

Minutes of RGF Green Port Growth Programme Board Meeting

5.00pm, Wednesday 9th November, 2016

Present: Scott Yates (SY) Chair, Alan Menzies (AM), David West (DW), Katy Swaby (KS), Scott Yates (SY), Paul Bell (PB), Bill Walker (BW), Deb Gray (DG).

In attendance: Sarah Clark (SC), Stacey Middlewood (SM) minutes.

NB Some sections of these minutes have been removed due to commercial sensitivity.

1	Apologies	Action
1.1	<p>Apologies were received from Tim Rix (TR), Mark Jones (MJ) Simon Brett (SB), Eleanor Carter (EC) DCLG. Deb Gray (DG) attended as the Hull City Council representative deputising for Mark Jones.</p> <p>The meeting was not quorate and therefore any decisions made will be approved after the meeting.</p>	
2	Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising	
2.1	The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting. All action points had been delivered or are on the agenda for this meeting.	
3	Declarations of interest	
3.1	Declarations of interest were declared by KS and DG for agenda item 5.	
4	Investment update – Siemens and ABP, update on other potential investments	
4.2	AM confirmed that the official opening of the Siemens Blade Factory Site is the 1 st December.	
5	Business Grant applications	
5.1	KS declared an interest in item 5 as a Director of the Enviromail grant application. KS did not receive sight of any of the grant applications circulated prior to the meeting and was asked to step out of the meeting for the duration of all agenda item 5 grant application discussions.	
5.2	DG declared an interest in the same project, Hull City Council being the land owner of the Enviromail site being purchased. As a non-direct beneficiary of any grant application received, DG was permitted to stay in the room during discussions.	
5.3	<p>Enviromail</p> <p>Board members agreed that there were no perceived issues with this project and grant request, in terms of the RGF outputs delivered in comparison to the grant award request it was deemed good value for money.</p> <p>Decision: The board approved this project.</p>	

5.4	<p>Glenair</p> <p>The Board agreed that this project presented good value for money and again no issues where raised.</p> <p>Decision: The board approved this project.</p>	
5.5	<p>Sondia Lighting</p> <p>The Board discussed potential issues that had been raised prior to the board meeting.</p> <p>The Board agreed that with the information they had received the project proposed good value for money and acknowledged that the location of the new premises did not pose a problem to any other funded project. It was also suggested that as with any grant contract should the company move out of the area within a specific time period, there would be clauses included to safeguard the RGF and that the parent company would act as guarantor in respect of this.</p> <p>Decision: The board approved this project.</p> <p>Action: SC to feedback to Business Grant Lead, Richard Lowther.</p>	SC
6	<p>Critical Year 5 Quarter 2 expenditure update</p>	
6.2	<p>In terms of the funds that had received Board approval, SC requested that the Individual Board Members consider how they can support and influence greater efficiency of spend in the organisations they represent.</p>	All to Note
6.6	<p>The Individual Board Members were also asked by SC to consider how the development of additional and supplementary projects could be brought forward, that project ideas should be discussed with her to see how they might fit within the objectives of the Programme.</p> <p>Decision: The board agreed that they would consider the points made.</p> <p>Action: Board members to encourage new eligible project ideas to come forward.</p>	All to Note ALL
6.7	<p>Board members to ensure that those projects approved are proceeding as a matter of priority and urgency to ensure full delivery of their contracts.</p>	AM MJ BW
7	<p>Strand update report highlights, recommendations</p>	
7.1	<p>SC was asked to give an overview of the key messages included in the strand report. SC reported that the supply chain activities were extremely active. The GPH Hub has delivered a number of well attended events including a WiME and Careers Advisors event and the pace of visitors requesting support continues to grow. This is in addition to the Siemens recruitment rounds.</p>	

7.2	BW raised a number of points regarding the development of the 'Training Hub' for the renewables sector. The Board agreed that it did not wish to reinvent the wheel, it acknowledged that the GPGP programme needed to move this agenda forward in line with its own timeline.	
7.3	There was a discussion about the Green Port Hull logo being branded 'Hull'. Board members felt strongly that this was the correct branding for the project given that Hull is the City of the East Riding and Humber geographical areas. Decision: BW to feed back to PH (Phil Hall)	BW
7.4	KS noted that it is confusing for businesses working in the field to know who and which organisations represent what activity and funding and which entities are working with GPH. SC confirmed any GPH funded activity would be clearly branded and asked KS to forward a recent invite KS had received to SC for review. KS enquired as to who was involved in investigating solutions for the electrical rewind company as she was aware of other organisations who may benefit. SC confirmed Dawn Hall business support strand lead was leading and that any contacts should be passed on to Dawn.	KS
8	DCLG/BIS Update	
8.1	In EC absence there was no DCLG / BIS update.	
9	AOB	
9.1	PB noted that the business support strand had organised a Christmas networking event for businesses at the Willerby Manor Hotel on Wednesday 14 th December.	All to Note
	Meeting closed at 5.40pm	
12	Date and time of next meeting: 5pm, Wednesday 14 th December 2016, Room 1, County Hall, Beverley.	