

# Participatory Budgeting



## Trying Out the Vocal Eyes Platform May 2023



Curated by Northern Heart and Soul CiC

This is a learning report of the test and trial in Wigan of Vocaleyes.

[Vocaleyes](#) is a platform and stakeholder engagement process for modern day community organising with innovative digital and dialogic tools. This platform enables more authentic ongoing conversations and grassroots led participatory democracy, budgeting and crowdsourcing.

This report covers the following areas:

1. **So what? - Has the work influenced ways in which decisions are made locally?**
2. **Background and context**
3. **Recruitment**
4. **Vocaleyes**
5. **Wigan, Leigh and Makerfield – The Groups & Fora**
6. **Decision Making - Deciding Together**
7. **Evaluation & Moving Forward Together**
8. **Learning & Insights**
9. **Budget and Spend**

1. **So what? - Has the work influenced ways in which decisions are made & resources allocated locally?**

***Prior to the introduction of Vocaleyes all decisions regarding projects and funding were made at Parish Council level. With this new approach members of the local community will be making the decisions. (Clare, Haigh Parish Council)***

***This work has supported the wider influence that was born out of the Abram Ward Neighbourhood Plan Forum and the work that Abram Ward Community Cooperative undertook as part of the Empowering Places programme. New ways of working have been identified since being part of the Vocaleyes project. (Dave, Wigan and Leigh Community Charity)***

***Yes, it has opened my eyes to the power of putting the ideas of residents into action rather than telling them what's going on. People get very enthusiastic when their own ideas are taken forward and we have engaged a wider demographic. (Vicky, Shevington and District Community Association, SDCA )***

***Definitely. We are lucky to have a community minded councillor in this ward who has got on board and come along to events. This seems to be having a wider influence on how the Brighter Boroughs monies is allocated in the local area. (Angela, Springfield, Beech Hill and Gidlow CommUnity, SBHG)***

## **2. Background**

In November 2021 Northern Heart and Soul CiC (NH&S) submitted a proposal to Power to Change to try Vocaleyes, in up to 6 neighbourhoods in Wigan. This money was linked to Wigan and Leigh Community Charity and their participation within the Empowering Places programme.

NH&S were introduced to the platform as members of the Movement for Neighbourhood Democracy and developed relationships with Susan Rodaway of Vocaleyes CiC. The interest in trialling Vocaleyes was influenced by the desire of the CiC to both grow and develop the platform, and, learn from the trial in Wigan. At the time of contract agreement, there were plans to create a new platform and contracts were signed in good faith that this would happen, almost immediately. We expected to shift platforms mid-way through the trial.

In December 2021 Power to Change offered Northern Heart & Soul CiC a grant of £30,000. £20,000 was released at contract start and £10,000 was held back until groups were ready to spend the £2,000 seed funding allocated to them.

NH&S allocated £9456 to Vocaleyes CiC for use of the platform, training and ongoing support for one year.

NH&S acted as fiscal host, liaised with Vocaleyes, convened the group, and offered additional support to group members.

### 3. Recruitment

Promotional leaflets and a short animation were created by NH&S and circulated via networks in Wigan, Leigh and Makerfield and directly to people known to be involved in community building and organising.



17 groups registered an interest in discovering more, 5 attended information sessions and the remainder received recordings of the session to help them decide if they wanted to take part.

As luck would have it, there was no need to develop a shortlisting criterion, as 6 groups, including NH&S wanted to try it out, meaning we had space for all.

By another stroke of luck, we also had representation from neighbourhoods across the 3 political constituencies of Wigan, Leigh and Makerfield.

#### Participating Groups:

- Shevington & District Community Association
- Cherries Community Garden – which changed to Haigh Parish Council
- Wigan and Leigh Community Charity – who decided to focus on Platt Bridge
- Higher Folds Community Centre – who left mid-way
- Golborne Voice – who almost made it to the end
- Northern Heart and Soul CiC – for Springfield, Beech Hill and Gidlow Community

The memorandum of understanding that was created to frame the work highlighted the importance of participation. It became clear that Higher Folds were unable to offer the level of participation required and after a discussion the agreement was mutually ended. Ashton Circles joined for a short space of time but were unable to stay involved due to cuts to their overall service.

#### 4. Vocal Eyes – the Support Experience

Vocal Eyes CiC provided 7 Train the Trainer sessions along with place focussed sessions, which were seen as key to widening the number of local people involved in each place. Golborne and SBHG requested two place sessions; Haigh and Shevington 1 each; and none were taken up by Platt Bridge. In addition, NH&S provided additional sessions and support to Shevington, Golborne and Haigh.

It was clear that the more the participating group were able to engage in support, and widen the offer in their local area, the more able they were to use the platform and grow ideas. You will find further insights into the participating groups' experiences in the evaluation section.

Vocaleyeyes were provided with a draft of this report and invited to contribute and include their experience. They chose not to contribute.

#### 5. Wigan, Leigh and Makerfield – The Groups & Fora and Spend

This section tells you more about the participating groups; the mechanisms that are used to make decisions in their local area and the way in which they allocated the seed monies.

**Golborne and Lowton West Voice** were represented by Alan, a founder of the group and also heavily involved in the local neighbourhood plan which was used as the decision-making mechanism for the Vocaleyeyes work. Like many neighbourhoods they were experiencing a difficulty in engaging residents in formal structures and were in search of a secretary. It was difficult for Alan to attend many of the meetings due to both personal and capacity issues. They developed a project that met the criteria for funding release but were unable to respond to questions that were raised during the peer decision making process, about permissions required to carry out the project and therefore, and unfortunately, the funding could not be released.

**Haigh Parish Council** were represented by Clare who became a Parish Councillor mid-way through the trial, and moved the trial from Cherries Community Garden to Haigh Parish Council. Clare attended all training group sessions and contributed greatly. Her ability to work with the platform, in spite of its drawbacks, demonstrated the possibility and potential for Parish Councils. The £2000 allocated was ring-fenced by the Parish Council and committed to be spent wholly on the community led projects as listed on the Vocaleyeyes Digital Platform, at a time in the near future when the decisions have been made as to which of the projects should go forwards.

Two projects are in the early planning stages and discussions on both projects have taken place with Wigan Council:

1. A Bridleway for Haigh
2. To develop a Riverside Picnic Area

Friends of St David's School Haigh are keen to get involved in Project 2 and it is envisaged that some of the funding will go towards buying equipment and accessories to facilitate the children in helping in the removal of invasive species in the picnic area, such as Himalayan Balsam.

**Wigan and Leigh Community Charity** were initially represented by Dave and then Lisa and sometimes both Dave and Lisa. Initially the focus was on the Abram ward. As they began to listen to the local community they realised that community members were not necessarily connected to ward, but to place, and so decided to focus on Platt Bridge. Both Dave and Lisa struggled to get to the network meetings due to other work commitments. They were also bringing back to life some of the voice and engagement mechanisms that had been in place when they created the neighbourhood plan, but had dwindled and had the opportunities of some short term investment from Safer Streets. The rekindling of community led mechanisms and the timescales for this trial did not align and therefore they were unable to meet the requirements for release of funds. They decided to hand the money back as they felt they had sufficient access to participatory budgeting funds through national programmes that were focussed on their local area.

**Shevington and District Community Association (SDCA)** were represented by Vicky, who retired as a Parish Councillor during the process, and is also a Labour Councillor. In Shevington they have a Community Association that sits alongside the Parish Council. They find this helps with local decision-making processes, keeping them more open and flexible than the Parish Council rules allow. Vicky was a very active member of the group, contributing with her technical skills and making the most of opportunities offered to her from Vocaleyes. She attended all training and group work sessions and used these as opportunities to get more people involved locally. This group met all the requirements required to enable the monies to be released in March 2023.

The £2000 allocated was spent / committed on:

- Methodist Church kitchen refurb - £500
- Digital Events Sign - £300
- St Bernadette's mindful garden - £250
- Shevy High Garden seating area - £250
- Mindful Events well-being event - £250
- Secure Dog Walking Area - £250
- Men's Shed - £200

**Springfield, Beech Hill and Gidlow Community** – which covers the ward of Wigan West were represented by Gill and Angela. They had the added benefit of having some access to additional monies and so were able to develop both online and onland approaches. They didn't have a formal decision-making mechanism in the area and wanted to develop approaches that tested decision making by community consensus. As well as supporting community ideas they were able to supplement the offering with small sparks funds for both community and business ideas. They organised two events - Cash and Chips and Pies and Pounds whereby ideas that had been worked up on vocal eyes were pitched and voted for on the evening. Community members were provided with voting cards with a number of options - I support this idea and want to fully fund it; I support this idea and want to partially fund it;

I support this idea but it is not ready for investment; I do not support this idea. Whoever was in the room made the decisions, and online votes were taken into account.

The £2000 was used as follows: £650 in total was allocated in November 2022 to Community Cycles (£250) and Dog Poo Dispensers (£400). £1410 was allocated in March 2023 to a community defibrillator (£1080), Lisa's face painting business start-up (£250) and Marcus's community posters (£80).

## 5. Decision Making

We agreed to adopt a peer decision making process to release funds. We saw the role of NH&S as convenors, although we acknowledge we had greater access to Power to Change resource. NH&S analysed group usage and prepared a short report to aid decision making at the January 2023 decision making meeting. We agreed that we would all talk about our work, look at the statistics in the report and decide together if we felt groups were ready for fund release. All bar Golborne provided information and attended the meeting.

The Memorandum of Understanding stated that '£2000 will be released once the platform is being utilised across the community and ideas have community support.'

The analysis was prepared in order to help us think about how we might define 'utilised' which could have different meanings in different contexts.

### **What do we mean by being utilised? Could it be?**

Number of members?

Number of ideas submitted?

Level of support with ideas – engagement / comments?

Project groups – people meeting to take forward / grow ideas?

We produced a summary of activity, as of January 2023, along with some supporting questions (presented below in italics) to aid discussion and collective decision making.

For terminology and sense making - the way that Vocaley works is - People submit ideas on the platform (usually through an admin) and members vote for them. If members want to get involved, rather than just support, they can pledge time (or money) to the idea. Ideas turn into projects when they have sufficient people (3 or 5) who have pledged time to make them happen.

### **Golborne and Lowton West**

25 members, 5 ideas and 4 pledges

4 of the ideas have volunteer pledges with one of the pledges having 5 volunteers – outdoor sensory area.

*This would seem to meet the threshold?*

*What is the progress with the outdoor sensory area?*

*Where is this up to? Permissions?*

*How likely is it that the money will be committed by the end of March?*

### **Haigh Parish Council**

46 members, 7 ideas, 7 pledges, 1 action

News feature used

Comments on all ideas

7 projects all with sufficient volunteers

*This would seem to meet the threshold?*

*Where would the £2000 be allocated and will that be formally committed via the Parish Council by the end of March?*

### **Platt Bridge**

10 members, 5 ideas

2 comments on 1 idea

No projects

*This would appear not to meet the threshold?*

### **Shevington**

23 members, 7 ideas

Comments on all ideas

3 projects, 2 with sufficient pledges

News feature used

*Would appear to meet the threshold?*

*What progress have the projects made and will a decision about where the £2000 will be allocated be made before 31<sup>st</sup> March?*

### **SBHG**

27 Members, 9 ideas, 4 pledges

All ideas engaged with. Minimum voter 3, max 17

News feature used, platform embedded within new community website

£650 committed to dog poo dispensers and bike recycling at Cash and Chips in November 2022.

3 working groups meeting – benches, defibrillator and memorial garden. Match funding secured via Brighter Boroughs. All money was committed on 29<sup>th</sup> March at Pies and £s.

### **Consensus Decision Making - January 2023**

After discussion we agreed to release funds to Haigh and Shevington, once formally approved by the respective Parish Councils. We agreed that SBHG had met the threshold. Subject to agreement with Power to Change, we agreed to increase the award to Haigh and Shevington by £500; to fund the platform for a further year to continue learning, and, to allocate remaining funds to participatory budgeting for Haigh, Shevington and SBHG. Platt Bridge were willing to self-fund.

*The decision to fund the platform for a further year was revised during the evaluation process.*



## 6. Evaluation and Moving Forward

Evaluation forms were sent to all participating groups, including those who left early, and returned by:

Golborne and Lowton West Voice  
Haigh Parish Council  
Platt Bridge  
Shevington Community and District Association  
SBHG

An evaluation session was held on 24<sup>th</sup> March and was attended by Haigh, Shevington and NH&S. A zoom session was held with Platt Bridge to ask clarification questions relating to the completed evaluation form.

Responses to the evaluation, by participating group are as follows:

### **1. If you cast your mind back to the invitation into the programme, what was that like for you?**

The invitation and initial work were exciting and full of promise. The actual use of the platform however failed to live up to expectations. The inability of the hosts to view our page caused issues which precluded our being able to obtain the funding despite interest from the community. This led to a sense of disillusionment and has caused us to rethink our membership. (Golborne)

I was pleased to be invited to take part in the pilot. I was very impressed with the concept and the introduction to it. I found the presentation to explain the background to the platform inspirational, and could see it working. (Haigh)

Was good to identify other Neighbourhoods who shared similar visions. It worked well to have some who were from Parish Councils and some from Neighbourhood Plan areas. (Platt Bridge).

I expected the platform to be much more developed and widely used than it actually is. I get the impression it worked well in only one area before we were recruited. I was surprised that other people had not raised the issues with the platform that we had. I liked the regular meetings which helped us bounce ideas off each other and gave me motivation to continue with the pilot. (Shevington)

We tried to make the invitation process as open as possible and spread the invite as widely as possible. Due to our newness in working in our own local community there may have been some trust issues around participation from other neighbourhoods - people not knowing who we are, or what our plans/ motivations are. We developed promotional information, including video and asked for it to be circulated via the SE Network and the Deal for Communities Team. We attended a SE network to discuss further. A Deal for Communities team member did book on one of the information sessions, but couldn't attend in the end. Due to the nature of funding, it was limited to those involved in locality work rather than communities of interest. We had hoped to reach people from Hindley, but Wigan and Leigh Community Charity wanted to do that. Perhaps we could have done more to invite in Sunshine House and Standish



groups? We were also interested in trying to seek representation from the 3 constituencies - Wigan, Makerfield and Leigh. (SBHG)

## **2. What has the relationship with the fiscal host, Northern Heart and Soul CiC, been like for you?**

Excellent relationship with NH&S who have really tried hard to overcome our issues. (Golborne)

I see it as a learning curve for all and look forward to a second-year networking with the other community group members. (Haigh)

Always great to support their vision for Neighbourhood Democracy. Worked well in setting up the WhatsApp group for regular communication. It was a shame that other work commitments, from my side especially, meant that more regular in person meetings didn't happen. (Platt Bridge)

Good communication and listening of our questions and concerns. Fair discussion on funding etc. (Shevington)

## **3. What has your relationship been like with Vocal Eyes and the one-to-one support offered?**

We used one to one support which didn't really address our issues. (Golborne)

I found the one-to-one support very useful when Susan and another colleague from Vocaleyes attended a virtual meeting with other members of my group to explain how the platform works and helping to persuade them on board. (Haigh)

Initially seemed to start well, but feedback both from Abram Ward members and also the wider group, seemed to identify some barriers in the software and back-office support from Vocaleyes internally. (Platt Bridge) *Didn't take up one to one support*

I think Vocaleyes needs to accept our feedback that the platform is too complex. People need simple, simple, simple. If they can't find the right button or menu they will log off without engaging. That goes for admins as well as users. I was surprised that Vocaleyes denied the issues and were quite defensive and were very rigid in the sense of what can and cannot be changed on the site. The point of a pilot is to make things better surely, not to keep them the same if it's not working? (Shevington) *Did take up one to one support.*

A bit of an on and off relationship. Very attentive when together and then long gaps. Not always following through with requests and actions. Susan worked hard to develop a relationship. Not sure if there's enough resources at headquarters to support the work or if funding is insecure. Thought there might have been some network to meet with others using

the platform. Felt that more resources / handbooks / videos are required to support the user. (SBHG)

#### **4. What's been your experience of using the platform?**

Poor. Complete rethink on making it more user friendly, especially for community members trying to put ideas on the platform. Not everyone is computer literate. (Golborne)

I love the concept, however it's not always user friendly and can be off putting to new members who find it confusing. (Haigh)

Some functions seemed difficult to navigate and make it difficult for the community member to register. (Platt Bridge)

Very complicated and quite dated in its design. The app is much better to use and simpler. (Shevington)

It feels like there's a good bit of work to do in making it more accessible so that people feel it's a place to go to discuss ideas. Whilst preventing toxicity occurring, as it can on Facebook, seems to have been a crucial part of development, it may in some ways have restricted development. Because people don't receive notifications when people comment on their idea or on their comments it relies on people wanting to return - which just isn't in the human nature of most people and therefore stagnates the process- it feels much more alive on the Facebook group. The opt in process to receive communications is a real pain too. People are able to join from anywhere too, which kind of skews the idea of locality working and it also allows skewing of votes and ideas. (SBHG)

#### **5. Recruiting to the Platform. What worked well and what was a great big fail? What tips would you offer?**

Make it more user friendly. (Golborne)

Use a 'hot topic' to attract people to the platform. Once there they need a good reason to return to it. Facebook works well in helping to introduce the topics and driving people to the platform. It is hard to get people to return to the platform as it tends to stay the same with little changing over time. I'm not sure that I fully understand this aspect. (Haigh)

Difficult to answer as Abram Ward was unable to recruit a wide range of local residents to access the platform. (Platt Bridge)

I wouldn't recommend it to others in its current state. I would if the admin side was simpler and then urge users to get the app. (Shevington)

Being alongside people. Helping them to submit ideas. Using the Facebook group to promote membership. Having onland events as well as online. It needs to change quite a bit for it to work really well in the local area. (SBHG)

**6. Say more about the democratic process you used to decide how to allocate the funding in your community.**

N/A. (Golborne)

Because we are still in an early phase of the pilot we haven't yet reached the stage where funds are allocated to specific projects. I imagine it will be a democratic process with the most feasible and popular projects becoming obvious. When we do reach this stage I would see it being a democratic process with individuals voting for their preferred project. (Haigh)

No answer (Platt Bridge)

It was very difficult as we have an ageing population and many community groups are run by 65+ age group. Hardly any of that demographic signed up. The schools were most engaging and school families got on board. (Shevington)

We used participatory budgeting events onland so that individuals / groups present their ideas and the audience votes. This saw two ideas being funded via the Cash and Chips event in November 2022 and three ideas being supported, but not deemed ready for investment. They returned to the Pies and £s event in March 2023 along with new ideas. The new ideas had not grown on the platform. (SBHG)

**7. Can you provide examples of how citizen voice and community power has grown? Have you been able to put cash directly into the hands of residents?**

No (Golborne)

Prior to the introduction of the digital-platform, citizen voice and community power was virtually at zero. The Parish Council had tried to encourage this, however, it didn't have appropriate systems in place, other than a requirement to attend Council meetings, or through email to the Parish Clerk.

Vocal Eyes has opened up an easy and quick method of communication, and when paired with social media it has become a very positive force for members of the community to express their ideas and opinions and also to engage with the Councillors, who now feel they can carry out their remit. It feels good and very positive.

Examples of this can be seen on the digital platform and the new FB Group:

Vocal Eyes now has 46 active members, with 2 topics and 8 ideas. Five of the ideas have been currently actioned through citizen voice, resulting in meetings with Wigan Council Officers and Directors:

1. 4 additional litter bins have been provided and the community has decided where they will be best placed. These will be put in place in the next coming weeks.
2. A joined up bridleway for Haigh Project is progressing well, with a suggested route by the equestrian community being seriously considered by Wigan Council. This is an active working group and meetings have taken place virtually and in person with

Wigan Council Directors walking the suggested route with the community members. This is work in progress with planned next steps in place.

3. A Christmas Tree for Haigh. Research has shown that there isn't a suitable spot for a newly planted tree, and so, rather than give up on the idea, it has been suggested that an existing tree in the heart of the village, by the village pub, church and school should be lit up and decorated by the community instead. This is work in progress.
4. A riverside picnic area. Three meetings with Wigan Council have taken place, but it is looking like the plans will need to be drastically scaled down because of budgeting issues. Revised plans, which will involve the local community, and local school in invasive species removal (balsam bashing) are underway. (Haigh)

Abram Ward has had very active citizens voice groups across its 5 villages. Platt Bridge Community Forum has been an active community voice since 2005, but the Vocaleyes project has enabled the Forum to relaunch having seen its member numbers dwindle in 2018 due to the lack of empowered local residents to provide succession planning. (Platt Bridge)

Yes, into the hands of groups — and through our community association we can organise projects on residents' behalf. (Shevington)

We've had little working groups grow where people got together to plan their ideas - particularly around a memorial garden for lost babies, benches and community defibrillators. We've also been able to offer small sparks cash for ideas to bring communities together up to the value of £150 in November and were able to support Christmas film nights at a local community centre. The event planned for the end of March also included small business ideas up to £250 and community ideas up to £200. (SBHG)

#### **8. Has this work shifted power dynamics locally, and/ or led to any interesting partnerships / joint funding initiatives?**

No answer (Golborne)

No answer (Haigh) – It's good for strengthening community engagement, for example at an annual Parish meeting last year there was just one member of the community present. The number attending this year's meeting was up to 38. I would say that's a big step forward. (Haigh)

The work has identified ways in which the Vocaleyes project should influence the VCFSE sector and the vision to create a dispersed leadership model, focused on a Neighbourhood model. (Platt Bridge)

Yes, we have improved relations between the community association and schools definitely. (Shevington)

Yes, mainly brighter boroughs - so the local councillor has match funded monies required for benches, memorial garden and community defibrillator. This enables us to stretch out the community pot and shift the power dynamics locally - more participative decision making. We

tried with a local school, and whilst there was interest, we couldn't move that to action within the timescales. We need longer to build relationships. (SBHG)

**9. What do you think the future of this group could be? Does it have a future?**

I don't know. (Golborne)

I would like to trial this with each member of the group giving support to others. It's good to network and bounce ideas off each other. (Haigh)

Developed into a wider Forum / Group where more Neighbourhoods are sharing voices - linking into the Local Infrastructure model that is still to be decided upon. (Platt Bridge)

Yes, if the platform is improved. I will probably add an online form to our website instead for the time being so people can simply submit an idea. They won't be able to vote but we can do this in other ways. Vocaleyes is a great idea it is just not being executed well enough at this stage. (Shevington)

I do think this group could become a network for those interested in shifting power to communities and supporting them to grow and exercise their democratic muscle. Given the range of local decision-making fora it is useful to explore and learn about each other's ways of working and also provide mutual support. (SBHG)

**10. Why did you stick with it even though it was difficult?**

In the hope it would come right in the end. (Golborne)

Yes, why not? The best outcomes often come from difficult situations. Rather than give up on something it's always best to find solutions to a problem. (Haigh)

View this as a key provision as part of the Borough's growing VCFSE sector. (Platt Bridge)

To connect with a wider demographic and allow people to drive forward their own projects. I am a big believer in enabling people rather than doing things for them. (Shevington)

Because I believe in the power of communities to make great decisions for themselves, and we need something like this to enable it. I'm not sure if this is the product we need, but I feel committed enough to keep with it for a while longer. The benefits of getting to know each other and how we might mutually learn from and support each other eclipsed the drawbacks. (SBHG)

## Moving Forward

At the evaluation session held on the 24<sup>th</sup> March and attended by Haigh, Shevington and SBHG we talked about and reflected on each other's experiences and reflections, which led us to make some further collective decisions.

Subject to agreement from Power to Change we decided to use the expertise that we had within the group, and remaining budget to:

- Start to develop something locally that might better suit our needs.
- Maintain one licence and page for Haigh, so that we could both keep our toes in with Vocaleyes and ensure the momentum at Haigh was sustained.
- Develop this group as a network, that also focussed on mutual support, and practice based ideas, shared learning.
- Provide opportunities for all those involved in local decision making in our local areas to come together, meet each other and learn together.
- Develop the network with a wider invite to areas that have, or are growing participative democracy practices.

## 7. Learning

- It requires focus and dedicated resources/time. This doesn't necessarily mean funded roles, as both Shevington and Haigh were able to grow the work without paid posts. Although resource is required to enable fair participation.
- The importance of starting where groups are at and embracing a range of different decision-making fora and methodology.
- That influence and change takes time and is hard work especially when decision making fora are either embedded in, or restricted by ways of doing things.
- The importance of having some form of local mechanism that makes decision making easier – e.g. community association, Pies and £'s.
- The importance of relationship building over time, and connectedness to local community so that trust based participatory budgeting can take place, and monies can be placed directly into residents hands as well as organisations that serve them.
- The political nature of the work, for this to grow it will mean returning some budgets to place when local funding pots have been centralised and decisions are mainly made by officers and elected members.
- The possibilities of being able to create something really special and community led, that really put power into the hands of people and places.
- The importance of an independent network that is able to remain apolitical and community centred whilst bringing together people who are using different mechanisms locally and also representing a variety of political affiliations.

## 8. Budget and Spend

Total Budget Available - £30,000 including 6 x £2,000 seed funding pots for participatory budgeting.

<b>Spend to Date</b>	
NH&S Directors Costs	1090
Vocal Eyes Platform	9456
PB	5050
Running Costs / Overheads	778
Equipment	986
Local promotion	870
<b>Total</b>	<b>18230</b>
<b>Committed Spend</b>	
Shevington 2022	500
SBHG 2022 PB	1450
Overheads	500
Network Room Hire	300
Website	660
	<b>3410</b>
<b>2023 Budget</b>	
PB	4000
Local Platform development	2500
Vocal Eyes	864
Network development	996
<b>Total</b>	<b>8360</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>30000</b>