

**Lowlands and Uplands Scotland ERDF and ESF Programmes 2007 - 2013
Programme Monitoring Committee**

**NOTE OF MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 28 OCTOBER 2009,
AT THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, EDINBURGH**

Present:

Dr John Rigg	Scottish Government (Convener)
Alan Boyle	West Fife Enterprises Ltd
Liz Connolly	Scottish Enterprise
Professor Campbell Gemmell	SEPA
David Grahame	LINC Scotland
Councillor Alasdair Hutton	Scottish Borders Council
Dame Barbara Kelly	Southern Uplands Partnership
Donna Mackinnon	SCVO
Dr David George McBeth	University of Strathclyde
Councillor David O'Neill	North Ayrshire Council
Grahame Smith	Scottish Trades Union Council
Dimtcho Tourdanov	European Commission, DG Employment

Apologies:

Riona Bell	Scottish Funding Council
Councillor David Berry	East Lothian Council
Councillor Kate Dean	Aberdeen City Council
Koen Delanghe	European Commission, DG Regio
Graeme Hyslop	Langside College
Dharmendra Khanani	Big Lottery Fund
Danny Logue	Skills Development Scotland
Charlie McMillan	SAMH
Angela Wiseman	Scottish National Rural Network

In Attendance:

Jessica Barr	Scottish Government
Mabel Hildebrand	Scottish Government
Nigel Lindsay	Scottish Government
David Souter	Scottish Government
Paul Teasdale	Scottish Government (afternoon only)
Gordon McLaren	ESEP Ltd
Susan Napier	ESEP Ltd (Minutes)
Nigel Thomas	ESEP Ltd
Susan Tamburrini	ESEP Ltd
Suzanne Henderson	Scottish Government (Item 7 only)
Wilson Malone	Scottish Government (Item 7 only)
Ian McCall	Scottish Government (Item 7 only)

1. Introduction

The Convener welcomed everyone to the meeting, and invited round-table introductions.

The Committee noted that 3 papers had been tabled. A letter from Graeme Hyslop, Langside College would be included at the relevant discussion points as would the communication from Koen Delanghe of DG Regio. Scottish Government had submitted a paper for information regarding the evaluation of Homecoming Scotland, as requested at the previous meeting.

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Riona Bell, Councillor David Berry, Councillor Kate Dean, Koen Delanghe, Graeme Hyslop, Dharmendra Khanani, Danny Logue, Charlie McMillan and Angela Wiseman.

3. Minutes of Previous Meetings

3.1 27 May 2009, Glasgow

The minute was agreed as a correct record. As the matters arising were included within today's business, they would be addressed at the relevant opportunity on the agenda.

3.2 4 September 2009, Glasgow

Options on Future Strategic Priorities for the ESF/ERDF Operational Programme (Item 5 from 04/09/09 Note)

Referring to item 5.1.1, 3rd bullet point, Committee members pointed out that the reference to 16-24 year olds should be more specific. The Scottish Government advised that this should read 16-24 year olds seeking College places.

Scottish Government took the opportunity to update members on items 5.1.1; 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 as follows:

Scottish Funding Council: The Scottish Government had met with the Funding Council and WoSCoP to determine the exact amount of ESF funding required. The total funds being sought were £6.87m and a full explanation of this is provided in the second stage bid. Also explored was the possibility of using a procurement process to get the best value for the available funds. This would enable any college to bid to provide additional places on particular courses. This project will be scored and come forward to the PMC as part of the third round proposals at the March 2010 meeting.

CPPs: Discussions have been held with ESEP, the Managing Authority and all 13 eligible CPPs. All want to amend their existing plans to respond better to the developing economic issues in their areas. Scottish Government have therefore agreed to a change process where all 13 have put forward revised plans rather than new applications. All are being appraised currently. A paper will be sent to the Committee to approve the changes and use of additional Priority 1 funds by Written Procedure in December 2009.

The Big Lottery Fund: Following some very constructive meetings with the Big Lottery, Scottish Government have agreed with them that they will withdraw their application for ESF funding to create a joint fund. A number of issues could not be

satisfactorily taken forward, mainly around timing – ESF approaching the end of funding allocations while the Big Lottery was just developing its next portfolio - and the rather different compliance approaches. It was therefore agreed that the challenge bids seeking ESF and Big Lottery funding would go ahead to appraisal, and Scottish Government and Big Lottery would continue to seek ways to work together and ease the administrative burden on project sponsors in dealing with two funds.

Members enquired regarding the capacity for joining together match funding from other bodies and ESF, as the withdrawal of Big Lottery funding would suggest this would be more difficult in future. Scottish Government advised that this would be unlikely in the current programme as, following discussions at the Funders Forum, the Big Lottery had been the only organisation interested in applying for ESF to produce a joint fund. It was noted that other organisations offering match funding had also found the restricted eligibility rules for ESF a problem. However Scottish Government were happy to enter into discussions with other interested parties.

Committee members suggested that, within 5.1.3, in the 2nd last paragraph the reference to CPP should be changed to Big Lottery Fund.

Scottish Government overview of paper (Item 5.2 from 04/09/09 Note)

The update was noted, suggested amendments adopted, and the minute was thereafter accepted as a correct record.

4. Financial and Physical Progress Report on the Implementation of the Programmes, including N+2

The IAB provided a comprehensive update on financial spend and the achievement against physical targets in implementing the ERDF and ESF programmes. Good progress is being achieved on both Programmes, although there are disparities between Priorities with low levels of activity under ERDF Priority 4, Rural Development, in particular. Committee members were advised that it was proposed to convene a workshop in November/early December to explore potential eligible project ideas within this Priority.

The Committee noted that analysis on the type of activity and monies spent had been carried out. This was a pre-requisite of the Commission's under the Lisbon earmarking process. The Commission indicated their satisfaction that 88% ERDF and 98% ESF projects had targeted Lisbon activities.

Scottish Government confirmed that the financial discipline of achieving spend to agreed deadlines remains a regulatory requirement for the 2007-13 programming period with the risk of automatic de-commitment in the event of non-compliance. N+2 would be achievable this year for both LUPS programmes. Graeme Hyslop (note) had raised concerns regarding the delays between submission of claims and receipt of payment.

A brief update on third round stage 2 bids was provided. Of particular note was that in ESF Priority 1 there were 65 applications. Also under ESF Priority 1 and ERDF Priority 3, £16m had been requested to extend the CPPs current plans for a further 1 year using a notification of change process. These bids were currently being scrutinised and the Programme Monitoring Committee would be provided with the resulting recommendations for each application using Written Procedure.

The Convener thanked the IAB for the presentation, and invited comment from Committee members.

Members enquired regarding the potential impact of a fluctuating exchange rate. The IAB advised that the rate used in this paper had been set at the beginning of the year by Scottish Government, and was 1.2 Euros to £1 sterling. The remaining funds in the programme depended on the date at which payments to project sponsors were locked into a specific exchange rate.

Referring to Priorities 1 and 3 ESF, the Commission confirmed that the figures did not take into account the requested changes to vire funds between these Priorities.

Committee members were concerned at the lack of activity within rural areas, and suggested that further information on the current position and reasons for the lack of projects coming forward be supplied. The IAB advised that in the context of ERDF Priority 4, the development of local partnerships in rural areas could assist in initiating and progressing quality applications. There is also a need to stimulate eligible activity in rural areas under ESF Priority 2 and ERDF Priorities 1 and 2.

Scottish Government advised that a meeting with SoSEP and relevant local authorities had been held on 23 October 2009 in order to address ERDF Priority 4 activity levels. Whilst it was noted that there were restrictions on eligibility, the Commission had gone as far as they could regarding rural development opportunities. The Scottish Government and IAB would arrange a workshop for local authorities and key partners to discuss potential areas for development.

Following a review of eligible areas, both Fife and South Lanarkshire local authority areas were now included in ERDF Priority 4. The Committee noted that research into innovation within rural areas was currently underway by Strathclyde University. It was hoped that the findings could influence the way forward for rural initiatives. A report on the research findings and any recommendations would be provided to Committee in due course.

(Donna Mackinnon joined the meeting)

Committee members were keen to ascertain what support could be given to tourism which was the main business activity in many rural areas, Scottish Government advised that visitor attractions could not be supported; however, business development could.

Referring to the Scottish Enterprise Strategic Delivery Body, the Committee enquired regarding availability of a more detailed report in future. Scottish Government advised a fuller report would be made to the Committee in March 2010.

Referring to Annex 3.1, the Committee noted there was no mention of carbon management within the list of energy projects. The IAB advised that project titles may not be the best guide to a project's activity. It was often the case that projects encompassed a range of sustainability issues. Unfortunately, more in-depth analysis of precise activities was not available.

Referring to the note from Graeme Hyslop, the Convener advised that agreement had been reached with the Commission regarding the levels of audit and compliance set out in the Management and Control Systems. Project sponsors were actively encouraged to submit accurate transaction lists and claims at the earliest opportunity, and workshops would be arranged by the IAB for those experiencing difficulty with the claims process.

(Paul Teasdale joined the meeting)

The Committee Agreed The Recommendations.

5. Update on ERDF Priority 3 and JESSICA

The Convener invited David Souter to introduce this item.

The Committee noted that a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed by the European Investment Bank (EIB). Two meetings had been held with Ministers, and they were fully signed up to use ERDF funds towards an economic recovery programme. It was hoped that a low-key sign-up event would be held in December 2009, with associated publicity.

A meeting by video conference would be held with the EIB on 29 October 2009. Whilst the Steering Group would continue to provide input/advice, all parties were now keen to make progress. It was of note that the Big Lottery Fund were now Steering Group members.

£10m in grant support had been ring-fenced to provide additional financial assistance to what were anticipated to be very complex applications. The grant would still come under the approved appraisal procedure for ERDF Priority 3 funding.

Committee members were asked to note the progress made to date. The Convener invited comments from Committee members.

Committee members agreed that it was good to see progress being made, and enquired how a balance of projects which could provide a return would be achieved. Scottish Government advised that the EIB would assist in the assessment of projects; however, one of the main criteria for judging applications was whether or not a return was possible.

It was noted that Scottish Enterprise's property assets had been identified as temporary match funding, and members enquired whether other partners portfolios would also be considered. Committee members raised concern regarding the potential for land and property being used as security for non-JESSICA activity. Scottish Government advised that consideration was being given to assets of local authorities, and that property assets would only be used to draw down ERDF funding.

The Committee Agreed The Recommendations.

6. Progress Report on the Assisted Venture Capital and Loan Funds

The Convener invited the IAB to address this item.

The IAB advised that the Venture Capital and Loan Funds would be providing quarterly reports including financial and physical information, in order to appraise the Committee of progress to date. The circulated Committee paper gave a flavour of how investments had been made on a geographical and sectoral basis, and identified that level of demand was currently beyond forecast activity.

The West of Scotland Loan Fund, Scottish Co-Investment Fund and Scottish Venture Funds were all making steady progress. Members were reminded that the Scottish Venture Fund was only initiated in 2008.

The Committee noted a balanced geographical and sectoral spread. However, whilst levels of activity in the West continued to increase, they remained lower than that in the East.

Referring to the note from Graeme Hyslop, the IAB agreed with the suggestion that inclusion of a comparison between the Scottish Co-investment Fund and Scottish Venture Fund geographical investments with some contextualisation would be of benefit.

The Convener thanked the IAB, and looked forward to receiving annual updates. The Committee were invited to comment.

Referring to the Scottish Venture Fund, Committee members raised concern regarding the geographical imbalance. The IAB advised that it was hoped that this would balance out over time, although this was very much dependent upon the nature of the sector, particularly technology spin-outs from Universities. The IAB were very keen to encourage a better balance in future.

The representative from LINC Scotland reported that Venture Funds were 2 years behind, as funding followed on from previous projects, and always followed a trend. New angel syndicate groups had been established in Highlands and Islands and also the West of Scotland with investments being made across the country in general.

Referring to the York Report commissioned by Scottish Enterprise, Committee members commented that £250m of funding had been invested in 2001 reducing to £150m in 2007 for Venture Capital Funds. The majority of this funding had been concentrated in the East. It would be of benefit to have some of the findings from this report made available in order to generate increased interest in the West. The representative from Scottish Enterprise agreed to provide this information, and pointed out that the figures reported referred to market demand, which would require to be generated in the West.

The Committee Agreed The Recommendations.

7. Exceptional Projects Procedure – Consideration of ERDF Strategic Projects

The Convener invited the IAB to provide a summary of the applications received.

The Committee noted that 5 applications had been considered. Two of these applications had been rejected in the second round, but approached to re-submit for stage 2. All applications had been time-critical and therefore eligible for consideration under the fast-track process.

The total grant required was £31.4m. Advisory Group recommendations were to approve £31.1m, covering 4 of the 5 applications received with some caveats. Projects were scored by the Virtual Advisory Groups and also went forward to the Standing Advisory Group for consideration.

7.1 University of Abertay, Dundee – Platform Alpha 2010 – ERDF Priority 2

A presentation on this application had been received from Paul Durrant. Total score awarded was 40.44. This project had originally been submitted for ERDF Priority 1 and received a scoring of 36.25. Reassessment of the activity indicated suitability for Priority 2, and the application was re-submitted under the fast-track process. The ERDF Priority 2 Advisory Group were happy to recommend this project for approval.

7.2 Coatbridge College – Coatbridge College Campus Enhancement – ERDF Priority 3

A presentation on this application had been received from John Doyle, Derek Banks and Shona Pettigrew. Total score awarded was 38.00. This project had originally been rejected in round 2 (having scored 32.15), but, following an appeal, it was re-submitted under the fast-track process. Following clarification on a number of areas, the ERDF Priority 3 Advisory Group agreed to recommend this project for approval subject to the IAB receiving additional information requested.

The Committee noted that an on-site visit had also been made to this proposed project.

7.3 Dumfries and Galloway Council – Dumfries Showcase Project – ERDF Priority 4

A presentation on this application had been received from Darren Burns, Dumfries and Galloway Council. Total score awarded was 25.83 which was well below the notional quality threshold. The IAB had raised issues regarding the eligibility of areas within the application and, given these concerns, the ERDF Priority 4 Global Grants Body Advisory Group decided not to recommend this application for approval.

7.4 Banff and Buchan College - Banff and Buchan College 2012 – ERDF Priority 4

A presentation on this application had been received from Paul Sherrington. Total score awarded was 43.28. Subject to receipt of further clarification on a number of areas, the ERDF Priority 4 Advisory Group were happy to recommend this application for approval.

The Committee noted, however, that the Commission had raised concerns regarding eligibility of this project under ERDF Priority 4. These concerns were mirrored by Scottish Government. Whilst this project would have been admissible under previous programmes, further education infrastructure was not covered in the regulatory framework for the current programming period.

The Convener thanked the IAB for the presentation and invited the Committee to comment.

Committee members noted that not all the projects seemed to be very strategic on a national level. Scottish Government reiterated the importance of applications being exceptional in order to qualify for consideration at this level.

Referring to the Banff and Buchan application, Scottish Government stated that Commission regulations do not permit the funding of training infrastructure. The purpose behind Banff and Buchan's funding request had only been established once a full application had been received. Those present suggested the College should have been notified of this at the earliest opportunity.

Concern was also raised regarding Banff and Buchan having a second opportunity to apply for funding. Scottish Government advised that following a site visit, it was agreed that aspects of the application could be funded under Priority 4. The IAB highlighted the need to fund added value. The application had improved with time and it was important to fund projects which were addressing new economic opportunities and the need to diversify the local economic base.

The Convener recorded thanks to members of the Advisory Groups involved in the scoring of the projects.

The Committee decided as follows:-
University of Abertay: Recommendations Agreed
Coatbridge College: Recommendations Agreed
Dumfries and Galloway Council: Recommendations Agreed

Regarding Banff and Buchan College, in accordance with ERDF regulations and the Commission advice, the MA and ESEP would go back to the college, revisit the bid and decide on the way forward.

7.5 Glasgow City Council - Pivot Capital Partners Venture Fund

The Convener welcomed Ian McCall and Suzanne Henderson of Scottish Government to the meeting. He also welcomed Jim Cunningham (JCu) of Glasgow City Council, and David Farquhar (DF), Brendan Richardson (BR) and John Chapman (JCh) of Pivot Capital Partners. Given the scale of the bid, the Convener had thought it appropriate for a presentation to be made to the Committee in order that members might have the full information.

The Pivot group gave a comprehensive presentation to Committee which included details of their individual backgrounds and experience, the challenges of the project and the intended impacts and value added.

The Convener thanked the group for a very informative presentation. He requested that members state their name and organisation prior to addressing their questions to the group.

The representative of Scottish Enterprise advised the Committee that the group did not have the full buy-in of Scottish Enterprise and enquired why had they chosen not to become a Co-Investment Fund partner when it was already established in Scotland. DF advised that co-investment funding was only offering 10% of the funds the group were looking to secure. DF added that the average investment in Scotland was £582k in 2008; Pivot Capital Partners were offering £9m. They did not consider that their arrangement was in competition with other investment funds. A paper had been prepared for the PMC – and circulated to members - which went into further detail in this regard.

Committee members raised questions on the capitalisation of the fund and the prospect for raising significant capital from the private sector. The Pivot Group were asked whether financial commitments, particularly in regard to overseas investors, were already in place. The Committee were advised that this capital was not secured currently, but the business relationships were already in place to take this forward. It was made clear that it would not be possible to progress the creation of the Pivot fund without ERDF support acting as a cornerstone investor.

As regards Glasgow City Council acting as the lead applicant and project sponsor, Committee members were concerned that the geographic scope of the Pivot fund might be limited to Glasgow. In response, the Glasgow City Council representative made it clear that the geographic area of coverage would be the LUPS Programme area.

The Committee enquired as to whether there had been or were plans to go to competitive tendering in securing fund management of the Pivot fund. The Pivot Group advised that tender documents had been prepared and a number of potential providers had been identified.

The Pivot Group were asked whether a lesser figure of ERDF funding (i.e. compared with the bid for £24m achieving the £62m total capital of the fund) might be viable from their perspective. The Group's response was that, whilst potentially a lower capital value of £50m could be considered, this would not fully optimise the fund and would not realise the full potential and intended benefits of the fund as presently described. Continuing this line of enquiry, the Committee also asked that, if the Pivot Group were to be unsuccessful in securing ERDF support, would they still be attracted to working in Scotland. In response, Pivot stated that their investment partners and potential investors were unlikely to have a continuing interest in operating in Scotland.

The Committee enquired about the target market for investee companies by Pivot. Pivot Group responded by saying that, in terms of sectoral targeting and based on their line of expertise and experience, they would be targeting the ICT sector. However, they made clear that ICT developments and products could have a major impact on other industrial sectors.

Members noted that the presentation had referred to previous engagements with Strathclyde University and enquired which departments had been involved. Pivot advised that they had worked with computer science and informatics department and contact had been made with the Principal.

The Convener thanked the Pivot Capital Partners for attending the meeting and providing Committee members with the opportunity to explore the potential of their proposal. On Pivot Capital Partners' departure, the Convener invited general discussion on the presentation from Committee members.

Committee members were encouraged by the proposal and noted the potential for a significant new opportunity for the growth and creation of global companies in an important and emerging new sector. However, they highlighted the need to ensure that all due diligence was carried out on the track record of the individual partners since Pivot was a relatively new entity.

Members also enquired as to the demand for this type of investment product and referred to the market gap analysis tabled by Pivot. Scottish Government advised that there was no evidence to this effect and noted that currently spin-outs were being supported through existing funds. Members were further advised by Scottish Government that, although the current market gap analysis was still being finalised, the gap appeared to be in the provision of debt finance. They stated that more up-to-date analysis would be available in late January/early February 2010.

Committee members enquired whether the decision on this proposal could be deferred until further information and investigation had been carried out. They were also concerned that there should be no undue delay in advising Pivot Capital Partners of the eventual decision of Ministers. The Committee also advised that, in the event of financial support being offered, it should be time-limited and conditional on Pivot Capital Partners raising the necessary co-finance within a 12 month period.

The Convener thanked the Committee for the full and frank discussion which had taken place.

The Committee agreed a decision on this application be deferred and that the following actions should be undertaken:

- **the Convener and Wilson Malone would meet Scottish Ministers to appraise them of the outcome of the PMC meeting**
- **Scottish Government officials would also provide the latest market analysis to Ministers**
- **a due diligence exercise would be commissioned by the IAB (for the Scottish Government) on Pivot Capital Partners and their achievements to date**

8. Exceptional Projects Procedure – Consideration of ESF Strategic Projects

The Convener acknowledged a conflict of interest for Donna McKinnon (SCVO) regarding their application. He invited the IAB to provide a summary of the applications received.

The Committee noted that all applications within the paper had been time-critical and were therefore eligible for the fast-track process. Each project sponsor had been asked to submit a stage 2 application which, in turn, had been considered by the Standing Advisory Group.

8.1 ScotAction Apprenticeship

A presentation on this application had been received from Jackie Galbraith of Scottish Government. Total score awarded by the Standing Advisory Group was 38.67. The Advisory Group were happy to approve this application, subject to submission of additional information, which had been received. Scottish Government added that this was the first scheme of its kind where the purpose was to keep apprentices in their post following completion of training. This project was recommended for approval.

8.2 Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations – Sustaining Future Jobs

A presentation on this application had been made to the Advisory Group by Joyce Thomson of SCVO. Total score awarded by the Standing Advisory Group was 35.17. The Advisory Group had concerns relating to the value added and the cost of providing the additional training proposed for individuals in temporary jobs. The Advisory Group requested further information from SCVO regarding staff and consultancy costs. Upon receipt, this information would be issued to the Advisory Group to make a recommendation which would go to the Committee members for decision by Written Procedure. It was not possible currently to make a recommendation.

8.3 Edinburgh Business Development – Intelligent Exporter

A presentation on this application was made to the Advisory Group by Roger Horam and Alasdair Kerr of Edinburgh Business Development and Stewart Laing of SDI. Total score awarded by the Standing Advisory Group was 33.83. The Advisory Group had concerns about the costs of procuring some expert services from outwith the EU, and wanted to press for more use of local expertise. Additional information had been requested from EBD which had since been issued to Advisory Group members. Once they had made a recommendation, this would go to Committee members for decision by Written Procedure. It was not possible currently to make a recommendation.

The Convener thanked the IAB for the presentation, and suggested that Committee members take a decision on the ScotAction Apprenticeship, but defer both other applications until the Advisory Group had sufficient information to make a recommendation. Their decision would then be requested by Written Procedure.

The Committee agreed to approve the ScotAction Apprenticeship application. However a decision on both the SCVO and Edinburgh Business Development applications would be made on the recommendations of the Advisory Group using Written Procedure.

9. Technical Assistance – Update on Approved Applications

Scottish Government advised that the £7.2m Technical Assistance monies had been spent in the first 3 years of the programming period, principally in payments to the IAB for delivering their contract with the Scottish Government and on the development of the EUROSYS database system for the processing of claims.

Members were made aware by Scottish Government of the potential for a Written Procedure Paper within the next 2-3 months regarding the National Visitors Survey and the impact upon SMEs.

The Committee Agreed The Recommendations.

10. Evaluation Action Plan – Update on Activities

The Convener advised members that this paper was a regulatory requirement of the Commission.

Scottish Government advised that the paper provided an update on the initial Evaluation Plan 2008. Members' attention was drawn to the evaluations of the Strategic Delivery Bodies and the cross-cutting themes due to commence in 2010. Most of the current evaluation in 2009 and 2010 was to explore the new business processes and delivery arrangements; thereafter, evaluation would be based on the outcomes and economic impact of the Programmes. A revised timetable of evaluation activities was attached for members' information.

Scottish Government are keen to ensure that results of evaluation reach the appropriate audiences, and welcomed suggestions from Committee members.

The Convener invited comments from Committee members.

Committee members enquired whether evaluation of Homecoming Scotland would be included within this report. The Scottish Government reported that, as this evaluation plan covers Structural Funds only, Homecoming Scotland would not be included. The Convener advised that Homecoming Scotland would receive a separate independent evaluation. The Committee were invited to consider the paper, and contact Paul Teasdale direct at the Scottish Government with any additional comments. Those present agreed to the plan as it stood. Scottish Government agreed to revise the paper following feedback received, publish the finalised copy on their website and update Committee members in due course as progress was made.

The Committee Agreed The Recommendations.

11. Any Other Competent Business

11.1 Timescales of Committee

In order to set a timescale for future large project bids, the Committee suggested that due diligence be carried out in advance in order for members to be best informed.

11.2 Homecoming Scotland

Committee members enquired whether the LUPS programmes had contributed financially to the 'Gathering' event. The Convener advised that no financial support had been provided under the Programmes.

12. Date of Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on 17 March 2010. A venue would be advised in due course.

The Convener thanked all present for attending and acknowledged their role in overseeing the significant progress being made in both the ERDF and ESF Programmes for 2007-13.