

Small grants	Medium grants	Large grants	Structure	Open text box
Which approach or combination I Please share your thinking for this grant size 1st choice - distributed dialogue. 2nd choice - deliberation. 3rd choice - community panel. I think all these options are best suited to the fund due to geographic size and the variety of people/ideas applying for funding.	Which approach or combination I Please share your thinking for this grant size 1st choice - distributed dialogue. 2nd choice - deliberation. 3rd choice - community panel. I think all these options are best suited to the fund due to geographic size and the variety of people/ideas applying for funding.	Which approach or combination I Please share your thinking for this grant size 1st choice - public vote. 2nd choice - distributed dialogue. 3rd choice - deliberation. I think due to the value of these larger grants, the local community (public) should get a vote on how the larger chunks of funding are spent.	Do you want the Panel to and the reason If you answered 'yes' please describe the change you propose	Is there anything else you want us to know?
Deliberation/Distributed dialogue	Deliberation/Distributed dialogue; people/ideas applying for funding.	Deliberation/Distributed dialogue;	No	n/a
I think a combination of criteria-based assessment and a review from a Local Panel is the ideal structure for small grants. The applications can be assessed against a steadfast and concrete set of criteria to ensure that there is a consist approach to award the grants, rather than a wishy-washy approach which is open to influence and bias. To counteract the rigid method of criteria-based assessment, I think also have a local panel to assist with deliberation would work to bring a subject view to how an applicants project can impact the local area, knowledge that criteria cannot address alone. I believe the small grant size should be kept low, allowing for a larger pool of recipient can be accommodated for. I think a funding range of £500 to £10,000 would be appropriate.	I believe the medium level grants selection needs to build from the small grants, keeping it relatively simple for applicants to get to the deliberation stage, but ensuring that it isn't as straightforward as box ticking to secure a grant. By opening the floor to more options and views outside of the local panel, through public votes and distributed dialogue. This further informs the panels decision to award these grants, having first narrowed them down based on the criteria and subjective local knowledge that they will have used in the small grants phase. I agree with the size of grants for the medium level, £10,000 to £50,000 can make a massive impact in local communities, but also means that the pot isn't drained with only a handful of applications.	I don't think the highest tier of grants needs a different set of approaches than the medium, it just needs to be more thorough and considered. This might mean an expanded set of criteria that the panel employ to ensure that the larger application is financially feasible, can be assessed effectively and has bench-markers which can help to define success. I still believe that it should be in the hands of local people to vote, pass comment and eventually decide on awarding the grant. However, I think that larger grants should also be assessed by the CNPA, considering the size of the pot and the size of grants that could be awards. I don't believe that the large grants should exceed £100,000, and should be capped there to ensure that the small and medium levels have a proportional	No	n/a
Criteria-based assessment;Local	Criteria-based assessment;Deliberation	Criteria-based assessment;Deliberation	No	I was not happy with some of the conversation going on during Session 4. I do not believe that the current members of the panel are entitled to be part of a decision making panel for award grants. That feels unethical considering we developed the funding structure, and I have already noticed clear bias and a lack of objectivity towards certain topics and issues within the national park. I see the idea that people don't want to 'give up' the chance they currently have to support the national park in decision making as a blatant and embarrassing power grab, and members of the panel who agree with this are speaking from the 'we' rather than the 'I', as they don't want to speak subjectively in case they are perceived poorly. I don't believe anyone within our group is remotely qualified and impartial enough to make decisions on what projects and applications should be awarded grants, considering the circles we have gone in based on members not having bothered to engage with or read the basic information packs and material provided by organisers. I have found that discussion opportunities often devolve into people raising personal grievances and vendettas against the CNPA, choosing to be overly critical instead of actually engaging with the opportunity to build something new and exciting. Personally, I don't see this as an opportunity to correct things but as an opportunity to try something new. I have also found that too much time is being spent allowing people to talk themselves round in circles, bringing up topics that are wholly irrelevant to the tasks at hand. Often this is a result of members not having actively engaged with any of the pre-reading or preparation material. but I do think more could be done to rein in conversations.
We want to engage people who haven't applied for funding before and make it easy so the ideas challenge could help people see relevance to them, an open collective model could encourage participants and widen the decision making and distributed dialogue also widens decision making. If a criteria based assessment were used then the criteria must be simple and not onerous. There is potential to combine some of these options for a mixed approach (eg ideas challenge with criteria based assessment)	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	No	I do want to say that I am still very much enjoying being a part of the panel and going through this process and I am very happy with the progress we have made with the funding model design.
I feel that this would be a fairer way of doing it as it is not influenced by peoples bias and opinions instead it is done by almost a checklist fashion and has to meet set standards	Same	Same	No	
Criteria-based assessment	Criteria-based assessment	Criteria-based assessment	No	
This is the fund that would be most accessible to smaller groups with less experience with funding and who just need to receive their money quickly to work on their projects. The assessment should be made fairly simple, with multiple ways of applying (over the phone, video, portfolio, etc. - not just a written form). Incorporating the distributed dialogue as a way of getting the work out there and sparking conversations across the park before applications open could be beneficial to link people together and brainstorm.	Multiple open collectives based on different criteria/ideas challenges (to improve the quality of discussions and reduce conflict), all	Applications complete a criteria-based assessment in the form of a presentation. A touring open collective (to capture voices from around the park) where applicants must present and then open up for discussions with the open collective. Projects that are supported by the collectives go through to a public vote OR to a central collective for deliberation.	Yes	I think we have made the fund inaccessible by not being specific enough about what projects this fund can support. I believe we could further divide the money into categories we've brought up in conversation such as: legacy projects, eco-tech, personal development, business start-up support, revenue/running costs, charity support... without this guidance, there will be some people who think their needs don't fit within the C2030 themes at first glance. Plus, I think we could all draw from our own beliefs and knowledge of who we are representing within this panel, to give opportunities to projects/people we want to support. Example: how will someone wanting to apply for funding for training course find this fund AND if they did find the fund, would they feel that putting in an application was worth doing? To them, it may seem that they are better trying to get a student loan rather than competing with so many different applications with varying levels of perceived importance to the community/decision makers. But then, we have lost out on supporting a young person who wants to learn and grow to work within the community.
Criteria-based assessment;Distrib	Collective models;Deliberation	Collective models;Criteria-based	Yes	I think the use of more visuals, where possible, will help with the influx of information at times. Diagrams/icons/visual assistance. Also, some more time to reflect on our thoughts before we go into discussions. I felt that in the last session, we were both trying to read and understand the information and get to grips with how we should apply it to our process whilst also in breakout rooms where people were already having discussions and it was hard to do everything at once! Would it be possible to see some of the content before the sessions to read ahead? Alsoooo last thing, could we hear the use of more examples as part of the main discussion when looking at different theories? I read the examples after the session on Wednesday and found it SO helpful in my understanding of the different theories and it was really cool to see how it could work in practice - I think a lot of the others would benefit from this too if there was time to make sure everyone read these at some point? You guys are doing great and I'm really enjoying all the learnings and conversations :) thanks for your hard work!
Despite the fact that we want the fund to be as easy as possible, to reduce limitation to application, it is important to make people get creative for the benefit of the Cairngorms. Setting the direction through theme-aligned idea challenge, helps to stimulate ideas that fit into the objectives of the National Lottery Fund. I would love the bulk of this fund, to focus a lot on ideas that increase/advance education, engagement and visibility for, on, and around the Cairngorms National Park - the flora, the fauna, the landforms, the people, their customs, communities, and the interactions with the fringes.	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	This is not too dissimilar from the small grants. The size is what makes me add criteria-based assessment, because the integrity of the grant-making process needs to be protected. You want the best ideas to get funded, because when they succeed, they not only become best-case practice stories for the Fund, but also for the Cairngorms. I'll like to see ideas matched against the use of eco-friendly technology, cultural advancement, economic stimulation, connecting with nature and improving nutritional physical and mental wellbeing	Yes	I want the Medium Pot to have fixed dates as well. Only the small pot should have rolling apps. I also want the 10% EDI fund to be a separate fund all together. It is important to set it aside, because 'true inclusivity can not be achieved by writing a massive generalised cheque to a hospital network or a school district. The money would naturally flow towards the path of least resistance which is serving the majority demographic. True inclusivity requires spending on highly specific targeted and often unglamorous interventions.'
Idea challenge	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	Yes	We need to address the elephant in the room, and agree on our definition of EDI, if at all, it deviates from the commonly accepted definition in the UK.
a mixed approach of criteria and distributed dialogue ends itself to geographical break down of park i.e. the elected members of Park down board areas.	Criteria-based assessment	£50-75,000 as if larger the whole fund starts getting soaked up by a very few projects unless this pot is capped	Yes	Consider just two scales small and large to simplify processes and allow a significant number of successful applications within the limit of £1,000,000
Criteria-based assessment;Distrib	Criteria-based assessment	Criteria-based assessment	Yes	We remove larger funds, we only have £1M and giving large awards by definition must prevent multiple smaller worth awards. Larger Grant applications covered multiple other places within park funding
Need speedy assessment criteria and award whilst good to try and encourage innovation	Criteria-based assessment;ideas	Larger grants need clear criteria, but also swift decision making	Yes	The submissions need to have names attached for openness, transparency and accountability, otherwise we have no way of knowing if true views of the panel
Grants should work to a fixed closing date, with a panel of selected professional from the community. The professional sectors should spread across the factors of what the grants are being applied for, farming, hospitality, tourism, HR etc. They would be able to deliberate, ask questions or award very quickly and simply.	Criteria-based assessment;Deliberation	This grant should have a little more criteria based to it, does not mean war and peace has to be supplied, but a more formal approach. Again a local panel of professional sectors that have an insight of the area and their fields, hospitality, farming, tourism, events, PR etc. They have the ability of deliberating, asking questions and then agreeing to the funds. Again answer to a closed	Yes	All funds to have a fixed date. Also think their should be a fourth pot for 'Legacy' this would be a personal, skill set funding for an individuals looking for financial assistance to gain new skills and education. The idea of those skills providing the community long term. Its important to perhaps set this pot aside as I believe that personal development might be lost when people look at the funding and see community etc. people would not necessarily apply for a skill set fund otherwise.
Deliberation;Local panel	Criteria-based assessment;Deliberation	Deliberation;ideas challenge;Local community.	Yes	There has been a discussion about the geographical location of some of the board, whilst I can see what they are referring to, I feel that many of the board have very strong feelings where the money should be allocated too. People on the verge of the boarder or further afield I believe have no pre-set objections to where or how the money should be allocated, we are there to merely set up the fairest, and easiest fund application and as a group we should be neutral in our approach, leaving aside any projects or funds that are close to ourselves.

Small grants		Medium grants		Large grants		Structure		Open text box
Which approach or combination f	Please share your thinking for this grant size	Which approach or combination f	Please share your thinking for this grant size	Which approach or combination f	Please share your thinking for this grant size	Do you want the Panel to c	If you answered 'yes' please describe the change you propose and the reason	Is there anything else you want us to know?
Ideas challenge	It would really empower whole communities, promote discussion, everybody from the community would be invited to participate (incl. children). The 'fun' aspect mitigates the risk of a core panel of similar demographics to the ones already in 'power' makes all the decisions. Communication about the event(s) are paramount.	Deliberation;Local panel;Mixed up (e.g CNPA)	only if the panel is paid, ideally participants picked at random, to avoid usual problems of over representativity of upper middle class male white retirees. If this isn't possible, then public vote after shortlisting from a professional panel	Deliberation;Local panel;Mixed up (e.g CNPA)	only if the panel is paid, ideally participants picked at random, to avoid usual problems of over representativity of upper middle class male white retirees. If this isn't possible, then public vote after shortlisting from a professional panel (e.g CNPA)	Yes	I don't propose a specific change for now, to me the structure of the funding is less important than the process(es). So I'd rather define the processes for them to be fair, involving true representativity of the communities, and then see if some processes are better suited for certain pots (geography, themes, size...)	As per my original application, and based on the discussions so far, I will keep lobbying to avoid over-representativity of typical demographics of people 'in power'.
Collective models;Criteria-based	It seems to me that the smaller grants should be less work to decide on so a criteria ish assessment with a quick easy form would be suitable, maybe mix in that locals/community members/a panel like ours is the group that assesses the applications.	Collective models;Criteria-based	I especially like the idea of some sort of combo of a distributed dialogue mixed with collective models, not sure how it'd work exactly yet though.	Collective models;Criteria-based	Having trouble separating this from the medium grants size while just thinking about all the possibilities. I do feel like the larger/more important the grant the more community involvement and decision-making in whatever form there should be.	No	Very open to hearing suggested changes but don't have any myself.	
	see my online comments		In my opinion this question is incompatible with the structure required by this consultation		In my opinion this question is incompatible with the structure required by this consultation	Yes	Indeed - I believe that the above structure is incompatible with the structure set up by this consultation	Panel member provided personal email address and no further comments, so we have removed this for anonymity
Mixed approach - please explain	I feel the small grants should be decided by the community in some form, whether a panel/distributed dialogue, but should be combined with a simple criteria based approach to help inform the overall decision.	Mixed approach - please explain	I also feel medium grants should involve the community but with heavier input from a criteria base.	Mixed approach - please explain	I feel the large grants should be subject to the most in depth criteria based approach with community involvement only after this.	No		I think a criteria needs to be used in all size of grants in order to inform community decisions but this should be very basic at the small level and more indepth at the larger level.
Criteria-based assessment	Easy to let staff cover small funding releases.	Collective models;Distributed dialogue;Local panel		Criteria-based assessment;Local panel;Public vote		No		
Mixed approach - please explain	I like the idea of keeping it simple whatever that looks like, for small grants	Deliberation		Deliberation		No		I like to think we as a panel will simplify the whole process, and sometimes it feels like we are making things too complex which is a regular criticism of funding in general
Distributed dialogue	This, by its very nature will hold the most Applications in terms of numbers. Therefore, we need to ensure that Grants approved are geographically	Collective models	Should be greater depth for the amount of	Criteria-based assessment		No		Panel member asked us to not share comments