

What's working well in the blueprint so far?	What would you change, and why?	Our guiding question is: how should this fund work, and how do we make sure communities are genuinely in control? What's the one thing we still need to get right to answer it?
For example, looking at the fund design as a whole, what feels right? What are you most confident in?	For example, is there anything in the blueprint that doesn't sit right with you, feels unclear, or that you think could work better? Be as specific as you can - the more detail you give us, the more useful it is.	This could be something that's unresolved, something that needs more thought, or something you feel strongly about that isn't yet reflected in the design.
The blueprint reflects majority view of what the fund should look like. I am very confident that the final piece, would deliver benefits for the Park and it's people, once we dot and cross the final Is and Ts.	I'm still not very clear about the scoring/weighting system for awarding the grants. And, I really think one panel tasked with reviewing applications from all three grant pools, makes sense.	Unless there's leverage from the NLHF, I wouldn't want the overhead cost of administering the fund, to get close to 30-40% of total grant fund available for award. If we manage to succeed with that, I think it can become a wonderful case study for sustainable participatory policymaking in practice; and this would eventually cause more donors to want to replicate, or award more grants to the Park. I'll love that we look beyond this £1m, and the next 2 years of implementation, and ponder on what legacy we want to leave behind through this process.
The level of detail required for each grant size. I think the simplicity of the process will be a relief to funding veterans and build confidence in people new to funding. I personally feel the EDI element will work well (keeping the 10% in reserve) and I don't feel any need to keep revisiting it or make the minimum 10% higher. It's a minimum threshold and I'm confident there will be many more applications hitting the EDI definition than just 10%.	I think the community panel decision making for medium and large grants is great in principle but we still need to really flesh it out - the logistics of it are still quite vague and I'm not sure the Park have enough to go on.	How should this fund work: With as much simplicity as possible and giving the widest range of people a shot at receiving funding. ~ I think we're hitting that. How do we make sure communities are genuinely in control: From the design process through to the decision making process, voices from around the Park should be represented ~ The Park have done a good job of bringing us all together from a really wide array of backgrounds. If this can be done when bringing a decision making panel together then we're well on our way to answering this question.
im confident we have got a lot of things right at this pointy.I think the amounts offered in grants sits well with me,however i would add that i think small should be upto 200,00.med 350,000,large 450,000....my thinking behind this is that there is a good spread of grants.	i think the panel that is going to deside grants,needs not to be people that are always on panels,i really think the mix of people on this panel is refreshing and i personally think we should all be on the next panel ,i feel we are a fair bunch of folks .That would make the next stage easy....however i know not everyone agrees with this,or even might not want to be on the next panel.Also EDI needs more discussion...	.I think we need to have specific amounts in the funds.An interactive map sounds like a great way for folks to check where funding is going,transparency is also very important in funding so evryone knows it isnt going to for example to cnpa friends....i think there is still a lot to clear up and ultimately agree on...will leave that till the zoom
I feel the application process and questions that people have to fill out are simple and is including of the people we are trying to get to use this funding.	I feel the size of pots needs to be gone over and thought about slightly more and think about the pros, cons and result from different sizes of money available.	
Very little confidence in anything currently, the blueprint still seems to be a collection of a variety of ideas with no sense of a consensus to any one direction on the majority of issues raised. I have tried to be more specific in comments directly on the document	I have tried to be specific in comments on the document	We need to go through every point point by point and vote on decisions then stick to them!
The proposed 'Structure' of the Fund is basically sound & the model employed by Involve, I believe, has been successful to date. I am also confident that the 'Operational Support' from the PA will guarantee the Panel's success & assist effectively to improve our Communities' Wellbeing.	I feel that the 'Community Decision Making' aspects have been questioned in depth to date & we are still to reach consensus. The point has been made that geographical consideration gives way if 'Project Quality & Community Benefit' is compromised as a result. Therefore, let us not get bogged down too much & remove any geographical reference where needed.	Community Engagement', I believe is the key. How we, as a Panel can either assist or facilitate this through the PA to make it economically attractive & engaging requires our awareness & proposed outreach activities to be agreed still.
representative paid panel is what I think is most important. The explicit support that will be given to applicants is great. Scoring of the projects is great.	The EDI 10% ringfenced is ok, but I would want it to be 15 or 20%.	I would want more involvement of the whole community. Not sure how, maybe as a "consultative" opinion, for the panel to take into account? so not as vote, but asking the whole community "what do you think of each of these projects?" . At any rate the decision should be totally transparent, and reported back to the community