

**Co-design Session 2 Notes 10am -
12.30pm, 28th November 2018**

Attendees: Cath Keane (Neighbourhood Team Lead, MCC), Charlotte Goldsborough (Co-ordinator, LGBT Foundation), 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), Elle Johnson-Morris (Business Support Apprentice, Our Manchester Funds, MCC)

Apologies: Amna Abdul (Exec Member, Manchester BME Network), Jane Thorpe (Acting Deputy Director of MHCC), Sarah Ives (Commissioning Manager, MHCC).

This document includes points added to the working agreement and givens of the co-design group. It also includes a summary of key discussion points and actions.

Actions from Session 1

- The Programme Team to write up all of the notes. **[COMPLETE]**
- The Programme Team will revise the strategy document to reflect discussions and to take out the prescriptive objectives in point 5.4 (of version 2). **[COMPLETE]**
- Comms on the process will be agreed between MCC/Macc. **[IN PROGRESS]**

Co-design group Working Agreement - Further clarification The co-design group reviewed the working agreement notes from the last session and felt another point needed to be added:

- Whilst it is important to look forward and not focus on history, it is also important to not repeat mistakes. On this basis, the group agreed to reflect on specific historical points that are relevant and appropriate to the discussion.

Co-design Givens/Boundaries - Further clarification The co-design group reviewed the working agreement notes from the last session and felt there needed to be a further clarification on the following point:

- The contract will be awarded to a Manchester based organisation.

- There were questions over whether this is something that is possible for us to determine; the Programme Team have confirmed with MCC Procurement that this cannot be specified in the tender process. However, the specification can be designed in a way that requires the bidding organisation/s to demonstrate knowledge/understanding and connectivity to Manchester and VCS landscape. The givens are to be updated based on this guidance.

Key discussion points in Session 1 - Further clarification The co-design group reviewed the notes from Session 1 and wanted to add some further notes based on what was discussed:

- It was debated and a number of people in the room felt strongly that Voluntary and Community groups (not-for-profit organisations) were of higher priority (for the contract) than social enterprises.
- There was a question over whether 'faith' should be explicitly included in any future definition, as the faith sector is a part of and supports other VCSE work going on. It was felt by many that whilst it was not explicitly mentioned, it was implicit as being included in the work of and with the Voluntary and Community sector.
- Some members felt that a clear focus is needed on reducing the amount of resource tied up in bureaucracy and processes, with a priority on maximising the cascading of the resources available down to voluntary groups, as much as possible.

Key discussion points in Session 2

- It was discussed and agreed by the group that the term 'Capacity Building' can be quite a limited term, as it does not reflect the work that can be done with groups and indeed is offered to groups currently. It also suggests a limited intervention. Everyone felt that 'development support' was a better term, as it reflects a building and growing approach - 'Try it, Do it, Grow it' approach.
- It was agreed that the infrastructure provider/s should take a 'building and growing' approach to development support, and that it is clear that support is provided to organisations that are willing to develop or improve. It was agreed that infrastructure support is not there to 'rescue' organisations.
- There was lots of discussion about capacity and how and in what ways demand can be managed. Everyone agreed that there will need to be a prioritisation process to manage this. It was also felt that some approaches could be looked at differently, such as more group activity and framing support to organisations/community groups about what other support from other providers/partners in the city can be accessed.
- However, as discussed in the last session the group agreed the infrastructure organisation needs to act as a facilitator as well as a provider, and where possible facilitating work at the community or thematic level. It was also agreed that this does not mean cascading down a lack of resources to other organisations; resource also has to be passed down.

- On this point and throughout discussions of the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and the 12 Integrated Neighbourhood, it was agreed by the group that work should be on themes as well as neighbourhoods.
- The group acknowledged the political dimension to the work of the infrastructure organisation which can have an impact capacity and service delivery.
- 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.
- Discussion took place around potential core elements of the contract and ways to build more flexibility into the model which responds to the core demands and allows for some room for flexibility and matters that arise (outside of core business).
- The group discussed the importance of partnership working in delivering support, with some members giving examples of where it has worked well in the past such as Community Asset Transfer training and policy development. It was argued that this is an approach that should be taken forward further.
- It was debated as to why groups of different sizes, thematic areas etc., all get access to the same level of support. Some members suggested ways in which to cap the amount of support given in a different way. It was clarified that different approaches had been taken previously. It was also felt by some members that by capping in certain ways, such as by size of organisations, would not be useful, as almost all organisations have no money available for development support or have to take the money from elsewhere, no matter what size they were.
- The Volunteer Centre was discussed; it was agreed by the Programme Team that on reflection the review did not get the full picture on the Volunteer Centre, as it had only consulted VCS organisations and not volunteers themselves (that make up the majority of the service user numbers).
- It was felt that clarity around the Volunteer Centre's purpose and who and what it is primarily there for is needed, as volunteering continues to be an important priority in the city and within the Our Manchester Strategy. This should consider the added value and connectivity between individual resident volunteering, organisational volunteer development and the relationship to other volunteering programmes in the city.
- It was discussed that whilst the infrastructure provider/s should facilitate support from other providers where appropriate, that there is still a role for the infrastructure provider/s to build trust with community groups/organisations. This will help with facilitation and in building trust within the sector. For example, organisations that support a community of interest not feeling like they can only access one type of support whilst other groups get the main infrastructure provider. Trust needs to be built with all groups, even if support is provided by another organisation.

- In terms of representation, it was agreed that this needs to be facilitated by the infrastructure organisation, but that it is resource heavy for both infrastructure provider/s and VCSE organisations.
- It was agreed that 'representation' is not necessarily the best description of the activity that happens, and should be described and delivered as 'voice and participation'.
- The group also felt that more work is needed with partners to get people on the same page in terms of what 'representation' or 'participation' is and what is expected when an organisation comes to a meeting. This includes time needed, support, who is the most appropriate, and where relevant paying the representative/participant for their time in order to facilitate engagement. The development of the MLCO Memorandum of Understanding was referenced as an example, where this is trying to be developed.
- The role of the infrastructure provider/s in representation/participation was discussed and where representation is most appropriate. Some members suggested that it is appropriate for the infrastructure provider to represent at forums specifically about the VCS. Where the forum is focused on a thematic issue, such as disability or children's, then it would be more appropriate for other VCS groups to be there.

MHCC ● The co-design group discussed MHCC representation at the sessions, as no one had been able to attend from MHCC to date. Whilst the co-design group agreed that there needs to be input from MHCC, it was felt that it would be more useful if the notes from Session 1 and 2 are shared with MHCC and to allow for some questions on what had been discussed so far rather than representatives turning up on the final session. The Programme Team will liaise with MHCC colleagues with a view to feeding back any comments and questions to session 3 for the co-design group to discuss further. It was agreed that this would be the best way to ensure there is MHCC involvement in co-design, and that there are no delays to the process.

Actions from Session 2:

- Programme Team to speak to MCC Procurement about Manchester based organisation given **[COMPLETE]**
- 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.
- Programme Team to email out all documents, including notes and presentations from both sessions **[COMPLETE]**

