

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Question 1 – Are there other areas you think the Partnership Agreement should address?

The Partnership Agreement should include Third Sector involvement at all levels of the delivery and management of the European and Structural Funds programmes. We would like to see the Partnership Agreement clearly indicating how the desired co-ordination between the three Scottish Funds would be operate as the diagram presented seemed still very much 'silo-based'. Also how will this programme work with other EU funding programmes such as the SRDP.

Question 2 – Do you think these thematic objectives will best address Scotland's short-term and long-term challenges?

We would like to make sure the thematic objectives are flexible enough to respond to changing demands as well as reflect regional and local differences.

Question 3 – Do you think there are any other thematic objectives which should be addressed?

We think Tourism should be a thematic objective. It is particularly relevant for Scotland and third sector input especially in through cultural community activity, traditional arts and heritage areas.

Question 4 – Do you think the Scottish Themed Funds will address Scotland's key challenges?

Why does it appear to be only 'hard to reach' - what about also those who are near such tipping points of near crisis - to take account of the Scottish Government's 'Preventative Spend' approach?

Question 5 – How do you think the governance and delivery arrangements will impact on your sector?

We need to be inclusive in our approach to the funding not led by a system. Ensuring the Third Sector is involved in the strategic management of the programmes will help link them to suitable delivery organisations especially as decisions taken at this level will impact on who can participate in the programmes and therefore the quality of outcome and benefit to communities in need. We would not like to see a gap between between funding sources and key issues.

The current proposal of no challenge funds is worrying as we don't know what is going to happen in the next 6 years so it would be good to have some funding available for new possibilities such as in digital innovations. Also moving purely to a procurement process with no 'grants' may end up excluding less well-resourced Third Sector organisations compared with commercial operators. Subcontracting third sector organisations can be seen as being inherently contrary to any ethos of partnership and local responsiveness, especially as CPPs do not uniformly involve the third sector in their decision making processes yet.

We would like to make sure that when communities are referred to, they can also be 'communities of interest' not just based on a geographical area.

Question 6 – How do you think the governance and delivery arrangements will impact on your organisation?

We would like to see the opportunity to allow national organisations to be able to bid to deliver at local level (particularly in partnership with local groups/networks) as well as local led/specific project delivery.

Question 7 – Are there any unidentified governance or delivery arrangements that could aid simplification of the future programmes and ensure that the Structural Funds complement each other?

The introduction of a Grants Programme and wider availability of 'Technical Advice' funding would help more organisations - particularly at local level - be involved delivering the relevant outcomes and adding value. Plus upfront, rather than post activity payments, would help the third sector greatly in delivery arrangements.

Question 8 – What other delivery options do you think would be feasible for delivering youth employment initiatives?

The consortia approach as brought together by SCVO, is a successful model that could be used - though allowing for part-time and longer term options can be a helpful way for organisations to give work experience that better suits their ability to supervise and support young people.

Question 9 – What other measures could be taken to reduce the audit and control pressures?

Onerous audit procedures put organisations off from taking part in such programmes. Application, monitoring and audit processes need to be designed with the user in mind and support in place to help those who may be entering this particular funding environment for the first time (such as 'technical advice' services).

Question 10 – Do you have any further comments on the proposals?

- Recognition of the role of arts and crafts groups/activity in bringing community together, promoting greater resilience, building confidence, self-esteem, restore health in looking at delivery options/routes.
- When considering the relevant unit costs for this funding, can these take account of other factors such as rurality and difficulty of access for participants?
- Reference to training has assumed Higher or Further Education institutions can provide this. There needs to be recognition and allowance for the skills and experience opportunities created through voluntary sector groups.
- We still don't understand why the Third Sector is not named as potentially being a lead partner? It brings the wealth of skills, local knowledge, social capital and often other funding to the table.
- How can the Third Sector be involved in the designing of future funding consultations as opposed to being seen as a recipient only?