

### SCOTTISH BORDERS LEADER PROGRAMME 2014-2020

Local Action Group meeting

19 July 2016 10.00 Tweed Horizons, Newtown St Boswells

### MINUTES

### Present:

Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) Frank Beattie, Scottish Enterprise (FB) Claire de Bolle, Youth Borders (CdB) Gordon Harrison, Scottish Borders Community Council Network (GH) John Henderson, Scottish Borders Food and Drink Network (JHe) Jules Horne, Creative Arts Business Network (JH) Bryan McGrath, Scottish Borders Council (BMcG) Jane Rosegrant, Borders Forest Trust (JR) - (Chair) Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW)

### Secretariat:

Hugh Williams, Scottish Borders Council (Principal Officer Rural) (HBW) Fiona McDougall, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Co-ordinator) (FM) Bartje Magee, Scottish Borders Council (EU Programme Support Officer) (BM) (minutes)

		Action
1.0	Apologies	
	Douglas Wilson, VisitScotland (DW) Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) John Dougan, Forestry Commission Scotland (JD) Andrew Mitchell, Berwickshire Community Councils' Forum (AM) Ian MacDonald, NFU Scotland (IMacD) Ian Tod, The Hippodrome Arts Centre CIC Ltd (IT)	
2.0	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising: Minutes were adopted as being a true reflection of the last meeting. Proposed by FB, seconded by HB. Actions of last minutes:	
	<ul> <li>SL is in contact with Mike Wilson of the Border Exporters Association to progress their project ideas.</li> <li>Facebook page has been set up, currently being monitored and</li> </ul>	



-		
	updated by JP on a regular basis. Link is:	
	www.facebook.com/Scottish-Borders-LEADER-1002604229794713	
	• Tracking sheet for project pipeline has been developed and will be	
	presented in the Co-ordinators report.	
3.0	Project Applications Round 1	
	The chair noted that 9 members were present (with one additional member	
	due to arrive later, making 10 members present in total) so that it was	
	quorate and able to take decisions on the applications presented. The mix of	
	public/private members was also appropriate, with only 2 members	
	representing the public section (<50%).	
3.1	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	(SBO/002/192C)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £35,301	
	LEADER grant requested: £17,650 (49.99%)	
	Average Score: 60%	
	Decision: APPROVE	
	This project was approved by unanimous vote.	
3.2	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	(SBO/005/192C)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £215,218	
	LEADER grant requested: £129,131 (60%)	
	Score: 59.13%	
	Decision: DEFER	
	This Project was deferred by unanimous vote.	
3.3	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
	(SBO/006/192C)	
	Total Eligible Project costs: £25,100	
	LEADER grant requested: £15,060 (60%)	
	Score: 61.79%	
	Decision: DEFER	
	This Project was deferred by uponimous yets	
	This Project was deferred by unanimous vote.	



4.0	MembershipIt was noted that Jules Horne was originally a representative of BordersCreative but this organisation has now ceased to exist. She is still arepresentative of the creative sector, through her membership of theCreative Arts Business Network, a network of artists and creativemanufacturers covering the Scottish Borders.As mentioned in minutes of the previous meeting, [a LAG member] (ScottishNatural Heritage) has now retired, and no replacement was available. [A LAGmember] (VisitScotland) is now on maternity leave. Her replacement isDouglas Wilson, who did take part in the scoring but had to send his	
	apologies for this meeting. In addition [a LAG member] (The Haining) is relocating outside the Scottish Borders and has therefore resigned from the LEADER LAG.	
	The mechanism for replacing members was set out in the LAG protocol. Section 5.11 states: The LAG will recruit additional members to replace members who resign, in line with the membership profile outlined in the Business Plan.	
	A recruitment advertisement will be posted on the LEADER website, LEADER Facebook page and the Scottish Rural Network. In the case of multiple applicants a selection process will be followed. The LAG will be able to ratify membership via written procedures.	FMcD/HBW
	A request was made for the recruitment information to be forwarded to the LAG so they can make it available to their wider networks.	
	LAG members agreed for the recruitment to take place as outlined above.	
5.0	Official adoption of scoring system for LEADER 2014-2020 programme The scoring system was discussed and revised during two workshop meetings in May 2016 with active participation by LAG members. The system has now been tailored to fit the Scottish Borders LEADER Programme. The outcome was circulated via email and adopted by the Chair on behalf of all members. The LAG ratified that decision at this meeting.	
6.0	Adoption of Monitoring & Evaluation Project Indicators proposal This LEADER programme collected all LDS indicators from around Scotland and found there were over 300, many asking the same question in different guises. Through a workshop/workstream process in which SB LEADER team participated, it has now been reduced to the list that was presented to the	



	LAG at the meeting. This list includes the Scottish Government common indicators that will be collected through the LARCs system and the Scottish Borders local indicators which will collect data that is pertinent to our LDS. They relate to Question 6 in the Application Form. The LAG agreed to adopt these indicators as Scottish Borders LEADER indicators for the LEADER 2014-2020 Programme.	
7.0	<b>Discussion on and ratification of Enterprise Facilitator role definition</b> At the previous LAG meeting it had been agreed that the LEADER team would further work on the definition of the Enterprise Facilitator's role. The LAG discussion highlighted some confusion between the role of	
	<ul> <li>Enterprise Facilitator and Development Worker. It was suggested that it would be better to concentrate on what the Enterprise Facilitator does, rather than what he/she does not do, and to then set it out in clear wording, possibly in bullet points. These should include: <ul> <li>Helping to build capacity in groups</li> <li>Helping to develop plans (but not write them)</li> <li>Works towards wider aims, not just group who employs him/her</li> <li>Crucially, to help projects to think about cash flows and sustainable income streams for longer term benefits</li> </ul> </li> <li>A re-worded proposal will be circulated via email for approval.</li> </ul>	HBW
8.0	<b>Staffing maternity cover</b> A staffing report was presented to the LAG including a proposal not to provide maternity cover for [a staff member]. However, recent information on Scottish Government guidance, delay of the IT system and audit risks meant that this decision was being reviewed.	
	The LAG expressed a wish to ensure the LEADER team is adequately staffed. Their concerns included the level of support given to Projects. Providing a good service to help ensure that strong projects are developed was considered part of the LEADER service and for some groups that support would be vital. If the maternity leave position led to any changes in expenditure, it was suggested this should be covered in the administration budget.	
9.0	<b>Programme Progress Report to LAG</b> FMcD outlined what had been achieved to date and the work that was ongoing to try to reach areas that had not previously benefited from LEADER funding.	



	<ul> <li>New Scottish Borders LEADER leaflets and posters have been produced and are available to hand out at events, meetings and among LAG members own networks if they wish.</li> <li>Farm Diversification had previously attracted less interest than other funds and a joint approach is being discussed with Kerry Barr, NFUS, with a presence by the LEADER team at the NFUS stand at the Border Union Show (29/30 July 2016).</li> <li>A table showing the pipeline of projects coming forward had been developed by the LEADER team. It was considered to be very useful and could helpfully include the 'running total' of the value of the projects and LEADER grant requested.</li> <li>This led to a discussion on the level of interest in the Programme and the ability of the LEADER Team to cope with the current workload. The Team will bring forward as many applications as possible to the next LAG meeting, but it was noted that the complexity of the process may limit how many applications are complete enough for consideration. In addition it will be important to stress higher expectations of Innovation to improve the quality of Projects coming forward.</li> <li>It was thought that the process of getting Projects from Expression of Interest to completed Application would be improved upon with practice.</li> </ul>	SL
10.0 10.1	<b>AOB</b> BMcG attended an Accountable Body meeting on behalf of Scottish Borders Council. This meeting will continue to take place twice a year to discuss ongoing issues and share best practice around issues like Service Level Agreements.	
10.2	JR (Chair) reported she had attended the LEADER LAG Chair meeting in Falkirk, two days after the Brexit vote. This meeting will also be held twice a year. The meeting had been told that the guidance and (paper) application forms for co-operation projects will be issued by the end of July 2016. The Group were also told that contracts that are awarded will be honoured but no promise was made to keep going until 2020. A letter was sent to Fergus Ewing MSP asking for confirmation on this issue. No date was set for the next meeting as yet.	
10.3	A discussion regarding the logistics of this application round took place as there were issues with sending round application papers for scoring. Some LAG members had servers that would not take zipped files, some could not	



open zipped files and for some it caused problems with full inboxes. Various options were discussed and members expressed a preference for receiving the documentation on a memory stick, sent through the mail. Internal SBC procedures will have to be consulted as to whether this is possible.10.4Where preferred, printed hard copies can be sent out, currently one member has chosen that option.10.4LAG members collectively sent their best wishes and thanks to [a staff member] as she is about to go off on maternity leave.11.0Dates and times of future meetings Tuesday 18 October 2016, Tweed Horizons, 10am-3pm12.0Business Sub-Group meeting: Project Applications Round 1 Attendees: FB, GH, JHe, BMcG, HW, GW (quorate)The Business sub-group meeting followed on from the main LAG meeting. It was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings.HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.12.1[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.] (SBO/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE12.2Date of next Business sub-group meeting Next meeting to be held after LAG meeting on 18 October 2016.			
<ul> <li>has chosen that option.</li> <li>10.4 LAG members collectively sent their best wishes and thanks to [a staff member] as she is about to go off on maternity leave.</li> <li>11.0 Dates and times of future meetings Tuesday 18 October 2016, Tweed Horizons, 10am-3pm</li> <li>12.0 Business Sub-Group meeting: Project Applications Round 1 Attendees: FB, GH, JHe, BMcG, HW, GW (quorate) The Business sub-group meeting followed on from the main LAG meeting. It was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings. HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.</li> <li>12.1 [Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.] (SB0/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE This project was approved by unanimous vote.</li> <li>12.2 Date of next Business sub-group meeting</li> </ul>		options were discussed and members expressed a preference for receiving the documentation on a memory stick, sent through the mail. Internal SBC	
member] as she is about to go off on maternity leave.11.0Dates and times of future meetings Tuesday 18 October 2016, Tweed Horizons, 10am-3pm12.0Business Sub-Group meeting: Project Applications Round 1 Attendees: FB, GH, JHe, BMcG, HW, GW (quorate)The Business sub-group meeting followed on from the main LAG meeting. It was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings.HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.12.1[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.] (SBO/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE This project was approved by unanimous vote.12.2Date of next Business sub-group meeting			
Tuesday 18 October 2016, Tweed Horizons, 10am-3pm12.0Business Sub-Group meeting: Project Applications Round 1 Attendees: FB, GH, JHe, BMcG, HW, GW (quorate)The Business sub-group meeting followed on from the main LAG meeting. It was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings.HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.12.1[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.] (SBO/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE This project was approved by unanimous vote.12.2Date of next Business sub-group meeting	10.4	•	
Attendees: FB, GH, JHe, BMCG, HW, GW (quorate)         The Business sub-group meeting followed on from the main LAG meeting. It was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings.         HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.         12.1       [Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]         (SBO/003/192B)       Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058         LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%)       Score: 55.98%         Decision: APPROVE       This project was approved by unanimous vote.         12.2       Date of next Business sub-group meeting	11.0	-	
<ul> <li>was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to subsequent Business sub-group meetings.</li> <li>HW was proposed and seconded to be Chair of the Business sub-group. He confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.</li> <li>12.1 [Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</li> <li>(SBO/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE</li> <li>This project was approved by unanimous vote.</li> <li>12.2 Date of next Business sub-group meeting</li> </ul>	12.0		
confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the only Business application for this round.12.1[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.](SBO/003/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98% Decision: APPROVE This project was approved by unanimous vote.12.2Date of next Business sub-group meeting		was pointed out that although other LAG members did not score or vote, they did want any comments they made taken into account. LEADER team took this on board and will ensure that these comments are put forward to	
(SBO/003/192B)         Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058         LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%)         Score: 55.98%         Decision: APPROVE         This project was approved by unanimous vote.         12.2       Date of next Business sub-group meeting		confirmed that the sub-group was quorate and with an appropriate mix of private and public attendees. He led the meeting in the discussion of the	
Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058         LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%)         Score: 55.98%         Decision: APPROVE         This project was approved by unanimous vote.         12.2         Date of next Business sub-group meeting	12.1	[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]	
12.2   Date of next Business sub-group meeting		Total Eligible Project costs: £84,058 LEADER grant requested: £42,029 (50%) Score: 55.98%	
		This project was approved by unanimous vote.	
	12.2		