

Event report

2014-2020 EUROPEAN FUNDING IN LONDON – BRIEFING & OPPORTUNITIES?

3.11.2014

VENUE

The Foundry
17-19 Oval Way,
London
SE11 5RR

A new programme of European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) launches later this year, running through to 2020. This event provided an opportunity for members and others to:

- Be briefed on the new round of ESIF funding, including an update on the London Enterprise Panel (LEP) strategy and priorities.
- Consider the opportunities and challenges for London's voluntary and community and social enterprise sector (VCSE) to participate in this programme.
- Hear about the role of the Big Lottery Fund as a match funder.
- Think about how other funders may wish to get involved, either in a match funder role or in supporting complementary activities.

Chair **John Griffiths**, Board Member of London Funders and Managing Director of Rocket Science, welcomed delegates with a 'sense of expectation'. He said the latest seven-year round of ESIF funding had been long in gestation, during which time the Regional Development Agencies had been replaced by Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The emergence of the Big Lottery Fund as a co-investor provides both opportunities and challenges. With the prospect of a programme bringing nearly £700 million of investment into London over the next five to six years, of which around £500 million will be for employment programmes (ESF), London Funders is committed to enabling these funds to reach out to disadvantaged people across the capital as effectively as possible.

European Structural and Investment Funds in London

Alex Conway, European Programmes Director, Greater London Authority

Alex presented an overview of how ESIF works with the London context. ESIF funding is made in seven-year tranches and recycles taxpayers' money back to member countries. It must be matched by funds from the country itself, normally at a ratio of 50%.

A total of 6.2 billion euros is available across England, with London allocated 748.6 million euros (c. £641 million). This is split between the European Social Fund aimed at boosting jobs and training, and the European Regional Development Fund to support SMEs and economic growth. With matched funding, a total of £1.3 billion is available to London over the period 2014 to 2020.

The European Commission sets the framework and regulations for how the European Funds must be managed. It negotiates and agrees the Operational Programme for each fund with the Managing Authority for each Member State – in England this is the DWP.

The Managing Authority is responsible for the delivery of the Operational Programme, reporting to the European Commission. In England, the Managing Authority does this both by running 'Direct Calls' (procurement or

A total of 6.2 billion euros is available across England, with London allocated 748.6 million euros (c. £641 million)

grant competitions whereby they source delivery bodies for the programme, who have to bring their own match-funding) and by appointing 'Opt-In Organisations' (OIOs – national bodies that can run their own competitions, but provide the match-funding themselves). For ESF 2014-2020, the OIOs are Big Lottery Fund, DWP and the Skills Funding Agency. The National Offender Management Service will continue to act as a Co-Financing Organisation at a national level, but will not offer an 'opt-in' to LEPs.

ESF will be distributed through the 39 new LEPs that replace the Regional Development Authorities, who will agree with OIOs what activities will be delivered in their area. The LEP for London – the London Enterprise Panel, also shortened to LEP – is chaired by the London Mayor, with representatives including other Deputy Mayors, Transport for London, the London boroughs and business leaders.

ESF priorities follow LEP's priorities, particularly in relation to youth unemployment. Inner London has been awarded an extra £37 million as part of the Youth Employment Initiative, while Outer London narrowly missed getting extra funds as its youth unemployment rate at the time of decision-making was just under the qualifying 25%. Talks are ongoing as the Inner London rate has now dropped just below 25%, while Outer London's has nudged above the quarter.

The 2014-2020 programme for London will not be dramatically different to the programme now ending, but there are some key differences, including:

- A co-financing approach through Opt-in Organisations. OIOs to date include: Skills Funding Agency, Department for Work and Pensions, Big Lottery Fund (national), plus London Councils and Greater London Authority (local). Some councils and the GLA are also considering match funding.
- LEP sets priorities for investment and coordinates activities across the OIOs. LEP is more locally-driven and in a better position to identify areas of need.
- OIOs are responsible for procurement and contracting and provision of match funding (reporting back to LEP and the Managing Authority).
- Projects are delivered by cross-sector partnerships with the right mix of skills and expertise.
- Direct bidding approaches may also be used in future.

The 2014-2020 Skills and Employment Priority areas are:

- 1. Freedoms, flexibilities and funding incentives**
 - a) Targeted employability programmes for the long-term unemployed/ disadvantaged workless groups to access sustainable job opportunities.
 - b) Tailored support for young people aged 15-24 not in education, employment or training (EET) or at risk of NEET.

ESF priorities follow LEP's priorities, particularly in relation to youth unemployment

- c) Career progression and progression in learning, particularly for the low paid/low skilled.
- d) Progression onto higher level and advanced skills training including higher-level apprenticeships.

2. Informed customers

- a) Promoting a much stronger London-wide and locally-driven careers offer through:
 - i. Bringing together schools, further education, higher education and employers to ensure training meets London's current and future skills needs.
 - ii. Improving information on post-16 career pathways.
 - iii. Brokering progression opportunities and jobs mapping.

3. Employer engagement

- a) Business support for SMEs to take on apprentices, provide good quality work placements and employment opportunities.
- b) Promote opportunities leading to entrepreneurship, business start-up and self-employment through skills development.
- c) Sector-specific business-focused skills programmes aimed at equipping SMEs, micro-business and sole traders with the skills they need to grow their business.

Outcomes will be measured by:

- Participants in employment on leaving.
- Inactive participants engaged in job searching upon leaving.
- Participants in education/training upon leaving.
- Participants gaining a qualification upon leaving.
- 26 weeks sustained education, employment and training (LEP).

Timing

Funds will not be available until the Operational Programme has been signed off. Much work has already been done but the England Operational Programme is a year behind schedule which is 'pretty much par for the course when it comes to EU funding'. Over the next six to nine months templates of activities will be developed to add numbers and volumes to the existing outlines, with launch expected in early 2015.

Operational programmes for Wales and Scotland are more advanced and have been submitted to the EC for agreement.

Funds will not be available until the Operational Programme has been signed off.

The role of the BIG Lottery Fund

Sufina Ahmad, Policy and Learning Manager, Big Lottery Fund

For the first time the Big Lottery Fund is a match funder in ESIF funds as an Opt-in Organisation (OIO). Sufina gave details of Building Better Opportunities – the Fund’s vision of how to work in partnership with ESIF to deliver two main aims:

- Maximising the *impact* of BIG funds. By cash matching under thematic objective 9 (promoting social inclusion and combating poverty), the Big Lottery will be effectively doubling the impact it could make with this amount of lottery money alone.
- Improving *access* to European funds by VCSE organisations. Its support and funding in the next round has the potential to increase the ‘voice’ and influence of the VCSE in this area, and facilitate access to a greater share of funds.

There are three tests to be applied:

- Alignment – European and LEP requirement must align with BIG’s investment priorities and operational processes.
- Additionality – shared investments with LEPs should be additional rather than duplicate existing investments.
- Costs – projects must be delivered within cost parameters.

To date the Big Lottery Fund has:

- Announced Programme Development Fund (PDF) awards across the UK valued at around £630,000. In London PDF funds have gone to the London Voluntary Services Council (LVSC) to:
 - Ensure widespread awareness of the ESF opportunities available locally through the opt-in with the Big Lottery Fund, with potential applicants fully informed of the requirements, risks and responsibilities involved, and given the opportunity to discuss the LEP’s priorities and local need.
 - Provide administrative support to develop positive working relationships between organisations in the LEP area, which will lead to good quality applications to the main ESF programme from 2015.
 - Provide a publicly-advertised contact for local organisations to find out more (fielding queries, maintaining a database and facilitating events) and be a source of knowledge about the area, investment priorities and stakeholders.
- Engaged with LEP to develop project templates.
- Worked with LEPs nationally to develop frameworks of planned activities.

The Big Lottery will be effectively doubling the impact it could make with this amount of lottery money alone

European and LEP requirement must align with BIG’s investment priorities and operational processes.

Based on conversations with all 36 LEP areas, the Big Lottery expects to match about £250 million of Lottery money with approximately £300 million of European money to provide a single application, decision, payment and monitoring mechanism for applicants.

This is an open funding application process, but the Big Lottery hopes that it will encourage the VCSE sector to 'seize the opportunity, step up, apply and provide services relevant to local labour markets, tailored to people's needs and abilities, and additional but complementary to existing provision'.

By offering match funding the Big Lottery will remove the need for VCSE organisations to apply for separate match funds. This will be new money rather than money already committed to other programmes. It will secure more straightforward access to European money by using a delivery model that the VCSE sector is familiar with, and that to date, the public and private sectors are not.

Unlike other OIOs, the Big Lottery is offering a cash match rather than programme match and therefore putting additional money into the pot so its opt-in is 50/50 (in the main) funding whereas other opt-ins are 100% ESF-funded. This means its opt-in will, in effect, double the amount of money on offer and allow the creation of bespoke programmes.

It is about outcomes, but there will be some outputs. The Big Lottery will not compromise its mission or values. It hopes to use a blended funding model, including upfront money as well as Payment by Results. 'We want to get people into jobs that suit them, and work with unemployed people, including those furthest from the labour market.'

The application process

We are proposing be a two-stage competitive grants process for all projects identified in the LEP Local Implementation Plan and applications from individual organisations or partnerships will be considered. Potential applicants will be encouraged to consider a variety of delivery models and structures.

The Big Lottery will offer grants rather than contracts, 'because that is our core business' and the VCSE sector is used to the Big Lottery grants process. Charities already in receipt of Big Lottery funding will still be eligible to apply.

Applications at stage one will be an outline proposal of what the applicant intends to do to meet the requirements of that particular project. The project outlines and criteria will be developed in partnership with LEP.

Applications at stage two will adopt a proportionate approach, so the smaller the grant, the less (detailed) the requirements; the bigger the grant, the more information will be needed, the more demanding it will be, and the longer it is likely to take. Maximum grant sizes will be largely dictated by the total LEP allocates to each priority.

The Fund will offer Lottery development grants for organisations that state in their initial application that they would like to use this. The amount awarded will be in proportion with the actual grant size that is being applied for, and the development funding will be made up entirely of Big Lottery

The Big Lottery will offer grants rather than contracts

money. This funding could be used to develop partnerships, plan and consult on activities, and prepare applications.

Funding officers will work closely with applicants throughout stage two, offering intensive support at every step. They will be flexible so that applicants who are ready to proceed quickly can do so, and those who need additional support can access it.

Although there may be pressure from the Managing Authority to start spending quickly, BIG is very keen to ensure the right decisions without rushing the process – it does not want projects failing in their first year or money being clawed back because all the requirements cannot be met.

The aim is to have decisions confirmed as soon as possible after the programme launches, and this could take us in to early 2016. Further application tranches will be completed in line with the LEP's Local Implementation Plan.

London Councils and ESIF funding

Dianna Neal, Head of Economy, Tourism and Culture, London Councils

With membership across the 32 London boroughs and the City of London, London Councils (LC) aims to help achieve a 'locally responsive ESIF programme informed by evidence but also practice experience about what works'. Dianna said that LC aims to use its practical experience working with the VCSE sector and others as an existing CoFinancing Organisation for ESIF, together with its local knowledge of boroughs, to:

- Influence the LEP's ESIF strategy to create a more localist approach.
- Advocate for simplification.
- Help shape and influence the ESIF programme.
- Prepare boroughs and their partners for the funding opportunities.
- Act as a local match funder.

LC is also well placed to help spot opportunities to join up funding streams. Although its spending to date through the programme is relatively small at £25 million, this has been match-funded by the Grants Committee and individual boroughs. With a focus on trying to reach those people the furthest away from employability, it has already delivered basic skills training to over 12,500 people on behalf of some boroughs.

In the 2014-2020 programme it aims to:

- Continue to be a local match funder with similar levels of spend to the current round (subject to political agreement).
- Continue with community grants (if match is secured from the boroughs).

LC is well placed to help spot opportunities to join up funding streams

- Work closely with the Big Lottery in London, aligning and making things work rather than duplicating.
- Co-ordinate borough access (if desired) to additional ESIF funds.
- LC will lead on behalf of the LEP to develop the use of ESF funds to promote adult skills, specifically:
- Entry-level and in-work progression for low-skilled unemployed people, for example, those in social care, retail and tourism.
- In-work progression of low-skilled, low-paid employed Londoners.
- Entrepreneurship, business start-up and self-employment.

It will also develop a new ESF families programme aimed at better integrating the ESF and Communities and Local Government (CLG) families programmes locally.

A focus will be looking at how services can be better integrated, getting providers and local authorities to work together to tackle multiple problems. This will bring both challenges and opportunities. A more localist approach should allow for better joining up between programmes, with an emphasis on how programmes can complement each other rather than compete or duplicate.

LC wants to encourage all CFOs to build a more diverse supply chain that provides opportunities for smaller players.

It is fundamental to concentrate on progression, not just getting people into work, but to incentivise more stable jobs to lift people out of poverty.

LC wants to encourage partnerships to be prepared for a quick start once the funding is released, but there is enough lead-in time to form meaningful relationships to ensure the money is spent well.

Its final aim is to help secure match funding, which 'is always a challenge but with creative thinking we can find ways to secure more funds'.

View from the London Voluntary Service Council (LVSC)

Steve Kerr, Policy and Project Manager, LVSC

LVSC is the representative body of the VCSE in London. Its strategic priority is to tackle poverty and inequality across the capital. Steve Kerr, Policy and Project Manager, explained how this drives LCVS's employment and skills work. Funded by Trust for London, over the past four years it has built up a network of over 500 organisations working on employment skills. It also has strategic representation on various bodies, including on the LEP Skills and Employment Working Group and the Lottery Programming Development Fund.

How the VCSE in London has been engaged so far

A focus will be looking at how services can be better integrated, getting providers and local authorities to work together to tackle multiple problems.

- There has been enormous interest in Big Lottery ESF offer.
- Engagement with VCSE from LEP and Opt-Ins on programme development has been positive.
- LVSC and other VCSE reps have contributed through GLA's task and finish groups.
- LVSC has convened thematic VCSE working groups on: in-work progression for low paid workers; older people; BAME communities, including refugees; parental employment; ex-offenders; disability employment; multiple complex needs.

Emerging issues include:

- Hard to help clients need holistic support over a longer term than current programmes allow. A two-year ESF contract in reality only allows a six- to 12-month period to work with individuals, which is just not enough. In this context 'holistic' means dealing with multiple life issues that are barriers to employment such as mental health, housing, and debt.
- Narrow Payment By Results models mitigate against holistic support – payment models must recognise a range of outcomes: engagement, distance travelled measures, self-employment and mini jobs. Milestone payments could be considered.
- Working strategically with employers is crucial.
- There are lots of examples of good practice but evidence is patchy and hard for providers to sustain/scale up.

Gaps include refugees, disabled people, complex needs, persistent low pay, and community based provision.

ESF is a great opportunity to gather evidence to demonstrate needs, and LCVS is working with the Big Lottery to shape its programme.

Looking ahead, LVSC sees three areas of focus:

Delivery

- Awareness-raising and helping VCSE to bid and deliver (focus on employers, partnerships, outcome-based funding).
- To provide ongoing support for VCSE providers during programme.

Policy

- It is yet to be determined how the Big Lottery programme will sit alongside Opt-In programmes already developed. All projects need to be strategic and aligned.
- A flexible approach is needed where statutory provision exists but is ineffective/inadequate – e.g. English for Speakers of Other Languages, disability.

ESF is a great opportunity to gather evidence to demonstrate needs, and LCVS is working with the Big Lottery to shape its programme.

Governance

- Collaboration is needed across statutory/employer/VCS stakeholders.
- VCS representation on LEP and ESIF committee needs to be strengthened.
- A strategic oversight of performance with respect to labour market inequalities is required.

There may well be multiple rounds that will offer smaller organisations more time and scope to form partnerships

Question to the panel

The presentations were followed by a question and answer session.

How can the VCSE be encouraged to access funding through the ESF programme?

While it has to be an open application process, the Big Lottery is expecting most applications from the VCSE. The VCSE is in a better position than the public or private sectors to access the funding through the Big Lottery as it is used to the process. Some big public and private sector organisations may have their eye on the programme, but they are less likely to go via the Big Lottery route. Each application must be judged on its own merit. There may well be multiple rounds that will offer smaller organisations more time and scope to form partnerships. In contrast, it is a condition of the funding available through London Councils that it goes to the VCSE.

How can ESIF money reward ‘what works’ to drive up quality?

You have to be cautious about defining ‘what works’. Good ideas may not work in one organisation, or an average idea only works because of brilliant people who then leave. Organisations when bidding can refer to what mechanisms worked in the previous round of funding, and refer to successes, showing what lessons have been learned.

Can this money be used to tackle the social problem of in-work poverty?

Dianna commented that this might be beyond the realm of ESIF but is a big issue in London, and one that needs to be looked at as a policy issue as well. What LC would like to see is this programme testing out some approaches to tackle in-work poverty. London has got an hourglass shaped economy when it comes to skills – lots of jobs that are quite low-skilled, not very many middle-level skills, and lots of high skills, so the question is how do we help people cross that divide. Maybe ESIF money can generate some new ideas about what works and what doesn’t work.

London has got an hourglass shaped economy when it comes to skills – lots of jobs that are quite low-skilled, not very many middle-level skills, and lots of high skills

The Big Lottery will use its work in each of the LEP areas to develop shared learning at a local and a national level.

Is it possible to have a holistic overview when many organisations are doing slightly different things?

Alex reported that when developing the previous round of ESIF funding a lot of energy was spent in trying to get everything perfect and avoid any duplication. He now realises that things can never fit together perfectly but what can be done is to get rid of perverse incentives such as allowing two different organisations to compete over getting the same person into work. Sometimes there will be some kinds of similar activities, but this is acceptable as long as outcomes are achieved that are about getting people into work and upskilling people.

How will the Big Lottery distribute money geographically across London?

Sufina responded that grants will be both pan-London and specific to boroughs. The project outlines will be developed in collaboration with lots of different organisations, including representatives for the VCSE. We can be quite confident that whatever comes out in the project outlines is specifically what's needed either within boroughs or more widely across London. As far as we know there will be no minimum or maximum size of grant. Working with 36 LEPs it would be counter-productive to set limits as some LEPs are providing much smaller Opt-in amounts. The programme needs to be flexible.

The programme needs to be flexible

How can partnerships be developed to ensure Londoners get the support they need?

Alex replied that most organisations in the UK tend to deal in three-year funding cycles, rather than seven-year. A typical project contract will be two- or three-year. In theory, ESIF the money is divided into equal tranches. The incentive is there to get money out quickly, especially on the Youth Employment Initiative, which is only valid for the first three years of the programme. If the money is not spent, the EU will claw it back. It is a theoretical possibility that if London spends its money more quickly, we would go back to the Commission and ask if London can spend some of money not yet spent by other LEPs.

In response to a comment from Kristina Glenn of Cripplegate Foundation on how the ESIF funding would be informed by the wealth of existing knowledge among trusts, Steve said that some of that data had already been considered. LVSC will use its programme development money to raise awareness and gather examples of good practice from trusts.

LVSC will use its programme development money to raise awareness and gather examples of good practice from trusts.

Alex stressed the fact that an enormous amount of work has already gone on with boroughs and voluntary sector organisations — the more brains we pick the better. The programme is not designed either by government and a few folks in City Hall, but we have reached out across stakeholders.

A view from both sides of the funding relationship

Emma Stewart, Women Like Us, Timewise Foundation; London Skills and Employment Board

Emma gave an insight from the point of view of both a funder and a delivery agent. Her position as Director of Women Like Us and of Timewise Foundation, and a member of the London Skills and Employment Board

meant she could comment on the 'top down strategic and bottom up nightmare'.

While recognising that it is 'a really complicated landscape', Emma said that what we know is that the Co-opted Organisations have done a lot of work to look at where they can put their money to drive investment to the frontline to enable Londoners to improve their life chances and get back into work or get on in work. They have been examining where investments are best aligned, where there are gaps, and where the need is.

There are five challenges:

Barriers to employment – We know getting a job is a key for a lot of Londoners to get them out of poverty, but there are a whole range of barriers to getting a job beyond just getting access to skills and employment provision. How are funders/strategic organisations going to align their support with what ESF provides? For example, parents require good quality localised childcare. ESF will try to support that but will not invest a lot directly. Housing associations know that for their residents to get a job they need to deal with their debt issues. People with mental health issues or problems with drug and alcohol abuse have a whole range of needs. Therefore how can organisations that want to engage with ESF ensure that their social return on investment is enabled because other services will co-exist around it, and that people can access those services. We know from best practice that co-location is key so that when people go to their GP or talk to their welfare advisors, there is also a conversation around employability. This has to happen quite early on in the process. Referral networks are key. Outside the ESF, there is a real role for funders convening and facilitating referral networks. There is often no upfront investment to help organisations find other agencies at a localised level to work with them.

Avoiding duplication – Not offering the same service to an individual, but also not going to the same employers. Small businesses who have not engaged with apprenticeships as much as they could report that the system itself is a barrier. This ESF round is a real opportunity not just to think about getting people into work, but about keeping them there and moving them on. The conversation with employers is more critical than ever before.

As employers, funders can also look at their own practice, and how they leverage their supply chains and networks. They can think not just about a vacancy, but how that job is designed. Parents and people with mental health issues may have skills, but may not be able to work eight hours a day five days a week. It's not always that there are no jobs, but there are no jobs that they can do.

Avoiding silos – This is one of the biggest challenges. The analogy of a football pitch with all the people down one end could be used to describe the ESIF/DWP troubled families programme. Avoiding that is not just about co-bidding, but genuinely co-designing services, making sure that the range of interventions is considered at a local and regionalised level. A current example is where Lambeth Council, a local funder (the Walcot Foundation) and a housing association are coming together to support people into better jobs, with each bringing a different role to the table.

Co-location is key so that when people go to their GP or talk to their welfare advisors, there is also a conversation around employability

There is often no upfront investment to help organisations find other agencies at a localised level to work with them.

Payment by results model – Small providers are always going to struggle when they don't get paid until they have delivered certain outputs. Local authorities, housing associations and other agencies should consider at what stage their investment is required. So many providers that are really niche and really good have fallen by the wayside because they couldn't work without upfront capital. It would be a disaster if that happened with ESF. This is part of the problem of running in two to three year tranches – what happens in the middle? The project might be commissioned so it has money for the first year, but what happens if you have a really brilliant idea or learn from another agency's experience halfway through? Funders could look at where they can add value at different stages of the process. Innovation is also about allowing for failure – the ESF does not. The Big Lottery involvement could help with that, but other agencies could really add value.

There is also the capacity-building role. Most voluntary organisations are very small. The holy grail is for social investors to find the consortia that can scale up. ESF can work with other agencies to help build those consortia.

Sharing learning and good practice – This should be used not just to drive outputs, but real learning to develop sustainable models and build outcomes. There is so much learning that just gets lost. In recent years the sector has been decimated and lots of good organisations have gone to the wall, so their learning is wasted.

Small group discussions

Discussions focused on two specific questions:

- How can we develop genuine partnerships to ensure Londoners get the right support they need?
- How may funders need to re-think their activities in this space to fill any areas not covered by ESF?

Feedback included:

- It is very hard to link up across all the different stakeholders and delivery bodies. This should be done on a borough basis rather than London-wide. As much as you can try to systematise it through referral pathways and so on, it comes down to relationships on the ground.
- Partnerships need strong organisations to take some of the risk and shelter smaller ones. We need to build on existing relationships.
- Some lessons can be earned from the existing Work Programme, particularly in the area of performance measurement.
- The voluntary sector can often deliver better than the private sector.
- While ESF will cover practical outcomes, there is space for independent funders to work around policy change.

Innovation is also about allowing for failure – the ESF does not

- Identifying partners to fill gaps not covered by ESF is key – housing associations could be big players, not necessarily in terms of money but in terms of reach.
- Partnerships need to be locally-focused and driven by need. They also should be sustainable regardless of funding stream.
- We must remember in supporting employment skills, one of the biggest problems amongst the hardest to reach is a lack of confidence.

Moving on

Each of the panellists was asked to summarise very briefly what they took away from the meeting (Dianna had had to leave)

Steve, LVSC

I would be interested in talking to trusts about the data they hold on their grantees. A lot of that work is hidden from the public commissioners but it has a lot of value to bring.

Boroughs have an important role to play in joining up providers across the employment skills and advice locally.

Emma, Women Like Us, Timewise Foundation; London Skills and Employment Board

It is tough for funders to create an impact against a landscape of £600 million. We need to ask organisations who have delivered ESF in the past, what would have helped? What else did the individuals that they were working with need that they couldn't offer?

Alex, GLA

Let's have more events like this – consultations are going to be happening.

We don't have all the answers but despite the time pressure to get money out of the door, we do have enough time and money to encapsulate what people want. It's an exciting opportunity to match-fund much more voluntary sector activity than we ever have been able to in the past.

Sufina, Big Lottery Fund

I too would like to see more events like this. I would encourage people to develop meaningful partnerships based on what you know so far. It might not be the final offer but it is worth starting to have conversations with colleagues in your area. We will continue to develop our project outlines, taking into account conversations with the LEP to agree that it is also about advice and advocacy and flexible outreach. It should not just be judged by how many people you got into a job but also how many people you supported with all elements of going into a job.

Boroughs have an important role to play in joining up providers across the employment skills and advice locally.

I too would like to see more events like this. I would encourage people to develop meaningful partnerships based on what you know so far

John summed up by saying there is enough flesh on the bones for this programme for everyone to start preparing and getting into genuine partnerships that will deliver really meaningful outcomes for people who most need them.

Contacts

www.london.gov.uk/lep

esf@london.gov.uk

www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/esf

Building.BetterOpportunities@BigLotteryFund.org.uk

www.londoncouncils.gov.uk

www.lvsc.org.uk

Participants

John	Blackmore	Action Acton
Mark	Maddison	Affinity Sutton Group
John	Westby	Affinity Sutton Group
Tom	Lane	Amicus Horizon
Sufina	Ahmad	Big Lottery Fund
Nathan	Denne	Blackfriars Advice Centre
Rohan	Martyres	CAN
Bobbi	Banks	Centre Point
Mary	Locke	Charity Bank
Jaishree	Mistry	Charity Bank
Bina	Omare	Circle Housing Group
Kristina	Glenn	Cripplegate Foundation
Felicity	Green	Drake Music
Tony	Bamforth	Elfrida Society
Cali	Ibrahim	Family Mosaic
Sarah	Connelly	Genesis Housing Association
Sherine	McFarlane	Genesis Housing Association
Alex	Conway	Greater London Authority
Adrian	Taylor	Guinness South
Joe	Dobson	Hackney CVS
Emily	Goulborn	Impetus - The Private Equity Foundation
Erik	Mesel	John Lyon's Charity
Cathryn	Pender	John Lyon's Charity
Frances	Connelly	London Borough of Camden
Kevin	McKenna	London Borough of Croydon
Mary	O'Sullivan	London Borough of Enfield
Gurmej	Rihal	London Borough of Hackney
Joy	Collins	London Borough of Harrow
Malcolm	John	London Borough of Harrow
Brian	Partridge	London Borough of Havering
Cedric	D'Amico	London Borough of Islington
Joanna	Eve	London Borough of Islington
Winston	Castello	London Borough of Lewisham
Jennifer	Oatley	London Community Foundation
Dianna	Neal	London Councils
Heather	Armstrong	London Learning Consortium
Stephen	Jeffrey	London Learning Consortium
Lisa	Greensill	LVSC
Steve	Kerr	LVSC
Rob	Hardy	NCVO
Pascale	Vassie	NRCSE
Rusunara	Begum	One Housing Group
Nazrul	Islam	One Housing Group
Sharon	Long	Partnership For Young London
Kate	Long	Peabody
Jonathan	Sandall	Peabody
Jill	Fricker	Poplar HARCA
Alex	White	Premier League Charitable Fund
John	Griffiths	Rocket Science
Alison	Kenny	Sanctuary Housing
Sophie	Arup	School for Social Entrepreneurs

Jonathan	Flory	Social Finance Ltd
John	Gleeson	Southern Housing Group
Anabel	Palmer	Southern Housing Group
Hamid	Vaghefian	sported
Jahanara	Hussain	The Hyde Group
Emma	Stewart	Timewise Foundation
Wendy	Baverstock	Tomorrow's People
Mike	Sherriff	Voluntary Action Islington
Lauren	Tobias	Volunteer Centre Hackney
Jessica	Wanamaker	Volunteer Centre Kensington And Chelsea

In attendance

Becky	Green	London Funders
David	Warner	London Funders

Apologies for absence

Katie Higginson, BBC Children in Need; Jane Sterland, Big Lottery Fund; Dan Hopewell, Bromley By Bow Centre; Nicola Kelly, CAN; Ben Rogers, Centre For London; Shani Lee, Desta; Mumtaz Samad, Family Mosaic; Amna Mahmoud, GLA; Kiran Patel, London Borough of Camden; Agnes Olagunju, London Borough of Newham; Nasim Ahmed, London Borough of Tower Hamlets; Andrew Jerney Boys, London Community Foundation; Victoria Warne, London Community Foundation; Susan Whiddington, Mousetrap Theatre Projects; Rachel Wharton, New Philanthropy Capital; Amanda Beswick, Oak Philanthropy (UK) Limited; Caroline Masundire, Rocket Science; Tom Shirley, Social Finance Ltd; Andrew Parry, Southern Housing Group; Liz Brinsdon, Sported; Joy Beishon, The City Bridge Trust; Peter Babudu, The Social Innovation Partnership; David Forsgate, The Social Innovation Partnership; Mustafa Ibrahim, Tower Hamlets Somali Organisation Network; Rachael Bailey, Women Like Us