

Agenda Item 12

WEST MIDLANDS REGIONAL ASSEMBLY

23 April 2008

'Connecting to Success' WMES Delivery Framework Consultation Response.

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform the Assembly of the response which WMRA submitted to the consultation on 'Connecting to Success' The West Midlands Economic Strategy (WMES) Delivery Framework consultation.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Assembly notes the response.

3. Background

- 3.1 Members will recall that the consultation on the WMES Delivery Framework consultation closed on Friday the 22nd February. As agreed at the last Regional Assembly meeting, the Chair and Vice Chairs signed off the draft WMRA response which was submitted on the 22nd. The response is attached at Appendix one for your information. The response can also be viewed on the WMRA Website at <http://www.wmra.gov.uk/page.asp?id=5>

Contact:

Sherman Wong – Head of Local Government Policy

Email: s.wong@wmra.gov.uk

Tel No: 0121 245 0210

West Midlands Regional Assembly

Response to the West Midlands Economic Strategy Delivery Framework Consultation

Introduction

The West Midlands Regional Assembly welcomes the consultation on 'Connecting to Success' The West Midlands Economic Strategy Delivery Framework. We are pleased to respond and trust that there will be similar opportunities to comment on future refreshed versions of the Delivery Framework.

As the implementation of the Sub National Review rolls out the Assembly will work with the Agency and key partners to consider how the region can take forward the Delivery Framework and more specifically those responsibilities currently under the remit of the Assembly, which may lead to amended actions and responsibilities within the Delivery Framework.

This detailed response is submitted on behalf of the Regional Assembly and its Partnerships, officer groups and secretariat. Our response starts with some key overarching comments and then makes detailed comments or queries following the structure of the Delivery Framework for ease of reference. We trust that our recommendations and comments will be taken on board in the positive and supportive light in which they are made.

Key Overarching Comments

The document is rightly set in the context of the Sub National Review of Economic Development and Regeneration. It would be helpful if the Delivery Framework indicated more clearly **how it fits with the work currently being undertaken on implementing SNR** within the region and the impact that this will have on the possible review mechanism identified in the Appendix.

The Government's post SNR agenda for economic development is one of **delegation and devolution to local authorities**. Local authorities will primarily deliver their new responsibilities through their Local Strategic Partnerships and Local and Multi Area Agreements. Whilst we welcome the acknowledgement of the need for sub-regional and local delivery in the framework it should still be strengthened to recognise the post SNR landscape and to ensure that the local authorities' delivery capacity can be harnessed to achieve the RES objectives.

We welcome the structure of the document, and particularly the inclusion of outcomes and indicators. However we feel that there is a considerable amount of work still to be done to ensure that this document is fit for purpose. Currently **the Actions stated do not in all instances, appear to add up to tackling the issues identified in the strategic objectives.** Where actions are indicated the quality of the actions is variable, some are specific and clearly identify how they will be achieved others are very aspirational and unspecific e.g. 1.2.1, 1.6.1, 2.1.1, and 2.5.2. We understand the importance of a short and accessible document however this must be achieved in a way which is not to the detriment of the actions necessary to drive the delivery of the WM Economic Strategy. Where the actions relate to a more detailed action plan, perhaps owned and delivered by other partners, this should be indicated including where these are available to view and how partners can influence them. Clearer and consistent links between the actions and the delivery partners would also be beneficial.

Again the **outcomes are of varying quality and use**, ranging from vague aspirations to those which are more specific and measurable. Baselines are lacking and it is difficult to assess ambition. We **strongly recommend that work is undertaken to make all the outcomes SMARTer.** This will also assist in the identification of suitable indicators. In the detail below we have made recommendations for the inclusion of actions and indicators which should enhance the document.

It is disappointing that there are several instances where indicators are still to be determined or where it is stated that no suitable indicator is available; as this means we are unable to assess and comment upon its likely effectiveness. (e.g. 1.5 , 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). The document should briefly set out the process/actions which will be undertaken to identify indicators. It is hoped that this consultation will enable partners to identify indicators which they have developed and which could be useful. If the Assembly can assist in developing further indicators we are happy to do so. The indicators should reflect changes in levels of activity resulting from the action rather than just, for example, record all new VAT registrations (p14) or carbon emissions (p15). These indicators should therefore take the form of changes against current rates either as percentages or actual amounts.

Currently the format provides **no indication of timeframes, milestones or completion dates for any actions or outcomes.** This coupled with the lack of priorities and any indication of actions which are currently underway or which will be new and the need for an explanation of the extent of linkages and interrelationships between actions that fall under different sections render this document ineffective as a Delivery Framework.

The **cyclical monitoring process described at page 40 is a welcome advance** on the previous document. However given the current position of the outcomes and indicators we question how it will be possible to measure the progress of the Framework effectively?

As we move towards the SIRS, distinct benefits could be gained from aligning the monitoring cycles for the WMRSS and WMES Delivery Framework. As the RSS monitoring output is statutorily required by 28th February each year, it would make sense to adopt this date rather than July as proposed for the Framework. We would also recommend that the monitoring framework should not be overly complicated and onerous and should where possible rely on existing data so that future monitoring is not dependent on the expenditure of further resources for example additional survey work. Process indicators have a place within monitoring frameworks and should be considered within the framework for example outcome 4.1 where currently no indicators are proposed. We would be happy to work with the Agency to see how we can maximise benefits of bringing together the monitoring of the RES and the RSS.

We welcome the way in which the Framework embraces partnership working. Partnership working is one of the clear strengths of the West Midlands, as demonstrated at the recent Regional Assembly Annual Conference. Partnership working will be key to the delivery of the framework and we are confident that continuation of such an approach during SNR transition and in the future will stand the region in good stead. [Effective partnership working and successful engagement requires commitment, understanding, hard work and leadership with the build up of trust across the partners. The document should make a connection to the Regional Concordat, to which the Agency is a signatory; and should identify which organisation will lead on the communication with partnerships especially those at grassroots level as they are the ones most likely to be disengaged.](#)

We welcome the identification of the role of regional and sub regional partners and partnerships in delivering the WMES. The document makes specific mention of various partners and partnerships including for example the Innovation and Technology Council and the City Region Board, who will have a role in delivering the framework. There is however no further information on these bodies available in the Framework. The Accessibility of the document would be enhanced by the inclusion of an Additional Appendix which, at least, provides signposts to where more information on these bodies can be found. We would request that the contribution of the four sub-regional Housing Market Area Partnerships is also considered. The HMAPs are now well-embedded within the WM Regional landscape and Officers involved in the Partnerships have developed a good understanding of how sub-regional working can assist in terms of meeting demands at both the Regional and Local levels.

We welcome the greater acknowledgement of the aims of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS). In support of the move towards the Single Integrated Regional Strategy (SIRS) and the revision and implementation of the WMRSS and associated strategies including the Regional Housing Strategy, a short paragraph in the Introduction to highlight the work that has taken place to align the WMES and the WMRSS and the apparent benefits of this would be helpful. The document could also better reflect and cross-reference to Sites of Significant Development, RIS's, RLS's and MIS's which would also help to make the document more regionally specific.

We also welcome the Framework's increased focus on sustainability and climate change objectives.

Specific comments

Introduction.

- We welcome the expansion of the process to review the progress of the Framework and consequent updates on an annual basis. The timeframe of the document is thus inherently twelve months, and more information can be found in the appendix. However it would be useful if this was made clearer in the introduction. We would also wish the document to be explicit about the involvement of stakeholders, in addition to the Lead Body for the various Actions, in this process.
- Further detail on the Sub National Review, including the SIRS, would be helpful to set the document in the current and future context.
- The Framework should also make mention to the Regional Targets which Liam Byrne announced on the 10th December. Greater clarity is required on the origin of the targets and how the Delivery Framework will be able to assist the region and key partners in achieving them. These targets should be woven in to the outcomes and indicators within the document to enable the region to demonstrate delivery.
- We welcome the mainstreaming of rural programmes and the significant contribution that this will make to delivering rural renaissance, however monitoring must ensure that there is no unintentional reduction in the consideration that these areas receive. Detail on how this could be achieved would be helpful. It is particularly important that the Agency demonstrates that it gives full consideration to all areas of the region.

- Whilst we recognise that rural renaissance is vital to the success of the region, urban renaissance is the other side of the coin. Revitalising and renewing the region's urban core and tackling the serious problems which lie there are fundamental to the Regional Spatial Strategy and to the Delivery of the Regional Economic Strategy. We recommend the inclusion of a paragraph within the introduction which highlights this fact to make the document more balanced in its approach to renaissance.
- When and how will the further work required to spell out the implications of the strategy and how it will be delivered at sub regional and local levels be carried out and how will this be integrated into the Delivery Framework? We trust that there will be suitable consultation opportunities for partners to be engaged.
- Recognition should also be given up front to the fact that Third Sector/ Environmental organisations will also have a role to play in terms of contributing to the delivery of WMES actions at the local, sub-regional and regional scales.

Chapter 2 - Delivering the Strategy.

- There will be an inevitable tension at times between the pursuit of regional level outcomes and local priorities. The new National Indicator Set for local authorities will express national priorities at local level. Consideration should be given to the way in which a connection can be made between the Delivery Framework and the local indicators.
- The inclusion of a commitment to use and strengthen cross-border arrangements where these will aid sub-regional or regional economic development priorities should be made.
- This chapter should clearly indicate how the three key delivery mechanisms will be linked. This issue has been raised in a number of the Regional Assembly's scrutiny reviews. For example the High Technology Corridor review recommended that the Agency develop stronger and more effective links between High Technology Corridors, clusters and Regeneration Zones"

Regeneration Zones

- We support the work to examine the rationale, in geographic and governance terms, for the current configuration of the Wolverhampton – Telford High Technology Corridors (HTC) and to explore if there is a case for a corridor in North Staffordshire. We recommend that:
 - i the extension of the M54 corridor to Shrewsbury be considered;
 - ii. connections be made to the North Staffordshire Partnership and the Transforming North Staffordshire work currently underway;
 - iii the document should state when the work will be completed and how it will be included in the document;

- iv the boundaries which were defined in part by travel to work patterns should take into account the influence of housing following the recent Housing/Economy Study and the HMA evidence base; and
- v consideration be given to whether or not the two Black Country Regeneration Zones should remain separate given that they are becoming increasingly linked including through governance arrangements.

High Technology Corridors

- Suggest amending the text to read "Corridor partnershipsand actively promote the corridor offer to a broader business audience, *including rural and more remote businesses*"
- The recommendation from the Assembly's scrutiny review of High Technology Corridors stated that the word "High" should not be used. In its response Advantage West Midlands stated "the Agency agrees that this could be considered again during the next review of the West Midlands Economic Strategy. Given the reference we would be interested to see the consideration that took place and the rationale behind the decision to retain it.
- We welcome the inclusion of the statement that Corridor action plans should more strongly reflect ICT and Science City strategies but would suggest that the document also acknowledges the need for these strategies to ensure that they consider and are influenced by the Corridors.

Clusters

- The introduction to clusters should acknowledge the necessary linkages between clusters and other sections of the Framework such as;
 - creating employee / job opportunities,
 - encouraging people from diverse backgrounds into these jobs / business areas, and
 - education and training at an early stage so the region will have a ready and willing workforce as these businesses grow.
- The Assembly's Strategic Review Group has previously expressed concerns to the Agency regarding the number of business clusters. The decision to cancel the planned scrutiny review of clusters was only taken following an assurance from AWM that the numbers would be examined as part of the revision process. We would welcome clarification from the Agency how the numbers of Clusters have been examined.

- We welcome the reduction in duplication that should result from COGs channeling business support and skills initiatives through mainstream delivery channels. But we have concern regarding the manufacturing COG in that it may be too large, too varied and could duplicate some of the other clusters including environmental technologies, high value added, medical technologies and transport technologies.
- We would recommend that the paragraph at the top of the second column on page 7 be amended to read “The intention is and generate greater critical mass, *whilst ensuring that the benefits are spread appropriately across both large and small, urban and rural businesses.*” This should help to ensure that specific methods of communication / involving rural businesses in cluster activities can be developed.
- The use of the word ‘indigenous’ (p4, 2nd bullet point; p5 2nd paragraph) is misleading, we recommend that ‘local communities’ are referred to.

Comments on Chapter 3 – The Actions

- The Regional Skills Partnership has developed a considerable number of indicators as part of building the evidence base for their work. As many of these as possible should be included in the Delivery Framework.

Page 10

- We note that lead partners have responsibility for overseeing delivery. Is their role limited to this or are they also involved in developing policies and programmes to deliver them? Suggest that the roles outlined on page 10 are further developed.

Page 11

- Local Authorities should be included as support partners for Action 1.1.1
- We recommend the addition of a measure which indicates the additional contribution made or which cover employment numbers in key sectors or qualification levels in key sectors.

Page 12

- Action 1.1.3, we welcome the development of public procurement opportunities, but would suggest that there are more opportunities than suggested for building early collaboration. Public sector procurement can and does include requirements for apprenticeships and local sourcing and could also be a tool for ensuring that providers are fully “equalities” compliant and, as suggested in the Skills Action

Plan could significantly support the regional skills agenda. Suggest the addition of all public sector organisations as support partners for this action.

- The full Beacon Manufacturing Group title should be used.
- The Regional Centre for Excellence has been merged into the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership (RIEP) and references to the Centre of Excellence should be changed to reflect this.
- Action 1.1.3 should include a specific activity in respect of working with RIEP to maximize public sector procurement opportunities.
- The measures for success and the Manufacturing Index from the new Regional Manufacturing and Support Strategy should be included as outcomes and indicators for Action 1.1.2

Page 13

- The wording in the rationale for objective 1.2 should be clarified to emphasise the need to attract investment into the region and to highlight the importance of capitalising on the cultural and heritage connections of different communities within the region.
- When will the International Business Forum be established, what will be its membership and terms of reference?
- Suggested additional indicators could be about relocations, participation/uptake of advice offers or the establishment of the International Business Forum.
- Action 1.2.2 should include a specific activity in relation to building on existing social/ business links and knowledge within particular communities, including black and minority ethnic communities, to develop strong international links; utilizing Diaspora communities effectively. Page 47 of "Connecting to Success" identifies this as a strength/opportunity for the Region. This could be led by organisations such as the Asian Business Forum and the Equality and Diversity Partnership.

Page 14

- In Action 1.3.1 we suggest that basic 'how to' information on starting a business is also made available.
- Clarify how the region will 'actively promote the benefits and challenges of starting a business'.
- Suggest the inclusion of the Equality and Diversity Partnership and the Economic Inclusion Panel as support organisations for Action 1.3.2
- Consider the inclusion of business density as an indicator.
- Action 1.3.2 'Provide bespoke enterprise support' is worthy but there needs to be clarification as to how the support will reach traditionally hard to reach businesses.

Page 15

- In Objective 1.4 we welcome the inclusion of the public sector in the rationale but there is no corresponding action around the support and leadership of the public sector in the imaginative procurement of new technical solutions. An action should be identified with the inclusion of the RIEP as a partner.
- Action 1.4.1 we would also suggest that the Housing Corporation and the Homebuilders Federation are included as delivery partners. House-building and the energy consumption of households contributes significantly to the Region's carbon emissions.
- Action 1.4.1 what is meant by regional business in the first paragraph? Bullet point 2 should identify the at risk sectors. Bullet point 4 is a well crafted action which identifies specifically how it will be achieved, this is much more helpful than the first three bullets.
- Suggest revising the wording of the outcomes to make them more meaningful, for example – *Increased productivity brought about by growth of business in environmental technology etc. Improved energy efficiency in regional businesses leading to reduction in emissions or in the rate of growth emissions.*

Page 16

- Action 1.5.1 Local Authorities and Business Link should be added as delivery partners. A GVA related indicator may also be helpful here.
- It would assist if the definition of "innovation active" on page 49 of "Connecting to Success" is also included in this document.
- Suggest strengthening the business crime bullet under 1.5.1 given that this is prominently identified as a weakness/threat to the region on page 49 of "Connecting to Success"

Page 18

- If the actions identified in 1.6 and 3.3 relate to the Skills Action Plan, there should be a reference made to the Action Plan within this document.
- Action 1.6.1 includes an activity to "Ensure effective feedback to training providers ...is identified ...". This should not be restricted to the identification of feedback but should include how it is given to and acted upon by providers.
- Action 1.6.1 the action is to "engage business" but there are no indicators to measure the extent of engagement such as a percentage increase in the number of businesses involved in the design of training and skills development. A measure of GVA per employee may be a measure for the added value outcome.
- To follow the demand led provision of training we would suggest that the actions in support of this objective could be more specific based on current demand. For example increased capacity within the building industry is needed to address existing skills shortages and ensure the delivery of the Government's Growth agenda. The Homebuilders Federation / specific training bodies within the Construction Industry (e.g. West Midlands Centre for Construction Excellence) could be

included as delivery partners and an expected outcome or indicator of its successful delivery could be the percentage by which specific skills shortages / Construction Industry vacancies are reduced.

- Action 1.6.1 we suggest the inclusion of the Equality and Diversity Partnership as a support partner for this action given their links to skills development for under-represented groups.

Page 19

- Action 1.6.2 suggest the removal of the Equality and Diversity Partnership as a support partners in relation to this action as their remit lies closer to action 1.6.1 as suggested above.
- For 1.6.2 suggest an indicator based on the proportion of employers training their staff which could be ascertained from industry (e.g. IoD, CBI, Chambers, EEF) sources.

Page 20

- Local Authorities should be added as support and delivery roles for action 1.7.1 in their strategic and employer capacities.
- The HTC's should also have a role in delivery.
- The key identified indicator for action 1.7.1 uses NVQ Level 4 as a benchmark, would it be more appropriate to use the National Qualifications Framework?
- Additional indicators could include changes in the percentage of graduates that remain in the region and start their own businesses and changes in survival rates of businesses started by graduates

Page 21

- Action 1.8.1 first bullet point should give examples of the new mechanisms being proposed.

Page 23

- The Birmingham Science City Partnership Board should be added as a partner and the document should specify which Regeneration Zone Board/s is referred to.
- The indicators are limited in their scope and only relate partially to the wider strategic objective. For example an indicator around relocations to Birmingham should be incorporated; it would also be useful to include an indicator in relation to changing perceptions if possible and an indicator for changes in numbers of visitors from within the UK, not just externally.
- For Birmingham to compete effectively as a global city the action will need to be supported by an appropriate marketing strategy for Birmingham as a key driver of the regional economy and for the rest of the Region to accept Birmingham as the leading city in the region

Page 24

- We welcome the inclusion of the Regional Transport Partnership as the Lead Body for the action and the identified actions echo the focus of the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS), and link directly to a number of the wider policies.

- The outcome 'the West Midlands will be a well connected region' is meaningless, this should be expanded so that it is possible to identify targets.
- Action 2.2.1 the principle of a focus upon early delivery of strategically important schemes is supported but as barriers which slow this process exist, emphasis should be placed on resolving these and gaining commitment from DfT to support this priority. In addition an explanation of how the actions consider the specific transport and accessibility issues of rural and deprived areas and those failing with the equalities mandate should be included.

Page 25

- Action 2.2.2 bullet point 3 the wording 'looking to pioneer' should be sharpened up.
- There is a role here for AWM as a partner.
- Indicators should be added around the ICT infrastructure take up and the roll out of high speed broadband coverage.

Page 26

- The focus section of 2.3 mentions "...meeting the needs of business and communities." However, the needs of communities do not appear to be reflected in the related action points.
- 2.3.1 Strategic Planning Authorities should be explicitly mentioned as delivery partners and we would suggest that an indicator relating to the densities at which new developments (both commercial and residential) are built is included.
- Suggest that WMRA as Regional Planning body be included as a Lead organisation.
- Actions 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 should be expanded to give a clearer indication of what these actions will entail.
- Action 2.3.1 the proposed indicator could be difficult to measure due to the time delays that can occur between completion of remediation and start/completion of development. It may be clearer if the indicator is more specific, for example when land is made ready for development or when development has been completed.
- Action 2.3.2 local authorities should be included in this section and EP should be changed to the full name, presumably English Partnerships.

Page 27

- Action 2.4.1 an indicator based on the uptake of low carbon forms of energy would be useful.
- Action 2.5 the social / people aspect of this objective needs to be developed in the related actions.
- 2.5.1 suggest the inclusion of the Homes and Communities Agency and Rural Access to Services Partnerships as key delivery partners.
- The outcome for 2.5.1 is currently very vague and will need to be more specific if sustainable communities rather than just housing numbers / regeneration targets are to be met. The WM Region is composed of many different types of communities beyond purely urban and rural

and the complexity of the existing communities should be acknowledged.

- The indicators should focus on the sub-regional housing market area level, as well as Regional. Any significant changes in the mix of communities should initially emerge at this lower spatial level and an indicator on the dispersal of BME communities across the sub-region would probably be useful in monitoring the future 'mix' of communities.

Page 28

- Whilst the WMES has chosen to 'mainstream rural', it should be noted that the Housing Corporation's National Affordable Housing Programme does have a discrete budget for delivering rural affordable housing over the 2008-2011 period. Clearly, the schemes developed through the NAHP can have a significant impact upon the overall sustainability of rural towns and settlements and it is vital that WMES actions, in relation to housing are aligned to the objectives of the NAHP.
- Action 2.5.2 the first bullet point should read 'creating a *high* quality..'

Page 29

- Action 2.6 the outcome makes direct reference to an improved physical infrastructure but there are no indicators proposed to measure this.
- Action 2.6.1 suggest the inclusion of the Enterprise Board as a partner.
- Action 2.6.2 includes a very specific activity regarding the use of local labour. This could be supported by an indicator that measures the percentage of jobs within new developments that are filled by local labour.
- Action 2.6.2 National and 'Regional style – Pathfinders' (i.e. North Staffs Partnership Urban Living, and '*evolve*', East B'ham / North Solihull HMRA,) should be added to the list of Support partners, as their programmes are central to the turn-around of communities where housing markets have failed and successful community cohesion. Third Sector organisations have contacts at the grassroots which also contribute towards these goals.

Page 30

- Action 2.7.1 additional indicators could measure the changes in the number of residents and business moving into the West Midlands region.
- Suggest the addition of Local Authorities as delivery partners in their role across a range of issues affecting quality of life, including responsibilities for tourism, public realm and cultural activities.

Page 31

- There are no actions in respect of voluntary and community participation which is identified on page 64 of "Connecting to Success" as an important contributor to developing employment skills.
- Suggestion the addition of GOWM at key partners for Actions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2

- Suggest the inclusion of indicators relating to business waste, procurement, household usage of renewable energy and household generation of renewable energy.

Page 32

- Are any of the Business Link performance measures applicable for the missing indicator?
- Suggest adding a further action to acknowledge the need for leadership within the public sector to be strengthened. Local authorities, the WMLGA and the RIEP could be added to the list of partners.

Page 33

- Action 3.3.1 suggest the inclusion of an indicator relating to the number of people not in education, employment or training.
-

Page 34

- Action 3.3.2 suggest the inclusion of Business Link, Education Business Partnerships as partners.
- Action 3.4.1 suggest the inclusion of the BCBC City Region Board as partners.

Page 35

- Action 3.4.1 clarification required regarding the role and reporting lines of the Rural Skills Partnership
- Action 3.4.2 suggest the inclusion of FE, HE and the Equality and Diversity Partnership as partners.

Page 36

- Action 3.5.1 should include local authorities within delivery partners as these provide careers advice and work preparation activities via schools.
- Action 3.5 possible additional indicators could measure changes in employer engagement and the impact of migration on employment in the region. The "difference between working age employment rate for white and non-white groups" is extremely coarse and will be misleading. As a minimum we should be looking at "white British; other white; African Caribbean; African; Indian; Pakistani; Bangladeshi; Other". The differences within the MEG populations are extremely significant and should not be ignored.
- Action 3.5.2 suggest the inclusion of the Equality and Diversity Partnership as a support partner.

Page 37

- No actions are included in relation to capitalizing on the regions international connections although this is identified as a strength/opportunity on page 68 of "Connecting to Success"
- Page 73 of "Connecting to Success" refers to the need to develop a shared self image, but there are no actions to support this aspiration.
- Action 4.1.1 delivery organisations should also include local authorities especially given the implications of the SNR and the creation of an economic duty on local authorities.
- The work in the region to develop a set of Social Inclusion Indicators may be helpful for the purposes of monitoring.
- Consideration should be given to the role of Birmingham in the Powerful Voice section.

Page 38

- Action 4.2 indicators could include changes in the perception of the region by influential bodies and the amount or impact of lobbying activities.
- Action 4.2.2 it may be possible to measure the use of European funding by utilizing performance measures adopted by the EU Connects Project. The EU Connects Team should be included as a support organisation.

Page 39

- Action 4.3.1 support and delivery should include Tourism WM, the West Midlands Leadership Group for the 2012 Games, the Equality and Diversity Partnership and the Economic Inclusion Panel.
- Action 4.3.2 delivery must include Birmingham City Council, Birmingham Forward and other partners identified in action 2.2.1 (page 23)
- Action 4.3 additional indicators could include business opportunities generated by 2012 that have been taken up by West Midlands businesses and changes in visitor numbers to the region linked to 2012 opportunities

Page 40

- Our general comments refer to the timing of monitoring and the desirability to link this to the statutory requirements for the RES
- This section should be more closely linked to section 9 Monitoring Performance within "Connecting to Success". Although we appreciate the wish to prevent duplication it is surprising that the section within the Delivery Framework makes no reference to GVA.
- Further clarification is required as to how the evaluation of the impact of programmes and projects will be reflected in monitoring arrangements.

- A State of the Nation Report will be prepared by the Equality & Human Rights Commission on a three-year basis. The possibility of WMRO taking on this role for the region and linking it with the State of the Region report has been raised and there is a potential opportunity for one to inform the other and joint-working.

Minor corrections and errors.

Page 5 - bullet iii. Should be updated as it states *formal guidance will be issued to partners in autumn 2007*.

Page 11- correction required – the rationale refers to more detail in section 3 of the Delivery Framework, this should read section 2.

Page 24 -the delivery partners for action 2.1.1 are duplicated at the top of page 24.