



European Union

European Structural
and Investment Funds

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

Growth Programme for England

ESI Funds Growth Programme Board

Summary Report from the National Sub-Committees

Purpose:

This paper summarises business at National Sub-Committee meetings held in the last quarter. It lists their current membership and covers:

1. Communications Sub-Committee
2. Employment, Skills & Social Inclusion Sub-Committee
3. Equalities & Diversity Sub-Committee
4. Evaluation Sub-Committee
5. Performance & Dispute Resolution Sub-Committee
6. Smart Specialisation Sub-Committee
7. SME Competitiveness Sub-Committee
8. Sustainable Growth and Development Sub-Committee
9. Sustainable Urban Development Sub-Committee

Recommendations:

That the Growth Programme Board notes the report.

Abe Allen
GPB Secretariat
05 June 2018

Communications Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| • Rob Martell (Chair)
MHCLG | • Margot Tomkinson-Smith
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP | • Matt Smart
Oxford University |
| • James Ritchie (Deputy
Chair) DWP | • Matt Silver
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly | • Liz Sheppard
Defra |
| • Thomas Corker
BEIS | • Jen Robson
North East LEP | • Laura Spencer
Big Lottery |
| • John Hacking
Third Sector National
Learning Alliance | • Laura Welham-Halstead
Greater Cambridge & Greater
Peterborough LEP | • Laure Farret
GLA |

1. The sub-committee met on 17 April 2018. The Chair summarised activities delivered throughout 2017: there were a number of positive results and achievements, including a well-received Annual Information Activity, which featured a Case Study Booklet for each programme and supporting social media campaign/partner engagement.
2. The Chair reported on the communications partner survey which was conducted in January / February 2018. There were increased levels of responses for the second straight year and the results were broadly positive and close to, or slightly improved upon, those in 2017.
3. The sub-committee considered the activity plan for 2018. Comms activities will be delivered against the plan and will take into account feedback and suggestions received in the communications survey. Members were asked to support the Managing Authorities in gathering imagery/films from projects and other local partners and to support / spread word about programme social media activity. Within the same group discussion, partners expressed the view that communications themed by sector would be a useful approach to adopt.
4. Minister of State for Employment Alok Sharma is keen to understand and explore how non ESF aware local organisations can be reached with messages about the programme. The sub-committee discussed the current situation and how it is impacting on wider engagements. James Ritchie (DWP) agreed to capture what was discussed and consult with members as this ministerial request is acted upon and communications continue with his office ahead of plans being finalised.
5. The next meeting will take place in October 2018. The focus will be the delivery of activities within the 2018 Communications Activity Plan, upcoming communications challenges and the content of the 2019 Communications Activity Plan.

Employment, Skills and Social Inclusion Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| • Steve Spendlove (Chair)
DWP | • Gabrielle Melvin
Office of Civil Society | • Nick Small
LEP Network |
| • Mark Bacon
Keele University | • Stacey Sleeman
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly | • Hitesh Patel
Citizens Advice |
| • Chris Ball
Newcastle University | • Ian Oakes
University of
Wolverhampton | • Nick Campbell
DWP |
| • Becky Brookes
Employers' Network for
Equality and Inclusion | • Sue Ormiston
The Big Lottery Fund | • Michelle Thompson
Department for Education |
| • Ellen Broome
Family and Childcare Trust | • Nicola Radford
Coastal Communities
Alliance | • Marc Vermyle
European Commission |
| • Rita Chircop
Greater London Authority | • Laura-Jane Rawlings
Youth Employment UK | • Judith Walker
DWP |
| • Eleanor Dearle
Local Government
Association | • Joanna Cain , WEA | • Iain Wishart
Education and Skills
Funding Agency |

1. The sub-committee met on 10 May 2018. The ESF Managing Authority (MA) presented a progress update, noting that data to the end of March was used:

- The current commitment to ESF is £1.4bn which equates to approximately 47% of the total allocation.
- There are 177 Direct Bid Funding Agreements and 150 MOUs for the four National CFOs.
- There are currently four live calls totalling approximately £3.9m. The MA is currently drawing up a programme of calls based on the information collected through the LEP network. A forward timetable will be produced, with calls planned in tranches every month up until February 2019.

2. Key findings from the Outputs data are:

- With regards to committed participant data, at national level 2 out of 17 sub-groups are seemingly underperforming in comparison to committed spend;
- At national level the “over 50’s” sub group is below that expected, particularly low commitments in IP1.1 and IP2.1. The MA is negotiating with LEPs to target these areas, future calls will continue to address this;
- Particularly strong YEI sub groups are “participants with disabilities”, “single adult household with dependant child” (87% 118%) and “inactive participants who are NEET” (78%);
- The “Ethnic Minorities” sub group, though performing well nationally at 68% in terms of participants against committed spend, still shows low commitments in IP1.3 and IP2.1. Commitment under IP1.4 for participants in this sub group is 142%.

3. Attention was then drawn to the Results – committed participants data, highlighting the following points:
 - Nationally, with the exception of YEI, all but one sub group is performing well against their targets (exceeding or within 5% of target);
 - IP1.2 participants “(below 25 years of age) in employment, including self-employment, or education/training” has improved. The target is 43% and we have committed 52% of this;
 - The actual IP1.4 “inactive participants into employment or job search upon leaving” and “in education of training on leaving” is 6% below target at 21%, recently closed and future calls will continue to improve this;
 - Under the same result performance for IP1.1 committed results are 53% against a target of 33%.
4. New members Joanna Cain from the Workers Education Association (WEA) and Stacey Sleeman from the People in Prosperity team, Cornwall Council gave the group an overview of their work and their involvement with the third party and voluntary sector.
5. Sub-committee members discussed ESF eligibility criteria for Young People (YP) and how this limits providers working with YP and how this can be improved.
6. Sub-committee members also discussed how best to support providers working with older people.
7. The next sub-committee meeting will be held on Thursday 9 August 2018.

Equality & Diversity Sub-Committee

Membership

- **Steve Spendlove (Chair)**
DWP
- **Alan Beazley**
Employers' Network for Equality and Inclusion
- **Duncan Carnie**
DWP
- **Tamara Flanagan**
New Europeans Association
- **Rita Chircop**
Greater London Authority
- **Marc Vermyle**
European Commission
- **Alice Hood**
TUC
- **Peter Riley**
Manchester Metropolitan University
- **Richard Corfield**
MHCLG
- **Rachel Quinn**
D2N2 Social Inclusion & Equalities Advisory Group
- **Nick Campbell**
DWP
- **Sue Ormiston**
Big Lottery Fund
- **Sharon Long**
Partnership for Young London
- **Helen Millne**
Third Sector
- **Shafqat Rahim**
ESFA
- **Mark Wright**
EHRC

1. The sub-committee met on 24 May 2018. The ESF MA presented a progress update, noting that end of March data was used.

- The current commitment to ESF is £1.4bn which equates to approximately 47% of the total allocation.
- There are 177 Direct Bid Funding Agreements and 150 MOUs for the four National CFOs.
- There are currently four live calls totalling approximately £3.9m. The MA is currently drawing up a programme of calls based on the information collected through the LEP network. A forward timetable will be produced, with calls planned in tranches every month up until February 2019.

2. Key findings from the Outputs data are:

- With regards to committed participant data, at national level 2 out of 17 sub-groups are seemingly underperforming in comparison to committed spend;
- At national level the “over 50’s” sub group is below that expected, particularly low commitments in IP1.1 and IP2.1. The MA is negotiating with LEPs to target these areas, future calls will continue to address this;
- Particularly strong YEI sub groups are “participants with disabilities”, “single adult household with dependant child” (87% 118%) and “inactive participants who are NEET” (78%);
- The “Ethnic Minorities” sub group, though performing well nationally at 68% in terms of participants against committed spend, still shows low commitments in IP1.3 and IP2.1. Commitment under IP1.4 for participants in this sub group is 142%.

3. Attention was then drawn to the Results – committed participants data, highlighting the following points:

- Nationally, with the exception of YEI, all but one sub group is performing well against their targets (exceeding or within 5% of target);
 - IP1.2 participants “(below 25 years of age) in employment, including self-employment, or education/training” has improved. The target is 43% and we have committed 52% of this;
 - The actual IP1.4 “inactive participants into employment or job search upon leaving” and “in education or training on leaving” is 6% below target at 21%, recently closed and future calls will continue to improve this;
 - Under the same result performance for IP1.1 committed results are 53% against a target of 33%.
4. Duncan Carnie from the Managing Authority Duncan Carnie gave a progress update on the Equality Training programme being delivered to key MA staff.
 5. Nick Campbell from DWP’s Evaluation team provided the group with an overview of the work his team have carried out and future work they have planned and asked the group if they had any areas that they would want the team to analyse.
 6. Sub-committee members discussed the development and progress towards this sub-committees presentation to the GPB in September.
 7. The next sub-committee meeting will be held on Thursday 25 October 2018.

Evaluation Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| • David Morrall (Chair)
MHCLG | • Michele Mazza
BEIS | • Sue Parkinson
LEP Network |
| • Aloke Siddique
BEIS | • John Hacking
VCO | • Francis Lee
LEP Network |
| • Sarah Boyall
MHCLG | • Simon Jones
MHCLG | • Phil Smith
Private Sector and Small
Businesses |
| • Nisha Patel
MHCLG Analyst | • Emily Kent
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly | • Anthony Mtitimila
Universities |
| • Justin Martin
Defra | • Amy Coleman
Culture | • Mal Nicholls
DWP, ESF Evaluation
Lead |
| • Nick Campbell
DWP | • Marianne Law
BEIS | • Max Nathan
Academic |

1. The Evaluation National Sub-committee last met on 5th December 2017.
2. The ERDF Managing Authority (MA) provided an update on progress with summative assessments. Key points included:
 - The guidance was published in August after extensive consultation with stakeholders;
 - A communications plan was in place, with the MA providing presentations for the Growth Programme Board, Growth Delivery Teams (GDTs), local partners, TA partners, local practitioner networks and, where there was demand, with local ESIF sub-committees. Meetings had been productive and feedback constructive; and
 - Evaluation champions have been put in place in GDTs to aid contract managers with queries relating to the summative assessment requirement.
3. The ERDF MA provided an update on progress on the National Evaluation. Key points included:
 - Following the scoping study, the National Evaluation design had been approved by the MHCLG Research Gateway. The panel found that the evaluation should progress in any Brexit scenario;
 - It is proposed that the contract for the 4-year National Evaluation will include annual break clauses in the event that requirements change;
 - The business case was to be put before the MHCLG Investment Sub-Committee (ISC) for a proposed National Evaluation spend of circa £2million, which constitutes less than 1% of the programme budget while still facilitating a sufficiently robust evaluation; and
 - Once approval was gained from the ISC, Ministerial approval would be sought to begin the tendering process and publish outstanding evaluation reports.

- The MA provided an update on work to ensure programme evaluation processes would be compliant with the forthcoming General Data Protection Regulation.
4. BEIS provided an update on the findings of a report produced by Regeneris on Priority Axis 4.
 5. DWP provided a progress update on ESF evaluation work. Key points included:
 - A process evaluation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) had been published. An impact evaluation was commissioned with Ecorys, due to report by mid-2018.
 - On the programme-level evaluation Ecorys had been commissioned for an impact evaluation design and scoping project. The scoping report was expected by the end of the year.
 - A report on the ESF leavers' survey was expected in early 2018.
 - DWP was also exploring uses of administrative data. Discussion was ongoing with the Commission around a way of combining administrative data with a less expensive survey approach.
 6. The next meeting is yet to be confirmed.

Performance & Dispute Resolution Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| • Zainab Agha (Chair)
MHCLG | • Emma Kirkpatrick
DWP | • Heather Waddington
Leeds City Region LEP |
| • David Malpass
MHCLG | • Stuart Scott
GLA | • John Hunt
College |
| • Mary-Louise Harrison
LEP Network (more developed) | • Keith Harrison
Action for Communities in Rural Kent | • Guus Muijzers
DG Regio |
| • Simon Jones
MHCLG | • Justin Martin
Defra | • Aniekan Ekwere
BEIS |
| • David Pratt
Higher Education | • Emily Kent
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly | • James Newman
LEP Network (transition) |
| • Russel Reefer
Local Government (LGA) | • Helen Milne
Third Sector | • Carol Botten
Third Sector |

1. The Performance & Dispute Resolution National Sub-committee met on 10 May 2018.
2. The ERDF Managing Authority (MA) presented a progress update. Members noted good N+3 progress.
3. The ERDF MA set out that increases in the volume of claims being paid were having a positive impact. Work had also been done to ensure project claim forecasts were more accurate providing increased certainty on future claims, resulting in a more optimistic picture for the 2018 target. The MA will take a harder line with applicants on deadlines. Compliance colleagues aim to ensure most A125 checks are completed over summer.
4. Members responded positively towards the identification of October 2018/ early 2019 call windows.
5. Concerns that investment under PA5 and PA6 was reduced by the OP modification and could be reduced further if PF milestones not reached. The ERDF MA assured Members that amounts in PA5 and 6 were set in discussion with local partners.
6. The ERDF MA will look to bring further performance data if required by members.
7. The ESF MA presented a progress update. Key points arising from the discussion which followed included:
 - Members welcomed the publication of the call schedule.
 - Concerns were raised regarding co-financing organisations (CFOs). The ESF MA provided assurances that CFOs were being held to account and agreed to bring a discussion paper to the next meeting to update on progress, identify issues to be considered in phase 2 alongside learning that could be fed into UKSPF work.
8. The sub-committee heard progress to date on internal FOREX discussions. The discussion consulted PDR members on their views on various options open to DWP and MHCLG on managing the FOREX rate and their views on how those options could be operationalised including governance arrangements.

9. General comments were:

- Several members recognised that the programme was a national one, albeit delivered through localities. There was a balance to be struck between scope for partners to deliver in line with notional allocations and measures MAs would have to take to address performance challenges, where different processes would need to be applied at appropriate junctures.
- There were a range of views about this. Some members felt that MAs would inevitably need to adopt different approaches to ensure effective delivery of programme targets and funding. Others felt that some LEP areas might be reluctant for MAs to intervene and take a different approach to address performance difficulties and underspend- in particular where they felt that they had not had the proper opportunity to spend it before different MA processes were applied.
- Also small amounts of underspend could be corralled together through discussions between LEP areas rather than being organised centrally by the MA; although it was noted that cross-LEP activity of this nature to date has been minimal.
- However, it was also suggested that presentationally, the proposed approach works. A two stage process could provide stakeholders with the opportunity to spend in line with notional allocations, with an understanding that MAs would operate central measures at a second stage.
- The members also recognised that the financial risk of underspend and overspend would sit with the MA's respective Departments and as such any solution needed to give proper account of that.

10. With regards to timing:

- There was a general consensus from those that supported the two stage principle that it should be introduced in 1-2 years' time, although there may need to be different arrangements in certain circumstances.
- However, as set out above, LEP areas need to feel that they have had proper opportunity to commit their funding, and that expectation may vary between LEP area and Fund.
- It was suggested that rather than set out a deadline, that LEP areas should be provided with the opportunity to undertake a review and make clear how they planned to invest the remaining funding and the timescale for doing so. Failure to meet that timescale would then lead to decommitment.

11. With regards to what it should support, the main comments were:

- Alternative central processes introduced by the MAs would need to set out the basis for such approaches and criteria that would be used, including the focus of funded activities.
- The MAs clarified that a new approach would still require applicants to bring match funding and deliver in line with all other Operational Programme requirements.

12. With regards to governance arrangements the main comments were:

- Any approach has to be open and transparent, and also must enable local partners to contribute to influencing the criteria, and be able to provide advice on investments in their localities.

13. In the discussion on a forward look the following comments were made:

- At the next meeting discussion on progress against N+3 plus will continue.
- FOREX policy would continue as required following the outcome of the discussion at the June GPB meeting, where a progress paper will be presented.
- There will be a discussion on CFOs and an update on where we are on future local growth policy provided.

14. The next meeting will take place on 6 September 2018.

Smart Specialisation Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| • Paul Drabwell (Chair)
BEIS | • Prof Stephen Roper
Warwick Business School | • Prof Joe Sweeney
Lancaster University |
| • Farhana Quasem
(Secretariat), BEIS | • Prof Roy Sandbach
Newcastle University | • Tony McEnery , CEO,
ESRC |
| • Tricia Allen
MHCLG | • Jen Rae
NESTA | • Andrew Carter
Centre for Cities |
| • Nicholas French
BEIS | • Gillian Docherty
The Data Lab | • Prof John Goddard
Newcastle University |

1. The sub-committee met on 18 April 2018. Key developments on place policy including on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, Local Industrial Strategies, and the Government ambition of achieving 2.4% of GDP investment in R&D by 2027 were discussed.
2. The key points raised by the group pertain to each of these policy areas:
 - Importance of recognising that the UK's industrial structure is that of a service economy. Many innovations are not just technology based, but are much broader with an emphasis on social innovation. Therefore, Government needs to consider what type of impacts it is seeking from increased innovation.
 - Human capital is important, and a pipeline of skills for innovation needs to be maintained. Utilising an evidence base to support investment decisions requires entrepreneurial capacity to interpret how the data informs strategic decisions.
 - Policy interventions and evaluation metrics should be considered in relation to the dynamic of a locality. E.g. the varying mix of institutions, and governance structures in different places are indicative of the differing growth challenges and strengths of localities.
3. BEIS are continuing to provide policy and analytical input to inform the high level objectives of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund model of innovation funding in economic productivity.
4. BEIS are continuing to consider the Smart Specialisation Hub's future in the context of Brexit, and the renewed emphasis on regional policy as set out in the Industrial Strategy. The Hub's current contract will conclude in summer 2018.

SME Competiveness Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| • Ben Pledger (Chair)
Cities & Local Growth | • Sean McKee
London Chamber of
Commerce | • Clive Lewis
Inst. Chartered Accountants
in England & Wales |
| • Tim Courtney
BEIS | • Glenn Collins
Inst. Chartered Accountants | • John Goodman
Co-operatives UK |
| • David Morral
MHCLG | • Allie Rennison
Institute of Directors | • Matt Silver
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly |
| • John Bennett
MHCLG | • Dominic Williams
Fed'n of Small Businesses | • Dawn Whiteley
National Enterprise Network |
| • John Horseman
MHCLG | • Thomas Parry
Forum of Private Business | • Ruth Lowbridge
Sector Skills for Enterprise |
| • Joe Manning
Cities & Local Growth | • Lee Hopley
Engineering Employers' Fed | • Louise Bennett
Chambers of Commerce |
| • Karen Leigh
Cities & Local Growth | • Richard Kendall
Humber LEP | • Mike Spicer
Chambers of Commerce |

1. The Sub-Committee met on 14 May 2018.

2. ERDF PA 3 update report:

- Anna Vinsen talked through the annexes sent through in advance of the meeting. These papers include quantitative data on spend till end of March 2018. PA3 spend is the highest at £1.23bn, though SME support does form part of other priority axes.
- Each of the three types of area (more developed, transition, less developed) have their own budgets. There was an OP modification where the 'transition' areas were increased by 8% and their budget increased by 10%. For transition areas, projects that are currently exist are vital.
- There are over 500 projects, with 119 that have been legally committed. Projects have been found which have a 3 year run, though this has been extended for financial instruments. We will need to ensure that projects are processed so there is no gap in funding. More funding does become available as projects underspend, and there is a low slippage rate.
- The performance framework currently includes a financial target and output target.
- On the Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund, if it goes ahead there will be a positive impact.
- There is a lot of demand for PA3, particularly in D2N2 and London. There was one call that took up almost all of the allocation and consequently was more competitive at local level.
- Good delivery at the moment means the number of businesses supported and jobs created. This may not necessarily be a good indicator for judging productivity.

3. Long Tail Productivity Review:

- The Productivity Review was rebranded to the Long Tail Productivity Review, focusing on the less productive businesses. There has been a productivity gap which has seen it flatten.
- The most productive businesses are implementing actions that all businesses could do, for example CRM and tech adoption. We should look at the context of the market in which interventions operate.
- The What Works Centre has a high threshold for judging which interventions work. For less intensive interventions, it is difficult to prove whether an intervention has worked either way and to evaluate who has captured the benefit.
- The team are working with HMT to produce an idea of what the productivity problem is. A call of evidence has been launched, which should be promoted to all stakeholders. This will conclude in July.
- There is greater variation in productivity in London than elsewhere.

4. UKSPF:

- The objective of the fund is to reduce inequalities between economies across the country. The fund will be aligned to the foundations of productivity.
- LEPs and MCAs will continue to manage funding.
- We have the intention to launch a public consultation later in 2018. The content of the consultation will be subject to cross-Whitehall discussion.
- We will launch an extensive period of engagement in advance of the consultation, building on engagement we carried out in summer 2017.

5. ERDF evaluation:

- Evaluation is ongoing across all the priority axes. This will look at a national evaluation, best practice projects/evaluating outcomes, examine the impact of interventions and what has worked, and value for money.
- There should be early findings at the end of the year.
- This evidence will feed into the UKSPF and growth policy.

Sustainable Growth and Development Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| • Patrick Allcorn (Chair)
BEIS | • David Read
MHCLG | • John Osborne
MHCLG |
| • Mark Joslyn
MHCLG | • Ben Plummer
MHCLG | • Meg Patel
Defra |
| • Duncan Carnie
DWP | • Graeme Kerr
Natural England | • Bill Edrich
Bristol City Council |
| • Paul Nolan
Mersey Forest | • Alice Larkin
Tyndall Centre | • Aled Jones
Anglia Ruskin University |
| • Phill Woods
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly | • Chris Saville
Environment Agency | • Phil Larkin
National Trust |
| • Mark Atherton
New Economy,
Manchester | • Roger Mortlock
Gloucestershire Wildlife
Trust | • Paul Bourgeois
Greater Cambridgeshire
& Greater Peterborough
LEP |
| • Richard Powell OBE
Chair, Wild Anglia CIC | • Iva Figueredo
Greater London Authority | |

1. The Sustainable Sub Committee met on the 31 January 2018. The agenda focused on three key areas, DEFRA's 25 Year Environment Plan, the Regeneris Report on Priority axis 4 and Clean Growth Strategy. In addition papers were submitted in relation to progress against Priority Axes, 4, 5 6 & 7. The meeting was primarily driven by these three presentations as discussion ranged around how ERDF could help support the delivery of them as there is a great deal of synergy between them and the details in the Operational Programme across the priority axes.
2. Dan Barwick from Defra attended the meeting giving an overview of the 25 Year Environment Plan which DEFRA launched on the 11 January 2018. The resulting discussions looked at potential links with the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.
3. The chair presented details on the Regeneris report which was commissioned by BEIS to review Priority 4 through a series of workshops and interviews with MHCLG staff, applicants and partners.
4. The report recognised that PA4 is ambitious and delivery is challenging. Capacity varies between LEPs and local areas, especially if local resources are stretched. Most bidders come from the local authority or higher education sectors that have the capacity to deal with risk, scope, and tackle complex rules including procurement (state aids) and value for money requirements. Alternative funding sources targeted at low carbon outputs have stifled PA4 delivery in some areas although, positively, the pipeline of projects has improved and allocations should be taken up. Learning from PA4 delivery will feed into UKSPF development. Government is looking to respond to the report's recommendations, especially on alignment and leverage of funding streams. Many of the recommendations had been identified by MHCLG already and addressed as part of the Programme Modification such as amendments to the PA4 Guidance.

5. BEIS gave a presentation on the Clean Growth Strategy and the linkages between the Industrial Strategy and The 25 Environment Plan. It sets out the Government's proposals for decarbonising all sectors of the UK economy through to 2030 and incorporates innovation and green finance. There is an opportunity for PA 4 to feed into the Clean Growth Strategy as the key target areas in the plan align very closely to PA4.
6. The presentations and subsequent discussion took up the majority of the meeting and the opportunity to look at the delivery of the Cross Cutting Sustainability theme was moved to the next meeting to ensure it was given the necessary time.
7. The Committee will next meet in July 2018.

Sustainable Urban Development and Urban Agenda Sub-Committee

Membership

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| • David Morrall (Chair)
MHCLG | • Badder Alfaresi
MHCLG | • Huw Jenkins
Liverpool City Region |
| • Iain Derrick
MHCLG | • Stuart Scott
Greater London Authority | • Robin McDowell
Bristol City Council |
| • Garry White
MHCLG | • Lloyd Broad
Greater Birmingham and Solihull | • Jem Woolley
Nottingham City Council |
| • Sam Lucas
MHCLG | • Felix Kumi-Ampofo
Sheffield City Region | • Alison Gordon
Manchester City Council |
| • Peggy Haywood
MHCLG | • Teresa Kirby
Newcastle City Region | • David Anderson
Scottish Government |
| • Kathryn Dews
MHCLG | • Heather Waddington
Leeds City Region | • Maggie O'Carroll
The Women's Organisation |

1. There has not been a meeting of the Sub Committee since the last GPB update in March 2018, which described the main points arising from the Sub-Committee meeting on 19 January.
2. Bristol City Council was designated as an Intermediate Body (IB) on 7 February, completing the full complement of nine IBs delivering their SUD strategies. It is currently in the process of drawing up a call for projects
3. The other 8 designated IBs have all launched calls for projects and they have generally been successful. As at the end of April the position was as follows:
 - Leeds City Region: The call was over-subscribed. Full applications are currently being drafted by applicants, and are due for submission by 6th May.
 - Sheffield: Call was over-subscribed; outline applications are currently being assessed.
 - Liverpool City Region: Two full applications are in progress, and use up the full allocation.
 - Greater Manchester: 4 outline applications have progressed to full application. One is currently being appraised and the others are due in by 5 June.

- Greater Birmingham & Solihull: 8 outline applications were received, of which four are progressing to full, and 2 still under consideration. The call was under-subscribed; in part due to the SUD strategy requiring links with the HS2 high speed rail link. A second call will be required.
 - Nottingham and Derby: 8 outline applications submitted of which 3 are progressing to full.
 - North East: 11 outline applications received, going through Gateway appraisal. PA4 (low carbon) over-subscribed whilst PA5 (climate change) is under-subscribed.
 - London: 11 full applications submitted in March, including 4 project extensions; currently in appraisal.
4. It is currently planned that the next meeting of the Sub-Committee will be held in early autumn 2018.