



National Audit Office

#### HELPING THE NATION SPEND WISELY

The National Audit Office scrutinises public spending on behalf of Parliament.

The Comptroller and Auditor General, Tim Burr, is an Officer of the House of Commons. He is the head of the National Audit Office, which employs some 850 staff. He, and the National Audit Office, are totally independent of Government. He certifies the accounts of all Government departments and a wide range of other public sector bodies; and he has statutory authority to report to Parliament on the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which departments and other bodies have used their resources.

Our work saves the taxpayer millions of pounds every year, at least £9 for every £1 spent running the Office.

# Review of the Rye Partnership

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Executive Summary	2
Introduction	3
Project Activities	4
Project Management	9
Governance and Operations of the Partnership	11
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Appendix 1 – Summary of expenditure on SRB projects	21
Appendix 2 – Rye Partnership projects	32
Appendix 3 – Findings from SRB statements of grant expenditure	35
Appendix 4 – Analysis of Market Towns Programme	37

## 1. Executive Summary

1. The Rye Partnership was established in 1997 as an informal association of organisations concerned with the development of Rye. Since that time the Partnership has received over £2 million of central government and European funding and has been supported both financially and operationally by Rother District Council. The Partnership incorporated as a company limited by guarantee in 2003 and aims to support the regeneration of Rye.
2. The National Audit Office has, at the request of a group of local residents, examined the Partnership's activities, focussing on those projects which were funded by central government and the European Commission. **Our examination did not constitute a formal audit but it has not revealed any wilful misuse of government funds.**
3. The Partnership received £1.6 million from the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) under the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB). This funding has delivered benefits, but the original aims and objectives were very ambitious and the Partnership has not been able to deliver benefits to the level it originally envisaged.
4. The Partnership was later awarded Interreg funding from the European Commission via the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and Market Towns funding from SEEDA. Although the projects generally met their objectives, our work has highlighted a number of project management issues. A GOSE inspection report identified that the management controls of the Interreg projects were very weak and, with the agreement of the Partnership, suspended funding for a time.
5. The Partnership has generally lacked the administrative and management capacity to effectively deliver its project activity, especially in the early years. This is particularly illustrated by the problems and delays experienced on some of the larger capital projects. The Partnership's capacity to manage projects has been affected by the limited resources available for project management and a disruptive turnover of staff. As a result we have found incomplete documentation on some project files and inconsistent project monitoring.
6. We have also identified a number of weaknesses in the Partnership's governance arrangements. In the past, the Partnership, through necessity, relied heavily on single individuals who exercised considerable influence over the Partnership's operations. The appointment of the first managing consultant was reactionary and done very quickly. Similarly, weaknesses in succession planning between the various managing consultants cost the Partnership time and money.
7. The Partnership did not always produce minutes of its meetings and financial statements in the early days, but it has met all statutory requirements for filing with Companies House since its incorporation.
8. The Partnership acknowledges that its communication with local residents could have been improved and that there is still work to do in this area.
9. The Partnership is aware that it needs to define its future role and is in the process of preparing a business plan for 2009 onwards. It needs to develop a strategy to secure funding and ensure financial sustainability, as well as strengthen community relations.

## 2. Introduction

10. The Rye Partnership was formed in 1997 to develop local community action to overcome social and economic problems in the Rye area. The members of the Partnership were drawn from the local business community, from various voluntary organisations and a small number of Councillors. In February 2003 the Rye Partnership incorporated as a company limited by guarantee.
11. Over the years the Partnership has been successful in obtaining Single Regeneration Budget and Market Towns Programme funding from the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA), and funding from the European Commission via the Interreg programme administered by the Government Office for the South East; a part of the Department for Communities and Local Government. This funding has been spent on designated projects in and around the Rye locality, with the objective of, amongst other things, regenerating the area and boosting tourism and skills in the employment market.
12. The Partnership has also been supported by Rother District Council which has, at various times, provided funding to cover running costs, staff expertise and other services at no cost to the Partnership. The Council has also grant funded a number of the Partnership's projects.
15. We are very grateful for the help and co-operation shown by staff and members of all the organisations involved.

### Scope of our investigation

13. The C&AG was approached by a group of local residents requesting an investigation into the performance and management of the Rye Partnership. Their concerns were amplified in further letters and meetings.
14. As statutory auditors of both the Department for Communities and Local Government and the South East England Development Agency, the Comptroller and Auditor General has the right to examine the activities of the Rye Partnership so far as they relate to the use of funding administered by the Government Office or received from SEEDA. In addition the Chair of the Partnership and the Chief Executive of Rother District Council have permitted the National Audit Office access to all aspects of the Partnership's activities that we have deemed necessary to perform our review.

### 3. Project Activities

#### Introduction

16. Since its formation in 1997 the Rye Partnership has engaged in a number of projects which have been part funded by public monies received from central and local government bodies including:
  - South East England Development Agency (SEEDA);
  - East Sussex County Council; and
  - Rother District Council
17. The Partnership has also received European Commission funding administered by the Government Office for the South East (GOSE; part of the Department for Communities and Local Government).
18. As the statutory auditor of central government funds we have only reviewed those projects which received funding from central government or European sources.

#### Overview

19. In its early years, the Rye Partnership was supported by Rother District Council staff and resources in bidding for Single Regeneration

Budget (SRB) funding from the South East England Regional Development Agency (SEEDA). The bid was successful and in 1999 SEEDA awarded the Partnership a grant of £1.638 million to spend on local regeneration activities over the next six years.

20. In 2000 the Partnership was successful in bidding for £89,000 of Interreg II European funding from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE). Interreg IIIA funding of just over £200,000 followed between 2004 and 2006.
21. In 2005, when the SRB funding came to an end, the Partnership was successful in bidding for a further £160,000 from SEEDA under its Market Towns Programme.
22. More recently, in 2008, the Partnership secured funding from the South East Area Investment Framework (AIF), funded by SEEDA and administered by East Sussex County Council to refurbish the Rye Fisheries. The amount offered and claimed for the refurbishment was £145,734.
23. Figure 1 shows the central government and European funding streams received by the Partnership.

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Funding programmes				Single Regeneration Budget									
										Market Towns			
											Area Investment Framework		
				Interreg II and Interreg IIIa									

Figure 1: Central government and European funding stream received by the Partnership

## Single Regeneration Budget

### Background

24. The Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) began in 1994 and brought together a number of programmes from several Government Departments with the aim of simplifying and streamlining the assistance available for regeneration activity. SRB provided resources to support regeneration initiatives in England carried out by local regeneration partnerships, as part of a shift towards involving the wider community in regeneration activity. Local authorities were therefore unable to bid for the funds directly themselves and, in order to bring funding to their areas, instigated the creation of local regeneration partnerships.
25. Schemes ran for up to seven years. The purpose of SRB was to enhance the quality of life of local people in areas of need by reducing the gap between deprived and other areas, and between different groups.
26. There were six rounds of bidding for funding and 1,027 bids worth over £5.7 billion were approved across the country. The average bid was therefore worth over £5.5 million. The Rye Partnership's 1999 'Rye Bay Renaissance' bid for £1.8 million of funding was relatively small and the Partnership was actually only awarded 90% of this, £1.638 million.
27. SEEDA imposed two key conditions in the letter offering the grant:
  - It required the Partnership to prepare an annual delivery plan, profiling expenditure and outputs, which had to be submitted and agreed by SEEDA
  - Rother District Council had to prepare an annual statement of grant expenditure as the accountable body for the grant. It had to be audited by an external auditor and submitted to SEEDA. Further information about Rother District Council's role as accountable body is included in Section 5.
28. In addition, the Partnership had to apply to SEEDA to seek approval for individual projects within the SRB scheme. The initial bid proposed 20 projects, covering a range of regeneration objectives: Community Development, Education and Skills Raising, Structure of the Local Economy and the Rye Town Initiative.

## Strategic objectives of the scheme

29. The original bid "The Rye Bay Renaissance – A Blueprint for Community Action to Achieve Rural Regeneration" was ambitious in its projected outcomes.
30. For example, one of the Partnership's strategic objectives was to raise the standards of literacy and numeracy at two local schools. The desired outcome was to raise literacy at key stages 1 and 2 to 83% (up from 64%). The numeracy target was to raise the proportion of those achieving key stage 2 (level 4 and above) from 51% to 75% between 1999 and 2002. Further, the Partnership aimed to raise literacy and numeracy at key stage 3 from a baseline position of performing 6 months behind the national average, to a closing position of performing above that average between 1998 and 2002. This was a lot to achieve with a budget of just £30,000 for this element of the project.
31. A further objective was to reverse the decline of the local economy, with the desired end of scheme position to be that the Hastings Travel to Work Area moved out of the bottom quartile for the country. Additionally, the Partnership aimed to reduce unemployment and raise average earnings. Both of these objectives could be seen to be well outside of the Partnership's direct control and the Partnership had no specific projects designed to achieve them.

### Projects

32. The SRB scheme comprised 22 individual projects. Most of these projects were proposed in the original bid to SEEDA. Appendix 1 to this report collates available information for all projects within the SRB scheme. The Appendix shows achievements against plans and expenditure compared to budgets for each of the proposed projects.
33. We reviewed several of the Partnership's SRB funded projects in more detail, namely:
  - Computers for Schools;
  - Rye Fisheries;
  - Central Garage Site (Rye Resource Centre);
  - Animate; and
  - Rye Harbour Stores.

Our detailed findings are set out in the case studies in Appendix 2.

**Expenditure**

34. In the Rye Partnership Newsletter for October 2000, the Chairman wrote of the availability of funding to provide “£12.5 million for nearly 30 regeneration projects in and around Rye up to 2006”. The claim was not properly explained at the time and the Partnership has not fully reported on how the money was spent since. However, the Funding Profile Summary in the delivery plan submitted to SEEDA, for the first year of the SRB programme, shows the basis of the Chairman’s statement:

		£
<b>Total SRB Challenge Fund</b>		<b>1,638,000</b>
Private Sector	5,300,000	
Voluntary Sector	316,000	
Other	120,000	
<b>Total Private Leverage</b>		<b>5,736,000</b>
<b>Total Other Public Sector</b>		<b>4,917,500</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>12,291,500</b>

Source: SRB Delivery Plan

35. A review of the annual statements of grant expenditure for the SRB programme reveals a total of £1,225,903 other public and £506,624 private funding was actually spent by the Partnership on the projects and the programme’s administration. There is no record of any other private or public sector funding having been received by the Partnership, although some other public funds are known to have been spent in the Rye area at the time of the SRB programme, for example the Environment Agency works carried out at Simmonds Quay.

36. Our analysis shows that, overall, the Partnership claimed £1,610,208 of SRB funding against the available funding of £1,638,000. There were, however, under and overspends on individual projects, most notably the Capacity Building project (£138,424 overspend), the upgrading of the fish market (£118,500 overspend), and the upgrade of the Tourist Information Centre (£22,458 overspend), which compensate for four large projects which did not go ahead as planned (Central Library, Rye Harbour Road

Workspace, Camber Enterprise Centre and Strand Quay).

**Evaluation**

37. All SRB schemes were evaluated at an interim and a final stage, with evaluations paid for from the scheme budgets. The Partnership commissioned an external company to evaluate the Rye Bay Renaissance scheme in 2003, and agreed with SEEDA that it could perform its own internal evaluation at the end of the scheme in 2005.

38. The 2003 review concluded that the Partnership’s original SRB scheme targets were very ambitious, and the scheme managers expected far greater outcomes than were possible to deliver. Some of the activities of the Partnership, for example the Fisheries project, were also deemed to be reactive in nature. However, the report concluded that the SRB projects in general appeared to be good value for money. It stated “that the people and businesses of Rye and the area around it have benefited from the scheme in unarguable”.

39. The end of scheme evaluation was completed by the Partnership’s own managing consultants, in 2005. The consultants had not been directly involved in managing the scheme and, indeed, were appointed after the scheme had finished. The report states that “the SRB scheme achieved many of its expected outputs, although these did not necessarily convert into the success that the original bid had anticipated...The expected outcome targets were too ambitious and in a few cases outside the scope of the SRB scheme”. The report also admits that “the Rye Partnership, both in terms of its structure and its management has at times struggled”.

**Statements of grant expenditure**

40. Rother District Council, as the accountable body for the SRB scheme, prepared six statements of grant expenditure over the lifetime of the SRB scheme. Of the first four, three were issued with a qualified audit opinion and one was unqualified. Audited statements for the final two years of the scheme could not be located at the time of our examination.

41. Only one of the six statements was submitted on time, by 31 December. The auditors identified ineligible expenditure, where the amounts claimed did not agree to supporting

documentation (totalling £10,000) or were claimed in the wrong year (technically ineligible, but later approved by SEEDA), in 1999/2000 and 2000/01, and the amount of grant due was adjusted accordingly in the following years. Further details from the audited statements of grant expenditure can be found in Appendix 3.

## Interreg

### Background

42. Interreg is a European Commission funded programme that helps regions in different European Union countries to work together in pursuit of common goals. Strict eligibility criteria apply to expenditure and grants must be matched by external funding.

### Festival of the Two Bays

43. This was the first of the Partnership's Interreg projects, applied for in 1999 under the Interreg II programme from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE). The objective of the project was to create a festival encompassing five existing events in the Rye area and in France, unifying the organisation and promotion of these events under a single brand and strengthening the events themselves. The Partnership, and the French partner to the project, were offered a combined grant of £89,200.
44. The project was subject to an interim monitoring inspection visit by the GOSE Audit Team under Article 10 of European Commission Regulation 438/2001. Their report identified that the Partnership had claimed £17,356 of unsupported and ineligible expenditure in its claims. It appears that the Partnership was eventually able to provide sufficient evidence to support the amounts claimed, and the total grant paid for the Festival of the Two Bays project was £88,640.

### Regeneration of Rye and Folleville through their Medieval Past

45. The second of the Partnership's Interreg projects took place in two phases between 2004 and 2006. Phase one included the delivery of an annual medieval festival, a heritage trail and exchanges of staff and craftspeople between Rye and Folleville, in France. Phase two of the project included the

illumination of key buildings in Rye and restoration work at the Ypres Tower in Rye.

46. This project was also subject to an Article 10 inspection visit by the GOSE Audit Team in 2005. They concluded that management controls of the project were 'very weak'. Indeed, the findings were serious enough for GOSE to suspend funding for the project. GOSE reported the irregularities to the European Commission because it had found ineligible expenditure above the reporting threshold of €4,000.
47. In particular the GOSE Audit Team identified:
- claims had been incorrectly completed;
  - procurement requirements had not been followed;
  - evidence to support the majority of volunteer time, used as match funding on the project, could not be provided;
  - evidence to support some expenditure could not be provided; and
  - project income from site fees had not been taken into account.
48. The GOSE Audit Team inspected all expenditure claimed by the Partnership on the project, which totalled £47,895 at the time of their visit. Of this, it deemed that £10,415 was ineligible as it had not been fully supported by evidence and £31,167 was ineligible as it did not comply with the terms of the offer letter.
49. The Partnership appointed The Stowers & Associates as replacement project managers to address the findings of the inspection. They worked to rectify the problems and provide supporting evidence for the amounts claimed, reconstructing the project's audit trail from scratch. A second inspection took place in 2006 and the GOSE Audit Team were satisfied that the biggest problem, the lack of effective project management, had been resolved.
50. GOSE issued a revised offer letter for the remainder of the project to the Partnership early in 2006, confirming that the funding was in place to complete the project. The remainder of the project went ahead and the total grant paid to the Partnership and its French partner was £203,129.

## Market Towns

### Background

51. The Market Towns programme generally followed the same scheme guidelines as the SRB programme but the funding was only available to small rural towns meeting particular criteria. Like the SRB programme, only local regeneration partnerships were able to apply for funding. SEEDA again appointed Rother District Council as the accountable body for the programme.

### Funding and projects

52. SEEDA granted the Partnership £160,000 of Market Towns programme funding on the basis of delivery plans covering the period April 2005 to March 2007. The delivery plans themselves were drawn up by the Partnership's consultants and were informed by the results of an independent Healthcheck commissioned by the Partnership in 2004. The cost of the Healthcheck was met from the Market Towns funding. The total amount claimed by the Partnership was £159,875.

53. Eight projects were included within the original Market Towns delivery plan. Further details on these projects and the finances of the programme can be found in Appendix 4.

54. Three of the eight projects (Rye Resource Centre, Lion St Community and Culture Centre and Rye Museum Visitor Information Centre) did not go ahead as planned. The project to fit out the Rye Resource Centre was dependent on it first being built on the central garage site, which has still not been done. The project to refit the Lion St Community and Culture Centre could only go ahead once the Resource Centre had moved to the Central Garage site. Four further projects were proposed and delivered in their place.

55. Unlike the SRB scheme, the Partnership was given delegated authority to approve its own projects within the overall programme. This meant that external applicants applied directly to the Partnership for funding and their applications were appraised by the Partnership's consultants prior to funding being awarded by the Board. From our review of project applications and appraisals it was clear that the application, appraisal and approval process was not always as demonstrably independent as it should have been. In four of

the seven projects which were required to follow the full application and approval process, the applicant was either a Director of the Rye Partnership or a member of staff.

56. The minutes of the Partnership's Board meetings show only four of the nine projects were formally recorded as approved by the Board:

- Information and Visitor Management (30 June 2005);
- Strand Quay Car Park Pedestrianisation Feasibility Study (30 June 2005);
- Rye Skate Board Park (30 June 2005); and
- Animate (7 February 2005).

57. It would appear that the remaining projects were either not considered by the Board or that the approval was not recorded in the minutes.

58. The Chairman of the Partnership was also the project applicant for the Animate project. He properly advised the Board of his interest in the project at the time it was considered and whilst he stayed in the room when the application was discussed, he did not vote on the matter. There is no record in the Partnership's Board minutes that the other three projects, applied for by a Director or member of staff of the Partnership, were considered by the Board.

59. Of the other five projects which were funded from the Market Towns programme, only two of the appraisal forms are signed by the Chairman as evidence of approval of the project by the Partnership.

### Evaluation

60. According to the original offer letter an audited statement of grant expenditure was required for any programme where the lifetime grant was over £100,000. However, SEEDA later decided that no statement of grant expenditure was required for the Market Towns programme because the grant was less than £100,000 in each year.

61. Due to the small size of the grant there was also no final evaluation of the scheme, either internally by the Partnership or externally by SEEDA. A record of all outputs for the Market Towns programme, reported quarterly by the Partnership, was collated by SEEDA on its project management system but these have not been independently verified.



## 4. Project Management

### Introduction

62. Project management is the process by which projects are initiated, appraised, approved, monitored and evaluated, and includes elements of administration, financial management and reporting.
63. The management of individual projects and programmes has been undertaken by a number of different people during the life of the Partnership. From 1997 Rother District Council provided advice and assistance in preparing bids for SRB funding and seconded staff to the Partnership to manage the programme. Since 2003 the Partnership has employed consultants to manage its projects and employs its own support staff.

### Overview

64. We reviewed the project files held by the Partnership in order to assess the project management process. We have concluded that the quality of project management has varied considerably during the Partnership's existence.
65. Other inspections and evaluations carried out at the Partnership (the system review referred to below, the SRB evaluation reports, the audit of the SRB statements of grant expenditure, the GOSE Audit Team inspection reports) would all appear to support that view.

### Systems reviews

66. In 2002 SEEDA commissioned an external review of the Partnership's SRB systems relating to management structure and decision making, financial control, monitoring, and project appraisal and approval.
67. The review concluded that the Partnership was below average, and made the following overall comments:
- "Two key members of staff left the Rye Partnership in quick succession in September 2001. This recent departure has clearly reduced the capacity to administer and manage the SRB scheme. Nevertheless, the audit identified a number of significant weaknesses in the management and monitoring systems which require immediate attention, particularly in relation to financial

control, monitoring, project appraisal and approval."

- "In general, the partnership has loose procedures in place and these tend to lack detail. As a result partners and staff do not effectively put them into practice, such as arrangement for monitoring, project approvals and declaring conflicts of interest."
  - "There is also a critical lack of written evidence on file, particularly for financial control, project appraisal and approval."
  - "There is a clear need for a comprehensive review, in line with the latest SRB guidance, to ensure that project managers, partners and staff have a full understanding of the requirement of SRB funding and their respective roles."
68. A follow up systems audit by SEEDA in 2005 noted improvements, particularly to project documentation, and rated the Partnership as below average to average. This report made the following comments:
- "The systems used by the Partnership are running satisfactorily with projects achieving their target outputs and the scheme drawing down its profiled funding."
  - "The financial and reporting systems in place are operating effectively and there is a separation of functions in place between the scheme managers and the Accountable Body to limit financial risk."
  - "Project files are good documentary records and historical files dating back to the inception of the scheme can be easily accessed."
  - "There is a formal system for validating project returns and expenditure through regular project monitoring visits, but reports are occasionally incomplete and it is not clear if all projects are visited each year. The visits need to be more rigorous and better documented on file, particularly with regard to assets and output/expenditure verification."

### Capacity to manage projects

69. At the time the Partnership was awarded SRB funding, these type of regeneration projects were still in their relative infancy, often lacked

maturity and suffered from insufficient understanding of the need to properly resource the management and administrative capacity of local regeneration partnerships. The Rye Partnership suffered similar problems and in its early years it had very limited funds available for project management and general administration tasks. For example, the Partnership received only £100,000 over the six years of the SRB programme for set-up, management and administration costs, from within the total amount of the grant. This was an insufficient amount to cover all the Partnership's running expenses, including the employment of suitably qualified staff, so the Partnership was reliant on seconded staff from Rother District Council. The Partnership was therefore placed in an invidious position; operate with insufficient administrative resources or not operate at all.

70. In more recent years Rother District Council has provided an annual grant under a service level agreement, some of which is available to cover running costs. Remaining overheads are met from the Partnership's other income streams.

71. The lack of administrative resources has also meant that the capacity of the Partnership to manage its projects has been very dependent on several key individuals over the years. When these individuals left the Partnership, it created considerable disruption. For example, the Partnership employed three different consultants in under two years, which inevitably resulted in the loss of corporate knowledge and experience. The disruption has been a contributory factor in the weak operation of some of the Partnership's project management systems. This is discussed further in Section 5, and has impacted on the Partnership's capacity to manage projects in several ways.

72. The Partnership has not always had a sufficient level of specialist project management expertise. Several of the Partnership's larger projects may have benefited from the more hands on involvement of project management staff with relevant qualifications, for example when negotiating property acquisitions and leases or when drawing up business plans, although this would obviously have been at some expense to the Partnership.

73. There has been an inconsistent approach to monitoring project expenditure and outputs. Our review of project files identified that

although the Partnership did monitor its projects, the regularity and effectiveness of this monitoring was not of a universally high standard. For several projects in the SRB programme, although monitoring visits were required to comply with SEEDA's SRB Manual, visits sometimes did not occur for several quarters at a time, and key output reports were not produced in a timely fashion. This lack of monitoring does not allow us to establish a full audit trail of progress and may have contributed to delays on some projects.

74. Document retention is generally good, though incomplete for a number of projects. We noted that the Partnership had retained a substantial amount of documentation relating to its activities, although the quality and volume of retained documentation was not consistent. Projects which were initiated at an early stage in the Partnership's existence typically do not have a complete set of project documents. It is therefore not always clear what activities were undertaken by the Partnership to scope projects before they were approved. This can, in part, be explained by the turnover of staff involved in managing projects.

## 5. Governance and Operations of the Partnership

### Background

75. The Rye Partnership was established as an informal association in 1997. The members of the Partnership represented a range of local interests including:

- Rye Town Council;
- Rye Chamber of Commerce;
- Rye & District Hotel and Caterers Association;
- Rother District Council;
- Rye & District Council for Voluntary Services;
- East Sussex County Council;
- Icklesham and Camber Parish Councils;
- Sussex Police;
- Thomas Peacocke Community College;
- Environment Agency; and
- Rye Fisherman’s Society.

### Overview

76. The Partnership had strong links with Rother District Council, particularly in its early years. The Head of Regeneration at Rother District

Council, Mark Evershed, acted as the Partnership Secretary until 2003 and was responsible for initiating projects on behalf of the Partnership.

77. Between 2003 and 2005 the Partnership underwent a period of significant change.

- The Partnership incorporated as a company limited by guarantee in February 2003. Some of the former members became company directors and the internal structure of the Partnership changed. The role of the wider membership in the Partnership has changed since incorporation, from a decision making role to an advisory one.
- In November 2003 Mark Evershed stood down as Head of Regeneration at Rother District Council. The Partnership felt it was at a crucial point in some of its projects and, in order to retain his expertise, appointed Mark Evershed as its first consultant. Mark Evershed was succeeded by Brenda Chester in July 2004 and The Stowers & Associates were appointed in 2005.

78. Figure 2 shows how these events coincide with the funding streams received.

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Partnership status	↑ Partnership formed						↑ Incorporation						
Chair of the Partnership	Councillor Peter Jones								Councillor Keith Glazier				
Head of Regeneration at Rother District Council	Mark Evershed						Graham Burgess						
Consultants							Mark Evershed	Brenda Chester	The Stowers & Associates				
Funding programmes			Single Regeneration Budget										
									Market Towns				
											Fisheries refurbishment		
					Interreg II and Interreg IIIa								

Figure 2: Timeline of events at the Partnership

## The Partnership's relationship with Rother District Council

79. From its inception the Partnership was linked with Rother District Council on a number of levels:

**The Council provided administrative support, regeneration expertise and funding in the way of grants and bridging loans.**

80. Rother District Council provided the administrative and secretariat support and expertise required to get the Partnership up and running. The Council's Head of Regeneration took on the role of Partnership Secretary and assisted in preparing the bids for funding through the Single Regeneration Budget and Interreg. The Council later employed staff, who were seconded to the Partnership, in the form of an SRB Co-ordinator and the Town Manager.

81. Rother District Council provided grants to the Partnership from its own budget to cover both running costs and contributions towards projects with which the Partnership was involved. The Council also provided the finance function for the Partnership. Transactions were recorded on the Council's own accounting system and the Council made payments on behalf of the Partnership, because the Partnership did not initially have its own bank account. The Partnership did not make any payment for this service.

82. The Council held assets in trust for the Partnership prior to its incorporation, as it had no legal status to hold these assets itself, and on one occasion in 2003 the Council also provided a bridging loan of £53,500 secured against these assets. The loan was required because the Partnership was only able to claim defrayed expenditure from SEEDA and the Government Office and did not have the working capital available to make all of its payments prior to receiving the grant. The Council charged interest on the bridging loan at 1% above the base rate.

**Rother District Council acted as accountable body for Single Regeneration Budget and Market Towns Programme funding.**

83. Rother District Council acted as the accountable body for the funding the Partnership received through the Single

Regeneration Budget and Market Towns programmes. East Sussex County Council acted as the accountable body when the Rye Partnership applied for Area Investment Fund monies to refurbish the fisheries plant. The accountable body relationship is a contractual arm's length relationship. As the accountable body, Rother District Council signed the offer letters issued by SEEDA to accept the funding and submitted subsequent grant claims to SEEDA on behalf of the Partnership. However, Rother District Council's management input into the Partnership's activities, including the Head of Regeneration being appointed as Secretary of the Partnership, was above and beyond that required by its status as accountable body. The Council has not acted as accountable body for the Partnership since the Market Towns programme ceased in March 2007.

**The Head of Regeneration of the Council was also Secretary of the Partnership.**

84. Until February 2003, when incorporation took place, Mark Evershed was simultaneously Head of Regeneration at the Council and Secretary of both the Rye Partnership and another local regeneration partnership. He was involved in much of the day to day running of the Partnership in the early days and attended the majority of Partnership meetings, although he was not able to participate in the votes held by the Partnership to take decisions. The combination of the two roles gave him significant influence over the activities of the Partnership.

**District Councillors were members of the Partnership.**

85. Prior to its incorporation, the Partnership had up to 25 members. Rother District Council appointed two District Councillors as members of the Partnership. Their role as representatives of Rother District Council did not require them to seek approval from the Council on the matters on which they voted at Partnership meetings and did not constitute a controlling interest by the Council.
86. However, the relationship between Rother District Council and the Partnership has evolved over time.

**The role of Partnership Secretary is now separated from the Council.**

- 87. Mark Evershed ceased to be Partnership Secretary on its incorporation in February 2003. The Partnership subsequently appointed a partner in a local accountancy practice as Company Secretary and this has enabled the effective separation of the role of Secretary from the Council.
- 88. When Mark Evershed left Rother District Council, he was succeeded as Head of Regeneration by Graham Burgess. Graham Burgess has taken a different approach to his predecessor and is not directly involved in the day to day activities of the Partnership, which is appropriate since the Partnership is now a private limited company. He is invited to attend Board meetings and provides advice to the Partnership as requested. The Partnership now uses consultants to work up bids for funding and employs one full-time and one part-time member of staff to work in the Partnership office on day to day project administration and estates management.

**There is an annual funding package provided by Rother District Council.**

- 89. The Partnership now sets its own strategic direction by way of a three year business plan, but Rother District Council continues to provide core funding on an annual basis under a service level agreement (SLA). The SLA is a contractual arrangement and does not allow for any degree of influence by the Council beyond the terms and conditions of the agreement. The report of the Director of Resources to the Improvement and Resources Sub Committee of the Council dated 21 November 2007 breaks down the value of the complete support package from the Council for 2007-08 (grants, donations and staffing):

Ring-fenced funding:	
Marketing materials	£10,000
Christmas Lights	£ 1,500
Discretionary funding	£16,000
Town Manager:	
salary and on-costs	£18,680
(in kind)	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£46,180</b>

- 90. As at January 2009, however, the Service Level Agreement for 2008-09 had still not been

agreed and signed by all parties. This was delayed by ongoing discussions about the Town Manager post and the allocation of funding. Instead the Partnership and the Council operated on the basis of an understanding that the SLA would be honoured by all sides. While the Council does not intend that the SLA will act as an enforceable contract, a signed SLA would provide the Partnership with more certainty over its income.

**Any District Councillor appointed as a Director of the Partnership must adhere to the requirements of the Companies Act and act in the interests of the company.**

- 91. Since its incorporation up to two District Councillors have sat on the Board of Directors at any one time. As Directors of a private company these District Councillors now have a personal and legal responsibility to act in the interests of the Partnership and not necessarily in the interests of Rother District Council.

**Finances**

- 92. When the Partnership was first established its finances were managed by Rother District Council. All transactions were recorded on the Council's ledger and subject to audit by District Auditors appointed by the Audit Commission. Payments were also made by Rother District Council on behalf of the Partnership, because it did not at that time have its own bank account.
- 93. According to the Partnership's constitution, accounts were to be kept and a financial statement would be presented at each Partnership meeting. The Partnership did not comply with that requirement and had some difficulties in obtaining regular financial information from Rother District Council. The Council did not produce separate financial statements for the Partnership, but did on occasion supply statements showing how much had been spent and was remaining on projects. The Partnership raised its concerns about this during a number of its meetings throughout 2003.
- 94. Rother District Council continued to maintain the Partnership's financial records for a short time after incorporation, as it was still the accountable body for the SRB funds and held property assets in trust for the Partnership.

Until the Partnership's first accounts were approved, in October 2004, the Partnership was unable to apply for funding, such as a mortgage or loan from a bank without the support of the Council, because it could not provide any financial history or financial statements.

- 95. The Partnership set up its own accounting system and the transfer of the finance function from Rother District Council to the Partnership took place in August 2004. The Partnership's business plan for 2005-2008 acknowledges that in hindsight the transfer would have been better undertaken at the end of the financial year, as there were difficulties unravelling who had paid for what.

### Statutory Reporting and Assurance Requirements

- 96. The Partnership was incorporated in February 2003, as a company limited by guarantee, and is subject to the requirements of the Companies Act 1985 and all subsequent revisions.
- 97. The Partnership has prepared and submitted its financial statements on time to Companies House for all years from 2003-04 onwards. The Partnership is classified as a small company under the Companies Act and is only required

to produce an abbreviated balance sheet with notes. The Partnership produces more detailed financial statements for its own use.

- 98. The Partnership's small company status exempts it from a statutory annual audit of its financial statements and the Directors have not requested an audit.

### Staffing and consultants

- 99. The staffing arrangements at the Partnership have impacted on the way projects were managed and funds were accounted for. The turnover of staff has been disruptive and the secondment of staff from Rother District Council has caused some confusion over line management responsibilities. However, the Partnership has developed a good relationship with the current management consultants, appointed in 2005, and this has brought some stability to the management of the Partnership.
- 100. Since the end of 2003, the Partnership's accounts have shown significant expenditure on consultancy fees, now totalling almost £145,000.

Table 2: Staffing costs at the Partnership

	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08
	£	£	£	£	£
Wages	0	1,157	13,481	16,661	24,156
Consultancy	9,200	37,892	55,018	24,480	14,054
Social Security	0	0	1,151	1,323	1,914
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,200</b>	<b>39,049</b>	<b>69,650</b>	<b>42,464</b>	<b>40,124</b>

NB These figures do not include the costs of the Head of Regeneration, the SRB Co-ordinator or the Town Manager as these were all Rother District Council employees.

Source: Rye Partnership Financial Statements

### Consultants

101. The use of managing consultants at the Partnership began with the appointment of Mark Evershed following his departure from Rother District Council.

#### **The decision to appoint Mark Evershed as the Partnership's first consultant was reactionary and done very quickly.**

102. In November 2003, Mark Evershed stood down as Head of Regeneration at Rother District Council. The Partnership's SRB programme was in its fourth year and several large projects, including the Central Garage site and the Interreg project were in progress.
103. An emergency meeting of the Board of Directors of the Partnership was held on 26 November 2003 to discuss how to proceed given Mark Evershed's resignation from the Council. All but two of the Directors were in attendance. The Chairman proposed the Partnership offer Mark Evershed a six month contract as a self-employed consultant from 1 December 2003 to 31 May 2004. Several of the Directors expressed concerns about this proposal, but the Board voted to offer him the contract. The overriding reason for this decision was the potential for delays to projects and loss of project knowledge if he was not appointed. Similarly, the Board considered it did not have time to explore other alternatives, such as recruiting a project manager, appointing consultants or seeking support from other local regeneration bodies. Nor did it seek advice on recruitment or appointment of consultants.
104. Mark Evershed proposed a monthly fee of £3,600 to progress all the Partnership's activities. However, the Partnership agreed to restrict his work to focus on the Fishmarket and Central Garage projects, and to develop the application for Interreg funding. However, the amount of the fee was not changed, nor is it clear from the Partnership's records how many days work this fee represented.
105. The Partnership subsequently sought £12,000 from Rother District Council to cover the additional costs of employing a consultant, but the Council agreed to pay only a proportion of this, on the condition that work on the Rye Resource Centre was prioritised.

#### **There was a limited handover between consultants which caused delays in projects and a loss of corporate knowledge.**

106. On completion of Mark Evershed's six month contract, the Partnership offered him a one month extension to the end of June 2004, which he accepted. In mid June, the Partnership appointed Brenda Chester to succeed him as managing consultant from July. Mark Evershed himself took up a new post at the end of July, so there was only a limited opportunity for a full handover, although all project files were retained by the Partnership. The minutes from the Partnership Members meeting on 22 July 2004 record that Brenda Chester considered that the task of getting up to speed with the projects had taken her longer than anticipated.
107. Brenda Chester remained in post for a year and was succeeded by The Stowers & Associates who also had to spend a significant amount of time familiarising themselves with the projects. The changes of consultants have caused some dislocation in knowledge and understanding, and delays to projects. This is always a risk with staff changes in small organisations but was exacerbated by the lack of clear succession planning contributing to a limited level of project handover.

#### **Staffing at the Partnership needs to be flexible depending on the level of project activity, but reliance on consultants is expensive.**

108. The Partnership's activity levels were historically dependent on the level of external funding it received to run projects. As the SRB scheme came to an end the Partnership reviewed its staffing needs against its current activity levels and agreed with Rother District Council that the SRB co-ordinator would be redeployed.
109. The cost to the Partnership of employing consultants over the past five years has now reached almost £145,000, but the cost in any one year depends on the workload involved. Consultancy fees peaked in 2005-06 when the consultants were engaged to close down and evaluate the SRB programme, set up the Market Towns projects, prepare a new business plan and rectify the problems on the Interreg project which had led to it being suspended.

### Seconded staff

110. As the Partnership was not a legal entity, Rother District Council employed the SRB co-ordinator and Town Manager although they were seconded to work at the Partnership. These staff took day-to-day direction from the Partnership and, later, from the managing consultants, but remained line managed by the Head of Regeneration at Rother District Council. This allowed potential for confusion over individuals' responsibilities.
111. The SRB co-ordinator was redeployed at the end of the SRB programme and the Town Manager left post in 2007. A replacement has not yet been appointed, and a review of the role has looked into alternative methods of town management.

### Administrative Staff

112. The Partnership currently employs one part-time and one full-time member of staff. They perform administrative duties, book-keeping and a basic finance function, estates management, supported by a maintenance contractor, and act as a secretariat for Board meetings.
113. The Partnership had sought to employ a General Manager in 2005 'to take total responsibility for all operations and management of The Rye Partnership', which would have given the Partnership some senior management of its own, but there were no suitable applicants for the role. This work continues to be split between the managing consultants and the administrative staff employed by the Partnership.

### Meetings and decision making

114. According to the constitution prior to incorporation 'a formal record of attendance at Partnership meetings shall be kept by the Secretary. The minutes arising from each meeting will be circulated, and will as appropriate be signed by the Chairman as a correct record of proceedings'.
115. However, according to the minutes of the meeting held on the 28th October 1999, a request was made as to whether minutes from previous meetings would be produced. In response the Chairman stated that 'it had been agreed to waive the production of minutes as

staffing resources had been insufficient to produce minutes as well as deliver bids and other Partnership activity'.

116. Some minutes were recorded for meetings between 1999 and 2003 and since the Partnership's incorporation in 2003 there have been very few instances where minutes have not been formally recorded. In August 2003, notes, rather than full minutes, were prepared and approved. And the minutes for the June 2006 Directors' meeting record that minutes of the last meeting were unavailable. No minutes for this meeting are recorded as having been approved at a later date.
117. In addition, we noted several instances where members are not recorded as present at the meetings, but are, later in the minutes, recorded as speaking. There are also very few instances where formal votes are recorded as taking place. The inconsistent recording of minutes, particularly during the early years of the Partnership, has reduced our ability to establish a clear audit trail of project activity.

### Conflicts of interest

118. The membership of the Partnership comprises, by its very nature, individuals and representatives of groups who are interested in improving Rye. Many of these groups are themselves looking to the Partnership to fund improvements that they want made. In a town with a small population, such as Rye, it is inevitable that some of these people will have other personal, commercial or political interests in the town.
119. Our review of the activities of the Partnership has noted a number of potential or perceived conflicts of interest. These have not always been dealt with in a transparent manner. For example, declarations of interest were not always recorded in the minutes of meetings. And, in the case of the Market Towns programme, some project applications came from Board Members, albeit in their capacity as representatives of another organisation.
120. As a private company, Directors of the Partnership have a personal and legal duty to act in the interest of the Company. Conflicts of interest could give rise to serious legal consequences, if acted upon. It is therefore in



everyone's interest that the Partnership is seen to be handling these potential and perceived conflicts of interests in a proper manner at all times to safeguard both public funds, where they are involved, and personal liability.

## **Communication and engagement with local residents**

121. The SRB interim evaluation report recommended that the Partnership seek to actively engage those who are less well represented and less vocal in the community. The report recommended that the Partnership also develop a communications strategy for informing the community of its progress.

122. The Partnership acknowledges that its communication with local residents could, at times, have been improved. The role of the Partnership and its activities were not clearly explained to local residents and concerned members of the public did not receive the assurances they sought over the management of public funds granted to the Partnership.

123. The publication of a Partnership newsletter, distributed to local homes, has been sporadic. More recently the Partnership produced a guide, 'The Rye Partnership – Past, Present and Future', summarising the work of the Partnership since it was first set up and setting out the strategic priorities of the Partnership going forward. This guide has also been distributed to local residents and can be found online. Our analysis of the SRB expenditure has revealed that the Partnership has underreported the amounts actually spent on SRB projects in the guide. For example, it quotes only one year's expenditure (£10,000) for the Animate Youth Centre project which actually spent £60,000, and the Computers for Schools project spent £125,000, not £25,000.

124. The Partnership operated its own website for a time but this closed down because the company hosting the site ceased trading. The Partnership intends to get the website up and running again soon but in the mean time refers people to the Visit Rye website, the official tourist and local business website for Rye. The Visit Rye website contains only a short paragraph about the achievements of the Partnership, a link to the Partnership's 'Past, Present & Future' guide and office contact details. It does not contain current information about forthcoming meetings, for example.

125. The Partnership considers it does attempt to offer the local community a number of ways to contribute their views and influence the Partnership's programme. Some Partnership and working group meetings are open to members of the public and the minutes of all recent meetings and financial statements are available on request from the Partnership office in Rye.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

126. The Partnership has been the focus of much attention locally in Rye since its inception in 1997. Our examination of the Partnership's activities, although not constituting a formal audit, has not found any evidence that government funds have been wilfully misused or fraudulently applied.
127. The Partnership had no history of project delivery before the SRB scheme began in 1999. The SRB scheme achieved mixed success but the Partnership was over ambitious about what it was possible to achieve with relatively small budgets.
128. The SRB bid and annual delivery plans included a large number of small projects, which were disproportionately time-consuming to monitor and administer, and yet the management and administration budget allowed within the scheme was only 6% of the total budget, or £100,000 over six years.
129. Although the Partnership was supported by Rother District Council as the accountable body for the SRB scheme, we consider that all the Partnership's funders and delivery partners had some responsibility for ensuring that the Partnership was able to act effectively. In particular we consider that SEEDA could have done more to assess and strengthen the Partnership's capacity to deliver the SRB scheme, prior to offering funding. SEEDA should have identified the weaknesses in the original bid and worked with the Partnership to remedy them.

### Recommendation 1

SEEDA should review its existing arrangements for working with local regeneration partnerships to ensure that, in future, issues regarding capacity and delivery are identified earlier in the process and appropriate action taken.

130. The Partnership had a poor understanding of the record keeping requirements to support European funding claims through the Interreg programme. This led the GOSE audit team to conclude that the management controls of the project were very weak and to suspend funding for a time whilst the Partnership's new consultants recreated the evidence.

### Recommendation 2

The Partnership should ensure that it is clear as to the exact terms and conditions of any future grants sought from public bodies, including the requirements for record keeping, monitoring and financial reporting, and that it has the capacity to comply with such terms.

131. The Partnership was given delegated authority to approve its own projects under the Market Towns programme. However, we identified that project applications and appraisals were not sufficiently independent. There is also insufficient evidence to show that the Board formally approved all the projects in the Market Towns programme.

### Recommendation 3

The Partnership should clarify its project appraisal and approval process, ensuring that the process is transparent and that all key decisions are documented. This is equally important for projects which are both approved and rejected or revised.

132. The quality of project management has varied throughout the Partnership's existence. The Partnership's capacity to manage projects has been affected by the limited resources available for project management and a disruptive turnover of staff. Up to 2003 the Partnership was fully reliant on Rother District Council's Head of Regeneration to provide management support and, when he left the Council, it considered it had no real alternative but to retain his support as an independent consultant in order to avoid losing the project knowledge he had built up.

### Recommendation 4

The Partnership should ensure that it has sufficient spread of project knowledge and expertise across staff, consultants and directors. There should be clear expectations for project documentation at all stages, which would enable other staff to pick up work at short notice if required.

133. The Partnership has experienced mixed success in completing and delivering its intended outputs. For example, the central garage site has been cleared and planning permission achieved, but the construction work to build a new library on the site has yet to start. In contrast, smaller capital projects, such as the skateboard park, the Animate

refurbishment and other projects which focussed more on skills, education and advice have been much more successful.

### Recommendation 5

The Partnership should consider where its particular skills in project delivery now lie and how these skills match with its business plan going forward. The Partnership could, for example, target its activities in areas where it has been successful in the past or may consider procuring more specialist expertise in areas where it has not yet fully proven its ability to deliver.

134. Rother District Council's role as accountable body was an oversight role, not a controlling one, but the Council also provided project management skills, a finance function for the Partnership and seconded staff to the Partnership. According to its constitution the Partnership should have received regular financial information, but this was not always available.

### Recommendation 6

It is unacceptable that the Partnership's Board did not have a full understanding of its financial position when taking key operational decisions. The Partnership now maintains its own finances and should ensure that it always has timely management accounts for decision making in future.

135. Staffing at the Partnership needs to be flexible depending on the level of project activity but reliance on consultants is expensive. However, the Partnership appears to have found the right balance with the current consultants with whom it has a good relationship.
136. Financial support in the form of grants and a bridging loan from Rother District Council was not inappropriate and public funds were not put at undue risk as the Council held assets as security for the loan. The Partnership still delivers regeneration projects in and around Rye for Rother District Council and receives some funding in line with the draft Service Level Agreement. However, the Service Level Agreement for 2008-09 had still not been signed in January 2009. It is the Partnership's intention to become more independent over time by building a sustainable asset base generating income for future projects.

### **Recommendation 7**

Rother District Council and the Partnership should agree and sign the current Service Level Agreement to make funding more secure and enable planning for the future. Both parties should look to extend the agreement beyond its one year term so that the Partnership has some assurance over the future level of funding it will receive and is better able to plan its activities and finances accordingly.

137. The Partnership did not always produce minutes of its meetings and financial statements in the early days, but this situation has improved since incorporation in 2003. The Partnership has met its statutory reporting requirements in accordance with the Companies Act and does not require an audit due to its small company status.
138. Potential conflicts of interest have not always been dealt with in a transparent manner.

### **Recommendation 8**

It is to be expected that many members of the Partnership have other commercial, political or charitable interests in the Rye area. Many of these interest may not be pecuniary in nature, but the Partnership should develop a formal policy as to what interests should be disclosed and what action should be taken when interests are disclosed. In all cases interests must be fully reported, recorded in Board minutes and, where appropriate, the member concerned should not be present when relevant items are discussed.

139. The Partnership acknowledges that its communication with local residents could, at times have been improved, particularly through the use of a website.

### **Recommendation 9**

The Partnership should give serious consideration to relaunching a website of its own and promoting its content to local residents.

## Appendix 1 – Summary of expenditure on SRB projects

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
<b>Community Development</b>							
i) Capacity Building	A three-pronged project, namely: i) A series of training days. ii) Appointment of a Capacity Building Co-ordinator. ii) Provision of financial resources to local community groups to fund initiatives.	The Partnership operated its headquarters from 25 Cinque Ports Street together with Rye and District Council for Voluntary Services. The building acted as a resource for several local groups and a centre for the local delivery of services including: Citizens Advice Bureau, Housing Need Services, Relate, Age Concern, Careers, Volunteer Support, Care for the Carers and Domestic Abuse project. The Community Help point was provided from these offices.  The Community Chest project has been used to support and enable local organisations to undertake small, discrete projects.	£175,000	£175,000	£313,424	£138,424	79%
ii) Central Facility	Re-development of derelict garage site into three story multi-use building for the use of a variety of community services:-	The Partnership used SRB funds to clear the proposed site with the intention of later development, however the project failed to progress beyond this stage. See Case Study in Appendix 2 for further details.					
- Resource Centre	i) Resource Centre (ground floor)		£80,000	£80,000	£119,600	£39,600	50%
- Library	ii) Library (First Floor)		£80,000	£60,000	£0	-£60,000	-100%
- Adult Education	iii) Rye Community Education Centre (Second Floor)		£15,000	£15,000	£0	-£15,000	-100%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
iii) Rye Bay Health and Social Care Project#	A project to improve the health of the population of the Rye Bay Area whereby health services, education, social services and voluntary agencies will work in cooperation. Health visitors and community nurses will offer health information and advice in informal settings. Basic skills, short courses and accredited courses will be developed.	Community Health Co-ordinator and Community Health Worker appointed. This project supported activities such as: Rye Harbour Parent and Child Group; Animate Parent and Child Group; Funbus; Rye Harbour Newsletter; Camber Newsletter; Extend Exercises; Camber Healthy Eating and Weight Loss Group; Post Natal Classes; Friendship Club and Fun with Food for young people. It also developed initiatives including: Relateen Services; Rye Harbour Play Facilities and Utopia youth area; Safe Baby Sitting; Cardiac Rehab; Smoking Cessation Support Group; Rye Harbour Summer Holiday Craft Workshop; Craft Skills Workshops for Volunteers; Relate Services and Camber Residents Association.	£50,000	£50,000	£46,825	−£3,175	−6%
iv) Support to young people - Animate Youth Centre	Project to part-fund the existing Animate Centre to ensure its survival.	The project funded the appointment of the Animate Coordinator - allowing the centre to continue to operate. Services provided have included Bright Sparks (music and sign), After School Club (11-14 years), Youth Club (11-14 years), Parent and Child Group, Smoking Cessation, Kick Boxing for Females, Youth Club 16+, Amateur Dramatics, Internet Cafe, Video Evenings,	£60,000	£60,000	£60,000	£0	0%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
		Craft Sessions, Healthy Eating classes and Drug Advice sessions.					
- Healthy Living Project#	Equipping young people to make informed choices about drug use or smoking, promote healthy lifestyles, prevent unwanted pregnancies and advocate issues surrounding social education.	Budget for this project was combined with the Rye Bay Health and Social Care Project. See entry for this project above for coverage of both projects.	£50,000	£50,000	£46,825	-£3,175	-6%
- Mentoring and Student Support	Mentoring support project to enable disaffected young people to play a positive role in the local community.	Mentoring and Student Support Co-ordinator began work in 2000/01, mentors were trained, referrals were received and a small number of students matched to mentors. However, the contract with Crime Reduction Initiative had to be terminated. The project was later expanded to include the Connexions initiative.	£45,000	£45,000	£44,620	-£380	-1%
v) Community Safety - Mediation Service	A project designed to reduce tension within the community by providing independent arbitration and advocacy for neighbourhood disputes etc. by linking Rye Bay to an existing successful scheme in Hastings.	This service achieved the CLS Quality Mark in Community Mediation and high success rates in cases received in the Rother area - well above national figures. A consultation exercise ascertained that 95% of users found mediators helpful. The project has delivered the annual Mediation UK Accredited Basic Mediation Skills Course.	£16,000	£16,000	£19,747	£3,747	23%
- Shop and Student Watch	A project designed to enable rapid communication amongst Rye traders through radio exchanging information about	25 shops and businesses have been linked through a radio network.	£7,000	£7,000	£7,000	£0	0%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
	suspicious activity and to offer support to visitors.						
- Bay-watch (Safe sands Camber)	A project to train volunteers to a national lifeguard standard and enable them to patrol, deal with incidents, communicate with emergency services acting as lifeguards, first aiders, tourist information and countryside rangers.	Project started in 2002 and trained volunteers to a high Beach Patrol standard on shore and has dealt with incidents, communicated with emergency services and provided a role in promoting community safety.	£40,000	£40,000	£39,750	£-250	-1%
vi) Rye Harbour Village Facilities	A project to introduce additional facilities to the Rye Harbour area, particularly for children and youth. This to include: - A hard court for ball games. - Children's play area. - A "Teenage Village". - Additional car parking for village hall users.	Children's play area only completed.	£40,000	£40,000	£8,000	£-32,000	-80%
vii) Leisure Facilities	i) Contribution to Rye and District Swimming Pool construction. ii) Upgrading Community Arts Facilities (Thomas Peacocke Community College school hall).	i) This element of the original bid was not given funding (it was not a new project and so did not fulfil SRB requirements). Therefore nothing was delivered on this. ii) Improvements to the hall have included installation of: tiered seating; a new lighting system and a control booth for sound and light.	£100,000	£68,000	£30,696	£-37,304	-55%
<b>Total Community Programme</b>			<b>£758,000</b>	<b>£706,000</b>	<b>£736,486</b>	<b>£30,486</b>	<b>4%</b>



Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
<b>Education and Skills Raising</b>							
i) Early Learning Excellence Centre	Project to support the Centre including funding: a development worker, tutor hours and learning support i.e. creche and IT facilities.	A dedicated steering group led by Rye and District CVS has helped progress a range of projects including recruiting for childcare and other courses, developing pre-school provision, equipment for outreach services, provision for Fun Bus and mother and toddler groups. Also provision of a local venue to be used for NVQ II training in childcare.	£40,000	£40,000	£39,841	£-159	0%
ii) Computers in Schools	Project to provide 100 computers to Thomas Peacocke Community College, 28 PCs to the Freda Gardham Primary School, and provide training and expert advice on computer use.	100 modem PCs provided to Thomas Peacocke Community College, and 30 provided to the Freda Gardham School.	£125,000	£125,000	£125,000	£0	0%
iii) Literacy and Numeracy Programme	Project to work with the Freda Gardham School and the Thomas Peacocke Community College to achieve learning acceleration. The primary school to employ extra classroom assistants to assist underperforming students, and the college to introduce an IT based initiative "The Successmaker Programme" targeted at the most needed students. Attempt to raise	This project has provided additional tailored teaching to students that are underperforming in literacy and numeracy. The results were deemed "outstanding": some students have received 1:1 tuition, others have obtained less intensive support.	£30,000	£30,000	£26,075	£-3,925	-13%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
	student performance in the college by 6 months over a 1 year programme.						
iv) After School Childcare Project	To provide funds towards this project to provide childcare to school age children (4-11 years). To be held at Freda Gardham School with capacity for 16 children.	The After School Club opened in 2001 and operates from a converted building in the grounds of the Freda Gardham Community Primary School and has use of the enclosed outdoor areas. In Spring 2004 there were 24 children aged from 4 years on roll. An OFSTED report in September 2003 graded the Club as "Good".	£17,000	£17,000	£17,328	£238	1%
v) Schools into Work - Tourism industry	Initiative to help fund a project run jointly by the Rye Hotel and Caterers Association and Thomas Peacocke Community College to assist underachieving GCSE pupils to achieve official vocational accreditation (GNVQ or equivalent).	Students were placed with local companies for work experience. 9 students completed the GNVQ Leisure and Tourism course in June 2004.	£40,000	£40,000	£40,000	£0	0%
- Wheels project	Proposed project was to assist the Thomas Peacocke Community College to produce an accredited vocational course on engineering / motor skills - involving developing a small workshop in the grounds of the College. Note however that project was not granted any funding - it was one of the elements removed when only 90% of the original bid was offered by SEEDA.	N/A. Project not granted SRB funding and therefore not conducted.	£50,000	£0	£0	£0	0%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
vi) Adult Education	Three projects related to the adult education centre and to be undertaken by the Community College in partnership with Hastings College: i) Adult education needs analysis. ii) Working with older learners. iii) Language skills for the tourist industry.	A needs analysis was undertaken in order to develop the programme and taster sessions for various potential courses were held.	£30,000	£30,000	£22,022	-£7,978	-27%
<b>Total Education and Skills Raising Programme</b>			£332,000	£282,000	£270,176	-£11,824	-4%
<b>Structure of the Local Economy</b>							
i) Rye Harbour Road Workspace Development	Project to fund shortfall in a project to develop the Rye Harbour Road industrial area, particularly in the provision of a footpath and other environmental improvements, and in ensuring local people can access the proposed development through better public transport provision, recruitment schemes and necessary skill training. Specifically, proposed projects are: i) Supporting the Rye Community Transport Scheme's "Dial a Ride Service". ii) To co-fund a minibus service. iii) Recruitment initiatives	Not achieved through SRB funds.	£100,000	£100,000	£0	-£100,000	-100%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
	iv) Targeted training programmes.						
ii) Camber Enterprise Centre	Project to develop an Enterprise Centre consisting of a number of light industrial units as a base for new local businesses, community enterprise schemes and co-operatives. SRB funding sought for developing the Centre and providing business support to the new businesses in conjunction with Ten Sixty Six Enterprise.	Not achieved.	£75,000	£75,000	£0	-£75,000	-100%
iii) Upgrading of Fish Market	SRB funds were sought as a contribution to a programme of upgrading the facilities at the Quay, and to implement additional issues identified in a scoping study in March 1999.	See separate Case Study in Appendix 2.	£175,000	£175,000	£293,500	£118,500	68%
<b>Total Structure of the Local Economy Programme</b>			£350,000	£350,000	£293,500	-£56,500	-16%
<b>Rye Town Initiative</b>							
i) Upgraded and Enhanced Tourist Information Centre (TIC)	To commission a study into the practicalities of upgrading and enhancing the existing Tourist Information Centre and the options for relocation, if required. SRB resources would	An extension to the facility has been built, and there has been a major refit of the interior. The enlarged TIC opened in Easter 2002.	£80,000	£80,000	£107,436	£27,436	34%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
	be used to implement the study's recommendations.						
ii) Information and Visitor Management	To employ a part-time co-ordinator to deliver undelivered projects in the Rye Town Initiative, including: promotion of facilities for visitors, provision of a physical "meet and greet" service, enhance opportunities to increase visitor spending, develop and enhance a Rye Visitor website, provide multi-lingual information, implement the visitor management elements of the Community Safety Initiative.	Information Panels have been provided in Car Parks and leaflets distributed. A Town Manager was appointed.	£40,000	£40,000	£22,458	-£17,542	-44%
iii) Improved Town Gateway, Strand Quay	A project to make several improvements to this area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve lawn areas, add benches, bins, picnic tables, interpretation panels, lighting and planting.</li> <li>- Remove eyesores, resurface areas, fencing and landscaping.</li> <li>- Create a quayside plaza.</li> <li>- Improve paved areas.</li> <li>- Planting trees, realign/resurface pavements and add new tourism signage.</li> </ul>	This project was withdrawn and replaced with the Rye Harbour Stores project - see this listed below.	£80,000	£80,000	£0	-£80,000	-100%
iv) Improved linkages between Strand Quay	Undertaking environmental improvements and upgrading under-utilised sites, including: upgrading walkways, improving	N/A. Project not granted SRB funding and therefore not conducted.	£100,000	£0	£0	£0	0%

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
and Fish market	surfaces, diverting pathways, adding signposting, redeveloping facilities for pleasure boat users, cleaning up the river, providing craft shops.						
<b>Total Rye Town Initiative</b>			£300,000	£200,000	£129,894	-£70,106	-35%
<b>Administration</b>							
Administration costs	Running of the above schemes.	N/A.	£100,000	£100,000	£100,285	£285	0%
<b>Other adjustments/additional projects</b>							
- Adjustment to SGE	Various adjustments as required by the auditors of the annual SGEs.	N/A.	N/A	N/A	-£7,133	-£7,133	N/A
- Rye Harbour Stores	This was a new project - not part of the original bid. It was first suggested in the 2001/02 Delivery Plan where the Partnership proposed to purchase the vacant village stores and re-open as a community shop. It replaced the 'Improved Town Gateway - Strand Quay' project which was removed from the programme. The Delivery Plan was approved by SEEDA.	The Rye Harbour Stores and two flats were purchased by The Rye Partnership with a combination of a mortgage and SRB grant. The Rye Partnership undertook a significant refurbishment of the shop, a tenant was contracted, the shop was reopened and the flats rented out.	N/A	Took on budget of £80,000 from "Improved Town Gateway, Strand Quay" project	£77,000	£77,000	N/A

Project	Intended Project Summary*	Summary of Actual Achievements***	SRB funding requested in original bid	SRB funding granted in 90% offer**	Total Actual Expenditure	Difference	% Over / under spend
- Rye Christmas Lights	Not part of original bid.		N/A	N/A	£4,000	£4,000	N/A
- SRB scheme evaluation	Not part of original bid but it was essential to evaluate the scheme.	This was an essential evaluation required by the SRB scheme. It was conducted by an external consultancy GHg consultants Ltd and published in August 2003.	N/A	N/A	£6,000	£6,000	N/A
<b>Total other adjustments</b>			N/A	N/A	£79,867	£79,867	N/A
<b>Total SRB Funding</b>			<b>£1,840,000</b>	<b>£1,638,000</b>	<b>£1,610,208</b>	<b>-£27,792</b>	<b>-2%</b>

Notes:

\*Summarised from "Rye Bay Renaissance - A Blueprint for Community Action to Achieve Rural Regeneration, Challenge Fund Bid (Round 5)" document, April 1999.

\*\*SEEDA granted 90% of the funding the Rye Partnership applied for - i.e. £1,638,000. This was based on a 90% reduction scenario submitted as part of the bid by the Rye Partnership. This scenario excluded the Wheels project and the Improved Linkages between Stand Quay and Fish market and also £32,000 of the proposed Leisure Facilities.

\*\*\*Information sourced from several documents, including: "The Rye Partnership - Business Plan 2005-2008 (1 June 2006 revision)", "The Rye Partnership, End of Scheme SRB Evaluation, December 2005", "The Rye Partnership, Past Present and Future", and the five Rye Bay Renaissance, Delivery Plans, 1999/00 to 2004/05.

#The budgets for the Rye Bay Health and Social Care Project and the Healthy Living Project were combined by the Partnership. Therefore for the purpose of this financial analysis any spending on either project has been split 50:50 between the two projects.

## Appendix 2 – Rye Partnership projects

### 1. Rye Fisheries Project

#### Introduction

1.1 The Partnership has been involved in the Rye Fisheries since 2002 when it acquired the assets of Duncan Grant Ltd, the existing tenants and operators of the fish processing plant. The proposed acquisition was appraised and approved by SEEDA as part of the SRB scheme. The assets acquired included a long lease on the processing plant, the freehold of which was owned by the Environment Agency. Prior to the Partnership's incorporation the lease was held in trust for the Partnership by Rother District Council.

1.2 The Partnership set up a separate company, Rye Fisheries Limited, to carry on the day to day trade activities of the Rye Fisheries, but the overall strategic direction of Rye Fisheries remained the responsibility of the Rye Partnership.

#### SRB Evaluation

1.3 The interim SRB evaluation report highlighted that there was some confusion as to whether the fish shop on the fish quay was purchased by the Rye Partnership as part of the overall purchase of Duncan Grant's assets. This is indicative of poor project management – in a substantial purchase such as this, the purchaser should be very clear exactly what is being acquired.

1.4 The report also criticised the target of the Fisheries project safeguarding 235 jobs. "The jobs directly safeguarded appear to be those of three people working in the fish preparation area, ... and the retail employee in the Fish Shop". In addition, only some 25% of the fish processing area was in use at the time of the report and as such was an underused resource. At time of evaluation, the project was deemed to be ambitious, poor value for money and with little strategic context.

#### Asset Transfer

1.5 The subsequent transfer of the fish processing plant assets from Rother District Council to the Partnership was problematic as the Environment Agency had to agree to the long lease being reassigned. This took over two years, until 2006, whilst the Agency considered the security of the

assets. As a result, although the lease was eventually reassigned to the Partnership, Rother District Council remains the guarantor of the lease in respect of part of the fisheries site for 15 years from 2002 at a potential cost of £8,500 per annum.

#### Rye Fisheries Limited

1.6 On taking ownership, Rye Fisheries Ltd rented one unit in the fish processing plant back to Duncan Grant Ltd, which enabled the company to continue trading. However, the company fell behind on its rent payments to Rye Fisheries Ltd and, and Rye Fisheries Ltd subsequently fell behind on its own lease payments to the Environment Agency. Rye Fisheries Ltd was not a profitable enterprise and the assets of Rye Fisheries Limited were transferred to the Partnership in 2005-06. The company has subsequently been dissolved.

#### Refurbishment

1.7 SEEDA identified Rye as one of three ports in the South East to take part in the national Fisheries Initiative and provisionally allocated funding of £195,000 for two years from April 2002.

1.8 The Partnership's business plan for running the fisheries was developed over a 12 month period and went through several iterations before it was accepted by SEEDA late in 2003. SEEDA had identified that the Partnership's plan was risky and complex but the completed business plan was independently appraised and found to be robust. In December 2003, SEEDA awarded £156,500 of capital funding and £38,500 of revenue funding. Additional funding from DEFRA of around £320,000 was also being pursued by the Partnership.

1.9 Following a competitive tendering process in February 2004 it emerged that the estimated construction costs would significantly exceed those included in the business plan and the design would have to be altered and the refurbishment scaled back.

1.10 The DEFRA match funding was not forthcoming and a lack of progress by April 2004 led SEEDA to withdraw revenue funding for the project, although the capital funding was allowed to roll forward. SEEDA ultimately withdrew their funding in 2006 on the grounds that there had been



a lack of response to requests for information and repeated delays to initiating the project.

1.11 The Partnership continued with its intention to refurbish the fish processing plant and subsequently sought funding from the East Sussex Economic Partnership, a sub-regional partnership funded principally by SEEDA, through the Area Investment Framework. The Partnership was awarded £145,734 to complete the refurbishment in 2008.

1.12 These monies were used to divide the processing plant into three units and replace the roof of the fisheries to allow future development of the upstairs area. Other improvements, including the installation of a fish freezer were also completed. The Partnership has a new tenant waiting to move in on the completion of the electrical installation.

### **Environment Agency quayside improvements**

1.13 The Harbour of Rye is maintained and managed by the Environment Agency, who carried out some major capital works over several years from 2004 to repair and upgrade the Harbour. These works were allied to, but not dependent on, the activities of the Partnership, and may well have been carried out anyway. The value of these works was included within the SRB programme as match funding.

### **Future developments**

1.14 The Partnership continues to seek to improve the fish processing plant and its surroundings. They have recently consulted with architects with regards to further developing the site.

## **2. Central Garage Site (Rye Resource Centre)**

2.1 The Central Garage Site, on Cinque Ports Street, was identified as a potential site for a new library and resource centre.

2.2 The £119,600 cost of clearing the Central Garage Site in 2003 was funded through the SRB programme, and so appraised and approved as a project in its own right by SEEDA. The site remained in the ownership of the original owner but there was an intention that the site would later be leased by the Partnership. The 2003-04 SRB

Delivery Plan states that the Partnership had purchased the Central Garage Site in Rye, but this was not actually the case.

2.3 The Partnership engaged architects, engineers and financial consultants to manage the design and financing of the project. The Partnership ran a competitive tendering process and awarded the contract to a local construction company. Planning permission was also obtained.

2.4 However, the project has stalled, due mainly to difficult negotiations with the land owner over the site itself, and is at least 4 years behind its intended schedule of starting construction in 2004.

2.5 The Partnership paid to rent and insure the site during the remediation work and for a short time afterwards, despite no construction activity taking place and having no lease or contractual responsibility for the site. The project has thus far failed to deliver a new library.

2.6 The Partnership has retained a significant number of documents relating to the project, though the trail of decision making is not always evident.

2.7 The Partnership may be liable to repay the SRB funding used to pay for the site clearance if a building with some civic and amenity access is not constructed on the site. This contingent liability is disclosed in the Partnership's accounts.

## **3. Animate**

3.1 Animate is a registered charity which owns and operates the Animate Youth Centre to promote the welfare of young people and provide facilities for leisure-time occupation for children and young people between the ages of 11 and 24.

3.2 Animate was awarded SRB funding of £10,000 per year over six years to fund the post of a youth centre coordinator. This enabled the provision of a number of clubs, groups and classes to ensure that young people throughout the area had a wider range of activities to access.

3.3 One of the project's expected outputs, a formal report on progress, was six months late, though it did indicate that the project was successful despite a relatively small budget. However, despite the small budget, monitoring forms show that the project had repeatedly underspent because there

were significant short falls on match-funding. No explanations for the underspends were recorded on file.

3.4 We found a lack of evidence in the project files of communication between the Partnership and the Animate Board, and this was also noted in the SRB Evaluation. However, the present Chair of the Partnership is also the Chair of Animate, so it is likely that communication was verbal and undertaken during the course of usual Partnership business.

3.5 The SRB Evaluation found that the project had largely achieved its aims in providing facilities for young people, although there was an element of uncertainty over future funding once the SRB funding ended.

3.6 Animate also received £20,000 from the Partnership's Market Towns Programme to refurbish the youth centre, including the provision of a commercial style kitchen which would be available for training purposes.

## 4. Computers in Schools

4.1 The Partnership spent £125,000 providing 30 computers for Freda Gardham School and 100 computers for Thomas Peacocke Community College, which was in special measures at the time. However, by the end of the SRB Programme in 2005, the computers were deemed to be obsolete for the purpose of use in schools, based on OFSTED criteria. The computers were instead put to use in an innovative scheme being leant to families where children did not have access to a computer at home.

4.2 There were difficulties encountered with the Partnership's monitoring of the project, including delays in providing relevant information to SEEDA. The SRB evaluation identified that these difficulties were largely due to staffing issues at Thomas Peacocke Community College, with the school's project manager resigning and not being replaced.

4.3 The Computers in Schools project did achieve its direct objectives in that there were marked

improvements in GCSE grades in IT, with 40% of students in the summer of 2003 getting an A\*-C, compared to a predicted 33%. Whilst achievement in all subjects improved, achieved IT grades were above the school average for all subjects. It is estimated that 4,405 children have benefited from the computers during the course of the project. However, this is the number of 'school pupil academic years'; the actual number of individual pupils benefited would be closer to 2,000.

## 5. Rye Harbour Stores

5.1 Rye Harbour is a small community of 450 residents, one-and-a-half miles from Rye Town Centre. It has limited facilities and relatively poor public transport provision.

5.2 The Partnership identified the benefit of acquiring the Harbour Stores which had previously closed down in 2000. Evidence on file indicated that the local population were heavily in favour of the shop reopening. However, the shop was considered to be an 'economically marginal' business during the winter, due to the lull in tourist activity.

5.3 The shop and the two flats above were acquired and the shop fitted out at a cost of £182,000. This was funded by SRB monies and a mortgage from Rother District Council. The Partnership then granted a lease to a new shopkeeper, who opened the business in 2002.

5.4 The SRB evaluation report deemed that the project was successful, though noted that the Partnership was charging rent at below market rate and had failed to increase the rent charged on the shop for two years, despite there being an agreement to do so. This was eventually resolved in 2005. Our review of documents held at the Partnership shows evidence of monitoring of the project, albeit with mixed effectiveness, with some actions not followed up. The project was completed under budget, and on time.

5.5 Evidence indicates that the new Harbour shop is a successful business, and a focal point of the community.

### Appendix 3 – Findings from SRB statements of grant expenditure (SGE)

Year	Date SGE received*	Opinion	Findings	Ineligible expenditure
1999/00	Received April 2001 – 4 months late	<b>Qualified opinion</b> with report.	Partnership did not have sight of supporting evidence for all figures supplied by individual projects.  No fixed asset register/inventory for SRB funded assets present during 1999/2000.	A number of payments defrayed after 31/03/00 were found to be included in the claim, totalling £12,669.75 although these payments were subsequently approved by SEEDA.
2000/01	Received January 2002 – 1 month late	<b>Qualified opinion</b> with report.	Quarterly monitoring returns submitted by projects lacked evidence of expenditure and support for match funding.  There was no method for proper monitoring of asset disposals, and also no procedure to perform an annual verification of assets at each project.	An entry on the schedules relating to payments made did not agree to supporting records. No confirmation of an amount of £10,000 could be obtained.  Also, there were two examples where projects had been awarded grants prior to expenditure being defrayed.
2001/02	Received December 2003 – on time	<b>Unqualified opinion.</b> No report.		
2002/03	Received March 2004 – 3 months late	<b>Qualified opinion</b> with report.	The Council had not maintained a clear split of costs between management and administration and the Capacity Building project (though it was noted that this is difficult to achieve).  On the Rye Resource Centre Project, £119,600 of SRB funds was expensed on demolition works (£34,600) and building control liaison (£74,969). The demolition contract was let by a partner to the Rye Resource	Amendment made to claim form to reflect level of expenditure and funding approved (Capacity Building Project).

Year	Date SGE received*	Opinion	Findings	Ineligible expenditure
			Centre. The auditors were not aware of what contract letting procedures were followed or if the procedures were equivalent to those of the Accountable Body.	
2003/04	Signed by Rother DC on 21/09/04.	Audited statements could not be located at the time of our examination.		
2004/05	Signed by Rother DC on 21/09/05	Audited statements could not be located at the time of our examination.		

\* Certificates are due to SEEDA by 31 December following the end of the financial year in question.

## Appendix 4 – Analysis of Market Towns Programme

Project name	Project description	Budget in original delivery plan £	Revisions to projects delivered £	Amount claimed £	Applicant	Organisation
Rye Town Initiative Review	Evaluate the impact of The Rye Town Initiative to inform future strategy	3,000		3,000	N/A	
Town Management – Visitors	Signage, information and publicity for Rye landmarks and events	21,000			Yolande Laybourne	Rye Partnership staff member
Skateboard Park	Build skate board park in Rye	20,000		20,000	Gina Sanderson	Rye and District Council for Voluntary Service
Enterprise Rye	Advice and awareness raising campaign for self-employment opportunities	8,300		8,300	Ann Cockerham	Thomas Peacocke Community College and Rye Partnership Director
Strand Quay Car Park feasibility study	Assess impact and practicality of pedestrianising the car park	5,000		5,000	N/A	
Administration and Management		25,000		25,000	N/A	
Healthcheck	Economic needs analysis	17,700		17,700	N/A	
Rye Resource Centre	Contribute to the fit out of the centre	40,000	- 40,000	0	N/A	
Lion St Community and Culture Centre	Refurbish community facilities	10,000	- 10,000	0	N/A	
Rye Museum Visitor Information Centre	Upgrade visitor centre facilities	10,000	-10,000	0	N/A	
TPCC Conference Facilities	Provide and install equipment suitable for use at large conferences	-	8,000	8,000	Ann Cockerham	Thomas Peacocke Community College and Rye Partnership Director
Johnson Field Cycle Track	Build new cycle track	-	30,000	27,850	Angela Alexander	Camber Parish Council

<b>Project name</b>	<b>Project description</b>	<b>Budget in original delivery plan £</b>	<b>Revisions to projects delivered £</b>	<b>Amount claimed £</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Rye Film Club	Replace film club projector	-	2,000	2,170	Geoff Boudreau/ Ken Bird	Rye Film Club
Animate Access and Training Centre	Refurbishment including fit out of commercial style kitchen for training purposes	-	20,000	20,000	Councillor Keith Glazier	Animate and Rye Partnership Director
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>160,000</b>		<b>157,896</b>		

Notes

The total match funding expected on the scheme was £26,600 Private and £240,700 other public funding.

The full application and appraisal process was not required for projects of a research, study, evaluation or report nature.