

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Question 1 - The table in part 5 provides an overview of the proposals under each of the EU 2020 headings – Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive – matched against the relevant thematic objective and investment priorities. Do you think the investment priorities are the most appropriate ones for the activity suggested?

Generally, the proposals in the table in part 5 of the document match the investment priorities well. It would be helpful to link the proposal around developing workforce more closely with the inclusive objective. I also think there is an opportunity for the active travel proposal to encompass a social inclusion element.

Question 2 – Section 6 sets out the linkages between Structural, Rural and Fisheries Funds as well as linkages to other EU Funding Programmes. We would welcome stakeholder comments on these linkages in order to help us develop this thinking further

-

Question 3 - Do you think the new proposals will have a positive or negative impact on the protected characteristics and wider issues of inclusion and participation?

In part 7, the consultation paper talks about an EQIA being carried out on Structural Funds Programmes 2014-20. It would be helpful to carry this out at a strategic level on the overall programme and its development, and also on each proposal as it is being developed. EQIAs should cover the statutory protected characteristics, and also a social class/deprivation category. This should be an essential criteria before funding is allocated. In addition, I would suggest that each proposal should demonstrate how potential service users have been involved and participated in the design of the programme. Experience tells us that this early engagement will develop wider ownership and consequently higher uptake of programmes.

Question 4 - If you think there will be a negative impact on the protected characteristics or inclusion and participation please provide suggestions as to what could be done differently to diminish this impact.

I think the suggestions at 3 above will be useful to ensure there is no negative impact on the protected characteristics or inclusion and participation. Our aim, however, should not be to minimise negative impact, but to ensure that there is no detriment to those with protected characteristics, or even that there should be a narrowing of inequalities as a result of each proposal.

Question 5 - Please provide your views for improving the process for design, procurement, delivery, monitoring and evaluation to strengthen delivery of sustainable development.

Given current financial constraints on Health Boards and other partners, there should be explicit description of how projects can be sustained or commitment to continued funding of successful projects. Evaluation should include cost effectiveness and/or comparison with other interventions that may be less effective.

Question 6 – Do you have any further comments on the proposals outlined in this document?

I would like to see greater use made of Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) as a mechanism for allocating and monitoring funding and impacts. CPPs have access to other funding streams and partners will be directing mainstream budgets towards CP priorities. This model has been successful in taking forward the employability pipeline work under the inclusive theme, but could be extended to cover other proposals and themes. There is a dilemma at the moment between increasing community ownership and involvement, and moving towards more strategic programmes with a high impact. CPPs can help bridge that gap by clustering local work and initiatives in a way that contributes to a more strategic set of outcomes.

Finally, it would be good to keep the whole process as visible as possible to partners. This would include the setting up of the Partnership Agreement Monitoring Committee and the Strategic Delivery Partnerships (membership, terms of reference and minutes).