European Union
European Structural and Investment Funds

European Structural and Investment Funds 2014 - 2020

Growth Programme for England

Minutes of the Growth Programme Board
11:30 Wednesday 9 December 2020
Microsoft Teams

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction.
2. Progress on Programmes*
3. Financial Instruments
4. Phase 2 National Evaluation Report
5. Communications National Sub-Committee Annual Update*
6. Case Studies*
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 introductions

1. **Jenny Dibden** welcomed Board Members and substitutes and advised that apologies received would be recorded in the minutes.

2. **Jenny Dibden** asked the board for any conflicts of interest, **Huw Edwards** and **James Newman** declared interests under Item 2 and Item 3 respectively. **Jenny Dibden** recognised the broad nature of the interests declared and suggested it was at Member's discretion whether to recuse themselves.

3. **Jenny Dibden** invited Board Members to say if they have anything they wish to include under **Items for Information.** No items were received.

Item 2: Progress of Programmes

<u>**European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)**</u>

4. **David Malpass** presented the ERDF report summarising the key points from the circulated Progress Update paper.

5. As of 31 October 2020, the total contracted figure is £2,594m (942 projects) and the programme is 80% committed, £630m is to be contracted and the total pipeline is £527m

(356 applications). Most of the new applications are under Priority Axis (PA) 4 Low Carbon Economy.

6. Using the European Commission (EC) CRII+ flexibilities, 420 claims have been processed as of 30 September 2020. These claims relate to 246 individual projects. 381 claims have been paid with a value of £50m ERDF.

7. The CRII+ flexibilities have been welcomed by projects and the number of projects using the flexibilities has been positive. A key issue has been using the flexibilities to pay claims quicker by decreasing the number of checks on projects primarily due to being unable to access evidence for claims during the COVID-19 crisis. The Managing Authority (MA) are working on how to process postponed checks in 2021.

8. The N+3 2020 target was achieved in September and exceeded by more than 14%. It is expected that the N+3 2021 target will be achieved in the first half of 2021.

9. As of 30 November 2020, £242m of the Sustainable Urban Development (SUD) allocation has been contracted and there are £55m applications in the pipeline. The level of ERDF committed to live projects has increased to 82%. The programme remains on track to meet its target.

<u>COVID-19 Response Update: Reopening High Streets Safely Fund (RHSSF)</u>

10. **£50m fund**. The first claims have been received from Local Authorities, 121 Grant Action Plans from Local Authorities have been reviewed and completed, and 36 Grant Funding Agreements have been completed.

11. Early issues regarding eligibility have been resolved and FAQs are now available on GOV.UK. Each Local Authority has also been assigned a specific Contract Manager as a main point of contact to support communication between the Local Authorities and the RHSSF team.

12. It was recognised that there has been a further tightening of restrictions in local area however claims are expected at the end of the Spring.

<u>SME Restart and Recovery, and Kickstarting Tourism Package</u>

13. **£20m and £10m funds respectively**. It was recognised that Growth Hubs have played a crucial role in delivery. 30 ERDF projects secured investment decisions within a 2 – 3-week period following receipt of project change requests. This includes 2 multi-LEP area projects.

14. A total of £29.8m of additional ERDF has been contracted and it is estimated that this will support c.6,600 SMEs. At the end of the September, 955 SMEs have received grant awards with a total commitment value of £2.7m.

15. **Alison Gordon** asked for more details on the development of activity through the Reserve Fund because there is now only a short amount of time to do anything with the money. **David Malpass** responded that the MA are working on finalising the pipeline and it is expected that any money left over will be put into recovery measures and existing projects where appropriate.

16. **Pernille Kousgaard** asked for early sight of thinking on the priorities for the Reserve Fund. There is a risk that calls for proposals for the Reserve Fund duplicate activity that local areas are already doing and are published too late leaving local areas without the time needed to respond and secure match funding. **David Malpass** noted concerns around the priorities and timing of the Reserve Fund calls. The MA recognise that a national call will be difficult and will work with partners on how to use the money.

17. **Pernille Kousgaard** raised concerns from Local Authorities about their ability to deliver the RHSSF due to local restrictions and asked whether the MA are having conversations with the EC about extending the delivery timeframe. **David Malpass** noted the concerns from Local Authorities and agreed to look at this.

18. **Carol Botten** asked the EC if any discussions were ongoing about extending the CRII+ flexibilities beyond 2020. **Guus Muijzers** replied that the CRII+ flexibilities do not end at the end of 2020, but the 100% intervention rate flexibility is limited to the accounting year 2020/21, claims using the flexibilities will continued to be paid until June 2021.

19. **James Newman** added that Members had been told that flexibilities would be finishing at the end of 2020 and therefore there would not be an opportunity to bring forward projects without match funding. **Geoff Hawker** responded that the 100% intervention rate is fixed for the accounting period 2020/21.

20. **Carol Botten** asked for further clarity on the delivery timeline for the 100% intervention rate flexibility. **David Malpass** responded that in order to draw down the money from the EC the MA needs to submit claims from applicants before 30 June 2021. This requires projects to spend the money and submit a claim, and the MA to process and pay the claim before it can be submitted to the EC. The MA is anticipating collecting claims by April/May 2021. **Geoff Hawker** added that this is the same timeline for the Digital Inclusion Call which means that the kit must be purchased by 31 December 2020.

<u>European Social Fund (ESF)</u>

21. **Geoff Hawker** presented the ESF report summarising the key points from the circulated Progress Update paper.

22. As of 31 October 2020, the total ESF commitment was £2.4bn (80% of the total allocation). There are 8 live calls on GOV.UK to the value of £9.3m with closing dates ranging from 23 November 2020 to 20 January 2021.

23. The MA has been focused on recruitment to support the appraisal and verification processes to help reduce the pipeline. The MA have been engaging with the Performance and Dispute Resolution (PDR) sub-committee and an extraordinary meeting was held to focus on ESF appraisal activity, the Reserve Fund and future opportunities.

24. The N+3 2020 target is proving challenging to meet because activity is slowing down due to COVID-19 restrictions and the MA and Audit Authority's ability to get checks done. Two calls have also been introduced on digital inclusion because data poverty was identified as a concern by Members. Due to the challenging timeline, several participants had to withdraw. Currently £1m 1,600 participants and the Greater London Authority (GLA) are at £1.4m 1,800 participants. Lessons learned will be used to design the Reserve Fund and its processes.

25. **Pete Long** presented the appraisal pipeline position as of 30 November 2020. £160m of the total pipeline has been now been contracted to live projects, all projects have been assigned to an appraiser due to additional resource and streamlining the appraisal process. Between 31 October and 31 November 2020, unassigned projects decreased from 150 to 102. £130m of funding agreements that have been issued or are about to be issued to project partners. The MA recognises that there are still challenges to overcome with regards to the appraisal pipeline and processes. It is estimated that the current pipeline will be concluded by mid-April 2021 and the expectation is that outstanding funding agreements will issued be within two weeks of a decision.

26. The MA are working to ensure the remaining money in the Reserve Fund is spent and actions are being taken to improve the process including working with projects and local partners including ESIF sub-committees and LEP officers, ensuring that for the remaining Calls that checks are undertaken and projects assigned to an appraiser within 2 weeks of the call closing, and on assignment setting out a forecast timeline to decision for the applicant to show clear milestones.

27. **Carol Botten** asked what the average length of time between the submission date and the offer is. **Pete Long** responded that the length of time between assignment to a decision is being closely monitored and in the last month it has been 19 weeks, but this is steadily falling due to additional resource and streamlining the process. The length of time between approval and the Funding Agreement being issued is kept as short as possible but this is dependent on outstanding decisions with the applicant. Several decisions have been made over the last week and the Funding Agreement was issued the following day.

28. **Pernille Kousgaard** noted that not all local areas have local Technical Assistance (TA) teams and that the MA need to ensure that they are talking to the right people. **Geoff Hawker** responded that the MA recognises this and is in the process of responding to this action from the PDR sub-committee.

Reserve Fund

29. **Steve Spendlove** presented the Reserve Fund position and thanked Members and the EC for their support in approving the Operational Programme (OP) modification that enabled it to respond to current and forecast support needs.

30. In October 2020 the Reserve Fund value was £324m. £39m of Call proposals have been received and approved but are still at the development stage following the re-launch of the Reserve Fund in June after the COVID-19 pause. In addition, Call Proposals to the value of £66m were deferred pending the provision of further information from applicants and the approval of the revisions to the OP but these have since been approved. Change requests to the value of £58m are expected from the National Lottery Community Fund and there is an expectation that the MA will be able to approve them subject to their Board approval. Programming activities, including project overcommitment assumptions, with a net value of £12m will be taken out of the Reserve Fund value bringing the December 2020 balance of the Reserve Fund to £147.3m.

31. Since the launch of the Reserve Fund, the MA has managed risk of underspend by applying overcommitment assumptions to the difference between the value of funding agreements and claims submitted, and between the call being launched and the total value of funding agreements as a result of the call. It is also to reflect the impact of Forex. The over-programming position is valued at £50.5m.

32. **Geoff Hawker** added that the MA are content to manage that risk and that a Task and Finish Group is being set up with volunteers from the PDR sub-committee to look at future call opportunities. An internal conversation is also ongoing to look at aligning the Reserve Fund with the Restart scheme and the Department for Education.

33. **Carol Botten** asked for clarity on the makeup of the £147.3m Reserve Fund balance. **Geoff Hawker** responded that the £147.3m includes over-programming, attrition and Forex and the MA are prepared to take that risk.

34. **James Newman** reiterated a point made at the PDR sub-committee that the MA are at risk of over-programming and asked whether the claims activity will have decreased because delivery has slowed down and therefore there is a further risk of reporting a forecasted figure rather than a real figure. **Geoff Hawker** committed to keeping the Growth Programme Board and PDR sub-committee updated on the Reserve Fund value. Claims have slowed down over the past 9 months, but the MA made the decision not to over-inflate the Reserve Fund figure.

N+3 Position

35. **Mark Burns** presented the N+3 position. Due to COVID-19, the MA has had an issue trying to obtain evidence for claims from Grant Recipients. The MA are anticipating an

IPA17 forecast in December 2020 of €108.4m and this will achieve and exceed the N+3 target by €2.7m. (100.15%). However, the Certifying Authority are still carrying out their checks and there is still a risk of decommitment. If the target is not achieved there is the option of writing to the EC to make them aware of the circumstances and talk about force majeure.

European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)

36. **Emma Friend** presented the EAFRD report summarising the key points from the circulated Progress Update paper.

37. As of December 2020, under Growth Programme Rounds 1 (launched in 2015) and 2 (launched in 2017), £165m projects have been invited to submit full applications, £112m of those projects have been contracted, and £18m has been paid out to beneficiaries. The third round of the Growth Programme closed on 16 February 2020 and Expressions of Interest (EOIs) totalling £353m were received, £192m have been invited to submit a full application and £9.3m has been contracted. The Rural Payments Authority (RPA) has now completed the appraisal of all full applications received under Growth Programme Rounds 1 and 2.

38. The final full application round concluded in October 2020 and the MA now understand how much money has been requested in relation to the full applications received. The MA have been able to lower the project approval score and approve projects held from Growth Programme Rounds 1 and 2. The MA expect to have all Round 3 applications assessed by mid-December and decisions will be communicated to applicants by the end of January 2021. Under the Growth Programme, actual jobs have increased to 1,391 and contracted jobs have increased to 4,258. The MA has achieved and exceeded its target of creating 4,075 jobs by December 2020.

39. **Pernille Kousgaard** asked how many projects are being approved and how they are split across the three strands. How many projects are supporting businesses in rural areas because that should be the focus during the COVID-19 crisis. **Emma Friend** agreed to circulate the breakdown to Members.

ACTION 2012/01 DEFRA to circulate the breakdown of projects from Round 3 of the Growth Programme.

European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

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

Item 3: Financial Instruments

41. **David Read** presented the Financial Instruments (FIs) position. As of 30 September 2020, the ERDF programme has contracted 11 FIs worth £1,269.86m, £517.5m ERDF and £752.36m match funding. All the funds are designed to be fully invested by December 2023 and the investment pipeline for live funds are either in line with or exceeding forecasts with strong productivity and employment outcomes. The Low

Carbon Investment Fund only started investing at the beginning of 2020. There are no concerns about the funds' ability to spend by 2023.

42. As of the end of September 2020, the Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund (NPIF) had invested almost £200m in 924 investments in 715 SMEs and leveraged £232m from the Private Sector. NPIF was based on assessment of the market. Since 1 April 2020 c£100m has been released into the fund that was previously held back whilst how the fund was working was assessed.

43. The British Business Bank (BBB) have secured an extra £100m from the 2020 Spending Review. There were concerns that due to the current investment rate the funding would run out for new investments by 2021 because the existing money will be used for following rounds of investment for the existing portfolio of businesses.

44. The positive impact of the funding can be seen in Early Assessment Reports undertaken by independent research company (SQW) on NPIF, Midlands Engine Investment Fund and the Cornwall Isles of Scilly Investment Fund (CIoSIF), the report for CIoSIF has just been published. The reports highlight that the funds are successful in increasing the supply of finance to viable businesses and have had a direct impact on improving the productivity and enhancing skills. The funds have had a wider positive impact including increasing awareness of external finance and confidence in raising finance in future across businesses supported.

45. The EC changed the regulations for the 2014-20 ERDF programme and FIs now have phased applications for payment to prevent excessive upfront payment of ESIF resources. Each claim value is 25% of the total ERDF allocation to the fund but FIs must hit performance targets to draw down the next payment. For example, for the NPIF 4th drawdown the FI has had to provide bank statements that show that 85% of the ERDF paid in the first 3 tranches has been disbursed to final recipients or paid in management fees.

46. COVID-19 has had an impact on the portfolio of businesses accessing finance and there has been an increase in enquiries for funding for working capital. The BBB predict that provision will continue to rise as a result of the impact of COVID-19 on the portfolio of businesses, but they are comfortable that the funds remain within the tolerances set at the beginning. The funds have also been working successfully with the Government initiatives, for example the Bounce Back loans, the Future Fund, and the Coronavirus Business Interruption Loan Scheme. It is expected that demand for loans will continue to rise.

47. There are concerns about the amount of Private Sector Leverage linked to the lack of equity match funding from private investors and the number of jobs created. This is because businesses are safeguarding jobs. It is expected that in 2021/22 there will start to be an improvement in this situation. The Fund Managers continue to monitor funds and the external environment; however, the portfolio is progressing well in the current climate.

48. The Urban Development Funds (UDF) are performing well. The only fund outside of the North West is the Mayor of London Energy Efficiency Fund, an energy and environment fund that follows on from an earlier fund under the 2007- 13 ERDF Programme which is

progressing well. It has recently undertaken its 4th draw down. The most established of the other UDFs is the Greater Manchester Fund of Funds. It has achieved 2 drawdowns with a total value of £30m from the £60m available. There has been a slowdown in deals being done due to market confidence. The Liverpool City Region UDF made its first investment in October. The Cheshire and Warrington UDF is making progress on a pipeline of investments and the Lancashire Urban Development Fund has recently appointed the Fund Manager and is expected to complete its first drawdown in Q1 of 2021.

49. In relation to the UDFs, there are a range of factors affecting commercial development as a result of COVID-19. Construction projects have been delayed and there has been concerns around contractor insolvencies. There are challenges regarding the valuation of projects and the banks' ability to lend on loan to value ratios. There has been a focus from High Street lenders on supporting existing customers with loan extensions and helping with short-term flexible solutions. There is also a concern for loan books in the retail, leisure and hotel sectors. Long–term trends include repurposing the high street and potential changes to location, demand and design of offices, as well as further investment in logistics to ensure resilience against future demand surges and disruption created by the Brexit transition.

50. **Carol Botten** asked how much money is still to be handed over to SMEs, is there a cost per job figure, types of SME support and any lessons for future funds? **David Read** responded that the figures are in the table provided in the ERDF Progress Paper and funds must evidence these figures, and how they have met targets, before the next drawdown can be completed. There is a different cost per job figure for each FI but compared to grant funds the cost per job is usually lower.

51. **Alex Conway** added that London started using FIs 2000 – 2006 and has seen returns. Work is being done to use lessons learned for future funds and there is an interest in using this type of fund where funding is limited. The Mayor of London Energy Efficiency Fund which comes under PA4, has projects ready and match funding available if further funding becomes available under this PA.

52. **Pernille Kousgaard** added that there is limited connectivity between funds that are funding new growth businesses and businesses looking to expand and the local business support infrastructure. The businesses accessing the FIs are not linked into the wider local business support offer. Furthermore, there is not the breakdown of information needed for local areas to understand how much funding is being invested under the PAs, in which LEP areas and sectors. **David Read** responded that connectivity has improved under this programme and there is a requirement for the Fund Managers to be embedded within the local areas which is critical where businesses need support beyond finance. The BBB-backed funds provide further details and is reviewed at a Regional Advisory Board level.

53. **Pernille Kousgaard** added that from a Combined Authority perspective the information provided to the Regional Advisory Boards is not cascaded. The local infrastructure has changed since the NPIF was set up and there needs to be a conversation about this in relation to the legacy funding and future domestic funds. Local areas need to know the businesses that are being invested in to help connect them to the local business support offer.

54. **Helen Millne** asked how we can get the data needed to understand the ownership of the businesses the FIs are supporting to ensure that they are supporting BAME and women-owned businesses too. **David Read** responded that this information is captured and is available to view

55. **Alison Gordon** added that it is important that we continue to evidence the success of FIs and that this is not lost in the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. **David Read** responded that MHCLG are looking at how this type of repayable finance driven at a local level works with other types of funds. A lot of work has been done to move away from grant dependency and ensure that the money is reinvested into local areas and there is good evidence that this has had a positive impact.

Item 4: Phase 2 National Evaluation Report

56. **David Morrall** introduced **Neil Evans and Prabhat Vaze** from Hatch Regeneris to present the Phase 2 National Evaluation Report update.

57. **Neil Evans** presented the Phase 2 National Evaluation Report update in the context of COVID-19 response and resilience. This evaluation has been pushed back by two quarters mainly to allow time for the flow of beneficiary data and project evaluations as well as due to COVID-19 delays. Types of analysis include desk-based analysis, consultations with MHCLG delivery and policy staff, review of project Summative Assessments, beneficiary surveys including c4,2000 interviews, and a counterfactual impact analysis covering c66,400 businesses.

58. On programme delivery performance, performance to the end of September 2020 shows that most PAs are within 10% of the notional allocation apart from PA6, 7 and 8. PA6 progress has been slow in the More Developed region in part due to a lack of need, a major project in PA7 is slowing down progress, and for PA8 most Community Led Local Development (CLLD) projects have now been contracted and are awaiting results of the delivery stage. Performance against the performance framework output targets has been good. All outputs have reached the target in terms of contracted outputs to date apart from 3 which is due to a lag in contracting projects.

59. There is a higher-than-expected number of businesses receiving grants as a result of business support projects delivering both advice and guidance and grant support; lighter touch diagnostic support (P13); and commercial floorspace (P2). There is a low level of claimed C3 and C7 outputs to date.

60. Evidence from the SME Beneficiary survey confirms findings of the Summative Assessments. High levels of business satisfaction at c85% overall and 90% would recommend this funding to their peer group. Entrepreneur beneficiaries are most likely to have achieved their objectives in full, Research and Innovation beneficiaries are progressing the most towards their objectives, but SME competitiveness support beneficiaries are making the least progress. Evidence suggests that support plays some role in progress towards these objectives but mostly acts as a catalyst for beneficiaries to achieve their objectives sooner. On average each business is creating 1 full time equivalent (FTE) job.

61. **Prabhat Vaze** presented the counterfactual impact evaluation. The evaluation used two analytical strands: a firm level analysis and an area analysis. 40,000 businesses were linked to the ONS Register and showed that there was employment generation in the 2017 and 2018 cohorts. By September 2018, the employment in these SMEs was 1.195m, an increase of 34,000 jobs. Estimate of additional jobs in supported SMEs is 16 – 38% of total employment.

62. **Neil Evans** added that in preparation for Phase 3 there is a need to extend timescales, ensure the flow and quality of monitoring data and enhance the quality of Summative Assessments. There will be a larger wave of, and longitudinal, beneficiary surveys which will allow for disaggregated analysis geographically which has been limited in Phase 2. Analysis will be expanded to cover intervention type and spatial areas.

63. **Alison Gordon** asked if place impact had been looked at in the counterfactual analysis and whether this analysis is available to view. **Prabhat Vaze** responded that some results are available in the report submitted to MHCLG and these results will be published. The methods used in the counterfactual analysis are proven to show comparable areas of employment growth. **Neil Evans** added that Hatch Regeneris are in the process of finalising the report with MHCLG. In the Phase 2 work, the analysis will not be disaggregated by spatial areas due to the number of projects being observed in those areas, it is aggregating the data of England as a whole and presenting the overall results.

Item 5: Communications National Sub-Committee Annual Update

64. **Lynsey Cooke** informed the board about the Communications National Sub-Committee Annual Update report.
65. **Huw Edwards** asked if there is a plan for a full communications audit to focus on impact and whether there are numerical targets against the evaluation measures. **Lynsey Cooker** responded that there are some numerical targets including the website, social media channels, and surveys. Both qualitative and quantitative data is collected and some of this will also come through in the evaluation report. Impact is shown through the case studies.

ACTION 2012/02 MHCLG to provide further information on communications targets and evaluation measures.

Item 6: Case Studies

<u>European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)</u>

66. **Alison Laggan** informed the board about the ERDF case studies.

<u>European Social Fund (ESF)</u>

67. **Steve Spendlove** informed the board about the ESF case studies.

Standing Item 7: Minutes of September Meeting and Progress on Actions

68. **Sophie Waddington** outlined the actions arising from the September meeting and that all actions have been completed, there are no outstanding actions.

69. **Jenny Dibden** asked the board if they approve of the minutes. **The board** agreed.

Standing Item 8: Items for Information

<u>National Sub-Committee Report</u>

70. **Sophie Waddington** informed the board about the NSC report.

71. The next meeting will be held on 23 March 2021.

Meeting closed: 14:15

Date, Time and Venue of Future Meetings

Tuesday 23 March 2021	11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG
Tuesday 22 June 2021	11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG
Tuesday 21 September 2021	11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG
Tuesday 7 December 2021	11:00 - [15:00] Conference Room 5a & 5b, MHCLG

Annex A

List of agreed actions from December 2020 Growth Programme Board meeting

No.	Action	Assigned to:
2012/01	DEFRA to circulate the breakdown of projects from Round 3 of the Growth Programme.	Emma Friend
2012/02	MHCLG to provide further information on communications targets and evaluation measures.	Lynsey Cooke

European Union
European Structural and Investment Funds

European Structural and Investment Funds
2014 - 2020

Growth Programme for England

Chair:

	Sector/Organisation Representing	Attending (Y/N)	Substitute For
Jenny Dibden Director, Cities and Local Growth	MHCLG	Y	

Board Members (full and advisory):

	Sector/Organisation Representing	Attending (Y/N)	Substitute For
Emily Kent Cornwall Council	**Cornwall and Isles of Scilly**	**Y**	
Carol Botten CEO, VONNE	Voluntary/Community Sector	Y	
Helen Millne The Women's Organisation	Voluntary/Community Sector	Y	
Councillor Albert Bore Birmingham City Council	Local Authorities	Y	
Alex Conway Greater London Authority	Local Authorities	Y	
Councillor Philip Atkins Staffordshire County Council	Local Authorities	Y	
Paul Green Local Government Association	Local Authorities	Y	Councillor Peter Thornton
Pernille Kousgaard Liverpool City Region	SUD	Y	Mayor Joe Anderson
Alison Gordon Greater Manchester Combined Authority	LEPs	Y	Simon Nokes
James Newman	LEPs	Y	

Sheffield City Region LEP			
Huw Edwards Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	LEPs	Y	
Jennifer Gunn LEP Network	LEPs	Y	
Clive Winters Coventry University	Further Education	Y	John Latham
Louise Bennett British Chambers	Business	Y	
Guus Muijzers European Commission	EC	Y	
Joanne Knight European Commission	EC	Y	
Marc Vermyle European Commission	EC	Y	
Janet Thornton Rural and Farming Network	Rural	Y	
Keith Harrison Action with Communities in Rural Kent	Rural	Y	
Richard Powell Chair Wild Anglia	Local Nature Partnerships	Y	
Geoff Hawker ESF Division	DWP	Y	
Steve Spendlove ESF Division	DWP	Y	
Emma Friend RDPE Division	DEFRA	Y	
David Malpass European Programmes	MHCLG	Y	
David Morrall European Programmes	MHCLG	Y	
Richard Davies Europe Division	BEIS	Y	

Additional Attendees / Observers:

Name	Sector/Organisation	
Simon Jones European Programmes	MHCLG	Observer
Sylvain Alem European Programmes	MHCLG	Observer
David Read European Programmes	MHCLG	
Lynsey Cooke European Programmes	MHCLG	
Alison Laggan European Programmes	MHCLG	
Pete Long ESF Division	DWP	
Mark Burns ESF Division	DWP	
Sean Hughes Growth Programme Board Secretariat	MHCLG	Growth Programme Board Secretariat
Sophie Waddington Growth Programme Board Secretariat	MHCLG	Growth Programme Board Secretariat

Apologies:

	Sector/Organisation	Sending a Substitute?
Professor John Latham Coventry University	Higher Education	Yes, Clive Winters
Simon Nokes Greater Manchester Combined Authority	LEPs	Yes, Alison Gordon
Mayor Joe Anderson Liverpool City Council	SUD	Yes, Pernille Kousgaard
Councillor Peter Thornton European Programmes	Local Authorities	Yes, Paul Green
Laura-Jane Rawlings Youth Employment UK	Voluntary/Community Sector	No, not on this occasion
Kris Magnus European Commission	EC	No, not on this occasion

Dominic Williams Federation of Small Businesses	Business	No, not on this occasion
Kevin Rowan TUC	Trade Unions	No, not on this occasion
Emma Kirkpatrick ESF Division	DWP	No, not on this occasion