



# **Feasibility Study for a proposed Funding Advisors National Network**

**Date: January 2008**



Finance Hub  
Charities Aid Foundation  
St Andrew's House  
18-20 St Andrew's Street  
London EC4A 3AY  
Tel: 020 7832 3016  
Email: [financehub@cafonline.org](mailto:financehub@cafonline.org)  
Web: [www.financehub.org.uk](http://www.financehub.org.uk)

### **Delivery agent details**

Prepared by the National Funding Advice Partnership

c/o fit4funding  
93 Lawefield Lane  
Wakefield  
West Yorkshire  
WF2 8SU  
Tel. 01924 239063  
[www.fit4funding.org.uk](http://www.fit4funding.org.uk)

## Content list

1. Executive Summary .....	4
2. Introduction .....	5
2.1 Section 1 .....	5
2.2 Section 2 .....	6
2.3 Recommendations.....	7
3. Detailed survey results.....	8
3.1 Section 1 details .....	8
3.1.1. Qu. 1 – 4 details of those responding.....	8
3.1.2 Qu. 5 preferred model for a FANN .....	9
3.1.3 Qu. 6 - 7 nature of membership.....	11
3.1.4 Qu. 8 - 9 areas of work involved in a FANN .....	14
3.1.5 Qu. 10 who would get involved.....	17
3.1.6 Qu. 11 comments on Section 1 .....	18
3.2 Section 2 details .....	23
3.2.1 Qu. 13 – 17 preferred model – details.....	23
3.2.1 Qu. 18 – 22 membership – details.....	30
3.2.2 Qu. 26 involvement – details .....	37
3.2.3 Qu. 27 - 33 revenue funding for a FANN.....	39
3.2.4 Qu. 34 purchase of services.....	44
3.2.5 Qu. 35 sources of revenue funding .....	46
3.2.6 Qu. 36 definition of a FANN.....	46
3.2.7 Qu. 37 guiding principles .....	49

## **1. Executive Summary**

Funding advisers from around the country have contributed to this Feasibility Study, which concludes that a Funding Advice National Network (FANN) should be established, as a project of an existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector infrastructure organisation.

The business plan outlining the development of the FANN should have as high priority working closely with existing funding advice agencies operating at regional and district level, and ensure it complements their services rather than competing with them. It should also be established to deliver long-term sustainability for the FANN.

Respondents to the study wish to see a sustainable, inclusive national organisation, which demonstrates added value in the services it provides. It is likely to be funded through membership fees, income generation through service provision, and grants.

Membership of the FANN will need to reflect local and regional networks, individual agencies, and organisations providing funding advice. Priority for membership will be those who have “funding advice” as a key part of their role, and consideration will need to be given to all publicly funded sectors.

This Feasibility Study is part of a larger development funded through the Finance Hub, as part of their delivery of services on behalf of CapacityBuilders. The next stage of development will be preparation of a business plan, and funding applications, as well as seeking a cooperative agreement amongst existing funding advice agencies operating at a national level to the launch of a FANN in 2008.

Chris Hollins  
On behalf of the National Funding Advice Partnership  
January 2008

## **2. Introduction**

The survey was divided into two sections – the first (Qu.'s 1 – 11) asked about organisations, and a broad look at the issues, whilst the second section unpicked the issues in greater depth.

### **Section 1**

This Feasibility Study sought funding adviser views on the details of a proposed Funding Advice National Network (FANN). A national survey was conducted between the end of August and end of October 2007, which had broad and detailed responses from individuals and networks across England.

There is widespread support for the establishment of a FANN, and a very small percentage (5.3%) of respondents who would prefer that a FANN was not established. This study was designed to “get behind” the broad issues at some depth, and in doing so has identified a range of key areas requiring careful consideration. It has also identified that there is strong agreement on some key issues, which cuts across those who are both in favour of, or against, the establishment of a FANN, even if their final conclusions are different.

The study has identified the preferred model for a FANN (a project within an existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisation was the favoured option, though a new organisation providing FANN services was a strong second). Half of respondents (49.1%) preferred a combination of network, organisational and individual membership, whilst membership from most sectors (except private consultants) was preferred by the majority. 70% of respondents would become a member, and become involved.

Amongst the functions of a FANN which stood out were: Sharing/networking/mutual support; information on what others are doing; provision of specialist training and standards and funding intelligence; provision of national funding intelligence and regional information bulletins, representing the views of funding advisers. It is also recognized that some functions are best carried out at regional/local level.

Section 1. is summed up by the identification of a range of factors, which it is thought will determine the success of the proposed FANN. These include:

- **The question of time and priorities**
- **Added value**
- **Inclusive and diverse**
- **Avoid duplication and build on the regions**
- **Sustainability**
- **Sharing/networking**
- **Funding includes income generation**
- **Campaigning/advocacy**
- **Charges/fees**

## 2.2 Section 2

A representative structure is preferred by the vast majority of respondents, though this was qualified by some people commenting that getting on with the job was more important than structures.

Detailed examination of the three “models” and types of membership on offer identified several key issues, which were reflected in comments elsewhere in the study. However the one which stood out was (see Qu. 14)

- Long term sustainability issues

Whilst other matters backing this up included:

- The need for development of new services
- Potential for sharing of functions/skills
- Problems associated with being part of a larger agency
- Problems associated with buying in FANN services
- The value of individual membership
- Problems associated with time available for a FANN
- The need for representation from all regions

The means of governance of a FANN was examined, and respondents were in favour of

- Quarterly meetings
- At a central location (but which could be rotated)

And there was very strong support for involvement of staff in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector whose main function is funding advice

The method of funding a FANN was not so clearly agreed, with income generation and grants being neck and neck. Though membership fees were less well favoured.

Income generation was seen to provide for greatest long-term sustainability and just over half the respondents thought they might pay towards specific services offered by a FANN.

The majority were broadly in favour of the definition of a “Funding Advice Network” but there were many useful qualifications which will help define it further.

Finally there was very strong approval of all five “principles” which could support the development of a FANN (see Qu. 37) with greatest approval being given to

“The model should work with the support of existing services, not compete with them”

## **2.3 Recommendations**

- 2.3.1 A Funding Advice National Network should be established.
- 2.3.2 The model to be used should be a project within an existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector infrastructure organisation.
- 2.3.3 The business plan which develops this model further should ensure that the national network builds upon and works closely with the existing funding advice agencies already operating at regional and local level throughout England, and .....
- 2.3.4 ensure that it works collaboratively with these existing services, does not compete with them.
- 2.3.5 Where the FANN finds that its must generate income, it must demonstrate clear added value.
- 2.3.6 The model must be one which maximises longer-term sustainability.
- 2.3.7 The model must have demonstrable involvement, though in working with what already exists may have to find creative ways of achieving this.
- 2.3.8 That the Business Plan develops a three-year strategy for moving towards this model, with an interim steering group.

### 3. Detailed survey results

#### Section 1 details

##### 3.1.1. Qu. 1 – 4 details of those responding

Qu. 1 answer options	Response Percent	Response Count
Name	100.00%	276
Job title	100.00%	276
E-mail address	100.00%	276
Telephone number	100.00%	276
Organisation	64.5%	178
Address	100.00%	269
<i>answered question</i>		<b>276</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>1</b>

With well over 250 individuals responding to this survey the results are large enough to indicate the views of the sector. Not all have indicated the organisation for which they are responding, though a trawl through e-mail addresses indicates that they are broadly reflective of those where the organisation has been identified.

Qu. 2 Would you like to be kept informed about			
answer options	Yes	No	Response Count
The Funding Advisers National Network (FANN) activities	256	11	267
Finance Hub activities and resources	237	18	255
<i>answered question</i>			<b>271</b>
<i>skipped question</i>			<b>6</b>

Whether individuals or networks, the vast majority of respondents wish to be kept further informed of both the Finance Hub and the activities of the proposed FANN.

Qu. 3 Which of the options below do you represent? (please tick all that apply)		
answer options	Response Percent	Response Count
A funding advice network (please give name in comments)	16.5%	45
Yourself (funding advice is part of my role)	79.0%	215

Yourself (funding advice is NOT part of my role)	9.2%	25
Another organisation (please provide name in comments)	16.2%	44
Comment		80
<i>answered question</i>		<b>272</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>5</b>

In addition to individual responses, a large number of respondents have identified themselves as indicating the views of a broader network – these range from established regional/district funding advice networks, to others having a supportive role in a different way – for example funders forums, a village trust, a parish council, a grant officers group.

<b>Qu. 4 What KIND of organisation do you represent? (Please tick one only)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
A third sector organisation	69.0%	185
A local authority	14.9%	40
A for-profit consultancy	4.5%	12
Other independent funding advice organisation	1.9%	5
Other	9.7%	26
(please give details)		47
<i>answered question</i>		<b>268</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>9</b>

The nature of the organisations responding is broadly split between those we would expect to have a stake in the provision of funding advice. Overwhelmingly they are 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations, however there are significant contributions from public agencies – mainly local authorities – from private consultants (who have brought a particular viewpoint to many of the later questions) and other agencies such as Business Link. There are one or two unexpected responses – a university, a police force. Amongst the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector agencies, CVS are predominant as would be expected.

**Qu. 5 preferred model for a FANN**

<b>Qu. 5 Our preferred model for a funding advice national network (FANN) would be: (Please tick one only)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
A new organisation that directly provides FANN services	31.7%	83
A project within an existing 3rd sector infrastructure organisation.	48.9%	128
A new organisation with charitable aims that pays another organisation to provide FANN services	6.1%	16

Would prefer there wasn't a FANN	5.3%	14
Other	8.0%	21
(please give details)		42
<i>answered question</i>		262
<i>skipped question</i>		15

The complexity of issues surrounding the potential for a FANN are explored in greater depth in later questions, however a clear view emerges in the responses to this question about how such a national network might be best organised. The “front runner” by far is for a FANN within an existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisation, (at 48.9%) whilst the second favourite is for a new organisation (31.7%) to provide FANN services.

Respondents were also given the opportunity to say that they would prefer that a FANN was NOT developed, however this option was chosen by only 5.3% of those replying.

In spite of the clear expressions here the additional comments around this question provide a microcosm of the problems facing the “funding advice” sub-sector at the present time, and may be summarised by the following extracts:

### 1. Work with what is already there

“..... if one is developed, it would be preferred to pay the current FAWN facilitator to continue their excellent work rather than another new organisation.”

“Support to funding advisers is best delivered at a regional or sub regional level. Members would prefer if resources were made available to better resource regional FAWNs to enable the continuation of the excellent support already provided in the North East.”

“I would like to see a collaborative approach, which works with existing agencies”

“A collaboration of existing funding advice organisations.”

### 2. Delivery more important than structures

“I don't mind what the structure is as much as ensuring that it delivers services to those it is instigated to support. A focus upon service delivery and support should be the driving force NOT upon structure”

“Surely, what is does is far more important than how it is constituted or governed.”

### 3. Sustainability

“Although I would like to see an independent organisation, I cannot see how this would, currently, be feasible in terms of sustainable funding.”

“I don't mind how it's organised, as long as it works and continues to do so.”

#### 4. Duplication

“I think there is expertise within existing organisations to provide funding advice. Setting up another new organisation would be duplicating what already exists”

#### 5. One size does not fit all

“One size does not fit all - funding advisors need to know the sector and local circumstances to provide advice”

“I meet with the North East FAWN regularly and I feel that funding advice worker meetings work very well at a regional level. Circumstances are too different within each region for a National Network to have a meaningful impact.”

These main topics crop up time and time again in the responses which follow. The issues here are reflecting both the scarcity of resources overall for maintaining funding advice throughout the country, the fact that many services struggle at a local level, and that national services may compete with what already works on the ground.

#### Qu. 6 - 7 nature of membership

Qu. 6 What kind of membership? (Please tick one only)		
answer options	Response Percent	Response Count
Organisations would be members	24.5%	66
Individual workers would be members	17.8%	48
Representation through a sub/regional network	6.7%	18
A combination of the above	49.1%	132
Other	1.9%	5
(please specify)		14
<i>answered question</i>		269
<i>skipped question</i>		8

Nearly half of respondents preferred a “mixed” membership, with individuals, organisations and networks in membership. Where responses preferred just one of these options, membership through “organisations” was the preference, whilst only 6% preferred membership through a regional network.

A point made strongly was that membership should reflect the needs of the sector:

“Anyone w[ho] could support the diversification of income streams within the community and voluntary sector.”

“Research customers needs first, develop a suitable specification and see who can deliver, no matter what their nature. It’s then about quality not partisan relationships or view points.”

“Flexible approach which maximises the benefit by ensuring those who need the support get it.”

Whilst one area with a strong regional network nevertheless preferred representation through the regions:

“Don't agree with the establishment of a national FANN but IF MUST have one prefer regional representative to represent North East FAWN.”

<b>Qu. 7 Who should be involved as members? (Please tick all that should be members)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Staff in 3rd sector whose main function is funding advice	75.6%	204
Staff in 3rd sector that have funding advice in their job description	73.3%	198
Staff that have funding advice in their job description, from any public agency	63.3%	171
Other funding advice workers (eg. Business Link advisers?)	53.3%	144
Private consultants	23.3%	63
Other	8.9%	24
(please specify)		36
<b>answered question</b>		<b>270</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>7</b>

This question allowed multiple answers and the additional comments help to illustrate the responses.

Clearly there are strong responses for those who have funding advice as part of their role and working for 3<sup>rd</sup> sector, or publicly funded agencies, to be able to access membership, whilst there was a lot lower support (at 24%) for private consultants in membership.

Nevertheless there are arguments for including anyone in membership who could contribute to the aims of the proposed FANN.

“Anyone w[ho] could support the diversification of income streams within the community and voluntary sector.”

“Anybody who gives funding advice to voluntary and community organizations.”

“If people are giving funding advice from any area they should be supported. If advisors are excluded who are giving funding advice I can only see this as detrimental to those the advisors are giving advice to. Private consultants are often ignored as they charge for the advice they give but my concern is if they are giving poor advice to the voluntary sector it is the sector itself that

ultimately loses out. Ensure an appropriate charging structure is put in place but please avoid being exclusive. Surely the aim is to improve the standards and quality of funding advice across the board!!!”

“So much of funding requires partnership that it would be wrong not to include the relevant organizations.”

Similarly there are comments favouring the specific involvement of volunteers, who whilst they could represent organisations, were not identified as a category within the question.

“Volunteers providing funding advice.”

“Could also consider individuals/community activists working on an unpaid voluntary basis who are also providing funding advice.”

Several respondents felt that inclusion beyond the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector should be possible, with the option of other forms of membership:

“Those ticked should have full membership but I do feel that public sector workers and other funding advice workers should be able to be involved and have associate membership.”

“Advisers from statutory and business agencies could perhaps be associate members.”

“There should be charges for membership that relate to the type of organisation you represent/how much you put in/how much you are likely to take out.”

“Private Consultants or private companies should pay for the services, thus helping to fund FANN?”

“If there are membership fees would like to see higher rates for public/private sector. If no fees for 3<sup>rd</sup> sector there should be charge for public/private sector otherwise we are subsidising statutory agencies and private businesses.”

And there was one respondent who wanted to exclude the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector

“This should not involve government bodies or third sector who will then distribute the information for free. Quality funding support is a chargeable activity which is beneficial to our community.”

And a very strong plea for a wholly inclusive approach, including funders, statutory agencies though recognising this also has its disadvantages:

“At a local level Funding adviser networks have benefited from local funders being regularly involved, I think this would also be useful at a national level. It would encourage funders to work with and inform Funding advisers. Perhaps funders who have outreach workers, support workers to help groups apply to own funds and signpost elsewhere would be the key workers to attend FANN, from funding organisations. Also at a local level, council staff, pct staff etc have contributed as workers who give out

funding pots and advise groups re: alternative sources and using Fan network to get information to groups - but perhaps this isn't as relevant at national level - perhaps the FANN would become too big and unwieldy with such a range of members and loose focus."

**Qu. 8 - 9 areas of work involved in a FANN**

<b>Qu. 8 Possible areas of work for a FANN are identified below:</b>									
<b>Three main areas for service delivery are:</b>									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sharing / networking / mutual support for funding advisers</b></li> <li>• <b>Provision of specialist training and standards and funding intelligence</b></li> <li>• <b>Advocacy and development of funding advice work</b></li> </ul>									
<b>(Please score how highly you think these are FANN roles from 0 – 5):</b>									
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Sharing/networking/mutual support for funding advisers: Opportunities to share practice	7	3	7	37	49	162	4.28	265	
Information on what others are doing and what is happening	4	5	6	54	84	112	4.06	258	
Provision of specialist training and standards and funding intelligence:	6	9	14	34	80	118	4.03	264	
National accredited funding advice qualification	14	17	31	64	49	84	3.45	263	
Quality standards for funding advice	7	16	26	52	74	82	3.63	260	
Provision of national funding intelligence and regional information bulletins	9	7	11	34	72	129	4.07	265	
Advocacy and development of funding advice work:	5	11	19	65	76	82	3.73	262	
Representing the views of funding advisers especially to funders	6	11	13	36	74	118	4.01	262	
Improving the profile of funding advice	9	9	16	50	77	97	3.83	262	
Other (please describe)									17
								<b>answered question</b>	<b>266</b>
								<b>skipped question</b>	<b>11</b>

Most significant issue - Sharing/networking/mutual support

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – Sharing/networking/mutual support, Information on what others are doing, Provision of specialist training and standards and funding intelligence, Provision of national funding intelligence and regional information bulletins, Representing the views of funding advisers.

Comments ranged from a desire to ensure that provision was countrywide:

“In principal I don't disagree with any of the above - that said the primary restraint will be around location and distance - If the FANN comes into existence I would be very disappointed if all delivery took place in and around London!”

To identifying, and dealing with gaps in provision:

“Identification of market gaps and circulation of market research should be the priority”

“helping to support the setting up of local/sub regional/regional networks where none exist and where there is a demand from advisors.”

Whilst networking/sharing have come out as the highest option, there are some qualifications, indicating the need for clarity in development of services.:

“Sharing, networking and support - is difficult at national level and I think works better locally. Funding advisers locally should be encouraged to get together locally and regularly (unrealistic in terms of time/resources and benefits nationally).”

Other comments concentrated on different aspects of funding advice:

“development of web-accessible resource bank of quality policies, procedures and documents which would improve quality and efficiency in the area of funding advice.”

“Enabling more grassroots (e.g. excluded communities) and specialists such as BME to be funding advisors, and better fundraising opportunities (as opposed to being advised most of time). Making sure that funders understand the difference between organisation, and activities, and when they are not duplication, etc!”

“Research on funding provision and distribution..“

“Representing the views of funding advisers to statutory authorities, especially government departments offering unreasonably short-term funding!”

<p><b>Qu. 9 It is recognized that there are some functions best done at other levels, for example the regional / sub-regional FAWN's role is best seen as:</b></p> <p><b>(Please score how highly you think these are regional/sub regional roles)</b></p>								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count

Providing opportunities for networking, sharing information, and peer and mentoring support	2	8	10	44	70	124	4.11	258
Building relationships with regionally-based funders	3	6	6	33	75	137	4.24	260
Providing (nationally developed) training and locally relevant workshops	6	11	26	55	71	90	3.71	259
Disseminating information on regional and sub-regional funds	3	4	12	39	67	134	4.18	259
Mutual support from other advisers	3	12	25	58	73	86	3.73	257
A forum whereby funding advisers could raise issues with funders	4	14	11	47	86	97	3.88	259
A means of overcoming isolation for some	6	9	32	65	60	86	3.64	258
At sub-regional level – training, network co-ordination, quality frameworks applied locally, county conferences	7	10	18	71	72	78	3.66	256
At local level – one to one support, and information, linking to sub-regional level services for front-line organizations	6	13	29	52	61	99	3.72	260
Other (please specify)								15
<i>answered question</i>								263
<i>skipped question</i>								14

Most significant issue - Building relationships with regionally based funders

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – Building relationships with regionally based funders, Providing opportunities for networking, Disseminating information on regional and sub-regional funds.

The range of activities at regional level appears to be recognised broadly through responses. The long-term future of existing (and good quality) provision is raised:

“I do not disagree with any of the principles above - the issue is where the resource are coming from to support FAW networks. As far as I am aware there is not a long queue of funders within the East Midlands region offering financial backing, which is clearly needed as FAWNs are not self-financing. In my view though they are a crucial and invaluable support resource for FAWs.”

Also offered is a sense of reality about what can be done with existing resources

“Both DEFAN and GEORGE have limited capacity to extend and develop the range of activities and services they offer.”

The need for inclusion at regional level is also noted:

“Needs to have a diverse and reflective membership and be accessible .....  
 For some groups this is a real issue. Specialist structures such as Black Fundraisers Network and faith based etc, must be involved.”

And reflecting some of the earlier answers, a plea for action rather words:

“More hands on, less lobbying”

**Qu. 10                      who would get involved**

<b>Qu. 10 Would you become involved - which (if any) individuals could devote time to supporting a FANN?(Please tick all options that apply to you)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
I would become an individual member	40.0%	100
My organisation would be a member and I would become involved	70.4%	176
I would be involved in a regional/sub-regional network	47.2%	118
I would put myself forward as a regional representative	17.6%	44
I would put myself forward for election as an individual	9.6%	24
Other	6.8%	17
(please describe)		27
<b>answered question</b>		<b>250</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>27</b>

The practical realities of introducing a national network will ultimately depend on whether individuals are prepared to put their time and effort into making it happen.

70% of respondents would join the national network through their organisation and 47% would be actively involved in their regional/sub-regional network. However only 17% would seek to be involved as a regional representative, and even fewer – 9% - would seek election as an individual.

From the comments some respondents would like to see how the proposed FANN works in practice before committing themselves. Others would be put off membership by large fees, and one thought involvement should be linked to proposals for a quality assurance scheme:

“Providers of accredited funding advice within the branded QA scheme should all be members and specify how they want to engage.”

Another thought that involvement could be difficult for a freelance worker

“I would like to become involved but as a freelance adviser, this would be difficult, financially”



come together to share information and best practice and to network generally. I don't think the individual members within the [local] Network would attend a national network as a majority don't currently attend the regional network due to time and cost. I see the purpose of a national network being most beneficial to people who support networks."

"I would love to be involved, however, can it be a 'virtual network'? I and my colleagues have so much work on that we find yet another network opportunity daunting."

"Being new in my post I see there is a great need for such a network, But it has to be relevant to me - i.e. being rurally isolated (so time limited to attend meetings in far away places!)"

"I have stated that I would like my organisation to be involved but that carries the proviso that you understand our limitations with regard to skills and capacity."

"Funding advice workers often wear many other hats so time constraints must be taken into account when thinking about the roles of regional reps/ network meetings etc. Email support as in ACRE village hall advisers would be a good model."

**ii. Added value**

"I do wonder what impact it really will have given the disparate nature of funding advice. I do wonder what value it will add beyond what is already provided .... I am not an opponent though if sufficient resources are committed."

"FANN needs to add value to the local and regional networks, so although it needs to carry out similar functions, these would need to be done by the FANN where it makes sense to act at national level and more locally when appropriate."

**iii. Inclusive and diverse**

"..... it is imperative that within the business plan sufficient resources are invested to ensure that FAWs from all corners of the country are made aware of the existence of the FANN and how it can assist them through an effective promotional campaign!"

"Big barriers to involvement are lack of time due to pressures of work, and geographical distance."

"I am aware that the term "Funding Adviser"; covers a very wide range of people with many different functions within the scope of their jobs. I think it would be a huge challenge to provide a network which would be useful to all of them. Good luck!"

**iv. Avoid duplication and build on the regions**

"For me new support resources for FAWs could be developed by the FANN including training materials BUT it must not duplicate resources already provided."

“These services are already provided by our regional FAWN to a very high standard. If a national FANN was developed this would be a duplication of services. To avoid this the FANN should support current provision and act as facilitator through existing services.”

“I think that for most funding advisers, support within regions is more appropriate and useful for funding advisers - local issues are more relevant and support from funding advisers dealing with similar regional issues would be better. Meeting up would obviously be easier at regional level and perhaps mean that the network would be better and more regularly attended. It would seem more relevant. National information could be sent out by e-mail.”

“Each region is quite different - most work is best done at a regional level with perhaps a coming together of representatives to discuss national issues may be twice a year.”

“You must be careful not to duplicate the valuable work already carried out by the Institute of Fundraising and the Directory of Social Change.”

“Obviously we need to be very careful to avoid duplication and undermining of flourishing local Funding Advice Networks. We were founder members of DeFAN, Devon Funding Advisors Network, which we feel provides a very good, low cost, supportive information sharing function. However there is a role for developing common standards, promotion of funding advisor accredited courses. Both our Development Worker and I are qualified (OCN level 3) funding advisors, however this minimal standard does not seem to be a target or requirement to most funding advisors.”

“Members feel that money would be better spent resourcing regional/sub regional funding advice work and FAWNs to become more effective before even considering the establishment of a FANN. Needs to be bottom up rather than top down.”

“Let's keep the number of new agencies and posts to a minimum.”

“Would want to ensure that work compliments other services and is cooperative with others, i.e. providing services that I cannot access from the local funders forum or from institute of fundraising.”

“If the FANN is about advice and support to funding advisor, setting standards for service delivery, accrediting training etc, then it should definitely be delivered by existing providers. There is a lot of funding information already delivered county and district councils, RAISE, Lottery, CVS offices etc. Is there really a case for something more administratively costly as a separate organisation, when we have the Finance Hub and the Office of the Third Sector already?”

#### **v. Sustainability**

“While I support in principle the development of a national FAN, it is imperative that FAN at sub regional and regional level have access to resources to secure their sustainability. We estimate that, in the SW, access

to a grant of just £1,000 per annum would be sufficient to keep our region's FANs active.”

**vi. Sharing/networking**

“I think the 'sharing/networking/mutual support' role is crucial for a national FANN in terms of its relations with funding advice networks at local/sub regional and regional levels.”

“Those involved in fundraising and funding advice are often isolated from others in similar roles. There is little opportunity to share good practice knowledge and skills.”

**vii. Not funding, but income generation**

“I firmly believe that we should move from the vocabulary of the word funding, third sector orgs today must have a diverse range of income streams and the title of any network should reflect that, there should be no confusion with people thinking this network is about sending round details of new grants.”

**viii. Campaigning/advocacy**

“There is also a role for clear campaigning at National and regional levels to Funders and other bodies on issues impacting on sustainable funding and funding issues.”

“As for advocacy, isn't this a role for organisations like NAVCA, the Institute of Fundraising, Finance Hub, RAISE, and all the other organisations established to work as a bridge between policy and practice.”

**ix. Charges/fees**

“Quality funding support is a chargeable activity which should have professional accreditation. This does not necessarily mean specialist qualifications. Experience is very important when providing Funding support. Provision of further free services would be detrimental to the sector.”

“If the conference and the training course fail because no one is willing to pay to attend them, then what we are seeing is the market voting with its feet. I would suggest a bursary scheme or sponsorship programme managed by the Finance Hub or Office of the Third sector to provide the training at a fraction of the cost.”

**x. General**

“This questionnaire is very much focused on the establishment of a FANN and, apart from Q5 makes no allowances for the opinions of individual and / or collective responses who do not want a FANN. Questionnaire is therefore heavily weighted towards a fait accompli which members of the North East FAWN very much resent and feel the strength of their opinions will not be fairly represented.”

“I think regional representatives should be people where funding advice is the main or sole focus of their role, rather than where it forms only a part of it. They should probably also be attached to non-profit making organisations that provide funding advice and third sector support as a core part of their work.”

“I worry that all funding advice and guidance would come from one local or regional source when there is need to understand the sector and local funding issues.”

“I think a central organisation where smaller vol/comm and learning centres can go for funding advice is overdue.”

“Would this be a virtual network with communication by email and website? Would be good to have the opportunity to ask questions if stuck with anything.”

“I've not been involved in funding networks so far, as although it is part of my job description, I have a lot of other things to concentrate on. A network which I could access remotely - eg. by email - would be really useful.”

“I believe there is too much focus on funding rather than thinking about resource-raising (which is not just about money). Help in kind can be as, and sometimes more, valuable than cash.”

## Section 2 details

Whilst 90.3% of respondents completed the first section (9.7% missed out each question on average) Section 2. was completed on average by 82%.

Qu. 13 – 17

preferred model – details

Qu. 12 This feasibility study pre-supposes that a Funding Advice National Network should have a membership representative of the sector throughout the country, which controls the activities of the FANN. Do you agree? (Please tick one option only)		
answer options	Response Percent	Response Count
The FANN should have a representative structure	81.4%	188
The FANN should find alternative mechanisms for governance, which don't involve representation	18.6%	43
Comment		33
<i>answered question</i>		231
<i>skipped question</i>		46

The overwhelming response to this question was to support a representative structure for a FANN, with 81% in favour. Nevertheless there were many qualifying comments, for example some felt that the purpose of the network was more important than how it is organised:

“I agree with representativeness as a concept but often this gets in the way of delivering a project etc and all too often is a paper exercise”

“Although I have ticked representative I am not overly bothered about the structure as long as it delivers for Funding advisors”

Whilst some respondents identified the issues around being a representative:

“Not certain about this one as it is probably a combination of the two – it should represent the sector but how it chooses to do this can be difficult to implement and become in its own right non representative. The sector is so large that frankly it is virtually impossible to have a limited number of individuals effectively represent it as they will be unable to represent their whole sector and will still bring to the table their own feelings and ideas even if they are supposed to be representing a far larger group. In my view you need people that have a broad interest in the sector but who realise they cannot represent the sector as each different facet of the sector wants different things and believes different things. Unsafe to expect a set number of people even if they are elected to do this effectively.”

“Strong dependence on quality of rep. If person fulfils the function because “someone has to”; then there is not the required enthusiasm for the job and

this frequently happens , whereas if a person is there because they strongly want to be then they will have more energy for the post.”

“Sometime it's difficult for the independent fundraiser to counter the increasing influence of public sector advisors”

“Smaller groups often have greater pressure of work and less time to devote to networks and membership organisation. The needs of these groups are often greater than the needs of those who have a great deal of time to devote to carrying out, studying and implementing feasibility studies.”

“it is not always possible to have representation as there are many calls on people's time and other resources”

“I don't think it is realistic to expect there will many individuals with the time to get involved in the rigmarole of a representative structure.”

“The interests of minorities would need to be preserved.”

“The structure should seek to engage a range of geographies, organisations, themes, and skills.”

“I would like a network open to anyone working in the field, possibly along the lines of a professional body in the commercial area, where membership is something to be advertised to show that your skills are up to date, ideally accessible electronically to avoid too much travel and time out of work.”

And the final words go to:

“I think on balance I would rather not see yet another representative structure.”

“I think a network should be allowed to evolve as the active membership wants it to and not be directive driven from a small representative group.”

“It is likely to be more acceptable to the constituency if it is representative, though I think it could perform its function equally well with an alternative structure which might be less cumbersome.”

The three models outlined in the first section for the establishment of a FANN were:

Model A – a new organisation with charitable aims

Model B – a project within an existing 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisation

Model C – a new independent organisation which pays other agencies to provide services

The fourth option – to NOT develop a FANN

As outlined in Section 1. Model B was the front-runner.

The following questions explore further the advantages and disadvantages of the three potential models, and which issues were felt to be most important. These questions have helped to get behind the broad agreement on the proposed model.

The answers to these questions provide a “range” of options between which respondents are choosing. There are no arbitrary right and wrong answers – just different shades of grey. The easiest way to compare them is to look at those responses which were felt to be the most important within that question. Some questions have generated a much higher average score than others, indicating that respondents felt that issue was more important. Those questions where the rating average score is placed at over 4.00 have therefore been identified, as indicating that these are amongst the issues felt to be most important.

<b>Qu. 13 Model A – a new organisation with charitable aims.</b>								
<b>Advantages</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Independence from any other network	19	26	26	43	49	70	3.23	233
Development of new services	14	17	22	58	62	63	3.38	236
Attracts separate grant aid	16	19	25	61	52	61	3.27	234
Separately identifiable membership with sense of ownership	14	17	28	56	52	64	3.33	231
Other (please specify)								13
<i>answered question</i>								<b>236</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>41</b>

Most significant issue - development of new services

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – none

This response falls within the pattern of answers to other questions – it is more important that the FANN delivers services.

The comments raise other issues:

The FANN should be self-sufficient:

“Grant aid not important if it is established as a social enterprise. Training and networking events and membership fees charged. Profit made establishes a new grant making trust!”

“Who would grant aid a grant advisor ???”

“I'm not certain that it would attract separate grant aid.”

The FANN if independent could be seen to be objective:

“Seen to be completely independent and therefore able to give objective information”

“Independent viewpoint on funding issues from those representing the sector to government, donors, etc.”

The potential for competing for grant aid with existing bodies, or need for co-operation with them:

“Some of these suggest dilution of funding - there is only one ultimate pot of money and more layers means less money at the sharp end.”

“Networks with other existing structures to enable better reach, intelligence, etc and does not threaten their activities and sustainability.”

“N/a at this stage. See previous comments re a quality assured network...not a new organisation...use an existing body to coordinate / administer”

<b>Qu. 14 Model A – a new organisation with charitable aims.</b>									
<b>Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>									
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Long term sustainability issues	6	7	13	22	76	110	4.07	234	
Competition with existing providers of services	10	10	23	45	56	87	3.68	231	
The higher the grant aid, the greater the competition for resources with other funding advice services	7	12	21	49	55	89	3.72	233	
Extra costs associated with a separate membership system	10	12	22	40	57	92	3.71	233	
Other (please specify)									9
<i>answered question</i>								<b>35</b>	
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>42</b>	

Most significant issue - Long-term sustainability issues

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – Long-term sustainability issues

Comments:

Displacing other services:

“I would be concerned about diverting funds away from other groups. If the FANN is independent it will probably be more expensive to run than if attached to another organisation. I also think it would benefit from being placed in a wider context of third sector support work so that it linked into other agendas, rather than standing alone.”

“why competition? FANN can work without racing with others.”

“Extra costs of setting up the new project plus it might lead to disharmony with current providers and further confusion amongst users”

“This should not just be for the third sector or competition would be an issue. We do need an organisation with a much wider scope.”

#### Self-financing/sustainability

“Ah, so you wish to survive on grants, perhaps the new model maybe better as a CIC, and to prove how effective it is it should take a percentage deductible before tax from the orgs that have benefited from its service by securing extra income”

Qu. 15 Model B – a project within an existing 3rd sector infrastructure organisation.									
Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)									
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count	
Potential for shared costs especially management	6	7	15	43	71	89	3.89	234	
Potential for sharing of functions/skills around infrastructure support	5	5	16	42	74	91	3.92	233	
Steering group to guide work	13	12	22	52	67	68	3.50	234	
Other (please specify)									12
<i>answered question</i>								<b>235</b>	
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>42</b>	

Most significant issue - Potential for sharing functions/skills costs.

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

Working with existing organisations:

“Track record of already existing provider would be very important. Costs which would be put in to new organisation could be invested in new services.”

“This is the best idea - maybe fit for funding could do it - at least they are best placed for the north”.

“Sustainability; potential to build on a recognizable/respected brand.”

Need to focus on the objectives:

“ [If] hosted in a non-funding specific structure will dilute the potential significance and clarity of a FANN.”

“It is important structure is representative and does not favour 1 structure over the other, especially for developing structures aimed at minority and disadvantaged groups.”

And one consistent comment:

“Don't agree with model B or the establishment of a FANN.”

<b>Qu. 16 Model B – a project within an existing 3rd sector infrastructure organisation.</b>								
<b>Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Steering group rather than full independence	21	25	48	44	40	49	2.9	227
Potential for funding advice to get lost amongst other services	8	12	29	46	54	78	3.59	227
Potential dominance of host agency approach to funding advice	5	9	24	36	61	91	3.82	226
Other (please specify)								12
<i>answered question</i>								<b>227</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>50</b>

Most significant issue - Potential dominance of host agency

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

There may be disadvantages but they can be worked with:

“You can write out the potential dominance in two ways: Ensure the Terms of Reference or constitution are written correctly to ensure this or better still have a moving host organisation.”

“Would just have to be careful - I think its possible if structured correctly”

“I feel the most important issue is to get a low cost network up and running-something that will be useful and sustainable because not distracted by the need to focus on its own survival.”

“.....depends on who it is hosted with. I would recommend NAVCA”

Need for a new approach/independence:

“Nothing fresh and new. Would not attract new members.”

“Many groups have disengaged with current infrastructure organisations because they do not feel they are representative of their needs. They would be unlikely to benefit from this approach.”

“FANN primarily seen as mechanism to finance other core services of organization.”

Cross sector approach:

“Over-emphasis on Third Sector contribution rather than cross sector partnership approach.”

<b>Qu. 17 Model C – a new organisation with charitable aims that pays another organisation to provide FANN services.</b>									
<b>Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>									
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Independence combined with potential for lower costs/cost sharing	22	27	31	70	46	34	2.84	230	
Potential for integrating services with another appropriate agency	23	22	49	71	42	22	2.67	229	
Other (please specify)									10
<i>answered question</i>								<b>230</b>	
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>47</b>	

Most significant issue - Independence combined with lower costs/sharing

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None

This question scored a very low Rating Average, indicating that these advantages were not high up the agenda. This may also reflect the general view that this option was not well favoured.

Comments:

“My least favourite - I think it would burn out and the money would not go very far. FANN would have little say after it parted with its funds”

“Paying two organisations to be involved seems likely to be dearer than one.”

“... too expensive and no added value in my mind”

“This sounds very laudable but experience suggests that this is not realistic. Would the staff be new to the field and enthusiastic or more inclined to follow previous models which they have experienced - previous history suggests the later.”

“Duplication can be wasteful, issues over access, diversity, etc; sustainability of other structures. Needs to be co-ordinated but money to go to more than 1 structure (spread the workload, but ensure cohesive, fair and accessible).”

**Qu. 18 – 22**

**membership – details**

<b>Qu. 18 Model C – a new organisation with charitable aims that pays another organisation to provide FANN services.</b>									
<b>Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>									
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>	
Potential for less control over delivery	15	13	31	30	63	76	3.5	228	
Other (please specify)									15
<i>answered question</i>								228	
<i>skipped question</i>								49	

Most significant issue - Potential for less control over delivery

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

There appears to be a strong view that this option would be both more costly, and difficult to manage:

“Surely this option would be the most expensive, putting in an extra layer of management?”

“Too many layers of contracting could reduce any benefits, and lead to problems over quality assurance.”

“It would seem to be a waste of resources to create an organisation just to pay another to deliver.”

“All the cost and time implications of model A + less control - the worst of all worlds.”

“Potential for confusion over lines of communication; bureaucracy of tendering process to appoint delivery organization.”

“Still need for independent governance of FANN, and associated costs to ensure delivery of services.”

“I would find it difficult to see the value of an organisation using this model and in this case would think it were better to have just the organisation that would be paid for FANN services.”

The following questions looked at the issues surrounding a structure for membership.

<b>Qu. 19 Option 1. Direct membership of individuals</b>								
<b>Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Direct connection between individual members and the FANN	9	9	15	51	65	74	3.69	223
Greater sense of ownership	11	11	22	48	59	69	3.55	220
Other (please specify)								6
<i>answered question</i>								<b>227</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>50</b>

Most significant issue - Direct connection between members and the FANN

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

“In reality, the majority of Funding Advisers won't have capacity to be involved in sub regional, regional and a national FAN. The national network should take a more strategic approach to issues across regions rather than duplicating what already exists.”

“If there is a strong and effective link via a sub-regional network, there would still be a significant sense of ownership.”

“Especially for those workers not in a local network”

<b>Qu. 20 Option 1. Direct membership of individuals</b>								
<b>Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Costly and cumbersome membership system	8	15	30	45	62	63	3.47	223
By-passing existing functioning networks	9	12	28	50	60	62	3.48	221
Regions with few members may not get national representation	10	6	27	49	68	62	3.55	222
Extra time commitment from individuals	9	7	26	55	49	77	3.61	223
Other (please specify)								9
<i>answered question</i>								<b>224</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>53</b>

**Other (please specify)**

Most significant issue - Extra time commitment from individuals

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None

Comments:

The need to represent a broad variety of interests

“Sectional interests of marginalised groups should not get swamped by majority interests.”

“It's more difficult to have sector-specific tiers of membership for individuals (who may move between sectors).”

“Needs to ensure that local, specialist etc can be represented, and good and emerging structures sustainability not threatened.”

Resource issues:

“This could result in individuals being asked to pay for their membership of FANN as a professional association. Many groups also have more than one person who would benefit from the service and they would have to pay for 2 memberships - something they are unlikely to do. Services who are poorly resourced may not have a dedicated fundraiser and would be unlikely to put forward an individual rep as a result - although they are the people who would be most likely to benefit from the service.”

“Another meeting, more paperwork, and more costs is not what sector wants. We want things streamlined, cost effective, accessible and relevant.”

“Why does a membership system have to be cumbersome and costly?”

Structural issues:

“Rather than either/or, strengthen each of the options so that each compliments the other and there is genuine choice for an individual.”

“Representation - what would be the criteria - need or numbers costly would be comparative to benefit and commitment is a requirement of success.”

Working with existing structures

“I would not support a FANN which by-passed existing functioning networks.”

<b>Qu. 21 Option 2. Membership through regional networks:</b>								
<b>Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Representation from all regions	8	5	15	43	58	84	3.83	213
Simple and cost effective representation	10	4	14	52	54	82	3.75	216

Other (please specify)	10
<i>answered question</i>	218
<i>skipped question</i>	59

Most significant issue - Representation from all regions

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

Structural issues:

“Not all regions will have a regional FAN, so an alternative mechanism should be developed to ensure they have representation.”

“Don't agree with a formal FANN, rather it was an informal network of regional reps meeting at regular intervals to share good practice.”

“How well do they represent?”

“No this is too far from the local-the lowest level of representation should be county level.”

“Danger that the established/big/strong organisations will.”

Resource issues

“Another structure could be more costly, not cost effective, and can be costly dependent upon size of region, workloads, income etc to participate on a regular level. Would reps have Backfill/expenses? What about small groups just starting to look for funds? Needs to be an effective and accessible, (cost effective or heavily subsidised/FREE) strand.”

“I think the assumption that Membership through Regional Networks would be simple and cost-effective is a mistaken one.”

<b>Qu. 22 Option 2. Membership through regional networks:</b>								
<b>Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)</b>								
<b>answer options</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Regions which lose their network may not be represented	5	6	23	37	69	78	3.8	218
Regions have to represent a “network” view	7	13	36	46	58	59	3.42	219
Other (please specify)								12
<i>answered question</i>								220
<i>skipped question</i>								57

Most significant issue - Regions which lose their network may not be represented

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

Structural issues

“Could always have 'reserved' places if networks non-existent, or even observer/non-voting status to address this.”

“FANN could be working to ensure strong networks so that there was little danger of the loss of a network.”

“Presupposes that regional networks exist, are functional and representative.”

Issues with representation

“Regional view may be difficult where there is considerable variation of social/economic areas within region.”

“Specialists and small groups etc have their own issues, which could be muffled by the bigger players ..... Many already feel this is the case, and more structures and opportunities for the big organisations to place them in positions of advantage will make things worse, not better.”

“The assumption that one bunch of people will wholeheartedly represent another is also a mistaken one - just take a look at our political parties.”

“Membership restrictions of regional networks would automatically exclude membership of the FANN.”

“Conflict of local priorities, it is very important to be seen as fair to all groups.”

<b>Qu. 23 There are 9 English regions. What size should the governing body of FANN be? (please tick one only)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Up to 10 members	27.3%	57
10 – 15 members	41.2%	86
15 – 20 members	22.5%	47
20 plus members	9.1%	19
Other (please specify)		16
<i>answered question</i>		204
<i>skipped question</i>		66

The favoured option appears to be a governing body of 10-15 members. However comments indicated that for some respondents it was too early to answer this question:

“Think we need to establish the need first and then the governance will follow”

“To far down the line to comment at this stage as I don’t think it necessarily needs a governing body. There is a need for QA and on going development of services provided by FANN members.”

Other comments identified some of the issues involved, especially the need to be inclusive

“15 to 20+ - needs to be inclusive, diverse, representative of types of organisations, communities, local, regional and national for any kind of “equitable balance”;. Very difficult to do - especially if specialist sub-groups are identified as needed!”

Or the need to reflect differences between regions, or not base membership on regions

“Smaller groups tend to work better, but large and strong networks could have the option of sending more than one representative as some networks have membership from more than one sector. Also there is a big disparity across regions in whether and how many FAW posts exist, how they are funded - specific or related - capacity (f/t or p/t) FAW and this in turn will affect the nature and strength of networks.”

“I don’t think this has to be tied to regions. Rather who will have the time and the interest?”

And the need to support regional activity

“Keep regional networks going”

<b>Qu. 24 How often, and in what way, should a governing body meet? (Please tick those that apply)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Monthly	10.1%	22
Quarterly	89.4%	194
At an annual meeting	13.8%	30
<i>answered question</i>		<b>217</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>60</b>

The majority view is for quarterly meetings.

<b>Qu. 25 In what way? (Please tick those that apply)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
At a central location	71.8%	148
On-line	50.0%	103
Jointly at another national event (eg. an annual meeting/event of another organisation)	30.6%	63

Other (please specify)	30
<i>answered question</i>	206
<i>skipped question</i>	71

Comments:

This question elicited a variety of responses and suggestions, with some respondents saying it was too early to decide, or that it should depend upon the needs of members:

“As is appropriate for the meeting and those involved.”

“This will depend on whether this is an independent network or a steering group in an existing infrastructure organisation.”

“As and when it needs to and in a manner that suits the members to get governance right and maintain an effective organization.”

Whilst others thought that all three methods of “meeting” would be feasible

“A mix of these would mean that the access is available to all . Completely online may be faceless but bypasses travel problems central is dependant on how central to who.”

“Use all three mechanisms to allow best level of involvement.”

“Combination of Annual event and six-monthly event (possibly to coincide with something else) plus skype conferencing or similar distance methods in other quarters.”

And the thorny question of what is “central” was raised

“Note that London is not in the centre of anywhere.”

“Perceptions of central locations are different dependent on where you are based. It is sometimes more difficult travelling east-west than north-south although distance may look shorter on a map!”

And many respondents felt that varied methods/timing of meeting, perhaps rotating round the regions would be the most effective:

“Perhaps it could be varied? National meetings could sometimes be tagged onto regional meetings and move around the country so that regional members still got a chance to talk to national members from other regions. This could happen occasionally and other meetings could be held at a more central location. A national event could be held once a year as an AGM.”

“Combination of meeting methods - to reduce costs where possible.”

“AGM at a national conference rather than a separate event. Quarterly meetings at rotating venues - London, Birmingham, York, another SE/SW location.”

“Predominantly on line with periodic meetings rotating in different regions.”

“A mixture of meeting opportunities should be used. Telephone conferencing is useful, should take the meetings round England,”

“Central location could be in dif areas for each quarter so easier for representation to be fair as regarding costs to attend.”

“Most FANs meet quarterly. Nationally this would be on different dates. If an urgent issue needs to be dealt with, monthly meeting for the FANN would ensure that issues can be dealt with promptly and not get out of date.”

“If monthly could be online but will still require face-to-face at some point.”

“As there are likely to be capacity issues, a flexible approach needs to be adopted. Meetings could rotate around the centre of the country to ensure equitable accessibility.”

#### Qu. 26 involvement – details

Qu. 26 How important is it that the following are involved? Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count
Staff in 3rd sector whose main function is funding advice	1	1	0	13	51	158	4.62	224
3rd sector workers who have funding advice in their job description	3	2	13	54	77	72	3.88	221
Staff that have funding advice in their job description, from any public agency	12	11	20	53	62	59	3.47	217
Other funding advice workers (eg. Business Link advisers?)	22	22	30	55	47	41	2.95	217
Private consultants	58	40	30	28	25	21	1.93	202
Comment								18
<i>answered question</i>								225
<i>skipped question</i>								52

Most significant issue - Staff in 3<sup>rd</sup> sector whose main function is funding advice

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – Staff in 3rd sector whose main function is funding advice

This question elicited one of the few “negative” responses, on the issue of membership of private consultants. Many respondents thought their involvement was not important though comments qualified this:

"I think that private consultants' involvement would depend on whether they provided funding advice to 3rd sector organisations as their main area of work, as opposed to carrying out fundraising contracts."

"Please don't marginalise private consultants - they can bring good practice and cost effectiveness skills. They may also be able to assist in FANN set up as they could already be involved in other networks."

"Currently there is an issue with private consultants advising organisations for profit, instead of making them aware of free alternative and equal (or better) services. Organisations are paying ..... even if do not get funding bid."

"Private consultants aren't all 'money grubbers' - BUT I would say that, wouldn't it!? Don't mind not having a vote!."

"We need to ensure that private consultants are giving effective advice, adhering to standards and not ripping the VCOs off. However, they should be making a financial contribution for the advantages they gain from FANN."

"Too often private consultants are doing fundraising, not funding advice."

Others sought to emphasise the purpose of the proposed network, and the potential for contribution/dominance by other sectors

"Might be a tendency for statutory staff to dominate, purely because they are more likely to have full time, permanent jobs and therefore be able to be fully involved."

"It is difficult to say if non-3rd sector individuals should be involved due to the problem that external influence may have. If it is positive (ie. supportive of 3rd sector) fine, but it just serves to dilute our resources as we are very skilled in the funding advice arena."

"Input from funders, policy makers on funding, fundraiser and resource raisers might be helpful, if in ex-officio or invited roles."

"Need mix of vol sec and public - some council likes are the lead locally for this type of advice"

"Appropriate not for profits that are funded by non-competitive funding and could be useful to FANN (eg. currently learning providers funded by the LSC to up skill in new funding related developments). Possibly restricted membership for private consultants that match very specific criteria."

"By engaging all the FANN would get a wider range of views."

Qu. 27 - 33

revenue funding for a FANN

Qu. 27 What percentage of its income should a FANN aim to receive from different sources (say within three years)?			
(Please write in your suggested percentages - all three should total 100.)			
answer options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Income generation from services provided/contracts (Possible services described in Section A)	37.36	7248	194
Membership fees/subscriptions	25.92	5028	194
Grants	38.66	7345	190
<i>answered question</i>			195
<i>skipped question</i>			82

Slightly less preference in the responses to this question, for income from fees/subscriptions. A marginal preference for Grants.

Qu. 28 Income generation/contracts									
Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)									
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count	
Independent income in a marketplace economy	4	5	11	46	73	62	3.84	201	
Potential for longer term sustainability	4	2	6	23	76	90	4.18	201	
Services developed owned by the FANN	4	2	15	27	74	79	4.03	201	
Other (please specify)									10
<i>answered question</i>								196	
<i>skipped question</i>								74	

Most significant issue - Potential for longer term sustainability

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – Potential for longer-term sustainability. Services developed owned by the FANN.

Diverse and opposite views emerge from the Comments:

Income generation seen positively

“Shows they know what they are talking about if they can generate income (as opposed to potentially funding from potential members and service users! Should not be competing with them, but developing & strengthening them.”

“Might help to emphasise the worth of the service provided if a reasonable charge is added.”

“The network may seek some pump-priming funding in the first place and then work towards the suggested income plan?”

But it has its limitations

“Competing in the market place is commendable but when compared to other areas where this has happened leads to dilution of quality of service. If this funding is needed it is because it is difficult to provide in mainstream and so suggests that this is because of its cost effectiveness so by default it can not compete.”

“FANN should not undertake service provision as this could be seen as a market domination over other advisers / fundraisers. Membership body should serve membership interests, member benefits, professionalisation and quality”

Qu. 29 Income generation/contracts									
Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)									
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count	
Income generation may detract from service provision	7	14	29	50	47	53	3.38	200	
Income only ever short term	11	10	36	44	55	44	3.27	200	
Services may compete with existing providers within the 3rd sector	6	8	30	37	49	70	3.63	200	
Other (please specify)									9
								<i>answered question</i>	195
								<i>skipped question</i>	77

Most significant issue - Services may compete with existing providers within the 3rd sector

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None

Comments:

The need to be accessible to those organisations in greatest need:

“Those that are in greatest need of accessing the services do not have the resources to pay so are therefore excluded”

“Always difficult to develop chargeable services to 'poor' third sector groups.”

And the need to focus on the task in hand

“Will lead to focus on doing something other than what was set out to do!”

“Income generation detracts from service provision in every other VCO that Funding Advisors support - why should FANN be any different? Indeed, as this is the environment we work in, examples from 1st hand experience sharpen the campaigning for change.”

However there is support for a market-led approach

“In a market led system, you have to learn to be good at what you do to survive. A strong and effective network will win the support of its membership an arrogant or bureaucratic one may be short-lived.”

“Credibility with recipients of funding advice on the ground.”

Qu. 30 Subscriptions / fees									
Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)									
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count	
Impact is only ever as good as members are prepared to pay for	15	9	19	51	65	39	3.31	198	
Ties members and network more closely together	9	12	20	53	53	50	3.42	197	
Other (please specify)									4
<i>answered question</i>								194	
<i>skipped question</i>								76	

Most significant issue - Ties members and network more closely together

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

“Don't rely on membership for funding - it will never get off the ground”

“Don't agree with subscription/fees. As [we] do not want a FANN would not be prepared to pay a membership fee.”

“Impact is only ever as good as the commitment of the members. I can think of expensive services which are not very effective, so price doesn't always give an accurate reflection.”

“Could have 'sliding scale' - as NAVCA does.”

Qui. 31 Subscriptions / fees								
Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count

Some funding advisers/networks may not be able to afford to pay	7	6	11	31	55	88	3.94	198
If individuals paid membership fees, that may not be compatible with a regional representation system	9	12	30	36	52	62	3.45	201
Other (please specify)								10
<i>answered question</i>								201
<i>skipped question</i>								76

Most significant issue - Some funding advisers/networks may not be able to afford to pay

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

The ability of members to pay is important

“Affordability should be a priority in establishing the levels of funding needed to run the FANN. This might mean that percentages suggested above will need to be altered.”

“Sliding scale would help cover this (for individuals - as well as groups - could be income based).”

“Fees would have to be set at a level members could afford, yet still be worth collecting.”

“Who’s paying us to pay FANN ??”

Qu. 32 Grants								
Advantages - Please score (0 low importance, 5 very important)								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count
Known income	6	2	13	46	61	69	3.83	197
Known period	6	2	12	44	61	71	3.86	196
Other (please specify)								8
<i>answered question</i>								198
<i>skipped question</i>								79

Most significant issue - Known period

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

“Best bet - anyway, this is the leading body at advising orgs how to get grants - lead by example!!!!”

“Sustainable funding is key a situation where a person has to spend a large part of their time chasing small pots of money is not cost or emotionally effective in the long run.”

“Members very concerned that a FANN would seek grant funding as this would be in direct competition with [regional] FAWN.”

“Demonstrates advisers can practice what they preach...”

“Don't totally agree with the premise of the question - grants aren't “known income” until you get them.”

Qu. 33 Grants								
Disadvantages - Are these important disadvantages? (0 low importance, 5 very important)								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count
May compete with regional based funding advice	4	8	19	36	63	67	3.76	197
Lifespan of grants always limited	6	8	12	28	67	77	3.89	198
Other (please specify)								12
<i>answered question</i>								<b>199</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>78</b>

Most significant issue - Lifespan of grants always limited

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – None.

Comments:

Dis/advantages of competing with existing providers

“I don't think the sector can afford to lose any more grant opportunities to big costly organizations.”

“Competes unfairly with non grant-aided providers, particularly those who chose non grant-aid for market reasons, direct relationship with subscribers, and the creation of a sustainable economy for funding advice.”

“Always possibilities of conflicts of interest. If services are 'unique' and national presence gives important advantages, this should be less important.”

“Competition is good - and being forced to move with the times and get the next grant is good - keeps it lean.”

Sustainability and competition/cooperation

“Sustainability will also be an issue, as it will with potential members. Grants should (if at all) be prime pump funds only, if can't sustain beyond that time

then not feasible. Needs to be able to create own income, and ensure not to the detriment of other structures!"

"So work in partnership with existing provision to create a whole which is greater than the sum of the parts!"

"The support being offered is chargeable. It reduces its value if it is supported by a grant."

"Seeking funding can detract from the business of operating the network and can create additional costs in itself"

**Qu. 34 purchase of services**

<b>Qu. 34 What level of services would a member organisation purchase (eg. materials, training, events)?</b>		
<b>Would you be likely to include an item in your budget for ongoing professional development (training) and for meeting quality standards (which you MIGHT purchase from a FANN if appropriate)? If so, how much would be a reasonable figure? (Please tick one option only)</b>		
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Under £100	40.8%	78
£100- 500	52.9%	101
Over £500	6.3%	12
Comment		38
<i>answered question</i>		<b>191</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>86</b>

A slight majority of respondents ((52.9%) would be prepared to pay in the middle range for services. The comments do point both to the need to keep services at affordable prices:

"We are a charity and therefore would have to see clear benefits and cannot afford general fees charged for conferences etc which are aimed at charitable sector normally"

"Existing organisations charge enormous amounts that preclude smaller organisations having a voice. Effectively we have a closed shop, particularly if one does work for very small organisations and therefore have a smaller income"

"I have a small training budget so I would have to prioritise any spend"

"Small organisations often seek bursaries. dependent upon where events are the TRUE Cost for the smaller organisation is a lot, with backfill, they have to find income to pay someone to do work while away, or overstretch themselves trying to catch up when return, and of course their service users have to wait. Also have to find travel and other expenses money on top of

event fee etc. developing on-line, flexible information, materials etc would suit sector best (at grass roots, and local levels)”

“Infrastructure bodies such as ours are expected to pay subscriptions to a number of affiliating bodies. We could spend a huge chunk of our income on these then have little left to actually undertake the work we are paid to do.”

“The locally based organisations I work with could probably afford between £50 and £400 depending on their size. There are currently many fundraising events my organisations cannot afford to send me on because the rates are just too high.”

Whilst others would like to see the added value from the provision:

“Can't answer as would depend on the quality, applicability, and scope of what was offered and how it helped us to generate revenue”

“We would pay for this as we see appropriate - the resources would have to be those which we cannot get elsewhere and add real value to our work”

“I think this depends on what the training is about, would I pay someone to give me training on how to write a grant application NO, if I was supported to secure a £500k contract then Yes and £500 is only one per cent and if paid as donation pre-tax we all win”

“Need to quantify what the organisation would get before can say what is acceptable”

Other respondents would prefer to use the services of their regional agency:

“None - would prefer to support my local FAWN which already does this.”

“Would be more likely to purchase from my regional FAWN.”

“Not as long as my local FAWN meets my needs so well.”

There were contradictory responses to paying for some services, for example quality standards:

“Would not pay for quality standards.”

“If a quality mark is available I would pay over £500. I already commit over £500 pa to training and OPD”

“I would say an organisation's budget should include £100-500 per adviser for training and meeting quality standards - but then the services would have to be comprehensive, as many ISOs would not have large additional training budgets.”

Charges could vary:

“Charges could be on a sliding scale depending on size/income. Discounts for small organizations”

“Voluntary sector has limited funds could be more for professional orgs”

Would funders pay these costs?

“..... so far we have had to operate on a shoestring budget but probably £100 - 200 would be acceptable if somebody was prepared to fund us...”

“Are funders prepared to pay the cost of FANN membership as legitimate expense?”

And some respondents do not have the funds for these activities:

“No budget for this in my organization.”

“Budget? Don't have a budget!”

“Both [local networks] have limited budgets and therefore restricted purchasing power from a FANN.”

**Qu. 35 sources of revenue funding**

<b>Qu. 35 What level of funding is likely from other sources, eg. local authorities, the Big Lottery Fund, Capacitybuilders and central government?</b>			
<b>Given that this is a proposed national service, although supporting local delivery, where should any grant aid come from? (Please place the options in the order 1 – 4)</b>			
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Response Average</b>	<b>Response Total</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Local authorities	3.66	689	188
Big Lottery	5.17	966	187
ChangeUp/Capacity Builders	162.46	30868	190
Central Government	110.48	20881	189
<i>answered question</i>			<b>190</b>
<i>skipped question</i>			<b>87</b>

Clearly the majority response to this question was that Capacity Builders is seen as being the most likely funder of this service.

**Qu. 36 definition of a FANN**

<b>Qu. 36 Is this a suitable definition of a funding advice network?</b>			
<b>answer options</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
“A funding advice network is defined by structured communication between funding advisers from different organisations.”	168	32	200
If not, how would you change it?			36
<i>Answered question</i>			<b>200</b>

Respondents have provided a wealth of additional comments on this topic, qualifying the 84% in favour of this definition.

Define the purpose behind communication:

“Emphasis should be on the support provided - no good communicating about things if you don't DO anything about it.”

“I would be more interested in what it does rather than how it is defined.”

“I would define what the communication was about... e.g. mutual support and the sharing and disseminating of good practice... etc....”

“A funding advice network, which will provide advice and networking opportunities at a national level ie. more clearly explaining what it will do, rather than what it is”

“Doesn't describe aim of such communication - why exist.”

Whilst others went to be more specific about the nature of the services to be provided:

“A FFAN supports funding advisors in delivering an excellent service through advocacy, training, mentoring and networking at a national level.”

“No reference to service to the customer or quality expected.... surely what its there to support and ensure”

“A funding advice network promotes best practice and information sharing between people who give advice to others on funding issues.”

“Communication and peer support between individuals from different organisations who provide funding advice to VCS organisations.”

“Would illustrate what structured communication means e.g. is it a newsletter. a meeting, discussion, etc”

“ADD something about 'shared values'?”

“A centre of expertise and information sharing”

“A funding advice network is by definition a series of structured communications, developments and information sharing between funding advisers from different organisations”

Others commented on who should be involved:

“Needs to involve funders and finance organisations. Needs to be implicit is fair, geographic reach 'accessibility, representative' non-competitive but co-operative/partner organisation.”

“A funding advice network enables communication between funding advisors from different organisations”

“Would like to see something about external communication added - not just about advisors sharing amongst themselves”

“Misses out the need for mentioning a wide variety of organisations and sectors.”

“What sorts of organisations? Need to state whether it is just voluntary organizations.”

And there were several new drafts for the definition:

“FANN - a learning community which aims to develop, support and exchange good practice in funding advice; encourage good funding practice by donors; and ensure that funding practice is equitable.”

“add ‘to support Funding Advisors in empowering the VCS to achieve their goals through effective and sustainable funding’ ”

“A funding advice network supports people and organisations by networking, sharing learning opportunities and resources, ensuring quality of advisers, providing advisers a voice at the highest levels and engendering trust in us by the people and organisations we advise.”

“A funding advice network is defined as the exchange of funding related information between interested parties across the 9 regions of England”

“Funding advice network is professional support for the development of advisers and organisations for the aim of sustainability.”

“A funding advice network exists to support and enable good quality funding advice by those whom work in this field.”

“A FAN is defined by structured communication between Funding Advisers from a range of organisations who provide funding advice to external bodies that is free at the point of delivery.”

“A funding advice network is defined by structured communication and action between funding advisers from different organisations.”

“A funding advice network is defined by structured communication between individual funding advisors and those from relevant organizations.”

And a couple of general comments

“Where members understand what they are paying for and the network delivers it.”

“Once you have received all the contributions please try to keep it succinct as it is above.”

Qu. 37

guiding principles

Qu. 37 How important are these principles in guiding this work?								
Please score (low priority 0, high priority 5)								
answer options	0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Response Count
Existing FANs will be involved in the process of establishing a FANN at the earliest possible stage	3	4	9	31	64	92	4.09	203
Members should have a clear voice in the affairs of a FANN for it to be successful.	1	0	5	34	60	103	4.27	203
The model to be developed should have maximum potential for sustainability	1	1	4	16	64	117	4.42	203
The model should be inclusive of all advisers providing support to the third sector	5	3	8	28	65	93	4.09	202
	1	3	7	18	40	134	4.43	203
<i>answered question</i>								<b>204</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>73</b>

Most significant issue - The model should work with the support of existing services, not compete with them.

Issues with rating average over 4.00 – All five issues in this section had a high rating average.