

## ADVANTAGE WEST MIDLANDS

Minutes of the 117<sup>th</sup> Board meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2009

### Present:

Sir Roy McNulty                      Chairman  
Jas Bains  
Dr David Brown  
Brendan Connor  
Gerard Coyne  
Cllr Roger Lawrence  
Angela Maxwell  
Sue Prince  
Cllr Diane Rayner  
David Smith  
Prof Michael Sterling  
Cllr Ken Taylor  
Cllr Mike Whitby

### Executive:

Michael Laverty                      Chief Executive  
John Doherty                          Corporate Director, Resources  
Tim Gebbels                          Corporate Director, Strategy & Skills  
Mark Pearce                          Corporate Director, Economic Regeneration  
Karen Yeomans                      Corporate Director, Partnerships & Communications

### Apologies:

John Crabtree  
Michael Oakes

Dr Richard Hutchins              Deputy Chief Executive

### In attendance:

John Perkins                          Government Office West Midlands  
Sue Marwa                              Board Support Executive  
Dylan Murphy                         Head of Board Support

ITEM	DETAILS	ACTION
1.	<b>Welcome to John Perkins</b>	
1.1	The Chairman welcomed John Perkins, GOWM Deputy Regional Director, to the Board meeting.	
2.	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b>	
2.1	The Board approved the minutes of the meeting on 29 September 2009.	

<b>3.</b>	<b>Matters arising</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	There were no matters arising that were not otherwise covered on the agenda.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Confidential Item</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	Councillor Mike Whitby declared an interest in agenda item 10, a confidential item.	
<b>5.2</b>	Councillor Ken Taylor declared an interest in agenda item 10, a confidential item.	
<b>5.3</b>	Councillor Roger Lawrence declared an interest in agenda item 10, a confidential item.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Declarations of items of any other business</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	The Board agreed to receive a verbal response on media reports regarding potential developments at the Longbridge site.	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Chairman's Report</b>	
<b>7.1</b>	The Chairman presented his report and the Board noted the following in particular:	
<b>7.2</b>	<u>Board Meeting Schedule</u> A majority of members had requested that meetings continue to start at 08.00 and that sessions be split between formal Board meeting (from 08.00 to c11.00) and briefing sessions allowing more detailed discussion on particular topics. These arrangements would be put in place from December 2009.	<b>Board Support</b>
<b>7.3</b>	Confidential Item	
<b>7.4</b>	<u>Engagement with business</u> No agreement had been reached on collective national business endorsement for RDAs. Individual RDAs would continue to engage the business organisations for which they were the designated lead (in AWM's case, the British Chambers of Commerce). The EEF (the manufacturers' organisation) had recently produced a document setting out their position on the future of RDAs and this report would be circulated to the Board. There was clear business support within the region however and efforts would continue to be made to secure regional endorsement.	<b>Richard Hutchins</b>

<b>8.</b>	<b>Chief Executive's Report</b>	
<b>8.1</b>	The Chief Executive presented his report and the Board noted the following in particular:	
<b>8.2</b>	Confidential Item	
<b>8.4</b>	<u>Delivery vehicles</u> A detailed report would be presented to the November Board meeting mapping responsibility for delivery. Karen Yeomans would liaise with Gerard Coyne in developing this paper.	<b>Karen Yeomans</b>
<b>8.5</b>	<u>Corporate Communications Sub Group</u> The record of the discussion at the 25 September meeting was noted subject to an amendment to more accurately reflect Brendan Connor's comments.	
<b>8.6</b>	The outcome of the meeting was noted and it was recognised that there was a need for RDAs to better coordinate their communications activity and more effectively engage ministers.	
<b>8.7</b>	<u>Annual Conference</u> The confirmed Debate Panel members were Madeleine Atkins, Vice Chancellor Coventry University; Christine King, Vice Chancellor Staffordshire University; Mohammed Nazir, Chair, WM Minority Ethnic Business Forum; and Roger Phillips, Leader of Herefordshire County Council and Co-Chair of the Joint Strategy & Investment Board (JS&IB). It was agreed that greater business representation was required on the Panel. Confirmation of Jonnie Turpie's participation was awaited and David Smith would check whether he was able to rearrange his commitments to participate.	<b>Karen Yeomans</b>
<b>8.8</b>	<u>RDA Budget Cuts</u> The Agency had collated a response to BIS which set out the consequence of the proposed 2010 budget cuts on project activity. As well as identifying specific project activity that would be stopped the response outlined the loss of GVA impact. The proposed cross-RDA cut would be £43m which would equate to c£5.5m for AWM.	
<b>8.9</b>	<u>IPA2</u> The 2009 assessment would not be a full independent performance assessment and would be referred to as the Independent Supplementary Review. The Agency's site visit would be in March 2010.	
<b>8.10</b>	<u>Midlands Excellence Site Visit</u> The site visit on 14 October seemed to have gone well but finalists would not be announced until December.	

<p><b>8.11</b></p> <p><b>8.12</b></p> <p><b>8.13</b></p>	<p><u>Spotlight Awards – September 2009</u> September's Spotlight individual award had been presented to Emma Smith (European Co-ordinator) for her work on the migration of her team's electronic files to Objective. This was a long and arduous task which she undertook with determination - resulting in a seamless transition to the new system. Since the migration, Emma had taken on the role of Objective Champion in addition to her normal duties. She provides support to all of her team (and other colleagues in her directorate), has made a real difference to her colleagues' working lives and embodies the Agency's value of Aiming for Excellence.</p> <p>The September team award had been presented to Mark Williets and Sam Holder (Planning Policy team) for their work on the Regional Spatial Strategy. Mark and Sam ensured the Agency met its statutory requirements to the highest possible level by leading and working in partnership with a range of internal and external stakeholders. In addition, they provided full support and guidance to their Agency colleagues who were directly involved in the public examination process. The Agency had received positive feedback from the West Midlands Regional Assembly and Government Office West Midlands as a result of Mark and Sam's work.</p> <p><u>Manufacturing Technology Centre (MTC)</u> Government was to announce on Thursday 29 October that the MTC project had been approved. This would create 150 jobs initially but this figure would rise as the site developed. A communications campaign, including press releases from industry partners, would be rolled-out following the announcement.</p> <p>It was noted that projects were the best vehicles for getting important messages across and a range of communication channels should be used.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Confidential Item</b></p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>2009-10 Annual Business Plan: Half-Year Update – Non-Confidential</b></p>	
<p><b>10.1</b></p>	<p>The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:</p>	
<p><b>10.2</b></p>	<p>This was the first Annual Business Plan the Agency had produced and provided an important link between the three year Corporate Plan and Directorate Plans.</p>	

<p>10.3</p> <p>10.4</p> <p>10.5</p> <p>10.6</p> <p>10.7</p> <p>10.8</p> <p>10.9</p> <p>10.10</p> <p>10.11</p>	<p><u>Priority 1 – Delivering the key strategic projects</u> Both internal and jointly held “Star Chambers” were keeping progress under review. There were some issues around the University Quarter, Stoke on Trent (due to the withdrawal of LSC funding) and i54, Wolverhampton (following a planning variation) but generally, good progress had been made.</p> <p><u>Priority 2 – Spending every pound, achieving maximum impact</u> There were two main challenges: implementing the Investment Performance Framework (learning the lessons of impact evaluation) and achieving European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) spend.</p> <p><u>Priority 3 – Producing regional strategies that influence, and are agreed with and supported by, external stakeholders</u> The Stakeholder survey result regarding consultation with stakeholders and regional partners was amber rated.</p> <p>Delivery Framework actions were being pursued vigorously.</p> <p><u>Priority 4 – Providing leadership in difficult times and Priority 5 – Satisfied external stakeholders</u> The Stakeholder Survey results had been very positive.</p> <p><u>Priority 6 – Satisfied and high performing staff</u> The Staff Survey results had been very good and positive trends had continued.</p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy (RES) included a headline carbon reduction measure and performance was reported within the balanced scorecard.</p> <p>Key issues for the next six months included: being the lead RDA in the run-up to the General Election; stakeholder management; NINJ implementation; IPA2; and the NAO Regeneration Study.</p> <p>The process for developing the 2010 Plan would be more inclusive and would be led by Functional Directors.</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>MIPIIM 2010 – Non-Confidential</b></p>	
<p>11.1</p> <p>11.2</p>	<p>The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:</p> <p>AWM had attended MIPIIM since 2002 and a Team West Midlands approach had been developed. An evaluation had been undertaken following the 2009 event and had produced very positive qualitative results.</p>	

<p><b>11.3</b></p> <p><b>11.4</b></p> <p><b>11.5</b></p> <p><b>11.6</b></p> <p><b>11.7</b></p>	<p>The 2010 programme would smaller than that for 2009: there would be no second stage and costs would be reduced by around £100k to c£200k in total. AWM attendance at the 2010 event would be limited to the Director of Development and the Chief Executive.</p> <p>It was difficult to identify a quantitative impact but the value of attendance was evident by the continued interest of partners. The number of private sector partners pledging a sponsorship contribution was consistent with previous years but the sums involved were smaller. Hugely important contacts were made with significant investors at the event and the potential inward investment returns were huge.</p> <p>Birmingham had made great progress in increasing its profile as a European city in which to invest. Confidence was built over time and a continued presence at MIPIM was crucial to developing a long-term vision.</p> <p>An AWM presence was crucial to the Team West Midlands approach and attendance was strongly supported.</p> <p>The Board approved the planned programme of activity for Team West Midlands at MIPIM 2010.</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Confidential Item</b></p>	
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>Shadow Joint Strategy and Investment Board Update – Non-Confidential</b></p>	
<p><b>13.1</b></p> <p><b>13.2</b></p> <p><b>13.3</b></p> <p><b>13.4</b></p> <p><b>13.5</b></p> <p><b>13.6</b></p>	<p>The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:</p> <p>The legislation was not yet in place but the intention was still that elements would be implemented from April 2010.</p> <p>The draft guidance on Leaders’ Boards reinforced the regional view that membership should comprise Leaders only.</p> <p>The JS&amp;IB was concentrating on achieving progress on regionally important issues such as High Speed Rail and the Airport runway extension. Progress against the 20 Impact Investment Locations was being tested and the results of the second “Star Chamber” session were to be reported to the JS&amp;IB.</p> <p>The Board endorsed the draft response to the Government consultation on Regional Strategies.</p> <p>The Chairman would meet Mark Pearce to discuss some issues of detail outside the meeting.</p>	<p><b>Mark Pearce</b></p>

<b>14.</b>	<b>Confidential Item</b>	
<b>15.</b>	<b>Regional Perceptions Indicator: Results from full survey – Non-Confidential</b>	
<b>15.1</b>	The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:	
<b>15.2</b>	Following the pilot in 2008 a full survey had been conducted in each of the English regions in 2009. The survey would be repeated in 2011.	
<b>15.3</b>	The West Midlands' overall score was the lowest of the regions (though the difference between the bottom four regions was not statistically significant).	
<b>15.4</b>	The media played a significant role in affecting perception and the lack of a significant media base in the region was a problem.	
<b>15.5</b>	MIPIM was an important element of improving external perceptions of the region but it was important to foster champions within the region.	
<b>15.6</b>	As well as achieving improvements in the region it was essential that people be made aware of those improvements. Perception was hugely important and the region should “shout louder” about positive change and better market its assets (both urban and rural).	
<b>15.7</b>	The results suggested there were some very real issues behind the perceptions and these needed to be better understood if they were to be tackled. Perception could only be improved if it was based on genuine assets and improvements – it was not sufficient to simply “bang the drum” more loudly.	
<b>15.8</b>	In isolation, regional marketing resources were small. A piece of work considering the current and potential future interaction of Marketing the Region, Tourism West Midlands, Science City and other such bodies was underway.	
<b>15.9</b>	The Board agreed that Tourism West Midlands be asked for its response to the findings.	<b>Mark Pearce</b>
<b>16.</b>	<b>Confidential Item</b>	

<b>17.</b>	<b>Economic Inclusion Panel – Non-Confidential</b>	
<b>17.1</b>	The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:	<b>Mark Pearce</b>
<b>17.2</b>	The Panel had been effective in concentrating efforts on delivering specific activity. One such piece of work was the development of a practical framework for public sector procurement. The associated toolkit was framed so it was applicable across the public sector and would be shared widely to promote its use across the region. It was agreed that a copy of the toolkit would be circulated to the Board for information.	
<b>17.3</b>	The recession was compounding the region's problems as it had the fastest rising young people's unemployment rate in the country.	
<b>18.</b>	<b>Equality and Diversity Update – Non-Confidential</b>	
<b>18.1</b>	The Board considered the submitted report and noted that:	
<b>18.2</b>	A three year Equality and Diversity Action Plan had been endorsed in October 2007.	
<b>18.3</b>	The Diversity Week grants had proved popular and there had been 26 successful applications (amounting to around £65k). Details of the successful applications would be published on the Diversity Week website.	
<b>18.4</b>	Around 12 members of staff, from a wide range of roles, had completed Level 2 or 3 Equality and Diversity qualifications.	
<b>19.</b>	<b>Confidential Item</b>	
<b>20.</b>	<b>Other Business</b>	
<b>20.1</b>	<u>Longbridge Studio Relocation</u> The Agency had been approached about funding the relocating Pinewood Studios to the Longbridge site but this had not been a viable proposition.	
<b>20.2</b>	<u>Thanks to David Smith</u> The Chairman, on behalf of the Board, thanked David Smith for his contribution to the Agency Board and Audit Committee.	