

NEW CLLD FUND
Local Action Group meeting
 21st October 2022
 (9.15am – 12.00pm online via Teams)

MINUTES OF MEETING

Present:

Gary White, Agenda Resilience (GW) – Voluntary - Chair
 Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) – Voluntary
 Lesley Forsyth, Scottish Borders Council (LF) – Public
 Pip Tabor, Southern Upland Partnership (PT) – Third/Community
 Charles Dundas, Borders Forest Trust (CD) – Third/Community
 Miriam Adcock, Zero Waste (MA) – Third/Community
 Anna Griffin, SEPA (AG) - Public
 Louisa Gardner, Young People (LG) – Private - Joined the meeting at 9.40am

Secretariat:

Joanna Pringle, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (JP)
 Gail Blacklock, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (GB)

		Action
1.0	Welcome and Introductions	
2.0	Apologies Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) – Voluntary Hans Watl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) – Private	
3.0	Project Applications JP confirmed that following the first stage screening process the highest scoring 16 projects had been scored by the LAG and were ready for discussion to agree approval or rejections. 8 members were present, 7 of those had scored applications with AA absent.	
3.1	Average score: 75.4% Reference no: L1-001 Decision: APPROVE The LAG were supportive of the project however LF highlighted that there is potential for SBC to fund this project through the Cost of Living Crisis Fund, although no decision by Directors has been made as of yet but is due to be made w/c 24.10.22. The LAG agreed to approve the project subject to a decision by SBC on the Cost of Living Crisis Fund project proposal. The LAG Staff Team will advise of the outcome once a decision is announced.	LF/JP

3.2	<p>Average score: 79.84% Reference no: L1-005 Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.</p>	
3.3	<p>Average score: 73.52% Reference no: L1-006 Decision: DEFER</p> <p>HB excluded herself from the discussion as she declared an interest.</p> <p>The LAG were generally supportive of the project but there were concerns about the delivery outcomes and what was deliverable in the timescale. Issues were raised regarding links to Place Planning within SBC, LF to have discussions with SBC colleagues.</p> <p>The LAG agreed to defer the project to have further discussions and decision to be made with tranche 2 scoring discussions.</p>	LF
3.4	<p>Average score: 72.92% Reference no: L1-008 Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.</p>	
3.5	<p>Average score: 77.36% Reference no: L1-017 Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.</p>	
3.6	<p>Average score: 80.79% Reference no: L1-023 Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>MA excluded herself from the discussion as she declared an interest.</p> <p>Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.</p>	
3.7	<p>Average score: 79.58% Reference no: L1-024 Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.</p>	
3.8	<p>Average score: 75.28%</p>	

	Reference no: L1-027 Decision: APPROVE Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.	
3.9	Average score: 79.03% Reference no: L1-030 Decision: APPROVE Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.	
3.10	Average score: 66.39% Reference no: L1-039 Decision: APPROVE Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.	
3.11	Average score: 75.42% Reference no: L1-043 Decision: APPROVE Support provided for the project and the LAG agreed to approve.	
3.12	Average score: 63.19% Reference no: L1-053 Decision: REJECT Discussions took place regarding the relevance of the project within the programme priorities and noted that although the guidance suggested that solar panel installation could be funded there lacked evidence of the community involvement within the application. Concerns were raised about supply chain issues for acquiring the solar panels and battery and there was also no evidence within the application of having completed an energy audit. The LAG agreed to reject this project however it was suggested that SOSE have a capital budget which may be able to support this project.	
3.13	Average score: 73.08% Reference no: L2-002 Decision: DEFER PT excluded himself from discussions as he declared an interest. Discussions took place and it was agreed that the LAG would like further information from the project;	

	<p>Q1: The application is for phase 1 of a wider project, what happens next in phase 2?</p> <p>Q2: There are concerns over the winter months relating to venues – how will this be managed?</p> <p>Q3: There are a lot of staff required/recruitment – what are the timescales of this?</p> <p>Q4: What are the connections to Destination Tweed?</p> <p>The LAG agreed to defer this project until they have further information from the project which will then be reported back to the LAG for agreement.</p>	PT/JP
3.14	<p>Average score: 66.25%</p> <p>Reference no: L2-010</p> <p>Decision: REJECT</p> <p>Discussions took place and it was felt there were concerns over the project being the best fit for this fund. Due to the scale of the private business the LAG felt it would have been a better fit had one of the Housing Association's had applied for the funding and contracted the work to [REDACTED]. The LAG also felt that the scope of work is too ambitious for the timescales.</p> <p>The LAG agreed to reject this project.</p>	
3.15	<p>Average score: 65.1%</p> <p>Reference no: L2-011</p> <p>Decision: REJECT</p> <p>The LAG felt the project wasn't the best fit for the funding programme. Due to the scale of works planned at [REDACTED] this was not a stand-alone project and there was a risk that if future funding for works wasn't forthcoming then the impact of the CLLD funding would be lost.</p> <p>The LAG agreed to reject this project.</p>	
3.16	<p>Average score: 77.98%</p> <p>Reference no: L2-014</p> <p>Decision: REJECT</p> <p>While the LAG are supportive of the work of [REDACTED] they were concerned that the project proposal was a continuation of the current delivery model which would be better suited to other funds. They also felt that the application was unclear on the specifics of the projects aims.</p> <p>The LAG agreed to reject this project.</p>	
4.0	Summary of project applications	

	<p>10 projects approved totalling £133,163.00 2 projects deferred and require further discussion when information is obtained totalling £66,536.00 4 projects rejected totalling £151,135.00</p> <p>Following the awards made there is now £222,522.97 remaining of the total £355,686 funding available. The LAG considered the list of project applications in order of the screening score and agreed that a further 17 projects will be scored by the LAG, the relevant paperwork will be sent only to LAG members who scored this first tranche of applications for consistency.</p> <p>The LAG Staff Team are to consider if there are any projects that would struggle with the delay in application scoring in delivering within the timescales.</p> <p>As a matter of urgency, conversations need to happen with the approved projects regarding the budgets and are they a true reflection within the timescales.</p> <p>It was noted as a general point that the applications were great but not all of them fit within the criteria of this programme. JP highlighted that due to the tight timescales set By Scottish Government there had been no staff time for facilitation and therefore no pre application screening which would have streamlined the process as not all would have progressed to submission stage.</p> <p>AG/MA/CD left the meeting at 11am.</p>	<p>JP</p> <p>SBC staff</p> <p>JP/SL</p>
5.0	<p>RFCF Tranche 2 funding</p> <p>The LAG members present discussed the proposals with GW noting the feedback was mixed on the two applications. He asked if the LAG wish to withdraw the applications from Scottish Government or leave them as we will not hear anything until the end of November.</p> <p>LG left meeting at 11.30am.</p> <p>It was felt that the LAG need to concentrate on building the new LAG membership and getting a better understanding of how the LAG fits within SOSE, REP and the wider economic context.</p>	
6.0	<p>Dates and times of future meetings</p> <p>LAG to complete scoring of the further 17 projects by 2nd November. LAG decision-making discussion to be held on 7th November.</p>	