

Communities First Review 2003

Huw Lewis AM

Introduction

"Our commitment now as a government is to make sure communities are empowered to regenerate themselves and tackle the social problems inherited by neglect and economic starvation. We want to ensure that all communities can share in the increased wealth and prosperity of Wales. The less well-off communities should be at the front of the queue to share in this prosperity."

Rhodri Morgan AM

May 2003.

Communities First is a 10 year programme to improve "the living conditions and prospects for people" in the 100 most deprived electoral divisions, 32 'pockets' of deprivation and 10 communities of interest. Communities First represents a formidable task.

The programme is non-prescriptive and relies heavily on the involvement of local people. This way of working produces its own potential strengths and potential challenges. The purpose of this review is to identify areas for improvement in policy and implementation of the programme as well as to examine funding arrangements and how they might be improved to favour these communities.

Communities First exists within a complicated web of other programmes and funding regimes. Involvement and accountability are complicated by the overlapping roles of many participating organisations and individuals. This can slow progress and make communication difficult. Much of the content of this review will be concerned with simplification of the programme, particularly for the benefit of local partnerships.

This review has been informed by visits to and interviews with local partnership members, co-ordinators, local authority officers and members across Wales. A visit was also undertaken to Edinburgh to examine the work of the Scottish Executive's anti poverty programme.

Review of Policy

My work on this review has shown that there is great enthusiasm for and acceptance of Communities First as a policy. The underlying aims and objectives, as well as the prescription to involve local communities through maximising their capacity is well supported. All participants agreed that the long term view of the programme is sensible and itself contributes to sustainable change.

The document "Communities First Guidance" of Oct 2002 identifies the following "fundamental activities" that the programme should promote:

- Building confidence and raising the self esteem of people living in the community.
- Increasing the incomes of local people (including reducing costs of food, heat, credit etc.)
- Improving health and well-being
- Encouraging and improving education and skills training for work
- Creating jobs
- Making communities safe, secure and crime free
- Making changes in the ways public services are delivered
- Improving housing and the quality of the environment
- Building up ownership and control of assets
- Encouraging active citizenship.

It is important to remember that all C1st activity should be identified and supported by the community itself *but should relate to these fundamental activities*. I would further suggest that each partnership address all of these activities over the life of the programme. A concentration on a lesser number will not provide the integrated approach to poverty C1st is intended to be.

Recommendation 1

All partners should be issued with strengthened guidance emphasising the fundamental activities as the key reference point for building Action Plans. This guidance should make clear that there is a clear expectation that over the life of the programme they are obliged to consider how to address each part of the vision framework.

We must also ensure that the system of monitoring and evaluation of these activities assesses *the impact they have on the Welsh Assembly's "Index of Multiple Deprivation"*. This must be done at a local and National level and must involve target setting over the short, medium and long term as set out in the Community Action Plan timescales. Communities First is a largely non- prescriptive programme, but, in the main, those consulted during this review agreed that some form of target setting and evaluation was necessary for the following reasons:

- Evaluation. We must be able to measure progress towards combating poverty. Such measurement would also allow identification and rollout of best practise across the country.

- Full engagement of all agencies. Our evidence gathering has uncovered repeated concerns that if Communities First is to succeed, then all agents for delivery must be engaged (e.g. ASPBs, other Assembly Government Departments).

Recommendation 2

Targets to measure progress should be set at partnership level. These targets, entitled ‘milestones’ should be as few in number as possible, but should relate directly to the ‘essential activities’ listed above as well as to the Index of Multiple Deprivation. It is vital that local partnerships ‘have ownership’ of the milestones, and that they are both ambitious and realistic.

The Assembly should also institute an annual report on the subject of Social Justice, and these milestones, together with the wider progress in social inclusion issues, including the contribution of all Assembly Government departments and ASPBs to the Social Justice agenda should be referred to in this report. The Annual Report on Social Justice should be debated annually in plenary.

It is important to realise that of itself, Communities First is not the answer to poverty nor is poverty limited to Communities First areas. . It does, however, give the hardest hit communities an ‘edge’ when dealing with the consequences of it, by empowering local people, co-ordinating activity with a high degree of local involvement, building the capacity of local people to deal with complex issues and by funding directly projects to combat the consequences and root causes of poverty.

Communities First is the Welsh Assembly Government’s flagship programme to tackle social exclusion. It is therefore important that the Communities First programme is harmonised with other Government policies, and sits alongside other areas of Government policy, such as, for example, the Spatial Plan.

Review of Implementation

Current Status

It is important to recognise that the communities involved in this programme, although sharing many similarities statistically, all begin from different starting points in approaching Communities First. Some areas are well advanced in recruiting co-ordinators, establishing partnerships and organising local people. Most of these more advanced areas have a history of partnership working (e.g. through People in Communities) and a good established relationship with at least one other Agency e.g. the Local Authority or CVC.

Other areas have greater problems and barriers to organisation. The primary difficulty in such areas is lack of capacity within the community; but other problems were highlighted by consultees e.g. historically poor relations between agencies and local people; ‘unofficial’ Communities First groups;

lack of understanding of the purpose of the Programme amongst key players e.g. Councillors or existing local organisations. Another problem worth highlighting is the potential for 'meeting fatigue' which already worries many consultees, with key people, particularly local residents vulnerable to disillusionment. Community morale and confidence in the programme are vital and must be sustained.

The findings of the review clearly indicate that partnerships operate in different ways and at different stages across the country. The partnerships also have different abilities and feedback indicated that some stakeholders felt that partnerships were unduly dominated by one or other partner.

The aim of empowering communities to regenerate themselves requires support from the Assembly, local authorities and others. There should be equal access to support available to all partnerships and co-ordinators across Wales, depending on local need. This currently does not exist. It is clear that many partnerships will find great difficulty in constructing potentially complex funding packages involving multiple match funding bids. Detailed funding profiles will be necessary in many areas, and it is unfair to expect partnerships to deal with these without assistance. Timescales for community consultation and partnership agreement has proved longer than may have been at first envisaged, and the development of Community Action Plans is proving problematic even for the better organised partnerships. Support, which comes from a variety of organisations, can be variable in nature, and depends on local circumstances. There is also a need to ensure that the maximum resources reach community level, and are not channelled elsewhere.

The role of local authorities in relation to the programme requires careful consideration. Local authorities' roles within the programme vary considerably across Wales, including those of elected members. The balance struck in shaping local authorities' role in relation to communities, more than any other single issue, determines the nature of the programme. It is important that the authorities' facilitative (rather than leadership) role within the programme is emphasised.

It is essential that Communities First Action Plans are harmonised with Local Authority Community Strategies, whilst recognising that the development of Communities First partnerships or Action Plans should not be unduly hurried to fit the timetable of Community Strategies.

I am also aware of the need to clarify the legal responsibilities of partnerships and local authorities, and the relationships between them, which impinge on this area.

The Communities First Support Network is intended to act as a 'One Stop Shop' for Communities First Co-ordinators and partnerships. The Communities First Support Network (CFSN) has provided support to the programme not available at local level, including training, legal advice, networking and peer support. over the last two years. Their contract ends in March 2004. The grant recipient is the Wales Co-centre and the level of grant is just less than £1m for 2003-4.

The recent evaluation of the CFSN indicates that it has performed well in some areas, and less well in others. Well run services include centrally provided services such as the information service, the Trust

Fund and central projects including capacity building. The evaluation was more critical in the area of CFSN support to co-ordinators and partnerships, while noting that this had not been a designated part of their remit. As a part of the voluntary sector, CFSN may have less leverage with local authorities.

An alternative approach on how to provide centrally sponsored support could be through increasing the Assembly Government's regional capacity to undertake a wider range of roles and responsibilities. The Assembly Government's team would have authority in their dealings with local authorities, which is more difficult for a voluntary sector based organisation to attain. I am concerned, however, that the development of such an arrangement would inevitably take time to bring to fruition. In the meantime, the expertise built up by CFSN would be lost, and there would be a risk of hiatus which could debilitate the programme. On balance, therefore I am inclined to clarify, redefine and focus the role of the CFSN. This will include consideration of it developing a regional level capacity to directly address issues of equality of support. These arrangements should be reviewed after one year to assess their functioning. Assembly Government officials will take forward more proactively the role of liaison and support to local government.

Recommendation 3

- a. *The Assembly develops appropriate monitoring techniques to promote minimum standards of partnerships engaged in Community Regeneration, and that this be introduced initially in the Communities First programme. It should also adopt a system of accreditation of Communities First partnerships to ensure recognised best practise in community regeneration is available across Wales.*
- b. *That Guidance be clarified to emphasise the primary role of local authorities within the programme as facilitative.*
- c. *That officials clarify the areas of legal responsibility of partnerships, and those local authorities that are grant recipients, and issue clear guidance including audit arrangements.*
- d. *That programme support be provided by the CFSN from April 2004, but that the role be renegotiated to emphasise the need for a more coherent service which provides equality of access to support across all areas of Wales. That a regional capacity be considered, and that arrangements be reviewed after one year.*
- e. *That Assembly Government officials proactively provide liaison and support to local government.*

The Trust Fund

The three year funding period for the Communities First Trust Fund ends in March 2004, and a decision is needed on its future beyond that date. The Trust Fund is managed by the CFSN, and administered by the WCVA on its behalf. The Fund has been universally welcomed as a positive development. The potential for speedy delivery through the fund has had a positive effect on the morale of communities, partnerships, co-ordinators and other partners.

However, some difficulties have also been encountered with the Trust Fund. These include:

- The 30 day deadline is not always met.
- Concern over groups outside Communities First areas making bids with little or no consultation with partnerships, with questionable benefits accruing to Communities First areas.
- Lack of feedback for unsuccessful applicants.
- Many partnerships are demanding more information from the WCVA on bids that may affect their area.
- Decision making on bids is perceived as too remote from local partnerships. There is an accountability problem here.

If the Fund is to continue, the long term aim should be to devolve the administration of the Trust Fund to local partnerships. However, with 83 partnerships currently in existence, mainly in embryonic form, it is unrealistic to expect that partnerships generally could assume this responsibility in the near future until they are established legal entities. While some CVCs could administer the Fund, this is not uniform.

In order to address the issue that decision making is too remote from local areas, partnerships, where they exist, and co-ordinators, should be consulted in the decision making process. This would provide the local engagement currently lacking.

Recommendation 4

- The Trust Fund should be extended for a further year, with consideration being given to further extension or permanent inclusion in the programme.**
- That the Fund should continue to be managed, at this stage, by CFSN, and administered by WCVA.**
- Local partnerships/co-ordinators should be consulted on all applications, in order to ensure that decision making is brought closer to local people.**
- Officials will look at the possibility of the Fund accommodating joint bids from different areas.**

Agents of Delivery

In order for Communities First to deliver on its aims, a large number of partner agencies must show commitment and become effectively involved. Communities First cannot 'stand alone' in the battle against poverty. As well as this, independent bodies such as charities and businesses should be encouraged to become involved in work which will eventually supplement their own aims and objectives.

The results of many meetings and interviews with agents of delivery of the programme, such as local

Partnerships, Local Authorities, Voluntary Organisations etc. consistently pointed out that there were big difficulties in constructing this integrated approach. These difficulties could be broadly grouped under three headings: Complexity, Capacity and Clarity.

Complexity

Put simply, there are too many regeneration initiatives at work and the funding arrangements we have to deal with are too complex. The recommendations in this Report should represent significant steps forward in dealing with this. The strengthening of regional capacity to provide expert advice should ease the complexity of funding issues, particularly for Local Partnerships, freeing them to plan and consult.

Capacity

Many concerns were raised with us concerning the issue of capacity. Most consultees were concerned with the problem of capacity building within communities, *but it is important to recognise that all agents for delivery have a capacity problem in relation to Communities First*. This includes the Assembly, ASPBs, the Voluntary Sector, and Local Authorities. Many are unclear about their role, some could be described as unaware that they have one, and all need to build expertise in the field of regeneration within their personnel. If Communities First is to succeed, all agents for delivery, including Assembly Government Departments and ASPB'S such as WDA and ELWa must be fully engaged in the programme.

As in our communities, we must recognise that capacity building takes time. We cannot, however, expect deprived communities to wait while all agencies of delivery of this programme build their capacity to deal with it. Capacity building and delivery must move forward in parallel. There are immediate measures that can be taken to begin to rectify this problem.

Recommendation 5

- a. **The Community Regeneration and Social inclusion Policy Board, chaired by the Minister, provides a forum for discussing strategic direction, and the level of engagement of each partner in this programme. Each meeting should consider reports from each partner outlining their Communities First related activity and their progress in capacity building.**
- b. **A series of secondments should be set up, whereby individuals working**

at national level, for example Assembly Government officials, and those at local level, such as Partnership chairs or co-ordinators could learn from each other's experiences. ASPBs and Local Authorities, and the voluntary sector should be included within this programme.

- c. *Academic institutions offering courses in regeneration should be*

encouraged to 'adopt' a number of partnerships to combine theoretical expertise with actual

experience by working alongside them on specific projects based on a 'real' delivery outcome e. g. a specific section of a Community Action Plan. It will be necessary to consider how equality of access can be achieved.

- d. *The WLGA be asked to produce guidelines for its members based on best practise models of involvement of local authorities with local partnerships.*

Clarity

Not all consultees were clear about the nature and purpose of the Communities First programme. A key appeal made by many consultees was for 'leadership' to be shown by the Assembly. This obviously sits a little uncomfortably with the idea of a 'non-prescriptive' approach; however there is room for a more pro-active approach from the Assembly.

Partnerships and Local Authorities in particular are in the main, working through these early stages of Communities First in comparative isolation. The mechanisms for dissemination of best practise are wholly inadequate.

In most areas the awareness of the general public of the aims and purpose of Communities First is too low.

The flexible and non prescriptive nature of the programme, and the pace of development within it, means that good communications are imperative. There is a need to improve the quality of communications at many levels within the programme.

Recommendation 6

- a. **The Assembly should issue a series of circular letters addressing issues germane to the programme. It will serve to provide greater clarity.**
- b. **A non-technical bulletin, a strategy for an internet based partnership to partnership communications capacity, a Conference for Communities First Partners, and local newsletters should also be produced. This should be further encouraged by production of a web-based template to assist. The Communities First logo should be supplemented locally by the addition of a strapline, for example "Communities First - The Welsh Assembly Government and Maerdy, working together". Work will be undertaken with partners to develop a Directory of all match funding streams available in Wales.**

Integrated Programmes

The key issue for the successful delivery of the Communities First programme – and of achieving the full ambitions of the Social Justice Agenda - is through the active engagement of mainstream programme resources. It is essential that mainstream programmes are 'bent' to favour the most deprived

areas, as reflected in the Index of Multiple Deprivation. This requires a strong commitment across the Assembly Government to ensure delivery in response to the needs identified in the Communities First areas. Initiatives are already underway that prioritise mainstream funding programmes in Communities First areas, such as water coolers - and school breakfasts. Without such commitment to 'mainstream' regeneration funding and activity, Communities First will never succeed to the extent we had hoped and envisaged.

Communities First represents around £83 million over three years. This sum is dwarfed by mainstream public spending, and is clearly insufficient in itself to lift 142 communities out of poverty. In order to succeed in lifting these communities out of poverty, it must be accepted by all partners that programme bending is essential.

At present we bend programmes to pay for the consequences of poverty like increased crime figures, low educational achievement and its impact on the economy or poor health and its drain on NHS resources. Communities First must change that emphasis so that programmes are bent to pay for the eradication of poverty.

There is confusion amongst partners about what 'Programme Bending' or 'changing the way public services are delivered' actually means in practice. There is also concern, particularly at local authority level, that non-Communities First wards will somehow suffer if resources are reallocated.

We recognise, however, that a great deal of the current confusion can be removed if the Assembly Government offers a clear definition of what programme bending means.

The Spending Review which has been established by the Assembly Government is a very significant and timely opportunity to achieve the 'bending' necessary to achieve Government priorities. The purpose of the Review is to provide an appraisal of existing and potential programmes so as to evaluate their contribution to the strategic objectives of the Government, identifying duplication and enhancing integration. Paramount among the strategic objectives of the Assembly Government are those relating to social justice, building strong communities, eradicating poverty and deprivation.

We would expect that the Spending Review evaluates the outcomes and the distribution of outcomes of programmes against the social justice objectives and recommends both the 'bending' and the more effective integration of activity which is justified by this evaluation.

-

Recommendation 7

- a. **The Assembly should produce a clear definition of 'programme bending' for each partner agency and for its own departments. This definition should include the use of mainstream budgets, not just regeneration funding, in projects; changing policy to reflect the needs of**

disadvantaged areas; piloting best practise in Communities First areas prior to ‘rolling out’ to the wider community.

- b. That the Spending Review should provide an appraisal of existing and potential programmes to evaluate their contribution to the Assembly Government’s social justice objectives over the medium term. On this basis the Review should influence the allocation of resources, identify duplication and enhance the integration of relevant activities.**

Community Hubs

A particular problem was noted while conducting interviews across Wales that concerned the largely ward based nature of Communities First areas. This can result, quite often, in the ‘hub’ of a community, (the place where many people from a deprived community might wish to work, shop or seek entertainment) not being within the ward boundary. This is most marked in the South Wales Valleys, where town centres are quite often not in Communities First Wards. These town centres must be renewed if the general picture of deprivation, and in particular the economy, of Communities First areas is to permanently change for the better.

Recommendation 8

- a. That the review of the Local Authorities Non Match Funding Local Regeneration Fund take account of Community Hubs, and that community hubs be included as a criterion when assessing applications.**
- b. That discussions be held with ASPBs and their sponsoring Divisions within the Assembly.**

Excluded Agents of Delivery

Already Communities First is a very inclusive programme. However, there are gaps. In particular those smaller, local, voluntary organisations which do not have representation through the WCVA. Another group would include organisations working and trading in communities which simply have not been considered for inclusion; for example social clubs and institutes, which may themselves be sources of match funding for the programme, and in the past would have been heavily involved in community activity through sports, culture, entertainment and community education.

Recommendation 9

Consideration should be given by the Assembly Government to including so far non-participating local organisations through awareness raising and guidance for co-ordinators.

Equality Issues

The Communities First programme has addressed issues of equality in its guidance and programme support. Considerable work has been invested to seek to ensure involvement of children and young people; minority ethnic issues have been reflected in the Minority Ethnic Communities of Interest and in programme support. Support has also been provided for the disabled, particularly the deaf and blind. However, less work has been done with the aged, and issues of gender are not addressed.

Recommendation 10

a) To address areas of equality and diversity not currently adequately considered. These include:

- i. children and young people be given automatic rights to participate in Communities First partnerships**
- ii. measures be introduced to the programme which provide a gender perspective in consultation with EPU and other key actors.**
- iii. Seek to actively involve older people in the programme, (as stated in ‘The Strategy for Older People in Wales’) and develop possibilities provided by Intergenerational linkages**

Review of Funding

There are over 60 funds / grants potentially available to local partnerships *through the Assembly alone*. When European, Local Authority and charitable funds are added the total would be well over 100.

This level of complexity has the potential to bog down a partnership and limit the potential draw down of money as well as damaging the morale of all concerned.

Our proposal is to provide a single funding portal, which partnerships and their co-ordinators may, if they wish, bid into.

Recommendation 11

The establishment of a pilot Communities First Single Fund should be considered. The core of this fund would be the Communities First budget allocated to that area, but there should be the maximum possible ‘match’ funding from other stakeholders which can be negotiated, e.g. ASPBs, Local Authorities, WEFO, Charitable institutions and, crucially all Assembly departments. The Communities First Single Fund will ensure an ‘up front’ commitment to programme bending, with a figure attached.

European Funding Streams

The rolling out of such Single Funds would require cross-departmental commitment across all Assembly departments, all ASPBs and the local authorities concerned. It will also require negotiation with other bodies, such as the National Lottery, Coalfield Communities Campaign etc.

While all consultees welcomed the Communities First Programme some were having difficulty operating it, using match funding and achieving best value as they were dealing with different and complex funding regimes.

This is exacerbated by the fact that some Communities First areas are eligible for EU Objective 1 Funding and some are not, thus creating inequalities within the programme and communities.

Recommendation 12

That as part of the current Mid-term Review of EU Structural Funds programmes the probability of reclassifying all Communities First areas as eligible for "objective 1 " should be explored, through the match funding of the Communities First Trust Fund.

Running Costs

Many consultees, particularly local Partnership Board members, were concerned that the bureaucracy surrounding administration of Communities First should not become too great. The point of Communities First is not to employ regeneration workers and administrators, but to regenerate deprived communities. Although it is clear that people will be necessary to deliver the programme, it should not be necessary for each and every partnership to employ an entirely free standing implementation team. However, a further safeguard is required.

Recommendation 13

A 'Running costs' spending cap should be negotiated with each partnership. This should be similar in its conception to the cap imposed on ASPBs, such as the WDA, to ensure that the overwhelming percentage of funding over the lifetime of the scheme is invested in project delivery rather than bureaucracy. It is recognised that each area will vary in its needs for administrative support, and set up costs mean that this early stage will involve greater investment in bureaucratic capacity, but that an administrative cap should be introduced to ensure that over the medium and long term the maximum resource possible reaches the local community.

Appendix 1

List of people/organisations interviewed.

Dave	Adamson	University of Glamorgan
Snovia	Ali	Black and Ethnic Minority Support Team
Jan	Bennett	Caerphilly County Borough Council
Alan	Bull	Neath Port Talboth County Borough Council
Reece	Burton	Cumni Communities First
June	Burtonshaw	City and County of Swansea
Helen	Bushell	Community Development Cymru
Betsan	Caldwell	WDA South West
James	Cawley	Vale of Glamorgan Council
Noel	Crowley	Neath Port Talboth County Borough Council
David	Davies	Cumni Clydach
Roger	Dinham	Job Centre Plus
Nathan	Evans	Black and Ethnic Minority Support Team
Erica	Feilding	Pembrokeshire County Council
Meryl	Gravelle	Leader Carmarthenshire County Council
Gareth	Hall	WDA
Tim	Hooper	Welsh Local Government Association
Reid	Hutchison	c/o Aberdeenshire Council
Clive	James	Prif Swyddog Polisi
Judith	James	NTLHouse,
Non	Jenkins	Audit Commission
Chris	Johns	Communities First Support Network
Gareth	Jones	Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
Huw	Jones	Sports Council for Wales
Jennie	Jones	Newport County Borough Council
Nia	Jones	Communities First
Rhys	Jones	Housing Services & Community Development
John	Killick	Torfaen CBC
John	Killion	Rhyl Community Agency
Lorraine	Miles	Neath Port Talbot Council for Voluntary Service

Andrew	Millard	Neath Port Talbot Council for Voluntary Service
Ian	Mitchell	Head of Community Regeneration and Empowerment
Robin	Morrison	Church in Wales
Peter	Mortimer	Rhondda Cynon Taff Boriough Council
Mary	Mulligan	St. Andrew's House
Alyn	Owen	Community Regeneration
Beverly	Owen	Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
Ann	Patterson	Communities Scotland
Simon	Pemberton	Wrexham County Borough Council
Alan	Penman	The Royal Infirmary
Andrew	Pierce	National Lottery
Anthony	Pierce	Church in Wales
Tim	Pippin	Caerphilly County Borough Council
Julian	Richards	c/o CornerstoneCommunity Project
Ken	Sawyers	Neath Port Talboth County Borough Council
Jane	Shattford	Communities First
Mike	Shaw	Ceredigion County Council
Martin	Skone	Vale Clouncil for Voluntary Service
Jayne	Stokes	WDA South West
Rod	Taylor	c/o Flintshire County Council
Gaynor	Thomas	Gwent Association of Voluntary Organisations
Alexan	Westlake	Caerphilly County Borough Council
Sue	Whittaker	c/o Bridgend County Borough Council
Nick	Wilcox	Community Services
Richard	Wilson	Communities Scotland
Victoria	Winkler	Bevan Foundation

Appendix 2

Local Authority take up of European Funding to match fund Communities First monies (as at September 2003).

EUROPEAN MATCH FUNDING / COMMUNITIES FIRST

June 2001 - 31
March 2006

Local Authority Area	Communities First Monies Awarded to date	European Structural fund type	European Fund amount	Employment/Activity/Service
Blaenau Gwent = £2,522,893.00			Nil	No response from Local Authority
Bridgend = £783,731.00			Nil	
Caerphilly = £306,506.00			Nil	
Cardiff = £1,145,370.00			Not known	
Carmarthenshire = £1,323,127.00			Nil	
Ceredigion = £136,960.00			Nil	Social Economy
Conwy = £781,832.29			Nil	
Denbighshire = £133,553.00			Nil	
Flintshire = £625,224.63			Nil	
Gwynedd = £1,064,569.60			Nil	
Isle of Anglesey = £1,334,402.40			Nil	To Employ a Communities First European Officer
Merthyr Tydfil = £3,904,654.40		Objective 1 ERDF	£285,100.00	
Monmouthshire = £109,674.06			Nil	
Neath Port Talbot = £1,832,611.70			Nil	
Newport = £613,036.56		Objective II & Transitional ERDF	£12,625.00	
			£12,625.00	To Employ a Communities First European Officer
Pembrokeshire = £404,700.00			Nil	
Powys = £365,870.09			Nil	

Rhondda Cynon Taff = £4,257,040.56	ERDF	£711,484.00	The Objective 1 projects are integrated funding packages so it's not possible to identify the "Employment/Activity/service" information without breaking down the budgets into very fine detail.
Swansea = £1,571,879.00		£137,988.00	Co-ordinator, Admin Officer, Training , Office costs
Torfaen = £321,131.29		Nil	
Vale of Glamorgan = £53,500.00		Nil	
Wrexham = £1,706,189.70	URBAN II	£103,711.00	Community Development Officer and Co-ordinator/ Project Workers. Strategy support worker. Childcare facilities.
Total = £25,298,456.28		£1,263,533.00	