



N.E. Scotland Fisheries
LocalActionGroup



Part-funded by the European Union's European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

NESFLAG Meeting

Wednesday 22nd June 2016 at 1.30pm
Peterhead Football Club (Board Room), Balmoor Stadium, Balmoor Terrace,
Peterhead AB42 1EQ

MINUTE

Present

Linda Hope	Scottish Maritime College (Co-Chair)
Jimmy Buchan	Amity Fish Co Limited (Co-Chair) (Joined the meeting following agenda item 6)
Andrew Newton	Kincardineshire Development Partnership
Michael Bates	Scottish Seafood Association
Darren Broadley	Peter & J Johnstone Ltd
Derek McDonald	Aberdeenshire Council
Jo Robinson	Visit Scotland
Shelley Hague	Angus Council
Robin Maddock	Banffshire Partnership Ltd
Stephen Murray	Royal National Mission to Deep Sea Fishing
Liz Scott	Buchan Development Partnership
Jamie Bell	Scottish Enterprise
Iain Young	Scottish Whitefish Producers Association
David-John McRobbie	Don Fishing Company
Anne Birnie	North East Scotland Fishermen's Organisation

Officers in Attendance

Martin Brebner	Team Manager - European Policies & Programmes
Jamie Wilkinson	European Programmes Co-ordinator
June Jaffrey	European Programmes Claims Officer
Anne MacLennan	European Programmes Claims Officer
Kim Ritchie	Angus Council

Apologies

James Bream	Aberdeen & Grampian Chamber of Commerce
Bruce Fleming	Angus Council
Brian Stewart-Coxon	Federation of Small Businesses
Nik Scott-Gray	Montrose Port Authority
Harry Simpson	Mackay Boat Builders (Arbroath) Ltd
Allan Crockart	Scottish Seafood Association

<p>1.</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.2</p>	<p>Welcome & Apologies</p> <p>The Chair welcomed those present, introducing Jamie Wilkinson as the new NESFLAG Co-ordinator. For the benefit of new NESFLAG members round the table introductions were made.</p> <p>Apologies were noted as above.</p>
<p>2.</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>The Chair advised that there are some outstanding Declaration of Interest (DoI) forms to be returned. These are to be re-issued and returned to by mail or electronically to NESFLAG@aberdeenshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>Action; DoI form to be re-issued.</p>
<p>3</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p>	<p>Minute of meeting 10th February 2016 and update on action points</p> <p>The draft NEFLAG minute of 10th February 2016 was proposed at correct by Linda Hope and seconded by Jamie Bell.</p> <p>It was noted that all actions from the previous meeting were addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoI – although several were received with a number still outstanding therefore the form will be re-issued. • Allocation letter – Martin wrote to Marine Scotland and also contacted by phone on a number of occasions but the formal allocation letter is yet to be received. • PAC membership – information was updated • Attendance record – was done and incorporated in the constitution and approved by written procedure • Paper-based application round – Martin spoke with Marine Scotland and was advised not to proceed on that basis but to wait on the IT system. • Launch event flyer – was circulated for cascading • IT system – Mark Nicoll was contacted regarding logins and usernames which we await. • “Launch process and application process” paper – amendments were made and paper circulated by written procedure. • Signatory for “Framework Agreement” – clarification was received with the Framework Agreement having now been signed and returned. <p>Martin advised the NESFLAG that the email indicating the financial allocation had an incorrect figure in it and there would be more comfort if a formal written letter was received. Along with clarity on a number of procedure issues which are significant to the NESFLAG i.e. final guidance not yet received for applicants. It was agreed by NESFLAG that the Co-Chair write more formally to Marine Scotland.</p>

3.4	<p>Action; Martin to draft a formal letter to Marine Scotland on behalf of the Co-Chair.</p>
4	<p>Co-ordinators update</p> <p>4.1 The Co-ordinator advised that the proposed application round at the end of April had been cancelled but had seen a good amount of Expression of Interests (EoI) being received. Most were fairly early stage in the project development.</p> <p>The Co-ordinator met with a number of applicants who are working on building their applications but are not yet robust enough for formal application.</p> <p>The Co-ordinator further advised that one project would have come forward to the April application round but will now proceed to the July date along with at least another two applications. The Co-ordinator would be happy with this number of applications coming forward to enable the IT system and procedures to be tested.</p> <p>4.2 The Co-ordinator has met with a number of the stakeholders across the area and will be in touch shortly with NESFLAG members to encourage assistance in attracting and developing projects.</p> <p>4.3 The themes of the pending applications likely to come forward for Round 1 are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterhead Harbour Port Authority - £100k extension to Port Henry Marina • Buchanhaven Harbour Committee – build a boat workshop with classroom space • Aberdeenshire Council Harbour Services – Wi-Fi at Banff, Macduff and Stonehaven harbours <p>4.4 Other EoIs coming in are working with the Co-ordinator currently and are mainly community based. Enquiries have been received in the South area i.e. Montrose Port Authority for a Marina, but it was noted that the majority of EoIs received are from the North area. The Co-ordinator would welcome a steer from the NESFLAG for future applications regarding what they would like to see coming forward.</p> <p>4.5 The Co-ordinator met with Angus Council colleagues to discuss workshops and animation/promotion of the fund and will look to have an event late summer in that area.</p>
5	<p>FLAG membership update</p> <p>5.1 The Co-Chair advised that several changes to membership had been advised/received recently. A paper outlining the changes the NESFLAG</p>

<p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.3.1</p> <p>5.3.2</p> <p>5.3.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.4.1</p>	<p>membership has had was drafted. There were three new applications for FLAG membership received and the following were noted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jimmy Buchan – resignation as Chair of the Scottish Fishermen’s Organisation • Moray Firth Inshore Fisheries Group – amalgamation with North and East Coast Regional Inshore Fisheries Group • Moray Firth Inshore Fisheries Association – membership application • North and East Coast Regional Inshore Fisheries Group – membership application • Seafood Scotland – change in personnel as Ian Land no longer works them; in the interim Anne Birnie will represent until a permanent replacement is found. • Aberdeen Fish Producers Organisation – change in representative from David Anderson to David John McRobbie. <p>Discussion took place on the membership make-up and functions of the Moray Firth Inshore Fisheries Association (represent the interests of those fishing in the area) and the North and East Coast Regional Inshore Fisheries Group (management of the space) with a concern over membership duplication and their functions arising. The NESFLAG agreed that clarification was required on this point with the suggestion that only one representative be sought.</p> <p>The NESFLAG approved;</p> <p>The application for NESFLAG membership from Amity Fish Company</p> <p>The change of representative for Aberdeen Fish Producers Organisation</p> <p>The change of organisation name that Michael Bates is representing (from PFFPA to SSA).</p> <p>Action;</p> <p>The Co-ordinator to write to MFIFA/NECRIFG for clarification and agreement on the most appropriate member from the organisation.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p>	<p>Appointment of new Co-Chair and Vice-Chair</p> <p>The group were advised that due to the resignation of Jimmy Buchan as Chair of the Scottish Fisherman’s Organisation and his subsequent stepping down as NESFLAG Co-Chair, along with the amalgamation of Moray Firth Inshore Fisheries Group into North & East Coast RIFG resulting in John Cox resigning from the NESFLAG; nominations were sought for these vacant roles.</p> <p>NESFLAG members were asked for nominations for another Co-Chair. Co-Chair Linda Hope had earlier circulated an email regarding offering Amity Fish, as private sector a membership, and Jimmy the position of Co-Chair. As positive feedback had been received to this proposal Linda Hope formally nominated Jimmy Buchan as Co-Chair seconded by David John McRobbie with the remainder of the group unanimously agreeing the decision.</p>

<p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.5.1</p> <p>6.5.2</p>	<p>NESFLAG members were asked for nominations for a second Vice-Chair. Michael Bates nominated himself and was supported by David John McRobbie.</p> <p>It was noted that it is a two year appointment term for Chair and Co-Chair with Linda Hope's term as Co-Chair was coming up for renewal shortly. The Co-ordinator will keep an eye on the appointment terms.</p> <p>The NESFLAG approved;</p> <p>Jimmy Buchan appointed as Co-Chair.</p> <p>Michael Bates appointed as Vice Chair.</p>
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p>	<p>PAC membership, scoring and responsibilities</p> <p>Membership; There are not currently sufficient PAC members to meet quorum. The Co-ordinator advised a quorum of 5 is required for meeting decisions with the majority being private sector members. A further call for members was issued prompting nominations from; Shelley Hague, David John McRobbie and Darren Broadley. As there are now seven PAC members the forthcoming round would be used as a trail for its effectiveness. Should this have to be re-visited then a further call for PAC membership application may be required.</p> <p>The use of electronic PAC correspondence being used as a mechanism for fulfilling meeting quorum was discussed but it was felt by the Co-ordinator that PAC members commit to attend meeting with round the table discussions being preferable.</p> <p>It was noted Moira Beverley (Aberdeenshire Council) has stood down as an associate PAC member due to her workload commitments.</p> <p>Jimmy Buchan joined the meeting at this point and took up his capacity as Co-Chair.</p> <p>Scoring is a requirement that the PAC have to fulfil. The Co-ordinator advised that an amended five point scoring sheet has been created by simplifying and condensing some of Marine Scotland frameworks addressing; Strategic fit, Horizontal themes, Need for Grant, Value for money and Capacity to deliver. The Co-ordinator clarified that scoring can be a round the table not aggregate result and the NESFLAG agreed to this approach. There is the opportunity for NESFLAG members to highlight any additions/omissions to the scoring framework. The amended scoring sheet will be sent to Marine Scotland for information.</p> <p>The Co-ordinators proposal is to score after the PAC meeting and after giving the applicant an opportunity within a two week timescale to respond to queries raised by the PAC, the PAC would have one week to score (by email) based on the new information. The PAC would then make a recommendation to the NESFLAG. Should an application be</p>

	<p>received with sufficient information then the PAC would score at the meeting. The PAC members would be required to score the applications in their own time prior to the meetings where they would then discuss the project and feed back to applicants. After scoring, a one page checklist against the Horizontal themes and a summary per project would be drafted by the Co-ordinator for recommendations to the NESFLAG members.</p> <p>After much discussion it was agreed that the Co-ordinator re-work the scoring process to include a step where the NESFLAG score when the PAC have not. A conference call would be held with PAC members after additional information has been received who would then have a week to reflect on the update to scoring. A score for each of the five scoring points is the preferred.</p> <p>The PAC should provide one of the following recommendations to the FLAG for each project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend for approval • Recommend for approval (subject to clarification of specific points by applicant) • Recommend for refusal • Application deferred (with approval of the FLAG (Co)Chair) to the following application round <p>It is unclear as yet if the IT system will allow all NESFLAG members to view applications at the stage or just PAC members and whether it requires the PAC or the LAG to score. The Co-ordinator advised that staff are due to be trained on the IT system shortly and would then cascade the training to PAC members.</p>
7.4	The NESFLAG approved;
7.4.1	<p>The following PAC membership applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shelley Hague (Angus Council) • David John McRobbie (Aberdeen Fish Producers Organisation) • Darren Broadley (Peter & J Johnstone)
7.4.2	<p>The PAC outcome recommendations as one of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend for approval • Recommend for approval (subject to clarification of specific points by applicant) • Recommend for refusal • Application deferred (with approval of the FLAG (Co)Chair) to the following application round
7.4.3	The simplified Scoring framework.
7.5	Action;
7.5.1	Co-ordinator to re-draft the procedure regarding timelines, role of the PAC, scoring at PAC and LAG meetings and remote communications for Conference calls should they be required.
7.5.2	PAC scoring and recommendation summary sheet

7.5.3	Post the PAC membership form on the NESFLAG website and circulate electronically.
7.5.4	Re-send the meeting dates to the NESFLAG members.
8	Conflicts of Interest Policy
8.1	The Co-ordinator wished to clarify the position regarding Conflicts of Interest therefore a policy was drafted and circulated for comment. It is for NESFLAG members to self-identify and volunteer conflict information at the start of each meeting. Any project application where a NESFLAG member is directly involved would be required to declare a conflict.
8.2	NESFLAG member organisations who submit project applications or assist with project applications are required to declare an Interest.
8.3	Members are welcome to assist potential project applicants but should use discretion should conflict arise and refrain from scoring the project and contributing to application discussions.
8.4	The NESFLAG approved;
8.4.1	The adoption of the Conflict of Interest policy subject to amendment of section 2.1; to record specific projects conflicts for and when they occur
8.5	Action;
8.5.1	Point 2.1 of the policy to be amended to reflect the requirement for recording conflicts for specific projects as and when they occur. The conflict register of interests will be updated on that basis.
9	2017 application round schedule
9.1	The Co-ordinator advised that two applications rounds will be held in 2016 and three in 2017. It is proposed that additional time be built in to assist applicants work up applications therefore an additional two weeks be added into the application deadline. This will result in changes to meeting frequency creating a shorter timeframe between rounds in 2016 and 2017.
9.2	Jamie asked the group if they wished sight of Eols which had been screened for eligibility in advance of the application deadline. He and the group may find this useful in getting a steer on the project activity. The Co-ordinator will draft a summary of Eols received since the previous meeting for circulation.
9.3	The NESFLAG approved;
9.3.1	The 2017 application round schedule.
9.3.2	An Eol summary be drafted in advance of the Eol deadline.
10	Incomplete applications – delegation of responsibilities
10.1	The Co-ordinator advised that experience from the LEADER rounds in accepting all applications highlighted that some were not at a suitable

<p>10.2 10.2.1</p>	<p>stage to come forward with a robust enough application but the Co-ordinator was unable to filter these and suggest application deferral. The Co-ordinator would like to have approved responsibility with consent of the Co-Chairs to better advise applicants. The PAC would only then receive projects which were ready. The e-application system will not allow an application to proceed for incomplete sections.</p> <p>The NESFLAG approved; Delegated responsibility to the Co-ordinator with the consent of Co-Chairs to defer applications which are considered incomplete or unready.</p>
<p>11 11.1 11.2 11.3 11.4 11.4.1 11.4.2</p>	<p>EMFF application e-system demonstration</p> <p>The Co-ordinator has access to the summary sheet of the e-applications where he can view the applications which have come in but not into the system from the applicants end. But was unable to show the group the system due to internet connectivity issues.</p> <p>It is the Co-ordinators intention to sit with applicants as they make their initial electronic application to offer support and assistance through the application process.</p> <p>It was noted that the Scottish Govt. have so far failed to provide any training on the e-application system.</p> <p>A flow-chart application process was circulated to NESFLAG members to give members an understanding of the process. Members felt it was a lengthy process but the flow chart was useful for internal use.</p> <p>Action; The Co-Chairs to write to the new Cabinet Secretary regarding the delays in the e-application system – drafted by the Co-ordinator. The Co-ordinator to draft an application system timeline flow-chart – taking screen-shots of each web-page.</p>
<p>12 12.1 12.2 12.3</p>	<p>FLAG Map</p> <p>The Co-ordinator re-worked the NESFLAG area map which was circulated to members for comment and is proposed for uploading to the NESFLAG website. Blue areas on the map indicate the data zones which are eligible. A project has to be deemed eligible to benefit the people of the highlighted map areas.</p> <p>It was noted that Aberdeen is excluded because the fund is targeted to rural areas. Kineff, Caterline, Blackdog areas had been omitted but the map could be re-worked to include these areas.</p> <p>It was noted that Co-operation and National projects will see FLAGs working together to deliver projects which operate across several regions.</p>

13	LDS priorities and project ideas
13.1	<p>The Co-ordinator asked if the NESFLAG wanted to broaden out the current priorities by expanding and adding priorities other than those already identified in the Local Development Strategies (LDS). Marine Scotland issued a broader list of priorities to the priorities agreed at an earlier point in time by them. Should the NESFLAG wish to pick up on these and to our own priorities we are required to go back to Marine Scotland for final approval. It was felt that the current priorities were too tight and that additions were welcomed. Should the NESFLAG be supportive of additional priorities then informal discussions will take place with Marine Scotland. Any request to change the priorities will not affect the next application round. The North and South LAGs would be notified of any changes likewise the budget lines and approval sought from them.</p> <p>All LDS (including Angus) will be required to be updated should priorities change in that area.</p>
13.2	Virement between LAG budgets can be done should a short-fall be identified. Budget considerations will be undertaken to reflect any changes.
13.3	Action;
13.3.1	Initial informal approach to Marine Scotland to discuss the potential for amending priorities and budgets.
13.3.2	The Co-ordinator to make a formal proposal identifying the addition of two priorities (Tourism, Heritage or Environment), which will be circulated to NESFLAG for comment prior to submission to Marine Scotland.
14	Animation workshops
14.1	<p>Workshops were discussed at previous meetings but have not yet taken place. The LAG Co-ordinators met recently to gather workshop ideas. It is proposed public open sessions, in medium sized town across Aberdeenshire, would be held to bring project ideas to the table. Led open agendas/facilitated sessions to bounce ideas off each other along with presentations from previous successful project would be the outline for the events. If the pilot is successful this would be rolled out across the NESFLAG area. Separate work with Angus LEADER team in Arbroath/Montrose would be required. The Co-ordinator asked NESFLAG members if they are willing to spread the word/contribute to the events. The pilot would be held in late summer and rolled out over Autumn/winter.</p> <p>The NESFLAG agreed this way forward.</p>
15	AOCB
15.1	Meeting venues; it is proposed to rotate meeting locations. As the majority of members are in the Fraserburgh and Peterhead areas the Co-

	<p>ordinator asked for views on willingness to travel to alternate meeting locations; possible to venues which have previously had AEFf funding and likewise holding meetings in the Angus area.</p> <p>The NESFLAG agreed this proposal.</p>
16	Date of next meeting
16.1	Wednesday 21 st September, 2pm, Council Chamber, Buchan House, Peterhead

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
Dol form to be re-issued.	JJ/AMcL
Draft a formal letter to Marine Scotland for Co-Chair signature.	MB
Write to MFINA/NECRIFG for clarification on the most appropriate representative from the organisation.	JW
Co-ordinator to re-draft the procedure regarding timelines, role of the PAC, Conference call etc.	JW
PAC scoring and recommendation summary sheet	JW
Post the PAC membership form on the NESFLAG website and circulate electronically.	JJ/AMcL
Re-send the meeting dates to the NESFLAG members.	JJ/AMcL
Point 2.1 of the Conflicts of Interest policy to be amended to reflect the requirement for recording conflicts for specific projects as and when they occur.	JW
Write to the new Cabinet Secretary regarding the delays in the e-application system.	JW
Draft an application timeline flow-chart – taking screen-shots of each web-page.	JW
Initial informal approach to Marine Scotland to discuss the potential for amending priorities and budgets.	JW
Make a formal proposal with two additional priorities which will be circulated to NESFLAG for comment prior to submission to Marine Scotland.	JW