

**EAST MIDLANDS
REGIONAL SCRUTINY BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting held on
Monday, 18th July 2005
at PERA

Members Present:	Secretariat:	Apologies	Group Advisors
Martin Traynor (<i>chair</i>) Cllr Annette Noskwith Cllr Geoff Carlile Cllr Graham Ridge Cllr Joan Ashton Cllr Milan Radulovic Cllr Ossy Snell Cllr Roger Begy Frank Lucas Pat Zadora Vernon George	Irene Reynolds Matthew Wheatley Sarah Moore Stuart Young	Cllr Barry Kirby Cllr Bill Law Cllr Linda Neal Tim Roache	Abby Johnson-Brennan – <i>emda</i> Andrew Morgan – <i>emda</i> Anthony Payne – <i>emda</i> David Wallace – <i>emda</i> Ian Lodder – <i>emda</i> Martin Gorman – GO-EM Ron Whittaker - <i>emda</i>

1.	Apologies	ACTION
	Apologies were received from Cllr Barry Kirby, Cllr Bill Law, Cllr Linda Neal and Tim Roache.	
2.	Declarations of Interest	
	A declaration of interest was received from Cllr Geoff Carlile who advised that he is a board member of the Alliance SSP and Derby and Derbyshire SSP. Martin Traynor stated that he is a board member of Leicester Shire SSP and Chair of Leicestershire Connexions.	
3.	Minutes of previous meeting held on the 7th of April 2005	
	The minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record.	
4.	Matters Arising	
4.1	<i>emda</i> have confirmed receipt of the Urban Action Plan response coordinated by Stuart Young.	
4.2	<i>emda</i> have collated responses from Urban Action Plan consultation. Anthony Payne stated that the Urban Partnership Group will consider the responses and which will help in shaping the final Action Plan.	
4.3	Stuart Young reported that 'Towards Sustainable Development?' the sustainable development scrutiny report, had been returned to consultants for revisions to be made. It was not possible for the consultants to carry out	

	further interviews due to time constraints. Stuart thanked Anthony Payne and others for their help in finalising the review	
5.	Evaluation of emda's Progress and Proposals in Meeting the Recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel Review, "SSPs – Delivering on their Potential?"	
5.1	Pat Zadora introduced the scrutiny panel follow-up review into Sub-regional Strategic Partnerships (SSPs). Board members were reminded that this was one of EMRA's 2005/06 Business Plan, key performance indicators for scrutiny. RSB is expected to evaluate and report on action against recommendations identified by each scrutiny panel review within nine months of its publication. This report provides an evaluation of the action against the recommendations with a written response of <i>emda</i> .	
5.2	Pat Zadora reported that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>emda</i> had made good progress on many points and that SSP's have also made progress since the publication of the Assembly's initial Scrutiny Report. • <i>emda</i> has moved towards achieving some of the recommendations in the original EMRA scrutiny report, but the process by which <i>emda</i> conducted their own review was not inclusive and the final proposals and their implications still lacked clarity and detail. • the Assembly's consultation revealed significant concern amongst partners about the process by which <i>emda</i> had undertaken their own review of SSPs to date. Many Partners felt that they have not been included in the process of <i>emda</i>'s review of SSPs. 	
5.3	Pat Zadora stated <i>emda</i> should provide dates and timings of when the rest of the recommendations will be completed. The SSP scrutiny panel will revisit <i>emda</i> 's progress in six months. Discussion: A number of issues were raised in discussion, including;	
5.4	Ian Lodder stated the first stage of <i>emda</i> 's review focussed on efficiency issues, with SSPs currently managing 870 projects. It was noted that one third of projects that had no determinable output. In terms of their review, Ian acknowledged that "If <i>emda</i> were starting again, we wouldn't start here."	
5.5	Pat Zadora suggested that it should be clarified whether <i>emda</i> 's proposed 'Shared Service Centre' is a service solely for SSPs or whether <i>emda</i> and other partners could use its services.	
5.6	Cllr Geoff Carlile welcomed the comments in the report. He warned that if <i>emda</i> is merely looking to reduce its own SSP costs, a burden will fall on	

	<p>local authorities who are already providing much support. Cllr Carlile stressed the importance of supporting SSP staff during uncertainty and that emda should examine the relationship between SSPs and Local Area Agreements.</p>	
5.7	<p>Cllr Roger Begy stated we had to move forward and rebuild trust between partners.</p>	
5.8	<p>Ian Lodder responded that Glenn Harris, emda's Executive Director of Corporate Services, is now leading on this. Emda have developed a project plan for the further implementation of their review of SSPs.</p>	
5.9	<p>Stuart Young noted that some partners are very disengaged and asked emda what they are doing to engage them. Ian Lodder stated that a number of meetings have been arranged with partners and that it is critical that the local authorities and community and voluntary groups are effectively engaged in SSPs and the review process.</p>	
5.10	<p>Ian Lodder agreed that it is important to discuss SSP engagement with the Chief Executive of Engage East Midlands.</p>	
5.11	<p>Cllr Milan Radulovic stated that although it is difficult to engage with the voluntary and community sector this is not an excuse not to engage at all. Cllr Radulovic also noted that local authorities' contributions to SSPs will be dependent on whether SSPs meet communities' needs and not whether they meet emda's output targets.</p>	
5.12	<p>Ian Lodder stated that back office functions will go to a shared service centre but SSPs will still make decisions on investments.</p>	
5.13	<p>Cllr Joan Ashton's question asked why it was so difficult to consult with local authorities? Ian Lodder stated that, at the time, emda chose only to consult the chairs of the SSPs because their review focused on the internal efficiencies of SSPs and their relationships with emda, although Ian accepted that if the exercise was to be repeated, emda may take a different approach.</p>	
5.14	<p>Geoff Carlile stated that local authorities repeatedly asked when emda was going to consult with them on SSPs, as local authorities are significant funders of SSPs.</p>	
5.15	<p>Pat Zadora concluded that the panel recommends that <i>emda</i> should set out a clear development plan for how and when they will complete their review of SSPs and address each of the recommendations of 'Delivering on their Potential' and what the objectives of their review are and that the Assembly will support <i>emda</i> to implement the outstanding recommendations and work with them in any subsequent review of SSPs. The RSB will further consider SSP developments in 6 months time.</p>	

	<p>Recommendations: The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p> <p>Consider the <i>emda's</i> full response against each recommendation as referred to in Appendix 5(a) of this report.</p> <p>Consider and endorse the way forward as suggested in Section 4 of this report.</p> <p>Consider and endorse this evaluation report into the impact of scrutiny as referred to in Appendix 5(b).</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed.</p>	SY
6.	Proposed Scrutiny Review into the Effective Delivery of the Regional Tourism Strategy	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p>	<p>Stuart Young presented the report referring to the proposed remit for a scrutiny review into the role of emda, East Midlands Tourism and other partners in supporting the effective delivery of the Regional Tourism Strategy. The panel will examine the clarity of purpose, organisation and operation of emda's approach to regional tourism development.</p> <p>The panel is scheduled to hold its initial meeting in early September 2005.</p> <p>Roger Begy stated this review will have some issues in common with the SSP review, such as sustainability of funding and partnership engagement and would be constructive to the delivery of the EMT business plan.</p> <p>Geoff Carlile advised that the panel should consider the sustainability of funding as DMPs have no funding as of yet.</p> <p>Recommendations The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p> <p>Consider and, if appropriate, endorse the remit for a scrutiny panel review into the effective delivery of the Regional Tourism Strategy as set out in Section 4.</p> <p>Submit to the secretariat any expression of interest to serve on the panel. Cllrs Begy and Radulovic stated their interest to serve on the panel.</p> <p>Propose to the secretariat any other individuals appropriate for potential panel membership.</p> <p>Endorse the use of consultancy support for the Panel Review.</p>	

	<p>Agree to the Secretariat supporting the establishment and on-going requirements of this panel</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed.</p>	SY/MW
7.	The Development of the Revised Regional Economic Strategy	
7.1	The draft RES consultation, which sets the framework for future economic development, will be published in September 2005, followed by a 12 week consultation period. Final revisions will be made early in 2006 with publication in March/April 2006.	AJB/SY
7.2	The “20 Questions for 2020” document provides a framework to guide initial discussion of the appropriate content of the revised RES.	
7.3	A power point presentation, from Abby Brennan-Johnson, showed the widespread consultation that emda aim to undertake and set out how emda are putting together their RES evidence base. The time line for the review was clearly demonstrated.	
7.4	Andrew Morgan continued the presentation. Andrew noted that the last RES had cross cutting themes, but this consultation will focus on the whole of the RES, thus not risking the approach of looking at only one strand rather than the whole.	
7.5	Pat Zadora expressed concern that the last RES consultation did not give groups time to read the report and return comment and there was a problem related to the timely provision of revised drafts. Abby Brennan-Johnson stated that emda would hope to avoid this by publishing documents well in advance of the expected timetable. The RSB noted that if partners are clear on timetables regarding different stages of the RES review, and they are adhered to - then similar problems should not arise again. Similarly, the Assembly will ensure that arrangements are in place to ensure we provide a timely response to emda (and other groups should similarly do so).	
7.6	The consultation timeline was detailed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 September 2005 – emda to issue RES consultation document • October 2005: emda to present at the full EMRA meeting • November – April 2006: emda will issue another draft of the RES • Various departments will then need to sign off on it • January 2006: Draft of the RES will be presented to the RSB 	
7.7	Stuart Young stated the RSB will collate responses from the Regional Policy Board and Regional Planning Board during the RES revision process. Members emphasised the need for close compatibility between the RES and RSS during their development.	

	<p>Recommendations: The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p> <p>Note the timetable for revising the Regional Economic Strategy and the involvement of the RSB.</p> <p>Note the need to work closely with both the Regional Planning and Policy Boards and endorse the establishment of a sub-group in order to ensure effective and co-ordinated action as referred to in Section 4 of this report.</p> <p>Consider the reports from emda summarising: a) The progress in the development of the revised RES, as detailed in Appendix 7(a); b) the establishment of the RES Reference Group, as detailed in Appendix 7(b); c) the proposed structure for the RES evidence base as detailed in Appendix 7(c); d) and the planned consultation events as detailed in Appendix 7(d).</p> <p>Discuss the priorities, vision and index for the region’s economy as referred to in the reports from emda and Section 3 of this report.</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed.</p>	
8.	a.) emda Performance Report b.) emda Chief Executives’ Report	
Q1 A Q2 A Q3 A Q4 A	<p>(Para 6.1) When will the Business Support Implementation Plan be delivered / implemented? What will be the implications for Business Links?</p> <p><i>The Implementation Plan has 8 different work streams that have different delivery dates in the lead up to April 2007.</i></p> <p>(Para 6.8) How successful is the GINEM network?</p> <p><i>Emda reported that the GINEM network met or exceeded all targets.</i></p> <p>emda credit the recruitment of Investor Development Managers to SSPs as supporting the achievement of the aftercare/investor development targets. What are the plans of emda have to further support their work?</p> <p><i>emda will continue to support investor development work but they are currently considering how investor development work should be undertaken and managed within their new Business Services directorate.</i></p> <p>Were any Tier 3 targets revised after 6 months to account for profiled achievements?</p>	

<p>Q5</p> <p>A</p> <p>Q6</p> <p>Q7</p> <p>A</p> <p>Q8</p> <p>A</p>	<p><i>emda reported that the Tier 3 targets had not been revised after six months to account for profiled achievements.</i></p> <p>A number of the successes against T3 targets were achieved through a significant improvement in performance during Q4, e.g. Brownfield Land (Q1-Q3 33%, Q1-Q4 120%), the number of science and technology based spin-out companies (Q1-Q3 46%, Q1-Q4 100%), investment benefiting deprived areas (Q1-Q3 66%, Q1-Q4 202%). Can emda discuss the factors that explain this uneven performance profile?</p> <p><i>Having a large number of outputs recorded in the year's final quarter does not indicate uneven performance but indicates when monitoring and reporting tends to happen.</i></p> <p>There was no Question Six</p> <p>Could emda provide the RSB with the list of the agreed new targets for 2005-6?</p> <p><i>The list of agreed new targets for 2005/06 was contained in the draft plan to the DTI. Emda await confirmation from the DTI.</i></p> <p>What will be the availability of the performance reports under the 6-monthly reporting cycle?</p> <p><i>Emda reported that they have not yet agreed a reporting schedule with the DTI. The RSB will be advised once a decision has been made. The principle will remain that RSB will get to see performance reports after they have been presented to emda's board</i></p> <p>Recommendations: The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p> <p>Consider the Annual (2004-5) Tier 3 Target Performance Report and emda's Chief Executive's Reports from June 2005.</p> <p>Consider emda's response to previously submitted written questions and ask any supplementary questions as appropriate.</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Scrutiny Panel Report, "The East Midlands and FDI – Destined for Success?"</p>	
	<p>After the Regional Scrutiny Board endorsed the "The East Midlands and FDI – Destined for Success" at the last meeting, the East Midlands Regional Assembly endorsed it on 22 July 2005.</p> <p>Recommendations The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p>	

	<p>The Regional Scrutiny Board is invited to note the published report, ‘The East Midlands and FDI – Destined for Success?’ and associated action as agreed by the RSB at its meeting on 7th April.</p> <p>The recommendation was endorsed.</p>	
10.	Scrutiny Review into Sustainable Development	
10.1	Frank Lucas introduced the Scrutiny Review into emda’s Sustainable Development performance, a document that had required substantial revision in order to become fit for purpose. Frank thanked Anthony Payne and other emda officers for their assistance in finalising the report. Frank reported that Sustainable Development is fairly well understood and embedded within emda, but there is room for improvement.	
10.2	<p>The Chair thanked Frank Lucas, <i>emda</i> officers and the secretariat for their efforts throughout the course of this review.</p> <p>Recommendations The Regional Scrutiny Board was invited to:</p> <p>Note the published report, ‘Towards Sustainable Development? Scrutiny Review into the Sustainability of Key Elements of <i>emda</i>’s Work in Delivering the Regional Economic Strategy’</p> <p>Agree to publish this report, send it to emda for their response, as per the suggested Scrutiny Performance Management Framework, and disseminate it to regional and sub-regional partners for their information.</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed.</p>	SY
11.	Regional Scrutiny Performance Management Framework	
11.1	Martin Traynor presented the revised Performance Management Framework (PMF), which will support a more robust process of measuring and evaluating the impact of regional scrutiny, with specific reference to outputs and outcomes of the regional scrutiny process.	
11.2	The research to examine the impact of regional scrutiny was commissioned by EMRA and undertaken by Milburn Trinnan La Court (mtl).	
11.3	Informed by the PMF, <i>emda</i> /EMRA/GO-EM should jointly agree a revised scrutiny protocol that outlines how future scrutiny processes will operate.	MW/AM/MG
11.4	It was asked why the board does not allow public access to scrutiny reviews. Pat Zadora stated that the frank and forthright discussions, if done in public, would not happen.	

11.5	Joan Ashton noted that the LGA have to conduct public scrutiny, but the working groups are private thus there is a balance.	
11.6	The Chair asked Stuart Young to consider these comments regarding potential public attendance and report back to the Board at a future meeting	SY
	<p>Recommendations</p> <p>The Regional Scrutiny Board is invited to note the revised performance management framework.</p> <p>The recommendation was endorsed.</p>	
12.	Regional Scrutiny Annual Report	
12.1	Stuart Young presented the draft Annual Report that details the Regional Scrutiny Board's activities during 2004/05. Stuart noted that the production of an Annual Report was recommended in the Performance Management Framework to promote awareness and understanding of the regional scrutiny responsibilities	
12.2	The Chair thanked everyone for their support in the work that has been undertaken during the year. The Chair recorded special thanks to Roger Begy, vice-chair of the RSB and to Pat Zadora for her support in the SSP review.	
	<p>Recommendations</p> <p>The Regional Scrutiny Board is invited to:</p> <p>Consider the draft Regional Scrutiny Board Annual Report 2004-5</p> <p>The recommendation was endorsed.</p>	
13.	Any Other Business	
	Pat Zadora thanked Stuart Young and Matthew Wheatley for all their hard work on the SSP follow-up review.	
14.	Arrangements for the Next Regional Scrutiny Board meeting	
	Monday, 3 October at 2.00pm at EMRA	