

Meeting: County Durham Economic Partnership Board

Date & Time: Tuesday 27th September at 10.00am

Venue: Durham Business Group, Belmont, Durham



Better for everyone

Present:	Name	Organisation/Pillar Rep
	Glyn Llewellyn (GL)	Chair
	Alison Gittins (AG)	Durham Business Group
	Andy Bailey (ABailey)	Partnership Team, DCC
	Andy Broadbent (AB)	People
	Bill Fullen (BF)	Inclusive Growth
	Kate Burrows (KB)	VCS Voice
	Michelle Cooper (MC)	VCS Voice
	Reshma Begum (RB)	Federation of Small Business
	Sarah Slaven (SS)	Business Competitiveness
	Sue Parkinson (SP)	Resources
	Tim Hammond (TH)	Innovation
	Angela Brown (ABro) (Minutes)	Durham County Council
Also in attendance via zoom:		
	Alex Gardiner (AG)	Metro Dynamics (Consultant)
	Andy Kerr (AK)	Durham County Council
	Claire Williams (CW)	Durham County Council
Apologies:		
	Amy Harhoff	Durham County Council

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
1.	Welcome and apologies	<p>GL welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked DBG for hosting the event today</p> <p>ABro listed the apologies</p>		
2.	Minutes of the meetings: 24th May and 12th July 2022	<p>The Minutes from the meetings in May and July were agreed as a true record with slight amendment to May's actions. AB had noted that Phil Teasdale was shown as being from New College Durham, and this should be Enterprise made Simple</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABro to amend actions 	ABro	
3.	Matters Arising	There were no matters arising		
4.	Draft County Durham Inclusive Economic Strategy – Andy Kerr/Alex Gardiner	<p>AG mentioned that she had given a presentation to the July meeting of the Board, where had she set out the suggested framework for the draft IES. There were a number of very good suggestions made at that meeting. Since then, she has moved to do first full draft of the Strategy, which has been circulated to all Board members and on which feedback will be sought over the remainder of this month. This may well result in significant changes.</p> <p>AG suggested that there were three things she would like to cover in the meeting :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To gain an understanding of whether the Partnership is happy with the direction of travel • To focus discussion on 2 areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How the IES will handle how to highlight potential opportunities and whether it was appropriate to do this using specific projects. The suggestion is for the new draft to take out named projects. ○ The document as currently written doesn't really reflect that this is a Partnership document to be delivered by Partners, so views on how to achieve that would be welcome 		

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>This information will inform the next draft of the IES</p> <p>AK introduced himself and shared slides with the Board members</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABro to circulate presentation <p>Questions</p> <p>ABailey felt that using DCC branding in the Strategy is potentially inappropriate and the use of the CDEP logo, with an introduction from CDEP, may be more reflective of the partnership ethos of the Strategy, noting that DCC is of course a member of the CDEP Board</p> <p>TH said he welcomed the idea of a partnership approach. He suggested that the document would benefit from having a clearly defined overall ambition, with the strategy then providing the plan to achieve this. He felt that a focus on productivity would be useful, particularly in the context of how that would be achieved, including through inward investment and new ways of working.</p> <p>BF agreed that the document as drafted would benefit from being a more overtly partnership document, and that a clear overall ambition, with the strategy setting out in broad terms how that ambition would be delivered, would render the document more in line with being an Inclusive Economic Strategy, which would have improved resonance with residents and businesses as a result.</p> <p>AB agreed with the points made. He advised that he had shared the current draft with the FE colleges which he represents on this Board. Overall, the view from the FE sector was that the document needed to be overtly collaborative and that care should be taken that it remained as a strategy, rather than, as currently, a hybrid strategy/development plan.</p> <p>RB also concurred with previous comments, and in particular from the point of view of the need to carry CDEP branding as a recognition of ownership. She made the</p>	<p>ABro</p>	

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>point that, as currently drafted, small businesses would view this as a County Council imposition rather than as a document representing a strategy of which they were part.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestion for working groups around each of the areas in the Strategy (“the 5 Ps”), it would be worth considering some discussions in the round to avoid possible silo mentality and recognising that actions in each area will underpin each other. RB also emphasised that, as a strategy to take us through until 2035, this needs to be recognised with an appropriate scale of ambition. Finally, RB made the point that the strategy needs to be sensitive to small business needs and constraints, as well as to those furthest from the workplace.</p> <p>MC reinforced the view that, as an Inclusive Economic Strategy, it needed to capture not only an intention to be inclusive, but a clear path to reaching those furthest from the workplace.</p> <p>SP felt that it was important to recognise that the work to date had taken us further than we have ever been before, and that having an Economic Strategy that felt that inclusivity was so important that it warranted being on the face of the document was a very big step. Inclusivity means not only of residents and of large and micro businesses, but also of wider stakeholders. She made the point that the next CDEP stakeholder event had attracted 110 registrations, and that this degree of partnership involvement will be a major benefit when it comes to leveraging the combined resources which will be needed to implement the strategy.</p> <p>SS suggested that the Strategy would be best served by avoiding referencing specific projects, which would be best left to the working groups who would develop the delivery plan.</p> <p>TH agreed, making the point that there was a difference between highlighting areas of opportunity to be pursued and developing a level of detail which would be out of place in a strategic document.</p>		

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
		<p>ABailey and KB emphasised the need to include rurality, and to ensure that rural solutions are included in the delivery plan</p> <p>AK thanked Board members for helpful comments and was of the view that we now have the right direction of travel. He agreed that the strategy needs to represent a step change through raised ambition. The delivery plan, which will succeed the Strategy, will be the road map of how the ambitions it contains are achieved. This will need to be robust, and would benefit from involvement of the Partnership Board as well as individual working groups.</p> <p>AG asked ABailey to provide the CDEP branding and thanked everyone for the discussion. She felt that, in addition to the points raised, further information on outcomes and targets will need to be included, and suggested that it would be useful to have the views of the Youth Council anchored into the document, perhaps by way of a foreword, together with the Chair of CDEP.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABro to send branding for CDEP to AG 	ABro	
5.	Any Other Business	<p>SP said that, with the consent of the Board, she intended to bring a paper to the next Board meeting which would consider proposals to refresh the Partnership governing document. In particular this would adapt the current portfolio approach to re-align it to the “5 Ps” in the IES and also to refresh membership.</p> <p>Jon Gluyas who has been with the Partnership for a number of years, has tendered his resignation from the Board, and TH has taken his place. GL stated that he would like to write to JG on behalf of the CDEP, and brought the meeting to a close.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP to bring paper to next Board reminding Board who partnership is and their roles • GL to write to JG 	SP GL	

Item No.	Subject	Discussion and Decision	Lead Officer(s)	Timescale
	Date and time of Next Meeting	23 rd November 2022 @ 1.30pm at Salvus House, Aykley Heads, Durham		