



In attendance:	Paddy Bradley (PB) Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) Alistair Cunningham (AC) – arrived 10.20am, left 12.30pm Col Andrew Dawes (AD) – left 12.30pm Doug Gale (DG) George Gill (GG) Susie Kemp (SK) Tim Martiensen (TM) John Mortimer (JM) - Chairman Alex Reed (AR) Mark Smith (MS) Cllr Gary Sumner (GS), representing Cllr Renard and Cllr Donachie Philippa Venables (PV) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman
Apologies:	Amanda Burnside (AB) Cllr Oliver Donachie (OD) Shahina Johnson (SJ) Parvis Khansari (PK) David Renard (DR) Adam Schallamach (AS) – on sabbatical Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Leanne Sykes (LS) Jonathan Webber (JW)
Guest(s):	Phil Clement (PC), SWLEP Allan Creedy (ACre), Wiltshire Council Alex Crook (ACr), BEIS Ian Durston (ID), SWLEP Ross Gill (RG), SQW Joe Manning (JMa), BEIS Debby Skellern, SWLEP
Chair:	John Mortimer
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)
Location:	The Crown Court, The Guildhall, Market Place, Salisbury, SPI IJH

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 9.30am. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW stated his Conflicts regarding the LGF General Account for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); and • AR stated his Conflict regarding the IoT, as Catalent was a named 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>partner.</p> <p>Welcome was extended to Mary Webb from the Federation of Small Business (fsb), Amanda Newbery, Dean Speer and Steve Godwin of Salisbury Business Improvement District (BID), to Alex Crook from BEIS and his colleague, Joe Manning, from the Cities & Local Growth Unit who would be speaking later about the Ministerial Review of LEPs. Welcome and congratulations were offered to Susie Kemp on her appointment as CEO at Swindon Borough Council. Cllr Gary Sumner was representing Swindon Borough Council and would vote on its behalf and Cllr Pauline Church would vote on behalf of Wiltshire Council. Adrian Ford from Wiltshire College was present representing Amanda Burnside, but without voting rights. Ross Gill of SQW was to present on Item 4.3, Digital Capabilities Strategy and Allan Creedy of Wiltshire Council was to present on Item 4.5, the Sub-national Transport Body. Alistair Cunningham was expected to join the meeting later.</p>	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
	<p>The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 24 May 2018 were reviewed and approved.</p> <p>Employment of SWLEP Director The Remuneration Committee, chaired by Peter Wragg, had met and made recommendations regarding the employment and terms of the SWLEP Director. The contract had been a fixed-term contract and had had several extensions. The discussions in private session with Board voting members were whether and how the Director's employment should continue. In public session, the Chairman asked the members to confirm their decision and announced the Director's continued employment.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the headline terms of employment of the SWLEP Director as recommended by the Remuneration Committee; AGREED that the Director will continue to report to the SWLEP Board Chairman; AGREED to the publication of the details of the Director's terms and conditions of employment on the SWLEP website and to review arrangements on an annual basis, or before if the SWLEP becomes an incorporated body.</p> <p>Matters Arising not on the agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforecast underspend in Local Growth Deal Projects. AR and ID were to meet on 23 August. ID was collating historical information for the discussion. 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Chairman's update The Chairman's list of activities since the last Board meeting was available in the Board pack. In addition, the Chairman advised of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that he had attended a number of briefing meetings regarding the recovery situation in Salisbury and the Royal visit. <p>Board Membership The Chairman announced the resignation of Vic O'Brien from the Board owing to increasing work commitments. Thanks were extended for his contribution made to the Board over the two years of his membership.</p> <p>Further recruitment would start for additional board members. The current membership stood at 13, although there was scope cited in the Assurance Framework to increase the membership to 20 members, which was also mirrored in the Ministerial Review to be discussed later in the agenda. In particular, it mentioned setting aspirational targets for gender diversity and balance. SWLEP would reach out to the business community to broaden the sector scope and diversity of applicants. Board Members were requested to use their network contacts to inform of the Board vacancies. The aim was to have the additional Board Members in place for the November Board Meeting.</p> <p>The question was raised as to the overall skill set and sector involvement of the current Board Members and to map that against the SEP to ascertain what knowledge and skills may be missing. Co-opted Board Members with particular sector expertise could be used.</p> <p>Director's Report The paper was provided for information. Appendices had been included for Marketing & Communications and Inward Investment. No questions were raised.</p>	Nov 2018
3.0	<p>Submitted Questions No questions were received from the public prior to the meeting.</p>	
4.0	<p>Strategic Developments</p>	
4.1	<p>Towards a Local Industrial Strategy for SWLEP</p> <p>Introduction – Methodology to produce our Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) The Working Group, chaired by Doug Gale, had so far met three times. Timelines have been calculated and the Commissioning Group had also been updated on progress.</p> <p>The Government had declared that every LEP must have its own Local</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Industrial Strategy completed by early 2020. The roll out of the next tranche of LEPs took place on 24 July to include the West of England, Heart of the South West, Cheshire & Warrington, Leicester & Leicestershire, North East and Tees Valley. The original pathfinder LEPs had included OxLEP, which had already been in touch because of the economic and strategic links with Swindon and Wiltshire, and the West of England LEP was in the next tranche. Given that Swindon and Wiltshire sits in the middle of both these LEP areas, SWLEP needed to be involved in both of these discussions.</p> <p>The LIS would require a deeper evidence base. Adding to the Local Economic Assessment were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South West Rural Productivity Study – an implementation plan was being drafted by the four LEPs involved to produce a rural-type sector deal; • Energy Strategy – an update was to be given later in the agenda, • Higher Education Strategy – the strategy had been adopted in principle, • Digital Strategy – presentation was to be given later in the agenda, • Cyber Resilience Science Innovation Audit – had recently been submitted to BEIS; and • the recently commissioned Rail Strategy, which was being managed by ID. <p>These would all add to the broadening of the work. A Board Member sponsor was still required for the Rail Strategy.</p> <p>There had been 300 attendees at events for these strategies and the especially formulated Four Grand Challenges workshops of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing the AI & Data-driven Economy; • Clean Growth; • Ageing Society; and • The Future of Mobility, <p>and more than 200 online questionnaire responses had been received to the HE Strategy. The Ageing Society and Clean Growth topped the list of business interests at the Grand Challenges workshop.</p> <p>The “big ideas” from the events were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business-led multi-campus university; • electric vehicles and battery storage; • hydrogen as an alternative source of clean energy – USP • Cyber resilience and the trust in the use of big data; • Immunology development and med tech; • Defence and aerospace supply chain development; and • Autonomous vehicles land and air. 	<p>Aug 2018</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The point was raised that the LIS should reflect the ways people would work in the future, not how they worked at present, recognising that the spread and speed of technology would continue to increase and would impact on the work force. With more people able to work from home, equality of access was crucial in these circumstances, although commercial space would still be needed for those that wished to work together. Projections for employment needs and skills levels should be investigated in the growth areas. It was acknowledged that the LIS needed to be agile and fluid to deal with any changes.</p> <p>The meeting acknowledged the complexity of the process. Working with Unitary Authority development plans was crucial and needed to be reflected in the LIS. The Chairman stressed the need to move from strategy and strategic language to an action plan in order to ascertain when / how this could be implemented.</p> <p>Joe Manning thanked the Board for the invitation to the meeting and stressed that the LIS should be evidence-led and show genuine understanding of the businesses, achieved through consultation. The LIS needed to be focussed long-term for a 10-15 year period and to stress the importance of productivity and distinctiveness. It would be a joint endeavour between government and places and to work together to develop. The reason that Government was carrying out LIS in waves was in order that LEPs could get maximum engagement with officials.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to refresh the Strategic Economic Plan in the first instance and include the local 'big ideas' within it which could be developed with government into a Local Industrial Strategy pending further guidance; and NOTED the progress made on the collation of local evidence and business consultation sessions to underpin development of the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Industrial Strategy. AGREED the proposed timeline for the refresh of the SEP/LIS.</p> <p>4.2 Local Energy Strategy – progress update</p> <p>MS made the introduction to the paper. The Working Group had met three times. The evidence base was being collated to ascertain the appropriate level of SWLEP involvement. Seven priorities listed in the paper were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accelerating clean growth; • improving Business and Industry efficiency; • Improving Our Homes; • accelerating the shift to low carbon transport; • delivering Clean, Smart, Flexible Power; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancing the Benefits and Value of our Natural Resources; and • leadership in the Public Sector for change in approach. <p>The Energy Strategy is a key part of the LIS. The Group wanted it to be ambitious in concept, but requiring proper delivery targets, being deliverable and measurable, to advise the allocation of SWLEP money. It was considered a challenge to get the full strategy ready in time for a September Board approval, and MS was therefore asking for the presentation to be moved to November.</p> <p>Smart controls and grid structure needed to be aligned with the Government's targets. There were significant differences between Swindon and Wiltshire, and the opportunities were more commercial in Swindon.</p> <p>The question was raised about clean energy in rural communities, particularly in farming. The agricultural infrastructure has the ability to produce localised energy supply by generating power for itself and out to the grid by solar arrays in fields and on farm buildings and by using advanced battery storage technologies. There was however the question about how to power the tractors.</p> <p>PB advised that mapping was being carried out on grid connectivity, Broadband connectivity and water resources which could be overlaid on the Swindon and Wiltshire area to give a better picture of requirements and potential opportunities.</p> <p>The Board NOTED progress on the Local Energy Strategy and noted / commented on the priorities at 2.9.</p> <p>It was requested that Ricardo attend the November Board Meeting to present the findings, rather than at the September meeting.</p>	<p>28/11/2018</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Digital Strategy</p> <p>GG made the introduction to the paper which was building a strong evidence base and forming a good foundation for SWLEP to build on. The Digital sector is not a vertical silo, but operates horizontally across all aspects of life. For example, the Internet of Things would revolutionise all our lives.</p> <p>Ross Gill presented to the Board. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website or by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/25-jul-2018/swlap-board-presentation-24-07-18.pdf?sfvrsn=b3eb101b_4</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Two workshops had taken place with good attendance and SQW had also held bi-lateral consultations with individual companies. The headlines were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital Creation – to create a dynamic ecosystem in which businesses at the forefront of digital innovation grow and flourish; • Digital Adoption – to ensure that all businesses in Swindon and Wiltshire are deriving competitive advantage from the use of digital technology; and • Digital Foundations – to create a workforce with the skills to create, embrace and derive value from advanced digital technology. <p>SWLEP should play a convening role to bring partners together, building private sector-led networks and linking to physical assets, for example, Corsham Mansion House.</p> <p>A Monitoring Framework to measure success of the strategy over time was being drafted as was the investment proposition.</p> <p>There were questions raised regarding the gaps in the digital infrastructure across Wiltshire and how that should be addressed. Although overall the county fared quite well with coverage and accessibility compared to the rest of the country, this would not be viewed sympathetically with rural communities which were badly served. A comment was received as to whether the SWLEP should be assisting these lesser served communities with more radical solutions. The ambition should be 100% coverage and access throughout the area. This is a sector which constantly moves and evolves and the area needs to stay ahead. One of the key actions in the report is to develop skills for the digital workforce. The emphasis is on children and young people, but a question was raised as to whether that was the right approach. With one of the LIS's Grand Challenges being the Ageing Society, should the focus be towards the older population? Aiming at the younger generation to get into digital employment via placements and apprenticeships was essential, as it was felt that University leavers would not necessarily be fit for the world of digital work as the technological environment moves so fast and there is a need to keep pace with developments.</p> <p>A link to the LIS Grand Challenges had commenced and this would be stressed.</p> <p>The outputs from the project were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy document • Evidence base • Brief investment proposition slide pack. 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The Board: NOTED the Swindon and Wiltshire Digital Capabilities Strategy 2018 as presented, and requested it be brought back to a future board meeting incorporating the suggestions made.</p>	Sept 2018
4.4	<p>Cyber Resilience - Science Innovation Audit (SIA) The Cyber Resilience – Science Innovation Audit (SIA) paper was provided for information. The SIA involved Gfirst, The Marches, Worcestershire and SWLEP. Outside of London, the area represented the largest single block of cyber resilience with Special Forces in Herefordshire, UK security GCHQ in Cheltenham, radar technology in Malvern, defence and security at Porton and the MoD Joint Cyber Unit at Corsham. PB made additional comments that the SIA had been submitted to BEIS and that we awaited the outcome of the review as to its use.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the content of this paper and endorsed the activity of the Alliance.</p>	
4.5	<p>Proposals for the Sub-national Transport Body (SNTB)</p> <p>ACre presented to the Board. The presentation can be found on the SWLEP website or by following the link below.</p> <p>https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/board-meetings/2018/25-jul-2018/stbs-swlep-july-2018-v2.pdf?sfvrsn=5db5870d_4</p> <p>The South West had been the last to develop options for a Sub-national Transport Body and there were two options now emerging:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South West Peninsula and • Western Gateway <p>The options would be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval in September 2018. The SNTB would look at both road and rail transport after production of the evidence base. They would be pressing for improved North South connectivity, for example, the A36 Bristol to Southampton, and although Hampshire was not in the Western Gateway grouping, the evidence base would form the basis of the argument.</p> <p>The Chairman noted that solutions emerging elsewhere in the country were for SNTBs covering significantly greater geographical areas, in contrast to the two body solution being proposed for the South West.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked ACre for the presentation and although SWLEP had no formal feed into the final proposal, it could offer opinions.</p> <p>The Board</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	CONSIDERED the content of the report, and comments were made as above.	
4.6	<p>Governance Ministerial Review of LEPs</p> <p>Joe Manning spoke to the meeting. The Review was formally published on 24 July 2018. It had been discussed at the Regional Cabinet in Newcastle on Monday, 23 July 2018 and James Brokenshire MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local government, raised the matter in the House.</p> <p>The year 2021 would see the Government coming out of its Local Growth Fund cycle. The LIS was a formal commitment, demonstrating the direction of travel towards the Shared Prosperity Fund and the Review set out policy expectations of the system.</p> <p>The Ministerial Review of LEPs set out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • roles and responsibilities; • leadership and organisational capacity; • accountability and performance; • geography; and • relationships between LEPs and Mayoral Combined Authorities. <p>The Board welcomed the clarity on Government’s continuing commitment to LEP with refined roles and responsibilities. They were still seen in a partnership role, bringing public and private sectors together for the benefit of the area. The Review demonstrated the framework within which LEPs were expected to operate, whilst allowing a degree of local discretion. There would be increased dialogue with government. The incorporation proposals would give legal status to LEPs and commonality for issues of accountability and scrutiny. The clear legal status would allow Government a formal contracting model. SWLEP was undertaking an analysis of its current structure and how it was performing against the outline of the Report. The results would be made available to the Board. SWLEP had been aiming for an April 2019 deadline for incorporation and this was also in line with the review. Overall, it was felt that SWLEP would deliver on all the recommendations.</p> <p>The next steps would be to consider how to eliminate the geographical overlaps of certain LEPs and produce a proposal to Government by the end of September with full responses expected by the end of October 2018. The Government recognised that this would mean additional work for LEPs, so additional funding would come in this, and next, financial year to assist with the implementation review and investment in organisational capacity. The question of the overall footprint of the SWLEP was raised, and the Board</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>being appropriately monitored. ID responded that DPT was keeping track of the projects and remained confident that deadlines could still be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the RAG rating for the Maltings project –had moved from AG to RED and the narrative was described as “in flux”. ID advised that this simply reflected the ongoing conversations about the nature of the future development. <p>The Chairman asked the attendees to stress to their teams the timetable SWLEP needed to hit for project spend.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the Commissioning Group’s assessment that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of the current status of all LGF projects.</p>	
5.2	<p>Allocation of Funding</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper which would set the scene for further discussions in September. The situation was outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £2.7m had been allocated to two projects, which were not yet live; there was pressure to re-allocate that money for another use, for example, to assist with Salisbury’s recovery from economic shock; there were potential sources of other funding; for instance the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (intended to replace European funding and LGF) and GPIF; a new Cultural Development Fund was to be launched; given the situation, the Board might feel that it needed to give higher priority to the needs of Salisbury and South Wiltshire; and proposals were coming forward to revise, and alter the sequencing of, The Maltings and Central Carpark project. There would be a need to discuss this further in September. <p>The Chairman vocalized the Board’s sympathy for the situation in Salisbury and Amesbury and recognised that the Board would want to commit resources to support recovery. SWLEP had already committed £21m to Salisbury projects for example, at the College and The Maltings, and there was likely to be a request for an additional £1.6m for the latter project. SWLEP should do everything it could to support South Wiltshire, but should take into consideration the total resources available to it and the importance of commitments it had already made.</p> <p>The meeting was advised that the Salisbury Recovery Plan had received Government sign off from the individual Government Departments and they were still heavily involved. ACr explained that Government had offered support for the Recovery Plan, but that there was no outline funding as yet. Recognising the extreme circumstances, the Government would be flexible</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>on outputs and outcomes for the Salisbury projects.</p> <p>To give the Board comfort and confidence it was suggested that the Salisbury Plan be reviewed in September which would detail the repurposing of the economic vision for the south of the county. Some Members of the Board were content to reduce other economic growth opportunities in the north of the county, in order to allocate more for the South, as there would be significant GVA loss in Salisbury.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the issues raised in the discussion of the report: and IDENTIFIED further information required for the discussion and decision-making at the September Board meeting, which included sight of the Salisbury Recovery Plan.</p> <p>Col Dawes and AC left the meeting at 12.30pm.</p>	<p>Sept 2018</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Finance Report – LGD Budget and profiling</p> <p>The paper was taken out of order and discussed ahead of Item 5.2. ID spoke to the paper and quoted a figure of £10.36m forecast underspend at the end of the financial year. There were however opportunities to accelerate spend identified by the Yarnbrook West Ashton project and the Wiltshire College, Lackham project, which would reduce this underspend.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
<p>6.0 6.1</p>	<p>SWLEP Core Activity Marketing and Communications</p> <p>Annual Report</p> <p>TB spoke to the paper and advised that he had received some comments from Board Members who had already viewed the draft Annual Report. Amendments to the draft would be made in time to upload to the SWLEP website and TB requested authority for the Steering Group to have final sign off.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the draft annual report; and AUTHORISED the Annual Report Steering Group to make any final amends which do not make major alterations to the current look and feel of the report.</p>	
<p>7.0</p>	<p>AOB</p>	
	<p>None.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting / Closing remarks</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 19 September 2018 at 9.30am in Room D001 / D001, Wiltshire College, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15 3QD.</p>	
	<p>Future Meetings</p> <p>Wednesday, 28 November 2018 Committee Room 6, Swindon Borough Council Civic Offices, Euclid Street, Swindon, SN2 2JH</p> <p>Meetings for 2019</p> <p>Wednesday, 23 January 2019 – PLEASE NOTE AFTERNOON MEETING Committee Rooms, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER</p> <p>Wednesday, 20 March 2019 Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN</p> <p>Thursday, 23 May 2019 Alamein Suite, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU</p> <p>Wednesday, 24 July 2019 Ceres Hall, The Corn Exchange, Market Place, Devizes, SN10 1BN</p> <p>Thursday, 26 September 2019 Auditorium, Aspire Business Centre, Ordnance Road, Tidworth, SP9 7QD</p> <p>Wednesday, 27 November 2019 Location to be advised</p>	
	<p>Part Two of the meeting (the public not present) remains commercial in confidence</p>	
8.0	<p>Growing Places Infrastructure Fund (GPIF)</p> <p>Conflicts of Interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JM re-iterated his standing Conflict with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; • ACr advised his Conflict with a potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan; PW's declaration that he knew potential beneficiary of a GPIF loan was noted. However, the Chairman felt this was not a sufficient reason for a formal conflict of interest to be recorded. <p>AR, as chair of the GPIF Working Group, spoke to the paper. He explained that owing to Vic O'Brien's resignation, an additional Board member was now required to join the GPIF Working Group.</p> <p>The applications were discussed with the Board.</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>The GPIF Working Group was working to develop the process for administering the smaller loans.</p> <p>An update on the existing GPIF loan was also presented.</p> <p>PB advised that he had received confirmation from AS on his voting for the recommendations.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the four applications presented to move to 'offer' stage; AGREED that further due diligence be undertaken for one applicant to assess if it should proceed to 'offer' stage, with a recommendation to be made to the Board by the GPIF Working Group; APPROVED up to £500,000 to be made available through loans from the GPIF fund to support the on-going recovery from the Salisbury and Amesbury incidents; APPROVED a loan to a company in Salisbury to assist the capital costs associated with the refurbishment and fitting-out of its premises; and APPROVED the ring-fencing of further loan monies to the same company, to be drawn down by the end of 2021, should this be required.</p>	<p>19/09/2018</p>
CLOSE of Part 2 at 12.55pm.		

Immer

19 September 2018