

## **Assistant Chief Executive – Budget Proposals (2015-16)**

### **Questions from CVS feedback session 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014**

#### **EIA 13 – 15**

1. Proposals seem to be a ‘salami’ slicing exercise rather than looking at impacts
2. Proposal should show the consequence of cuts i.e. the costs incurred as an impact, otherwise how will decision makers know the full impacts of the proposed cuts? We haven’t identified the financial impact of every £1 given in grants equals £13 in value – this message needs to be highlighted (need to show the investment of grant monies). Transparency missing around consequence of cut
3. Papers do not reflect the city response – no consultation prior to budget setting process
4. What is the evidence base to challenge the above?
5. Is reducing the grants budget really value for money?
6. Process of mitigation within commissioning model: resourcing around development of partnerships to bid for monies and time resource of completing applications. Larger organisations will win out over smaller. Risk of losing infrastructure support and difficult to fundraise for basics.
7. Can you clarify how much funding will be lost and the percentage loss to current budget holders of the three year grant in 2015/2016? This will help us with planning
8. The loss of grants means losing a vehicle for the VCS to gain core costs which are not easily accessed elsewhere. It also helps keep costs down for end users as no VAT. This will have knock on effect to beneficiaries who are in poverty/low income  
A large proportion of the grant underpins commissioned work. A risk could be that as a city, we lose more funding if we do not have a grants process.
9. What are the impacts for BME groups, LGBT, faith and Disability groups of losing the CETS prospectus work. The voluntary sector needs to change their approaches and therefore need more infrastructure and community development/ engagement support. The sector is at a critical point and the EIAs show more reliance on the VCS for community services and active engagement of citizens. Surely the funding in CETS helps this. Reducing it will be detrimental to collaborative working.
10. It is only nine months into an integrated approach to infrastructure community development and engagement work and this collaboration between different organisations is only just starting to show results in supporting community services.