

# Greensand Ridge Local Action Group Steering Group

## Minutes of Meeting 27<sup>th</sup> February 2009

### Members Present

David Morgan (DM)	Beds & Cambs Rural Support Group, Chair
Leanne Bacon (LB)	Gamlingay PC
Bridget Smith (BS)	Forward Gamlingay
Diane Budd (DB)	Business Link
Gill Welham (GW)	Greensand Trust
Mark Smith (MS)	North & Mid Beds CVS
Jon Boswell (BRCC)	BRCC (Accountable Body)
Richard James (RJ)	Haynes PC

### Delivery Team Present

Joel Carre (JC)	BRCC (Programme Director)
Cliff Andrews (CA)	BRCC (Programme Manager)

### In Attendance

Sara Hind (SRH)	EEDA
-----------------	------

Ref	Notes	Action Lead
<b>1. Apologies</b>		
1.1	None Received	
1.2	Mick Dobson will be written to enquire whether, given his lack of attendance of past three meetings, he wishes to retain his membership of the LAG Steering Group.	<b>CA, DM</b>
<b>2. Register conflicts of interest</b>		
2.1	Members of the Steering Group were asked if there were any new conflicts of interest to add to the register: -Mark Smith stated that both Ampthill Town Council for who he is a Councillor had submitted a Project Idea; and that Mid Beds DC for who is also a Councillor were a lead partner in a Project Idea submission, although he has no knowledge/ involvement in the application.	
2.2	Leanne Bacon and Diane Budd were asked to submit their Personal Profiles to Joel in the very near future.	<b>LB, DB</b>
<b>3. Minutes of last meeting (23 Jan 2009)</b>		
3.1	The following corrections to the minutes were identified: 2.1 - Gamlingay Parish Council, not Forward Gamlingay, had submitted a Project Idea 2.1 – Jon Balaam, rather than Gill Welham had submitted a Project Idea on behalf of the Greensand Trust 5.2 – <i>Typographic correction</i> , EEDA, rather than EDA	

	5.5 – <i>For Clarification, additional wording added to read:</i> SH explained that a LA can apply for funding as a lead partner if they are not the final beneficiaries of the investment (example: not eligible for capital funding to enhance a built facility, but eligible for providing a subsidised training programme <i>to eligible beneficiaries</i> ) 5.14 – <i>Typographic correction, Redborne, rather than Redbourne</i>	
3.2	4.3 – Many of the Facilitator's have received EEDA training on State Aid. A summary of this training will be presented to the LAG meeting on 6 <sup>th</sup> March.	
3.3	5.8 – Action to be carried forward. JC to contact Gill Eden re compilation of a list of other funding sources, for use by facilitators when meeting applicants.	JC
3.4	5.28 – The revised Project Idea form is available on the LAG website and is now being used by applicants.	
<b>4. Accountable Body update</b>		
4.1	JC presented the previously circulated RAG (Red, Amber, Green) update, highlighting particular elements.	
4.2	The production of a Communication Plan has slipped due to capacity issues, but will be drafted by March 13 <sup>th</sup> for agreement by Steering Group on March 20 <sup>th</sup> . SRH to provide JC with example communication plan and suggested headings.	JC SRH
4.3	The promotional leaflet has been signed off and sent to print. JC to enquire whether leaflets can be available for the LAG Meeting on March 6 <sup>th</sup> .	JC
4.4	A promotional letter and prospectus will be sent to Town & Parish Councils in the near future.	JC
4.5	The contract with the Greensand Trust for delivering project facilitation is not yet in place. Greensand Trust staff have commenced facilitating projects and getting the contract in place is a priority for JC	JC
4.6	All projects have now been assigned a facilitator. Most projects have been visited or contacted by their facilitator. Facilitators have received some EEDA training (3.2), but are still needing further information/training. JC requested that SRH attend a Delivery Team meeting to provide further information and answer facilitator's queries.	SRH
4.7	The LAG Partnership Agreement has been endorsed by EEDA and will now be signed by the LAG Chair and the BRCC CEO.	
<b>5. LDS Delivery Plan, 2009-2011</b>		
5.1	JC presented his previously circulated notes of the EEDA Review Meeting he attended on February 12 <sup>th</sup> .	
5.2	Ref Point 3. It was agreed that a Code of Practice procedure needs to be agreed for decision making in	

	<p>relation to Project applications. The decisions of the LAG and the LAG Steering Group need to be transparent and auditable.</p> <p>Steering Group members who have submitted a project application will be asked to leave the room when their application is being discussed.</p> <p>Steering Group members who have submitted a project application will be able to partake in discussions about other project applications, but any substantive comments will be recorded and attributed to them.</p> <p>All members of the Steering Group must feel able and happy to defend the decisions of the group.</p> <p>SRH suggested that 'casting vote' on decisions re project applications should not be an issue as decisions should be unanimous, or at least a clear majority. If the group is evenly split on a decision it shows that there are sufficient concerns to need to defer a decision until further information/ amendments to the application are made.</p>	
5.3	<p>A discussion was held as to whether additional conflicts of interest should be registered.</p> <p>DB stated that her work involved her promoting the LAG funding opportunity to clients; and GW and JB stated that colleagues within their organisations, although not directly themselves, are facilitators, assisting project applicants. It was agreed that for each of these 3 cases there was no perceived conflict of interest; but that this should be reviewed as part of the registering conflicts of interest standing agenda item at each meeting.</p> <p>Any conflicts of interest registered will be extracted from that meeting's minutes and used to update the Conflicts of Interest Register.</p> <p>It was agreed a clear division of duties/roles was needed among staff from the Greensand Trust and BRCC in relation to their involvement with the LAG/ LDS.</p>	
5.4	<p>It was raised, discussed and confirmed that applicants do not have a right of appeal against a decision not to grant approval for their application.</p>	
5.5	<p>A point of terminology was raised for clarification: A project 'Sponsor' is the Facilitator. The person/ group submitting an application is the 'Applicant'.</p>	

5.6	Ref Point 5 – Clarification was given that small-scale projects can be funded, as long as they deliver high quality/ high value/ high impact outcomes. However, given the high level of time input required in developing and delivering projects, by both the applicant and the LAG/ delivery team, it was felt that applications would generally not be for less than £20-30k RDPE funding.	
5.7	<p>Ref Point 6 – EEDA would like to see a more strategic led approach to the geographic spread of funding allocations, especially in relation to ‘swiss army knife centres’. Only limited funds are available, so we need to be sure they are spent in the right place.</p> <p>SRH summarised that as a LAG, through the Delivery Plan, we know how much we want to spend and on what we want to spend it; but need to think more strategically where, and by who, we want to spend it.</p> <p>JC proposed to follow the example of the Fens Adventure LAG by running a series of thematic workshops, with representation from both professional experts and potential applicants. The workshops could have a combined aim of gathering evidence for and agreeing a strategic framework; and prompting/ developing ideas for project applications. The workshops may lead to the creating of on-going thematic partnerships groups.</p> <p>JC to progress the organisation of the workshops; bringing together ‘theme leaders’ for briefing meetings and assistance with developing the workshop programmes. Other Delivery Team members will be able to assist the planning and delivery of the workshops.</p> <p>MS offered to enquire whether the Council Chamber at Chicksands could be used as a venue for the workshops.</p>	<p><b>JC</b></p> <p><b>MS</b></p>
5.8	The LDS budget profile can be amended over time to reflect under/ over-spend within the total allocations per measure.	
<b>6. LAG Agenda Items</b>		
6.1	<p>The Steering Group requested that the minutes of this meeting be available to them ahead of the LAG meeting on March 6<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>DM to provide a summary of the meeting for the LAG meeting on March 6<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>Once Steering Group meeting minutes have been</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p> <p><b>DM</b></p>

	agreed and signed at the following meeting, they will be posted on the LAG website.	
6.2	Proposed agenda items in addition to the standing agenda items: -Communications Plan -Thematic Workshops -Summary of training on State Aid training -Possible Equal Opportunities training -Discussion on making LAG meetings more interactive	
6.3	A report on progress made by facilitators with their allocated projects will be given at the March 20 <sup>th</sup> Steering Group meeting.	
<b>7. Any Other Business</b>		
7.1	2 new Project Ideas have been submitted: -Amphill TC for a heritage based project at Amphill Park. -A private company for a willow/ woodland products project.	
7.2	SRH informed the group of a press release announcing the launch of LandSkills East regional training programme. Projects applying for Greensand Ridge RDPE funds for training could be re-directed to apply to LandSkills East; releasing currently allocated training funds to other measures. ( <a href="http://www.landskillseast.co.uk">www.landskillseast.co.uk</a> )	
<b>9. Date of Next Meeting</b>		
	20 <sup>th</sup> March, 2009, 9.45am at BRCC Community Room, Cardington.	

Cliff Andrews  
Greensand Leader Programme Manager  
January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009