

Meeting Date: 29 April 2013, Windmill Cafe

Voting members: Helen, Tommy, Fiona, Mo, Katie, Saima, Claire, Ferouz, Linda, Alan, Fabien, Annemarie, Jessica

Matter arising

Jason (via email) suggested separate steering group (to discuss papers, accounts, decisions) and ideas forum (organising community events) to play to group's strengths/interest.

Voting members tally: 7 residents present, so 6 non-resident members able to vote

Trusted Organisation Questions

First item discussed was the questions to send to organisations being invited to be our trusted local org and hold the start-up £20k. Trevor recapped what this organisation would be responsible for, and distributed the questions for anyone who didn't have them. Ferouz tabled the idea that this organisation should be a local charity; this was discussed briefly but decided it wasn't an essential criteria.

Claire and Fabien requested that the list of questions was simplified to show essential vs desirable criteria, so an organisation would know by reading the questions whether they were likely to be selected. This concept was generally agreed by the group but would be put to vote for confirmation.

Annemarie asked to clarify how often the trusted org would be expected to produce reports for us, to give the org a sense of the volume to work.

Alan asked that a question was added so the organisation could explain how they would ring fence out money apart from theirs. The group generally agreed to this, but an official vote wasn't taken. **NOTE TO FOLLOW UP.**

Fabien queried the request for 1 year's worth of accounts, and whether this was sufficient. The group discussed having 1 year of accounts presented vs 3, and what this would demonstrate about the stability/longevity vs newness of an organisation.

A vote was taken on how many years of accounts up request:

1/2 year - 8 votes

2/3 years - 5 votes

As this didn't achieve the 2/3 majority, this vote didn't pass. The discussion continued, with Saima asking how we could otherwise determine an organisation's reliability.

Trevor listed things such as their reserves policy, the manner that pensions accounts are handled, as part of the forensic audit that can be done. The group agreed to take a vote again, as opinions had shifted after this discussion.

A vote was taken on how many years of accounts up request:

1-2 years: 9 votes

2-3 years: 4 votes

Motion carried to ask an organisation for 1-2 years of accounts.

The discussion then moved on to the contents of the questions: the wording, what to include, and how to organise it.

A vote was taken on whether or not to have a checklist at the top of the document, and differentiate essential criteria from desirable.

Yes votes: 12

Abstain: 1

Motion carried to include a checklist and 'essential' vs desirable criteria.

A vote was taken on whether or not to make frequency of reports a statement in the questions, or leave the frequency to be determined later.

Decide later: 10

Decide now: 2

As the volume of activity and frequency of reports will be determined by how often we spend/cut cheques, and we haven't made plans in this direction yet, **the motion was carried to leave this decision until a later date.**

Claire suggested that to save an organisation time in preparing their response, we could invite them to send their annual report. The group then discussed whether or not the report should be in lieu of answering some questions, or in addition. Ultimately, the group recognised that question 2 could be changed to accommodate this idea.

A vote was taken on whether or not to change question 2 to include in its question 'or provide a link to your annual report'

Yes: 11

No: 2

Motion carried that organisations can provide their annual report as a way of answering question 2.

After discussion, the consensus of the group seemed to indicate that questions 1-4 could constitute a checklist of essential criteria, while questions 5-7 indicated added value/desirable criteria.

A vote was taken on whether or not to label questions 1-4 as an 'essential criteria' checklist, and questions 5-7 as 'desirable'.

Yes: 11

Not: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion carried to label questions 1-4 as an 'essential criteria' checklist, and questions 5-7 as 'desirable'.

The Community Event

Fiona proposed having a table at Stoneydown Folk Fete on 30 June, as said she had reserved one for Big Local in advance. Trevor mooted previous ideas: a stall in the lower half of the market with a 'washing line' to gather people's feedback; write-on wall space at or outside The Mill; an event at Tenby Court with Ascham homes. The group were most in agreement on a market stall and a Tenby Court event, but did not discuss write-on wall space.

Fabien offered two pop-up banner stands for use at the market stall/other locations. These would need a design on them to represent the St James the Big Local. **Action: Fabien was asked and agreed to mock up some designs, to be brought to the next meeting.**

Other community events to be involved with was an event at Frederic Street, via Norman's suggestion. Tommy suggested tagging along to a 23 June Scout fete at Leucha Rd hut, as well as possibly a 18-19 May cleanup event. The group liked the notion of attending these events, and staffing any stalls with enthusiastic members of the big local group.

The known calendar of events to date are:

23 June – Leucha Rd hut Scout fete

30 June – stall at Stoneydown Folk Fete

Early July (TBC) – stall in lower half of the market

???? – Frederic St event

???? – Ascham homes Tenby Court event

???? – local School fetes (Schools in area: Coppermill, Mission Grove, Stoneydown, St Patrick's)

Items proposed for these stalls:

Rota of people to staff them

Leaflets with logo and information about the Big Local

Postcards with logos, so people may post their ideas to the group

'Washing line' to feedback ideas

Contacting Schools/confirming dates for unknown dated events

Action: Begin next meeting by looking at Fabien's designs, deciding what events to attend and what to take to them, and coming up with a rota