



House of Commons
Committee of Public Accounts

Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti- Deportation Campaigns

**Ninth Report of
Session 2003–04**

*Report, together with formal minutes,
oral and written evidence*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 2 February 2004*

HC 305
Incorporating HC 1229-i, Session 2002–03
Published on 2 March 2004
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£12.00

The Committee of Public Accounts

The Committee of Public Accounts is appointed by the House of Commons to examine "the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit" (Standing Order No 148).

Current membership

Mr Edward Leigh MP (*Conservative, Gainsborough*) (Chairman)
Mr Richard Allan MP (*Liberal Democrat, Sheffield Hallam*)
Mr Richard Bacon MP (*Conservative, South Norfolk*)
Jon Cruddas MP (*Labour, Dagenham*)
Mr Ian Davidson MP (*Labour, Glasgow Pollock*)
Rt Hon Frank Field MP (*Labour, Birkenhead*)
Mrs Cheryl Gillan MP (*Conservative, Chesham and Amersham*)
Mr Brian Jenkins MP (*Labour, Tamworth*)
Mr Nigel Jones MP (*Liberal Democrat, Cheltenham*)
Ms Ruth Kelly MP (*Labour, Bolton West*)
Mr George Osborne MP (*Conservative, Tatton*)
Jim Sheridan MP (*Labour, West Renfrewshire*)
Mr Siôn Simon MP (*Labour, Birmingham Erdington*)
Mr Gerry Steinberg MP (*Labour, City of Durham*)
Jon Trickett MP (*Labour, Hemsworth*)
Rt Hon Alan Williams MP (*Labour, Swansea West*)

The following were also members of the Committee during the period of this inquiry.

Mr Nick Gibb MP (*Conservative, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton*)
Mr David Rendel MP (*Liberal Democrat, Newbury*)

Powers

Powers of the Committee of Public Accounts are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 148. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/committee_of_public_accounts.cfm. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Session is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee is Nick Wright (Clerk), Christine Randall (Committee Assistant), Leslie Young (Committee Assistant), and Ronnie Jefferson (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk, Committee of Public Accounts, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 5708; the Committee's email address is pubaccom@parliament.uk.

Contents

| Report | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Summary | 3 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Conclusions and recommendations | 4 |
| 1 Lessons learned | 7 |
| 2 Managing risk | 9 |
| 3 Getting the best from reduced Lottery receipts | 10 |
| Formal minutes | 11 |
| Witnesses | 12 |
| List of written evidence | 12 |
| List of Reports from the Committee of Public Accounts Session 2003–04 | 13 |

Summary

Introduction

The Community Fund has provided funding of over £2.27 billion to the charitable and voluntary sector which is one of the good causes to benefit from the proceeds of the National Lottery. Grants of some £20 million have been made to asylum seeker and refugee organisations.¹

In July 2002 the Community Fund approved a second grant to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (NCADC) of £336,000 following a previous grant of £191,000 in 1998. Prior to any payment being made, Ministers asked the Community Fund to check the legality of the award, prompted by their concerns about some of the activities of the NCADC which might be considered to be political and doctrinaire. The Fund confirmed subsequently that NCADC were eligible to receive the grant but attached additional terms and conditions to the award. These required the organisation to take reasonable steps to ensure that its policies, activities and publications were not doctrinaire and to ensure that its campaigning and advisory work remained within the law.

On the basis of a Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General,² we took evidence from the Community Fund on weaknesses in the procedures it applied in deciding to award grant funding to the NCADC and the wider implications of these weaknesses for other grant awards. We focussed on lessons learned, managing risk and prioritising funding decisions in the light of declining lottery receipts.

1 C&AG's Report, *Community Fund: Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns* (HC 519, Session 2002–03), para 2

2 C&AG's Report, *Community Fund: Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns* (HC 519, Session 2002–03)

Conclusions and recommendations

- 1. If this Committee's earlier recommendations had been acted upon fully the issues surrounding the award of grant to the NCADC might not have arisen.** In 2001 we reported on grant assessment and monitoring procedures at the Community Fund and made a number of recommendations.³ More could have been done to implement them, particularly those on visiting projects and schemes and on assessing the achievements of grant recipients following the funding of their work.
- 2. The Fund have subsequently introduced a number of improvements to procedures and have accepted the recommendations made in the Comptroller and Auditor General's Report.** It now needs a clear action plan and timetable for their implementation and a robust system of performance monitoring to ensure its procedures are enforced.
- 3. The Community Fund needs to be more robust with grant recipients who breach the terms of their grant.** It needs an effective policy which contains appropriate sanctions including, for the worst cases, withdrawal of funding.
- 4. The Fund needs to make greater use of the expertise within its committee structure of independent members so that each application is subject to proper consideration and discussion by them.** Committee performance should be measured to monitor the rigour of the process and learn lessons, for example through feedback from members and analysis of the reasons for rejecting the advice offered by officials.
- 5. The Fund should widen its definition of risk, and consider the context within which applicants operate, to avoid funding activities that could be considered political and doctrinaire.** The Community Fund's risk profiling of the NCADC as a grant applicant was inadequate and focussed too narrowly on financial risk. Risk profiling also needs to be reviewed over the period of the grant funding through regular monitoring.
- 6. The Fund should have known how far grant funding would be used to assist the settlement and integration support of asylum seekers, and how far to challenge deportation orders.** As part of their assessment of risk, the Fund needs to be aware of proposals to fund sensitive areas of expenditure.
- 7. The Community Fund should be more consistent with grant recipients which are not subject to the monitoring regime applied to registered charities by the Charity Commissioners.** It currently applies more rigorous grant approval procedures to non-charitable applicants, but subjects them to the same level of monitoring as registered charities following an award of grant. But non-charitable bodies are often small, unsophisticated and unregulated, and as such are potentially more susceptible to the misuse of funds.

3 4th Report from the Committee of Public Accounts, *Grants made by the National Lottery Charities Board* (HC 168, Session 2000–01)

8. **Faced with decreasing Lottery receipts, the Community Fund will have to prioritise its funding decisions more effectively than in the past.** The Fund's policy is to provide funding for a maximum of six years even though it recognises that some projects may not be sustainable when their funding ceases. Where grants are designed to have a lasting effect, the Community Fund needs an explicit strategy to ensure applicants fully address questions of sustainability.

1 Lessons learned

1. In 1999 and in 2002, the Community Fund made two grants to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (NCADC) of £191,516 and £336,261 respectively. The stated aim of the NCADC is to provide practical help and advice to those appealing against deportation from the United Kingdom.⁴ The Community Fund subsequently attached additional terms and conditions to their second grant because of concerns about the activities of the NCADC, and a report by the Comptroller and Auditor General identified weaknesses in the procedures operated by the Fund.⁵ The Fund acknowledged that their grant procedures exemplified in their awards to NCADC were deficient, lacked robustness and that mistakes had been made.⁶ They cited the pressure to be seen to be distributing their large lottery receipts as quickly as possible as the reason for poor grant monitoring.⁷

2. Weaknesses were evident in all areas of the Fund's processes that operated at the time from grant application, assessment and approval, through to grant monitoring and end of grant review. The Fund said they had accepted all the recommendations made in the Comptroller and Auditor General's Report and assured us that improvements had already been implemented or were very close to being so.⁸ We asked why the recommendations on risk assessment and grant monitoring in our previous Report⁹ on the activities of the Community Fund had not been fully implemented.¹⁰ The Fund argued that the recommendations made had not been ignored but agreed that the full breadth of the issues had not been recognised.¹¹

3. Concern about announcements made by the NCADC on their website was one reason why the Fund reviewed their grant.¹² Some of the website content of the NCADC was controversial, raising doubts as to the organisation's suitability to continue to receive Lottery funding.¹³ The Community Fund acknowledged that a website review should have been a part of its initial assessment procedures of the NCADC applications.¹⁴ The Fund introduced additional terms and conditions to address the issue of controversial or inappropriate website usage and monitored adherence to these, but the NCADC continued to place material on its website that was unacceptable.¹⁵ The Community Fund thought it

4 C&AG's Report, paras 4–5

5 *ibid*, para 12

6 Q 2

7 Q 11

8 Q 103

9 4th Report from the Committee of Public Accounts, *Grants made by the National Lottery Charities Board* (HC 168, Session 2000–01), paras 38–40

10 Qq 99–102

11 Q 101

12 C&AG's Report, para 1.10

13 Qq 1–3

14 Qq 139–144

15 Qq 86–89, 147–149

had asked the NCADC to remove unsuitable comments from its website on at least two occasions.¹⁶

4. The terms and conditions of grant award included grant recovery in response to breach of conditions at the discretion of the Community Fund. It had not yet exercised this sanction and the Accounting Officer felt that he would be extremely reluctant to use under any circumstances.¹⁷ In this instance, despite the continuing abuse of grant conditions and reminders being issued by the staff of the Fund, the Accounting Officer could not tell us at what point he would consider grant withdrawal.¹⁸

5. Grant committees decide which applications to fund on the basis of initial recommendations by grant officers.¹⁹ The failure of the then England Committee to challenge the second grant award to the NCADC was recognised by the Fund as a weakness in their procedures.²⁰ Following the Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, the Community Fund believed the diverse and independent committee representation now being encouraged was enabling the Fund to take better decisions.²¹

6. The Community Fund told us that its committees are now challenging grant proposals much more actively,²² and giving consideration to each application which had not been explicitly required in the past.²³ As a result the rejection rate had increased from around 6% at the time of the second grant to the NCADC in June 2002 to 25% during the past year of operation of the strategic grants committee.²⁴

16 Q 153

17 Qq 90–92, 150

18 Q 151

19 C&AG's Report, paras 2.19–2.22

20 Qq 4–7

21 Qq 167–169

22 Qq 10, 125–132

23 Q 131

24 Qq 125–132; The strategic grants committee replaced the England grants committee which awarded the original grants to the NCADC

2 Managing risk

7. The Community Fund's risk profiling procedures at the time of the NCADC grant awards were inadequate, awarding the organisation the lowest available risk weighting.²⁵ The Fund accepted that their narrow focus on the financial viability of the project overlooked a number of the basic requirements of good risk management. The Fund often had to fund high risk projects because of its responsibility to ensure funds reached across society including those sections of the community in greatest need.²⁶ It had strengthened its risk assessment procedures but had little apparent understanding of the impact of its grant funding within the areas assessed as high risk. In this case it was not aware of the proportion of asylum seeker funding that was used for settlement and integration support, as opposed to the proportion that went towards funding the costs of challenging deportation orders.²⁷

8. The low risk assessment originally awarded to the NCADC grant application resulted in cursory review procedures being exercised by the Community Fund during the lifetime of the first grant.²⁸ The NCADC had not tried to hide any aspect of its work and had sent the Fund copies of newsletters and drawn attention to its website, but because of a lack of awareness of the risk being run such material was never scrutinised.²⁹ The Fund now employs additional assessment procedures for non-charitable bodies such as the NCADC as a result of this case.³⁰ These bodies are however subject to the same in-grant monitoring procedures as registered charities, which appears not to allow for the unsophisticated nature of many non-charitable bodies, or the additional level of supervision and control exercised by the Charity Commission.³¹

25 Q 9

26 Qq 29–30

27 Qq 64–68

28 Q 11

29 Qq 113–116

30 Q 41

31 Qq 40–55

3 Getting the best from reduced Lottery receipts

9. The level of lottery receipts available to the Community Fund for distribution is decreasing, falling from £450 million in 1999/2000 to £250 million in the current year.³² The fall had already added pressure to make more effective funding decisions with an increasing number of applications failing and required the Fund to manage demand by being clearer with applicants about its priorities.³³

10. The Fund allows a maximum of two grants to a particular body for a total of 6 years funding. It recognised that at the end of this six year funding period some of those funded would not be able to survive.³⁴ From January 2004, it proposed to taper grants so that they would decline in value in each year of the second three year period to encourage applicants to find alternative funding and be less reliant on the Lottery.³⁵

11. To increase their effectiveness, the Community Fund are moving to an Investor model approach of grant funding. This partnership model will entail working more closely with successful grant applicants to help them achieve and monitor the outcomes of their own and the lottery's investment in their projects. Instead of a hands-off approach, this approach will give increased emphasis to outcomes, but will also present challenges for the Community Fund particularly in determining appropriate measures to monitor these outcomes.³⁶ It will entail more work, during the life of funding, by Community Fund staff, with an expectation that visits will be made to at least half of all large grants over £60,000. The lack of monitoring of the NCADC grant and failure to make any visit was caused in large part by the amount of grant officer time devoted to application assessments. The Community Fund will address this imbalance by redeploying staff who were previously engaged solely in making these assessments.³⁷

32 Qq 164–165

33 Qq 168–169

34 Qq 12, 58–60

35 Qq 59, 107–112

36 Qq 31–32

37 Qq 11, 57

Formal minutes

Monday 2 February 2004

Members present:

Mr Edward Leigh, in the Chair

Mr Richard Allan
Mr Richard Bacon
Jon Cruddas
Mr Ian Davidson

Mr Frank Field
Mr Brian Jenkins
Mr Gerry Steinberg
Jon Trickett

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 11 read and agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations read and agreed to.

Summary read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Ninth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select Committees (Reports)) be applied to the Report.

Adjourned until Wednesday 4 February at 3.30 pm

Witnesses

Monday 27 October 2003

Page

Mr Richard Buxton, Chief Executive, Community Fund, and **Mr Richard Martineau**, former Chairman, England Grants Committee

Ev 1

List of written evidence

Community Fund

Ev 16

List of Reports from the Committee of Public Accounts Session 2003–04

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------|
| First Report | Tackling fraud against the Inland Revenue | HC 62 |
| Second Report | The new electricity trading arrangements in England and Wales | HC 63 |
| Third Report | The Sheep Annual Premium Scheme | HC 64 |
| Fourth Report | Improving service delivery: the Forensic Science Service | HC 137 |
| Fifth Report | Warm Front: helping to combat fuel poverty | HC 206 |
| Sixth Report | Department of Trade and Industry: Regional Grants in England | HC 207 |
| Seventh Report | Progress on 15 major capital projects funded by Arts Council England | HC 253 |
| Eighth Report | The English national stadium project at Wembley | HC 254 |
| Ninth Report | Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns | HC 305 |

The reference number of the Treasury Minute to each Report will be printed in brackets after the HC printing number

Oral evidence

Taken before the Committee of Public Accounts

on Monday 27 October 2003

Members present:

Mr Edward Leigh, in the Chair

Mr Richard Bacon
Jon Cruddas
Mr Frank Field

Mr David Rendel
Mr Gerry Steinberg
Mr Alan Williams

Sir John Bourn, Comptroller and Auditor General, and **Mr Chris Bedford**, National Audit Office, further examined.

Mr Rob Molan, Second Treasury Officer of Accounts, HM Treasury, further examined.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL:

Community Fund: Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns (HC 519)

Witnesses: **Mr Richard Buxton**, Chief Executive, Community Fund, and **Mr Richard Martineau**, former Chairman, England Grants Committee, examined.

Q1 Chairman: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Committee of Public Accounts. This afternoon we are looking at the Comptroller and Auditor General's Report on the Review of grants made to the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns. We welcome Mr Richard Buxton, who is the Chief Executive of the Community Fund, and Mr Richard Martineau, former Chairman of the England Grants Committee at the Community Fund. Perhaps, Mr Buxton, I could ask a general question of you. The relevant passages in the Comptroller and Auditor General's Report can be found on pages 9 to 10, paragraphs 2.5 to 2.11. If we are looking at the National Coalition for Anti-Deportation Campaigns, as you know there was some considerable publicity at the time, there were allegations that this was clearly a political organisation, and I think at one stage it referred to the Home Secretary as a "fascist dictator", so it clearly had strong views. What we would like to know from you, Mr Buxton, is why your assessment procedures paid so little attention to the wider activities of this organisation?

Mr Buxton: Thank you, Chairman. I think it is important to recognise that probably 95% of the work of this organisation was not something that most people would regard as directly political, it was about helping individuals who were threatened with deportation to understand what was going to be happening to them and to enable them to exercise their rights to petition the Home Secretary. Therefore, a very substantial proportion of what they were doing was actually very worthwhile and the type of project that, amongst a wide range of other projects, can be funded by the Community Fund. Clearly there was a case that some of the work that they were doing, a limited a proportion of the work that they were doing, went outside the

boundaries of what the Community Fund ought to be funding. I think we recognised that our processes in operation at the time were not sufficiently robust enough to pick up the fact that a proportion of the work that this organisation was doing meant that certainly we should not be funding that work that they were doing.

Q2 Chairman: What you are saying to this Committee, which is fair enough, is "we made a mistake, our processes were not sufficiently robust"?

Mr Buxton: I think that is absolutely right.

Q3 Chairman: You accept that at least in part its work was that of an overtly political organisation which should not have been funded from the Lottery?

Mr Buxton: Absolutely. As a result, we put in place some additional terms and conditions for the grant which now prevent the organisation from doing those things which cross the boundary of political and doctrinaire activity.

Q4 Chairman: Can I ask you, Mr Martineau, about the role of your committee. The relevant paragraphs are 2.21, 2.22 and 2.24 on pages 12 to 13. You can see there, particularly in paragraph 2.21, looking on page 12 now: "There was no discussion or questioning of the second grant award to the NCADC by the Committee that approved the grant award." What is the purpose of your committee if you did not spot this at the time?

Mr Martineau: This particular application within the portfolio—we were of course looking at a whole range of grants that day—was treated in the normal way. That is, I introduced it to the committee, the name of the charity or organisation, the amount of money it was looking for, and asked the grant officer

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

to highlight any particular points that he thought should be highlighted. I should say that the papers, the portfolio itself, always went out a week or ten days beforehand so all members had time to study them in detail. Having asked for any comments I think we had two, one was somebody said they thought it was an excellent grant and left it at that and a professor of geography, a world renowned expert in population, did talk about migration of refugees, where they came from and went to, but nobody raised the specific question of—

Q5 Chairman: What then is the role of your committee if you did not spot this in time? Surely the role of your committee is precisely to spot this sort of gaping hole in front of the Community Fund, is it not?

Mr Martineau: We were unaware of the gaping hole at the time, it was not mentioned in any paper.

Q6 Chairman: Who draws up your papers? Are you saying that it is the fault of the Community Fund?

Mr Martineau: We are back to the fact that there was a fault, our procedures were at fault, and it was not there, so—

Q7 Chairman: Your people just were not told?

Mr Martineau: No.

Q8 Chairman: We are back to Mr Buxton, I am afraid.

Mr Buxton: Thank you.

Q9 Chairman: If we now look on page 14, paragraph 2.36, you will see there that the first grant award to the NCADC was awarded the lowest risk weighting out of a range of three. How could that be?

Mr Buxton: Because at the time when we made the first grant award, which was in 1999, the risk weighting was totally determined by what we regarded as the financial risk of the project. If it was a very small organisation getting a very large grant, if it was an organisation that had had particular problems handling money in the past, then those sort of factors led it to be given a high risk weighting. As I say, at the time the risk weighting was solely in terms of the financial risk of failure of the project rather than taking account of the wider risks, including the reputational risk issues.

Q10 Chairman: Now you look at this, do you?

Mr Buxton: We have completely changed our risk assessment and we now allow a high risk weighting to be given for any one of a range of factors and this is now thoroughly debated during the course of the committee meetings.

Q11 Chairman: If you look at the next paragraph you can see it says: “. . . there was no requirement under current Community Fund guidelines to visit the grant recipient body during the duration of the grant award.” I have to ask you why monitoring was so poor?

Mr Buxton: I think very much the emphasis of the Community Fund, certainly in the early days after the Community Fund was established, was very much on putting our staff resources into the assessment of the grant applications. I think the Community Fund, particularly in its first few years, was very much under pressure to be seen to be utilising the very substantial resources that it had been given and seen to be making grants quickly. I think grant management in the early years of the Community Fund very much took a back seat role, it simply was not something that was given a high priority. We are changing that now but obviously we have to maintain a balance. Obviously we try to keep within relatively modest resources and we have to balance the staff resources that we put into grant assessment as against the staff resources that we put into grant management. We have shifted the balance now but at the time the issue was that we were not putting a particularly solid volume of resources into grant management.

Chairman: What lessons have you learned from this episode? What assurances can you give the Committee that something like this will not happen again and Lottery money will not go to overtly political organisations but will go to that which the Lottery money should go, namely good causes?

Q12 Mr Field: Will there be a third application successfully submitted?

Mr Buxton: The Community Fund's current policy is that we do not fund the same project for more than two three year tranches, so the simple answer to that is for the same project, no. In terms of what have we learned, I think the most important thing, Chairman, is that we have now put in place very clear guidelines on what constitutes political and doctrinaire activity. Of course, there is still a degree of subjectivity in those guidelines, I do not think there can be an absolute definition of what constitutes political and doctrinaire activity, but we have much clearer guidelines that are operated by our staff. That does mean that grant applications are scrutinised much more thoroughly. We check websites much more thoroughly. We have changed our end of grant monitoring procedures. There is a whole series of changes that we have put in place as a result of this to ensure that Lottery money actually goes for the purposes for which it was intended.

Chairman: Thank you very much.

Q13 Mr Bacon: If you go on to the internet and type in “risk management” you will very quickly find all kinds of risks that you encounter in a project. I remember when Mr Gershon was talking about risk, he was talking about construction risk, capital risk, every kind of risk under the sun. How could you draw up a set of assessment criteria that in the first place were so narrow that the only thing they looked at was the financial viability of the project? Why would that be the only criterion?

Mr Buxton: That was not the only criterion for the assessment of the project, that was the criterion for the assessment of the risk weighting attached to the project.

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Q14 Mr Bacon: I am asking you about the risk weighting. How could you come up with a risk weighting based on one criterion when everyone knows that there are loads of risks and if you go to buy a paperback on project management and look at the chapter under “risk” there will be loads of things that it says you should think about? How can you ignore what is so obviously commonsense?

Mr Buxton: At the Community Fund we, for example, have been working with the Office of Government Commerce to do a risk assessment on a new project that we have been working on, but I think—

Q15 Mr Bacon: I am asking about the original criteria.

Mr Buxton: Absolutely. The original criteria did not encompass a sufficiently broad definition of risk. The only thing that I can say in defence of that, in a sense, is that at that time a great many other public sector organisations also did not take into account a sufficiently broad definition of risk.

Q16 Mr Bacon: “At that time” being?

Mr Buxton: Certainly at that time in 1999 and clearly when we came to make the second grant in 2002. At that time we also failed to have a sufficiently broad assessment of what risk was.

Q17 Mr Bacon: Who wrote the policies and procedures that were not sufficiently robust?

Mr Buxton: They were written internally by staff of the Community Fund.

Q18 Mr Bacon: They were. The Community Fund has an operating budget of £27 million per annum, which is just under 10% of the share of the Lottery proceeds.

Mr Buxton: That is right.

Q19 Mr Bacon: I take it the other 90.1% goes to good causes?

Mr Buxton: Absolutely.

Q20 Mr Bacon: Is nearly 10% not too high compared with well run charities, for example?

Mr Buxton: No. We have actually carried out a benchmarking exercise which benchmarked the Community Fund against a number of other major grant makers, including grant makers operating wholly in the private sector, including the Lloyds TSB Foundation and Comic Relief. The conclusion that we came to on the benchmarking exercise was that our costs were broadly in line with the type of cost levels which are actually found by other organisations making grants into a similar sector. One of the most important factors in making that comparison is the size of grant. If you are an organisation that is making a small number of very large grants you might expect to have a different cost profile from an organisation such as ours which is making quite a large number of grants of quite varied sizes. Our benchmarking exercise indicated that, broadly speaking, we were in line, particularly taking into account the wider brief that the Secretary

of State expects us to play, for example, in developing work in communities that perhaps have not had their fair share of access.

Q21 Mr Bacon: On page six the specified beneficiary groups of the Community Fund are listed as per the Strategic Plan for 2002–07. Who decided who those specified beneficiary groups would be? Was that you, the Secretary of State or both of you in conjunction?

Mr Buxton: It was decided by ourselves subject to the approval of the Secretary of State and it followed the major consultation exercise.

Q22 Mr Bacon: At paragraph 1.11 it talks about the style of campaigning and that there were extracts from the website and newsletters causing concern. Could you give us some examples of the statements that were being made causing you concern?

Mr Buxton: I cannot give you the details of those. I think your Chairman alluded to one of them.

Q23 Mr Bacon: You cannot give me any details of them? I have not found any details in the Report. I usually read the Report before these hearings, I do not always talk to the Chairman before. It says at paragraph 1.10: “. . . the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and the Home Secretary issued a joint statement asking the Community Fund to check the legality of the grant award.”

Mr Buxton: Absolutely.

Q24 Mr Bacon: “They had a number of concerns over statements made on the website . . .”

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q25 Mr Bacon: Does that mean you have come here to talk about this Report and you cannot tell me what statements were causing concern?

Mr Buxton: I can give you a rough indication. I cannot quote you word for word.

Q26 Mr Bacon: It does not have to be verbatim, a rough idea.

Mr Buxton: A rough indication. They were making statements that in principle the deportation of any asylum seeker was always wrong. They were making certain personal comments about the Home Secretary and the Home Secretary’s views. They were making comments about issues relating to the Sangatte refugee centre. I think those were three of the areas broadly speaking, I just cannot give you the absolute word for word quote.

Q27 Mr Bacon: When you get an organisation applying called the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns, it is plain that immigration and asylum and deportation are politically controversial issues on which there will be a wide range of views. It is obvious from the title of the organisation that it may cause controversy from whatever political standpoint. Did that not immediately set alarm bells ringing that you would have to have a closer look at the political context?

Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: I think that when we considered the application in 2002 this was in the context of an organisation that we had been funding since 1999 and since 1999 we had never had a single incident or complaint or issues raised with us by anybody, by any member of the public, by any government department, by any Member of Parliament, about any of the work of the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns. On that basis, although the name clearly indicates that there is something controversial here, our own experience of the organisation and their work was not such that it actually meant that we considered there was a high risk. That was a mistake. I fully accept that was a mistake.

Q28 Mr Bacon: I would like to ask about the enhanced risk profiling. It talks about this on page four and says: "The Community Fund should ensure that enhanced risk profiling is also used to determine which grants are subject to in-grant monitoring visits and enhanced checking . . ." It is rather jargonese but I understand this means if you have got a particularly risky project then you subject it to more monitoring.

Mr Buxton: Absolutely.

Q29 Mr Bacon: Does anyone in your organisation ever say if you have got a really high risk project maybe you should not be funding it?

Mr Buxton: That is a decision that is taken by the committee at the time of the application when clearly the riskiness of the project is one of the factors that is taken into account.

Q30 Mr Bacon: That is like saying, and it is repeated on page 15 under "recommendation" at the top and also in paragraph 2.40 where it says at the bottom, "More fundamental is that any assessment visit should be consistent with in-grant monitoring visits and set within the context of recommendations made in respect of the need to review the risk profiling that currently informs the assessment, review and award criteria", which is not the clearest prose I have ever heard. I assume that this also means that the purpose of the monitoring is to check on the riskiness of an individual project and where you have a highly risky project you put more monitoring in place. If it is a highly risky project, why are you funding it?

Mr Buxton: Because we have a responsibility to actually make sure that our funding reaches right across society, including those sections of the community in greatest need. Often some of the organisations coming to us are going to present significant risks and yet if that project works, that project is going to deliver a significant benefit. What we have to do when making an assessment of the project is to trade off the risks against the potential benefits.

Q31 Mr Bacon: Thank you very much. Can you tell me about the investor model, what on earth does that mean?

Mr Buxton: What it means is that rather than simply saying we are going to fund a project, what we want to do is fund the difference that the project is going to make. So it is not enough to build a village hall, the building itself is only an intermediate stage in making a difference to the village, what we want to know is how is the village hall going to make a difference to the lives of the people in the village, what difference is it going to make. What the investor approach says is first of all we care about the difference that the project is going to make and, secondly, unless the project succeeds we fail. We only succeed if the projects we fund succeed. Simply getting rid of the funds is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end, and the end is actually making some form of social difference.

Q32 Mr Bacon: If you are an investment management firm you have investments and you can easily measure what returns you are going to get, but you cannot do that in the same way, can you?

Mr Buxton: No, you cannot. You have to define what you expect as the social outcome. If funding the village hall is going to mean that there is going to be somewhere for the parent and toddler group to meet and that is going to make it easier for some of the people in that community to gain skills, we can actually measure the difference that is going to make to the lives of that community. It requires a different way of measuring it but I think the underlying concept is the same.

Q33 Mr Bacon: So basically it is another word for additionality?

Mr Buxton: It is additionality in the sense of adding value. It is about making a difference.

Q34 Mr Rendel: Paragraph 1.1 makes it clear that the Community Fund was established to distribute money to charities and the graph underneath that rather widens it to charities and benevolent and philanthropic bodies. First of all, what is the difference?

Mr Buxton: A charity is anything which actually complies with the Charity Commission registration procedures and is registered. For us it is very easy: if you are a charity, you have a charity number. There are lots of organisations out there, for example the tenants and residents' association on a council housing estate, that would not be a registered charity but exist to actually meet the needs of people living in that particular community and they have not gone through the formal hurdles of charitable registration. Anything that has a broadly humanitarian purpose and is not exclusively for the benefit of its members would fall within this philanthropic and benevolent category which is something that Parliament clearly chose to put in it to differentiate it from a charity.

Q35 Mr Rendel: Is it reasonable to suppose that the bodies that are philanthropic or benevolent bodies but are not charities, if they chose to apply, would nevertheless fulfil the requirements of the Charity Commission?

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: No. We have taken legal advice on this issue. Although we would expect any organisation that is philanthropic and benevolent to have broadly charitable objectives, it is possible that they might be engaging in some sorts of activities which at the moment would exclude them from registration as a charity.

Q36 Mr Rendel: What sort of activities?

Mr Buxton: Such as campaigning activities.

Q37 Mr Rendel: You are happy to give money to bodies where there are campaigning activities?

Mr Buxton: We are happy to give money to bodies where the campaigning is part of the overall work that the organisation does. We would not give money to organisations that were solely, for example, campaigning for a change in the law.

Q38 Mr Rendel: Would you normally expect that the money would be given only on condition that it is not used for campaigning?

Mr Buxton: Not used, in a sense, for party political campaigning. For example, if an organisation came to us to do with the deaf and wanted a change in policies to do with the issuance of hearing aids, that might well be something that it was considered perfectly reasonable for us to fund.

Q39 Mr Rendel: The NCADC is not a charity, I understand.

Mr Buxton: It is not a charity.

Q40 Mr Rendel: Do you use any particular tests for those bodies to which you give grants which are non-charities as compared to those which are charities?

Mr Buxton: Yes. To some extent those tests have only been introduced since the award of the grant to the NCADC. We now have a series of tests that our grant assessment officers, who assess each grant application, are required to go through where the organisation is not a registered charity. For us it is a much more cumbersome process than where the organisation is a registered charity.

Q41 Mr Rendel: Those tests were introduced as a result of this case?

Mr Buxton: Those were introduced as a result of this case.

Q42 Mr Rendel: Not talking about the grant application, but before you found this case and made these changes, did you do any particular tests during or after the period of grant for those bodies which were not charities?

Mr Buxton: What we did was simply to look at the objects of the organisation and if the objects of the organisation were broadly humanitarian then that was something which enabled the organisation to pass the eligibility test and to be eligible for funding.

Q43 Mr Rendel: That is during the grant application?

Mr Buxton: That is during the grant application, yes.

Q44 Mr Rendel: Once the grant had been given were there any monitoring tests done specifically?

Mr Buxton: No, at that stage there were no further monitoring tests done.

Q45 Mr Rendel: Are you now doing different monitoring tests for non-charity bodies?

Mr Buxton: We have different tests as regards the application stage and, in addition, we do monitoring of websites, but we are not actually doing any additional in-grant monitoring checks, no.

Q46 Mr Rendel: So, for example, having given a grant to a body on the grounds that its campaigning is only non-party political, you are not afterwards checking whether it has become party political?

Mr Buxton: Only as part of the normal monitoring processes that every grant applicant goes through. Every grant applicant goes through some form of in-grant monitoring process. The detail of that is not varied because it happens to be an organisation that is not a registered charity. The vast majority of organisations that we fund that are not registered charities are very small community groups. These are local tenants and residents' associations, associations of elderly people and so on, so by and large these are very small groups and are often the groups least likely to give us problems.

Mr Rendel: Who, as anyone sitting around this table knows, can very easily get into the hands of one political party. I would have thought there is a case to be made for saying they should be monitored. I do not say it happens in my party but I have seen it happen.

Mr Bacon: I am sure you have. We have.

Q47 Mr Rendel: Is there not a case for saying that this is just the sort of group that might fall under party political influence?

Mr Buxton: It is not our experience. If there is any evidence that this is an additional risk we would have to consider it, but at the moment I am not convinced.

Q48 Mr Rendel: It seems to me that there is a clear case to be made for setting up a different series of tests for those which are non-charities, if only because presumably the Charity Commission are doing tests for those which are charities but you are rather left on your own with those which are not charities.

Mr Buxton: I think that is where the difference in the grant assessment process is critical.

Q49 Mr Rendel: I am pleased to hear that as a result of this case you have brought in additional tests for non-charities but it also makes sense that you test before and during the grant, and indeed at the end of the grant, to check that it has been properly used.

Mr Buxton: I think what we do is to say where we think there is a significant risk today of the organisation being engaged in something that is potentially controversial then we will attach a higher level of monitoring to it, but if it is simply a tenants

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

and residents' association that happens not to be a registered charity then I think I would be reluctant to go down that route.

Q50 Mr Rendel: So you are not at present, even to the NCADC, I understand, giving further tests appropriate during and after the period of the grant?

Mr Buxton: With the NCADC we are monitoring their website every week to make sure that there is nothing that goes on there that is actually going to cause them to be in breach of their terms and conditions of grant.

Q51 Mr Rendel: So the website is being monitored but no other tests are being done?

Mr Buxton: The website these days is a pretty good indication of the type of communication work that an organisation is doing.

Q52 Mr Rendel: What proportion of your grants goes to non-charities?

Mr Buxton: I could not tell you that figure off the top of my head. I can do you a note, but I do not know the figure now.¹

Q53 Mr Rendel: I am interested that you did not seem to have spotted the difference between the two in the way that you should have, at least until this case came up. I am surprised you do not know what the proportion is.

Mr Buxton: We are in the business of funding charitable, philanthropic and benevolent organisations and in principle once we have funded them we would expect to be treating them in a broadly similar way. As I say, most of the non-charities are very small.

Q54 Mr Rendel: Charities do have another body which is looking at them and making sure that they are obeying the regulations and acting properly as charities and non-charities do not. I would have thought that you clearly should be paying more attention to them. There is no point in you repeating the job of the Charity Commission.

Mr Buxton: I have to say, in my experience we have had a number of high profile cases where charities have gone very badly wrong. I do not think the Charity Commission is in a position to be doing that sort of detailed monitoring of every one of the registered charities. I think we have to keep an eye on charities as much as we have to on the—

Q55 Mr Rendel: You are doing the Charity Commission's work for them?

Mr Buxton: No. We have a particular remit which is much, much narrower.

Q56 Mr Rendel: What percentage of the bodies to which you are giving grants are not visited either during or after the grant period?

Mr Buxton: That very much depends on the size of the grant. For the small organisations, the grants under £5,000, it is almost certain that the

organisation will not be visited during the life of the project or during the assessment process. There will almost certainly be a telephone assessment process and they will not be visited. A small number of visits will be done for audit purposes. For larger grants, we are in the position of changing—

Q57 Mr Rendel: What is a larger grant?

Mr Buxton: For a larger grant, say over £60,000, we would obviously be looking for a higher percentage. The intention is with the changes we are putting in place to our grant assessment and grant management systems, I would hope by some time next year we will be visiting at least half of all of the large grants either at assessment stage or during the life of the project. Ideally it would be good to visit all of the larger projects but at the moment we are not in a position to do that.

Q58 Mr Rendel: Finally, following up Mr Field's question about the possibility of a third grant, and paragraph 2.16, which shows the body has currently had limited income from other sources, how certain are you that this organisation will be able to continue when this current grant runs out?

Mr Buxton: I am not at all certain.²

Q59 Mr Rendel: Why did you give them the grant? I thought the whole point was you were not supposed to give them a grant until you were certain.

Mr Buxton: Not at all. There are lots of organisations that we fund where when the end of the six year funding period comes some of those organisations are not going to be able to survive beyond that point. This is a subject of quite considerable concern to us in general terms because obviously we are the number one largest single funder of the charitable and voluntary sector and the sector often raises with us the question of "What happens to us at the end of six years?" This is a debate that is going to have to continue. Should we, for example, be prepared to fund organisations beyond a six year funding period? What we have actually decided to do, and this will be implemented from January of next year, is any organisation that comes to us for a second grant period will get a tapering grant, in other words the grant will go down in size with each year of the second three year period, in order to force the organisation to be less reliant on us as a long-term funder. Nevertheless, this is a very serious issue because of our relationship with the voluntary community sector.

Q60 Mr Rendel: Paragraph 2.16 does say "... Community Fund support should have been questioned together with proposals for its continuing viability should Community Fund funding not be forthcoming. This issue appeared to be given only cursory consideration." Are you saying that you were not supposed to consider that at all, continuing viability?

¹ Ev 16–18

² Ev 16–18

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: When an organisation comes to us and they have been mainly dependent on our funding and they come to us at the end of the first three year period, clearly we have to be mindful that if we choose not to fund them then chances are the organisation will fold or go into a very reduced mode of operation. That is something that we need to be aware of. That is not the determining factor in the decision. It is perfectly possible that at the end of the three year period we would choose not to continue to fund an organisation. Clearly the committee would be inclined to be sympathetic to an organisation coming to us for a second three year funding period, that is why we now have the new policy coming in from January in the new year to taper the level of grant in the second three year funding period to reduce this issue about the dependence of organisations on us.

Q61 Chairman: Are they now being more polite about the Home Secretary?

Mr Buxton: I do not believe that they have made any negative comments since we began the period of intensive monitoring and additional conditions.

Q62 Mr Field: Your body does lots of important work, can I put on record our thanks to you for that. Can I, as somebody who in the 1979 Parliament when the first Private Member's Bill for the Lottery came forward helped sponsor it, so I am not anti-Lottery at all, say that in those early days I realised probably many more of my poorer constituents would be supporting the Lottery than my richer constituents. I wonder to what extent do you bear in mind how poorer people respond to this pattern of grants that you give in that one of the big political issues, as Richard said, for the whole country, but particularly in poorer areas, is the issue of illegal immigration? Here was an organisation which was clearly not supporting those who had a right to come and not, therefore, giving them grants to help them settle and get on and make their way in the new world but for people who were disputing the decision that they should not be here and, therefore, the organisation probably catered for a fairly large number of people who should not actually have been in the country at all. Knowing the views of poorer voters in Birkenhead, they were pretty appalled by your decision to give money to this organisation in the first place, money which they directly contribute to. To what extent does that ever influence your weeding out grants, that the people in the first place who give you money to give away would not much approve of the way you are spending it?

Mr Buxton: I think inevitably, given the breadth of funding that we are responsible for, for any one grant there are going to be some people in our society who are in favour of that grant and some people in our society who are not going to be in favour of the grant. We are required under the terms of our policy directions to make sure that our money is spread throughout the United Kingdom in geographic terms but also in terms of different sections of the community and, therefore, I think we have a responsibility to make sure that our grant

spending does actually reflect all sorts of different needs. If you look back at our pattern of spending since the Lottery came into being, less than 5% of our funding has gone in any way, shape or form to projects to do with asylum seekers; 95% has not. That money has been going to the elderly people, to children and young people, to other particular groups in our society. I think that, yes, this particular grant was controversial in some ways but the beneficiaries of this grant were often people who were in very great need, who were exercising a legal right that is built into our asylum system to petition the Home Secretary. You will be aware that a number of people who do petition the Home Secretary are subsequently given leave to remain.

Q63 Mr Field: Not very many.

Mr Buxton: No, but some of them are. This grant was actually helping those people to exercise their legal right. As long as the system exists to enable them to have that legal right to petition the Home Secretary and as long as these people could demonstrate that there was a genuine need, I think it was not inappropriate for a small proportion of Lottery funding to be given. Unfortunately, the way in which this grant was then presented in the national press was that it gave the overwhelming impression that a very high proportion of Community Fund money was being spent on these types of projects.

Q64 Mr Field: You said 5% of the budget was going to asylum seekers.

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q65 Mr Field: Can you give us a break down of the 5%, of the proportion that was going to help legitimate asylum seekers settle and prosper here and how much was going to the industry which has grown up helping people dispute the guardian of our borders?

Mr Buxton: I could not give you an exact figure. I suspect that if we did some detailed analysis we might be able to give you an approximation.³ I think a very large proportion—

Q66 Mr Field: Can I just say if we can have that analysis it would be very helpful. Do you not think it is revealing that you make a general defence that this is rather exceptional, much of the money is going to other sorts of projects, but you cannot actually give me that figure. This goes back to Richard's comments. To what extent have you got a hold on those most sensitive areas of your grant giving?

Mr Buxton: I think the vast majority of groups who work with asylum seekers are going to be working with people across the timescale, so they are going to be working with people who are relatively recently arrived in this country, they are going to be working with people who to some extent have been here a number of years, and one of the issues for us is at what point does a refugee community cease to be a

³ Ev 18

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

refugee community and be part of what one would regard as the normal wider community, is there a timescale for that?

Q67 Mr Field: Probably after your six year deadline.

Mr Buxton: Clearly there are a lot of groups that work right across the spectrum and having met a number of these groups, for example the Somali project in South-east London, they will be working with members of the Somali community who are immediately arrived all the way through to members of the Somali community who may have been here five or ten years and, therefore, it is actually quite difficult to pigeonhole the work of many of those types of organisations.

Q68 Mr Field: I think you are missing the point that I am trying to make, but maybe it is a form of defence. I am not trying to dispute that you should not be giving money to asylum seekers, nor am I saying it is not in their best interests and the host's best interests that we have got projects which integrate communities as well as possible and give them resources to make the most of their new lives here. What I am saying is that one of the most sensitive political issues in this country is the whole issue of asylum seekers and yet you cannot tell me how much of your money is actually going to those who are disputing the status of whether they are asylum seekers or not as opposed to other projects and that worries me. That leads me to my second point, and I did not follow Richard's points when he was talking about risk management, but if I was working in your organisation I would need general guidelines to help me look at things, should bells ring on this or should they not? I just wonder whether you can explain to me the sort of guidelines that you give to staff to look at projects which might give you the same embarrassment as this one. What are the main headlines of that message?

Mr Buxton: For example, is an organisation adopting a position on a particular issue which is expressed somehow in absolute terms? For example, in relation to asylum seekers, are they saying no asylum seeker should ever be deported or, if it was in education terms, no school exclusion is ever justified? We are now guiding our staff to be looking for expressions of language which are in fairly dogmatic terms which are not supported by evidence. We are asking our staff to make sure that they are looking for evidence that whatever the organisation is arguing they are doing it on a case by case basis, they are using the information that is available, they are able to demonstrate that there are external referees who are supporting their position. These are the types of tests that we now require our staff to apply.

Q69 Mr Field: One criterion on political for you would be somebody who has adopted an extreme position?

Mr Buxton: Absolutely.

Q70 Mr Field: If somebody came and said their project was that they condemned poverty outright, that would be an extremist position and you would not support it?

Mr Buxton: I do not think there is anybody in this room who would want to criticise people who were condemning poverty, but if they were expressing it in a way which said that by definition certain types of people are always going to be poor and, therefore, are always going to be entitled to benefits no matter what their circumstances, then perhaps there is something there that would seem to be dogmatic and would require us to look at further.

Q71 Mr Field: That might also be a great truth?

Mr Buxton: It might, but we should at least be asking the question.

Q72 Mr Steinberg: Most of the questions I want to ask have been covered. I think it was the Chairman, it might have been Mr Bacon, who asked you what was actually said originally on the website and you mentioned two or three things. Could you repeat them again?

Mr Buxton: Yes. I think that there were some comments about the Sangatte refugee centre and I think they were working to do some campaigning in relation to the Sangatte refugee centre.

Q73 Mr Steinberg: I think you said that they were very critical of Blunkett.

Mr Buxton: They made some direct comments about—

Q74 Mr Steinberg: What did they say?

Mr Buxton: What did they say?

Q75 Mr Steinberg: Yes.

Mr Buxton: I think they associated the word “fascist” with the Home Secretary. I do not think they directly called him a fascist but they used a sentence in which the words “fascist” and “Home Secretary” were linked.

Q76 Mr Steinberg: This was not picked up by yourselves clearly?

Mr Buxton: We did not do a website check. We did not find that until that was drawn to our attention. That was a failure.

Q77 Mr Steinberg: When was this drawn to your attention?

Mr Buxton: This was drawn to our attention initially—

Q78 Mr Steinberg: Before the second bid?

Mr Buxton: No. This was shortly after we had made the second grant.

Q79 Mr Steinberg: Because you did not visit the scheme, did you, after the first grant, even though you were invited to go? Have you visited it since?

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: I am sure we have visited it since, yes.

Q80 Mr Steinberg: You either know or you do not.

Mr Buxton: The answer is I could not tell you who and when but it has been visited.

Q81 Mr Steinberg: You did not think we were going to ask you that question today?

Mr Buxton: That is clearly one that I did not prepare for.

Q82 Mr Steinberg: I would have thought it was obvious.

Mr Buxton: With hindsight it is clearly an obvious question.

Q83 Mr Steinberg: I was going to ask, but I am not sure that I can now, what did they find when they went on the visit?

Mr Buxton: I am not sure that necessarily a visit would be that revealing of an organisation that has perhaps got an office, that is why we have been doing the website checks every week since we made the grant, because we think that is the way they communicate.

Q84 Mr Steinberg: They do not have an office?

Mr Buxton: They do have an office, yes.

Q85 Mr Williams: It sounded as if you said that they did not have an office.

Mr Buxton: No, visiting an organisation that has an office, you simply do not see—

Q86 Mr Steinberg: If you went into my office you could tell that I do not particularly support the Conservatives or the Liberals. What action have you taken to see that they do not repeat what they were putting out last time on the website?

Mr Buxton: As I say, we have been doing a weekly website check ever since as that is the main way in which organisations communicate. There have been one or two occasions when they have said one or two things in a newsletter produced on the website and we have immediately had a word with them and pointed out this was in breach of the draft conditions and they have withdrawn it.

Q87 Mr Steinberg: Funnily enough, I went on their website yesterday afternoon when I read the Report to see if there was anything untoward. The one thing that I pulled off was a note which says—I am not making any judgment on this but perhaps you would though—“Giving with one hand and taking away with the other—Blunkett style”, and then it goes on to say, “Up to 15,000 families with children who have applied for asylum before 2 October 2000 will be considered for amnesty and indefinite leave to remain. NCADC are more than happy for all those families who benefit. But, the bad news is David Blunkett intends to starve out of Britain any families who claimed asylum . . .”. Would you describe that as acceptable?

Mr Buxton: No. I think that probably crosses the line, to me.

Q88 Mr Steinberg: I would have thought so as well. Clearly you are not monitoring it very well, are you?

Mr Buxton: As I say, we do a weekly website check. I am very glad that you have drawn it to our attention and we will make sure that we take that up with them.

Q89 Mr Steinberg: Is that the point though? That is now on the website and I might disagree with you, I might think that is perfectly acceptable, but all I am saying is you say it is not.

Mr Buxton: I think that is emotive language which I would not support.

Q90 Mr Steinberg: It might be acceptable, it might not be acceptable, but you are saying it is not. The only time that you are taking any action is when this appears on the website and you warn them off. That seems to me to be a cockeyed way of doing things. They publish things on the website that could be libellous or slanderous, whatever the word is, and after they have made the statement you tell them they are naughty boys and you slap their hands. Why did you not put into the grant some sort of recovery where if they broke the conditions you reclaimed the grant?

Mr Buxton: We have exactly that condition in—

Q91 Mr Steinberg: Have you used it then?

Mr Buxton: We have not used it in this particular instance, no.

Q92 Mr Steinberg: Might you use it in this one?

Mr Buxton: It is something that I would do reluctantly on any grant, to withdraw the grant. Clearly, you are right, there comes a point when you cannot allow an organisation to continue to do things that are not acceptable. That is a judgment that I have to make.

Q93 Mr Steinberg: The one time that I do have to congratulate you for was when you actually ignored counsel’s advice and put some conditions in because if counsel had had their say and you had taken their advice you were going to allow it to continue as it was the first time, is that right?

Mr Buxton: That is right.

Q94 Mr Steinberg: I do congratulate you there, that you had the guts to say that the lawyers were wrong, and mostly they are, are they not? I have a daughter who is a lawyer and a son who is a barrister and more times than not they are wrong. You talked about village halls, not me, and the subject itself was clearly very delicate. Richard mentioned that, Frank mentioned it and David mentioned it. As politicians, perhaps we are in more of a position to regard what is politically sensitive than you may well be, I do not know, but if we go to our surgeries or look at our postbags, asylum is one of the most controversial issues you can get. It is quite clear that, I suspect, the majority of British people are not anti-asylum but anti those who are abusing the asylum system. It riles me very much, and did people at the time when they saw, for example, this organisation getting nigh on

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

£200,000 or whatever it was, and their own local organisations put in for a few quid and they do not get it. The point that I am coming to is in my constituency, which has not done very well out of the Community Fund, there is an organisation called Belmont Community Association who have put in for £200,000 and the application is next week. They have raised £200,000. I shall be watching very carefully to see how much they get. Would you like to write it down: the Belmont Community Association? As I say, I shall watch with great interest when that award is given. Mr Martineau, you have had a very easy time this afternoon and I was amazed that you got away with it when the Chairman said it did not seem to be your responsibility and went back to Mr Buxton. I would argue with the Chairman and say you have got away with it a little too easily because it might have been your responsibility. Presumably you, as a taxpayer—I do not know whether you play the Lottery or not—must know the feeling of the British people. Did you not smell a rat when it came in front of you?

Mr Martineau: No. I smell lots of rats now but when I read these papers, no, I did not smell a rat. The one thing that perhaps influenced me was it is called the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns and has been taken to be a national campaigning organisation but in the papers it was very clear that what they were running were individual campaigns for individual people who were subject to deportation orders. The figures they gave about those were quite impressive and, indeed, one of them had full parliamentary support and I believe even the Prime Minister supported. The campaigns consist of helping people to write to the Home Secretary and other bodies asking for their case to be reviewed.

Q95 Mr Steinberg: I am not trying to be rude, do not get me wrong, but looking at your CV you are a very busy man. Were you too busy to have a look at it?

Mr Martineau: No.

Q96 Mr Steinberg: Are you still the Chairman?

Mr Martineau: The actual England Committee has now been merged into another one. I still chair the Eastern Region Committee.

Q97 Mr Steinberg: Did you lose your job because of this?

Mr Martineau: No. Interestingly enough, the committee was already going to be dissolved before this grant was given. This was going to be the last meeting—it was the last meeting—of that committee.

Q98 Mr Steinberg: Okay. The National Audit Office and this Committee work extremely hard, particularly the National Audit Office, to ensure that public money is not wasted or abused, and the result of their work in particular, and our work in supporting them, I understand, and I am sure Sir

John will confirm this, is that they save the taxpayer an average £3 billion a year because of the work that they do.

Sir John Bourn: We save eight times the cost of funding the office each year, yes, which does mount up.

Q99 Mr Steinberg: The way that he does that is by making recommendations to this Committee and the Committee endorses his recommendations and we expect those organisations to implement the recommendations being made. Clearly when you read the Report there are organisations who take notice of what we say and there are organisations who ignore what we say and the organisations who ignore what we say tend to come backwards and forwards. In a previous report that this Committee made about the Lottery fund, we made certain recommendations and that was about four years ago.

Mr Buxton: Well before my time as Chief Executive.

Q100 Mr Steinberg: You are responsible whether it was done before your time or not.

Mr Buxton: I accept that.

Q101 Mr Steinberg: I am quite sure you read the report we made four years ago. We made three recommendations that were very, very important at the time: the need to improve weaknesses in risk assessment; that visits should be made to recipients; and there should be self-assessment reports. But your organisation ignored those recommendations. If you had not ignored those recommendations it is possible that you would not be sitting here this afternoon having to answer questions from ourselves because of the failure of your organisation to actually look at the situation you are in. Why were those recommendations ignored?

Mr Buxton: I do not think it is fair to say that they were ignored. On the issue of risk, at that time, going back and having reread the papers, what was identified then was not particularly about the reputational risk issues that confronted us in the NCADC situation, they were recommendations to do with other aspects of our risk assessment. In terms of the monitoring reports and so on, those changes were implemented. I think the changes were implemented but perhaps they were not implemented in a way which picked up the full breadth of the issues as thoroughly as all of us would now have wanted to have seen them, but they were not ignored.

Q102 Mr Steinberg: They were not put into being, were they, they were not implemented? You did not visit, I do not think there has been a self-assessment report, and certainly the need to improve weaknesses in risk assessment has only just been put in recently.

Mr Buxton: Self-assessment reports by the organisations are required, and were required and have been required for some time. In terms of the changes to the risk assessment, yes, we have only just put in the changes in relation to risk assessment with

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

regard to the reputational risk, but that was not something that had come out of the original NAO Report.

Q103 Mr Steinberg: The last question I want to ask you, and again the National Audit Office have produced an excellent Report, they have made a number of recommendations that I am quite certain this Committee is going to endorse if a final report is produced, is how far down the line have you gone to implementing the recommendations that have been made in this Report?

Mr Buxton: I think they are either all implemented or very close to being implemented.

Q104 Mr Williams: I see in paragraph 2.16 that when you first made your grant of £191,000 the body to which you gave the grant had non-Community Fund income of about £38,000. Did that lead you to think that it was a significant and substantial body?

Mr Buxton: Clearly at that stage the organisation was a relatively new organisation that had a relatively modest income. The first grant was £191,000 but that was spread over three years, so that is a grant of just over £60,000 a year, so although it was a significant grant it was a grant that was reasonable in relation to the organisation's other income.

Q105 Mr Williams: It says in that same paragraph, "While the NCADC was due to receive limited funding from other sources, its ability to continue in operation without Community Fund support should have been questioned together with proposals for its continuing viability should Community Fund funding not be forthcoming". You did not do that, did you?

Mr Buxton: No.

Q106 Mr Williams: Why not?

Mr Buxton: The Committee saw that here was a project which the reports they had indicated was a good project that was delivering good results. Yes, the organisation was relatively dependent on our funding but then so are a great many other organisations relatively dependent on our funding and the Committee decided that under those circumstances it was reasonable to continue funding.

Q107 Mr Williams: That is all well and good but you are still not answering the question. You agreed this Report and the wording says that while the organisation was due to receive limited funding from other sources, its ability to continue without your support "should", not "could", not "might", have been questioned together with proposals for its continuing viability if the funding was not forthcoming. Since you have signed up to the fact that that should have been done, why was it not done? Either it should or it should not.

Mr Buxton: My understanding of the general point that the National Audit Office is making is that when—

Q108 Mr Williams: No, no. The National Audit Office is not making this point. You and the National Audit Office are making this point. It is an agreed Report.

Mr Buxton: Absolutely. The general point is that when an organisation comes to us for a second tranche of funding we have to ask ourselves the question, "Is this organisation becoming over-dependent on the Community Fund funding? What would happen if the Community Fund did not continue to fund, and by giving a second tranche of funding are we actually damaging the organisation by making it over-reliant on the Community Fund funding?" That is the point that is being made here. It is a point I fully accept and that is why, with effect from April 2004, we have changed our policy to introduce tapering for second three-year grants whereby the amount of money we give the organisation will be reduced each year during the three-year grant period, which will force the organisation to be looking for other funding streams, thus reducing the potential risk of dependence. That is the recommendation that is being made at the end of 2.16 and it is one that obviously we have changed our policies to reflect.

Q109 Mr Williams: In column 289 of *Hansard* on 24 October last year a Member intervening in the debate pointed out that a representative of that organisation, the one to which you were giving the grant, on television said that the money was very welcome because "it would pay salaries this month". That does not sound very much like something that was secure and ongoing without continuing support from your organisation.

Mr Buxton: A large proportion of the organisations that we fund, if we did not fund them, at the end of the three-year grant period would find it difficult to continue. That is why we have fully accepted the recommendation that is being made by the National Audit Office. That is something that we need to give much more careful consideration to when an organisation comes to us for a second three-year grant. That is why we accept the recommendation.

Q110 Mr Williams: When you monitor can you be sure that you are providing money in order to support this basic activity of making representations on behalf of people wanting to appeal? How far do you check for cross-subsidy into other activities? How do you do it?

Mr Buxton: In the case of an organisation like this where we are funding the vast majority of their work, we need to make sure that we understand what they are doing as an organisation as a whole because it would be quite difficult to disentangle the bits that we are funding from the bits that somebody else is funding. The situation would be different if we were funding a small proportion of the organisation but in both cases what we look for is that the organisation itself has to provide a self-assessment, has to provide us with their evidence of what they are doing. We then have a look at that evidence and make sure that we have seen something which gives it some sort of validity. For example, if they are

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

saying that they are paying staff, then we would expect to see evidence that they have the appropriate payroll records. There are a number of basic checks that we can carry out.

Q111 Mr Williams: So when in their application they stated in the first case that they had an annual income of about £38,000, and in the second case an annual income of about £73,000, how did you validate that those figures were correct?

Mr Buxton: They would be telling us what their sources were for that income. In most cases my recollection is that that income was from other grant-making organisations. Then, as part of checking the financial health of the organisation, we can make checks with other bodies. It is our experience that in very few cases the organisations seek to deliberately mislead us in terms of their financial situation. We also, as a mandatory part of the assessment process, have a look at their bank statements, so we can see whether they are getting the money in.

Q112 Mr Williams: You say that in the case of many organisations their income in any case is derived from other grant organisations, so in this case were the £38,000 and the £73,000 a year also coming from other grant organisations?

Mr Buxton: Certainly my recollection is that at least part of that funding was coming from one of the Joseph Rowntree organisations.

Q113 Mr Williams: The NCADC drew attention to their website and also forwarded copies of its newsletters to you with their application. That sounds very open.

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q114 Mr Williams: Were they in fact typical? Did anyone read them?

Mr Buxton: They did not scrutinise them properly, no.

Q115 Mr Williams: With hindsight have you looked at them? I assume you have now checked the original copies they sent you against what you subsequently discovered. Were they fair and legitimate representations of the sorts of comments that were appearing normally on their website or did they send you some carefully filleted ones?

Mr Buxton: No. They sent us exactly the same material as on the website. As I say, when we checked the website and the newsletters what we found was that there were a small number (but nevertheless there were a number) of comments that went outside the boundaries that we should have found acceptable.

Q116 Mr Williams: But no-one thought to read them?

Mr Buxton: No, they were not read during the grant assessment process.

Q117 Jon Cruddas: How often do the grants committees meet?

Mr Martineau: This particular committee meet every other month.

Q118 Jon Cruddas: So six a year?

Mr Martineau: Six a year.

Q119 Jon Cruddas: How long do the meetings tend to go on for?

Mr Martineau: This particular committee had two functions in that it was made up of the chairs of all the English regional committees and it was the only time that they all got together. The morning is spent on the—

Q120 Jon Cruddas: It is an all-day meeting?

Mr Martineau: It is an all-day meeting. The morning is spent on the grant portfolio and the afternoon on policy, etc.

Q121 Jon Cruddas: How many of the applications go to the Grants Committee in a normal sort of meeting?

Mr Martineau: It varies a lot. The portfolio can be about 100 pages.

Mr Buxton: Forty or 50 applications.

Q122 Jon Cruddas: Per Grants Committee meeting?

Mr Buxton: That would be a reasonable number for a committee.

Q123 Jon Cruddas: So does the committee only deal with controversial applications?

Mr Buxton: No. We have a policy in the organisation that all grant decisions are made by committee, so no positive approval can be given other than by a committee.

Q124 Jon Cruddas: So at the meeting presumably there is an assessment based on the objective financial criteria?

Mr Buxton: Absolutely. There will be a three- or four-page officer report which will contain a financial assessment and an assessment of the work of the organisation. That will be for each of the applications, including those that are recommended for rejection as well as those recommended for approval.

Q125 Jon Cruddas: So can you quantify how many of those officer assessments or recommendations are changed by the committee?

Mr Martineau: In this particular instance about three.

Q126 Jon Cruddas: Three out of 50, so 6%?

Mr Martineau: Yes. We funded 13, one of which had not been included in the original portfolio as recommended by the grant officer. That was put in because we thought it was a particularly strong one and it was a woman's health one. One was taken right out because we thought it was bad value for money and did not show enough signs of deprivation to warrant funding. Five were not in because we did

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

not have sufficient funding. They were quite good grants but the budget would not run to them, and 13 were rejected as being of poor quality.

Q127 Jon Cruddas: Is that a standard number?

Mr Buxton: No. The situation has changed quite a lot since we made the grant to the NCADC.

Q128 Jon Cruddas: Before that then, can you quantify the percentage that would overturn the recommendations of the officer?

Mr Buxton: In general a relatively small number.

Mr Martineau: It varies if one goes around the country. This was the all-England committee. Around the country it varies from region to region enormously. The south west has a very high rejection rate and the north west for some reason many less. It is the number of applications against the budget which they have which decides it.

Q129 Jon Cruddas: But you assume that there will be more officer recommendations overturned with the new systems?

Mr Buxton: I now attend all of the meetings of the Strategic Grants Committee which is the committee that replaced the England Grants Committee, and certainly my experience in the last year of the Strategic Grants Committee is that the committee has been overturning probably in the order of 25% of the officer recommendations, which is a much higher figure.

Q130 Jon Cruddas: Is every case discussed?

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q131 Jon Cruddas: There has none gone through on the nod? We have all been on committees.

Mr Buxton: We have a rule now which requires there to be proper consideration of each application.

Q132 Jon Cruddas: So there was not beforehand?

Mr Buxton: There was no explicit rule.

Q133 Jon Cruddas: So it was agreed that not every case would necessarily be considered by the committee?

Mr Martineau: These were all discussed with the exception—we have a rule that the assessment goes through various processes. If it is quite obvious that the application is going to fail at the very first assessment, if the grant officer looks at it and the constitution is such that it is an organisation that we cannot fund—

Q134 Jon Cruddas: Sorry: does that mean that your quantification of high, medium or low risk assessment will determine which would be discussed before these changes occurred?

Mr Buxton: No.

Q135 Jon Cruddas: So even though this was a low risk assessment that would mean that it would be more likely that it would not be discussed in full by the committee?

Mr Buxton: No.

Q136 Mr Bacon: Mr Buxton, at the beginning you said you had quite a high proportion of your costs going on administration over some organisations because you made a large number of small grants and that had an impact on the total number of staff that you employ, which is quite understandable. According to the Report you have 450 staff and in the financial year 2001–02 it says you made 7,500 awards totalling £351 million, which is, for your 450 staff, on average 16 awards per member of staff per year.

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q137 Mr Bacon: I realise this is a crude way of measuring the efficiency of an organisation.

Mr Buxton: No; absolutely.

Q138 Mr Bacon: That means three weeks per application per member of staff on average. I presume, although I realise they will not all be doing this, that a quite high proportion of those 450 are involved in either assessment or in monitoring in some shape or form.

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q139 Mr Bacon: Therefore, to say three weeks per application/ongoing monitoring per member of staff per year is not a bad index. That brings me back to Mr Williams' question which he raised on paragraph 2.13 about the question of not looking at the website, because it says, as Mr Williams alluded to, that the NCADC did draw your attention to their website as well as forwarding copies of their newsletters and that "if these had been reviewed assessment officers might have questioned the ability of the NCADC to receive a grant . . .". You said that the website was not looked at. What I want to know is this. If you are an assessment officer, you get in the material about the potential organisation and they draw attention in the material that they send in to you the fact that they have a website. You have three weeks per application per member of staff, taken in the round, net, net, net. How could it be that the website was not looked at? Did this person who was doing this have a curiosity by-pass or what?

Mr Buxton: No. The failure was a management failure, not a failing of the individual member of staff. We had not given sufficiently clear guidance to our staff on looking at such things as—

Q140 Mr Bacon: I know it says here, "This was not a requirement of the assessment process at the time", and I appreciate that that was not in the guidelines, but what I am saying is this. If you are an assessing officer looking at an organisation which has come to you asking for money and they tell you they have got a website, surely one of the first things anybody would do is go and look at the website and see what was there, especially when it is something as politically sensitive as anti-deportation campaigns? How could it be that nobody in your organisation looked at the website before deciding to make a grant?

Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: All I can say is that across the organisation at that time we were not doing website checks, and that was clearly a failing. It was not this particular instance where we did not look at the website. It was simply that we were not looking at websites, full stop.

Q141 Mr Bacon: Why were you not looking at websites, especially when they are drawn to your attention, and you have three weeks per application per member of staff? That is 15 working days per member of staff.

Mr Buxton: No. We have 13½ hours to do a grant assessment.

Q142 Mr Bacon: So it is not quite two working days?

Mr Buxton: Yes; 13½ hours is the allowed time for a grant officer to do a full grant assessment.

Q143 Mr Bacon: If you have not got a lot of information and you need to find some fairly quickly is not the first thing anybody does these days to go to a website?

Mr Buxton: Precisely. I could not agree with you more. All I am saying is that the Community Fund was not at the time of the NCADC grant doing something which now it appears to all of us at the Community Fund we quite clearly should have been doing for some time. That was clearly a mistake; that was a management mistake rather than a mistake being made by the individual member of staff.

Q144 Mr Bacon: Do you think it is possible that there was not enough attention given to what might be found on the website because there really was not much concern?

Mr Buxton: There was not a great deal of concern in this particular situation because this had been a grant that we had originally awarded in 1999. We had had no difficulties with it; there had been no concerns expressed by members of the public or anybody else about this particular grant. Nevertheless, we should still have done a website check on that organisation and all the other organisations.

Q145 Mr Bacon: The 13½ hours you mentioned—obviously, if you are doing an assessment of a grant for £5,000, or if you are doing an assessment for a grant of £300,000 or £2 million, it ought to vary quite a bit.

Mr Buxton: Yes.

Q146 Mr Bacon: Roughly, if it were a £5,000 grant how many hours would it be and if it were a quarter of a million how many hours would it be, and if it were a couple of million how many hours would it be?

Mr Buxton: The 13½ hours are for grants in excess of £60,000. On average it is 13½. At the other end of the scale and what to some extent is not reflected in the figures you were quoting from the annual report is that the Community Fund also runs the awards for all schemes on behalf of all lottery distributors which

accounts for something like 10,000 awards a year, and there the amount of time is much more in the order of a couple of hours rather than the 13½ hours.

Q147 Mr Field: I would like to come back to a question that Gerry raised because it does illustrate the political sensitivity of your organisation because in answer to one of his questions you admitted that you had not actually looked at the website today.

Mr Buxton: No.

Q148 Mr Field: And given that it was the website which raised the issue in the first place, one might have thought you would have looked at it today. I have to confess I have not looked at it. I have not done my homework as Gerry has done, but I was quite shocked by what he read out. You have presented in your answer that this is an organisation quite properly campaigning to help people who might be prevented from being deported, and therefore it is a personal service. Therefore, if I had gone to the website (if I had that ability to go to the website, which I do not), I would have expected to find, “We are a service that provides help to individuals who feel they have been unjustly treated under the country’s immigration laws”. I would not have expected to read a diatribe about whether Mr Blunkett said this or did that or anything else. Why is it that you continue to tolerate an organisation which gets money off you, large sums of lottery players’ money, to provide an individual service when you go to their website and they are running what is a good old political campaign? There is nothing wrong in that. It is just whether lottery money should be used for it.

Mr Buxton: I hope Mr Steinberg will not disagree that most of the website actually dealt with the very specific things that you were talking about, in other words, individual campaigns and support for individuals, and that only a relatively limited part (which should be zero) contained certain comments which are clearly not acceptable.

Q149 Mr Field: But given that you are giving an individual service for people who probably have not got access to the site anyway, you would addressing your message to people who would be helped in that, so all one would want is, “This is the service. This is our address. This is the sort of help we can offer”, quite a small website.

Mr Buxton: No, no. I think the website provides a lot of information even to helper organisations about how to go about the petitioning of the Home Secretary that is allowed under these circumstances. There is a lot of practical information on the site.

Q150 Mr Field: Like you, I am going to have somebody look at the website tomorrow. At what point with these transgressions do you feel that the grant should be withdrawn? How many more times is somebody going to point out to you, as you do not seem to spot it, that they are ignoring your instructions?

Mr Buxton: Withdrawing a grant is something that I would do very reluctantly under any circumstances.

Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Q151 Mr Field: It is the “any” I am asking.

Mr Buxton: It is difficult to give a definitive answer and to say one more incident and the grant would be withdrawn.

Q152 Mr Field: You have had an NAO Report on this.

Mr Buxton: Yes, but what we are saying is that during the time since the NAO Report we have been monitoring the website every week. I would be very interested to find out when that precisely went on the website. We have had very little difficulty since the time that the NAO produced their Report. Clearly, if this is indicative of a return to an attitude that was there perhaps before the NAO Report, before we put the additional grant conditions in, we would have to consider terminating, but that is not something—

Q153 Mr Field: How many times have you asked them to take material off?

Mr Buxton: I think we have asked them two or three times.

Q154 Mr Williams: In looking at this, it is a very thin Report because it is a very limited area of inquiry. Can I ask the C&AG how far were you able to establish how the grant money was being used? You had no access, I assume, to the documents involved because it is not in the public sector?

Mr Bedford: Yes, we can see the accounts, we can see what the money has been spent on, and we do make visits to parties.

Q155 Mr Williams: With all the appropriate back-up documentation as well?

Mr Bedford: Yes.

Q156 Mr Williams: Did you in this case?

Mr Bedford: We had no problems. We have not reviewed the accounts of this particular grant-funded body.

Q157 Mr Williams: You have not?

Mr Bedford: No.

Q158 Mr Williams: I see. Let us come back to you, Mr Buxton, because the Minister, in speaking to the House, made the point, again in column 289, that responsibility for ensuring the proper spending of this grant within the terms under which it has been awarded now rests with the Community Fund. The NAO has not, to my surprise, carried out such monitoring. In what sort of detail have you carried out monitoring? How far do you know where your money has gone and how?

Mr Buxton: We do our monitoring at the end of each year of the grant.

Q159 Mr Williams: How?

Mr Buxton: At the end of each year of the grant the NCADC will be required to submit documentation to us showing how they have spent the money during the course of their first year. We will then look for evidence to corroborate the figures that are provided to us by the NCADC. That may involve us doing a

visit to the NCADC at the end of the first year of the grant. I think a visit is almost certain in this particular case.

Q160 Mr Williams: Almost certain?

Mr Buxton: Almost certain. It is almost certain we will visit them at the end of the first year of the grant.

Q161 Mr Williams: But they have had two grants.

Mr Buxton: Yes, absolutely.

Q162 Mr Williams: And they have had half a million pounds, or they are due to get half a million pounds.

Mr Buxton: They are due to get, yes.

Q163 Mr Williams: So how do you know, since the NAO does not know, that the money has been used for the purpose for which you granted it other than that they wrote to you and said it was used for the purpose for which it was provided?

Mr Buxton: We know that the majority of the money was used to employ staff, we know the names of the individuals who have been employed, we have copies of the contracts of employment of those individuals, we have the job descriptions of those individuals, and we have bank account evidence to show that those individuals were paid. I do believe we have some hard evidence. They said they would employ a certain number of people; they have employed a certain number of people. We know from the website and other things about the campaigns that they have been conducting in respect of particular individuals, so I do think we have a pretty high degree of confidence that the money has been used for the purposes for which it was intended.

Mr Williams: That is reassuring. Thank you.

Q164 Chairman: Can we just check my figures on how much lottery funds you are distributing? In 2000 were you distributing £450 million and that has gone down to £285 million last year? Is that right?

Mr Buxton: Yes. In 1999–2000 it was £450 million.

Q165 Chairman: And it has gone down to £285 million last year?

Mr Buxton: And £250 million this year.

Q166 Chairman: So what has happened to your staff in the meantime?

Mr Buxton: The staffing levels have remained broadly similar because the number of applications that we have to process is unfortunately not determined by the number of grants that we are able to award. We are having to process just as many grant applications even though we do not have as much money to give out.

Q167 Chairman: Increasingly you are going to have to make very tough decisions, of course, if there is less money to distribute but you have the same number of applications coming in. Have you got confidence that your staff have the necessary mental toughness to make those decisions?

 Community Fund and England Grants Committee

Mr Buxton: Ultimately the final decisions about which grants are to be made are decisions that are for our committees. We have a conscious policy that grant decisions are made by committees rather than by individuals because this allows a number of people to contribute. A committee in an England region—and Mr Martineau can comment further—has ten people on it who are drawn from across the region, including two individuals who are selected by lot from amongst the community. I believe we are the only major MDPB that selects at least part of our committee by lot from the community in order to increase the diversity of representation on our committees.

Q168 Mr Field: So not players? Just the community?

Mr Buxton: They are not selected by lot specifically from players but, obviously, a proportion of those inevitably will be players. In 1999–2000 we were running at a success rate of about 50%. Now the success rate is down to 36%, so clearly that does mean that we are having to turn down a number of very good grant applications. That is the difficulty now, that we have far more good applications than we could conceivably fund. We have introduced a number of policy changes. First of all, our maximum grant size has been reduced and now in the England regions we have a maximum grant size of only £250,000. That is quite a lot compared with other grant-makers but, for example, you cannot build a sophisticated village hall for our maximum grant size. That is no longer possible. We are also introducing the policy on tapering which means that if somebody comes to us for a second three-year grant they are going to get less money each year. We have also had to be much more explicit about the priorities, the different types of things that we fund. We have identified a number of priority categories through a consultation process and have said that if you are outside the priority consultation categories you are not excluded from applying but your chances of success may be higher if you are in a priority category. Ultimately we have to rely on the

committees to properly scrutinise the grant applications and arrive at the decisions. That is not an easy process for the committees, but I believe the changes we have made since the NAO Report mean that our committees are now giving much better scrutiny to the grant applications, and I think we have a much higher confidence that the grant applications we are making today are the types of grants that we want to make.

Q169 Chairman: Okay, Mr Martineau. Can we trust you to make the right decisions in this increasingly difficult environment in which you are working?

Mr Martineau: Yes. There is one extra thing which Mr Buxton did not mention which we are doing, and that is that we are trying to manage down the demand in this area from the voluntary sector and so it is getting harder and harder to send in really good cases. In fact, I am chairing a meeting next week in the eastern region where for the very first time we are not going to be rejecting any on the grounds of insufficient funds. We have dampened the demand, particularly in the area of, say, village halls where we have made it quite explicit that we cannot afford to fund more than two or three village halls a year, and so the number coming in is less. Whether this is repeated around the country I do not know.

Chairman: Gentlemen, thank you very much. That concludes our inquiry. It has been a very useful exercise. You have been good enough, Mr Buxton, to admit that your organisation was at fault in not checking the website and you have promised to do better in the future, although I was somewhat alarmed at what Mr Steinberg has found on it, and I am grateful to him for his assiduity this weekend in checking the website and coming up with the information that this organisation is still saying that the Home Secretary is starving out asylum seekers, which sounds like a political statement to me. I think at best you were naive in your grant mechanisms on this occasion and indeed perhaps your organisation was lackadaisical, so we will be reporting on this matter further. Thank you very much.

 Supplementary memorandum submitted by the Community Fund

1. During the evidence given to the Committee of Public Accounts on 27 October, two questions were raised by members of the Committee which are dealt with in this memorandum.

Questions 52, 53 and 58 (Mr Rendel): grants to charities and other bodies

2. Mr Rendel asked about the proportions of grants made to organisations which are not charities. This information is set out at Annex 1 to this memorandum.

3. Sections 38(i) and 44(i)(b) of the National Lottery etc Act 1993 set out those organisations to which the Community Fund may make grants. These are:

“38–(i) The Charities Board may make out of any money they receive grants for meeting the expenditure of charities or of institutions such as are mentioned in paragraph (b) of the definition of ‘charitable expenditure’ in section 44(i).

“44–(i) In this part

‘charitable expenditure’ means expenditure—

- (a) by charities, or
- (b) by institutions, other than charities, that are established for charitable purposes (whether or not those purposes are charitable within the meaning of any rule of law), benevolent purposes or philanthropic purposes.”

4. Charitable organisations are those which are registered with the Charity Commission in England and Wales and subject to its regulation. “Charitable” also includes those organisations which are recognised as charitable in law for tax purposes by the Inland Revenue in Scotland and Northern Ireland where the Charity Commission does not operate.

5. Philanthropic and benevolent organisations are not clearly defined in law so the Community Fund operates on the basis of advice received from Leading Counsel about what sort of organisations these might be. The advice from Leading Counsel is that a philanthropic and benevolent organisation must have about it the essential attributes of a charity, namely that the organisation acts from a sense of altruism, for the public benefit and without any possibility of private gain or mutual benefit.

6. Therefore, in order to establish the eligibility of organisations applying for grants, the Community Fund considers the constitution of the applicant organisation to make sure those tests are met. Registered charities will either have a registration number from the Charity Commission in England and Wales or a reference number issued by the Inland Revenue in Scotland and Northern Ireland which makes identifying them a straightforward matter.

Data

7. Three sets of data are attached at Annex 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

8. Annex 1.1 shows applications and grant awards made to the Community Fund’s Large Grants Programme (ie amounts over £60,000), Medium Grants Programme (up to £60,000), Research Grants, International Grants and those submitted to a pilot scheme in the West Midlands for community buildings. The information provided goes back to the start of grant making in 1995 up to 31 March 2003. The first part of the table shows applications from charities and from unregistered organisations including the amounts requested. These are then totalled in the end shaded columns. The second part of the table shows the awards made over the same period for charities, unregistered organisations and the totals. The last table shows the percentage of applications from and awards to charities and unregistered organisations.

9. Looking at the percentages table, the data shows that the split between awards to charities and unregistered organisations has been fairly constant. The percentage of awards to charities is between 80% at its lowest and 89% and has been constant at 88% for the last three financial years. The percentage of awards to unregistered organisations has been between 11% and 20% each year and is now constant at around 12%. The lower recording of applications from charities in 1995–96, 1996–97 and 1997–98 is probably an under-recording at a time when the Community Fund was dealing with much higher volumes of applications and systems for distinguishing between charities and other organisations were not as well defined as they were from 1998 onwards.

10. Annex 2 shows similar data for applications to the original Small Grants Schemes (amounts up to £5,000) run by the Community Fund on its own before the joint funding schemes with other lottery distributors under the Awards For All banner began (see Annex 1.3).

11. The Small Grants Scheme began during 1996–97 operating first only in Wales, Scotland, South West and North East England as a pilot before rolling out across the rest of the United Kingdom. The last Small Grants Schemes ran during 2001–02. The data shows that there is a much higher proportion of applications as well as awards to organisations which are unregistered, concerned with community based activities where registration as a charity or with the Inland Revenue is not something the organisations wish to pursue (or are required to by law) or where the activities might not be ones which the Charity Commission might not register but are fully within the philanthropic and benevolent guidance given to the Community Fund by Leading Counsel.

12. Annex 1.3 shows for comparative purposes the applications from and awards to organisations applying to the joint Lottery distributor Awards For All scheme which now operates in all four UK countries, having started during the 1998–99 financial year.

13. In England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, the Lottery distributors which take part in Awards For All are the Community Fund, the New Opportunities Fund (from 2001), the Millennium Commission (until 2001), the Heritage Lottery Fund, the Arts Councils and the Sports Councils. In Wales, Awards For All includes only the Community Fund, the New Opportunities Fund (from 2001), the Millennium Commission (until 2001) and the Heritage Lottery Fund.

14. In England, Awards For All is a formal joint scheme under the provisions of section 12 of the National Lottery Act 1998. This means that all the eligibility criteria applying to the individual participating distributors can be “pooled” and it is not possible to say which applications from or awards to charities or other organisations are attributable to individual distributing bodies. In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, Awards For All works on a slightly different basis but again it is not easily possible to distinguish applications from and awards to different types of organisation by the individual distributors. However, the data shows that as with the original Community Fund Small Grants Scheme, the percentages of awards to unregistered organisations is much higher. The other distributors can make grants to many other types of organisation beyond charitable, philanthropic and benevolent bodies, which is why the percentage of awards to non-charities is much higher.

Questions 65 and 66 (Mr Field): refugees and asylum seeker projects

15. Mr Field asked for more details about the funding provided by the Community Fund for refugees and asylum seeker projects. The analysis at Annex 2 sets out funding provided during the 2002–03 financial year.

16. Annex 2.1 shows the type of project work carried out by refugee and asylum seeker projects which the Community Fund supported in 2002–03. Each application received is assigned to one project work code only so the code allocated can represent a diverse range of work.

17. Against each project code, the first two columns show the number of applications received and amounts awarded. The third and fourth columns show the number of grants made and the amounts awarded. The fifth column shows success rates comparing the number of awards against the requests made and the sixth column shows the percentage of funding allocated against amounts awarded (rounded up or down to the nearest whole percentage point).

18. The last part of this annex shows how funded refugee and asylum seeker projects work with refugees and asylum seekers themselves. This categorisation is based on project summaries (see Annex 2.2) and the assessment notes held on file for each project. Some of the projects which fall within the refugee and asylum seeker corporate priority group do so because a proportion of their work is concerned with refugee and asylum seeker issues. These are classified as projects without a refugee and asylum seeker focus.

19. The data shows that nearly half the 98 projects funded in 2002–03 did long term work with refugee and asylum seeker communities, a much lower number worked only with newly arrived asylum seekers with a significant number working with both.

20. Annex 2.2 sets out in summary form information about each of the 98 projects funded in 2002–03, describes the project work code (see Annex 2.1) and whether the type of work is long term, mixed (being work with long term communities and new arrivals) or with new arrivals. The last 10 projects are those without a specific refugee and asylum seeker focus. The final column shows the amount of grant awarded.

Richard Buxton
Chief Executive

26 November 2003

Annex 1.1

CHARITABLE STATUS

LARGE, MEDIUM, INTERNATIONAL, RESEARCH AND WEST MIDLANDS BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Applications (Large, Medium, Research, International, West Midlands Building Pilot):

| | <i>Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>Amount requested by registered charities</i> | <i>Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount requested by unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total number of applications</i> | <i>Total amount requested</i> |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2002–03 | 4,689 | £680,709,842.00 | 1,035 | £226,379,124.00 | 5,724 | £907,088,966.00 |
| 2001–02 | 5,153 | £856,216,554.00 | 1,063 | £151,781,772.00 | 6,216 | £1,007,998,326.00 |
| 2000–01 | 5,284 | £1,024,895,663.00 | 1,119 | £181,811,828.00 | 6,403 | £1,206,707,491.00 |
| 1999–2000 | 5,847 | £1,001,733,838.00 | 1,264 | £298,629,974.00 | 7,111 | £1,300,363,812.00 |
| 1998–99 | 4,729 | £665,775,984.00 | 1,219 | £174,079,918.00 | 5,948 | £839,855,902.00 |
| 1997–98 | 10,661 | £1,536,972,275.00 | 4,279 | £548,520,172.00 | 14,940 | £2,085,492,447.00 |
| 1996–97 | 15,716 | £1,909,672,202.00 | 6,035 | £631,892,178.00 | 21,751 | £2,541,564,380.00 |
| 1995–96 | 6,873 | £1,090,930,970.00 | 8,495 | £1,407,468,007.00 | 15,368 | £2,498,398,977.00 |
| Total | 58,952 | £8,766,907,328.00 | 24,509 | £3,620,562,973.00 | 83,461 | £12,387,470,301.00 |

CHARITABLE STATUS

LARGE, MEDIUM, INTERNATIONAL, RESEARCH AND WEST MIDLANDS BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Awards (*Large, Medium, International, Research, West Midlands Building Pilot*):

| | <i>Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>Amount awarded to registered charities</i> | <i>Awards to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount awarded to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total awards</i> | <i>Total amount awarded</i> |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2002-03 | 1,792 | £233,818,189.00 | 244 | £25,407,656.00 | 2,036 | £259,225,845.00 |
| 2001-02 | 1,777 | £246,193,064.00 | 231 | £27,580,248.00 | 2,008 | £273,773,312.00 |
| 2000-01 | 2,079 | £310,089,326.00 | 290 | £34,830,602.00 | 2,369 | £344,919,928.00 |
| 1999-2000 | 2,535 | £361,910,519.00 | 301 | £36,351,595.00 | 2,836 | £398,262,114.00 |
| 1998-99 | 2,661 | £316,863,954.00 | 341 | £30,145,578.00 | 3,002 | £347,009,532.00 |
| 1997-98 | 2,596 | £281,116,216.00 | 602 | £48,144,549.00 | 3,198 | £329,260,765.00 |
| 1996-97 | 3,405 | £275,843,276.00 | 833 | £42,790,627.00 | 4,238 | £318,633,903.00 |
| 1995-96 | 2,002 | £140,142,444.00 | 462 | £19,431,304.00 | 2,464 | £159,573,748.00 |
| Total | 18,847 | £2,165,976,988.00 | 3,304 | £264,682,159.00 | 22,151 | £2,430,659,147.00 |

CHARITABLE STATUS

LARGE, MEDIUM, INTERNATIONAL, RESEARCH AND WEST MIDLANDS BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Percentage of Community Fund funding (*Large, Medium, International, Research, West Midlands Building Pilot*):

| | <i>% of Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>% of Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>% of Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>% of Awards to unregistered organisations</i> |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| 2002-03 | 82% | 88% | 18% | 12% |
| 2001-02 | 83% | 88% | 17% | 12% |
| 2000-01 | 83% | 88% | 17% | 12% |
| 1999-2000 | 82% | 89% | 18% | 11% |
| 1998-99 | 80% | 89% | 20% | 11% |
| 1997-98 | 71% | 81% | 29% | 19% |
| 1996-97 | 72% | 80% | 28% | 20% |
| 1995-96 | 45% | 81% | 55% | 19% |
| Average | 71% | 85% | 29% | 15% |

Annex 1.2

CHARITABLE STATUS

SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

Applications:

| | <i>Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>Amount requested by registered charities</i> | <i>Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount requested by unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total number of applications</i> | <i>Total amount requested</i> |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2002-03 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| 2001-02 | 207 | £730,144.00 | 337 | £1,312,785.00 | 544 | £2,042,929.00 |
| 2000-01 | 415 | £1,565,694.00 | 704 | £2,773,959.00 | 1,119 | £4,339,653.00 |
| 1999-2000 | 1,814 | £6,211,108.00 | 1,779 | £6,227,917.00 | 3,593 | £12,439,025.00 |
| 1998-99 | 2,706 | £9,231,828.00 | 2,417 | £7,765,148.00 | 5,123 | £16,996,976.00 |
| 1997-98 | 3,364 | £10,321,348.00 | 3,091 | £8,952,734.00 | 6,455 | £19,274,082.00 |
| 1996-97 | 333 | £1,003,583.00 | 258 | £755,273.00 | 591 | £1,758,856.00 |
| 1995-96 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| Total | 8,839 | £29,063,705.00 | 8,586 | £27,787,816.00 | 17,425 | £56,851,521.00 |

Awards:

| | <i>Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>Amount awarded to registered charities</i> | <i>Awards to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount awarded to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total awards</i> | <i>Total amount awarded</i> |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>Small Grants</i> | | | | | | |
| 2002–03 | 0 | — | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2001–02 | 121 | £397,341.00 | 182 | £653,137.00 | 303 | £1,050,478.00 |
| 2000–01 | 227 | £780,969.00 | 307 | £1,090,971.00 | 534 | £1,871,940.00 |
| 1999–2000 | 1,250 | £4,132,450.00 | 831 | £2,787,810.00 | 2,081 | £6,920,260.00 |
| 1998–99 | 1,813 | £5,808,360.00 | 1,115 | £3,154,994.00 | 2,928 | £8,963,354.00 |
| 1997–98 | 2,139 | £5,689,965.00 | 1,596 | £3,713,373.00 | 3,735 | £9,403,338.00 |
| 1996–97 | 236 | £531,780.00 | 144 | £294,403.00 | 380 | £826,183.00 |
| 1995–96 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5,786 | £17,340,865.00 | 4,175 | £11,694,688.00 | 9,961 | £29,035,553.00 |

CHARITABLE STATUS

SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

Percentage of Community Fund funding:

| | <i>% of Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>% of Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>% of Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>% of Awards to unregistered organisations</i> |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2002–03 | — | — | — | NA |
| 2001–02 | 38% | 40% | 62% | 60% |
| 2000–01 | 37% | 43% | 63% | 57% |
| 1999–2000 | 50% | 60% | 50% | 40% |
| 1998–99 | 53% | 62% | 47% | 38% |
| 1997–98 | 52% | 57% | 48% | 43% |
| 1996–97 | 56% | 62% | 44% | 38% |
| 1995–96 | — | — | — | NA |
| Average | 51% | 58% | 49% | 42% |

Annex 1.3

CHARITABLE STATUS

AWARDS FOR ALL

Applications:

| | <i>Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>Amount requested by registered charities</i> | <i>Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount requested by unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total number of applications</i> | <i>Total amount requested</i> |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2002–03 | 6,934 | £26,357,053 | 18,750 | £71,278,380 | 25,684 | £97,635,433 |
| 2001–02 | 5,536 | £20,328,177 | 13,712 | £50,514,961 | 19,248 | £70,843,138 |
| 2000–01 | 8,874 | £31,039,262 | 20,573 | £71,816,670 | 29,447 | £102,855,932 |
| 1999–2000 | 6,898 | £23,622,866 | 15,630 | £51,950,916 | 22,528 | £75,573,782 |
| 1998–99 | 954 | £2,779,482 | 2,174 | £10,480,746 | 3,128 | £13,260,228 |
| 1997–98 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| 1996–97 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| 1995–96 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | — |
| Total | 29,196 | £104,126,840 | 70,839 | £256,041,673 | 100,035 | £360,168,513 |

Awards:

| <i>A4A</i> | <i>Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>Amount awarded to registered charities</i> | <i>Awards to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Amount awarded to unregistered organisations</i> | <i>Total awards</i> | <i>Total amount awarded</i> |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2002–03 | 3,995 | £14,341,766 | 11,127 | £40,445,553 | 15,122 | £54,787,319 |
| 2001–02 | 4,355 | £15,355,904 | 9,698 | £34,371,089 | 14,053 | £49,726,993 |
| 2000–01 | 5,030 | £16,288,108 | 9,245 | £29,761,304 | 14,275 | £46,049,412 |
| 1999–2000 | 4,621 | £15,057,163 | 7,842 | £23,926,532 | 12,463 | £38,983,695 |
| 1998–99 | 715 | £1,969,038 | 1,411 | £3,543,926 | 2,126 | £5,512,964 |
| 1997–98 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | 0 |
| 1996–97 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | 0 |
| 1995–96 | 0 | — | 0 | — | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 18,716 | £63,011,979 | 39,323 | £132,048,404 | 58,039 | £195,060,383 |

AWARDS FOR ALL

Percentage of funding:

| | <i>% Applications from registered charities</i> | <i>% Awards to registered charities</i> | <i>% Applications from unregistered organisations</i> | <i>% Awards to unregistered organisations</i> |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|
| 2002–03 | 27% | 26% | 73% | 74% |
| 2001–02 | 29% | 31% | 71% | 69% |
| 2000–01 | 30% | 35% | 70% | 65% |
| 1999–2000 | 31% | 37% | 69% | 63% |
| 1998–99 | 30% | 34% | 70% | 66% |
| 1997–98 | — | — | — | — |
| 1996–97 | — | — | — | — |
| 1995–96 | — | — | — | — |
| Average | 29% | 32% | 71% | 68% |

Annex 2.1

COMMUNITY FUND: FUNDING TO REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS 2002–03

TYPE OF PROJECT WORK FUNDED

This break down shows the type of project work for which refugee and asylum seeker organisations were funded in 2002–03. Each application is assigned one project work code only, so each code can represent a diverse range of work.

| | <i>Requests</i> | <i>Amount requested</i> | <i>Awards</i> | <i>Amount awarded</i> | <i>Success rate</i> | <i>% of Annual RAS funding</i> |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Advice/Information—Specific Areas | 19 | £2,401,188 | 6 | £568,744 | 32% | 4% |
| Advice/Information and Counselling | 38 | £4,514,720 | 16 | £1,692,588 | 42% | 13% |
| Advice/Information in a range of different areas | 35 | £5,090,985 | 14 | £1,892,462 | 40% | 14% |
| Advocacy, campaigning and awareness-raising | 3 | £418,173 | 1 | £89,422 | 33% | 1% |
| Advocacy, campaigning and awareness-raising on specific issues | 1 | £193,437 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Amenities | 1 | £170,213 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Arts & Cultural | 1 | £60,050 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Arts & Cultural Activities | 3 | £140,286 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Arts Development | 1 | £30,000 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Children & Youth Community Services | 1 | £49,354 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Children and youth recreational activities | 1 | £50,504 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Community advocacy, campaigns or awareness-raising | 1 | £172,442 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Community Centre | 2 | £331,035 | 1 | £158,299 | 50% | 1% |
| Community Development | 2 | £119,744 | 2 | £119,750 | 100% | 1% |
| Community Services | 5 | £1,309,582 | 2 | £290,622 | 40% | 2% |
| Conflict resolution advocacy, campaigns or awareness-raising | 1 | £142,755 | 1 | £142,755 | 100% | 1% |
| Counselling and self-help—not health-related | 2 | £46,750 | 1 | £13,390 | 50% | 0% |
| Counselling Service—medical | 2 | £938,477 | 1 | £130,205 | 50% | 1% |
| Cultural and religious education | 2 | £109,800 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Day Nursery/Creche | 1 | £59,949 | 1 | £59,949 | 100% | 0% |
| Discrimination (racial, sexual, etc) Advice/Information | 1 | £59,901 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Education and training | 7 | £836,710 | 3 | £353,497 | 43% | 3% |
| Employment Advice/Information | 7 | £1,052,684 | 2 | £280,437 | 29% | 2% |
| English as a Second Language | 4 | £389,779 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Environmental Work | 1 | £58,320 | 1 | £58,320 | 100% | 0% |
| Family Support/Parenting Skills | 3 | £533,776 | 2 | £360,005 | 67% | 3% |
| Grants | 1 | £59,820 | 1 | £59,820 | 100% | 0% |
| Health advocacy, campaigns or awareness-raising | 3 | £248,827 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Health Promotion | 2 | £119,940 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| HIV & Aids | 1 | £105,949 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Housing Advice/Information | 6 | £1,127,075 | 4 | £909,318 | 67% | 7% |
| Housing advocacy, campaigns or awareness-raising | 1 | £293,926 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Human Rights | 1 | £105,094 | 1 | £105,094 | 100% | 1% |
| Immigration and Nationality Advice/Information | 31 | £4,226,669 | 10 | £1,567,478 | 32% | 12% |
| Mother Tongue Teaching | 1 | £120,750 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Networking support | 2 | £119,612 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Not Otherwise Classified | 4 | £928,729 | 1 | £328,620 | 25% | 2% |
| Other community enterprise | 2 | £780,887 | 1 | £250,000 | 50% | 2% |
| Other community facility | 5 | £399,223 | 1 | £11,579 | 20% | 0% |
| Other community service | 7 | £797,520 | 4 | £362,925 | 57% | 3% |
| Other Community Services | 1 | £201,429 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Other crime initiative | 1 | £41,876 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Other economic and social development | 1 | £38,960 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Other education | 2 | £448,785 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Other recreational activities | 1 | £156,803 | 1 | £130,764 | 100% | 1% |
| Other social support service | 7 | £1,020,823 | 4 | £736,307 | 57% | 6% |
| Other specific area of advice/information | 5 | £505,649 | 2 | £265,468 | 40% | 2% |
| Other voluntary sector development | 4 | £807,909 | 1 | £193,306 | 25% | 1% |
| Refugees | 1 | £147,171 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Resource centre | 1 | £183,519 | 1 | £179,781 | 100% | 1% |
| Self-development | 3 | £390,703 | 1 | £207,631 | 33% | 2% |
| Social Support Services | 1 | £15,000 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Supplementary To School | 1 | £145,252 | 1 | £122,897 | 100% | 1% |
| Support to Volunteers | 3 | £448,885 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Training | 1 | £44,379 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Training for Personal Development | 3 | £492,192 | 0 | — | 0% | 0% |
| Training for Work | 6 | £787,945 | 2 | £255,801 | 33% | 2% |
| Training in/for VSD | 1 | £199,472 | 1 | £182,427 | 100% | 1% |
| Voluntary Sector Development | 4 | £567,019 | 3 | £507,455 | 75% | 4% |
| Welfare Rights Advice/Information | 2 | £210,386 | 2 | £211,005 | 100% | 2% |
| Blank | | | | | | |
| Grand Total 2002–03 | 265 | £36,231,967 | 98 | £13,188,422 | 37% | 100% |

TYPE OF REFUGEE AND ASYLUM SEEKER WORK FUNDED

This breakdown shows how the funded projects work with refugees and asylum seekers. The categorisation is based on project summaries and assessment notes for each project. Some of the projects which fall within the refugee and asylum seeker corporate priority group do so because a proportion of their beneficiaries come from this group, but they do not work specifically on refugee and asylum seeker issues, so these are classified as “Projects without a RAS focus”.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Long-term work with RAS communities | 45% |
| Newly arrived asylum seeker support | 16% |
| Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | 27% |
| Project without RAS focus | 10% |
| Total | 98% |

Annex 2.2

COMMUNITY FUND FUNDING TO REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS 2002–03

| Unique Reference Number | Applicant Name | Info: Project Summary | Codes: Project Work | Type of work with RAS | Current Award Value |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| MK/1/ 010071465 | African Community Council for the Regions | The project aims to support the needs of individual African refugees and community organisations in Birmingham by acting as a hub of information on service provision. It will form partnerships and give peer mentoring support and assistance on community development issues such as health, employment, training and benefits. It also aims to integrate African service users into mainstream public services. | Access to information advocacy, campaigns or awareness-raising | Long-term work with RAS communities | £170,502 |
| ML/1/ 010064577 | African Culture Promotions | The project is to provide a sexual health awareness and peer education project for African refugee women who are not making use of the reproductive health services, ie ante-natal care, family planning, cervical screening, HIV/AIDS prevention programmes, etc. Activities include workshops and seminars, culturally, linguistically appropriate resources and outreach work. | Advice/Information—Specific Areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £60,000 |
| ML/1/ 010073038 | African Families Support Services | The project, over 3 years, aims to promote good parenting among African refugee families. The project will deliver: a support group for parents with refugee teenage children, intergenerational awareness activities, one to one information sessions and mentoring. A web site that will disseminate information and host success stories from the project will also be developed. The organisation will recruit a part time Parenting Support Worker to co-ordinate and develop the project. This project will improve parenting skills and prevent the breakdown of families. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £60,000 |
| MJ/1/ 010048031 | Barnet Somali Community Group | The aim of the project is to employ a co-ordinator for Barnet Somali Community Group to manage and develop its activities. This will build the capacity of the organisation to provide and improve the quality of its advice and information, arrange social activities for families and hold educational and cultural classes for women and children. The project will help to tackle isolation and disadvantage. | Advice/Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £84,139 |
| MK/1/ 010058238 | Big Buzz after School Club | The project is to enhance the facilities at an after school club to make a more positive, welcoming environment for refugee children and help them and their families to integrate into school and the community by teaching English. Integration work will also be carried out in schools and an anti-racist package developed for use in schools. A Family Liaison Worker will signpost and advocate on behalf of local families. | Supplementary to School | Long-term work with RAS communities | £122,897 |

Ev 24 Committee of Public Accounts: Evidence

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| MH/1/ 010039997 | BTCV Scotland | The project aims to provide a forum for the education of, and social inclusion of, refugees and people from black ethnic minority groups through the development of an Environmental Education Social Club in south Glasgow. | Environmental Work | Long-term work with RAS communities | £58,320 |
| MJ/1/ 010032999 | Cambridge Refugee Support Group | The project will enable the organisation to expand, improve, enhance and consolidate its services to refugees. This includes a drop-in service, help with a wide range of issues, language classes, an outreach service and social events. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £147,605 |
| MK/1/ 010059592 | Croydon YMCA Housing Association | The Croydon Resettlement Project (CREST) will work with homeless refugees and asylum seekers living in Croydon's YMCA hostels. The focus of the project is to progress them into permanent accommodation whilst ensuring that they have the skills they need to sustain their tenancies and live independently. The CREST project will also seek to address other issues which may prevent refugees and asylum seekers from maintaining tenancies, such as alcoholism and unemployment. The aim of the project is to help enable refugees and asylum seekers to rebuild their lives and to live independently. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £144,183 |
| MK/1/ 010061975 | Football Unites, Racism Divides Educational Trust | The project will tackle racism, through the medium of an interactive learning website and a resource library. The work will focus around young people aged 12–24 years old. | Conflict resolution advocacy, campaigns or awareness- raising | Long-term work with RAS communities | £142,755 |
| MH/1/ 010041502 | HIV/AIDS Association of Zambia | The project aims to run focus groups, one to one meetings, workshops and outreach to address the 4 main issues that concern people with HIV/AIDS the most. These issues are discrimination, children and families, low income and getting back to work and isolation/disability as a result of HIV/AIDS. The workshops will discuss the range of issues and help people with their concerns. The development officer will also put together a newsletter and distribute it among beneficiaries and the public. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £41,763 |
| ML/1/ 010066255 | Home-Start Glasgow South | This project will provide practical support to asylum seeker and refugee families, with young children to allow them to intergrate within the local community and access the full range of statutory services and community activities available within the area. | Other community service | Long-term work with RAS communities | £29,835 |
| MK/1/ 010066270 | Iranian Association | The purpose of the project is to provide a Welfare Benefits team to assist the refugee and asylum-seekers who are users of the Iranian Association. By employing a Benefit Advisor and training a team of 10 volunteers in this work, the organisation will be able to provide more coherent and beneficial assistance in raising awareness of welfare rights, completing benefits claim forms, interpreting, translation and advocacy for the majority of users who need to access state welfare benefits. | Welfare Rights Advice/ Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £119,586 |
| MK/1/ 010065586 | Kings Lynn Asylum & Refugee Support | The project will see three paid staff provide the co-ordination for services to refugees and asylum seekers in King's Lynn and West Norfolk. This will include: a weekly drop-in centre, to be continued and expanded, signposting to appropriate agencies, an appropriate response to queries in Russian and Spanish languages. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £236,658 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| MK/1/ 010059582 | Latin American Women's Rights Service (LAWRS) | The project aims to provide a gender and culturally sensitive counselling project to assist Latin American refugee women survivors of atrocities, violence, losses and displacement who are enduring difficulties as asylum seekers/ refugees in this country and experience psychological distress. Outcomes will be different for each user of the service but overall it is expected that beneficiaries will achieve a greater ability to cope with the traumatic aspects of their personal histories and with the day-to-day pressures and stresses of living as refugees in the UK; a greater ability to affirm themselves and to positively recognise their strengths to re-establish confidence and self-esteem; and to enable women to take positive steps towards rebuilding their lives in their new environment and improve the quality of their lives. | Counselling Service— medical | Long-term work with RAS communities | £130,205 |
| MJ/1/ 010046047 | Newham United Tamil Association | The project is to provide advice and support services to the Tamil community in Newham and surrounding areas, on issues of housing, welfare benefits, immigration, and access to employment and education. The appointment of a paid member of staff, together three existing volunteers, will enable the Management Committee, who have been running and delivering services to date, to focus on development of new and existing services and the strategic management of the organisation. | Advice/ Information— Specific Areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £200 |
| MJ/1/ 010037374 | North Staffordshire Racial Equality Council | A project to provide information, advice, support and training to BME community groups. This will enable them to develop their skills and confidence and capacity to establish or strengthen their own organisations and meet the specific needs of their communities and play a greater role in local policy decision making and funding allocation. Through training, one to ones, and supporting production of management procedures. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £244,427 |
| MJ/1/ 010034273 | Positive Action in Housing Ltd | This project aims to provide a free, independent, multilingual and culturally-sensitive outreach housing information and advice. This will enable minority ethnic and refugee communities in Glasgow, and elsewhere as demand indicates, to overcome homelessness, racial harassment and isolation and enable access to housing free from discrimination and the fear of racial harassment. | Housing Advice/ Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £189,157 |
| MJ/1/ 010046875 | Positively Women | The project will enable HIV positive refugee women to live healthier, more stable lives through the provision of culturally appropriate peer support through one to one sessions, groupwork and advocacy, immigration advice and legal representation before the immigration authorities and in immigration appeals, information and advice on issues affecting HIV positive refugees including health, social care services, housing, benefits, education and employment. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £199,051 |
| MJ/1/ 010046565 | Praxis Community Projects Ltd | This project aims to continue and develop the work of the Education & Employment Unit which was started in 2001 to empower refugees, asylum seekers and migrants through education, employment and enterprise. The Unit provides advice, guidance and mentoring, assistance in financing education, provision of basic skills training in English, Literacy and IT, continued professional development in health and social care professions, access to ICT, creating new enterprise initiatives and providing after care. This application is to secure the existing two | Education and training | Long-term work with RAS communities | £197,261 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| MK/1/ 010056144 | Redbridge Refugee Forum | Education Advisor posts. The Advisors will also undertake outreach work to hostels, refugee groups and faith communities, provide counselling and practical support, and develop and run a drop-in job search facility. The project also seeks to extend the hours of the Finance Worker to properly manage the financial aspects of the programme including administration of student grants. The project will strengthen the organisation's infrastructure, enabling it to focus on its current programme of direct services and strategic work and build its capacity to develop these to the next stage. Immediately the project will give the Forum stability, sustaining and building its capacity to support refugees through the delivery of direct services and partnership work. Medium to long term it will result in the expansion of existing services in response to demand and the development of new services in response to identified needs. The outcome to the client group will be a greater volume and variety of direct services meeting their needs, delivered by statutory agencies, community groups and the Forum, resulting in an improvement in the quality of their lives, and their movement towards economic and social inclusion in the community. | Voluntary Sector Development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £249,569 |
| ML/1/ 010062540 | Redcar and Cleveland Citizens Advice Bureau | This project will employ a specialist advice worker to inform, empower and advocate the ethnic population of Redcar and Cleveland to address issues such as welfare benefits, tax credits, debt, housing and health care. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,852 |
| MJ/1/ 010033855 | Refugee Council (The) | The organisation provides direct services and support to refugees and asylum seekers in the UK. It also provides capacity building projects to Refugee Community Organisations (RCO's) and other organisations working for refugee and asylum seekers. This project will build on the quality systems project (ME01135) which developed the Quality Assurance System for Refugee Organisations (QASRO). It will provide a cascade approach to training and dissemination through training National Refugee Forum members to deliver training to smaller local and regional groups. A pilot project will be used to test the training and QASRO and findings will be disseminated via workshops and a programme of 40 training sessions over the two years of the project. A website will also be developed to provide easy access to information on quality systems. | Other voluntary sector development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £193,306 |
| MH/1/ 010051887 | Refugee Survival Trust | This project will allow the organisation to develop and promote its work as a grant making body for refugees and asylum seekers. The project will increase the capacity of the organisation to administer and process applications, plus develop a network of contacts with refugee agencies and communities. | Grants | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,820 |
| ML/1/ 010063950 | Refugee Training | This project aims to provide advice, information and representation for Somali refugees, enabling them to access a range of statutory services and benefits. The organisation want to provide advice sessions to service users in their own language, translate letters from service organisations and organise appropriate responses, and organise appropriate interpretation services. Through the project they also want to represent beneficiaries to service organisations, and to generally act as an advocate for them. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,706 |
| MK/1/ | Research and | The project will help meet the needs of | Education | Long-term | £96,236 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 010071066 | Development Centre for Ethiopians in Britain | Ethiopian refugees/asylum seekers and some disadvantaged members of the BME community by providing a skills development training course in IT, ESOL and study skills (such as report writing and presentation skills). Supplementary classes on Saturdays in English, maths and science for children and young people will also be run to help them succeed in mainstream education. A drop-in centre will be run to provide information, advice & guidance on education, training and employment. Social and information events will be held to reduce isolation and encourage involvement in classes and training. | and training | work with RAS communities | |
| MH/1/010034667 | Sierra Leone Women's Forum UK | The project will develop outreach work with older people to include advice and information services, advocacy, interpreting and networking, health awareness and befriending. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,900 |
| MJ/1/010047980 | Somali Community Centre | This project will provide advice to Somali refugees on housing and welfare benefits in a culturally sensitive manner. A Welfare and Benefits Solicitor will provide specialised advice to urgent cases, representation for users in court, advocacy, and outreach sessions in the Somali community to raise awareness of benefits and rights, and build capacity. The project will also provide opportunities for Somali volunteers to gain experience in the welfare and benefits field. By assisting families to establish stable homes and finances, the project will enable the Somali community to reduce alienation and tackle other problems such as employment, education, health and communication barriers. | Housing Advice/Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £149,987 |
| MJ/1/010042523 | Somali Special Needs Scheme | The project will employ a housing worker to work as a crisis advocate to assist people with a Somali or Muslim background to access services. They will identify new or underused services and help to address access issues. | Other social support service | Long-term work with RAS communities | £134,073 |
| MH/1/010050194 | Somali Womens Support and Development Group | The project is to employ a project co-ordinator who will improve the structure of the organisation and expand its services. This will be done by focusing on publicity and networking with other organisations and local agencies. Apart from focusing on networking, the new post will also monitor and evaluate the procedures of the project and provide face-to-face sessions to beneficiaries. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,953 |
| MK/1/010061187 | South London Tamil Welfare Group | The project will strengthen the line management structure of SLTWG through the appointment of staff to manage the Refugee Services; develop Community Services; and manage the Corporate Services to enable the Group to handle the current services more effectively, develop staff and allow for service expansion. | Self-development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £207,631 |
| MJ/1/010049908 | Sudanese in Diaspora | The project is the continuation and development of an advice and information service for refugees and asylum seekers in areas of welfare benefits, housing, health, immigration, education and training and employment. In addition, a new weekly legal advice clinic will operate run in partnership with established legal advice providers in East London. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £183,245 |
| MH/1/010044688 | Sudanese Midlands Refugee Community Association (SMRCA) | The project aims to improve the quality of life for Sudanese refugees living in the West Midlands region by providing a wide range of support services including information, advice, welfare rights, signposting and interpretation and translation services. Specific activity/interest groups will also be set up to facilitate capacity building and training opportunities will be made available. | Community Development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,996 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| MK/1/ 010063325 | Tamil Refugee Action Group | The project aims to develop the existing service of promoting health education advice and support services to Tamil refugees, with particular emphasis on life styles and eating habits to prevent diabetes and heart disease. The project is being developed to include neighbouring Boroughs of Ealing and Barnet. It will also be extended to include a number of other illnesses from AIDS/HIV to Asthma and breast cancer. The seminars are delivered in Tamil as the client group do not necessarily speak fluent English and all literature is in Tamil and English. | Advocacy, campaigning and awareness-raising | Long-term work with RAS communities | £89,422 |
| MK/1/ 010064833 | Tamil Relief Centre | The project is to fund a women's outreach worker to improve the social inclusion, long-term settlement and integration of Tamil refugees and asylum seekers that are housebound, secluded and living in poverty due to language and cultural barriers. This will be carried out through an outreach worker to provide advice and information on welfare benefits, housing, education, training, employment as well as tackling domestic violence to enable Tamil women to be more independent. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £104,570 |
| MH/1/ 010048268 | The African Child | The project aims to reduce the disadvantages faced by young African people by delivering a range of support services. The services will provide information on teenage pregnancies, parenting, drug and alcohol misuse, HIV and STI's as well as unemployment. This will be done through a number of means such as workshops, Website, Youth Forums, a Newsletter and telephone information.system offering support over the phone. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £60,000 |
| MK/1/ 010061649 | The East London Somali Youth & Welfare Centre | The project will set up and run a forum for young Somalis as well as providing job related training, personal development, and improved access to services. The project will also promote the needs of Somali youths to local voluntary agencies, local authorities and the public. | Training for Work | Long-term work with RAS communities | £122,849 |
| MK/1/ 010070523 | The Partnership College | This project aims to coach the target group of refugees and asylum seekers to develop a learning strategy to enable them to gain employment. The coaching establishes the skills and qualifications that the beneficiaries have and provide confidence building, a learning plan and signposting access to basic skills and training. The project will help and support beneficiaries to overcome problems to enable them to confidently participate in learning programmes. | Training for Work | Long-term work with RAS communities | £132,952 |
| MK/1/ 010060121 | The Summerfield Foundation Ltd | A project to allow the continuation of the Community Development Project that supports and assists local residents, traders and community groups. The project will facilitate the development and capacity building of local community groups. It will help by signposting refugees/asylum seekers, BME, lone parents and young people to organisations and initiatives that will assist them with employment opportunities and social activities. | Community Services | Long-term work with RAS communities | £149,387 |
| ML/1/ 010070844 | Trelawny Overseas Relief Association | The project aims to employ a full-time worker to manage and co-ordinate day to day activities, staff and volunteers, monitor local community needs and to help develop long term strategies for the organisation. This will strengthen their ability to provide advice and guidance on specific issues such as employment, welfare and housing primarily to the African Caribbean community in Walsall. | Community Development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,754 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| MJ/1/ 010049823 | Waltham Forest Citizens Advice Bureau Service | The project has four distinct aims. The extension of the service to the northern part of the borough. Recruit and train volunteers from refugee and asylum groups. Recruit and train volunteers from other disadvantaged groups. Expand team of advisers so that staff better reflect the community profile. | Welfare Rights Advice/ Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £91,419 |
| MJ/1/ 010033938 | Wandsworth and Merton Law Centre Ltd | The project will deliver employment-related advice, support and representation to Wandsworth residents and workers, support and train local advice workers and local community groups. The project will be delivered in conjunction with Battersea CAB and be based in Battersea. | Employment Advice/ Information | Long-term work with RAS communities | £223,054 |
| ML/1/ 010066234 | Way Forward Organisation | The project will work with young African refugees to provide advice and information on substance abuse and other issues such as peer pressure, unwanted pregnancies, STDs, unemployment and training. It will help refugees to improve their confidence, choices and lifeskills. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,990 |
| MJ/1/ 010041076 | Women's Education in Building | A social enterprise with income-generating activities in a one-stop-shop that offers measures to tackle disadvantage in enterprise and training with a particular focus on the barriers faced by refugees and asylum seekers, other minority ethnic communities, women returners, unemployed young people and adults with poor basic skills in the building and allied trades. Each of the initiatives is designed to provide flexible and responsive support, language/literacy support, disabled access and culturally-sensitive advice and guidance. | Other community enterprise | Long-term work with RAS communities | £250,000 |
| ML/1/ 010066499 | Yan-Huang Cultural and Arts Association | To provide support, information and ESOL training to pupils and parents from Greenwich Chinese Community School. Support will be offered in Mandarin, to Chinese refugee families. | Education and training | Long-term work with RAS communities | £60,000 |
| MH/1/ 010042779 | Yemeni Development Foundation | A pilot project to deliver a range of customised capacity building support to 7 Refugee Community groups. This will include developing long term business and finance plans to enable them to deliver effective and sustainable services. | Voluntary Sector Development | Long-term work with RAS communities | £59,620 |
| ML/1/ 010062893 | African Community Welfare Association | The project will develop ACWA to provide a consistent 5-day a week service to its client group, and to further develop the existing team of volunteers and the organisation's overall activities. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £54,367 |
| MJ/1/ 010040939 | Bedfordshire Congolese Community Links | To develop this organisation to enable it to better provide a range of services and activities intended to increase the confidence and self esteem of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants from Black Africa sub-continent (west and central Africa) now living in Luton and Bedfordshire. To provide—advocacy for immigration, asylum and welfare benefits, education and training opportunities at weekends (to include computer skills and language classes), interpretation and translation, health information in community languages, shared community events and help with transport or childcare to enable attendance at above. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £199,099 |
| MJ/1/ 010030561 | BH Community UK | The project is to develop new services such as a women's and a youth group, providing courses on setting up small business, IT and website skills, and social activities to cover sports and excursions etc to improve the quality of life for members of the Bosnian community. | Other community service | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £147,327 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| MJ/1/ 010055627 | Bosnian Refugee Information Centre Kosovar Support | The project aims to address the needs of refugees and asylum seekers from the former Yugoslavia by offering them advice on a range of issues. This includes advice and help in the form of a psychotherapist who will counsel and deal with the mental stress that the refugees have suffered through torture, loss of family, rape and isolation. It will also provide physiotherapy for those beneficiaries who have suffered physical injuries as a result of torture and a health and advocacy worker to assist with the case work to re-unite and support families. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £173,184 |
| MH/1/ 010033490 | Cabinda Community Association | This project aims to build the capacity of the organisation and develop the services that it delivers. In particular the project aims to strengthen the policies, management and fundraising of the organisation, and develop a pool of volunteers to aid them in delivering their services. They presently provide information and advice, and workshops and seminars for refugees and asylum seekers primarily to people from Cabinda, but they are open to all. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £56,756 |
| MJ/1/ 010051946 | Citizens Advice Service in the Borough of Wigan | The project aims to provide advice and assistance to asylum seekers dispersed to the Wigan Borough to ensure that they receive their proper entitlements and to mitigate as far as possible the hardship, anxiety and confusion which they can experience. The project will also assist people who are awarded refugee status and exceptional leave to remain to ensure that they can effectively access mainstream services in order to enhance their chances of successful settlement in the community. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £124,626 |
| ML/1/ 010060258 | East African Women Community Organisation | The project will set up an advice and information service for East African Women and their families. The advice and information service will operate as a drop in service, open 4 days a week. The service will offer advice on health and education; it will offer information and referrals on health, education, housing and immigration. Volunteers will provide an advocacy and interpreting service on visits to health, legal and education and housing services. | Advice/ Information— Specific Areas | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £32,357 |
| MJ/1/ 010045843 | East London Oduduwa Association | The Association receives referrals in the main from the Refugee Council of refugees or asylum seekers who need temporary and urgent accommodation. If accommodation is available, the referral will be accepted and a complete package of social support will be provided including information on and directions to appropriate agencies (DSS, Doctors, Education Authorities, etc) and that level of support will continue whilst it is needed. | Other social support service | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £179,209 |
| MH/1/ 010041977 | Ethiopian Health Support Association | This project aims to build the capacity of the organisation, to enable them to develop their infrastructure and services. They want to employ a Project Co-ordinator to oversee the work of the organisation and to supervise and develop the work of 2 part-time workers and the volunteers. Through this project the organisation hope to improve their services to provide support to more people, and on a more flexible basis. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £59,820 |
| MJ/1/ 010029026 | Family Support Group | The project aims to develop and extend the work of the Parent to Parent Project (PPP) by providing additional accredited training for unemployed volunteers who have had experience in supporting vulnerable families in their own homes. Volunteers will be trained to meet support needs of refugees and asylum seeker families, set up parent networks and self-help groups. | Community Services | Mixed—work with long- term communities and new arrivals | £141,235 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| MH/1/ 010035956 | Great Lakes Initiative & Support Project | The project will expand and improve the services of The Great Lakes Initiative and Support Project to refugees and asylum seekers from the Great Lakes area of Africa. It will enable them to overcome difficulties they face as refugees, such as isolation, unemployment, lack of confidence, skills and access to services, enabling them to improve their ability to integrate and settle and improve their quality of life. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £59,714 |
| MK/1/ 010066235 | Hackney & Islington Refugee Training Partnership | The project will increase the capacity of refugee community organisations (RCO) in the boroughs of Hackney and Islington, through improved management and administrative structures and increasing their access to information and training networks. The RCOs will also gain representation in local and national decision and policy making processes as well as becoming more sustainable. | Training in/ for VSD | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £182,427 |
| MK/1/ 010069700 | Haringey Somali Community and Cultural Association | The project is to continue and develop the work of MG239025, offering drop-in and telephone advice on immigration, welfare, debt and housing issues to Somali refugees and asylum seekers. The project will now also arrange referral to ESOL classes and information seminars aimed at preventing problems arising with welfare, housing and debt. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £186,236 |
| MK/1/ 010061560 | Hounslow Law Centre Limited | The project is long established and aims to deliver an integrated advice service to established and new refugee communities in outer West London in order to improve the legal, economic and social situation of this client group. The project achieves this by providing information, advice, guidance and advocacy to asylum seekers and refugees until satisfactory job or work placement outcome is reached. This project offers training for service providers as well as acting as an advice service for other organisations on refugee related matters. | Advice/ Information— Specific Areas | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £229,648 |
| MJ/1/ 010045212 | Kings Cross Homelessness Project | This project aims to contact homeless families living in temporary accommodation in the Kings Cross, Euston and Camden area and link them into advice and services that they need. The project will specifically target those that have so far not received advice or support from existing networks by undertaking outreach to homeless families in temporary accommodation at Hostels, Hotels and Bed & Breakfast's. Initially the families will be introduced to the 2 centres of Kings Cross Homeless Project and Field Lane Homeless Families Centre, and through this any further needs will be identified and solutions sourced. The majority of these families are Refugees and Asylum seekers, whose situation is made harder because their first language is not English. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £59,239 |
| MK/1/ 010058882 | Leeds Asylum Seekers Support Network | The project will provide a befriending, orientation and learning support service for refugee and asylum seekers in Leeds. | Other social support service | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £285,996 |
| ML/1/ 010062673 | Mama Na Dada International | This is a mentoring and helpline project that will help young refugees and asylum seekers through peer support. This will be in the form of a telephone helpline and on-line support. The project will also involve an outreach qualified counsellor who will visit people that do not have access to, or are unable to visit the offices. The volunteers involved in the project will go through a training programme which will enable them to help run the service. | Counselling and self-help—not health-related | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £13,390 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| MJ/1/ 010032655 | Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Refugee Forum | The project is to establish a refugee resource centre. The centre will provide somewhere for refugees and asylum seekers to meet and obtain information, support and practical help and will promote public awareness and a better understanding of the issues facing refugees and asylum seekers. | Community Centre | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £158,299 |
| MJ/1/ 010032391 | Springfield Community Flat | Project to focus on the appointment of a Senior Project Manager to enable the charity to continue and extend its role of support and empowerment within a deprived community. The project will expand current services including the provision of a creche for the use of asylum seekers in Euro Tower and work towards the creation of a new community health centre. The postholder will free up time for the present community development worker and other staff/volunteers to deal with day-to-day operations, enabling the Senior Project Manager to extend the organisation's partnerships and co-ordinate local community development by working with a range of statutory and voluntary sector agencies under regeneration and neighbourhood renewal initiatives. Priority activities include reopening adventure playground, creche at Euro Tower and Stockwell Community Centre, playschemes, debt counselling and family support work. | Other community service | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £103,231 |
| MK/1/ 010056077 | The Comfrey Project | The organisation promote the health and well being of asylum seekers and refugees by reducing the profound isolation, loneliness and boredom felt by many. This project will offer allotment based horticultural activities in up to four locations. It will provide well equipped sites for users to meet as a group with staff, to plan, cultivate and maintain allotments. Users will have the opportunity to make decisions, take control and be respected and valued. The project workers will also work with individuals to identify other needs and sign post users to appropriate help and information. | Other recreational activities | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £130,764 |
| MH/1/ 010047838 | The Hanlon Centre | The project is to continue a time-limited project that provides services for Somali asylum seekers and refugees through paying for the salary of an existing Somali/Arabic speaking Community Worker, who will assist beneficiaries in finding training and employment. | Employment Advice/ Information | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £57,383 |
| ML/1/ 010061048 | The Horn of Africa Community Group | The Anti-Poverty Project will tackle poverty and social exclusion by providing support and services to vulnerably housed and homeless people in the Somali community. It will assist them in overcoming the barriers of language and cultural and social differences which means that they cannot often access entitlements and services on their own. Essential services will be delivered in the form of advice, advocacy and outreach work to assist people facing homelessness, housing repairs, racial harrassment, overcrowding, evictions and welfare complaints. | Advice/ Information— Specific Areas | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £35,000 |
| MK/1/ 010062477 | The Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture | The organisation provides survivors of torture who have come to the UK with medical treatment, practical assistance and psychotherapeutic support, Document evidence of torture, provide training for health professionals working with torture survivors, educate the public & decision makers about torture & its consequences, ensure that Britain honours its international obligations towards survivors of torture, asylum seekers and refugees. | Not Otherwise Classified | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £328,620 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | The project will strengthen & build within the UK local/regional capacity to deal with the large numbers of asylum seekers & refugees who have been dispersed outside London. This will be done by providing specialist training to refugee community organisations and the voluntary sector on refugee mental health. The org will provide training on support issues such as interpreting services, casework support & counselling support. In addition to formal training the project co-ordinate local services & community groups by providing advice & consultation. | | | |
| MK/1/ 010072241 | Waltham Forest Citizens Advice Bureau Service | The aim of the New Opportunities in Walthamstow (NOW) Project is to provide advice and assistance to both refugees and asylum seekers via outreach sessions held at the premises of refugee community organisations (RCOs) based in and around the SRB5 area in Walthamstow in addition to sessions held at their bureau in Leytonstone. The service spans the whole of Waltham Forest but also has an impact outside the borough boundaries through their social policy work. Long term the project aims to assist with practical, financial support and integration by maximising the use of existing legislation. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £165,354 |
| MH/1/ 010042221 | Worldwide House of Hope | Project to fund the employment of a new co-ordinator in order to develop and strengthen the organisation's services and activities. The community served by the organisation is French speaking West African. It gives advice on issues such as housing, education, training, immigration and employment. It disseminates information and raises awareness on the above issues and helps with registering people with a GP, liaising with housing agencies etc. The project will provide translation and interpretation for the benefit of French speaking West Africans and will link them with mainstream services and opportunities in education, training and employment. | Advice/ Information in a range of different areas | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £52,320 |
| MJ/1/ 010038677 | Yemini Education and Relief Organisation | The project is to employ a projects manager and a development worker to enhance and develop the services provided by the organisation. | Other social support service | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £137,029 |
| MJ/1/ 010049734 | Yemini Refugee Organisation | A development project to provide advice and support to refugees and asylum seekers as they seek to rebuild their lives and integrate into their local communities. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Mixed—work with long-term communities and new arrivals | £182,747 |
| MK/1/ 010058133 | Asylum Aid | Asylum Aid was founded in 1990 and has become one of the leading independent agencies assisting refugees in the UK. Its core work consists of advising and representing people in their asylum applications. Its focus is on the most vulnerable and disadvantaged of refugees, including women, children and the disabled and those without access to other sources of advice. This project will combine community development, training and research on issues affecting women refugees in the UK with provision of expert, sympathetic advice, support and legal representation (this part of the project will be paid for by Legal Services Commission) to individual women. | Access to information advocacy, campaigns or awareness- raising | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £219,799 |
| MJ/1/ 010036013 | Asylum Welcome | This project will enable this organisation to develop their Advice and Guidance activities. | Advice/ Information | Newly arrived | £255,575 |

Ev 34 Committee of Public Accounts: Evidence

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | This will be done by resourcing an advice, guidance and support service that will be available four days per week, developing an outreach service, developing a detainee service, and developing a youth service for unaccompanied young refugees. | in a range of different areas | asylum seeker support | |
| MJ/1/010021268 | Brighton and Hove Citizens Advice Bureaux | The project will involve three organisations (Brighton and Hove Citizens Advice Bureau, Brighton Housing trust and Money Advice and Community Support Services) who, working together as a consortium will provide a free immigration advice and money advice service, enabling those in debt to get advice and negotiating affordable repayment programmes. The service will be accessible through convenient opening times and outreach work. | Other specific area of advice/information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £144,655 |
| MJ/1/010034482 | FIAC Limited | This project is a development of one which ended in March 2002. It will work with specialist legal advice providers who are, or hope to be franchised in developing policy and implementing the Specialist Quality Mark and enhancing its information services to benefit members, second tier agencies and others. | Advice/Information in a range of different areas | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £168,309 |
| MK/1/010062119 | Hillingdon Law Centre | This project aims to provide refugees and asylum seekers with quality information, advice and representation when applying for refugee or asylum status to remain in the UK. Through providing accurate information, better informing clients, and representing individuals at tribunals the organisation will reduce the number of rejected refugee and asylum applications. Through this project the organisation hope to reduce the stress and anxiety felt by refugees and asylum seekers going through the status recognition process, and therefore improve their well-being and health. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £134,353 |
| MK/1/010070664 | Losanganya L Analengo De London | The project aims to provide refugees and asylum seekers with professional advice, counselling, interpretation and translating services, training and employment advice and emergency food and shelter assistance for newly arrived asylum seekers. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £176,203 |
| MK/1/010074344 | Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture | The Medical Foundation provide clinical and social support to survivors of torture and their families. Most of the people that they see are refugee and asylum-seekers and the majority of them require an interpreter who are able to advise the clinical staff on the cultural background of the clients and are involved in all the clinical services of the Foundation. The project aims to provide all clients with an interpreter who is culturally sensitive to his or her individual and family needs, by improving the quality of the interpretation they provide and by organising their interpretation resources more effectively. | Advice/Information and Counselling | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £230,624 |
| MJ/1/010045576 | National Coalition of Anti Deportation Campaigns | The organisation educates the public on anti deportation issues, gives support to campaigns on anti deportation and lobbies Government on unjust deportation. This project seeks to develop MF253185, funded by the England Committee. It would provide advice and support for deportees, provide a network for them to meet and support each other, lobby for justice for migrants in the UK and educate and inform about deportation and immigration issues. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £336,261 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | This will be achieved by employing a worker in the North East to meet the increasing need caused by dispersal, developing new anti deportation campaigns, publication of a newsletter, production of electronic bulletins, updating of the website, organisation of national meetings and the development of a network to support people facing deportation. | | | |
| MH/1/ 010040539 | Rafidain Relief Association | The project is to develop an existing grant (MF219520) to provide a range of support services to newly arrived Iraqi asylum seekers and refugees. Services will include advice and information on issues such as immigration, housing and welfare benefits, job related training and employment preparations such as interview techniques, completing applications and CVs and job search programmes. In addition beneficiaries will have access to mother tongue classes, counselling on health, play schemes for children and cultural and social events. Development aspects include the provision of interpreting and translation, advocacy services for families and practical support for disabled members. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £52,096 |
| MJ/1/ 010028765 | Refugee Action Kingston | Development project to support newly arrived and vulnerable refugees through volunteer programme. The project will aim to ensure meaningful participation of asylum seekers and refugees as volunteers in the development and delivery of services provided by the charity in partnership with its own Refugee Support Project which covers Sutton, Richmond and Kingston. The project will therefore be extended to Sutton and Richmond. Refugees and asylum seekers will be able to volunteer and work alongside local people providing an enriching cross cultural educational experience. The aim is to provide users with a comprehensive package of support ranging from practical and emotional to recreational and social activities, through the volunteering and mentoring programme of skills development and exchange. The Adult and Community Learning Fund will pay for six 10-week courses over 2 years at local Adult Education College for 60 mentors in total. Number of volunteers expected to increase from 50 to 130. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £155,076 |
| MK/1/ 010065349 | Refugee Council (The) | This three-year project will offer assessment and referral services to newly arrived asylum seekers who are experiencing emotional distress. People will be referred on to Community Mental Health Teams (CMHTs), Community Refugee Organisations and the Medical Foundation for the Care of Victims of Torture. This project will offer clients a weekly or fortnightly meeting with a caseworker for six months to a year, to see them through the trauma of arrival or while they are on waiting lists for other agencies. | Advice/ Information— Specific Areas | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £211,539 |
| MJ/1/ 010036889 | Refugee Lifeline | A project to provide dedicated Advice Workers with language skills and translation support to provide confidential, quality, targeted advice to asylum seekers, refugees and people who have entered the UK but are currently unknown to the Immigration Service or who have “disappeared” during the long asylum process but that now wish to make a formal application to remain or to extricate themselves from an abusive situation resulting from the circumstances of their entry. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £189,837 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| MK/1/ 010060830 | Sahil Housing Association | An application to develop an existing Community Fund funded project to support the Somali community especially in the areas of housing, health, education and training and welfare issues. The project will improve access to advice and information, accommodation services for the homeless and support for newly-arrived refugees and asylum seekers. Interpretation and translation services will be made available for Somali people and the organisations that work with them. | Housing Advice/ Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £160,649 |
| ML/1/ 010061669 | Sangayi Association | To provide advice, support and guidance to newly-arrived refugees and asylum seekers and to members of the African French/Lingala community. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £51,880 |
| MJ/1/ 010034380 | Southwark Day Centre for Asylum Seekers | Project to develop activities at the organisation's three day centres in Southwark, providing asylum seekers with an informal environment for establishing social links, having lunch, clothes and advice and advocacy on immigration and housing. The centres will enable asylum seekers to broaden their opportunities in education and give confidence in English as a foreign language. It will ensure that users' basic needs are appropriately met through statutory agencies in health, housing, education and social services. The development aspect of the project will be shown in targeting refugees and asylum seekers who have special needs (physical and/or mental), unaccompanied minors, families and victims of trauma/torture. Partnerships will be formed to provide counselling and appropriate housing. Support will also be given to community or specific ethnic groups wishing to set up on their own, with the aim of sustaining the local community of refugees and asylum seekers. | Immigration and Nationality Advice/ Information | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £204,192 |
| MH/1/ 010049447 | The London Detainee Support Group | The London Detainee Support Group is set up to provide advice, support and assistance to people who have been detained in London. The project will enable the group to attract and increase the numbers of volunteer visitors who support the asylum seekers who are in detention centres. The work will also involve developing a library of information that the volunteers can use to provide valuable support. | Advice/ Information and Counselling | Newly arrived asylum seeker support | £19,618 |
| MJ/1/ 010034426 | Black and Minority Ethnic Community Partnership | This 3-year project would enable the BME community in Brighton and Hove to develop new self-help groups, improve liaison with existing community groups and improve local service provision. | Resource centre | Removed— not RAS focused | £179,781 |
| MK/1/ 010063712 | Bristol Resource Centre | This project is to continue to offer a reception/ information service to undertake diagnostic interviews with callers, provide basic information and advice, make referrals, book interpreters, and complete forms. It also plans to undertake a consultation exercise about improving co-ordination between local organisations and produce best practice packs to facilitate multi agency communication and liaison. | Other specific area of advice/ information | Removed— not RAS focused | £120,813 |
| MK/1/ 010057689 | Child Psychotherapy Trust | This organisation works to promote the understanding and treatment of emotional or psychological disturbances and personality development in children and young people. It does this by producing information leaflets for parents and professionals, has an advice line and training. This is an emotional literacy programme to support parents and those working with them. It will produce written | Family Support/ Parenting Skills | Removed— not RAS focused | £300,091 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | information and Internet information to demystify the specialist knowledge held by child psychotherapists and makes it accessible to high risk and hard to reach groups. Outcomes of the project consist of enabling parents and professionals to understand the usual ages and stages of emotional development, what good parenting is and how to read the child's behaviour or language that expresses its needs and how fathers can contribute. The long-term changes they will try to effect are better parent—child relationships and improvement in the standard of parenting. | | | |
| MK/1/ 010063427 | Community Can Cycle | The project aims to alleviate poverty and debt amongst families in Castlemilk and surrounding areas and provide children with the opportunity for safe play and exercise by developing their community bicycle scheme which offers free repairs and a subsidised sales service. This will enable the organisation to bring the benefits of these services to more people, while greatly expanding its recycling operations to generate income with the aim of becoming self-sufficient. | Other community service | Removed— not RAS focused | £82,532 |
| MK/1/ 010055798 | Family Service Units | This project is a development of one funded by the Board approaching the end of its third year. This project will now tackle racism, break down isolation of residents, improve the employment prospects with vocational training, reduce youth crime and provide capacity building | Voluntary Sector Development | Removed— not RAS focused | £198,266 |
| MJ/1/ 010038144 | National Rent Deposit Forum | This is a development application seeking to continue the creation of new rent deposit schemes, building more partnerships with other housing organisations in providing the homeless and potentially homeless with access to information regarding the renting of accommodation. | Housing Advice/ Information | Removed— not RAS focused | £409,525 |
| MH/1/ 010035329 | Sighthill Youth Centre | This project will enable the organisation to undertake essential refurbishments to its premises which will provide young people living in the Sighthill area with continued access to social, educational and recreational activities. The improvements will also provide greater scope to introduce a wider range of activities and cater for various other community groups. | Other community facility | Removed— not RAS focused | £11,579 |
| MJ/1/ 010053753 | The British Institute of Human Rights | The British Institute of Human Rights increases public awareness and understanding of human rights issues, enables vulnerable and marginalized groups to understand and claim their human rights effectively and act as a resource to policy makers and others on the human rights issues. They do this by holding an annual series of human rights lectures and debates, giving talks and presentations to schools, universities, and governments. This project will develop and establish a Community Outreach programme that will help community and voluntary groups to assist the most disadvantaged to know their human rights, know when they are being infringed and go on to combat discrimination and disadvantage. It will do this by a series of awareness raising sessions and human rights training, conferences seminars and workshops, and developing and publishing appropriate materials. | Human Rights | Removed— not RAS focused | £105,094 |
| MH/1/ 010050766 | The Glasgow Young Women's Christian Association | This project aims to meet the demands on a service that serves to improve the quality of life of vulnerable people, primarily women aged between 16-40, through a range of community learning, and childcare projects. | Family Support/ Parenting Skills | Removed— not RAS focused | £59,914 |

| <i>Unique Reference Number</i> | <i>Applicant Name</i> | <i>Info: Project Summary</i> | <i>Codes: Project Work</i> | <i>Type of work with RAS</i> | <i>Current Award Value</i> |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| MH/1/ 010035420 | World's End Under Fives Centre | The project will provide low cost childcare services for low income families, whilst providing support, developing friendships and networks to improve the quality of parenting within the local community. | Day Nursery/ Creche | Removed— not RAS focused | £59,949 |
| | | | Long-term projects | 45 | |
| | | | Mixed projects | 27 | |
| | | | Newly arrived projects | 16 | |
| | | | Project without RAS focus | 10 | |