

**NEW CLLD FUND**  
**Local Action Group Scoring Meeting**  
7<sup>th</sup> November 2022  
(9.30am – 12.00pm Microsoft Teams)

**NOTE OF MEETING**

**Present:**

Gary White, Agenda Resilience (GW) – Private – Chair  
Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) – Voluntary  
Lesley Forsyth, Scottish Borders Council (LF) – Public  
Anna Griffin, SEPA (AG) – Public  
Pip Tabor, Southern Uplands Partnership – Voluntary  
Louisa Gardiner (LG) – Private  
Annique Armstrong, VisitScotland (AA) – Public  
Miriam Adcock, Zero Waste Scotland (MA) - Voluntary

**Secretariat:**

Simon Lynch, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (SL)  
Linda Cornwall, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (LiC)  
Joanna Pringle, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (JP)  
Gail Blacklock, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (GB)

		Action
1.0	<b>Apologies</b> No apologies.	
2.0	<b>Project Applications</b> JP opened the meeting to undertake discussion on the 17 Tranche 2 applications which had been scored by all 8 LAG members.	
2.1	<b>Average Score: 76.39%</b> <b>Reference No: L1-002</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE pending feedback regarding links to Low &amp; Slow and Warm Hubs</b> Apart from 1 deferral, all members wanted to approve this application. Concerns from one member that consultation with communities was not clear and there could be a possibility of duplication with others undertaking similar projects across the area.	LF

2.2	<p><b>Average Score: 65.28%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-010</b>  <b>Decision: REJECT</b></p> <p>Although a good project it was felt the application was weak in terms of wider community benefit. Solar Panels will assist in reducing energy costs, but the mower considered really only of benefit to the club. Also concerns with the timeline for installation of panels within 3 month time period. Considered probably a better fit for other community funding avenues.</p>	
2.3	<p><b>Average Score: 78.47%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-011</b>  <b>Decision: APPROVE</b></p> <p>All felt this was a good all round project. Group in Peebles area has carried out similar composting toilet project which has been a great success. Proven success rate and considered deliverable in short timescale.</p>	
2.4	<p><b>Average Score: 72.22%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-015</b>  <b>Decision: APPROVE</b></p> <p>Few concerns around fit within the CLLD Fund requirements. After discussion it was considered that although more an informative project than delivering effect climate change at the present time, research into the marine environment was required to effect change for the future. The project will support growth for the future and group has a track record of effective delivery and knowledge in field.</p>	
2.5	<p><b>Average Score: 62.92%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-022</b>  <b>Decision: DEFER and revisit following decisions on other 16 applications</b></p> <p>Project had not completed section on partnership working so could not be scored on this aspect by some members. Purchase of electric tools alone was not considered effective justification for net zero. No mention of solar panels in application which again did not fully justify net zero element. Application did demonstrate raising of awareness in regard to net zero with staff and clients and liked social inclusion aspect. Considered low 60s scoring will rule out in any case next to other higher scoring projects but re-visit once other 16 applications discussed.</p>	
2.6	<p><b>Average Score: 63.75%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-025</b>  <b>Decision: DEFER and revisit following decisions on other 16 applications</b></p>	

	Concerns around partnership working with other tourist groups in Hawick as no demonstration in application. Although good project, considered weak in terms of consultation and links to regional and local tourism strategies. Does demonstrate eco-tourism through the development of town trail via walkers to specially developed website. Lot of web applications which track walkers routes online and felt would be better linking into one of these sites rather than developing specialist site for [REDACTED]. Felt it will be likely rejection considered low score but will look at again once all applications discussed.	
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Average Score: 78.19%</b> <b>Reference No: L1-028</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE</b> All unanimously agreed to approve this project.	
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Average Score: 69.03%</b> <b>Reference No: L1-029</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE dependent on outcome of higher scored projects</b> Concerns with some that this competed with a similar project in Tweeddale area however it was clarified that they actually work in partnership in their own areas. Concerns that new clothes were being bought to swap rather than recycled but it was confirmed that it was under garments which were being bought and other items recyclable. Liked the reduction in used garments which reduced landfill and alleviated poverty. Agreed to defer depending on discussion regarding other applications and re-look.	
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Average Score: 60.14%</b> <b>Reference No: L1-034</b> <b>Decision: REJECT</b> Event appears to be happening after the fund is closed, although workshops happening before 28/2/2023. Few members only felt able to score on activity happening before close of programme. Felt it was a weak application, no real like to Climate Change other than holding of an event in surrounding rural area, no evidence of local demand or legacy for future. No apparent links to Heart for Duns who are developmental in events for the area.	
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Average Score: 74.72%</b> <b>Reference No: L1-036</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE</b> All but one LAG member felt this was a good project with good fit for fund. Also potential to develop links with another project delivering a differing model but capacity to learn from each other and share ideas in order to grow.	

	(AG left the meeting at 10.35am)	
2.11	<p><b>Average Score: 57.78%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-042</b>  <b>Decision: REJECT</b></p> <p>Although a good net zero project in provision of e-bikes, there were concerns regarding timescales for delivery, given there is a known wait time on delivery of e-bikes. Also concerns only 3 e-bikes would not be able to impact at as high a level as maintained in application and no real evidence to support this.</p>	
2.12	<p><b>Average Score: 73.61%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-046</b>  <b>Decision: APPROVE</b></p> <p>Application to carry out prep work for a carbon reduction heating system. Building offers a lot of community usage. Cannot press ahead with largescale funding until prep undertaken. Meets net zero priority for community building.</p>	
2.13	<p><b>Average Score: 72.64%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-047</b>  <b>Decision: APPROVE</b></p> <p>Most members liked initiative but concerns over the handing out of vouchers from local shops instead of actual food. This has been checked with SG and is eligible for funding. Those in poverty have option to choose which local shops they use which reduces potential benefits for some shops and not others. Also undertaking workshops with those in poverty to provide legacy to help themselves in future. Considered short term pilot project to test alternative approach to meeting poverty alleviation. <b>Condition of any offer of grant that applicant provides report detailing effectiveness of initiative for future.</b></p>	
2.14	<p><b>Average Score: 71.53%</b>  <b>Reference No: L1-048</b>  <b>Decision: DEFER and revisit following decisions on other 16 applications and confirmation from SG</b></p> <p>LAG were notified that this project actually included statutory fees such as Planning Permission, statutory reporting (Tree Survey/Bat Survey) which was ineligible under the terms of the CLLD Fund. This would reduce the project cost from £13k to £9.5k. SL checking with SG whether this is an actual requirement as SG Community Led Vision Guidance states “costs that are a statutory requirement and reclaimable by the Accountable Body re: statutory maternity/paternal pay/statutory sick pay” are deemed ineligible. LAG agreeable to fund at lower level removing the Planning element if need be.</p>	SL

2.15	<p><b>Average Score: 70.96%</b> <b>Reference No: L2-018</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE</b></p> <p>Had been some concerns about timescales for delivery however structure is shipping container. Agreed much needed project to alleviate poverty in a local area not already undertaking such an initiative. Evidence of reducing food waste from local supermarkets which has environmental benefits as well as food poverty.</p>																																																	
2.16	<p><b>Average Score: 62.31%</b> <b>Reference No:</b> <b>Decision: REJECT</b></p> <p>It was felt that this project wasn't a comfortable fit the CLLD Fund. Also, no evidence of long term community legacy for the future.</p>																																																	
2.17	<p><b>Average Score: 79.42%</b> <b>Reference No: L2-024</b> <b>Decision: APPROVE (subject to staffing for Sept/Oct being revised)</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding budget and delivery. Project due to start in September. Concerns around recruitment of Project Manager, Admin and Marketer which could hold project up. Clarified that Project Manager and Admin would be recruited internally. Felt 2 x 9 week courses for 16 women could be delivered in timeframe but staffing costs would need to be re-visited due to late start of project.</p>																																																	
3.0	<p><b>Re-Cap</b></p> <p>JP confirmed that the total approved for Tranche 1 is £162,874 (this takes into account final approval of L2-002 (Connecting Threads) which LAG Members have now agreed to fund via email confirmation following clarification of queries.</p> <table><tr><th>Tranche 1</th><th>Project Ref</th><th>Budget</th><th>Score</th></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-024</td><td>£9,173</td><td>79.58%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-008</td><td>£19,804</td><td>72.92%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-027</td><td>£13,750</td><td>75.28%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-039</td><td>£8,500</td><td>66.39%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-023</td><td>£19,647</td><td>80.79%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-030</td><td>£19,740</td><td>79.03%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L2-002</td><td>£49,511</td><td>73.08%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-005</td><td>£12,488.16</td><td>79.84%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-043</td><td>£6,723.56</td><td>75.42%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>L1-017</td><td>£3,537.28</td><td>77.36%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td><b>£162,874</b></td><td></td></tr></table>	Tranche 1	Project Ref	Budget	Score		L1-024	£9,173	79.58%		L1-008	£19,804	72.92%		L1-027	£13,750	75.28%		L1-039	£8,500	66.39%		L1-023	£19,647	80.79%		L1-030	£19,740	79.03%		L2-002	£49,511	73.08%		L1-005	£12,488.16	79.84%		L1-043	£6,723.56	75.42%		L1-017	£3,537.28	77.36%			<b>£162,874</b>		
Tranche 1	Project Ref	Budget	Score																																															
	L1-024	£9,173	79.58%																																															
	L1-008	£19,804	72.92%																																															
	L1-027	£13,750	75.28%																																															
	L1-039	£8,500	66.39%																																															
	L1-023	£19,647	80.79%																																															
	L1-030	£19,740	79.03%																																															
	L2-002	£49,511	73.08%																																															
	L1-005	£12,488.16	79.84%																																															
	L1-043	£6,723.56	75.42%																																															
	L1-017	£3,537.28	77.36%																																															
		<b>£162,874</b>																																																

The Communities & Partnerships Locality Co-ordinator has confirmed that L1-001 [REDACTED] will be funded by the SBC Cost of Living Fund, so has been removed from consideration.

LAG Members agreed that as there were still concerns over the timeframe for delivery of L1-006 [REDACTED] which was deferred in Tranche 1, Members would prefer to prioritise funding for [REDACTED] to meet food poverty rather than Place Planning.

Following discussion it was agreed that the following would be approved for Tranche 2. All projects will be asked to submit revised budgets and any underspend will be used to offer funding to [REDACTED]. All other projects which were deferred and to be re-visited during discussion are now rejected.

Tranche 2	Project Ref	Budget	Score
[REDACTED]	L2-024	£38,086	79.42%
[REDACTED]	L1-011	£9,056	78.47%
[REDACTED]	L1-028	£8,433.89	78.19%
[REDACTED]	L1-002	£18,879	76.39%
[REDACTED]			
[REDACTED]	L1-036	£15,388.54	74.72%
[REDACTED]	L1-046	£19,672	73.61%
[REDACTED]	L1-047	£19,750	72.64%
[REDACTED]	L1-015	£8,130	72.22%
[REDACTED]	L2-018	£35,245	70.96%
[REDACTED]	L1-029	£16,045	69.03%
		<b>£188,685.43</b>	

This means a total of £351,559.43 has been approved at present, subject to revision of Tranche 2 project budgets.

The meeting ended at 12.25pm