

MINUTE OF MEETING

Present	Simon R Macdonald Jim Traynor James Paterson Clive Fox Nick Turnbull Sarah Brown	West Coast Regional Inshore Fisheries Group (Chair) Retired former Tobermory Harbour Master Argyll and Bute Council Scottish Association for Marine Science (SAMS) Mull Fishermans Association C2W Consulting
Apologies	David Adams-McGilp Elizabeth Dougall	Visit Scotland Ayrshire LEADER - Programme Coordinator
In Attendance	Ishabel Bremner Mary Louise Howat Mary Simpson Duncan Dewar	Argyll and Bute Council - FLAG Lead Administrative Partner Argyll and Bute Council - Senior Development Officer Argyll and Bute Council - European Support Officer Argyll and Bute Council - Systems Assistant (Minutes)

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed all present.

2. Apologies

The apologies were noted as above.

3. Previous Minutes (20 August 2020)

The approval of the November 2020 minutes was carried forwards due to the lack of a quorum of members present at that meeting

N Turnbull and J Paterson proposed acceptance of the August 2020 minute, this was also carried forward for a quorum to agree.

Concerns were voiced at levels of attendance at the meetings.

There were no matters arising from the minute.

4. Programme Update including financial update

M Simpson confirmed that there was sufficient remaining budget to approve the application currently being considered.

5. Project scoring and decision

- **SCO2718 – Project Enabler-Fishing Communities – Clyde Fishermen’s Trust**

The scores returned for this project ranged from 6 to 16, with an average of 11.5 (the normal minimum score to approve being 12).

ML gave an introduction to the project indicating that this is a strategic project that covers the whole area. ML Howat read a summary of members' prior comments on this application. **(See Appendix 1)**

It was noted that the FLAG could seek further information from the applicant before coming to a final decision, or make a decision with conditions attached. ML Howat clarified that any timeline to address FLAG concerns would be that set today by the FLAG.

ML Howat pointed out that this was the only potential project to include Ayrshire, but noted that the FLAG had previously decided not to divide the budget between areas.

Several Members expressed the view that applications should be considered on their merits, without giving weight to their geographical spread.

The combination of high scoring versus unfavourable comments from the same Members was noted.

The Chair took a vote on whether to support the application:

Decision: not supported, by majority 5-1

6. Upcoming application for FLAG scoring and decision

- **SCO2722 – Commercial Fuel Berth Tobermory – Tobermory Harbour Association – FLAG timeline for approval**

ML Howat advised that this application had been due for consideration today. However, there had been technical issues, which are now resolved, and she hoped to have the application available for scoring by the end of the day.

Approximately £283K of funding is sought, at a 100% intervention rate.

The FLAG were asked to set a time line for scoring and subsequent decision, and, after discussion it was agreed that scoring should be completed by close of play on Tuesday 27 October, and a virtual meeting would be held on Monday 2nd November to decide on the application.

J Traynor declared his interest, and will not participate in the scoring process or decision.

N Turnbull sought clarification on whether he could score the application; however, as he has no direct involvement, there was no issue noted concerning him taking part.

It was noted that, to ensure a quorum, a high attendance of eligible members would be required.

7. FLAG Chair letter to Fergus Ewing MSP and Response

The Chair summarised and reviewed the recent correspondence (circulated to Members) between himself as Chair of the FLAG Chairs group, and Cabinet Secretary Fergus Ewing MSP/Mark Nicoll of Marine Scotland, regarding the future funding arrangements etc.

The next stage in the correspondence with the Scottish Government would be finalised at the forthcoming Chairs meeting, so he invited comments from the FLAG:

Concerns were raised at fisherman being side-lined.

Members exchanged views on the balance between targeting support at the fishing industry (for example through new infrastructure), and projects supporting the wider marine environment and other types of facility user. The wording "Fisheries led projects taking into account other users" was suggested and acceptable to both sides of the discussion.

The use of the Crown Estate monies allocated to the Council was raised. J Paterson explained that the stipulation was for funding to be used in coastal communities, so uses were, for example, flood defences, rather than for fisheries specific purposes.

I Bremer asked whether there would be a consultation from the Scottish Government on the blue economy model, and noted that the Council would welcome a chance to present a collective voice in any consultation.

Asked about any news on follow on funding to EMFF, the Chair noted that there was no definite information on this to date.

8. AOCB

None

9. Date of Next Meeting

Monday 2nd November, 11am, on the Microsoft Teams platform.

Signed _____ date _____

Appendix 1

Project Enabler – Fishing Communities - Project Ref: SCO2718

Assessment Criteria	Combined FLAG Comments
<p><u>Strategic Fit</u> <i>To what extent does the project fit with and deliver against the objective and priorities, of the Argyll and Ayrshire Fisheries Local Action Group?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good fit to Supporting Diversification; Strengthening Governance • fits well with priorities 2&3 • Project conforms with one priority • I am unclear as to what the outcomes are other than a vision for the future • Whilst I see that it fits under priority 3, I don't see a reference to working with established, and SG recognised representatives of fishing interests such as the WCRIFG. It also doesn't refer to working with the relevant marine planning partnership in the Clyde. This all means that it doesn't deliver against the stated aims of priority 3, it is more a project which could cause division than cohesion.
<p><u>Evidence of Demand/Need</u> <i>To what extent can the project demonstrate evidence of community, market or business demand now or in the future, or addressing a gap in product/service?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anecdotal evidence is included although not in an ascribed manner • Project has not satisfied the evidence of need • I am unable to see the evidence of community demand for this project • The Clyde 2020 project and the WCRIFG have been working on this issue with the CFA/CFT for a long time. A number of different visions have been identified and published including those within the draft regional marine plan. A further separate vision is not identified by any of these programmes as a necessary step. I cannot identify any new 'need' within the application.
<p><u>Value for Money</u> <i>Do the costs of the project represent value for money and a good return on investment for the EMFF support and will this funding demonstrate additionality to the project?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention rate of 100%? Some in-kind support from CFT - use of office space etc. Proposed salary level seems appropriate. Potentially some savings may occur if remote meetings have to replace some of the physical meetings. • Low benefit for money • I am unclear as to what real benefits this project brings and "visions" are not clear • There doesn't seem to be any added value and I cannot see any reference to how the vision would become embedded in relevant policy or strategy in a meaningful way.
<p><u>Capacity to Deliver</u> <i>Extent to which the applicant can deliver the project and comply with rules, claims processes and cash flow management</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFT is an established organisation with a track record of representing fisheries interests in the Clyde area. I do have a slight concern here that the project could end up only presenting certain groups of fishers' interests and not engage fully with wider stakeholders, including fishers not in the CFT, the Clyde Marine Planning Partnership, others

Argyll and Ayrshire Fisheries Local Action Group Meeting
On-Line via Microsoft Teams, Tuesday 20th October 2020 at 11:00am

	<p>with interests in the long-term future of fishing in the area (and with potentially reducing its environmental impacts) - although wider engagement is mentioned in the text, the post will essentially be sectorally based so this could be a risk - or at least perceived by others in this way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation can deliver in this field • Am sure the Trust has the ability to deliver the project • With their income at an all-time low I wonder if they may have staffing issues and lack the ability to deliver. Due to Covid I think most businesses are working on their core delivery, and that would include the trustees of CFT so they may also find it difficult to oversee this project. 	
<p>Sustainability/Legacy <i>To what extent will the project bring long term economic, social or environmental benefits beyond the life of the project? Including creation of additional or safeguarding jobs.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Vision Paper really manages to capture many of the local issues then there could be a strong long-term legacy. Capturing the needs of local fishing communities will generate very useful data, but this needs to be done in such a way that it can be realistically used as the basis for future project applications and planning. Delivery of a solid legacy will be dependent on securing of future funding - as the applicants acknowledge. • The provision of a long term strategy should address this • No evidence that this will happen • I fail to see how this project brings long-term social/economic or environmental benefits • There isn't any evidence that this project will lead to more jobs or sustain those that exist. This is what the WCRIFG is there for and where this discussion should be happening. 	
<p>Robust Project Plans (Cost of £25K and above Only) <i>Extent to which the project plan (deliverables, objectives, timescales) can be relied upon</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a slightly weak part of the application. Milestones are listed but there are really only 2 - completion of research by Feb. 2021 and delivery of the Vision paper. This does not allow for very close monitoring against unexpected delays and problems e.g. what happens if the post-holder were to become ill or un-able to work? There is a paragraph on Covid mitigation which was good to see given the timeframe of the project. However, I think there is a risk here to the project in that it may be harder to reach a wide stakeholder base through virtual meetings alone (if that is necessary). The applicants will need to think carefully about how to engage the full spectrum of stakeholders and not just to focus on vocal actors who are probably already well engaged with the CFT. • Business case is detailed, however, in my opinion, not of value • would expect project to be delivered • The applicant does not do a risk assessment of the role and therefore offers no mitigations should the role not achieve the stated aim within the timescale. 	