

# Minutes

## First Meeting

### Gargunnock Windfarm Fund Panel

**22<sup>nd</sup> June 2017, 8pm, Gargunnock Community Centre**

Present:

Chair - Geoff Peart

Panel Members - Julie Cole, Kirsty Baird, Mark Evans, Stuart Ogg,

Administrator - Carol MacGregor

Apologies: Carolyn Rivers & Kimberley Hay

#### Appointment of Chairperson

Geoff Peart voted as Chair for year 1.

Official name decided as Gargunnock Windfarm Fund Panel as there are so many other 'Committees' in the village. Going forward these members will be referred to as the 'Panel'.

#### Administrative Services

**Terms of Reference** required for the group – these terms are detailed in a separate document.

Currently there is no independent person's role, this will potentially be required.

Logos etc required to be used from KWEL (Kings Wind Energy Ltd) (Foundation Scotland. Artwork still to be supplied.

#### Allocation of Funding

Full criteria discussed is laid out in the separate **Funding Guidelines** document. Elements covered at the Panel meeting include:

Fund requests will be assessed when applications have been received following a public request for applications. This will be sought once the Terms of Reference and Funding Guidelines have been set out. Ideally looking towards the end of August/early September 2017 to have these in place.

Funds received April of each year. Year 1 already received. Suggested that this 1<sup>st</sup> year's money be used as an endowment deposit to ensure there is a fund beyond the 25 years. Agreed that this would have to be taken to the community as a whole to decide upon.

Panel went through what is within the remit of the fund and regulations that must be adhered to, ensuring transparency and fairness.

Due diligence for each application discussed. How to ensure money has not been applied for fraudulently whether intentional or not. Need to make sure operating with transparency without being bureaucratic. Options are to recoup and/or ban further applications? Are there other Funds that have been set up that could be looked at? Panel to look at other Funds such as Falkirk Environment Trust to see what their policy is.

Laid out the list of types of subject matters/criteria/projects that could be considered to grant/fund application. Match funding, partnership working, utilising local suppliers. Nothing that should be the responsibility of the local authority.

### Fund Mechanisms

Should match funding come first or the grant?

Who can apply? - Applicant must be based within the Gargunock Community Council area or provide benefits to the Gargunock area.

-The project must be consistent with one or more of the fund outcomes.

-applicants for major grants should be a constitutive body and a charity/not for profit organisation and 'other' for smaller amounts. Don't need to be registered charity however. For larger grants over £500 company accounts required or demonstrate their financial stability. For smaller grants for less than £500 can just accept receipts or evidence that the money has been spent and or pictures which could be used on the website/text that could be used within The Bugle.

-any unspent monies should be returned and a deadline given by when the money should be spent.

-insert restriction that only one application per organisation per year

Could use a points system for the assessment of applications. If there is a restriction in the funds then choices will have to be made. For instance, if the Wind Fund monies will aid the group to get extra/match funding from elsewhere.

Concern raised that the Fund may be used to replace fundraising projects that already occur in the village. Proposed that should include innovation/new project as a criteria. Don't want the funding to create a well-funded community which doesn't get together as a community.

Use the criteria from Foundation Scotland and then the following when considering applications:

1/Match Funding

2/Support local business (as long as still value for money) – 3 quotes must be sought

3/Promote capacity building

4/Provide new/additional/innovative service

Ideally looking at having a good balance of larger and smaller grant applications, however not to specify how to manage the balance.

Proposed 3 categories of applications. 1/ small applications £500 under, 2/ large applications up to £5000 and 3/major applications up to £20k

For any major application a meeting with the applicant and panel would be required and the panel have private discussions.

**All panel members must remain neutral as many members will be representatives/members of other groups. All decisions will be made against the criteria and if an application is turned down then it is because it has not satisfied the criteria.**

**Not every application can be funded even if it meets the criteria if the fund is oversubscribed.**

**Put forward that in April each year applications are considered on a first come first served. Each application considered and where there are not enough funds for all it would be decided upon the projects that most fit the criteria for those applications received within the deadline.**

Fund Panel meetings should be private or public? Allow applicants to come and state their case and then decision made with just a meeting of the panel members. Perhaps every year have an open meeting/evening where the project recipients can talk about what they have done/achieved etc.

The Panel is open to having a young person/teenager on the panel to represent the youth of Gargunnock.

Proposed there be a minimum of a quorum of 5. If a Panel member is going to directly benefit then they should be excluded from voting? Should we have a larger committee or a smaller quorum? If situation of deadlock then refuse application or have an independent chair? Need a strict rule to avoid conflicts of interest. Decision making process need to be clear, fair and open and adhere to strict guidelines.

#### Administrator Fees

Trust Application from Douglas Johnston. 5% of the fund can be allocated to administration costs.

Put forward that the 5% was not mentioned in the open meeting.

Foundation Scotland would only fund the 10% required to be paid to lawyers/administrators of the Fund if all 6 communities used Foundation Scotland to be involved in the decision-making process. Cambusbarron and Kippen have already said no to this model so this consideration is not available.

Panel agree that paid for administrative support is a requirement. For jobs such as a database management, chasing information etc.

Panel not comfortable with the idea of taking the whole 5% for administrative funds as this would leave no contingency. Perhaps it should be treated as part of an application process the same as other applications. Also at this stage it is difficult to evaluate how much time the administrative tasks will take across the year.

Suggested that 5 days funded initially in order to get to first round of applications and then review. Agreement to allocate £550 for 41 hours and review.

Trust to supply a separate application for additional administrative costs linked to the Trust, the Community Centre and the Bugle that were previously carried out on a voluntary basis so it could be tested against the criteria. Panel concerned that these decisions should be made with full transparency.

Next proposed meeting – August Monday 21<sup>st</sup> or Thurs 24<sup>th</sup> at 7.30pm or 8pm tbc

Purpose of August meeting - Agreement of all the documentation so can look towards accepting applications.