

# EXTRAORDINARY BOARD AGENDA AND BOARD PAPERS

**DATE AND TIME:** 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017, 14.00 – 16.20

**VENUE:** CLUB ROOM 4, THE CLUB BUILDING, ALCONBURY WEALD ENTERPRISE CAMPUS, ALCONBURY, CAMBS PE28 4WX

Item	Brief description	Time	Access/circulation prior to board meeting
1. Welcome and Introductions	From Chairman, Mark Reeve	14.00 5 mins	
2. Declarations of Interest	Board Members are asked to confirm any personal interest in the items set out in this agenda		Board & Corporate Members
3. Assurance Framework	To review progress, and agree the Assurance Framework in line with Government requirements Paper by Neil Darwin	14.05 45 mins	Board & Corporate Members
4. GCGP working with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	To discuss future working arrangements between GCGP and the new Combined Authority Verbal discussion	14.55 60 mins	Board & Corporate Members
5. Taking forward GCGP's Governance Review	To agree an approach to the GCGP Governance Review Paper by Neil Darwin	15.55 15 mins	Board & Corporate Members
6. Minutes from Board Meeting held on 17 January 2017	To agree Minutes	16.10 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members
7. AOB		16.15 5 mins	Board & Corporate Members

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 15:00 on Tuesday 7 March 2017**

**VENUE: THE CLUB BUILDING, ALCONBURY WEALD ENTERPRISE CAMPUS, ALCONBURY, CAMBS PE28 4WX**

## Item 3: Assurance Framework Review

### FOR DECISION:

- i) To approve the revised GCGP Assurance Framework (February 2017) to enable the Accountable Body to confirm compliance with revised Government guidance to LEPs by 28th February
- ii) To agree that GCGP Board retains the decision-making authority for investments within its Growth Deal allocation with the exception of the Agri-tech Initiative which continues to be delegated to the Agri-tech Programme Board
- iii) To agree / commit to review GCGP's Governance and Assurance during 2017, to include areas of improvement identified as part of the Assurance Framework review.
- iv) Agree to identify 'SME Ambassador(s)' within the Board membership in line with Government's request for this community
- v) To support the ambition of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to seek better alignment of decision-making and investment processes with the Growth Deal and City Deal.

### 1. Introduction

This paper provides a progress update on the 2016/17 review of the GCGP Assurance Framework and seeks agreement to the revised version (February 2017). The Framework is one of the key governance documents for the LEP and requires sign-off by the LEP's Accountable Body, now on an annual basis.

The review of the Framework has highlighted a couple of minor areas which require improvement to ensure GCGP is compliant with new guidance. Plans for improvement include establishment of a new GCGP Ethics Committee.

### 2. Background

All Local Enterprise Partnerships are required to develop, agree and implement a single assurance framework covering funding from Government for which they are responsible. This is to ensure that LEPs have robust processes in place. GCGP therefore already has an approved Assurance Framework in place as part of its broader corporate governance arrangements.

GCGP's Assurance Framework was last reviewed formally during 2015 to prepare for draw down of Growth Deal funds, with progress reported to Board in March 2015.

In April 2016, the Government reviewed Assurance Frameworks in the context of new Devolution Deals, and so issued a Single Pot Assurance Framework Guidance for areas which will receive devolved funding and powers to a Combined Authority, but still have separate Growth Deals. In July 2016, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough agreed its own Devolution Deal and began to prepare for a new Combined Authority.

In Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Local Growth Fund will not be fully integrated into the Single Pot. This is because, as well as the LEP geography being different to the Combined Authority, the Government guidance for LEP framework contains some specific requirements which do not apply to both. However the LEP will seek to align processes for managing and delivering the Local Growth Fund with the Combined Authority as much as is possible and practical to do so, while still adhering to Government guidance to LEPs.

In November 2016, the Government issued revised national guidance for LEP Assurance Frameworks. This was in recognition of the LEPs' maturity and greater scope. LEP officers began an early stage review of the Assurance Framework in light of new guidance.

Growth Deal funds will be transferred from Government to GCGP's Accountable Body under a Section 31 grant determination on an annual basis. Cambridgeshire County Council is GCGP's Accountable Body in respect of the following;

- a. £146m Growth Deal funding, which includes;
  - i. Agri-tech Initiative
  - ii. Signpost 2 Grant small grant fund
- b. £16m Growing Places Fund
- c. £3.2m Regional Growth Fund Agri-tech Initiative
- d. £300k Growth Hub
- e. £250k LEP Core funding (annual); and
- f. £250k LEP Strategy funding (annual).

Non-capital expenditure (currently Growth Hub, Core and Strategy funding) will be subject to a simplified accountability procedure confirming that money has been accounted for correctly and spent in accordance with the grant conditions (if appropriate). The LEP Assurance Framework will still apply to non-capital expenditure in terms of governance, transparency and value for money.

### **3. GCGP Assurance Review 2016/17**

Since the revised LEP guidance was issued in November, the GCGP team has been working with Accountable Body colleagues to review and update the LEP Assurance Framework. The County Council's Section 151 Officer has already reviewed and provided feedback on the updated Framework, and further changes made based on his recommendations. The latest Framework is attached as Appendix 1 to this paper.

GCGP has also completed 'Peer review' exercise within the LEP Network. Colleagues from Enterprise M3 LEP have provided independent objective feedback on GCGP's compliance with Government guidance, and general assurance and transparency issues. This feedback has been

positive, with some areas identified for general improvement around access to information regarding processes for applying for GCGP's funding.

The LEP Board is requested to approve the revised GCGP Assurance Framework (February 2017) to enable the Accountable Body to confirm compliance with revised Government guidance to LEPs by 28th February.

The Framework requires a clear identification of the LEP's authority for decision making. It is therefore recommended that the GCGP Board retains the decision-making authority for investments within its Growth Deal allocation with the exception of the Agri-tech Initiative which continues to be delegated to the Agri-tech Programme Board.

During the review of the Framework, a number of key areas were identified for immediate improvement and this has already been actioned, in particular better information via the GCGP website regarding the LEP's decision making and funding opportunities. Work on improving information on GCGP's funding and investments will be completed by March 2017.

Other areas where the Government has provided revised guidance to LEPs has included the make-up and conduct of LEP boards. In response to this, GCGP proposes a plan to strengthen governance and assurance, including setting up an Ethics Committee which will look at issues such as succession planning, diversity and conduct of board members.

In line with revised guidance, GCGP's Assurance Framework will be reviewed annually, with the review cycle commencing in the Autumn following the completion of the LEP's Annual Report and Accounts.

It is recommended that the Board agrees to commit to review GCGP's Governance and Assurance during 2017, to include areas of improvement identified as part of the Assurance Framework review.

As part of the Assurance review, GCGP has been exploring ways to align its processes with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, as well as the Greater Cambridge City Deal. This is to improve transparency and accountability, develop and share expertise in appraising and evaluating major projects and provide a better experience for those seeking investment from the area's largest funding programmes.

The Board is requested to support the ambition of the Combined Authority to seek better alignment of decision-making and investment processes with the Growth Deal and City Deal.

# GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

## ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

### February 2017 Draft v3

#### 1. Section 1 – Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership (GCGP) has successfully bid for £146m of the Government's Local Growth Fund – also known as Growth Deal - over the period April 2015 to March 2021. This document sets out the roles, responsibilities and key processes for ensuring accountability, probity, transparency and value for money of that and GCGP's other funding as set out in paragraph 1.13.
- 1.2 As a minimum, GCGP ensures compliance with the Government's guidelines for Growth Deal funds in the following ways;
- GCGP publishes the current Assurance Framework on its website<sup>1</sup>. It also provides information on strategic priorities, available funding and application and decision-making processes;
  - the Assurance Framework is clear regarding who has authority for decision making in relation to investment;
  - the LEP Board has at least one identified member who represents and engages with the SME business community;
  - GCGP will establish a new Ethics Committee. The work of that Committee will include;
    - improving diversity in our membership of our board and sub-groups as part of succession planning;
    - improving clarity and application of Rules of Conduct for GCGP Board members.
- 1.3 Section 2 of this document covers governance and working arrangements including relationships and alignment with the Combined Authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and the Greater Cambridge City Deal as well as governance for its wider responsibilities including the Growth Hub and Enterprise Zones.
- 1.4 Section 3 covers options appraisal and prioritisation. Section 4 deals with value for money (VfM) and business case development. Whilst differing sources of appraisal may be used dependent on the nature of an intervention (skills, economic development or transport) all will be consistent with, and have a proportionate application of, the 'five cases' approach set out in HM Treasury's The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government and its supplementary guidance.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.gcgp.co.uk/yourlep/corporate-governance/>

- 1.5 In developing this Framework four key principles were used. The first was to draw together the approved assurance processes that already exist in relation to GCGP funding programmes (recognising that Cambridgeshire County Council already provides an Accountable Body function for two devolved funds under GCGP's control). The second was to take into account the guidance on assurance to Local Enterprise Partnerships. The third was to ensure the right processes are in place to ensure decisions over funding provide value for money. Finally, to take a light touch, focusing only on those key practices and standards which are necessary to provide government and local partners with assurance that decisions over funding are proper and robust.
- 1.6 The Government announced the first wave of Growth Deals in 2014. Investment from the Local Growth Fund is directed through Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), using Strategic Economic Plans (SEPs) as the guiding strategic documents. To date, GCGP has been awarded £146m across three Growth Deals.<sup>2</sup>
- 1.7 All Local Enterprise Partnerships are required to develop, agree and implement a single Assurance Framework covering the funding from Government for which they are responsible. This is to ensure that LEPs have robust processes in place. GCGP therefore already has an approved Assurance Framework in place as part of its broader corporate governance arrangements.<sup>3</sup>
- 1.8 In April 2016, the Government reviewed Growth Deal Assurance Frameworks in the context of new Devolution Deals, and so issued a Single Pot Assurance Framework Guidance for areas which will receive devolved funding and powers to a Combined Authority, but still have separate Growth Deals.<sup>4</sup> In July 2016, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough agreed its own Devolution Deal and began to prepare for a new Combined Authority.
- 1.9 In November 2016, the Government issued revised national guidance for LEP Assurance Frameworks.<sup>5</sup> This was in recognition of the LEPs' maturity and greater scope.
- 1.10 Where Local Enterprise Partnerships and Combined Authorities have agreed that the Local Growth Fund will be fully integrated into the 'Single Pot' of funding awarded in Devolution Deals, the local Single Pot Assurance Framework (once formally agreed by DCLG) will supersede the local assurance framework for project appraisal, prioritisation, assessing value for money, allocating spend and monitoring and evaluation. In Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, as the LEP covers a different geography (see membership and governance in Section 2 below), Local Growth Fund will not be fully integrated into the Single Pot. However the LEP will seek to align processes for managing and delivering the Local Growth Fund as much as is possible and practical to do so, while still adhering to Government guidance to LEPs.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.gcgp.co.uk/local-growth-strategy/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.gcgp.co.uk/yourlep/corporate-governance/>

<sup>4</sup>

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/516215/Single\\_Pot\\_Assurance\\_Framework.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/516215/Single_Pot_Assurance_Framework.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-enterprise-partnership-national-assurance-framework>

- 1.11 The Government's guidance refers to the strategic partnership role of a LEP Board and its relationships with partner bodies, such as the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and the Cambridge City Growth Deal (City Deal).
- 1.12 As LEPs have Accountable Bodies to undertake the public funding accountability responsibilities for administering funds, the Assurance Framework must also be applied by the LEP's Accountable Body. GCGP's Accountable Body in respect of Local Growth Fund grant is Cambridgeshire County Council.
- 1.13 Cambridgeshire County Council is currently GCGP's Accountable Body in respect of the following;
- £146m Growth Deal funding, which includes;
    - £2.55m Agri-tech Initiative (Growth Deal)
    - £200k Signpost 2 Grant small grant fund
  - £16m Growing Places Fund
  - £300k Growth Hub
  - £250k LEP Core funding; and
  - £250k LEP Strategy funding.
- 1.14 Non-capital expenditure (currently Growth Hub, Core and Strategy funding and a small proportion of Growing Places Fund) will be subject to a simplified accountability procedure confirming that money has been accounted for correctly, spent in accordance with grant conditions (where appropriate) and that appropriate steps have been taken to gain value for money.

## **SECTION 2 - Governance and Working Arrangements**

- 2.1 This section describes the governance systems and mechanisms for funding managed by GCGP.
- 2.2 This is the Assurance Framework for GCGP Enterprise Partnership. Geographically this includes all areas within the following local authority boundaries (and so doing wholly includes Cambridgeshire County Council):
- Cambridge City Council
  - East Cambridgeshire District Council
  - Fenland District Council
  - Huntingdonshire District Council
  - Peterborough City Council
  - South Cambridgeshire District Council
  - Kings Lynn West Norfolk District Council
  - Forest Heath District Council
  - St Edmundsbury District Council
  - Uttlesford District Council
  - North Herts District Council
  - Rutland County Council
  - South Kesteven District Council
  - South Holland District Council
- 2.3 GCGP also works across a larger geography or with different geographies on different

issues, for example with neighbouring LEPs on cross-border activities or with strategic partners on national or sub-national issues, for example Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge Expressway and East-West Rail. Within the borders of its geography, the LEP also has specific relationships for example as a member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, with individual or multiple local authorities on a project by project basis and with other investment partnerships eg. the Greater Cambridge City Deal.

- 2.4 GCGP is a Company Limited by Guarantee, company number 07553554. The Articles of Association are attached as Appendix A, which describe the nature of the Company, its Board and core operating principles. The Members Framework Agreement is attached as Appendix B, which records the terms and conditions of their understanding and of regulating their relationship with each other and certain aspects of the affairs of and their dealings with the Company. The Scheme of Delegation is attached as Appendix C, which details a named person, Board or Sub-Committee for financial decision-making.
- 2.5 GCGP oversees the delivery of a business-led programme of interventions that will help to support the sustainable economic growth and continued prosperity of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough area. This is in line with GCGP's overarching vision and Strategic Economic Plan. In particular GCGP will:
- ensure value for money is achieved;
  - prioritise investments within the available budget;
  - make decisions on individual investments;
  - monitor progress of project delivery and spend; and
  - actively manage the devolved budget and programme to respond to changed circumstances.
- 2.6 The LEP Board agreed on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 that it will retain the core responsibility for decision-making on project approvals under the Growth Deal, taking into account the corporate governance provided in the Appendices.
- 2.7 The LEP Board has a private sector chair, with a minimum of 50% of its membership coming from the private sector. It also has several identified board members to represent and engage with the SME business community.
- 2.8 The LEP is committed to improving diversity within its membership. This will be part of the work of a new Ethics Committee which will develop a diversity statement explaining how the Local Enterprise Partnership will look to ensure diverse representation at Board and sub group level which is reflective of their local business community (including geographies and protected characteristics) as part of succession planning. The Ethics Committee will also build on the existing Code of Conduct within the Members Framework, ensuring private sector board members in particular understand and apply the Seven Principles of Public Life.
- 2.9 GCGP's decision-making will be informed by three advisory groups (programme boards):
- the Local Transport Panel will assess and make recommendations to the Board on transport projects;
  - the Investment Sub-Committee will assess and make recommendations to the Board on economic development and skills projects; and

- the Agri-tech Programme Board will assess and make recommendations to the Board on Agri-Tech projects.
- 2.10 The Board also resolved in February 2017 to continue its delegation of decision-making responsibilities regarding the Agri-tech Initiative to the Agri-tech Programme Board.
- 2.11 Terms of Reference for each sub-committee are attached as appendices. Terms of Reference are also attached for GCGP's two Enterprise Zone boards – Alconbury and Cambridge Compass. The LEP is also represented on the Greater Cambridge City Deal.
- 2.12 The Accountable Body will hold the funding and make payments to the delivery bodies on behalf of GCGP. The Accountable Body will account for these funds in such a way that they are separately identifiable from the Authority's own funds, and provide financial statements to GCGP as required. Any interest accrued on GCGP's funds can and will only be used in accordance with a GCGP decision.
- 2.13 The Accountable Body will undertake the following responsibilities:
- ensuring that decisions and activities of the GCGP conform to legal requirements with regard to equalities, social value, environmental, State Aid, procurement etc.
  - ensuring (through Section 151 Officer) that the funds are used appropriately;
  - ensuring that GCGP keeps an official record of its proceedings ;
  - holding relevant financial documents ;
  - responsibility for the decisions of GCGP in approving projects in compliance with this Assurance Framework (e.g. if subjected to legal challenge);
  - review grant offer letters/contracts ;
  - review claim forms; and
  - ensuring that the LEP Assurance Framework is adhered to.
- 2.14 Grant offer letters / contracts with delivery partners will set out the specific requirements regarding conformity and adherence to the Assurance Framework in undertaking any work or delivering projects funded by GCGP.
- 2.15 The role of Accountable Body and (where relevant) project promoter will need to be strictly independent of each other to provide assurance of no conflict of interest.
- 2.16 Annual audits will be carried out by Accountable Body's independent auditor. As a Company, GCGP's accounts are already subject to regular independent audit. These accounts are available via Companies House.
- 2.17 GCGP recognises the need for clear arrangements in place which enable effective and meaningful engagement of local partners and the public. It also acknowledges the need to be clear and unambiguous about who has authority for decision making and the processes and practices which give people, businesses and other organisations confidence that decisions made are proper. For both reasons, GCGP has put in place a range of arrangements to ensure transparency and engagement, as follows.
- 2.18 GCGP has a dedicated website which the LEP uses to openly advertise current funding opportunities, and indicate forthcoming opportunities. The website also provides up to

date information on project and programme progress, funding awards and application and decision-making processes. The URL is <http://www.gcgp.co.uk>. The website will also be used to invite public comment relating to large capital proposals, particularly transport schemes.

- 2.19 The agendas and papers for and minutes of meetings of the Board are published on the LEP's website<sup>6</sup>: The only exception to this relates to material of a confidential or commercially sensitive nature.
- 2.20 In addition to the formal representation of Local Authority representatives on the Board itself, GCGP has also established a Local Authority Leaders Group. Chaired by the Chairman of GCGP, this brings together the political leaders (or equivalent) of all 15 Local Authorities covered by the GCGP area. Terms of reference are in Appendix F.
- 2.21 In addition to the formal representation of business and academia on the GCGP Board, there are a number of mechanisms to engage with these constituents (beyond the general communications function of GCGP). A series of sub-committees exist to engage with specific sectorial interests. These provide advice to the Board and help to stimulate pipeline project ideas. GCGP also has a Growth Hub - Signpost 2 Grow<sup>7</sup> which acts assists the LEP in understanding the needs and priorities of the area's SME business community. Information on GCGP's wider groups is on its website.
- 2.22 Although GCGP's Company Limited by Guarantee structure means that it is not covered by the Freedom of Information Act, it will work through the Accountable Body to ensure that as far as is practicable, Freedom of Information and Environmental Information Regulation requests are dealt with in line with relevant legislation.
- 2.23 The Members Framework sets out GCGP's approach to conflicts of interest. A Register of Board Members' Interests is maintained and is published on the LEP's website. The conflicts of interest policy also applies to sub-committees, and declarations of interest are made at every meeting where formal decisions are taken.
- 2.24 GCGP will handle any complaints in line with the published complaints policy.

### **SECTION 3 - OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND PRIORITISATION**

- 3.1 The identification of new projects and subsequent prioritisation is overseen by the LEP's relevant sub-groups or thematic panels as described in Section 2 above, and will adhere to the Assurance Framework and its appendices. This work is supported by an Independent Technical Advisor who provides impartial advice upon which to base funding decisions. Appendix H describes the assessment process for agri-tech projects under the Agri-Tech Initiative. Appendix I describes the assessment process for Skills projects. Finally, Appendix J describes the assessment process for Transport projects.
- 3.2 The range of interventions funded by the LEP will be kept under review by GCGP in line its key priority areas. At the same time, work will continue on developing a robust pipeline of new projects to attract further private and public sector investment. This will continue

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.gcgp.co.uk/yourlep/board/board-meetings>

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.gcgp.co.uk/business\\_support/signpost2grow/](http://www.gcgp.co.uk/business_support/signpost2grow/)

to identify options that are deliverable, offer high value for money, maximise social value, and provide wider benefits to the GCGP area. Option concepts may be “bottom-up” (derived from a call for projects or direct approach by businesses / delivery bodies) or “top-down” (through a strategic commissioning route). Where the LEP uses a commissioning approach, opportunities for partners to present proposals will be openly advertised on GCGP’s website and communicated via sub-groups and wider stakeholder community.

- 3.3 GCGP has developed a clear basis against which such projects and programmes are identified, appraised and prioritised, although the level of assessment needs to be proportionate to the scale and type of project (for example the Agri-tech programme requires a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire and then a single stage of Business Case application). Detail of the process for each funding type is set out in the relevant appendices, and is summarised below and on the GCGP website.

**Initial Sifting – Expression of Interest**

- 3.4 When a new opportunity for funding is announced, the GCGP Board, programme boards, panels, Local Authorities, and key delivery partners are asked to identify candidate projects for their geographic and priority areas for consideration, provided that they demonstrably meet the criteria outlined in Table 1 below. These should also be drawn from the Strategic Economic Plan and other long-term planning documents such as Local Plans and Local Transport Plans.
- 3.5 A proforma is provided to capture consistent information on each proposal and the completed proforma should be no longer than four pages. Members of the public and the business community will also be able to identify projects, and the proforma will be published and publicised on the GCGP website. The proforma will capture the key elements of the proposed project such as but not limited to the following themes and criteria, including the funding sought. The proforma and all supporting information is made available on GCGP’s website.

**Table 1) GCGP Standard Project Criteria**

THEME	CRITERIA
Purpose and Type	The primary proposal of the project should be to support local economic growth within the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough area. Project types include, amongst others, transport, digital, water and flooding, housing and planning, regeneration and public realm, employment sites, business support, skills and employment, innovation.
Strategic Impact and Objectives	The objectives and impacts / constraints addressed of the project need to be aligned with each other and to the objectives of the Strategic Economic Plan (and wider long term planning documents such as a Local Plan) to show how it would have a positive impact across a defined geography. In addition, an outline of the impacts of no investment should be included (the ‘do nothing’ option).

Cost Threshold and Type	The total costs of the project, along with funding sought from the LEP. Requests for funding from the LEP can be for capital, revenue or both, but noting that Growth Deal funding is capital only.
Financial Requirement and Funding Sources	Details of match funding to be provided should be included in the bid, subject to individual programme requirements. Funding should be sought where there are no other realistic options (that is where there is a funding gap), and the other sources of funding, their amount, and their likelihood stated. Details of other funding sources considered and disregarded should be provided.
Deliverability and Risk	The proposed project needs a reasonable degree of public support, and should be both affordable and deliverable within a clearly defined timescale. Key risks should be identified with proposed management and mitigations outlined to reduce/manage those risks.

- 3.6 All applications go through an initial sifting process, assessed against the criteria highlighted above. This initial sifting process will be undertaken by GCGP officers with specialist support if required. Any projects that do not have a strong Strategic Fit and perform poorly against the criteria will not be taken further, with feedback being given to the project promoter. GCGP reserves the right to decide not to include a project in the prioritisation process if key information is missing or if it is not based on a robust set of assumptions. However the Strategic Case may be revisited if a significant period has lapsed or circumstances changed since the outline application / Expression of Interest made. A provisional allocation of funding at outline stage does not guarantee that a full Business Case application will be approved.

### **Strategic Prioritisation – Strategic Outline Business Case**

- 3.7 Projects that pass through the initial sifting stage will be allocated to project pipeline lists relating to the priority area or areas they most strongly align (e.g. skills, innovation, employment, housing, transport). Project promoters are then invited to develop and submit a Strategic Outline Business Case using a template provided by GCGP.
- 3.8 GCGP requires the Strategic Outline Business Case to be developed with adherence HM Treasury's The Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government. The guidance sets out how a business case in support of a new programme or new project must evidence that the project has a strong:
- Strategic case – the intervention is supported by a compelling case for change that provides holistic fit with other parts of the organisation and public sector;
  - Economic case – the intervention represent best public value;
  - Commercial case – the proposed deal is attractive to the market place, can be procured and is commercially viable;
  - Financial case – the proposed spend is affordable; and
  - Management case – what is required from all parties is achievable.
- 3.9 For transport projects, Strategic Outline Business Cases will be assessed by the Independent Technical Advisor using a modified version of the Department for Transport's Early Assessment and Sifting Tool. The Independent Technical Advisor will compile the first stage of a Strategic Prioritisation Report containing recommendations to the LEP Transport Panel for comment and approving recommendations for GCGP Board.

Feedback will be provided to the project promoter. Non-transport projects will go through a similar assessment process alongside other projects within the same theme, ie skills, business growth, innovation.

## **SECTION 4 – PROJECT APPRAISAL AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS**

### ***Detailed Project Appraisal and Value for Money***

- 4.1 Once projects have been prioritised, GCGP will inform project promoters that projects have been granted programme entry and need to be developed to Outline and Full Business Case stage in order to access funding (subject to any specific exceptions given in the programme appendices). Business cases must be in line with HM Treasury's Green Book: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government and relevant Central Government Department Guidelines such as the Department for Transport's WebTAG, proportionate to the scale of the project.
- 4.2 Business case development must follow a reasonable and robust approach, and provide a high degree of certainty that the project will deliver 'high' value for money. That is, a Benefit Cost Ratio of two-to-one (2:1) or greater.

### ***Stage 0 – Agreement of Approach***

- 4.3 Project promoters have the opportunity to seek early advice on whether their business case development and appraisal approach is proportionate and fit-for-purpose, particularly in relation to any modelling that might be required and to the assessment of social and distributional impacts. Proportionality should reflect the nature, value, impact of the project, and time available. This can prevent abortive work from being conducted by project promoters, the Independent Technical Advisor, the Local Transport Panel, the Local Enterprise Partnership Board, and the Accountable Body by not presenting under-developed project business cases for final assessment and quality assurance.

### ***Stage 1 – Draft Outline Business Case***

- 4.4 The first stage of project appraisal is the development of a Draft Outline Business Case by the project promoter for each of its prioritised and shortlisted projects. Project promoters are aiming to demonstrate 'high' value for money. Environmental and social and distributional impacts are a key element of the value for money equation. Project promoters will need to be mindful that there could be both potential synergies and conflicts between these. Project promoters should consider the spatial distribution of positive and negative impacts, whether the impacts are very large for a small number of users or dispersed over a larger number of users. Analysis should also attempt to identify who are the 'winners' and 'losers' and to what extent. The business case work must make any such synergies and conflicts explicit and should propose suitable mitigation where relevant.
- 4.5 Where the LEP is developing a programme of projects which are seeking funding approval at the same time, Draft Outline Business Cases will be assessed together by the Independent Technical Advisor. This will help ensure consistency of approach and

fair assessment. Feedback will be given to the project promoter and the Local Enterprise Partnership through a Draft Outline Business Case Assessment Report. The report will not only make recommendations for project business case progression or amendment, but also contain assessment of the adherence and proportionate and robust application of government guidance (with a greater focus on the strategic case and economic case), the reasonableness of the approach, the level of uncertainty in assuring value for money and key risks, and key recommendations for improvement.

- 4.6 The Independent Technical Advisor may recommend a project is not prioritised for development of a Full Business Case and amended for the same or a later bidding round if time permits; or recommend approval for the development of a Full Business Case. The Steering Group will review the list of projects for amendment and the list of projects for Full Business Case development, then make its recommendations to the relevant programme board / panel, before they make their recommendation to the Local Enterprise Partnership Board for approval.

### ***Stage 2 – Revised Outline Business Case***

- 4.7 The development of a revised Outline Business Case has a far greater emphasis on commercial, financial and management cases, ensuring arrangements are appropriate for effective delivery, including necessary statutory and procurement requirements (as appropriate). The revised Outline Business Cases seeking funding approval by the Local Enterprise Partnership and Accountable Body should be assessed together by the Independent Technical Advisor, with feedback provided to the project promoters and Local Enterprise Partnership through a Revised Outline Business Case Assessment Report. Similar to the Draft Outline Business Case Assessment Report, the report will contain assessment of the adherence to a proportionate and robust process (with an equal focus on all five cases), the reasonableness of the approach, the level of uncertainty in assuring value for money and key risks, and recommendations for funding approval or amendments to the business case.
- 4.8 The Revised Outline Business Cases, the report and its recommendations for funding, will be reviewed by a programme steering group, which will make recommendations to the relevant Sub-Boards, before they in turn make recommendations for funding approval to the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Accountable Body.

### ***Stage 3 – Department for Transport Retained / Portfolio Projects***

- 4.9 For projects that have funding retained by the Department for Transport, Stage 3 is the review for the business case submission to the Department for Transport. In these instances, the role of the Independent Technical Advisor to review the business case and provide professional advice to the Accountability Board of any key risks or issues arising from that assessment that need to be considered by the board to support the associated decision for funding.

### ***Stages 4 and 5 – Full Business Case***

- 4.10 For large projects over £5 million it is unlikely that project promoters will have already been through procurement and detailed design following the Outline Business Case.

These projects; those considered high risk by the relevant GCGP programme board / panel; or for those where increases in costs might jeopardize 'high' value for money, are likely to be required to go through these stages to develop a Full Business Case, to further reconsideration and approval of the Value for Money assessment.

- 4.11 Stage 4 is commensurate with Stage 0, outlining the approach, process, procedures and timescales for development of the Full Business Case.
- 4.12 Stage 5 is the production and assessment of the Full Business Case. It is not anticipated that this process is iterative. Based on the Assurance Review, recommendations are made by the Independent Technical Advisor to the GCGP programme board / panel on the Value for Money Assessment and the certainty of that assessment's accuracy. The relevant GCGP programme board / panel will then make a decision whether or not to recommend the project received funding (see Value for Money below).

### **External Scrutiny of Business Cases**

- 4.13 Where relevant, the project sponsor must engage stakeholders as part of the business case development process and include the results of this engagement in the business case documents. Each Programme will set out the requirements for the publication of Business Cases and results of Business Case Assessments. Commercially sensitive information will be redacted.
- 4.14 Any public or stakeholder representation on the business cases must be considered by the GCGP Board and the Board must demonstrate how such representations have been considered.
- 4.15 The results of the relevant Independent Technical Advisor's assessment will be published as supporting papers for the Local Enterprise Partnership and its programme boards / panels, as well as being made publically available and publicised on the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership website, in sufficient time for members of the public, business community and other stakeholders to make representations to the Local Enterprise Partnership Board or its programme boards / panels. This is mainly relevant to the consideration of funding for transport schemes, but may be applicable to other large capital LEP investments.
- 4.16 Commercially sensitive information may need to be redacted in line with the Freedom of Information Act 2002.
- 4.17 Public or stakeholder representation on the business cases must be considered by the Local Enterprise Partnership Board and the Board must demonstrate how such representations have been considered.

### **VfM / Benefit Cost Ratio**

- 4.18 At each stage of business case sign off, the Section 151 Officer of the Accountable Body will require production of a Value for Money Statement which will summarise the economic case for the project and include an overall Benefit Cost Ratio. This will allow comparison of the monetised benefits with the costs; allow stakeholders to understand

the potential costs, benefits and impacts; and allow the Section 151 Officer to sign-off the Value for Money Statement, or not, after the Local Enterprise Partnership Board has approved funding. The Section 151 Officer should engage the relevant Independent Technical Advisors throughout to advise on whether delivery of the project is likely to result in 'high' value for money – a Benefit Cost Ratio of 2:1 or greater. A final draft Value for Money statement should be provided for review by the Section 151 Officer before a Board decision is made.

- 4.19 Projects with a Benefit Cost Ratio of less than 2:1 will not normally be funded unless wider appraisal evidence provides a compelling case for investment. Such compelling circumstances could include where a project is required to unlock a barrier to growth or deliver wider economic benefits without detriment to the other cases of the business case; or where the time, effort and / or cost of monetisation of other economic, environmental and / or social and distribution impacts is too great for the value for the project and time available, but likely impacts would be to raise the Benefit Cost Ratio to or above two-to-one.
- 4.20 Where this occurs project promoters will be required to justify the investment through provision of an evidence base and a proportionate analysis of benefits not included in the central benefit-cost analysis, and to demonstrate how these help deliver the objectives of the Strategic Economic Plan.

### **Project development costs**

- 4.21 The project promoter is responsible for all up-front costs at each stage of the business case development. Reasonable costs for the Independent Technical Advisors' independent assessment and GCGP prioritisation will also be required to be covered by project promoters. GCGP will consider requests to forward fund project development costs in exceptional circumstances.

### **Sign-Off, Release of Funding and Conditions**

- 4.22 If funding is approved, a formal agreement will be issued between the Accountable Body, GCGP and the project promoting body setting out the conditions under which the devolved funding is to be spent and the respective responsibilities, and for ensuring the conditions are adhered to. The Accountable Body will not release funding until the GCGP Board has approved funding and the Value for Money Statement has been signed-off by the Section 151 Officer of the Accountable Body. A final draft Value for Money statement should be provided for review by the Section 151 Officer before a Board decision is made.
- 4.23 If the Accountable Body's Section 151 Officer does not agree that a decision of the GCGP Board is in line with this Assurance Framework and therefore does not agree to sign-off the Value for Money Statement, the Accountable Body will propose a means of resolution with GCGP Board, informing the relevant programme board / panel, project promoter, and Independent Technical Advisors as relevant.

### **Programme and Risk Management**

- 4.24 As part of their funding agreement with GCGP, project promoters are required to provide

clear project milestones for delivery.

- 4.25 Any risks to the delivery of a project should be made clear from the outset and monitored regularly. A robust system of risk management will be put in place for individual projects overseen by the GCGP Board. This will enable spend profiles to be effectively monitored and managed by project promoters, the Accountable Body, the GCGP Board and its programme boards / panels.
- 4.26 The project promoting body is responsible for informing the Accountable Body and GCGP of any significant changes to a project's scope, costs and implementation timetable. The Accountable Body and Local Enterprise Partnership (and its relevant programme board / panel) will consider any necessary remedial actions.
- 4.27 Each project promoter will submit regular monitoring reports to GCGP and Accountable Body, generally on a quarterly basis as a minimum, which will confirm the programme and budget pre-delivery for each project, along with costs and delivery progress against programme during delivery, and identify any changes and highlight any key issues. This information will be used to identify project specific risks and issues, and will enable the overall programme to be managed.
- 4.28 As defined in the relevant Programme, the Accountable Body will undertake regular audits of the financial process by requesting evidence from the project promoter that funds are being spent on the specified capital project. The Accountable Body will advise GCGP of any concerns or irregularities.
- 4.29 GCGP will not be liable to fund increases in costs in full or part. These must be met by the project promoter. Delays to a project start as specified in a funding agreement may result in the withdrawal of a funding allocation to enable the GCGP Board and Accountable Body to bring forward another project that is deliverable within the timescales.

*version control: FV 7.0 last amended 13.02.17 by Alex Francis, GCGP Growth Deal Programme Manager*

## GCGP Assurance Checklist Feb 2017

No.	Requirement / Task	Mandatory or Desirable?	Already achieved or in progress?	If achieved, where stored / available (ie web link)	If in progress, how and when to be achieved?	Date confirmed in place
	<b>LEP Board / Governance</b>					
	LEP must have an identified board member to represent and engage with the SME business community	M	In place – need contact details on website?		Clearer information on website re who is / are the SME reps and how to contact them.	21 Feb 2017
	Local frameworks must be clear and unambiguous about who has authority for decision-making	M	In place – board to renew on 21 Feb		Check flowcharts etc up to date on website Review scheme of delegation?	21 Feb 2017
	Members Framework	D	Legal Review planned		Legal Review	
	LEPs to demonstrate a commitment to diversity, including a diversity statement explaining how the LEP will look to ensure diverse representation at Board	D	In progress – part of succession planning		Through Ethics Committee to be set up	
	AF to set out rules of conduct for Board members	M	Satisfied minimum. Current version of Members Framework includes reference to 7 Principles of Public Life (Section 3.2)		Through Ethics Committee to provide clarity and support to private sector board members in particular	21 Feb 2017
	<b>Accountable Body Agreement</b>					
	Need to revisit respective roles re funding processes, also re LTB etc subject to	D	Accountable Body agreement to be			w/c 20 Feb

	changes to boards & panels in light of Combined Authority.  Need clarity re conflict resolution – only in outline at present.		reviewed once AF agreed			
<b>Website / transparency</b>						
	Assurance Framework must be published on LEP websites	M	Current version July 2015 – upload new once approved by Board	<a href="http://www.gcgp.co.uk/yourlep/corporate-governance">http://www.gcgp.co.uk/yourlep/corporate-governance</a>	upload new once approved by Board 21/2  Improvements to Governance webpages	21 Feb 2017
	Assign designated executive responsible for regular review of assurance	D	CEO and Exec Director		Need to agree frequency of review and set up schedule	Done
	Register of Interest & Conflict of Interest Policy	D	Now published on website – needs regular review		Policy needs further work (Ethics Committee)	Done 31 Jan 2017 (part)
	Arrangements for the lawful and effective implementation and delivery of projects – to include that funding opportunities should be openly ‘advertised’ . Expression of Interest forms and key dates etc to be on website.	M	In place but needs improvement  Need to decide whether to publish all notes etc for all sub-groups – part of ongoing transparency review. Different groups have different processes – need better consistency.		GPF/GD pages Opportunities for funding through open commissioning under Growth Deal 3 via calls for proposals.  Ongoing – new website work will provide better information re funded projects. Need to improve detail of	w/c 13 Feb 2017 – AF/LWH

					minutes relating to investment decisions.	
	AF should cover how business cases are published and publicised before funding decisions are made so external comment is possible. LEPs should show how comments have been taken into account. Suggested period for this is <b>3 months</b> .	M	Not currently done consistently – need to improve for major schemes – transport only?		Work in progress	
	Strategic Economic Plan published	M	Published on website already			Done
	Annual Report published	D	14/15 published but none for 15/16		Peer review suggested a statement on website re lack of 15/16 report	Head of Comms
	Annual accounts – AF must state how and when accounts are published	M	Unclear on website – short version available via Companies House only.		To consider whether to include more detail of management accounts on website.	
	Board papers to be uploaded prior to Board meetings	D	To trial		To trial	Head of Comms
	Now must set out circumstances under which the Accountable Body would not comply with a LEP decision and the process for resolving conflict	M	Included within Decision Making			

	Framework to include details of rules governing arrangements for overseeing Growth Hubs, Enterprise Zones and City Deals where appropriate	M	In place – need to review		Add appendices / info on website re ToR for these arrangements	
	Freedom of Information Policy Published	D	In place – review for consistency other LEPs and in light of closer working with Combined Authority			
	Complaints Policy published	D	In place on Website			
	<b>Ensuring VFM</b>					
	Funding decisions must be made on impartial advice	M	In place – use of Independent Assessor – check applicable throughout all subgroups			
	Active management of risk	M	In place – ensure regular reporting to board across all funding			
	LEP must identify a named individual responsible for Value for Money and a named individual responsible for scrutiny of recommendations relating to each business case	D	Exec Director Finance & Operations		Need to clarify process and practice for review of VFM and scrutiny of business cases	
	Check new sections re monitoring & evaluation and new appendix A and B	D	Check if reflective of the considerations in Appendices to guidance			
	<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>					
	M&E plan – programme and project level Sharing of best practice	D	Senior team to review			

## Item 5: Taking forward GCGP's Governance Review

### For decision:

1. For the Board to agree the proposed Governance Review of the LEP to be carried out by independent lawyers as per the specification below.

### Governance Review: GCGP LEP

Following on from the last Board meeting, the LEP Executive has approached three independent law firms (that do not act for the LEP on day to day LEP legal matters) to undertake a potential governance review of the LEP in light of the new Assurance Framework.

We approached three firms (Buckles, Mills & Reeve, and Taylors Vinters) with the following brief:

- Review the current Mem & Arts to see if they are still fit for purpose
- Review our current Governance arrangements in the light of the new BEIS Assurance Framework
- Review and provide suggestions where required for how to best handle any potential conflicts of interest, and how we can define a 'conflict of interest' in the terms of the LEP
- Updating the Financial Scheme of Delegation to reflect the new Executive Director for Finance & Operations at the LEP

We requested that this work is carried out as a desk top review, looking at all relevant documents in the light of the new BEIS Assurance Framework, including individual meeting and decision making structures and arrangements. High-level issues will be flagged as soon as possible, with a detailed Governance Report on the basis of the information provided, including any recommendations for action for the Board to consider.

After assessing the responses, we believe that both Buckles and Mills & Reeve have potential conflicts of interest due to roles that senior members of their team hold. Taylor Vinters also have a particular specialism of working with organisations who receive significant amounts of Government funding, but are not technically public sector organisations.

On this basis, we would therefore recommend that the following work is undertaken by Taylor Vinters. The fee for this work is estimated at between £5,000 and £7,000 excluding VAT.

**Item 6: Minutes from Board Meeting held on 17 January 2017**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE GREATER CAMBRIDGE GREATER PETERBOROUGH  
ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP BOARD OF DIRECTORS HELD IN ALCONBURY WEALD  
ON TUESDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2017**

Present: Mark Reeve (Chairman)  
Peter Abel  
John Bridge  
Cllr Steve Count  
Trevor Ellis  
Terry Elphick  
David Gill  
Claire Higgins  
Cllr John Holdich  
Cllr Robin Howe  
Prof Iain Martin  
Mark Read  
Cllr James Waters

In attendance: Neil Darwin – Chief Executive GCGP  
Laura Welham-Halstead – GCGP  
Adrian Cannard - GCGP  
Michael Tolond – Company Secretary  
Pete Northover – BIS  
Steve Bowyer - Opportunity Peterborough

Guests: Neil Gibson – Bucks County Council (for Minute No 2017/03)  
Martin Tugwell – Bucks County Council (for Minute No 2017/03)  
Rob Shaw – Director LDA Design (for Minute No 2017/05)  
Peter Tyler – Director LDA Design (for Minute No 2017/05)  
Dr Ying Jin – University of Cambridge (for Minute No 2017/07)  
Matthew Bullock – University of Cambridge (for Minute No 2017/07)

MINUTE NO.		ACTION
2017/01	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were received from the following Board Members; Steve Elsom, and Cllr Terry King and Graham Hughes, Board Advisor.	

	The resignations of Cllr Terry King and Nigel Slater as Directors were noted.	
2017/02	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>Prof Iain Martin declared an interest in respect of item 6 in his capacity as a member of Cambridge Ahead and David Gill declared his interest also due to his previous participation in discussions on the issues covered.</p> <p>With the Chair's agreement, Cllr Steve Count circulated an open letter to Board members relating to Declarations of Interest and proposed that the Board pass 3 resolutions in respect of the company's Register of Interests and corporate governance procedures. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Holdich. The paper had not been discussed with the Chair or Executive prior to its circulation.</p> <p>These issues had arisen following comments made publicly by the MP for North East Cambridgeshire Steve Barclay in relation to the LEPs activities in Fenland and wider LEP area. These would be circulated to Board members.</p> <p>After due discussion, and in line with previous issued guidance from Government it was agreed by the Board that a full register of interests would be published by the LEP on its website by the end of January, it was noted that Government advice has asked all LEPs to adhere to the new Assurance Framework the by end of February.</p> <p>Following discussion regarding potential conflicts, Cllr Count was requested to provide the Board with examples of corporate governance issues which could affect the LEP's activities.</p> <p>The Board agreed that the LEP's corporate governance should be reviewed externally subject to any specific issues being identified and reported to the LEP Executive and the new standards for LEPs being introduced by the Government during February 2017. The Executive would seek external support for this work and seek confirmation from the Board to appoint support.</p> <p>The Board also discussed concerns regarding the geography of the LEP in light of the new Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and comments from Mr Barclay MP. It was confirmed by the Chair that GCGP as a Local Economic Partnership represented the true an economic footprint of the area, approved by Government in 2011, would therefore be retaining its current boundaries. It would ensure that it worked closely with the Combined Authority to ensure alignment and prioritisation where necessary.</p> <p>Cllr Steve Count recorded his disappointment that governance issues which he had previously raised had not been dealt with by the Board and Executive.</p>	<p><b>ND</b></p> <p><b>SC</b></p> <p><b>ND</b></p>
2017/03	<b>HEARTLANDS UPDATE</b>	

	<p>Neil Gibson and Martin Tugwell presented their strategic alliance, the strategic transport forum, their key immediate priorities, their challenges and the need for a strong, co-ordinated strategic voice representing the Heartland area.</p> <p>Mark Reeve on behalf of the LEP requested the Heartlands representatives to inform GCGP how the Heartlands propositions would complement the current LEP infrastructure plans and strategy.</p> <p>It was agreed that the LEP Executive would provide more detail to Heartlands to identify any potential benefits to GCGP.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2017/04	<p><b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE UPDATE</b></p> <p>Neil Darwin reported that he would circulate electronically two requests for decisions by the Board a Commercial Support Grant for the Cambridge Compass Enterprise Zones and a Website Tender.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2017/05	<p><b>DEFERRAL OF AGENDA ITEMS</b></p> <p>In view of time constraints within the meeting the Chairman proposed and it was agreed that discussion of agenda items 5 – Growth Deal Update, 7 – Strengthening Inward Investment and Innovation Support, and 8 – Agri-Tech Extension Approval and Support Initiative would be deferred until the next meeting.</p>	
2017/06	<p><b>PROGRESS ON THE STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN (SEP)</b></p> <p>Rob Shaw, Director of LDA Design, introduced the progress to date on the SEP including the socio-economic data, growth and infrastructure provision, environmental and physical constraints on economic growth.</p> <p>The second stage of the project would involve focus on engaging with the breadth of interested parties who are seeking to contribute to the SEP and identifying a set of priority investments and opportunities.</p> <p>Cllr Count expressed his concerns regarding the work completed to date by LDA Design and the data used in supporting the economic plan data that had been produced to date. It was agreed that all stakeholders would be fully engaged and consulted to ensure that the data was completely validated and relevant. An update on the SEP would be provided at the March Board meeting.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2017/07	<p><b>MODELLING LAND USE AND TRANSPORT SCENARIOS</b></p> <p>Dr Ying Jin and Matthew Bullock of Cambridge University presented details of their work on the futures relevant to the Cambridge city region and the testing of land use and transport scenarios during the period 2017-2050. This covered a review of the previous modelling work for Cambridge Futures and how these applications could be used locally based on the results of the modelling work.</p> <p>The outline of the plan for modelling which could be used in the GCGP area was presented including the use of traffic/speeds data, house price and rents data, the</p>	

	<p>proposed timeline of land use and transport scenario tests. This would produce a wide range of coherent scenarios for debate and to support the business case for major investments.</p> <p>It was agreed that the approach taken within the project would be a useful addition to the LEP Strategic Economic Plan on the basis of it covering the whole LEP area. The full cost of the project would be evaluated by the Executive and submitted to the Board for approval, taking account of any existing work currently underway with local authorities.</p>	<b>ND</b>
2017/08	<p><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2016 were approved and the matters arising were noted as being actioned or being prepared for future meetings. Details of the Conservative Party candidates for the forthcoming Mayoral election in May were reported.</p>	
2017/09	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There was none.</p>	
2017/10	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>The date of the next meeting was fixed for Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 3pm at Alconbury Weald Enterprise Campus.</p>	