

The approach of each Area Partnership including proposals:

BERWICKSHIRE APPROACH:

At Berwickshire Area Partnership on 3 December 2020, it was agreed that a working group be convened to discuss and make recommendations. This working group met on 26 January 2021 9 February 2021 and again on 23 February. A sub-group was also established to specifically focus on the Community Fund. The working group then made a presentation to the Berwickshire Area Partnership on 4 March 2021 to discuss recommendations and make the following proposals:

- Establish a sub-committee of 10 members with full delegated powers - Berwickshire Community Fund Assessment Group (BCFAG) that will include 3 Elected Members to review the current Community Fund and develop new criteria, application form and guidance in response to local need and demand
- A single process that will include – assessment against basic eligibility criteria, scoring and assessment, consolidation of scores and then notification to applicants
- Decision to be made by the BCFAG who will subsequently report their decisions to the Berwickshire Area Partnership
- Applications processed 4 times per year
- Evaluation and monitoring of projects being awarded funding will also be monitored by the BCFAG
- Community Council, Festival and Village Hall grants should be ring-fenced for 2021/22

CHEVIOT APPROACH:

Cheviot Area Partnership met and discussed the Area Partnership and Community Fund on 25 November 2020. A working group was set up and met on 14 January 2021 to discuss and make recommendations to the Cheviot Area Partnership on 27 January 2021 and again on 18 February. The proposals from Cheviot in relation to the Community Fund were as follows:

- No change required to the criteria
- A Funding Panel (if it has the ability to make awards) to include Elected Members, Community Councils and community representation
- Voting to be expanded for when consensus not reached
- Officers to do technical checks prior to a funding panel scoring the application and making a recommendation to the Cheviot Area Partnership
- A Quality of Life Fund be established for devolving to Community Councils in regards to local priorities
- Village Hall Grants should remain core funded
- Festival Grants should continue to be ring-fenced
- Community Council Grants should remain core funded although this will be included in the Community Council Scheme Review
- Funding could be devolved to Community Councils for local priorities

EILDON APPROACH:

Eildon Area Partnership met on 12 November 2020 and the attendees were asked for comments back via the Chair. 2 further sessions with communities were held on 17th December and 22nd December 2020, and the findings presented back to the Area Partnership on 28th January 2021. The proposals from Eildon with regards to the Community Fund were as follows:

- Would be keen to explore how a funding panel might work
- Would like more involvement of Community Council representatives in the assessment process
- Encourage Community Councils to consult with their committees
- Local communities should be able to commission SBC to carry out particular work within an agreed budget – road speed signage/improvements, additional lighting/potholes
- To continue to fund Festival Grants, Community Councils and Village Halls at current levels

TEVIOT & LIDDESDALE APPROACH:

After discussion at the Teviot & Liddesdale Area Partnership on 17 November 2020, the eight Community Councils met with Elected Members and agreed a proposal which was discussed with Council officers, and feedback was provided by those officers. A presentation was then made by representatives of the Community Councils to the Teviot & Liddesdale Area Partnership on 12 January 2021 and the feedback incorporated into the final proposals. In relation to the Community Fund, the following was proposed:

- Representation from each CC (8) & elected members (6), Chair/vice voted by committee
- Spent on anything defined under OSCR' charitable purposes, not statutory items
- Must have support of the community, endorsed by the CC it represents
- Recommendations reviewed and scored by the committee
- Assessments published and open to scrutiny, no scoring = no voting.
- Papers shared in advance of meetings (website enables potential to include public voting/feedback)
- Proposals shared at Forum for wider discussion/endorsement/approval
- After ring-fenced budgets provided for (CC grants, village halls, festivals etc.)
 - SBC Fund A 50%: Community based projects decided by community allocated into 10 shares, HCC & Burnfoot = 2 shares, rest = 1
 - SBC Fund B 50%: AP catchment, bids related to place plans, reviewed by 'Admin' to assess criteria fit/relevance/benefit prior to scoring
 - Partnership Funds: determined by contributor, likely project/task specific. Ideally have flexibility to 'match fund' SBC or other funders

- Management of the community fund needs to be taken out of the day to day function of the AP but reviewed in each meeting.
- To ensure transparency and accountability it is proposed applications should be scored and assessed against the relevant criteria with scorecards published so each sponsor can see what they were awarded and know the views of the management team.
- Each scoring panel member must score/publish or their votes don't count.
- Following assessment and review, projects should be published and reviewed at the AP for wider discussion and approval.
- A web based facility to publish paperwork to support bids will engage more people across the catchment and enable wider voting, if this was felt to be appropriate for projects which impact the wider catchment.
- Panel representation proposed is from CCs and elected members with Chair and Vice roles as well as admin support.
- A panel of 14, all having a wide understanding of community need and fit and able to collectively make a recommendation for the AP to consider and approve.
- The ability to seek match funding, and working in partnership to achieve the ambition of the Area Partnership

TWEEDDALE APPROACH:

Tweeddale Area Partnership discussed the findings and recommendations of the SCDC report at a meeting on 3 November 2020. The Chair then held a number of drop in surgeries to discuss proposals and presented these on the 19 January 2021. These proposals were:

- **Criteria for funding** – Each Area Partnership should agree its own criteria for funding from the Community Fund. These should be established by contribution and discussion at an Area Partnership meeting dedicated to this process.
- **The process** – It is vital that people feel they are being involved in the assessment of each application and that the process more transparent. Consider a shortlisting process.
 - Short-listed applications should be advertised and information provided in advance of the AP meeting
 - Concern that bigger communities secure more funding than smaller ones. Need a mechanism to make sure distribution is fair.
 - Giving a proportion of what is asked for (where fund is over-subscribed for example) is not always a good solution – need to check what effect this would have on the viability of the project
- **Decision-making** – as is currently the agreed process, where there is consensus for an application it will be approved by an Area Partnership

meeting without any vote. Short-listing would help to provide consensus as would providing information in advance