



SOUTH EAST
LOCAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIP

STRATEGIC BOARD AGENDA PACK

Thursday 16th July 2020
Zoom Video Conference



Agenda

Item 1	14:30	Welcome	Chris Brodie	
Item 2	14:35	Minutes from 12th June meeting Declarations of Interest Matters arising	Chris Brodie	Pg. 3
Item 3	14:45	Transport East <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decision to agree representatives	Adam Bryan	Pg. 8
Item 4	14:55	Getting Building Fund <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decision to agree £85m project package	Chris Brodie	Pg. 10
Item 5	15:25	AOB and Close		

Information Pack Items

Results of the Electronic Procedure

Future Strategic Board meeting dates:

4th September, 2nd October; 11th December;

19th March 2021

Minutes of Strategic Board 12th of June 2020

Attendees

Chris Brodie	Chair
Sarah Dance	Deputy Chair
Adam Bryan	CEO
Aideen Sadler	Opportunity South Essex
Ana Christie	Team East Sussex
Angela O'Donoghue	Further Education representative
Carol Ford	Kent and Medway Economic Partnership
Claire Lewis	Success Essex
Clive Soper	Team East Sussex
Clr David Finch	Essex County Council
Clr David Monk	Kent District/Borough/City Councils representative
Clr Graham Butland	Essex District/Borough/City Councils representative
Clr Keith Glazier	East Sussex County Council
Clr Mark Coxshall	Thurrock Council
Clr Rodney Chambers	Medway Council
Clr Roger Gough	Kent County Council
Clr Ron Woodley	Southend Borough Council
Geoff Miles	Kent and Medway Economic Partnership
Graham Peters	Team East Sussex
Jo James	Kent and Medway Economic Partnership
Liz Gibney	Kent and Medway Economic Partnership
Matthew Arnold	Kent and Medway Economic Partnership
Miles Adcock	Success Essex
Penny Shimmin	Social Enterprise Representative
Perry Glading	Opportunity South Essex
Prof Karen Cox	Higher Education Representative

Apologies: Clr Rob Gledhill

Other attendees:

Alex Riley	SELEP Secretariat	Jo Simmons	SELEP Secretariat
Amy Bernardo	ECC	Joanne Cable	Medway Council
Amy Ferraro	SELEP Secretariat	Iwona Bainbridge	SELEP Secretariat
Andrew Metcalf	Maxim PR	Kerry Clarke	KCC
Anna Eastgate	Thurrock Council	Kim Forward	Hastings Borough Council
Ben Hook	RDC	Lee Burchill	KCC
Carmen Nicoara	King's College London	Lorna Norris	ECC
Carole Barron	University of Kent	Louise Aitken	SELEP Secretariat
Charlotte Moody	ECC	Mark Jones	SELEP Secretariat
Chris Burr	Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	Marwa Al-Qadi	ESCC
Claudia McKibbin	Essex County Council	Michael Payne	KCC
Dave Evans	ESCC	Paul Chapman	ECC
Ellie Clow	SELEP Secretariat	Peter Shakespear	ECC
Floortje Hoette	Produced in Kent	Richard Dawson	East Sussex County Council
Gary MacDonnell	ECC	Sarah Nurden	KMEP

Helen Dyer	SELEP Secretariat	Sharon Spicer	SELEP Secretariat
Helen Russell	SELEP Secretariat	Stephanie Mitchener	ECC
Hilary Knight	Natural Partnerships CIC	Stephen Taylor	Thurrock Council
Howard Davies	SELEP Secretariat	Steve Evison	ECC
Iain McNab	CLGU	Susan Berdo	KCC
Ian Lewis	Opportunity South Essex	Sylvana Jones	KCC
Nicole Wood	ECC Executive Director of Finance and Technology	Jim Wilkinson	SELEP Secretariat
Rhiannon Mort	SELEP Secretariat	Jess Steele	White Rock Neighbourhood Ventures
Suzanne Bennett	SELEP Secretariat	Jane Hartnell	Hastings Borough Council
Tristan Smith	ECC	Vimbai Foroma	ECC
Vivien Prigg	ECC	Zoe Gordon	ECC

This meeting was held as video conference and a recording can be found by [clicking here](#); the timestamp of the start of the discussion for each item is indicated in brackets

Item 1: Welcome and introduction

1.1. Chris Brodie welcomed the Board to the virtual meeting.

Item 2: Minutes of last meeting, declarations of interest, matters arising (4'58" timestamp on video)

2.1. The Board **agreed** the minutes of the last meeting.

2.2. Chris Brodie declared an interest relating to the discussion of the funding of the Secretariat.

2.3. Sarah Dance declared the following interests:

- i) an interest relating to the discussion of the funding of the Secretariat;
- ii) a pecuniary interest in England's Creative Coast and will not take part in any relevant discussions that may arise; and
- iii) her husband is working with Canterbury Christ Church University.

2.4. Jo James declared an interest relating to the Growth Hub as Kent Invicta Chambers is the contractor for the Kent and Medway Growth Hub.

2.5. Karen Cox declared an interest relating to the Kent and Medway Medical School. She will leave the meeting for this part of the discussion.

2.6. There was a general discussion regarding providing a response to the MHCLG call to projects received shortly before the meeting.

Item 3: COVID-19 Economic Intelligence Update (26'00")

3.1. The Board **noted** the contents of the Economic Intelligence pack.

3.2. Regular intelligence updates will continue to be provided, focusing on those areas of most relevance to the Board.

Item 4: Summary: COVID-19 Impact and Options for SELEP (37'45")

4.1. The Board **noted** the summary information in advance of considering items 4a, 4b and 4c.

Item 4: A- Capital Programme Impact Analysis (41'15")

- 4.1. The Board **agreed** that the Accountability Board can agree to award the funding to new projects, if the Local Authority can identify an alternative LGF project to accept a charge over the project, equivalent to the value of the new project, until the final third of funding is confirmed by Central Government. For example, for £4m LGF to be awarded to the Kent Medical School for spend in the next few months, KCC would put a £4m charge against an alternative LGF project, until the final third of funding is confirmed by Central Government.
- 4.2. Where it is not possible to put a charge over an alternative LGF project or the local authority chooses not to pursue this option, the project can come forward to the Accountability Board for funding approval but the funding will be conditional upon the final third of LGF being received from Central Government.
- 4.3. The Board **noted** that under agenda item 4c, the Board is asked to use £3.525m Growing Places Fund (GPF) to bridge the gap between the LGF currently committed by the Accountability Board and the funding which has been received from MHCLG to date. Should HM Government pay the final third of the capital grant in this financial year, the £3.525m will be returned to the GPF pot. If the Board do not agree to repurpose £3.525m GPF, as set out under agenda item 4c, the Board will need to identify additional projects to bear the £3.525m LGF risk; this funding will only be available to the partner authority if the remaining third of LGF is transferred.
- 4.4. The Board is **agreed** to enter into updated Service Level Agreements for the transfer of LGF, as set out in section 6 and in the form as substantially similar to the terms set out in Appendix E, and delegate authority to the CEO and COO to finalise the terms of the agreement.
- 4.5. The Board is **endorsed** the use of 'Option 4' capital swaps with local authority capital programmes to demonstrate the spend of LGF within 2020/21, as set out in section 9 below.
- 4.6. The Board **agreed** to prioritise the NIAB project over the Colchester grow-on project.
- 4.7. The following comment was noted in relation to this report from Rother District Council relating to the Bexhill Enterprise Park North:

“While the first part of the mitigation refers to the appeal it does not provide the full picture. RDC offered (a year ago) to pay for a masterplan of this site in order that the plan submitted could be adjusted to meet the NE Bexhill supplementary Planning document (SPD). This was rejected by Seachange Sussex (SCS). However, it is a mitigation factor that should be recorded that could be undertaken in order to meet the drawdown timescales. The mitigation should be that SCS submit a masterplan and revised planning application that confirms with the NE Bexhill SPD. RDC offered to pay for this work and to work with SCS so that this was delivered”.

Item 4: B- GPF Project Prioritisation (1h30'46")

- 4.1. The Board agreed the following prioritised GPF pipeline of projects:

Project	Federated Area	GPF ask (£)	Cumulative total (£)
Green Hydrogen	KMEP	3,470,000	3,470,000
Observer Building (Phase 1)	TES	1,750,000	5,220,000
Barnhorn Green (Phase 1)	TES	1,750,000	6,970,000
Wine Innovation Centre	KMEP	600,000	7,570,000
Cockle Wharf	OSE	3,500,000	11,070,000
Herne Relief Road	KMEP	3,500,000	14,570,000
No Use Empty South Essex	OSE	1,000,000	15,570,000



No Use Empty Commercial	KMEP	2,000,000	17,570,000
Observer Building (Phase 2)	TES	1,616,500	19,186,500
Barnhorn Green (Phase 2)	TES	1,750,000	20,936,500
No Use Empty Residential	KMEP	2,500,000	23,436,500

- 4.2. The Board **noted** that the award of funding to the GPF projects will be considered under agenda item 4c.
- 4.3. The Board **agreed** that should the Board decide to prioritise any GPF projects for investment under agenda item 4c, that a further credit check is completed prior to any funding being awarded to third party scheme promoters by the Accountability Board.
- 4.4. The Board **agreed** that should the Board decide to prioritise any GPF projects for investment under agenda item 4c, that the project Business Cases must be presented to Accountability Board for funding approval within 6 months of this meeting.
- 4.5. The Board **agreed** that the prioritised GPF pipeline of projects will be used to identify the next priority projects to be included within the GPF programme, under the following circumstances:
- i) in the event that projects prioritised by the Board for investment under agenda item 4c don't receive funding approval from Accountability Board within 6 months; and
 - ii) to facilitate the reinvestment of any GPF repayments made against existing projects in 2020/21 and 2021/22.

Item 4: C- COVID-19 GPF Options (2h17'58")

- 4.1. The Board **agreed** Option C; GPF Round 3 should be part funded with the projects on the prioritised list being funded to a value agreed by Board and the remainder diverted to the other activities below:
- i) allocate £1 million funding to establish a revenue reserve to support the SELEP Secretariat operating budget during financial years 2021/22 and 2022/23;
 - ii) allocate £1 million funding to establish an extended Sector Support Fund programme to operate in 2020/21 and 2021/22 and to add an additional criterion to the programme criteria that requires projects to demonstrate their contribution to COVID-19 recovery;
 - iii) allocate £2 million funding to establish a COVID-19 Skills Fund to support COVID-19 recovery, this potentially could be a grant fund or a loan fund or a combination thereof;
 - iv) allocate £2.4 million funding to establish a COVID-19 SME Business Support Fund to support COVID-19 recovery; and
 - v) allocate £3.6 million funding to establish an LGF COVID-19 LGF Contingency Fund that would underwrite the risks to the LGF programme that have arisen due to the changes to the payment of the capital grant by HM Government. Any funding allocated to this contingency would revert to the GPF pot if and when the final third of LGF monies are paid.
- 4.2. This will be subject to Accountability Board approval to set up the budgets (not the establishment of the funds or the use of the funding in this way).
- 4.3. The Board **noted** that repurposing GPF to other funding options will reduce the value of the recycled loan fund available to support future rounds of GPF.

Item 5: Impact of COVID-19 on Higher Education Sector (2h50'47")

- 5.1. The Board **agreed** to be a voice speaking for the value that the University presence brings to any given region and urgently take the impact of Covid-19 on the U9 and wider higher education sector to government.
- 5.2. The Board **noted** the impact of Covid-19 on the U9 and their impaired capacity to respond to the economic and social recovery of the region.
- 5.3. The Board **noted** the breadth of support the U9 group can bring to the recovery of the region.

QUORUM WAS LOST AFTER ITEM 5 (3h00'00").

THE FOLLOWING DECISIONS WILL BE CONDUCTED VIA ELECTRONIC PROCEDURE

Item 6: Growth Hub Update and ERDF Legacy Funding

- 6.1. The Board is asked to **agree** the ERDF Legacy Funding proposal to provide support for businesses looking to pivot/ adapt during economic recovery.
- 6.2. The Board is asked to **note** SELEP's current Growth Hub model

Item 7: Sector Support Fund Applications

- 7.1. The Board is asked to:
 - i) **note** the amount of Sector Support Funding available for projects is £206,500 which would be insufficient to fund the three projects that have been put forward to the Board;
 - ii) **endorse** the following projects which have been assessed as meeting the SSF eligibility criteria for funding:
 - Delivering skills of the future through teaching: teaching for growth (extension proposal) (£76,000); and
 - Buy Local South East (£69,510), subject to verbal confirmation at the Board meeting that the Project has received endorsement from the Federated Boards;
 - iii) **note** that a further application for funding has been received for the SE Export Development (SEED) (£129,860) project which is not recommended for approval at this time, as not all the eligibility criteria has been met;
 - iv) **agree** that England's Creative Coast be allowed to extend its delivery by one year; and
 - v) **note** the update on the delivery of the SSF programme.

Item 3: Nomination of SELEP representative on Transport East Forum

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Strategic Board (the Board) endorsement for a new SELEP representative for the Transport Forum (Forum) of Transport East.

2. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Board is asked to:

- 3.1.1. agree that Perry Glading, Chair of Opportunity South Essex Federated Board, will represent SELEP on the Forum of Transport East
- 3.1.2. agree that Trevor Scott, board member of Success Essex Federated Board, will act as Deputy.
- 3.1.3. note that George Kieffer formerly the SELEP Board representative to the Transport East Forum stood down from the Transport East Forum in March 2020.

4. Background

- 5.1 Transport East is the Sub-National Transport Body for Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Southend and Thurrock. It provides a single voice for the region's councils, business leaders and partners on transport strategy and strategic transport investment priorities.
- 5.2 The strategic direction for Transport East is led by the Transport Forum, with membership of the Forum including representatives from local authorities, LEPs, Chambers' of Commerce and delivery partners (such as Highways England and Network Rail).
- 5.3 Main areas of work have been identified for Transport East in the short-term, including;
- 7.3.1. Establishing Transport East as an effective Sub-National Transport Body (STB) – currently scoping the requirements of a long-term business plan and funding proposal, to ensure a successful, effective and well-run STB which will champion the aspirations of its partners.
- 7.3.2. Transport East evidence base and Strategy – Plans are currently underway to initiate engagement this summer on an ambitious, focused and coherent Transport Strategy, based on evidence, aligned to national goals and reflecting the ambitions of the region. A recently commissioned carbon reduction 'deep dive' with key employers and organisations is being completed. It is also developing proposals to support partners on their shared Covid-19 recovery challenges, including passenger transport and active travel
- 7.3.3. Investment and Delivery Planning – developing a pipeline and delivery plan for the regions transport investment priorities, aligned to the Transport Strategy, supporting local authorities and infrastructure providers to lobby for the development, funding, acceleration of priority projects.
- 7.3.4. Partnership, Communication and Advocacy – A communication plan is being constructed to ensure Transport East speaks with a single voice for the constituent partners, with priorities communicated loudly, credibly and effectively via a close working relationship with the government and other sub national bodies

5.4 The Forum will review progress on the 100-day plan at its meeting on 22 July 2020. A link to the 100 day plan can be viewed [here](#)

7. The SELEP Board Representative

- 7.1 The previous SELEP representative on the Forum, George Kieffer, retired from the Board on 20 March 2020 and, as a result, ceased to be eligible to be SELEP's representative in the Forum so stood down, therefore SELEP's position on the Forum has become vacant.
- 7.2 Transport East is currently an informal partnership but with an aspiration to move toward full Sub-National Transport Body statutory status. SELEP will be kept up to date on the process for seeking statutory status to ensure the necessary SELEP governance arrangements are in place for the SELEP representative on the Forum. In the meantime, whilst the Forum operates as an informal partnership, the Board is asked to agree a SELEP representative. The Board is permitted to appoint anyone to act as their representative on the Forum.
- 7.3 The SELEP Board representative will be required to represent SELEP on the Forum and can expect to be involved in the following activities:
- 13.3.1. attend (virtually or in person) four Forum meetings per year;
 - 13.3.2. attend an annual summit; and
 - 13.3.3. attend additional workshops, to inform the development of the transport strategy
- 7.4 The two SELEP Federated Boards covered by the Transport East geography (Success Essex and Opportunity South Essex) recently worked together to secure the nominations, as put forward in this report.
- 7.5 The Board is asked to agree that the SELEP representative on the Transport East Forum will be Perry Glading, as a SELEP Director. However, recognising the time pressures, it is proposed that Trevor Scott, a member of the Success Essex Federated Board, will attend a majority of the Forum meetings as Deputy.
- 7.6 Updates will be provided to the Board on the activities of Transport East as milestones are reached on the development of the transport strategy and as the processes are put in place to seek formal statutory status.

8. Accountable Body Comments

- 8.1 There are no comments from the Accountable Body on this report.

Author: Howard Davies

Position: SELEP Capital Programme Officer

Contact details: howard.davies@southeastlep.com

Item 4: Getting Building Fund – our £85m package

1. Purpose

- 1.1 SELEP have been allocated up to £85m from HM Government’s new ‘Getting Building Fund’ and the Strategic Board (the Board) is asked to agree the projects that will be put forward to HM Government (HMG) to be funded through the allocation.
- 1.2 Local federated areas have been developing their lists over the last 10 working days and the federated area Chairs have met twice with the Chair and Deputy Chair to discuss the overall SELEP package.
- 1.3 Simon Clarke MP has written to all LEPs indicating that we need to work with officials and submit our package to government by **Friday 17th July**. This meeting represents the end of SELEP’s identification of projects and the list, or a version of the list, in Appendix A will be issued to government shortly after this meeting.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to:
 - 1.1.1. Note the strict criteria from government as set out in section 3.
 - 1.1.2. Agree SELEP’s project package to a value at, or just under, £85m. *An indicative list is set out in Appendix A for consideration by the Board*, noting that full approval by Accountability Board in the same manner to LGF projects is required before investment is made.
 - 1.1.3. Note that a reserve list of projects will be presented to October Board in order that any projects agreed by Strategic Board now that can’t proceed for any reason, can be swapped for an alternative prioritised project. This will be dependent on HMG providing assurances that projects can be swapped under the conditions of the Getting Building Fund
 - 1.1.4. Note the administration costs of this addition to the SELEP Capital Programme, the cost of taking projects through the Independent Technical Evaluation (ITE) process in particular. It should also be noted that there will be an increased cost to be met by the sponsoring and delivery organisations as they are required to undertake monitoring and evaluation. There is no indication that HMG will fund these costs.
 - 1.1.5. Note that the Assurance Framework will require revision to update for the assessment of these projects. This will be done following consultation with Accountability Board in accordance with the SELEP Assurance Framework.

3. Background

- 3.1 Government have been consistently clear that this new funding opportunity is to be used strictly for projects which can be delivered within a very restricted timeline and must be substantially complete by 31 March 2022. It is envisaged that the projects will therefore play an important and immediate role in the positive reset of the national economy post-COVID.

- 3.2 Following the submission of the selected SELEP projects agreed by Board on 18 June 2020, an initial assessment of those projects has been carried out by Government officials and a RAG rating was applied. The specific criteria of this assessment have not been shared but the focus has been on deliverability in the specified timescale. Officials have shared their assessment of the projects from the list that they have rated Green or Amber-Green. This can be found at Appendix B.
- 3.3 Given the short timescales for delivery, Cities and Local Growth Unit (CLGU) have somewhat steered us away from large infrastructure projects, to focus on projects which are more modest in scale and can be delivered at a faster pace. Projects which help support the revitalisation of town centres are also encouraged by officials.
- 3.4 It is not only expected that the project will be delivered within 18 months but also that the project benefits follow in short order. As such, the Board may wish to consider the pace of benefit realisation as part of the selection of schemes, to ensure maximum impact in creating jobs and boosting the economy in the short term.
- 3.5 Communications from Government officials has included the following expectations:
- a. We need to agree the projects that will be put forward for funding by Friday 17th July
 - b. As is the case with Local Growth Fund (LGF), LEPs will be responsible for the value for money and local delivery of the projects as set out in Local Assurance Frameworks
 - c. **The funding needs to be spent *in full* in the two financial years.**
 - d. Given the oversubscription to the fund and the variation of project quality, officials are looking to ensure that the best projects are selected. They have been given these parameters:
 - Projects must be from the list submitted in response to the Secretary of State's letter
 - Projects must meet the deliverability and strategic fit criteria set out in the letter
 - Projects which aren't on the Green/Amber-Green list supplied by CLGU, can only be considered by exception.
 - e. As far as possible, officials want to ensure that as many of the projects as possible that make it to the final list will have strong delivery and spend *this* financial year (i.e. up to 31st March 2021). HM Treasury are pushing for a front-loading this financial year, therefore officials are looking to test where it is possible to revise spend profiles and bring forward spend as much as possible, perhaps back-loading other local funding contributions. Officials will need to demonstrate to HM Treasury that they have had those conversations locally.
- 3.6 The message from HMG is that funding cannot slip beyond the stated end date of 31 March 2022 and there is likely to be clawback provision made in the grant determination. Further details on grant terms and conditions haven't be shared at time of writing it is not known how the funding will be phased across the two financial years and whether there is flexibility on how the funds can be applied across those two financial periods. To avoid the clawback of funding by HMG, firm assurances will be sought from scheme promoters as to the deliverability of the project put forward. The clawback of funding would not only have a damaging reputation impact, for SELEP and delivery partners, but would also result in funding shortfalls and potential abortive costs being incurred.
- 3.7 The risk of clawback will be passed by SELEP and the Accountable Body to the upper tier authorities via a Grant Agreement, the risk will not be borne by SELEP or the Accountable Body.

- 3.8 All projects which are identified for funding will be required to develop a robust business case and complete the Independent Technical Evaluation (ITE) process, prior to funding being awarded by the Accountability Board. The independent evaluation of projects is a requirement from Central Government. The scrutiny of the projects prior to Accountability Board consideration will not only consider the case for investment but also challenge the assumptions including within project delivery schedules.
- 3.9 Given the pressing time constraints, scheme promoters will be required to bring forward a business case to Accountability Board by the end of 2020, for funding approval. Recommendations for funding approval will only be made to the Accountability Board for projects which have full planning consent, security of all other funding sources, a delivery schedule showing the ability to deliver the projects within 18 months from now, and where no other major delivery constraints are identified. If projects which are selected by the Board are unable to satisfy these requirements, funding will fall to the next project on the pipeline which will be formed from the reserve list if that is allowable under the grant conditions. If this is not allowable, funds will be returned to HMG.
- 3.10 Where project sponsors identify that projects cannot come forward in the timescales available projects should be withdrawn immediately. Any reserve list projects, should project swaps be allowable, will have a very short timeline from approval to delivery which will greatly restrict the types of projects that could come forward.

4. Projects identified by HMG

- 4.1 Reflecting the strong focus on fast delivery and strategic fit, Whitehall officials provided us with an 'initial list' of projects which they favour due to their good alignment with government's aims for the fund. This is not in ranked order:

Project	Location	Funding sought
Transport and Logistics Institute	Grays / OSE	£0.6m
Swan Modular Housing	Basildon / OSE	£4.53m
Britton Farm Redevelopment Learning Skills & Employment Hub	Chatham / KMEP	£2.3m
Tindal Square, Chelmsford	Chelmsford / Success Essex	£0.75m
Public, Maritime and Sustainable Technology Hub – UTC	Newhaven / TES	£1.3m
Eastbourne Fisherman's Quay	Eastbourne / TES	£1.08m
Resort Studio	Margate / KMEP	£4.44m
Enterprise Centre for Horizon 120 Business Park	Braintree / Success Essex	£7m
Jaywick market and commercial space	Clacton / Success Essex	£1.972m
New Performing and Production Digital Arts Facility at North Kent College	Dartford / KMEP	£12.625m
		£36.597m

- 4.2 They have also noted their interest in the following projects:

- Riding Sunbeams, Solar Railways (£3.75m, East Sussex)

- Local Full Fibre Network (£2.5m, Essex)
- Connecting Rural Kent and Medway (£6.407m, Kent & Medway)
- Full Fibre Broadband – Rural (£0.68m, Essex)
- Observer Building, Hastings (£3.54m, East Sussex)

4.3 This takes the notional total of ‘illustrative’ projects to £53.474m.

Federated areas have been positioned to use these projects as the starting point for local discussions as, clearly, a clear alignment with this original list will give us a strong chance to agree our overall package with government in the timescales specified.

5. Process

- 5.1 On the 3rd July, the SELEP CEO instigated a process which necessitated federated area prioritisation during the week beginning 6th July along with two separate meetings of the SELEP Chair, Deputy Chair and Federated Area Chairs (with government officials). Those Chair meetings sought to compile the overall package on the basis of the inputs from federated boards.
- 5.2 The Board is asked to agree the package in Appendix A, noting the government’s criteria repeated in this paper and the spirit of the I letter from Robert Jenrick which is included as Appendix C.
- 5.3 It should be noted that the projects identified in the package will move quickly through to the Accountability Board through the steps indicated in SELEP’s Assurance Framework. When funding is confirmed and the Grant Agreements are signed, our normal processes will be in place and the responsibilities for the discharge of funding and any clawback payments will be passed to the project sponsors through Grant Agreements in the accepted way.

6. Other considerations

- 6.1 This extension to the capital programme is unlikely to be accompanied by revenue funding from HMG. There is therefore an issue of the additional costs of administering the fund and how they are covered.
- 6.2 It is estimated that the cost of taking all the projects on the proposed list through the Independent Technical Evaluation process in the very compressed period available would be in excess of £250,000. This cannot be afforded from existing budgets without significantly scaling back other project activity. Other options for funding are being explored with Government and the potential of repurposing other funding, although this will require further approval by Strategic Board.
- 6.3 The short timescales for the funding to be deployed and the projects delivered will place strain on the SELEP team, Accountable Body and local partners. In seeking additional funding from the Getting Building Fund, partner authorities are encouraged to consider the resource implications at a local level, to ensure delivery teams and wider support functions, such as legal and finance, are well placed to respond to the short timescales involved.

7. Accountable Body Comments

- 7.1 The Government have not yet provided confirmation of all the conditions of the funding to be agreed or advised on the timing of the receipt of the funding.
- 7.2 The Accountable Body is only able to allocate funding that meets the conditions of funding, has been agreed in accordance with the SELEP Assurance Framework and has been received by the Accountable Body. All funding will be transferred under a grant agreement which is expected to

include provisions for clawback should funding not be utilised in the required timescales or in line with the decisions of the Accountability Board.

- 7.3 A requirement of the Assurance Framework is that all Projects must have a business case that is subject to an Independent Technical Evaluation (ITE). The costs associated with this review cannot be met by the GBF itself as this funding is expected to be allocated as a Capital grant by HMG; ITE costs can't be capitalised. The report estimates that the total ITE costs for all business cases could cost in excess of £250,000. The 2020/21 approved budget does not include these costs as they were unknown at the time the budget was agreed; this means that other planned activities are likely to be needed to be scaled back, should additional funding not be made available by HMG or alternative funding identified.
- 7.4 Funding allocations are also expected to include a requirement for monitoring and evaluation of outputs and outcomes, for which there is currently no indication that revenue funding support will be available and will have to be met by the delivery body.
- 7.5 It is a requirement of the submission to Government that the s151 Officer of the Accountable Body affirms the deliverability of the Project Spend in 2020/21 and 2021/22. By inference, this sign-off is also confirming that any match-funding set out in the return is available.
- 7.6 To enable this sign-off to be undertaken by the s151 Officer of the Accountable Body, this assurance is being sought from the respective s151 Officers from the Partner Local Authorities in relation to the Projects in their areas. The s151 officer of the Accountable Body will only be able to provide assurances to HMG up to the level provided by the Partner Authorities in their returns.

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A- Proposed £85m Project Package
- 8.2 Appendix B-List of projects from Long list flagged as Green/Amber-Green by CLGU
- 8.3 Appendix C- Letter from Secretary of State, Robert Jenrick dated 20 June 2020
- 8.3 Appendix D- Full spreadsheet of Project Package

Author: Adam Bryan

Position: Chief Executive Officer

Contact details: adam.bryan@southeastlep.com, 07884 475191