

Should applicants be able to apply to the fund more than once?	Do you think match funding has a role in this fund?	What does meaningful benefit to the Cairngorms community mean to you?	Is there anything else you want to say about eligibility following our discussion in the last session?	How might geography feature in decision-making?	What role do you see for members of the panel on an ongoing basis? Please select all that apply.	What should a decision-making process prioritise when choosing between applications?	Is there anything else you want to say about community decision-making following our discussion in the last session?	For small grants, what information do you think an applicant should need to provide?	For medium grants, what information do you think an applicant should need to provide?	For large grants, what information do you think an applicant should need to provide?	What should the fund ask of people once they've received a grant? (reporting and accountability)	What would success look like for this fund?	What would put you off applying to this fund?
Yes - repeat application size	Yes - it should be encouraged but not required, at any grant	In practice this means that whatever project is put forward must benefit the Cairngorms as a place and the people living there.	No	decision making should include recording of the communities reached, and success will mean the ftn will have been proportionally spread across the park. Certain projects could get higher score by improving the natural environment (e.g. low emission transport, etc)	Panel membership should have the option to be part of decision-making	How well it is benefiting the community and if it will leave a legacy and something that will still be going back to the community in years to come	No	How they intend to use the money and if it will benefit the community and how. They should also state how they intend to carry out said project and also if it fits with our 2030 themes	Same	More detailed responses	To keep updating on how the project is coming along	The application process	
Yes - repeat application reach	No - requiring match funding could be a barrier for the people this fund is trying to	The community (well represented, both in numbers and demographics) should find a benefit in it, after discussing benefit of it.	Encouraging applicants to provide clear measurable potential benefits (e.g. scientific research and/or community survey)	I think geography matters at the outreach, application and decision-making stage. We need to account for smaller communities not having enough people (who aren't already involved in local community councils) to represent them and be in a position to access funding. I think we could divide decision making panels based on areas, but also have a central decision making panel made up of all these smaller local panels.	Ideally the deciders should be paid, in this case one cannot be a jointly twice (incl. members of this present panel), if not paid, then no restriction.	community impact - environmental sustainability	fair representativity of the community in the panels, market research and discussion mandatory	quantify community impact (can be through surveys) + environmental impact / sustainability	same as small, + at least 2 persons involved as applicants interview	same as medium + consolidated group and detailed time plan and budget	catchup progress as 121 meetings with 1 or 2 panels/its.	proportional geographical representativity, carbon 0 impact, surveys and interview of community members about the projects outcomes.	fund matching, paperwork, dehumanization of the funding process.
Yes - repeat application this in Session 7	I'm not sure - I'd like to discuss	Opportunity, inclusivity, sustainability, wellbeing for those living in and connecting with the Cairngorms. The project must offer an improvement in some aspect of life for the Cairngorms community whilst still meeting one of the Cairngorms 2030 aims. For example, making travel easier, cheaper or more feasible for residents and visitors. For climate mitigation or adaptation measures this might be helping residents cut their energy use or use energy more effectively (especially as living in such a rural area makes energy more expensive - most homes will be heated with oil or calor gas for example). Air based projects may improve resident and visitor wellbeing.	I think match funding could be a requirement based on certain eligibility criteria.	I think geography matters at the outreach, application and decision-making stage. We need to account for smaller communities not having enough people (who aren't already involved in local community councils) to represent them and be in a position to access funding. I think we could divide decision making panels based on areas, but also have a central decision making panel made up of all these smaller local panels.	Panel members should be able to return to a non-voting, advisory capacity only/Panel membership should rotate and include people from both within and outside the main Cairngorms communities (Avenmore, Braemar etc)	Is this an applicant that has applied for funding before? Do they receive funding from elsewhere already? How does this project benefit people from marginalised groups? Does this benefit people who LIVE in the park? Does this allow people who may not otherwise get to ACCESS the park? How does this improve the wellbeing, sustainability, opportunities, and inclusivity of the park? How does this project demonstrate legacy?	There needs to be a focus on engaging the people who don't otherwise normally participate. This is an opportunity to do something DIFFERENT!! I feel like we can try something new and find a better way of decision making than the norm.	Basic information, a cover letter/video/voice note/portfolio	As above, plus testimonials, accounts, consultation or other sufficient evidence of organisational structure, previous funding. There is probably some more information that would be sensible to gain but I'm not sure	As above, depending on the upper limit of the grant.	A report of any kind (photo/video/presentation/written) which demonstrates what they've done within 3 years.	The community having greater opportunities and for there to be some element of legacy.	The broadness of the fund.
Yes - repeat application this in Session 7	I'm not sure - I'd like to discuss	To me, this has two meanings. Firstly, skills and knowledge are being developed within and passed on to its members of the Cairngorms community as a result of projects funded by the CCF. Secondly, members of the Cairngorms community will have access to people, places and facilities that improve their wellbeing as a result of projects funded by the CCF.	would rather see this fund enable projects from individuals or smaller organisations and groups or individuals rather than governmental bodies or large NGOs etc.	I think the outreach stage is the most important time to draw in applications from under funded areas - there's not much point in having a geographically diverse decision making panel if there are very few applications from smaller/under funded areas. At the decision making stage, I feel simplicity might be key. Trying to do too much could lead to too many people being involved in the process, which could be overwhelming. I think it's important to have a diverse panel. However, I'm happy to discuss this and see what everyone else thinks.	Panel membership should have the option to be part of decision making	Does the project develop skills and knowledge within the Cairngorms community? Does the project improve access to people, places and/or facilities that will benefit the wellbeing of members of the Cairngorms community? What is the long-term reach of the project likely to be - how many people will it benefit both directly and indirectly, and for how long?	I am looking for a sense of fairness in the way the funds work but it is hard to describe what this looks like in detail	How much money is sought, what it is to be spent on (in-kind terms), what it will deliver and how this benefits the community (in the widest sense). Some idea of how the application relates to EOI	As above with the addition of a timeline of how the project will be delivered.	The nature of the project including how it meets the Cairngorms 2030 key themes, how it benefits the Cairngorms community, how much of the grant will be spent within the CNPA area (on goods, services and labour), what the spend profile plan is, what makes this project different from existing provision within the CNPA area	Progress reports should be submitted at 6, 12 and 24 months. These should be simple narrative descriptions of the small grants and more prescriptive for the large grants. I am uncertain what they should comprise for medium grants.	Success would see funding applied across a wide spread of the geographic National Park and a significant number of funded applications with a spread of values including some unexpected projects but with most providing enduring benefit for the community. Failure could be because little real benefit was delivered, because most of the fund was spent in a few small geographic parts of the National Park and/or because projects were not well managed and had not received grant funding for projects before.	If I did not know about the fund being available, if I felt applying was not worth the hassle involved or that qualifying criteria did not fit me, if I had too little time
Yes - repeat application size	Yes - it should be encouraged but not required, at any grant	Yes - it should be encouraged but not required, at any grant	Something that creates a noticeable difference. This is something specific to every community and differs for every project, and isn't directly physical. It's just means that a project achieves what it sets out to do. Community is a broad term, and a beneficial impact for one person, a group, or a whole area can be seen as a meaningful benefit.	I do not believe this fund should be available for anyone under 16 to apply. This doesn't exclude anyone younger, who can have an application submitted on their behalf.	I agree with the last statement, but don't hold any firm opinion on any other aspect	Does the project develop skills and knowledge within the Cairngorms community? Does the project improve access to people, places and/or facilities that will benefit the wellbeing of members of the Cairngorms community? What is the long-term reach of the project likely to be - how many people will it benefit both directly and indirectly, and for how long?	A summary of what their project is and how it fits into the themes of Cairngorms 2030. How it might benefit the community as per my previous answer.	As above with the addition of a timeline of how the project will be delivered.	As above, with a timeline plus some way of showing they are an established group/project/organisation (would like to discuss how you would do this, and some way of showing previous spending perhaps?) I think there needs to be a way of making sure they will be accountable but I'm not sure exactly how to go about it.	There are some form of legacy from it. Whether that means more people applying for funding in the future, projects still running in years to come, or skills and knowledge being passed on.	If I thought it wasn't meant for me - I think 'case' examples should be shown to people how a range of projects can fit the Cairngorms 2030 themes.		
Yes - repeat application reach	No - requiring match funding could be a barrier for the people this fund is trying to	Something will happen that is not at the moment fully covered by existing activities, it might not be a new idea but many people in the community will either directly benefit or think that it is a good idea that others will gain from the application.	Can't be too prescriptive on eligibility criteria but give guidance on who would be most likely to be eligible, when the application is being assessed any application from someone less likely has less chance of success but is not going to be ruled out of being considered.	Agree with all of the above.	Linkage with the communities the application comes from, likelihood of success of aims of the application, any benefits to the group/individual carrying out the project being funded, longevity of outcome of the project.	The idea, how it would be carried out, who will do it and rough idea of cost. Who in and how will the community benefit. Details such as bank accounts, detailed costings, previous project experience, audited accounts etc. should only be requested once grant is offered and if deemed appropriate to the nature of the project.	The idea, how it will be carried out & hoped results.	As above for small grants but more detail on how need for project has been established and how the successful benefit of the project will be demonstrated.	As above for medium grants	Quarterly reports. Panel members invited to see finished result/completed job.	Accountability for monies spent, an agreement of what is needed to monitor progress on a project that takes place over a longer period, an agreement on what measures are to be used to measure the success of the project.	A spread of types of activity and areas of benefit across the Park with all money spent.	Any feeling of inability to achieve the successful outcome of a project. Lack of support from CNPA staff in completing the project as quickly and smoothly as possible.
Yes - repeat application reach	No - requiring match funding could be a barrier for the people this fund is trying to	Bringing people to the Cairngorms for work or pleasure.	N/A	I think there has to be someone from each 'corner' (ward) of the park involved to take the application & decision making stage.	Panel membership should have the option to be part of decision-making	The biggest benefit to people/area not necessarily the largest group of people	N/A	Their idea, how it will be carried out & hoped results.	Their idea, how it will be carried out & hoped results.	Their idea, how it will be carried out & hoped results.	To see people/businesses improving themselves & bringing people/ideas to the national park.	Thinking my idea wouldn't be good enough to receive funding.	
Yes - repeat application reach	Yes - it should be a	Based on the 'merits' of each application, with clear cut, tangible evidence & consensus for this to proceed.	No, I don't think so at this stage.	I like the inference of establishing & making known right from the start that EOI is 'Up for Grab' for any deserving project within our Communities.	Certainly, oversteering the fruits of our labour, possibly utilising individual strengths or even considering geographical cover if zones were created? I am open to any suggestions if they can be validated as falling into our set parameters!	The Basics + additional Substantiation Template illustrating the 'Breakdown of Costs' involved.	Template for the basic requirements needs to be produced.	A complete Business Plan with attachments.	Progress Templates to be returned in a timely manner.	Based on Rating Templates sent back.	Sanita grant simple Evidence of implementation, for medium and large grants some form of audit process	Open and transparent publishing of grant applications including those not successful and those successful	Too much info overload !?
No - funding should be requirement for large grants	Yes - it should be a	Demonstrably benefit local people	Open discussion and open sharing of application information including list of applications approved and rejected.	Clear evidence that funding is aimed towards full geographical spread	Panel membership should have the option to be part of decision-making/Not handed over to Cairngorm national park for funding decisions or filtering of applications	Demonsratable local community benefit	Half a page A4 - simple process.	Idea and financial information	Full financial plan, stress testing of viability, match funding proof				
Yes - repeat application size	Yes - it should be encouraged but not required, at any grant	Helps the community you live in, a group of people you are connected with, an event that brings people, opportunity and revenue into your area, a legacy in a building, green space or person that helps that body of people or area for a continued period of time. Makes peoples life that little bit easier.	Match funding I believe will be a sticking point for many across the group. There should be Match funding preferred for certainly some of the grants. This shows commitment from the applicant and group they represent, with a better outcome of success as it shows people are behind it. Preferred not essential as perhaps wording	I don't think geography should feature in the decision making, I think if the public are allowed to have a heavy vote, then areas highly populated and supported will win the vote, rather than based on the project merits. Limited votes for a public steer and funds based on merits, rather than areas	They can be part of the decision making, but they need to be on this for the right reason, they have a skill set that allows them to bring something to the table (hospitality, farmer, builder, community worker, career etc) Along with having no input or connecting to anyone applying for a grant	Values, impact, return	no						