

**Population Health Targeted Fund - Consultation Older People's Element
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**

The document below, uses the headings that have been consulted on for the grant fund and includes a combination of questions and themes based on things that have been raised a number of times.

| AIMS | Questions | Reply |
|-------------|---|--|
| | Lack of suitable transport (with support) has come up a number of times as an issue for older peoples services. | We recognise that this is an issue and are aware of wider work around transport taking place across Greater Manchester to look at solutions. We welcome your ideas in general and encourage you to think of local solutions in your bid(s) to this fund. |
| | Connections with family and friends raised a number of times in terms of existing and new and reaching different communities of identity. | We agree that existing connections should be built upon and need to be built up where they don't currently exist, particularly from an equalities and communities of identity perspective. |
| | This should be about older people being able to contribute and recognising that they have a wealth of experience to learn from. | We agree. Service user involvement in the organisation, design and delivery of services is a fundamental principle of the Our Manchester Voluntary & Community Sector (OMVCS) grant programme and will be in this grant fund too |
| | Engagement needs to be considered from a geographical, age, disability, community of interest perspective. | We agree. We want and will be asking for applicants to consider equality and diversity across all of their bids, particularly the impacts on individuals that can be |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>multiple. Rather than being too prescriptive and potentially excluding particular groups, we want applicants to prioritise Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority (BAME) older people and to consider equality and diversity across all of their bids.</p> |
| | <p>Funding for local provision i.e. local amenities and centres are already stretched / limited.</p> | <p>We agree and recognise that some provision and services are already stretched. This is a much wider issue. However, there are a number of pieces of work taking place with Manchester City Council, Manchester Health & Care Commissioning and Manchester Local Care Organisation working with VCS organisations to think about how we can start to address this. For example, the North Inquiry led by the OMVCS Programme Team and Neighbourhood partnership forums, meetings and resources working with Integrated Neighbourhood Leads and Health Development Coordinators.</p> |
| | <p>Will the grant weight BAME and North priorities?</p> | <p>All applicants need to respond to the aims, objectives and priorities and demonstrate who they will be working with and how they will reach and work with those communities. The assessment of the applications will include the use of criteria that will give weighting to the priority to engage with BAME older people and communities, and coverage in a neighbourhood, particularly where there are parts of the neighbourhood or communities in that neighbourhood that do not have support or nothing that already exists.</p> |
| | <p>Age range raised frequently - suggestion to lower the age to as</p> | <p>The grant fund is using the Age Friendly Manchester</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>low as 45 and others have suggested 50 and 55+.</p> | <p>guide of 50+ for older people. However, applicants will still need to describe how they will focus on reaching 65+ older people within that</p> |
| | <p>It's not just about targeting (new), it's about those already reached.</p> | <p>We agree, it is about building on what you are already doing and also reaching other older people, particularly those individuals and communities not being reached.</p> |
| | <p>BAME - are we expecting groups to focus on particular communities?</p> | <p>Within your bid, when planning your activities and delivery we want you to think about how you are going to reach and engagement (BAME) older people in the neighbourhood. You should think about the makeup of the areas, which communities, any marginalised groups and consider how you will work with older people in terms of age, disability, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion and belief.</p> <p>We encourage you to speak to different people and groups locally that can help with this including Health Development Co-ordinators, Buzzer workers and other neighbourhood officers.</p> |
| | <p>Does this include Greater Manchester Age friendly work and/or organisations?</p> | <p>This is a Manchester (City Council boundary and residents) focused grant. See the details on eligible organisations that can apply in any of the communication documents that have been shared to date and in the forthcoming documents that will be launched for the fund. If you are still unclear please contact - omfunds@manchester.gov.uk</p> |
| | <p>Which Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) are you referring to?</p> | <p>The EIA being referred to relates to the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) from the Our Manchester VCS grant</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | programme launched in 2018 for delivery in April 2018 (that runs until March 2021) |
| OBJECTIVES | Existing and new. Can these be either or just new? | The grant is about existing and new connections. This will be reflected in the prospectus and guidance documents. |
| FUNDING PROPOSAL | Clarification required around what the 12 neighbourhoods - justification for neighbourhoods and are they fixed? | Yes, the neighbourhoods and the funding allocations are fixed and were agreed with MHCC based on a range of health and social care, population and socio economic data and intelligence which has resulted in the weighted allocation amounts across the city. This will not be changed. |
| | Neighbourhood allocations - need explanation as to how allocations have been worked out | See answer above |
| | Recognition needed of the capacity of groups which is already stretched | We recognise this. Within this grant we expect full cost recovery for all elements to be applied in your bid. It is also one of the reasons why partnership working is important. |
| | In full cost recovery, is the priority still on delivery and how much towards management costs? | We expect group to determine this but to be reasonable within costings you are putting forward, as we would expect the majority of costs to be on delivery |
| | Need to be explicit about reason for working in partnership | We want to build partnerships where they make sense and add value and help to reach older people in different communities. If there is a clear reason and benefits from not working in partnership in a particular neighbourhood, tell us why in your application. |
| | Coverage figures (7,000-10,000) confusing - Prefer you to | We agree, it is confusing. Essentially, the grant is about |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>describe coverage rather than the numbers that have been used so far</p> <p>1 or 2 bids per neighbourhoods - a number of suggestions that it should be more than 1.</p> <p>Also neighbourhood allocations versus City wide</p> <p>Flexible approach to area or is it fixed?</p> <p>How can citywide organisations that work with different communities of identity / interest bid i.e. Deaf Centre?</p> <p>What is being done about the City Centre? Is there 12 or 13 neighbourhoods?</p> <p>Can we bid up to 3 times but only once in each neighbourhood?</p> <p>Have smaller grant allocations i.e. £10,000</p> | <p>building on what does or doesn't exist in a neighbourhood and reaching communities/older people not already being reached.</p> <p>It has been agreed that it is one bid per neighbourhood, as this grant is about impact and setting up long term infrastructure within neighbourhoods. As the funding for the grant is from MHCC (Transformation Fund) it is an opportunity to work in a different way.</p> <p>The neighbourhood areas are fixed and a lead organisation (and partners) can apply to work across or in part of a neighbourhood. A lead organisation (and partners) can also bid in more than one neighbourhood with a maximum of 3 bids.</p> <p>A lead organisation/ partner receive funding in up to 3 bids and can bid up to 3 times but only once in each neighbourhood. We recognise this may not work with all citywide organisations, but will with some. You need to look at the neighbourhoods you are best connected with and whether or not this grant fund is for you.</p> <p>We will continue to use the 12 neighbourhoods as described in our communications to date and will be detailed in the prospectus and guidance documents for this grant fund. The city centre is included in Miles Platting, Newton Heath, Moston & City Centre neighbourhood</p> <p>Yes that is correct</p> <p>We will not be adding smaller grant allocations to this</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>grant fund. The focus of the grant is on the needs and delivery of work with older people in each of the 12 neighbourhoods and impact not necessarily about having a large quantity of grants. We are trying to encourage groups to work together to build collaboration and capacity within the sector</p> <p>No, this has been done already by allocations of money</p> <p>No, as per above.</p> <p>No, as per above and also, it is about being realistic about what can be done with the funds over 2 years.</p> <p>In short, this is about equality, diversity and opportunities and applicants demonstrating an understanding about communities of identity and interest in a neighbourhood and how you will respond to this.</p> <p>Equality should be considered right across all applications, particularly the impact on older people in terms of geography, age, disability, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion and belief. For some older people the impact can be in a number of ways so this should focus on the person and how this can be addressed.</p> |
| <p>APPLICATION PROCESS</p> | <p>Clarification of why only OMCVCS, CPA and Young Manchester groups are eligible</p> | <p>The co-design, principles and due diligence process of these programmes were done using some of the same principles and at a similar time. Organisations funded</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p data-bbox="193 909 316 1843">via this programmes have groups gone through due diligence already and have ongoing relationships with the funders.</p> <p data-bbox="331 909 491 1843">Two stage process is right - recognise timeline is tight in terms of summer holidays</p> <p data-bbox="507 909 651 1843">Where gaps are identified at the Expression of Interest stage, will you only go back out to groups that have submitted bids?</p> <p data-bbox="730 909 842 1843">Can we have a word version of the application form and will there be a save and go back facility when completing the on--line form?</p> <p data-bbox="866 909 906 1843">Who is on the Assessment Panel?</p> <p data-bbox="1082 909 1161 1843">Can we provide examples of Memorandums of Understanding and Service Level Agreements?</p> <p data-bbox="1297 909 1337 1843">Will there be an independent evaluation?</p> | <p data-bbox="193 87 316 909">Thank you for the feedback on this which we have received from when we first communicated about the fund. We agree that a two stage process is the right way to go and also recognise that the timeline is tight.</p> <p data-bbox="507 87 699 909">No, we will make this information public using the MHCC and Macc websites and any other channels that we can. This will be sent back to all of the eligible groups too regardless of if they have expressed an interest or not.</p> <p data-bbox="730 87 770 909">Yes to both, we will make both available.</p> <p data-bbox="866 87 1050 909">We are following the process as per the main OMVCS grants programme and will generally cover the assessment panel in the prospectus and also communicate this in detail as part of recommendations, reporting and sign off processes.</p> <p data-bbox="1082 87 1273 909">We will not be providing this, it should be agreed between partners who will can choose to use different formats and templates that best work for the organisations. Please refer to Macc on this issue and/or liaise with each other for examples.</p> <p data-bbox="1297 87 1369 909">This is currently being discussed. We will update you as soon as we know the outcome.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Clarity required around the role of smaller organisations around monitoring | The lead applicants will be expected to ensure that the monitoring is completed and submitted. This should be part of the partnership discussions and agreement, clearing setting out who is doing what. This will be covered in the prospectus and guidance documents for the grant fund. |
| Can I work in partnership with one of our current organisations i.e. eligible group working with another eligible group? | Yes, the onus is on you telling us why you are working in partnership and how it will help you to meet the aims and objectives of the grant fund. |
| Request for bid scenarios. | We will address this in the prospectus and guidance documents for the fund. For example, applying to different neighbourhoods. Please refer to some of the other FAQs which explain scenarios of funded groups working with funded groups and/or unfunded groups. Regardless of the scenario, there will need to be a lead applicant and the focus should be on how this will benefit the older people you are/will be working with. |
| Will lead groups be required to undertake monitoring of smaller groups? | Yes, lead groups will be expected to submit the monitoring returns More details will be in the prospectus and guidance documents for the grant fund. |
| Local grass roots organisation / unfunded groups - Do these need to be constituted? | Yes, all groups will need to be constituted but do not need to be incorporated charities. |
| REQUIREMENTS Explanation around monitoring - additional requirements | The monitoring for this fund will use the OMVCS quarterly monitoring process and annual surveys, with the potential of limited number of additional measures from health. This will be kept proportionate to the funding amount and the principles of not asking for |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p data-bbox="193 911 236 1843">things that we are not going to use.</p> <p data-bbox="244 911 491 1843">Will there be any support around the application process?</p> <p data-bbox="499 911 667 1843">What is the ongoing role of Integrated Neighbourhood leads, Health Development Coordinators, Buzz workers and Neighbourhood officers?</p> <p data-bbox="675 911 922 1843">How will the end of the OMVCS core programme and the end of this funding align?</p> <p data-bbox="930 911 1367 1843">Guidance on the word 'significant' requested</p> | <p data-bbox="260 87 483 911">The lead organisations have already been successful in applying to the eligible funding programmes, rather than repeating sessions around this, we have arranged something specific about working in partnership. Sessions are scheduled for 19th September at Macc. Details of how to register will be circulated.</p> <p data-bbox="507 87 659 911">We are communicating with them on an ongoing basis about the work and encouraging you to communicate with them about projects, activities, referrals and signposting.</p> <p data-bbox="683 87 914 911">The OMVCS core programme is currently funded until the end of March 2021, whereas this grant fund will have almost another year to run (subject to go live date). If for any reason a lead organisation is no longer funded, we will negotiate this with you around what options are available.</p> <p data-bbox="938 87 1367 911">'Significant' should be based on the relationship between groups and what is needed to deliver the project and activities overall. In some situations a significant amount of funding will mean a more equal split of the funds, in other situations it will be split differently based on who is delivering what within the project and/or specific delivery of activities. This should take into account the partnership meetings and the monitoring role that is required to be undertaken by the lead applicant.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Expectations around decommissioning - if partnership breaks down who is responsible for resolving this, the lead partner or the programme management team?</p> | <p>The situation will be looked at on a case by case basis with every effort made to try to find solutions. This will also include discussion and negotiation about how the money can and will be used by partners in line with the aims and objectives of the grant fund.</p> |
| <p>Can an element of funding be used on infrastructure e.g. partnership work and networking to support delivery?</p> | <p>Yes. We recognise that some areas are starting from a lower base than others, although the majority of spend should be on delivery of activities. Please build partnership work and networking development into your grant application.</p> |
| <p>Is there particular comms in the grant programme identified?</p> | <p>There will be ongoing comms throughout the programme and like with the OMVCS programme we want to use case studies and other evidence to promote the positive work, impact and outcomes from the grant fund.</p> |
| <p>Why are the Older People's fund and First 1000 days fund grant amounts and bidding different?</p> | <p>They are two separate funds with different aims and objectives. The primary aim of the older peoples fund is to increase the health and wellbeing of older people in each one of the 12 neighbourhoods of Manchester. This was set from the start of the Programme Team taking on the development of the fund. The funding allocations for the Older Peoples grant are neighbourhood based and smaller than the First 1000 days, which has been taken into consideration with regards to the actual amount of money that will be potentially split between partners over a 2 year period and the number of times organisations can bid to the fund.</p> |