

Kairos in Soho

In partnership with
London Friend
Pace
The Metro Centre

Report of the In Our Name Launch 19 February 2010

South Bank University



Contents

Contents	1
1 Aims	2
2 Planning the Launch	2
2.1 Access	3
3 Participants	3
4 Programme	4
4.1 Introduction	4
4.2 Analysis of interactive exercise responses	5
4.3 Workshops	6
4.4 Workshop insights	7
5 Participant feedback	11
6 Launch aims revisited	13
7 Moving Forward	15
Appendix 1	16

1 Aims

ION is a London LGBT infrastructure project, led by Kairos in Soho, managed in partnership with London Friend, PACE and the Metro Centre.

The aims of the In Our Name (ION) launch event were as follows:

- To explain what ION is and engage participants in and with the project
- To seek feedback and comments from the participants on the components of the project
- To celebrate and develop a sense of LGBT community
- To increase understanding of the needs and aspirations of the sector
- To assess if the project has the potential to address these within the sector
- To create a sense of ownership and motivation
- To share an enjoyable and positive experience

The above aims were developed in light of the overall In Our Name project aim, which is to provide a model of sustainable London-focussed LGBT VCS infrastructure so that a diverse range of LGBT VCOs are better able to meet the needs and represent the views of LGBT Londoners.

The outcomes that KiS and partners aim to achieve under the ION programme are as follows:

- *By the end of the project a diverse cross-section of at least 30 London LGBT VCOs will have increased their capacity and there will be an overall increase in sector wide income of 30% over the 2006 level*
- *By the end of the project 30 LGBT VCOs will be more effectively and more consistently contributing to policy development, across borough, sub-regional and regional structures*
- *By the end of the project 20 funders will demonstrate an increase in their awareness of LGBT need which will be indicated in their policies and funding behaviour*
- *By the end of the project 20 local, regional and issue specific infrastructure agencies will be better equipped and more actively engaged in addressing the needs of LGBT VCOs and the LGBT community*

2 Planning the Launch

The launch was discussed at the ION Partners meeting of 5 August 2009 and it was agreed that the event:

- Should be both a celebration and working event
- Should introduce LGBT VCOs to the project and enable them to have a clear sense of the project and what they might gain from it and contribute to it
- The format should combine presentation and facilitated focus groups around the project themes

- LGBT VCOs would be asked to identify representatives with a specific interest in In Our Name

2.1 Access

The event was advertised on the Kairos in Soho website and the LGBT History Month website. Comprehensive postal and email invitations were completed across the LGBT VCS. The ION Partners assisted with personal invitations to increase participation. A press release was circulated to KiS's media contacts and by Big Lottery Fund though no press attended.

Participants from smaller organisations were offered travel bursaries, and those from organisations without paid staff were also offered £50 consultancy fees to facilitate attendance and value contributions.

Sign language interpreters were present and advertised. KiS also promoted the possibility of offering additional support to facilitate access.

Feedback was offered afterwards that it would have been a good idea to advertise that paid childcare could have been arranged and KiS will undertake to do so in future.

3 Participants

The ION Launch was attended by representatives from 39 organisations; the majority came from LGBT VCOs, a few representatives from forums attended and there were two participants from generic infrastructure organisations. 83% of those who had pre-booked attended on the day and 1 participant who had not pre-booked attended.

31% of the organisations present were LGBT community of interest organisations and 31% were unfunded/less funded organisations.

37 participants out of 44 (84%) filled in feedback forms, which is thought to be a high response rate resulting from the attention paid to giving feedback throughout the morning. However, it is important to note that completion of feedback forms can also be more or less common amongst particular populations of people.

Of those who returned forms, 65% were men and 35% women. 18% of the respondents to the question on gender identity said that they had a different gender identity to the one they were assigned at birth. The largest proportion (46%) of participants were between 30 and 45, 30% were 46-59, 14% were 60-75, 11% were 22-29, and none were 16-21.

The representation of young people could be improved at future ION events and more widely in the ION project. At the time of the PiP research (2007) young people were the most likely population sub-group to be served by organisations out of 31 VCOs that targeted specific groups. KiS will pay particular attention to outreach to organisations of and representing younger LGBT people in future. It is understood however that staff of these projects are not necessarily young people.

24% of respondents were lesbian; 59% gay; 8% bisexual; 3% heterosexual; and 5% other (queer and asexual). The representation of those who identify as lesbian and bisexual could be improved, and yet is also consistent with challenges in relation to equality for the sector as a whole identified for instance during the PiP research. It is notable for KiS that a greater equality between different genders is achieved at LGBT community events for individuals, as opposed to sector events.

86% of respondents were white, 11% were Black or Asian and 3% were mixed. However, analysis of attendees shows that 18% of attendees are Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) or mixed. Under representation of BAME people is consistent with problems of representation, prejudice and exclusion within the sector; in the PiP sample 15% of all organisations served specifically BAME LGBT communities and so KiS will work strategically to engage more diverse individuals and organisations in the ION project. Research shows that BAME organisations are less likely to have paid staff overall. We also recognise that LGBT community of interest organisations are particularly disadvantaged in terms of income and staffing, and so it would likely be more difficult for people from those organisations to attend daytime meetings.

Only 10 people responded to the question asking about support needs and so the results for that question are not indicative. Of those who responded, 4 had support needs, 4 stated that they did not and 2 preferred not to say. Support needs included BSL interpreters, who were present at the event; information presented visually as well as in text; and a crèche. KiS will endeavour to present textual information visually where possible and to meet childcare needs (discussed further in section 7).

Of respondents to the question about religion/belief 53% said that they did not have religion or belief, 38% said that they did and 9% preferred not to say.

The largest proportion (45%) of respondents were employed full time, 16% were employed part time, the amount studying, unemployed, or retired were fairly evenly spread between 11% and 13%; 3% preferred not to say. Again it is likely that the time of the event attracted those who are employed in the LGBT VCS. The question about caring responsibilities attracted a low response and so the results are not indicative.

4 Programme

4.1 Introduction

The event, held at the Keyworth Centre at London South Bank University from 9.30am-2pm on 19 February 2010, opened with registration and networking as participants enjoyed their choice of organic porridge and bacon rolls.

KiS CEO Jane Standing opened the event, welcoming participants. She said: “This is just the beginning of what we hope will be a five year period of increased communication between us, sharing good practice, collective action to improve the funding landscape, innovation, and increased mutual support.”

Jane then welcomed Debbie Pippard, Head of London Region at the Big Lottery Fund, who stated that the Big Lottery Fund had conducted their own research on the situation of LGBT organisations in London to identify where and how to invest in infrastructure, before agreeing to support LGBT infrastructure.

Debbie addressed the importance of funding infrastructure, and shared that Big Lottery Fund was pleased to support the ION project and interested in the innovative infrastructure model it provides. Debbie also reported on the success rates of LGBT charities in getting funding, albeit for the Awards for All small grants. LGBT VCOs have a higher than average rate of success in this programme. Debbie concluded by confirming her support for the project and her confidence in KiS taking the work forward in a collaborative and creative way.

Jane then went on to describe the project in a little more detail, explaining that the In Our Name (ION) Infrastructure Project (2009-2014) is a London lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) project managed by KiS and delivered in partnership with London Friend, PACE and the Metro Centre. The project aims to provide a unique infrastructure model developed from within the community so that diverse organisations are supported to better deliver their missions. The philosophy of the project is to encourage organisations to reflect on practice and experience, and to invest in creating a more sustainable and nurturing environment for growth. Jane stated that the work originated from research conducted by KiS in 2007 which involved many of the LGBT VCOs present at the launch.

Overall, in the five years timescale of the In Our Name Project the LGBT VCS can expect to see a more connected sector, operating within a more sustainable economy, with increased awareness amongst funders and support organisations, and a better experience across the sector as a whole. At the core of the project is a commitment to increasing equality, increasing awareness, and increasing engagement with difference, right across the sector.

Unfortunately, as a result of technical difficulties at the venue the explanation about the ION project components was shorter than anticipated and therefore there was an expectation that participants may comment that the components were not too well explored. Full information about the components was provided in the pack.

Following the presentations, there was an interactive voting session. Participants were shown questions on slides and asked to vote using electronic keypads. Participants were asked questions about themselves; their organisations; their sources of support; their knowledge of London's LGBT voluntary and community sector; their thoughts on making the sector more sustainable, about creating a celebratory framework for doing LGBT work; and about what they thought about the ION project. The purpose of this exercise was to connect participants into each other, into the sector, and into some of the issues, as opposed to carrying out a formal research exercise.

4.2 Analysis of interactive exercise responses

Participants were asked what contributes most to their identity and were able to choose up to 3 responses from a choice of 9. Sexual identity and gender identity received the most responses (the same amount).

When asked to choose up to 3 statements that best describe their organisation, participants preferred more positive statements to the more negative ones, e.g. "innovative and

specialist”, followed by “an organisation that is great at something” were selected over “experiencing funding challenges”. While all may be true, positivity within a sector that clearly gains marginal support is to be celebrated.

Knowledge of the broad London-based LGBT VCS was mixed. Responses to the question “Approximately how many LGBT organisations are there in London?” were quite evenly spread between choices of under 25 through to 200+, though the highest proportion thought that there are 50 to 100. KiS found between 50 and 60 formal, though very differently sized, organisations during its recent research, but acknowledges that there may be up to 200 including all social, small, new and longer standing community groups. Most participants thought that the LGBT sector has a higher proportion of the total income of London’s VCS than it actually has (the highest proportion thought that it had 1%, while it in fact has approximately 0.05%; £6.09m in 2007; £9.3m in 2009). Participants expressed surprise at this figure in later workshops.

Consistent with the PiP report, which found that low levels of support from generic infrastructure were accessed by the LGBT VCS, participants said that their organisation’s greatest support came from “friends and family in and around the organisation” followed closely by “other LGBT VCOs”, with about half that number citing “infrastructure/support organisations” (more said “local public authorities” than the latter).

As anticipated, the largest proportion of respondents answered “accessible funding streams” to the question “what would help make London’s LGBT sector as a whole more sustainable?” followed by “recognition and understanding of LGBT aspirations, experience & needs.”

When asked “how can we create a celebratory framework for doing LGBT work?”, the most people said by “working together and sharing our experiences”, followed by “creating innovative ways of measuring the change that we’re making” and “highlighting the work of smaller/less funded/unstaffed organisations.”

Finally, when asked about the ION project most said that it “looks interesting” followed by “I [am] excited....”

On reflection the interactive voting session should have been shorter and the questions simplified. In evaluation 11 participants rated this exercise as ‘fair’, 10 ‘good’, 8 ‘excellent’ and 3 ‘poor’.

4.3 Workshops

Following a short break, participants joined the knowledge café/workshops. The workshops aimed to increase understanding and ownership of the ION project and to assess the potential value of the project for individual organisations. The design of the groups also attempted to encourage participants to think outside the realm of their own experience.

The workshops lasted 1 hour and 15 minutes and were facilitated by staff from KiS and the ION partners. Note-takers were present in all of the workshops to capture key insights.

The workshops were structured as follows:

- Participants were asked to write down information about their own organisation on cards provided, so that they could then swap cards and discuss ION project components from each others' perspectives
- Participants were asked to think about the three project components scheduled to start this year (the Learning Network, Almanac and Funding Network) from the perspective of a different organisation (cards were swapped in between discussion of each component). Participants were asked specifically to think about what each organisation might need from and might contribute to each component
- Some of the workshops concluded with brief discussions of the remaining project components (the Thinking Network and Innovation Hubs, due to start slightly later in the project). Further exploration of both components will be scheduled.

It was felt by some participants in one of the workshops that it would be inappropriate for others to imagine and speak from an experience that was not their own. The workshop format was adapted accordingly.

4.4 Workshop insights

Learning Network: To provide opportunities to learn about and inform the sector, to work together and to reflect on practice.

There was enthusiasm expressed in the workshops for the Learning Network. In the absence of regular cross-sector face to face meeting opportunities, participants felt that the network would provide space *“to make links, to find out what groups exist, to make connections”*. They also felt that in order for the network to work, *“people have to be open to learning, open to learning new ways of working”* and to listening to one another: *“I would love the Learning Network to be more of a ‘Listening Network’, where we actually listen to each other’s experiences.”*

There was a sense that the Learning Network could provide a forum first of all for relationship building amongst VCOs. For example: *“What we have in common is the pursuit of fairness for LGBT people. But we could share more than just knowledge – we could share back office functions too, and training for instance. The first steps have got to be getting to know each other and then we can find out what we can give each other”*

“We need to explore what we have in common and then campaign together as a community, as a family”

“If the aim of the Learning Network is to share best practice, what we need to do is to articulate our key aims and missions – to see whether we share common ground. At the moment I don’t know much about other organisations”

Participants expressed that they would like to see sharing of learning in:

- specialist issue expertise (e.g. homelessness, immigration, and the LGBT experience) in a connected and holistic way: *“Potential for looking at issues in a connected way”*

- Expertise that may not be present within the sector: *“we shouldn’t be afraid of bringing people in from the outside if the resource within the community isn’t there”*
- Volunteering and volunteer support
- Mentoring
- Partnerships
- Organisational change: *“get ideas about how organisations change following successful funding applications – governance issues”*
- Diversity – for example the Network was envisioned as a means of engaging with and learning how to be accessible to LGBT communities of interest: *“[My organisation] wants to be more inclusive and maybe a Learning Network could help us learn how to do that”*. Community of interest VCOs saw the Network as a place *“to raise awareness, to combat discrimination within the LGBT community”*.

Participants also saw the Network as a forum for practical skills-sharing:

- *“It’s important for groups that have no budgets, for there to be skills sharing between funded and unfunded groups”*
- *“For a tiny group, the Learning Network would be a good way to find out information about basic stuff, money, premises, media”*

And coordination:

“Sometimes we are all doing our own work in our own corners and this network could be a way to share better – we only get 0.05% of the funding so we can’t spend time replicating.”

Participants recognised accommodating the diversity of the sector as a priority, feeling for instance that it’s important that both small and large organisations get something from the Network: *“Difference here has to be acknowledged in the sizes of organisations. Would be good to hear what other smaller organisations think.”*

And that the Network itself could prioritise listening to organisations whose experiences and analyses may not be as widely disseminated as others:

“Professional/funded organisations can learn a lot from unfunded organisations as the latter are so specialist.”

“Larger organisations are now presenting ‘the voice of the LGBT Community’. Others groups learning is being missed.”

To summarise, key insights about the Learning Network shared in the workshops covered visions for the role of the network, including relationship building and sector-wide coordination; concrete ideas for learning topics and themes; and equality and diversity among and between LGBT VCOs.

The Almanac: To highlight statistical and strategic information about the LGBT sector

It was clear from all of the workshop discussions that there is a desire amongst LGBT VCOs to get to know the sector and also to disseminate information about their own organisations.

For instance: *"I want more people to learn about [my organisation's] work so they can refer people to us."* The Almanac will provide a tangible way of meeting that need, increasing *"visibility of organisations."*

A key insight shared in the workshops is that the Almanac should be both flexible and creative. For instance, many participants expressed a desire to see the Almanac available online, and updated regularly, with updated information contributed by organisations themselves. Participants felt the Almanac should be *"artistic", "very visual", "creative, multimedia, an evolving resource."*

Ideas shared for the content of the Almanac included:

- *Statistics including "number of members, the number of women in a group, how many are BME or disabled, so we can see what the group or organisation is really like and decide whether or not we need to work with them to improve the balance"*
- *"up-to-date information about each organisation's activities"*
- *"trends and good practice"*
- *"trends outside the LGBT sector, for example [amongst funders] - is the London LGBT sector more experienced in acquiring funding from certain places than the LGBT sector elsewhere, or than other sectors?"*
- *"Signposting, a main contact, and a summary of services that organisations provide"*
- *"a calendar of key dates and events to help organisations plan ahead with their own activities"*
- *"include references and sources"*
- *Impact and outcomes of specific activities that organisations deliver*

The Almanac could go beyond statistical, quantitative organisational profiles, *"bringing out understanding & learning"*, perhaps using *"personal stories, anonymised."*

The Almanac could be used to:

- *"Promote policy change & funding"*
- *"Support funding applications"*
- *"Highlight work, issues"*
- *"Show some of the gaps"*
- *"Demonstrate where funding goes"*
- *"Help the lobbying case"*
- *"Make visible the under resourcing of the LGBT VCS"*
- *"Identify possible partners"*
- *"Promote services and raise issues"*

And to:

"Demonstrate positivity."

The Almanac was envisioned as *"more than just a directory – a journal."*

Participants shared what they felt to be some of the challenges that will be faced in putting together the Almanac, for example *“drawing everyone in to provide data - In Our Name may need to support smaller groups to input information”* and *“high turnover issues in volunteer run organisations.”*

To summarise, key insights about the Almanac shared in the workshops covered flexibility and creativity in format and presentation; content ideas; potential uses; and challenges.

Funding Network: To provide a range of activities to influence the financial situation of LGBT VCOs.

Participants saw the strategic roles of the Funding Network to:

- *Grow “the envelope” so more funding generally is coming into the sector. Ask each other - have you tried, this one, that one?”*
- *“Underline the point – funding needs to be made more accessible.”*
- To facilitate funding collaboration: *“build relationships & partnerships”* and *“enhance collaborative/partnership working, for bid writing. The Funding Network could identify groups that could come together to make stronger bids”*
- *“Map needs to a specific funding body or pot”*
- To share and learn from each others’ funding experiences: *“If someone knows already that you’ve got a very good or bad chance of getting funding, [it will save an organisation time]”; “talk openly about non-traditional funding sources. Some organisations are really good at thinking outside of the box, for example trading, social enterprise. I’ve seen organisations that have done really well, and the network could be a space for asking how they did it.”*
- To lobby funders on the sector’s behalf: *“if there’s a specific funder that no one’s getting success with, the sector can align, and bring the funder in to ask why”*
- *“Look at how as a sector we can diversify our income sources”*
- Take joint strategic action where services provided by the LGBT VCS are saving money for statutory providers – *“[our organisation] is saving money for our local PCT with the service that we provide. We could turn around and say, ‘would you like to give us this money that we are saving you?’”*
- Share creative fundraising ideas
- *“Think of particular projects and where to get funding from”*. It was also suggested that bigger LGBT VCOs collaborate with smaller LGBT VCOs to fundraise for and deliver projects on specific issues for which the smaller LGBT VCOs have specific knowledge and skills.
- To explore and challenge under-resourcing of LGBT community of interest VCOs: *“Why are BME organisations never there?”*

It was also felt that practical support could be given to smaller LGBT VCOs via the Network: *“there could be surgeries for help with applications”* and *“we could produce a pack/funding FAQ”*; yet it was also noted that *“we need to identify what projects need funding and then look at putting in bids together, rather than providing advice on how to write a bid because NCVO do that already.”*

A *“Meet the funders event”* was suggested too.

To summarise, participants were enthusiastic about the Funding Network and shared ideas about the strategic activities it might undertake.

Prior to the ION Launch it was decided to give less priority to the Thinking Network and Innovations Hubs, it was agreed that they would be discussed if time permitted. As a result, there was less discussion of these two components and the notes are therefore not comprehensive.

Thinking Network: To develop policy positions with LGBT VCOs so that the sector, policy makers, service providers, funders, infrastructure organisations and statutory bodies are better informed and better able to serve and support LGBT people.

It was felt that a Thinking Network could act to get LGBT VCS issues into policy dialogues within local authorities: *“Local authorities need documents produced by us in their frameworks first. We need to work out how we can get into their frameworks.”*

A theme that emerged in discussion about the Thinking Network was again for organisations in the LGBT VCS to listen to one another: *“some of the voices are being lost.”*

The Network *“could address specific policy issues that organisations work in across different levels, from grassroots to organisations/people already doing policy work.”*

“It could be about how to communicate with government. To formulate our own strategy for doing so. There are ways to and ways not to.”

“Would be good to speak with one cohesive voice”

Innovation Hubs: To enable small units, comprising LGBT VCOs, funders, and infrastructure organisations, to learn together and support each other.

Participants felt that having the right people from funders and infrastructure agencies involved was important: *“the key is champions”*. Participants were enthusiastic about the ‘tripartite model’ (LGBT VCOs, funders and infrastructure organisations) of the Innovation Hubs: *“a way to get in and persuade people.”*

5 Participant feedback

Overall, 78% of respondents said that the event was ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ and 21% thought that it was ‘fair’. KiS aims for a higher record of goods or excellent at future events.

Feedback on the event was likely to have been influenced by quite persistent and annoying technical difficulties causing delays to the programme at quite important points during the presentations – these problems were also noted in the feedback comments section. Three respondents scored the event ‘poor’ on administration and event management. The vast majority, however (69%), scored this as ‘good’ or ‘excellent’. The majority (52%) felt that the catering and refreshments were ‘excellent’ and 36% thought they were ‘good’. A substantial

number (41%) also felt that the venue and layout were 'excellent' (41% thought the latter were 'good').

The workshops overall were rated as 'good' by 42%, 'excellent' by 16%, 'fair' by 32% and 'poor' by 10%; there was some sense from the comments that participants felt the workshops could have been less *"planned/directed – we had loads to talk about and just needed time to do so"*; this is consistent with general comments that there is little time for the sector to meet and get to know each other outside formal meetings.

After the event, the majority (95%) agreed or partly agreed that they had a better understanding of the In Our Name Project components. 88% agreed or partly agreed that they had a better understanding of the LGBT sector. The vast majority (94%) felt that they had had a useful networking experience; and importantly 58% agreed and 36% partly agreed that 'there is something in this project for my organisation'; none disagreed and just 6%, two respondents, partly disagreed.

The responses indicated far less agreement with the statement 'I have a better understanding of infrastructure', with 14% disagreeing outright, and 11% partly disagreeing. One participant commented: *"Not sure if it was clear enough what people's universal understanding of infrastructure was"*. The pack contained extensive information about the meaning and history of LGBT infrastructure, which may remedy this slightly, but this will be taken on in future sessions.

Participants were invited to list two aspirations and two frustrations at the end of the event, and these can be summarised as follows:

Inspirations

"I was inspired to listen & discover more about the organisations present."

"Inspiration – richness of our diversity."

"Idea of learning together and reflecting on best practice."

"To share the various skills throughout all LGBT groups to support each other as one community."

"The chance of having more info and connection with more LGBT orgs & groups across London on an ongoing basis."

"– what we need as LGBT people will only be known once we start talking together as organisations and sharing ideas."

"This is an opportunity to strengthen the LGBT sector. It could allow us to play to our strengths and increase them; identify gaps and close them. BUT to do this we must have credibility. Over to you..."

"Relationships come first – build good relationships & good partnerships follow."

"current work plan is timely regarding the recession – co-ordination is needed – mayor's meetings are useless – the VCS should be doing it for ourselves and we are"

Frustrations

"I was frustrated by the impact of worrying about funding on creative & imaginative solutions & activism."

“Don’t assume that all smaller groups want or need to fundraise or to grow. Some of us just want support for what we’re doing at the size we are – information about how we can access meeting rooms & cheap photocopying etc might be more useful than fundraising advice.”

“If I’m honest this was the first Event within the sector where the energy was focused on moving forward and the exciting opportunities ahead. It is frustrating knowing as a sector we only receive 0.05% of funding. I hope we can all work together with Kairos + other LGBT infrastructures and non LGBT infrastructures to really build an inclusive + cohesive community.”

“We seem to always concentrate on research & proving that we need resources (as a community). I think funders know this, it’s more about coming up with innovative projects.” We MUST ensure the project goes further to provide practical support to the ‘T’ community, not just the L, G and B.”

“There was a list of LGBT orgs displayed – frustrating that all of them did not attend.”

”How can we move beyond some of the distrust that still seems to be talked about?”

6 Launch aims revisited

Aim: To explain what ION is and engage participants in and with the project

Overall, the launch event appears to have met the aim of explaining the ION project and engaging participants with it. Detailed information on the ION project components was circulated before the event and included in the delegate packs, though it is certain that technical difficulties inhibited a thorough sharing of the project components. It was further explained that the project is based in research undertaken for the PiP report, and many in the sector were involved in that research and are familiar with the report.

Participants were engaged to consider the needs and aspirations of both their organisation and the sector as a whole during the interactive voting exercise. The ION components were explained again during the workshops, where participants had the opportunity to share their views and ideas on each individual component. Many others who may not have shared in the workshops handed in ‘speech bubbles’ with some of their thoughts on the project components. KiS is pleased with the evaluation finding that after the event the vast majority (95%) agreed or partly agreed that they had a better understanding of the In Our Name Project and its components.

That said, KiS also recognises that ION is a complex project that will be best understood in action and so is relatively unsurprised to hear some feedback such as “*I am leaving without the level of understanding about ‘In Our Name’ that I would have wanted.*” This is the beginning of a process.

Aim: To seek feedback and comments from the participants on the components of the project

The workshops generated valuable feedback and comments from participants on each of the ION components. Participants shared both visions of each of the components as well as concrete, practical ideas on what each component can focus on and deliver.

Aim: To assess if the project has the potential to address these within the sector

There was some feedback that participants felt that they would like more hearing and analysis of what their organisations' needs are, before launching into project components that attempt to address identified needs. The project components were developed from analysis of the sector's needs and aspirations, as identified in the PiP research, in 2007. Whilst that research is a couple of years old now, KiS has engaged several organisations in discussion about the sector's needs and aspirations more recently and our sense is that the needs identified during the PiP research have not changed dramatically. There may still be a need at all events to make time for this expression, as it is likely to be as much about sharing, as about articulating overall needs and aspirations.

In terms of creating a sense of ownership and motivation, the evaluation finding that 94% agreed or partly agreed that 'there is something in this project for my organisation' indicates enthusiasm for the project and that participants saw ways for their organisation to contribute to making the project successful.

There is evidence from the event that the project components have the potential to address needs within the sector as identified during the ION launch event. For instance the Learning Network will provide what was consistently identified as a needed space for people across the sector to come together regularly in a facilitated way, and address a need for people to have space to get to know the sector better and to build relationships across diverse organisations. The excitement about and volume of ideas generated for the Funding Network activity demonstrates its potential to meet sector need for strategic action on funding.

Nevertheless, KiS will be continually revisiting and re-assessing whether the ION components are effectively addressing needs and aspirations within the sector as the project unfolds and where new work could be developed to do this.

Aim: To increase understanding of the needs of the sector

The ION project was placed in the context of sector needs identified during the PiP report research. Needs of individual organisations were expressed during the workshops in the context of each of the project components. Participants were engaged with thinking about the needs and aspirations of the sector during the interactive consultation exercise, where they could also see how their own views compared with those of others across the sector.

Aim: To celebrate and develop a sense of LGBT community and to share an enjoyable and positive experience

It seems, from the evaluation forms, that through choice of venue and a 'meet and greet' at the door; provision of good food; preparation of nicely presented packs; a diverse turnout of people committed to LGBT communities; and a varied programme we were able to 'share an enjoyable and positive experience' and help to 'celebrate and develop a sense of LGBT community'.

The 'aspirations' handed in after the event consistently mention LGBT community, e.g.: *"It was inspiring to be among dedicated, committed activists who are willing to work towards an ideal of LGBT communities & organisations working together."*

The launch is thought to have been an all round success, with some teething issues, and some clear learning and direction from the sector coming through.

7 Moving Forward

The In Our Name Launch has provided Kairos in Soho and the ION partners with valuable information, ideas and suggestions which will inform how the project unfolds and develops. The representatives of VCOs present at the meeting expressed a clear interest in and need for building relationships across the sector, they also wish to learn about the range of services and activities offered to LGBT people. They have a desire to grow, though not necessarily in size, and to develop relationships and joint work. The Funding Network will, for example, facilitate collaboration between better funded and less funded LGBT VCOs so that smaller organisations are better placed to increase their income.

It will be important to ensure that there is continuing dialogue between KiS and the LGBT sector to ensure that diverse needs are catered for. LGBT VCOs will be given every opportunity to contribute to the development of the project and the suggestions made by LGBT VCOs will be incorporated as far as is possible. This project assumes a two way relationship between Kairos in Soho and partners, and LGBT VCOs, this is essential if we are to jointly improve the situation of LGBT people in London.

There is a commitment to integrating equality and diversity issues into all aspects of In Our Name. Equalities and smaller groups will be encouraged and supported to be actively involved. For example, youth groups were under-represented at the In Our Name Launch and KiS will explore ways of ensuring their attendance at future events and will offer childcare support so that is possible for LGBT parents to participate in and contribute to ION activities. The agenda and content, access, speakers and publicity are thought to be key to inclusion.

In the process of progressing In Our Name KiS aims to incorporate the extensive knowledge and expertise which exists in the sector, to ensure that we learn from each other, to explore new learning and ways of working together and to develop an LGBT sector which reflects diverse interests and needs and makes a constructive and creative contribution to building a more vibrant LGBT sector in London.

Immediate Next Steps

- Disseminate this report
- Set a date for the first Learning Network and first Funding Network
- Develop the membership framework for In Our Name
- Further develop the Almanac framework based on feedback
- Outreach on a one to one basis to representatives unable to attend the launch
- Create the strategy for the Learning and Funding Networks
- Continue development work on Innovation Hubs and the Thinking Network

Appendix 1

Delegate List

Ajamu X	rukus!
Antoine Rogers	Kairos in Soho
Ashlee Christoffersen	Kairos in Soho
Bob Green	Stonewall Housing
Bob Hodgson	MPS LGBT Advisory Group
Catriona Cormack	PACE
Christina Alley	Kairos in Soho
Christopher Scott Burrows	Positive East
Darren Peters	Consortium of LGBT VCOs
David Pilkington	SIGNteach
David Spence	Kairos in Soho
Dax Ashworth	Southwark Council
Debbie Pippard	Big Lottery Fund
Deborah Gold	Galop
Erin Power	UKLGIG
Greg Ussher	The Metro Centre
Griffith Vaughan Williams	Campaign for Homosexual Equality
Ingrid Pollard	Photographer
Jane Standing	Kairos in Soho
Jay Stewart	Gendered Intelligence
Jenny Lazenby	Out For Our Children
Jens Schulze	Deaf Leather and Bear Group
Jill Power	UKLGIG
Joan Neary	Kairos in Soho
Joseph Swift	Kairos in Soho
Ju Gosling	Regard
Laura Carter	Bede House
Laura Fox	Richmond upon Thames LGBT Forum
Louise Kelly	Stonewall

Lyn Chase	Hudson Interpreting Services Ltd
Marion Hack	Art Group
Martha Dunkley	TransLondon
Martin Reid	Tower Hamlets ChangeUp Consortium
Matthew Halliday	London Friend
Michael Bennett	Quest
Michael Nastari	Jigsaw (Partnership)
Michael Toze	FTM London
Nick Maxwell	Age Concern Opening Doors
Nigel Harris	Camden LGBT Forum
Subodh Rathod	Wise Thoughts
Orla O'Flanagan	ActiveArt
Paula Dooley	GIRES
Pav Akhtar	Imaan - the Muslim LGBT Group
Philip Dayle	Kairos in Soho
Phil Nicol	London Lesbian & Gay Switchboard
Robert Brown	Absolute Freedom Group
Ross Burgess	Croydon Area Gay Society (CAGS)
Sarah Corlett	Kairos in Soho
Sarah Scarrott	Broken Rainbow
Stephen Bradshaw	ABCL2010
Stephen Hudson	Hudson Interpreting Services Ltd
Tarot Couzyn	ActiveArt
Tim Brogden	LVSC
Tim Franks	PACE
Tim Sigsworth	Albert Kennedy Trust