

**SCR BUSINESS GROWTH EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**4<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2017**

**BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Paul Houghton, LEP / Grant Thornton – Chair</p> <p><u>In Attendance</u> Chris Scholey, Doncaster Bassetlaw NHS Foundation Trust David Grimes, SCR Exec Team Rachel Clark, SCR Exec Team Dave Hewitt, SCR Exec Team David Shepherd, Barnsley MBC Giles Searby, Keeble Hawson Ruth Adams, SCR Exec Team Lee Viney, SCR Exec Team Andrew Denniff, BRCoC Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Lewis Rose (DDDC), Cllr Julie Dore (SCC), Diana Terris (BMBC), Gavin Baldwin (LEP), Dan Swaine (BoDC / NEDDC), Julie Kenny (Pyronix), Ed Highfield (Creative Sheffield) and Lloyd Snellgrove, SHU</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> February were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>The following matters were noted as arising:</p> <p>5. <u>Digital Action Plan</u> It was confirmed appropriate information regarding the Plan have been fed to MetroDynamics for inclusion in the SEP refresh work.</p> <p>8. <u>SPOKE Updates</u> Regarding Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund, it was noted</p>	

	<p>various meetings have been held or are convened to give appropriate consideration to the various opportunities presented.</p> <p><b>Action: Lee to ensure all Growth Advisors are wholly familiar with the Challenge Fund opportunities</b></p> <p>It was confirmed an SCR response was submitted to the consultation exercise.</p>	LV
3	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>No specific declarations of interest in relation to the matters to be discussed on today's agenda were noted.</p>	
4	<p><b><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></b></p> <p>The Board was advised that given the recent activity around EU membership, DCLG may be doing further calls for bids for ESIF funding, potentially in May, July and November 2017. It was noted this is likely to be the final year for ESIF calls.</p> <p>It was noted officers have assessed options and collated information regarding schemes delivered or 'in the pipeline' for delivery to help inform the identification of new schemes or investment themes.</p> <p>A series of suggestions were therefore provided. These included supply chain activity for specific sectors, increased support for AMID, digital economy and RISE programmes.</p> <p>It was agreed any call would still need to fit with the overall SEP strategic priorities, as identified via the SEP refresh.</p> <p>It was acknowledged the need to find matched funding may be an issue.</p> <p>It was suggested that calls should not be restricted to specific sectors.</p> <p>Support was noted for the supply chain development suggestion.</p> <p><b>Action: Lee to incorporate the Board's comments into developing the SCR's plan to responding to requests for additional funding calls.</b></p>	LV
5	<p><b><u>Improving Business Engagement</u></b></p> <p>Noting the LEP and CA refresh of the SEP and consequent development of associated investment plans, of which business engagement will be a clear priority; a paper was presented</p>	

seeking to stimulate discussion aimed at the consideration of the SCR LEP's approach to broader business engagement where this relates to developing better policy and strategy as opposed to the operational engagement the LEP has via the Growth Hub service.

The report explained the SCR's preferred definition of 'business engagement', suggesting this term be used to describe the interaction between an organisation (almost always a public body/ University) and the private sector and focussed on the benefits of better business engagement in respect of the SCR's ability to make better policies and strategies.

Examples of how this might be achieved were provided.

The Board noted engagement with the SY Chambers of Commerce who have been looking at how the SCR's business engagement ambitions might be achieved through partnership with the Chambers.

Additional consideration was given to the merits of more focussed thematic engagements, geographic engagements and sectoral engagements, together with the pros and cons of more structured relationships with business communities.

It was asserted the LEP is there to help businesses achieve their desired growth, rather than dictate and disseminate policy, and suggested the primary driver for this work should therefore be whatever means of engagement would best enable this ambition. It was also suggested the reality is that 'no amount of engagement will ever be enough'.

The Board acknowledged the 'excellent' engagement rates achieved to date by the Growth Hub.

It was noted that the different sectors have different engagement needs and a variety of wider other-forum associations. Some sectors may therefore welcome proposals for increased engagement and other less so. It was therefore suggested that a sectoral engagement model might be best one of 'offered support' rather than 'structured support imposition' and the sectors should be given the ability to self-organise, building on their strengths.

Hypothetical consideration was given to the notion of a single Chamber of Commerce covering the SCR geography.

It was suggested the cost of managing engagement with the business communities still needs to be taken into consideration.

In summary, it was suggested that the sectoral orientation of business engagements may be best for the SCR, and offers

	<p>should continue to work with sectors to provide support where required and encourage the various sector groups to be wholly representative of all appropriate organisations.</p> <p>It was suggested the Sector Group Chairs Group would be instrumental in helping to facilitate this model and also suggested the Sector Chairs Group may benefit from representation from the LEP private sector members at meetings + other organisations where beneficial.</p> <p><b>Action: Dave H to further explore the ‘Sector Group Chair + model’</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the contents of the report and support for a sectoral-led model of business engagement in the interests of making better SCR policy and strategy.</b></p>	DH
6	<p><b><u>SCR Inward Investment Annual Report 2016/17</u></b></p> <p>A report was received to provide an overview of inward investment activity across the Sheffield City Region for 2016/17.</p> <p>The report covered the approach of the SCR Invest Team to attracting new investment to the city region and performance for the year including notable successes and less fruitful activity. SCR. The report also included planned activity for 2017/18</p> <p>It was suggested 2016/17 had been a strong year for foreign direct investment into the SCR and there have been a number of significant inward investment wins. Final inward investment figures will be confirmed in June / July.</p> <p>The Board was advised that nationally, only the Yorkshire and Humber Region had shown significant inward investment growth over the last year.</p> <p>It was noted 68 inward investment project successes are expected to be confirmed for the year, creating or safeguarding 3,166 jobs. Breakdowns of these projects by district and by sector were provided. Examples of specific investment projects were provided.</p> <p>Welcoming in the figures, the Board discussed the difficulties associated with capturing all job growth and job loss information. It was suggested that good account management and proactive relationships with businesses are the best means of ascertaining accurate information.</p> <p>The Board was advised of planned developments for 2017/18 and provided with the draft calendar of trade shows and exhibitions. Consideration was therefore given to what more the SCR’s</p>	

	<p>'ambassadors' can do to better promote the region abroad and it was noted 3 SHU students have been engaged to undertake research into the role inter-medial organisations have in respect of promotions and marketing.</p> <p>The report noted the SCR has appointed a suitably qualified and experienced Lead Generation Organisation (LGO) for a three year period for the following activities: inward Investment lead generation activities, targeting specific industry sectors, targeting specific Geographical areas, developing and managing a pipeline of opportunities, developing inbound visits of qualified prospects to the SCR, sector based market intelligence and account management and reporting.</p> <p>Information was provided in respect of activities planned in relation to the Northern Powerhouse initiative.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the contents of the report.</b></p>	
7	<p><b><u>Post MIPIM Review</u></b></p> <p>It was reported that of the various themes championed at MIPIM, the urban regeneration event was the best attended. The general level of interest for all events appeared to be linked to how genuinely investable the propositions were considered to be.</p> <p>It was noted there have been a number of lessons learnt including the need to attract more sponsorship and identify more potential investors who are not yet familiar with the SCR.</p> <p>Feedback on the apartment set-up was generally positive and intentions to replicate this model next year were noted.</p> <p>It was suggested that of the various UK delegations, that presented by the Midlands Engine was stand-out, with a single brand, high profile speakers, ministers and business leaders. It was suggested this raises questions around whether the SCR should look to engage with any pan-Yorkshire or pan-Northern Power House model of promotion at future events.</p> <p>The Board acknowledged the need to have more of the logistics organised earlier and noted an expectation that officers will already be on with developing plans for MIPIM 2018.</p> <p><b>Action: Ruth to circulate more information around the emerging plans for MIPIM 2018</b></p> <p>The Board gave consideration to why AMID did not generate as much interest as expected, given the significant size of the site (2000 acres) and its potential. It was suggested future pitches</p>	RA

	perhaps need to be more targeted towards property and land developers.	
8	<p><b><u>SPOKE Updates</u></b></p> <p>A report was received providing updates in respect of the various Growth Hub spokes.</p> <p>Policy objectives, progress to date and planned next steps information was provided in respect of each spoke.</p> <p>The Group asked how the export spoke is being 'driven'. It was suggested this spoke may be accorded with the development of the Trade and Investment Plan.</p> <p>It was requested that a substantive update on the Export spoke be presented at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Action: David G to make arrangements for a presentation on the Export spoke to be received at the next BGEG meeting</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the contents of the spoke updates report are noted.</b></p>	DG
9	<p><b><u>Forward Plan</u></b></p> <p>Provided for information.</p>	
10	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>It was noted the meeting was effectively inquorate due to Board Member absence. Reasons for absence were provided.</p> <p>It was noted that quoracy requirements and the need to help members manage diaries would be addressed as part of the SCR governance review.</p>	
112	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2.00pm at Broad Street West, Sheffield.</p>	