

Meeting Minutes

Meeting title	Written Procedure ARRC project
Date/time/venue	By email – from Mally Findlater 16th January 2018 @ 14:44
Attendees	<u>Members:</u> Diane Savory (DS) (<i>Chair</i>), Adam Starkey (AS) Rob Loveday (RL) Roman Cooper (RC), Mark Hawthorne (MH), Stephen Jordan (SJ), Mike Warner (MW), Neill Ricketts (NR) Russell Marchant (RM), Jenny Raymond (JR), Deborah Potts (DP), Stephen Lydon (SL)

No.	Item	Action	By
3b	<p>Written Procedure: Agenda Item 5.i – Growth Deal Programme reallocation of funds: ARRC project change</p> <p>SM has a conflict of interest (declared at the Board meeting 12.12.17), so did not participate in this agenda item processed by written procedure.</p> <p>Agenda item 5i for the December Board meeting was withdrawn, to be considered in January 2018 by a Board sub-group. The full Board delegated responsibility to the sub group to review all the current project information, including the latest submission in the Board paper and make a final decision to recommend to the Board. The full Board to receive the recommendation to be processed by written procedure.</p> <p>The sub group meeting took place on 12.01.18. The attendees were:</p> <p><u>Board Sub Group:</u> Diane Savory (chair), Jenny Raymond, Rob Loveday, Steve Jordan <u>Staff:</u> David Owen, Dev Chakraborty, Mally Findlater, Neil Hopwood</p> <p>The Board paper for item 5.i (amended to include changes to the minutes agreed 12.12.18) was considered, as well as further clarifying information provided by the University of Gloucestershire.</p> <p>The Sub Group, on behalf of the full Board was asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • note the supplementary submission from the University of Gloucestershire • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the project has a viable revenue stream • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the investment will be sustainable in the medium to long term • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the supplementary submission provides sufficient reassurance that this investment should proceed. <p>Decisions agreed on 12.01.18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • note the supplementary submission from the University of Gloucestershire – The Board sub group noted the supplementary submission from the University of Gloucestershire, as well as the later clarifying information provided by Richard O'Doherty 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the project has a viable revenue stream – The Board sub group decided that they were not satisfied that the project has a viable income stream. The revised financial forecasts are reliant on income from KTP (Knowledge Transfer Projects). There is no certainty of these funds, as the business development activity to secure them is in its early stages. The Sub Group fully support the University’s ambition to re-enter the KTP market, particularly within specialisms where the University has strength and credibility, but were not satisfied that the forecast level of KTP’s had sufficient likelihood of success to be relied on as the main revenue stream for the project. They also noted that the KTP income stream would not necessarily lead specifically to the development of Gloucestershire’s capability in the renewable sector. • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the investment will be sustainable in the medium to long term – The Board sub group decided that they were not satisfied that the investment would be sustainable in the medium to long term. They were interested in and supportive of the University’s strategic plans for Engineering, and look forward to future developments. However, although the teaching income forecast for the medium to long term was credible, they were not satisfied that the forward planning in Engineering has sufficient focus on the advanced renewables sector to be regarded as a sustainable revenue stream for the investment in this project. • confirm if they are or are not satisfied that the supplementary submission provides sufficient reassurance that this investment should proceed. – The Board sub group decided that they were not satisfied that the supplementary submission provided sufficient reassurance that this investment should proceed. They acknowledged the University’s commitment to support the project financially if the income was less than forecast. However, they confirmed that they would see this as a last resort, and following their decision that they were not satisfied that there was a viable income stream, they did not agree that an underwriting position from the University provided sufficient certainty that the project would be delivered as required to justify this considerable investment. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dev Chakraborty to seek ways that the LEP can support the University in securing new KTP contracts in discussion with the University and the Growth Hub. (DC) • The sub group recognised the amount of resource that the University has committed to developing this project, and also the considerable support that they have received from the LEP team. Both teams to be thanked for their work (DO / MF) <p>Decision: Following from the above, The Board sub group confirmed that the decision to allow the project to progress to due diligence will be withdrawn. As a result, the indicative funding will be withdrawn, and the project removed from the programme. The sub group also decided that the project would not be automatically added to the pipeline of projects for future funding. If the University decide to resubmit, it would be treated as a fresh submission.</p> <p>Action by written procedure:</p> <p>The sub group decision was recommended to the full LEP Board by written procedure via email on 16th January 2018 @ 14:44, with a deadline for responses by 5pm on Tuesday 23rd January 2018. Due to the delegated responsibility status of the sub group, the written procedure stated that if a Board member did not respond, it would be assumed that they accept the sub group decision, and that they confirmed the decision recommended to them (as above)</p>	<p>DC</p> <p>DO/M F</p>	
--	---	-----------------------------	--

	<p>Responses were received from RM and DP, confirming the decision. DS, JR, RL and SJ were on the subgroup, and all agree the recommendation. AS, MW, NR, RC, MH and SL made the decision not to respond, and therefore confirmed the decision by default.</p> <p>Decision: By written procedure, the full Board confirmed the decision made by the sub group (in full, as above)</p>		
--	---	--	--