

# THRIVING THIRD SECTOR STEERING GROUP

ROOM 6, COUNTY HALL, NORTHALLERTON

MONDAY 23 SEPTEMBER 2013 at 10.00AM

## AGENDA

	Item	Purpose/Lead
1.	Minutes of the meeting 20 May 2013 - <b>Enclosed</b>	Agree as an accurate record.
2.	Apologies	
3.	Update on Social Care issues	Helen Taylor
4.	Big Lottery	Caroline James, Regional Manager (yet to confirm)
5.	Revising or replacing the North Yorkshire Compact.	Update
6.	Economic Growth Strategy	a discussion regarding the social inclusion and social economy aspects of the EU Single Growth Programme
7.	Work Programme and Future Meetings	Agree date for next meeting and discuss priorities and future discussion items.
8.	Any other business	

Ray Busby  
County Hall  
NORTHALLERTON

10 September 2013

[Type text]

## Minutes of the Thriving Third Sector Steering Group Meeting

20 May 2013 at County Hall, Northallerton

### Present:

Judith Bromfield	York & North Yorkshire LSDO
Avril Hunter	NYCC
Neil Irving	NYCC (chair)
Hazel Kirby	Northallerton & District VSA
Milton Pearson	Craven CVS
Carol Renahan	NY&Y Forum
Sue Vasey	Your Consortium
Katie Bland	Harrogate & Rural District CCG
Lorraine Laverton	NYCC (minutes)
Bryon Hunter	NYCC
David Ita	Healthwatch North Yorkshire
Bob Carter	Cloverleaf Advocacy

### Apologies:

Alex Bird	Age UK North Yorkshire
Ray Busby	NYCC
Tina Chamberlain	RAY
Kate Senior	Craven District Council
Leah Swain	Rural Action Yorkshire
Mike Webster	NYCC

### **1. Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2013.**

These were agreed as an accurate record.

Update on transport: Work is ongoing via the Creative Change Team based at NYYF concerning 'mapping and gapping' transport provision.

### **2. Skills and Employment update**

The Group considered a paper by Sue Vasey. This highlighted the main challenges for VCS in North Yorkshire including;

- Apprenticeship Reform – may significantly reduce VCS involvement with return to a model based on classroom delivery.
- Restrictions for traineeships – programme aimed at 16-19 year olds and excludes 20-24 year olds that were in the original consultation document
- Complex geography of the LEP – Cross border LEPs need to be taken account of.

The paper went on to list key issues within North Yorkshire that were identified at a meeting of major stakeholders in April 2013. A Task and Finish group from major stakeholders is to be set up by the NYCC Chief Executive to take the issues forward.

Comments raised during the course of the meeting were as follows:

- The difficulty obtaining statistics for the age group 18 – 24 years
- Changes are happening nationally
- The need for leadership on development of a local strategy
- Voluntary sector highlighting the issues to local MPs

**AGREED:**

- 1. That Sue Vasey will update members of the Group on relevant developments.**

**3. The Compact**

The Group discussed the current status of the Compact.

Comments were invited on people's opinion of the current Compact, its usefulness and what might be an appropriate way forward.

Comments included:

- There appeared to be a lack of enthusiasm for the Compact in its current form
- That the adoption of the national Model would be more appropriate due to cross border working.
- There would be benefit to focussing on the development of relationships
- It would be useful for the VCS to come together to define the approach

**AGREED:**

- 1. That Carol Renahan and Judith Bromfield will arrange a meeting of VCS to develop an approach for revising or replacing the North Yorkshire Compact.**
- 2. That the approach is shared with this Group prior to the next meeting.**
- 3. That the view of the Group is that any future North Yorkshire Compact should be based on the National model.**

**4. Healthwatch**

Bryon Hunter gave the Group some background to the contract for Healthwatch and advocacy services and introduced David Ita of Healthwatch and Bob Carter of Cloverleaf Advocacy.

David Ita gave an overview of Healthwatch across the County and advised the Group that library surgeries would be held at least twice a month in different areas of the County. These would be an opportunity to gather information but to also recruit volunteers who would go on to be involved in 'readers panels', 'community engagement' and 'enter

and view' for example. (Volunteers would receive training for the 'enter and view'.)

David went on to inform the Group about the development of a Directory of Services that will in the future be linked to Google maps. Milton Pearson mentioned this was something that had already been done with the Bradford Healthwatch and the Airedale & Wharfedale CCG

Bob Carter of Cloverleaf provided leaflets and posters for the Group to take away and advised the Group that Cloverleaf were independent of the NHS and was there to support people who reside in North Yorkshire no matter where they receive treatment.

## **5. Work Programme and Future Meetings**

Next meeting scheduled for 10.00 am on 23 September 2013 at County Hall, Northallerton.

Potential items for the agenda were discussed and agreed subject to availability:

- Compact – proposal from VCS for replacing or revising the North Yorkshire Compact
- Social care challenges – invitation to Helen Taylor to provide an update, possibly including public health
- NHS challenges – invitation to Amanda Bloor to provide an update
- The new economic environment of cuts to public sector services and the opportunities / challenges for communities – Neil Irving to provide an update on developing thinking within local authorities
- Big Lottery Funding – invitation to Regional Manager, Caroline James to provide an update

## **6. Any Other Business**

Katie Bland asked if there were any key messages to take back to CCGs. There were two questions Katie was asked to take back with her:

- Q1 What understanding do the CCGs have of the Compact?
- Q2 Are there any examples of good practice from the pilot schemes of the relationships between CCGs and the VCS?

# ITEM 5

## NORTH YORKSHIRE COMPACT

Report to the Thriving Third Sector Meeting 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2013

Further to the proposal to undertake a scoping exercise on a potential refresh/renew of the North Yorkshire Compact by members of the TTSG it was proposed and agreed that the voluntary sector representatives lead on taking this forward and Sue Vasey and Judith Bromfield were nominated.

The scoping exercise involved a review of the North Yorkshire Compact, the national Compact and research on the latest developments in other areas of England and how they had refreshed/renewed their local compacts.

The national Compact agreed in 2010 was developed in partnership with Compact Voice following a public consultation exercise with the sector.

[http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/compact\\_renewal\\_consultation\\_response\\_2010\\_0.pdf](http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/compact_renewal_consultation_response_2010_0.pdf)

Both the government and the Chair of Compact Voice encourage local areas to follow the principles in the national Compact and use it as a framework for local Compacts and indeed some localities have including York who have recently undertaken a renewal exercise for their Compact.

The recommendation to the TTSG that the national Compact is adopted as the framework for a new North Yorkshire Compact and an example of the content has been drawn up as a very first draft. This draft is a direct copy of the national Compact with some changes in language to reflect the locality rather than government and a change from Civil Society Organisations to Voluntary, Community & Social Enterprise to represent the sector. This draft is an example of what North Yorkshire could look like if it were presented for consultation and content is more important than layout that needs further development.

It is also recommended that the consultation is launched in Compact Week is 4<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> November.

Judith Bromfield

Chief Officer, Richmondshire CVS

Compact Champion

# WORKING TOGETHER

Public Service Organisations and Voluntary & Community Sector Organisations  
working effectively in partnership for the benefit  
of communities and residents in North Yorkshire.

## THE NORTH YORKSHIRE COMPACT



# Appendix to item 5

## FOREWORD

Chair of the Health & Wellbeing Board as the only strategic multi-agency partnership?

# Appendix to item 5

The Compact is now in its fifteenth year and plays a vital role in defining the relationship and improving the partnership between public sector organisations and the **voluntary community and social enterprise organisations (VCSE).**\*

The Coalition Government's vision of the Big Society to reform public services and champion social action and the Health and Social Care Act 2012 that has radically changed the health and social care landscape signify a cultural change to give people more power and control over their lives and communities.

Strong independent VCSE's are central to this vision and that is why it is timely and critical that the relationship between VCSE's and public sector organisations is renewed. We need to take account of new organisations such as Clinical Commissioning Groups and new multi-agency partnerships such as the Health & Wellbeing Board and not least the challenges of spending cuts and budget reductions.

This new Compact has been drawn up using the framework of the national Compact the agreement between the UK government and VCSE's in England renewed in 2010 by the Coalition government that also introduced new measures to ensure greater accountability on the implementation of the Compact.

[http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the\\_compact.pdf](http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_compact.pdf)

[http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the\\_compact\\_accountability\\_guide.pdf](http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_compact_accountability_guide.pdf)

The significant changes in this new North Yorkshire Compact are that it is shorter and outcomes focused. This coupled with greater accountability and an undertaking from the public sector to respect and uphold the independence of VCSE's will be the platform to build strong relationships and improve communities and public services.

*\*The term VCSE include small local community and voluntary groups, registered charities both large and small, foundations, trusts and the growing number of social enterprises and co-operatives. These are also referred to as third sector organisations or civil society organisations. It is recognised that not all VCSE's have a relationship with the public sector, those that do recognise the value of a positive relationship with public bodies and the benefits this can bring to communities.*



# Appendix to item 5

An effective partnership between the Public Sector and VCSE's in North Yorkshire will help achieve the following outcomes:

1. A strong and diverse and independent civil society.
2. Effective and transparent design and development of policies, programmes and public services.
3. Responsive and high- quality programmes and services.
4. Clear arrangements for managing changes to programmes and services.
5. An equal and fair society.

## Commitments for the Public Sector and VCSE's:

1. A strong diverse and independent VCSE
--

### Undertakings for the Public Sector

- 1.1 Respect and uphold the independence of VCSE's to deliver their mission, including their right to campaign, regardless of any relationship, financial or otherwise which may exist.
- 1.2 Ensure VCSE's are supported and resourced in a reasonable and fair manner where they are helping the Public Sector fulfil its aims.
- 1.3 Ensure that the Public Sector collectively recognises the need to resource local support and development organisations in order to assist VCSE's with their capacity and capability to deliver positive outcomes.
- 1.4 Ensure greater transparency by making data and information more accessible, helping VCSE's to challenge existing provision of services, access new markets and hold government to account. change to public service providers to account?
- 1.5 Consider a range of ways to support VCSE's, such as enabling greater access to state owned premises and resources.
- 1.6 **Free check for volunteers clause no requirement as not relevant to local public sector**, may be replaced with something about the value of volunteers? Check Volunteering Code and insert. (b)

### Undertakings for VCSE's

- 1.7 When campaigning or advocating, ensure that robust evidence is provided, including information about the source and range of people and communities represented.

# Appendix to item 5

- 1.8 Ensure independence is upheld, focusing on the cause represented, regardless of any relationship they have with the Public Sector, financial or otherwise.

2. Effective and transparent design and development of policies, programmes and public services.

## **Undertakings from the Public Sector**

- 2.1 Ensure that social environmental and economic value\*forms a standard part of designing, developing and delivering policies, programmes and services.
- 2.2 Consider the social impact that may result from policy and programme development, and in particular consider how these would impact local efforts to inspire and encourage social action and to empower communities.
- 2.3 Work with VCSE's from the earliest possible stage to design policies, programmes and services. Ensure those likely to have a view are involved from the start and remove barriers that may prevent organisations contributing.
- 2.4 Give early notice of forthcoming consultations, where possible, allowing enough time for VCSE's to involve their service users, beneficiaries, members, volunteers and trustees in preparing responses. Where it is appropriate, and enables meaningful engagement, conduct 12- week formal written consultations, with clear explanations and rationale for shorter time-frames or a more informal approach.
- 2.5 Consider providing feedback to explain how respondents have influenced the design and development of policies, programmes and public services, including where respondents' views have bnot been acted upon.
- 2.6 Assess the implications for the sector of new policies, legislation and guidance, aiming to reduce the bureaucratic burden, particularly on small organisations.

## **Undertakings for VCSE's**

- 2.7 Promote and respond to government consultations where appropriate.

# Appendix to item 5

- 2.8 Seek the views of service users, clients, beneficiaries, members, volunteers and trustees when making representation. Be clear who is represented, in what capacity, and on what basis that representation is being made.
- 2.9 When putting forward ideas, focus on evidence-based solutions, with clear proposals for positive outcomes.

3. Responsive and high-quality programmes and service.
--

## **Undertakings for the Public Sector**

- 3.1 ensure that VCSE's have a greater role and more opportunities in delivering public services by opening up new markets in accordance with wider public service reform measures and reforming the commissioning environment in existing markets.
- 3.2 Consider a wide range of ways to fund or resource VCSE's, including grants, contracts, loan finance, use of premises and so on. Work to remove barriers that may prevent VCSE's accessing public funding, thereby enabling smaller organisations to become involved in delivering services where they are best placed to achieve the desired outcomes.
- 3.3 Ensure transparency by providing a clear rationale for all funding decisions.
- 3.4 Commit to multi-year funding where appropriate and where it adds value for money. The funding term should reflect the time it will take to deliver the outcome. If multi-year funding is not considered to be the best way of delivering the objective, explain the reasons for the decision.
- 3.5 Ensure well managed and transparent application and tendering processes, which are proportionate to the desired objectives and outcomes of programmes.
- 3.6 Agree with VCSE's how outcomes, including the social, environmental or economic value, will be monitored before a contract or funding agreement is made. Ensure that monitoring and reporting is relevant and proportionate to the nature and size of the opportunity. Be clear about what information is being asked for, and why and how it will be used.

## Appendix to item 5

- 3.7 Ensure equal treatment across sectors, including reporting and monitoring arrangements, when tendering for contracts.
- 3.8 Recognise that when VCSE's apply for a grant they can include appropriate and relevant overheads including the costs associated with training and volunteer involvement.
- 3.9 Discuss and allocate risks to the organisations best equipped to manage them. **Where prime contractors are used, ensure they adhere to the principles of this Compact in allocating risk.** Ensure delivery terms and risks are proportionate to the nature and value of the opportunity.
- 3.10 Ensure that the widest possible range of organisations can be involved in the provision of services through appropriate funding and financing models, for example outcome based payments and payment in advance of expenditure. Payment in advance of expenditure should be considered on a case by case basis where this represents value for money.
- 3.11 Ensure all bodies distributing funds on the public sectors behalf adhere to the commitments in this Compact. This includes the relationship between **prime contracts and their supply chains**. Demonstrate how funding arrangements and financial support can allow smaller and specialist providers to play a greater part.
- 3.12 Apply the compact when distributing European funding. Where conflicts arise with European regulations, discuss the potential effects and agree solutions together.
- 3.13 Encourage feedback from a range of sources on the effectiveness of the public sector partnership with VCSE's and how successful it has been in delivering their objectives. Consider placing this feedback in the public domain.

### Undertakings for VCSE's

- 3.14 Ensure eligibility for funding before applying and be explicit about how outcomes will be achieved.
- 3.15 ensure robust governance arrangements so that organisations can best manage any risk associated with service delivery and financing models, including giving funders early notice of significant changes in circumstances.

## Appendix to item 5

- 3.16 Be open and transparent about reporting, recognising that monitoring, whether internal or external, is an aspect of good management practice.
- 3.17 Demonstrate the social, environmental or economic value of the programmes and services provided, where appropriate.
- 3.18 Help facilitate feedback from users and communities to the public sector to help improve delivery of programmes and services.
- 3.19 Recognise that the public sector can legitimately expect VCSE's to give public recognition of its funding.

4. Clear arrangements for managing changes to programmes and services.
--

### Undertakings for the Public Sector

- 4.1 If a programme or service is encountering problems, agree with the VCSE a timetable of actions to improve performance before making a decision to end a financial relationship.
- 4.2 Assess the impact on beneficiaries, service users and volunteers before deciding to reduce or end funding. Assess the need to re-allocate funds to another organisation serving the same group.
- 4.3 Where there are restrictions or changes to future resources, discuss with VCSE's the potential implications as early as possible, give organisations the opportunity to respond and consider the response fully respecting sector expertise, before making a final decision.
- 4.4 Give a minimum of **three months notice** in writing when changing or ending a funding relationship or other support, apart from in exceptional circumstances, and provide a clear rationale for why the decision has been taken.

### Undertakings for VCSE's

- 4.5 Plan for the end of funding to reduce any potential negative impact on beneficiaries and the organisation.
- 4.6 Contribute positively to reviews of programmes and funding practices.

# Appendix to item 5

- 4.7 Advise the Public Sector on social, environmental or economic impact of funding changes, and on ways to minimise their effects on people invulnerable situations.

<b>5. An equal and fair society</b>
-------------------------------------

## **Undertakings for the Public Sector**

- 5.1 Work with VCSE's that represent, support or provide services to people specifically protected by legislation and other under-represented and disadvantaged groups. Understand the specific needs of these groups by actively seeking the views of service users and clients. Take these views into account, including assessing impact when designing and implementing policies, programmes and services.
- 5.2 Acknowledge that organisations representing specific disadvantaged or under-represented groups can help promote social and community cohesion and should have equal access to public funding.
- 5.3 Take practical action to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality and to ensure a voice for under-represented and disadvantage groups.

## **Undertakings for VCSE's**

- 5.4 If receiving funding from a the public sector, show how the value of the work can help deliver the public sector duties on promoting equality and tackling discrimination.
- 5.5 Take practical action, such as through funding bids, to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and build stronger communities.

# Appendix to item 5

Resolving Compact Disputes

Monitoring, Review and Development of the Compact

Signatories to the Compact



## Discussion Paper on Options for Establishment of an Employment and Skills Board

### Summary

1.1 The Task Group is asked to consider and guide the establishment of a York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Skills Board. This paper sets out thinking and options around three key decisions the group is invited to advise on:

**Decision 1:** Do the group support the establishment of an Employment and Skills Board (or similar structure) and what should its remit and geographic coverage be?

**Decision 2 –** What size and membership would the group like to recommend for the Board? How should a Chair be selected and agreed?

**Decision 3 –** What structures should support the Board and how often should groups meet?

### Background

1.2 This paper is intended to support discussion and potential establishment of a YNYER (Employment and) Skills Board. It briefly reviews some background material on similar Boards elsewhere and offers some thinking and options for taking forward such a structure in the YNYER LEP area.

1.3 The context for the paper is the evolution and widening of the responsibilities of the YNYER LEP, in particular its growing influence over the skills agenda, and influence over new European Social Fund resources (2014-2020) that will include skills, employment and inclusion. There is currently an absence of a senior skills focused group that covers the LEP geography, with the Task Group being the nearest thing established so far. However given future demands, there is a case for establishing a Skills Board in the future.

1.4 The Skills Board would focus on the Strategy and Investment Plan Priority covering skills, employment and inclusion. The Task Group has had a key role in shaping the content of this Priority, and taking into account consultation feedback and European funding requirements, the revised draft is likely to set out six main activities:

- Building employability skills
- Apprenticeship (and work experience) opportunities
- Connecting business to education
- Upskilling the workforce and sector skills needs
- Supporting people to access employment, especially young people
- Active inclusion and community led solutions

## Skills Boards Elsewhere

- 1.5 To support this paper, we have briefly reviewed the operation of Skills Boards – or more often *Employment and Skills Boards* – elsewhere.
- 1.6 There is no consistent picture about what areas do or do not have an Employment and Skills Board (ESB). Some LEP areas have established them but many others have not. The most prominent local example is the Leeds City Region ESB, which has been constituted for some time and is well embedded and supported. Other examples include the Manchester Skills and Employment Partnership, which is linked to its combined authority.
- 1.7 Whilst some large LEPs have an ESB, many LEPs do not. Some of those cover skills through an arm's length position where they link to existing ESBs led through local authorities (such as in Lincolnshire and in Nottingham/Nottinghamshire), or are have set up skills structures but not an ESB. The Humber is an example of the latter, where there is a widely constituted Skills Network, an Enterprise Zone Skills Delivery Group, and a high level task based Skills Commission (which has now reportedO. Finally, some LEPs such as Cumbria are in the process of setting up an ESB.
- 1.8 The conclusion from this review is that many LEPs are in a similar position to YNYER and have not previously had an ESB as part of the LEP. However, the momentum is towards establishing structures to cover skills linked to or within LEPs, and this is likely to build further as LEPs respond to their new roles in relation to European Structural and Investment Funds and national Growth Deals.
- 1.9 The remainder of this paper covers options for different aspects of creating an ESB.

## Fundamentals – whether to have an ESB and defining its purpose

- 1.10 The first decision that needs to be taken is to clarify that partners wish to establish an ESB of some kind and to define its remit and purpose.
- 1.11 Based on roles of bodies elsewhere and needs that have emerged in discussion or in relation to future tasks, the **main purpose and responsibilities of an ESB could include:**
- a) To guide **strategic decision making** on skills and set policy and priorities that guide action
  - b) To make **decisions on resource allocation** on skills and employment, oversee relevant investment at high level, and review progress towards key goals and targets
  - c) To guide and **commission skills intelligence and analysis**, such as to identify gaps in provision
  - d) To foster partnership and collaboration between key parties with and an interest and influence in skills and employment, and bring together employers and skills 'providers'.

- 1.12 In terms of **remit**, the main question is how far a Board should focus wholly on skills, or whether it should also cover employment and related inclusion issues. A narrower brief on skills probably reflects the main area of interest for many private sector partners. However, the EU funds the LEP will play a central role in influencing also cover employment and inclusion, and it would be helpful for a Board to cover these issues because of that.
- 1.13 Part of the value of an ESB would be to bring together partners and co-ordinate action across the whole LEP area – including East Riding, North Yorkshire and York, all of which have their own separate structures currently. There may be some complications in bringing together this wider grouping, but the benefits of establishing a LEP wide structure are likely to outweigh these.

**Decision 1:** Do the group support the establishment of an ESB (or similar) and what should its remit and geographic coverage be?

### **Size, Seniority and Membership**

- 1.14 Most ESBs bring together partner organisations at a high level. Given the suggested roles of the group, that is likely to make sense for a YNYER group too. It would mean membership at a Director level or above. Specifics on membership are covered later in this paper.
- 1.15 ESBs vary significantly in size. Larger ESBs such as the Leeds City Region ESB have a membership of up to around 25 (including 12 businesses/employers in LCR). It would be equally possible to have a more streamlined ESB. Senior skills groups in the Humber have, for instance, involved around 10 members.
- 1.16 Clearly the benefits of a larger Board are around inclusivity and breadth of input and expertise. The downside is a potentially more cumbersome nature, less time for contributions from each partner, dilution away from the most core stakeholders, and greater support requirements to run meetings. Smaller Boards have the converse benefits, but pose the risk of missing out key partners if they are *too* small.
- 1.15 The structure of the Board is more easily discussed with some consideration of the partners who may participate in it. In this respect, some of the key stakeholders that might be involved are listed below. The group will want to recommend which ones should sit on a YNYER ESB taking into account its intended remit, purpose and the overall size and feel of Board that is sought.

### Potential Board Members

- Private Sector/Employers – potentially covering a spread of sectors and sizes, and a mix of actual businesses and business representative organisations
- Local authorities (elected members or senior officers), probably covering each of the three upper tier authority areas in some way – subject to their desire to participate
- College and skills provider representation
- HE/university representation
- A school representative
- Skills agencies - such as Skills Funding Agency, Jobcentre Plus and National Apprenticeship Service (NAS)
- Voluntary and community sector representation
- Government interests – such as DWP or BIS Local

1.17 For purposes of discussion and getting the ball rolling in agreeing a membership, one mid sized and illustrative option for a YNYER ESB could be based on:

- Independent Chair (to be agreed – potentially a LEP Board member to ensure linkages)
- 3 private sector employers (mix of sectors, sizes and geography)
- 3 local authorities (covering invites for the East Riding, North Yorkshire and York areas)
- 1 college representative
- 1 school representative
- 1 university representative
- 1 skills agency representative
- 2 voluntary and community sector representatives

(a Board of 12 in total plus the Chair)

1.18 If required, a small number of additional parties (e.g. Government departments or agencies) could have non-voting observer status at the Board to keep them in touch with its operation and to inform the Board as required. Additionally, parties not included on the Board itself could be involved in an associated officer led group (such as this Task Group) if that would add value.

**Decision 2** – What size and membership would the group like to recommend for the Board? How should a Chair be selected and agreed?

## **Connected Structures, Meeting Frequency and Support**

- 1.19 There is a need to make sure that a YNYER ESB does not operate in a vacuum, but equally a risk that employment and skills structures can become complex, extensive and time consuming, and put emphasis on process rather than product. We need to find the right balance in providing an inclusive forum that can support the ESB in decision making without going overboard on process and structures. A startpoint for discussion may be the creation of an ESB Partnership Group, bringing together key interests, agencies and expertise including that not represented on the Board but which can add value by supporting it or helping to develop proposals. Such a group might include around 15-20 people.
- 1.20 Some ESBs meet every month or six weeks. However others meet less often, and that has advantages in reducing support requirements and the time investment by participants – which could deter some from taking part if too onerous. A startpoint for discussion may be an initial assumption of around four meetings per year, but with the ability to set up other Board meetings or sub-groups to cover specific tasks if required. The ESB Partnership would need to meet at least as frequently as the ESB, and might have around six meetings per year.
- 1.21 This paper does not cover support requirements in detail. However it is important to note that there will be a need for some support to make the new ESB and skills structures operate effectively – preparing papers, intelligence, briefings and setting up meetings, etc. This is likely to require a full time member of staff.
- 1.22 Connections and collaboration with ESBs and similar structures in neighbouring LEP areas will be important in maximising effectiveness and efficiency. This aspect is not covered in this paper, but should be considered further as proposals and working relationships are developed.

**Decision 3** – What wider structures should support the ESB and how often should groups meet?

### **Next Steps**

- 1.23 The discussions and recommendations of this group should be used to shape a proposal paper that goes to the LEP Board for in principle agreement. After that discussion, a lead responsibility and resources need to be agreed for fine tuning proposals, finalising agreement with key parties, recruiting a chair and setting up a first meeting. It will be highly beneficial to hold a first meeting in late 2013 before the LEP EU Structural and Investment Framework is submitted.