

AUGUST 2020

GROWING PLACE-BASED GIVING

End of Programme
Report to DCMS



CONTENTS

Executive summary	3
Introduction	4
About the growing place-based giving programme	6
The Schemes	7
Barking & Dagenham Giving	8
Bristol City Funds	8
Step Up (East Manchester)	8
The Stanley Fund	8
Totally Stoked	8
Yorkshire Coast Catalyst	9
Programme Assessment	9
Impact of Covid-19 on schemes	10
The learning: Insights from the programme	11
Outcome: Have established strong governance, strategy and income models	11
Outcome: Core costs covered or have a realistic plan and timeline in place	12
Outcome: Clear channels through which local communities are involved in the development of the PBGS and its grant distribution decisions	13
Outcome: Established their profile as an option for giving locally	14
Policy – The Future of Place-Based Giving	14
Empowering communities and giving voice to local people	15
Using convening power and clear leadership	15
Networking across different sectors of society	15
Harnessing long-term potential requires lasting commitment	15
Creating true additionality	15
Opportunities – what can place-based giving deliver:	16
Main recommendations:	17
Conclusion	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The introduction of the Civil Society Strategy in 2018 by then Minister for Civil Society, Tracey Crouch, saw the government commit to developing place-based giving schemes across the UK as a way for philanthropy to play an important role in the development and growth of towns, cities and regions. Place-based giving schemes already existed, predominately in London and other urban areas. A place-based giving scheme (PBGs) is a partnership between communities, philanthropists, corporate donors, and local organisations (e.g. businesses, civil society organisations), local authorities, and national funders that bring together resources in a collaborative way to benefit the community in a defined geographic location. They will ordinarily be led by a local authority, a charitable trust or a community anchor organisation, such as a council for voluntary services. The schemes will engage communities as donors and volunteers, and also crucially as partners with a voice in what priorities and projects the scheme supports, promotes and funds.

From March 2019 to June 2020, CAF undertook work with six schemes across England as part of Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport's (DCMS) Growing Place-Based Giving programme, where Government provided funding of £100,000 over 18 months and put in place a support programme with CAF, to help them to set up and make strides towards raising funds to address local issues.

Growing Place-Based Giving was a learning programme to understand what is required to help place-based giving schemes of various early stage development and geographical locations. It was important for us to understand if there are any similarities and requirements needed for a successful place-based giving scheme to develop and become sustainable.

These schemes were:

- Barking & Dagenham Giving
- Bristol City Funds
- Step Up For Manchester
- The Stanley Fund
- Yorkshire Coast Catalyst
- Totally Stoked

Geographically spread out across England with different urban and rural environments, at the start of the programme the six schemes were at various stages of early development. As part of this programme the schemes were offered a mix of grant funding alongside advisory support. The schemes were able to decide what type of support they wanted, as long as it would help with the development and sustainability of the schemes.

All of the schemes were given four outcomes to meet over the course of the one year grant programme.

They were:

- Strong governance, strategy and income models
- Core costs covered or have a realistic plan and timeline in place
- Clear channels through which local communities are involved in the development of the PBGS and its grant distribution decisions
- Established their profile as an option for giving locally

In this report we have summarised the wider learnings which emerged from the programme which are of relevance for a wider audience. We have considered the enablers and barriers to sustainability of schemes. We have also reflected on the impact of Covid-19 on the schemes, an unpredicted and unprecedented development for the schemes and the communities they support. We are pleased to see that schemes rose to the challenge of responding to Covid-19 in a way that suited their partnerships and their communities. When it comes to the implementation of the programme and the progress made by each individual scheme, we have shared further insights with DCMS in an internal report. This report included information which was mainly of use for DCMS and the schemes.

We have released learning for other early stage schemes and for funders as stand alone reports for each audience. This report also looked at the policy implications along with recommendations drawn from CAF's policy knowledge, experience of managing this programme and other available research. We have found that most of the schemes found commonality in the issues encountered around needing time to develop their plans and build strong trusting partnerships, and challenges raising core costs.

Key findings and recommendations include:

For implementers

- Develop schemes with a light touch view on ownership in order to truly ensure that the community own the decision making
- New schemes should expect to commit significant time to partnership management in particular in the initial stage of scheme development
- Have a clear view on who can make decisions
- Have honest discussions in terms of commitment and role allocation within the scheme
- Have a realistic assessment of timeframes and initial benchmarks for success and short and medium-term aims and outcomes across partners
- Try to get early funding and support for mapping local needs and the local funding ecosystem

Further detail on these can be found in the report, along with a summary of conclusions.

For government and funders

- Ensure that any roll out of the model does not rely on 'one size fits all' approaches and takes into account local context
- Support models that facilitate civic engagement, thus enhancing people's sense of empowerment and social cohesion
- Champion a narrative of community philanthropy while actively supporting local generosity movements and use place-based schemes as a way to distribute funds according to local priorities
- Use insights from the GPBG programme and other place-based giving initiatives to help define and promote a common language around place-based giving
- Look at ways to incentivise mobilising local business and large businesses with a local footprint to engage with place-based giving
- Assume the role of an important early stage funder that can help get schemes off the ground and lead the way in funding schemes' core costs and championing the importance of this approach
- Provide long term funding, recognising the significant time needed for assessing the landscape, relationship building, community engagement and fundraising locally

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the learnings from the Growing Place-Based Giving programme to enable six early stage place-based giving schemes (PBGs) to develop their sustainability and resilience. For the purpose of this report we have summarised the wider learnings which emerged from the programme which are of relevance for a wider audience. When it comes to the implementation of the programme and the progress made by each individual scheme, we have shared further insights with DCMS in an internal report.

CAF has explored the potential for place-based approaches to giving and the idea of "civic philanthropy" through our policy work for a number of years. This included contributing to the DCMS-commissioned research report in 2018 that led to the establishment of this new grant programme, so we have been pleased to "close the loop" and see some of these ideas through to practical action.

Through this initiative CAF has worked with the following six schemes:

Scheme Name	Lead Organisation	Location
<u>Barking & Dagenham Giving</u>	London Borough of Barking & Dagenham (local authority)	London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
<u>Bristol City Funds</u>	Quartet Community Foundation	Bristol
<u>Step Up For Manchester</u>	One Manchester (housing association)	East Manchester (currently the wards of Beswick Clayton and Openshaw and Ancoats)
The Stanley Fund	Co Durham Community Foundation	Stanley, Co Durham
<u>Totally Stoked</u>	VAST Services (charity)	Stoke-on-Trent
Yorkshire Coast Catalyst	Two Ridings Community Foundation	Yorkshire coastline but for now focussed on Scarborough

The Growing Place-Based Giving (GPBG) programme was created in response to Government's ambition, outlined in the Civil Society Strategy, to make giving as easy and compelling as possible. So they were looking to invest in ways that help people to give back to the places to which they feel they belong.

The programme aimed to provide learning for DCMS but also for other early stage schemes and interested funders. The following report outlines the activities undertaken, the development of the six schemes, learning insights (framed around learning for the two audiences of schemes and funders) and finally reflects on the connectivity of place-based giving to policy.

For the purpose of this report and programme CAF and DCMS have defined a place-based giving scheme (PBGS) as a partnership between communities, philanthropists, corporate donors, and local organisations (e.g. businesses, civil society organisations), local authorities, and national funders that bring together resources in a collaborative way to benefit the community in a defined geographic location. They will ordinarily be led by a local authority, a charitable trust or a community anchor organisation, such as a council for voluntary services. The schemes will engage communities as donors and volunteers, and also crucially as partners with a voice in what priorities and projects the scheme supports, promotes and funds.

Notes on language:

Whilst schemes may interchangeably speak of their steering group or board CAF has used steering group throughout.

Whilst they may refer to the organisations and individuals who sit on their steering group as members, partners or other, CAF has used partners throughout.

When CAF refer to the six schemes, this means the six schemes funded through DCMS as listed above.

The schemes are referred to as 'early stage' as each had been set up less than two years before starting the GPBG programme and for most it was significantly less.



ABOUT THE GROWING PLACE-BASED GIVING PROGRAMME

The programme aimed to help guide schemes towards becoming sustainable and resilient, helping them develop the governance structures, fundraising models, long-term strategies, and community engagement plans that will lead to them having a recognisable impact in their area long into the future.

From March 2019 to June 2020 a dedicated programme manager at CAF worked with each scheme from on-boarding and analysis of support needs at the start, through to bi-monthly check in calls and reporting. Four peer networking days were held where the six came together and exchanged good practice ideas, discussed common challenges and shared their experiences with CAF for programme learning.

An advisory board was also convened from the start to reflect on the learning gathered from the programme and set strategic objectives for influence and change beyond it. It was hoped that the initial programme funding would act as a catalyst for increased funding and learning shared in the sector. Individuals with a commitment to ensuring the long-term viability of place-based giving schemes and a desire to learn what works in encouraging local philanthropy were invited, representing the public, private and charitable sectors. The board has reviewed the learning as it has emerged and has helped strengthen insights, which have been included in this report.

This programme aimed to help the schemes achieve these outcomes:

- have established strong governance, strategy and income models
- are operating in a way that means they have core costs covered, or have a realistic plan and timeline in place towards this outcome
- have clear channels through which local communities are involved in the development of the PBGS and its grant distribution decisions
- have established their profile as an option for giving locally

Support

To help the six schemes achieve the outcomes, CAF created an action plan together with each scheme, outlining the support that they would receive in developing their schemes. It is important to note that just because the schemes did not select a particular topic, does not mean that they did not develop in that area. To varying extents, all schemes worked on all of these areas but they selected the areas they felt they needed external advisory support based on their priorities, or what resources or skills they already had in place to invest in priorities.

The schemes were offered support by CAF (and other trusted associates with specialism in communications and marketing) in key areas of development that are critical to a resilient place-based giving scheme. The table below indicate advisory support planned (black) and received (red).

Red ticks are the areas that they received support by the end of the programme.

	Vision	Strategy	Comms and Branding	Governance	Fundraising strategies	Future Modelling
Barking & Dagenham Giving	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)		✓ (black) ✓ (red)		✓ (black)
Bristol City Funds			✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)
Step Up (East Manchester)			✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	
The Stanley Fund		✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)		✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black)
Totally Stoked	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)		✓ (black) ✓ (red)		
Yorkshire Coast Catalyst		✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	✓ (black) ✓ (red)	

When we compare the ticks, we see that generally schemes were clear in identifying the areas of support they needed. However, for some as they progressed in their development they realised they needed support in other areas.

Despite best efforts to be flexible, sometimes the support was ready when the scheme was not or vice versa. This is in part due to the nature of early stage schemes being in an evolving space where challenges they identified at the beginning of the programme didn't materialise in a way they expected it to. A longer period of time would have allowed schemes to wait until they were ready for support without the end of programme deadline looming so quickly.

The Schemes

Scheme name	Lead Organisation	Other Partners	Income model (who targeting)
Barking & Dagenham Giving	London Borough of Barking & Dagenham (local authority)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ East London Business Alliance (ELBA) ■ Barking and Dagenham Renew ■ Participatory City Foundation ■ BD CVS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Corporate and trust and foundation fundraising. ■ Targeting financial support from the Council via a proposed endowment.
Bristol City Funds	Quartet Community Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Two individuals with links to voluntary and corporate sector in Bristol ■ VOSCUR ■ Bristol and Bath Regional Capital ■ Sanlam UK ■ Avon Wildlife Trust ■ Bristol City Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Short term, aiming to have core costs covered by Quartet Community Foundation and Bristol City Council ■ Long term, aiming to cover core costs via fundraising from local philanthropists and corporates.
Step Up For Manchester	One Manchester (housing association)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Manchester City Council: Neighbourhood Team, Our Manchester Investment Team and the Work and Skills Team ■ Local Care Organisation Institute of Place Management ■ Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Corporate and community fundraising to raise funds to distribute ■ A mixture of partners donations and grants to fund core
The Stanley Fund	Co Durham Community Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Stanley Town Council ■ Advice in Durham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Core is currently the community foundation but longer term hope to involve corporates and/or philanthropists ■ For funds to distribute, targeting SMEs and local funds
Totally Stoked	VAST Services (charity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Middleport Matters Community Trust ■ All the Small Things CIC ■ Caudwell Children ■ Phoenix Gas Services ■ Realise Foundation ■ Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce ■ TPD Digital ■ Stoke-on-Trent City Centre Bid ■ Counter Coin Community ■ Stoke-on-Trent City Council ■ Emmaus North Staffs ■ Honeycomb Group ■ The Hubb Foundation ■ Alice Charity ■ Saltbox ■ Voluntary Arts England ■ YMCA North Staffordshire ■ TJE Consulting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Core cost funding is currently being sought from trust and foundations.
Yorkshire Coast Catalyst	Two Ridings Community Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ CAVCA ■ The National Lottery Community Fund ■ Scarborough Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Model is to take core as a percentage of all funds raised.

*Note that whilst the same partners are expected to stay once the changes are made to governance, some may be steering group and others may be advisory board members

Barking & Dagenham Giving

Barking and Dagenham Giving is hosted by London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (LBBD). At the start of the programme the partners had already been meeting and had ideas of how to proceed but were keen to develop their governance and strategy. They stated in their Expression of Interest (EOI) that they intended to use the funds and time to develop a mission, think about investments and establish a governance mechanism. The scheme is a member of London Funder's PBGS network.

In late May 2020, Barking and Dagenham Giving launched their website and hosted a B&D Giving week, which was an online campaign that partnered young people with You Press to conduct 35 interviews across the borough. These interviews had young people tell their story of Covid-19 and how they are adapting to it.

They also created, with participation of community organisations and individuals a rapid response fund to combat the effects of Covid-19 on the borough.

Bristol City Funds

At the start of the programme, Bristol City Funds was one of the most developed schemes. Hosted by the Quartet Community Foundation, Bristol City Funds has been in operation for about a year. Prior to joining the DCMS PBGS grant programme, the scheme had developed three key groups to govern the scheme (a governing board, a Social Investment Advisory Board, four thematic Funding Priority Groups which are made up of voluntary sector representative and are intended to fundraise and distribute grant funds to other voluntary sector organisations in Bristol.)

The scheme identified in their EOI that they wanted support on developing communications and branding, governance, fundraising strategies and future modelling.

Step Up (East Manchester)

The Step Up scheme is hosted by One Manchester Housing Association in East Manchester. The scheme began from almost a standing start having never formally met as a group before the start of the programme. However, they were able to very quickly agree their thematic area of health and wellbeing. They were keen to get support around governance, identifying best practice, making a business case for investment and sustaining coordinated approaches to community engagement.

The scheme has decided that they will not focus on grant making in traditional sense but instead are following a method of:

1. developing the capacity of projects,
2. then connecting them directly to funders,
3. supporting them to pitch well.

By facilitating this, corporates get to give their money directly to a project and they hope this will develop a relationship of trust between the corporate and the project, which in turn will lead to additional funding and support. This will allow for the development of capacity of individuals in community, supporting the community to be advocates for their own needs and making corporates supporters of the community.

The Stanley Fund

The Stanley Fund is hosted by the Stanley Community Foundation. In their EOI they identified strategy and income models as the main areas of support needed. This scheme is very locally focused and Stanley Community Foundation was willing to support with seed funding. Their other partners were a local councillor, the Police, Crime and Victims Commissioners office and 'Advice In Co. Durham', which is a network of 170 voluntary groups led by the local Citizens Advice. Stanley (with a population of 33,600) is the largest district in rural County Durham, and an area that has suffered significant deindustrialisation, both mining and steelwork. It is home to some of the most significantly disadvantaged communities nationally making the scheme critical for local development. During Covid-19 the scheme had proposed that local council emergency funds were channelled through the scheme but the town council decided to do this in house. However this did ultimately lead to some really positive conversations about how the local council saw the Stanley Fund as the long term solution that would be there for the community for the long haul and were supportive of this.

Totally Stoked

At the start of the programme, Totally Stoked was early in the incubation stage of developing a PBGS for Stoke-on-Trent. VAST (the local CVS), as the lead partner had started to contact key stakeholders within Stoke to explore the possibility of developing a place-based giving scheme. They stated in their EOI that they would want to spend the grant money on a community connector to fundraise and liaise and engage with community leaders and residents.

The scheme's approach has been to position itself as a new way of resourcing local social action in a sustainable manner. No funds have been distributed but instead goods, advice and support have, plus promotion opportunities, audience development and connections. In response to Covid-19, Totally Stoked was worked with Stoke City Council to create an online portal to match up those who wanted to give and support local people and organisations and those who needed support.

Yorkshire Coast Catalyst

Yorkshire Coast Catalyst is hosted by Two Ridings Community Foundation. They decided to focus their Place-Based Giving Scheme on Scarborough, initially, although they have ambitions for it to expand and connect with other stakeholders along the coastline. They worked in partnership with Coast & Vale Community Action (CAVCA) that is the local voluntary sector body promoting and supporting local charities and social enterprises.

Their EOI (expression of interest) referenced a desire to create a collective pool of assets from a range of sources including major donors, corporate foundations, local authorities and smaller amounts via public giving. Their strategy was to use CAVCAs reach in the community and their 'totally socially' initiative to engage and connect with the community. This is a project to meet local people in the community and discuss what they want help with. Other partners are the National Lottery Community Fund and Scarborough council. During Covid-19 they have been able to get some good PR with the local paper around funds they have distributed and hope to build on this.

Programme Assessment

Despite the challenges, CAF believes the schemes could all be sustainable post the programme ending in June 2020. However, this will come down to whether the schemes can cover core funding. Where the lead organisations contribute to core-funding, CAF has greater confidence that they will be able to sustain their giving scheme for long enough to develop a track record and attract new sources of funding. The number of outcomes targeted in just 12 months was challenging. Had schemes just focussed on doing what they needed to in order to raise core funding, this may have made a difference. Attaining stakeholder buy-in, developing robust models and establishing governance took up a significant proportion of time.

However, raising core funding alone would still have been hard to do without the other pieces in place. In fact, all elements of development are dependent on one another and it takes time to progress on multiple priorities in a cohesive manner. It remains to be seen whether lead organisations 'carrying' schemes rather than designating a separate individual/team to lead on developing and running the scheme is an ideal solution. On the positive side, it shows commitment to the scheme and that the year has convinced them of its value. However, 'carrying' organisation could also become more dominant in terms of the overall decision making because they see funding and resources as "their" money. We hope that the underpinning values of collaboration, structures of governance and principles of partnership adopted during this programme will mitigate such risks.

CAF had hoped to identify a roadmap of a typical or ideal scheme's progress through the different stages of development. However this has not been possible as the schemes themselves and the context of their experiences and advice varies significantly. We learned that there is no blueprint and answers to problems emerging will be different each time. Having said this, we have identified some overall insights which are shared below.



Impact of Covid-19 on schemes

Covid-19 interrupted both the schemes' business as usual and the planned activities, but most outcomes are still being achieved albeit in different ways. We noticed a few themes across the schemes:

- Schemes were expecting to undertake significant community and fundraising events in the spring and early summer of 2020. Some of these were changed to online social media campaigns whilst others are being re-scheduled and revisited in the light of social distancing measures.
- The impact on steering groups varied. In many cases they continued to meet virtually in lockdown, some meeting more often. Others found that as their partners were already overwhelmed with the implications of the crisis on their own organisations; they had to reduce their engagement with the schemes.
- Some schemes changed the emphasis of their messaging to encompass the effect that Covid-19 was having on the area in their 'ask'. For example Stanley edited a video they were already producing to not only talk about local pride in the area but also highlight the challenges to local people from the virus and lockdown.
- Some funding distribution was delayed as panels were not able to meet and projects could not begin but schemes expect to be able to move ahead with these shortly.
- Schemes were able to use the groundwork they had already undertaken during the programme to start new work to support their communities during the pandemic. For example, Barking and Dagenham Giving worked with 22 local organisations and individuals (via two workshops) to design a Rapid Response Fund which received £100,000 from the Lankelly Chase Foundation. Totally Stoked supported the council by creating a website that could be used to help co-ordinate resources and help people who were shielding for health reasons.

Without the support from this programme to strengthen their steering groups, strategies and messaging, it is likely that the schemes would not have been in a position to be able to quickly respond to needs that emerged during the crisis.

THE LEARNING: INSIGHTS FROM THE PROGRAMME

Outcome: Have established strong governance, strategy and income models

What have we learned?	Why does it matter?
<p>The short time frame for the programme was possibly one of the most frequent issues raised by the schemes. Much of this comes down to schemes, by nature, being partnerships of organisations (with their own priorities and stakeholders) from across sectors, committed but not funded to work together.</p>	<p>Overall, some schemes went with a unilateral approach where key decisions were decided by the partner and other schemes when with a collaborative approach where key decisions were decided by all partners of the schemes steering group. Both approaches came with positive and negatives for the schemes. It was up to the scheme to decide which approach was more effective for them.</p>
<p>To get partnership development right, and thus create buy-in from the partners, it is essential that this is done in a long time frame that allows for mutually beneficial collaboration, criticism and agreement of both the role and responsibilities of the different partners. Furthermore, establishing this strong buy-in from partners also allowed schemes to respond quickly to Covid-19 with their partners.</p>	<p>Some schemes found that when they rushed partners to agree to actions without proper consultation that the partners were likely to pull away from supporting the schemes. For the partners to commit resources (time, money, wider networks etc.) to the scheme they, firstly, needed to understand both the value they bring to the scheme, and the value of the scheme overall. It is only when this has been achieved that partners will buy into collaborating on making the scheme a success. By investing time and creating strong relationships between the partners, the schemes found that when they faced a situation where rapid decisions needed to be made (e.g. building a Rapid Response Fund to Covid-19) it was possible to do this quickly and efficiently as mutual trust existed between the partners.</p>
<p>CAF found that the schemes often developed in a 'staged approach. Time and resource constraints, limited the capacity of partners to co-create and progress on different stages at the same time. This was mainly due to the lead partner having to develop the scheme and they could only progress at a rate that suited their resources. This meant the schemes often developed by taking a step-by-step linear approach.</p>	<p>With a staged approach it can be harder to change existing procedures and instead hamper collaboration as partners might not feel they can contribute to certain stages. Furthermore, this approach made it more pressured for schemes and the lead partner was often focused on making something happen rather than working with the steering groups to see what emerged organically, with some potentially simpler solutions being missed. It also often resulted in responsibility for development sitting with the lead partner, rather than cascading from the top and being owned by different partners.</p>
<p>Schemes generally were able to develop strong governance over the course of the programme. This was often time consuming but necessary and to a large extent was determined by their starting point and the pre-existing relationships with their partners. It should, however, be noted that whilst relationships with partners are strong for the present, the schemes anticipate that their overall governance model may change as they develop and different needs might emerge. As a funder, it was important to push for strong governance, but to be flexible with how quickly this could occur.</p>	<p>CAF has found that it is crucial for schemes to get their governance right for their partners and their locality. Where a scheme did not achieve this, they ended up having to devote time and resources going back to revisiting their governance as it blocked effective working and produced a greater risk of partners dropping out of the scheme. This process of establishing strong governance will often require patience and flexibility from all partners, and the lead organisation.</p>

<p>The schemes were able to develop a vision and strategy over the course of the programme.</p> <p>A few schemes created a theory of change to articulate their intended impact. Some schemes created their vision and strategy in close collaboration with their partners, while others were led by the lead organisation, who then presented for review the scheme's strategy and vision.</p>	<p>The development of a vision and consequently a strategy allowed the schemes and partners to review their (existing and/or planned) outputs and impact, to assess whether such outputs were achievable by the scheme and most importantly, whether they aligned with local needs. CAF found that the time taken to develop a strategy was crucial for helping the schemes to create a giving scheme that suited their communities. However as it was often developed in tandem with testing out different approaches it was often not complete as early as they anticipated.</p>
<p>With schemes often conflicted between needing time to develop a strategy and wanting to produce activities that would provide early wins to prove success and impact, CAF found that developing a vision and at least the 'bones' of a strategy helped counter complaints from partners that the schemes were either acting too slowly and/or were not acting strategically. The strategy did not have to be formally signed off early on as they are often live documents during this innovation stage, but a sense of shared direction was important.</p>	<p>Without this crucial process of developing a strategy, we found that partners were often unsure what the scheme was going to achieve and whether it was worth their time organisations time to invest in the scheme. Sometimes only when strategy was developed with actionable plans did we see partners becoming confident in the schemes ability to make real impactful changes within their locality.</p>
<p>Developing a strategy and a shared vision allowed schemes to quickly make decisions on how they could respond to the impact of Covid-19 on their communities.</p>	<p>CAF found that when Covid-19 started to impact on communities in England, schemes were quickly able to identify how they could respond. The schemes already had strategies which detailed the actions, partners and resources needed to respond to community needs. With the knowledge already shared within the partnership, it was possible for schemes to progress parts of their strategy at a faster rate to respond to Covid-19.</p>

Outcome: Core costs covered or have a realistic plan and timeline in place

What have we learned?	Why does it matter?
<p>Income models were not a one size fits all option as schemes had a wide range of different ideas and processes for bringing in money to fund core costs.</p> <p>We found that schemes were sometimes surprised by the opportunities that were presented to them to cover core costs. A motivation for research and a high degree of flexibility meant that the schemes were able to receive core cost support from a range of difference sources that suited their scheme.</p>	<p>It is not recommended that a scheme decide arbitrarily at the start to access core costs from specific income sources without research. Schemes will need to investigate and test ideas for sourcing funding.</p>

Core costs (as opposed to income raised to then grant out) has been the most challenging element for each scheme. Initially the real challenge with a new scheme is working out what it will do and look like in order to then even start to calculate what their core costs will be.

CAF's understanding of pre-existing schemes that have developed (without the benefit of DCMS funding and support) is that schemes have looked at this the other way round and focussed more on what they can do with what they have and this has shaped their strategy, rather than creating a strategy and then looking to fund it as ours have. One of the biggest reasons cited as to why this approach was taken by the six schemes was because the tight time pressure of the one year programme and that core costs were covered for this year. Therefore, schemes have to look for funding that will allow the continuation of activities which were funded by the DCMS grant.

Each of the six schemes have a plan to cover their core costs. However, in light of Covid-19 and the impact that has had on the UK economy, schemes are now reassessing their plans. Many of the schemes are initially looking to access grants in the short term then move to other forms of fundraising that take longer to build.

The complexities of securing core cost funding for the schemes is in line with what CAF often sees with small charities; a pattern of starting off grant funded then moving to corporate or major donors for example. CAF know from our work with these charities and funders that commonly it takes 18 months from starting a campaign to achieving an income from these income sources. Therefore having a plan to secure short and longer term funding is essential for schemes.

Outcome: Clear channels through which local communities are involved in the development of the PBGS and its grant distribution decisions

What have we learned?	Why does it matter?
<p>Schemes made varying progress toward developing channels through which the schemes involve the community.</p> <p>Mostly schemes tapped into pre-existing networks and/or research, such as, those of their partners but a number of them also did their own direct consultation through meeting people on the streets, convening their own meetings or other methods. Using existing networks is sensible as there is already an existing relationship.</p>	<p>CAF found this was often one of the hardest areas for the schemes to achieve within the short time frame granted to them. For the majority of the schemes, they wanted to develop their vision and mission before engaging with the community. This meant that the schemes had to go through the process of creating and agreeing a vision first.</p> <p>We saw reasonable levels of community consultation through effective means (surveys, meetings etc.) across the board.</p>
<p>Some schemes found Covid-19 an essential time to engage with their local community and to co-design support with the community. An unprecedented challenge like this can create opportunities to engage with communities in a way that has not been tested by the scheme before.</p>	<p>Schemes rose to the challenge of supporting their communities during the initial Covid-19 crisis. By doing this they have reported that they have strengthened links both with the community themselves, but also with other stakeholders, such as, local authorities, grant funders, other voluntary sector organisations. While schemes might have had to spend considerable time building up the trust of the community, acting immediately to respond to Covid-19 has meant that this trust has developed at a faster pace than anticipated, allowing for a greater ease in engaging the community on current, and hopefully future, activities.</p>

The skills to build relationships with partners and wider community stakeholders were essential for schemes.

We found that those schemes who hired an external co-ordinator, and especially a co-ordinator who had experience in community engagement, meant they had the skills (and often had) connections to engage with partners and get them on board with the scheme.

Outcome: Established their profile as an option for giving locally

What have we learned?

Before Covid-19, establishing a profile was one of the last things to happen for the majority of the schemes. Some schemes led in responding to Covid-19, while others supported other key partners. As the schemes had focused so much work on developing partnerships within their area, it was easy for them to utilise these stakeholders to support the community.

Why does it matter?

In the beginning of the programme, the schemes often found that they needed to be very clear on what their vision and strategy were before they could start communicating it out to their community. While some schemes engaged with members of the community prior to the launch of their campaign, this was often framed in a public consultation to understand what the community wanted from a PBGS.

However, with the impact of Covid-19, schemes found that they had to explain less what their vision was, but more how they could help the community to respond to Covid-19. This proved an effective position for the schemes, with the majority of them becoming a key partner for their community and stakeholders to drive responses to Covid-19.

Policy – The Future of Place-Based Giving

The analysis of this funding programme, although specific to the schemes themselves, can help us to think more broadly about the future of place-based giving and its role in the wider philanthropic landscape. A combination of direct insight from this work and insights from existing research and literature point to a set of conditions that need to be fulfilled in order to make place-based giving work and the opportunities it offers to help in efforts to “level up” communities in the future.

We identified five core elements of value that should be considered by decision-makers:

- Empowering communities and giving voice to local people
- Using convening power and clear leadership
- Networking different sectors of society
- Harnessing long-term potential through lasting commitment
- Creating true additionality



Empowering communities and giving voice to local people

Place-based giving should be thought of in the context of efforts to achieve changes to how (government and voluntary sector) services are delivered at the local level and to improve socio-economic circumstances in the long run. There is a real opportunity for this model to create genuine community ownership through participatory practices; and to demonstrate civic engagement in a way that is hyper-local and accessible for those who feel disconnected from national politics. It can also support social cohesion through convening and connecting people from different communities and walks of life who come together for a common cause. If schemes are responsive to place and context they can be a powerful tool for a local area to level up.

Using convening power and clear leadership

The success of place-based giving is, to a large extent, based on the ability of dedicated local leader/s to drive development while building strong cross-sectoral coalitions with other organisations, and by using bottom-up approaches which are grounded in the input and perception from those at the grassroots level to inform a more general approach. This is in contrast to top-down approaches, which is determined prior to any consultation, and where feedback from those directly involved is sought only after implementation. A scheme needs leadership and anchor points (e.g. dedicated staff and a hosting organisation), but without being dominated or owned by one particular stakeholder in a way that might drive others away. This is a fine balancing act and one that always needs to be checked. Funders and government can generate momentum and establishing 'seed initiatives' that stakeholders can convene around and take forward themselves once enough support from the local community has been generated.

Networking across different sectors of society

Place-based giving schemes thrive when large networked coalitions of different stakeholders work towards a common goal and use a common language to define their activities and aims. This can not only draw in more funding, resources and expertise, but also build a larger base on which the scheme can develop over time. Building these coalitions takes time and effort and needs to be adequately resourced.

Harnessing long-term potential requires lasting commitment

A significant finding from the GPBG programme is that place-based solutions require time to develop and become sustainable. However, once this happens upfront investments can deliver significant value through the wider impacts of the scheme. Place-based giving schemes in their early stages can also struggle with the 'Catch 22' of trying to ask for funding without a track record of delivery, and trying to create a track record of doing good in their communities without the funds available. Fundraising for onward granting is a difficult task on its own. In addition, schemes also have to fundraise to cover their core costs (overheads, staffing, administrative) – which is often challenging even though these are crucial to their success. Both issues – time and core funding upfront – require lasting commitment.

Creating true additionality

Place-based giving schemes can be a way to reintroduce people to regular giving. It has the benefit of feeling connected to causes rooted in their community, and can be seen as more accountable because donors can "see" the impact of their giving. But there is also a limit to what schemes can do in terms of raising funds and meeting needs. The expectation should not be that it replaces 'general' public spending and services. Initiatives need to provide additionality and ideally provide a service and outcome that is not already provided by the state or markets (at an affordable price).

Place-based giving is also too fragile to replace public service provision (both financially and in terms of the role key individuals play) and solutions are bespoke and built organically, which makes comparisons of services and impacts across places and contexts difficult (which is different for public services and businesses who should aim to provide the same type and level of service to all clients). However, the impacts of engagement, community cohesion and ownership, together with the additionality of the impact can be a crucial element of local regeneration. It is important that partners involved in building a PBG scheme clearly define their roles and understand:

- what they are contributing to its development,
- how their added value is different from other partners involved (not all partners will have the same role),

- to what extent the work that they do for the scheme is different from their 'core work' or 'businesses as usual' and requires additional resourcing and commitment.
- It can give genuine voice to local people. This is a potential outcome but also a factor underpinning success – schemes worked well where they listened to people from the ground up and were true community ownership of processes and outcomes was achieved.

Opportunities – what can place-based giving deliver:

- It promotes strategic local giving, bringing in key players in the local community, promoting partnerships and providing the infrastructure for interconnectivity. It can be vehicle to galvanise local philanthropy, civic engagement and community spirit in the wider sense.
- Specific and well-resourced roles with a remit for growing place-based giving have a real impact on success and motivation of schemes.
- Local areas are complex and different, and there is often the assumption that local need is already known - which is not necessarily the case. Providing long-term commitment and funding for a scheme provides the opportunity to unearth and articulate these needs and priorities. It can help unearth new resources and ideally new levels of giving from individuals and wide range of philanthropic actors (funders, businesses, local decision-makers) that would have otherwise not occurred and can thus help realise projects that contribute to lasting change on the ground.
- In 'normal times' place-based giving is, by design already targeted at supporting local communities and the civil society organisations that serve them. We have seen during the Covid-19 pandemic that having a resilient local civil society ecosystem that can respond to the crisis makes a huge difference in how communities are impacted on a social, economic and health level. From this perspective, place-based giving should play a crucial role in supporting local communities to develop longer-term resilience so that they are better prepared for future shocks.



Recommendations:

For government and funders

- Ensure that any roll out of the model does not rely on 'one size fits all' approaches and takes into account local context and recognise that while the model applies equally well to smaller communities as to whole cities, the financial opportunity is not the same.
- Support models that facilitate civic engagement, thus enhancing people's sense of empowerment and social cohesion, and support schemes so that they can be co-designed with citizens (but also other private and public stakeholders), collaborative and participatory, and thus democratise the concept of philanthropy.
- Be a champion of a narrative of community philanthropy while actively supporting local generosity movements and use place-based schemes as a way to distribute funds according to local priorities.
- Use insights from the GPBG programme and other place-based giving initiatives to help define and promote a common language around place-based giving. Leverage convening power to bring all stakeholders together on the outset of the development of a scheme - including mobilising local councils and businesses.
- Look at ways to incentivise mobilising local business and large businesses with a local footprint to engage with place-based giving. Incentivise collaborative models that can generate broad cross-sector coalitions when providing funding and support for local schemes.
- Assume the role of an important early stage funder that can help get schemes off the ground and lead the way in funding schemes' core costs and championing the importance of this approach to other funders, stakeholders and local citizens who want to engage with the scheme.
- Provide long term funding, recognising the significant time needed for assessing the landscape, relationship building, community engagement and fundraising locally, and go beyond providing grants and incentivise new forms of giving (e.g. through giving campaigns aimed individuals and galvanising community philanthropy, providing match funding).
- Do not aim to use place-based giving to replace current provision (or provision that has been cut) which ought to be fulfilled by the government or

other providers. Instead provide funding in order to create something new/complementary.

For implementers

- Develop schemes with a light touch view on ownership in order to truly ensure that the community own the decision making. Use the model as a way to democratise philanthropy, moving it away from something that 'the rich' do and encouraging everyone to acknowledge that they have something to give- be that time, expertise, resources or money.
- Community consultation can come at different points in time (e.g. some schemes might choose to do it at the outset, others want to do it once vision, mission and governance are clear) but should take place at one point.
- New schemes should expect to commit significant time to partnership management in particular in the initial stage of scheme development.
- Have a clear view on who can make decisions. The governance set up can differ (e.g. a lead or core set of organisations being able to make unilateral decisions, or having a whole steering board agreeing on decisions) will have significant implications for partner and time management.
- Have honest discussions in terms of commitment and role allocation within the scheme. Depending on their governance set up, PBG schemes can only be 'as fast as their slowest member'. Having a tiered set up with a group of core organisations and an outer tier of supporters could, for example, help with managing different levels of commitment across partners
- Have a realistic assessment of timeframes and initial benchmarks for success and short and medium-term aims and outcomes across partners. Many schemes will have to invest significant time into fundraising efforts for example, starting with grant-funding for core costs. If differing expectations on timeframes and what can/should be achieved are not managed on the outset then this could lead to changes in commitment (e.g. partners engaging less or dropping out).
- Try to get early funding and support for mapping needs the local funding ecosystem. This will provide information and a picture of the service provision landscape that can be used to inform the scheme development but also signal to other decision-makers and partners the added value and additionality of a particular focus of a scheme. 17

CONCLUSION

Key findings by CAF:

- PBG has the potential to drive community revival, bolster civic pride, engage people with and increase local philanthropy and mobilise giving of time, money and resources, increase community resilience in the long-term and therefore help withstanding future crises. It can address local needs and priorities and therefore be a locally tailored initiative, it can enhance local ownership of developments, but also contribute to better use and distribution of resources (not only local resources but also national in a wider sense), and therefore contribute to the levelling up agenda.
- It can give genuine voice to local people. This is a potential outcome but also a factor underpinning success – schemes worked well where they listened to people from the ground up and where true community ownership of processes and outcomes was achieved.
- It promotes strategic local giving, bringing in key players in the local community, promoting partnerships and providing the infrastructure for interconnectivity. It can be vehicle to galvanise local philanthropy, civic engagement and community spirit in the wider sense.
- CAF has found that there is no ideal generic blueprint for the development of a PBG scheme and the 'right' answers will be different for each scheme and the circumstances they find themselves in. But there are overall insights and learnings which are shared in this report, and they also have a bearing on how policy-makers, local decision-makers and stakeholders (in particular funders) engage with the topic, in particular in the early phases of building up a scheme
- Local areas are complex and different, and there is often the assumption that local need is already known - which is not necessarily the case. Providing long-term commitment and funding for a scheme provides the opportunity to unearth and articulate these needs and priorities. It can help unearth new resources and ideally new levels of giving from individuals and wide range of philanthropic actors (funders, businesses, local decision-makers) that would have otherwise not occurred and can thus help realise projects that contribute to lasting change on the ground.

- It takes time to develop trust with the community. Schemes and funders will need to expect that it will take time and space for the community to understand the benefit of the scheme to them and how they can interact with it in a way that benefits both the scheme and them as the community.
- Place-based giving, by design, can be effective in responding rapidly to crisis. With their interconnectivity within the community, and their ability to pull in support from various channels, giving schemes can be the effective centre point of a local response.

For implementers, CAF has found:

Core costs and levels of funding required

- PBG needs seed funding to ensure sufficient staffing, and cover other core costs. Implementers need to be aware that it is always a challenge for the voluntary sector to fundraise for core costs and not project costs.
- Areas of social economic depression are unlikely to have actors who can invest in core costs, even if they wanted to compared to an area of economic prosperity, which might have a wide pool of potential investors who have greater economic power.
- There is a need to get early funding and support for mapping the local funding ecosystem and support provided. This will provide information and a picture of the service provision landscape that can be used to inform the scheme development but also signal to other decision-makers and partners the added value and additionality of a particular focus of a scheme. Ensure that any roll out of the model does not rely on 'one size fits all' approaches and takes into account local context and recognise that while the model of a place-based giving scheme may be introduced in smaller communities as well as whole cities, the financial opportunities presented to place-based giving schemes is not the same.

Timeframes and stakeholder management

- Long-term engagement is key – agreeing on common cause, local priorities and needs, identifying gaps in the service landscape, making decisions on how to best deploy resources and how to mobilise them, coalition building, community consultation and involving citizens, developing a governance model, vision/mission/strategy, building up a track record to attract further funding – this all takes time under normal circumstances.
- However, Covid-19 has placed the schemes and their communities in a unique situation. CAF has found that giving schemes, in their response to the crisis, have had to speed up the timeframes in which they develop a strategy, create partnerships and involve citizens among other priorities. This has been possible because of the existing trust that has developed between partners.

New schemes should expect to commit significant time to partnership management in particular in the initial stage of scheme development. Have a realistic assessment of timeframes and initial benchmarks for success and short and medium-term aims and outcomes across partners. Many schemes will have to invest significant time into fundraising efforts for example, starting with grant-funding for core costs. If differing expectations, on timeframes and what can or should be achieved, are not managed on the outset then this could lead to changes in commitment (e.g. partners engaging less or dropping out).

Governance and decision-making processes

- CAF has found that it is crucial for schemes to get their governance right for their partners and their locality. Where a scheme didn't, they ended up going back to revisit it as it blocked effective working. This process will often require patience and flexibility from all partners.
- Have a clear view on who can make decisions and create a system of accountability. The governance set up can differ (e.g. a lead or core set of organisations being able to make unilateral decisions, or having a whole steering board agreeing on decisions) will have significant implications for partner and time management. Have honest discussion in terms of commitment and role allocation within the scheme. Depending on their governance set up, PBG schemes can only be 'as fast as their slowest member'. Having

a tiered set up with a group of core organisations and an outer tier of supporters could, for example, help with managing different levels of commitment across partners

- CAF found that those schemes who hired an external co-ordinator, and especially a co-ordinator who had experience in community engagement, meant they had the skills to engage with partners and get them on board with the scheme.

Community engagement

- Some schemes found that they needed to be very clear on what their vision and strategy were before they could start involving their community and delivering projects. Others decided to start with activities and projects and then developed a strategy around what worked. What was crucial for both of these different approaches is for the scheme to be clear with their partners and wider stakeholders why they are taking that approach and the impact they think it will have on the development of the scheme.
- Schemes should be developed with a light touch view on ownership in order to truly ensure that the community own the decision making. Use the model as a way to democratise philanthropy, moving it away from something that 'the rich' do and encouraging everyone to acknowledge that they have something to give- be that time, expertise, resources or money. Community engagement/consultation is a must, though it can be found at a wide range of difference stages and activities. It will be up to each scheme to decide when and how they will engage with their community.
- In particular funders and implementers should support models that facilitate civic engagement, thus enhancing people's sense of empowerment and social cohesion, and support schemes so that they can be co-designed with citizens (but also other private and public stakeholders), collaborative and participatory, and thus democratise the concept of philanthropy.
- Assume the role of an important early stage funder that can help get schemes off the ground and lead the way in funding schemes' core costs and championing the importance of this approach to other funders, stakeholders and local citizens who want to engage with the scheme.

- Funders should consider long term funding, recognising the significant time needed for assessing the landscape, relationship building, community engagement and fundraising locally, and go beyond providing grants and incentivise new forms of giving (e.g. through giving campaigns aimed individuals and galvanising community philanthropy, providing match funding).
- Funders may be able to support schemes to access advisory support to help them develop in key areas (e.g. communications, governance, strategy). Outside support can be an excellent way to compliment existing skills and experience already found within the scheme. Furthermore, it can also provide a crucial outsider perspective that can play an important role in balancing local power dynamics.
- Be a champion of a narrative of community philanthropy while actively supporting local generosity movements and use place based schemes as a way to distribute funds according to local priorities.
- Look at ways to incentivise mobilising local business and large businesses with a local footprint to engage with place-based giving. Incentivise collaborative models that can generate broad cross-sector coalitions when providing funding and support for local schemes.

At an overarching level, CAF has found that there is no one size fits all model for a scheme to use to develop a place-based giving scheme. It is possible to succeed by using a range of different methods. However, we have found common themes that are crucial for success. They are: engage in partnership development, ensure the giving scheme is complimenting the existing space and not duplicating resources, develop a vision and strategy for the scheme and engage with the local community.

CAF has recognised and advocated for the need for charities to build resilience and sustainability to weather challenges and the need for investment into organisations to allow them to build a firm footing. In the light of Covid-19 which has certainly tested all areas of civil society, whilst each place-based giving scheme was still relatively early stage, we saw successful responses to the crisis. This underlines the need to support early stage development as the schemes have every chance of not just surviving the pandemic but contributing in valuable ways to their communities.

Without the funding and support the six schemes received on this programme it seems fair to say that most of the six would not have been as developed or as ready to contribute to the pandemic's response.



From using the learnings in this report, it is also crucial that considerations are made on how the schemes, implementers and funders can work together to develop to increase philanthropic giving across the UK. CAF has reflected on asking where to go from here?:

- What role can PBG play in the transformative changes of society that lay ahead?
- Has the Covid-19 pandemic put more emphasis on philanthropic activity at a local level? How can policymakers capitalise on this?
- How do PBG schemes relate to other models for social action at a local level e.g. new mutual aid networks?
- Will there be a patchwork for schemes or is there a way to strategically fund the development of schemes in areas where they are most needed (but also where they could kick off easily and be embedded quickly)? Who should take on this work? What data sources can we draw on to map need and current provision?
- Do not aim to use place-based giving to replace current provision (or provision that has been cut) which ought to be fulfilled by the government or other providers. Instead can funding be provided in order to create something new/ complementary?
- How do we position PBG in the wider context of developing ecosystems of philanthropy at a local level? How can this be implemented and by whom among stakeholders such as Mayoral offices, Local Authorities, coalitions of funders)?

