

## Co-design Session 2 (continued) Notes

9:15am - 10.45am, 5th December 2018

**Attendees:** Cath Keane (Neighbourhood Team Lead, MCC), Claire Evans (Chief Exec, 4CT), George Devlin (Chair, LMCP), Keiran Barnes (Equality Team Leader, MCC), Lynne Stafford (Chief Exec, Gaddum Centre), Mike Wild (Chief Executive, Macc), Steve Conway (Charity, Social Enterprise & Community Development Consultant), Steve Higgins (Community Asset Transfer Manager, MCC), Mark Nesbitt (Exec Member, Manchester BME Network), Michele Scattergood (Chief Exec, Breakthrough UK), Michael Salmon (Programme Lead, Our Manchester Funds, MCC), Jess Waugh (Programme Development Officer, Our Manchester Funds, MCC),

**Apologies:** Amna Abdul (Exec Member, Manchester BME Network), Charlotte Goldsborough (Co-ordinator, LGBT Foundation), Jane Thorpe (Acting Deputy Director of MHCC), Sarah Ives (Commissioning Manager, MHCC).

This document includes a summary of key discussion points and actions.

### Actions from Session 2

- The Programme Team to speak to procurement and clarify whether 'Manchester based organisation' can be specified **[COMPLETE]**
- The Programme Team to speak to MHCC about Session 1 and 2 and see if there are any comments and questions for further consideration of the co-design group. **[COMPLETE]**

### MHCC

- MHCC wanted it noted that none attendance reflects their stretched capacity and not how important they believe the co-design group and process is. MHCC and Programme Team leads to continue to work together to deliver this work, with agreement that the Programme Team are the designated leads.
- MHCC provided the Programme Team with comments on what was discussed in session 1 and session 2:

#### **General comments**

- Having more than one contract if it is felt a single provider cannot provide an equitable level of support (in terms of knowledge and skill) is not necessarily a bad thing. However it is noted that economies of scale are reduced by splitting this contract in too many ways.
- It seems from comments that there would be benefit in ensuring that the contract is clear and prescriptive with regard to how the new service is delivered, for example:
  - how work is prioritised – to ensure transparency re who gets support and how
  - processes for agreeing and monitoring an agreed yearly (or other specified timescale) work plan – to ensure clarity on what is being requested reducing the risk of a provider being overwhelmed by requests from different agencies/funders.
  - Focussed on outcomes rather than transactions – so as not to stifle innovation.
- It may also be worth suggesting that whilst there may be different funding streams (MCC/MHCC) contracts should be approached as requiring an agreed set of outcomes measured by one commissioner.

#### **Session 1 comments (MHCC comments to co-design notes in blue)**

- Whilst there is a desire within MCC/MHCC to have a single infrastructure contract rather than two or more separate contracts, it is not definitive. If the co-design group were to make recommendations either way this would be taken forward to the Our Manchester VCS Programme Board and MHCC Executive
  - Would agree that if there were concerns that one organisation did not have the expertise/subject matter knowledge to support a range of different areas equitably, then recommending a number of separate contracts would be a good approach.
- The group discussed the proposed integration of the MCC and MHCC contracts and budgets. As the MHCC element is a quarter of the budget, some of the group proposed that it should only have a quarter of the future contract delivery.
  - If budgets are to be combined would it make sense to 'debadge' where money has come from and instead agree a joint set of outcome based objectives for the contract that everybody agrees with? Trying to manage different elements of the contract separately can be resource intensive for both provider and commissioner.

### **Session 2 comments**

- Demand management was discussed, and how it was important to be clear to all partners, including MCC/MHCC, about what the contract covers and what needs to be commissioned separately. However, it was recognised that this has been difficult previously and it will require a number of different approaches to improve this situation over time.
  - This could be done by being clear within the contract how a workplan is agreed and monitored, (specified within an agreed time frame and based on outcomes) and who has the authority to alter plans etc

### **Co-design response**

The co-design group responded to the comments provided by MHCC:

- Whilst co-design members agreed in principle with the comment on both MCC and MHCC agreeing a joint set of outcomes rather than separately, a concern remained about how this would work in reality due to the lack of direct input in the codesign process to date.
- It was also added that any joint outcomes need to be proportional with the amount of money being put into the contract by each commissioner. There was a suggestion that MHCC could match fund.
- Furthermore, members felt that MHCC need to have a broader strategic conversation internally to outline their expectations of the contract and what can be achieved. It was also discussed that identified leads, involved in the decisions for the contract, need to have a wider strategic view if the focus of the MHCC money will no longer be on mental health.

### **Session 2 continued, key discussion points**

As discussed at the last meeting, it was agreed that Session 2 would be continued at the beginning of this session as there was still a lot to discuss. The session was moved to an earlier time to accommodate this.

- Social value was added to the givens as something that all MCC/MHCC contracts have to demonstrate now as part of the tendering processes and ongoing contract management.

- There was a discussion around the idea of anchor organisations providing governance and assurance support particularly thematically and for communities of interest or identity
- Participation and voice was discussed further, including what boards the infrastructure provider/s could sit on. It was suggested that the commissioner could list the boards that they want the infrastructure provider/s sits on (as currently happens). However, it was agreed that there will always be a tension that needs to be actively managed by provider/s and commissioner as the infrastructure organisation will always be asked to attend more boards.
- There was a question about the current list and whether the Children's and Families board should primarily be attended by Young Manchester (Youth Trust, that has a commissioning and partnership support role in the city)
- Facilitation of others in boards and scrutiny committees was discussed. It was agreed that it should be a focus for the infrastructure provider/s to look at how to diversify voices where its relevant, and that there needs to be better feedback mechanisms to, from and between the sector.
- It was discussed whether commissioners could be explicit about the type of participation that is wanted in the sector, with resource in the contract amount specifically attached to facilitate VCS engagement. It was agreed that one off payments for representation is not a long term view and does not allow for growth potential.
  - Related to this was an agreement that this model needs to be owned by everyone in the system in order for it to be successful.
- It was agreed by the co-design group that the system needs to change and the Local Authority/public bodies/etc, should go to the VCS. Currently the VCS are asked to input and attend boards, but they're not always useful or relevant. Furthermore, conversations are had with the VCS at the 11th hour, rather than earlier where it would be more useful. In a system where the VCS establish its own networks / boards (as part of a wider leadership and participation model) and people are required to come to the VCS, it would allow for more meaningful and equal participation.
  - It was felt that the role for the infrastructure provider/s in this would be the overall principles agreed in Session 1 of peer support and facilitation.
- Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) participation was discussed by the group:
  - The group agreed that support for BAME groups goes back to the principles discussed in Session 1 about the infrastructure provider/s needing to be explicit about how they can facilitate access differently for the Voluntary sector and Community sector.
  - This included a suggestion of resource attached to this.
  - The infrastructure provider/s need to be an enabler of the work around Communities of Identity (CoI)
  - It was argued that BAME engagement and participation should not be seen as a separate issue, and instead viewed as a priority issue.
- The co-design group also discussed the offer available to groups and how it should be limited. Currently groups are limited to 7 hours of support, and in the past it had been tried without a set amount of hours. A baseline for assessment was discussed but the group agreed that this would be difficult to decide and apply as size of organisations does not necessarily equate to money available for development support.
  - The group felt that the minimum offer for groups should be that they are entitled to a conversation about their organisation and about what support can and cannot be provided.
  - However, it was also agreed that assessments are not necessarily easy or light touch, and can be quite time intensive.
  - It was discussed that the provider/s should be asked to detail how they will prioritise in the tender document.

**As agreed in the co-design boundaries, anyone that would be potentially bidding for**

**the contract were asked to leave the room for the commencement of Session 3, as final recommendations were to be made.**