



# Regenerate NPT: Project Closure Report

**Project Organisation:** VIEW (DOVE) Ltd

**Project Name:** Feasibility Study: Sarn Helen Care & Support Services

**Project Start Date:** 1 July 2021      **Project End Date:** 8 October 2021

**Date of Report:** 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022

**Attached Documents List:** Feasibility Study attached

There is a mandatory requirement to complete this document at Project Closure. The purpose of the report is to provide a project level document evidencing how well the project has performed against the original Business Plan delivered by the Local Partnership and Local Action Group during the lifetime of the project, and how it has contributed to the aims and objectives of the Local Partnership's Local Development Strategy. Project performance against the planned/approved costs, delivery timescales and Key Performance indicators will also be detailed. **Please try and keep within the maximum word count.**

## 1. Background: (briefly detail the background to the Project – 250 max)

Discussions were held with a number of local vulnerable and elderly residents who had found it difficult to identify the appropriate people to offer help at home. Discussions had also taken place with a number of skilled people who could offer a range of services, and who were keen to find work, however they did not have the financial resources for marketing, taking part in training, etc.

DOVE staff talked to their local Councillor and to their Local Area Coordinator for the Dulais Valley, and formulated the idea of Sarn Helen Care & Support Service.

As a result of the Covid19 pandemic, we recognised that the employment market was struggling and while this project might start off small, if feasible, there would be opportunities to protect people, protect employment and provide much needed services in our communities.

It was anticipated that the business could be a set up as a stand-alone co-operative, supported by DOVE Workshop. We recognised that it would be appropriate to carry out a feasibility study to test the need and financial viability of creating a new business and wanted the feasibility study to address: the availability of local people with skills and their interest in joining the co-operative; identify the needs and challenges of local people, and the cost of providing the service and how accessible those services would be. The study would also need to research potential competition, duplication and how we could work with existing businesses to enhance and improve services.

If the study proved positive we anticipated formulating a business plan and seeking start-up costs.

The study found that a social enterprise would not be a viable approach but potentially a signposting service could be explored with far lower risks and liabilities.

The study also identified issues of duplication there are two well established operators providing the service in the area plus a newly created provider offering very similar services nearby.

<b>2. Project Outcomes as per application</b>	<b>Was this achieved? What supporting evidence is there of achievement? If not achieved, why not?</b>
Feasibility Study in accordance with WG Guidelines (as stated on page 2 of the application form)	Feasibility Study attached.
Briefly what has the study identified?	
<p>The overall conclusion is that there is a social demand that should be met and the assessment of potential social demand for the service appears to be well founded. If there were no other providers in this area, then the project would have a strong case for funded support. Even though there is provision in the area it was established that there were long waiting lists and difficulties in recruiting freelancers within the delivery area.</p> <p>The need for securing more local labour to deliver local solutions also appears to be well founded.</p>	
<b>3. Strategic Achievements:</b> (outline what the project has achieved in terms of alignment with LEADER Themes and Priorities and any contribution to national strategies - 300 max)	
<b>Theme: 3</b>	<b>Priority: Enterprising NPT</b>
<p>Attempted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address gaps in support which would benefit from delivery in and by the community</li> <li>• Pilot community delivery of non-statutory services</li> <li>• Enable rural communities to find and access the support available to them.</li> <li>• We can learn from the results of the Feasibility Study.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. With regards to your comments at application stage, how have you managed this project in terms of sustainability?</b> (What plans have been put in place to maintain the project once it is completed? 400 words max)	
<p>Are the ideas sustainable, if not, why not. Are there ideas for a possible viable alternative?</p> <p>There are significant financial viability challenges that dictate that a model as proposed will almost certainly require ongoing grant revenue subsidy.</p> <p>And with the presence of other larger providers plus a newly formed provider offering a similar service that are publicly funded already.</p>	
<b>5. Project Beneficiaries:</b>	
<p>Survey demographics  61% were female and 39% were male  There was a good spread of ages (although the majority were older 62% were 55 plus  23% had a disability  97% were White British</p>	
<b>6. Cross Cutting Themes:</b> If relevant, briefly describe how your project contributed to the following themes:	
<b>Equal Opportunities:</b>	
N/A	
<b>Sustainable Development including Economic, Environmental and Social</b>	
N/A	
<b>Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion</b>	
N/A	

<b>7. Conclusion Summary:</b> Please provide a summary on the project's performance, identifying any key issues that need to be addressed:				
<b>a) Summary</b>				
The gathering of data proved to be challenging with a low response rate. Only managing to capture 70 surveys.				
<b>b) Key Issues</b>				
Not being able to contact harder to reach members of the community face to face to explain why we were carrying out the survey.				
<b>c) What went well?</b>				
Initial meeting of a group of people coming together and being prepared to get involved with the service if proved to be viable.				
<b>d) What didn't go well?</b>				
Due to the current climate and the COVID restrictions that were in place at the time of the survey, made it difficult to engage the hard to reach in the community				
<b>e) What could have been done differently?</b>				
On hindsight it would have been better to wait until the restrictions were relaxed giving us the opportunity to visit more community members and hold targeted focus group.				
<b>8. TO BE COMPLETED BY LEAD BODY:</b>				
<b>Project Performance – Financial &amp; Indicator Achievements:</b> (detailed performance against approved timescales and budget expectation, including reasons for all variances)				
<b>a) Performance indicator achievement against targets approved:</b> Final position:				
PI Reference	Approved Target	Total Achieved	Justification for underachievement	How has achievement been evidenced
LD.CL.001	Number of Feasibility Studies			
	1	1		
LD.CL.007	Number of stakeholders engaged			
	40	5	Confusion re definition of stakeholder and participant	Meeting attendance record. Survey sheet.
LD.CL.008	Number of participants engaged			
	0	72		Surveys completed.
NPT01	Number of communities engaged			
	3	3		Onllwyn, Crynant & Seven Sisters. Surveys completed.
NPT02	Number of groups engaged			
	1	0	No Group engagement difficult due to pandemic restrictions	
NPT03	Number of young people participating in the project			
	10	7	Engagement proved difficult	
NPT04	Number of women participating in the project			
	15	43		Surveys completed.
NPT05	Number of Welsh speakers participating in the project			
	8	12		Surveys completed.
NPT06	Number of older people participating in the project			
	15	48		Surveys completed.
NPT07	Number of individuals with disabilities participating in the project			
	6	17		Surveys completed.

NPT12	Advice/support surgeries in community facilities		
	1	0	Difficult because of pandemic restrictions
b) <b>Pilot Activities/Projects:</b> Outlining all of the stages and activities, including the timelines. To promote externally and link to the Wales Rural Network Website. Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this project <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
c) <b>Feasibility Studies:</b> To promote externally and link to the Wales Rural Network Website. Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this project <input type="checkbox"/>			

d) <b>Project Closure Financial Position against original approved: (following final claim)</b>				
Timescales	Original Approved		Adjusted Approved	Final Closure Date
	From	To	8.10.21	8.10.21
	1.7.21	27.8.21		

e) <b>Summary of Financial Performance</b>				
		Original Approved	Adjusted Approved	Final Claim
Total Project Costs		£5,000		£5,000
RDP Funding		£4,000		£4,000
Levered Funding		£1,000		£1,000
Intervention Rates	% RDP	80%		80%
	% Match	20%		20%
		Cost Heading	Justification for under/overspend	
Under/overspend				

<b>9. Handover contact details:</b> For post project monitoring and evaluation activities, Welsh Government will require contact details of staff who may be able to provide assistance.	
Name: JULIE BIBBY	Designation: JOINT CO-ORDINATOR
Email: juliebibby@btconnect.com	Telephone: 01639 700024
Website address: www.doveworkshop.org.uk	
Facebook page: DOVEWorkshopHub	
<b>Document Retention Procedures:</b> Documents (which includes all evidence relating to your project) must be retained in a suitable format for a period of 10 years following the end of the current LEADER programme – this means at least until 2031.	

Signed: *Julie Bibby* Date: 10 February 2022  
(Project Lead)

Signed: *NABray* Date: 10/02/2022  
(RDP Manager – Lead Body)

**Post Project Activities by the Local Partnerships and Local Action Group:**  
Define what activities need to be undertaken by the Lead Body after the project has been closed include any post project follow up actions which may need to be undertaken following project closure:

