

**European Union**European Structural
and Investment Funds**European Structural and Investment Funds
2014 - 2020****Growth Programme for England****Worcestershire ESIF Sub-Committee****Minutes of meeting held 13/02/2018
Worcestershire County Cricket Club****Agenda:**

1. Welcome, introduction and apologies
2. Minutes of meeting of 6/12/17 and action update
3. Presentation – West Midlands International Growth Programme
4. ERDF update, outline assessments and full appraisals
5. ESF update
6. EAFRD and LEADER update
7. Future Calls
8. Any other business
9. Date and time of future meetings

1. Welcome, introduction and apologies

1.1 Chris Hallam (CH) welcomed members to the Worcestershire ESIF Sub-Committee meeting.

1.2 Apologies for absence from the meeting were received and are detailed in Annex C below.

2. Minutes of the last meeting and action update

2.1 CH invited comments on the minutes from the last meeting. No comments were received from members. CH highlighted some typing errors for correction. The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

2.2 CH confirmed there were no actions from the previous meeting.

3. Presentation: West Midlands International Growth Programme

3.1 Steve Havins (SH) from West Midlands Chamber of Commerce gave a presentation on the West Midlands International Growth project. The slides from the presentation will be circulated with the minutes.

3.2 SH agreed to send the Chair details of the number of businesses committed and what the businesses will deliver to be circulated to members with the minutes.

3.3 Following his presentation, SH took questions from members.

3.4 CH thanked SH for his presentation on behalf of the Sub-Committee.

Official

4. ERDF Update, outline assessments and full appraisals

Management Information Update

National update

4.1 Kathryn Dews (KD) gave an update on the national picture of the ERDF programme based on the latest Growth Programme Board papers (December 17) which were based on figures to the end of September 2017.

4.2 At this point, 456 projects were contracted, comprising of 43% of the total programme budget. For Less Developed areas this represents 57%, for Transition areas 37% and for More Developed areas 43%.

4.3 The total amount paid out through claims at the end of quarter 3, 2017 was £164m. There has been a slow start to the amount of funding paid out due to the time it has taken to issue Funding Agreements and the time taken for projects to set up. However, £45m was paid in the previous quarter so spend is ramping up.

4.4 The position on our ability to meet the 2018 targets based on forecasted spend for contracted projects is as follows:

- **Priority Axis 1:** On track for outputs and spend in all categories of region
- **Priority Axis 2:** On track for spend in Less Developed and Transition regions, but behind target in terms of outputs.
- **Priority Axis 3:** Met targets for spend and outputs.
- **Priority Axis 4:** On track with spend and outputs in Less Developed areas, however, behind target in More Developed and Transition areas. Work has been done to make changes to the eligibility criteria for Priority Axis 4 allowing more flexibility in terms of projects which can be brought forwards.

4.5 It is expected that the N+3 target will be achieved nationally if projects spend is in line with the forecasted profiles. The focus of the Managing Authority is ensuring projects submit their claims on time and to profile. If projects are not meeting their forecasts, Contract Managers arrange visits with grant recipients and put an action plan in place and apply the underperformance clause in Funding Agreements where necessary. It is anticipated there will be some slippage in quarter 4 of 2017. Claims are currently being processed and once figures are available these will be provided through the regular Management Information reports provided.

4.6 KD highlighted the September calls were worth £267m overall and the outlines from that call were being looked at as part of this meeting. Applications that came in through the December call round will be ready for the ESIF Sub-Committee to review.

4.7 KD invited questions from members.

4.8 Linda Robinson (LR) requested all figures were included in the papers in advance of the meeting. KD agreed this would be looked at for future meetings.

Official

Worcestershire LEP Management Information update

4.9 Susan Winsor (SW) gave an update on Worcestershire ERDF Management Information. SW highlighted the four different set of figures circulated prior to the meeting and gave an update focusing on the figures in Annex 4: Progress against Output Performance Framework Targets and Annex 1: Progress against Allocation.

4.10 The Performance Management Information now reflects the allocation adjustments that have been made as part of the Operational Programme modification. The Management Information is summarised as follows:

- **Priority Axis 1:** The amount under consideration exceeds the LEP's notional allocation, which can be managed through ranking projects at the ESIF SC (Strong, Medium or Weak).
- **Priority Axis 2:** The Worcestershire Superfast Broadband agreement has now been signed between the Managing Authority and Worcestershire County Council. The project represents 90% of the LEP's notional allocation. There is £112k left to allocate.
- **Priority Axis 3:** The amount under consideration represents 85% of WLEP's notional allocation. There is a remaining £2.03m left to allocate until the end of the programme.
- **Priority Axis 4:** The amount under consideration represents 60% of WLEPs notional allocation. There is a remaining £2.59m left to allocate until the end of the programme.
- **Priority Axis 6:** The Love Your River application was presented to the Sub-Committee. The application represents 87% of WLEP's notional allocation. There is a remaining £177k left to allocate until the end of the programme.
- **Total:** The total amount claimed to date across all Priority Axes is £4.527m. This leaves a balance of £6.075m to be claimed to meet the 2018 PFT. A number of the C1 Outputs for the PFT in the LEP area have been achieved. Overall, Worcestershire LEP is performing well compared to other LEPs.

4.11 CH invited questions from members.

4.12 Sue Crow (SC) asked what would happen to small allocations of funding left in an individual Priority Axis budget. KD explained that we would do mop up calls.

4.13 KD confirmed Worcestershire LEP was behind target in terms of Priority Axis 2 and 4. However, this is the same at a national level. Changes have been made to Priority Axis 4 allowing more flexibility which should lead to improvements in targets for this priority.

4.14 Ian Stirzaker (IS) asked whether an 'output achieved' represents a project completed. KD explained that this was not the case and gave the definition of an output and explained that the Management Information tables show the outputs for each Priority Axis.

4.15 LR asked if small amounts of funding under an individual Priority Axis can be allocated to a different Priority Axis. KD explained there would be mop up calls later in the year but funding cannot be moved between Priority Axes at this stage. The programme overall is constantly being reviewed to see

Official

if, where and when funding can be potentially moved to so there **could be** further funding available at a later stage for WLEP.

4.16 Gary Woodman (GW) said the picture in Worcestershire is good overall. Towards the end of this year, calls can be issued to use up any remaining funding. GW said it as a good idea to pre-warn potential applicants of the remaining money allocated to the LEP. GW said it would be helpful for the Managing Authority to provide rag risks in the Management Information for the Sub-Committee to highlight potential the risks.

4.17 CH agreed that Worcestershire LEP is in a good position in terms of spend and is performing well compared to other LEPs.

4.18 Ken Pollock (KP) asked why there are two lines for each Priority Axis in the Management Information, as the sub total and total figures are the same. KP asked why the LEP has allocated 108.7% of funding for Priority Axis 1.

4.19 KD explained each Priority Axis has two lines of data due to some LEPs having different categories of region. This requires a line per category of region and then an overall total. However, there is only one category of region (More Developed) in Worcestershire, which is why the sub total and total figures are the same. The template used is standard format across all LEPs.

4.20 KD explained the LEP cannot commit 100% of its allocation as it needs to ensure it meets its Performance Reserve target in order to release the additional 6% of funding, which is already included within the WLEP's notional allocation. If the LEP does meet the Performance Reserve target it will have projects in the pipeline. Where 100% is exceeded through the submission of multiple applications these would need to be strategically ranked. The highest ones will be invited to submit a full application and the others put on a waiting list to see if further funds become available.

4.21 SC asked whether it was possible to have a conversation with applicants to see if their project could go ahead if they received less ERDF, rather than having a list of pipeline projects to be brought forward if the Performance Reserve funding is released.

4.22 KD said this would need to be considered on a case by case basis.

4.23 John Bennett (JB) summed up by explaining it was important to present the national perspective as some projects will de-commit money which would mean there will be more money available in Worcestershire. Nationally, projects are requesting to de-commit around 20% of their funding. This is due to project delays caused by difficulties in recruiting project staff and a lack of SME demand.

4.24 GW said the LEP needs to be confident that it can deliver if money comes back into the pot. It is important to know which Priority Axes have underspend nationally and where the LEP could mop up this underspend by having a pipeline of projects ready.

Outline applications

Priority Axis 1: Worcestershire Proof of Concept Extension

4.25 Christopher Capewell (CC) introduced the application.

Official

4.26 The Sub-Committee were asked for any declarations of interest. SC and KP declared an interest so did not comment during this agenda item.

4.27 CH invited comments from the sub-committee. See annex A below for comments from members.

4.28 The Sub-Committee agreed the project was a strong strategic fit.

Priority Axis 4: Business Energy Efficiency Programme Extension

4.29 CC introduced the application.

4.30 The Sub-Committee were asked for any declarations of interest. SC and KP declared an interest so did not comment during this agenda item.

4.31 CH invited comments from the Sub-Committee. See annex A below for comments from members.

4.32 The Sub-Committee agreed the project was a strong strategic fit.

Priority Axis 1: WATEP Worcestershire Aerospace Technology Exploitation Programme

4.33 CC introduced the application.

4.34 The Sub-Committee were asked for any declarations of interest. There were none declarations of interest.

4.35 CH invited comments from the Sub-Committee. See annex A below for comments from members.

4.36 There was a detailed discussion with regards to the affordability of this project. If this project was invited to full with the requested level of ERDF expenditure, then Priority Axis 1 would be oversubscribed. There were also issues that had been identified through the assessment around the requirement of a guarantor. Following this discussion, it was agreed the application should be brought back for consideration, only if the conditions could be met and the amount scaled back is in line with the available budget. The Sub-Committee agreed the project was a medium strategic fit.

Full applications:

Priority Axis 3: Grow-Agri Worcestershire

4.37 CC introduced the application.

4.38 The Sub-Committee were asked for any declarations of interest. KP declared an interest due to his academic background although does not have an interest in the applicant organisation.

4.39 CH invited comments from the Sub-Committee. See annex A below for comments from members.

4.40 The Sub-Committee agreed the project was a strong strategic fit.

Priority Axis 6: Love Your River Worcestershire

4.41 CC introduced the application.

4.42 The Sub-Committee were asked for any declarations of interest. SC and KP declared an interest so did not comment during this agenda item.

4.43 CH invited comments from the Sub-Committee. See annex A below for comments from members.

Official

4.44 The Sub-Committee agreed the project was a strong strategic fit.

5. ESF update

5.1 Tim George (TG) gave an update on ESF. TG explained the Management Information has not been updated since September 2017. The data is being updated this week and will include claims made by Co-financing Organisations (CFOs).

5.2 ESF is where expected in terms of committed expenditure but not in terms of actuals.

5.3 Four Funding Agreements have been issued or are about to be issued. Project Inception Visits are to take place and spend will appear on the report which will include supporting activity.

5.4 The ESFA and DWP CFO's have approached the Managing Authority regarding extension of their contracts. LEPs need to agree whether they are willing to allocate money to extend these contracts. Once requests are received, they will be assessed and appraised by the ESF MA and brought to the Sub-Committee for comment on strategic fit. In Worcestershire, there is potential for a £1.5m extension under Investment Priority 2.1 for the ESFA but the Managing Authority has not received any applications yet so is unable to confirm. There are currently ESFA projects under Priority Axis 1, but none are asking for an extension.

5.5 CH asked whether there will be a need to consider these applications via written procedure.

5.6 TG confirmed there would be a need for written procedure. To provide assurance, TG confirmed the Managing Authority is expecting value for money to remain the same or improve.

6. EAFRD and LEADER update

6.1 Jo Jury (JJ) gave an update on EAFRD and LEADER.

6.2 The indicative allocation for EAFRD is £2.24m. Worcestershire LEP was an early adopter with five projects coming forward. The balance remaining is £1.76m and £1.8m worth of approved/contracted projects or projects at full application. There has been a robust pipeline of projects and JJ thanked the LEP for their support.

6.3 There has been a lack of projects under tourism, apart from those that had some that fit under business development. EAFRD would welcome projects coming forward in this area. These can be non-commercial projects such as improvements to canal pathways. The Wildlife Trust has been active in other areas but not in Worcestershire.

6.4 CH commented EAFRD is overcommitted but JJ is asking for more projects to come forward.

6.5 JJ said some projects drop out or underperform so it is helpful to have a pipeline.

6.6 In terms of value for money, the figures for job creation are good and the average investment per job created is £20,000 and some are good quality jobs. JJ said she would provide an update on outputs at the next meeting.

6.7 In terms of the rest of rural programme, there is a Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP project that includes £600,000 of projects in Worcestershire. In terms of rural countryside productivity, two projects with a grant value of £430,000 are in appraisal.

Official

6.8 LEADER is going well, with Worcestershire being one of the top performers in the country.

6.8 JJ attended an agri-tech event on Thursday and will raise awareness of funding at this event. Last week a small grants programme was launched for farmers. They can apply online which is a straight forward application process.

6.9 CH commented that he was pleased with the success of the EAFRD programme and thanked JJ and the LEP for their efforts.

6.10 CB said the LEP linking up with LEADER had worked well. They had run some small scale workshops and had good engagement. They will do another push on tourism infrastructure before the call deadline.

6.11 CH invited comments. There were no further comments.

7. Future Calls

7.1 KD gave an update on future calls. Following discussions with WLEP colleagues and Stakeholders two Calls (PA3 and PA4) were drafted for publication in March. The Managing Authority asked for agreement from members of the WLEP to go out for these calls for the remainder of the allocation, ring-fencing any agreed amount for the Trade and Manufacturing call from PA3. **Members agreed to this approach.**

7.2 KD asked if the WLEP wanted to participate in a national trade call. The initial suggested amount was for £150,000 from the Priority Axis 3 allocation. If the WLEP agrees to put £150,000 into the trade call and receives no bids, the LEP gets to keep this funding. If applications coming in through the trade call exceed £150,000, the LEP can approve all applications and rank these as a strong, medium or weak strategic fit, providing a pipeline of projects. **Members agreed to participate in the call for £150,000.**

7.3 KD asked if WLEP members would like to participate in the manufacturing call to include £300,000 from the Priority Axis 3 allocation. Again, if bids are received of a higher value these can be ranked as a strong, medium or weak strategic fit. **Members agreed to this approach.**

7.4 KD explained that we are expecting sign off from the Growth Programme Board for calls to be launched as follows:

- March 2018: 2nd March – 20th April
- October 2018: 5th October – 23rd November
- March 2019: 22nd March – 3rd May

If nationally money becomes available, there may be more in Worcestershire to allocate.

8. Any other business

8.1 CB said she had received a message from David Throup during the meeting sending his apologies for the meeting.

8.2 KP asked if was possible to have an overview of Summative Assessments at a future Sub-Committee meeting.

8.3 JB confirmed that this would be possible.

Official

- **Action 1: Brief to be given at future meeting on Summative Assessments.**

9. Date, time and venue of future meetings

9.1 CH confirmed the dates of future meetings are as follows:

- 13 June 2018
- 19 September 2018
- 12 December 2018

9.2 All meetings will start at 10am at Worcestershire County Cricket Club.

Official

ANNEX A: ERDF Outline/Full Application Comments

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| LEP Area: | Worcestershire | |
| Date: | 13/2/18 | |
| ERDF Priority Axis Call: | 1 | |
| Project Name: | Worcestershire Proof of Concept Extension | |
| Project Applicant: | Worcestershire County Council | |
| Total Project Value: | £5,150,314 | |
| ERDF sought: | £2,575,157 | |
| Category A | Category B | Category C |
| X | | |
| <p>Declarations of interest: Sue Crow and Cllr Dr Ken Pollock</p> <p>The Managing Authority described the project, highlighting the issues identified through the outline assessment and invited members' comments on the local strategic fit of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The following comments were recorded:</p> | | |
| Name | Comment | |
| CH | Expressed that he thought this was a strong application which extends an existing, successful project. | |
| The Chair concluded the discussion and categorised the proposed operation as follows: | | |
| The committee agreed to support the application. | | |
| Category A: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities and is considered high priority | Category B: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities though is not high priority | Category C: The proposed operation does not fit with local strategic priorities |
| X | | |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Recorded by: | Susan Winsor |
|---------------------|--------------|

Official

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| LEP Area: | Worcestershire | |
| Date: | 13/2/18 | |
| ERDF Priority Axis Call: | 4 | |
| Project Name: | Business Energy Efficiency Programme Extension | |
| Project Applicant: | Worcestershire Country Council | |
| Total Project Value: | £4,573,810.00 | |
| ERDF sought: | £2,268,865.00 | |
| Category A | Category B | Category C |
| X | | |
| <p>Declarations of interest: Sue Crow and Cllr Dr Ken Pollock</p> <p>The Managing Authority described the project, highlighting the issues identified through the outline assessment and invited members' comments on the local strategic fit of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The following comments were recorded:</p> | | |
| Name | Comment | |
| CH | Highlighted that positive comments were made by members following the presentation from the Council at a previous meeting. CH believes that the project is a strong fit and recommended that the project be approved subject to the conditions set out in the outline assessment. | |
| Ian Hardman (IH) | Confirmed support for the project and confirmed that in North Worcestershire, 80 businesses had been supported and £300,000 of grants had been awarded. | |
| The Chair concluded the discussion and categorised the proposed operation as follows: | | |
| The committee agreed to support the application. | | |
| Category A: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities and is considered high priority | Category B: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities though is not high priority | Category C: The proposed operation does not fit with local strategic priorities |
| X | | |

Official

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Recorded by: | Susan Winsor |
|---------------------|--------------|

Official

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| LEP Area: | Worcestershire | |
| Date: | 13/2/18 | |
| ERDF Priority Axis Call: | 1 | |
| Project Name: | WATEP Worcestershire Aerospace Technology Exploitation Programme | |
| Project Applicant: | Midlands Aerospace Alliance | |
| Total Project Value: | £1,487,400 | |
| ERDF sought: | £743,700 | |
| Category A | Category B | Category C |
| | X | |
| <p>Declarations of interest: None</p> <p>The Managing Authority described the project, highlighting the issues identified through the outline assessment and invited members' comments on the local strategic fit of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The following comments were recorded:</p> | | |
| Name | Comment | |
| CH | Expressed there is an aerospace supply chain, particularly in the north of the county. He noted the condition to bring forward a single multi-LEP project but had concerns around the Worcestershire project getting consumed within a wider project. | |
| KD | <p>Explained that the applicant had submitted the same application to a number of LEP areas and it would be a condition to submit one application as this would make the project more manageable. The project was over the allocation in Worcestershire and would need to reduce its ERDF request in Worcestershire.</p> <p>KD highlighted that due diligence was necessary and that the applicant would be offered a maximum ERDF amount of £500,000. It would need to find a guarantor if it wished to apply for funding above this level. The project has been supported in other LEPs.</p> | |
| LR | <p>Asked whether only 10 of the 30 companies would receive a grant.</p> <p>CC explained that all would receive a diagnostic and therefore receive some support and that in total 20 jobs would be created.</p> | |
| JB | Explained that the due diligence should not be underplayed as the | |

Official

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | applicant would need to scale back its proposal or find a guarantor. | |
| KD | Explained that as the project involves other LEPs, the guarantor would not necessarily have to be from Worcestershire LEP. | |
| SC | Said her main concern is around match funding. Staffing costs are high and SME match is required so there could be cash flow issues until SME match is received. | |
| CH | Asked Tony Green (TGr) if he had any concerns around recruitment of staff. TGr confirmed he did have some concerns. | |
| SC | Said the Council addressed this issue by training up new staff rather than recruiting staff with existing expertise. | |
| JB | Confirmed recruiting appropriate staff is a national issue perhaps caused by organisations not offering an appropriate salary and due to uncertainty around ERDF. | |
| CH | Expressed this meant there were some additional risks around this project. | |
| TGr | Highlighted that the project would create 20 jobs however, the information on page 3 of the outline assessment suggested that there was potential for creation of 77 jobs so the offer was poor. CC explained that the 20 jobs was just in Worcestershire, whereas the 77 covered a wide geographical area. | |
| KP | Expressed that manufacturing and entrepreneurialism received negative publicity in the media and therefore these industries had difficulty attracting young people. He is therefore in favour of this type of project. | |
| IH | Supported the application in the context that KP gave. | |
| Juliana Crowe (JC) | Said there was a need for these specialist skills in the LEP. | |
| CH | Went round the table asking members to state whether they supported the project and whether they felt the project was a strong or medium strategic fit if they did support the project. The majority of members agreed to support the project as a medium strategic fit. | |
| The Chair concluded the discussion and categorised the proposed operation as follows: | | |
| The committee agreed to support the application as a medium strategic fit. | | |
| Category A: The proposed | Category B: The | Category C: The proposed |

Official

| operation fits with local strategic priorities and is considered high priority | proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities though is not high priority | operation does not fit with local strategic priorities |
|---|--|---|
| | X | |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Recorded by: | Susan Winsor |
|---------------------|--------------|

Official

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| LEP Area: | Worcestershire | |
| Date: | 13/2/18 | |
| ERDF Priority Axis Call: | 3 | |
| Project Name: | Grow-Agri Worcestershire | |
| Project Applicant: | Warwickshire College | |
| Total Project Value: | £2,062,620 | |
| ERDF sought: | £1,031,310 | |
| Category A | Category B | Category C |
| X | | |
| <p>Declarations of interest: Ken Pollock has an academic background in this field but no interest in the applicant organisation.</p> <p>The Managing Authority described the project, highlighting the issues identified through the outline assessment and invited members' comments on the local strategic fit of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The following comments were recorded:</p> | | |
| Name | Comment | |
| CB | Expressed that the project was a strong strategic fit and is a priority sector for LEP. However, CB noted that jobs created were low. | |
| LR | Expressed that she supports the bid and agreed with CB that job numbers are low and this was a disappointment. | |
| KP | Expressed support for the project. | |
| The Chair concluded the discussion and categorised the proposed operation as follows: | | |
| The committee agreed to support the application. | | |
| Category A: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities and is considered high priority | Category B: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities though is not high priority | Category C: The proposed operation does not fit with local strategic priorities |
| X | | |

Official

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Recorded by: | Susan Winsor |
|---------------------|--------------|

Official

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| LEP Area: | Worcestershire | |
| Date: | 13/2/18 | |
| ERDF Priority Axis Call: | 6 | |
| Project Name: | Love Your River Worcestershire | |
| Project Applicant: | Worcestershire County Council | |
| Total Project Value: | £2,696,022 | |
| ERDF sought: | £1,235,508 | |
| Category A | Category B | Category C |
| X | | |
| <p>Declarations of interest: Sue Crow and Cllr Dr Ken Pollock</p> <p>The Managing Authority described the project, highlighting the issues identified through the outline assessment and invited members' comments on the local strategic fit of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The following comments were recorded:</p> | | |
| Name | Comment | |
| CB | Strongly supports the project as it is part of the LEP priorities and strategic economic plan. | |
| CH | Said the project had been strengthened by Worcestershire County Council taking over as lead applicant. | |
| The Chair concluded the discussion and categorised the proposed operation as follows: | | |
| The committee agreed to support the application. | | |
| Category A: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities and is considered high priority | Category B: The proposed operation fits with local strategic priorities though is not high priority | Category C: The proposed operation does not fit with local strategic priorities |
| X | | |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Recorded by: | Susan Winsor |
|---------------------|--------------|

Official

Annex B Actions

List of Agreed Actions from 13/2/18 Worcestershire LEP ESIF Sub-Committee Meeting

| Agenda Item | Action | Action Assigned to |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | Brief to be given at future meeting on summative assessments. | KD |

Official

Annex C Attendee List

Worcestershire ESIF Sub-Committee 13/2/18 meeting

Chair & Deputy Chair:

| Name, title and organisation | Sector/Organisation Representing |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Chris Hallam (CH) (Chair) | Santander Corporate and Commercial Banking |
| Kathryn Dews (KD) | Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Managing Authority |

Sub-Committee Members:

| Name, title and organisation | Sector/Organisation Representing |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Claire Bridges (CB) | Worcestershire LEP |
| Cllr Dr Ken Pollock (KP) | Local Authority (Worcestershire County Council) |
| Cllr Ian Hardman (IH) | Wyre Forest District Council |
| Cllr Linda Robinson (LR) | Local Authority (Wychavon District Council) |
| Gary Woodman (GW) | Worcestershire LEP |
| Ian Stirzaker (IS) | Business Partner (SME Solicitors) |
| Jo Jury (JJ) | Rural Payments Agency |
| John Dawson (JD) | Business Partner – SME (Prestige) |
| Juliana Crowe (JC) | Equalities (Rooftop Housing Group) |
| Sue Crow (SC) | Local Authority (Worcestershire County Council) |

Official

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Tim George (TG) | Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) Managing Authority |
| Tony Green (TGr) | Education, Skills Employment (Heart of Worcestershire College) |

Others in attendance (non-members - including secretariat):

| Name, title and organisation | Sector/Organisation Representing |
|------------------------------|--|
| Christopher Capewell (CC) | Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Managing Authority |
| John Bennett (JB) | Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Managing Authority |
| Steve Havins (SH) | West Midlands Chamber of Commerce |
| Susan Winsor (SW) | Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Managing Authority (minutes) |

Apologies:

| Name, title and organisation | Sector/Organisation Representing |
|------------------------------|---|
| Ann Williams | Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) |
| Caroline Bedell | Rural (CLA Midlands) |
| David Throup | Environment (Local Nature Partnership) |
| Helena Baxter | Business Partner – Micro (HB Consulting) |
| Ian Edwards | Worcestershire LEP |
| Linda Beauchamp | Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy |

Official

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| | (BEIS) |
| Louise Jones | University of Worcestershire |
| Mark Richardson | University of Worcester |
| Richard Quallington | Voluntary & Community Sector (Worcestershire Voices) |
| Sarah Morris | Skills Funding Agency |
| Stephen Brown | Trade Union (Musician's Union) |