NB: In line with our Local Assurance Framework (LAF) these minutes are published as a draft record until formal ratification at the subsequent meeting.

LLEP INVESTMENT PANEL

Minutes of the Meeting

19 November 2020
(Adjourned from 3 November 2020)

Attendance and Apologies:

Members		Representing	
Andy Reed OBE	**AR**	LLEP Board of Directors	Chair
Emma Anderson	**EA**	LLEP Board of Directors	
Ajmer Kaur Mahal	**AKM**	LLEP Board of Directors	
Neil McGhee	**NM**	LLEP Board of Directors	
Cllr Terry Richardson	**TR**	LLEP Board of Directors	
Officers			
Stuart McAvoy	**SM**	Leicester City Council – Accountable Body	
Helen Miller	**HM**	LLEP	
Mandip Rai	**MR**	LLEP Chief Executive	
Advisors			
Jaqueline Moody	**JM**	Cities and Local Growth Unit (CLGU)	

10.	**Welcome and Apologies**	
10.1	AR welcomed those present to the meeting.	
10.2	Apologies were received from Dr Nik Kotecha and Sonia Baigent.	
11.	**Programme Monitoring**	
11.1	Programme Monitoring Presentation	
11.1.1	HM introduced the presentation, noting that it had been deferred from the previous meeting.	
11.1.2	HM noted that the information presented in the report was for the review period until the end of September 2020.	
11.1.3	HM noted that one of the aims of the presentation was to hear from Board Members what they considered the most appropriate level of detail in terms of reporting.	
11.1.4	HM noted that the programme dashboards presented were derived from the Delivery Plan. HM suggested that detailed queries on different areas of the programmes and services were considered best dealt with by inviting the relevant lead LLEP officer to attend Investment Panel meetings as appropriate. It was agreed that the Chair of the Investment Panel would consider this with the Head of Programmes to agree a timetable.	
11.2	Enterprise Adviser Network	
11.2.1	HM noted that the reason why most benchmarks were amber in the RAG status was because there had not previously been a full complement of staff for delivering the EAN. It was further noted that the team was now at full capacity and therefore looking to cover 100% of LLEP schools.	
11.2.2	HM noted that when schools closed in March a number of planned EAN events were cancelled and no delivery was possible. It was further noted that since schools reopened in September, many Careers leads were looking at prioritising other elements of delivery, further explaining why the RAG status was mainly amber.	
11.2.3	It was suggested that with regards to benchmark 5, the most important thing wasn't how many encounters had happened but what the results of encounters were. HM advised that the benchmarks were based on Gatsby indicators, derived from the National Careers Service who determined that these indicators were effective in supporting employability opportunities of young people. HM suggested that Gerarde Manley could attend the next meeting to give a deep dive on the work of the EAN beyond KPIs.	

11.2.4	It was asked why EAN delivery did not continue virtually when schools were meeting virtually. HM responded that there was a real mix of approaches and some schools did continue to meet virtually, delivery continued but this was not possible for all schools. EAN continued delivery through other ways during lockdown such as the Careers in a Box initiative.	
11.2.5	It was AGREED that:	
	1. Gerarde Manley be invited the next Investment Panel meeting to give a deep dive on the EAN.	**HM**
11.3	Business Gateway (Growth Hub)	
11.3.1	HM noted that the KPI results were positive but that a number of other contractual commitments were not reflected in the KPIs and that the dashboard could reflect more of the granularity of the work of the Growth Hub.	
11.3.2	It was asked if there could be more clarity and contextualisation of the KPIs presented on the dashboard with regards to timings and other factors. HM clarified the meanings of the KPIs presented and other granularity not shown in the dashboard. NM offered to discuss what he would like to see with HM at a later date.	
11.3.3	HM noted that it had been a reactive year, causing an increased demand in front line inquiries and penetration, exceeding targets.	
11.3.4	It was asked what the relevance of the KPIs were to the Investment Panel. HM noted that they would allow Members of the Panel to make more informed decisions at the Board level	
11.3.5	It was AGREED that:	
	1. The Business Gateway (Growth Hub) dashboard provide more context to KPIs and present more granular detail.	**HM/NM**
11.4	Enterprise Zones	
11.4.1	HM noted that the dashboard presented bore no relation to investment proposals and instead showed culminative data from the four Enterprise sites, based on each site's implementation plan and achievements relating to other types of investment.	
11.4.2	HM noted that progress with the zones had been slow, with some sites arguing that a lack of investment had delayed what was anticipated to be delivered. It was further noted that due to an agreement with Charnwood, progress could be made with regards to the Leicester and Loughborough Enterprise Zone project investment and that it was hoped an agreement would soon be reached with Hinckley and Bosworth.	

Minute		Action

11.4.3	HM noted that due to the data that gets reported by the site coordinators taking a long time to collect, the data on the dashboard shown was from Quarter 1, but that a Quarter 2 picture would be available imminently.	
11.4.4	HM noted that the Steering Groups were monitoring the progress of the Enterprise Zones themselves on a quarterly basis.	
11.5	Growing Places Fund	
11.5.1	HM noted that the Growing Places fund did not have the same KPIs as the other dashboard presented as it was more focused on what the agreed investments would deliver in a given period.	
11.5.2	HM noted that the two live investments were the Haywards and Gresham investments and that the Gresham investment was progressing well.	
11.6	General	
11.6.1	There was discussion around the level of detail needed in reporting on the programmes. It was suggested that different levels of detail in reporting were appropriate for different programmes.	
11.6.2	Issues with previous investments were noted and it was suggested that that a focus of the reporting should be what the options are if milestones aren't reached. It was also suggested that what was possible with certain investments should be made clear at Board meetings.	
11.6.3	It was suggested that with regards to deep dives, AR and HM could coordinate and decide when to do a deep dive on a given subject.	
11.6.4	HM suggested that in order to minimise queries and to expedite the decisions of the Investment Panel, future project sponsors should be invited to attend Investment Panel meetings. The Investment Panel agreed to this suggestion.	
11.6.5	It was AGRRED that: 1. Deep dives be arranged for certain subjects at future Investment Panel meetings. 2. Applicants be invited the future Investment Panel meetings to give feedback and answer questions.	HM/AR
12.	**Written Processes**	
12.1	HM noted that there was a very tight window for queries raised at the Investment Panel about specific projects to be answered before the report on the Investment Panel was brought to the Board meeting. It was agreed by the Panel Members that the Chair of the Investment Panel be delegated	

	to approve responses to any minor queries/points of clarification that had been raised regarding investment proposals. The Chair would engage other Panel Members in any major queries and/or where there was any uncertainty about the response.	
12.2	It was AGREED that:	
	1. Members of the Investment Panel have the opportunity to see and feedback from responses to queries raised at Investment Panel before Board meetings.	**HM/AR**
13.	**Minutes of the Previous Meeting**	
13.1	It was noted that there was a repeated sentence in section 4.4.1.	
13.2	It was AGREED that:	**Democratic Support**
	1. The repeated sentence be corrected before the next meeting.	
14.	**Close of Meeting**	
14.1	The meeting closed at 4.58pm.	