

Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership
DRAFT Funding Panel
6pm, Wednesday 19th January 2011
South West Neighbourhood Office

In Attendance

Mrs Judith Wightman	(Chair) Ratho and District Community Council
Mr Steuart Campbell	Longstone Community Council
Mrs Heather Levy	Firrhill Community Council
Mr Norman Tinlin	Fairmilehead Community Council
Mr Ken Shade	Balerno Community Council
Mr Peter Gray	Colinton Amenity Association
Cllr Ricky Henderson	Pentland Hills Ward
Ms Nancy Henderson	Children & Families
Ms Margaret Babier	Corporate Services
Mr Noel Cochrane	Scottish Storytelling Centre
Mr James Spence	Scottish Storytelling Centre
Ms Christine Doherty	CEC
Mr Scott Neill	CEC

Apologies

Cllr Ron Cairns	Pentland Hills Ward
Mrs Helen Ogg	Juniper Green Community Council
Kate Kasprowicz	EVOG

<p>1. Welcome & Apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the group to the first meeting after the Festive break.</p> <p>Special welcome was made to Nancy Henderson & Margaret Babier representing the lead departments (Children & Families, Corporate Services) responsible for the transition of the Fairer Scotland Funding from its current administrative arrangements to move the allocations and monitoring processes to the three lead departments of the Council, City Development, Children and Families and Corporate Services.</p> <p>Also greeted by the chair and members were the representatives from the Scottish Storytelling Centre, James Spence & Noel Cochrane.</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of previous meeting/matters arising</p> <p>Members in general noted that application NP7/11/09 from Currie and Balerno round Table had not as yet delivered an end of project report. KS confirmed that the buggy was being used in the area including Balerno. Chair requested the PDO chase up this outstanding report for the next meeting of the FP.</p> <p>PG noted that the wording of section 2 relating to the CAA application for signage should clearly state that the original signs for Colinton were provided by the local Church and not CAA itself.</p>	<p>SN</p> <p>SN</p>

<p>3. Community Grant Applications</p> <p>The Chair invited the Scottish Storytelling Centre representatives to present their application. Members of the panel had been furnished with copies of said application.</p> <p>JS gave a brief history of the organisation and its purpose. NC highlighted the type of service the centre offers to elderly people in the neighbourhood and provided a story as an example.</p> <p>Other areas of the application covered were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project based operation • Designed to stimulate elderly people • Community wide remit • Must be interactive with not only elderly people but encourage carers and staff <p>The following applications were discussed and the decision of the panel was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To award The Scottish Storytelling Centre £4,530 to provide 50 storytelling & supported reminiscence activities to older people living in the Pentland Partnership Area. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FP Members wished to know the venues around the PNP the SSC would visit in the proposed programme and requested that these be spread throughout the NP area 2. FP Members being allowed to visit storytelling sessions. <p>The following notes of Non Financial interest were provided as follows:</p> <p>Norman Tinlin – Tryst Patchwork Group Peter Gray - Tryst Patchwork Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To award Tryst Patchwork Group £750 to stage one evening and two day quilt exhibitions & shows. 	
<p>4. Fairer Scotland Funding – Update</p> <p>CD set the scene for this piece of business for the FP members and introduced Nancy Henderson from Children & Families Department and Margaret Babier from Corporate Services.</p> <p>NH informed the members that the discussion would cover 4 issues in relation to the transition details of the FSF funding transferring to Councils.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial Position 2. Progress to date 3. Moving Forward 4. General issues 	

Over the last few months the three lead departments have come together to look at the FSF information provided by monitoring forms reports and information from NP's. Spend in year 3 has been much higher than the normal annual allocation and spend as a result of accumulated funds, allocation process and procurement issues. .

Currently the 3 lead departments feel that once discussions are concluded with the Scottish Government there will likely be a proposed cut in the FSF budget to Edinburgh of approximately 8% - 12%, this will not be confirmed until the Scottish Government confirms the City allocation and the Council confirms its budget early in February. Currently talks are progressing with the Government and a decision should be imminent.

MB wanted the members to be aware that the employability strand of this fund may be further affected and funding in future from the government for this strand of work could be reduced. This could affect the overall FSF allocation process. Once this position is clarified further discussions would be needed with NP's.

MB asked members to note the appendices in the report tabled especially appendices 2, 3 & 4 which set out the criteria the lead department will use. Lead departments have looked at all the information and determined under which of the three FSF priority work streams current projects under particular streams of work would best fit. This was detailed in the committee report in December.

CD raised the matter of some PNP projects cross over strands of work and gave an example. CD asked how the lead departments proposed to review projects before dividing them up and to ensure that projects that clearly demonstrated cross cutting strands of work would be considered by the other departments as joint activity under more than one stream of work.

MB stated that the example provided was not picked up ?and that further review would have to take place to ensure this did not affect any other projects. Funding streams would be looked at for 12/13 in more detail.

NT questioned the influence the NP's would have once they stepped away? Both officials stated that the Council had made its decision and the lead department chosen to carryout this work. This said both believed that the dialogue being set with NP's will be lasting and good relationships created and maintained.

MB reported that local needs will be balanced with priorities bearing in mind the range of funders that could assist projects in the future. Certainly the production of local statistical information and analysis has been invaluable and will assist local projects offering specific key services to secure other types of funding.

Cllr H stated that he was encouraged by initial engagement with NP's and hoped of a consistent of approach across the City. Arrangements are slow in putting key elements in place, but this needs to be clear and the process and routes for NPs to have dialogue with the three leads departments

<p>needs to be visible with the structure being clear.</p> <p>Concern was raised with the term disinvestment, this potential loss of funding for critical project work. The concern is if this budget comes to an end locally how will the partnership know or influence funding local services and it will not be absorbed by the lead departments across other areas?</p> <p>MB responded by stressing that potentially under the developing commissioning process there is a bigger pot of funding available. Each NP has specific needs that are particular to them. Certainly some local projects may lose out but others could gain.</p> <p>Officials discussed the tables in the report under the headings of the appendices with the FP members. General discussion took place and the following concerns were noted;</p> <p>HL – issue for PNP not having initial infrastructure in place which other NPs have benefited. This means baselines still need to be set and unable to see if a project has yet been successful.</p> <p>To properly analyse local statistical information the NP needs local input</p> <p>KS wanted to know how reductions will be managed?</p> <p>MB stated that some funding will come from central funding, however currently the 3 lead departments are not in a position to confidently advise. A number of NP's have invested in Early Intervention work. In addition many projects certainly in the PNP are in their early stages and relevant baseline data has not been available to give direction. In many cases this essential data becomes available near the end of a project's life not at an early stage.</p> <p>Members felt that a number of PNP projects were indeed imbedded in the City wide strategy which should offer some consideration as they are already delivering work towards achieving city objectives.</p> <p>NH confirmed that the 3 lead Dept will go out to projects to find out more information such as targets, stats, outcomes and how they meet the NP perspectives for the longer term transition phase.</p> <p>The Chair asked the lead departments could provide feedback to the FP by the next meeting due on 30/3/11, however officials felt that would be too tight a timescale at this point. The lead departments will keep the NP aware of any developments through the P&I Team.</p> <p>A report is currently being prepared for council to make recommendations on FSF, the transition arrangements and proposed allocation. It will be ready and be presented to council on 10/2/11, members can view or obtain a copy through CPOL when it is available.</p>	
<p>5. AOCB</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members approved applicants coming to the FP meeting to deliver presentations and to take members questions. • Possible method to be used for groups presenting end of projects reports. • Members were informed that the Funding Report will be altered for the next PNP meeting to include decisions made at this FP meeting. New version will be distributed prior to the public meeting on 25/1/11 	SN
<p>6. Date of next meeting</p> <p>The next funding panel meeting was agreed as Wednesday the 30th of March 2011 at 6pm.</p>	