

SCR BUSINESS GROWTH EXECUTIVE BOARD

23rd JANUARY 2018

BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD

No.	Item	Action
	<p><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Neil MacDonald (LEP) – CHAIR Laura Bennett (LEP) Diana Terris (BMBC)</p> <p><u>In Attendance</u> Damien Wilson (RMBC) Tim O’Connell (RMBC) Scott Cardwell (DMBC) Andrew Denniff (BRCoC) Sarah Want (TUoS) Rachel Clark (SCR Exec Team) – for Chris Scholey Helen Lazarus (SCR Exec Team) Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team Lee Viney (SCR Exec Team) – for item 5 Andy Gates (SCR Exec Team) – for item 4 Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Julie Dore (SCC), Chris Scholey (LEP) and Carol Stanfield (SHU)</p>	
1	<p><u>Chair’s Introduction</u></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and set out his vision for how the Board will be operating going forward.</p> <p>This included an expectation to Board will focus its attention on matters of strategic oversight and try to avoid being caught up too much in operational detail. Meetings will be conducted in an open style and questions from attendees will be welcomed</p> <p>It was noted written papers will be taken as read.</p>	

2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>No specific declarations of interest in relation to the matters to be discussed on today's agenda were noted.</p>	
3	<p><u>BGEB Membership</u></p> <p>The Group was provided with an explanation of the Board's membership. It was noted that as well as the statutory Board Members (LEP, CEX and Leaders), there will be standing officer representatives of the 4 SY districts, 2 universities, business representation community (chambers of commerce) and the substantive sub-boards (Trade and Investment, Growth Hub Operations and Business Investment Fund) + Executive Team and Joint Authorities' Governance Unit officers.</p> <p>It was noted the representative of the Growth Hub Operations Board is still to be determined.</p> <p>It was noted additional representatives will be brought in as required.</p> <p>It was noted clarity will be sought regarding Cllr Rose and Dan Swaine's membership intentions</p>	
4	<p><u>LEP Business Engagement</u></p> <p>The Board received a presentation on the LEP's business engagement activities and objectives. This covered how business engagement is used to inform policy and the means via which the opinions of the SCR's business community are captured.</p> <p>The Board discussed the role of the 'sector groups' noting that whilst some are undertaking some good work, the general landscape is somewhat patchy. It was noted the sector groups are not overseen by the Executive Team.</p> <p>It was noted the Exec Team has a number of means of engaging the business community and readily engages the support of business representative organisations such as the Chambers.</p> <p>It was noted the Exec Team also undertakes the quarterly economic survey in partnership with the chambers. This helps to say 'how we are doing' but doesn't necessarily inform policy choices.</p> <p>The Board was advised of what work is undertaken to 'promote the SCR's offer to the businesses we promote, through initiatives</p>	

	<p>such as the Skills Board, Growth Hub, employment pilots and through the promotion of the SCR's investible propositions at events such as MIPIM. It was noted consideration is being given to whether these would be best promoted through a single web presence.</p> <p>It was noted only a fraction of the SCR's c.68k businesses are currently directly engaged; but it is also asserted the SCR is not a business representative organisation and predominantly is an entity that unlocks business growth potential. The Board noted support for the principle the SCR exists to unlock growth.</p> <p>It was suggested the reality of varying opinions means it will be practically impossible to attain a wholly consensus view from the business community on policy matters. There will always be calls asking 'what does the LEP think of this?' but the Board recognised the practical complexities involved with determining such position statements.</p> <p>It was suggested efforts could be introduced to directly engage the region's top c.100 employers but recognised it is sensible to avoid duplicating similar efforts being undertaken by the SCR's local authorities.</p> <p>It was suggested we could be more explicit in promoting the policies crucial to unlocking economic development. LEP Board members could take a more proactive role in helping to strengthen the management of key accounts.</p> <p>It was suggested we could commission an annual business summit to engage the business community more widely and publicly</p> <p>It was suggested lessons could be learnt from other regions where efforts have been made to establish an enthusiastic 'city region business community voice'. It was acknowledged the unique geography of the SCR makes this more of a challenge.</p> <p>Action: Mark, Helen (and Exec Team) to capture the Board's comments regarding engagement and build into delivery planning for 2018/19</p>	
5	<p><u>Digital Action Plan</u></p> <p>A report was received to provide an update on the Digital Action Plan and the proposed next steps.</p> <p>The Board noted general in-principle support for the recommendations contained within the Action Plan, as listed in</p>	

support of the vision and strategic aims, acknowledging there was still much to do in terms of converting these into actual activity.

It was noted the Plan has been intentionally developed with consideration to the government's Digital Strategy ambition.

The Board acknowledged where the intended actions required to achieve the digital vision aren't necessarily within the gift of the SCR and in reality need to be delivered in partnership with other agencies or bodies and often led by the industry itself.

It was agreed it is useful to have a robust evidence base to inform future discussions with delivery partners.

It was suggested the actions might be viewed as 'as expected' and the real issue at hand is determining how it is made a reality and how we get our delivery partners to 'buy into' the SCR's interpretation of a preferred future digital landscape.

It was suggested it may be useful to identify where different people are 'delivering similar things' to what the SCR wants to see delivered, and establish how we might tie into those existing or intended activities, particular where the SCR might be viewed as a contributory partner. This will help avoid duplication of effort and also help the SCR get a better understanding of the realities of what it is best placed to lead on the delivery of itself.

Consideration was given to whether perceptions of the SCR's 'quality of life' offer should be seen as a detraction, and the extent to which this might lead to digital graduates who have studied in the SCR leave and set up businesses elsewhere.

The Board noted support for the proposed next steps, including the convening of an 'industry panel' initiative.

It was suggested more could perhaps be done to make the Plan more specific to the SCR and less generic.

A question was raised regarding whether the recommendations should be deemed finalised from the Board's perspective. It was suggested that they could be given such a status (as they are relatively of the right intention) and would be appropriately refined going forward as more of the detail is sorted out.

The Board noted general support for the intended next steps. Those being to convene industry panel events, engage relevant partners in designing the delivery model, encourage partners to take more of a leadership role on delivering discrete elements of the Plan and to develop a better understanding of where existing

	<p>work (SCR-led and otherwise) contributes to the planned recommendations.</p> <p>It was suggested it would be useful to establish where any available funding would be best invested, perhaps ESIF of other unspent funding streams.</p> <p>The Board considered what should be taken to the LEP Board and when the most appropriate time should be to do this. It was suggested it would be useful to undertake the intended industry panel events to inform a short term action plan and take that to the LEP Board for endorsement and to provide the Board with a summary update of the Digital Plan's development.</p> <p>Action: Exec Team (supported by Laura) to progress the industry panel events.</p> <p>It was asserted the general principle should be that the Plan is seen as owned by the sector itself.</p> <p>It was suggested the Plan is perhaps not very 'SCR-y' and could be read as the ambition for anywhere in the UK. It was therefore suggested it would be useful to make this specific to the SCR if possible.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board notes the content in support of the Digital Action Plan recommendations and support the next steps.</p>	
6	<p><u>Business Growth Plan</u></p> <p>A report was presented inviting the Board to contribute to the development of a targeted Business Growth Plan to oversee the achievement of the SCR's strategic aim to create an international City Region with a higher number of growing businesses, creating more and better jobs through improvements in sectoral productivity driven by targeted support and investment (ref. SCR Inclusive Industrial Strategy).</p> <p>The Board was informed initial ideas were presented to the last LEP Board meeting and received favourable comment and support, with the request the BGEB lead on the development of the draft Plan.</p> <p>It was noted the Business Growth theme hasn't historically benefited from having a bespoke Plan (unlike the SCR's other priority themes) that sits between the SCR Inclusive Industrial Strategy and discrete areas of work e.g. the Growth Hub. It was suggested such a plan would also help to demonstrate how the</p>	

	<p>Business Growth theme is central and supportive of other themes (skills, transport and infrastructure).</p> <p>The Board welcomed the proposal to develop a Plan and noted general in-principle support for the 3 proposed substantive strategy themes: increasing productivity, improving scale-up rates and strengthening supply chains.</p> <p>It was suggested this work should link in with the complementary objectives of the Science and Innovation Board and also be aligned to the SCR Skills Action Plan where appropriate.</p> <p>It was suggested the Plan needs to explicitly recognise the SCR's desire for inclusive growth.</p> <p>It was suggested the network of economic directors should be engaged to help inform the Plan's development.</p> <p>Action: Helen to factor in the Board's comments in developing the draft Plan</p> <p>Action: ALL to submit further comments and ideas</p> <p>The Board noted the long tradition of strategy development and expressed an expectation this Plan will be translated into delivery.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board confirm its support for the development of a Sheffield City Region Business Growth Plan.</p>	
7	<p><u>Trade and Investment Board</u></p> <p>Regarding items 7-9, the Chair suggested the Board's standard expectation should be for the receipt of accompanying written updates members can use ahead of the meetings to familiarise themselves with matters of note.</p> <p>Regarding the activities of the Trade and Investment Board, it was noted Chris Scholey had recently been appointed Chair of the Board.</p> <p>The Board was provided with a summary of the content and objectives of the Trade and Investment Plan. And how this aligns to helping achieve the potential of the SCR's strategic assets.</p>	
8	<p><u>Growth Hub Operations Board</u></p> <p>It was noted the first meeting of the Board will be held shortly. This will be chaired by LEP Board member Alexa Greaves.</p>	

	<p>It was noted Regeneris have been commissioned to undertake a review of the Growth Hub model. This will include a stakeholder consultation exercise.</p> <p>It was confirmed BGEB will receive an update at the start of the commission to provide information regarding the review's scope and a further update at the end of the commission to present the findings.</p>	
9	<p><u>Business Investment Fund (BIF) Panel</u></p> <p>It was reported BIF has been overperforming in respect of its KPIs and it is estimated that for every £1m invested, £5.3m of private sector investment has been levered.</p> <p>It was noted BIF is manageably overcommitted for this year and a request for additional funding has been made to the Combined Authority, suggesting the utilisation of some LGF underspend.</p> <p>It was suggested the success of BIF could lead to the streamlining of some criteria and the incentivisation of supporting the development of higher end jobs. It was noted this and other matters will be captured in a soon to commence BIF review.</p>	
10	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>The Board was informed of plans to consider future business finance and address where innovative investment practices are not particularly prevalent in the SCR.</p> <p>It was noted that DCLG have been engaged in discussions around the South Yorkshire Investment Fund (SYIF) legacy which amounts to c.£15m and is effectively awaiting a decision on its usage.</p> <p>It was reported DCLG have expressed a preference for this fund to be aligned with other Yorkshire legacy funds and managed by Finance Yorkshire. Meetings have therefore been arranged with Finance Yorkshire representatives to ensure the ambitions of the SCR are appropriately recognised (ahead of a report back to DCLG on the proposals).</p>	
11	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>Tuesday 27th February, 2.00pm at Broad Street West, Sheffield.</p>	