

ESSEX BUSINESS BOARD: Minutes of meeting 18th March 2019

6pm – 8pm

Room MAB-101 Lord Ashcroft Building

Anglia Ruskin University

Present:

David Rayner (Chair), Birkett Long LLP

Adam Bryan, Essex County Council

Fiona Bodle, Anglia Ruskin University

Andrew Campling, BT

Dominic Collins, Essex County Council

Vanessa Cuthill, University of Essex

Haydon Yates, Harlow Enterprise Zone


Stuart James, Wilkin & Sons

Joel John, Essex County Council

Cllr Gagan Mohindra, Essex County Council

Rosie Powley, Essex County Council

	Item	Notes:
1.	Welcome and Introductions (Chair)	DR welcomed board members. Apologies were received from: Ian Vipond George Kieffer Mike Gilbert Dawn Redpath
2.	Declaration of Interests (All)	The following declarations of interest were declared during the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr GM and FB regarding involvement with the Digital Innovation Zone (Item 4)• VC regarding involvement with The Parkside Phase 3 scheme (Item 6)

3.	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising (Chair)	<p>Chair reviewed minutes from the previous meeting. Minutes were agreed by all.</p>  <p>Final EBB 03122018 Minutes.docx</p>
4.	SELEP Update (Adam Bryan)	<p>AB provided the board with an update from SELEP:</p> <p><u>LEP Review</u></p> <p>The SELEP Strategic Board will need to move to a membership of 20 plus 5 co-opted members to become compliant with the LEP review. To date 22 votes have been received for the proposed change and 4 votes have been received against the proposed change.</p> <p>To progress the new board composition two options are being discussed; 1) discussed and agreed internally by the SELEP Strategic Board Members 2) To commission an external review.</p> <p>Discussions took place on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC felt that the budget of 50K (allocated for an external consultant to undertake this piece of work) was high. • AB assured the board that if this option was taken forward that SELEP will be looking to do this work as cost effective as possible. • FB added that if an external consultant is commissioned the outcomes must be accepted and taken forward by the board. DC agreed. • AC asked for further clarification on the private/ public split of the 20 voting members and the 5 elected members. AB clarified that governments expectation is that the board of 20 members will be required to be comprised of 6 public sector members

		<p>and 14 private sector members. The additional 5 (co-opted) members will be required to have a maximum of 2 public sectors representatives (8 public sector representatives in total).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC felt that a board comprised of 20% co-opted members is a high. • Gender diversity of the board membership will also be a significant and on-going piece of work. • DC said that clarification was required regarding the impact of the LEP review on Federated boards. • AB highlighted the risk to future funding if this issue is not resolved. • SJ added that he would vote for the independent review. <p><u>Local Industrial Strategy Update</u></p> <p>AB presented the below PowerPoint to the board</p> <div data-bbox="810 1377 866 1440" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>LIS_SBoard_220319_v1.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The production of a Local Industrial Strategy is a key priority for LEPs and will assist LEPs to bid for the future Shared Prosperity Fund. • The South East LEP 'Smarter Faster Together' document will form the beginning of the SELEP LIS and has been launched digitally.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence base requirements for the LIS is far greater than what previous requirements would have been. • The South East LEP is in wave three of producing a LIS. Some LEPs in previous waves have already produced their LIS and lessons learned can be made from these. <p>DC added that a LIS / Productivity Strategy is to be completed for Essex. <u>Action RP to include this as an agenda item for discussion at the board meeting.</u></p> <p>Discussion took place around to what extend an Essex LIS will need to reflect governments requirements. AB added that the Essex LIS should reflect exactly what is needed for Essex, the SELEP LIS will be required to more directly address Governments requirements.</p> <p>AC shared concern regarding local LIS documents not aligning to the LEP LIS and it was agreed that all strategies need to be aligned.</p> <p>A question was asked if a local LIS was needed and if the LEP LIS should be an overarching strategy for all areas. DC added that in a LEP of four recognised federated geographies, local level LISs are needed.</p> <p>FB added that the Digital Innovation Zone has data that could potentially support this work. <u>Cllr Gagan Mohindra and FB declared an interest as part of the Board.</u></p>
5.	<u>For Decision:</u> Review of EBB / ESB Membership (Dominic Collins / All)	<p>DC invited discussion on the below proposal to undertake an open and transparent recruit to a new consolidated board for North, Central and West Essex in line with National Assurance Framework requirements</p> <p>To agree: That the current board will remain in place until recruitment to the new board and chair has been completed.</p>




EBB Board Proposal
18.03.19.docx

The following points were raised:

- DR suggested the benefit of having one greater Essex Federated Board.
- The challenge around the geographical coverage of the skills agenda. ESB previously covered greater Essex whereas the refreshed federated board will cover north, west and mid Essex.
- AC added some of the current members of the ESB sit on the board to represent South Essex. DR responded that these individuals can take part in the SELEP Skills Advisory Panels.
- VC concerned about losing engaged businesses.
- FB added it was disappointing to see that universities had not been mentioned in the proposal paper and that universities can play a key role in supporting the secretariat of the new board. **ACTION DC and FB to have a follow up conversation regarding the role of universities and the new board.**
- DB also raised that he hopes there will be a role for the business membership bodies on the new board.
- HY added that the board needs to improve the communication around what the private sector can gain from taking part.
- DC reiterated that the formation of the new board is aimed at bringing all positive aspects into one refreshed board.

DR overall concluded with the conversation and agreed happy to proceed.

6.	LGF3b Update Information/Discussion (Joel John / All)	<p>JJ provided the group with the below LGF3b update:</p> <p> EBB Agenda Item - LGF 3b update.docx</p> <p><u>VC declared a conflict of interest regarding The Parkside Phase 3 Scheme</u> and shared that the project had received no feedback from Steers following the meetings with Steers on 21st January.</p> <p>AB added that the role of the federated board should be to help ensure that strategic projects are put forward.</p> <p>AC suggested that the federated board could invite LGF3b scheme promoters to a meeting to present on their projects to board members.</p>
7.	AOB (All)	<p>JJ provided a capital project update.</p> <p><u>ACTION Georgia Searle to be invited to the next EBB meeting to provide explanation around delivery areas across Essex.</u></p> <p>AC asked if it is possible for SELEP papers to be circulated with enough time to read in advance of the federated board meeting and asked if SELEP papers could be shortened with the finer detail added to the Annex.</p>