



**European Union**

European Structural  
and Investment Funds

**European Structural and Investment Funds  
2014 - 2020**

**Growth Programme for England**

## **ESI Funds Growth Programme Board**

### **Review of Local Area ESI Funds Sub-committee Membership**

*(NB: Annex B of this document will print in A3)*

#### **Purpose:**

To provide the Board with a report on the outcome of the review of LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee membership.

#### **Recommendation(s):**

That the Growth Programme Board notes the report.

#### **Summary:**

1. The LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee (LSC) terms of reference commit Managing Authorities to a review of LSC's membership during 2017 to ensure their composition "remains relevant to investments still to come forward through the Programmes".
2. A review of LSC membership was commissioned by the GPB secretariat and undertaken by LSC secretariat, to be reviewed by the LSC's deputy-chair. Developed as a desk-based exercise, LSC secretariat's were asked to complete a framework (annex A) for each sub-committee which focuses on their current composition and establishes their suitability for future work which will be coming on-stream.
3. The key findings were:
  - i. Sector representation, as described in paragraph 71 of the LSC terms of reference (annex B), is broadly being achieved across the 38 sub-committees. Where gaps have been identified, these are most commonly found across the Trade Union / Employer and Equality and Diversity sectors: however, the returns emphasise that where these gaps in membership exist, LSC members are taking active and ongoing measures to address these.
  - ii. Sub-committee composition remains relevant to investments still to come forward through the programmes and no significant issues or areas of concern were identified by LSC secretariats
  - iii. Membership is also considered suitably proportionate across the majority of the 38 sub-committees
4. A table summarising the returns received from LSC secretariats is at annex C.

## Annex A LEP area ESI Funds Sub-committees - Review of Membership

Name of LEP area ESI Funds Sub-committee	
Framework completed by	
Date completed	

### Purpose

The LEP area ESI Funds Sub-committee (LSC) terms of reference (ToR), adopted in December 2015, commit Managing Authorities to review LSC membership in 2017 “to ensure its composition remains relevant to investments still to come forward through the Programmes” (see annex A, para.76).

At the Growth Programme Board held in March 2017, we committed to commission local secretariats to carry out the review. This framework will enable a consistent approach to be taken across all sub-committees. Outcomes should be reported back to the GPB secretariat, which will report progress to the Board later in the summer.

### Methodology

This is designed, principally, to be a straightforward desk-top exercise carried out by local secretariats and reviewed by LSC Deputy Chairs. It should not be onerous or disproportionately burdensome. Focus should always be on the sub-committee’s *composition* and its *relevance* to investments still to come forward.

You may think it appropriate to share your assessment with LSC members, either by correspondence or at an early meeting, before sending results back to the GPB secretariat. A report summarising the outcome of this review will be taken to a future Growth Programme Board, for Board members’ information.

### Review framework

<p>Section E of the terms of reference describe membership of local sub-committees. Partners to be represented on local sub-committees are listed at para. 71.</p> <p>Does the sub-committee achieve representation from partners in the following groupings? Are there any gaps?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair (partner)</li> <li>• Deputy Chair (Managing Authority)</li> <li>• Local Enterprise Partnership</li> <li>• Local Authority</li> <li>• Business partners (including small businesses and social enterprise as appropriate to the local area)</li> <li>• Voluntary &amp; Community Sector</li> <li>• Environment (with relevant expertise in e.g. sustainable development)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Response:</b></p>
---	-------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade Union and employer representation (as appropriate)</li> <li>• Equality and diversity representation</li> <li>• Higher Education</li> <li>• Education, skills &amp; employment</li> <li>• SUD city region groupings where appropriate to the local area</li> <li>• Rural (where appropriate)</li> <li>• CLLD Local Action Group(s) where appropriate to the local area</li> <li>• Managing Authorities for each of the ESI Funds and BIS local</li> <li>• Others as needed by the LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee</li> </ul>	
<p>If any gaps were identified, what measures have been taken, if necessary, to address this gap?</p>	
<p>Does the sub-committee's composition remain relevant to investments still to come forward through the Programmes?</p> <p>If not, what measures need to be taken to address this?</p>	
<p>LSC membership "should be proportionate and not give undue weight to any one sector" (para. 73).</p> <p>Is this considered to be the case for this LSC?</p> <p>If not, what have been the barriers to achieving this?</p>	

## Annex B Extract from LSC Terms of Reference (December 2015)

### E. Membership

69. The composition of the LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee will reflect the priorities of the Operational Programmes that apply in each LEP area and the supporting local ESIF strategy and reflect as far as possible the breadth of partners specified in Article 5 of the Common Provisions Regulations and the EU Code of Conduct on Partnership.
70. The Managing Authorities will be responsible for ensuring the membership is compliant with regard to these requirements. In putting together the LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee, Managing Authorities will have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, taking account of the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with and without a protected characteristic.
71. Partners to be represented are set out below.
  - Chair (partner)
  - Deputy Chair (Managing Authority)
  - Local Enterprise Partnership
  - Local Authority
  - Business partners (including small businesses and social enterprise as appropriate to the local area)
  - Voluntary & Community Sector
  - Environment (with relevant expertise in e.g. sustainable development)
  - Trade Union and employer representation (as appropriate)
  - Equality and diversity representation
  - Higher Education
  - Education, skills & employment
  - SUD city region groupings where appropriate to the local area
  - Rural (where appropriate)
  - CLLD Local Action Group(s) where appropriate to the local area
  - Managing Authorities for each of the ESI Funds and BIS local
  - Others as needed by the LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee
72. Each partner above should ideally be represented with a separate individual to minimise potential conflicts of interest. Members may represent more than one grouping in agreement with the Managing Authority.
73. Membership should be proportionate and not give undue weight to any one sector.
74. The partner Chair and Managing Authority Deputy Chair will be additional seats on the LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee.
75. Members need to be clear about who they are representing and how. All partners selected should be representative of their sector and/or relevant stakeholders and able to demonstrate accountability to their constituencies.
76. Membership will be for a three year term. The Managing Authorities will review LEP area ESI Funds sub-committee membership in 2017 to ensure its composition remains relevant to investments still to come forward through the Programmes. Where members leave before that time, representatives will be sought again by the Managing Authorities from the sector/organisation they are representing. Membership will also be refreshed as needed to reflect any changes in relevant EU and national regulations and policy.

## Annex C Summary of LEP area ESI Funds Sub-committee Secretariat Returns

Name of LEP area ESI Funds Sub-committee	Does the sub-committee achieve representation from partners in the groupings listed in para.71 of the LSC ToR? Are there any gaps?	If any gaps were identified, what measures have been taken, if necessary, to address this gap?	Does the sub-committee's composition remain relevant to investments still to come forward through the Programmes? If not, what measures need to be taken to address this?	LSC membership "should be proportionate and not give undue weight to any one sector" (para. 73 of the LSC ToR). Is this considered to be the case for this LSC? If not, what have been the barriers to achieving this?
Black Country	Yes, except for Trade Union/Employer representation	A number of individuals have been approached to represent Trade Union/Employer, but no one has been able to accept the invitation. The LEP and local partners continue to seek a representative.	Yes. The recent addition of the Black Country Chamber of Commerce has strengthened SME engagement and representation as we move into the delivery phase of activity.  Although the group has a designated representative for Equality and Diversity, the members' attendance has fallen and the group will consider a replacement if the attendance issue is not resolved by the Q4 meeting.	Yes
Buckinghamshire Thames Valley	Yes, except Environment, Trade Union and Equality and Diversity	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps.	Yes	Yes
Cheshire and Warrington	Yes, except for Local Nature Partnership and Chamber of Commerce	An alternative representative for Local Nature Partnership is being sought from the Environment Agency.  A letter was sent to the Private Sector representative (Chamber of Commerce) but they have not been able to attend subsequent meetings. The LEP lead is discussing alternative representative with the Chamber.	Yes – subject to satisfactory replacement of Chamber representative.	Yes
Coast to Capital	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly	Yes, except Local Action Groups	Local Action Groups did not have a representative to nominate until recently. The secretariat is seeking to co-opt a representative from that sector and has begun the process of seeking appropriate representation.	Yes	Yes
Coventry and Warwickshire	Yes, except the Rural representation is currently from the Local Authority – an additional representative being sought	Rural representation has been partially addressed and additional representation is being sought.	Yes	Yes
Cumbria	Yes	N/A	Yes – although attendance and participation is currently being monitored; those that do attend are mostly local authority based and managing authority.	Yes; however meeting attendance mostly comprises of the Local Authority and managing authority.
D2N2	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Dorset	Yes, except Trade Union/Employer representation	Trade Union representation will be discussed at the July meeting. There is a potential gap emerging with Equality & Diversity, as the representative has recently had to withdraw. A temporary replacement has been identified but not yet engaged.	Yes – although there is a wider issue that member attendance at meetings is variable and therefore both the quality and quantity of advice provided can be lacking. Membership, role and attendance will be discussed with committee at the July meeting.	Yes; there are three local authority members (1 being the Chair) but they alternate between attending meetings
Enterprise M3	Yes, except Equality and Diversity	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps. We are exploring the possibility of the Trade Union representative taking on equal opportunities and diversity role.	Yes	Yes
GFirst	Yes, except Trade Union/Employer representation	The sub-committee is aware of the gap in Trade Union representation and sub-committee members are routinely asked to consider and suggest suitable candidates.	Yes	Yes
Greater Birmingham and Solihull	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes

Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Greater Manchester	Yes, except LEPs	The LEP board is currently being reviewed and a new member will be appointed shortly.	Yes	Yes
Heart of the South West	Yes, except Equality and Diversity	The Equality and Diversity representative changed job roles in December 2016 and could no longer fulfil the role. A suitable replacement member has been approached.	Yes	Yes
Hertfordshire	Yes, except Environment	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps.	Yes	Yes
Humber	Yes	Private sector participation has reduced and the LEP have been looking to invite a refresh alongside their refresh of the LEP board – inviting nominations for both. LEP board receive updates at each meeting from the Chair and the LEP ensure they engage with their private sector constituents to support advice on the development of calls – particularly those with a private sector focus.  A new Trade Union representative has also been nominated.	Composition will be strengthened by private sector involvement with remaining focus predominantly on SME /innovation support.  Liaise with LEP to confirm progress with private sector nominations, recognising that wider engagement approaches rather than sub-committee membership and attendance may be more effective in ensuring private sector 'voice' is heard.	Yes: broadly reflective, noting absence of private sector.
Lancashire	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Leeds City Region	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Leicestershire	Yes, although sub-committee is currently in the process of appointing a new Chair	The Chair left in late 2016, and the sub-committee are seeking a replacement.	Yes	Yes
Lincolnshire	Yes, except Trade Union/Employer representation	Trade Union representation continues to be sought.	Yes	Yes
Liverpool City Region	Yes, although Local Authority representation is to be reviewed post Metro Mayor appointment	Following IB/SUD designation, additional representation has been sought from Liverpool City Region Combined Authority for SUD strategic lead.	Yes	Yes
London	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
The Marches	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
New Anglia	Yes, except Equality and Diversity.	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps.	Yes	Yes
North East	Yes	N/A - Trade Union, SUD and CLLD representation is covered through existing membership	Yes	Yes
Oxfordshire	Yes, except Equality and Diversity.	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps.	Yes	Yes
Sheffield City Region	Yes	No gaps have been identified at this stage; however consideration is being given to how business and private sector representation could be strengthened.	Yes	Yes
Solent	Yes, except Environment, Trade Union and Equality and Diversity	Membership was discussed at December 2016 meeting. A paper considering representation gaps was taken to the Q3 meeting and a formal discussion will be held at the Q4 meeting.	Yes; although it has been noted that conflicts of interest can reduce the numbers available to comment on proposals.	Yes
South East	Yes	CLLD representation has been addressed by the forming a sub group.	Yes	Yes
South East Midlands	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Stoke and Staffordshire	Yes, except Equality and Diversity	The Chair, Deputy Chair and appropriate LEP officers actively seek to address gaps where they arise.	Yes	Yes
Swindon and Wiltshire	Yes, except a Higher Education representative at present	The sub-committee are aware of the Higher Education gap. Swindon and Wiltshire do not have an HE institution in the LEP area, but Bath	Yes	Yes

		University have been represented previously, with the member moving jobs recently. An alternative is currently being sought.		
Thames Valley Berkshire	Yes, except Equality and Diversity	The composition of the sub-committee will be discussed with the LEP with the aim of filling the identified gaps.	Yes	Yes
Tees Valley	Yes, except Equality and Diversity and Education, Skills and Employment.	The secretariat is contacting the Equality and Human Rights Commission and Association of Colleges to ascertain if they can field a representative or advise on a suitable representative.	Yes; there has been a recent election of a Metro Mayor to Tees Valley and consideration may need to be made regarding representation of the Mayor's office on the sub-committee. Tees Valley is in discussions on taking on IB status and consideration may need to be given to representation of the IB on the sub-committee.	Yes; although the secretariat is aware the LEP want to bring in additional Combined Authority new Board members. This would give undue weight to one sector. The secretariat is currently in discussion with the LEP on this issue.
West of England	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Worcestershire	Yes, except Business Partner – social enterprise.	Where gaps appear members have actively looked to recruit a new member.	Yes	Yes
York, North Yorkshire and East Riding	Yes, except: Business Partner, Environment, Rural, Trade Union, Equality and Diversity	Education, Skill & Employment nominations will be sought from another training provider. Discussions will be held with the voluntary and community sector to identify equality and diversity representation. New nominations are being sought for Environment and Rural representation. Trade union representative difficult to source due to local resource issue. Business partners – sustained representation has proven difficult to achieve, some members also have business backgrounds and are actively involved with LEP. Private sector – Discussions will be held with the LEP officers to identify LEP representatives stepping down who may have an interest in ESIF SC membership.	Yes	Yes; although LSC membership is weighted towards the public sector, this reflects the type of investments that the fund provides.