

**BIG LOTTERY FUND**

**MEETING OF BIG LOTTERY FUND ENGLAND COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THURSDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2011 at 9:30  
AT 1 PLOUGH PLACE, LONDON, EC4A 1DE**

**MINUTES****PRESENT:**

Nat Sloane	<i>England Chair (in the Chair)</i>
John Gartside	<i>Board Member and England Committee Vice- Chair</i>
Alan Billings	<i>England Committee Member</i>
Sue Charteris	<i>England Committee Member</i>
Margaret Hyde	<i>England Committee Member</i>
Albert Tucker	<i>Board Member and England Committee Member</i>
Nalini Varma	<i>England Committee Member</i>
Geoff Wilkinson	<i>England Committee Member</i>

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Peter Wanless	<i>Chief Executive</i>
Dharmendra Kanani	<i>Director for England</i>
Linda Quinn	<i>Director of Communications &amp; Marketing</i>
Margaret Cooney	<i>Deputy Director England (Regions &amp; External Relations)</i>
Tim Davies-Pugh	<i>Deputy Director, Operations and Programme Management</i>
Andrew Morris	<i>Deputy Director Business Development</i>
Ambreen Shah	<i>Deputy Director England Policy</i>
Jon Fox	<i>Head of England Policy</i>
Lorna Brewster	<i>England Programme Manager</i>
Amanda Todd	<i>England Committee Manager (Secretariat)</i>
Gurdeep Sidhu	<i>England Committee Manager</i>
Ged Sola	<i>Senior Policy Adviser (Item 6 only)</i>
Charlotte Gardiner	<i>Policy Manager (observer, Item 7 only)</i>
Mark Cooke	<i>Director of Finance and Corporate Services (Item 8 only)</i>

**APOLOGIES:**

Danny Silverstone	<i>England Committee Member</i>
Lyn Cole	<i>Strategic Business Executive</i>
Suzanne King	<i>Head of Parliamentary and UK External Relations (item 8)</i>

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1. Apologies were received from Danny Silverstone, England Committee Member and Lyn Cole, Strategic Business Executive.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest

**3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL OF ENGLAND COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 14 JULY 2011 (EC/11/M06)**

3.1 With the following amendments, these were agreed and signed as a correct record of the meeting:

- i) Paragraph 4.5: 'Albert Tucker noted the importance of transparency and clarity, in view of the criticisms of BIG, and the Chair emphasised the matter ~~not~~ **was** being treated seriously.'
- ii) Paragraph 8.2iii : The following sentence was added "For clarity, it was agreed that 'later stages of life' would be taken as commencing at 50."

#### 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF ENGLAND COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 14 JULY 2011 (EC/11/M06)

##### 4.1 Big Local Trust (Item 4.6v)

Memorandum EC(11)P71(C), Big Local Trust Investment Strategy summarises the discussions that the Chair had with Michael Quicke of CCLA on the Big Local Trust Investment Strategy and the Chair's recommendation to proceed with an investment strategy aimed at capital preservation, with a provision for a formal review at the end of two years.

##### 4.2 Impact of public sector spending cuts (EC(11)P45) (Item 5.3viii)

Dharmendra Kanani tabled a paper which outlines BIG's risk-based approach, in particular the 12 inherent risks and how the new funding management system allows BIG to take a systematic approach to risk management. Committee Members were invited to contact Andrew Morris if they had any specific queries and to raise any subsequent issues with Dharmendra Kanani.

##### 4.3 Impact of public spending cuts (EC(11)P45) (Item 5.3xii)

- i) As an ongoing action the Policy team will consider the effect on health, legal services, the North-South divide and the London divide in future papers.
- ii) It was agreed that on a regular basis the policy team will bring particular products of research for discussion at Committee. Members requested that this takes the form of a framework of discussion which help inform decisions as opposed to presentations.
- iii) Clarification of when work relating to rural areas would be available for review by Committee Members was requested and that this is discussed at a future meeting.  
**ACTION : England Secretariat to add to England Forward Plan**
- iv) Committee Members were requested to provide details of areas of particular interest to them and which will help inform the Committee's thinking and decision making.  
**ACTION: Committee Members**

##### 4.4 Additionality (EC(P11)P46) (Item 6.2viii and ix)

- i) The Chair confirmed that Lyn Cole had provided a summary of the discussions on additionality at July's England Committee and that these will be fed into the October Board Meeting. **Action: Chair**
- ii) Given the current fluid environment with regards to additionality, this item has been added to the forward plan for the England Committee.

##### 4.5 People Powered Change (Item 7)

Members commented that in the Reaching Communities meeting of 21 September 2011, 91% of organisations had previously applied to the programme. People Powered Change initiative had reached a new audience as the majority (70%) were new applicants. This initiative was an example of where a relatively small amount of money was having a large impact and that approach should be pursued. Dharmendra Kanani confirmed that a further proposal will be brought to England Committee. **Action: Dharmendra Kanani/Linda Quinn**

5. ENGLAND DIRECTOR'S REPORT, SEPTEMBER 2011 AND PORTFOLIO PLAN (EC(11)P57, EC(11)P58)

- 5.1 Dharmendra Kanani introduced the paper and emphasised his aim of providing Committee Members with a wider strategic view of BIG as an organisation; reviewing the work of the directorate from both an England and wider UK perspective, in particular the development of the England portfolio refresh and highlighting areas on the current and future England agenda.
- 5.2 It is proposed that this paper is a standing item on future meetings. In this month's report particular attention was drawn to a number of key strategic developments such as the public consultation on policy direction and the Business Process Re-Engineering Programme along with updates on the key 2011/12 investment themes.
- 5.3 To aid the development of the paper for future meetings, the view of Committee members on its structure, content and usefulness was sought. In general discussion the main points raised were:
- i) The consensus was that the paper was very helpful and informative and should continue.
  - ii) Committee Members felt that it was particularly useful for England members who were not on the Board.
  - iii) In the context of the proposed move to bi-monthly meetings it was felt that this report would benefit from more narrative, specifically for Dharmendra Kanani to identify key issues for him in his role as England Director.
  - iv) Committee Members requested that where the paper is presenting decisions to Committee rather than full reports, that this is made clear.
- 5.4 The following specific items within the report were raised for more detailed discussion:
- i) Strategic Framework (Item 2.2)
    - Peter Wanless advised that although work on the England portfolio refresh had started this would need to take account of the strategic framework refresh.
    - Consideration also needed to be given to the relationship between the Committee and the new UK Chair and it was agreed that it would be beneficial for the Committee Members to meet with the UK Chair. **ACTION: Chair.**
    - It was agreed that the strategic framework paper would be circulated to England Committee members to give them the opportunity to shape and influence the discussions. **ACTION: Dharmendra Kanani.**
  - ii) Public disturbances (Item 2.4)
    - Further information was requested on who was leading on this work.
    - Albert Tucker advised that the policy team were doing some work on young people, aiming at gaining the insight of practitioners.
    - The Strategy, Performance and Learning directorate are also working with UnLtd, Nesta and government in gathering information in this area.
  - iii) BPR (Item 2.7)
    - Dharmendra Kanani was requested in his SRO capacity to provide more detail on the progress of this programme for the benefit of EC members.
    - Dharmendra Kanani advised that a number of issues had been identified which were now subject to commercial negotiations. A six week delay to the internal go live date with staff was anticipated. The Board Sub Group will receive an update to this effect and a strategic milestone review in October will consider the next phase in the programme delivery.

- In terms of the system and its implementation, 90% of staff have been through a walkthrough of the system and the feedback is that it is more intuitive and flexible. A team of change champions has been established who will help develop key messages and support the cultural change management; a Super User and Support Team (SAS) have also been identified to help staff with the system at a local level.
- People agenda consultation is going well. The Joint Union Group have been supportive and staff are now being given the opportunity to raise and discuss issues.

iv) Older People (Item 2.8-2.10)

- Concern was expressed about the balance of the programme in terms of supporting the theme of isolation. Dharmendra Kanani reassured Committee Members that the guidance materials and communications will address this.
- Dharmendra Kanani gave further details of the partnership with the Daily Mail. Given its daily circulation this partnership will allow BIG to reach a significant readership and he expressed confidence that a positive, agreed message will be delivered.
- The governance of the Fund was discussed and it was confirmed that the panel would consist of 3 members, plus experts in the area and nominated Daily Mail readers, and it was felt that this would give a good mix and balance of deliberations. Committee requested that one member of the group should be someone who lives in an isolated area and/or is able to assess the implications of lack of services and facilities.
- Dharmendra Kanani confirmed that discussions with the Daily Mail were ongoing regarding the fund's name, however it had been confirmed that Angela Rippon would be the fund's ambassador.

v) Building Capabilities – Business in the Community Solicitation (Item 2.15)

- Paper EC(11)P70(C), Business Connectors solicitation had been issued to England Committee members for comment and feedback for consideration by the Chair.
- The Chair emphasised the importance of structuring the solicitation to mitigate the issues and concerns raised by members hitherto.
- The decision to solicit will be taken by the Chair and lead Committee Member for Capability Building, Margaret Hyde.
- Margaret Hyde commented that this was a significant opportunity for BITC, hence there was a risk of excluding other providers.
- A decision on the submission will be taken by England Committee at its November meeting.

vi) Microgrants (Item 2.20)

- Further information was requested on this issue and the proposed pilot, specifically comparison with delivery through Community Foundations. Jon Fox advised that the project team had taken into account the key issues raised by England Committee at its July meeting, including whether BIG is the best organisation to deliver this type of funding. The pilot would provide a significant piece of research and would look at a range of funders and 5 in depth.
- Dharmendra Kanani confirmed that there was a better and more cost effective route to assessing the comparative advantage of running a microgrants programme internally or through a partner. He pointed to the fact that the cost, time and bureaucracy involved in establishing an external delegation is likely to take longer than the pilot itself.

## 5.5 The England Committee agreed:

- (i) To note the paper
- (ii) To feedback to Dharmendra Kanani areas they would like covered in the report

*Ged Sola joined the meeting*

## 6. PACKAGE OF RESILIENCE FUNDING IN ENGLAND (EC(11)P59)

6.1 Ambreen Shah introduced the paper which builds on the discussions at the July England Committee meeting requesting BIG to consider ways to support existing grant holders in the current economic and social climate and address the impact of public sector spending cuts.

6.2 The proposal consists of a £50m investment through a range of activities:

- i) An increase to the Awards for All (£5m) and Reaching Communities budgets (£10m) for new grants
- ii) Providing support for existing grant holders through a resilience fund (£32m).
- iii) A response fund (£3m) to give flexibility within the portfolio to respond to new and emerging need.
- iv) Decision making will be via staff and officer delegation for sustaining impact funding and via Chair's action (following recommendation by a panel of officers) for Bridging Support.

6.3 In discussion the key points were:

- i) Committee Members welcomed the excellent paper and the approach. The speed and pragmatic response to an issue discussed at July's meeting was also noted. Dharmendra Kanani added that the team had worked closely with the legal team to find a solution to the level of ambition of the programme, and joined Committee Members in thanking the team for this work.
- ii) The theme of doing things differently and supporting excellence was emphasised. Committee commented that in the Reaching Communities meeting on 21 September, a number of applicants had also received Transition Fund funding, and the challenge was how to persuade recipients to make a shift in their delivery model. This view was endorsed by officers with Peter Wanless commenting that it questions our principles of being an intelligent funder if we fund organisations to continue as is. Ambreen Shah emphasised that the programme was also about rewarding excellence and the need to demonstrate this would be crucial to the decision making process. Jon Fox commented that a recommendation to organisations would be for them to demonstrate how they had changed since they had first applied and not to work on the assumption of future grants.
- iii) Committee commented that regional teams are often aware of the projects that are delivering excellence and which should be encouraged and suggested that if decision making is being devolved to officers then the regional team could play a leading role. Whilst recognising the resource implications for the regional team Committee Members stressed the importance of feeding in regional intelligence without making the process too cumbersome for staff. Dharmendra Kanani commented that regional colleagues work closely with grants staff so the relationship to support this is already in place.
- iv) Committee Members discussed the budget allocation for this package and the following points were made:
  - Concern as to whether the proposed allocations, including the proposed focus on one year extensions, were appropriate, suggesting an alternative approach could be to select the best projects and sustain them for longer.

- A number of Reaching Communities projects had large grants and members requested clarification that some discretion to moderate that sum was available. It was confirmed that the assessing GO would be best placed to make that judgement.
  - That the Reaching Communities allocation was increased to £12m and the Resilience Fund revised to £30m, and this was agreed.
  - The need to be pragmatic in decision making in terms of projects that should continue to be funded. Ambreen Shah confirmed that this intelligent approach had been emphasised in the paper.
  - Committee Members commented that this package had the potential to be very popular and the communications strategy would be key. It was noted that the individual budget elements would not be communicated to enable funds to move across the portfolio to where they will achieve the greatest impact.
- v) To support learning information is collected from applicants specifically on where gaps are in funding, the difficulties they are facing and if appropriate why organisations have chosen not to apply for funding.
- vi) To avoid confusion with other programmes, e.g. Sustainable and Resilient Communities, it was suggested that the name of the package is considered.

#### 6.4 The Committee agreed:

- (i) To the development of the package of resilience funding in England**
- (ii) To amend the proposed budget increasing the Reaching Communities additional budget to £12m and revising the Resilience Fund to £30m.**
- (iii) To the proposals for decision making**
- (iv) To receive information on the communications strategy.**

**ACTION: Linda Quinn**

*Ged Sola left the meeting*

*Charlotte Gardiner joined the meeting (observer)*

#### 7 DISCUSSION ON SOCIAL INVESTMENT (InvC(P11)2)

7.1 The Chair opened the discussion and outlined the aim of the session. Committee Members were to consider two areas:

- i) What approach could / should BIG take in the medium term with regards to social investment
- ii) How to use the £3m allocated to social investment in the short term.

Committee Members views would be taken to the UK Board meeting and a specific proposal would be presented at the November England Committee.

7.2 The Chair delivered a presentation which gave further information on the context of social investment; the aims for BIG and 3 possible options:

- i) Support specific product development/launch
- ii) Support capacity building for intermediaries
- iii) Support capacity building for direct delivery organisations

The key assumption behind these options was that BIG was not in the business of designing social investment.

7.3 The Chair updated Committee Members on his discussions with Nick O'Donohoe, Big Society Capital Chief Executive and commented that in his view there is potentially an

imbalance between organisations that are investment ready and funding available and in this context the £3m stake available is a large sum.

- 7.4 Feedback and comments on the proposal options and possible alternatives was sought. In discussion the key points raised were:
- i) The voluntary and community sector most often are the agencies that respond to and pick up the pieces of market failure through the communities they serve and that this is an important facet in considering how we take forward social investment. In addition, it was noted that consideration should be given to supporting trustees of charities. Dharmendra Kanani responded that this would be a role more appropriate for national and regional infrastructure bodies such as NCVO.
  - ii) The need to remember that there are many small to medium organisations for whom this type of funding is not appropriate but still need grant income was stressed. This view was concurred by the Chair who emphasised that even if social investment is successful this will be a relatively small market.
  - iii) The importance of identifying a niche role for BIG which could then be replicated in the current portfolio was emphasised.
  - iv) Option 1
    - It was suggested that the work of the Peterborough SIB could be built upon with ongoing communications and a co-ordinating role to support the learning opportunities.
    - Within this it was suggested that BIG could find a model that escalates and spreads outcomes which can then be measured with a financial return. Issues with a social cost and social return could be identified. Dharmendra Kanani commented on the need for BIG to keep sight of the outcomes that it wanted to be associated with.
  - v) Option 2  
Committee felt that there were other funders who were better placed to support this area. This view was endorsed by Dharmendra Kanani.
  - vi) Option 3
    - There are many investment ready organisations and queried whether other potential co-investors, e.g. government and health agencies, would lend in the current market. If the market needs to be opened this is potentially an area where BIG could play a role.
    - BIG already has more intelligence than other organisations in areas such as young people for example, and potentially this intelligence role in identifying business opportunities was a role that BIG could play. Becoming more commercially aware was an area that the voluntary sector could be encouraged to consider, e.g. in management metrics, to help them start thinking differently. It was suggested that trustees could be encouraged to take risk if working models could be developed that promote success and excellence as there was a sense that the voluntary sector was currently more commercially aware than is often envisaged.
    - Peter Wanless commented that BIG faced an interesting choice between identifying organisations who had saleable products in the portfolio or creating the conditions for them to come forward for investment and it would be interesting to establish which way had the greatest likelihood of success.
    - It was recognised that there was potential for a collaborative role for BIG in this area with other key players, e.g. Impetus and the Chair endorsed this view as an intelligent way of approaching this area. It was felt that this was a large area for BIG to support alone but that strategic relations with other capacity builders could be developed.
  - vii) In summary, the consensus was that Options 1 and 3 were the areas it was felt that BIG could play a role in the short-term. Regarding Option 2 it was felt further consideration was needed on what BIG's role could be and where value could be added by its involvement. Dharmendra Kanani suggested how BIG invests in this area is as important as what is funded. In this respect there is an opportunity to build the

capacity of social venture intermediaries by requesting them to collaborate and work with BIG in its investment in relation to Options 1 and 3.

#### 7.5 The England Committee agreed:

- (i) **To the development of a proposal for the £3m social investment fund for presentation at November's England Committee.**

**ACTION: Tim Davies-Pugh**

- (ii) **That suggestions for a longer term strategy should be developed.**

**ACTION: Tim Davies-Pugh**

*Charlotte Gardiner left the meeting*

*Mark Cooke joined the meeting*

#### 8. THIRD PARTY FUNDING (Annex C, Res/(P11)15)

8.1 Mark Cooke introduced the paper and outlined the key assumptions about third party income in the current Operating Costs Strategy. These assumptions are considered demanding but required to offset the anticipated reduction in lottery share income and taking a more proactive approach to third party funding is seen as one solution.

8.2 It was emphasised that the strategy does not address the delivery aspect of these assumptions which are subject to review by Joanne McDowell, Director of Northern Ireland and will be considered by the Board in October 2011.

8.3 In discussion the key points raised were:

- i) The costs associated with the delivery of third party funding

Mark Cooke advised that costs incurred are contractual and not set at the 5% operating costs target for BIG funded programmes. Committee queried whether if programmes are run on behalf of government departments is it realistic to expect that they will accept operation costs of greater than 4%. Peter Wanless advised that he was meeting with Cabinet Office and would be emphasising the cost implications of intelligent funding and delivering the customer experience. Mark Cooke confirmed that organisationally the allocation of costs to Third Party Funding was relatively easy as an accounting activity.

- ii) Income Fluctuations

Members commented on the risks associated with income fluctuations. Mark Cooke agreed that this was potentially an issue particularly in terms of consistently achieving the level outlined in the assumption. It was highlighted that BIG currently has income fluctuation and had processes in place to manage this. Peter Wanless commented that mitigating actions could be taken, e.g. development of a forward plan with BIG's sponsor department to facilitate more intelligent third party funding procurement.

- iii) Reputational Risk

Committee Members commented on the relationship between lottery and non lottery funding should the Board chose to bid for more non lottery funding and the reputational risk of BIG being seen as a cash delivery machine if we move too far away from the overriding mission. This point of BIG's reputation if a bidding strategy is pursued was expanded and members queried if BIG was aware of other organisations that were trying to underpin their deficits by providing grant funding on behalf of other organisations. Peter Wanless commented that the Board was alive to this risk and the template formulated for deciding on whether to bid for third party funding took this into consideration. Peter Wanless also commented that the new funding management system could potentially be used to provide shared back office services to other funders.

iv) Internal implications

Further information was requested on the implications for the staffing strategy. Peter Wanless confirmed that there had been open dialogue with staff to help them understand how BIG was working as a business. Mark Cooke commented on the potential cultural change required. If BIG moves into the arena of bidding for work on a regular basis this will result in new working relationships and internal arrangements and the potential difficulty of this should not be underestimated.

8.4 **The England Committee agreed:****(i) To note the paper**

*Mark Cooke left the meeting*

9. POLICY DIRECTIONS (EC(11)P62)

9.1 The Chair introduced the paper which provided Committee Members with details of the proposed policy directions developed by Cabinet Office which are currently out for consultation.

9.2 The Chair highlighted that these broadly reflect the current England priorities.

9.3 The key points in discussion were:

- i) Committee Members and Officers were supportive of the proposed policy directions and members congratulated officers for the work done to support their development.
- ii) Specific attention was drawn to Paragraph 2c, and it was questioned whether these could potentially restrict activities. Jon Fox commented that over time these priorities must be addressed. Dharmendra Kanani expressed the view that these principles would not limit or exclude particular activities.
- iii) The specific reference to cumulative impact made in the paper was highlighted.

9.6 **The England Committee agreed:****(i) To note the paper****(ii) That the Committee's views on the policy directions would be fed back to the UK Chair. ACTION : Chair**10. ENGLAND COMMITTEE GOVERNANCE (EC(11)P63)

10.1 The Chair introduced the paper developed following an invitation from the UK Chair to consider governance at a country level. In the paper a number of changes to the England Committee governance were suggested and the views of Committee Members on these was requested.

10.2 The main areas of discussion were:

- i) The role of the England Committee provides legitimacy and external assurance to the decision making process. Once this becomes officer led then decision making necessarily becomes objective and formulaic which Alan Billings stated he would be unwilling to support.
- ii) While there was an agreement for increasing delegations in principle, it was felt that this approach for Reaching Communities was inappropriate. The Reaching Communities meeting on 21 November was highlighted where a number of projects would not have been funded without Committee Member involvement. Members commented that as a Committee they review the portfolio as a whole and envisaged difficulties in having delegations and Committee Member input within one single

portfolio. Some practical suggestions for Reaching Communities were put forward, e.g. approve officer recommendations up to a specific amount with Committee Member moderation. Members could then comment by exception. This approach could meet the desire to streamline the process and reduce paperwork. It was noted that currently 80% of decisions are delegated to officers at the OP stage.

- iii) Committee Members raised the value that they bring to the Committee in terms of their skills, history and regional input. The consensus amongst members was that the regional link was a key part of the role and feeds strongly into the discussions.
- iv) Members confirmed a desire to see more delegations however were uncertain as to how the organisational structure of BIG would facilitate this. Delegation also implied risk and Committee Members would need assurance on how teams were approaching decision making.
- v) A preference for thematic decision making was noted.
- vi) The general principles outlined in the paper were supported by Committee Members.
- vii) The Chair's understanding of a good Board was welcomed.
- viii) Committee Members stressed the importance of clear communications between the executive team and England Committee with a move to bi-monthly meetings.
- ix) It was commented that a move to fixed rate remuneration takes time pressure off Committee Members.
- x) It was requested that the practice of pairing of England Committee members with the executive team for developing new initiatives is continued with 2 members.
- xi) The Chair confirmed that England Committee can remain at up to 10 members.
- xii) The chair was requested to clarify in the paper that annual reviews have been conducted for Committee Members. **ACTION: Chair**

#### 9.6 The England Committee agreed:

- (i) To note the paper
- (ii) That the Committee's views on the governance review would be fed back to the UK Chair. **ACTION : Chair**

#### 11. ENGLAND COMMITTEE APPROACH TO DELEGATIONS (EC(11)P64)

11.1 Tim Davies Pugh introduced the paper which outlined the four options that had been developed:

- i) A continuation with the current process
- ii) Delegations based on an award level threshold of £300k
- iii) Delegation based on a quality threshold
- iv) A combination of one or more thresholds

11.2 Tim Davies-Pugh highlighted the instant wins that increasing delegations could give in terms of administrative workload and costs and the specific impact of these on the Reaching Communities programme were summarised in the paper; the requirement for a transition phase irrespective of the option(s) chosen; that all options would be considered and tested in relation to the new funding management system.

11.3 The related work around supporting staff to make judgement based as opposed to process based decisions and to empower staff to see the bigger picture was also emphasised.

11.4 The key points in discussion were:

- i) A preference for thematic delegations, however the parameters around delegations needed to be clear at the set up stage of the programme.

- ii) A combination of approaches would be required to take account of all aspects of the assessment process and this should be considered when developing new programmes.
- iii) Concern with an arbitrary £300k delegation level.
- iv) It was noted that in Reaching Communities Committees, there was often a consensus amongst committee members, which on occasion differed from officer judgement.
- v) Delegations to officers on targeted programmes could be considered.
- vi) The importance of understanding and experiencing the voluntary and community sector amongst staff in the funding process if there is to be confidence in increased delegations.
- vii) There are several layers of decision making therefore the development of staff was important. Dharmendra Kanani agreed with these views, adding that identifying where executives and non-executives sit and add greatest value in the decision making process was a key issue for BIG.
- viii) Alternative options suggested included the establishment of an investment committee of officers; projects that are not recommended for funding are discussed; projects that staff are uncertain about due to a specific policy issue or risk are put to committee.
- ix) The Chair emphasised that this discussion illustrated the need to get a balance between officer judgements and leveraging the expertise and the experience of the Committee.

#### 11.5 **The England Committee agreed:**

- (i) To note the paper and options proposed.**
- (ii) That the Committee's views on delegations would be fed into the corporate review and October board discussion. ACTION Chair.**

#### 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

##### 12.1 Improving Futures

The Chair confirmed that paper EC(11)P55, Improving Futures – Funding for Additional Projects, proposing four additional projects be invited to submit a full application had been approved by England Committee by correspondence.

##### 12.2 England Committee Member Recruitment

The Chair provided England Committee with an update on the recruitment for England Committee Members. In total 71 applications had been received from a good mix of candidates. 14 candidates were shortlisted for interviews on 18-20 September and 3 October. Helen Stephenson (OCS) and Victoria Hornby (Sainsbury Family Charitable Trust) were on the panel alongside the England Chair and Dharmendra Kanani, England Director. The Chair confirmed that as part of the governance review the England Committee could continue at 10 members. New and existing Committee Members will attend an induction event, currently proposed for 30 November – 2 December 2011.

##### 12.3 Communications and Marketing – England Committee Report (EC(11)P69C)

- i) Committee Members thanked Linda Quinn for the August 2011 Communications and Marketing update.
- ii) Committee Members requested further information on the following items:

##### Village SOS

Linda Quinn provided the following update:

- a) Viewing figures had been good, with the programme on Sunday achieving the highest audience share that day (2.4m viewers). Projects had also given anecdotal evidence of good levels of follow up.
- b) BIG had intervened after the first episode regarding visual representation which highlighted the challenges associated with interpretation of OFCOM rules, and this could potentially be an issue with future work with Channel 4.
- c) Linda Quinn was attending a brainstorming session with the BBC 22 September to discuss the partnership and its future. Albert Tucker commented that he was very impressed with the work with the BBC, and passed on his congratulations to the team.
- d) Due to a low level of follow through to the Learning Campaign, the opportunity to apply had been extended by two weeks.
- e) A full report was being developed and this would be shared with England Committee Members. **ACTION: Linda Quinn**

#### BIG Local

Margaret Cooney provided the following update

- a) Negotiations are ongoing for the trust deed.
- b) The next 50 areas are currently being identified. Community Development Foundation (CDF) are also delivering Community First, therefore information was being reviewed for overlaps.
- c) The launch date will potentially move to January 2012 so as to maximise the impact and allow the submission to and approval of CDF/consortium information by the Charities Commission.

#### Summary guide for equalities

Linda Quinn confirmed that this could be accessed via the BIG website and that a link to this information would be provided. **ACTION: Linda Quinn**

#### Older Persons Fund

Linda Quinn confirmed that the fund's champion had been confirmed as Angela Rippon.

The meeting closed at 13.15.

### 13. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

- 13.1 The next England Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday 8 November 2011 at 11am in Plough Place, London.

*The England Chair*