## SCOTTISH BORDERS LEADER PROGRAMME 2014-2020 Local Action Group meeting

Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2019 10.00am at Tweed Horizons, Newtown St Boswells

## **MINUTES**

## **Present:**

Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) - Voluntary
Frank Beattie, Scottish Enterprise (FB) - Public
Clare de Bolle, YouthBorders (CdB) - Voluntary
Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) - Voluntary
Gordon Harrison, Scottish Borders Community Council Network (GH) - Voluntary
Jules Horne, Creative Arts Business Network (JH) - Private
Jane Rosegrant (JR) — Private
Annabelle Scott, Messrs A A Scott (AS) - Private
Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) - Voluntary

## Secretariat:

Linda Cornwall, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Coordinator) (LiC)
Bartje Magee, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (BM)
Nesta Todd, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (NT)

		Action
1.0	Apologies Bryan McGrath, Scottish Borders Council (BMcG) - Public Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) — Private	
2.0	Conflict of Interest  LC declared a conflict of interest 17/P00085 – it was noted that LC would not take part in this decision as he is not part of the Business Group.  No other conflicts of interest were noted.	
3.0	Minutes from last meeting  Minutes were approved – GW proposed, HB seconded  Matters arising:  17/P00069 was deferred 17/P00076 was deferred P/1700081 – Approved by the LAG but has now been withdrawn by the applicant. Funds committed are back in the budget.	

	• Staffing – item 9.0 – JR gathered views on this matter and met with BMcG. As a result contract has been extended to Dec 2020 and a further PSO will be recruited, possibly for one year.	
4.0	Budget update/LDS Change Request In discussion with Scottish Government and to clarify current position, there is a proposed amendment to the LDS, for which a Change Request is needed. These were set out in a separate document but the main points are:  • Update overall LEADER budget in line with SG confirmation of £277,758 EMFF Admin & Animation budget plus additional £21,856 to cover EMFF admin/animation already incurred by Scottish Borders for Tyne-Esk and Fife areas  • Enterprise Facilitator to move from admin budget to project budget. This is because LARCs meant they had to be administered under projects  • A Change Request is needed to include Fife in the FLAG area and to reflect Marine Scotland's latest communication regarding the budget split. Where it originally was to be worked out on population levels, it is now a straight 1/3 split for each area  • Confirm extension of LEADER Facilitator post and recruitment of a full time European Programme Support Officer to meet needs of	LiC
	Programme delivery  LAG members unanimously approved the proposed changes, LiC will proceed with the Change Request.  JR reported that the Chair meeting she attended had discussed budget and allocation. No area admitted to not spending their allocation. They did discuss the difference between commitment and spend, not clear whether underspend would stay in own area or if it would go into central pot.  Central pot for Co-operation projects will be established, it is thought there will be a central pot for other strands as well. Projects would need to be ready	
5.0	to start in order to be successful bidding in to this pot. There will be very little time left to deliver the project.  LEADER Programme Progress Report  LiC reported that Scottish Borders was monitored by Scottish Government,	
	wash up meeting was 5/2/19. One of the issues arising 17/P00052, which had been approved via written procedure. Written procedure is set out in the Group Protocol, which is part of the LDS. It was not thought this needed any further action  Scottish Borders LEADER has maintained its Green status, JR thanked the team for their hard work.	

6.0	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]	
	17/P00063	LiC
7.0	Project Applications Round It was noted that 9 members were present (quorate), 1 member represented the public sector (<50%)	
7.1	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]  17/P00092 Total Eligible Project costs: £73,000 LEADER grant requested: £33,810.00 (46.31506849%) Average Score: 67.23% Decision: APPROVE  Decision Approved unanimously, 8 for.	
8.0	<ul> <li>Project Pipeline – any projects on this list should receive a letter saying there will be no more projects approved as funds have been allocated</li> <li>Looking forwards – LAG members felt a LEADER event should take place that celebrates Scottish Borders LEADER successes. The following points were mentioned:         <ul> <li>Possible venue – Thirlestane Castle?</li> <li>Successful projects to present their project plans/ideas and outcomes</li> <li>Invite other organisations – match funders/other funders</li> <li>Invite local politicians – to promote future rural funding</li> <li>Key note speaker to attract interest</li> <li>Publicity, including Border Life</li> <li>A summer event – either June or September (missing holidays)</li> <li>Invite neighbouring LAGs</li> <li>If possible produce a short film about legacy, involve young people</li> <li>SL to work on this event</li> <li>Small LAG working group – GW, HB, JH and GH offered their services</li> <li>A summer event – GW, HB, JH and GH offered their services</li> <li>If possible produce a short film about legacy, involve young people</li> <li>SC to work on this event</li> <li>Small LAG working group – GW, HB, JH and GH offered their services</li> <li>Small LAG working group – GW, HB, JH and GH offered their services</li> <li>A summer event – GW, HB, JH and GH offered their services</li> <li>B to work on the services</li></ul></li></ul>	SL
9.0	<ul> <li>Dates and times of future meetings</li> <li>Tuesday 28 May – earlier because of summer event</li> <li>Tuesday 22 October</li> </ul>	

10.0	Business Sub-Group It was noted that 5 members were present (quorate), 1 member represented the public sector (<50%) GW to act as Chair in absence of HW	
10.1	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]  17/P00069  Total Eligible Project costs: £72,285.58  LEADER grant requested: £36,142.79 (50.000000%)  Average Score: 56.15% (previous meeting)  Decision: DEFER  Decision:	
	Deferred, 4 votes Deferral to written procedures once LiC has clarified costs	LiC
10.2	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]  17/P00084  Total Eligible Project costs: £48,621.00  LEADER grant requested: £20,000.00 (41.13448921%)  Average Score: 54.71%  Decision: APPROVE  Decision  Approved, 3 for, 1 abstained	
10.3	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]  17/POO085 Total Eligible Project costs: £140,949.44 LEADER grant requested: £40,949.44 (29.05257375%) Average Score: 58.08% Decision: APPROVE  Decision: Approved, 3 for, 1 against	
10.4	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]  17/P00087	

	Total Fligible Pusication and CAM 040 20	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £101,940.20	
	LEADER grant requested: £50,000.00 (49.04836365%)	
	Average Score: 56.81%	
	Decision: APPROVE	
	Decision:	
	Approved, 4 for.	
	[Destruction destributed by College and a college between the filter and the filter and the college between the college betwee	
	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]	
10.5		
	17/P00088	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £53,516.63	
	LEADER grant requested: £26,758.00 (49.99941140%)	
	Average Score: 54.62%	
	Decision: APPROVE	
	Decision. APPROVE	
	Decision:	
	Approved, 4 for.	
	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]	
10.6		
	17/P00090	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £138,722.58	
	LEADER grant requested: £ 50.000.00 (26.04315894%)	
	Average Score: 58.75%	
	Decision: APPROVE – see NOTE below	
	Decision:	
	Rejected, 2 against, 1 abstained, 2 for (Chair decision)	
	2,2222, 2,22222, 2,22222, 2,222	
	<b>NOTE</b> : The project sent in additional information which was not included in the	
	·	
	information to the LAG. The information was circulated to Business Group	
	next day and asked if that changed their vote. One person changed his mind	
	and therefor the decision was as follows:	
	Decision:	
	Approved: 2 for, 1 abstained, 2 against (Chair decision)	
	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	
	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these Minutes]	
10.7	[1 Toject details and the discussions are not published in these williates]	
10.7	47/00000	
	17/P00093	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £24,000.00	
	LEADER grant requested: £12,000.00 (50.000000%)	
	Average Score: 60.77%	

Decision: APPROVE	
Decision:	
Approved, 3 for, 1 against.	
PRIORITISATION OF BUSINESS FUND APPLICATIONS	
Due to the lack of available funding to accommodate all applications put	
before the LAG for decision (total funding available £112k, funding sought	
£202k) it was agreed to prioritise applications for funding based on a pre-	
agreed prioritisation model. Each member of the group was asked to score	
all six applications in order of their own priority, 1: highest priority to 6:	
lowest priority. Projects were ordered accordingly.	
NOTE: Due to changed circumstances (see item 10.6) Business Group was	
asked to vote again, adding the additional project. Projects were ordered in	
the following priority:	
1. 17/P00088 - approved at level of request	
2. 17/P00085 – approved at level of request	
3. 17/P00093 – approved at level of request	
4. 17/P00087 - approved at level of £32,328 pending confirmation	
applicant can cover shortfall	
5. 17/P00090 – deferred pending more funding becoming available	
6. 17/P00084 – deferred pending more funding becoming available	