



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

SCOTTISH BORDERS LEADER PROGRAMME 2014-2020

Local Action Group meeting

18 October 2016

Tweed Horizons – 10am-3pm

MINUTES

Present:

Heather Batsch, The Bridge (HB) - Voluntary
Frank Beattie, Scottish Enterprise (FB) - Public
Clare de Bolle, Youth Borders (CdB) - Private
Luke Comins, Tweed Forum (LC) - Private
Gordon Harrison, Scottish Borders Community Council Network (GH) - Voluntary
Jules Horne, Borders Creative (JH) - Private
Bryan McGrath, Scottish Borders Council (BMcG) - Public
Andrew Mitchell, Berwickshire Community Councils' Forum (AM) - Private
Jane Rosegrant, Borders Forest Trust (JR) - Private
Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) - Private
Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) - Voluntary
Douglas Wilson, VisitScotland (DW) - Public

Secretariat:

Hugh Williams, Scottish Borders Council (Principal Officer Rural) (HBW)
Fiona McDougall, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Co-ordinator) (FM)
Simon Lynch, Scottish Borders Council (LEADER Facilitator) (SL)
Nesta Todd, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (NT)
Bartje Magee, Scottish Borders Council (European Programme Support Officer) (BM)

		Action
1.0	Apologies John Dougan, Forestry Commission Scotland (JD) - Public John Henderson, Scottish Borders Food and Drink Network (JHe) - Private Ian MacDonald, NFU Scotland (IMacD) - Private	
2.0	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising: The minutes were adopted as being a true reflection of the last meeting. The following action points were followed up: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3.1 – SBO/002/192C, amended application form in line with recommendation from LAG, 'profit' changed to 'surplus'.• 3.2 – SBO/005/192C, Project was deferred and re-assessed by written procedure. This project was rejected.• 3.3 – SBO/006/192C, Project was deferred and re-assessed by written	



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

	<p>procedure. This project was approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.0 – Recruitment for new LAG members was actioned, for full report and discussion on membership and staffing, see 2.1 below. • Enterprise Facilitator role had been refined and circulated via email. It was approved by the LAG via written procedure 	
<p>2.1</p>	<p>Membership and staffing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JHe sent his apologies for this meeting and has asked to be excused for a period of 6 months, pressures of work. Members agreed to this. • Recruitment process for new LAG members was followed. A selection panel discussed three applicants, one of the applicants was excluded on the basis that he lived outside Scottish Borders LAG area. The other two were invited to join, subject to LAG approval. Members approved the proposed candidates, Annabelle Scott and Bosco Santimano. • Nesta Todd was officially introduced, she has just started working for LEADER as Project Support Officer, maternity cover for [a staff member]. 	
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Project Applications Round 02</p> <p>It was noted that 12 members were present (quorate) of which 3 members represented the public sector (<50%)</p> <p>LAG members confirmed that there was no conflict of interest in relation to any of the applications presented to the LAG at this meeting.</p>	
<p>3.1</p>	<p>[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</p> <p>(SBO/010/192C) Total Eligible Project costs: £249,724.00 LEADER grant requested: £77,193.00 (30.91%) Average Score: 59.09% Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>The project was approved by unanimous vote subject to match funding.</p> <p>Conditions: Offer is subject to ability to raise the match funding.</p>	



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

<p>3.2</p>	<p>[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</p> <p>(SBO/011/192C) Total Eligible Project costs: £35,344.70 LEADER grant requested: £21,206.82 (60%) Average Score: 62.38% Decision: DEFER</p> <p>This project was approved in principle but a request was made for [the applicant] to provide additional information regarding the savings that would be made in cash terms. This information would be sent round the LAG members for their approval.</p> <p>Conditions: Offer is subject to [the applicant] providing satisfactory electricity savings information in pounds.</p> <p>Recommendation: That there is a knowledge sharing aspect to the project, on the use of green energy, particularly for other similar groups.</p>	<p>SL/FMcD</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p>[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</p> <p>(SBO/012/192C) Total Eligible Project costs: £11,200.00 LEADER grant requested: £6,720.00 (60%) Average Score: 65.94% Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>This project was approved by a majority of 10 (1 abstained, chair has casting vote only)</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>LEADER Programme Progress Report to LAG FMcD provided the report (attached). 2.1 – Total No. of expressions of Interest received to date – 95. 2.2 - Encourage more community groups. 5.1 – HBW & BMcG looking in detail at how penalties are devolved down to local authority. 5.2 – Regained our ‘Green’ audit status.</p> <p>A LAG member brought up frustrations with the scoring system, the strategic fit criteria does not allow a good score if the project only falls within one LDS aim, no matter how good the project is. Guidance for the criteria came from Scottish Government and they were adopted at the Scoring training sessions.</p>	<p>FMcD & SL</p>



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

	<p>If in practice a criteria seems unfit for purpose, the LAG can change the scoring guidance. The LEADER team will offer a suggestion for the re-wording of the Strategic Fit criteria and send it round the LAG for their consideration.</p>	FMcD & SL
5.0	<p>Enterprise Facilitator applications HB declared a potential conflict of interest but as there were no project discussions at this stage, it was felt unnecessary.</p> <p>SL is working with several groups working on applications for an Enterprise Facilitator. He proposed to bring them forward together so LAG could assess the applications as a group. It was thought this would lead to better decision making, evaluating projects against each other. Projects will be encouraged to come forward early 2017.</p>	
6.0	<p>Project Outlines - discussion SL reported a drop in responses to his Project Outline emails and wanted to know if the LAG thought the process was fit for purpose. Outline comments from the LAG are fed back to the applicants and are much appreciated as they can enhance applications.</p> <p>Discussion took place to ensure that the LAG was happy with how the project outline documentation was circulated as it was important for the whole group and process, that there was a satisfactory response. It was pointed out that responding more often makes the process more familiar and therefore would take up less time.</p> <p>Actions: An e-mail reminder to LAG, listing responses, to be sent.</p>	SL
7.0	<p>Update from Accountable Body HBW updated on BREXIT. Projects signed off before the autumn statement are secure. Some Local Authorities are approving projects 'subject to finance being available' but SBC have adopted the policy of business as usual as the BREXIT process will not likely to be finished until 2019. Depending on the Scottish Government's reaction to the autumn statement it may be necessary to delay the offer letters after the next LAG meeting.</p> <p>Reporting calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Compliance Report – to 15 Oct • Annual report – to 31 December (calendar year) • Public meeting, involving stakeholders, to publicise annual report will take place in Spring • Re-elect Chair & vice-chair on a yearly basis, this will take place at the first meeting of each year <p>BMcG expanded on point 5.1 in the Progress Report to the LAG (see item 4),</p>	



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

	<p>detailing the system of fines that are in place for SBC as the LEADER accountable body. The current situation seems to be that fines, as high as £100,000's could be imposed. From the previous LEADER Programme, there were 4 errors and SG is to be fined £1 million.</p> <p>LAGs need clear guidance on the risks of penalties for non-compliance and assurances about proportionate audit requirements. There is a need to make sure things are absolutely perfect, so as not to leave ourselves open to fines. BMcG reassured LAG group that team are working on this and he is also discussing these points with the Accountable Bodies group.</p>	BMcG
8.0	<p>AOB Next application deadline is 30/11/16.</p>	
9.0	<p>Dates and times of future meetings</p> <p>Tuesday 24 January 2017, Tweed Horizons, 10am-3pm</p>	
10.0	<p>Business Sub-Group Present: Frank Beattie, Scottish Enterprise (FB) - Public Gordon Harrison, SB Community Council Network (GH) - Voluntary Bryan McGrath, Scottish Borders Council (BMcG) - Public Andrew Mitchell, Berwickshire Community Councils' Forum (AM) - Private Hans Waltl, Federation of Small Businesses (HW) - Private Douglas Wilson, VisitScotland (DW) - Public Gary White, Peebles CAN (GW) - Voluntary</p> <p>It was noted that 7 members were present (quorate) of which 3 members represented the public sector (<50%)</p> <p>LAG members confirmed that there was no conflict of interest in relation to any of the applications presented to the LAG at this meeting.</p>	
10.1	<p>[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</p> <p>(SBO/008/192B) Total Eligible Project costs: £37,298.98 LEADER grant requested: £18,649.49(50%) Average Score: 68.72% Decision: APPROVE</p> <p>This project was approved by unanimous vote.</p>	



Scottish Borders LEADER

Developing Enterprising Communities

12.1	<p>[Project details and LAG discussions are not published in these minutes.]</p> <p>(SBO/009/192F) Total Eligible Project costs: £248,959.00 LEADER grant requested: £50,000.00 (20.08%) Average Score: 60.77% Decision: APPROVED</p> <p>This project was approved by a majority vote, 5 in favour, 1 abstained.</p>	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>It was suggested projects would be encouraged to supply an extra year's projected cash flow, especially for relatively short building projects. This would allow the LAG to see future profitability and sustainability. It would also let them better assess the added value of the LEADER investment.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 14:05pm</p>	