



## **Minutes of the Growth Programme Board meeting**

**11:00 Tuesday December 18<sup>th</sup> 2018**

**Conference Room 5, Marsham Street, London**

---

### **Agenda**

- |                                |                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and introduction    | 5. ERDF National Evaluation     |
| 2. Progress on Programmes*     | Presentation                    |
| 3. Reserve Funds update*       | 6. Communications National Sub- |
| 4. BEIS 2020 Cohesion Policy – | Committee Annual Update –       |
| Verbal Update                  | Presentation                    |
|                                | 7. Minutes of September meeting |
|                                | and progress on actions         |
|                                | 8. Items for information*       |

*Agenda items marked \* were  
accompanied by Board papers*

---

### **Minutes**

#### **ITEM 1: Welcome and introduction**

1. The **Chair** (Julia Sweeney) opened the meeting and welcomed board members and started the meeting by providing an update on recent EU exit events. **Julia Sweeney** explained that in a Deal scenario the withdrawal agreement means that the UK will continue to participate in EU programmes financed by the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014 – 2020 until they end. Consequently, EU funding for UK participants and projects will be unaffected by the UK's withdrawal from the EU for the entire lifetime of such projects. In a No-Deal scenario the Chancellor announced in October 2016 that the government will guarantee funding for certain EU projects that are agreed before we leave the EU. In July 2018 the government extended this guarantee so that it would cover the full period of the 2014–20 programmes, and new projects would be funded as long as they offer value for money and are in line with domestic priorities. **Julia Sweeney** advised board members that if we were heading into a No-Deal scenario, board members would be



contacted and a separate meeting may be arranged. Looking forward, there the government ambition to develop a UK Shared Prosperity Fund and that once a consultation was opened, details would be circulated to members.

**ACTION 1812/01 – circulate UKSPF consultation details to board members when available**

2. **Julia Sweeney** noted the passing of Cllr Ian Stewart, who was a valued member of the Growth Programme Board and that she had wrote to the family to relay commiserations on behalf of the board.
3. **Julia Sweeney** welcomed substitute members **Catherine Crocker** (Local Authorities), **Paul Green** (Local Authorities) and **Dr Clive Winters** (Universities)
4. **Julia Sweeney** asked members for any conflicts of interest. None were declared.

**ITEM 2: Progress on Programmes**

**European Regional Development Fund**

5. **David Malpass** presented the progress report on ERDF delivery. The contracting figure is currently £1,525m (587 projects), which is a net increase of £15m from the position on 30 August. Applications in the pipeline continue to decrease, with 414 applications are currently under assessment versus 434 at the end of September. The figures presented show that the MA has met N+3 in terms of category of region expenditure. A payment application totalling approximately £250m has been prepared during November, this will ensure that the target is met and exceeded. Subject to final checks the target is expected to be surpassed by over €50m.
6. **David Malpass** explained the 2018 performance framework targets have been revised after the Operational Programme was amended in November 2018. However, where areas are not meeting their Priority Axis spend targets, then the 6% performance reserve will need to be transferred to a different Priority Axis. This means that overall no performance reserve will be lost and that the spend required to access the performance reserve will be achieved in over 75% of areas. A detailed report on LEP progress was shared at the meeting.
7. **Huw Edwards** raised a query as the LEP network had said that there were some outstanding irregularities from 2017, he asked if this information was accurate. **Julia Sweeney** responded by explaining that the error rates are



concluded by audit authorities so any LEP network intelligence may be out of date.

8. **Phil Atkins** asked if there will be an analysis between the overspend and the underspend in PAs, as this could help inform priorities for future funds. **Julia Sweeney** advised that ongoing analysis both on ERDF and more broadly across government and that this analysis will help inform the development of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.
9. **Carol Botton** asked how the reallocations will work if areas don't meet the next performance targets. **David Malpass** explained that in this situation the reserve fund will operate, and money would move to another priority axis within the same category of region. **Carol Crocker** responded by asking how the reserve will be allocated to two equally performing areas. **David Morrall** confirmed that an answer will be provided by next year and that they will be consulting LEP areas on the decision to get local views.
10. **Emily Kent** praised the progress that has been made and asked if the focus will shift to new calls after N+3 work was completed. She stated that several calls for PA5 had been delayed and that it had been difficult to find an EA match. In terms of CLLD she said that she agreed with establishing a national network quickly in order to share some of that best practice. **David Malpass** explained that for PA5 they are continuing to work with the Environmental Agency in order to solve any issues. With regards to the delay in calls he explained that he would need further details about it and will speak with the relevant people. **David Malpass** also confirmed that he will look at the possibility of setting up a national network for CLLD.

**ACTION 1812/02 – The ERDF Managing Authority to explore a national network for CLLD**

11. **Guus Muijzers** stated his appreciation of the hard work that went into meeting the N+3 targets and that it was great to see the figures in place to demonstrate the target will be met.

**European Social Fund**

12. **Steve Spendlove** presented the progress report on ESF delivery. At the mid-point of the programme, approximately 50% of the funding has been committed. The MA will be working with LEP areas to commit the remaining 50% over the next 12 months.
13. Based upon claims received, the MA is set to achieve the N+3 target at programme level. An N+3 Group was set up to closely monitor progress



towards the N+3 target and the performance figures reflect the effectiveness of the measures implemented by this Group and the reprioritisation work that the MA has undertaken over the last two months. The forecast at the end of October was 103.65% of N+3, an improvement on the previous forecast of 101.68%.

14. The Less Developed (LD) Category of Region (CoR) and YEI are below target, however this does not mean the target will not be achieved as achievement is measured at programme level. The financial aspect of the Performance Framework target is set to be met in the Transition and More Developed CoRs. There is a PA1 shortfall of €13.5m in the Less Developed CoR, which is being addressed. CFOs were asked to ensure that all Less Developed Region project claims were up to date, and any outstanding eligible expenditure was included in an interim Q3 claim (covering the period up to the end of July 2018). Interim Q3 claims from DWP and ESFA have been received and are being processed. A similar approach has been adopted with the Direct Bid Projects in the LD Region to ensure all available claims contribute toward the performance target. If this shortfall is not made up the funding will move to PA2. In terms of participants there is currently a PA1 shortfall, in the Less Developed CoR of 2,503 and a PA2 shortfall of 12,069 (21.65%) in the More Developed CoR. This is based on the latest validated information available (June 2018) with the large number of CFO claims being received for Quarter 3 the MA is confident of this target being achieved.
15. During the reprioritisation exercise calls were continued to be launched. The timetable is under constant revision to ensure that call opportunities are maximised. There are currently 58 calls on the call timetable covering the period December 2018 until April 2019 that total approximately £138m.
16. There will be a finite number of call slots from April onwards so higher value applications and consortia bids will be encouraged to maximise the slots available, this will give all LEP areas an opportunity to launch calls. To support this approach and to reduce the time for an application to progress through the appraisal process, **Steve Spendlove** set out the following amendments:
  - The minimum call value has increased from £50,000 to £150,000 of EU funding per call
  - The minimum application value has increased to 25% of the ESF call value or £150,000 ESF funding, whichever is the greater



- The MA introduced a single stage application process with effect from 29 October 2018.
17. **Helen Millne** asked whether the inclusion of smaller and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations had been considered in the changes to call value. **Steve Spendlove** responded by saying that the overarching aim is to maximise the allocation funds, the use of funds in support and that they would also like to decrease the burden of administration for smaller or 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations. Encourage working relationships or partnerships at local levels to support them, in particular consortia approaches are encouraged, however recognise these don't happen overnight. He confirmed that LEP leads are aware of the approach going forward.
  18. **James Newman** praised the progress in meeting N+3 but commented that it is important to understand the difference between committed and actuals in phase 2. He also highlighted the need to keep pressure on CFOs' delivery and to keep the momentum going towards next year's N+3 targets.
  19. **Simon Nokes** noted that a minimum of 25% of the call value seemed high and wondered whether it's the right number. He also asked for a breakdown of data by LEP areas (similar to ERDF provision) and questioned where the confidence in getting over a 65 % percent barrier in PA 1 was coming from. **Steve Spendlove** explained that this is based on forecast of claims from CFOs and these had been checked by the Certifying Authority. He also confirmed that he will provide a breakdown of numbers in LEP areas going forward. **Simon Nokes** asked where the CFO data was coming from. **Catherine Blair** explained that forecasts are from grant recipients that they can test against the actuals. She advised that it was a reasonable estimate using a combination of the forecasts, the actuals and the case profiles.
  20. **Keith XXX** raised the issue of the BBO programme being extended and concerns he had heard with regards to discrepancies at the micro level between contractors and subcontractors, with money being held up due to local conflicts. He asked were the board aware of this and what the process was to resolve this. It was suggested that the Performance and Dispute Resolution sub-committee was the avenue to raise these issues.
  21. **Huw Edwards** noted that the proposed single stage assessment process for ESF would help with clearing any backlog.
  22. **Emily Kent** welcomed the progress on N+3 but was concerned the focus on this had affected other business areas, for example PIV and cashflow. She stated said that while she recognised the need for a minimum project value, having it at 25% of the call value is of concern for Cornwall & Isles of Scilly



(CloS). The requirement for local involvement with ESF is difficult as in CloS they have had a single bidder from outside of the local area. As a result, they are stuck because they don't know if they can guarantee the project is delivered locally. She asked whether these issues can be resolved.

23. **Carol Botton** asked if the call window could be extended from 8 weeks, given a change to single stage application and 25% minimum value would impact on available capacity to meet the new call requirements. She also raised concerns that local ESIF sub-committees are not receiving a huge level of detail from CFOs and therefore don't have the full picture at local or national level, which would help frame future activity. **Steve Spendlove** confirmed that he had noted her concerns. **Catherine Blair** advised that in the future a gap analysis will be provided to the board which will show where relative imbalances are placed. She assured members that in the future they will be focusing on three things: working smarter; working flexibly; and planning for the programme. The gap analysis will help this approach.
24. **Marc Vermyle** commented that he was pleased with DWP's progress with N+3.
25. The amendments were noted by the Board – no further comments or concerns were raised.

**ACTION 1812/03 – The ESF Managing Authority to provide a breakdown of figures for LEP areas**

**European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development**

26. The report on EAFRD delivery progress was presented by **Tony Williamson** and advised that as of 1 November under the RDPE Growth Programme, £68m of grant had been awarded to 381 projects, including £10m spent by 89 completed projects from the offers launched in 2015. Of this £68m, £20.6m has been paid out, creating 259 FTE jobs. The scheme is on track to spend its full budget and meet its job creation target. The RPA have now processed all 1,864 Expressions of Interest (EOI) received from the 2017 calls and local ESIF Sub-Committees have commented on the local fit of projects. So far, invitations to submit a Full Application have been issued to 1,266 applicants for funding totalling £234m. From these, 513 projects have submitted applications for funding of £99m, with 292 projects so far securing grant offers worth £62m. In addition, 8 contracts for funding totalling £47.3m under the £75m Rural Broadband Infrastructure offer have been approved. Defra and the RPA are continuing to consider options for utilising any EAFRD Growth Programme funding remaining once all the projects arising from the



2017 offers have been contracted, including the possible use of exchange rate gains.

27. **Huw Edwards** commented that there are still problems with broadband in Rural areas, there are currently 8 projects dealing with this and whether there are any new projects taking a different approach. **Tony Williamson** confirmed that the new projects will be using conventional technologies, but they are open to conversations about further projects.
28. **Emily Kent** asked why it has taken years to get projects through the process. **Tony Williamson** responded by explaining that there are two reasons for this, the first is down to when applicants submit their full application, secondly is due to the bottleneck created by the initial 2019 treasury commitment. He assured members that they will continue to progress applications in line with deadlines.
29. **Janet Thornton** commented that the number of contracts is uneven and one or two particularly stand out in certain areas. She asked if there were reasons for that and if can we learn from it. **Tony Williamson** responded by saying that there could be several reasons for this. He advised there is likely a link between those areas that have a rural capacity and those that do not that. He advised that they will be looking at those correlations and can work with members to use that information to develop the future UKSPF.
30. **James Newman** commented saying that it seems like a laid-back programme because you can receive an expression of interest that may or may not turn into applications. He asked how we can get those expression of interests into applications quicker. **Tony Williamson** responded by saying they do not want to give the impression that they aren't encouraging applications, the RPA are encouraging applicants to submit their full application. **James Newman** asked for quarterly reports for the future and for it to be taken away as a general comment.
31. **Phil Atkins** stated that the varied performance and lack of industry experience is something we need to learn from. He asked that if the RPA ceased to exist in the future, what would be the plan going forward. **Tony Williamson** responded by saying that if we're going to continue applications and utilise industry knowledge, they would need to ramp up capacity in different geographical areas across to ensure that any transition does not mean a loss of knowledge. **Carol Botton** commented that she would like to see cross cutting themes in the future for all programmes.



32. The update paper was noted by the board and there were no further comments or questions.

### **ITEM 3: Reserve Funds**

33. **David Morrall & Steve Spendlove** provided an overview of the ERDF and ESF Reserve Funds update paper. The common principles between the two reserve funds are:

- Introduced at the latest point that is necessary to commit all available funding;
- Ensuring Reserve Funds deliver Operational Programme and local priorities;
- Managed in an open and transparent way;
- Minimizing the amount of changes to business process; and
- Looking to use existing governance mechanisms where possible.

Both MHCLG and ESF are continuing to work on developing transparent and clear processes setting out how funds from the Reserve Funds can be applied for and the process each MA will use to consider any applications for funding. The latest developments were discussed at the Performance and Dispute Resolution sub-committee meeting on 15 November.

34. **Paul Green** asked if the ESF Reserve Fund can also be used to address local economic shocks. **Catherine Blair** responded stating that she thinks we should be doing that already and agreed with the importance of ensuring this continues in the future.
35. **Dr Clive Winters** noted that the language in the paper made it difficult to understand, asked how this would be communicated to LEPs and what support would be provided to local areas. **David Morrall** confirmed that he would look at the report and make it clearer going forward, also that LEPs are engaged through local sub-committees and the LEP network, but that ahead of the launch of the reserve fund more proactive outreach will be undertaken to ensure that the money made available is utilised.
36. **Carol Botton** stated that we could use this as an opportunity to blend ESF and ERDF more. She also asked if it could be good to look at whether the level of technical support is related to underperforming LEPs. **David Morrall** responded by saying that they will try to blend ESF and ERDF as far as possible. He confirmed that Technical Assistance is available across the country and that MAs are constantly looking to understand why some areas perform better than others.



37. **Cllr Phil Davies** questioned whether cities were represented on the Performance and Dispute Resolution Sub-Committee (PDRSC), and in particular MCA representation. **James Newman** stated that he represents Sheffield City region in the group but that there could be further broadening of representation. **David Morrall** replied saying that having reflected on that point, it was concluded that the group does have city representation, but he is happy to think about how we can do more.

**ACTION 1812/04: David Morrall agreed to speak with Cllr Phil Davies on representation and membership**

38. **Simon Nokes** asked why ERDF is prioritising local calls and ESF is prioritising national rolling calls. He also asked what happens when there is a national call and one area doesn't agree to the proposed activity, would the activity still proceed, and furthermore how does this relate to role of Intermediate Bodies (IBs). **David Morrall** explained that a national approach will not undermine the local context of the ERDF programme. He said that advice from local will continue to ensure approaches are locally driven, but there comes a point where small pockets of money have to be combined in order to extract maximum value and impact from the remaining funding. IB calls will continue up to autumn, after that it is a live question as to how the role of IB will work in governance. **Simon Nokes** asked to clarify if David meant that he could see the reserve fund being used to either progress projects in a single geography or used to progress activity in all areas. **David Morrall** responded by saying he would like to facilitate more cross LEP working, but that any cross area working would require a pragmatic approach as the reserve fund is designed to utilise the money in a short time frame.
39. **James Newman** stated that the reserve fund is inevitable but that local areas should have every opportunity to utilise the money. He said that once that opportunity is over, there needs to be clarity on how the reserve funds are accessed and subsequently allocated, ensuring these are understood by all. He added that it seems sensible to look at the reserve fund as a potential opportunity to support any UKSPF priorities, thereby providing continuity ahead of any transition to a new fund.
40. **Huw Edwards** stated that the continuing sensitivity on his side of the room is due to the national reference of the scheme, he said that he thinks it's largely wording. He stated that MAs talk about how they want to spend the money, which is important but it's also important to focus on why some people aren't spending it and to get some funds to them. **Catherine Blair** agreed with this point stated that this was what she was thinking earlier and that she encourages an early warning system so that a discussion can be made as to



why these problems are arising. **David Morrall** said that reserve fund approach isn't a new approach, there's always been a mechanism in the event certain money can't be spent so that we can that money available. In terms of matching funding, there have been discussions from PDR on how to make areas more aware of available match funding in a better way and we will keep you informed of updates.

41. **Zainab Agha** summarised the discussion by saying that they are reviewing membership to ensure the right representation around the table. However, members need to ensure they are representing the views of their sectors. The reserve fund's main function is to utilise funding, but it is also a great opportunity to facilitate joint working and it is everyone's interest to make the most of the opportunity. She mentioned MAs have been careful to reiterate the message that the programme will remain locally driven. She said that she would really appreciate if she could send the communications in advance to members so that they can help ensure the right message is sent out.

#### **ITEM 4: BEIS post 2020 Cohesion Policy update**

42. **Nick French** provided a verbal update on BEIS engagement with the European Commission on the development of Cohesion Policy beyond 2020. This has involved a focus on simplification, potentially at N+2. The UK continue to feed into the development of this while we remain a member of the EU.
43. **Carol Botton** asked whether we would continue this work in the transition period. **Nick French** replied explaining that we would not continue once the UK is no longer a member of the working group.
44. **Carol Botton** asked a further question about how the work will influence the UKSPF. **Nick French** responded saying the UKSPF are gathering information from the current programme rather than the future discussions. **Julia Sweeney** commented that in developing the UKSPF government is looking at a range of evidence to inform future policy developments. She mentioned that the structural funds environment requires you to look across several member states with different systems and therefore you require a strong control environment. However, for a fund just within the UK, the control environment is potentially very different.
45. **Catherine Crocker** asked since we are still interested in PEACE PLUS, will the UK be continuing with other transnational projects? **Nick French** responded by saying that it has not been decided yet, It has only been confirmed that we will continue in PEACE PLUS.



## **ITEM 5: ERDF National Evaluation presentation**

46. **Neil Evans** and **Stuart Merali- Younger** from Regeneris, presented on the approach being taken for the ERDF national evaluation.
47. **Paul Green** asked if Regeneris were looking at a LEP area analysis and what the role for LEPS is. **Neil Evans** replied stating that it is a national evaluation but seeking inputs from different levels and how this can be disaggregated, so data is bottom up from projects.
48. **Helen Millne** questioned whether Regeneris is looking at cross cutting themes, such as diversity. **Regeneris** stated they are different dimensions and aspects to these issues and how they play out vary from location to location but will look to the qualitative element of the evaluation to explore these.
49. **David Morrall** summarised by stating that the work Neil Evans is doing for ERDF is important. It's probably the most ambitious evaluation as the programme is very complex. He stated that it was interesting that there are different models of evaluation for each individual priority axis (Pas) as the programme is so complex. As a result, it is difficult to get one model of evaluation that works best for all PAs and that is something we have learnt for our future UKSPF model.

## **ITEM 6: Annual Communications Sub Committee Report**

50. **Rob Martell** presented the Annual Communications Sub Committee report. He advised that the 2019 communications activity will aim to build on the initial years of the programme and further publicise the ERDF and ESF opportunities in England. It will continue to promote the purpose, priorities and availability of ERDF and ESF and how to access them. It will also align, where possible/suitable, with communications for planned future funds in England which are currently in development and which will follow the current European Structural Fund programming period. Lists of beneficiaries receiving funding will continue to be published on gov.uk to ensure that details of ESIF investments are openly accessible.
51. Communication channels and networks for projects and key partners will also be further developed to maximise opportunities for joint publicity and sharing best practice and positive news stories; and project case studies will be developed and used to further publicise the programme aims and achievements. As some of the early projects from the programme reach maturity, there will be an increased focus on what projects ERDF and ESF funding has delivered. We will



however also continue to promote new funding opportunities within the programme and new projects.

52. **Huw Edwards** thanked Rob for ensuring all subcommittees are receiving the reports. He asked about the wider impact of the communications. **Zainab** answered stating that the wider impact is demonstrated in the projects themselves, as it shows what is being done on the ground. **Julia Sweeney** added that most of the activity is linked through the regional press. This is complemented keeping the growth story alive nationally through high profile ministerial visits and that the policy impact is amplified through local projects. It's about tying the local part with the national.
53. **David Morrall** stated that you can see some of our projects coming out more recently through growth hubs, we can see the case studies and see what works well.
54. **Catherine Blair** summarised by emphasising that there are numerous ways to communicate but case studies make a very powerful impact because people can relate to the individual telling the story. It is fundamental that lessons are learned, and communication is conducted in the most efficient way possible.

#### **ITEM 7: Minutes of the September meeting and progress on actions**

55. **Owen Murray** presented minutes of the September meeting. All actions had been discharged. The minutes were agreed.

#### **ITEM 8: Items for information**

56. **National sub-committees' report:** The Board received and noted the report.

**Meeting closed: 14:10**

#### **Date, time and venue of future meetings**

- Wednesday 20 March 2019 11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG
- Tuesday 18 June 2019 11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG
- Thursday 19 Sept 2019 11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG



**European Union**

European Structural  
and Investment Funds

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

**Growth Programme for England**

## **Annex A**

### **List of agreed actions from December 2018 Growth Programme Board meeting**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Assigned to:</b>
1812/01	Circulate UKSPF consultation details to board members when available	GPB Secretariat
1812/02	The ERDF Managing Authority to explore a national network for CLLD	David Malpass
1812/03	The ESF Managing Authority to provide a breakdown of figures for LEP areas.	Steve Spendlove
1812/04	David Morrall agreed to speak with Cllr Phil Davies on representation and membership	David Morrall

## **Annex B**

### **ESI Funds Growth Programme Board meeting December 2018 - Attendees**

#### **Chair:**

	<b><i>Sector/Organisation Representing</i></b>
<b>Julia Sweeney</b> Director, European Programmes and Local Growth Delivery	MHCLG

#### **Board Members (full and advisory):**

	<b><i>Sector/Organisation Representing</i></b>
<b>Catherine Crocker</b> Greater London Authority	Greater London Authority
<b>Emily Kent</b> Head of Economy, Skills & Culture Cornwall Council	Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly
<b>Dr Huw Edwards</b> Thames Valley Berkshire LSC	LEPs
<b>Simon Nokes</b> Greater Manchester Combined Authority	LEPs
<b>James Newman</b> Sheffield City Region LEP	LEPs
<b>George Kieffer</b> Vice Chair, South East LEP	LEPs
<b>Cllr Philip Atkins</b> Leader, Staffordshire County Council	Local Authorities
<b>Lloyd Broad</b> Birmingham City Council	Local Authorities / LGA
<b>Paul Green</b> Policy Advisor, LGA	Local Authorities



## European Union

European Structural  
and Investment Funds

## European Structural and Investment Funds 2014 - 2020

### Growth Programme for England

<b>Andy Churchill</b> Civil Society Involvement	Voluntary/Community Sector
<b>Helen Millne</b> Chief of Operations & Finance, The Women's Organisation	Voluntary & Community Sector (National)
<b>Dan Bellis</b> Federation of Small Businesses	Business / Private Sector (SMEs)
<b>Keith Cowell</b> Principal, City of Westminster College	Further Education
<b>Professor John Latham</b> Vice-Chancellor, Coventry University	Higher Education (Universities)
<b>Cllr Phil Davies</b> Wirral Council	Sustainable Urban Development
<b>Janet Thornton</b> Vice Chair, Yorkshire Food Farming & Rural Network	Rural Farming Network
<b>Richard Powell</b> Chair, Wild Anglia Local Nature Partnership	Local Nature Partnerships
<b>Keith Harrison</b> Chief Exec, Action with Communities in Rural Kent	LEADER
<b>Steve Spendlove</b> ESF Division	DWP
<b>Catherine Blair</b> ESF Division	DWP
<b>Nick French</b> European Directorate	BEIS
<b>Tony Williamson</b> Head of RDPE Strategy Team, Rural Policy	Defra (EAFRD)
<b>Zainab Agha</b> Deputy Director, Policy & Partnerships	MHCLG
<b>David Malpass</b> Deputy Director, Growth Delivery Network	MHCLG
<b>David Morrall</b> Head of European Programme & EU Urban Policy	MHCLG
<b>Simon Jones</b> Policy Manager, MHCLG	MHCLG
<b>Guus Muijzers</b> European Commission	European Commission
<b>Marc Vermayle</b> European Commission	European Commission
<b>Frederik Tiger</b> European Commission	European Commission

#### Additional Attendees:

Name	Sector/Organisation
<b>Swati Chuni</b> European Programmes	MHCLG



## European Union

European Structural  
and Investment Funds

## European Structural and Investment Funds 2014 - 2020

### Growth Programme for England

<b>Owen Murray</b> Growth Programme Board Secretariat	MHCLG
<b>Neil Evans</b>	Regeneris
<b>Stuart Merali- Younger</b>	Regeneris

#### Apologies:

	<b><i>Sector/Organisation</i></b>
<b>Sir Albert Bore</b> Birmingham City Council	LGA/Local Authorities
<b>Mayor Joe Anderson</b> Liverpool City Council	SUD / Core Cities
<b>Shelly Dowrich</b> Government Equalities Office	Equalities
<b>Kevin Rowan</b> Trades Union Congress	Trade Unions
<b>Robert Matthews</b> Head of Unit, EU Fisheries Funding	Defra (EMFF)
<b>Emma Kirkpatrick</b> Head of ESF Managing Authority	DWP