

# Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting title</b>		<b>GFirst LEP Board Meeting</b>	
<b>Date/time/venue</b>		25/04/2017 @ 08:30 to 10:30. Headspace/Oxstalls Campus	
<b>Attendees</b>		<p><u>Members:</u> Diane Savory (DS) (Chair), David Owen (DO), Roman Cooper (RC), Stephen Jordan (SJ), Mike Warner (MW), Adam Starkey (AS), Claire Mould (CM), Stephen Marston (SM) &amp; Matthew Burgess (MB)</p> <p><u>In attendance:</u> Jacqui Blackshaw (Minutes), Dev Chakraborty (DC), Katie Jenkins (KJ) &amp; Sarah Danson (SD) for item 6, Mally Findlater (MF) for items 7 &amp; 8</p>	
<b>Apologies</b>		Nigel Riglar, Mark Hawthorne, Neill Ricketts & Rob Loveday	
No.	Item	Action	By
1)	<p><b><u>Welcome &amp; Introduction</u></b></p> <p>DS welcomed all Board Members and apologies as noted above. GD3 has been formally announced and will be discussed in agenda item 8.</p>		
2)	<p><b><u>Minutes of Last Meeting 14 February 2017 &amp; GlosCol New Campus Funding Approval Minutes &amp; Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p>The minutes were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017. There were no outstanding actions.</p> <p>The minutes of the written procedure for the GlosCol New campus funding decision were approved as a true and accurate record.</p> <p>Matters arising from the GlosCol New Campus Funding Approval Minutes:</p> <p>MB advised that the College cannot meet BREEAM assessment condition, due to there being an issue with wildlife but reassured the Board that the building would otherwise be built to the equivalent of a 'Good' rating under BREEAM.</p> <p><b><u>Decision:</u></b> The Board approved the removal of this condition in its current form, on the basis that the commitment to build to a standard that is equivalent to a BREEAM 'Good' rating be noted.</p>		
3)	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>The Register of Interests remains unchanged, with no extra declarations made in the meeting. There is not a requirement to show percentage of shareholdings and these can be removed if required.</p> <p><b><u>Action:</u></b> Board members to advise Jacqui Blackshaw of any amendments that need to be noted.</p>		
4)	<p><b><u>LEP Board Membership</u></b></p> <p>DO clarified the process of appointment of Board Members and re-selection.</p> <p>a. Discussion took place around the current Board positions and whether they reflected knowledge and experience required by the LEP. DO put forward the idea of representation of young people on the Board, ie a local school member</p>		

	<p>(where appropriate). DO explained that the 2050 exercise carried out in schools was extremely positive. SM doesn't think it would work very well in view of the amount of paperwork the student would need to read beforehand, but in general the idea was good. MW suggested that someone representing the under 25's group who are just entering life and could be more engaged in what we do.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board were asked to take this question away to think about it and get back to DO/DC in the next fortnight.</p> <p>b. DO asked the Board to formally approve the appointment processes, terms of office and re-selection processes as outlined in Section 3 of the board paper. GFirst LEP is broadly in line with other LEP's process. It was also noted that GFirst LEP has a smaller than average board size, has less churn of Board members and that the voluntary sector is better represented than other LEPs.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> There were no objections to this process, and the Board formally agreed to the adoption of the processes as outlined</p> <p>c. DO asked the Board to approve the re-selection of Diane, Adam &amp; Roman.</p> <p>DS left the meeting whilst the discussion took place. DO confirmed that DS was willing to be Chair for a further 3 years, which would represent her third and final term of office. No comments, suggestions or concerns were raised.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board decision was unanimous in favour of the re-selection of Diane as Chair of the Board</p> <p>Re-appoint Adam as Vice Chair. AS left the meeting whilst the discussion took place.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board decision was unanimous in favour of the re-selection of Adam as Vice –Chair of the Board</p> <p>Reappoint Roman. RC left the meeting whilst the discussion took place.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board decision was unanimous in favour of the re-selection of Roman as a Board member</p> <p>MW made the point that if anyone had any objections to the appointments then they should have let the Board know in writing in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>d. Private sector appointment. DO explained that we would welcome applications from groups not currently represented on the Board. Board members will be sent the advertisement by email, and will actively promote the opportunity to suitable candidates.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Board members unanimously agreed to instruct the Chief Executive (DO) to initiate the appointment process for the remaining private sector position after the general election.</p>	ALL	9.5.17
5)	<p><b>Industrial Strategy Response</b></p> <p>DS invited KJ to provide a perspective from Government in light of the upcoming general election. KJ stated that Government officials were currently in purdah. KJ stated that although GFirst LEP are not officially bound by these rules, to have regard for those rules and exercise caution when talking about or publicising anything which has been Government funded. Be careful about being seen to support any side or party as an LEP.</p> <p>Industrial Strategy – Local Response</p>	DO	

	<p>DO advised he had received the LEP Network response, the response from the County and the response in collaboration with surrounding LEPs focused on cyber security and defence.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The LEP Network, County, and Joint submission on cyber security and defence will be shared by email with the board.</p>		
--	---	--	--

6)	<p><b><u>Growth Hub Update</u></b></p> <p>(a) Network Update – SD advised that the Cheltenham proposal was not currently going ahead due to lack of sponsorship. A new round of procurement will commence on 8<sup>th</sup> May when it is hoped a solution for Cheltenham, Stroud and the Forest of Dean will emerge. SD advised that the new CRM is now up and running at a minimum product level at the moment with developments continuing until June. The website has also been launched and any feedback from the Board is welcome as developments continue with this.</p> <p>(b) Business Plan Refresh - AS had a question regarding Sustainability on p34 of business plan. KJ informed the Board that Growth Hub revenue funding is an issue and part of the wider thinking around local growth funding post Brexit. SD added that we are exploring different sustainability models. SM added that Government may create a national funding scheme to replace ESIF.</p> <p>AS queried that the benefits to the University of Gloucestershire were not clear from the business plan. SM advised that the University were entirely happy with the business plan and that University Executive had already approved it. It will be the responsibility of the Growth Hub Management Board to keep the business case updated and report to LEP Board.</p> <p>(c) RAU Due Diligence report – MW raised a concern over the cost over-run for Farm 491 (£700,000), he asked how this had happened? DS advised that this will be brought up at the next Growth Hub Management Board meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> May when Simon King will be available to ask.</p> <p>BREEAM condition could be similar to GlosCol.</p> <p>MB asked about the salaries for Navigators but DO advised that it was not appropriate for the LEP Board to dictate the salary levels for staff employed by other organisations.</p> <p>(a) The Board were asked to form a sub group to review the Growth Hub App business case in view of the large amount of money, to continue the development. AS asked whether Trip Advisor type feedback was still planned. SD confirmed it was but it would need more discussion at the Growth Hub Management Board Meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Decision:</u></b> Sub group would be Rob and Diane.</p> <p>(b) The Board were asked to approve the revised Growth Hub business plan.</p> <p><b><u>Decision:</u></b> Approved by all however SM declared an interest.</p> <p>(c) The Board were asked to approve the development of the Funding Agreement for the Growth Hub at the RAU:</p> <p><b><u>Decision:</u></b> Approved to move to Funding Agreement.</p> <p><b><u>Action:</u></b> SD to let Board members know the date when the Expression of Interests will be shortlisted. (nb Shortlisting would have been 9<sup>th</sup> June but due to Purdah it will now take place 30<sup>th</sup> June).</p>		
----	---	--	--

SD

<p>7)</p>	<p><b><u>ESIF Update</u></b>  AS summarised that the ESIF committee is functioning effectively and that the EU funding programme is progressing well.</p> <p>MF advised that financial detail in the paper was correct at the point of issue but that the exchange rate for funding will be revised shortly, which will affect the Sterling values.</p> <p>There are two major areas of interest:  Low carbon - calls go out in May and ERDF funding for Growth Hub and other business support activity.</p> <p>SJ was concerned about the ERDF timescales, MF confirmed that all contracts that are signed prior to March 2019 will be fully funded, but that there is uncertainty about the period of delivery that will be allowed after this point. This is the subject of ongoing discussions with DCLG, and is of particular relevance to the sustainability of the Growth Hub core activity. LEP staff are actively planning the roll out of the residual ERDF funding for Business Support, as advice becomes available, and to ensure that funding is made available and allocated.</p> <p><b><u>Action:</u></b> MF to provide a paper to next Board meeting to provide an update.</p> <p>There was a debate about the potential impact of the forthcoming Brexit negotiations on the way the EU funding programme will be managed in its later stages, and it was recognised that this is as yet unknown. All projects detailed in the supporting paper are part of the existing programme, and contracts signed under this would follow the current conditions. DS asked whether there would be more room for commercial activity but DO didn't think there would be. MF commented that Government could give more UK money for Growth Hubs which is the subject of ongoing lobbying by all areas, but that this would be unlikely to be to the same level that we are currently relying on through EU funding.</p> <p>MF advised that the ERDF contract for Fastershire would be going ahead soon. MF/AS to update the Board on the effect of the EAFRD Broadband call on coverage in rural areas once the details become known.</p> <p>SM queried the £13m unallocated on ESIF. MF confirmed that there is a forward plan that manages the roll out of calls to ensure that these funds are likely to be allocated, with a limited risk of funds being withdrawn. However, there are particular challenges with ESF, which should become clearer over the next few months, and which will be managed through the ESIF committee.</p> <p><b><u>Decision:</u></b> Board noted interim position.</p>	<p>MF</p>	
<p>8)</p>	<p><b><u>Growth Deal Programme:</u></b></p> <p>The Board discussed the paper regarding the process for reallocation of Growth Deal funds that become available when projects are either withdrawn or underspent. The process identifies the 'opportunity' through the standard programme management processes, as well as an additional process to clarify all funds that can be identified as newly available for reallocation. This will confirm the status of all projects with 'indicative' funding that have not yet progressed to funding agreements, the mechanism for opening up the opportunity to the existing pipeline of Board approved and prioritised projects, as well as a limited opportunity for the LEP Board and / or the GEGJC to put forward new projects for consideration if they are 'exceptional'. The standard local assurance framework process would then be implemented from this point.</p> <p>MF &amp; DO clarified the status of 'exceptional' projects that could be forwarded by</p>		

	<p>either the LEP Board or the GEGJC for consideration as those that were not known at the point of GD3 pipeline assessment, that have the potential for exceptional growth and meet the funding and timing of the opportunity. DO advised that all funds released for reallocation return to a central 'pot' in line with the process as described, and that there can be no expectation that the reallocation would be for the same type of investment as the source project(s). KJ advised that GFirst LEP should ensure that there is full transparency throughout the process and that it is consistent with the local assurance framework. All decisions should be published on the GFirst LEP website.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board noted and approved the process as detailed in the covering paper.</p> <p>MF presented the performance output summary table, and confirmed that this information would be published on the website shortly. In addition, the diagrammatical representation (the 'Dashboard') would also be published, providing easy access to information on the Growth Deal programme.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> MF to keep the Board informed regarding progress of jobs on the summary sheet.</p> <p>MF presented the Forward Look and Spend Profile Summary for March 2017.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Board noted that the overall performance of the Growth Deal programme is either meeting or exceeding expectations.</p>	MF	
9)	<p><b><u>Gloucestershire Infrastructure Investment Fund(GIIF) Programme Update</u></b></p> <p><u>The recommendations from the Investment Panel meeting of 4 April 2017 were submitted to the LEP Board for approval.</u></p> <p>(a) The Board were asked to note and approve the updated loan funding award of £2m to Gloucester City Council for the Gloucester Transport Hub and to instruct Gloucestershire County Council to enter into the loan agreement process with the promoter.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Unanimous in favour.</p> <p>(b) The Board were asked to approve the extension of the £1.8m loan repayment terms for Southgate Street, Gloucester to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017 subject to terms and conditions. The Board were also asked to instruct Gloucestershire County Council to proceed with the necessary legal arrangements to implement this change.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Unanimous in favour (CM left the meeting so could not vote).</p> <p>(c) The LEP Board were asked to explore the potential with Government to seek additional Growing Places funding to extend the successful GIIF programme. KJ asked DO to get papers prepared to show impact of the scheme as this could potentially assist to get additional funding from the new Government.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Board members supported this proposal</p>		
10)	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <p>SJ advised that Cheltenham is to host the Tour of Britain on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2017.</p>		

**Dates of Next Meetings:**

- Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2017 @ Away Day in RAU – details to follow
- Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> August 2017 @ 8:30
- Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2017 @ 8:30
- Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2017 @ 8:30