# Brilliant Barrow Board

## Thursday 23 September 2021, 11:30am – 1:00pm

| Item | Agenda Item | Time | P/R/V* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Opening comments from Chair | 11:30 | V |
| 2 | Apologies for absence | 11:35 | V |
| 3 | Declarations of interest | 11:40 | V |
| 4 | Matters arising not covered in agenda | 11:45 | V |
| 5 | Minutes of last meeting | 11:50 | R |
| 6 | Business Case Assurance Update | 11:55 | R |
| 7 | Programme Management and Early Spend | 12:05 | R |
| 8 | Programme and Risk Update | 12:20 | R |
| 9 | Communications Update | 12:30 | P |
| 10 | Levelling Up and Community Renewal Fund | 12:40 | V |
| 11 | AOB | 12:50 | V |

* Presentation / Report / Verbal

# BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD

Meeting: Friday, 16th July, 2021
at 10.00 a.m. (Virtual Meeting)

PRESENT:

Steve Cole – Chair (BAE Systems), Cllr Ann Thomson – Vice Chair (Barrow BC), Michael Barry (Cumbria CC), Cllr Anne Burns (Cumbria CC), Chris Clouter (ABP), Steph Cordon (Barrow BC), Simon Fell (MP), Janet Garner (BAE Systems), Tracey Ingham (Cumbria CC), Geoff Jolliffe (NHS), Jo Lappin (Cumbria LEP), Neil McCulloch (Spirit Energy), Brittany Mason (BEIS), Julie Mennell (University of Cumbria), Lauren Newby (Hatch Regeneris), Duncan Nicholson (National Lottery), Nicola Parker (Cumbria CC), Sam Plum (Barrow BC), Daniel Tyler-McTighe (Barra Culture) and Andrew Wren (Furness College).

Sharron Rushton – Minute Taker (BBC)

| ITEM | ACTION |
|---|---|
| **1 – Opening Comments from Chair**<br><br>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced new members to the Board. He thanked all concerned for the progress made over the period and the comprehensive pack put together for today's meeting. He stated that it was important that all were well sighted on how to move forward with final submissions for business cases and the appraisal process. It was essential that the Board were comfortable with the governance assurance and progress leading to high quality recommendations.<br><br>**2– Apologies**<br><br>Apologies for absence had been received from Suzanne Caldwell (Cumbria Chamber of Commerce), Ali Greenhalgh (Cumbria CVS), Alison Hatcher (Cumbria CC), Elaine Herbert (DWP), Paul Hodgson (Barrow BID) and Carla Passerello (DWP).<br><br>**3 – Declarations of Interest**<br><br>The Chair noted that each member of the Board had interests in matters pertaining to their respective organisations and that it was not necessary for these to be repeated at every meeting as these had been recorded in the register of interests. Jo Lappin declared an interest in the Business and Enterprise Project and Councillor Burns declared an interest in any item related to Cumbria County Council. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
|---|---|
| **4 – Matters Arising not covered elsewhere on the Agenda**<br><br>There had been no matters arising, not covered elsewhere on the Agenda.<br><br>**5 – Minutes of the Last Meeting**<br><br>The minutes of the meeting held on 21st May, 2021 were agreed as a correct record.<br><br>**6 – Assurance Framework Update**<br><br>Steph Cordon reported that the draft Assurance Framework and Terms of Reference had been presented to the Brilliant Barrow Board at its last meeting on 21st May, 2021. This was subsequently approved at the Executive Committee in June 2021. The final versions were attached as appendices to the report.<br><br>She advised that the Council, as accountable body, were comfortable that the framework and processes were in place for the next important stage of business case appraisals.<br><br>Members unanimously approved the Assurance Framework and Terms of Reference and agreed to sign into ways of working to form the basis of critically how the Board move forward with the business case assessments.<br><br>Steph Cordon agreed to speak to Alysha Moore regarding appointing a representative on Brilliant Barrow Board from Future's Board.<br><br>Regarding the assurance framework and process mapping, Julie Mennell asked if the Board would be looking to be more explicit in terms of in terms of timescales for decisions to be made and communicated as this would be really important in how projects were managed and progressed.<br><br>The Chair advised that the framework was the definition of how the Board go about the activities for the projects and he requested Michael Barry to assemble key dates and associate to key steps in the process for the assurance framework.<br><br>Daniel Tyler McTighe requested the Membership be updated to reflect that he was now the representative for Barra Culture.<br><br>RESOLVED: (i) To endorse the Assurance Framework and Terms of Reference | Steph Cordon/ Alysha Moore<br><br>Michael Barry |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| (ii) To agree to appoint a new representative on Brilliant Barrow Board from Future's Board<br><br>(iii) To assemble key dates and associate to key steps in process for the assurance framework<br><br>(iv) To update Membership<br><br>**7– Business Case Assurance and Risk**<br><br><u>Business Case Assurance</u><br><br>Michael Barry advised that following the Heads of Terms agreement there was a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to MHCLG for consideration. MHCLG needed to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document prior to funding being released.<br><br>To enable submission of the Town Deal Summary document to MHCLG in November, 2021, the high level programme for the business case phase of the Town Deal included the following key stages:<br><br>• Business case development support in place – February<br>• Project development governance structures in place – March<br>• Project development technical support in place – April<br>• Draft business cases submitted for initial review – May<br>• Final business cases submitted for project assurance – July/August<br>• Project assurance process complete – September/October<br>• Board consideration of project assurance – October<br>• Submission of town Deal Summary document – November<br><br>Progress remained broadly in line with the high level programme and work continued to monitor and support activities of each Project Delivery Body.<br><br>A timetable had been agreed for the submission of business cases into the assurance process. A submission window had been identified, which allowed sufficient time for completion of the process within the overall programme.<br><br>The agreed dates for each project business cases were mapped against the agreed submission window. Dates were reflective of the current level of development of each business case and some room for flexibility remained, including earlier submissions were possible, to | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| ensure a managed flow of submission over the period. The submission of business cases reflected the technical considerations required to conclude their development.<br><br>A draft work programme had been developed and tested with MHCLG. In broad terms the work programme consisted of:<br><br>• Receipt of business cases and initial assessment<br>• Detailed assessment – 'Green Book' compliant<br>• Accountable Body Legal and Finance input<br>• Agreement of assessment reports – including conditions as appropriate<br>• Consideration of assured business cases by the Brilliant Barrow Board<br>• Approval of the assured business cases through Accountable Body governance<br>• Submission of the Town Deal Summary Document to MHCLG<br><br>The full draft programme was attached as an appendix to the report.<br><br><u>Business Case Development and Assurance – Risk Management</u><br><br>Michael Barry advised that a Programme Risk Register was maintained which identified key risks to the development and assurance programme and how these were being managed.<br><br>The Programme Risk Register was attached as an appendix to the report.<br><br>The risk register identified the key programme level risks with potential to impact on the development of final project business cases, the project assurance process and ultimately the submission, and subsequent MHCLG approval of the Town Deal Summary Document.<br><br>The key risks revolved around the work of Project Delivery Bodies and the inputs required to complete business cases and meet the requirements set out in the Government's Green Book. Supporting this were the interactions between the Accountable Body, Project Delivery Bodies and Government. In addition, external factors such as the requirements for statutory permissions, match funding contributions and the ongoing impacts of Covid 19 were addressed.<br><br>Each Project Delivery Body was responsible for maintaining an appropriate project level risk register for their respective projects. At present, each category of risk was presented at programme level, | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| however as work continued to monitor and support the development of business cases, specific project level risks within these categories may be escalated and added to the Programme Risk Register, where this was considered appropriate.<br><br>Currently, no specific project risks had been assessed as requiring escalation onto the Programme Risk Register. A report highlighting the key development risks identified for each project case was attached to the report as an appendix.<br><br>The Chair stated that it would be useful to see where the Board interacted with the schedule and requested that an overlay on the programme schedule be provided.<br><br>Julie Mennell suggested further thought should be given to the continued capacity of the accountable body to oversee and deliver the Town Deal as she felt that sufficient consideration had not been given.<br><br>Michael Barry advised that, in terms of this year, clear mechanisms were in place and there was a service level agreement between Barrow Borough Council and Cumbria County Council, however, there would be challenges for future years.<br><br>Sam Plum stated that getting business cases in on time was fantastic and the next stage would be receiving the money and allocating the spending over a four year period. She reported that as the accountable body, there would be a monitoring and evaluation framework, however, it was unsure what this would look like at this moment in time. She stated it would be a big task to take on the role without additional resources and no additional funding and does raise the concerns whenever possible.<br><br>The Chair stated that, as a Board, assurance was required to resource and deliver projects and he offered to write support letters escalating the importance, when appropriate. He also suggested that Board members considered deploying their own current resources to offer support where possible.<br><br>Julie Mennell also questioned what the basis of additional conditions in terms of projects the accountable body could make.<br><br>Michael Barry advised that the accountable body would manage its own risks and may want to include additional checks, eg, legal status, financial recording, etc, to ensure the projects were not putting the business at an unacceptable risk. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
|---|---|
| Jo Lappin raised concern regarding the significant omission of the Local Government Reorganisation. She stated that, as a consequence of Cumbria being the only place in the Country that had had four options then the development of underpinning the work would be in a difference place and the announcement could prove to be a huge distraction.<br><br>The Chair stated that it would be important for the risk register to capture all the risks and mitigations going forward, particularly through the transition period which could be disruptive. Steph Cordon and Michael Barry agreed to review the risk register.<br><br>Andrew Wren requested an update on the decision regarding the learning quarter. Councillor Thomson advised that the decision had been delayed until Wednesday 21st July, 2021.<br><br>Andrew Wren also advised that the project had got through to the final stage for match funding from the education and schools funding agency. A final decision would be made later in the year.<br><br>The Chair stated that it was essential to identify opportunities that were available as well as risks and agreed to discuss developing an opportunities register at the next Board meeting.<br><br>RESOLVED: (i) To agree the schedule<br><br>(ii) To provide an overlay on the programme schedule to see where the Board interacts<br><br>(iii) To review the risk register to include all risks and mitigations going forward<br><br>(iv) To develop an Opportunities Register<br><br>**8 – Business and Enterprise Support**<br><br>Jo Lappin updated the Board on the Barrow Business and Enterprise Support Programme. She updated on the following:<br><br>• Rationale for Investment<br>• Key Challenges<br>• Programme Objectives<br>• Programme Overview<br>• Support Strands<br>• Outputs and Outcomes<br>• Next Steps | Steph Cordon/ Michael Barry |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| The Business and Enterprise Support Project would:<br><br>• Assist residents, particularly from the most deprived communities in Barrow, to access good quality economic opportunities<br>• Enable SMEs in Barrow to become more competitive, resilient, expand and recover from the effects of Covid 19<br>• Create a strong on the ground presence to encourage enterprise in Barrow, working through the Communities Wellbeing Hubs<br><br>The project would deliver 4 schemes to support enterprise and business productivity in Barrow:<br><br>• Strand 1: A programme of enterprise stimulation and support for individuals<br>• Strand 2: A programme of stimulation and support for existing and new local community businesses and social enterprises<br>• Strand 3: Tailored support to help businesses access wider supply chain opportunities<br>• Strand 4: Tailored business support to enhance competitiveness<br><br>The project would aim to provide support to 696 businesses/individuals, offer intensive and in-depth support to 260, looking at competitive resilience with 120, assist 147 individuals to start a business, therefore, creating 147 full-time employment opportunities and looking at creating £1.7m net additional gva.<br><br>Timescales for delivery and key milestones include:<br><br>• Develop final draft FBC – Almost complete<br>• Soft Market Testing – Q3 2021/22<br>• Review BEIS business support objectives/core offer<br>• Tender Exercise Q4 2021/22<br>• Programme Launch – April 2022<br><br>Lauren Newby advised that following a meeting on Thursday, 15th July, 2021 slight amendments had been made and the figures had been presented in a slightly different way: a combined total of 962 enterprises; 534 enterprises receiving non-financial support and 428 potential entrepreneurs.<br><br>Subject to a final proof read the FBC would be submitted today. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| Geoff Joliffe asked if the project would be targeting at the most deprived communities as would be key in relation to health and employment prospects.<br><br>Lauren advised that the case for intervention was very important and the Community Well-Being Hub Project would be aimed to provide a venue offering support and targeting entrepreneurs and community businesses. Jo Lappin reiterated that targeting the most deprived communities was one of the priorities identified. She advised that from a LEP perspective they were rebooting the Future Campaign which was aimed at young people doing a wide range of jobs or established businesses and to promote entrepreneurism and business to these young people.<br><br>Sam Plum referred to the Prime Ministers update on the Levelling Up Funding and advised that direct correlation was made between health inequalities and the need to put funding in the most deprived areas of the Country. It was important to work with people living in poverty and do everything possible to look at social enterprise, skills development and access to good jobs etc.<br><br>Sam Plum also advised that the incoming Chief Executive for Cumbria County Council was the Chair of the Centre for Local Economic Strategy so was committed to community wealth building and working on social enterprise which was really positive.<br><br>Councillor Burns had attended a meeting with the ICC and discussions had included assisting elderly people admitted to hospital with necessities required. She stated that the impact on shops closing within the town centre had prevented people purchasing such items as they were unable to access internet shopping.<br><br>The Chair agreed that this was a critical point and it was important for the high street to have utility and value to support the most vulnerable.<br><br>Janet Garner offered supply chain elements support to LEP as the work would align with some of the internal work they were currently doing.<br><br>RESOLVED:- To note the updated information. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| **9 – Local Cycling and Walking**<br><br>Nicola Parker updated the Board on the Local Cycling and Walking Project. She advised that Cumbria County Council had an ambitious programme for improving cycling and walking infrastructure across the County and Barrow was one of six locations being developed.<br><br>The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) was a ten year plan to develop and deliver local walking and cycling plans within the County as well as looking at strategic corridors and the Barrow LCWIP was well on the way.<br><br>200 responses were received from a public consultation in May, 2021 which were feeding into the LCWIP.<br><br>A draft priority network plan for cycling Barrow was shown giving a comprehensive network for cycling within the town. There were a number of phases including:<br><br>• Michaelson Road/Bridge Road<br>• Abbey Road, Roose Road, Town Centre<br>• Abbey Road to Dalton in Furness<br>• Walney Island<br>• Other Schemes<br><br>The details for each scheme were verbally reported and visual displays had been provided.<br><br>As part of further opportunities for infrastructure two schemes were being looked at; the continuation of infrastructure into Dalton in Furness and providing a connection to Walney Island.<br><br>It was noted that the Government had set new standards regarding the expected cycle infrastructure moving forward and unless the schemes met these standards then funding would not be granted.<br><br>Lauren Newby advised on the next steps which included:<br><br>• Finalise concept designs and confirm cost estimates to inform Business Case<br>• Complete Business Case working with hatch<br>• CCC Governance<br>• Submission of Business Case by 13th August, 2021<br>• Business Case Assurance | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| • Use survey data to refine and complete designs to take forward to delivery<br><br>The Chair stated that the town would really benefit from the vital project and that there was a number of critical components to help with health, well-being and de-carbonising along with business connectivity and collaboration.<br><br>The Chair also requested the Board help with encouraging use and adoption and advised that BAE could integrate comprehensively with their schemes such as cycle to work. Janet Garner advised that BAE were heavily involved in the working group and would request feedback for the next Board meeting.<br><br>Nicola Parker advised that the Cumbria County Council's plan was focusing on the infrastructure component at the moment but were very much minded to look at behavioural change and encourage people to use the infrastructure.<br><br>The Chair raised a point of view regarding the logistics as he felt there was a piece missing regarding the layout. He stated that if the Board could identify a scheme to include a cycle/walk bridge from Marina Village onto the Buccleuch Dock then BAE would be prepared to put real estate aside which would create a loop around the town. He encouraged the Board to look into this further as it could be a critical piece of infrastructure for the town.<br><br>Sam Plum suggested sharing visuals etc widely of the schemes prior to submitting the full business case would be beneficial for both communications and engagement. She agreed that the phase linking Walney would be fantastic for residents to link to the Earnse Bay Centre.<br><br>Sam Plum also advised that Barrow Borough Council had signed up with a number of anchor institutes to work collaboratively looking at travel plans and how workforces could be encouraged to get to work in a healthier way. She urged other organisations to sign up to the anchor working.<br><br>Councillor Burns reported that Cumbria County Council had installed cycle maintenance stations in each ward and they were really well used. She discussed the possibility of including cycle libraries in the system to encourage young people to cycle.<br><br>RESOLVED:- To note the updated information. | Janet Garner |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| **10 – Business Case Development**<br><br>Michael Barry advised that since agreement of the Heads of Terms the focus of the activity had shifted to the preparation of full business cases for each project. The focus of activity now surrounded the finalisation of the business cases and their submission to the assurance process. Attached to the report was a summary of each of the cases in development. Business and Enterprise Support and Local Cycling and Water had been discussed as separate agenda items. Additional projects included:<br><br><u>Housing Market Renewal</u><br><br>Steph Cordon updated the Board on the Housing Market Renewal Project. The objective was to improve the housing offer in Barrow and create better conditions for its residents. This was a targeted high impact programme of renewal, piloting a series of upgrades to properties in need of refurbishment. The project would initially complete a programme of upgrades to homes and commercial properties in the Central area of Barrow (Rawlinson Street) as well as improving the quality of 279 homes in the Ferry Road Triangle, a deprived area with strong evidence of issues surround housing quality.<br><br>It was expected that the Business Case would be submitted on 23rd July, 2021.<br><br><u>Barrow Learning Quarter</u><br><br>Lauren Newby updated the Board on the Barrow Learning Quarter Project. The project would create new and improved centres of learning close to Barrow Town Centre. The project's objectives were to increase participation in higher education by Barrow residents and to improve the productivity of Barrow's workforce through higher-level skill acquisition.<br><br>It was expected that the Business Case would be submitted on 30th July, 2021.<br><br>Julie Mennell advised that the University Board were very supportive. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| Marina Village<br><br>Steph Cordon updated the Board on the Marina Village Project. The project would:<br><br>• Catalyse the regeneration of Barrow's waterfront area through the remediation of a large parcel of derelict industrial land and underutilised open space<br>• Revitalise the town centre through the provision of new high quality housing suitable for families and higher earning professionals at Barrow's major employers<br><br>The Town Deal funds would be directed towards the following activities:<br><br>• Assembling and clearing the remaining parcels of land on Marina Village that were not in Barrow Borough Council's control<br>• Initiating the planning process for the areas of the identified Marina Village site that were outside of the current planning application boundaries<br>• Assessing the feasibility for the relocation of the recycling depot located to the east of the site and brining it forward for redevelopment<br><br>It was noted that match funding sources already identified were:<br><br>• Cumbria LEP: £5.5m (Getting Building Fund)<br>• Brownfield Land Release Fund: £1.5m (awaiting decision)<br><br>It was expected that the Business Case would be submitted on 30th July, 2021.<br><br>Place Development<br><br>Steph Cordon updated the Board on the Place Development Project. The project would seek to remove key barriers to the successful delivery of cultural and heritage activity within Barrow. The projects investment objectives were:<br><br>• Build the profile of Barrow as a tourism destination<br>• Raise the profile of Barrow as an attractive place to live, work , study, invest and visit<br>• Enhance the culture and leisure offer to support quality of life and retain local spend | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| The project focused on Public Realm Improvements, Promotional activities and Planning and ongoing management of project delivery.<br><br>It was expected that the Business Case would be submitted on 6th August, 2021.<br><br><u>Community Hubs and Earnse Bay</u><br><br>Tracey Ingham updated the Board on the Community Hubs and Earnse Bay Project. The project was focused on developing a network of three locally based Community Wellbeing Hubs underpinned by a new Outdoor Centre at Earnse Bay.<br><br>The Community Hubs would support people in Barrow's most deprived areas to develop skills, access services and come together to build thriving communities. The Outdoor Centre would provide access for local communities to open spaces and outdoor education. The project objectives were:<br><br>• To put residents at the centre of public service delivery<br>• To reduce deprivation and improve the physical and mental health and well-being of our community<br>• To equip people with the skills and confidence to achieve their potential to take full advantage of opportunities.<br><br>It was expected that the Business Case would be submitted on 6th August, 2021.<br><br>RESOLVED:- To note the updated information.<br><br>**11 - Communication and Engagement**<br><br>Michael Barry provided a verbal update on the communications and engagement activity. He reported that strategic communications had been driven hard at a project level ensuring that the wider public were aware. There were plans for showcasing business cases in early August via social media and events. He advised that the Futures Board were looking to further embed the central support given to the group to ensure strong links were there.<br><br>The Chair advised that this year would be the 150 year celebrations of shipbuilding in Barrow so using the idea of past, present and future then there could be an opportunity to showcase the combination of the projects and get the engagement of the community. | |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| Janet Garner advised that she had distributed a high level brief earlier in the week regarding the 150 years celebrations and agreed that there would be opportunities to link events. Janet agreed to contact Sam Plum to discuss.<br><br>Sam Plum advised that there would be positive communications around the investments on Barrow Island in the coming weeks which would highlight how projects joined together, gaining enthusiasm around communities. She stated that the graphic for the new learning quarter looked fantastic and it would be important to show images to the public to gain positive energy.<br><br>RESOLVED: (i) To take forward discussions regarding showcasing projects<br><br>**12 – Levelling Up and Community Renewal Fund**<br><br>Lauren Newby provided a verbal update on the Levelling Up Fund Submission and the Community Renewal Fund Submission. She stated that should the bids be successful then they would maximise the impact of the Town Deal.<br><br>The Levelling Up Fund would drive investment into the town centre to facilitate an enhanced leisure, arts and culture offer and attract footfall and spend.<br><br>The Levelling Up Fund was submitted on 18th June, 2021 with a £16m ask focused around a revitalised Market Hall and a range of accessibility improvements. The objectives included:<br><br>• Transform the role and perception of Barrow through an enhanced leisure, arts and culture offer<br>• Diversify the town centre offer by creating a contemporary, attractive and exciting indoor destination to encourage footfall, dwell time and spend<br>• Establish gateway to the heart of the town centre and enhance linkages between civic, culture and retail uses<br><br>The outcome of the Levelling Up Fund was anticipated to be Autumn 2021 and funding needed to be spend by 31st March, 2024.<br><br>The Community Renewal Fund would provide valuable revenue to pilot new ways of working with target groups would could inform delivery in Town Deal Projects. | Janet Garner/ Sam Plum |

| ITEM | ACTION |
| --- | --- |
| The Community Renewal Fund bid was led by Barrow Borough Council and was submitted for Cumbria County Council appraisal in May, 2021 and following appraisal had been progressed to MHCLG for consideration. It was noted that other Community Review Fund bids may also deliver activity in Barrow. The outcome was imminent and the project would run from September, 2021 to March, 2022.<br><br>RESOLVED: To note the updated information.<br><br>**12 – Any Other Business**<br><br><u>Note of thanks</u><br><br>Councillor Thomson thanked everyone involved for all the hard work.<br><br>**13 – Date of Next Meeting**<br><br>The next meeting would be held in October, 2021. Details to follow.<br><br>The meeting closed at 12.10 pm. | |

Chat Script:

- *Jo Lappin*
  As an update, government has now confirmed that the additional £1.5m can be allocated to Marina Village, as foreshadowed at the last meeting

- *Simon Fell*
  Next Thursday in a written statement is what I'm being told

- *Lauren Newby*
  Alligned to career inspiration the business case recognises the importance of the Barrow Learning Quarter in facilitating entrepreneurship in young people

- *Geoff Jolliffe*
  We are aligning our Anchor Institute approach to support employment in these communities

- *Michael Barry*
  This drive to achieve alignment was core the approach taken in the Town Investment Plan

- *Jo Lappin*
  Helpful that gill also has direct LGR experience having worked on this in Cornwall

- *Chris Clouser*
  New cycling infrastructure looks great

- *Jo Lappin*
  One that hasn't got structural issues at the outset

- *Lauren Newby*
  If you could join the bike library initiative up with the cycling proficiency activity in schools that could work well

- *Michael Barry*
  The scheme is also important in terms of place and perception

- *Nicola Parker*
  Thank you everyone for your time and feedback. We will carry on with the approach set out and get the business case finished. Happy to share the presentation if that would be of use

- *Sam Plum*
  Potential social enterprise fixing and renting bikes to use on the new cycleways

- *Julie Mennell*
  Was signed off

- *Steve Cole*
  Great news Julie – well done

- *Sam Plum*
  Visual looks brilliant

- *Jo Lappin*
  Excellent news Julie

- *Councillor Burns*
  We are talking about that as the Barrow Domestic Appliance Team move into the Centenary Centre they are looking at taking some one on to do this as a social enterprise

- *Michael Barry*
  Further to the earlier conversation please note the ambition for bridge in dotted yellow line

- *Chris Clouter*
  I assume that everyone is aware of the plans for a footbridge which were developed back in 2006/07. There may be some useful detail in those designs that could be resurrected

- *Geoff Jolliffe*
  Not really the agenda for this meeting but can I say and ask for your support – please keep pushing vaccinations. We have thousands who have not turned up or declined. Can we encourage early testing – its readily available and despite relaxing of rules please encourage all. Infection, prevention and control measures so we all can enjoy the benefits this board aims for

- *Steve Cole*
  Great point Geoff – we will all get behind this of course, essential for our community and business resilience and safety

- *Andrew Wren*
  For info, the Cumbrian FE colleges have also submitted a CRF application to raise awareness of and access to skills training. This will also be a real benefit to Barrow, £500,000 and, like the CRF project Lauren has just described decision pending

| BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD | Agenda Item No. 6 |
|---|---|
| **Date of Meeting: 23 September 2021** | |
| **Reporting Officer: Lead Officer (Economic Programmes) – Cumbria CC** | |

## Title: Business Case Assurance Update

**Summary and Conclusions:**

The assurance process of Town Deal business cases is being undertaken in line with the agreed Local Assurance Framework and is in accordance with the Five Case Model. The key aim of the assurance process is to ensure the project is robust, deliverable, aligned to a clear case for intervention and represents good value for money.

Supporting the Programme Management Office (PMO) function, independent appraisers are currently in the process of completing a Green Book appraisal of the business cases to provide the required assurance, for review and approval by the Board and the Accountable Body.

Business cases for all seven schemes have been subject to an initial review and schemes are now at different stages in responding to detailed queries. In all cases, responses have been requested no later than 17 September. This is to allow for the appraisal to be completed, and to incorporate input from the Accountable Body's Legal and Finance functions before the outcome of the assurance is considered by the Board and the Accountable Body.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board:

1. Note the progress of the Business Case Assurance process.

## Report

### Background

As previously reported to the Board, following agreement of the Heads of Terms there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to MHCLG for consideration. MHCLG need to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

Business cases are not submitted to MHCLG and responsibility for ensuring business cases meet the required 'Green Book' standard lies with the local Accountable Body (Barrow Borough Council). The results of this local assurance process must be reflected in the Summary Document, which must be submitted to MHCLG within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

The assurance process is undertaken in line with the agreed Local Assurance Framework and is in accordance with the Five Case Model, which is the Government's best practice approach to developing proposals in a holistic way that optimises the public value produced using public resources.

The key aim of the assurance process is to ensure the project is robust, deliverable, aligned to a clear case for intervention and represents good value for money.

### Assurance Process

Supporting the PMO function independent appraisers from within Cumbria County Council's Economic Programmes (EP) team are currently in the process of completing a Green Book appraisal of the business cases.

The EP team has extensive experience of project appraisal, including accreditation in the Better Business Cases approach. Separation of duties has been established to ensure there is a clear distinction between the programme development and assurance functions, as laid out in the Local Assurance Framework.

The assurance process is also utilising expert economists, who have been procured to review the Economic case, and will include input from the Accountable Body's Legal and Finance functions.

The assurance process includes an initial review, with detailed queries then being raised with scheme promoters. Following consideration of these queries by the scheme promoters, responses are provided, with any relevant revisions being made to the business cases.

A final review will then be undertaken by the appraisers. Upon completion of this, an assurance report will be completed. This will include a clear recommendation, with summaries of each of the Five Cases and key risks

highlighted. Where possible, these risks will be mitigated by the recommendation of conditions to form part of the approval and contracting process. It will also highlight any project specific risks that should be escalated for inclusion on the Programme Risk Register.

This report, along with any supporting documentation that may be required, will then be made available to the Board to provide the required assurance, for review and approval by the Board and the Accountable Body.

**Programme**

All seven business cases were received by 16 August which was broadly in line with the draft work programme that has previously been shared. Initial reviews have taken place and following a detailed Green Book assessment, queries have been shared with scheme promoters in all cases. Schemes are now at different stages in responding to these queries. In all cases, responses have been requested no later than 17 September.

As noted under item 8, additional requirements and clarifications received from MHCLG, regarding programme management resource and programme cashflow, are expected to require varying degrees of re-working to project business cases, which in turn will extend the period required to conclude business case assurance. The date for responding to queries has not been amended however, as it is essential that existing queries are addressed prior to any amendments being agreed.

This will ensure sufficient time remains within the overall work programme for the final review to take place, and to incorporate input from the Accountable Body's Legal and Finance functions before the outcome of the assurance is considered by the Board and the Accountable Body.

**End.**

| BRILLIANT BARROW BOARD | Agenda Item No. 7 |
|---|---|
| **Date of Meeting: 23 September 2021** | |
| **Reporting Officer: Senior Manager Economy and Place – Cumbria CC** | |

**Title: Programme Management Resource & Early Capital Spend Requirement**


**Summary and Conclusions:**

During late August and early September, revised guidance has been received from Government concerning resource allocation for Programme Management and new requirements have been put in place concerning programme cashflow.

Government have now advised that Programme Management must be defined within the final programme financial profile, which is due to be submitted to MHCLG by 27th September. No additional funding has been offered therefore any Towns Fund used towards Programme Management must come from within the original £25m Heads of Terms settlement.

Government have also introduced a requirement for Towns to receive and spend 5% of their total capital allocation within the 2021/22 financial year. Based on the current level of capital within the Town Investment Plan this equates to a 2021/22 payment from MHCLG of £1,181,500.

This presents challenges to the programme, particularly given the advanced stage of development projects have now reached and the need to maintain progress towards final submissions to MHCLG by 17th November. To address following the assessment of options a recommended way forward has been developed.


**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board:

1. Note the requirement to define Programme Management resource and agree the recommended approach of amending existing project funding allocations; and

2. Note the planned approach to meeting the MHCLG requirement for early capital spend in the 2021/22 financial year.

## Report

During late August and early September, new and revised guidance has been received from MHCLG concerning:

1. The requirement for Programme Management resource to be defined within the Town Deal financial profile; and

2. The requirement for Towns to receive and spend 5% of their total capital allocation within the 2021/22 financial year.

The impacts of these requirements and detailed below and for each a recommended approach is provided for consideration.

### Programme Management Resource

It is essential that appropriate resources are in place to effectively manage ongoing delivery of the Town Investment Plan, until the end of programme delivery in March 2026.

The Town Investment Plan included an 'ask' of £500,000 to resource Programme Management, however this was not offered by Government in the subsequent Town Deal Heads of Terms and the full £25m allocation was directed towards projects within the Town Investment Plan.

Government have now advised that Programme Management must be defined within the final programme financial profile, which is due to be submitted to MHCLG by 27th September. No additional funding has been offered therefore any Towns Fund used towards Programme Management must come from within the original £25m Heads of Terms settlement.

While this clarity is welcome; the timing of the advice brings challenges to 'Wave 1 Towns' including Barrow, as projects are at an advanced stage of development and project funding allocations were confirmed in January this year, in response to the Heads of Terms offer.

The Accountable Body have identified a requirement of £500,000 over the 4 years of delivery to March 2026. This is consistent with the original TIP 'ask' and represents 2% of the Town Deal. These costs relate management at programme-level and the fulfilment of obligations as Accountable Body, including finance and audit responsibilities. Costs relating to the management of projects delivered directly by the Accountable Body are not included. As is the case with all 7 projects in the Town Investment Plan, project management costs form part of the costs specified within project business cases.

Expenditure on Programme Management is considered a revenue funded activity. MHCLG limits the use of Towns Fund against revenue activities to 7% of the overall Town Deal, to include both Programme Management and any allocation of revenue to projects. As noted above, currently all revenue funding within the Town Investment Plan is allocated to projects, with no

allocation to Programme Management and this equates to 5% of the programme. MHCLG have confirmed that some degree of variance to the original ratio of capital and revenue within the Heads of Terms could be accommodated, however this would assessed on a case-by-case basis and no guarantee of approval is given.

On this basis, the recommended approach is to determine where existing allocations to projects within the Town Investment Plan can be amended, to release the £500,000 Programme Management funding requirement. This approach will allow any necessary amendments to the detail of projects and business cases to be progressed immediately, with the required level of assurance, within the available timeframe leading to submission of Town Deal Summary Documents for the 17th November deadline.

Available options for implementing revisions to existing project allocations are:

- A pro-rata reduction based on the level of existing allocations
- An equal reduction across all 7 projects
- Approaching projects to 'offer up' a proportion of existing allocations
- A mix of some or all of these approaches

Time and resource requirements to undertake Accountable Body activities and Programme Management are expected to be roughly equal across all projects. Any 'pro-rata' reductions linked directly to project allocations would therefore not be equitable and would be difficult to justify. As revenue funding currently accounts for 5.5% of the programme, taking a large proportion of Programme Management resource from capital projects (which would be the case when using a pro-data approach) would take revenue funding above the 7% limit and MHCLG approval would be required.

Applying an equal reduction across all 7 projects would equate to approximately a £71,000 reduction to each project. While this approach is equitable, the impact on each project would be expected to vary. Larger projects may be in a position to accommodate the reduction within risk allowances, whereas projects with smaller allocations and those 100% funded through the Town Deal would need to consider potential impacts on levels of project activity and project outcomes. Under this option, there would be a minor increase above the 7% revenue limit, potentially requiring MHCLG approval.

When considering the 'offering up' option, again there would be potential to go above the 7% revenue limit, dependent on which projects offered up a proportion of their allocation. However, offers from existing revenue allocations would not alter the existing ratio of capital and revenue funding within the programme. Projects with revenue allocations have therefore been considered first under this option.

The Business & Enterprise Support project has the highest existing revenue allocation at £800,000 (just under 60% of the existing revenue total) and is the only project which consists entirely of revenue activities.

The Community Hubs & Earnse Bay project includes a revenue allocation of £400,000 which provides a revenue to deliver activity at the Hubs and the Outdoor Centre during early years of operation.

The Place Development project includes a revenue allocation of £170,000 which provides staffing resource and an activities budget, to oversee delivery of the project and support development of a sustainable programme of events.

Of the three projects, the Business & Enterprise Support project is considered the most 'scale-able' in terms of its activities, which will deliver business assists calculated on a unit cost basis. Discussions with the project delivery body have indicated that a reduction in scale would achieve a saving of £300,000 which could be 'offered up' towards Programme Management funding.

As noted above, the project currently accounts for just under 60% of revenue funding within the Town Investment Plan and the funding offered by CLEP for re-allocation represents 60% of the Programme Management funding requirement. This provides a pragmatic solution which maintains the project within the TIP while minimising the amendments required across other projects and avoids significant amendment to capital allocations, which is an important consideration given the 7% revenue limit. CLEP are currently working to establish the impact of the proposed reduction on overall project activity levels and project outcomes, which will be reflected in the final business case and Town Deal Summary Document to come forward to the Brilliant Barrow Board in October.

In terms of securing the remaining £200,000 required to support Programme Management, an equal reduction across the other projects in the Town Investment Plan is considered as the preferred option. The relatively small reduction required in each case (just over £33,000) will minimise the potential impact of each project and limit the extent of revisions required to business cases. Although some reduction will be achieved through reducing capital allocations (moved to revenue under Programme Management) the overall impact will not take revenue allocations above the 7% limit.

It is therefore recommended that the identified £500,000 requirement for Programme Management resource is met by:

1. Reducing the allocation to the Business & Enterprise Support project from £800,000 to £500,000; and

2. The remaining £200,000 required for Programme Management is shared equally, by reducing the allocation to each of the other 6 projects within the Town Investment Plan (a reduction of £33,333 for each).

Should the recommendation be agreed, the Accountable Body and PMO will work with each Project Delivery Body to ensure business cases are amended to reflect the revised allocations.

## Early Capital Spend Requirement

In August MHCLG introduced a requirement for Towns to receive and spend 5% of their total capital allocation within the 2021/22 financial year. Based on the current level of capital within the Town Investment Plan (notwithstanding any amendments as a result of Programme Management funding requirement) this equates to a 2021/22 payment from MHCLG of £1,181,500.

Similar to the amendment regarding Programme Management funding, the introduction of this requirement negatively impacts 'Wave 1 Towns' including Barrow, as development of projects has been carefully managed to avoid early spend pressures. While significant project development activities (e.g. scheme design and business case development) are being undertaken 'at risk' during 2021/22, project spend profiles are predicated on contracted delivery commencing from April 2022. This is reflected in project business cases currently going through the assurance process. Current business case profiles show a 2021/22 Towns Fund spend of £789,000 which falls well short of the 5% requirement.

Guidance released by MHCLG sets out the following key points regarding the 5% early spend requirement:

- The 5% advance received for 2021/22 must be spent 'in year'.
- Contractual commitment, as well as payments, can count towards meeting the 5%.
- 5% will be deducted from all future payments to Local Authorities, to account for the advance.
- Where the 5% advance is used towards projects which ultimately do not proceed, MHCLG will not seek to claw back the funding concerned but neither will it be replaced.

Initially, work was undertaken with project leads to determine whether activities originally scheduled in 2022/23 could be accelerated, to provide additional spend in 2021/22. While some development work could be accelerated, reaching the 5% target also relied on elements of delivery being accelerated. This brings an increased level of risk in terms of whether spend would ultimately be achievable, given the volume of activity that would require acceleration. Project business cases would also require amendment to reflect earlier delivery.

In subsequent meetings with MHCLG, the following additional clarifications have been provided:

- MHCLG accept that Towns may not have sufficient project spend in 2021/22 to use the full 5% advance – they stress that payment of the advance is not connected to submitted project spend profiles and Local Authorities should use their 'freedoms and flexibilities' instead to achieve spend in year, subject to section 151 officer approval.

- As the advance is not connected to submitted project spend profiles, the 5% target is at local programme level and there is no 5% 'cap' on project spend, nor a requirement for all projects to contribute to it.
- Towns Fund financial profiles should continue to reflect project profiles (i.e. business cases) and should not be amended to reflect the 5% where sufficient project spend is not available – this is consistent with the approach we have taken in the draft financial profile submitted to MHCLG on 31st August.
- Where a Local Authority makes 'advance' payments to external project delivery bodies in 2021/22, MHCLG consider this would count as spend towards the 5% requirement.

These clarifications have allowed a wider range of options to be considered for meeting the spend requirement, reducing the risks associated with acceleration of activities originally planned for future years, while also minimising any impact on project business cases.

The following approach is now recommended, which utilises both existing profiled spend and makes use of the option to 'advance' payment to projects:

1. **Existing profiled project spend:** This will be applied to projects delivered directly by the Accountable Body (Housing Renewal, Place Development & Marina Village), where spend on project development includes payments to external suppliers (e.g. consultants and other professional fees). There may also be potential for the value of 'commitment' under contracts entered into for delivery to contribute towards the 5% target if signed in 2021/22.
2. **Other programme-related spend:** Again, this relates to spend by the Accountable Body directly and relates to contracts with external suppliers relating to development of business cases programme support functions. A large proportion of this spend has already occurred, albeit a (relatively) small amount in terms of the 5% target.
3. **Advance payments to external project delivery bodies:** Utilising the flexibility provided by MHCLG, advance payments of between 5-10% of Town Deal allocation can be made in respect of projects delivered by organisations external to the Accountable Body (University of Cumbria and Cumbria County Council).

The combination of these three steps, with the varying advances approach used under step 3, has potential to provide spend of £1,420,269 which would exceed the 5% requirement (as currently forecast) by £238,769.

A key consideration when considering payments to meet the 5% target is the confirmation by MHCLG that clawback would not be sought on any element of the 5% advance paid to projects which, for whatever reason, do not subsequently proceed. It should be noted however, that by the time advance payments to projects would be expected, the business case assurance process will be complete, and the results considered by the Brilliant Barrow Board prior to submission of Town Deal Summary Documents to MHCLG.

**End.**

| BRILLIANT BARRW BOARD | Agenda Item No. 8 |
|---|---|
| **Date of Meeting: 23 September 2021** | |
| **Reporting Officer: Senior Manager Economy and Place – Cumbria CC** | |

## Title: Programme and Risk Update

**Summary and Conclusions:**

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to MHCLG for consideration. MHCLG need to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

Business cases are not submitted to MHCLG and responsibility for ensuring business cases meet the required 'Green Book' standard lies with the local Accountable Body (Barrow Borough Council). The results of this local assurance process must be reflected in the Summary Document, which must be submitted to MHCLG within 12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms (by 17th November 2021).

Supporting this activity, a work programme and a programme risk register have been developed. The work programme maps out the assurance process up to submission of the Summary Document. The risk register identifies key risks to delivery of the work programme and how these are being managed.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board:

1. Note progress in relation to the Business Case Assurance Work Programme and proposed amendments (**Appendix A**);

2. Agree the recommendation to amend the date of the October Brilliant Barrow Board; and

3. Note and provide comment on the Programme Risk Register (**Appendix B**).

## Report

### Business Case Development

Following the Heads of Terms agreement there is a requirement to develop full business cases for each project and submit a mandatory Summary Document to MHCLG for consideration. MHCLG need to review and be satisfied with the Summary Document before funding can be released.

The development of project business cases has now reached an advanced stage, with all business cases having been submitted into the local assurance process by mid-August (see 'Work Programme' below). The assurance process is ongoing and once concluded, business cases will be updated where necessary to reflect any amendments or clarifications provided during the process.

### Work Programme

To enable submission of the Town Deal Summary document to MHCLG in November 2021 (12 months from the signing of Heads of Terms), the high-level programme for the business case phase of the Town Deal includes the following key stages:

- Business case development support in place – February
- Project development governance structures in place – March
- Project development technical support in place – April
- Draft business cases submitted for initial review – May
- Final business cases submitted for project assurance – July/August
- Project assurance process complete – September/October
- Board consideration of project assurance – October
- Submission of Town Deal Summary document to MHCLG - November

Progress remains broadly in line with the high-level programme and work continues to monitor and support the activities of each Project Delivery Body.

Within the high-level programme however, some adjustment is now necessary to reflect additional MHCLG requirements and clarifications, which impact on business cases and the assurance process. During late August and early September, revised guidance has been received from MHCLG concerning resource allocation for programme management and new requirements have been put in place concerning programme cashflow. This is covered in more detail under item 7 and requires varying degrees of re-working to business cases, to work within these financial requirements. In turn, this will extend the period required to conclude business case assurance.

At the outset, the agreed work programme allowed for an extended period of contingency between the Town Deal Board date of 11th October and the Accountable Body Executive Committee scheduled for 10th November. Use of this contingency is now considered necessary, to ensure that final 'assured' business cases and Town Deal Summary Documents reflect the amendments

now required. It is therefore recommended that the Brilliant Barrow Board scheduled for 11th October is moved to a later October date, between 20th and 22nd October, to be agreed.

The work programme has been updated to reflect the proposed board date and to include the time the necessary to revise business cases where necessary, prior to completion of the assurance process. The revised work programme is provided at **Appendix A**.

In addition to the main work programme concerning business case assurance, a number of other pieces of work are ongoing for submission to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal Summary Document in November, or earlier as required.

- **Programme financial profile:** An updated draft profile, based on business cases received into assurance, was submitted to MHCLG on 31st August. The final financial profile, which will be used by MHCLG to determine annual programme payments to the Accountable Body, is required by 27th September. The final profile will reflect any amendments identified through the assurance process.
- **Project Adjustment Forms:** The development of full business cases has inevitably led to some degree of change from the project details originally confirmed to MHCLG in January, in response to Town Deal Heads of Terms. Discussions with MHCLG are ongoing to determine what level of justification will be required, if any, to accompany the submission of Town Deal Summary Documents in November. Where justification is required, Project Adjustment Forms will be submitted and will draw from the detail included in business cases.
- **Final Monitoring & Evaluation Plan:** A draft M&E Plan was submitted to MHCLG on 30th April and feedback received did not raise any significant issues. The M&E Plan is currently being updated, to reflect the detail provided in business cases and will be finalised following completion of the assurance process. The final version will be submitted to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal Summary Documents.
- **Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis**: The PSED requires public bodies (including all local authorities receiving Towns Fund) to consider how their Town Investment Plan and projects affect people who are protected under the Equality Act 2010. Although considered in the design of projects and in business cases, the requirement for a separate analysis is included as a condition in the Town Deal Heads of Terms. The Accountable Body are leading on this assessment, drawing on existing approaches and reflecting the detail in project business cases, with additional input from project leads as required. The completed PSED Analysis will be submitted to MHCLG alongside the Town Deal Summary Documents.

**Business Case Assurance**

At the May meeting of the Town Deal Board, a Local Assurance Framework for the Barrow Town Deal was agreed. In line with the Local Assurance

Framework, project business case assurance is now being undertaken, this will include input from the Accountable Body's Legal and Finance functions.

In broad terms the business case assurance process consists of:

- Receipt of business cases and initial assessment
- Detailed assessment - 'Green Book' compliant
- Accountable Body Legal and Finance input
- Agreement of assessment reports - including conditions as appropriate
- Consideration of assured business cases by the Town Deal Board
- Approval of the assured business cases through Accountable Body governance
- Submission of the Town Deal Summary Document to MHCLG

A separate report on the assurance process is provided under item 6.

**Business Case Development & Assurance - Risk Management**

Supporting the programme of business case development and assurance, a Programme Risk Register is maintained which identifies key risks to the agreed work programme and how these are being managed. The Programme Risk Register is provided at **Appendix B.**

The risk register identifies the key programme-level risks with potential to impact on the development of final project business cases, the project assurance process and ultimately the submission, and subsequent MHCLG approval of, the Town Deal Summary Document. The key risks revolve around the work of Project Delivery Bodies and the inputs required to complete business cases and meet the requirements set out in the Government's Green Book. Supporting this are the interactions between the Accountable Body, Project Delivery Bodies and Government. In addition, external factors such as the requirement for statutory permissions, match funding contributions and the ongoing impacts of Covid-19 are addressed.

Each Project Delivery Body is responsible for maintaining an appropriate project-level risk register for their respective projects. Project business cases include a full project risk register which are subject to review as part of the assurance process. Conclusions from the assurance process, to reported to the October Town Deal Board, will outline what are considered the key risks in relation to each project and, where possible, these risks will be mitigated by recommended conditions to be included with project grant funding agreements.

**End.**

**Appendix A:** Business Case Assurance Work Programme
**Appendix B:** Programme Risk Register

## Barrow TIP - Business Case Assurance Programme

| | Action | Start | End | Week Ending: 16/07/21 | 23/07/21 | 30/07/21 | 06/08/21 | 13/08/21 | 20/08/21 | 27/08/21 | 03/09/21 | 10/09/21 | 17/09/21 | 24/09/21 | 01/10/21 | 08/10/21 | 15/10/21 | 22/10/21 | 29/10/21 | 05/11/21 | 12/11/21 | 19/11/21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Project Leads submit Final Business Cases to Barrow BC (Accountable Body) and Programme Management Office (PMO) | 16/07/2021 | ~~13/08/2021~~ 16/08/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Business Cases subject to initial review by PMO and fundamental queries shared with Project Leads | 19/07/2021 | ~~20/08/2021~~ 27/08/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | PMO assessments undertaken | 19/07/2021 | 03/09/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | PMO raise detailed queries with Project Leads | 26/07/2021 | 03/09/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Project Leads prepare and submit responses to PMO queries | 02/08/2021 | 17/09/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | PMO review project responses and complete draft assessments | 20/09/2021 | 01/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Project Leads (and support) amend business cases to reflect 1) assurance responses where necessary 2) revised Town Deal allocations (subject to Board agreement on 23/09) | 13/09/2021 | 27/09/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Accountable Body identify project changes to BEIS/MHCLG - for decision on requirement for Project Adjustment Forms | 20/09/2021 | 08/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | PMO assessments finalised, including internal QA and any recommended conditions | 28/09/2021 | 08/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | PMO sends completed assessments to Accountable Body for legal and finance review, including any additional conditions | 04/10/2021 | 08/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Accountable Body & PMO agree final assessments & board papers (including Town Deal Summary Documents & other items for submission) | 11/10/2021 | 14/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Brilliant Barrow Board papers issued | 15/10/2021 | 15/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Brilliant Barrow Board Meeting - to consider results of assurance (including Town Deal Summary Documents) - Assumed date subject to Board agreement on 23/09 | 22/10/2021 | 22/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Preparation & issue of papers for Barrow BC Accountable Body Governance. | 25/10/2021 | 29/10/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Accountable Body Governance - formal acceptance of assured business cases & approval of Town Deal Summary Document (anticipated to be 10/11/2021 Executive Committee) | 01/11/2021 | 12/11/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Submission of Town Deal Summary Document to BEIS / MHCLG (Latest) | 15/11/2021 | 17/11/2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Colours Key:**

- **Project Leads within project delivery organisations**
- **Local Town Deal Programme Management Office (PMO)**
- **Barrow Borough Council - Accountable Body**
- **BEIS / MHCLG**

# Barrow TIP Development - Programme Risk Register

| Updated: | 16/09/21 |
|---|---|

| Risk No. | Risk Detail | Mitigating Actions | Owner | Actions Update | Likelihood (1 to 5) | Impact (1 to 5) | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | There is a risk that completion of stage 2 project business cases could be delayed, caused by a lack of capacity and/or co-ordination, resulting in delayed project assurance and delayed submission of the Town Deal Summary document and therefore the potential loss of Towns Fund allocation. | The Accountable Body will procure a single lead consultant to work across the 7 TIP projects, leading on preparation of business cases with input from project delivery bodies, to ensure consistency of approach and to control quality. | Accountable Body | All business cases are now complete and have been submitted into assurance. Hatch support is retained to assist project leads in the response to assurance queries and any required amendments to business cases prior to final 'assured' business cases being agreed. | 2 | 4 | |
| 2 | There is a risk that required inputs from project delivery bodies could be delayed, incomplete or fail to meet requirements, caused by a lack of capacity or relevant expertise within project delivery bodies, resulting in delays to completion of business cases and project assurance. | The Accountable Body and PMO will work with each project delivery body to ensure the required technical support is procured and that all necessary technical inputs (design, costings etc) are provided, in a timeframe compatible with key stages of business case development. | Project Delivery Body SROs | The key technical inputs required to develop projects have been received and incorporated into business cases submitted into assurance. Appropriate technical support remains in place where required, to continue project development activities 'at risk' prior to final Government approvals and into the delivery phase, included within projects costs set out in business cases. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery - these are currently being assessed as part of the assurance process. | 1 | 3 | |
| 3 | There is a risk that local project assurance cannot be completed within timescales and to the required standard, caused by lack of capacity in the Accountable Body, resulting in failure to submit the Town Deal Summary document or significant Government queries following submission. | The Accountable Body will put in place arrangements with Cumbria County Council to act as the Town Deal Programme Management Office (PMO) which will include the co-ordination of local project assurance (in line with Green Book requirements) and development of a Local Assurance Framework for the Town Deal. | Accountable Body | The SLA between the Accountable Body and Cumbria County Council (PMO) is in place and the assurance process is underway. This work is guided by the Programme Assurance Framework approved by the Brilliant Barrow Board & Accountable Body. A work programme for assurance is maintained and progress updates provided to the Board, including where revisions may be necessary. | 1 | 4 | |
| 4 | There is a risk that the 'General Conditions' set out in the TIP Heads of Terms document (Private Sector Engagement Plan, Compliant Assurance Process & Public Sector Equality Duty Analysis) are not met, caused by delays or incomplete responses being submitted, resulting in delay to Government approval of the Town Deal Summary Document. | The Accountable Body will engage appropriate support to refine and develop the Private Sector Engagement Plan. The Accountable Body and PMO will develop a 'Green Book' compliant project assurance process and the Accountable Body will co-ordinate completion of PSED analysis. | Accountable Body | A Private Sector Engagement Plan was included in the Heads of Terms response submitted to Government in January 2021. A Programme Assurance Framework has been developed and approved by the Brilliant Barrow Board & Accountable Body. Work is underway to complete the PSED analysis during September/October, led by the Accountable Body. | 2 | 3 | |

| Risk No. | Risk Detail | Mitigating Actions | Owner | Actions Update | Likelihood (1 to 5) | Impact (1 to 5) | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | There is a risk that failure to fully comply with Government Towns Fund Guidance, caused by Brilliant Barrow's position as one of the first approved Town Deals, results in late amendments being required to business cases and/or delays to Government approval of the Town Deal Summary Document. | Maintain regular communication with Government on new and emerging guidance. Draw on experience with other similar programmes where necessary. Work with project delivery bodies to ensure updated guidance is reflected in project development and business cases. | Accountable Body | Recent clarifications and new requirements received from Government, regarding programme management resource and programme cashflow, will now require varying levels of amendment to all business cases. This additional work has been highlighted to the Brilliant Barrow Board and revisions are proposed to the work programme to accommodate these requirements, while maintaining progress towards the fixed deadline for submission of the Town Deal Summary Documents to Government. | 4 | 3 | |
| 6 | There is a risk that projects cannot demonstrate a secured funding package, caused by delays in securing required match funding contributions, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document. | Ensure match funding requirements are addressed in work programmes and identify key project-level risks. Where funding may not be secured for project assurance, ensure business cases provide sufficient assurance on progress and risks. Project-level risks relating to funding packages will be escalated to programme-level as required. | Project Delivery Body SROs | All project business cases identify a full funding package, however in some cases this funding is not yet confirmed. Regular contact between the PMO and Project delivery bodies continues to monitor progress. The assurance process will identify where appropriate conditions can be used to mitigate risk to the programme. At this stage, no significant risk of projects failing to secure the intended match funding requires escalation. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery - these are currently being assessed as part of the assurance process. | 3 | 4 | |
| 7 | There is a risk that projects cannot provide sufficient assurance with regards to deliverability, caused by delays or failures to obtain planning consents or provide sufficient confidence in planning status, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document. | Ensure planning is addressed in work programmes and identify key project-level risks. Where full planning will not be in place for project assurance, project delivery bodies should undertake early engagement with planning authorities, to ensure business cases provide a clear planning strategy with assurance on progress, risks and timescales. Accountable Body and PMO to work to manage expectations of Government while providing assurance. Project-level risks relating to planning will be escalated to programme-level as required. | Project Delivery Body SROs | Comfort has been received from Government on flexibilities, with clear planning strategies acceptable in the Town Deal Summary document, where full planning will not be in place. Where planning is required, business cases present a clear timeline for achievement and letters of comfort have been obtained from the planning authority. Manageable planning risks can be addressed through appropriate conditions in conclusions from project assurance and subsequent project funding agreements. At this stage no project-level risks require escalation. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery - these are currently being assessed as part of the assurance process. | 3 | 4 | |

| Risk No. | Risk Detail | Mitigating Actions | Owner | Actions Update | Likelihood (1 to 5) | Impact (1 to 5) | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | There is a risk that projects cannot provide sufficient assurance with regards to deliverability, caused by delays or failures to secure sites required for projects, resulting in failure to complete project assurance within the required timescales or failure by Government to approve the Town Deal Summary document. | Establish clear strategies and timescales for securing sites where this is a requirement. Accountable Body and PMO to work with project delivery bodies to monitor progress and level of risk. Project-level risks relating to sites will be escalated to programme-level as required. | Project Delivery Body SROs | All projects have sites identified and delivery bodies have confirmed their ability to secure sites within the required timescales. The assurance process requires appropriate evidence of these commitments and where necessary, risks will be addressed through appropriate conditions. At this stage no project-level risks require escalation. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery - these are currently being assessed as part of the assurance process. | 2 | 4 | |
| 9 | There is a risk that final business cases are not consistent with details provided to government in the TIP and Heads of Terms response, caused by changes made during business case development, resulting in delays or failure to receive Government approval of the Town Deal Summary document. | Government have initiated a change notification process, recognising that changes are likely to occur as business cases develop from submission of TIPs and Heads of Terms. Potential for change should be monitored and where necessary, notifications provided to Government at the appropriate time. | Accountable Body | Business cases are now in assurance and no changes within these are considered to be significant. However, it is expected that business case will require amendment due to recent Government notifications regarding programme management resources. In some cases these amendments will be considered a significant change and communication is ongoing with Government to determine how change notifications should be handled. | 4 | 3 | |
| 10 | There is a risk that projects cannot demonstrate compliance with subsidy control frameworks, caused by uncertainty around the new UK subsidy regime, resulting in delays or failure to receive Government approval of the Town Deal Summary document. | Accountable Body & PMO to work with each project delivery body to ensure potential subsidy implications are identified. Ensure development programmes allow sufficient time to receive appropriate legal advice and identify potential issues, with corrective actions as necessary. | Project Delivery Body SROs | Business cases include an assessment of project activities with regards to subsidy control, where appropriate using an independent legal opinion. The Accountable Body have commissioned legal input to independently assess each project, which will highlight any risks and amendments required to business cases. At this stage, no significant risks have been identified (i.e. would require substantial modification to projects). | 2 | 4 | |
| 11 | There is a risk that project development may be impacted by additional restrictions to working practices, caused by current and future responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in delays to the completion of business cases. | Establish remote working arrangements, regular meeting cycles and early identification of potential impacts. Ensure sufficient consideration is given to COVID in project level risk management and programming of project development tasks. | Project Delivery Body SROs | Project lead bodies are established in remote working, regular meetings take place and impacts on business case development are managed. There may be potential for some impact to 'on site' technical work supporting business cases, however this is also considered manageable. As projects move from development to delivery, the potential impacts will change. Each project business case includes a full risk register covering all aspects of delivery - these are currently being assessed as part of the assurance process. | 2 | 2 | |

| Risk No. | Risk Detail | Mitigating Actions | Owner | Actions Update | Likelihood (1 to 5) | Impact (1 to 5) | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | There is a risk that business cases do not demonstrate the level of public support and engagement required for Town Deals, caused by delayed, incomplete or inconclusive public engagement, resulting in failure to meet the expectations of Government and the ambitions reflected in the Town Investment Plan. | Agree a clear strategy to build on the public engagement which underpinned the TIP, with co-ordination by the Brilliant Barrow Communications & Engagement Group. Ensure a Communications & Engagement Plan is in place for each TIP project, enabling final business cases to demonstrate the required level of public engagement within the strategic case. Build on existing use of Brilliant Barrow online and social media platforms. | Communications & Engagement Group | Comms & Engagement Group meets fortnightly, receiving updates on project level activities and co-ordinating engagement activity to inform business cases. Comms & Engagement Plans are in place where engagement has been required for business cases. Some more detailed engagement can only take place later in the development phase, once funding is confirmed. Brilliant Barrow platforms being utilised both to inform public of developments and as method of engagement through surveys etc. | 2 | 3 | |