

**PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT:
DELIVERY OF STRUCTURAL
FUNDS, RURAL DEVELOPMENT
FUNDS AND MARITIME AND
FISHERIES FUNDS IN ENGLAND**

Government Response to the
Informal Consultation

JULY 2012

Contents

Introduction	3
1. Consultation Process	4
2. Overall key messages from stakeholders	5
3. Government Response.....	6
4. Next Steps	7
Annex A: Summary of responses to the informal consultation	8
Annex B: List of respondents	17

Introduction

EU policies for cohesion, rural development, maritime and fisheries each play a significant role in supporting sustainable, environmental, social and economic restructuring across the EU. They contribute to socio-economic development and employment growth - helping to rebalance the economy whilst protecting our natural resources. The main financial instruments that support this agenda in the UK are the Structural and Cohesion Funds - which comprise the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) - the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF).

For the 2014-2020 funding period, the European Commission has published a working paper containing proposals suggesting how the Funds can be implemented more effectively under an overarching EU Common Strategic Framework

This offers the UK the opportunity to look afresh at how we currently deliver the Funds and how the funds can best be deployed to support sustainable growth and jobs. Our approach will then be set out in the 'Partnership Agreement', a high level business plan that the UK will need to agree with the European Commission, which will then set the direction of the funding programmes.

To inform the development of the Partnership Agreement an informal consultation was launched in England to gather initial views. The results of this are presented in this document. The Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish Administrations are making their own consultation arrangements as part of the preparations for their own sections of the UK Partnership Agreement.

If you have any further comments in relation to this response or next steps please write to:

Steve Cross
Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
1 Victoria Street
4th Floor Spur 1
London SW1H 0ET

Tel: 020 7 215 2606
Fax: 020 7 215 5579

Email: structuralfundsnegotiations@bis.gsi.gov.uk

1. Consultation Process

An informal consultation was conducted between 28 March and 27 April 2012. Copies of the consultation were sent by e-mail to a wide range of stakeholders and a copy was also available on the website for the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills.

187 responses were received from local and non-departmental government bodies, universities, the civil society sector and business organisations. Local Government was numerically the most significant respondent, with responses received from a range of councils of different type, size and location across England. Business responses were received from individual companies as well as a mix of representative bodies - Local Enterprise Partnerships, economic partnerships and business organisations. Interests across stakeholders ranged from urban to rural based programmes to those with specific interest in environmental, transport, social, economic and innovation issues. A breakdown by stakeholder group is set out below:

- Local Government: 77
- Universities: 22
- Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs): 14
- Business Organisations: 7
- Large Companies: 3
- SMEs: 7
- Civil Society: 28
- Individual Responses: 3
- Local Action Groups: 10
- Non-departmental bodies and government agency: 7
- Regional economic partnerships: 5
- Climate change bodies and Passenger Transport Executives: 4

The organisations who submitted responses are listed at Annex B.

The Government would like to thank all those who responded to the consultation.

2. Overall key messages from stakeholders

Objectives for the Common Strategic Framework Funds (Question 1)

Overall, all of the broad objectives proposed by the European Commission were seen as relevant to stakeholder development needs.

Flexible programme boundaries (Questions 2 and 3)

The majority of local government responses and many civil society organisations expressed strong support for place based programmes. They were concerned that a national structure would represent a move to a 'one size fits all approach', which would lead to a lack of local engagement. LEPs also would be reluctant to pursue national programmes if no element of local decision making were incorporated in the process.

There was also broad support for 'themed' programmes, in particular from those in business, higher education and some civil society organisations but there were different views on what this would mean. There must be flexibility in the process to ensure delivery occurs at the level most appropriate to the type of intervention and local stakeholders are involved.

Each of the Commission objectives for the Funds received support from different stakeholders as appropriate for thematic programmes, with innovation, ICT/broadband and environmental issues most often referenced.

Reduced administrative burden (Question 4)

There was strong support for a more standardised approach to application, timescales and selection procedures across the funds; simplified management and audit procedures; integrated systems for aligned projects and shorter time frames for decisions, authorisation and disbursement of payments.

There were also calls for clear rules for programmes to be set out in advance.

Integrated and aligned programmes (Questions 5 and 6)

There was strong support for a degree of integrated programming, in particular in relation to ERDF and ESF, to enable more aligned support for business development alongside skills development. Those with an interest in environmental or rural development put forward combinations of EAFRD, EMFF, ERDF and ESF to broaden the scope of activities and increase impact.

There was broad interest in the potential within the proposed new tools for better integration across places eg Integrated Territorial Investment, Community Led Local Development and Joint Action Plans but more information was required on how they could be used.

Fresh thinking on match funding (Question 7)

Many of the local government and some higher education responses highlighted that match funding remained a challenge and better central government planning to align their priorities with local programmes would help.

There was also interest in the more creative use of alternative local sources of funding, such as the introduction of tax increment financing, retention of business rates, recognition of volunteer time as valid match and further exploitation of private sector funding.

3. Government Response

Process and Timing

Negotiations on the EU regulations that will govern each of the Common Strategic Framework Funds are advancing but the detail is still to be agreed. Negotiations for the Multi Annual Financial Framework (ie the seven year EU budget framework) are underway as a separate process. The latter will establish financial allocations to each fund - and for the Structural Funds, to each Member State and category of region. Therefore, the various regulations underpinning each of the Common Strategic Framework Funds cannot be finalised until the Multi Annual Financial Framework has been settled.

A UK Partnership Agreement is a new EU requirement aimed at setting the strategic framework and justification for the investments proposed across the UK through the various programmes of the Common Strategic Framework Funds. It will be based upon the specific challenges highlighted by the Commission in relation to the UK's performance in meeting EU 2020 objectives and the UK's National Reform Plan, against which the Partnership Agreement and its proposed investment priorities will be reviewed and agreed by the European Commission. Operational Programmes will need to be submitted to the Commission following the UK Partnership Agreement.

This new procedure signals the extent to which importance has been placed on using the funds covered by the Common Strategic Framework as a primary instrument for driving jobs and growth.

Operational principles

The responses to the informal consultation provide useful information about how the Funds might be delivered. The Government will consider these over the summer and will update stakeholders in autumn 2012.

The Government's priority is to find delivery mechanisms which are both efficient and effective in supporting strategic priorities and provide financial control and it has developed some principles which will help shape future decisions.

- The development of the Partnership Agreement and Programmes will be responsive to Partners' priorities and will optimise the Funds' ability to contribute to economic growth, jobs and sustainable development.
- Programmes' interventions and delivery mechanisms will be consistent with and add value to national and local strategies for accelerating economic growth, skills and jobs, sustainable development and the protection of natural resources.

- Programmes' geographic boundaries will be tailored to provide the most efficient and effective economic and environmental impact. Functional economic and environmental areas will be important in shaping these boundaries, alongside opportunities to plan at national, city and other levels.

Co-ordination between Funds

- Programmes for different Funds will be aligned to ensure that they are complementary.
- Funds may be combined in an Operational Programme and/or local measure where to do so will provide more effective delivery of strategic objectives. Cross-Fund arrangements will be considered in place-based or thematic interventions.
- Interventions supported through the Territorial Co-operation Programmes will be consistent with the geographic and thematic strategies to address economic growth and sustainable development as relevant.

Administration

- Project application, management and monitoring arrangements will be kept as efficient, effective and accessible as possible. Where an Operational Programme and/or local measure is funded through multiple Funds these arrangements should be aligned to ensure that they are consistent, complementary and clear.
- Monitoring and evaluation arrangements will be co-ordinated across Operational Programmes so as to ensure effective analysis of shared and Fund-specific goals, robust communication of impact and dissemination of high value outcomes and best practice.
- Private sector match-funding and leverage should be sought wherever possible.

4. Next Steps

The Government Departments and the Partnership Team (a team of four secondees from the local authorities, civil society and high education sector) will follow up with stakeholders on the results of the consultation.

A series of stakeholder consultation meetings will then be arranged in autumn 2012 across the country. Evidence gathered from these events and more detailed information gathering in the lead-up to them will then inform the development of programme proposals, which will then be the subject of a formal consultation for the Partnership Agreement, in spring 2013

Annex A: Summary of responses to the informal consultation

Objectives/themes

Question 1: Which of the Commission's objectives for the Common Strategic Framework Funds most align with your objectives and plans?

Overall, all of the broad objectives proposed by the European Commission were seen as relevant to stakeholders development needs.

Most stakeholders did not express views on the implications of the proposed concentration of funding into a limited number of objectives, but those that did so were:

- Local government, a small number suggested that the proposed minimum percentage concentration limits should be reduced and/or that the number of proposed thematic objectives to be funded should be increased. Others cautioned against a rigid framework or detailed definitions that might limit the scope of proposed interventions.
- Environmental organisations who suggested there should be a greater focus on the climate change adaptation objective.
- Civil Society organisations who suggested ring-fencing of at least 20% of ESF for inclusion/anti-poverty work and that ERDF should include a specific focus on disadvantaged groups and communities. Local Government while noting the value and importance attached by the ESF to employability, vocational skills and social inclusion, also called for efforts to be made to address funding issues related to the need for higher level skills.

It should be noted, however, that all ring fencing of funds will be determined at EU level, so the option to vary ring fences are not wholly within the Government's control. Others pointed out that activities which meet environmental, cultural and social activities can also support growth and jobs, for example, investment in natural resources, built heritage, climate change mitigation, sports activities and transport. In addition, some from the civil society sector said that SME competitiveness element should include a focus on social enterprises given their role on job creation and economic growth.

Geography & local focus

2. Are there certain Common Strategic Framework objectives which might be more suited to thematic, 'issue-based' programmes? If so, why and what mechanisms would be required to ensure sufficient local flexibility and involvement in decision-making and strategic guidance?

There was broad support for a thematic approach but there were also different views on what a thematic approach meant. Civil society organisations saw this as ranging from national strategy setting to national projects. The local government organisations answered this question in three broad and different ways.

- Some considered that a thematic approach across the different funds within local or 'across LEP boundary' programmes would provide for a more strategic and integrated use of the funds.
- Others opposed the proposal for thematic programmes if these were designed and delivered using national structures. They argued that national programmes were likely to work directly against a local agenda.
- The third group did recognise that some of the proposed objectives may be best designed within national thematic programmes. This group suggested that national programmes would allow for better alignment with public match funding provided by departments of national government.

Overall most stakeholders, but in particular the higher education and business sectors, saw opportunities in a thematic approach. As a general rule this was seen as useful to meet objectives which address inequalities across geographical, societal or economic regions or where there are market failures in technology that would benefit from a more integrated local and a national approach.

Each of the Commission's objectives for the funds was proposed by different stakeholders as a valid thematic programme however, innovation, ICT and environmental thematic programmes were notably most often referenced. A national financial engineering instrument was also proposed.

Reasons given for a thematic approach were:

- Limiting programmes to strictly defined geographic and political boundaries would have a negative impact on innovation and supply chains which transcend geographical boundaries.
- Local activity would be aligned with national priorities and therefore would have potentially greater impact.
- Issues relevant in one region have relevance to others and a thematic approach would enable coherence in delivery
- National match funding would be more readily accessible and funds would more easily attract private investors.

However, concerns were raised with a purely national approach. These included:

- A 'one size fits all' structure would result with little regard to local economies or their changing circumstances.
- Difficulty in integrating different actions at the local level into nationally driven projects would ultimately exclude local activity, including local private finance
- National programmes would lead to a reduction in transparency with no real involvement in design and management by local partners. Many local government

and civil society organisations oppose national thematic programmes citing their experience and perceptions of the current ESF programme as an example.

Mechanisms to ensure sufficient local flexibility and involvement in decision-making and strategic guidance

Respondents called for sufficient flexibility to ensure that localities can shape national frameworks to local circumstances and that delivery happens at the most appropriate level. Mechanisms proposed include:

- Place-based investments to be determined locally, within a flexible national policy framework, by an inclusive Joint Monitoring Committee with strong engagement from the LEPs and other key stakeholders
- National/pan regional thematic investments are jointly developed and agreed between the lead national body and the local Joint Monitoring Committee/Commissioning Board
- Top slicing of national funds for place based activities.
- A requirement for local elements of national programmes to share experience and best practice.
- A 'Duty of involvement' clause in any national contracts obliging contractors to engage with local partners such as LEPs.
- An active and creative approach to promote the opportunities that the funding provide and get ideas of what they should be spent on

3. Where does your organisation see opportunities for more localised place-based programmes or projects within programmes and for which Funds or combination of Funds? How would this improve outcomes?

Most stakeholders expressed support for localised programming. It was seen as a way to secure local buy-in, better target SMEs and encourage the promotion of economic activities that are socially and environmentally sustainable. It was suggested that place based investments would benefit those areas that involve multi-level system of governance where coordination and networking between different areas of government and stakeholders is required.

Some stakeholders however did express concern that a place based programme would be too restrictive, potentially excluding individuals and businesses which contribute to a local economy but which sit outside the geographical boundary.

Some stakeholders saw the potential in a mix of national and local programmes with funding devolved from national programmes to a local partnership, so that national priorities are interpreted at a local level eg to manage flooding and coastal erosion issues.

Opportunities for aligning and integrating the Funds

The proposal to join the Funds for place based programming was strongly supported. To enable this will require better alignment by all local programmes to agreed local objectives as set out in local economic strategies.

Stakeholders raised the following benefits in combining funds:

- Projects can deliver more holistic support by working at the different stages of development eg a project could provide both business and skills support to SMEs.
- Higher education institutions pointed out that this would provide for projects to operate at a regional or cross border basis.
- Reduced confusion for business on what support is available as all the support is available from one source
- Greater impact and value for money. Rural economies would be more easily able to benefit from a growth agenda.
- Civil Society sector said that this combination would better support social and regeneration programmes, as in the current programme ERDF and ESF interventions are organised separately from each other.

Table 1: Examples of place based projects suggested by stakeholders.

Funds	Schemes
ERDF	Regeneration of community infrastructure, green infrastructure, land use change, transport and poverty.
ESF	Skills and employment, social inclusion and poverty
EAFRD	Land management and eco system services, support rural business in diversifying into sustainable tourism.
ERDF and ESF	Green Deal, ERDF to provide grants, loans (via Jessica) or a guarantee to those in social housing at risk of fuel poverty and ESF to support the skilling of workers. Support ICT deployment and digital inclusion Promotion of social inclusion
ERDF, EMFF and EAFRD	Projects to meet water framework, flood risk assessment and marine strategy directive outcomes
All four funds	Reverse the decline of marine communities. Rural growth and social inclusion in rural areas including the uplands Low carbon, sustainable activities.

Some stakeholders said that a stronger place based approach would mean that the administrative capacity of local groups may need to be developed. Use of technical assistance, retaining local expertise in 'regional' offices and sharing services were provided as examples of how this could be addressed.

Some stakeholders said that funding programmes should represent functional economic areas.

Flexibility was seen as important to enable cooperation with surrounding areas, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication or competition, and to enable projects to produce local/regional benefits while allowing for national or international collaboration. For instance, allowing national charities or other bodies to engage without having to submit multiple bids

Streamlined administration

4. What key things need to change in the way the Funds are currently used in order to reduce the administrative burden involved, whilst conforming to EU management control requirements?

In response to this question, stakeholders highlighted that changes need to take place to the whole administrative process of all of the Funds. This was an important issue to address if the Funds were to be effectively delivered and stakeholders participating to their full potential. Audit arrangements were most often referenced as being a key area of concern. Comments tended to fall in three broad areas:

- There should be clear guidance and support from the start of the programme and throughout the application to the delivery stage. This should cover what is required and what is eligible, especially procurement. An online one-stop shop for advice on funding support was proposed.
- There should be consistency in the interpretation of the rules throughout the process. This should include state aid, procurement and eligibility
- The national rules and requirements put in place to deliver the Funds should be simplified and be proportionate for all, and should meet, not exceed, EU requirements. Electronic systems to enable efficient applications and on line submissions was suggested.

Some points were raised on the balance between increasing local delivery with the need to reduce administrative burden. An example of how two Leader programmes are managed by one organisation to achieve local economies of scale was referenced. Co-financing organisations used in the ESF programme were also highlighted by one as a way to keep administrative burdens to a minimum.

Multi-fund projects would require a reduction in administrative burdens to be successful. Proposals which could be considered included:

- A single audit regime for all four Funds and for domestic funds
- A common application process, including a single application form, to enable project promoters to make a single claim for multi fund projects.
- Coordinated dates on all funding proposals.

- Combining technical assistance across the funds and delegating it to support effective delivery

Integration / joining up across funds & between outcomes

5. Are there specific combinations of Funds, or elements of Funds, which lend themselves to operating in a more integrated or aligned way? If so, what kind of complementary measures and outcomes would you want to see?

There was overwhelming support from stakeholders for a stronger integration of the Funds. Synergies between ERDF and ESF were most often highlighted, though those from the environmental and coastal areas/interest also pointed to the potential of joining these with EAFRD and EMFF. As a general rule the exact combination of funds that would be relevant would depend on the geography and the issue that was being addressed. Examples of what this could mean in practice were:

- Using ERDF, ESF and EAFRD to overcome lack of broadband in rural areas, stimulating demand so that marginalised communities can gain the skills to benefit from it.
- Addressing worklessness and youth unemployment by aligning skills investment with future business needs with all of the Funds
- ERDF and ESF could together enable projects to focus on improving skills alongside investments in research, technology development and innovation
- Regeneration of deprived areas
- Green infrastructure – an example in Germany was referenced as using EAFRD, ESF, ERDF and national funds to support this area. The mix would be dependant on local circumstances. The aim would be to encourage investment in renewable energy technologies and up-skill current and future employees.

This approach can be seen in domestic funding schemes such as the Coastal Communities Programme which has brought together different funds to develop a joined up series of interventions. Other case studies included:

- Regeneration of a council estate in South Tyneside
- An ESI-ERDF Business Engagement programme complemented by an ESF Combined Universities Cornwall research programme in Cornwall.

Many local government respondents said that we would need to move away from the current focus on short term outputs delivered by individual projects and instead focus on longer term outcomes in a programme. A concern by one stakeholder that the time lag involved in capital projects in relation to the shorter timescales involved in associated skills

support has meant that combining the Funds in the past has proved difficult, reinforced that point.

Many stakeholders also suggested that there should be better links with other funding sources to maximise impact such as:

- EU funding - Connecting Europe Facility, Creative Europe and Horizon 2020; and
- Domestic national schemes such as Regional Growth Fund, Enterprise Zones and Growing Places Fund.

Outcomes from an integrated approach

One business representative said that the benefit of an integrated approach was that it would enable different aspects of a problem to be addressed rather than trying to artificially separate the problem. Others said that this more holistic approach would lead to a better understanding of the impact of the investment as a whole by enabling schemes to consider new enterprises, productivity improvements etc rather than just focusing on short term outputs relevant to the required procedures of a specific funding stream.

Some also highlighted that a more integrated approach would encourage at a local level a simplified assessment procedure and at a national level a more joined up approach by different government departments.

Examples of complementary outcomes were proposed such as reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, energy production from land, sustainable food production, water security, improved land management and compliance with the Birds, Habitats and Water Framework Directives

6. Where does your organisation see opportunities for using some of the options proposed by the Commission to promote more localised and co-ordinated programming, such as Joint Action Plans, Integrated Territorial Investments and Community-Led Local Development?

There was widespread interest in using such tools to support sustainable local communities. Almost all from the local government and from the civil society noted the potential for these proposed administrative tools but called for more information about how these structures could be developed and managed in the future. This would enable stakeholders to understand the potential administrative burdens, financial risks and the size of the Funds involved. Some LEPs indicated that in order to understand further whether these tools were relevant for their local area, technical assistance should be made available.

Integrated Territorial Investments

Some proposed that these should be extended to EAFRD and EMFF (although this is not currently in scope in the EU regulations), that it could be extended beyond cities and be aligned, for instance, with LEPs. Stakeholders said that these instruments had the potential to support employment, social inclusion and skills objectives.

Joint Action Plans

Some stakeholders said that these could be appropriate when a step change is required within a sector – eg renewable energy or marine technology - especially where the programme needs to operate over a large geographical area. A Joint Action Plan for National Parks was proposed in order to support SMEs, low carbon and environmental objectives. One stakeholder was disappointed that Joint Action Plans as proposed by the Commission do not support infrastructure.

Community Local Led Development

This was seen as a useful way to support social inclusion as well as micro businesses by addressing small scale specific geographic needs. The Global Grants Programme in the 2000-2006 ESF programme was referenced as an example.

Other

7. Are there any other specific points you wish to be considered which are not covered by the other questions?

Other points raised included:

Role of organisations

Some LEPs argued for a role as an intermediate body and models were provided on what a LEP based programme might look like. Some local government bodies sought a more formal role in the management of the funds, whether as a 'managing authority', intermediate body' or 'accountable body'.

SME support

One stakeholder suggested that the use of procurement should be explored to support SMEs and encourage them to look outside their immediate locality for business.

Match funding

Some stakeholders raised problems with identifying public and private sector match funding in the current programme and suggested the next programme should:

- Allow contributions by beneficiaries towards the costs of the project to be used as match funding
- Recognise volunteer time as a valid match (as had been done in Wales)
- Align Government funding with EU funding priorities.
- Review whether local co-financing or other national co-financing organisations should be re-introduced (Civil Society respondents suggested there should be a national co-financing organisation for the civil society).

Evaluation

There was support for a stronger focus on outcomes rather than outputs and one stakeholder suggested that Government consider the performance of 2000-2006 programmes to appreciate the longer term impacts of investment and lessons learnt through use of Urban 2, performance reserve and direct bidding to ESF.

Others

Some civil society respondents suggested that projects supported by the Common Strategic Framework Funds should be required to have a neutral or positive impact on the environment.

A couple of respondents commented that there should have been a reference to cross border programmes in the informal consultation.

Annex B: List of respondents

Action with Communities in Rural Kent

Anglia Ruskin University

Arts Council England

Association of Independent Meat Suppliers

Association of North East Councils

Aston University

Barnsley, Rotherham, Doncaster and Sheffield Councils

Bassetlaw District Council

Bath & NE Somerset Council

Big Lottery Fund

Birmingham City Council

Birmingham City University

Black Country LEP

Blackpool, Fylde & Wyre Councils

Bolsover District Council

Bradford CVS

Brighton & Hove City Council

Buckinghamshire Thames Valley LEP

Caddesdown Business Support Centre

Cambridgeshire County Council

CEDOS/ADEPT

Central Bedfordshire Council

CERT - Immingham Resource Centre

Cherwell District Council & South Northants Council

Cheshire & Warrington European Funding Group
Chesterfield Community Fire station
CIRIA
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Climate UK
Colchester Borough Council
Combined Universities in Cornwall
Commission for Rural Communities
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
Core Cities Group
Cornwall Council
Country Land & Business Association
County Durham Economic Partnership
Coventry & Warwickshire LEP
Coventry University
Cumbria County Council
Cumbria Tourism
D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership
Derby City Council
Derbyshire County Council
Derbyshire Dales District Council
Devon County Council
Dorset LEP
DR Company
Durham County Council
East Midlands Business Ltd

East Midlands Councils

East of England Partnership

East Riding of Yorkshire Council

East Sussex County Council

Enterprise M3 LEP

Environment Agency

Essex County Council

Euclid Network

European Council for the Village & Small Town

Exeter City Council

Fens Adventurers Rural Development Programme

Gateshead Council

GE UK

General Motors

Greater Dartmoor LEAF

Greater London Authority

Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce

Greater Manchester LEP

Groundwork London

Halton Borough Council

Hampshire County Council

Heart of Eden Development Trust

Heart of the South West LEP

Herefordshire Council

Hillside Clubhouse

Hull City Council

Industrial Communities Alliance

Institute for Sustainability

Involve Yorkshire & Humber

Kent County Council

Kirklees Council

Lancashire County Council

Lancaster University

LEADER Coast, Wolds, Wetlands & Waterways Local Action Group

Leicester City Council

Lincolnshire County Council

Liverpool City Region

Liverpool City Region LEP

Local Government Association

Local Government Yorkshire & Humber

London Borough of Havering

London Borough of Hillingdon

London College Beauty Therapy

London Councils

M B Learning Ltd

Making it Local Local Action Group

Marketing Cheshire

Merseytravel

National Association for Voluntary and Community Action

National Council for Voluntary Organisations

National Housing Federation

National Institute of Adult Continuing Education

Natural England

Network for Europe

New Anglia LEP

New Forest District Council

New Forest Local Action Group

New Forest National Park Authority

Norfolk County Council

North Devon Council

North East Procurement Organisation

North Tyneside Council

North York Moors, Coast and Hills LEADER

Northamptonshire Enterprise Partnership

Northumberland Coast & Lowlands LEADER Coordinator

Northumberland County Council

Northumberland National Park Authority

Northumberland Uplands Local Action Group

Norwich City Council

Nottingham City Council

Nottinghamshire County Council

One East Midlands

Oxfordshire City-Region LEP

Passenger Transport Executive Group

Peak District LEADER Local Action Group

Plymouth University

Positive East

Preston City Council

Regeneris

Rolls Royce

Royal Holloway University of London

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

Russell Group Universities

Sevenoaks District Council

Shepway District Council

Shropshire Council

Skills Funding Agency

Somerset County Council

South Devon Coastal Local Action Group

South East England Councils

South Hams Council and West Devon Council

South Tyneside Council

South West European Partnership

Southern England Local Partners

Southern Regional Flood and Coastal Committee

Sport & Recreational Alliance

Staffordshire County Council

Suffolk County Council

Sunderland City Council

Sussex Village Halls Advisory Group

Sustrans

Swindon & Wiltshire LEP

Taunton Deane Borough Council

Tees Valley Unlimited

Teeside University

The Hadrian's Wall Trust

The Mammal Society

The Mersey Forest

The National Trust

The Regional Climate Change Partnership for Yorkshire & Humber

The Royal Town Planning Institute

The Wildlife Trusts

Torbay Council

Torridge District Council

UK Contractors Group

UniversitiesUK

University College London

University College, Falmouth

University of Bath

University of Birmingham

University of Exeter

University of Kent

University of Leicester

University of Nottingham

University of the West of England, Bristol

University of Warwick

Wakefield Council

Warrington Borough Council

Waveney District Council

Welsh Local Government Association

West Midlands Councils

West of England LEP

West Sussex County Councils

WWF-UK

Yorkshire Universities

There were 3 responses from individuals

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is also available on our website at www.bis.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
Tel: 020 7215 5000

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk, or call 020 7215 5000.

URN 12/942