Grenfell Community Assembly

Notes from Grenfell Community Assembly Held on Tuesday 18th November 2020

Theme: Grenfell Projects Fund

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

Introduction

The Grenfell Community Assembly has been established to ensure that Grenfell related matters are openly discussed and provide the place for statutory and non-statutory partners to respond to local concerns.

An Assembly will take place approximately every eight weeks in North Kensington, bringing the conversation closer to residents. The Assembly is not a replacement for Grenfell Scrutiny, there will be ongoing scrutiny of Grenfell issues through the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee and four Select Committees.

November 2020 Grenfell Community Assembly

The third Assembly took place on 18th November 2020 online and was publicised to residents, with a specific aim to attract residents who do not normally engage with the Council. This included a variety of methods, including: leaflets, social media and the Council's website.

The topic of this Grenfell Community Assembly was the 'Grenfell Projects Fund'. The Assembly provided an opportunity for residents to discuss how they felt about the Grenfell Projects Fund had worked including, marketing, administration, process and the presentation days.

Over 48 residents attended the last online Grenfell Assembly, in addition to a number of local Councillors.

To date the Grenfell Projects Fund has awarded a total of £678,433.90 to 57 projects, all voted for by local residents from North Kensington.

Assembly agenda

The Assembly took place between 5.30pm and 7.30pm, with the following agenda:

Time	Item
5.30pm	• Online arrivals
5.55pm	• Grenfell Projects Fund Film
6.00pm	• Welcome, introductions and overview of the evening
6.10pm	• Grenfell Projects Fund Update
6.20pm	• Breakout Room Discussion (Round One)
6.40pm	• Participatory Budgeting Values and Principles
6.45pm	• Breakout Room Discussion (Round Two)
7.05pm	• Community Works Update
7.15pm	• Overview of Miro
7.22pm	• Next Steps and introduction topic for the next Community Assembly
7.25pm	• Closing remarks

Online Workshop discussions

As part of the agenda, residents had the opportunity to be part of the evaluation process for the Grenfell Projects Fund and put forward recommendations for the next round. Questions posed were:

1. What worked well?
2. What worked less well?
3. How could we take the learning from the first Grenfell Fund to improve future rounds?

Introduction

An external facilitator chaired the Assembly. The online breakout room discussions were facilitated with a mixture of council officers and Young Ambassadors from the Youth Participation Team.

This report does not include personal identifiable data, and we have not published information that is sensitive or names of individuals that were put forward during the online breakout room discussions.

This document

This document contains a summary of feedback from the Assembly, as well as more detailed feedback generated at each online breakout room. We hope that this document is read by people who did not attend the event and encourages more people to take part in future Grenfell Community Assemblies.

We have included the detailed feedback notes of the comments and views expressed by individual residents at each discussion table, it does not necessarily mean that each comment is endorsed by the majority of attendees or the many residents who were not present for those discussions.

Next steps

In partnership with our colleagues in across the council, we are working on an action focused response plan that will be shared with the community by the end of January 2021.

The response plan will include the actions we are already taking, the actions we have planned and potential new actions that have been identified by the community. The response plan will also include ways in which the community can be involved as well as ways the community can contribute to improving services locally. The Grenfell Community Assembly will review the response plan at the start of the next Grenfell Community Assembly.

As the Assembly becomes more established, we hope to get even more residents to either facilitate the whole event or the online and/or table discussions to allow for greater resident involvement.

The next Assembly will likely take place in January 2021. The date will be Monday 25th January, and this will again be online. Further details will be publicised via the Council's website and other social media formats.

Acknowledgements

The Council would like to thank everyone that attended and participated in the Grenfell Community Assembly and to all the partner organisations that attended, assisted and facilitated discussions.

Summary of discussions

This section of the report captures the key points of the discussions held on the seven themes at November's Grenfell Community Assembly. Full details of comments made in relation to each theme can be seen on subsequent pages.

Session One: Evaluating GPF: What worked well and less well

Projects' impact, value for money
- Some projects were received very well
- Some projects do not benefit the local community or have questionable value
- Some projects not costed well, either too expensive or unable to deliver with their funding
- Not enough funds or badly distributed

Participation and transparency
- Participatory budgeting seen as change for the better, attempt to put power back into the community
- There is appetite for much more engagement from early-on to shape the Fund
- Challenges to transparency and to what extent the Council is actually listening

Voting process, decision days
- Voting process felt like popularity contest although successful projects felt empowered, very competitive process that put too much pressure on presenters, voters biased towards friends, lack of protection from bullies within the community
- Decision days too long with too many presentations, events seemed too expensive and not best use of money
- Complaints around ID checking on decision days, residents without passports and driving licences felt excluded

Outcomes/categories
- Opportunity for more balance between number of projects in each group and fairer distribution of funds that could benefit projects in undersubscribed categories (compared to very competitive oversubscribed categories)
- Outcomes or categories in which projects were grouped felt arbitrary

Support for applicants
- Applicants want more support to prepare bids and presentations
- Applicants would like more communication from the Council to understand the process

Support for successful projects, funding release
- Delays to release funds damaged projects' delivery and trust in the process
- Successful projects need more support to improve admin skills and financial control

Session Two: Moving forward and governance

Governance
- Governing schemes proposed include residents' panel and methodologies such as World Cafe
- Calls for Council to decrease their role in running the fund by commissioning voluntary organisations and/or sourcing more administrators within the community

Participation and transparency
- Calls for more participation, for reviewing the competition element of voting/decision days, and for fostering more collaboration and less competition between bidders/projects
- Council should increase transparency and listen more
- Calls for more youth participation throughout the process

Voting process, decision days
- Calls for more support for smaller organisations to prepare presentations, explore alternatives for written, online, pre-recorded video presentations
- Voting could be done online although there are concerns around digital exclusion
- Find ways to tackle bullying, perhaps agree with the community ground rules for physical and online meetings

Outcomes/categories
- Revise outcomes with the community
- Calls for community steer to decide how to group projects and what outcome each project belongs to

Support for applicants
- Offer more support for applicants including training
- Have clear guidelines on how applicants should engage with the Council

Assembly feedback
- 59% of residents found session useful, 31% weren't sure, 9% didn't. Numbers based on 32 responses to snap poll
- Calls for more structured conversations, more time to speak and less presentations

Themed discussions

This section of the report puts forward detailed notes from each of the online breakout room discussions.

The detailed feedback notes capture the comments and views expressed by individual residents at each discussion table, it does not necessarily mean that each comment is endorsed by the majority of attendees.

Session One: Evaluating GPF: What worked well and less well
Projects' impact, value for money

1. There were many special projects that really have made a difference
2. Some projects don't benefit the local community or have questionable value
3. Some projects not costed well, either too expensive or unable to deliver with their funding
4. Not enough funds or badly distributed
    - Some projects don't benefit the local community
        - Some of the projects questionable value
        - Some projects more meaningful than others
        - Funding should be allocated based on the area
        - Some ideas needed more thought
        - Projects were well meaning
        - Not that impactful projects
    - Projects not costed well
        - Some projects too expensive
        - Got to make sure projects will deliver with their funding
        - Some projects e.g. Mind Utd were well costed and allowed money for others
        - Positive collaboration: Groups were helping others to deliver projects
    - Important projects couldn't be funded, not enough funds
        - More projects could have benefited from the funding who did not receive it
        - Some projects weren't deserving of the funding and if other projects hadn't dropped out then they may not have received the funding
    - Suggestions for the way forward:
        - Put more funding into activities that are able to take place despite COVID

Participation and transparency

1. Participatory budgeting seen as change for the better, attempt to put power back into the community
2. There is appetite for much more engagement from early-on to shape the Fund
3. Challenges to transparency and to what extend the Council is actually listening
    - Imaginative and change for the better
        - Intention to put power back into the community
        - Went ok
        - Went extremely smooth
        - For a first time it went well and thank you all staff
        - Wonderful that community gets a say in projects
        - Noted that RBKC has been listening more
        - Fairly easy process

- New fresh idea for pitching for people's voice
  o Residents must be much more involved in shaping the Fund
    - Needed more early-on community engagement
    - Many feel frustrated at the process' lack of accountability and transparency of the funding and ignoring the "people on the ground"
    - Faith projects didn't feel they could participate
      • I don't accept that faith congregations didn't want to engage
    - It is important that the community can see the projects in front of them and then make a decision
  o Lack of trust in the community
    - Projects felt pre-approved
    - Wasn't clear why some were funded, and others weren't
    - Answers to questions that residents ask needs addressing
  o Suggestions for the way forward:
    - A lot of the projects currently needing funding should be being supported by the Council already so Grenfell money could then support more 'extra' projects
    - Fund must comply with the Charter for Participation
    - Under £10,000 grants may meet with a smaller panel to reduce scrutiny, smoother process?
    - Should fund people in the community in administrative roles
    - Must transfer the balance of power to the community
    - I really want to hear about round 2 to be honest

Voting process, decision days

1. Voting process felt like popularity contest although successful projects felt empowered, very competitive process that put too much pressure on presenters, voters biased towards friends, lack of protection from bullies within the community
2. Decision days too long with too many presentations, events seemed too expensive and wasted of money
3. Complains around ID checking on decision days, residents without passports and driving licences felt excluded
   o The pitch days felt like a popularity contest
     - X-factor like funding, widespread view
     - Some people voting for their friends, a popularity contest rather than on what was best for the community
     - People bringing along their friends to vote for them so unfair and biased
     - People that were pitching and/or their friends tried to get you to vote for them
     - Too much local politics and local egos
     - Questions around the validity of the vote - could this be done in a different way?
     - You need to be fairly confident to go on stage
     - Anxious for community members. Especially those not native English speakers
     - Very Competitive process
     - Perhaps morality, disagree with process

- Discontent about how the voting is done
- Groups that had nothing to do with the community were receiving money
- 2 or 3 projects weren't able to be funded the full amount. Ended up dropping out of the whole process.
- Some groups in the community lost out on the money
- Some people felt it would be too much pressure
- Presenters felt rushed, too much pressure on presenters
- Should have realised people from community wouldn't feel comfortable presenting and should have been more support for them
- When people were upset on the day just brushed under carpet, don't think anyone from the council ever said sorry
- Should have been handled with a lot more empathy from the council
- Not impressed with community attitude and lack of support towards presenters
- Group of presenters heckled by a man in the community. Lack of protection. This has put certain individuals off.
- A number of organisations not as well received; more protection/support should have been provided
- Felt empowered that their projects were voted on-had support
- Was really empowered being voted by the community was humbling
  - Some issues on first decision day
    - Too many projects to vote in a single day
    - Too much money spent on first event
    - Cost of delivery very expensive
    - The food and the drink part of the event was taking too much time
    - Too much focus on the meal
    - Too many pitchers on the day can lead to less concentration, drops and people leave before the end
    - Not enough time for full presentations
    - Not organised enough, not thought through enough about how much time each presenter would need
    - No real handle on how it would go
    - Very long day
    - Very tiring as so many presentations and some so very similar
    - Should have known in advance that there wasn't enough time for all the presentations on first day
    - Did not feel the community was represented enough
    - The day went well, staff worked well
    - A lot was going on the day, but it went well
    - Good turnout
    - Some amazing groups got some money.
    - Food on the day was lovely, general agreement
    - Good vegetarian options
    - Woman facilitating fairly good
    - People were worried but it all worked on decision day

- Registration documents - had to carry passport, should be allowed registration confirmation
  - Establishing residency is one thing. Requiring ID in order to gain access to a community event in which they were being asked to vote on how to spend their own recovery money is blatantly anti-inclusive. Residents should have other ways to establish their residency than providing formal ID, which many may not have.
  - Refused entry at 2nd Decision day as 'not registered' but had registered
- Suggestions for the way forward:
  - Having next round online may be inconvenient for some but emphasis on providing for those without access to desktops
  - Digital Exclusion of some parts of the community like older people and people with learning difficulties and disabilities
  - Need for more structure and an overview of the different projects to be presented

Outcomes/categories
- No balance between number of projects in each group, unfair distribution of funds benefited projects in undersubscribed categories compared to very competitive oversubscribed categories
- Outcomes or categories in which projects were grouped felt arbitrary
  - Some categories oversubscribed
    - Some categories undersubscribed - so all projects funded
    - Not enough projects for every outcome- Health and Wellbeing in particular felt oversubscribed
    - Waste of time being there if projects were automatically allocated funding
    - Went home halfway through due to automatic funding being allocating
  - Categories a bit arbitrary
    - Projects grouped all together should be better organised
    - RBKC chose the categories and where projects sit
    - My project was placed amongst many other projects with children, young people and adults and felt that what we deliver was not communicated appropriately

Support for applicants
1. Applicants want more support to prepare bids and presentations
2. Calls for Council to improve communication with applicants
   - The process was not clear/ communication
     - Improve Comms with providers
     - Lack of communication via email meant views were not heard
     - Make the application process and conditions necessary clear
     - Set up system for applicants to check status of their application
     - Have process and timeline written down to make it clearer
     - Some questions were repetitive on the application
     - A lot of confusion amongst those who were bidding
     - The way the rules and criteria were explained wasn't clear
     - More feedback where projects were unsuccessful

- Application was easy
- Community need more support before hand
    - Didn't feel ready to apply then but feel ready now
    - Some projects needed more help to get to decision days
    - Felt that we were not given another chance with application
    - Projects dropped out due to process being biased and not meeting the needs of the community
    - More community and organisation support towards creating a community video. Videos allow for more polished messages
    - Community members should have equal footing with RBKC staff
    - Initial stage was very stressful
- Suggestions for the way forward:
    - Set up a support hub for community organisations to help them apply, general agreement with this

Support for successful projects, funding release
1. Delays to release funds damaged projects' delivery and trust in the process
2. Successful projects need more support to improve admin skills and financial control
    - Funding not released to projects until a late stage causing further delays
        - One project had to borrow funds in order to deliver until they received their funding
        - Outstanding projects that gained funds who relied on the funding
        - Many people think funding is too far delayed
        - Council and not community are controlling the funding despite what it is alleged
        - Why do we have to self-fund?
    - Many not have admin or finance skills or access to office materials, needs to be some support for community
        - GPF group (positive comment probably referring to GPF successful group meetings)
        - Project for young people run by a family affected by the fire abandoned
        - Andreia has been fantastic
        - A lot of word of mouth concerns being raised, a lot of projects that now need funding and wonder if this is the right route for it
    - Suggestions for the way forward:
        - Workshops beforehand to help understanding and gain more support during meetings eg learning how to do a risk assessment

Session Two: Moving forward and governance
Governance
- Calls for Council to decrease their role in running the fund by commissioning voluntary organisations and/or sourcing more administrators within the community
- Governing schemes proposed include residents' panel and methodologies such as World Cafe
    - Council should not facilitate the process directly

- If the process you're building requires administration, why hasn't the administrator been sourced from within the community?
- If a trusted bridge group were handling this money, they could just phone people up to talk to them rather than worry about public image and bureaucracy.
- People who have worked in the borough and understand North Kensington should be more involved as they have more trust in them than council officers
- We need to get the Council out of the room as much as possible
- Define whether or not this is the right structure to work in north ken
- Commission KCSC to run the Fund
    - Design and deliver
    - Will get better results with less money
    - They are embedded in the community, more than Council
    - Lovely relationship, better results than the council with less money
    - KCSC should be engaged to run the community-led projects grants distribution. There is no one else the community trusts with the administration of these funds, and frankly it's unethical for the council to do so, given the current court case/s.
  - Follow Charter for public participation
  - Everyone really need to present in person?
  - Who governs the process with providers or applicants?
  - Need checks and assurances
  - Have a local panel that would vote on local projects - more local engagement
  - Maybe apply World Cafe dynamics
  - Consider providing funds to ongoing activities which have received no funding yet. Limiting the application pool to "new" projects is unnecessarily punitive to community-led projects that have been successful despite the paywall.
    - Not only that but some projects have been working despite COVIDS. Why should those not be considered for funding and support?
  - Budget could go further

Participation and transparency
- Calls for more participation, for reviewing the competition element of voting/decision days, and for fostering more collaboration and less competition between bidders/projects
- Council should increase transparency and listen more
- Calls for more youth participation throughout the process
  - Need greater participation
    - More of the public co designing
    - How to engage people with quiet voices?
    - How many more different people can we get from the community, more people to be invited to watch
    - It is felt that this is being done in a top down way
    - Competition element not really needed since most got funded
        - Share ideas to improve proposals not compete
        - Everybody must have the same format

- - Community need to be better informed so they can make decisions
    - Asking inexperienced people to give their views on what they want but limited by what they know
    - Need some project managers to explain and give either or options
  - Residents should have more opportunity for consultation on the recovery strategy.
    - More consultation on Recovery Strategy
    - Residents should have more interactive opportunities to consult on the strategy
  - More focus on every community, not just Notting Dale
  - Every ward has been impacted not just Notting Dale
- Council should increase their transparency
  - RBKC needs to listen more than it currently is
  - Need to listen more to the answers and take time to understand community views
  - When you restate my views, make sure you've actually understood them. And when I tell you haven't understood, BELIEVE ME.
  - A lot of what was wrong with original process were pretty obvious and we have told you
  - Asked a lot and boxes are ticked but don't see what happens
  - There are some very upset people who feel like they are being ignored, a lot of frustration and people feel like they are not being heard
  - Community researchers could have told you all this years ago, and in fact they did. Why was community-led research discounted in this process?
  - Pretty soon the Council is going to get to the point that people won't come to these sort of events etc
  - Don't see any improvements
  - RBKC is not showing us they are trustworthy
  - Build more trust with the community
  - FACTORS THAT ERODE COMMUNITY RESILIENCE Include: Protracted incidents, Domestic dislocation, Mistrust of leadership, Lack of predictability, Inadequate recovery resources, Human-caused, Child-related, Poor communications, Misleading communications, Preventability of the event, A large number of fatalities
  - Issues with data protection. Transparency on how data is being stored and for how long.
- Give young people more ownership - they are the future
  - A lot of projects were for young people - young people's views should be included
  - Young people should be involved throughout the process
  - Engage more with young people and involve them - see what the people want
  - More projects for young people and opportunities for leadership
  - Concerned about young people in particular becoming disillusioned

Voting process, decision days

- Calls for more support for smaller organisations to prepare presentations, explore alternatives for written, online, pre-recorded video presentations
- Voting could be done online although there are concerns around digital exclusion
- Find ways to tackle bullying, perhaps agree with the community ground rules for physical and online meetings
    - A better process for those who are a smaller organisation or more shy
        - Voting process not fare for smaller organisations
        - People could choose to have an advocate to present on their behalf
        - Don't force everyone to present
        - Some pitchers much more skilled than others, unfair
        - Presenters should have more time, so everyone is able to concentrate
        - Too many pitchers in one day
        - 20-30 projects on each day maximum
        - Too many projects being voted on for one day - divide into groups based on which projects apply which groups of people
        - More clarity on what is expected on presentation days
        - Shorter presentation days so people can absorb it better
        - Need to be able to decide between similar projects
        - Similar projects could be merged together - a lot were very similar
        - Proposals must be more clear
            - Short brief on what each company does
        - Limit the numbers of projects doing the same thing
        - Watch presentation of all similar projects together then vote after hearing them all. E.g. all physical together, all arts projects, can compared like for like
        - Part of people's material wasn't shared
        - It can't be all about popularity
        - People dismissed because of the X-factor like platform
        - Too competitive
        - There needs to be a scope for residents to ask questions. No time allocated for Q&A
        - Alternatives to face to face presentation
            - Write out proposal instead of presenting
            - Video presentation allow residents to pick and choose which presentations they want to watch. Could prevent potential triggers.
            - Videos can be vetted by the council.
            - Time limit should be put on the video allowing every party an equal amount of time.
            - Council should offer funds to help groups prepare and create a video presentation
            - Will help and support local and young filmmaker
        - Council got local businesses to provide food for the events.
        - A lot of time was wasted last event due to the many breaks and lunch breaks.
    - Voting can be done online

- More online voting for young people
- Young people should be voting for projects engaging young people not adults voting
- Use online voting and consultation Zoom works. Rather than wasting money on first event could've had little events at community centres
- Money spent on events could have gone to projects
- Have the community there in the room is positive
- Encourage more local people to attend
- Take it out to community centres. Don't just put it out on Next Door, use social media platforms
- Advertised on Instagram, Facebook, Twitter
- If people weren't being digitally excluded, you could hold these meetings online and people could take their time to review and vote on the projects -- e.g. like crowdfunding.
- More rules around voting system so less cronyism
- A way that people can vote through representatives
- FREE PUBLIC WIFI ACROSS RBKC - RBKC's potential projects are missing some pretty important and low-hanging fruit; providing free public WIFI to the borough would have an instantaneous positive effect counteracting digital exclusion faced by so many. This would help improve many lives directly, improving inclusion. Residents would be better served by this than by a jobs fair.
  - **BULLYING**: Council should introduce some ground rules for physical and online meets
    - Presenters should be offered the chance to present their projects on film
    - Ask community their opinion on what the ground rules should be
    - Need some empathy and some recognition of people's emotions
    - Bullying should be tackled. If a member in the audience has misbehaved, they should be barred from attending and voting
    - All presentations should be online. Removes bullying aspect, helps those who struggle with public speaking, allows Q&A in chat.

Outcomes/categories
- Revise outcomes with the community
- Calls for community steer to decide how to group projects and what outcome each project belongs to
  - Proposed outcomes should be decided by residents from the 7 wards
    - Projects could be split by targeting: Age groups/Gender
    - Making groups based on what they deliver e.g. dividing groups based on age groups they are delivering to. So, people can vote on projects that apply directly to them
    - Have more youth-based projects
    - How to make the decision more directly for the community
    - 8 outcomes to be proposed
    - Perhaps remove categories - people could be able to vote on individual categories - not prescriptive categories
  - The community should decide what groups to put the applicants into

Support for applicants
- Offer more support for applicants including training
- Have clear guidelines on how applicants should engage with Council
  - More support to smaller organisations to prepare bids and presentation throughout the application process
    - Harness and encourage smaller organisations to apply
    - More time to prepare presentations and proposals
    - Realistic costs and funding allocation - council could perhaps break down the costs and help people budget - make more realistic and sensible
    - Nurture and train people to deliver effective projects
    - Commission organisation to support smaller groups, interviews, video, presentation
    - Make the application process transparent and inclusive - people with interesting ideas may not have the skills to "polish" their plans, so give them ways to share their projects that don't require professional speaking skills or polished presentations
      - This is important since this is a traumatised community and may not be able to get up and speak easily
      - Make room for the quiet people. After all, this is a traumatised community with lots of ESL residents.
    - Support hubs for bidders
    - Have more support in pitching
    - More support for those who bid for projects for next round
    - There needs to be a lot more support for this in the community to make bids etc.
  - Guidance should be created to help organisations and communities know what can and not be presented
    - Document the way that applicants should expect to communicate with the governing body (timelines/dates, formal check-ins, expectations, requirements), and follow the published guidelines

Assembly feedback
- 59% of residents found session useful, 31% weren't sure, 9% didn't. Numbers based on 32 responses to snap poll
- Calls for more structured conversations, more time to speak and less presentations
  - Need some structure to asking us what we think
  - Tonight's meeting feels like being talked at and people not getting the opportunity to talk about what they want to
    - Absolutely this. When people tried to talk, they were shut down. It felt patronising
  - Feels like this is just more of the same
  - This Miro program is ludicrous for tracking things and documenting how people feel.

Chat Log

Projects' impact, value for money
- o We want progress report and outcomes and number of residents who benefit from it.
- o Whilst some really outstanding projects were funded there were a lot of shockingly bad ones that were a complete waste of time!

Participation and transparency
- o Co-design? Really? Could we have details and record of this engagement? I went to the one at the library and no one was there
- o Which budget are the bureaucrats and outside speakers being paid from?
- o Big question here: disclose and be transparent tell us if any of these people also work for the council because we heard it. it's not a conflict of interest?
- o It was the manner in which the whole process was managed and given to the community why groups dropped out. It was a disaster
- o 50% of over 70's and 33% of those with disabilities do not have access to digital technology. This really is a crucial issue during this period. (Digital impact assessment RBKC)
    - ▪ The elderly are effectively excluded from all this as they may not have internet connections, do not know how to use IT, do not have a smart phone that they know how to use, and they are more likely to die from Covid, especially if they are BAME
    - ▪ We have kids and elderly who are isolated, desperate for digital access and training. We know who they are - our friends and neighbours. Please have an accessible digital fund and WIFI across RBKC.
    - ▪ Digital access fund with training sounds great
- o It's more than just listens to us. It's about acting on what they are told. They listen and then discard!
- o RBKC only talks to RBKC RAs, not the rest. And too many RAs are led by old school KCTMO ex-employees and most are leaseholder dominated. Not representative of the rest of us at all

Voting process, decision days
- o Can we be told how many proposals that were NOT approved by the "community" were subsequently funded by RBKC?
- o What was the total cost of the first event you had at KCC?
- o It's also wrong to say, really, that the community chose the projects
- o How do residents without passports and driving licences provide ID?
    - ▪ If you want to reach out to people who are not often heard passports and driving licences are very restrictive
    - ▪ How about the electoral register? The Council Tax register? Council tax bill, telephone bill, electricity bill, gas bill
    - ▪ Provided ID beforehand at a registration appointment at Dalgarno but on turning up to the 2nd event at the church. I got refused entry and had to kick off to get in! I think RBKC fights against those who 'speak out'. However, I'm not easily gotten rid of so did get in

- - Residents provided their ID, and the council covertly recorded their passport number/driving licenses without knowledge or consent in a database
  - How many Outcome groups were so under subscribed that all projects were funded? thereby negating any public vote, and any claim to participatory budgeting.

Outcomes/categories
  - Six outcomes imposed upon us, chosen by whom? If there had been consultation, the fund would have been allocated taking into account the greater need for health and wellbeing.

Support for applicants
  - I have had to self-fund 9 out of 10 hours work I've done managing community-led projects and was excluded from the funding process because due to admin mistake.

Support for successful project, funding release
  - I will ask what I did in the Projects update meeting. Why were those who were able to operate not given their funding sooner? Many projects had to self-fund as the council were exceptionally slow in handing out the funding allotted. This meant that other projects, who've already had their funding cut by 50% by RBKC were having to sub projects to at least allow them to get started.
  - Why did those that were awarded a grant, and had adapted for Covid, and where ready to start, have to wait for so long for the money?
  - How many projects that were awarded funding have since been denied their funds?
  - Did they check if they are all DBS?

Assembly feedback
  - Can we get rid of the slides please? I would prefer to see attendees.
  - Do we want to go into rooms?
  - I understood this wasn't just for people who were involved in the funding process but also for this who might want to bid in future. As it seems it's not, I'll probably dip out of the meeting and catch up with people another time.
  - My group was small too, perhaps it is because there are so many council staff on this call, some of whom are to facilitate.
    - I think it is mainly council officers speaking to other council officers
  - This is supposed to be for us to discuss and raise what matters to US. And still the council are dictating what we may talk about.
  - No point going into breakout room
  - I wonder what RBKC will do with all the feedback that is being put on here, coz none of it is supporting their patronising actions!!

Community Works
  - Covid has changed a lot. Please speak to local organisations or groups. We desperately need to address that we are in a digital age. So many don't have digital access.

- We need to have internet/broadband access. Why do we not have this across North Kensington & RBKC, rather than in small pockets.
  - o Very pleased to see Area 4 and 6
  - o I think that the community would be better served by free public WIFI than job fairs.

Feedback from those that didn't go into breakout rooms (captured by Mutual Gain):
Voting process, decision days
  - o verification information required to attend the event - beyond passport or driving license. Tunde suggested passes like carnival, others in my group (I didn't have a scribe so not on Miro) suggested for social housing tenants they could bring their tenancy agreement, or we could accept a utility bill
  - o enough staff to process the verification documents to avoid disabled people queuing
  - o managing how voting pads are registered to people - can't get out without signing your voting pad out
  - o local estate-based leaders at the door welcoming (and identifying) who does live in their area

Support for successful project, funding release
  - o Calls for Swift distribution of funding post event