1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to note action taken under delegated authority, by the Convener and Head of Regeneration Services, to submit the Councils' response to the BIG Lottery Consultation on its future funding priorities and (2) to note that the Council has coordinate a response on behalf of the North Lanarkshire Partnership.

2. **Background and Context**

2.1 The BIG Lottery is currently carrying out a consultation to help them plan for the future and shape their funding policies from 2009 - 2015. The responses will guide how they award funds to projects in order to help BIG make the biggest impact with the Lottery pound.

2.2 The process will involve BIG looking:

- back on their accumulated experience of more than 10 years of Lottery funding and reflecting on what they view as working well
- looking at what has been achieved to date; and
- what can be done better in the next funding period between 2009 and 2015.

2.3 BIG has identified 10 'BIG Questions' which it would like to be answered across the UK. The responses will help to frame their overall strategy for 2009 -15. In addition, for each of the four countries of the UK there are supplementary questions which reflect the individual priorities of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

The consultation closed on 27 February 2009. A summary of the consultation responses will be published in summer 2009 and will inform BIG's future funding priorities.

3 **Response to Consultation (please also refer to Appendix One)**

3.1 The Physical Regeneration and Funding Team has attended 2 consultation workshops with the BIG Lottery; the first with other Scottish Local Authorities and the second with Scottish Charitable Trusts Scottish Government and other funders. The team will also attend a general consultation workshop which will focus on voluntary sector responses to the consultation.

3.2 An NLC response has been prepared on the basis of the responses from Council Services and the consultation sessions with the Big Lottery. A copy of the full response to both the UK and Scottish questions is attached for information (as Appendix One) but in summary the main issues are:
North Lanarkshire Council Response to BIG Consultation - UK Questions

**UK Q1a. Do you agree that the theme of transitions provides a useful starting point for BIG funding?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Q1b. Do you agree that the theme of isolation provides a useful starting point for BIG funding?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Q1c. Are there other themes you would suggest?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Q2a. Do you agree they should have a greater focus in providing funding to benefit those most in need?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes – it is important that funding goes to those most in need</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No – the balance is about right as it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think BIG should have a different focus.

While appreciating the flexibility that broader themes bring to programme delivery the themes 'transitions' and 'isolation' are wide ranging and, therefore, by definition have the potential to overlap making it difficult for applicants to determine into which theme these projects have best 'fit'. This has been the applicant experience in the Big programme in Scotland to date with the broad themes of 21st Century Life and Life Transitions. Attempting to be all inclusive under these themes has brought confusion and led to a lack of sufficient distinction between the current programmes. This has led to the potential for good projects to fall between differing outcome areas and/or to be referred back and forth between them. Consequently, BIG has had to expend finite resources in working with projects to clarify the best fit into the programme. More clarity in the outcomes for the new BIG programme would allow staff time to be realigned so that BIG could work more closely with strategic partners.

Over the last two years Central Government funders, especially in Scotland have moved to outcome focused results from funding. BIG should bring added value and complement this process. Big should also focus on its purpose to provide support to communities and people most in need. The BIG Lottery should be reflecting devolved Government priorities in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and complementing their outcomes. BIG should examine how it can facilitate and complement delivery at a local level by working with strategic partners to address local need and priorities. The voluntary sector is clearly a key partner in this process. For example, in Scotland BIG should build relationships with Community Planning Partnerships (CPP) that are delivering on identified local need through Single Outcome Agreements (SOA) that in turn deliver on key government outcomes.

To achieve success in the delivery of outcomes, to address key gaps in local need, it is crucial for BIG to follow its aim of being an intelligent funder with other key funders and strategic partners. In Scotland BIG should focus on, and enter into dialogue with strategic partnerships and Partnership Hubs (where they have been established in response to BIG'S request for local mechanisms to facilitate dialogue).

Furthermore, to date BIG has not been successful in channelling funding to our most deprived communities. There are cold spots where lottery funding for projects/activities is not following the lottery pound paid by people in these communities. There is a need to identify and address gaps in current programmes as part of a strategic dialogue with partners in these areas e.g. there was a discussion with the Partnership Hub in North Lanarkshire in January 08 about adopting a strategic approach with key partners. It is this type of approach that needs to be carried through and BIG needs to be proactive at the start on this issue and put mechanisms in place to ensure that there is a priority in its funds for these areas which results in funding going to good project activity which delivers on local need to the most deprived communities.

To ensure that the lessons learned from the previous programme are carried forward and that the focus for the new programme is appropriate, BIG should undertake an independent evaluation of its programmes and activities to include an evaluation of its proposed programmes. BIG's themes for the new programme should focus on deprivation and exclusion i.e. targeting communities in need and should also bring a focus for young people in line with policies and outcomes for the More Choices More Chances agenda. Close attention should also be paid in this evaluation to the priorities of other key funders, including the Scottish Rural Development Programme which includes the Leader programmes which support rural communities. BIG funding should bring true additionality to limited project resources.
UK Q3a. How can BIG best help build lasting partnerships and networks that support communities and people most in need? Tick top two

| Insist on partnership approaches for larger bids | ✓ |
| Support voluntary and community sector organisations to build alliances with each other | |
| No opinion | |
| Other (please specify below – Max 90 characters) | ✓ |

BIG’s key role is that of a funder, therefore, the organisation and the structures it develops should not seek to duplicate what is already in situ. In order to realise its aim of being an intelligent funder BIG must enter into strategic dialogue within, and build on, existing structures and partnerships to gain intelligence and identify ‘true’ gaps in provision in order to support communities and people most in need.

For example, in Scotland CPP’S exist with a legal requirement to facilitate local partnership working across all of the Public and Third Sector bodies: thus the voluntary sector is identified as a key partner in this process. There are rafts of community engagement activities currently being delivered by these partners and the voluntary sector. A key consideration is that the BIG Lottery does not duplicate and, therefore, confuse local provision but complements provision. It can only do this by working in partnership with other existing providers in the area to identify gaps and in partnership seek opportunities to plug these gaps.
**UK Q3b.**

How can they get better at engaging with the private sector?

For effective engagement with the private sector BIG:

1) needs to have a clear rationale for engagement with set objectives and outcomes; and
2) should not consider providing direct support to the private sector in the form of grants.

BIG should recognise that the private sector is not homogenous. Large companies may have Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policies, however, it less likely that SME’s will have such policies and small companies rooted in communities will engage through local connections and not through BIG.

There may be a role for BIG in working with large companies to broker relationships and access for projects to Corporate Social Responsibility monies. Working in collaboration within existing business networks will enable BIG to enter into strategic dialogue, again as an intelligent funder, at a corporate level with large companies. This level of discussion in the implementation of CSR policies and potential access for lottery applicants to these funds is arguably beyond the capacity of the smaller applicant and BIG may be able to benefit smaller applicants by facilitating access to CSR funds from large companies.

The business networks do offer a range of business support to the voluntary sector and to the community. BIG’s role here again should be in partner dialogue with these existing structures and signposting applicants to them where appropriate.

---

**UK Q4.** After 2012, when 60-70 per cent of their undertaking ends, should they continue to guarantee a percentage of the funding goes to the voluntary and community sector?

| Funding should go to the organisation in the best position to deliver the project outcomes, whichever sector they are from. |  |
| BIG should extend its undertaking to the voluntary and community sector beyond 2012. |  |
| No opinion |  |
| Other | ✓ |

BIG’s long term strategy is to support communities and people most in need and these needs should be identified at a local level. Achieving lasting and sustainable outcomes that make a difference to communities requires close working with strategic partners at both a local and national level including the voluntary and community sectors as key contributors. Resources should be targeted to fund activities that will best deliver on agreed outcomes for communities and targeted on those organisations best placed to deliver the outcomes.
UK Q5. Over and above giving out grants, what would make BIG a better funder in the way they work? Pick two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More pre-application support, such as talking through ideas, explaining funding available, development grants, guides on matters such as effective project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More specialist support and advice for grant holders relevant to the issue or sector in which a grant has been made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More support for grant holders in areas such as project management, financial planning, awareness-raising and engagement, evaluation and sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More activity to build networks of grant holders to help share learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIG developing a more visible profile in debates on social issues, using their learning and the learning of their grant holders and partners</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to offer existing levels of support to applicants and grant holders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below – Max 90 characters)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If BIG were to build a more visible profile particularly in relation to social issues this would necessitate its engagement with strategic partners and thus improve its capacity as an intelligent funder.

The linkages made through this engagement by working with Councils for Voluntary Services (CVS), Volunteer Centres and Local Authorities would place BIG in a position to harness and/or signpost to other support structures. For example, the CVS in Scotland has a direct role in supporting grant holders in areas such as project management, financial planning, awareness-raising and engagement, evaluation and sustainability. These skills are currently underused by BIG and if they are used this is not done in a co-ordinated manner thereby diluting the potential impact.

Harnessing project support for applicants is important because of issues of:

- consistency and quality of advice from BIG
- the level of information which has to be supplied and often the level of additional information requested post application
- the changing demands of project assessors as the application process progresses
- the level of detail being requested from applicants which challenges many public authority applicants let alone small voluntary sector applicants particularly in the Growing Community Assets Programme though this was also the experience in the Young Peoples Programme.

More support is need at pre application, grant delivery stage and in all areas noted above and BIG is right to have identified these as critical risk factors in successfully delivering project outcomes. BIG can mitigate resource issues by cascading activity to other strategic partners and harnessing project development expertise that is already out in communities.

BIG should be externally evaluated and there should be an evaluation of the next programme to ensure that BIG’s future planned activity focuses on communities and people in need.
UK Q6. Should they aim to fund fewer projects, but fund for a longer period? Or have they got the balance about right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund fewer projects for longer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current balance is about right</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund more projects for a shorter period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key component of BIG’s work should be to fund projects/activities that have clear outcomes which reflect and complement local strategic priorities. If BIG were in strategic dialogue at a local level then it would be much easier to ensure that funding would address local need and raise awareness of the added value to partners. Strategic management in this form would ensure that BIG is an investment funder and not just a funder of short term projects. If BIG works in partnership with strategic partners this will help to make activity and outcomes more sustainable at a local level.

BIG could have a pivotal role in piloting and innovating in areas where there is no current statutory or partner provision to enable the further development of new forms of strategic delivery. BIG for example can fund pilot activity which makes the arguments for a change in current delivery of key partners activities. The key is identifying where BIG can make a difference or continue to make a difference through determining what can’t or isn’t currently done locally and what should be.

UK Q7. Do you think BIG should take more risks with their funding to promote innovative solutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in a proportion of their work</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, across all of its work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it should concentrate only on what is known to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIG, in partnership, could have a pivotal role in piloting and innovating where there is no current provision to enable the development and delivery of new activity. BIG for example could fund pilot activity which makes the arguments for a change in current delivery for key partners. The key is where BIG can make a difference or continue to make a difference through identifying what can’t be done locally and what needs to be done. BIG needs to listen to local communities to find realistic and sustainable solutions.

BIG should also recognise that funding one innovative solution in one area should not preclude it funding that solution in another area – a project should not be refused because BIG has already supported a similar project. The impact it will have in each area will be unique as the circumstances in each area are different. BIG should also be looking for sustainability through dissemination of good practice and it should look to funding for transference of ideas. This may mean that it balances the continuance of funding for a project or organisation against the broader aim of carrying forward sustainable delivery against outcomes which may be through another route and, hence, again bringing innovative sustainable solutions to bear.

However, innovation should not be insisted on for innovations sake. There will be good and effective ideas that come forward that can deliver on outcomes and address local need that should be considered for funding.
UK Q8. Are there areas beyond those described above, where you think it is important to operate at a UK level, rather than at a country level?

(Max 700 characters)

BIG should prioritise and focus its country funds in the context of the devolved governments' priorities and in support of the national and local outcomes determined by these governments.

However, UK funds could be used to pilot some discreet small scale innovative activities across all regions to enable a translation of the lessons learned at UK level to a specific country level.

On the other hand, there could also be programmes at UK level to promote best practice from successful projects at country level where elements of the activity have had particularly good results that are transferable.

No opinion

UK Q9. Which ways of increasing public involvement do you think would work best for BIG? Pick two.

| Public membership of decision-making committees | √ |
| On-line surveys / forums | |
| Local decision-making panels | |
| Public voting on projects via television, radio or the internet | |
| Citizens’ panels or juries | |
| More public involvement in the development of projects | |
| Mix of all of the above | |
| No opinion | |
| Other (please specify below) | √ |

There are qualitative benefits in having public membership of scoring panels that decide on projects and ideas that have all been subject to a standard assessment process: for example, brokering partnership working, transparency, communication with communities, breadth of experience in public service and public accountability.

Public competitions to vote on funding for projects can cause unfair advantage as the selection process can be conditional on, or subject to regional size and variance. This process also can line up equally deserving projects in unseemly competition for funds.

However, more focused and productive public involvement could be achieved through voting for awards along the lines of the Grammies, Oscars and Brits for funded projects. This would allow specific lottery funded projects to be showcased to the public and a clear picture given of the positive impact that they are bringing to communities. The awards could focus on recognising and developing the work of those who actively demonstrate and lead the way in encouraging others to adopt sustainable principles and support similar activity in other areas.

BIG could build a more visible profile by reviewing its current publicity guidance to ensure that funded projects give the maximum publicity to the BIG brand in local areas. BIG could also encourage innovatory approaches to project publicity through questions asked in the application process.

The raised profile at local level would impact on communities' recognition of BIG and its purpose. This in turn could positively increase public involvement and those purchasing Lottery tickets to support good causes.
UK Q10. BIG is not restricted to distributing Lottery money alone. Are there other sources of funding that BIG would be the right organisation to manage, either on their own or in partnership?

BIG should focus on its core business of distributing lottery funds in accordance with its purpose; and improve the quality and accountability of the whole process. There are issues of consistency and quality of advice, the level and type of information requested transparency in decision making, the level of feedback to projects and the lack of local connection into the needs and priorities of local areas. In particular, BIG should review its activities and its programmes and work with local strategic partnerships to complement activity to benefit communities and people in need. BIG should review its internal structures in Scotland to enhance its capacity to work at a local and regional level and by working with key partners such as the CVS, SCVO Volunteer Centres and Community Planning Partnerships it could cascade support for some functions to free up its resources.

BIG could also work in partnership with other funders to ensure that its funding of activity is additional and addressing gaps in funding provision.
SQ1. How can the Big Lottery Fund distinctively add value to the Scottish Government’s ambitions for a more successful Scotland that is ‘wealthier and fairer; smarter; healthier; safer and stronger and greener’?

BIG investment in Scotland should be closely linked to investments made by other Scottish stakeholders such as the Scottish Government, Local Government, businesses and the Third Sector. BIG’s role should not be developed in isolation but be complementary to other investments. BIG should seek to develop a distinctive role which focuses on delivering against its purpose to help communities in need and target specific outcomes where it can deliver additionality. This is particularly important to ensure impact and sustainability in a climate where overall lottery funding is likely to be reduced in the first three years and where recession and tightening of budgets will have an impact.

BIG can establish this role by again acting as an intelligent funder and adopting some of the practice used in constructing previous European programmes by putting in place an internal planning structure and resources to scope need and priorities with Community Planning Partnerships at a local level and then translate these into appropriate programme measures and priorities for BIG that ensure BIG does distinctively add value to the Scottish Government’s outcomes at local and national level.

SQ2. Do the current outcomes for Scotland provide a sensible, workable and flexible framework for the Big Lottery Fund? Are there gaps in these which prevent BIG from responding to current and future need? Are there outcomes which need to be removed or changed?

BIG can only respond to current and future need if its programmes, policies, procedures and structure are focussed on ensuring that outcomes are achieved for those communities and people who are most in need.

In order for BIG to add value to the Scottish Government’s ambitions for a more successful Scotland it should invest in structuring its resources to enable its capacity to engage in working at a local level across Scotland with strategic partnerships. This would bring benefits to all stakeholders in the process and most importantly to communities through working with local structures. This would contribute to using resources more effectively; better information sharing and improved support for applicants; a more integrated approach to the delivery of project activities; bringing together different knowledge and skills to address complex problems; greater efficiency or value for money in the use of resources; additional capacity to plan and develop projects through pooling expertise and resources and achieving improved outcomes through developing new approaches.

No opinion
SQ3. Does Investing in Communities need to be improved or revised to help communities and voluntary organisations deal with the current and future challenges facing people and communities in Scotland? If so, how?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principle of outcome funding which underlies Investing in Communities is appropriate and in tune with the approach adopted by the Scottish Government, in its Concordat with local government and Community Planning Partnerships through Single Outcome Agreements and in the approach being adopted by other funders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

However, currently BIG is funding activity which fits its own separately developed criteria and, therefore, prioritising those criteria over those identified by strategic partners at local level. This means that the BIG is not seen as key local partner and in many instances can take decisions contrary to locally developed priorities and actions.

While appreciating the flexibility that broader themes bring to programme delivery the themes are wide ranging and, therefore, by definition have the potential to overlap making it difficult for applicants to determine into which theme projects have best ‘fit’. This has been the applicant experience in the Big programme in Scotland to date with the broad outcomes of 21st Century Life and Life Transitions. Attempting to be all inclusive under these outcomes has brought confusion and led to a lack of sufficient distinction between the current programmes. This has led to the potential for good projects to fall between differing outcome areas and/or to be referred back and forth between them. Consequently, BIG has had to expend finite resources in working with projects to clarify the best fit into the programme. More clarity in the outcomes for the new BIG programme would allow staff time to be realigned so that BIG could work more closely with strategic partners. For example, in Scotland BIG should build relationships with Community Planning Partnerships that are delivering on identified local need through Single Outcome Agreements which in turn deliver on key government outcomes.

To achieve success in the delivery of outcomes, to address key gaps in local need, it is crucial for BIG to follow its aim of being an intelligent funder with other key funders and strategic partners. In Scotland BIG should focus on, and enter into dialogue with strategic partnerships and Partnership Hubs (where they have been established in response to BIG’s request for local mechanisms to facilitate dialogue).

Furthermore, to date BIG has not been successful in channelling funding to our most deprived communities. There are cold spots where lottery funding for projects/activities is not following the lottery pound paid by people in these communities. There is a need to identify and address gaps in current programmes as part of a strategic dialogue with partners in these areas e.g. there was a discussion with the Partnership Hub in North Lanarkshire in January 08 about adopting a strategic approach with key partners. It is this type of approach that needs to be carried through and BIG needs to be proactive at the start on this issue and put mechanisms in place to ensure that there is a priority in its funds for these areas which results in funding going to good project activity which delivers on local need to the most deprived communities.

To ensure that the lessons learned from the previous programme are carried forward and that the focus for the new programme is appropriate, BIG should undertake an independent evaluation of its programmes and activities to include an evaluation of its proposed programmes. BIG’s themes for the new programme should focus on deprivation and exclusion i.e. targeting communities in need and should also bring a focus for young people in line with policies and outcomes for the More Choices More Chances agenda. Close attention should also be paid in this evaluation to the priorities of other key funders, including the Scottish Rural Development Programme which includes the Leader programmes which support rural communities. BIG funding should bring true additionality to limited project resources.

No opinion
SQ4. Should Investing in Communities be adjusted to reflect the new circumstances and policy framework for the third sector in Scotland, in particular how should it best add value to, or complement, the Scottish Government's Enterprising Third Sector Action Plan?

Social Enterprises are currently not precluded from making applications to BIG. Also there are Scottish Government Funds to encourage the development of Social Enterprise. Again, it is important not to duplicate provision but to add value if this is needed. If a need is identified through dialogue and evaluation any involvement in Third Sector development should be complementary and fit within locally determined priorities.

In order to add value to, or complement, Third Sector action BIG needs to enter strategic dialogue with existing structures and partnerships, for example, local business teams, business in the community and Chambers of Commerce in conjunction with the local strategic partners and build on those structures only where appropriate and where there is an identified need.

No opinion
Q5. How can the Big Lottery Fund's resources build a more sustainable third sector into the future?

BIG is a funder and can enable through enabling partnerships. BIG could help build a more sustainable third sector by working in partnership with the voluntary sector to enhance its capacity to work with its strategic partners.

BIG should also harness the capacity of local partnerships to help it support applicants at pre and post project stage. BIG should build capacity building and compliance into its application process. Organisations should meet required OSCR standards in order to be funded. Consideration should be given to tapering support at the end of the project period and to building in support for business development as a condition of funding.

The linkages made through this engagement by working with Councils for Voluntary Services (CVS), Volunteer Centres and Local Authorities would place BIG in a position to harness and/or signpost to other support structures. For example, the CVS in Scotland has a direct role in supporting grant holders in areas such as project management, financial planning, awareness-raising and engagement, evaluation and sustainability. These skills are currently underused by BIG and if they are used this is not done in a co-ordinated manner thereby diluting the potential impact.

Harnessing project support for applicants is important because of issues of:

- consistency and quality of advice from BIG
- the level of information which has to be supplied and often the level of additional information requested post application
- the changing demands of project assessors as the application process progresses
- the level of detail being requested from applicants which challenges many public authority applicants let alone small voluntary sector applicants particularly in the Growing Community Assets Programme though this was also the experience in the Young Peoples Programme.

More support is need at pre application, grant delivery stage and in all areas noted above and BIG is right to have identified these as critical risk factors in successfully delivering project outcomes. BIG can mitigate resource issues by cascading activity to other strategic partners and harnessing project development expertise that is already out in communities.

BIG should be subject to an independent evaluation which looks at operational issues of consistency of advice, transparency of decision making, post award support and this evaluation should also look at the achievements of outcomes and impact of the fund across Scotland. Getting the project support right at the start of the funding process will help to enable sustainability.

No opinion
SQ6. Through Investing in Communities, the Big Lottery Fund has tried to support people in need and also fund work that can help prevent need occurring. It has also invested in projects that make it easier for people, communities and organisations to deal with need when it arises. Should BIG continue the approach of supporting both work that helps people in need now and work that helps prevent need occurring?

Yes, BIG should continue the approach of supporting both work that helps people in need now and work that helps prevent need occurring. However, it is important that BIG is effective in targeting communities and people most in need and that the issue of cold spots in deprived areas is now addressed. It is important that there is targeting to deliver lottery activity which enables BIG to meet its purpose of providing support to communities most in need.

No opinion

SQ7. Single Outcome Agreements and Community Planning Partnerships are at the heart of the Scottish Government’s policy agenda. Funding and decision-making on many policy areas have been streamlined and devolved. Should BIG take account of these structures as an indication of local need and priorities, or is it important to provide flexible funding that is not linked to these agreements?

BIG investment in Scotland should be closely linked to investments made by other stakeholders such as the Scottish Government, local government and the third sector. BIG should have a distinctive role by focusing on specific outcomes around people and communities in need. BIG’s role should not be developed in isolation but be closely connected to other investments targeting such individuals and/or communities and this is even more imperative in the current economic climate.

BIG should prioritise the outcomes which are identified in locally developed plans and in SOA’s rather than adopting its own outcomes and priorities and find a distinctive and additional contribution to achieving these existing outcomes, which express the Scottish Government’s priorities at local level. Otherwise BIG is a funder sealed off from what is happening in local areas and funding projects and activities which are presented to it that may have no priority in a local context or missing out on funding activity that would deliver against key local outcomes. It should also be aware of other funds such as the Scottish Rural Development Fund and the activities that can be delivered through these funds in order to ensure complementarity.

It is key that the BIG lottery enters into dialogue with key strategic partners at a local level to be able to deliver on its aim as acting as an intelligent investor funder. This should help with issues of sustainability and ensure that the investment is not short term project funding that does not deliver on outcomes.

The flip side of this question is what happens if BIG does not engage with strategic partnerships. How can it

- establish local need;
- avoid duplication of project activity;
- identify gaps in provision;
- maximise the impact of funding; and
- ensure complementarity of outcome with SOA and Scottish Government objectives?

No opinion
SQ8. Is there a particular role for BIG to add value in this context by focusing support on community engagement within these new local structures?

BIG should develop a deeper understanding of the existing networks/partnerships in CPP areas particularly for the purposes of improving engagement within the local structures. If BIG develops an understanding of what is happening at a local level it will be better placed to support the voluntary sector and particularly under-represented groups in engaging in the design and delivery of services which support the outcomes in the Single Outcome Agreements.

However, it is important that BIG works with the structures that are in place locally and doesn’t set up alternative delivery mechanisms which confuse local provision (e.g. there are other partners funded to work on community engagement) and if funding activity this funding should be targeted at jointly identified gaps in provision.

It is also important that BIG looks to funding activities and services in communities in need and takes on board mechanisms to target social deprivation. The fund has geographical cold spots where funding is not flowing to those poorer communities who are supporting the lottery through paying their lottery pound and there should be dialogue with the strategic partners, which includes the voluntary sector in these areas, to address this issue.

No opinion

SQ9. How can the Big Lottery Fund help businesses and voluntary organisations work together to make a difference in communities?

For effective engagement with the private sector BIG:

1) needs to have a clear rationale for engagement with set objectives and outcomes; and
2) should not consider providing direct support to the private sector in the form of grants.

BIG should recognise that the private sector is not homogenous. Large companies may have Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) policies, however, it less likely that SME’s will have such policies and small companies rooted in communities will engage through local connections and not through BIG.

There may be a role for BIG in working with large companies to broker relationships and access for projects to Corporate Social Responsibility monies. Working in collaboration within existing business networks will enable BIG to enter into strategic dialogue, again as an intelligent funder, at a corporate level with large companies. This level of discussion in the implementation of CSR policies and potential access for lottery applicants to these funds is arguably beyond the capacity of the smaller applicant and BIG may be able to benefit smaller applicants by facilitating access to CSR funds from large companies.

No opinion
SQ10. Should BIG engage in developing opportunities for sectors to work together to solve problems or sustain solutions? What role can BIG play, through its funding and its partnerships, to support innovation?

If BIG works with strategic partnerships it can identify where the gaps are and what the partners are not currently able to do. It can be part of the funding solution along with other key partners and funders. BIG should also continue to engage in the Funders Forum and in the Frontline Forum Officers Group.

BIG, in partnership, could have a pivotal role in piloting and innovating where there is no current provision to enable the development and delivery of new activity. BIG for example could fund pilot activity which makes the arguments for a change in current delivery for key partners. The key is where BIG can make a difference or continue to make a difference through identifying what can't be done locally and what needs to be done. BIG needs to listen to local communities to find realistic and sustainable solutions.

BIG should also recognise that funding one innovative solution in one area should not preclude it funding that solution in another area – a project should not be refused because BIG has already supported a similar project. The impact it will have in each area will be unique as the circumstances in each area are different. BIG should also be looking for sustainability through dissemination of good practice and it should look to funding for transference of ideas. This may mean that it balances the continuance of funding for a project or organisation against the broader aim of carrying forward sustainable delivery against outcomes which may be through another route and, hence, again brining innovative sustainable solutions to bear.

However, innovation should not be insisted on for innovations sake. There will be good and effective ideas that come forward that can deliver on outcomes and address local need that should be considered for funding.

No opinion
BIG priorities should add value to, complement and reflect local need

BIG should establish a long-range, unified and broad direction in policy areas aligned to Single Outcome Agreements

BIG should be clear and concise in its strategic dialogue which represents an effort to understand and utilise strategic planning ideas arising from Community Planning Partnerships

BIG should allocate limited resources, via a partnership process in a more rational, and "results-producing" way

BIG should build in an evaluation component to monitor and revise its overall strategic approach as it progresses to become more responsive and accountable to current and emerging need.

Response to Consultation from North Lanarkshire Partnership

4.1 The North Lanarkshire Partnership, via its' funding sub group (the Partnership Hub) have also submitted a response. This was co-ordinated by Regeneration Services and submitted by the North Lanarkshire Partnership Board. The response was in line with the comments submitted from the Council.

Corporate Considerations

5.1 The Council, via Regeneration Services, will also contribute to the responses being prepared by the network of Scottish Local Authority External Funding Officers (SLOG), the Scottish Region of the Alliance and through COSLA.

Recommendations

6.1 It is recommended that the Regeneration Committee:

i) note action taken under delegated authority, by the Convener and Head of Regeneration Services, to submit the Councils' response to the BIG Lottery Consultation on its future funding priorities

ii) notes that the Council will co-ordinate a response on behalf of the North Lanarkshire Partnership.

Maureen McConachie
Head of Regeneration Services

Local Government Access to Information Act: For further information please contact Ellen Archibald, 01698 302446