

## 2.0 MINUTES OF WLEP BOARD MEETING ON 20<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2014

**Thursday, 20th November 2014 3.00pm – 5.00pm  
Mazak, Worcester**

### PRESENT:

Peter Pawsey (Chair)	(PP)	Chairman, Robert West and Director Midland Heart
Chris Walklett	(CW)	Partner, Bishop Fleming
Nick Baldwin	(NB)	Chairman, Office for Nuclear Regulation
Dr Simon Murphy	(SM)	CEO, Worcester Community Trust
Cllr Simon Geraghty	(SG)	Deputy Leader, Worcestershire County Council
Cllr Margaret Sherrey	(MS)	Leader, Bromsgrove District Council (rep Northern DCs)
Stuart Laverick	(SL)	Principal & Chief Executive, Worcester College of Technology
Cllr. David Hughes	(DH)	Leader, Malvern Hills District Council (rep Southern DCs)

### IN ATTENDANCE:

Gary Woodman	(GW)	Worcestershire LEP
Luke Willetts	(LW)	Note taker, Worcestershire LEP
Duncan Sharkey	(DS)	Chief Executive, Worcester City Council
Kirsty Sneyd	(KS)	Facilitator, Blue Acorn Solutions
Mark Martin	(MM)	Substitute for Francis Christie
Zad Padda	(SP)	Substitute for Prof. David Green
Mike Ashton	(MA)	Substitute for Carl Arntzen

### APOLOGIES:

Carl Arntzen	(CA)	MD, Worcester Bosch Thermotechnology
Professor David Green	(DG)	Vice-Chancellor, University of Worcester
Francis Christie	(FC)	MD, Francis Christie Ltd

<b>1.</b>	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Peter Pawsey (Chair) welcomed the Board and he noted that there were apologies from Carl Arntzen and Professor David Green and welcomed/thanked Mark Martin and Zad Padda for attending as alternates.</p> <p>PP welcomed Duncan Sharkey as Chief Executive observer.</p> <p>Peter Pawsey also acknowledged absence of Francis Christie due to ill health and expressed best wishes to him in his recovery on behalf of the LEP Board. He thanked Mike Ashton for attending in Francis absence.</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes from the Board Meeting 25th September 2014</u></b></p> <p>The Minutes were signed off as a true record by the Board</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b><u>Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p>The Action Points from the September Board meeting were reviewed:</p>	

- 3.1 Redistribute Governance Rules of the LEP – **complete**
- 3.2 Agree MoU between the LEP and the accountable body with final draft presented at the next Board meeting – **on agenda**
- 3.3 Business Incubator Feasibility Study to be progressed – **currently out to tender, interviews scheduled 12 December**
- 3.4 A funding guide to be produced – **work in progress**
- 3.5 DH to provide a local plans update for the Board – **on agenda**
- 3.6 Implementation Plan and monitoring process to be presented to the next Board Meeting – **on agenda**
- 3.7 Development of the terms of reference for a programme delivery group – **on agenda**
- 3.8 The Appointment of the EUSIF Committee to be progressed – **on agenda**
- 3.9 Continue the negotiations with opt in providers – **partially covered in correspondence dated 20 October. Opt-in mechanism withdrawn in EU for top three, with some remaining e.g. Big Lottery, DWP. NB queried contacts being used in DWP as could suggest some alternatives. It was agreed a briefing note on this issue to be provided.**
- 3.10 CW to distribute a copy of the Inward Investment Report – **on agenda**
- 3.11 Investigate Professional Indemnity Insurance for the Board Members– **on agenda**

**Correspondence:**

PP updated on two pieces of correspondence

- 1 – Defra letter regarding Food Enterprise Zone – SG referenced Secretary of State engagement at a recent visit to the county. All partners are keen for proposed work in this area to continue. Need to coordinate response across LEP partnership.
- 2 – DCLG letter from Sir Bob Kerslake re: LGF funding – letter sought to provide comfort about future funding allocated for Growth Deal 1. This has been shared with S151 officer at Accountable Body who has suggested comfortable with assurance provided subject to LEP Board being satisfied that local assurance mechanisms to ensure value for money are in place.

Finally PP updated LEP Board that a telecom meeting is scheduled on Tuesday 25 November 2014 with Secretary of State, Greg Clarke and LEP Chairs to discuss latest position re: Growth Deals and associated funding.

Gary Woodman

4.

**Away Day Feedback and Next Steps to Develop the WLEP Business Plan Including Key Performance Indicators – Kirsty Sneyd**

KS presented feedback from LEP Board's Away Day event in September. Essentially, there were 4 key points as a result of the event:

- 1 – Need to develop a framework of projects that contribute to the objectives of the LEP
- 2 – Need to think about resources – need names against projects.
- 3 – How do we monitor progress and ensure progress?
- 4 – Need for effective communications

**1 – Framework**

KS referenced OGSM (Objectives, Goals, Strategies, Measures) Framework as possible methodology for addressing this issue.

Key question is 'How does the Board want to group the framework'?

PP suggests sticking with the existing x4 'pillars' of current business plan as focus areas as opposed to the x3 areas of People/Place/Business referenced in the SEP. PP also suggested that x3 key sector sub-groups report to LEP Business Board with the Chair of Business Board reporting back to LEP Board as required.

SG agreed that Business Board needs to be given a clear brief to report progress of key sector groups to the Board.

SG challenged the targets in SEP i.e. £2.9bn increase in GVA and additional 25,000 jobs by 2025 – as these were predicated on LEP receiving full sum of investment requested of government, circa £300m. The reality of government investment, announced to date, is circa £50m therefore do we re-calibrate accordingly?

Following comment from SL, there was then discussion amongst LEP Board about the merits of having a 'real' version vs 'aspirational' version of targets in order for LEP to compete favourably in terms of future funding programmes.

MA made the point that it's important WLEP ensures targets/KPIs used locally are consistent with those used by Whitehall to measure success – 'measure the right things'!

**2 – Resources - Who is Responsible?**

KS suggested the RACI (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed) model for planning communications.

PP and GW confirmed that work has already been done to ensure accountability is clear for LGF projects.

However a programme of non-funded projects needed identifying over the next 3 to 5 years to develop a pipeline of proposals/priorities that will deliver the investment to create growth and jobs.

	<p><b><u>3 – Monitoring Progress</u></b></p> <p>KS again mentioned possibility of exploring an OGSM framework, with advice of getting key statistics onto one pager for LEP Board and focus of time spent on those areas not on track.</p> <p>GW updated that a Balanced Scorecard / Dashboard is being developed for LGF programme. The targets associated with the wider Business Plan needs to follow suit.</p> <p><b><u>4 - Communications</u></b></p> <p>KS asked the Board, 'What do you want communications to do'? Is it to inform, trigger actions etc.?</p> <p>One key message from away day was work is needed on the 'elevator pitch' for LEP – this will help all to be clear on what the LEP stands for and is set up to achieve.</p> <p><b><u>Business Plan</u></b></p> <p>SM asked when a draft of the revised Business Plan would be available for LEP Board to comment on and inform, and to query what it was likely to look like.</p> <p>GW responded that essentially it is a culmination of SEP and ESIF strategy that pulls out the key deliverables over the short term (12 months) and medium term (1-3 years) in the first instance.</p> <p>LEP Board agreed high-level programme for refresh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skeleton/framework of business plan – Jan 2015 LEP Board</li> <li>• Final version agreed – April 2015</li> </ul>	<b>Gary Woodman</b>
5.	<p><b><u>Growth Deal Update</u></b></p> <p>GW updated that there has been a change of dynamic in terms of the Implementation Plan for the Local Growth Deal.</p> <p>Previously having this in place was a condition of WLEP receiving LGF allocation, however it has since evolved into a document which is now owned by central government with WLEP contributing to its production, and essentially acts as a highlight report for the programme with updates agreed regularly between WLEP and the BIS Relationship Manager.</p> <p>WLEP still striving for funding flexibility i.e. single LGF payment up front in April 2015 for 15/16 allocation as opposed to quarterly payments in advance.</p> <p>GW also updated that progress is being made on reconvening the Worcestershire Local Transport Body (LTB) to provide LEP Board with local assurance around major transport schemes. This is acknowledged as good practice by Department for Transport (DfT).</p>	

	<p>GW also updated on Growth Deal 2 progress with the 5 schemes pitched by WLEP currently being appraised by central government. Dialogue is underway between WLEP, scheme promoters and central government to address any queries as part of appraisal process. No announcements expected before Autumn Statement.</p> <p>GW also stated the need to establish a pipeline of projects and suggested this is a key role of the Planning and Infrastructure sub-group.</p> <p>The LEP Board was advised that no major concerns with any of LGF projects at this stage. Risks are being identified and key one currently is capacity of WCC and contractors due to number of LGF schemes which are about infrastructure delivery. This continues to be monitored and SG offered assurance that this is recognised by WCC and being actively managed.</p> <p>GW covered the proposed Terms of Reference for the Programme Delivery Group (PDG) and NB offered his services to sit on this group. This offer was supported by SM and endorsed by LEP Board.</p> <p>The purpose of the Programme Delivery Group <i>‘The core purpose of the Group is to provide assurance to the LEP Board on the delivery of the Growth Deal projects. The LEP will have to report the progress of the projects to central government and ensure report the best value for money, on time, to budget and of the required quality.’</i></p> <p>LEP Board agreed with all recommendations of this paper.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b><u>EU Investment Strategy Update</u></b></p> <p>LEP Board noted the update provided by GW on the ESIF update.</p> <p>LEP Board approved the engagement of AMION in developing the next iteration of the ESIF strategy in line with government guidance.</p> <p>As per discussion earlier under Matters Arising, it was agreed that a paper should come to LEP Board in January providing clarity on the Opt-Ins.</p> <p>It was noted that the first meeting of the ESIF Committee was arranged for the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014.</p> <p>SM commended LEP Executive Team on the recruitment to Shadow ESIF Committee stating it was executed professionally and smoothly, and was being held up as an example of best practice.</p> <p>SL raised the point about ensuring the links with GBSLEP are maintained.</p>	<p><b>Gary Woodman</b></p>

<p>7.</p>	<p><b><u>WLEP and Accountable Body Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)</u></b></p> <p>LW updated LEP Board on the key drivers for this piece of work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation of Internal Audit function of Accountable Body</li> <li>• One of the pre-conditions stipulated by BIS in WLEP achieving funding flexibility re: LGF programme</li> </ul> <p>WLEP and WCC co-designed the MOU and LEP Quad considered this at their meeting on 28 October.</p> <p>The Board ratified MOU.</p> <p>CW added that MOU has been a welcome addition as FARA can now use this as a basis for discussions with Chief Exec and S151 Officer of WCC to establish relationship with the accountable bodies Finance Department.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p><b><u>Subgroup Reports and Outputs</u></b></p> <p>PP offered each LEP Board rep to update on sub-group papers circulated to Board prior to meeting:</p> <p><b><u>National Profiling – CW</u></b></p> <p>CW stated the need for a strategy for this group (how are we raising profile of County, where etc.) needs to be more focused.</p> <p>CW questioned what resource do we have to support work of this group? This was a partnership approach with resource from the County Council, LEP and other partners. SM questioned how do we deal with potential push-back from Whitehall e.g. perception that WLEP are 'going it alone' vs UKTI etc. It's a mixed approach, but involving and informing UKTI about the actions and steps we are taking and therefore how we can take advantage of UKTI's programme as well.</p> <p>SG suggested focus needs to be on the key sites and sectors identified via the SEP.</p> <p>DS suggested that various people/organisations will already be going out on their own to do this type of activity. Therefore suggested need to get communications out asap to partners otherwise impact of various activity may get dispersed. There needs to be recognition that LEP can't stop planned activity until LEP are ready; therefore potential strategy would be in corralling planned activity under LEP umbrella and plug it into work of this sub-group.</p> <p>Agreed that an approach of using various partners to promote the message was the way forward.</p> <p><b><u>Business Growth – GW</u></b></p> <p>It was highlighted that this sub-group (formerly known as Access to Finance) now has a broader role – providing access to finance plus giving guidance on professional services to support business growth.</p>	

	<p><b><u>Employee and Skills Board - GW</u></b></p> <p>In CA's absence, the good progress and achievements of this sub-group were noted.</p> <p>Key question is where does this group go next in terms of focus?</p> <p><b><u>Place, Development and Infrastructure – GW</u></b></p> <p>PP and DH referenced a meeting they attended earlier in the day on this forum. Requires focus.</p> <p><b><u>Agri-Tech Sector Group – ZP</u></b></p> <p>LEP Board acknowledged that a sub-group has now been established and has met for the first time, however it is early days.</p> <p><b><u>Cyber Skills</u></b></p> <p>LEP Board acknowledged the establishment of National Cyber Skills Centre at Malvern.</p> <p><b><u>Manufacturing</u></b></p> <p>Networking forum has been running for a while, and covered as a regional focus (West Mids). As covered in Item 4, as Business Plan develops, this group needs greater focus.</p> <p><b><u>Tourism</u></b></p> <p>MA updated on role of Tourism group and suggested this could be used as a support group for the National Profiling Group to ensure alignment of objectives and resources.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b><u>Annual Conference Feedback and Annual Report</u></b></p> <p>PP covered key points of paper and reiterated attendance figures and positive feedback received to date on LEP Annual Conference event.</p> <p>PP stated that based on success and feedback, the same venue has been booked for next year – 6 Nov. LEP Board agreed with this decision.</p> <p>DH suggested it would be useful to explore with businesses that attended, what benefits were received as a result. PP stated that trend is for professional services to attend as a networking opportunity and that production businesses are being targeted next year for attendance.</p> <p>SL suggested exploring use of technology for future event e.g. webinars etc. This may increase attendance/coverage and aligns to LEP strategy of County being hi-tech.</p>	

<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Budget</u></b></p> <p>GW gave a brief overview of the LEP Budget. CW confirmed that he is working on developing a dashboard of this information for next LEP Board meeting.</p> <p>More of a focus will be on projections moving forward. Also need to consider use of surplus, however DS suggested that it is highly likely work/requirements will emerge as business plan develops over the coming months – so this will no doubt identify resource requirements.</p> <p>SL raised a query about whether resources are available to finance the development of schemes to be 'shovel-ready' – recognising that LGF schemes that attracted funding were 'well-developed'.</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Chairs Report</u></b></p> <p>PP and MA updated on Chinese trade mission and associated successes.</p> <p>PP sought views on his proposed letter to Lord Adonis about the issue of structuring the LEP geographies and boundaries. A discussion took place on recent announcements and concern was expressed that this could take focus away from delivery. The discussion concluded with the LEP Board agreeing that PP to issue the letter.</p>	<p><b>Peter Pawsey</b></p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Executive Staffing Report</u></b></p> <p>GW updated on progress made to increase capacity of WLEP Executive Team based on approvals granted by LEP Board in September and July.</p> <p>LEP Board noted progress made.</p>	
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Professional Indemnity Insurance for Directors</u></b></p> <p>PP suggested more information was needed to be sought from other LEPs on this issue, based on £3-4k p/a quotes referenced in paper circulated.</p> <p>More information to be sought from LEP Network too. LEP Board agreed with suggestion that this was accelerated and supported by FARA and Quad as appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Update on Local Plans</u></b></p> <p>Update report was well received by LEP Board and acknowledged as useful summary of current position.</p>	

15.	<b><u>Any Other Business</u></b>  None.	
16.	<b><u>Dates of Meetings in 2015</u></b>  <b><u>LEP BOARD:</u></b>  2 <sup>nd</sup> April - Coomers 21 <sup>st</sup> May - Coomers 23 <sup>rd</sup> July - Worcester Bosch 24 <sup>th</sup> Sept - Worcester Bosch 19 <sup>th</sup> Nov - Worcester Bosch	