

Monday 1st March 2021

14:00 – 15:30

MS Teams Meeting with Dial In Option

AGENDA

| Open Meeting | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Item | Subject | Lead | Report Status/Timing |
| 1 | Introductions & Apologies | James Leavesley / Sinead Butters | 5 mins |
| 2 | Declarations of Interest | | |
| 3 | Notes of the previous meeting and any matters arising | | |
| | | | 5 mins |
| Governance | | | |
| 4 | Assurance Framework overview Terms of Reference and meeting protocols regarding Items 5 and Item 6: <i>verbal</i> | Secretariat c/o Simon Ablewhite | Information 5 mins |
| Delivery | | | |
| 5 | Fiscal Policy Incentives *Commercially Sensitive* - not published or redacted | Project Sponsor and Secretariat | Decision 35 mins |
| 6 | Getting Building Fund Contingency Project section | Hatch / Secretariat | Decision 30 mins |
| | | | 70 mins |
| Governance & Finance | | | |
| 7 | Issues and actions to escalate to LEP Executive Board | All | Discussion 5 mins |
| 8 | Forward Plan | All | 5 mins |
| | | | 10 mins |
| 9 | Any Other Business | James Leavesley / Sinead Butters | 5 mins |
| 10 | Next scheduled SPMG Meeting: Tuesday 4 th May 2021, 14:00 – 15:00 | | |

PTO

| SPMG Membership | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Voting Members | Private/Public Sector | Confirmed Attendance |
| Caroline Brown (Exec Board Private Sector Director) | Private | ✓ |
| Sinead Butters (Vice-Chair) | Private | ✓ |
| James Leavesley (Chair) | Private | ✓ |
| Tony McGovern (CCDC) | Public | ✓ |
| Alun Rogers (LEP Executive Board Chair) | Private | ✓ |
| Jon Rouse (SoTCC); | Public | ✓ |
| Quorate: For the SPMG meeting to be quorate no fewer than three voting members (2 private sector directors; 1 public non-exec member) should be present. Ref: Pg. 21, Assurance Framework | | |
| Secretariat support | | |
| Sharon Palphreyman (Programme Manager, LEP) | Secretariat | ✓ |
| Simon Ablewhite (S151 Officer for the LEP, Accountable finance lead) | Secretariat | ✓ |
| Mark Parkinson (Chief Executive, LEP) | Secretariat | ✓ |
| Non-voting: the following representatives may attend in an advisory/observer capacity: | | |
| Clare Hannah, CLGU representative | CLGU | ✓ |
| LEP Board Directors (none confirmed) | - | - |
| Senior non-executive public sector members (none confirmed) | - | - |

Enc: n.b. The pdf contains quick links to help navigation to the papers

| | | |
|---------|---|-----------------|
| Paper 1 | Minutes of previous meeting 11 th January 2021 | agenda item 3 |
| Paper 2 | Fiscal Policy *Commercially Sensitive* - not published | agenda item 4i |
| Paper 3 | Fiscal Policy – LEP CEO Recommendation *CS*-not published | agenda item 4ii |
| Paper 4 | GBF - Contingency Projects – Project Selection c/o Hatch | agenda item 5i |
| Paper 5 | GBF – Policy Considerations c/o LEP CEO | agenda item 5ii |
| Paper 6 | Forward Plan | agenda item 8 |

SSLEP Strategic Programme Management Group (SPMG)

Monday 1st February 2021, 14:00 – 15:30

Virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams link

Notes and Actions

In attendance:

Voting members:

James Leavesley (Chair), Sinead Butters (Vice-Chair), Alun Rogers (SSLEP Executive Board Chair); Caroline Brown (Exec Board member - Private Sector Director); Tony McGovern (CCDC); Jon Rouse (SoTCC); Emma Catterall (Exec Board member - Private sector).

Non-voting attendees:

- Simon Ablewhite (SCC, S151 Accountable finance lead), Clare Hannah, CLGU/BEIS representative

Secretariat Support:

- Mark Parkinson (SSLEP CEO), Sharon Palphreyman (Programme manager, SSLEP);


Guests:

- Agenda item 4, Building Fund contingency schemes – approach to prioritisation: Dan Lindsay (Hatch Regeneris)

Apologies: None

| Item | | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 1 | Welcome and introductions JL welcomed Dan Lindsay from Hatch Regeneris to the meeting. | |
| 2 | Declarations of Interest & Agreed Protocols The meeting was quorate. The following declarations of interest were noted, regarding the Getting Building Fund schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TMcG is a Governor for South Staffs College (one of the SEF final list schemes) • SB has an interest in PM Training, Cleveland Works • JR has an SoTCC interest in the Stoke schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GBF: Powering Up Enterprise, ○ GBF contingency scheme: Church Street Gaming Hub. | |
| | Delivery | |
| 3 | Notes and action updates from the last meeting, 11/01/2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shire Hall Business Hub –business model. AR is to seek an SSLEP Board member volunteer to represent the LEP on the Shire | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | <p>Hall Steering Group. MP confirmed that conversations are being progressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Powering Up Enterprise - a schedule/process for attributing spend to each scheme and for monitoring spend/progress/outputs for each scheme is to be defined as part of the contracting process. DL is supporting SoTCC in the process to define the mechanism by which the schemes are individually accountable by site. • Drakelow park – <i>to be discussed later in this meeting</i> • Contingency schemes: provide summaries describing what each scheme is delivering – <i>included in Hatch's presentation at agenda item 4.</i> • Additional option for any unallocated funding: JL had asked SPMG to consider supporting the current need for school IT equipment to support home-schooling in the current Covid crisis and asked if this is something that could be included perhaps via SEF schemes. MP to speak to Tony Baines and ask for a briefing note for Board. Ongoing action. • ACTION: Hatch will prepare a paper to bring to the next SPMG meeting, to look at how prioritisation of contingency schemes could work. <i>To be covered in agenda item 4</i> • City East Link Road: ACTION: MP to seek assurance from CH/BEIS that achieving 99% spend will not impact negatively on SSLEP's reputation and will not negatively impact on future funding opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representing BEIS, CH confirmed that that there would be <u>no black mark</u> against SSLEP for using the freedoms and flexibilities open to the Accountable Body. JL thanked SA for his guidance and recommendations in applying the freedoms and flexibilities (<i>to be covered in agenda item 6i</i>) <p>JR raised an error in the minutes on Page 6, relating to Stoke Flood Alleviation. <u>Erroneous minute:</u> It was felt that the EA have handed back the £700,000 very late in the day, but MP noted that the EA are saying that they inherited the scheme and that they have actually come up with a solution that will not only be more effective and have greater benefits but is also cheaper. <i>(JR pointed out that the EA had not in fact inherited the scheme but had worked in partnership on the design)</i></p> <p><u>Revised minute:</u> It was felt that the EA have handed back the £700,000 very late in the day, but the EA say that the revised solution will not only be more effective and have greater benefits but is also cheaper.</p> <p>Revised minute will be circulated to SPMG for sign-off.</p> <p>The remaining minutes were agreed as accurate.</p> | MP |
| 4 | Getting Building Fund | |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p><u>Contingency Projects – approach to prioritisation</u></p> <p>DL gave a presentation explaining the process and status of the contingency schemes.</p>  <p>Feb 2021 GBF Contingency Prioriti</p> <p>£190k funding is available for reallocation. Applicants were given the opportunity to submit a revised proposal, including revisions to funding package and details of what could be delivered with the available GBF funding. DL will follow up with the applicants who wish to continue, to seek further information and to confirm scheme deliverability via a detailed appraisal and comparison/prioritisation process. DL will bring a further appraisal and recommendation paper to SPMG on 01/03/21. SA felt that it would be useful to compare outputs against the original outputs from the withdrawn scheme.</p> <p>JR confirmed that SoTCC would not be bringing forward the Gigabit Voucher scheme at this stage but would instead focus on the Church Street Gaming Hub. JR will send SPMG confirmation of withdrawal.</p> <p>Projects that could not deliver with the reduced offer would potentially be considered at a later date if/when further funding becomes available.</p> <p>As well as holding a list of contingency schemes, JL felt that it might be a useful exercise if, in future appraisal exercises, DL could also indicate which schemes would be in a position to utilise additional (small) amounts of funding to speed up or maximise benefits, as this could potentially be another solution to any underspend/withdrawal of shortlisted schemes.</p> <p>TMcG said well done to Hatch and the LEP team for the readiness of the pipeline.</p> <p>TMcG said that with a further £250k, all 3 of the shortlisted contingency schemes could proceed and asked if there was any other LEP funding available to enable that. SA will look into other SSLEP funding pots and will bring a paper to the next meeting.</p> | <p>DL</p> <p>JR</p> <p>SA</p> |
| 5 | <p>Getting Building Fund</p> <p><u>MHCLG Request for Change process</u></p> <p>The MHCLG process and Change Request template was circulated with the agenda pack, for information. Once a contingency scheme has been selected/approved by SPMG, it will need to go through this process.</p> | |
| 6 | <p>Local Growth Fund policy update:</p> | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| | <p>i <u>City East Link Road, Stoke-on-Trent (CELR)</u> SA has discussed options with SoTCC Capital Finance team. The recommendation is to switch some funding from CELR to Etruria Valley Link Road (EVLN). EVLN has completed its LGF spend but is still an active scheme with various funding sources and could spend the additional LGF in Q4. SoTCC would then be able to switch funding back to CELR in the new financial year. Switching LGF to EVLN means that all LGF grant will be spent on LGF schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA will need to confirm the exact amount of CELR underspend to switch to EVLN (approx. £680k) • A legal change will be required for both CELR and EVLN funding agreements. SA/JR said that it will be fully documented – the exact figure will be inserted at the last minute to ensure accuracy. <p>Decision: SPMG APPROVED SA's recommendation to switch underspend from CELR to EVLN. (<i>JR abstained from the vote due to his declared COI</i>).</p> <p>ii <u>i54 Western Extension, South Staffordshire</u> SA update paper – circulated with agenda pack. The SSLEP contribution of £10m for this scheme would take the form of a loan until the business rates started to come in, in a few years' time. The £10m loan would accrue interest of over £3m. Paying the SSLEP commitment earlier would reduce the interest payable and significantly reduce the costs of the scheme to the LEP. TMcG asked who would benefit from the retained rates that i54WE would no longer need if it had received alternative funding earlier. SA said that as soon as the debt has been paid off for i54 and i54WE, the LEP will then benefit from the retained business rates. TMcG asked what the legal arrangements were for this and what business rates would be accrued and when. SA said that the original agreement is that LEPs retain the business rates from Enterprise Zones for 25 years. The only risk would be around any government changes in their approach to enterprise zones. SA gave very rough figures, based on businesses on site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surplus from 26/27 would be around £2.5 per year but there are some outstanding commitments to i54WE and to the SoTCC schemes where LGF underspend was withdrawn last year. <p>Ceramic Valley Enterprise Zone: the timings are uncertain re when properties will be let/sold but forecasting from 25/26 at around perhaps £4m per year.</p> <p>Action SA: Diarise when retained rates are expected back so that SSLEP can ensure that a pipeline of schemes is in place, ready.</p> | SA |
| 7 | <p>CDGD/GBF Risk Register</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>GBF - Drakelow</u> – some concern was expressed around this scheme. A paper was brought to the last SPMG on 11/01/21. MP spoke to a scheme representative earlier today. The land deal (a key milestone) is going to the Drakelow Park Project Board in | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--------------|
| | <p>March. MP reassured SPMG that the scheme is progressing as expected. However, SPMG asked for the risk status (it is already a Red risk) to be escalated to Board due to the reputational risk to SSLEP if the project fails to progress.</p> <p>After some discussion, it was agreed that conversations could take place directly with D2N2 LEP to enable a clearer view.</p> <p>ACTION: AR and JL to progress conversations with D2N2.</p> | AR/JL |
| | Governance and Finance | |
| 8 | <p>Issues and actions to escalate to SSLEP Executive Board (18/02/21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drakelow (Red risk) – escalate concerns to Board. | |
| 9 | <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> | |
| 10 | <p>Forward Plan</p> <p>Reviewed. No comments/changes.</p> | |
| 12 | <p>A.O.B</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Stoke Flood Alleviation</u> SPMG is currently waiting for the EA to confirm underspend/forecast spend for Q4. However, JR said that due to the recent flooding it is unlikely that the scheme will be able to spend additional funding. However, JR commented that ERDF funding has been confirmed for further work upstream. 2. <u>Future project pipeline - discussion</u> SB questioned whether bigger Local Authority schemes should be prioritised by the LEP as meeting requirements, or should the LEP be bringing forward more smaller schemes, building capacity? JL voiced concern that GBF looked largely at LA schemes; very few private schemes were considered. However, it was acknowledged that this was due to the timescale allowed by MHCLG – there was no time allowed to publish or process a full Open Call. JL advised building a hopper of ready schemes, large and small. CB agreed with SB and wondered if it is how we market the funding opportunities. Are we making | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>it known that small schemes can apply? Hidden front door? JL said that we could look at how to do it differently going forwards.</p> <p>TMcG said that small councils often struggle to deliver business cases to the standard required. SSLEP to fund business case development?</p> <p>AR responded: create forward view of project. Raise profile of LEP as source of funding and support. We are already looking at how to support/offer training regarding business cases.</p> <p>MP said that a policy session had previously been brought to the LEP. GBF was Covid-specific, to prop up projects impacted. Schemes achieved strategic fit with the LIS. To align with the full process in the Assurance Framework, a Funding Call would be expected to take around 6 months but MHCLG did not allow this for GBF.</p> <p>JR suggested that SPMG take this conversation to Executive Board. Levelling Up/Shared Prosperity announcements are expected; regardless of where the funding is allocated to, there should be a single view of priorities/pipeline, which aligns with the LIS.</p> <p>JL agreed that we need to look at how to support private SMEs. Have we got the rich mix of schemes? Bottom-up approach – LEP needs to build the capacity of partners and businesses to bring forward schemes. If Drakelow does not progress, we could have difficulties finding a substitute quickly.</p> <p>AR said that SSLEP is curating a list of schemes in the LIS Implementation Plan. MP to take feedback to the LEP secretariat re the curated list. SB said it is a valid point re extending the offer beyond LA partners.</p> <p>The request for SSLEP to provide business case training is being progressed – Hatch are currently addressing this; it has been delayed due to Covid work impacting on those who have expressed interest.</p> | |
| 13 | <p>Next SPMG meeting: Monday 1st March 2021, 14:00 – 15:00</p> | |
| | <p>Acceptance of minutes</p> <p>These notes represent an accurate record of the SSLEP Strategic Programme Management Group (SPMG) held on 1st December 2020 via Microsoft Teams.</p> <p>Signed: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>James Leavesley, Chair of SPMG</p> | |

SSLEP Getting Building Fund

Prioritisation of Contingency Projects

Contingency Project Overview

This paper sets out our recommendations concerning the reallocation of £190,000 of SSLEP Getting Building Fund. This follows the approach agreed with SSLEP's SPMG on 1st February 2021, set out in the paper *Prioritisation Framework for Contingency Projects*.

Of the 7 GBF contingency projects, the following 3 projects are considered at this stage:

- **Church Street Phase 2 – Gaming Hub (Stoke on Trent City Council)**

Originally seeking £450,000, the applicant has confirmed that this project will be deliverable with £190,000 GBF through the allocation of additional match funding by the council.

- **SEF A – Cleveland Works (PM Training)**

Originally seeking £1,000,000, the applicant has confirmed that Phase 1 of the initial proposals are deliverable within the available funding envelope. The revised proposals will support the redevelopment of the existing training centre at Atlas Work at a total cost of £251,000. £125,500 is sought from GBF.

- **SEF G – Automation & Robotics Suite (JCB Academy)**

The applicant originally sought £172,710 from GBF and consequently the original proposals can be fully delivered within the available GBF contingency funding envelope without amendment.

Of the remaining projects:

- **Four Ashes Enterprise Park** Expansion has withdrawn from the GBF process.
- Stoke on Trent City Council has confirmed that Church Street Phase 2 is the council's priority project for GBF. The council has therefore not submitted the **Gigabit Voucher Scheme** for consideration at this stage.
- Both **Cornhill Small Business Units** (submitted by Staffordshire Moorlands Council) and **Stafford Civic Centre – Eastgate Phase 3a** (submitted by Stafford Borough Council) are not deliverable within the available level of contingency funding and have not been resubmitted for consideration at this stage. However, both applicants have indicated that, should further funding be made available, they would wish for the projects to be reconsidered at that time.

| Projects Under Consideration at this Stage | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Funding Request | Match Funding | Total |
| Church Street Phase 2 | £190,000 | £260,000 | £450,000 |
| SEF A: The Cleveland Future Skills Hub (PM Training) | £125,500 | £125,500 | £251,000 |
| SEF G: The Automation & Robotics Suite (JCB Academy) | £172,710 | £100,000 | £272,710 |

Original GBF Submission

The contingency funding has become available due to the withdrawal of the Corporation Street Economic Development project (The Carnegie Centre) by Tamworth Borough Council. The project sought £190,000 GBF towards a £340,000 project to provide a repurposed a vacant public sector building as an extension to the council’s Enterprise Centre.

When considering match funding, Church Street Gaming Phase 2 would represent an increase in the overall level of investment (public and private) associated with GBF. Both the Cleveland Future Skills Hib and Automation and Robotics Suite would represent a small reduction in overall investment – of £89,000 and £67,000 respectively. However this represents a very small proportion of the overall investment associated with GBF investments in the Stoke and Staffordshire region.

The original proposals were associated with the following outputs:

- 10 jobs created
- 1 additional construction job
- 200 sqm of new or improved learning/training floorspace
- 50 training days for 600 trainees
- 1 business enterprise project

Comparison of Outputs

The table below sets out how the outputs of the alternative schemes compare to the original proposals. All outputs are presented as headline gross outputs for ease of comparison with the original submission.

| Output | Corporation Street | Church Street | Cleveland Works | Automation and Robotics Suite |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Jobs Created | 10 | 5 | | |
| Construction Jobs | 1 | Not specified | | |
| New or Refurbished Floorspace | 200 sqm | 280 sqm new | 1,006 refurbished* | 294 refurbished |
| Learning Outputs: 16-19 | | | 20 (15 Level 2 apprenticeships & 5 higher apprenticeships) | 31 (Level 3) |
| Other Learning Outputs, inc. Short Courses | 50 training days | 20 (nature of training tbc) | 25 (Study programme / traineeship) | 36 (Adult learners Levels 1-3) |
| Work Experience Placements | | | 10 | |
| New Businesses Created | | 2 | | |
| Business Assisted | | | | 30 |

** The floorspace for Cleveland Works represents the total floor areas of Atlas House. While the whole site will benefit from investment, should this project proceed, SSLEP should confirm the precise floor area directly benefiting from GBF funded refurbishment.*

Based on the outputs reported by applicants:

- Church Street Gaming Phase 2 is the only project to deliver employment outputs and are based on the improved capacity of the centre which will be based on a collaborative workspace model – rather than the workshops specified in the original SSLEP funded proposals.
- Church Street Gaming Phase 2 may also accelerate the delivery of outputs associated with previous SSLEP funding by providing the final gap funding to complete the centre and cover additional costs associated with the new Gaming Hub focus.
- The two other projects are primarily focused on skills provision, however this may unlock indirect employment opportunities. These learning outputs, including apprenticeships and other full-time courses will provide more significant learning outcomes than the 50 training days associated with the original Corporation Street proposals.
- All projects provide an improvement on the level of new or refurbished floorspace provided in the original scheme.

Based on the outputs reported by applicants and the comment about employment outputs above:

- 1) The outputs associated with Church Street Gaming Hub Phase 2 are closest in line with the original submission to government – although include a lower number of employment outputs.
- 2) The Automation and Robotics Suite makes the strongest overall contribution to project outputs.

Strategic Contribution

All projects have been assessed as making a good contribution to SSLEP’s strategic objectives and we can confirm that this is still the case. In relation to each of the projects:

- Church Street Gaming Hub will support the development of the software and computer programme sector within the region, which is identified in the SEP as a core element of the creative industries and providing opportunities within the region for Staffordshire University graduates. The LIS notes that Staffordshire University is one of the biggest digital skills ecosystems in the UK higher education sector.
- Cleveland Works will also provide refurbished facilities enabling more flexible education areas – providing greater capacity and improved resilience for the delivery of training courses (e.g. in relation to Covid-secure teaching arrangements). It will also enable the PM Training to deliver the digital elements of their original submission – including digital and creative skills (e.g. Cyber Security, Digital Support, Software Developer, IS Solutions). As set out above this will provide a strong alignment with the SEP and LIS.
- The Automation and Robotics Suite will allow new and existing learners of varying age groups and ability levels to develop an understanding of and an ability to use robotics technology – making a direct contribution to the future of engineering and ‘Industry 4.0’.

All of the projects have a clear focus on digital or high value training opportunities and have the potential to make a strong contribution to the region – addressing the needs of priority sectors for the region.

Deliverability

In relation to deliverability:

- The original assessment of Church Street gaming rated the Business Case as ‘medium’ against a number of delivery criteria. No major concerns were identified at this stage, the project will build on an existing SSLEP investment, and the project is expected to be able to progress quickly upon approval. However, in the appraisers view the Business Case was light on some details including the procurement methodology and risk assessment and at this stage a detailed cost plan is not available.
- Cleveland Works have amended their application since the original submission in light of the available funding. However, as this represents one element of the original scheme, this will not impact on its delivery. Planning permission is not required for the internal works proposed and the applicant states that works can commence quickly on approval. The project is at RIBA 3 stage with designs agreed and signed off, however a committed funding package is required before further work can be completed. A detailed breakdown of equipment costs has been provided in the original application.
- The Automation and Robotics Suite involves the purchase of equipment rather than significant refurbishment. Costs are based on detailed quotes and on this basis, delivery risks are expected to be minimal and the project was previously approved for SEF by Staffordshire County Council.

No major concerns have been identified over delivery for each of the projects. By focusing on the purchase and implementation of capital equipment, the Robotics Suite project is likely to be associated with the lowest delivery risks. Cleveland Works is similarly considered to be highly deliverable within the proposed timescales.

While no major concerns have been identified, our assessment of Church Street Gaming Hub does identify areas where further detailed work is required in relation to project costs and delivery risks.

Recommendations

Based on the information provided by applicants, the **Automation and Robotics Suite (JCB Academy)** is considered to have low delivery risk, provide a strong strategic contribution to the region and deliver a high level of outputs relative to the level of funding sought. **On this basis it can be recommended for contingency GBF funding.**

However, to inform SPMG’s final decision, it should be noted that:

Cleveland Works is assessed at a similar level in relation to delivery. It has a slightly, but not substantially, lower level of learning outputs, but does have a greater focus on providing training opportunities for younger people in high value sectors – which may be of particular value as the region recovers from the current pandemic.

If the priority of SSLEP is to maintain employment outputs for the fund, Church Street Gaming Hub Phase is the only project to deliver direct employment outputs – however these are lower than the level associated with Corporation Street.

Strategic Programme Management Group**Monday 1st March 2021****Getting Building Fund, Contingency Projects****Policy and tactical considerations**

1. The preceding paper under Item 5i provides an overview from the Independent Technical Assessor (c/o Hatch) on the strengths and weaknesses of the business case appraisals, relating to three contingency projects that are being considered to award grant funding of up to £190K under the Getting Building Fund (GBF).
2. The GBF change request process set out by CLGU has not yet been tested. It has not yet been established if CLGU would allow this £190K and any potential future funding underspend (e.g. Drakelow scheme or any of the other ten contracted projects under GBF) to be reallocated in full or part to the Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire LEP area.
3. It is not uncommon that grant funding schemes such as GBF benefit from a second tranche of funding allocations due to underspend amalgamated at a national level and then redistributed at short notice on a pro-rata basis or through competitive bidding rounds. Given the strength of the full list of six contingency projects (combined grant ask of £3.4m as presented in Appendix 1 for ease of reference) that can provide significant Covid-19 recovery stimulus to the LEP area through an award of reallocated or additional GBF grant funding, consideration could be given by SPMG to adopting a tactical approach. Such an approach could involve using the 'change request process' to move some of our pipeline of projects from 'shovel ready' to a CLGU pre-approved 'accelerated/established scheme' status that was part of the original criteria around the MHCLG 'Call for Ideas/Getting Building Fund'.
4. Consideration could be given to selecting the project that has the greatest scope for scale-up in order to establish principles with CLGU around the nature and speed of the approval process. This could enhance the LEPs ability to quickly attract and secure any future funding should it become available at short notice. Likewise, selecting a project that is more closely aligned with innovation concepts would demonstrate strategic alignment with the LEPs vision and current brand repositioning work taking place through the Executive Board and newly formed MarComs group.
5. The Skills Education Fund (SEF) is already designed in a similar way to select from a range of similar schemes, so there would be no clear benefit from testing the 'change request process' with a SEF project at this stage. However, given the low risk that SEF presents to the SPMG, a decision could be made to simply select the remaining SEF project.

Example scenario of a tactical approach to improving the LEP pipeline status

6. The two non-SEF projects grant request is £126K and £190K which totals £316K. The £190K unallocated GBF could be split on a given ratio, lets say on a 50:50 basis (£95K per project) and a Change Request is submitted for both projects, with the LEP making a commitment in principle to make up the difference of £126K (£316K - £190K = £126K). How the LEP makes up the difference can be decided once the final Local Growth Fund (LGF) programme is settled in March 2021 and/or exploring other options within our capital related schemes.
7. Depending on the outcome of the 'change request process', and final LGF spend profile, SPMG could then adopt a similar approach to the remaining contingency projects so the LEP has a well-positioned pipeline to attract any further tranches of GBF funding should it become available in the near future (e.g. HM Treasury Budget statement on 8th March 2021).
8. Ultimately, in reaching a decision, it is a judgement and balancing exercise for SPMG in considering reputation with internal and external stakeholders, and how much of SPMG resource should be applied to sweating the residual GBF within the context of the current uncertainties around the medium term Local Industrial Strategy funding and policy agenda for LEPs.

Note prepared by:

Mark Parkinson
Chief Executive, LEP

Appendix 1: Getting Building Fund: full list of contingency projects

| Ref No. | Description |
|---------|--|
| 13 | Four Ashes Enterprise Centre *N/A* scheme progressing without GBF South Staffordshire (£1.5M) |
| 14 | PM Training – Cleveland Future Skills Hub Newcastle-under-Lyme (£1.0M) |
| 15 | East Gate Regeneration Stafford (£695,000) |
| 16 | Cornhill Enterprise Centres Leek, Staffordshire Moorlands (£575,000) |
| 17 | Church Street Gaming Hub Stoke-on-Trent (£450,000) |
| 18 | Gigabit Voucher Scheme Stoke-on-Trent (£450,000) |
| 19 | Skills Equipment Fund - JCB Rocester, East Staffordshire (£173,000) |

Strategic Programme Management Group

Monday 1st March 2021

Forward Plan

| SPMG | | Meeting Date | | 1 March 2021 / Q1 2021/22 | |
|--|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Lead Board Member/ Secretariat: | Item Name: | Time: | Recommendation: | | |
| Secretariat c/o Hatch and Project Sponsor | Getting Building Fund – Church Street Gaming Hub payment mechanism for inclusion in contract | | | | Decision |
| Secretariat c/o Hatch | Getting Building Fund – Contingency project next steps / response form CLGU | | | | Information |
| Secretariat c/o Hatch | HM Treasury Green Book update | | | | Discussion |
| Secretariat c/o Hatch | Business case training to Local Authority technical officers – feedback/update | | | | Information |
| Project Sponsor / SPMG Nominee | Getting Building Fund – Shirehall, Stafford project shaping | | | | Discussion |
| Project Sponsor | Getting Building Fund – Drakelow Park project update | | | | Information |
| Secretariat c/o Social | Getting Building Fund – Project communications Management Information System | | | | Discussion |
| Secretariat | Technical Note / Financial Note to support Executive Board over fiscal policy incentives | | | | Information |