasible to apply. This would be difficult to apply in the same way this time round due to the construction of the funding proposal. However, clearly the Council should have some rationale for allocating funds otherwise they could go to just a very small number of larger organisations and the aims to address need across the borough with a neighbourhood connect would be seriously compromised. We think Camden should definitely **not** pursue a model of funding a few organisations with large amounts. The final proposals for the allocation of funding may well need further discussion to ensure this vital pot of funding is best used.
- No a good organisation should get more funding to increase their work
- This approach has worked in the past but this consultative approach leaves too many outstanding issues and unanswered question
- Probably as the funding is limited and if the contract is 7 years. We think it is a good thing that all groups can apply, but a limit may help to increase the number of good strategic partners Camden has and help foster better selection of partnership working organisations. There needs to be realistic expectations, an unlimited funding application from a small group may be seen as way too much because past amounts given to equalities groups has been very small in some cases, but if they will be applying on a full cost recovery model and factoring the issues of rent as they do not have a building, they should be given a fair access if the amount they require reflects the actual cost of the work they do, in real terms not the current way in which high output with low funding is seen as a gain for the council, it is detrimental to the sustainability of the levels of work done previously and should be funded according to the level of work and areas covered. How will you determine this process of selection and what factors will you look at when picking partners in this area? If you do not make the grade what happens?
- Probably as the funding is limited and if the contract is 7 years. We think it is a good thing that all groups can apply, but a limit may help to increase the number of good strategic partners Camden has and help foster better selection of partnership working organisations. There needs to be realistic expectations, an unlimited funding application from a small group may be seen as way too much because past amounts given to
- equalities groups has been very small in some cases, but if they will be applying on a full cost recovery model and factoring the issues of rent as they do not have a building, they should be given a fair access if the amount they

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

require reflects the actual cost of the work they do, in real terms not the current way in which high output with low funding is seen as a gain for the council, it is detrimental to the sustainability of the levels of work done previously and should be funded according to the level of work and areas covered. How will you determine this process of selection and what factors will you look at when picking partners in this area? If you do not make the grade what happens?

- Probably as the funding is limited and if the contract is 7 years. We think it is a good thing that all groups can apply, but a limit may help to increase the number of good strategic partners Camden has and help foster better selection of partnership working organisations. There needs to be realistic expectations, an unlimited funding application from a small group may be seen as way too much because past amounts given to equalities groups has been very small in some cases, but if they will be applying on a full cost recovery model and factoring the issues of rent as they do not have a building, they should be given a fair access if the amount they require reflects the actual cost of the work they do, in real terms not the current way in which high output with low funding is seen as a gain for the council, it is detrimental to the sustainability of the levels of work done previously and should be funded according to the level of work and areas covered. How will you determine this process of selection and what factors will you look at when picking partners in this area? If you do not make the grade what happens?
- Probably but there would need to be discussion about what is an appropriate level to set the cap - e.g. if an effective staff team is required
- No. My heart automatically jumped in with a 'yes' on this one. But my head says it's unrealistic and not pragmatic. As stated above some of our sector can attract more funds than others. This needs to be reflected in local grant awards. It also takes into account the third sector groups that get support from outside the CTS grants. To cap those that only receive from CTS will artificially prevent necessary funds for basic sustainability. Perhaps the total Council spend needs to be considered - not simply the VCS grants - it is too artificial. Also where the work of the Borough is virtually all in the hands of a group (e.g. most LGBT work is done by Camden LGBT Forum - officially and otherwise) then the grant needs to reflect the lack of spend centrally on council staff (which do not exist for LGBT and many equality strands)
- No – the funding should be led by need within the borough and the quality of provision on offer. The importance of providing support from specialist, dedicated services should be emphasised though, as should the importance of ensuring a diverse range of support is on offer from a broad cross section of organisations
- 1. Yes but it should be done on the basis of banding by e.g. size of partnership and range of coverage. Further consultation needed on this to develop criteria
- Not where partnerships are involved or organisations of different size, a cap would be arbitrary, unless there are legal procurement reasons that would create a limit. If there are such limits it would make the decision to include paying rent to Camden in the core strategic funding even more problematic. It would also disadvantage organisations that are in areas of high need and/or run facilities in more expensive areas and as such have higher delivery and core costs
- No.
 - All existing organisations should continue to receive full rent grant and VCS friendly lease without the break clause.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- A transfer of asset via pepper corn rent should offered to empower and strengthen the sector.
- There should be an overall cap, which no organisation can exceed. But then on an individual basis, the cap should be proportionate to the organisation's total income. For example, a maximum of £500,000 per annum, but no more than 40% of the organisation's annual income.
- No. Particularly if there are partnerships involved or organisations of different size, a cap would be arbitrary, unless there are legal procurement reasons that would create a limit. If there are such limits it would make the decision to include paying rent to Camden in the core strategic funding even more problematic. It would also disadvantage organisations that run facilities in more expensive areas and as such have higher core costs
- No. Particularly if there are partnerships involved or organisations of different size, a cap would be arbitrary, unless there are legal reasons that would require a limit. If there are such limits it would make the decision to include paying rent to Camden in the core strategic funding even more problematic. It would also disadvantage organisations that run facilities in more expensive areas and as such have higher core costs. Tiers of funding could be useful in terms of shaping what is expected in terms of applications and monitoring for larger organisations.
- No there should not be as some projects will have higher expenses based on what they do and where they are located.
- No as one would hope that the best provider/application would win out, with the best possible outcome achieved for the target groups
- No, awards should be made on merit, volume and nature of outcomes and need
- No, groups should be funded based on value to the community and need. Some interventions are more expensive than others. That's WHY we need government funding and can't rely on the marketplace to provide.
- No – funding should be awarded depending on the amount that is required to develop and deliver the work. The overarching Camden Plan should dictate the priorities that the funding can help achieve
- Yes but related to size and IMD 'score'.

Q8: Do you have any further comments on the Strategic Partners Fund?

- need support for all organisations
- I think it's a great idea in difficult circumstances. Congratulations on the boldness. North London Cares and the issues we work on would hugely benefit from such an approach if we were part of it.
- Support the basic ideas
- From attending the consultation meeting, I felt there can be a bit more clarity around a couple issues and I thought there were some contradictions in the way the fund is currently being explained; core v project funding -. It was explained the fund is meant to provide core funding support and is not meant to be for project funding. At the same time, organisations were being encouraged to come up with 'initiatives' which address inequalities which are currently not being addressed enough, for example through inter-generational work. I think the fund could be a bit more flexible; core funding is definitely the biggest need for voluntary sector organisations at the moment but the fund should give them the flexibility how to spend the money.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

LBC funded equalities work v non funded equalities work -. I got the impression the fund was trying to identify equality issues which were not being addressed through work funded by other LBC departments, for example CSF and social services. I felt there was a contradiction here as some organisations might do good work addressing equalities issues with funding from, for example CSF for youth participation, but are not receiving any LBC support for core funding support. Perhaps there are no contradictions here, just the way details were perceived and maybe could be described differently. Also felt that some organisations may not fully understand the description of 'equality organisations' while they may actually be engaged in delivering excellent 'equality' work without appreciating it.

- All established community and voluntary organisations should be Strategic Partners of the Council, as they are organised and working in partnership. As a result, they have to have a fair share from the Strategic Partners Fund of the Council
- Just educate big communities to be tolerant and share their space and resources with the rest of the community especially with small groups. We have asked Kilburn Youth Station, Kingsgate Community centre, Kilburn Grange Children's Centre, Kingsgate Day centre for older people and people with disabilities(Kilburn Resource Centre) and Promoting Independence Group (Sycamore Community Hall) and Tenants' and Residents' Association and the women centre. We have asked them if we can use their spaces on Saturdays and Sundays, when they do not use it themselves. They said no without conversation. We have even asked them if we can hire the hall or the hut for one day to celebrate Eid. We didn't get it unfortunately. I was told by some of the services that we do not give the hall out for faith celebrations like Eid, but they do celebrate Christmas and Easter whereas the majority of Kilburn Residence are Muslim
- The needs for Somali Elderly and Disabled Centre include limited space for services such as luncheon club. There are about 100 council premises occupied by bigger VCS organisations, therefore we need the council to give us access to use those centres.
- All established community and voluntary organisations should be Strategic Partners of the Council, as they are organised and working in partnership. As a result, they have to have a fair share from the Strategic Partners Fund of the Council
- There appears to be a lack of an overarching strategy. 2. The consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. 3. How does this process relate to other departmental cuts? E.g. Adult Social Care with £16 million cuts, Children, Schools and Families where the funding for early years has been cut. 4. What, if any, is the strategic link with Place Shaping? 5. The document compels organisations to sign leases based on heads of terms it claims have been previously agreed. These leases have not been signed because final points were not agreed; in particular the point referring to market rents. It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line services into property services.6. It seems to us that consulting on Strategic Partnerships without discussing the necessary support makes little sense. 7. What are the plans for the Third Sector Team to work with & support the development of Strategic Partnerships? Are the plans for other support?
- No apart from it is a good idea and should deliver change for the better
- There appears to be a lack of an overarching strategy. 2. The consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. 3How

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

does this process relate to other departmental cuts? E.g. Adult Social Care with £16 million cuts, Children, Schools and Families where the funding for early years has been cut. 4. What, if any, is the strategic link with Place Shaping? 5. The document compels organisations to sign leases based on heads of terms it claims have been previously agreed. These leases have not been signed because final points were not agreed; in particular the point referring to market rents. It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line services into property services. 6. It seems to us that consulting on Strategic Partnerships without discussing the necessary support makes little sense. 7. What are the plans for the Third Sector Team to work with & support the development of Strategic Partnerships? Are the plans for other support? (x3)

- It's presented as an attempt to deal with a massive problem produced by heavy cuts...but several of our trustees believe it is drafted in a way that protects central admin by having 8 zones, at the expense of front line delivery / meeting real need.
- To be strategic and to have any significant impact the Strategic Partners Fund should encompass all of the Council's investment in the sector and not just the £1.5 – 2 million per year that sits in Culture and Environment. In Children's Schools and Families there is a budget of £11million per year, Health and Social Care invest £15 million per year and Public Health £3.8 million. In addition there is the investment in the borough from the Camden Clinical Commissioning Board and other key players.
- 7 year funding for organisations, what happens to those who are not funded and the needs change over the years? 7 years is core funding. The 7 years is unrestricted and organisations can choose how to spend the funding based on the outcomes for the equality group. How will this be measured and it looks like monitoring is minimal. How will quality be measured? How will outcomes and impact be measured for this fund? This has not been explained. Funding needs to be provided to smaller groups and not only large groups as smaller groups have the expertise, experience of reaching harder to reach communities that are in need. 7 year grants should be for core equality/community based strategic partners. It would be important for those receiving 7 year funding to be able to apply for other project based funds. What support has been given to all current funded groups to be able to demonstrate the impact they currently have using your new framework for need and IMD? How will you insure all groups can apply for funding with limited funding workers especially equalities groups and small organisation?
- There seems to be a lack of overarching strategy and joined-up thinking between the different Camden departments which affect community organisations. The cuts in Adult Social Care and Children Schools and Families should be viewed in relation to The Third Sector funding detailed. It could also be linked to the Community Infrastructure Levy. The lease issue remains for many community organisations:
 - Buildings built for Community use being charged market rent
 - Heads of Terms and individual leases not matching up and the resultant time it takes to deal with this
 - The proposed transfer of funds from front-line services into property services
 - How the current lease proposals fit into the Camden plan and how the money is accounted for
 - The impact on fundraising that the lease terms have

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- The fact that proposed leases have upwards only clauses for rent and the Camden funding is proposed to taper away. The result of this could be that Camden's voluntary sector will be a net contributor towards some Camden departments. Is this the aim?
- Again, the lease issue does not take into account some other factors;
- If funding is limited then paying market rent will affect how much money can be spent on service provision or in subsidised rent to partner organisations/individuals.
- What if someone with a Camden grant vacates a Camden premise?

Resources and support are needed to ensure that strategic partners are more than just 'partner's in name only and a tick-box exercise. There needs to be a method of evaluating the fund built-in to the process. Additionally, thought needs to be given to how this will all be tendered for. The consultation should allow for other recognised charitable structures where appropriate.

- It is important to ensure the limited services partly funded in the more affluent areas is not totally lost at the detriment of those in need if funding is totally moved to the areas of deprivation
- When we are talking about Strategic Partners Fund, do we mean ...
 - a newly imposed frame of desirable partnerships which suit LBC and the newly drawn up investment areas, or
 - A coherent, well supported voluntary sector which forms organic, bottom up partnerships in order to stay relevant to the needs of the community it is committed to continue serving?
- There are a number of additional issues:
- 1. It remains disappointing that there appears to be a lack of overarching strategy. This exercise began as a review of the Council's corporate relationship with the sector. The consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. There is no clear strategic link with Place Shaping. There is no link to other sources of funding, such as, e.g., Community Infrastructure Levy and whether it could be linked to Strategic Partners (for example, capital investment for facilities assuring no rent is charged).2. The document states that organisations must sign leases based on heads of terms previously agreed. The fact that these leases have not been signed is due to the simple fact that there is no actual agreement on the proposed leases, in particular the reference to market rents. It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line into property services, particularly in these difficult times. Organisations should not be forced into paying market value rents. These premises are used by the organisations to provide much needed services to the disadvantaged and vulnerable residents of Camden and supporting outcomes of the Camden Plan. At present, no account is given as to how the money is currently being spent and what will happen with it in future, and what difference that investment will make or any outcomes at all. It is our argument that agreeing a nominal rent would assure the maximum impact and accountability of these funds and we believe this will hold up to the abovementioned test. In fact, one could argue that it perverts the historical actual investment Camden made (e.g., in building a community centre) from one of social impact into income generation. As there is a taper in the grant funding and an "upward revision only" clause in the draft leases this means the sector would pay Camden more and more over the 7 years. There is also no clarity on how this would work in practice. The suggestion that has been made within public meetings is that if an organisation has, e.g., £100k core funding at present and would be charged £50k in rent, they would simply apply for £150k. Clearly, this is not

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

likely to happen with the lower amount of funding available. It also makes no provision for the scenario in which someone receives a Camden grant and then decides to vacate those premises. 3. Consulting on Strategic Partnerships without discussing the necessary support makes little sense. What are the plans for the Third Sector Team to work with developing the Strategic Partners? How is this work going to be evaluated? What are the plans for other support? How will this be tendered for?

- I am concerned about having 8 zones which seems like it would take a lot of money to administer.
- No it seems very precise and adequate.
- There seems to be a lack of overarching strategy and joined-up thinking between the different Camden departments as to how they individually and accumulatively impact on VCS organisations. The cuts in Adult Social Care and Children Schools and Families should be viewed in relation to the Third Sector funding detailed. It could also be linked to the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- The lease issue remains for many community organisations and raises serious concerns:
 - Buildings built for Community use being charged market rent
 - Heads of Terms and individual leases not matching up and the resultant time it takes to deal with this, rents being already pre-determined with no negotiation
 - The proposed transfer of funds from front-line services into property services
 - How the current lease proposals fit into the Camden plan and how such rental money is accounted for
 - The impact on larger fundraising that the lease terms have
 - Proposed leases have upwards only clauses for rent and the Camden funding is proposed to taper away.
 - If funding is limited then paying market rent will affect how much money can be spent on service provision or in subsidised rent to partner organisations which may be addressing specific inequality and rely on low costs to operate
 - The use of such funding as CIL to help mitigate against this – would this be forthcoming against other community priorities?
- The imposition of market rents seems a contradiction in terms for those VCS organisations facing such a prospect. If chosen as a Strategic Partner to help those communities most in need, the ability of those very organisations will then be seriously compromised within a short space of time if having to pay substantial market rents. If this is a policy rather than legal decision, surely Camden could reconsider its long-term approach and make changes towards a nominal rent – creating more sustainable prospects for the VCS and consequently more attractive to external funders – one of the stated wishes for the VCS (and Borough) to achieve.
- The consultation should allow for other recognised charitable structures where appropriate other than Registered Charities and Ltd Companies
- Given the unprecedented level of cuts the council is facing (with more to come) it would seem best to invest as much as possible in the VCS at this stage who could play a key role in supporting beleaguered communities to remain resilient, lever in funds which the council can't, and find innovative solutions to as yet unforeseen problems. The proposals only deal with a sub-section of overall VCS funding, but we would fully recommend that the

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

maximum amount of **£2million** per year is certainly initially allocated at this stage to provide maximum help for the VCS at this important time.

- There is a lack of overarching strategy, no details of how it relates to other funding being used to support disadvantaged groups and communities e.g. Adult Social Care, Children's Schools and Families the areas in which many VCO provide services. Looking at Strategic Partnership bid but treating the VCS like a cash cow trying to extract commercial rent and offering short term leases. If there is no opportunity for nominal rent or rent relief we will need to cover the rent bill and would no longer be able to pass on the subsidy to groups and organisations using our premises. For us the rent will be in the region of £29,000 on top of running costs which is currently around £38,000 per annum excluding salaries. This includes: heating, lighting, licences, insurance, waste disposal, stationary, HR Services, IT, Broadband, auditing the accounts, rates, repair and maintenance, affiliations, subs, publications, publicity, training, depreciation etc. £67,000 would be the starting point for calculating future hire and rental cost plus any reduction is core funding which would also need to be calculated in the above sum and passed onto providers, users groups, and organisations wishing to use our space in the future. We are a social business and like any other business need to cover our costs and have the additional legislative requirements of the charity commission which means that we cannot operate in a way that would cause financial liabilities and must also maintain a set level of reserves
- Monitoring should be innovative and officers should be visible so they can see the work happen, not rely on reports from a distance, how can you set 7 year funding goal will there be reviews? break clauses, monitoring of changes to Camden community, what if you have an influx of new communities not known about 6 year ago when you awarded contracts etc.? How will you capacity build groups in this area? Can you support the growth of groups, will you consider them to occupy under used building when and if they come up, how fluid is the process and responsive to change. How do you avoid the usual suspects doing the usual thing, if it is not always effecting change for Camden residents?
- On the whole I think it is going in the right direction. I am pleased with the concept. I would like to see council departments compelled to contribute to strategic development so that it is not all falling on the CTS team's hands. Perhaps other departments could also match fund some costs - if it is truly strategic then other department need to fairly fund the VCS as well. Where grants are project based then decisions are understandably made on evidence such as need, track record, capability and whether the aims fit into a wider outcomes model. For small groups the strategic funding will deal with the issue of only existing where project funds have been secured. Also it will need to take into account the existing assets of organisations. E.g. there is no point giving limited funds to a group with core assets already. The strategic fund must be for local groups with no (or limited) core funding from elsewhere. Assets also include potential access to funds and donors and track record of the popularity of funding a certain issue e.g. if core funds have been easily obtained by groups popular to fund (e.g. older living) then the CTS could assist them with maintaining this through a programme of support. If a charity relies on the LA for existence then the higher grant is valid. This is where I see strategic and project funding being very different. The community impact fund could be used for project based work and I would not prohibit larger groups from accessing this if they are best placed to do it - but where money is limited strategic funds should go to the smaller pan geographic groups

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

providing generic and specialist support to the whole borough (statutory, residential, sector to sector etc.)

- 1. Many organisations are already doing this in a variety of ways. LBC needs to research these and produce a document of "best practice"
- There appears to be a lack of an overarching strategy;* the consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. There is no detail of how this relates to Adult Social Care with £16 million in cuts or to Children, Schools and Families where the funding for early years has been cut (primarily the funding going to VCS organisations) and for drop-ins organisations are left with £100,000 to fight over with no effort made to raise matched funding or maximise use of assets;* there is no link to other sources of funding, such as, e.g., Community Infrastructure Levy and whether it could be linked to Strategic Partners (for example, capital investment for facilities assuring no rent is charged).; * the document states that organisations must sign leases based on heads of terms previously agreed. The fact that these leases have not been signed is due to the simple fact that there is no actual agreement on the proposed leases, in particular the reference to market rent. It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line into property services, particularly in these difficult times. Certainly, it should not happen without clear assessment according to equalities guidelines, and of course, judging it against the outcome of the Camden Plan. At present, no account is given as to how the money is currently being spent and what will happen with it in future, and what difference that investment will make or any outcomes at all. It is our argument that agreeing a nominal rent would assure the maximum impact and accountability of these funds and we believe this will hold up to the abovementioned test. . As there is a taper in the grant funding and an "upward revision only" clause in the draft leases this means the sector would pay Camden more and more over the 7 years.; * rent relief is only one cost of opening and running a community building to deliver services to those most in need, The actual cost is at least £30,000 including one staff post and we already have to find ways to fund this. The removal of rent relief as well will have enormous consequences for organisations who run community buildings and the groups and people who use them. The imposition of commercial rents will have to be passed on to the users and small groups who currently receive heavily subsidised rates and will make FCR bids for Camden commissioning contracts higher and less competitive. It is also highly questionable why Camden wants to charge commercial rates to VCSO's delivering services for and on their behalf to those in the most deprived areas and with the highest need. * There is also no clarity on how this would work in practice. The suggestion that has been made within public meetings is that if an organisation has, e.g., £100k core funding at present and would be charged £50k in rent, they would simply apply for £150k. Clearly, this is not likely to happen with the lower amount of funding available. * It also makes no provision for the scenario in which someone receives a Camden grant and then decides to vacate those premises. Nor does it take into account where organisations are already paying rent towards non-Camden-owned properties. This creates incentives for Camden properties not to be used, rather than incentivising making the most of the assets that Camden has.
- There are a number of additional issues:
- It remains disappointing that there appears to be a lack of overarching strategy. This exercise began as a review of the Council's corporate relationship with the sector. The consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. There is no detail of how this relates to

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Adult Social Care with £16 million in cuts or to Children, Schools and Families where the funding for early years has been cut (primarily the funding going to VCS organisations) and for drop-ins organisations are left with £100,000 to fight over with no effort made to raise matched funding or maximise use of assets. Similarly, there is no clear strategic link with Place Shaping. There is no link to other sources of funding, such as, e.g., Community Infrastructure Levy and whether it could be linked to Strategic Partners (for example, capital investment for facilities assuring no rent is charged). The document states that organisations must sign leases based on heads of terms previously agreed. The fact that these leases have not been signed is due to the simple fact that there is no actual agreement on the proposed leases, in particular the reference to market rent. It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line into property services, particularly in these difficult times. Certainly, it should not happen without clear assessment according to equalities guidelines, and of course, judging it against the outcome of the Camden Plan. At present, no account is given as to how the money is currently being spent and what will happen with it in future, and what difference that investment will make or any outcomes at all. It is our argument that agreeing a nominal rent would assure the maximum impact and accountability of these funds and we believe this will hold up to the abovementioned test. In fact, one could argue that it perverts the historical actual investment Camden made (e.g., in building a community centre) from one of social impact into income generation. As there is a taper in the grant funding and an "upward revision only" clause in the draft leases this means the sector would pay Camden more and more over the 7 years. Would Camden really like the headline "Charities asked to pay Camden's bills?"

There is also no clarity on how this would work in practice. The suggestion that has been made within public meetings is that if an organisation has, e.g., £100k core funding at present and would be charged £50k in rent, they would simply apply for £150k. Clearly, this is not likely to happen with the lower amount of funding available. It also makes no provision for the scenario in which someone receives a Camden grant and then decides to vacate those premises. Nor does it take into account where organisations are already paying rent towards non-Camden-owned properties. This creates incentives for Camden properties not to be used, rather than incentivising making the most of the assets that Camden has. As the organisation running the only privately-owned community centre in Camden we are already experiencing the irony that our private landlord ultimately gives us greater stability and freedom to develop than Camden. Consulting on Strategic Partnerships without discussing the necessary support makes little sense. What are the plans for the Third Sector Team to work with developing the Strategic Partners? How is this work going to be evaluated? What are the plans for other support? How will this be tendered for? 5. There are other recognised charitable structures to form an organisation. Why restrict legal forms in the way the proposed consultation paper does?

- Trustees are not clear on what the council expects strategic partners to do and how much they would be subject to aims/targets or whatever set by the council. There is no explanation in this document of HOW the council would work with such partners; what its expectations would be; and what does the council actually MEAN by partnership. It's a very broad term and clearly we can't be equal partners (as the council has the money and does the commissioning) so how would partnership work. What does the council get in return for this funding? In effect, the strategic partners funding freezes council support to specified partners for a seven year period. It is difficult to see how

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

this encourages the VCS and how it in any way addresses the problem that new groups find it hard to access funding.

- There are a number of additional issues:
 - **Lack of Strategic Leadership** - It remains disappointing that there appears to be a lack of overarching strategy. This exercise began as a review of the Council's corporate relationship with the sector. The consultation document only deals with a subsection of the Third Sector funding. There is no detail of how this relates to Adult Social Care with £16 million in cuts or to Children, Schools and Families where the funding for early years has been cut (primarily the funding going to VCS organisations) and for drop-ins organisations are left with £100,000 to fight over with no effort made to raise matched funding or maximise use of assets. Similarly, there is no clear strategic link with Place Shaping. There is no link to other sources of funding, such as, e.g., Community Infrastructure Levy and whether it could be linked to Strategic Partners (for example, capital investment for facilities assuring no rent is charged).
 - **Rents and Leases** - The document states that organisations must sign leases based on heads of terms previously agreed. The fact that these leases have not been signed is due to the simple fact that there is no actual agreement on the proposed leases, in particular the reference to market rent. There is a lack of understanding within the council about the impact that charging market value rents will have on organisations. Most of these organisations also support smaller organisations and allow them to use their premises with no or very little cost. The knock on effect of no rent relief and charging of small groups and other users will be very damaging and may lead to closure of some of the centres and small groups. We must also highlight that the organisations are delivering Camden Plan objectives and outcomes for Camden residents and this is another reason why they should not be charged rents, especially market value rents. We also need to clarify that rent relief is only one cost of opening and running a community building. The running costs in addition to this are at least £30,000 if you include a staff post.
- It is our view that there should not be a transfer of funds from the front line services, particularly in these difficult times. Certainly, it should not happen without clear assessment according to equalities guidelines, and of course, judging it against the outcome of the Camden Plan. At present, no account is given as to how the money is currently being spent and what will happen with it in future, and what difference that investment will make or any outcomes at all. It is our argument that agreeing a nominal rent would assure the maximum impact and accountability of these funds and we believe this will hold up to the abovementioned test. In fact, one could argue that it perverts the historical actual investment Camden made (e.g., in building a community centre) from one of social impact into income generation. As there is a taper in the grant funding and an "upward revision only" clause in the draft leases this means the sector would pay Camden more and more over the 7 years. Would Camden really like the headline "Charities asked to pay Camden's bills?"
- There is also no clarity on how this would work in practice. The suggestion that has been made within public meetings is that if an organisation has, e.g., £100k core funding at present and would be charged £50k in rent, they would simply apply for £150k. Clearly, this is not likely to happen with the lower amount of funding available. It also makes no provision for the scenario in which someone receives a Camden grant and then decides to vacate those premises. Nor does it take into account where organisations are already

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

paying rent towards non-Camden-owned properties. This creates incentives for Camden properties not to be used, rather than incentivising making the most of the assets that Camden has. As the organisation running the only privately-owned community centre in Camden we are already experiencing the irony that our private landlord ultimately gives us greater stability and freedom to develop than Camden.

- Consulting on Strategic Partnerships without discussing the necessary support makes little sense. What are the plans for the Third Sector Team to work with developing the Strategic Partners? How is this work going to be evaluated? What are the plans for other support? How will this be tendered for?
- There are other recognised charitable structures to form an organisation. Why restrict legal forms in the way the proposed consultation paper does?
- VCS organisations are not commercial organisations and as they mainly provide services without charge it is impractical to expect them to pay rent for their premises at market value. This is especially so as they are in a high value area and their services save the Council money.
- The Strategic partners fund for STCA would appear to link in with our direction of travel, we are however extremely concerned as to our ability to deliver should the issue of the rent, along with the potential service charges held within our lease not be reconsidered. Whilst we completely understand the vast deficit facing the Council and the need to make funding cuts we feel this is short sighted and can only lead to a financial black hole for STCA that we cannot pass onto our users. Loss of free/space support by STCA for smaller groups who use our space for free currently this includes. Visually Impaired Camden, Good Gym, Food Cycle, DrugFam, Shelter, Mary Ward. Potentially the complete loss of STCA or at the very least a significant reduction in the services we are able to offer. We have worked hard over the past 5 years to introduce new income generating models inclusive of our Community Café, Nursery expansion and the development of a Business Unit model. But we are spatially constrained and have limited options, so we would ask again that the Council and the housing department consider the community buildings as part of its Social responsibility and provide peppercorn rents, with the return on this incalculable. Bravery and blue sky thinking is needed on this one
- Funding core costs for small, local organisations is hugely valuable. The emphasis on partnership work may distract organisations from applying for this even if it is ultimately what they really need.
- The proposal to charge community centres rent, not consulted on here, will bear heavily on us by inevitably increasing our cost base. A youth club needs to operate in the early evening which is the time premises' operators could most easily achieve a premium hire charge. Much of our funding is from small grant-giving bodies and individuals who will not be in position to increase their contribution and will find GOAL less attractive when we are able to do less for the funds requested because of the increased proportion of grant expended on premises hire. Rent creates an unlevel playing field as other organisations (with whom we non-Camden or funds from non-Camden sources) operate from premises which, for various reasons, are only charged a peppercorn rent.

It also decreases rather than increases transparency as no list of premises occupying Camden premises on a peppercorn rent basis is available.

To date Camden Council's repair service for the properties we operate from has been very slow and repair delays have regularly disrupted activities.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

We provide an important service in Gospel Oak/Haverstock without funding from Camden. It appears that in the future we will have to pay Camden for providing that service and there is nothing in this document which suggests that we will have access to funding from Camden to offset this in the future.

- Camden recognising access needs of organisations – consultation document in an inaccessible form for many people – full of jargon - written by those in the know – “written by people who live in Hampstead who do not understand the needs of people who live in Somers Town.” How many people know about the 8 zones and the research that that they are based on? Not fair or transparent. Council should know what needs to change – should not need to ask the question. Council should meet groups face to face and ask what they need. More joined up working needed. Need to stop cuts to services for disabled people. The Council needs to support groups that most need support. Bigger organisations should find out the strengths of smaller organisations and make weaknesses become opportunities instead of threats.

Section C: Community Impact is an approach we want to develop with the sector, to bring together the combined resources of the VCS, Council, health and private sector partners to tackle ingrained problems.

Q1: Which social problems would a Community Impact approach be helpful in tackling?

- health ,
- domestic violence ,
- educations
- physical health problems,
- learning disabilities
- services for dementia and Alzheimer's
- After School clubs reading and writing
- weekend crisis centre open where Camden can refer people for support
- Ad hoc issues in local neighbourhoods,
- Reactive responses to riots or gentrification, for instance.
- Issues surrounding migration, which have a pulse and trends of their own
- New ideas that tackle emerging problems, such as loneliness and isolation, but which currently have a low evidence base.
- Investments in VCS leaders - for example applying 'projects' based funding to organisations to develop internal infrastructure (such as a year's investment in a fundraiser at North London Cares).
- training and preparing people to enter the labour market are both important
- Youth and older children - leisure, health, obesity, anti-bullying, anti-gangs, Prevent strategy
- Immigration, refugee, children in need, housing, healthy and information and advice and youth Activities
- Immigration, refugee, SEN children, housing, health issues, radicalism, arrange marriages and extremism and street gung groups.
- Asylum and Refugee issues, disabled, elderly, language support and advocacy, youth services, parents and health issues.

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- If the Council recognises small voluntary community organisations as valued partners of the Council in the public service provision, they are more helpful in tackling social, educational and health problems, as they are historically responsible for the provision of social/health care and educational services at a lower level of costs. There are hundreds of ethnic minority voluntary and community organisations in Camden which are close to the majority of the service users and have the capacity to use hundreds of volunteers for the delivery of services
- There are historical social problems that affect hundreds of ethnic minority communities such as language barriers that prevent access to information that supports community integration. Other issues are Immigration, refugee, children in need, housing, health and information/advice on positive youth activities
- Litter and drug misuse
- Potentially this fund could address just about any issue. Keys to success will be timing, capacity & support. The creation of neighbourhood hubs or themed groups could be valuable. However given the total investment, expectations will need to be carefully managed
- Unemployment, isolation, poverty, mental health and well being
- Anti-social behaviour, unemployment, obesity, social exclusion and isolation.
- Health inequalities, obesity
- Poverty, social exclusion
- Anti-social behaviour, health inequalities, obesity
- Potentially this fund could address just about any issue. Keys to success will be timing, capacity & support. The creation of neighbourhood hubs or themed groups could be valuable. However given the total investment, expectations will need to be carefully managed(x2)
- Refugees
- Youth issue, Anti-Social behaviour, social exclusion, obesity etc.
- Social exclusion of disabled people including parents with a learning disability or young disabled adults. I think this fits into both Strategic Partners and Community Impact approaches
- Young people
- Helping people with mental health issues get a job
- People accessing health services.
- Community cohesion – groups learning from each other to take away misconceptions and have better understanding of different groups within the community especially culture.

Q2: Do you think this is an effective way of tackling ingrained problems in Camden?

- Yes
- Yes, I think that you need to look into these problems and find out why they are ingrained and what are barriers /inequalities that are keeping them ingrained and what is the best way to deal with these problems in the short and longer term.
- I'm actually more sceptical about this as it feels like priorities could change wildly from one year to another leading to inefficiencies in the system. I

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

appreciate that this fund may partly need to react to changing social issues but having some sort of upfront plan about what areas you most want to tackle in the next 2-3 years ahead (on a rolling basis), and varying those areas only relatively gradually from year to year, would probably be a good idea.

- In combination with the strategic investments, yes. It is fluid and flexible and therefore agile. It can tackle problems in new ways and respond to evolving challenges in a rapidly changing borough. Without the strategic support, though, it would be too scattergun an approach
- Yes, because it targets funding at particular problems
- Possibly, how can I say? So long as someone is doing something right, it doesn't matter who or what they are
- Potentially.
- There should be more targeted funding for more development to lessen or to tackle the ingrained problems.
- It is an effective way to tackle ingrained problems using small voluntary community organisations. The majority of the service users are supposed to be from the ethnic minority communities which have the capacity to provide services for their own community members
- Yes - there is an effective way to tackle ingrained problems by directly using small voluntary community organisations. The majority of the service users are supposed to be from the ethnic minority communities which have the skills and expertise to engage them and to provide services for their own community members (refer to above Q1) To bring a long term and sustainable solution for such social, health, educational and economic problems, the Council should include all small community organisations to participate in the local Strategic Partnership approach aiming to develop individual community organisational capacity and to establish strong partnership which enable them to deliver effectively the required care services for children/young people and vulnerable community members
- It is not fully effective but it is one step towards thwarting litter louts.
- It has potential – and there is certainly evidence that this model can work; “local solutions to local problems” has long been a sector mantra. This model could give the VCS the opportunity to test drive problem solving in a different way. However, again, given the fiscal allocation, expectations will need to be carefully managed.
- As good as any
- Depends on how the funding is allocated. In our area KCBNA already works with a lot of organisations and partners and helps to address most of the issues mentioned above. It is better to use the existing models rather than invent a new one in an area where it is effective. You should support the larger organisations and institutions to work with the smaller organisations and community centres.
- Can be if the Council supports the NHS to work with local organisations
- Can be if there is effective partnership working and communication and sharing of resources
- Could be if you work in partnership with community organisations like KCBNA who can engage with the socially excluded or hard to reach groups
- It has potential – and there is certainly evidence that this model can work; “local solutions to local problems” has long been a sector mantra. This model could give the VCS the opportunity to test drive problem solving in a different way. However, again, given the fiscal allocation, expectations will need to be carefully managed.(x3)

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- No. It's a way of addressing short term issues but it does not offer long term solutions to ingrained problems. Money would be better spent on the 8 areas and/or(preferably) a borough wide approach
- It can be but only if Camden Council takes the Strategic lead and ensures that all departments in Camden, other key partners like the CCCG, Police etc. all engage and input funds to work effectively
- Will work well for something like volunteering and employability if LBC maintains its input and support - involvement of the private sector will be a support but a gain is not a one-stop solution. Needs 360 degrees approach across sectors.

Q3 Do you have any other comments on the proposals for Community Impact Initiatives?

- Organisations which are strategic partners should not be excluded from also applying for and receiving "Impact" funding. On the contrary, the best strategic partners working on major strategic issues should be encouraged to develop products and projects to tackle other ingrained problems in an experimental way.
- Having read the paper and attended the meeting, I am still not clear what the Community Impact Fund is about. It seems very similar to the Partner Fund
- Support disadvantaged children who are struggling with their school work. Provide homework support to help those children keep up with what is expected from them by their schools. The main stream school have afterschool clubs but not in their own languages where help can be provided for children and parents.
- Run English classes and safeguarding and child protection training for parents to enable them to better support their children's education and to keep their children and the community safe.
- Bring communities together so they are able to support one another.
- Starting a football training for example for young people and children age 7 to 16
- Support disadvantaged children who are struggling with their school work.
- Provide homework support to help those children keep up with what is expected from them by their schools. The main stream school have afterschool clubs but not in their own languages where help can be provided for children and parents.
- Run English classes and safeguarding and child protection training for parents to enable them to better support their children's education and to keep their children and the community safe.
- Bring communities together so they are able to support one another.
- Running football clubs for example for young people and children.
- Facilitates training and educate parents in their own language as well as provide English classes with Crèche.
- In order to tackle the ingrained problems among disadvantaged individuals and communities in Camden and to bring a long term and sustainable solution for such social, health, educational and economic problems, the Council should include all small community organisations to participate in the local Strategic. Partnership approach aiming to develop individual community organisational capacity and to establish strong partnerships which enable

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

them to deliver effectively the required care services for children/young people and vulnerable community members.

- Yes areas of priority are - Support disadvantaged children who are struggling with their school work. - Provide homework support to help those children keep up with what is expected from them by their schools. The main stream school have afterschool clubs but not in their own languages where help can be provided for children and parents. - Run English classes and safeguarding and child protection training for parents to enable them to better support their children's education and to keep their children and the community safe. - Bring communities together so they are able to support one another. - Starting a football training for example for young people and children age 7 to 16
- We are concerned that the fiscal value of the fund is disproportionate to the ambitious objectives & consider that whilst the initiative is commendable the proposal (as written) lacks clarity. We believe that the VCS will be crucial to the success of frontline, problem solving initiatives. We consider that with our collective expertise in multi-dimensional creative responses to community issues we are best placed to pilot & test creative solutions, economic use of resources, attract additional funding, improve CSR engagement etc. Would it not be preferable to roll this amount into the Strategic Partners Fund and to and to make provision for involvement in Impact Initiatives to be an option in this fund?
- You must also find ways of getting the local community members involved for this to be effective
- There will be an overlap with Strategic Partners initiatives (eg for disability related issues) which either needs to be accepted or clarified There is no supported volunteering scheme in the borough at this time - whichever strand it fits into it needs to be recognised as a significant gap in the supportfor Camden residents making a contribution to their community.

Section D: We are proposing to form an on-going VCS Advisory Group to carry through the aims outlined in this consultation and support us with the detail of a number of the proposals.

Q1: So that the VCS Advisory Group reflects the diversity of the VCS in terms of type, size, service and funding relationship with the Council, organisations could perhaps nominate themselves for the group under different categories. What are your views on this?

- Funding relationship with voluntary groups and council is very important
- So long as the categories encourage real diversity of organisation and people I see no problem with this.
- Yes, I think this is a good idea as you'll be able to see the variety and variation in different groups and if there are any gaps.
- No as all should be based on cost as you have no money
- I think that's a good idea. I wonder whether it's worth having a small number of reps from local businesses also (in particular those with a strong interest incorporate social responsibility) - might be helpful just to provide a different perspective and help foster links between VCS and local business
- Go for it!

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Designing committee by committee sounds like a challenge to me. I think the Council should pick 3-5 people it knows can lead and add value to the group, others to lead sub groups if required, and then allow other organisations to come forward to be part of the groups. The groups shouldn't be too labour intensive. I would love to be part of it but giving more than an hour a quarter is tough. Keep the group small and agile and give it the power to consult amongst others and it will get things done. Within the group a chair could be elected to give the group energy and impetus
- Should be a spread of organisations, both large and small, and catering for different client groups.
- It will be hard to have a 'representative' body unless resources are given to members to consult with their 'constituency' - even to be 'elected' by them. The role of the Advisory Group needs to be clearer before people are asked to put themselves forward. Try to keep the categories as distinct as possible - and go for a maximum size of 15 approx., with an independent chair and secretariat. Ensure they can make a difference on some issues.
- Good idea
- I think this would be very beneficial, though if we can assure the continuity of all groups and organisations as well as their positive productivity
- I think this would be very beneficial, though if we can assure the continuity of all groups and organisations as well as their positive productivity
- It is a good idea but there should be more participation and more emphasis given to small and marginal communities.
- This is a good idea to put VCS into different categories to identify their needs and capacities in establishing the necessary partnership based on the information.
- Yes, but I'd also say the Advisory Group needs to have a networking event once a year so we can all get together, share our views with them, and to make sure these reps stay in touch! I'd not have time to be on it, we're just too stretched!
- This is a good idea to put VCS into different categories to identify their needs and capacities in establishing the necessary partnership based on the information.
- The Council would have to oversee and regulate the nominations to create a balance in the way in which different interests are represented
- We think this is a laudable & welcome ambition however there will be a significant capacity issue for some organisations. Some consideration needs to be given to what being representative means & how participants consult with & disseminate to those that are claiming to represent. Having an advisory group brings a potential danger of dividing the sector into those who have an "in" and those who do not. Camden will not have the resources to be close to the community in the way the voluntary sector is, and as such is in danger of missing opportunities to harness local assets
- Sounds like a good idea
- Good idea. KCBNA would be an excellent representative for the area
- Good idea. I am a service user but would be interested
- I am an individual
- Good idea
- We think this is a laudable & welcome ambition however there will be a significant capacity issue for some organisations Some consideration needs to be given to what being representative means & how participants consult with & disseminate to those that are claiming to represent. Having an advisory group brings a potential danger of dividing the sector into those who have an

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

"in" and those who do not. Camden will not have the resources to be close to the community in the way the voluntary sector is, and as such is in danger of missing opportunities to harness local assets.(x3)

- It's laudable but perhaps unrealistic. Most of the skilled volunteers, trustees, advocates etc. that we come across are quickly grabbed and used to fill gaps in what used to be funded. It is possible that there are people "out there" who are more interested in a borough wide approach than in the needs of voluntary organisations, but these represent issues rather than the organisations working with them,
- Sounds like a good idea. You should also invite residents groups too
- Yes but should be run by VAC not Council and needs to be friendly and accessible to people with a learning disability.

Q2: Are there any other steps the Council should take to improve the strategic relationship with the VCS?

- Needs good monitoring system
- The key thing is to be supportive on the VCS' terms. So don't require too much paperwork or evaluation when VCS groups have so many time and resource pressures. Enable the best VCS groups to thrive with extra time. Encourage informal relationships and partnerships to evolve on their own terms.
- Make sure to give enough training and support to groups to improve their confidence and self-esteem.
- Improve their chances for their children to achieving better academic results and securing places at better universities.
- Integrate more effectively into the wider society.
- Aspire to ambitious career options and social mobility.
- Such children feel less isolated and are less vulnerable to criminality.
- Also council should work with all organisation small community or big organisation equality.
- Make sure to give enough training and support to groups to improve their confidence and self-esteem.
- Provide enough safeguarding training in community languages and make sure you reach every corner, not only communities regular service users.
- Publicity of the services is the most important part of your success. People have to know about services in Camden.
- To improve the chance for their children to achieving better academic results and securing places at better universities.
- To integrate more effectively into the wider society
- To aspire to ambitious career options and social mobility
- To feel less isolated and to become less vulnerable to criminality.
- Also council should work with all organisation small community or big organisation equality.
- Yes, keep informing any changes and future consultations.
- If the new VCS-approach policy will be implemented, we hope all small community organisations will have the chance to develop their organisational capacities and deliver project activities and services for their community members.
- I think this would be very beneficial, though if we can assure the continuity of all groups and organisations as well as their positive productivity, then we

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

can: Make sure to give enough training and support to groups to improve their confidence and self-esteem. Improve the chances for their children to achieving better academic results and securing places at better universities. Integrate more effectively into the wider society. Aspire to ambitious career options and social mobility. Children feel less isolated and are less vulnerable to criminality

- Don't be afraid using specific expertise and input of people from VCS. Use local VCS skills for research rather than automatically commissioning outside bodies
- Look more closely at the staff. Persons with serious substance misuse issues have been found in paid positions, working with and influencing vulnerable groups to the detriment of their well-being.
- As a matter of urgency the Council needs to consider how cross departmental communication can be improved. An overarching strategy needs to be developed that considers the full impact of decisions on the VCS across all departments. In terms of commissioning all Council departments should ensure that the question "could/should the local VCS be commissioned/delivering/be involved in this" be asked before purchasing in expensive external agencies/providers
- Directly approach and encourage marginalised groups and communities
- More effective meaningful engagement. You should listen to what the VCS say not just one way traffic
- Listen to what they say
- Listen to what people say and ensure that consultations are effective and not just seen to be doing but listen to what residents and organisations say
- As a matter of urgency the Council needs to consider how cross departmental communication can be improved. An overarching strategy needs to be developed that considers the full impact of decisions on the VCS across all departments. In terms of commissioning all Council departments should ensure that the question "could/should the local VCS be commissioned/delivering/be involved in this" be asked before purchasing in expensive external agencies/providers. (x3)
- If a consultation service were developed, we'd need ways of limiting time requirements and/or finding a new breed of contributor
- Support the other Strategic Partners like CCCG, NHS and others to engage effectively with the VCS
- Important not one off and have regular focus groups; Get people involved Get to know organisations; Value organisations' work; More funding for advocacy groups; Council be pro- active in supporting and listening to their concerns and needs; Organisations work with council to develop funding programme; Council should be open with funding process and show no favouritism and be completely impartial; Good monitoring support should be put in place; Listen more

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

Section E: We want to improve how we use data about who accesses services and what their needs are. We think data-sharing to help service design is the way forward, but we want to strike a balance. During the past year the Council has used available data to create 22 neighbourhood profiles across the borough. These can be used by the Council, VCS and other partners to understand the needs and assets in a neighbourhood as well as providing useful statistics when applying for funding. The information will be available on the Camden Open Data site in the autumn.

Q1: Would you be willing to input data about services and users into a shared database?

Yes (x 22 responses)

No (x 2 response)

No response (x 6)

Q2: Any further comments?

- I think data sharing is a good idea but you have to be cautious of data protection and confidentiality issues and be mindful of how different organisations deal with these issues
- I'm not sure what this means. Data is not a panacea - people are people and can't be sieved into numbers. Conversations and relationships are more important than analysts, and stories are more powerful than statistics
- The council needs to target smaller community organisation.
- Shared database should be for the benefit of the communities and the service users
- Happy to share, but it would have to be worth my time putting in the data!
- Shared database should be for the benefit of the communities and the service users
- High security risk
- Data is an essential & a valuable tool when used appropriately. However there is a danger of using pure 'numbers' to create easy/shallow solutions to complex issues. Having said that we will welcome a free, linked -up database system that will serve our research & evaluation needs. We hope it would come with regular training and support. With appropriate data -sharing protocols it could greatly improve inter -agency referral systems & partnership working
- Data sharing is key to enable VCS organisations to be able to demonstrate their impact
- None, apart from care should be taken with personal data and as long as the person has agreed to the sharing of their data
- Data is an essential & a valuable tool when used appropriately. However there is a danger of using pure 'numbers' to create easy/shallow solutions to complex issues. Having said that we will welcome a free, linked-up database system that will serve our research & evaluation needs. We hope it would come with regular training and support. With appropriate data-sharing

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

protocols it could greatly improve inter-agency referral systems & partnership working (x3)

- Would be great to have but there would be concerns about confidentiality how people/organisations with limited IT skills could access the knowledge. Look at the idea in more detail, come up with some proposals and ask the question again.

Section F: Please give any additional comments not covered elsewhere.

- You need to be more robust with groups and their cost base before giving any funds
- Rent relief is important to us
- We provide a variety important services including classes in BME community languages, support with mainstream curriculum subjects like English, Maths and Science during evenings and weekends. We also offer extra-curricular fun activities and support different cultural events and festivals. We provide a whole family approach to improving children and young people's health and well-being through sporting activities and healthy eating sessions so that they understand the theory and practice needed to become healthy citizens in the future. We run Parenting classes, Safeguarding and Child Protection workshops. We translate for schools and other communities during Parent/Teacher meetings twice every year. Any one-to-one support needed in school from Head teacher to class teacher or any other member of the school, we are there
- We provide variety important services including classes in our Home languages; support with mainstream curriculum core subjects (English, Maths and Science) evenings and weekends. We also offer extra-curricular fun activities and support different cultural events and festivals.
- We provide a whole family approach to improving children and young people's health and well-being through sporting activities and healthy eating sessions so that they understand the theory and practice needed to become healthy citizens in the future. We run Parenting classes, Safeguarding and Child Protection workshops. We translate for schools and other communities during Parent/Teacher meetings twice every year.
- Some of the main benefits of using voluntary community sectors for the delivery of social/health care and education services can include:
 - saving money estimated 40 - 50% of the budget proposed to be spent on service provisions through private social care agents;
 - cutting budgets without affecting frontline regular services for disadvantaged community groups and individuals;
 - helping ethnic minority community organisations develop service delivery capacity and create employment opportunities for disadvantaged people.

We believe that the word 'disadvantage' must not continue from generation to generation in the life cycle of ethnic minority communities. In order to remove this attachment of 'economic and educational disadvantage' from the ethnic minority communities and to bring a long term and sustainable solution for such educational and economic disadvantaged people and communities, the Council authorities and policy makers should engage in a policy debate with the target communities on how to establish strong family and community institutions that enable them to deliver the required services for their own

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

children, young people and vulnerable community members. Economic and education disadvantage of ethnic minority communities does not affect only minority groups, but it does cost and affect the whole society. For example, according to the REACH Report (2007) based on a 2006 index, the cost of tackling educational underachievement, unemployment, minority ethnic children overrepresentation in school exclusions and the criminal justice system was about £808 million a year (based on a 2006 index). Nine years later, this cost can be estimated by more than a billion pound a year. So, this CVS approach policy of the Council is the best way for the local and national government to deal with the root causes of the problem with low costs now rather than to deal with the symptoms of the problem with high costs later. We also strongly advise the Council to develop effective control and monitoring systems to make sure that:

- basic standards and requirements to be met by the voluntary community organisations, which can involve in the provision of social, health and education services
- Proper guidelines and capacity building training to be available for small community organisations that enable them to meet the requirements to be set out by the Council.
- Some of the main benefits of using voluntary community sectors for the delivery of social/health care and education services can include:
 - saving money - estimated 40 - 50% of the budget proposed to be spent on service provisions through private social care agents;
 - cutting budgets without affecting frontline regular services for disadvantaged community groups and individuals;
 - Helping ethnic minority community organisations develop service delivery capacity and create employment opportunities for disadvantaged people.
- We believe that the word 'disadvantage' must not continue from generation to generation in the life cycle of ethnic minority communities. In order to remove this attachment of 'economic and educational disadvantage' from the ethnic minority communities and to bring a long term and sustainable solution for such educational and economic disadvantaged people and communities, the Council authorities and policy makers should engage in a policy debate with the target communities on how to establish strong family and community institutions that enable them to deliver the required services for their own children, young people and vulnerable community members.
- Economic and education disadvantage of ethnic minority communities does not affect only minority groups, but it does cost and affect the whole society. For example, according to the REACH Report (2007) based on a 2006 index, the cost of tackling educational underachievement, unemployment, minority ethnic children overrepresentation in school exclusions and the criminal justice system was about £808 million a year (based on a 2006 index). Nine years later, this cost can be estimated by more than a billion pound a year. So, this CVS approach policy of the Council is the best way for the local and national government to deal with the root causes of the problem with low costs now rather than to deal with the symptoms of the problem with high costs later.
- We also strongly advise the Council to develop effective control and monitoring systems to make sure that:
 - basic standards and requirements to be met by the voluntary community organisations, which can involve in the provision of social, health and education services

Camden Council and Camden's Voluntary and Community Sector: Consultation Questionnaire

- Proper guidelines and capacity building training to be available for small community organisations that enable them to meet the requirements to be set out by the Council.
- 1. The Equalities Assessment for these proposals is mentioned but is not being included in the consultation – why? It isn't clear how this assessment can be robust - given the lack of detail in the consultation. 2. No reference is made to the cumulative impact of the cuts - cuts in library provision, under -5s drop-in, adult social care etc. Have these been taken into account? If so how? 3. The consultation document has missed an opportunity to maximise impact by failing to include a plan to use the voluntary sector to maximise the use of Camden assets, & /or create links with the private, business or public sectors. 4. The timescale of consultation is such that the report is being written before the consultation is over. Given the pressures organisations are under, the expectation cannot be that people are able to input before the deadline, and it discourages future submissions and involvement from the sector
- Can you please ensure that my response is included in the cabinet report
- 1. The Equalities Assessment for these proposals is mentioned but is not being included in the consultation – why? It isn't clear how this assessment can be robust - given the lack of detail in the consultation. 2. No reference is made to the cumulative impact of the cuts - cuts in library provision, under-5s drop-in, adult social care etc. Have these been taken into account? If so how? 3. The consultation document has missed an opportunity to maximise impact by failing to include a plan to use the voluntary sector to maximise the use of Camden assets, &/or create links with the private, business or public sectors. 4. The timescale of consultation is such that the report is being written before the consultation is over. Given the pressures organisations are under, the expectation cannot be that people are able to input before the deadline, and it discourages future submissions and involvement from the sector. (x3)
- We note the intention to keep leases out of the consultation on the grounds that the Cabinet reached a view in 2013. Very few community centres have signed leases and the current proposals do not define rent levels so are largely meaningless. We need to talk about leases and the associated issue of rent relief.
- I think 7 year funding is too long and there should be break clauses after 3 years in case there are changes in the organisation including loss of key staff, governance etc.
- Camden People First need more staff; Funding has been really important for the Hate and Mate Crime Project; Rent money is important; Groups from 8 zones need to meet each other to get to know each other and better understand their needs. People from Hampstead should meet with people from Somers Town.. My concern is if the council stops funding groups supporting people with mental health issues and and LD there would be lots of problems because the vulnerable people would stay at home and not get any helps