

Annex A - Questions asked in previous correspondence and answers – new responses are dated 3rd March 2023

Ref date	Q No.	Question	Ref date	Answer
14 th December 2022	Q1	Can you confirm that the panel did not consider the impact of the work of Achieve More Scotland over the past three years, including our response to the pandemic and our success in establishing a comprehensive programme of activity (per our Phase 5 application), despite the Scottish Government having invested £500,000 in the organisation?	2 nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	In order for the process to be as inclusive and fair as possible, assessments were based solely on the information which applicants chose to include in their submissions, rather than external factors or established relationships. For all applicants, regardless of whether they are or are not currently part of Phase 5 of CfC, that allowed an equal opportunity to provide information about their track record, not least during the pandemic.
	Q2	Does the Safer Communities Directorate believe an investment of £500,000 awarded at the start of a global pandemic, which limited the opportunities to fully deliver on key outcomes, and subsequently withdrawn at the earliest opportunity represents a value for money investment?	2 nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	It is fully recognised that the pandemic presented enormous challenges for a huge range of organisations in achieving their prior ambitions and that, despite the exceptional efforts made by many to mitigate the impact of the pandemic, the opportunities to deliver will have been impacted. That, of course, applies to organisations regardless of whether or not they were funded through Phase 5 of CfC. Funding has not been 'withdrawn' from Achieve More Scotland. The Scottish Government entered into an agreement to provide funding throughout the three years of Phase 5 of CfC (i.e. 2020/21 - 2022/23) and that agreement is being honoured in full. There was no commitment to provide funding beyond that three-year period, either for Achieve More Scotland or for any of the other existing partners. Indeed, all applicants for Phase 5 of CfC were required, as part of their proposals, to consider and explain the level of sustainability that their work would achieve by the end of that phase and/or the exit strategy. Each 3- year grant award is time-limited, which is again made clear to partners in the Grant Offer Letter signed at the start of each phase. There is no implication that funding will necessarily continue beyond that phase.

	Q3	<p>Which of these criteria did our proposal not meet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support young people most at risk of being involved in ASB, offending or reoffending into positive destinations. - Provide person-centred support for young people, parents and families impacted by Adverse Childhood Experiences and trauma. - Support young people to improve their health, mental health and well-being. - Support people, families and communities most affected by crime. 	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	We have attached a document (Enc 1) with this response which provides detail about how your own organisation was scored by the panel of Scottish Government officials.
	Q4	Did the panel expect all applicants to meet all of these criteria within their funding bids?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	As per the published guidance, it was specified that applications would need to demonstrate that their project meets all the criteria of Phase 6 of CfC. Any application being deemed eligible and then being scored highly enough to be a contender for funding in Phase 6 of CfC will indeed have been judged to have met the criteria to a sufficient degree.
	Q5	Did all successful applicants meet all of these criteria?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	As per the published guidance, it was specified that applications would need to demonstrate that their project meets all the criteria of Phase 6 of CfC. Any application being deemed eligible and then being scored highly enough to be a contender for funding in Phase 6 of CfC will indeed have been judged to have met the criteria to a sufficient degree.
	Q6	Can you give examples of what the decision makers would describe as 'clear evidence that the project would provide person-centred support' and where we failed in this regard? Area for Development – point 1	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	<p>As outlined in the application and logic model, one of the aims of the CashBack programme is: Provide person-centred support for young people, parents and families impacted by Adverse Childhood Experiences and trauma.</p> <p>Therefore evidence was being asked for in relation to working specifically with those impacted by ACEs and trauma which may include evidence of how your services and programmes were aligned with or used trauma informed practices for example.</p>

				Further information is provided in the application guidance document which provides specific explanations to and links to key documents. There were opportunities to ask questions about the application questions during the application period, via the dedicated mailbox or in online Q&A sessions. We will take on board your feedback that further information on what evidence constitutes providing person centred support.
	Q7	Can you give examples of what would have made our response more specific to the question asked? Area for Development – point 2	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The feedback you received was: The approach came across as being broad-brush with the potential risk of not picking up on the bespoke needs of some young people accessing the project. Therefore, more information on how your approach targets specific needs and supports specific needs may be required.
	Q8	Can you advise on what further could have been stated to strengthen this response within the limits of the 200 words available per question,? Area for Development – point 3	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	As outlined in the application and logic model, one of the aims of the CashBack programme is: Provide person-centred support for young people, parents and families impacted by Adverse Childhood Experiences and trauma. There is a specific link to the Scottish Government guidance on ACES in the application guidance document. Therefore evidence was being asked for in relation to working specifically with those impacted by ACEs and trauma which may include evidence of how your services and programmes were aligned with or used trauma informed practices for example.
	Q9	On the basis of the information provided, do you and the Safer Communities team stand by the statement that: “There was limited evidence of risk identification and this raised some concerns about the status of risk management and business continuity planning and the experience and capacity of the	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	Feedback from the notes from the sift review state that Governance structure was scored as adequate. This takes on board decision making, assurance processes and delegated authority routes as well as the skills of those on different governance groups. On risk, the application guidance states that this is your opportunity to refer to your organisation’s risk register, and explain how your project is supported by any business continuity plans and wider organisational ability to adapt.

		organisation.” Area for Development – point 4		
	Q10	Can you specifically detail what the concerns were that were raised by the decision-makers with regards to risk management, experience and capacity? Area for Development – point 4	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	It also noted from the sift report that the organisation’s reliance on Cashback funding is high and the proposals for Phase 6 would increase the proportion of dependence on funding. Therefore, a robust sustainability, business continuity and exit plan was required given the Cashback funding commitment is for only a 3 year term.
	Q11	Can you confirm whether those on the decision-making panel were aware of the experience and capacity of our organisation? Area for Development – point 4	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The panel members used the information that was provided in the application form and assessment form to base their decision on.
	Q12	If risk, experience and capacity were concerns for Safer Communities or for Inspiring Scotland why were these not addressed with Achieve More Scotland during Phase 5 and why would the Scottish Government invest £500,000 in the organisation for Phase 5? Area for Development – point 4	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	In order to be fair and equitable, being part of Phase 5 was not part of the assessment decision making process for Phase 6. The panel members used the information that was provided in the application form and assessment form to base their decision on.
	Q13	What further measures would the Safer Communities Directorate and decision-making panel suggest were included that weren’t highlighted in our application? Area for Development – point 5	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The feedback you received was: There was limited reference to measuring success, which seemed entirely focused on independent evaluation of young people’s feedback rather than a wider range of measures. Other measures could include measures from the wider delivery process and those involved.
	Q14	Can you be more specific and support with examples? Area for Development – point 6	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The feedback you received was: Evidence used to support the application was not referenced substantively or specifically. Generalised statements were less convincing or compelling. The notes from the Inspiring Scotland sift report state: Outcome 1: applicant refers to sourcing Police Scotland area-specific call-out statistics for bespoke indicator(s). It is not clear that this data is available to the applicant or whether this is just an aspiration. Outcome 2: applicant refers to Erasmus+ being available to participants. This is not expanded upon and is not thought

				to be the case, given UK is not a participating country. Outcome 4: lack of specification about volunteering programme (how many will participate etc.).
	Q15	Can you explain to us why, if the panel identified this as one of the strengths of our application – information that is well-documented across multiple governmental reports – why is it identified also as an 'Area for Development'? Area for Development – point 6	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	I do not see this referenced as a strength in the feedback material.
	Q16	Can you explain to us why, if this information is commonly 'known' to the decision-makers, would we be expected to re-specify this information and, as such, waste word count? Area for Development – point 6	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	In order to maintain equity and fairness in the assessment process, panel members are asked to use the information provided rather than their own personal knowledge or experiences.
	Q17	What does this actually mean? <i>There was a general absence of detail and specific detail in a local context and limited evidence that the Place Principle had been considered appropriately.</i> Area for Development – point 7	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	There is specific guidance on the place principal and links provided in the application guidance document and was a theme of the online Q&A sessions. https://www.gov.scot/publications/place-principle-introduction/
	Q18	Can you explain what further detail the decision-making panel required in reference to the 'Place Principle' that would have enabled us to score better on this aspect? Area for Development – point 7	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	As stated in the application guidance link -The Scottish Government and COSLA have agreed to adopt the Place Principle to help overcome organisational and sectoral boundaries, to encourage better collaboration and community involvement, and improve the impact of combined energy, resources and investment. Therefore, evidence should describe how your proposal will address, promote and encourage collaboration and involvement.
	Q19	In the limited space available for answers in the Phase 6 application, can the Safer Communities	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	As outlined in the application guidance there is a link to the Scottish Government's guidance on children's rights and best practice around using a Child Rights and Wellbeing

		Directorate clarify what more we could have done to make our commitment to Children’s Rights more ‘explicit’ and where this ‘explicit’ commitment should have been detailed? Area for Development – point 8		Impact Assessment (CRWIA) to develop and design a programme. Specific reference to using this process or delivering through the themes of children’s rights principles may improve a response.
	Q20	Can you confirm exactly where in the Phase 6 application does it specifically ask organisations for an ‘organisational policy on positive climate’? Area for Development – point 9	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	<p>Detail on this was provided in the application guidance documentation. Q55. Please describe how the proposal will contribute towards positive climate action? Tell us:</p> <p>(a) the ways in which your project or organisation can support positive climate action</p> <p>(b) how your project will support a just transition to net zero</p> <p>(c) any climate benefits the project will have</p> <p>(d) are you aware of or have you considered if/how you could reduce the carbon impact of the project</p> <p>(e) how the project encourages positive behaviour change and/or increases understanding of climate change.</p> <p>The guidance also provides a link to the Just Transition - A Fairer, Greener Scotland: Scottish Government response pages.</p>
	Q21	What aspect of our response to this question (55) does not clarify our stated aims and commitment to contributing towards positive climate change? Area for Development – point 9	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The feedback that you received was: Some reference to the organisational policy on positive climate would have been helpful. Clarity on what your organisational policy covers and what the project covers was required.
	Q22	Can you confirm that all of the projects that have been successful for Phase 6 funding met all of the funding criteria?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	As already stated above, the published guidance specified that applications would need to demonstrate that their project meets all the criteria of Phase 6 of CfC. Any application being deemed eligible and then being scored highly enough to be a contender for funding in Phase 6 of CfC will indeed have been judged to have met the criteria to a sufficient degree.

	Q23	Can you confirm how many organisations being recommended for Phase 6 have been funded in every Cashback phase?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	A decision about which organisations will be funded in Phase 6 has not yet been made public. We anticipate that a decision will be announced in the next few weeks.
	Q24	How many organisations funded in Phase 5 are NOT being funded in Phase 6?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	A decision about which organisations will be funded in Phase 6 has not yet been made public. We anticipate that a decision will be announced in the next few weeks.
	Q25	What effect do you and the Safer Communities Directorate – and Inspiring Scotland - believe that withdrawing these services after 18 - 20 months of an incredibly positive impact (as reflected in impact reports and feedback from young people participating in the Phase 5 Project) will have on young people who are, and feel, marginalised already?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	With specific reference to the suggestion that investment is being withdrawn, as detailed earlier, the Scottish Government entered into an agreement to provide funding throughout the three years of Phase 5 of CfC. That agreement is being fully honoured. There was no commitment to provide funding beyond Phase 5, either for your organisation or for any of the other existing partners. Each 3-year grant award is time-limited, which is made clear to partners in the Grant Offer Letter signed at the start of each phase. There is no implication that funding will necessarily continue beyond that phase. Indeed, all applicants for Phase 5 were required, as part of their proposals, to consider and explain the level of sustainability that their work would achieve by the end of that phase and/or the exit strategy.
	Q26	Does the Safer Community Directorate understand that those who will be adversely impacted by the decision to withdraw the investment which has previously made such a positive impact, are the very young people your documents, policies and statements indicate you are most concerned about –those with multiple ACE's, limited life opportunities (even more so given the current economic climate), do you and your colleagues understand that these are THE VERY YOUNG PEOPLE THAT ARE RIPE FOR INVOLVEMENT IN CRIME due to lack of services, opportunities and the like	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	More broadly, the Scottish Government indeed recognises the scale of need in the communities which you serve, and in other communities across Scotland. The fact that the Scottish Government is aiming to proceed with CfC at all, despite the very extreme financial pressures that it faces, is testament to a recognition of that need and of the value that is attached to work to address it. As stated above, the funds available for CfC are significant but finite, and that is why the Scottish Government is able to support some but not all of the very compelling proposals that exist. The rolling programme of renewal aims to help ensure that finite funds are invested as effectively as possible in this important area.

	Q27	Do you and the Safer Communities Directorate believe that the decision making process was thorough, that due diligence was done on all 158 projects who applied for Phase 6 funding and that the scoring of applications truly reflected the quality and potential impact of each of the proposed projects?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	We remain confident that this assessment process gave fair and equitable treatment to each of the proposals received for Phase 6, based on the information which applicants chose to submit in the application form.
	Q28	Does the Safer Communities Directorate and the wider Scottish Government understand the adverse impact of withdrawing these services from the most deprived communities in the country?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	More broadly, the Scottish Government indeed recognises the scale of need in the communities which you serve, and in other communities across Scotland. The fact that the Scottish Government is aiming to proceed with CfC at all, despite the very extreme financial pressures that it faces, is testament to a recognition of that need and of the value that is attached to work to address it. As stated above, the funds available for CfC are significant but finite, and that is why the Scottish Government is able to support some but not all of the very compelling proposals that exist. The rolling programme of renewal aims to help ensure that finite funds are invested as effectively as possible in this important area.
	Q29	To assist us in preparing for follow up actions, we require Safer Communities Directorate to:		
	a	a. Inform us of who was involved on the decision-making panel? This will be helpful to understand the background and knowledge of those making key decisions on Cashback funding and their knowledge and experience of the organisations they are making funding decisions about;	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	Panel members were drawn from across a wide range of Scottish Government policy areas. We tried to balance a mix of grades and match policy experience with application types where possible.
	b	Clarify exactly what was the decision-making process/scoring?;	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	I can advise that, following the closure of the application period on 12 August 2022, Inspiring Scotland and the Scottish Government's CfC management team undertook an initial sift of applications to establish which were and

				<p>were not eligible. Early notifications were issued to those deemed ineligible, while the remainder of the applications proceeded for assessment. All eligible applications were subject to an Inspiring Scotland review where all sections of the application were considered and scored either poor, adequate or good, together with relevant comments where required. The resulting sift form from Inspiring Scotland was incorporated into the assessment form and included in an assessor pack that was issued to all panel members.</p> <p>Once an agreed score had been provided for each application, these were collated with scores from Inspiring Scotland, and views of CfC-experienced Young People. An overall score was then established, comprising 55% Scottish Government panel; 40% Inspiring Scotland; 5% CfC-experienced Young People. A ranked list of scored applications was then produced.</p>
c	Clarify whether those making the decisions took into account how those funded in Phase 5 had responded to the pandemic and whether they utilised Cashback resources to benefit the communities they were funded to serve?;	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	Those involved in the assessment of applications will have taken into account how those funded in Phase 5 had responded to the pandemic and whether they utilised Cashback resources to benefit the communities they were funded to serve, insofar as that information was set out in their application forms.	
d	Grant us access to all of the successful Phase 6 applications and the scoring for them, as well as the scoring for our funding bid. If required, please consider this as a request under the Freedom of Information Act.	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	Notwithstanding the exemptions noted above, I am able to provide three documents which I hope will be of interest. A previously mentioned, one (Enc 1) gives some detail about how your own organisation's application was scored by the panel of Scottish Government officials. Another (Enc 3) - with the names of other organisations redacted for the reasons given above (notably the exemptions provided by section 27(1) and 30(c) of FOISA - gives information about the overall scoring / ranking of the eligible applications. A further document (Enc 4) gives some detail about how your organisation's application was scored by our Delivery Partner.	
e	In order to expedite this process, can you clarify whether a request from MSP's for access to these applications	2nd February 2023 (Ref 202200334364)	Finally, I can advise that we endeavour to be as helpful and forthcoming as possible in relation to all requests, taking account of the law and the public interest,	

		would require to go through an FOI process?		regardless of whether or not FOISA is specifically cited. As stated on the website of the Scottish Information Commissioner, www.itspublicknowledge.info , "elected representatives have the same FOI rights as any other citizen".
4th January 2023	Q1	How many organisations approved for funding in Phase 6 have been funded in every Cashback phase?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	There are 24 organisations receiving funding under Phase 5 of CfC and, of those, 6 have been funded through every phase. As regards Phase 6, a decision about which organisations will be funded has not yet been made public.
	Q2	Who are these organisations?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	A very significant amount of information about the CfC programme is available at the dedicated website, https://cashbackforcommunities.org . This includes information about the organisations which have been funded throughout the various phases of the programme. For ease of reference, however, I can confirm that the 6 organisations which have been funded since the inception of the CfC, up to and including Phase 5, are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basketball Scotland • Scottish Football Association • Scottish Rugby Union • Scottish Sports Futures • YouthLink Scotland • Youth Scotland As stated above, a decision about which organisations will be funded in Phase 6 has not yet been made public.
	Q3	Have these organisations been funded for the same project across all cashback phases?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	Each of the funded project partners mentioned before, and who have received funding since 2008, have seen their projects evolve since inception of the CfC programme. Since Phase 1, the criteria for each individual phase has been modified and all projects who were successful, not merely the 6 highlighted here, have had to adapt their projects to meet the new criteria and requirements. In addition, programmes for the 6 highlighted organisations have adapted their projects based on learnings from previous phases as well as external evaluation feedback. Each application from organisations, whether existing or new, has been considered on its own merits and based on

				the suitability to meet the criteria of the new funding phase for which it is applying.
	Q4	Can you provide access to the previous applications and scoring systems for these organisations for each Cashback Phase?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	<p>With specific regard to section 30(c), disclosure of the requested information under FOISA would be likely to prejudice substantially the effective conduct of public affairs. This is because there is a significant probability that substantial prejudice would arise, in that release in this case would be likely to lead organisations to perceive that future applications and scores would also be released to others, including potential rivals. This would be likely to have a chilling effect and deter some from applying fully and candidly, or at all, to contribute to the delivery of work of public benefit. This exemption is subject to the 'public interest test'. Therefore, taking account of all the circumstances of this case, we have considered if the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in applying the exemption. We have found that, on balance, the public interest lies in favour of upholding the exemption. We recognise that there is some public interest in release as part of open and transparent government, and to inform public debate. However, this is outweighed by the strong public interest in maintaining the ability of the Scottish Government to invite and receive applications on the basis that their contents are treated in confidence.</p> <p>With specific regard to section 33(1)(b), disclosure of the requested information under FOISA would be likely to prejudice substantially the commercial interests of other organisations which applied. This is because there is a significant probability that substantial prejudice would arise, in that grant application is a competitive process requiring applicants to disclose a significant quantity of potentially sensitive information about themselves, their operations and their plans, and the disclosure of such information to others, including potential rivals, would be likely to lead to potential detriment in their future competitive position and ability to raise funds. This exemption is subject to the 'public interest test'. Therefore, taking account of all the circumstances of this case, we</p>

				have considered if the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in applying the exemption. We have found that, on balance, the public interest lies in favour of upholding the exemption. We recognise that there is some public interest in release as part of open and transparent government, and to inform public debate. However, this is outweighed by the strong public interest in maintaining the right of organisations to put forward grant applications in confidence.
	Q5	What evidence is there that these organisations and their projects have had significant impact across all phases to date, per stated criteria for each phase?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	Part of the CfC programme involves a robust monitoring and evaluation process, which includes quarterly and annual review of performance against outcomes, as well as external evaluation support culminating in annual reports from the evaluator. In addition, stakeholder feedback and case studies provide a rich source of qualitative feedback which has also supported the assessment of impact. This provides insight as to the impact each organisation has achieved and is reviewed by the Delivery Partner and Scottish Government on a regular basis.
	Q6	Can you provide us with copies of this evidence?	2nd February 2023 (Ref 2023003336532)	Copies of the latest Partner annual reports and evaluation reports are available for all Partners on the dedicated CfC website, https://cashbackforcommunities.org , and are posted there each year. In addition, an Annual Impact report across the CfC programme is also published, along with an end of phase programme evaluation report. In addition, details of activity each Partner has undertaken within Local Authority areas is also provided on the website, going back to 2008 and details the funding allocated to these specific activities along with the number of young people participating in the projects in these local areas. Consequently, this information comes within the exemption provided by section 21 of FOISA (Information otherwise accessible) as it is information which can reasonably obtain other than by requesting it under FOISA.
13th February 2023	Qa	Within the Assessors Guidance it refers to scoring of questions in the range 0 – 3, yet in one of the enclosures sent to me, with scoring of	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	As outlined in the process section of this response, once all panels had provided an agreed score, these were combined with scores from IS, and views of CashBack experienced young people who had also been asked to

		key questions, we are scored 4 and 6 without any explanation of what these scores refer to		provide feedback. The overall score was then weighted: 55% SG; 40% IS; 5% young person view and this is where the different score ranges appear.
	Q1	Firstly, on the areas in which our proposed services would be delivered – we clearly stated that ALL areas for service delivery would fall within SIMD 1 and we specified data points to support this. Yet, we scored a 2 on this question. I would appreciate if we could have a clear explanation as to why our response to this question didn't score at the highest level – 3 – given that we were clear about the data points where our services would be delivered?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	This score is part of the initial review that Inspiring Scotland conducted. A score of 2 is good and demonstrates meeting the objectives. There is very limited use of the score 3 in this category.
	Q2	Secondly, we scored 2 on our governance, again without any clarity on why.... What more would be required to score a 3 with this level of representation, skill, and knowledge?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	Feedback from the notes from the sift review state that Governance structure was scored as adequate. This takes on board decision making, assurance processes and delegated authority routes as well as the skills of those on different governance groups.
	Q3	In the interests of transparency, it would be of great assistance if you could detail the background and experience of those who assessed our application to ensure that we can be confident of their knowledge of the challenges as set out in our application and the communities which we highlighted as areas for service delivery.	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	Panel members with experience of the policy areas in which applicants projects were addressing were matched.
	Q4	If Mr Allen has no clear idea with regards to why assessors have scored questions in the manner they have, how can he possibly state that the process has been fair and transparent?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	Panel members followed the guidance on the assessment form and in the guidance document contained in their packs. The panel chair oversaw the panel discussion and scoring process and their role is detailed in the panel assessor guidance.

	Q5	How are assessors held accountable for their scoring?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The panel chair oversaw the panel discussion and scoring process and their role is detailed in the panel assessor guidance. There is a review process of the scoring across panel members and groups to ensure consistency.
	Q6	Are there any crosschecks done on scoring?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	There is a review process of the scoring across panel members and groups to ensure consistency.
	Q7	How can Mr Allen state that “we remain confident that this assessment process gave fair and equitable treatment to each of the proposals received.”? What evidence has he to support this statement?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The process and structures outlined in this letter underpin the confidence in the decision making processes.
	Q8	Mr Allen writes: “With specific regard to section 30(c), disclosure of the requested information under FOISA would likely to prejudice substantially the effective conduct of public affairs. This is because there is a significant probability that substantial prejudice would arise, in that release in this case would be likely to lead organisations to perceive that future applications and scores would also be released to others, including potential rivals. This may deter some from applying and candidly, or at all, to contribute to the delivery of work of public benefit” Can you, as Director of the department give a clear explanation of how this would be the case?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The application process does not ask for consent to share commercially sensitive information or for applications to identify what is commercially sensitive or not. Therefore, the whole application and the processes are deemed commercially sensitive and confidential to maintain trust, positive working relationships, quality and credibility. Under this umbrella we are bound by FOI Section 43 not to disclose this information publicly.
	Q9	If, as Mr Allen suggests, this is an open and transparent application process, it is in the public interest that all applicants for public money should be open to public scrutiny of the information as it pertains to the work they are applying for?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	Information on the application process, guidance, online events and Q&A sessions all contribute to the open and transparent process. The application process does not ask for consent to share commercially sensitive information or for applications to identify what is commercially sensitive or not. Therefore, the whole application and the processes are deemed commercially

				sensitive and confidential to maintain trust, positive working relationships, quality and credibility. Under this umbrella we are bound by FOI Section 43 not to disclose this information publicly.
	Q10	Can I ask you, Mr McGillivray, to clarify that it is the position of the Safer Communities Directorate and the Scottish Government that applicants for Cashback funding are not required to be open to public scrutiny relating to funding bids?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	The application process does not ask for consent to share commercially sensitive information or for applications to identify what is commercially sensitive or not. Therefore, the whole application and the processes are deemed commercially sensitive and confidential to maintain trust, positive working relationships, quality and credibility. Under this umbrella we are bound by FOI Section 43 not to disclose this information publicly.
	Q11	Can I also ask that you confirm that it is the position of the Safer Communities Directorate and the Scottish Government that applicants for Cashback funding are deemed to be rivals rather than potential partners working together to achieve the objectives of Cashback funding for the benefit of Scotland's most challenged communities?	3 March 2023 (Ref: 202300344836)	This was a competitive application process and therefore in this capacity organisations and partnerships were treated in competition with each other. The application process looked positively on joint bids and partnerships and welcomed the combined strengths of multiple partnerships and joint working.