

The Mill, 7-11 Coppermill Lane, London, E17 7HA

14.00-16.30 Wednesday 23 November 2022

10.00am-14.00pm
 14.00 -16.30pm

BL area tour and lunch to St James and William Morris Big Local areas.
 Board Meeting (including AGM)

Discussion and decision		
<p>Present</p> <p>Trustees David Warner (chair), Matt Bell, Chris Catterall, Sahil Khan, Caroline Macfarland, Charlotte Pickles, Nicola Pollock, Richard Wilson</p> <p>Non-trustees Margaret Bolton, Michelle Brissett, Rosie Chapman (Protector), James Goodman, Matt Leach, Verity Soons, Mary Woodman (minutes).</p>		Actions
1.	<p>Welcome, intros and apologies for absence</p> <p>The chair welcomed trustees and staff to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Jeanette Lichner and Patrick Melia.</p> <p>Miatta Fahnbulleh sent apologies and the board noted that she would be standing down as of the AGM.</p> <p>Sahil Khan would join the meeting late.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>In relation to item 8, Nicola Pollock declared an indirect interest in discussion regarding the CWF campaign as a member of the Oversight Trust, which is responsible for overseeing the operations of companies that receive funding under the current dormant assets scheme.</p>	
3.	<p>Reflections on today's visit</p> <p>The chair thanked the team for organising the visits which were enjoyable and impressive. The board were invited to share reflections and the following key points were raised/discussed/noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted the positive energy and achievements of the areas and commended the partnerships leading the projects 	

Discussion and decision		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that the areas felt considerably different to other visits in the past 12 months. The possibility of a 'London factor' and the differences between the observed energy and ability deliver significant achievements in London compared to other BL areas was discussed. The board noted that these two Big Locals were perhaps a-typical of areas in the London where many areas had struggled to make significant progress. • Reflected on how over the last decade both areas had seen considerable externally driven development and change; if the areas were being chosen now for the programme it was possible neither would be prioritised on the basis of deprivation, when compared to other areas. This made it perhaps harder to identify and assess impact when compared to other places where Big Local was the only major intervention being made. • Noted that community strength, a place-based approach and strong partnerships with the local statutory sector (in this case the school) felt more prominent in William Morris and reflected on the issue. • Noted the keen interest in both areas in legacy planning and the jointly commissioned work to explore what this might mean. <p>It was agreed that it would be valuable to revisit research on delivery and success in London vs non-London areas to expand our understanding of these differences and their causes.</p>	<p>Research Team to explore scope for further research into differences in outcome between London areas vs areas outside of London and why they are there</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1.</p> <p>4.2.</p>	<p>Minutes and matters arising</p> <p>Approve minutes of board on 29 June 2022</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 29 June 2022 were agreed as an accurate record subject to amending attendance to reflect that Caroline Macfarland wasn't in attendance.</p> <p>Matters arising/action points not covered by the agenda</p> <p>The board requested additional information on the situation in Ramsey. Jon Fox noted that the pavilion was currently not open and was the subject of an ongoing dispute. The team were managing their input carefully, whilst understanding that this was – fundamentally – an issue which needed to be resolved at a local level.</p>	<p>Jon Fox to provide an update to the board at its next meeting.</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1.</p>	<p>Committee proceedings</p> <p>Governance and remuneration committee – 27 July 2022 and 24 November 2022</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 27 July 2022 were noted.</p> <p>The draft minutes of the meeting on 24 October 2022 were noted.</p> <p>Nicola Pollock highlighted the discussions in the committee on closure, and informed trustees that a draft Closure Strategy would be brought to the board in January. Rachel Rowney would be leading on closure planning on her return in the spring.</p>	

Discussion and decision

The committee had also discussed approach to cost of living and staff remuneration and pay award moving forward. A number of nil or low-cost interim measures that could help staff would be introduced. The 2023 pay award would be further discussed by governance and remuneration committee at its meeting in January.

There were currently two Board vacancies, with a further vacancy expected in the new year. Any new recruitment would be considered alongside the governance review and committee structure in early 2023-24, and this would be further discussed at a future committee meeting. The chair would complete outstanding trustee individual discussions ahead of the board meeting in January 2023 – this information would feed into decisions around trustee recruitment.

5.2. Programme delivery committee – 2 November 2022

The minutes of the meeting on 2 November 2022 were noted.

Jon Fox updated the board in Sahil Khan's absence, bringing the following key points to the attention of the board.

- Chris Falconer had provided a substantial update on closure guidance for Big Local areas and next steps.
- Key discussions centred around our 'plan b' for areas at risk of not spending out - with some principles set out which would be developed further. One key principle that had been agreed was that wherever possible areas should be seen to have received their promised £1m, even if this required approaches that diverged somewhat from Big Local practice to date.
- Trustees elaborated that a full discussion had been had at the committee to test a variety of approaches.

5.3. Legacy and learning committee – 25 August 2022 and 2 November 2022

The minutes of the meeting on 24 August 2022 and draft minutes of the meeting on 2 November 2022 were noted.

James Goodman updated in Patrick Melia's absence, bringing the following key points to the attention of the board;

- In August, the committee had continued conversations around key elements of the Legacy Strategy (which were then received by the board at the September awayday), received an update on the dormant assets consultation and discussed the Communities in control evaluation which was overall a positive report with some evidence of population level impacts in BL areas.
- In November, the committee had discussed the relationship between big locals and public agencies and would be looking at the framing of this

Discussion and decision		
5.4.	<p>research for the next legacy committee meeting. Draft strategy discussions continued building on those at the September awayday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next version of the draft Legacy Strategy would be looked at at the January board strategy day. <p>Finance audit and risk committee – 3 August 2022</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 3 August 2022 and the draft minutes of the meeting on 3 November 2022 were noted.</p> <p>Chris Catterall updated the board on key discussions at the committee, noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanks to Nicola for attending to ensure the meeting was quorate. CCLA provided an investment report and noted that the cash portfolio was proving to have been a prudent move. A potential 30% increase in fee from auditors had been raised and was currently being negotiated. Further information would be available in coming months. The increase could be offset by commissioning a separate check on the new finance system, which might otherwise have been bundled into the overall audit package. Budget reprofile and management accounts had been discussed in depth and the team had done excellent work in this area. Inflation mapping continued to be challenging and a continuing piece of work. 	Michelle Brissett and Chris Catterall to provide update to the board re auditor's fees when further information became available
6	<p>Annual Reports and Accounts</p> <p>6.1 Audit reports and accounts - covering note</p> <p>Michelle Brissett introduced the item bringing the following attention to the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance audit and risk committee had reviewed the Annual Reports and Accounts and recommended it to the board for approval. There had, again, been a clean audit this year with a smooth process. The committee also recommended that Board approve the Letters of Representation for signing. Finally, the committee had recommended that Moore Kingston Smith be reappointed as auditors for the following year assuming an agreement on the fee could be reached. <p>The board congratulated the team on another clean audit.</p> <p><i>Sahil Khan joined the meeting</i></p> <p>6.2 To note the audit management report for Local Trust for 2021-22</p> <p>The board noted the audit management report for Local Trust for 2021-22.</p>	

Discussion and decision		
6.3	<p>To consider and approve the audited accounts for Local Trust for 2021-22</p> <p>The board noted and approved the accounts for Local Trust for 2021-22.</p>	
6.4	<p>To consider and approve the audited accounts for Big Local Trust for 2021-22</p> <p>The board noted and approved the accounts for Big Local Trust for 2021-22</p>	
6.5	<p>To agree to sign the letters of representation for Local Trust and Big Local Trust</p> <p>The board noted and approved the letters of representation for Local Trust and Big Local Trust</p>	
7	<p>Chief executive's report</p> <p>Matt Leach recommended the report be taken as read with nothing further to bring to the attention of the board.</p> <p>Staff churn at junior level was raised. The board noted that recruitment to the policy and communications teams was where the most challenge was being encountered at the moment. Lower paid roles within the programme team were also proving a challenge to fill, especially in London.</p> <p>The board noted the paper.</p>	
8	<p>Update on external political environment</p> <p>Margaret Bolton introduced the paper and made the following main points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been a meeting with DCMS officials on 21 November which had covered the current state of play on dormant assets consultation and progress on the community element of the levelling up white paper. • On dormant assets, basic analysis of consultation had been done and options paper had been submitted to the minister. • No decisions had yet been made, however an announcement was still expected in the 2nd week of January. • The Local Trust policy team remained focussed on the final stages of the campaign, as well as working up a draft implementation plan to help inform consideration of next steps, should a decision be made to go ahead. • No ministerial view yet taken on the community elements of the white paper; we would continue to keep track of progress over coming months. <p>The board noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Local Trust had played a leading role, the campaign for a CWF had been on behalf of the CWFA and the organisations who were part of it, and not for a 'Big Local part 2' delivered by Local Trust. However, it 	

Discussion and decision	
	<p>was hoped that the CWF if announced would benefit from learning and insights from the Big Local programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board asked how confident the Executive Team were about a positive decision on CWF. Margaret said that some strong competitive bids had been submitted to the consultation, whilst noting that we remained positive. The board noted that two prominent organisations from within the community sector who had joined the CWFA had nevertheless submitted their own separate bids to the consultation seeking funding for their own organisations. This was disappointing, but reflected the lack of maturity of some parts of the sector. • The board emphasised that it would be important to remain proactive and pin down the principles that we believe should underpin the delivery model. This would help us to respond with clarity to any requests for Local Trust to contribute to ongoing work following any decision to proceed with a CWF. <p>Overall, the board were highly supportive and appreciative of the work by the Executive Team and Local Trust colleagues on the CWF campaign, and with ongoing preparation for any possible announcements in the new year.</p>
9 9.1	<p>Performance, risk and finance and investment reports</p> <p>Local Trust business plan monitoring to 30 September 2022</p> <p>The Chair introduced the paper and invited directors to comment on progress. Given the number of targets for the year, it was suggested that they might focus on targets that had been delayed or it was assessed would not be hit given progress at mid-year.</p> <p>Directors provided updates for each of the delayed targets, providing additional context to the information which was provided in the papers. The board thanked directors and noted the updates Further detail of these updates can be found in annex 1.</p> <p>Three items had more substantial changes to be noted by the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2 – areas spending out – this was regularly reviewed with a close eye and was not currently a red risk in terms of a general slow down on areas spending out (though it was expected that plans locally would regularly change) • 6.5 –Youth network - The proposed youth network for young people in BLs to connect together had been tested and there was not a huge appetite at the moment. It was therefore not proposed that continued work would take place on this proposal. Young person’s engagement remained a priority and a community engagement support offer (with external organisations) would now incorporate this. • 24.2/3 –EDI externally – currently having discussions of how to incentivise support for areas and to ensure that the right support offer was available. Work on this was taking place in the context of ongoing

Discussion and decision		
9.2	<p>work within Local Trust on an EDI strategy for the organisation, that would be brought to Board in March 2023.</p> <p>The board noted the business plan monitoring report to 30 September 2022 and progress towards targets alongside the amendments proposed.</p> <p>Big Local Trust and Local Trust management accounts to 30 September 2022 and reforecast to 31 March 2023</p> <p>Michelle introduced the paper and noted that we continued to run ahead of profile on grant commitment at the current time. This was due to cautious budget assumptions at the start of the year. This was not expected to continue at the same pace, and we were currently seeing indications of some considerable slowdown in commitments across areas in the autumn. However, initial budget targets were expected still to be met.</p> <p>Our financial position continued to be healthy, and it was expected that increases in interest rates might provide some additional contingency reserve during the current year. However, given uncertainty about the current economic environment, no assumptions were being made at present about this. Chris Catterall noted that the team were taking a sensibly cautious approach to managing funds, whilst keeping Finance Audit and Risk Committee informed in terms of the overall financial picture.</p> <p>The board approved the Big Local Trust and Local Trust management accounts to 30 September 2021</p>	
9.3	<p>Big Local Trust investment reports to 30 September 2022</p> <p>The board noted the Big Local Trust report to 30 September 2022.</p>	
9.4	<p>Local Trust investment report to 30 September 2022</p> <p>The board noted the Local Trust investment report to 30 September 2022</p>	
9.5	<p>Risk register as of 32 October 2022</p> <p>The board noted the register and noted the addition of some new risks relating to current political/financial instability.</p>	
10	<p>Long term budget reprofiling</p> <p>Matt introduced the report bringing the following key points to the attention of the board;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper set out how the next three years' budgets would be updated to take account of expected levels of inflation. It also set out changes to resourcing of teams which reflected discussions between trustees across committees and board over the last few months. 	

Discussion and decision		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially the view had been to align inflation projections for the future with Bank of England forecasts. However, Finance audit and risk committee took the view that it was sensible to take a more cautious approach. Budget assumptions would now be reviewed in the light of the changing inflation and interest environment every six months. • Changes to staffing and other budgets included in the mid-year reprofiling would help ensure that when the next budget was brought to Board in March, the overall picture was not overcomplicated by too many changes and updates to assumptions and plans. <p>The board noted and approved the proposals, but in doing so made the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes to plans for senior staffing were highly welcome, particularly in the light of the Closure Report prepared earlier in the year • Ensuring adequate staffing to support the programme in the next two years would be incredibly important as the programme reached a critical point in terms of delivery. However, increasing staff in some areas at a time of considerable financial pressure on other charities meant that optics and communication would be important to consider. • There was a lack of clarity in relation to the impact of the reprofiling on overall contingency provision, and in relation to the extent that savings on rep costs would offset investment in area support staff. Nicola asked if this could be clarified. <p>The board accepted the proposed long-term budget reprofiling as a basis from which to take forward planning work for the 2023-24 budget that will be brought to Board in March 2023</p>	<p>Michelle Brissett to provide more information to Nicola Pollock on these points.</p>
11	<p>Area sustainability plans</p> <p>Jon Fox introduced the paper, bringing the following to the attention of the board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is based on Deed requirement to report back to TNLCF on sustainability plans in the eleventh year of the BL Trust Deed. • Following discussion with Programme Committee, TNLCF and the Protector, significant progress had been made in preparing plans for submission. • Area sustainability plans should not be confused with legacy plans. The latter created and owned by Big Local partnerships as their plans and intentions for legacy. The sustainability plans are created by Local Trust set out our assessment of where areas have got to, and the support that we plan to provide them with to ensure they achieve a sustainable legacy • A cover report would be developed for TNLCF to highlight key points and hopefully avoid this being just be a box-ticking exercise. <p>The board noted that plans would be shared with trustees for information and the work would be finalised with Rosie, David, and Sahil ahead of submission to the TNLCF. The board agreed with the approach and delegated sign off as proposed.</p> <p><i>Richard Wilson left the meeting</i></p>	<p>Sustainability plans to be shared with the board and Jon to flag any area reports where a deeper review from trustees would be necessary.</p>

Discussion and decision		
12	<p>Any other business</p> <p>A request was made for board dates to be confirmed to the protector as soon as possible.</p> <p>James Goodman reminded trustees of the CCC event on 13th December. Given transport strikes, the event had now been rescheduled, and new plans for the event would be shared.</p> <p>Thanks to the team for organising an excellent day.</p>	<p>Governance team to confirm Board and Committee dates.</p> <p>James to contact trustees re revised plans for the CCC event when rescheduled.</p>
16.20 pm - meeting close		