



## **High Technology Corridors**

### Scrutiny Review 2004/5

Please direct any requests for translation, interpretation, large text or audio tape versions of this document to [access@wmra.gov.uk](mailto:access@wmra.gov.uk) or tel 021 245 0200. All requests will be dealt with on an individual basis.

## **Contents**

### **Page Number**

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Review Methodology	3
3.	Panel Members	4
4.	Evidence Presented	4
5.	Introduction to High Technology Corridors	5
6.	Definitions of High Technology Corridors	8
7.	Advantage West Midlands' Support Role	9
8.	Boundaries	16
9.	Project Appraisal	18
10.	Future Funding	20
11.	Monitoring	21
12.	Sustainable Development	22
13.	MG Rover	24
14.	The High Technology Corridor Brand	25
15.	Conclusion	26
16.	Summary of Recommendations	27
	References	30
	Glossary of Terms	31
	Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference	32
	Appendix 2 – Evidence Submitted	34
	Appendix 3 – High Technology Corridor Structures	37
	Appendix 4 – Corridor Project Outputs	39

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 A core function of the West Midlands Regional Assembly is scrutiny of the Regional Development Agency, Advantage West Midlands. This process is governed by the Scrutiny and Strategic Review Protocol agreed between the Assembly, Advantage West Midlands and Government Office West Midlands. The main activity within this function is the carrying out of scrutiny reviews to examine specific areas of Advantage West Midlands' activities that contribute to the Regional Economic Strategy.
- 1.2 High Technology Corridors are one of the three key delivery mechanisms of the Regional Economic Strategy. The Spending Review 2004 reinforced government commitment to innovation and technology transfer placing new responsibilities on Regional Development Agencies to develop links between universities/research centres and businesses.
- 1.3 The aim of this review was to examine Advantage West Midlands' role and activities in relation to High Technology Corridors not the actions of individual corridors or partners involved in them. We acknowledge that this delivery mechanism is dependant upon a number of key partners but this report focuses on Advantage West Midlands.

## **2. Review Methodology**

- 2.1 The review was carried out using a panel hearing approach. All Assembly Members and Alternate Members were asked if they wished to be involved in the process and subsequently a Panel was identified. In order to ensure that the review addressed sustainable development issues it was agreed that Sustainability West Midlands would be asked to nominate a co-opted panel member.
- 2.2 West Midlands Regional Assembly has delegated responsibility for carrying out this review to the Panel who have prepared this report reflecting their views and recommendations. This report will be submitted to the full Assembly for discussion and endorsement on 26 October 2005.
- 2.3 We wanted to explore the progress made by Advantage West Midlands in facilitating the development of High Technology Corridors and their involvement in this innovative approach.

- 2.4 The review process consisted of a briefing session for Panel Members, evidence sessions, including visits to each of the three High Technology Corridors, and Panel discussions. The evidence sessions were held on 7, 14, 22 March, 5, 12, and 19 April 2005. Following completion of evidence sessions with stakeholders a formal hearing was held with Advantage West Midlands on 25 April 2005. A draft report was circulated to all participants for their comments which were discussed by the Panel. This report contains a number of amendments made as a result of this consultation period.
- 2.5 The Panel agreed the Terms of Reference for the review at the briefing session as attached in Appendix 1.
- 2.6 This report discusses a number of themes in the light of the evidence presented, draws conclusions and makes a number of recommendations for Advantage West Midlands. Detailed reports of the evidence sessions will be available on West Midlands Regional Assembly website ([www.wmra.gov.uk](http://www.wmra.gov.uk)). Further details regarding this review can be obtained from Dagmar Waller, Strategic Review Officer, telephone 0121 678 1054 or email [d.waller@wmra.gov.uk](mailto:d.waller@wmra.gov.uk).

### 3. **Panel Members**

- 3.1 The Panel comprised of:
- |                           |                                |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Cllr Margaret Rowley      | Wychavon <b>Chair</b>          |
| Cllr Robert Rowden        | Worcester City                 |
| Cllr Peter Douglas-Osborn | Birmingham                     |
| Cllr Jack Cookson         | Redditch                       |
| Bruce Undy                | West Midlands Business Council |
| Julie Roy                 | West Midlands Business Council |
| Bernard Doyle             | Sustainability West Midlands   |
- 3.2 Not all Panel Members were able to attend each session however they were involved in the identification of recommendations and in the approval of this report.

### 4. **Evidence Presented**

- 4.1 The West Midlands Assembly does not have the power to summon witnesses to Panel Hearings. We would therefore like to thank those who agreed to contribute to the process. They were frank and open and provided us with much to discuss and consider.

- 4.2 Unfortunately we had to balance our wish to talk to as many partners as possible with the time and resources available. We would like to apologise to any individual or organisation who would have wished to participate in the process but was not invited to do so.
- 4.3 In addition to the verbal evidence given, written evidence was also considered. This included supporting or additional information from those attending the hearings and background papers and reports. Appendix 2 details written evidence considered by the Panel and individuals who attended the hearings.
- 4.4 We would like to take this opportunity to thank Advantage West Midlands for contributing to the initial Panel Briefing and in supporting the review process both in attending evidence sessions and in the provision of a range of information. We would also like to thank the High Technology Corridor Chairs and Directors for their enthusiastic support for the review process.
- 4.5 The need to further diversify the regional economy was underlined during the review process by the announcement of the closure of MG Rover at Longbridge.

## 5. **Introduction to High Technology Corridors**

### Background

- 5.1 High Technology Corridors were an outcome of the first Rover Task Force (2000) led by Advantage West Midlands. This had been established by the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry in response to the announcement by BMW that they intended to restructure and sell substantial parts of the Rover Group. The purchase of the Longbridge site by Phoenix and the agreement with Ford to take over Land Rover production at Solihull reduced the immediate threats but did not address the over dependence of the region on the automotive sector. Consequently the Secretary of State approved the use of £58 million to carry forward a number of recommendations made by this Task Force. In addition further finance was also made available from other sources including European funding. These recommendations focused on modernisation of the automotive base, diversification of the regional economy and regeneration (High Technology Corridors) and the creation of new opportunities.

- 5.2 The final report of the first Rover Task Force stated "If we are to be a competitive world class player in the industries of tomorrow we need to take early actions to spot and exploit emerging markets and technologies". It identifies three areas that could act as catalysts for developments flowing from universities and other centres of excellence in the area. These form the basis of the three High Technology Corridors.

The Wolverhampton Telford Technology Corridor  
The Central Technology Belt (previously A38 High Technology Corridor)  
The Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Technology Corridor.

- 5.3 For a detailed map showing the location of the High Technology Corridors in the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy please access the following webpage [www.wmra.gov.uk/regional\\_planning.htm](http://www.wmra.gov.uk/regional_planning.htm)
- 5.4 High Technology Corridors are one of the three key delivery mechanisms of the Regional Economic Strategy, Delivering Advantage (the others being Clusters and Regeneration Zones). They are also part of the statutory policy framework set down within the approved Regional Spatial Strategy for the region. This defines the geographical extent of the High Technology Corridors and the planning policy principals associated with them.

#### Aims

- 5.5 The strategies and action plans for the three corridors were developed in partnership and were initially detailed in the report "Regenerating the West Midlands Region: A study to consider opportunities for high technology corridors/clusters". These have developed further over time reflecting the differences in approach and priorities of the three corridors. The overall aims are clearly laid out in the Regional Economic Strategy, Delivering Advantage, as attracting and developing high-tech, high value added businesses into three parts of the region, utilising existing research institutions, universities and property opportunities including incubator and "grow-on" space.
- 5.6 It is hoped that the impact of the High Technology Corridors will have a positive effect on the whole of the region. The focus of this initiative is on technology driven development to teach a more innovative, buoyant, forward looking set of attitudes. The key to the corridor concept is the inclusion of

universities and research centres of excellence in order to facilitate transfer of technology into the wider economy.

#### Funding

- 5.7 High Technology Corridors are managed by partnerships supported through complex funding mechanisms. Principal sources of revenue and capital have been:

First Rover Task Force (administered by Advantage West Midlands)  
European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)  
Advantage West Midlands single pot

There are issues of sustainability of funding to be addressed particularly as the first Rover Task Force funding is required to be spent by April 2006 and the new round of ERDF will commence in 2007. There is no guarantee that further European funding will be available.

- 5.8 Partners within each corridor structure also provide significant additional funding and in kind support often used to match funding from Advantage West Midlands.

#### Management Arrangements

- 5.9 Each of the corridors has similar structures with a Steering Group/Board leading strategic development and Operation Groups leading projects. They are all chaired from within the partnerships and have a small secretariat headed by a Director. Appendix 3 gives details of individual corridor structures.
- 5.10 Advantage West Midlands did not prescribe a set management approach for the corridors and each has developed differently while successfully involving key partners. The Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Technology Corridor has developed within the framework of the existing sub regional economic partnership and has been integrated into the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Partnership structures. The Central Technology Belt has spent significant time and effort to develop a company structure to enable them to become an investment vehicle in the future. The Wolverhampton Telford Technology Corridor has developed as a new partnership with a more noticeable academic based approach.
- 5.11 When investigating the corridors we were provided with a significant amount of information and this report is not

intended to be a summary of this. It discusses a number of issues that we have identified as important for Advantage West Midlands to consider in its future support for high technology corridors.

## 6. **Definitions of High Technology**

- 6.1 We wanted to explore what partners understood by the term “high technology” and were initially surprised that a definition had not been developed that could then be used to help assess whether or not a business or an idea could be supported through the corridor programmes.
- 6.2 During the evidence gathering process a number of definitions were provided from “technology that gives rise to discontinuous innovation leading to a change in behaviour” to “things which move technology forward”. It became more obvious that in actuality high technology varied from corridor to corridor. A “real science” approach at Malvern Hills Science Park within the Central Technology Belt offering laboratory type support contrasted sharply with the Creative Industries Centre at Wolverhampton Science Park.
- 6.3 The Chair of the Central Technology Belt described the corridor as technology rich rather than high technology. Many of the businesses supported by the corridors do not consider themselves as high technology businesses. We saw a number of examples of knowledge based enterprises who were using technology to enhance products for example the development of “talking parking bollards” by Space Hoy Ltd in the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire corridor.
- 6.4 We support Advantage West Midlands’ view that corridors should not be prescriptive in the type of technology that they support and that a clear definition could result in exclusion of ideas. Manufacturing is changing both within this region and more widely, and most processes contain some element of high technology. We are concerned that use of the term “High Technology” could prevent businesses and individuals contacting the corridors for assistance. This has been partially resolved by none of the corridors using the word high within their names.
- 6.5 Advantage West Midlands’ view is that the word high should be retained in order to ensure that advanced technologies are used to push back boundaries and to keep the region

ambitious. This view of the benefits of using the word “high” was not shared by partners during our evidence sessions.

### **Recommendations**

- 6.6 Recommendation 1 - That Advantage West Midlands considers the use of the word technology rather than high technology in relation to the corridors as part of the forthcoming review of the Regional Economic Strategy.
- 6.7 Recommendation 2 - That Advantage West Midlands promotes the corridors as supporting the use of advanced technology in existing businesses as well as new/SME business and ensures that its publicity material in relation to corridors does not exclude sectors or businesses that would benefit from this initiative. This is linked to recommendation 15 relating to marketing the corridor brand.

## **7. Advantage West Midlands’ Support Role**

- 7.1 Advantage West Midlands has a key role to play in supporting the development of and delivery within High Technology Corridors. One of the main objectives of this review was to identify how Advantage West Midlands support individual corridor structures. This role has a number of facets some of which are discussed in other sections of this report. From the evidence presented, we have identified a number of specific issues that we wish to discuss in some detail.

### **Supporting Development**

- 7.2 Advantage West Midlands played a pivotal role in the first Rover Task Force (2000) and in the subsequent development of the concept of High Technology Corridors. “Regenerating the West Midlands Region: A study to consider opportunities for high technology corridors/clusters” commissioned by Advantage West Midlands, provided an analysis of opportunities and needs in each of the corridor areas together with strategies and action plans developed in conjunction with corridor partners. These projects became the basis for phase 1 corridor activities up to March 2006.
- 7.3 As detailed in paragraph 5.6 Advantage West Midlands is a key funder of High Technology Corridor projects. It also provides discrete funding for corridor secretariats. The

agency has ring fenced £57.5m to support High Technology Corridors in the period 2005-8.

- 7.4 Advantage West Midlands has a key role to play within the corridor partnership structures. They are represented both on Corridor Steering Groups/Board at a senior level and on operational groups by Partnership Managers located within Advantage West Midlands. These are an initial point of contact and act as a champion for the individual corridors within the Agency. Advantage West Midlands have a High Technology Corridor Policy Lead Officer whose role is to lead the development of and to co-ordinate corridor activities.
- 7.5 As part of Advantage West Midlands' Corporate Planning process for 2005-8, High Technology Corridors were asked to produce three year operating business plans. These were developed in conjunction with Advantage West Midlands, both as a key partner and as a potential funder, and reflected and sought support from Advantage West Midlands' draft Corporate Plan 2005-8.
- 7.6 Evidence presented to us has reinforced the importance of Advantage West Midlands' role as a key corridor partner because of its position within the region. We were pleased with the willingness of Advantage West Midlands to work with corridors to resolve any issues of concern such as project appraisal (see Section 9).
- 7.7 From the evidence presented to us, it became apparent that corridor projects have tended to support small and medium enterprises (SMEs). This is partly due to the key role these organisations play in innovation and to the requirements of ERDF funding. We felt that more emphasis should be placed on involving larger businesses in facilitating technological transfer to SMEs. These may be involved in technological development such as Marconi, the aerospace and the automotive industries, or may wish to use advanced technology to support product development with SMEs.
- 7.8 We have attempted to assess whether or not co-operative projects would have been developed irrespective of corridors or Advantage West Midlands' catalyst role. We concluded that this may have occurred where strong partnerships already existed such as the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Partnership. In this case the funding from the first Rover Task Force was the key factor. Advantage West Midlands have played a strong catalyst role in the other corridors.

## **Management Arrangements**

- 7.9 Section 5 of this report describes the current corridor management structures. As stated in paragraph 7.4, Advantage West Midlands plays an important role as an active partner within individual corridors with representation at both Steering Group/Board level and within Operational Groups. We were very pleased to note the range of partners involved in corridor arrangements. The importance of local ownership of corridor strategies and policies are essential to their success.
- 7.10 We were interested in how the management arrangements have developed to meet the aspirations of each corridor resulting in distinct approaches including integrated partnership (Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire), academic (Wolverhampton Telford) and business (Central Technology Belt). We felt that the different progress made in developing and delivering projects has partly been due to the different structures adopted by each corridor. Although there are differences in approach we were encouraged by the willingness to be flexible and learn lessons from the experiences of other corridors. This has been encouraged by Advantage West Midlands as part of its co-ordination role.

## **Communications**

- 7.11 We were pleased to note how Advantage West Midlands has worked to develop good communication mechanisms with and between corridor structures although we feel that there is still room for improvement. Corridor Chairs meet quarterly with the Chief Executive Advantage West Midlands to discuss key issues. The Advantage West Midlands Policy Lead co-ordinates monthly meetings of Corridor Directors and Partnership Managers. In addition individual projects have project sponsors within the Agency who deal with specific project issues. It is important to ensure that good communications are further developed to meet needs.
- 7.12 The role of the Partnership Manager is seen as crucial and is valued by the corridors. The problems experienced by some corridors in the past in respect of changing personnel or vacant posts have underlined this view.

- 7.13 Individuals within Advantage West Midlands, who deal with High Technology Corridors on a regular basis, are aware of the objectives of this key delivery mechanism. Evidence presented to us suggests that difficulties arise when particular projects require input from additional staff within Advantage West Midlands. There are concerns that the aims of corridors are not widely understood and that the internal structure of the Agency contributes to this, for example corridors cut across the geographical responsibilities within Advantage West Midlands.
- 7.14 Advantage West Midlands is working to ensure that corridors priorities do not compete in terms of marketing and business support. This is supported by the good communications between them facilitated by Advantage West Midlands. For example all three corridors identify Medical Technologies as a priority area but are currently focussing on different aspects of this including Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire on telemedicine, Wolverhampton Telford on medical products and Central Technology Belt on the biomedical field. We are concerned that there is the potential for competition between corridors that may not benefit the region as a whole.

### **Facilitating Linkages between Delivery Mechanisms**

- 7.15 The relationships between Regeneration Zones, Clusters and High Technology Corridors are complex and Advantage West Midlands has an important role in ensuring co-ordination and balance between them. Although the focus of these mechanisms are different we feel that it is essential that partners involved in any of these have a clear understanding of how they can work together for their mutual benefit.
- 7.16 Relationships between Regeneration Zones and High Technology Corridors vary. We were pleased to note that the Wolverhampton Telford High Technology Corridor Steering Group includes the Director of the Future Foundations Regeneration Zone. This has been reflected by the close working relationship in respect of the I54 development which will contain both High Technology Corridor and Regeneration Zone projects.
- 7.17 We would expect closer relationships between clusters and High Technology Corridors and to some extent these have developed although not in a structured way. Advantage West Midlands is working to develop closer understanding, for example by inviting one Cluster Manager to each monthly

High Technology Corridor Director meeting. We were unable to identify evidence of specific linkages or benefits directly arising from this process.

- 7.18 We felt that a further complication has been the choice of the name clusters for the Wolverhampton Telford Corridor's thematic approach to polymers and advanced engineering. These are not part of the clusters identified within the Regional Economic Strategy although they appear to have similar aims.
- 7.19 We appreciate that the three delivery mechanisms have different agendas and this will impact on the opportunities that exist for joint working. High Technology Corridors take a long term view of development looking at generational change.
- 7.20 Advantage West Midlands recognise that it has a critical role in facilitating appropriate relationships. We were pleased to hear that the recent corporate planning process had included "swop shop" activities comprising of joint practical discussions led by Advantage West Midlands' policy leads. It was clear from the evidence presented to us that this had developed the relationship between clusters and High Technology Corridors but that there was still a gap with Regeneration Zones.
- 7.21 We were concerned that there appeared to be a significant overlap between financial support projects funded by Advantage West Midlands and corridor projects. Particular examples of this include the Advantage Creative Fund and Invored (an investment readiness programme to help technology entrepreneurs. We would hope that Advantage West Midlands enables these regional projects to learn from the corridor experiences. We would expect that potential overlaps are considered when High Technology Corridors identify future projects.

### **Relationship with Innovation and Technology Council**

- 7.22 Advantage West Midlands established the Innovation and Technology Council (ITC) in July 2004 following governmental guidance. It is made up of 9 members from the private sector, 4 from the regions knowledge base (including universities) and 2 from the public sector. Its purpose is to provide effective business and academic leadership to technological innovation in the region, as an integral component of the Regional Economic Strategy. It acts as an

advisory body to Advantage West Midlands and is currently identifying key areas of work.

- 7.23 The future relationship between High Technology Corridors and the ITC is very important. Evidence presented to us included the hope that High Technology Corridors would feed ideas into the ITC. It is anticipated that the Director (appointed since the evidence hearings) would be responsible for receiving ideas from a variety of sources and channelling these to the most appropriate place including High Technology Corridors.
- 7.24 High Technology Corridors do not have a direct representation on the ITC although individual corridor partners may be represented through other mechanisms, for example universities via the West Midlands Higher Education Association. However there was little or no awareness of the membership of the ITC. High Technology Corridor Chairs and Directors identified the need for corridors to play an important role in the ITC's initial strategy but had not been involved in its development. We were disappointed that no contact had been made between the ITC and High Technology Corridors either individually or at any of the regular meetings with Advantage West Midlands. Concern was expressed to us that although the ITC was aiming to be an influencing body it had not taken any opportunity to discuss corridor priorities.
- 7.25 We also noted that this lack of connectivity was not restricted to the ITC and High Technology Corridors. There is a need for Advantage West Midlands to ensure discussions are held between all delivery mechanisms and the three recently created regional bodies - the Innovation and Technology Council, the Enterprise Board and the Regional Skills Partnership.
- 7.26 As noted above (paragraph 7.15) there is significant complexity in respect of the delivery mechanisms within the region. The seemingly independent development of these bodies and lack of mutual understanding will merely increase the complexity and reduce clarity. We are pleased that Advantage West Midlands accept their responsibility in bringing delivery mechanisms and these bodies together to form a coherent whole and to prevent fragmentation.

## **Links with Regional Strategies**

- 7.27 We were pleased to note the linkages between the Regional Economic Strategy and the Regional Spatial Strategy in respect of High Technology Corridors. An area of possible conflict between these is corridor boundaries which is discussed in section 8.
- 7.28 We were concerned however with the lack of understanding of the impact of other regional strategies on High Technology Corridors and vice versa. For example the Regional Housing Strategy may have a significant impact upon the proposed development on the existing QinetiQ site at Malvern Hills. Transport was identified as a key issue in the development of corridors (Regenerating the West Midlands Region – a study to consider opportunities for high technology corridor/clusters) but there appears to be limited consideration of this in the Regional Transport Delivery Plan.
- 7.29 We were also intrigued by the announcement in the Budget that Birmingham had been designated as a Science City. Partners were unable to identify what this actually meant or how it may impact upon High Technology Corridors although it was quite clear that no additional government funding was being made available to support this. We were pleased to note that the Central Technology Belt had been involved in the work leading to the announcement and were assured that this would be linked to the priorities of this corridor.

## **Recommendations**

- 7.30 Recommendation 3 - That Advantage West Midlands continues to work with Corridors to develop and share good practice and learn from each other in respect of management arrangements and development of processes.
- 7.31 Recommendation 4 - That Advantage West Midlands develop stronger and effective links between High Technology Corridors, clusters and Regeneration Zones including regular meetings between representatives of the three delivery mechanisms.
- 7.32 Recommendation 5 - That Advantage West Midlands ensure linkages are made between the Innovation and Technology Council and High Technology Corridors. This should include Council members representing each High Technology Corridor.

- 7.33 Recommendation 6 - That Advantage West Midlands Partnership Managers are fully briefed regarding regional strategies in order to enable an assessment of their impact by High Technology Corridors. In addition Advantage West Midlands should ensure that the views of High Technology Corridors are taken into account when they respond to consultation on new or revised regional strategies.
- 7.34 Recommendation 7 – That Advantage West Midlands, as part of the forthcoming revision of the Regional Economic Strategy, ensure that strategic approaches (particularly in terms of time horizons) and the planned outcomes of corridors, clusters, the Innovation and Technology Council and other regional boards, are internally coherent and consistent.

## 8. **Boundaries**

- 8.1 Although High Technology Corridors are geographical areas based on a series of centres or development nodes, described to us as being like pearls on a string, they do not have clear boundaries. This adoption of “fuzzy” boundaries was a deliberate approach to concentrating emphasis within a geographical area without excluding businesses purely by postcode. It has led to physical projects such as science parks being clearly located within corridor areas but allowed other virtual projects based on networking or support mechanisms to develop in a more organic manner. We would agree that where businesses can contribute to corridor aims it is more important to consider what these do rather than where they are located.
- 8.2 During discussions with a variety of partners it became apparent that geography was seen to be less important than people and enterprise in developing and managing a corridor although it does play an important role as a focus for activity. We were told on a number of occasions that corridors are much more than just a strip of land but feel that this perception has been reinforced by the use of the word corridor. It was interesting to note a comment that one of the benefits of the change of name from the A38 Corridor to the Central Technology Belt was the loss of the word corridor.
- 8.3 Despite the emphasis on flexible boundaries there is a need to ensure that High Technology Corridors maintain a spatial dimension to ensure a focus for resources. This will contribute to the identification of the High Technology

Corridors as areas of technological development in the region providing points of contact for home grown innovative businesses and supporting inward investment.

- 8.4 High Technology Corridors form an integral part of the Regional Spatial Strategy which states that "the term corridor reflects the functional linkages between activities". The key aim of the Regional Spatial Strategy is to reduce the migration from urban to rural areas. There is a potential conflict between the deliberately "fuzzy" boundary approach and the focus within the Regional Spatial Strategy on nodes or centres of development. We would agree that there is a danger that not concentrating physical development within nodes could lead to significant transport implications and contribute to increased migration from urban areas. We would wish to avoid such conflict by ensuring that there is a clear understanding of the aims and goals of the Regional Spatial Strategy. (see recommendation 6, paragraph 7.33)
- 8.5 There were a number of concerns expressed to us regarding physical development within High Technology Corridors. These included the need to make sure that there are sufficient sites for high technology development while maintaining a balance with other developments and the length of time sites can be retained for high technology development against market pressures. We were also made aware of the difficulties of identifying high technology developments which could lead to challenges regarding the justification for refusing planning permission to the Regional Assembly on conformity issues. (The Town and Country Planning Act Use Class Order 2005 provides only one specific classification in relation to high technology – B1b – Business Research and Development – Laboratories, Studios.)
- 8.6 Advantage West Midlands have a key role to play in addressing these concerns as a site owner and an influencing role as a statutory consultee on planning applications. Wherever possible Advantage West Midlands should ensure that they and High Technology Corridor partnerships work to ensure sites for high technology development are identified within the development nodes and retained for this original purpose.
- 8.7 Evidence was submitted to us requesting formal extension of High Technology Corridor beyond the existing "fuzzy" boundaries to encompass additional development nodes. The underlying reason for wanting inclusion in a corridor appears

to be one of perception – if you wanted to be seen as an area for innovative and technological development you had to be in a corridor. This would then lead to some funding becoming available for technology parks, joining up of initiatives and an improved ability for local businesses to engage with Higher Educational establishments. There was also a view that inclusion in a corridor area would automatically provide direct funding. We do not feel that it is appropriate to comment on these individual cases but were concerned that High Technology Corridors were being seen as the only route to achieve the profile of “a forward thinking business location, hence, a place to start and grow a business within a stimulating, supportive enterprise culture” – Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council. We would emphasise that developing innovative and new technologies within the region is not limited to High Technology Corridors.

- 8.8 There is a need to ensure that the development of High Technology Corridors take place within a wider regional context. This is especially important in relation to physical development and boundaries. The Regional Spatial Strategy which defines the physical aspects of corridors (see paragraph 5.3) is currently undergoing a partial review, the first stage of which is the Black Country Study. Wolverhampton Telford Technology Corridor and its partner organisations are closely involved in this process. It is important to ensure that the impact of the outcomes of these studies on High Technology Corridors is considered.

### **Recommendations**

- 8.9 Recommendation 8 - That Local Authorities involved with High Technology Corridors ensure that Local Development Frameworks encourage the development of sites within the framework of the Regional Spatial Strategy, in particular policy PA3 – High Technology Corridors.
- 8.10 Recommendation 9 - That individual High Technology Corridor partnerships and Advantage West Midlands take account within their future development, the recommendations and conclusions of phase 2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy Partial Review

## **9. Project Appraisal**

- 9.1 One of the specific areas of concern brought to our attention was the length of time taken to appraise projects funded by

Advantage West Midlands. High Technology Corridors do not have delegated budgets and therefore projects requiring Agency funding have to be forwarded to Advantage West Midlands for approval. We acknowledge the need to ensure public funds are used in the most effective manner and that Advantage West Midlands have to work within the framework laid down by central government.

- 9.2 Advantage West Midlands' current approval process consists of three stages; concept, outline and full. An "ideal" project with minimal queries should take an average of twelve weeks from the initial submission to full approval. Evidence submitted to us suggests that twenty weeks is a more realistic duration with some projects taking 6 months or more to obtain full approval. We were pleased to note that the process includes a formal sustainable development appraisal.
- 9.3 The approval process for projects funded through the first Rover Task Force included an additional level of approval from the Rover Approvals Group within Department of Trade and Industry. As this funding has now been allocated this additional stage is no longer required.
- 9.4 Evidence submitted to us suggests that the appraisal process is too lengthy especially for projects related to innovation and technology. Time is often critical especially within a changing environment. Partners also feel that the process is repetitive and overly bureaucratic.
- 9.5 We would remind partners that they have a responsibility to submit appraisal ready projects. Evidence presented to us demonstrated that where SMEs received business planning advice they were more likely to submit appraisal ready projects. While acknowledging the danger of funding a well prepared project application as opposed to a good project, we would urge Advantage West Midlands to develop and share good practice and lessons in respect of project preparation with prospective applicants.
- 9.6 A suggestion put to us is that the corridor business planning process and development of a three year strategic plan fulfils the requirement for concept approval. We welcome Advantage West Midlands' intention to work towards shortening the appraisal process by moving towards a two stage process. We also are pleased that Advantage West Midlands recognises that they have a responsibility to ensure

projects are examined as soon as possible and either referred back or moved to the next stage.

### **Recommendation**

- 9.7 Recommendation 10 - That Advantage West Midlands link the concept stage within the current project appraisal system with the High Technology Corridor business planning process and develop good practice advice for those submitting projects for appraisal.

## **10. Future Funding**

- 10.1 During the review process we have had considerable discussions regarding future funding of High Technology Corridors. The remainder of the first Rover Task Force funding has been allocated and we would urge Advantage West Midlands to encourage corridors to spend this during the current financial year. Advantage West Midlands has ring fenced £56 million of capital and £1.5 million of revenue to support High Technology Corridors during 2005-8.
- 10.2 Corridor Chairs and Directors accept that the majority of future funding from Advantage West Midlands will be for capital projects only and are actively examining other revenue funding options. These include the possibility of using capital funds to generate revenue for example using rental income from incubation units, joint working with clusters/Regeneration Zones and obtaining additional funding/contribution in kind from partners and the private sector. High Technology Corridors are waiting for clarification from Advantage West Midlands regarding Department of Trade restrictions on the use of capital funding and this needs to be resolved as soon as possible.
- 10.3 The structure adopted by the Central Technology Belt was designed to allow the creation of an investment vehicle that could use the income from capital projects to support the operation of the corridor and to develop new projects. The other corridors have not adopted a similar structure but equally have not ruled this out in the future.
- 10.4 We feel that the lack of revenue funding is a key challenge for High Technology Corridors. Future funding is not yet available to extend any current revenue projects beyond March 2006. Revenue funding is often required to support the development

of capital projects and there are concerns that these lack sufficient support. We do acknowledge the value of Advantage West Midlands' commitment to supporting corridor secretariat costs.

- 10.5 We feel that the High Technology Corridors may be in an ideal position to apply for any additional or new European Funding Streams related to the Lisbon agenda of competitiveness and innovation. Advantage West Midlands have a key role in identifying any such funding opportunities and in working with corridors to develop funding bids.
- 10.6 We are concerned that a High Technology Corridors do not have a long term funding plan or an exit strategy for current European funding streams. There is a danger that the aims of the corridors may be compromised by the need to chase funding.

### **Recommendation**

- 10.7 Recommendation 11 - That Advantage West Midlands should work with High Technology Corridors to develop a sustainable funding plan for revenue post 2006 and capital post 2008.

## **11. Monitoring**

- 11.1 It was disappointing that baseline data, such as the number of technology based business and employment levels within corridor areas when they were established, is not available. We were therefore unable to assess the level of achievement of this initiative.
- 11.2 The Regional Economic Strategy identifies four targets to achieved by the projects within all corridors during 2004-10 as
- 7000 jobs created and safeguarded
  - 2500 new and improved businesses
  - 15 hectares of brownfield land reclaimed
  - £23 million of private sector investment
- 11.3 Appendix 4 details project output data provided by Advantage West Midlands. These relate to national identified outputs that all Regional Development Agencies are required to report against. These are generic outputs and not specifically designed to reflect the aims of High Technology Corridors. Further information regarding target profiling and milestones

achieved would have allowed us to assess the impact of High Technology Corridors.

- 11.4 The Regional Economic Strategy Annual monitoring report provides information on a number of headline indicators for example business survival rates, but these are not linked to individual delivery mechanisms.
- 11.5 We have a number of interesting discussions regarding the difficulties of matching long term outcomes to the requirement for short term outputs. It is important to measure achievement against significant milestones in the shorter term. Partners have suggested a number of options including benchmarking and development of specific indicators. We believe that Advantage West Midlands should have these discussions with partners in order to develop measures based on corridor action plans and milestones.
- 11.6 We would support Advantage West Midlands' view that this area requires further work but feel that more should have been done by this stage in the development of High Technology Corridors.

### **Recommendations**

- 11.7 Recommendation 12 - That Advantage West Midlands work with High Technology Corridors to develop an effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism based on long term outcomes.

## **12. Sustainable Development**

- 12.1 Although we were pleased to note that Advantage West Midlands' project appraisal process includes a sustainable development appraisal, we were disappointed that this appears to be the only way in which sustainable development is being formally addressed. We received no evidence suggesting that the wider implications of sustainable development were being considered within the development of projects. We would advise High Technology Corridors to have regard for the Regional Sustainable Development Framework during the early stages of project development.
- 12.2 The Regional Sustainable Development Framework was published in January 2005 as a tool for incorporating sustainable development into the business planning process.

It details a number of objectives and our discussion of sustainable development in High Technology Corridors is based around three of these; standards, planning and innovation.

- 12.3 We were pleased to note on our visits to the High Technology Corridors that significant consideration has been given to efficient building design. This commitment has been possible as publicly funded projects are less subject to market pressures to reduce initial building costs. It is acknowledged that these additional costs are recouped over time but it is difficult to encourage private developers to take a longer term view.
- 12.4 We would encourage Advantage West Midlands and High Technology Corridors to continue to work with developers in order to influence the standard of design and build. This will become more difficult as corridor developments are privately led e.g. Battery Park, Selly Oak, Birmingham, in Central Technology Belt
- 12.5 The majority of new builds within the corridors are sited within or adjacent to university or other science park developments. This means that on the whole efficient use is made of existing infrastructure. However it became apparent that sustainable transport was not considered to be a priority. A bus route had been put in place to Warwick Science Park but most current tenants used their own cars apparently due to the non standard hours worked. We were pleased to hear in evidence that 50% of the employees at QinetiQ lived within 1 mile of the site which reflects the attraction of Malvern as a place to live and work. The possible impact of the development of this site in respect of transport and housing implications is an example of how the Regional Spatial Strategy could impact on developments within High Technology Corridors.
- 12.6 We would encourage Advantage West Midlands and High Technology Corridors to consider sustainable transport as part of developments.
- 12.7 A key area of concern is the possible use of greenfield sites for development as an alternative to brownfield sites. Advantage West Midlands has a regional target for remediation of brownfield land. The Regional Spatial Strategy Annual Monitoring Report 2004 identifies that out of 281.4 hectares of employment land developed within the region 39

hectares fell within corridor areas. It is expected that this figure will increase as Central Technology Belt projects move forward.

- 12.8 When visiting the corridors and talking to partners we felt that some sustainability issues were being considered in a positive way. However we felt that Advantage West Midlands did not take the opportunity of the final hearing to identify the scope of its activities in relation to sustainable development in High Technology Corridors. We would agree that the project appraisal process plays an important role in encouraging sustainable development. However we feel that this could be encouraged much earlier through the business planning process.
- 12.9 Advantage West Midlands could use some of the energy efficient designs as good practice examples in its wider role in respect of sustainable development. Detailed records regarding costs and benefits would be available over time and these could be used to influence private and other public sector developments.

### **Recommendation**

- 12.10 Recommendation 13 - That Advantage West Midlands work with High Technology Corridors in order to encourage sustainable design within corridor projects and to influence other developments including those outside corridor areas.

### **13. MG Rover**

- 13.1 The announcement of the closure of MG Rover occurred part way through the review process. We accept that this closure would not have a direct impact on High Technology Corridors but still wished to explore any relevant issues.
- 13.2 Advantage West Midlands currently own 57 acres of the Longbridge site. The Central Technology Belt has been developing a project that would act as a seed for technology led businesses on this site. A manufacturing industry nanomaterials institute (MINI) is planned in conjunction with the University of Birmingham and equipment manufacturers. This would act as a service centre for industry that would become self supporting in three years. It is important that within the future development of the remainder of the Longbridge site provision is made to support the aims of High

Technology Corridors and the Central Technology Belt in particular.

- 13.3 We were interested to hear the activities being carried out to provide short term support to MG Rover employees and suppliers and would commend Advantage West Midlands for their prompt and comprehensive response. This closure served to remind us of the need for the region to move towards new technology. We are concerned that the concentration of High Technology Corridors on small and medium enterprises and micro enterprises would not address the large number of job losses resulting from the closure of MG Rover or any other major employers within the region.

### **Recommendation**

- 13.4 Recommendation 14 - that Advantage West Midlands works with partners to ensure that future development on the Longbridge site is consistent with its environs including the centres of Northfield and Rubery and as far as possible that it takes account of the aims of the Central Technology Belt.

## **14. The High Technology Corridor "Brand"**

- 14.1 We have been impressed with the aims and achievements to date of all the High Technology Corridors. However we are surprised that these are not more widely known or published. Although High Technology Corridors are one of the three key delivery mechanisms of the Regional Economic Strategy they seem to be less understood than the other two. This was particularly brought home to us during a workshop with representatives from the business sector.
- 14.2 There appears to be little understanding of the role of High Technology Corridors even among those businesses benefiting from them. It is perceived that help has been provided by the science park or the university rather than the corridor and contacts have been made through word of mouth. We were intrigued to find that the strongest view of the High Technology Corridor brand was amongst those Local Authorities lobbying for inclusion within them.
- 14.3 Advantage West Midlands has led the development of the Regional Marketing Strategy which is closely linked to the Regional Economic Strategy's aim to develop a powerful voice for the region. The intention of the Regional Marketing

Strategy is to promote the West Midlands Region and ensure that it is recognised for its strengths. It recognises that perceptions affect investment and development choices which impact upon the economic health of the region.

14.4 We feel that Advantage West Midlands is not taking full advantage of the opportunities to promote High Technology Corridors both within its own corporate publications and those associated with the Regional Marketing Strategy. High Technology Corridors seem to have a lower profile than the other delivery mechanisms. For example only one of the forty five actions within the Regional Economic Strategy is identified as having linkages with High Technology Corridors although clearly more do. Our visits to each of the corridors demonstrated projects and successes that the region should be promoting. The Regional Marketing Strategy publication *The West Midlands Region : full of surprises*, describes the region as "a truly successful region responsible for a constant stream of fresh ideas that radiate out and influence the world." High Technology Corridors are sources of these ideas and should be promoted in a more robust way.

14.5 We were pleased to note that Advantage West Midlands had allocated funding to each corridor for marketing but also feel Advantage West Midlands have a key role particularly in respect of the Regional Marketing Strategy and in attracting inward investment.

### **Recommendation**

14.6 Recommendation 15 - That Advantage West Midlands actively promote the High Technology Corridors and their successes within its corporate publications and as part of the Marketing the Region campaign.

## **15. Conclusion**

15.1 We acknowledge that High Technology Corridors are a long term approach that aim to achieve "generational change". It is therefore difficult to assess their effectiveness after only three years especially with the lack of evidence of a structured approach to measuring outputs against aims and key milestones. We were however impressed with the enthusiasm of partners and with the projects presented to us as case studies.

- 15.2 We feel that Advantage West Midlands needs to learn from, and share, the varied experiences of the three corridors and to adopt good practice.
- 15.3 The emphasis to date has been on the transfer of technology from universities and other research establishments to businesses. We were concerned that little attention appears to be given to transferring technology and innovative practices between different business sectors. We hope that this becomes one of the future priority areas for both Advantage West Midlands and the High Technology Corridors.
- 15.4 One of the aims of the review was to assess the support provided by Advantage West Midlands to the corridors. Overall we would compliment Advantage West Midlands on progress although there are of course some areas of concern. These may be due in part to the relative newness of the corridor structures and other bodies such as the Innovation and Technology Council. We feel that it is important for Advantage West Midlands to address the issues raised as soon as possible.
- 15.5 We recognise that businesses developing new or innovative uses of technology will not generally be large employers and therefore will not be able to replace MG Rover or other major employers within the region's economy. We would hope that High Technology Corridors will enable other businesses to use this new technology to enhance the development of products and processes.
- 15.6 We would like to thank Advantage West Midlands for all the support they have provided for the review process. We have found the process and subject matter to be very interesting and would hope that Advantage West Midlands and the corridors benefit from this review.

## 16. **Summary of Recommendations**

- 16.1 We have made fifteen recommendations that we believe will assist with the future development of High Technology Corridors. The rationale for each recommendation is discussed within the main body of the report.
- R1 That Advantage West Midlands considers the use of the word technology rather than high technology in relation to the

corridors as part of the forthcoming review of the Regional Economic Strategy.

- R2 That Advantage West Midlands promotes the corridors as supporting the use of advanced technology in existing businesses as well as new/SME businesses and ensures that its publicity material in relation to corridors does not exclude sectors or businesses that would benefit from this initiative. This is linked to recommendation 15 relating to marketing the corridor brand.
- R3 That Advantage West Midlands continues to work with Corridors to develop and share good practice and learn from each other in respect of management arrangements and development of processes.
- R4 That Advantage West Midlands develop stronger and effective links between High Technology Corridors, clusters and Regeneration Zones, including regular meetings between representatives of the three delivery mechanisms.
- R5 That Advantage West Midlands ensure linkages are made between the Innovation and Technology Council and High Technology Corridors. This should include Council members representing each High Technology Corridor and the use of the new High Technology Secretariat.
- R6 That Advantage West Midlands Partnership Managers are fully briefed regarding regional strategies in order to enable an assessment of their impact by High Technology Corridors. In addition Advantage West Midlands should ensure that the views of High Technology Corridors are taken into account when they respond to consultation on new or revised regional strategies.
- R7 That Advantage West Midlands, as part of the forthcoming revision of the Regional Economic Strategy, ensure that strategic approaches (particularly in terms of time horizons) and the planned outcomes of corridors, clusters and Regional Councils are internally coherent and consistent
- R8 That Local Authorities involved with High Technology Corridors ensure that Local Development Frameworks encourage the development of sites within the framework of the Regional Spatial Strategy, in particular policy PA3 – High Technology Corridors.

- R9 That individual High Technology Corridor partnerships and Advantage West Midlands take account of, within their future development, the recommendations and conclusions of phase 2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy Partial Review
- R10 That Advantage West Midlands link the concept stage within the current project appraisal system with the High Technology Corridor business planning process and develop good practice advice for those submitting projects for appraisal.
- R11 That Advantage West Midlands should work with High Technology Corridors to develop a sustainable funding plan for revenue funding post 2006 and capital funding post 2008.
- R12 That Advantage West Midlands work with High Technology Corridors to develop an effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism based on long term outcomes.
- R13 That Advantage West Midlands work with High Technology Corridors to encourage sustainable design within corridor projects And to influence other developments including those outside corridor areas.
- R14 That Advantage West Midlands works with partners to ensure that future development on the Longbridge site is consistent with its environs including the centres of Northfield and Rubery and as far as possible that it takes account of the aims of the Central Technology Belt.
- R15 That Advantage West Midlands actively promote the High Technology Corridors and their successes within its corporate publications and as part of the Marketing the Region campaign.

## **References**

Scrutiny and Strategic Review Protocol (Joint agreement between West Midlands Regional Assembly, Advantage West Midlands and Government Office West Midlands)

Delivering Advantage – The West Midlands Economic Strategy and Action Plan 2004-2010 (Advantage West Midlands)

Rover Task Force – Final Report and Recommendations for the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry (Advantage West Midlands)

Regional Spatial Strategy published as Regional Planning Guidance for the West Midlands (West Midlands Regional Assembly)

Regenerating the West Midlands Region – A study to consider opportunities for high technology corridors/clusters – Stage Two Report to the rover Task Force (SQW Limited)

Wolverhampton Telford Technology Corridor – Strategy and Three Year Plan

Winning Technologies – The Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Technology Corridor Strategic Plan 2005 – 2008

Central Technology Belt Three Year Operating April 2005 – March 2008

Advantage West Midlands Draft Corporate Plan 2005 – 8

Regional Economic Strategy Annual Monitoring Report (Advantage West Midlands)

A Sustainable Future for the West Midlands – The Regional Sustainable Development Framework January 2005 (Sustainability West Midlands)

West Midlands Spatial Strategy – Annual Monitoring Report 2004 (West Midlands Regional Assembly)

Regional Marketing Strategy (Advantage West Midlands)

The West Midlands Region : full of surprises (Advantage West Midlands)

## **Glossary of Terms**

AWM	Advantage West Midlands
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
GOWM	Government Office West Midlands
HTC	High Technology Corridor
ITC	Innovation and Technology Council
I54	Major Investment Site, Wobaston Road, Wolverhampton
RES	Regional Economic Strategy
RSDF	Regional Sustainable Development Framework
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
RZ	Regeneration Zone
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SWM	Sustainability West Midlands
WMRA	West Midlands Regional Assembly

### **West Midlands Regional Assembly Strategic Review of High Technology Corridors Terms of Reference**

#### Aim

The aim of this review is to examine Advantage West Midlands' role in developing and supporting High Technology Corridors, one of the three main delivery mechanisms of the Regional Economic Strategy. It will also examine the impact of High Technology Corridors on the regional economy, while recognising that these are long term initiatives.

#### Method

The review will be carried out by a Review Panel made up of Assembly Members with an additional co-opted member acting as a sustainability champion. Evidence will be submitted to the review either in writing or by the review activities. These will include a briefing session, discussion events and hearings, including one event within each corridor area, and will culminate with a formal hearing with Advantage West Midlands. The events within each High Technology Corridor will provide allow specific projects to be used as case studies. The review will be supported by an independent advisor.

#### Objectives

The objectives of the review are to identify the contribution made by High Technology Corridors to:

- Diversifying the business base
- Fostering and supporting enterprise and innovation

The review should also identify the role of Advantage West Midlands in:

- Supporting individual corridor structures
- Monitoring impact and added value
- Facilitating involvement of business, Higher Education and research organisations and public sector bodies

Panel Members will develop issues to be considered during the review process. Additional areas may be identified as a result of preparatory work and input from partners and stakeholders.

#### Cross Cutting Themes

All reviews are required to consider how the cross cutting themes of Sustainable Development and Equalities and Diversity will be addressed within the review process.

## Outputs

A final report will be produced by the Panel and circulated widely.

## Review Panel

The Strategic Review Group, the Assembly's scrutiny co-ordinating body, has delegated responsibility for this review to the Review Panel. The Panel are required to report progress to the Strategic Review Group through officers and via the Strategic Review Group Member on the Review Panel. The final report is made on behalf of the Assembly and will not require further approval but will be reported to the full Assembly. In addition any recommendations made for the Assembly itself will need to be accepted by the full Assembly.

The Panel Chair will be selected by Panel Members and will be required to act as spokesperson for Panel, with Assembly support, as required.

Panel meetings will be considered quorate if three Assembly Panel Members are present. All Panel Members should abide by the Assembly Code of Conduct (see attached) and are required to declare any possible conflict of interests.

## Timescales

The review will commence on 28 January 2005. It is expected that the final report will be completed by 1 July 2005.

### Evidence Submitted to the Review Panel

#### Written Evidence

Written evidence was received from:

University of Birmingham  
Birmingham City Council  
Herefordshire District Council  
Worcestershire Partnership  
Bromsgrove District Council  
QinetiQ  
CSW Corridor Steering Group  
CPRE Warwickshire  
Solihull MBC  
University of Wolverhampton  
Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council  
Black Country Chamber and Business Link  
Birmingham and Solihull LSC  
CPRE WM  
Black Country Consortium  
Shropshire County Council

#### Participants in Review Activities

As part of the review process, the Panel received input from the following individuals as part of formal hearings, case study visits, workshops or informal discussion.

Dave Edmonds - Advantage Creative West Midlands Ltd  
John Longstaff Tyrrell – HTC Policy Manager Advantage West Midlands  
Norman Price OBE - Deputy Chair Advantage West Midlands  
Mary Harpley - Corporate Director Enterprise and Innovation Advantage West Midlands  
Roger Sumpton - Director of Strategy Advantage West Midlands  
Alan Emery - Advantage West Midlands  
Hilary Chilton – Head of Innovation Advantage West Midlands  
David Blake Advantage West Midlands  
Wendy Richards Advantage West Midlands  
Karen O'Malley – Advantage West Midlands  
Manorama Jopanpuri – Asian Business Forum  
Jan Rowley – Birmingham City Council  
Dave Carter – RSS Prosperity for All Policy Lead (Birmingham City Council)

Ian Brough – Black Country Chamber of Commerce  
Mike Bushell – Black Country Chamber and Business Link  
Michelle Roberts – Black Country LSC  
Ann Goldman – Bourneville College  
Ted Ryan – Bourneville College  
Michael Clarke – Chair Central Technology Belt  
Alan Folwell – Chief Executive Central Technology Belt  
Rob Read - Connect Midlands  
Stan Aldridge – Coventry City Council  
Brian Williams – Coventry University Services  
David Rowe – Chair Coventry, Warwickshire and Solihull Technology Corridor  
Bhovinder Nagra – Programme Manager, Coventry, Warwickshire and Solihull Technology Corridor  
Gerald Kells CPRE  
Roger Duthwaite – CSWP  
Ian Smith – Employers Engineering Federation  
Bill Fryer – Director, Future Foundations Regeneration Zone  
Adrian Marshall - Herefordshire Council  
Alan Ronald - Herefordshire Council  
Chris Harvey – Herefordshire and Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce  
Christine Jones – Herefordshire and Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce  
Mel Webb – Learning and Skills Council  
Russell Poole – ICT Services Partnership  
Bob Michaelson – Institute of Directors  
Nick Madeley – Madeley Management Associates  
Nigel Shaw - Malvern Hills Science Park  
Yaseen Akthar – Newman College  
Alan Threadgold – QinetiQ  
David Griffiths - Shrewsbury and Atcham District Council  
Cllr Jo Jones - Shrewsbury and Atcham District Council  
Tom Mongan – Subcon Laser Cutting Ltd  
Stuart Linnell – Vfm Radio Ltd  
Colin Davis – Warwick Manufacturing Group  
John James – Pro Vice Chancellor, Warwick University  
Pravin Patel – West Midlands IT Association  
James Watkins – West Midlands Business Council  
Helen Brown – West Midlands Higher Education Association  
Rose Poulter – Director, West Midlands Regional Assembly  
Dave Thew – RSS Co-ordinator, West Midlands Regional Assembly  
Nicola Bargery - Wolverhampton City Council  
John Brooks - Vice Chancellor, University of Wolverhampton  
Alan Collins - Head of Business Development and Enterprise University of Wolverhampton

Gerald Bennett - Pro Vice Chancellor, University of Wolverhampton  
Rob Moreton – Dean, School of IT, University of Wolverhampton  
Andrew Gilson - Assistant Director Wolverhampton Science Park  
Alwyn Davies – Worcestershire County Council  
Geoff Palmer – Worcestershire County Council and CTB  
Mike Norris - Director WTTC  
Ros Barsley - Administrator WTTC  
Paul Hackney - Polymer Cluster Champion WTTC  
Paul Butler - Advanced Engineering Cluster Champion WTTC

**High Technology Corridor Structures**

**Central Technology Belt**

Has a company structure

Board

- Meets 6 times a year plus additional strategy and ad hoc meetings when required
- 16 Directors plus Company Secretary
- Chaired by Michael Clarke, Vice Chancellor Birmingham University

Executive Management Group

- Meets monthly
- Deals with operational issues and inputs into Board
- 8 Members including CTB Director
- Chaired by Adrian Gill, CTB Board Industrial Member

Working Groups

- 5 working groups working on action planning coordinated by EMC - covering
- Knowledge base
- Business development/technology transfer
- People/skills
- Sites/infrastructure
- Marketing/customer focus

**Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Corridor**

Forms part of CSWP Ltd, sub regional economic partnership

Steering Group

- One of 6 steering groups feeding into CSWP
- Chaired by David Rowe – Director Warwick Science Park
- Responsible for corridor strategy, leadership and planning

Operations Group

- Responsible for operational support for projects, marketing and performance management

## **Wolverhampton Telford Technology Corridor**

Independent partnership approach

### Steering Group

- 19 members
- Chaired by John Brooks Vice Chancellor, University of Wolverhampton
- Meets quarterly
- Provides strategic leadership, reviews and approves project proposals, oversees business plans and reporting of individual projects, approve monitoring reports and co-ordinates partnership arrangements

### Operational Group

- 16 members
- Chaired by Nike Norris, Corridor Director
- Provides operational support, approve and monitor individual projects business plans and budgets, measure performance and stimulate new partnership proposals

## Appendix 4 – Summary of Outputs

Project Name	Forecast Start	Forecast End	Businesses Assisted		New Jobs Created		Jobs Safeguarded		Brownfield Land Remediated/Recycled (Hectares)		Learning Opportunities Created		New Business Created	
			Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
CSW10 Partnership Network	01/03/2003	31/03/2006	167	1	0.00	0.00	23	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CSW1 Support for Growth of ICT dev	26/03/2003	31/03/2006	20	12	6	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CSW2 ICT Skills Task Force	01/01/2003	31/03/2005	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00
CSW3 ICT Skills Training Scheme	01/03/2003	31/03/2006	100	58	0.00	0.00	300	128	0.00	0.00	300	128	0.00	0.00
CSW4 Transport Design Cluster	26/03/2003	31/03/2006	73	20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CSW5 Support for Design	01/03/2003	31/03/2006	11	0	12	5	52	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6	1
CSW6 Creating Inv. Readiness	01/06/2002	31/03/2006	178	119	174	33	388	43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33	26
CSW7 Provision of Grow-On Space	01/09/2000	31/03/2006	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CSW8 Develop the CSW Corridor	01/04/2003	31/03/2006	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CSW9 Phenomenon	01/04/2003	31/03/2006	0.00	0.00	40	39	18	18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16	16
		<b>Total</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43</b>
WT4 Advanced Engineering Cluster	01/11/2002	31/03/2006	77	47	77	23	857	390	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	2
e-Innovation Centre Telford	01/12/2002	31/03/2011	158	0	91	0	157	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	47	0
WT3 Integrated Innovation Initiative	01/01/2003	28/07/2006	69	6	72	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	140	0	40	0
WT5 Polymer Cluster	01/04/2002	30/04/2006	80	50	91	37	880	389	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7	4
Wolverhampton Science Park	01/11/2002	31/03/2008	0.00	0.00	350	151	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	70	51
		<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>1894</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>57</b>
Director for Comm of Medical Tech	26/03/2003	31/03/2007	24	0	25	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Director for Comm of Nanotech	01/01/2000	31/03/2007	15	0	17	0	6	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
A38 Innovation Network Project	26/03/2003	31/03/2006	235	106	60	114	102	218	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Malvern Hills Science Park	01/07/2002	31/03/2008	0.00	0.00	130	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
A38 Mechanism for Investment/develop	26/03/2003	31/03/2006	0.00	0.00	0	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26	0
A38 Technology Transfer Fund	04/08/2003	31/03/2007	14	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9	0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
		Overall totals	1221	419	1163	403	2801	1188	0	0	440	128	254	100