

**Minutes of CALLP Scheme Delivery Committee Meeting**

**Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2020, 1-3pm, Spectrum Centre, Inverness**

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p><b>1</b></p> | <p><b>Welcome, introductions &amp; apologies</b></p> <p><i><b>Present</b></i><br/> Ann Marie Firth-Bernard (AMFB) – CCDC, Local Development Officer<br/> Fiona Saywell (FS) - CCWT Project Officer (part time), CALLP Education Manager (job share)<br/> Gordon Sleight (GS) – Historic Assynt, Director<br/> James McDougall (JMD) – Woodland Trust, Senior Outreach Officer<br/> Julia Campbell (JC) – Coigach Community Development Company, Local Development Officer<br/> Lucy Graham (LG) – SWT, Head of Development<br/> Peter Lowe (PL) –Woodland Trust, Senior Outreach Advisor/Ancient Woodland Lead Scotland<br/> Peter Muir (PM) – Coigach Salmon Fisheries Limited<br/> Richard Williams (RW) – JMT, Land Operations Manager<br/> Sarah Robinson (SR) – SWT, Director of Conservation (Chair)</p> <p><i><b>In Attendance</b></i><br/> Boyd Alexander (BA) – CALLP Scheme Manager<br/> Elaine Macaskill (EM) - CALLP Woodland Manager, Woodland Trust<br/> Laura Traynor (LT) – CALLP Assistant Scheme Manager (Minutes)<br/> Meryl Carr (MC) - SNH, Operations Officer, Wester Ross and Skye</p> <p><i><b>Apologies</b></i><br/> Anne Campbell (AAC) – CALLP Sustainable Crofting &amp; Rural Projects Co-ordinator<br/> Jorine van Delft (JvD) – CCWT, Director<br/> Katrina Martin (KM) - CALLP Education Manager (job share)<br/> Lewis Macaskill (LM) – Assynt Foundation, Chair<br/> Mark Foxwell (MF) – SWT, Highlands &amp; Islands Reserves Manager<br/> Vickii Campen (VC) – CALLP Training, Events and Volunteer Co-ordinator</p> |  |
| <p><b>2</b></p> | <p><b>a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (5<sup>th</sup> November 2019)</b></p> <p>Minutes of previous meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2019 <b>agreed</b> by committee that they are a true account of the meeting, subject to the following amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct the numbering of minutes to reflect agenda items numbering.</li> <li>• Add paper references to decisions table.</li> <li>• Add that FS asked if members could vote for their own organisation’s projects.</li> <li>• Add that PM stated his disappointment as he perceived that the venison marketing survey had been watered down in the new brief.</li> </ul>  |  |

|                 |   |                      |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|
|                 | <p>LT to make amendments to 5<sup>th</sup> November 2019 minutes as stated above.</p> <p><b>Action Points from 5<sup>th</sup> November 2019 and other matters arising not covered by agenda.</b></p> <p><b>Actions points:</b> See Action Point Summary Table at end of minutes.</p> <p><b>Matters arising:</b> No matters arising</p>  | <p><b>AP1 LT</b></p> |
| <p><b>3</b></p> | <p><b>Review of Governance email consultation:</b></p> <p><b>a. SDC ToR Review</b></p> <p>BA presented paper outlining new Terms of Reference for the Scheme Delivery Committee. PM asked what this paper was based on. BA stated he used the existing SDC Terms of Reference and examples online.</p> <p>AMFB asked if two people attending from the same organisation have one vote or two. BA stated it is the organisation that has the vote rather than the number of attendees so it is one vote.</p> <p>PM queried what happens if SDC member organisations don't send a representative to meetings and if an appeal to voting results could be added in. To be considered in redraft.</p> <p>Clarity needed around the function of the CALLP Project Board and if it gets reinstated.</p> <p>SR stated that getting a document agreed now would help ensure a smooth decision making process for the remaining 20 months of the scheme.</p> <p>FS read out emailed comments from JvD regarding staff conflict of interest. JvD expressed that FS should be able to attend for CALLP and represent CCWT in her absence as they are a volunteer organisation and not always available for meetings, especially when these meetings are held far away from the project area. JvD disagreed with the conflict of interest part of the paper as most people in the project area are used to representing several community organisations in different settings and cannot be avoided. JvD suggested FS could theoretically be unpaid CALLP staff only during casting the vote for CCWT if that helped. JvD said there should be no conflict of interest in FS proxy voting or relaying the view of CCWT if JvD cannot attend. SDC agreed CALLP staff can attend in paid time and represent other member organisations during voting.</p> <p>PM queried whether there were any public funding precedents that would need to be addressed in the Terms of Reference. SR stated there were no external requirements for the SDC Terms of Reference.</p> <p>SR suggested that during the voting process SDC attendees must declare what organisation they are representing and voting on behalf of. EM highlighted a benefit of people representing multiple organisations is that they could see issues from more than one perspective.</p> |                      |

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
|                 | <p><b><u>Decision: SDC agreed revisions to Terms of Reference above. BA to redraft and bring back to the SDC for further comment by email. Once comments received and compiled final version to be sent by email to SDC for decision.</u></b></p> <p><b>b. Procedure For The Allocation Of Any Identified Underspend - Reactivate CALLP Board</b></p> <p>It was suggested that CALLP Scheme Board should ratify the updated SDC ToR once finalised.</p> <p>RW suggested keeping underspend allocations under the jurisdiction of the SDC to speed up decision making in the time remaining for the scheme. BA to add responsibility for making decisions about scheme underspend to the SDC ToR.</p> <p>PL suggested CALLP Scheme Board is consulted by email or telephone rather than calling a meeting. As the Board is comprised of the SDC plus additional member organisations, RW suggested inviting extra members to the SDC meeting instead of having a separate Board meeting.</p> <p>BA to draft Scheme Board ToR and circulate to SDC for comment. Once approved by SDC BA to circulate Scheme Board ToR to all partner organisations for decision from the board (all member organisations comprise the Scheme Board).</p> <p>LT highlighted that ToR would also be needed for the board though this could be very simple due to its limited scope.</p> <p>SR suggested using the word “majority” instead of “consensus” in reference to decision making in either ToR.</p> <p><b>c. File sharing</b></p> <p>LT explained that for future SDC meetings, papers, agendas, and minutes will be available to access online through a Microsoft Sharepoint Group rather than emailed to members as attachments. This will be particularly helpful when there are a lot of papers required at meetings as some people have reported difficulties receiving larger email attachments. An email will be sent out telling members that the files are ready to view and download in advance of the next meeting.</p> <p>LT to contact SDC members to set up access to the Sharepoint Group.</p> | <p><b>Decision 1</b></p> <p><b>AP2 BA</b></p> <p><b>AP3 LT</b></p> |
| <p><b>4</b></p> | <p><b>National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update</b></p> <p>BA stated that at the last meeting with the NLHF monitor in December, the monitor suggested using some budget from contingency for partnership development, i.e. what happens to the partnership and future projects after the current scheme finishes.</p> <p>MC asked if that post would be making funding applications. BA stated the exact remit of the post was not decided yet. LG suggested person would identify funding streams.</p> <p>PL suggested clarification on the term “legacy” in these briefs as it is often used to mean different things.</p>  |  |

|                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | <p>RW asked whether the list of suggested projects developed so far would be taken forward by this project development post. BA stated that was the intention. FS highlighted that the list was discussed at recent team meeting and was suggested to be a starting point not an exclusive list.</p> <p>SR asked what impact using this funding from our contingency would have on rest of scheme and other projects. BA to work up more detailed brief and bring back to SDC for decision.</p> <p>BA also stated that the monitor suggested increasing the budget available for the venison portion of the Sustainable Deer Management project to leave scope for further work to be carried out based on the results of the questionnaires. However as work that was due to be carried out this winter was cancelled due to not getting approval until January, there is budget available within the project. The work is unable to be rescheduled due to the close end of the shooting season.</p> <p>BA stated extra budget may be required for communications relating to the High Value Open Habitats (HVOH) project. LT suggested maybe some budget for this could come out of general scheme communications. BA to discuss HVOH communications plan and budget required with LT to see if it can come out of the general communications budget.</p> <p>Contingency requests were approved by the NLHF monitor by email for the increased Clachtoll Broch platform installation costs, increased full cost recovery charges, and the three contingencies brought up at the last SDC meeting (OWL project CPD training budget and equipment storage facility, and Clachtoll Broch experimental archaeology).</p> <p>GS stated Historic Assynt would be asking to use the contingency and expects approximately £8,000 additional match funding from Historic Environment Scotland (HES) if they approve his request. GS stated he had emailed HES several times to ask about an increase in funding and expects it to be successful based on past experiences with HES.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC agreed to approve the 60% for the Clachtoll Broch NLHF contribution.</u></b></p> <p>GS to confirm with HES additional match funding and to reassure the contractors.</p> <p>BA to email LG about contingency for the full cost recovery (FCR) figure before accepting.</p> | <p><b>AP4 BA</b></p> <p><b>AP5 BA, LT</b></p> <p><b>Decision 2</b></p> <p><b>AP6 GS</b></p> <p><b>AP7 BA, LG</b></p> |
| <p><b>5</b></p> | <p><b>Additional Projects Update</b></p> <p><b>a. Update on email request for brief approval for additional projects</b></p> <p>BA emailed a paper outlining the additional projects to the SDC. The proposal regarding Eisg Brachaidh was approved by 6 out of 8 members, 1 member asked if another project should be brought in to replace the path project which was removed following the November SDC meeting, and 1 member asked for further information about the Eisg Brachaidh proposal (paper brought to SDC on agenda, see next item).</p> <p>BA stated the 4 additional projects have been approved by the SDC by email.</p>  |  |

|                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
|                 | <p><b>b. Eisd Brachaidh update</b></p> <p>EM presented paper on Eisd Brachaidh brief proposing to fence the boundary, reduce deer numbers and monitor effect of reduction. EM highlighted the continued confidentiality of the proposals.</p> <p>FS stated JvDs comments regarding Eisd Brachaidh. These comments stated concern surrounding the potential for negative publicity for the scheme and public perception because of the impact on the grazings of the tenant and what had been discussed with the tenant. EM stated discussions have been taking place between the tenant and landowner. EM stated that the ideal solution is to take the proposal forward with the tenant involved.</p> <p>PM asked if NLHF required like to be replaced with like for new projects. LG stated NLHF were happy that the outcomes across the board were being met so was happy with the new proposals.</p> <p>PM asked if a map was available for the proposal. EM to circulate map of Eisd Brachaidh fencing proposals and add map to brief.</p> <p>PM asked what happens if full funding isn't secured. EM stated if full funding for the proposal isn't secured then the project would not be able to go ahead as it would impact on the grazings of the tenant.</p> <p>Tendering for fence will take place soon to provide more accurate costings. This does not mean the proposals are going ahead at this stage. The landowner will be discussing proposals with the tenant.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC approved ringfencing NLHF funding towards the Eisd Brachaidh proposals until May 2020.</u></b></p> <p>LG highlighted quick turnaround from NLHF key if Biodiversity Challenge Fund approved, expected to hear result in March.</p> <p>EM to update Eisd Brachaidh brief for May SDC meeting with full details of costs following tender process and whether Biodiversity Challenge Fund application approved.</p> | <p><b>AP8 EM</b></p> <p><b>Decision 3</b></p> <p><b>AP9 EM</b></p> |
| <p><b>6</b></p> | <p><b>Finances and Fundraising</b></p> <p><b>a. NLHF Finance Report</b></p> <p>Expenditure in Year 4 Quarter 1 (1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019) was £180,649, bringing the total scheme expenditure to date to £2,383,206.</p> <p><b>b. Tenders &amp; Changes</b></p> <p>i) P04 High Value Open Habitats (HVOH) – request to start</p> <p>BA presented a paper requesting permission to start for the High Value Open Habitats Project and stated that match funding was all in place.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC approved the High Value Open Habitats request to start.</u></b></p>  | <p><b>Decision 4</b></p>   |

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>ii) P21 Coigach &amp; Assynt App – request for intervention and to start BA presented paper requesting intervention for app project to start.</p> <p>LG suggested changing name of project to reflect wider scope than just the app. BA to come up with new name for Coigach &amp; Assynt App Project that is more inclusive of the additional interpretation elements included in the project.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC approves additional NLHF intervention of £24,205.60 for the Coigach &amp; Assynt App project and grants permission to start.</u></b></p>   | <p>AP10 BA</p> <p>Decision 5</p> |
| <p>iii) P20 Clachtoll Ranger Hut Budget – Update</p> <p>LT gave update on project preliminary design, budget and progress. PM gave suggestions about the design regarding display space and windows.</p> <p>iv) P26 Clachtoll Broch – reallocation of contingency</p> <p>£3,000 was approved from contingency for the Broch Liaison Officer (BLO) at the May 2019 SDC Meeting. GS stated that due to setbacks caused by the weather, less time had been used by the BLO than had been anticipated. The costs of the experimental archaeology workshops had increased due to the unavailability of local stone and stone had to be brought in from Inverkirkaig at an additional cost. GS requested permission to reallocate part of the approved contingency from the BLO to the experimental archaeology workshops.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC approves partial reallocation of contingency from BLO to experimental archaeology as required.</u></b></p> | <p>Decision 6</p>                |
| <p>v) P28 Music &amp; Tales of Coigach &amp; Assynt – tender approval composer</p> <p>AMFB stated that the tender brief for the composer was advertised locally and on the Creative Scotland website. This attracted 21 applicants who were shortlisted to 5. The shortlisted applications were assessed using a detailed score sheet. The assessment panel was comprised of 4 local musicians and reached a largely unanimous decision. As the preferred person has not been notified yet their name is being kept confidential at this time.</p> <p><b><u>Decision: SDC approves the tender process for composer for the Music &amp; Tales of Coigach &amp; Assynt project.</u></b></p>  | <p>Decision 7</p>                |
| <p>vi) <b><u>Scheme Management – Blog author</u></b></p> <p>LT stated that a brief had been written for a blog author to write blog articles to demonstrate how the CALLP scheme was achieving its outcomes. However Scottish Wildlife Trust’s Marketing &amp; Communications Manager suggested a more strategic look at how communications to the end of the scheme should be carried out. LT asked if any SDC members were interested in being part of this strategic planning to get in touch.</p> <p>EM suggested contacting the PR &amp; Communications Officer of Woodland Trust, to be involved in the discussion.</p>  |                                  |

|   |   |         |
|---|---|---------|
| 7 | <p><b>Risk Register (February 2020) – Full review</b></p> <p>Full review of Risk Register undertaken and the following changes made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Staff risk increased probability from Low to Medium due to getting closer to the end of the scheme. Added additional action to say that the work that could be carried out by the proposed partnership development post would create confidence in the likelihood of future work and therefore increase the likelihood of retaining staff to the end of the project.</li> <li>2. Local No-Partner Landowner Disapproval probability increased from low to medium. Added additional action to increase positive PR locally for projects.</li> <li>3. The capacity of Project Partners to deliver projects risk: add additional action to review all projects following quarter to end of March 2020 for May meeting. Projects to provide timelines for work to end of scheme.</li> <li>4. Change name of “Maintenance obligation post Scheme completion” risk to “Inability to comply with maintenance obligation post Scheme completion”.</li> </ol> <p>LT to update risk register with these changes.</p> | AP11 LT |
| 8 | <p><b>AOCB</b></p> <p>Digital archive paper supplied for information. Correction of storage space needed: paper should read 6 gigabytes not 6 terabytes. Suggestion to price needs based on 50 gigabytes to ensure adequate storage space.</p> <p>PM states that he was expecting responses to the tender for work on the Badentarbet Net Shed project in 3 weeks’ time. PM stated he anticipates that the cost may be more than originally set in 2014 and asked what the process is if the response exceeds the budget. SR stated PM would need to make a contingency request and that PM could ask for this to be approved by email if a quick turnaround is required.</p> <p>RW asked if peatland proposal can come back to SDC. MC stated there could be funding available from SNH for this based on a year by year basis once new financial year starts.</p> <p>MC highlighted wildfire conference in Kinlochewe on 6<sup>th</sup> March.</p>  |         |
| 9 | <p><b>Date of the next meeting(s)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 6th May 2020, SDC, Lochinver</li> <li>· 5th or 12th August 2020</li> <li>· 10th or 11th November 2020</li> </ul>   |         |