

City of London's Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Analysis of Grants Awarded

Key Findings

This paper provides the first comprehensive analysis of the grants awarded by the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund since its launch in 2020. Notable findings of the grant analysis include:

- Approval rates for CILNF applications are more or less constant with between 70-80% of applications being recommended for funding each year.
- The average length of grant in 2024/25 is 1.75 years.
- Of the £8,155,330 grants awarded (to 1.10.24) £2,054,810 (25%) of total grant spend was towards infrastructure and capital elements and £6,100,520 (75%) was towards activities and service delivery.
- The value of the capital elements to grants awarded is not as large as may have been expected, with 72% of the grants with a capital element awarded less than £100,000 and a third (33%) awarded a capital element of less than £25,000.
- Although 43% of grants with a capital element were awarded to grantees in the religious sector the average value of these grants was relatively modest (£74,316) compared to the average value of capital elements awarded to VCS sector organisations (£249,775) and culture/arts sector organisations (£237,321).
- 18% of grantee organisations had a turnover of £5+m, but almost a third (28%) of grants were awarded to small organisations with a turnover of less than £100k.
- Although a quarter of CILNF grantee organisations (25%) were user-led (with representation from beneficiaries within the management and/or Board) including 9% BAME-led. By comparison the value of grants to user-led organisations £1,367,104 was only 16% of the total value of CILNF grants awarded. Of concern, is that the average grant to BAME-led grantee organisations was only £46,651 – approximately a third of the value of the average grant to non-user led organisations.
- 57% of the total value of CILNF grants awarded £4,641,404 have been given to grantees working in the cultural and heritage sectors with the lion's share having been awarded to grantees from the cultural sector (40% of total CILNF funds awarded - £3,263,754). This reflects CILNF's historic focus supporting the delivery of the Destination City strategy.
- By comparison grantees from the health sector and the youth sector are few in number and have been awarded 3% or less each of the total CILNF pot with low average grants of £50,085 and £48,485 respectively.
- In relation to the City of London's Corporate Plan Strategic Outcomes many CILNF funded projects delivered more than one Corporate Plan Strategic Outcome. Almost half of the grants (46%) awarded to date have increased community cohesion meeting the strategy to create 'Diverse engaged communities'. 44% of CILNF grants awarded have increased weekend footfall meeting the CoL's strategy to create a 'Vibrant Thriving Destination'. Almost a third of grants (32%) have improved the public realm and/or cultural icons delivering 'Flourishing public spaces'.
- Grants often simultaneously benefitted a specific community and general beneficiaries. 75% of all CILNF grant funded projects benefitted general beneficiaries. A quarter (25%) of all CILNF grants benefitted children under 11 years old and a further 25% benefitted young people/youth aged 11-25 years. 18% of funded projects benefitted minoritised ethnic groups. However CILNF funded projects benefitting LGBTQ+ communities and People with learning difficulties were almost absent from the funded portfolio.

City of London's Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Analysis of Grants Awarded

Background

1. This paper provides the first comprehensive analysis of the grants awarded by the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund since its launch in 2020, primarily in order to establish a baseline from which to measure future changes to the impact of fund in response to the programme of CILNF outreach work that has been initiated.
2. The paper analyses the impact and learning from 68 CILNF grants awarded over the funding programme's initial 45 months of operation (December 2020 to August 2024 inclusive) by addressing the key learning questions agreed for the programme.
3. The CILNF is an atypical grant funding programme in relation to both the type of organisation that is eligible to apply and the breadth of projects which it is able to fund. These USPs are its key strengths enabling it to be responsive to, rather than to prescribe, local community needs. In line with embedding EDI within funding best practice, CILNF has a rolling deadline and offers the potential for long-term 5-year funding providing flexibility for applicants and enabling them to plan further ahead. The programme's management is underpinned by the CILNF Equalities Action Plan and reviewed against IVAR's Open and Trusting Grant-Making for Public Agencies.
4. During the Summer 2023 City communities were engaged through public consultation to determine their priorities for the CILNF. Surveys were received from 207 respondents of which 40% of respondents lived in the City, 38% of respondents worked in the City and 22% of respondents both lived and worked in the City. Respondents identified eight community priorities which were incorporated in the updated CILNF Policy in January 2024. Applications for CILNF now need to meet at least one community priority:
 - a. Preserving existing and creating of more green space in the City including estate gardens and support for gardening clubs.
 - b. Addressing the needs of people from disadvantaged backgrounds, minoritised communities, older people, disabled people, LGBTQIA+ people and those living in poverty.
 - c. Sporting, exercise and health activities including promoting walking and cycling.
 - d. Activities and services for children, young people and families.
 - e. Making public spaces and services fully accessible for disabled people and the elderly.
 - f. Proposals and activities that have been co-designed by engaging the community in the development of the proposal and/or proposals that demonstrate community support.
 - g. Mitigating climate change & enhancing biodiversity & wildlife.
 - h. Improving street cleanliness.

Value and distribution of grants over time

5. The first CILNF grant was awarded on 15 December 2020 and the programme has been in operation for 3 years and 9 months as at end August 2024 (45 months). A total of £8,155,330 in grants has been awarded over this period.
6. Grants awarded over this period have ranged in value from £7,885 (St Michael Cornhill) to £774,000 (Barts Heritage). Of the top five largest grants awarded, 3 were awarded in 2022/23 corresponding to the year with the highest average value of grant awarded £221,396. See Table 1.

| Financial Year | No of months | No of grants awarded | Value of grants awarded in year | Average value of grant awarded |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 2020/21 | 4 | 4 | £406,410 | £101,603 |
| 2021/22 | 12 | 20 | £1,985,085 | £99,255 |
| 2022/23 | 12 | 14 | £3,099,542 | £221,396 |
| 2003/24 | 12 | 18 | £1,609,037 | £89,391 |
| 2024/25 | 5 | 12 | £1,055,256 | £87,938 |
| Total | 45 | 68 | £8,155,330 | £119,931 |

7. The average value of grants awarded dropped significantly in 2023/24 due in part to the closure of the CILNF to large applications whilst the CILNF community consultation was undertaken. Whilst this temporary closure may have artificially lowered the value of the average grant that year, subsequently the value of the average grant awarded in the first five months of 2024/25 is similarly low £87,938 (see Table 1). This coincides with the start of the CILNF outreach programme to increase the number and broaden the range of applications to the funding programme with a specific focus on supporting community and grassroots organisations. Such applicants tend to have a smaller turnover and often new to grant funding tend to request smaller value and shorter term initial grants. These initial pilot phase and scoping grants are anticipated to be followed by requests for 3-4 year continuation grants once demand for, and impact of, projects has been evidenced.
8. There have been 68 grants awarded to date from a total of 98 applications – an average of 18 grants awarded per year. There have been 12 applications to date in the first 5 months of 2024/24 which with seasonal peaks and troughs could be anticipated to rise to 29 grants in total for the year – a 56% increase on the total number of grants in the previous year. This correlates to the increase in pre-application advice sessions that have been given in the months since the CILNF outreach programme began with an average of 17.3 pre-application sessions per month since June 2024 – more than triple the average number of sessions provided in the previous 9 months. The outreach programme is still in its infancy and its outputs are not expected to be fully felt until at least April 2025.
9. Approval rates for CILNF applications are more or less constant with between 70-80% of applications being recommended for funding each year with other applications either being rejected or withdrawn by the applicant during assessment. See Table 2.

| Financial Year | No of months | Total applications | No of applications rejected | No of applications withdrawn | No of grants awarded | % approval rate |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 2020/21 | 4 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 31% |
| 2021/22 | 12 | 25 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 80% |
| 2022/23 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 70% |
| 2023/24 | 12 | 25 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 72% |
| 2024/25 | 5 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 80% |
| Total | 45 | 98 | 13 | 17 | 68 | |

10. Whilst the CILNF can fund applications up to £500,000, the fund is in fact characterised by its award of grants of less than £100,000. 66% of CILNF grants to date (45 grants) have been for less than £100,000 (see Table 3). Ignoring the possible anomaly of grants awarded in 2023/24 when the fund was shut to large applications for part of the year, subsequently in 2024/25 the proportion of grants awarded of less than £100,000 has

continued to rise with 92% of grants awarded in this financial year (2024/25) being less than £100,000.

| Financial Year | No of months | No of grants awarded | No of grants awarded < £100k | % of total grants awarded < £100k |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 2020/21 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 50% |
| 2021/22 | 12 | 20 | 11 | 55% |
| 2022/23 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 43% |
| 2023/24 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 83% |
| 2024/25 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 92% |
| Total | 45 | 68 | 45 | |

Length of grants awarded

11. In line with funding best practice and in response to the CILNF public consultation CILNF Policy was updated in January 2024 to explicitly allow continuous funding for up to a maximum of five years. However, there has been as yet no particular change in the average length of grant over the last four years (see Table 4). Note in 2023/24 CILNF was shut to large applications for part of the year. The average length of grant in 2024/25 is 1.75 years.

| Financial Year | No of months | No of grants awarded | Average length of grant in years |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020/21 | 4 | 4 | 2.25 |
| 2021/22 | 12 | 20 | 1.75 |
| 2022/23 | 12 | 14 | 1.86 |
| 2023/24 | 12 | 18 | 1.3 |
| 2024/25 | 5 | 12 | 1.75 |
| Total | 45 | 68 | |

12. 82% of CILNF grants awarded are for two or less years in duration, with only 3% of grants awarded to date being for the maximum 5 years (see Table 5).

| Length of grant | No of CILNF grants since programme launch | % of CILNF grants since programme launch |
|------------------------|--|---|
| 1 year | 40 | 59% |
| 2 year | 16 | 23% |
| 3 year | 8 | 12% |
| 4 year | 2 | 3% |
| 5 year | 2 | 3% |
| Total | 68 | |

13. There is no discernible trend in the length of grants awarded. See Table 6.

| Financial Year | No of months | % of 1 year grants awarded | % of 1 or 2 year grants awarded | % of 3, 4 or 5 year grants awarded |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 2020/21 | 4 | 50% | 50% | 50% |
| 2021/22 | 12 | 50% | 80% | 15% |
| 2022/23 | 12 | 50% | 71% | 29% |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| 2023/24 | 12 | 78% | 94% | 6% |
| 2024/25 | 5 | 58% | 83% | 17% |
| Total | 45 | | | |

Continuation/Repeat Funding

14. In January 2024 CILNF Policy was amended to prevent applicants becoming reliant on CILNF funding by introducing a 12 month fallow period after 5 years of continuous funding and introducing a maximum grant over a five year period of £500,000. Prior to this there was no clear maximum award from the fund.

| Organisation | No of grants | Total value of grants awarded |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Barbican Centre Trust | 4 | £737,807 |
| Age UK City of London | 3 | £188,121 |
| Pollinating London Together | 2 | £500,000 |
| New Diorama | 2 | £335,640 |
| Urban Learners | 2 | £105,250 |
| Ramadan Tent Project | 2 | £52,350 |
| Tempo Time Credits | 2 | £49,869 |

15. To date only 7 organisations have received two or more CILNF grants of which Barbican Centre Trust (Communities Team) has received four and Age UK City of London three grants. Only two of these repeat grantees have reached or exceeded the new CILNF maximum grant level. See Table 7.

Capital v. Activity Spend

16. Since the CILNF opened a total of £8,155,330 has been awarded in grants (to 1.10.24) of which £2,054,810 (25%) of total grant spend was towards infrastructure and capital elements and £6,100,520 (75%) of total grant spend was towards activity and service delivery.
17. The value of funding towards capital and infrastructure projects is relatively stable each year at approximately £435,000 to £500,000 per year – although we only have figures for the first five months of 2024/25 to date. Conversely the percentage of grants in each financial year with a capital element is diminishing over time (see Table 8).

| Financial Year | No of grants with capital element | % of grants awarded with capital element | No of grants awarded | Value of capital element awarded | Value of activity element awarded |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 2020/21 | 3 | 75% | 4 | £230,301 | £176,109 |
| 2021/22 | 6 | 30% | 20 | £435,268 | £1,549,817 |
| 2022/23 | 5 | 36% | 14 | £443,713 | £2,655,829 |
| 2023/24 | 3 | 17% | 18 | £490,886 | £1,118,151 |
| 2024/25 | 1 | 8% | 12 | £454,642 | £600,614 |
| Total | 18 | | 68 | £2,054,810 | £6,100,520 |

18. The value of the capital elements to grants awarded is not as large as may have been expected given the nature of the fund, with 72% of the grants with a capital element

awarded less than £100,000 and a third (33%) awarded a capital element of less than £25,000 (see Table 9).

| Value of capital element of grant | No of grants with capital element | % of grants with a capital element |
|--|--|---|
| < £25k | 6 | 33% |
| £25k-£49,999 | 4 | 22% |
| £50k-£99,999 | 3 | 17% |
| £100k-£249,999 | 1 | 6% |
| £250k+ | 4 | 22% |
| Total | 18 | |

19. Only 22% of grants had a capital element of a value of more than £250,000. The capital element of grants ranged from £7,855 to £454,642 (London Symphony Orchestra). The other three significant grants with a capital element were: Barbican Association £449,550; The Temple Church £311,000 (of a total grant of £408,500); Historic Royal Palaces £300,000.
20. By comparison the top six (single) grants for activity were: Barts Heritage £774,000; Museum of London £650,605; Barbican Centre Trust Ltd £272,370; Pollinating London Together £270,000; Temple Bar Trust £250,000; Parochial Church Council of the Ecclesiastical Parish of St Andrew by the Wardrobe £250,000.
21. Analysis of capital element of grant awarded by grantee organisation sectors shows that religious organisations were awarded the most grants with a capital element (8 grants total capital element value £594,532) but that the average value of these capital elements of the grants (£74,316) was less than an third of the value of capital elements of grants awarded on average to voluntary & Community/Residents Associations Sector organisations (£249,775) and Culture/Arts sector organisations (£237,321). So although 43% of grants with a capital element were awarded to grantees in the religious sector the average value of these grants was relatively modest. See Table 10.

| Grantee Organisation Sector | No of grants with capital element | % of grants with capital element | Value of capital element of grants awarded to the sector | Average value of capital grant by grantee sector |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Voluntary & Comm inc Residents Association | 2 | 11% | £499,550 | £249,775 |
| Culture Arts | 2 | 11% | £474,642 | £237,321 |
| Charitable company | | | | |
| Heritage | 3 | 17% | £353,650 | £117,883 |
| Health | 1 | 6% | £65,301 | £65,301 |
| Livery Companies | 1 | 6% | £49,791 | £49,791 |
| Religious | 8 | 43% | £594,532 | £74,316 |
| Environment | 1 | 6% | £17,344 | £17,344 |
| Total | | | £2,054,810 | |

Areas/wards specifically benefiting from CILNF grant funding

22. Only 19% of grants awarded were specific to a given ward, the other 81% of grants generated benefits across the City of London.
23. Wards benefiting from a location specific grant were: Farringdon Without (4 grants); Portsoken (4 grants); Aldersgate (1 grant); Bishopsgate (1 grant); Castle Baynard (1 grant); Cordwainer (1 grant); Cripplegate (1 grant).
24. 54% of the 13 ward specific grants were capital only, 23% of ward specific grants were for activity only and 23% of ward specific grants were for a mix of capital and activity.

Type of CILNF grantee organisations – turnover, user-led, sector

25. 39% of CILNF grantee organisations had a turnover of £1m or more with 18% of organisations having a turnover of £5m or more. Of those with a turnover of £5m or more 50% were cultural/arts organisations.
26. Significantly, 53% of CILNF grantee organisations had a turnover of under £1m with 28% of organisations having a turnover of less than £100k. Organisations with a turnover of less than £100k were constituted in a wide variety of ways including businesses, registered charities, CIC and constituted voluntary organisation and there was no predominant type of organisational model. (See Table 11).

| Annual Turnover of grantee | No of grantees | % of grantees |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| £5m+ | 12 | 18% |
| £1m to £4,999,999 | 14 | 21% |
| £500k to £999,999 | 5 | 7% |
| £100k to £499,999 | 17 | 25% |
| < £100k | 19 | 28% |
| D/K | 1 | 1% |

27. Almost two thirds of grantees (64%) were charities (Registered Charities, Charitable Companies and CIOs). However, there has been no notable change in the type of grantee organisation type over time. See Table 12.

| Grantee organisation type | Number of grantees | % of grantees | Financial Year | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 |
| Registered Charity | 24 | 35% | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 5 |
| Charitable Company | 17 | 25% | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Business organisation/ association | 8 | 12% | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| CIC | 6 | 9% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other (Churches, Livery Cos) | 5 | 7% | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Charitable Incorporated Organisation | 3 | 4% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Constituted voluntary organisation or Resident Association | 3 | 4% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Exempt or excepted charity | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| IPS/Bencom | 1 | 2% | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 68 | | | | | | |

28. A quarter of CILNF grantee organisations (25%) were user-led (with representation from beneficiaries within the management and/or Board) with 9% BAME-led. By comparison the value of grants to user-led organisations £1,367,104 was only 16% of the total value of CILNF grants awarded. Of concern, is that the average grant to BAME-led grantee organisations was only £46,651 – approximately a third of the value of the average grant to non-user led organisations. See Table 13.

29. Of the 17 user-led organisations 14 (82%) had a turnover of <£500K.

| | Number of grantees | % of grantees | Value of grants to awarded | % of total CILNF spend to date | Average value of grant |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| BAME user led | 6 | 9% | £279,907 | 3% | £46,651 |
| Other user led | 11 | 16% | £1,087,197 | 13% | £98,836 |
| Not user led | 51 | 75% | £6,788,226 | 84% | £133,102 |
| Total | 68 | | £8,155,330 | | |

30. 57% of the total value of CILNF grants awarded £4,641,404 has been given to grantees working in the cultural and heritage sectors with the lion's share having been awarded to grantees from the cultural sector (40% of total CILNF funds awarded - £3,263,754). This reflects CILNF's historic focus to support the delivery of the Destination City strategy. The new CILNF Priorities introduced post public consultation in January 2024 do not include delivery of arts or culture unless they are delivering on one of the eight identified community priorities (See Clause 4).

31. Although 18% of CLINF grantees were from the religious sector, this sector has only been awarded 15% of the overall CILNF funds to date representing an average grant of £103,699 compared to an average grant to heritage sector grantees of £275,530, VCS/Residents Associations average grant £157,534 and Culture/Arts average grant £155,417.

32. Grantees from the culture/arts sectors represent the largest group of grant recipients, the largest value of grants awarded to any sector and a high average grant per

organisation. Whilst the culture/arts sector has received a lot of high value grants from the CILNF, by comparison grantees from the health sector and the youth sector are few in number and have been awarded 3% or less each of the total CILNF pot with low average grants of £50,085 and £48,485 respectively. See Table 14.

| Grantee Organisation Sector | Number of grantees | % of grantees | Value of grants to awarded to grantees in sector | % of total CILNF spend to date | Average value of grant to grantees in sector |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Culture/Arts | 21 | 31% | £3,263,754 | 40% | £155,417 |
| Heritage | 5 | 7% | £1,377,650 | 17% | £275,530 |
| Religious | 12 | 18% | £1,244,382 | 15% | £103,699 |
| Voluntary / Community including Residents Associations | 4 | 6% | £630,137 | 8% | £157,534 |
| Environment | 6 | 9% | £597,960 | 7% | £99,660 |
| Other | 9 | 13% | £491,190 | 6% | £54,577 |
| Health | 5 | 7% | £250,423 | 3% | £50,085 |
| Youth Provision | 3 | 5% | £145,454 | 2% | £48,485 |
| Infrastructure/ Advice | 1 | 1% | £80,089 | 1% | £80,089 |
| Livery Company | 2 | 3% | £74,291 | 1% | £37,146 |
| | 68 | | £8,155,330 | | |

Meeting Community Priorities

33. New Community Priorities were introduced in January 2024 but due to the time taken between application and decision the first grant awarded under the new CILNF Policy was not awarded until May 2024. As at August 2024 only 9 grants had been awarded that relate to the new CILNF Community Priorities.

| CILNF Community Priority Met | No of grants | % of grants |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| Services for people from disadvantaged backgrounds | 6 | 67% |
| Co-designed/community supported proposals | 4 | 44% |
| Sport, exercise and health activities | 3 | 33% |
| Children, young people and family activities | 3 | 33% |
| Improving accessibility for disabled people and the elderly | 3 | 33% |
| Developing green spaces and gardening clubs | 2 | 22% |
| Mitigating climate change & enhancing biodiversity | 1 | 11% |
| Improving street cleanliness | 1 | 11% |

34. Funded projects can meet more than one community priority. To date two thirds (67%) of grants awarded since May 2024 have delivered services for people from disadvantaged backgrounds and 44% of funded projects have been co-designed or evidenced community support for their proposals. All of the eight community priorities have been addressed through the grants awarded to since May 2024. See Table 15.

Main CILNF grant funding outputs and outcomes

35. CILNF grants were tagged in relation to their main grant purpose/output. 31% of CILNF grants to date delivered arts/culture including public art; the main focus of 16% of grants was the delivery of capital projects and restoration and the main focus of 12% of grants was the delivery of community celebrations & events. Other key outputs delivered through CILNF funding were Environmental improvement, climate action and biodiversity; access improvements; advice services; training, upskilling & employment; mental health services; sports and exercise. See Table 16.

| Main grant purpose (outputs) | No of grants | % of grants |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| Arts/culture including public art | 21 | 31% |
| Capital works and restoration | 11 | 16% |
| Other | 8 | 12% |
| Community celebrations & events | 8 | 12% |
| Environmental improvement, climate action, inc biodiversity | 5 | 7% |
| Access improvements | 4 | 6% |
| Advice services | 4 | 6% |
| Training, upskilling, employment | 4 | 6% |
| Mental Health Services | 2 | 3% |
| Sports & Exercise | 1 | 1% |

36. CILNF grants to date were also analysed in relation to the City of London's Corporate Plan Strategic Outcomes that the grants delivered. Many projects delivered more than one Corporate Plan Strategic Outcome. Almost half of the grants (46%) awarded to date have increased community cohesion meeting the strategy to create 'Diverse engaged communities'. 44% of CILNF grants awarded have increased weekend footfall meeting the CoL's strategy to create a 'Vibrant Thriving Destination'. Almost a third of grants (32%) have improved the public realm and/or cultural icons delivering 'Flourishing public spaces'. See Table 17.

| Main grant purpose (outcomes)/ CoL's Corporate Plan Strategic Outcome | Number of grants | % of grants |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Increased Community Cohesion - 'Diverse engaged communities' | 31 | 46% |
| Increased weekend footfall - 'Vibrant Thriving Destination' | 30 | 44% |
| Improved public realm & cultural icons - 'Flourishing public spaces' | 22 | 32% |
| Reduced Social Isolation - 'Diverse engaged communities' | 19 | 28% |
| Improved mental or physical health - 'Providing excellent services' | 16 | 24% |
| Pathways to employment - 'Providing excellent services' | 14 | 21% |
| Increased visitor spend - 'Vibrant Thriving Destination' | 12 | 18% |
| Climate mitigation - 'Leading Sustainable Environment' | 9 | 13% |

Grant beneficiaries

37. 81% of CILNF grants awarded benefited both City of London residents and City of London workers. 19% of CILNF grants awarded were focused entirely on benefitting

City of London residents. No grants were awarded that only benefitted City of London workers.

- 38. Of the 13 projects whose beneficiaries were entirely City of London residents 62% were delivered by organisations with a turnover of less than £500k.
- 39. CILNF grants were tagged in relation to their main grant beneficiary groups. Grants often simultaneously benefitted a specific community and general beneficiaries. 75% of all CILNF grant funded projects benefitted general beneficiaries. A quarter (25%) of all CILNF grants benefitted children under 11 years old and a further 25% benefitted young people/youth aged 11-25 years. 18% of funded projects benefitted minoritised ethnic groups. However CILNF funded projects benefitting LGBTQ+ communities and People with learning difficulties were almost absent from the funded portfolio. See Table 18.

| Main grant beneficiary group/s | Number of grants | % of grants |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|
| General beneficiaries/ no specific target gps | 51 | 75% |
| Children < 11yr | 17 | 25% |
| Young People/Youth 11-25yr | 17 | 25% |
| Minoritised ethnic groups | 12 | 18% |
| People with physical disabilities | 7 | 10% |
| Older people | 6 | 9% |
| People living in poverty | 6 | 9% |
| Refugees/Asylum seekers | 2 | 3% |
| Homeless People | 2 | 3% |
| Looked After Children & Care Leavers | 2 | 3% |
| LGBTQ+ | 1 | 1% |
| People with learning disabilities | 1 | 1% |

Responding to Public Consultation suggested CILNF operational improvements

- 40. Respondents to the public consultation were asked whether they had any suggestions on how the CILNF could improve how it operates. This question only received responses from 52% of respondents with a further 2% stating they had no suggestions. This reflected the fact that many respondents had little or no prior knowledge of CILNF.
- 41. Suggested improvements identified by over 5% or more of respondents were (in descending importance): Actively identify and reach out to potential applicants including grassroots community groups, sole traders, independents and businesses to make sure their needs are met (14%); Improve awareness of the fund through improved comms and promotion of success stories (11%); Transparency in relation to investment decisions (8%); Provide more information about the CILNF's funding criteria (6%).
- 42. These suggested improvements have informed and shaped the CILNF comms and outreach work since April 2024. Proactive outreach to identify and engage potential CILNF applicants through community stakeholders and other conduits is enabling the CFCMT team to develop a strong pipeline of applications with a specific focus on identifying and supporting community and grassroots groups to apply for funding. As at November 2024 we are aware of a pipeline of 37 CILNF applications that we are supporting to develop or are in preparation with an estimated value of £3,597,370.
- 43. Competition for local press coverage and social media from other services within the City of London is fierce, but CFCMT has secured dedicated comms support to place key stories and posts to raise the profile of the fund locally. Working through grantees has

been more successful with grant holders promoting CoL CILNF funding on all printed material and through their own press engagement.

44. In response to public consultation feedback the CILNF website pages have been overhauled with information on all CILNF grants to date, the full CILNF policy and funding criteria with a page dedicated to Frequently Asked Questions. Traffic to the CILNF webpages has doubled and the monthly rate of provision of pre-application advice provided by the team tripled since April 2024 and the start of the outreach work..