

Community Learning Local Development Fund

Local Action Group Meeting

Tuesday 14th February 2023

(12.00noon to 3pm)

TWEED HORIZONS, NEWTOWN ST.BOSWELLS

NOTE OF MEETING

Present:

Hans Waltl (GW) – Private – Acting Chair
Lesley Forsyth, Scottish Borders Council (LF) – Public
Anna Griffin, SEPA (AG) – Public
Pip Tabor, Southern Uplands Partnership – Voluntary
Miriam Adcock, Zero Waste Scotland (MA) – Voluntary
Hazel Smith, Re-Tweed (HS) – Third
Luke Fisher, Tweed Forum (LF) – Third
Fiona Benton, Third Sector Interface (FB) – Third

Secretariat:

Simon Lynch, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (SL)
Linda Cornwall, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (LC)
Nesta Todd, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (NT)
Gail Blacklock, Scottish Borders Council (Economic Development) (GB)

		Action
1.0	Welcome HW introduced himself as Acting Chair of the LAG following the resignation of GW. As most of those at the meeting were in fact new LAG members asked everyone around the table to introduce themselves.	
2.0	Apologies Louisa Gardiner, Private (LG); Charles Dundas, Borders Forest Trust (CD); Phil McCreadie, SoSE (PMcC); Margaret Simpson, SB Social Enterprise Chamber (MS) Annabelle Scott, Private (AS) – not in attendance Rep, VisitScotland – Public – not in attendance <i>At 12:50pm meeting was not quorate but AG had informed SL she was on her way which would make the meeting quorate following her arrival. AG arrived at 13:00pm</i>	
3.0	Conflict of Interest There were no conflicts of interest noted.	

<p>4.0</p>	<p>Election of Chair/Vice-Chair HW informed that group that he was only acting as Chair following GW resignation and that a new Chair and Vice-Chair (which was the position he originally held) required to be elected.</p> <p>SL asked members if anyone else would like to be considered for the Chair role but all members unanimously voted HW in as Chair of the Group. HW asked if there were any volunteers for the role of Vice-Chair. Only PT was happy to take on the role as Vice-Chair with the opportunity to have a second Vice-Chair. PT therefore elected into the role. HW encouraged other members to come forward for the second Vice-Chair role which he was happy to mentor if need be.</p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>History & Legacy of LEADER & RCTC SL provided an overview to the new LAG members on what has been undertaken by the LAG in the past and referred to the LEADER Legacy document which has recently been circulated showcasing the types of projects of which the LAG undertook decisions for the LEADER 2014-2020 programme. LAG members were impressed with the document and excited by what can be achieved with future funding. Showcase of what has been achieved by the 21 CLLD applications is also proposed post March 2023.</p> <p>SL also gave a background as to how EU LEADER funding came about and its focus on Communities, Rural Enterprise and Farm Diversification. HW also highlighted the importance that the LAG made decisions appropriately in relation to what projects progressed given the risk to the public pound.</p> <p>SL also briefed as to how the LEADER administration worked in the past and how as Lead Partner/Accountable Body SBC effectively provided project money up front which could only be claimed back from SG once spend had been undertaken. Final evaluation of processes had picked up a high level of bureaucracy for both applicants and administrators which has been relaxed somewhat by SG in CLLD funding procedures.</p>	
<p>6.0</p>	<p><i>Due to over run of time, it was decided to move to Item 7 “Future Funding Possibilities” and move “CLLD Programme Progress Report” after Youth LAG presentation</i></p> <p>Future Funding Possibilities (originally Item 7) Due to overrun of time, SL provided an update and overview of the CLLD funding for 23/24 which is expected to be announced by Scottish Government in the near future. It is anticipated Scottish Borders may receive roughly same allocation as 22/23 and this will only be for revenue projects but this is still be confirmed. Revenue can however take into consideration small items of equipment such as laptops, mobile phones etc. SL also advised that Scottish Government are pretty flexible on how LAGS wish to use their funding ie. run a grant scheme, commission a</p>	

	<p>piece of work which has been identified as required in the area or build capacity of the LAG. It is for the LAG in each area to decide.</p> <p>As there was no time to undertake overview of other funding – meeting adjourned for a comfort break at 2pm ready to resume at 2.15pm for presentation by the Youth LAG.</p>	
7.0	<p>Youth LAG</p> <p>SL introduced Susan and Carly to the meeting. Susan briefed the LAG members on how YouthBorders became involved with the LAG and the background to the Youth LAG. This is made up of 5 young people who worked an average of 5-7hrs per week on the administration of Youth applications. The young people were directly involved in the setting up of the criteria, advertising for applications, assessment and decision making of those. Applications were open to both groups (up to £1,750) and individuals (up to £750). 36 applications to a value of £38,000 were received, 21 were funded (12 groups and 9 individuals) and details of all those funded can be found on the YouthBorders website. Susan/Carly will send web link for members to view. Also hoped to show a brief presentation, however technology failed and presentation will also be forwarded on for LAG to view.</p> <p>Scottish Borders Youth LAG is also involved in a co-operation project with Cairngorms and 2 young people will be attending a residential in Orkney/Outer Hebrides assisted with support staff. Funding for this has been through LAG funding and the Cairngorm Trust. Visit is due to take place in June 2023. Also opportunity arisen to attend the Rural Youth Parliament to give the Scottish Borders Youth LAG some promotion.</p> <p>HW thanked YouthBorders for their hard work in the delivery of the youth projects and looked forward to working with them in the future. Option to include a Youth LAG rep on the main LAG group to become involved in projects involving younger people would be an advantage for the future. Asked Susan and Carly to stay and take part in Item 8.</p>	Susan/Carly
8.0	<p>CLLD Programme Progress Report (originally Item 5)</p> <p>SL referred to the Progress Note which has been circulated with the Agenda. Reported that all 21 CLLD projects were progressing well, in fact a few were already completed and all expected to have monies drawn down by end February. No underspend expected.</p>	
9.0	<p>CLLD Funding</p> <p><i>Note: This is first in series of planned discussion with no decisions made until exact funding situation known.</i></p> <p>HW referred back to the briefing paper which was circulated around LAG members with the Agenda and touched on in Item 5. Asked LAG members to consider what they wished to use the next allocation of CLLD funding for, any priorities linked to it and whether they were happy for SBC to remain as Lead Partner with the support it provided.</p>	

	<p>Everyone around the table was invited to give a view individually. The outcome of the discussion was:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) LAG members present confirmed previous LAG views not to set up LAG as independent body but to rely on approach of unconstituted body plus Council as Lead Partner. LAG members felt due to expertise of current staff team and complexity of situation any other approach currently would be counter-productive. (b) Priority support for funding was to communities but to try and ensure what was offered by the LAG was not duplicated by other funding sources (c) LAG felt it would be good to have a conversation with SoSE as to what type of support for businesses was already being delivered through them so as to limit duplication and maximise support potential. SL fed in that PMcC is unfortunately quite ill and expected to be out of action for some time yet. Members felt it was important to have someone from SoSE represented on the group from both the communities and business side – possibility of LAG funding businesses in regard to green, social impact activities but not direct benefit to business itself (d) LAG preferred grant schemes to be as light touch as regulations would allow, based on members experiences and grant recipient feedback. (e) If funding available the LAG would be keen to develop the Youth LAG concept further (f) LAG wanted someone from Regional Economic Partnership as member. SL/LF to arrange. <p>Preference was to fund applications up to £20,000 as limited uptake for higher end up to £50,000 during last programme</p>	
<p>10.0</p>	<p>Dates & Times of Future Meetings Still to be decided.</p> <p>HW thanked members and support staff for their input and closed the meeting at 3.15pm.</p>	