



**Minutes of the Cheshire and Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership
Marketing Cheshire (Marketing & Communications) Sub-Committee Meeting
held on 3rd February, 11am, Wyvern House, Winsford.**

In attendance: Adrian Bull, Philip Cox, Andy Farrall, Brendan Flanagan, Andy Lyon, Nicola Said, Caroline Sangar-Davies, Jacqueline Wilson, Catherine Walker.

Apologies: Stephen Fitzsimons

Item No.	Item	To be Actioned by	By When
1.	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Apologies noted as above. b) Conflicts of interest. None declared. 		
2	<p>Matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BF to chase CEC again regarding SAGC assets, no response yet. • CW to update future meeting dates in-line with key projects. • No other matters arising. 		
3	<p>LEP Delivery Plan 2020/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC confirmed that that the paper circulated following the last Marketing sub-committee relating only to the marketing and communications element of the Delivery Plan. • There has been some reflection since the Delivery Plan was initially discussed with the core focus being outcome driven. They are an externally focused document and used by BEIS and MHCLG to review LEP performance so the emphasis is on key outcome driven actions. • A further draft of the complete delivery plan will go to the LEP board on 26th February with the aim of publishing by the end of March. • PC commented there will be an opportunity to send round again to the marketing sub-committee for comment. • PC also referenced the LIS and highlighted that it won't necessarily draw through to the delivery plan, in part as the LIS is a 10-year plan and the delivery plan annual. • Wider discussion followed about the alignment of the LIS; a recurring theme in comments about sustainability; the alignment with the destination management plan led by Marketing Cheshire; cultural strategy (sits with Quality of Place strategy rather than the delivery plan). • BF commented that its important that the perceptions study informs other strategies, such as QoP, and follows through into delivery. • PC also referenced the need to ensure stakeholder engagement, particularly regards talent and business attraction, is considered and is used to qualify the approach being taken. 		

	<p>During conversations with leaders and CEX's its apparent that all parties want a focus on high-value, retaining and upskilling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AF is writing a brief for the cultural strategy research. AL commented its important to consider the night-time economy as part of a cultural strategy. • In summing up PC confirmed that once the LIS is published the LEP will work on a LIS delivery plan. <p>Action: send final draft of delivery plan to sub-committee for comment</p>	CW	26/2/20
4	<p>External Perceptions Tender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CW provided an update on the progress made in relation to external perceptions procurement. 6 responses to the ITT had been received with the panel shortlisting 2 for clarification calls. Copies of the shortlisted proposals were given to the sub-committee members and members were asked to provide any comments/feedback by 12noon on 4th February, ahead of clarification calls on 5th February. <p>Action: CW to email proposals to those not present and then send an email to the sub-committee members post clarification calls to confirm proposed supplier appointment. Members to approve by email.</p>	CW	10/2/20
5	<p>ITT Update and timeline</p> <p>A) Inward Investment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CW had provided a procurement timeline in the papers sent. • CW confirmed that PC/AF held a briefing session for interested parties so they could more fully understand the brief. • BF cautioned that it should be about investment more generally, not just inward investment (BF suggested capital investors, business investment). <p>Action: CW will keep the sub-committee informed at key milestones, and will send a proposal for supplier appointment for approval</p> <p>B) Website redevelopment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of brief provided in the meeting papers. • PC confirmed that the LEP family of sites will be a key platform for information relation to C&W and clarified that the LEP branding/Place brand would be applied to the sites to ensure coherence of messaging. 	CW	14/2/20
6	<p>Place Marketing (next steps)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CW ran the proposed sequencing for next steps. • BF asked about the overall timing for leaders/CEX's that PC confirmed estimated mid-June with an expected launch around September time. • The sub-committee would be involved at key stages including bringing aspects such as branding concepts back to this group. • AF reiterated that the brand aligns to the place, not the LEP, but that messaging across the LEP family would be aligned. • AB commented that the process of stakeholder engagement will be ongoing not start/finish. <p>Action: CW to review future meeting dates</p>	CW	28/2/20

	Action: sequencing to be updated with key milestones and stakeholder touchpoints.	CW/NS	31/3/20
7	<p>MC/LEP family comms & marketing plan 2020/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As previously discussed at the sub-committee there are different 'divisions' of the LEP that aren't exclusively linked to Place, so there is a continued need for a LEP family marketing & comms action plan that supports the LEP objectives and those within the LIS and delivery plan. PC discussed the impact the LEP has and whether it should be about visibility or bringing in funding. CSD agreed and questioned whether businesses need to know about the LEP. AB commented there would be different touchpoints, with NS commenting that the comms should bring forward connection with the right strand of the business as relevant to the audience, which is then connected to the LEP rather than the other way round. Discussion around stakeholders and recognition that each LEP 'division' will have different stakeholders, but there will be cross-over. Understanding this will allow for leverage and correlation across LEP messages. AF confirmed that there is strength in different individuals being identified in stakeholder groups as this allows us to influence Government, but with a consistent set of messages/family message where cross-over exists. <p>Action: All LEP 'divisions' to map stakeholders and identify cross-over. Action: Draft LEP family marcomms plan to be brought to sub-committee for review and approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NS raised that the sub-committee to date has been place based and asked whether the sub-committee would like to use this platform to be aware of the wider work of MC; and that of the LEP family. PC suggested that this would be valuable and AB agreed that the sub-committee would welcome this. 	Various CW/NS	30/4/20 27/3/20
8	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC advised the sub-committee that Joe Manning has been appointed CEO of MC/Deputy CEO of the LEP. He is currently a deputy director in BEIS and brings a wealth of experience and valuable government connections. No formal announcement at this stage. 		