

**Coast to Capital Investment Committee  
Friday 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019  
Crawley Borough Council Offices, Committee room B**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Investment Committee Members:**

Julie Kapsalis (JK) – Interim Chair of the Investment Committee; Jonathan Sharrock (JS); Phil Jones (PJ); Colin Kemp (CK); Dan Yates (DY); Adam Tickell (AT)

**Board Members in attendance:**

Karen Dukes (KD)

**Officers in Support:**

Anthony Middleton (AM); Cali Gasson (CG); Taygan Paxton (TP); Hannah Gosling (HG); Anna Meredith (AMe);  
– Coast to Capital

Carli Foster (CF); Sean Murphy  
– Accountable Body (SM)

**Governance Advisors**

Cath Goodall (CaG) - BEIS; Peter Duggan (PD) – DfT

**Apologies**

Martin Harris  
Tony Newman  
Louise Goldsmith  
Manju Shahul-Hammed  
Jamie Arnell  
Lisa Taylor

## **1. Open, Welcome and Introductions**

- 1.1. Welcome, introductions and apologies were made. The Chair of the Committee gave a brief overview of the purpose of the meeting to all attendees.

## **2. Conflicts of Interest**

- 2.1. The Chair read out the Conflicts of Interest statement to which, no declaration were made.

*Secretary note: It was noted that some members of the Committee, or the organisation(s) they work for, may be considering putting in a bid for the future call of unallocated funding. This had been previously considered and agreed that no members were conflicted with taking part in the discussion of the meeting and/or submitting a future bid.*

## **3. Unallocated Funding – Call for Bids**

- 3.1. An overall introduction to the purpose of the meeting was given. It had been made aware that a pot of Local Growth Funding was currently unallocated, The aim is to reallocate all funding within the financial year of 2019/20, in line with the Local Growth Funding timeline spending period of March 2020/21.
- 3.2. In July 2018, the LEP Board had agreed a process to move towards a more targeted commissioning approach rather than an open call. This had been due to the focus of the call to be aligned with the 8 priorities listed in Coast to Capital's Strategic Economic Plan, Gatwick 360. Further to this, it had also been discussed and agreed at a previous Investment Committee that investment should be made only to projects that can fully spend the LGF allocation by March 2021.
- 3.3. The first recommendation brought to Committee members was to agree a two phase funding allocation strategy, with Phase 1 to be allocated to projects that would have strong alignment with the eight Strategic Economic Plan priorities. Phase two of the funding allocation strategy would then allocate any remaining funds if and when they had come available via 'claw back' to a pipeline of projects derived from Phase 1.
- 3.4. In previous years, applicants had been asked to submit a Full Business Case which had been a time consuming and costly affair for both the Delivery Body and Committee members. The proposal for this unallocated funding to create a two phase call for bids would allow the submission of expressions of interest which would be scored by Coast to Capital's Senior Management team. All EOI documents, and supporting scoring sheets would be presented back to the Investment Committee with a recommendation against the long list for final decision and further scrutiny.
- 3.5. Alongside the proposal, it had been brought to light to all the importance to have a transparent process and share to all Committee members completed score sheets

and any information related (including expressions of interest), allowing members to take decisions accordingly. It was suggested to upload all documents onto a secure shared drive to allow for a full transparent process with the initial sift.

- 3.6. It was asked that the 'spend allocation within set timescales', be a key part of the weighting and scoring. The current criteria in funding highlights the 'deliverability by March 2020/21' with only a 15% weighting. It was suggested and agreed that the LGF expenditure before the spend deadline would be checked at the initial sift rather than within the SMT scoring criteria. This would be to ensure all projects going any further meet this crucial timescale.

*Action: Changes to wording to reflect the initial sift/ gateway to spending the full allocation within the LGF timescales.*

- 3.7. It was suggested to all that full allocation should be expected to be drawn down within a 12 month period (by December 2020), allowing concrete deliverance of a potential scheme. This had been agreed by all Committee members, with an expectation to see phasing of the drawdown within the business case brought forward.

*Action: Changes to the timeline to expect all allocation to be drawn down by December 2020.*

- 3.8. A condition of submitting an EOI had been that applicants would sign a disclaimer statement to formally accept specific terms and conditions of submitting an application for funding. This had included a non-disclosure clause to avoid the time consuming process, but it was agreed the tone of the wording required changing to ensure the LEP give as much transparency as possible.

*Action: Changes to the wording to enable an improved tone of voice.*

- 3.9. It was decided that in the event of an applicant not being invited to submit a Full Business Case following submission of an EOI, applicants will be informed in writing (including feedback) but that there will be no additional feedback mechanism post this. If unsuccessful following submission of a FBC, applicants would be informed in writing with further feedback only being provided to the extent and discretion decided by Coast to Capital officers.

*Action: Amendments to wording as per the Investment Committee's decision and inform (in writing) unsuccessful applicants following the submission of an FBC.*

*Action: Write to Government requesting if Croydon and Lewes would be allowed to bid into the new call due to boundary changes, however it is recycled Growth Deal funding so need further guidance.*

- 3.10. It was confirmed that the call had been open to **all** for bidding submissions, including public and private sectors.

- 3.11. It had been suggested the need to add additional text to the guidance document, to highlight which criteria each heading within the EOI was aligned too. This would enable easy identification for both applicants and scoring members.

*Action: Amend guidance document to enable headings to align directly with the scoring criteria.*

- 3.12. In terms of launching the call, amendments to the documents reflecting the Investment Committees comments would be made, ready for publication on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2019. The new call would be launched across the Coast to Capital website, social media platforms such as Twitter and LinkedIn, email, the CRM database and newsletter to enable extended reach.

## 4 Funding Withdrawal Protocol

- 4.1 As Coast to Capital had aspired as a LEP to excellence across all annual assessment categories, a very clear policy of governance and protocol of the process of clawing back funding back was needed.

As previously agreed by the Coast to Capital Board, a High Risk monitoring protocol had already been in place, with a report provided to those scored as RED, or AMBER/RED. The Investment Committee had then had the authority to make decisions from 'the withdrawal of funding' to a 'watch and wait' approach.

- 4.2 As we move towards the end of the parliamentary spending period, Committee members would be asked to review various projects that could not fully spend their LGF allocation within the agreed deadline.

- 4.3 Clarification was needed to all existing and new Delivery Bodies going forward, advising them of the new protocol in writing. It was confirmed from a Government perspective, they want to see Growth Deals and outputs delivered within the timeframe given and it was made clear by Government the need to keep an eye on important, strategic projects which had been widely needed within the region and going forward keeping in touch for regular updates on those.

- 4.4 The protocol outlined that the Delivery Body was to provide a credible plan to spend the awarded LGF funding, had been expected of them to respond within 30 day period. The 30 day period could then be extended by discretion of the Chairman for up to a further 30 days.

It was agreed by all Committee members the need to include an urgent assurance upon writing to the Delivery Body with an explicit next step warning. Discussions had also developed, with the Investment Committee agreeing the change from a 30 day respond period to 7 days, ratifying a much firmer approach.

*Action: Amend the response period to 7 days. Following amends the new and agreed protocol will be circulated to all existing delivery bodies.*

## 5 AOB

- 5.1 None to note.