

VOLUNTARY SECTOR FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FROM 1 APRIL 2008

CONSULTATION PAPER



Title	VOLUNTARY SECTOR FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FROM 1 APRIL 2008
Purpose of Paper	<p>The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT), Richmond Council for Voluntary Service (RCVS) and Richmond & Twickenham Primary Care Trust (R & T PCT) have formed a Joint Working Group on voluntary sector funding. The objectives of the Group are two-fold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To consider the options for the future management of funding to the voluntary and community sector and make recommendations to the Council and the PCT. 2. To make proposals to the Council and PCT on the priorities for future funding of the voluntary and community sector. <p>This draft paper considers the first of the above objectives and asks for comments from stakeholders.</p>
Partners	This paper is issued for consultation by LBRuT. It has been written with the assistance of the Joint Working Group on Voluntary Sector Funding (London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Richmond Council for Voluntary Service, Richmond & Twickenham PCT).
Who is being consulted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link officers and key stakeholders within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames • Link officers and key stakeholders within Richmond & Twickenham PCT • Voluntary and community sector (including organisations that are not current recipients of financial support from LBRuT or the PCT) • Local charitable trusts
How to respond and submission deadline	<p>Please read through the attached document and respond to the questions at the end of each section. A space for general comments is included at the end of the document. This can be done either directly onto the document and emailed or on hard copy.</p> <p>If you have communication needs then please contact LBRuT at the address below.</p> <p>Please send your comments by <u>Monday 14 May 2007</u> to:</p> <p>Carol MacBean Partnership Manager London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Room 300 Civic Centre 44 York Street Twickenham TW1 3BZ</p> <p>Email: c.macbean@richmond.gov.uk</p>
What happens to the responses	The responses will be collated by LBRuT and shared with the Joint Working Group on Voluntary Sector Funding, and be fed into the final proposal for the new Funding Framework.

CONTENTS

1. Statement of Intent in working with VCS	4
2. Objectives of Funding	4
3. Commissioning Services	6
4. Types of Funding	8
5. Outcome Funding	8
6. Capacity building and infrastructure of the sector	9
7. The Compact	10
8. The Role of Grants Direct	10
9. Funding Strategy	11
10. Small Grants	11
11. Main Grant Funding Programme	14
12. Buying Services	16
13. Partnering Arrangements	17
14. Rent Subsidies	17
15. Transitional arrangements	17
16. Way Forward	18
APPENDIX 1 Voluntary and Community Sector Groups Involvement in Partnership Arrangements	19

Options for Voluntary Sector Funding Arrangements

1. Statement of Intent in working with VCS

The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and Richmond & Twickenham Primary Care Trust (R&TPCT) have made a clear commitment to working in partnership with the local voluntary and community sector, recognizing the benefits that can be achieved for local people in this approach. The sector plays an important role in the following:

- improving and enriching the quality of life for residents, especially the most vulnerable
- the contribution that volunteers make in terms of skills and time which helps to maintain the fabric of local communities.
- providing services that enable people to live independently for longer without intervention by the statutory services
- acting as a voice for local communities to help improve services
- delivering services which offer people local solutions, tailored to their individual needs

The Richmond upon Thames Local Strategic Partnership is a partnership of local organisations providing local services, including health, social care, education, transport, policing and environmental services. In consultation with local people, they have identified the key priorities for the local area in the Community Plan. It is important that the Council and its partners focus their resources on those priority areas.

The Council and the R&TPCT also recognise the need to build capacity in the sector, to deliver services effectively but also to enable the sector to participate as a full partner in identifying need, agreeing priorities for funding and in enabling service users to take an active role in influencing decisions.

This paper attempts to look at all the current funding the Council and Richmond & Twickenham PCT gives to the sector, including grant aid, bought and commissioned services, partnership and “passported” funding and subsidies, with a view to agreeing a future framework on **how** the sector should be funded, to provide clarity and efficiency in future funding arrangements. A separate paper looks at the priorities or **what** should be funded.

2. Objectives of Funding

The current funding arrangements for the voluntary and community sector are managed through a partnership between the Council, Richmond Council for Voluntary Service (RCVS) and the R&TPCT. We have established a joint working group to look at improving the funding arrangements in a way that meets the needs of all stakeholders as closely as possible. The Working Group has agreed that it wishes funding to achieve the following objectives:

2.1. Promotion of strong partnerships

The council recognizes the sector’s contribution to a broad range of services in the borough, especially preventative services which allow people to live independently for longer or reduce risk to vulnerable groups.

Many voluntary sector organizations are key partners in providing those services and this can be expected to increase over time. The voluntary sector can often deliver more individually tailored services, offering people more choice at a local level. The council wishes to build on that partnership work and will be reviewing and strengthening the Compact to help us do so.

2.2. Alignment of funding with the Council's objectives

As pressure on local authority spending increases, resources must be more targeted to those most in need. We will never have sufficient resources to fund all of the work that voluntary groups want to do in the community and therefore choices must be made to fund the priorities. The Council's priorities flow from the Community Plan, which is developed in consultation with the local community and our partners.

2.3. Voluntary sector voice in identifying priorities

As well as having a voice in developing the Community Plan, the voluntary sector is well represented on key partnerships responsible for planning, buying and monitoring the performance of services. A list of voluntary sector involvement in partnerships is attached and is being used to identify any gaps and to ensure that the sector has the opportunity to influence priorities.

2.4. A simple and transparent process

Funding arrangements must balance the needs of funders for a sufficiently robust process to ensure the procurement of good quality services, with the needs of organizations to keep administrative costs to a minimum. We would like to build on the improved, more transparent arrangements developed over the last three years.

2.5. Integration of funding received by organizations

Although this paper primarily deals with grant funding, it is recognized that the majority of council funding to the sector is through contracts, service level agreements (SLAs), rent subsidies and through "passporting" monies directly to the sector. This totals about £5m of which grants (from both the Council and the PCT) are about 25%. As noted above it is expected that the total funding to the sector will increase in the future, through increased delivery of services in partnership with the sector.

The single application process enabled by Grants Direct benefited nearly half of all applicants and this is a feature of the current arrangement that we would like to retain if possible.

2.6. Clarity in decision making

Current arrangements are the result of a compromise between the Council with the PCT and Richmond Council for Voluntary Service in order to meet the governance requirements of both organizations. Whilst this is something that partners are committed to making work, there have been some underlying issues for groups around the clarity of the process and it is important that future arrangements address this.

2.7. To allow for longer term funding arrangements

This remains an objective of all partners, in order to provide stability and also in order to be more efficient.

2.8. Monitoring of outcomes

We want to ensure that the monitoring of the outcomes achieved through funding the sector is proportionate and meaningful for funders and funded organizations. Often we have no choice as to what is monitored as this is driven by Government requirements, but the intention is to keep monitoring to a minimum and to be clear about what is required at an early stage.

2.9. To encourage a strategic approach to the development of the sector

We want to invest in the development of strong, sustainable organisations with a diverse funding base able to deliver quality services. A strategic approach needs to be based on evidence of need and local knowledge as well as monitoring of outcomes and performance. Our intention is that change within the sector is managed and support given to individual organisations as necessary to access training, help with fundraising and to assist in managing change.

Consultation Questions:

2.10. Do you think these are the right objectives?	Yes/ No
Comments	

2.11. Are there any other objectives that should be achieved through funding the voluntary and community sector?
Comments

3. Commissioning Services

Historically in LBRuT the award of grants has been based on an open application process by organisations seeking funding for services they wish to provide. Inevitably this tends to lead to a patchwork of provision with gaps in coverage of some services and duplication of others.

The council wishes to move to a “commissioning” model, by which it means that it will identify the services it wishes to buy from the voluntary sector. Commissioning has been defined by the Audit Commission as follows:

Commissioning is the process of specifying, securing and monitoring services to meet people’s needs at a strategic level. This applies to all services, whether they are provided by the local authority, NHS, other public agencies or by the private or voluntary sectors.

Commissioning is the term used to describe a cyclical process, designed to improve services. It has a number of stages:

- identifying and measuring the need for services
- reviewing the existing levels of service provided
- identifying the resources available
- agreeing the outcomes to be achieved
- deciding on priorities
- arranging for delivery of the service
- monitoring and review of what is delivered
- modifying and revising the strategy

The Council will be developing the Voluntary Sector Strategy with a much greater focus on the outcomes it wishes to achieve with funding. These outcomes will be based on our priorities, which in most cases will have been agreed with the voluntary sector and other partners and which are published in a number of planning documents, including the Community Plan and various strategic partnership plans.

We will be encouraging the sector to propose services which will meet these outcomes and agree some performance indicators which will help us to identify whether the outcomes have been achieved.

A draft of the funding priorities will be published for consultation shortly.

Consultation Question:

3.1. What training and other help do you need to understand and to participate in the commissioning cycle?
Comments

4. Types of Funding

The Model below, based on the IDeA continuum of commissioning suggests one way of viewing how different impacts may require a different means of funding:

Table 4.1.

Type of need	1. Non statutory aspirational need	2. Specific community interest	3. Specific service/function	4. Specific service/function	5. Developmental service, based on desired outcome
Examples (please note these are given for illustration purposes only and may not reflect the position in LB Richmond)	Creation of a wildlife garden	Tackling Domestic Abuse / Racial inequality	Mediation service	Meals on wheels Community transport	Home care
Type of Funding application	One off Small Grant application	single provider, annual application	single provider Multi year funding programme	More than 1 possible provider, Invited to tender Fixed length contract	Negotiate partnership/fixed term partnership
Funding mechanism	Grant	Grant with funding agreement	Grant with service level agreement	Contract	Strategic partnering agreement

The funding mechanism used, i.e. grant, service level agreement, contract or partnering agreement* and the length of the time for which funding is allocated, will be the most appropriate for the type of service or function proposed. Some services which are currently grant funded might more appropriately be contracted services and some grants for services which are more developmental in nature would be better managed as a partnering agreement. The criteria for deciding on the most appropriate type of funding will be risk-based, depending on factors such as the importance of the service, the vulnerability of clients and the amount of funding invested.

This model has been discussed informally with stakeholders and most seem to favour a mixed approach to funding the voluntary sector that allows for flexibility, responsiveness and efficient use of resources.

* These are explained more fully in sections 10 – 13

5. Outcome Funding

The shift to the commissioning model brings with it the change of emphasis to funding outcomes, rather than a number of inputs or outputs. (Inputs are the resources that are put into an organisation to carry out an activity. Inputs may be human, material, financial

or expressed as time. Outputs are all the detailed activities, services and products that are provided)

The Council wishes to purchase more services from the voluntary sector and in order to do that must be assured that organisations have the right systems in place for managing staff, budgets and performance, i.e. organisations must have a minimum capacity to function efficiently. These types of costs have been expressed as “core costs” in the past. These could include the following:

- costs of Chief Executive officer
- administrative costs of running the management board
- audit costs
- fundraising and finance function
- health and safety
- ICT systems
- accommodation

It is important to emphasise that these costs relate to the capacity of an organisation to deliver outcomes and funding will be based on the agreed outcomes to be achieved. Therefore, the level of contribution to what is termed “core costs” will vary, depending on the needs of individual organisations in being able to deliver the agreed outcomes.

The Government has championed the principle of “full cost recovery” whereby the full cost of services includes an appropriate proportion of overheads. The Council is also committed to this principle, as it is more transparent in identifying the true costs of a service.

Consultation Questions:

5.1. Do you understand the concept of Full Cost Recovery?	Yes/ No
Comments	

5.2. Do you apply it to your funding applications/ adopt the principals when agreeing service level agreements?	Yes/ No
Comments	

6. Capacity building and infrastructure of the sector
--

Capacity building is defined as including training, accreditation, costs for staff management and supervision. Currently at least 10% of the total amount available for distribution over the three years is ring fenced to support capacity building and to strengthen the infrastructure of the sector.

In order to encourage the growth of vibrant and independent organisations the sector needs to be able to respond to a changing environment. Through its leadership of the Change Up Strategy, the Richmond CVS has a key role in helping the sector to obtain the training and support it needs to obtain funding and deliver quality services. Future Council funding to RCVS will continue to have a focus on this key function.

More recently the concept of Key Strategic Organisations (KSOs) has been an attempt to provide more targeted support to the sector locally and provide strategic focus in a number of key areas. It is proposed that a review of KSOs is undertaken which will involve funders, voluntary organisations and KSOs themselves to identify what has and has not been successful with this model and what is the best means to help development of the sector.

7. The Compact

Both the Council and the PCT have a Compact with the VCS which establishes a shared vision and the principles for working in partnership between the voluntary and statutory sectors in the borough. Funding is one of the key elements within the Compact and it sets out our commitment to:

- Work in partnership to develop policies about resources;
- Encourage fair access to funding;
- Consider the provision of core costs;
- Operate funding arrangements that encourage long term planning;
- When developing commissioning strategies give positive consideration to the potential for the voluntary sector to undertake work in appropriate areas; and
- Consult the voluntary sector about the financial implications when new roles and responsibilities are being considered.

It is proposed to update the existing Compact to take account of new developments and changing expectations in both sectors, particularly in relation to the procurement of services. There will be a full consultation on this later in the year.

Consultation Question:

7.1 What other areas should be included in the review of the Compact? Do you think these are the right objectives?

Comments

8. The Role of Grants Direct

It is not the intention of this paper to review the current management arrangements for the grants programme, as these have already been the subject of an independent review.

The strength of Grants Direct has been in developing more robust and transparent processes around the administration and management of grants and providing a single point of access to groups wishing to find funding. In addition, the close involvement of the RCVS has also given the sector a greater voice and influence in the funding process, which has been beneficial to funders and organisations alike.

However, the decision making processes in place currently for the grant funding programmes has been identified as requiring clarity and therefore some options are proposed to address this, both for small grants and for the main grant programme.

These options are included under sections 10 and 11.

9. Funding Strategy

It is proposed that the Council adopt the following funding strategy for voluntary sector:

Small grants

One off applications to support smaller community based initiatives.

Main grant funding programme

To contribute to the core costs of groups whose focus is a specific community interest or who provide community based services.

Buying services

Funding via a contract for essential or key services which must be provided to a specified minimum level.

Partnering arrangements

Significant investment in developmental or capacity building services which contribute to a long term shared partnership vision.

This strategy would apply to all funding of the voluntary sector, not just existing grant funding.

10. Small Grants

In 05/06 the Council awarded 77 grants of under £5000, totalling £163,000 for small community based projects. Sixty-two of these were awarded from the Civic Pride Fund, (now the Local Initiatives Fund) the others were given by council departments and by Grants Direct.

To replace these arrangements it is proposed that a small grants programme be established. This would be an annual programme for one off grants, with an upper cash limit and with a simple application and award process, keeping administrative costs as low as possible. It would be suitable for pump priming new initiatives and supporting smaller community based projects as illustrated in the table at 4.1. The criteria would be very broad based, to promote the social, environmental and economic well being of residents in a local area.

Consultation Questions:

10.1. What do you think about the idea of a small grants programme and why?
Comments

10. 2. What should be the upper limit of grants distributed under a small grants programme and why?
Comments

The Council cannot delegate its decision making to another body, so the options for making decisions about small grants are as follows:

1. Decision making by Council Members.
2. Delegating decision making to council officers
3. Having a panel composed of representatives of a number of partner organisations, but chaired by a council Member or officer, in whom decision making will be vested.
4. Establishing a Community Chest, by awarding a single lump sum grant to a charitable body to distribute .Any decisions would be made by the charitable body and the amount awarded by the Council would need to reflect this risk. For this reason many Community Chests are set up for around £50,000.

Please indicate below the option for decision making that you think would be best.

Consultation Question:

10.3. What do you think is the best way of making decisions about small grants? (Please tick your preferred option)	
Decision making by Council Members	
Delegating decision making to council officers	
Having a panel composed of representatives of a number of partner organisations, but chaired by a council Member or officer, in whom decision making will be vested	
Establishing a Community Chest, by awarding a single lump sum grant to a charitable body to distribute.	

Comments

There are also options to be considered for managing the award of small grants as follows:

1. a single Grants Panel for all sectors
2. a number of panels, each for its own sector, geographical area or Community Plan theme

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Single Panel	Decision making more consistent across sectors.	Requires broad range of knowledge/expertise.
	Efficient to manage-small number of meetings	Potentially large number of stakeholders in decision making for different sectors.
	Single pot allows greater flexibility	
Many Panels	Expert panel	Inefficient -greater number of meetings, each dealing with a small number of grants.
	Could accommodate stakeholders in each area.	Little flexibility as the funding pot for each Panel would be small.

If agreed, it should be possible to develop a small grants programme to start in April 2008-09 and continue on an annual basis.

Consultation Question:

10. 4. Should there be a single panel or several panels? (Please tick your preferred option)	
A single Panel for all small grants	
A panels for each sector	
A panel for each geographical area	
A panel for each Community Plan theme	
Comments	

11. Main Grant Funding Programme

The aim of the main grant programme would be to enable the development of a sustainable voluntary and community sector.

The award of funding would be assessed against the council's priorities, expressed as outcomes it wants to achieve. The aim would be to have either an annual or three yearly funding agreement, with agreed outcomes and performance indicators. Three year funding will be subject to stability of Council funding from the Government for the period of the agreement and the organisation meeting the performance requirements of the agreement. Awards would be via grant with a funding or service level agreement, depending on the most applicable arrangement, with reference to the illustrations in columns 2 and 3 of the table at 4.1.

Funding will be available for core costs where they are required to deliver the agreed outcomes, ensuring that groups will have a minimum basic management capacity in place to enable them to provide key services.

It is proposed that the partnership with the voluntary sector will continue, with a joint team managing the main grant programme, working much more closely with the strategic partnerships and with Council Departments, in order to align funding more closely with council objectives and build capacity in partnership working with the sector.

The joint team will continue to manage the application, assessment and recommendation process and once a decision had been taken, agree the funding arrangements and monitor and evaluate the outcomes, reporting back to the decision making body.

The options for decision-making are as follows:

1. A single Grants Direct Panel or Board, consisting of the chairs of the strategic partnerships and possibly also the LAA theme leads meeting twice a year to award grants. Ideally the Panel would include voluntary sector representation, but should have no more than 7 members.
2. Each strategic partnership to establish a Panel to award grants, e.g. Community Safety, Children & Young People, Adults Strategic Partnership. This could be integrated with their commissioning arrangements.
3. A Grants Direct Panel composed of Cabinet portfolio holders
4. Grants Panels established on departmental lines

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Single GD Partnership Board	Provides an overview of funding to the sector for the partners	Governance arrangements will need to be addressed, but could reside with a Cabinet Member who is part of the Board.
	Can address cross cutting services	No lead partnership in some areas.
	Provides flexibility by funding all being in one pot.	Need to limit membership, leaving out some partners.

	Will allow key partners to have a say.	
	Efficient for grants advisers to manage.	
GD Panel for each partnership	Provides overview of spend for each strategic partnership.	Partnerships might concentrate on commissioning VCS funding and fail to progress on joint commissioning of mainstream funds.
	Will allow integration with partnership objectives	Less efficient for grants advisers to manage than single GD Board.
	Will allow more stakeholders to have a say	Governance arrangements will need to be addressed, but could reside with a Cabinet Member who is part of the Board.
		No lead partnership in some areas.
		Unable to address cross cutting issues easily
		Less flexibility as funding pots will be smaller
Panel of Cabinet Members	Decision making clear.	Partners will not have say.
	Can address cross cutting services	Will not necessarily be integrated with partnership objectives
	Provides flexibility by funding all being in one pot.	
	Will allow integration with Council objectives	
	Efficient for grants advisers to manage.	
Departmental Panel	Decisions could be delegated to officers or lead cabinet member could take decision.	Partners will not have say
	Will allow integration with Council objectives	Will not necessarily be integrated with partnership objectives
		Unable to address cross cutting issues easily
		Less efficient for grants advisers to manage than single GD Board.
		Less flexibility as funding pots will be smaller

Joint Working Group Preferred Option:

In the light of the objectives for the funding of the voluntary and community sector, set out in section 2, the Joint Working Group considers that option 1. is most likely to meet these objectives as it provides a strong focus on partnership working, can work at a strategic level and provides flexibility in use of the available funding.

Consultation Question:

11.1. Of the options for decision making listed above, which do you think is the best option and why? (please tick)	
Single Panel or Board	
A panel for each partnership	
A panel of cabinet members	
A departmental panel	
Comments	

12. Buying Services

The government is driving the move to buy more services from the voluntary sector and the Change Up initiative is designed to build capacity in the VCS as providers of services. For some types of service, a contract is the most appropriate means of securing delivery of a service. Locally, the KSO initiative is designed to build capacity in organisations in their sector to help them to provide more services under contract if they wish to.

As illustrated in table 4.1. column 4, buying or securing services by means of a contract is most appropriate where there is a specific service to be delivered and where there are a number of possible providers. The council currently directly buys a number of services from the sector, with 38 voluntary organisations delivering services under contract. Of these, 23 also receive a grant.

It is not proposed to change the current departmental arrangements for letting contracts to the voluntary sector, which are governed by the Council's Financial Regulations and Contract Standing Orders. However, it is proposed to review the current grants programme to see if some services should be provided under contract and the funding moved into the departmental budget. Similarly there may be some funding currently delivered under contract which may be more suitable for a grant or service level agreement.

It is proposed that the role of grants advisers should include liaison with Council Departments in developing their commissioning strategies, including those services that the council wishes to buy. They will also have a role in building capacity in the sector to take advantage of opportunities to provide services, for example in facilitating consortium bids or where a larger organisation wins a contract and sub contracts to smaller organisations within the sector. They will also work closely with partnership commissioning bodies e.g. Joint Commissioning Boards to ensure that the voluntary sector is well placed to take advantage of partnership funding.

13. Partnering Arrangements

A key part of the Council's strategy is to continue to invest in the infrastructure of the sector, ensuring that individual organisations have access to advice, information and training in order to build strong independent organisations, but also to ensure that the sector develops to meet new needs and fill gaps in provision.

Partnering arrangements are illustrated in table 4.1. column 4 and represent organisations in which the council and its partners are making a significant investment. A number of current grants fund longer term developmental or partnership work and might be termed "partnering arrangements" for instance, with Richmond CVS to provide second tier support. It is proposed to identify some longer term objectives for this funding which will be awarded on a three yearly basis, in order to give greater stability and assist in longer term planning.

Consultation Question:

13.1. What do you think should be the criteria for entering into a partnering arrangement?

Comments

14. Rent Subsidies

The council published its Voluntary Sector Property Strategy in November 2005 and made a commitment to a more transparent system for the allocation of LBRuT rent subsidies, based on the council's priorities and to work more closely with the sector in exploring opportunities for community use of property.

Rent subsidies to 30 voluntary sector organisations for 2006/07 currently total £749,229. Eight of these organisations receive only a rent subsidy, awarded on an annual basis. Rent subsidies form part of the core funding needs of these organisations and therefore will be considered alongside the main grant programme, with notification of rent subsidy being sent at the same time as award of grant notifications.

15. Transitional arrangements

The Council is anxious to keep the costs of administration and management of the Grant programme as low as possible, compatible with meeting its need for adequate governance and monitoring arrangements. Whilst the role for grant advisers is expanded in terms of liaison and working with a wider range of partners in order to achieve a more integrated system of funding, it is also expected that the move to more three yearly funding arrangements should reduce the number of applications and assessments being dealt with each year.

Depending on the outcome of consultation and the speed with which a decision can be made on funding arrangements, it is likely that some transitional arrangements may

need to come into effect for the reassessment of funding. For instance, larger grants could be reassessed in the first year, with the remainder in the following year, or a rolling programme could be agreed for each service area, for instance, children and young people, older people, culture, etc.

Consultation Question:

15.1. In thinking about possible transitional arrangements, what are the most important factors to take into consideration?
Comments

16. Way Forward

The timetable for the funding review is as follows:

Consultation on Funding Strategy	March-April 2007
Consultation on Priorities	April-May 2007
Review of Compact	January – May 2007
Review of KSOs	March-April 2007
Agreement on Strategy	May-June 2007
Agreement on Funding Priorities	June-July 2007
Agreement on transitional arrangements	June 2007
Establishment of Commissioning Bodies and implementation	June-Dec 2007

Consultation Question:

16.1. If there are any general comments or queries you would like to raise about the proposals in this paper which have not already been covered please make your comments here

Your name _____

The name of your organisation _____

Thank you for your comments.

**VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY GROUPS INVOLVEMENT IN PARTNERSHIP
ARRANGEMENTS**

LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Ethnic Minority Advocacy Group
Richmond upon Thames Council for Voluntary Service
Inter Faith Forum

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Ethnic Minority Advocacy Group
Richmond Victim Support
Richmond Council for Voluntary Service

Sub Groups:

Community and Police Partnership

35-40 local community representatives

Domestic Abuse Forum

Victim Support
Age Concern
ASCA
EMAG
Welcare
Relate
Refuge
Asian Women's centre
RCAB
Mortlake Community Association
Richmond Youth Partnership
Everyman Project
Barnes Community Association

RACE EQUALITY PARTNERSHIP

Ethnic Minorities Advocacy Group
Vietnamese Organisation
Kingston Race Equality Council
South West London Refugee Forum
BME Carers: Richmond MENCAP
Richmond Council for Voluntary Service
Citizen's Advice Bureau
LB Richmond Black Worker's Support Group:

DISABILITY EQUALITY ACCESS PARTNERSHIP

Richmond AID
Richmond CVS
Richmond Disability Forum/Disability Resource Team
VISOR
Richmond Mind
Richmond Mencap
Project for Children with Special Needs
Richmond Carers
RUILS
Staff Disability Action Group
Integrated Neurological Services
Voluntary Sector Community Group
Crossroads

CHILDREN'S EXECUTIVE GROUP

Richmond Council for Voluntary Service

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLES STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Richmond Council for Voluntary Service
Richmond Youth Partnership
Three Wings Trust
The Bridge
Young Carers
National Autistic Society
SOSSEN
Phab
Metoo & Co
Crossroads

LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD

Richmond Council for Voluntary Service

Sub Group – Make a positive Contribution

Richmond Council for Voluntary Service (Chair)

Childrens Centre Partnership Boards (9)

Richmond Childminding Group
RCVS
Castelnau Community Association
Mortlake Community Association
Welcare
Homestart
Crossroads
Three Wings Trust
The Cambrian Centre

ADULTS STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Richmond Council for Voluntary Service
User/ Carer Partnership
Richmond Carers Centre

Older People Joint Commissioning Board

Age Concern
User/Carer Partnership

Long Term Conditions and Disabilities Joint Commissioning Board

RAID
User/Carer Partnership

Mental Health Joint Commissioning Board

Twining Enterprise
User/Carer Partnership

Users and Carers Partnership Group

Facilitated and supported by Richmond Council for Voluntary Service on behalf of RTPCT and LBRuT

People with Learning Disabilities

Richmond Homes for Life Trust
Richmond Council for Voluntary Service
Mencap
User/Carer Partnership

LOCAL AGENDA 21

Richmond Environmental Network
EcoAction

BETTER BOROUGH GROUP

London Wetland Centre
REIC
Environment Trust
RCVS
EcoAction
Ham and Petersham Association
Teddington Society
London Wildlife Trust
ZWIN
Orange Tree Theatre

RICHMOND LEARNING PARTNERSHIP

University of the Third Age