

**NEW CLLD FUND**  
**Local Action Group meeting**  
 20 June 2022  
 (10.30am – Microsoft Teams)

**NOTE OF MEETING**

**Present:**

Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) – Voluntary - Chair  
 Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) – Voluntary  
 Jules Horne (JH) - Private  
 Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) - Voluntary  
 Lesley Forsyth, Scottish Borders Council (LF) – Public

**Not in Attendance:**

Gordon Harrison, Scottish Borders Community Council Network (GH) - Voluntary  
 Annabelle Scott, Messrs A A Scott (AS) - Private  
 Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) – Private

**Secretariat:**

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

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<p>GW welcomed everyone to meeting to discuss the proposed new CLLD Fund being set up by Scottish Government.</p> <p>SL confirmed that 5 members were present (quorate), one member represented the public sector (&lt;50%)</p> <p><i>(Meeting could only last an hour as LF, JH, LiC required to leave for meetings at 11.30am).</i></p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p>GW suggested the brief Agenda for the meeting was:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAG Membership – Transition</li> <li>• Lead Partner</li> <li>• CLLD Offer of Grant</li> <li>• LAG Future - Post 22/23</li> </ul> <p>GW then asked SL to provide brief overview of SG requirements for new Fund. SL advised that the new CLLD funding for 22/23 was geared towards support to increase LAG capacity and/or provide project grants for 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</p>	

	<p>organisations, local businesses, community organisations and it was up to the LAG to determine the rules for the CLLD funding. It was also up to the LAG to determine who it wished to act for them as Lead Partner.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>LAG Membership - Transition</b></p> <p>HB asked for confirmation as to who were in fact still on the LAG and actively taking part in LAG discussions/meetings. HB advised that there are currently 9 members, however IMcD (NFU) has never actively took part in meetings for a considerable time due to work commitments and Sam Smith who attended the last meeting as the new Chief Officer – Economic Development is not an actual LAG member. It was agreed it was important to ascertain which of the current members wished to continue in their LAG role and which wished to stand down before any refreshment/recruitment of new members commenced.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Lead Partner</b></p> <p>HB and JH proposed that SBC be asked to act as Lead Partner as, given the very short timescale for delivery granted by SG to deliver the new fund, there would be no time to recruit another body and the supporting staff required to assist with administration/finances. It would also not be ethical to use the full grant awarded purely to build LAG capacity and preference was to run a grant scheme along with building LAG capacity for the future. The new role of SBC however require to be agreed by the new Chief Officer – Economic Development and support staff agreed from previous LEADER Team personnel. SBC would also take on animation role as well as administration.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<p><b>CLLD – Offer of Grant</b></p> <p>There was concern the deadline for the submission of the Vision Plan was 1<sup>st</sup> July 2022. SL confirmed that at the last Staff Group Meeting SRN had intimated that the final deadline for submission of this would be mid August. It would take SG 2 weeks from submission of a Vision Plan to come back to LAGs with a decision so it was best LAGs submitted these as soon as possible in order to minimise time delay. The amendment to the deadline is due to some LAGs being unable to provide documentation within that timescale as allocations are varying considerably across areas. Template provided by SG contains 10 questions and replaces need for a full Business Plan.</p> <p>HB suggested some of the questions dealing with process should be kept close to original process for LEADER, stripping out any non-essential requirements as this would cut down on time-wasting to set up new processes.</p> <p>It was felt that there was enough evidence of community consultation from other aspects of community engagement both through SBC and Third Section agencies to populate the plan. GW suggested outreach as another method of attracting new LAG members as well as the usual press and community networks and it would be worthwhile getting recruitment underway now. SL</p>	

	<p>advised that an offer of grant from SG should be signed off before progressing with recruitment. SL advised that SG had been in touch with him to offer a pre-discussion of LAG ideas on 28<sup>th</sup> June. Any ideas could be put to SG on that date to determine acceptability. HB queried the ability to form sub-groups and was keen for a Youth LAG to be set up in Scottish Borders. SL advised this has already been carried out by Cairngorms LAG as part of RCTC testing and was favourably received by SG. HB asked SL to circulate any information relating to the project. There was confusion on guidance requirement for 50/50 gender split in LAG recruitment. It was confirmed that SG/SRN has relaxed this requirement to “note that it is a minimum requirement that <b>you aim to achieve greater gender diversity within your LAG this year</b>”, in line with the updated text in the Community Led Vision Guidance document.</p> <p>JH questioned whether rural entrepreneurship would still carry on, SL highlighted the SG priorities with emphasis on the 3 main priorities of Rural Poverty, Net Zero, Covid Recovery which would support a large section of projects including entrepreneurship but confirmed LEADER very much a thing of the past and new CLLD approach moving forward.</p> <p>It was identified that 2 pieces of works needed to be undertaken quickly to complete Vision Plan:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAG Vision going forward</li> <li>• LAG recruitment to meet equality requirements</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that a Youth LAG should have their own grant scheme to take forward youth initiatives in the Borders.</p> <p>GW suggested a LAG Youth Engagement document should be drafted up and circulated for comment. Suggested SL assist with this. SL checking with SBC commitment and requirement of staffing.</p> <p>HB suggested Template is circulated around existing members to enable all to add bullet point comments which can be embellished to form plan and identified specific outcomes for Scottish Borders CLLD Fund. There are a wealth of projects in Borders which could fit the 3 main priorities. Asked SL for confirmation of funding split (£415k for projects, £73k for admin/administration). It was agreed there was no time for big projects, especially capital projects as all projects required to be delivered ideally by end February 2023 to allow time for evaluation (max £45/£50k manageable). Relevant caps should be identified as part of LAG fund guidance.</p> <p>GW suggested systems for processing need to be identified and HLS process tested as part of RCTC could be used for this to save time. GW/SL have undertaken numerous presentations in regard to HLS process which has proved very successful and there is interest nationally and abroad. HB asked</p>	SL
--	---	----

	<p>in LAG members could attend one of these or presentation be made available. JH requested sight of the RCTC evaluation carried out by SG. SL to circulate.</p> <p>GW re-capped actions from the meeting:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft up Vision Plan – GW plus Support Officer identified by SBC</li> <li>2. Draft up Youth LAG Engagement Document –</li> <li>3. Obtain Confirmation from SBC agreeable to be Lead –</li> <li>4. Determine application processes (take from LEADER where possible and streamline as appropriate)</li> </ol> <p><i>LiC left the meeting at 11.30am, LF left the meeting at 11:33am, LiC left the meeting at 11.37am</i></p>	SL
6.0	<b>LAG Future – Post 22/23</b>	
	Meeting ended at 11.45am	