

ABERDEEN PROSPERS COMMUNITY PLANNING ABERDEEN

Note of meeting, 6th November 2017

	In attendance	Apologies
	<p>Matt Lockley (ML), Aberdeen City Council, Economic Development (temp chair) Duncan Abernethy (DA), NESCOL Jamie Bell (JB), Scottish Enterprise Mark Bremner (MBr), Aberdeen City Council, Cultural Policy and Partnerships Linda Buchanan (LB), Aberdeen City Council, Lifelong Learning Jamie Coventry (JC), Aberdeen City Council, Economic Development Allison Carrington (AC), Skills Development Scotland Joyce Duncan (JD), ACVO Kirsty Jarman (KJ), Department for Work and Pensions Lori Manson (LoM), Aberdeen City Council, Economic Development (item 3) Lavina Massie (LaM), Aberdeen Civic Forum Jonathan Smith (JS), Aberdeen Civic Forum Roz Taylor (RT), Elevator – Business Gateway</p>	<p>Richard Sweetnam (RS), Aberdeen City Council, Economic Development, Chair Michelle Cochlan, Aberdeen City Council, Community Planning Duncan Cockburn, RGU and Cultural Network Nicola Graham, SDS Derick Murray (DM), NESTRANS Mark McEwan (MM), NHS Grampian Paul Tytler (PT), Aberdeen City Council, Localities</p>
	Item	Action points
1	<p>Welcome and introductions</p> <p>ML welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular Lavina and Jonathan representing the Aberdeen Civic Forum. Apologies and substitutes were noted (as above).</p> <p>LaM asked why Aberdeen Prospers' membership did not include key business organisations such as Opportunity North East, Aberdeen and Grampian Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses.</p>	<p><i>AP29 – ML to discuss with Chair</i></p>

<p>2</p>	<p>Notes of last meeting, actions</p> <p>ML apologised that the notes of the last meeting had not been circulated. They will be sent out shortly for approval at the next meeting. The updated action log had been circulated though and ML ran through it, focussing on the actions that weren't yet complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP3 – action/delivery plan – on agenda • AP11 – improvement activity – on agenda • AP12 – Regional Skills Strategy and Action Plan and AP20 – DYW/IIYP – schedule for January meeting • AP13 – short meeting to discuss skills shortage indicator – pending • AP22 – community benefits – on agenda. Consideration to be given to section 75 as future agenda item • AP24 – enterprise in localities pilot – on agenda • AP25 – map of regional partnerships – circulate ahead of January meeting • AP27 – economic footprint – further work required 	<p><i>AP30 – ML circulate notes of 22 Aug</i></p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Community Benefits – presentation by Lori Manson</p> <p>LoM presented on Community Benefits, giving a background to the legislative context, the implications for public sector bodies when procuring works, goods and services and the work that has been done to date within Aberdeen City Council to establish a Community Benefits programme. LoM also gave an update on the Harbour Board project and the benefits that have been delivered as part of that project by the main contractor, Dragados. Whilst this project is not technically covered by Community Benefits legislation, it provides a good example of what can be delivered.</p> <p>Group discussion focussed on the following key points:</p>	<p><i>Presentation circulated with these notes. AP31 – group to contact Lori directly with any further thoughts</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are communities and neighbourhoods able to influence the content of Community Benefit initiatives? How can their needs be met? How well publicised are Community Benefits so that local groups can apply for support? • Noted the key role of ACVO and the Civic Forum in promoting the availability of Community Benefits and the wider positive impact that this could have on perceptions of major projects • The renewed focus on the Place Standard Tool through the Community Engagement Group might offer a means of greater influence / communications • Care needed with benefits such as TimeBank – some smaller community groups or projects may not have the time or capacity to bid in for this. KJ noted that some work was ongoing to encourage smaller groups to collaborate and bid jointly for support • How are Community Benefit agreements managed? Is there scope for contractors to default on their agreements and pay a financial penalty instead? LoM recognised that active management of Community Benefit agreements by the contracting officer was essential and that yes, in some cases financial penalties do apply • JS said that health and social care commissioning through the Integrated Joint Board should be a priority as this could run into the £tens of millions in the coming years • Further work is required to capture Community Benefit activity from the wider public sector – a potential role for Aberdeen Prospers would be to oversee this 	<p><i>AP32 – Michelle Cochlan to consider how this could be facilitated</i></p> <p><i>AP33 – ACC/LoM to discuss with IJB</i></p> <p><i>AP34 – schedule update for Nov 2018</i></p>
4	<p>Annual Outcome Improvement Report / Delivery Plan</p> <p>ML ran through the Annual Outcome Improvement Report which had been tabled at the Community Planning Management Group last week and would be considered by the Community Planning Board at its next meeting on 4th December. JB fed back that there is an opportunity for further input from the</p>	

group on the content. JC offered to collate feedback from the group as he is already working on tightening up some of the indicators and making sure that the numbers are correct.

Discussion focussed on the fact that many of the indicators listed are either of limited direct relevance to Aberdeen Prospers and / or are indicators that the group cannot feasibly influence. It was agreed that if there is the opportunity to change some of these or bring them together under more meaningful outcome measures, this should be taken.

For example, indicators relating to passenger numbers at the airport and footfall in the city centre provide important statistical context but for the Aberdeen Prospers group, there are limited ways in which any influence can be brought to bear on performance against these indicators. The focus for Aberdeen Prospers should be on what increased passenger numbers or footfall could drive in terms of increased income for retailers, more and better paid jobs for local people etc.

In terms of the indicators relating to investment land and sites, again it was recognised that this is important background information but that the focus should be on what Aberdeen Prospers can do as a group to support investment propositions in the city (i.e. embedding a cultural perspective) and on ensuring that new investment projects deliver more and better paid jobs.

Feedback from the CPA Management Group last week is that the Outcome Improvement Groups should have more focus on key challenges and that their focus should have, as a core principle, those priorities where partnership action is required to affect improvement.

The group agreed that some of the indicators should be changed or removed as they are not relevant for Aberdeen Prospers and / or have limited direct economic impact. These are:

AP35 – all to get back to JC with comments / proposed amendments – by 17 November

AP36 – JC/ML/JB to look at refresh of outcomes for Aberdeen Prospers to ensure more direct relevance

AP37 – CP Manager to be advised

- Educational attainment at NVQ4 and above of resident population – **change to SVQ4**
- % of people cycling as main mode of travel - **remove**
- Satisfaction levels with the city's green spaces - **remove**
- % of people accessing the city centre using travel other than car - **remove**
- Number of inward trade delegations supported by ACC* - **change to supported by partnership(s)**

Queries were also raised about the housebuilding indicators and whether these should sit with Aberdeen Prospers or the Sustainable City group. If the latter, then they should be removed from Aberdeen Prospers' remit.

Following this discussion, ML introduced the draft delivery plan for 2017-19 that he had pulled together on behalf of Aberdeen Prospers. It attempts to address some of the issues raised in the previous discussion by giving some focus to the work of the group. The 5 key priorities listed are:

- Economic footprint
- Gap reduction in localities
- Skills shortages
- Investor readiness
- Transport access to / around airport and new arena

It was agreed that with the exception of the transport priority, which would need further consideration with Nestrans, the priorities for improvement look about right. JD mentioned the potential to add a further priority around commercialisation of the research and innovation coming out of the universities. Group members were asked to feed back anything specific to ML by the end of November, with a view to having the delivery plan signed off before the end of the year.

AP38 – CP Manager to advise

AP39 – all to review delivery plan proposals and feed back to ML by end Nov

5

Local Business Gateway pilot - feedback

RT updated the group on the Local Business Gateway pilot that had been developed over the summer and run in September in three different community venues in Mastrick, Northfield and Cummings Park. The improvement activity had been deliberately designed to test out whether different venues and timings of the events would have an impact in terms of their success. The events were widely promoted throughout the local areas, on social media and partner websites and through Elevator's extensive networks. Partners in Jobcentre Plus were on hand at each of the events to offer advice on the New Enterprise Allowance and also on any benefit implications of starting up a business.

The events were poorly attended, with only two people attending across all three events. RT said that whilst this was obviously disappointing, there were lessons to be learned that could inform future local delivery proposals. Firstly, and entirely outwith the control of Elevator, the weather was particularly bad at the time of the events in September. Secondly, there is potentially an issue with perception and people in localities not wishing to be seen to be engaging with support services by their friends and neighbours. Thirdly, the issue of childcare provision was raised although RT pointed out that this hadn't been requested by the locality teams.

RT also pointed out that the three localities do already have a healthy direct take-up of Business Gateway services.

Going forward, it was suggested that:

- Stand-alone events should be avoided (due to disproportionate resource implications for Elevator / JCP) but that enterprise should be factored in to wider community events
- All partners should take an action to understand and publicise the availability of Business Gateway services (i.e. through NESCOL, the

	<p>NHS, Council locality teams). RT to provide promotional information, where required, and has offered to meet partners' teams to bring them up-to-speed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with the Developing the Young Workforce programme and schools should be a priority. RT noted that in the recent Making it Happen conference, only one school had signed up for the enterprise challenge • Further opportunities to promote enterprise should be identified and shared with RT (see AOCB / Linda below) 	<p><i>AP40 – RT/PT to factor these suggestions into final review of the improvement pilot</i></p>
6	<p>One-stop employability shop</p> <p>ML updated group members on progress with the proposed one-stop employability shop. A visit is scheduled for Friday and after that partners will be asked to formalise their commitment. The current model has Instant Neighbour as the main leaseholder, with Aberdeen City Council taking a sub-lease and having licenses with partners for their space / contributions. The primary objectives are to improve access to employability services, deliver more effective partnership working and sign-posting for customers and ultimately increased and better sustained job outcomes by offering a more coherent package of services.</p> <p>JD raised concerns about whether this would displace services in localities and therefore mean less access for those people who couldn't afford to or were unable to travel in to town. In addition, the length of the initial lease (5 years) was flagged as a potential issue. Finally, JD asked whether appropriate surveys had been undertaken to support the proposal.</p> <p>ML responded that these concerns were noted and were being considered as part of the project development phase.</p>	
7	<p>Economic footprint</p> <p>The meeting closed at this point. However an outstanding action is for an</p>	<p><i>AP41 – ML to circulate further details</i></p>

	<p>economic footprint of the Community Planning Partnership to be undertaken, following the Scottish Government / Improvement Service template. This could then drive a separate improvement plan across Community Planning Aberdeen.</p>	<p><i>to public sector partners. Schedule update for Jan 2018 meeting</i></p>
8	<p>AOCB</p> <p>LB mentioned that a conference for head and senior lead teachers was being planned for February 2018 and that there would be an opportunity for Elevator to present on enterprise activity and Business Gateway services.</p> <p>Date of next meeting: <u>18th January 2018, 14:00, venue TBC</u></p>	<p><i>AP42 – LB to forward details to RT</i></p>