

**NEW CLLD FUND**  
**Local Action Group meeting**  
 11 July 2022  
 (1.00pm – Microsoft Teams)

**NOTE OF MEETING**

**Present:**

Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) – Voluntary - Chair  
 Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) – Voluntary  
 Jules Horne (JH) - Private  
 Lesley Forsyth, Scottish Borders Council (LF) – Public  
 Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) – Private

**Not in Attendance:**

Annabelle Scott, Messrs A A Scott (AS) - Private

**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)

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<p><b>Apologies</b>            Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) – Voluntary</p> <p>SL confirmed that 5 members were present (quorate), one member represented the public sector (&lt;50%)</p> <p>GW welcomes Sam Smith (Chief Officer – Economic Development) to the meeting.</p> <p>GW advised that GH had submitted his resignation and it was recognised by the LAG members what a huge miss his knowledge and experience would be. GW sought guidance from HB regarding representation on the LAG from the Community Councils Network. HB advised that a meeting would be held in mid August from which a new representative was likely to be identified.</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising</b>            GW asked members to agree the Minutes. Proposer: Seconder: HB</p> <p>Matters Arising:-</p> <p>5.0 GW/SL fed in that actions to develop LAG Protocol and MOU were progressing and MOU was currently being reviewed by SBC Legal Team.</p>	

	LAG recruitment policy also being developed. Also fed in that the Community Vision Plan had been submitted to SRN by the 1/7/22 deadline and currently awaiting decision.	
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>LEADER Legacy Document</b></p> <p>LiC confirmed that following the LEADER meeting in March, the Legacy document had been updated to take into account revision of project numbering and obtainment of higher spec photographs for some projects. The Legacy document had been circulated around Members last week and only a few minor corrections required by HB for the Enterprise Facilitator project. LiC broached the idea of some launch publicity and the option of tying this in with the new CLLD fund. LAG members were receptive to this idea although some worry of tie in with LEADER with new fund given the regulations and restrictions of EU fund and complicated LARCS system. Sam Smith (SS) expressed the importance of this being a celebration document and the impact this will have on politician's views in respect of future funding. GW willing to provide intro and JH assist with script for this. A briefing for Members plus an update on the LEADER web/facebook pages would be advantageous. LiC to arrange a meeting with Adam Drummond, SBC Corporate Communications Officer and GW to discuss content/ideas.</p>	LiC/GW/JH
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Update on CLLD Submission</b></p> <p>As stated above in 2.0, the Community Vision Plan required by SG in order to release new CLLD funding was issued by the deadline of 1.7.22. GW will send around a review of how the new LAG Protocols/documentation are progressing. Simplification of existing LEADER documentation has been used wherever possible. SL confirmed that SG estimated to come back with a decision on Community Vision Plan within 2 weeks although it is not clear if this will be via an offer of grant or verbal/email communication. It is assumed any offer of grant will be to SBC as Lead Partner as the LAG is unconstituted. There had been a deadline for all grant monies to be committed by December 2022, however SG have now intimated this will trigger a meeting if not committed rather than monies being taken back. To ensure evaluation can be carried out before end of March 2023, all Scottish Borders projects would need to complete by end February 2023 at latest.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<p><b>Discussion on LAG</b></p> <p><b>Lead Partner Funding</b> – GW sought assurance from Sam Smith that resourcing of the LAG could be accommodated on a 'when required' basis. It was anticipated more resource time would be required at the start to accommodate project development and towards the end when evaluation assistance was required. Sam Smith advised that this should be factored in to the LAG's planning but it was likely that SBC would be able to accommodate resources requirements to tie in with the running of the UKCPF projects. Size of grants administered will also determine how much Officer time is likely to</p>	

	<p>be required. What is required by way of evaluation is not known at present but SS happy to be flexible to support LAG, UKCPF, CRF and LUF to retain experienced staffing. SL advised that LAG could buy in more resource over and above the 12-15% from grant allocation for admin and animation if needed (this could not however be to buy more local authority staffing time). The MOU which states legal agreement between LAG and SBC will ensure correct governance in place to limit risk to Lead Partner who will assume responsibility if LAG unconstituted.</p> <p><b>Membership/Recruitment</b> – SL advised of position re: decision making at moment. The LAG can recruit new members at moment as long as no expenditure is undertaken. SBC no issue with this as only concerned with grant offer requirements. HB/JH would like to promote the possibility of the new CLLD fund widely now. It was felt that as long as it was stated that an application for this fund had been submitted and was awaiting decision there is no reason why this cannot be promoted. This could tie in with joint promotion with LEADER Legacy document and invite applications to join LAG. GW/SL to meet with AD (Communications) to discuss options.</p> <p><b>Role and Responsibilities/Activities</b> SL fed in that Group Protocol is still in development stages. MOU is complete and has been submitted to SBC Legal who has since come back with comments (mainly to ensure MOU ties in with offers of grant from SG). Group Protocol will be circulated around members for comment soon. GW asked LAG members to come up with a suitable name for the new fund. ‘Borders Local Development Fund’ was put forward by HB.</p> <p><b>LAG Projects</b> The CLLD Fund offers the LAG the opportunity to commission projects of its own. GW asked LAG members to put forward ideas for appropriate projects and will send around a scoping paper to determine suitable interventions.</p>	<p>GW/SL</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>GW</p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p><b>Discussion on CLLD Bid</b></p> <p><b>Timescales</b> – Clarification is required on when Youth LAG monies will be determined as spent (ie. once Youth LAG set up and money dedicated to grants paid over, or does any grants allocated by the Youth LAG need to be spend by end March 2023). SL will clarify this with SG.</p> <p><b>Youth LAG Update</b> - Many agencies across the Borders are very supportive of the set up of a Youth LAG to provide a voice and assist with delivery of other youth funding. There is no such group exists in the Borders at the moment. LF suggested that as well as providing small pots of money for youth groups the Youth LAG could commission a project of its own which could develop into larger SFP project funding. GW felt more thought was required in respect of the Youth LAG and would circulate an Option Paper.</p>	<p>SL</p> <p>GW</p>

	<b>Main Grant Scheme Update -</b> To be discussed at later date	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>AoB</b> N/A	
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Next Meeting</b> SS will share the SPF presentation slides with SL for onward circulation to the LAG.  SL to create a doodle poll for next meeting which should take place after SG has made a decision on CLLD funding.	SS/SL  SL