
| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Report To: | Policy and Resources Executive- Sub Committee | Date: | 12 June 2013 |
| Report By: | Corporate Director – Environment, Regeneration & Resources | Report No: | IC/13/06/01/AF/JH |
| Contact Officer: | Stuart Jamieson | Contact No: | 01475 712401 |
| Subject: | Clyde Valley Community Planning Partnership - City Deal Initiative | | |

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek authorisation to participate in the first stage (termed 'Gateway One') of an economically focused Infrastructure fund and City Deal for the Clyde Valley Community Planning Partnership Metropolitan City Region.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 The City Deal process was initiated in 2011 as part of the UK Government's broader devolution agenda. City Deals seek to empower local areas to drive economic growth by putting greater resources and financial freedom into the hands of local leaders through economic competitiveness.
- 2.2 Glasgow City Council commissioned KPMG to undertake a Scoping Study to examine how an Infrastructure Fund could be established by building upon models developed by major English cities. The study examined issues around geography and governance; potential performance metrics and the economic appraisal process; funding and finance. Glasgow City Council intend to pursue a City Deal and have recently commenced dialogue with the other local authorities who make up the City Region. As a result, a four stage Gateway process has been proposed to establish an Infrastructure Fund by Spring 2014.
- 2.3 To participate in the 'Gateway One' level, the following require to be developed in detail and signed off by decision makers by the end of June to meet the proposed timetable.
- Agree types of investments/sectors for inclusion;
 - Agree metrics for appraising performance;
 - Sign off on economic modelling approach;
 - Agree instructions for working up individual investments;
 - Define local funding sources 'in play' but not decisions on the level at this stage.
- 2.4 Clyde Valley Community Planning Partnership member Authorities are being asked:
- If they wish to participate in developing an Infrastructure Fund and subsequent City Deal over a shared area;
 - If they are content that the overriding objective of the Fund is to prioritise jobs and productivity (GVA) growth at the geography agreed;
 - To note that programme minima should be developed to ensure that growth is distributed across the defined geography and targets the distribution of benefits between social and community groups;
 - If they are content that a range of funding options are pursued, recognising that

local authority contributions will be a significant element to trigger HM Treasury 'earn back' contributions, reflecting total tax take growth;

- To note that once Councils have agreed whether to be included, participating Councils will develop an appropriate governance structure.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That the Executive Sub-Committee agrees to Officer participation at the 'Gateway One' level of the process, in the knowledge that there is no financial obligation at this stage.
- 3.2 That delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director – Environment Regeneration and Resources to develop the details of the proposal as outlined in Para 2.3 and report back to Committee in due course.

Aubrey Fawcett

Corporate Director – Environment, Regeneration & Resources

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Launched in England in 2011, the City Deal initiative has shifted power from government to cities to attract private sector investment and create jobs. It also includes giving cities additional powers over planning, transport and finance.
- 4.2 So far eight City Deals have been agreed with the English Core Cities. A further 20 second-tier English cities are now competing for their own deal over the course of the next 6 months whilst the Core Cities are looking to both ‘widen and deepen’ their original deals.
- 4.3 The £2 billion investment by Greater Manchester and the investment anticipated by other City Regions may put the Clyde Valley Metropolitan City Region at risk of falling behind its UK competitors. It has been suggested that to remain on an equal footing, the Clyde Valley Metropolitan City Region should be exploiting the potential opportunities offered by a City Deal to deliver transformational infrastructure investment and generate the resulting local economic benefits.
- 4.4 Glasgow City Council have invited Officers to two briefing sessions on the City Deal programme and whilst there is general support for the principle, detail has not been fully explored and no cost implications have been identified.
- 4.5 The following gateway process was proposed to establish an Infrastructure fund by Easter 2014.

| Gateway One | Gateway Two | Gateway Three | Gateway Four |
|---|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree the types of investments / sectors for inclusion Agree objectives / metrics for appraising performance, including ‘programme minima’ Sign-off on economic modelling approach Agree instructions for working up individual investments Define local funding sources “in play” (but not decisions on the level) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test/ demonstrate economic modelling suite and sign-off that it is fit for purpose Sign-off on medium list of investments / interventions Agree funding scenarios to be developed Engage with potential partners and government on scale of contribution / funding devolution on offer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present prioritisation of schemes against lead metric on a net cost basis (eg including match funding and other offers) Refine package to ensure that programme minima are delivered at each funding scenario Iterate with potential funders and government on co-funding/devolution propositions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present final shortlist of “compliant” funding scenarios – i.e. those that maximise the lead metric and deliver the programme minima Decisions on which scenario to be taken forward as final City Deal proposition based on degree of local funding commitment Decisions on the necessary delivery and governance reforms |

- 4.6 The geography over which the Fund is to operate and its impact to be assessed is a key consideration. Whilst a City Deal is not contingent on all authorities participating, a larger geography implies a better measure of success; principally because the economic impacts of investment are closer in size to what they would be at a net national level, allowing Treasury to see how local and national fiscal objectives are aligned. A larger geography also minimises the scope for displacement of economic activity from one local area to another.
- 4.7 It is proposed that GVA (a measure of jobs and productivity) is used as the principal metric against which prospective projects are appraised and prioritised for investment. However it is also proposed that – across the programme – a set of programme minima is established to ensure that the programme as a whole delivers sufficient value for all local partners contributing to the fund. The proposed programme minima document is attached in Appendix 1.

5.0 FINANCE

- 5.1 The follow up report to Committee will provide clarity in terms of the financial commitments (on going and one off) which any participation would require and the proposed funding sources.

Financial Implications – One off Costs

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | Budget Year | Proposed Spend this Report | Virement From | Other Comments |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Financial Implications – Annually Recurring Costs/ (Savings)

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | With Effect from | Annual Net Impact | Virement From (If Applicable) | Other Comments |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 6.1 Not applicable at this stage.

Clyde Valley Infrastructure Fund

Programme Minima

KPMG LLP

4 June 2013

This report contains 15 Pages

cm/127

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Programme Minima | 1 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Guiding principles to design of objectives | 1 |
| 1.3 | Lead metric against which projects are appraised | 1 |
| 1.4 | Objective setting for the programme as a whole | 2 |
| 1.5 | How are the Programme Minima used? | 3 |
| 1.6 | What has been discussed to date | 3 |
| 1.7 | Potential Definitions | 4 |
| 2 | Analysis of Data | 5 |
| 2.1 | Metric targeting deprivation across the Clyde Valley region | 5 |
| 2.2 | Youth unemployment | 6 |
| 2.3 | Addressing youth unemployment with least complexity | 9 |
| 3 | Considerations for Chief Executives and Leaders | 10 |
| 3.1 | Lead Metric | 10 |
| 3.2 | Location of jobs created v access to employment | 10 |
| 3.3 | Geographic spread of benefits | 10 |
| 3.4 | Targeting deprivation | 10 |
| 3.5 | Youth unemployment | 10 |
| 3.6 | Summary of proposed objectives and criteria | 10 |

1 Programme Minima

1.1 Introduction

This paper sets out the specific and measurable objectives that could shape the choice of a package of economic infrastructure schemes that would be supported by the proposed Clyde Valley Infrastructure Fund.

1.2 Guiding principles to design of objectives

The guiding principles would normally be:

Consistent with the agreed sources of local funding. In practice, this means that there needs to be a linkage between the way in which the programme minima are set and the funding streams it is agreed will be in play.

Transparent and measurable This means that each objective needs to be turned into a metric that can be modelled and forecast, and that a mechanism needs to be found to allow these “metrics” to be traded or otherwise combined.

1.3 Lead metric against which projects are appraised

There is consensus that, given the purpose of the Fund would be to target economic growth, Gross Value Added (“GVA”) should be the lead objective against which all potential projects are appraised (as per the Scoping Study).

GVA is recommended because it captures both jobs and productivity impacts, recognising that in practice evidence from elsewhere suggests that the bulk of the GVA benefits at the Clyde Valley level as a result of infrastructure provision will be felt in terms of increased employment potential.

Impact on GVA will be measured:

- **Net at the defined geography** – Fundamental to the Earn Back Deal secured by Greater Manchester (“GM”) was a formula that allowed success to be objectively measured at a large enough geography to bring the net growth delivered closer to the national average. This meant that schemes that only resulted in a redistribution of jobs and/or productivity within GM performed very poorly in the prioritisation rankings; and
- In the medium-term, at a **single point in time** (year to be defined) as per the Core City approach (e.g. 10 years for GM).

Given the long term nature of the Fund and the projects it will support, scheme operating costs and revenues will be as significant as up-front costs over the life of the Fund. Therefore, the lead objective should assess the **net increase in GVA delivered per £ of whole life cost** to the Fund.

This allows schemes to be prioritised on a best value basis and involves the following process:

- A prioritisation process involving the calculation of **whole-life** cash flows over the underlying asset life for each scheme on the potential long list (i.e. capital, renewal, opex, maintenance, procurement, development, evaluation, passenger revenue and external capital contributions). These will then be discounted to produce the Net Present Cost (“NPC”) which will be used in conjunction with forecast local Clyde Valley GVA benefits to produce a local ‘real economy’ benefit to NPC ratio.

1.4 Objective setting for the programme as a whole

Secondary objectives or “programme minima” can be critical in ensuring that all partners feel that they will receive a fair share of the benefits of the Fund.

In existing discussions with Clyde Valley participants, it was agreed that the fund programme should be subject to a set of minimum outcomes, building on the models developed by the English Core Cities. It was recognised that these minima could provide a powerful tool for binding together a wider geography. A potential approach to defining programme minima was identified as follows:

- Targeting of the distribution of benefits across the defined geography, e.g. a minimum outcome for each contributing authority; and
- Targeting of the distribution of benefits between specific social/ community groups

However, the greater the number of these minima:

- The harder it will be to identify an optimal package of schemes;
- The optimisation of the GVA impact of the Fund will be subject to more constraints; and
- The decision making process will potentially be more protracted, complicated and less transparent.

Although part of the rationale for programme minima is to ensure that every community across the Geography agreed gains as a result of the Fund, it is inevitable that some will gain more than others. As decisions on funding have yet to be made programme minima need to be defined in relative terms

The level at which these programme minima are set will be crucial:

- Too low, the local consensus necessary to deliver the Fund will be difficult to sustain
- Too high, there is a risk there will be an unacceptably high opportunity cost in terms of what the Fund can deliver against the lead economic objective.

The GVA enhancing potential of increased labour market connectivity is closely linked to the outcome of increased accessibility to employment. Therefore any secondary objective centred on “balanced growth” or benefit equality is potentially complementary to a GVA-linked lead objective.

1.5 How are the Programme Minima used?

Initially schemes are ranked on the basis of net GVA delivered. Then a cut off point is made some way down the list, depending on funding available. That programme is then further tested to ensure it meets the programme minima – e.g. geographic spread or deprivation factors

Where the minima are not met, schemes are substituted until all minima are achieved, while minimising the GVA sacrificed.

1.6 What has been discussed to date

At the Clyde Valley workshop on 21 May, KPMG presented the rationale for programme minima and provided examples of what has been agreed elsewhere. The table below was presented.

| Feature | Greater Manchester | West Yorkshire | South Yorkshire |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| Lead objective | Maximise long term GVA | Maximise long term GVA | Maximise long term GVA |
| Geography | Net impacts at the Greater Manchester level (10 authorities) | Net impacts at the West Yorkshire level (5 authorities) | Net impacts at the Sheffield City Region level (9 Authorities) |
| Programme Minima | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in transport CO₂ emissions; above average increases in employment connectivity for most deprived 25% of wards (IMD basis) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better than average improvement in accessibility for the most deprived 25% of LSOAs (IMD basis); employment accessibility improvement in any district being at least half the average; <u>aspiration</u> to reduce transport CO₂ emissions but constraint of no worse | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each district must benefit by at least half the best growth in jobs, measured in jobs per head of population; Better than average improvement in access to jobs for those most disconnected from the economy across SCR. Those most disconnected from the economy in each district must benefit by at least half the average growth in access to jobs for SY as a whole for this group. |
| Scope | Initially non-rail transport, but broadening over time to other economic development activities (with GVA focus) | All transport, and some regeneration schemes at the margin. | All forms of infrastructure |

The use of local business rates as a source of funding South Yorkshire's programme has led to a change in programme minima to reflect where job creation occurs rather than accessibility to jobs. This change is subject to the GVA sacrificed as a result of the change of programme not being excessive when compared to the GVA forecast when an "employment access" minima was considered.

The participants agreed in principle that a Fund operating wider than the Glasgow city geography should be underpinned by a set of programme minima that targeted geographic and social distribution of benefits for the programme as a whole. It was agreed that any environmental consideration around sustainable transport or CO₂ reduction would be aspirational, rather than forming part of the defined programme minima.

In the discussion around programme minima, issues were raised about how upskilling the workforce could be targeted through the fund. It was agreed that – rather than being part of the programme minima – it would be extremely useful to have separate discussions with Skills Development Scotland on targeting local support to complement the Infrastructure Fund.

1.7 Potential Definitions

1.7.1 Geography

Examples of programme minima in this area could include:

- Every Clyde Valley Region authority to gain an average improvement in employment accessibility no less than half the average across Clyde Valley Region as a whole resulting from the Fund; or
- The Fund could set an objective such that no single district should experience a gain of more than double the overall average in additional GVA or access to employment resulting from the Fund's investments.

1.7.2 Specific social/ community groups

The working group discussed potential options for targeting the distribution of benefits between specific social groups. Two potential minima were identified among the group:

- Targeting deprived communities: i.e. above average increase in employment connectivity for the worst 5% or 15% of deprived areas as defined by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation; and

Targeting youth unemployment.

1.7.3 To date other City Regions have not targeted youth unemployment through programme minima. That is not to say a Clyde Valley fund could not do so. Both the SIMD and the ONS produce data on youth unemployment. The SIMD definition covers 16 to 19 year olds not in education, employment or education; whereas the ONS definition covers 16 to 24 year olds.

1.7.4 These issues are discussed further in the next section on Analysis of Data.

2 Analysis of Data

Analysis of the 2012 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (“SIMD”) provides a useful basis for setting the metrics around the programme minima. All the tables below cover the whole Clyde Valley Region. Clearly, the analysis would need to be updated if not all councils decided to participate.

2.1 Metric targeting deprivation across the Clyde Valley region

The table below, showing the working age population in Clyde Valley region, has been extracted from the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation data 2012.

| Distribution of working age population across Glasgow City region | | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 000's | Working age population | Percentage of total (%) |
| Local authority | | |
| Glasgow City | 404 | 36% |
| North Lanarkshire | 206 | 18% |
| South Lanarkshire | 195 | 17% |
| East Renfrew shire | 53 | 5% |
| Renfrew shire | 107 | 9% |
| Inverclyde | 49 | 4% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 57 | 5% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 63 | 6% |
| Total | 1,134 | 100% |

Note: Working age population is (i) Men 16-64; and (ii) Women 16-60

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD data

Using the Clyde Valley data set only KPMG has re-ranked the data zones to give a relatively ranking within the Clyde Valley region. **The table below shows that a metric aimed at the 25% most deprived data zones would target just below a quarter of the working population of the Clyde Valley region.**

The table below also shows the percentage of the working population in each Council area living in the most deprived 5%; 15% or 25% data zones.

| Proportion of working age population in each council that live in the x% most deprived data zones of Clyde Valley | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 000's | Working age population | 5% | 15% | 25% |
| Local authority | | | | |
| Glasgow City | 404 | 10% | 25% | 36% |
| North Lanarkshire | 206 | 2% | 9% | 20% |
| South Lanarkshire | 195 | 1% | 6% | 12% |
| East Renfrew shire | 53 | 1% | 1% | 6% |
| Renfrew shire | 107 | 3% | 11% | 20% |
| Inverclyde | 49 | 2% | 17% | 34% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 57 | 2% | 13% | 23% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 63 | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Total | 1,134 | 5% | 14% | 23% |

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD data

As noted above, the percentages here are particularly sensitive to the overall geography chosen and the numbers of Councils participating.

2.2 Youth unemployment

The table below shows the level of youth unemployment (as defined by SIMD – 16-19 year olds not in education, employment or training) compared to each Council's percentage of the Scottish population. **More than half the Council's have a higher rate of youth unemployment than its population would suggest compared to the Scottish average.**

The table also shows the split of youth unemployment (as defined by SIMD) across the Clyde Valley region.

| Youth unemployment | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 000's | Population | Percentage of Scottish population | Youth unemployment | Percentage of Scottish youth unemployment | Percentage of Clyde Valley Youth |
| Local authority | | | | | |
| Glasgow City | 592,820 | 11% | 8,788 | 14% | 36% |
| North Lanarkshire | 326,360 | 6% | 5,205 | 8% | 21% |
| South Lanarkshire | 311,880 | 6% | 4,204 | 7% | 17% |
| East Renfrew shire | 89,540 | 2% | 636 | 1% | 3% |
| Renfrew shire | 170,250 | 3% | 2,280 | 4% | 9% |
| Inverclyde | 79,770 | 2% | 1,194 | 2% | 5% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 90,570 | 2% | 1,446 | 2% | 6% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 104,580 | 2% | 714 | 1% | 3% |
| Total | 1,765,770 | 34% | 24,466 | 39% | 100% |
| Scotland total | 5,222,100 | | 62,753 | | |

Note: Youth unemployment is defined as persons 16-19 not in full time education, employment or training

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD data

Further analysis of the Clyde Valley region by the most deprived data zones using the SIMD data set for "Education, Skills and Training domain 2012" is set out on the table below. Again KPMG has re-ranked the data zones to give a relative ranking. **This indicates that a programme minimum targeted at providing improved access to employment opportunities in the 25% of areas with the highest level of youth unemployment as defined would cover 20% of the overall targeted group, but significantly more in West Dunbartonshire and North Lanarkshire.**

| Proportion of working age population in each council that live in the x% most deprived data zones of Clyde Valley by people aged 16-19 not in full time education, employment or training rate | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 000's | Working age population | 5% | 15% | 25% |
| Local authority | | | | |
| Glasgow City | 404 | 3% | 11% | 19% |
| North Lanarkshire | 206 | 5% | 16% | 24% |
| South Lanarkshire | 195 | 4% | 11% | 21% |
| East Renfrew shire | 53 | 0% | 4% | 9% |
| Renfrew shire | 107 | 3% | 11% | 23% |
| Inverclyde | 49 | 6% | 13% | 22% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 57 | 4% | 17% | 28% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 63 | 0% | 2% | 6% |
| Total | 1,134 | 3% | 11% | 20% |

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD data

KPMG also looked to see whether there was a strong correlation between the areas in the lowest 25% of Clyde Valley data zones for deprivation levels and those areas listed above with high levels of 16 – 19 year olds not in education, employment or training.

The table below compares the percentage of youth unemployment to the population in the 25% most deprived data zones in the Clyde Valley region.

| Proportion of each category in each council that live in the x% most deprived data zones of Clyde Valley | Working Population | Youth Unemployment (SIMD 16 to 19 year olds) |
|--|--------------------|--|
| 000's | 25% | 25% |
| Local authority | | |
| Glasgow City | 36% | 19% |
| North Lanarkshire | 20% | 24% |
| South Lanarkshire | 12% | 21% |
| East Renfrew shire | 6% | 9% |
| Renfrew shire | 20% | 23% |
| Inverclyde | 34% | 22% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 23% | 28% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 2% | 6% |
| Total | 23% | 20% |

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD data

The comparison indicates that for the 2012 SIMD survey there does not appear to be an exact correlation between areas of overall high deprivation and youth unemployment as defined above:

- Glasgow and Inverclyde have lower levels of youth unemployment than the population in these data zones would suggest.
- South Lanarkshire is significantly higher (almost double), while the remainder are higher.

Clyde Valley authorities may therefore feel that this would tend to add weight to having a separate programme minima targeted at youth unemployment.

2.2.1 Alternative Measures of Youth Unemployment

In order to test this hypothesis, KPMG also assessed using a different measure of youth unemployment. The ONS measures youth unemployment by reference to claimants of the Job Seekers Allowance (“JSA”). The ONS definition covers claimants up to the age of 24. However the data can be analysed to provide a comparator to the SIMD data. The table below summarises the various measures that could be adopted

| Proportion of each category in each council that live in the x% most deprived data zones of Clyde Valley | Working Population | Youth Unemployment (SIMD 16 to 19 year olds) | Claimant Count (19 and under claiming JSA) | Claimant Count (24 and under claiming JSA) |
|--|--------------------|--|--|--|
| 000's | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% |
| Local authority | | | | |
| Glasgow City | 36% | 19% | 6% | 21% |
| North Lanarkshire | 20% | 24% | 7% | 20% |
| South Lanarkshire | 12% | 21% | 5% | 17% |
| East Renfrew shire | 6% | 9% | 3% | 7% |
| Renfrew shire | 20% | 23% | 5% | 19% |
| Inverclyde | 34% | 22% | 1% | 8% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 23% | 28% | 6% | 26% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 2% | 6% | 0% | 6% |
| Total | 23% | 20% | 5% | 18% |

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD and ONS data

Given that those under the age of 18 are unable to claim Job Seeker’s Allowance the ONS claimant count for the same age group as the SIMD data shows a lower percentage and is therefore not necessarily a more useful measure on which to base a programme minimum.

However, The ONS data for claimants aged 24 and under gives a wider group to target but do not fully correlate to the SIMD data, although the two are not wholly dissimilar, with the exception of Inverclyde.

| Proportion of each category in each council that live in the x% most deprived data zones of Clyde Valley | Youth Unemployment (SIMD 16 to 19 year olds) | Claimant Count (19 and under claiming JSA) | Claimant Count (24 and under claiming JSA) |
|--|--|--|--|
| 000's | 25% | 25% | 25% |
| Local authority | | | |
| Glasgow City | 19% | 6% | 21% |
| North Lanarkshire | 24% | 7% | 20% |
| South Lanarkshire | 21% | 5% | 17% |
| East Renfrew shire | 9% | 3% | 7% |
| Renfrew shire | 23% | 5% | 19% |
| Inverclyde | 22% | 1% | 8% |
| West Dunbartonshire | 28% | 6% | 26% |
| East Dunbartonshire | 6% | 0% | 6% |
| Total | 20% | 5% | 18% |

Source: KPMG analysis of SIMD and ONS data

2.3 Addressing youth unemployment with least complexity

A separate programme minima targeting youth unemployment would add a layer of complexity to achieving an investment programme that maximises GVA and meets the programme minima – as can be seen from the analysis above.

Recognising that this is an important issue for Councils and to achieve a workable solution, it is proposed to add youth unemployment “black spots” to the 25% most deprived data zones (using SIMD) if not already included in that definition. This would achieve the objective with least complexity.

3 Considerations for Chief Executives and Leaders

3.1 Lead Metric

This paper suggests that the Lead Metric should be net GVA across whatever geography is agreed for the Fund and associated City Deal.

3.2 Location of jobs created v access to employment

The development of programme minima elsewhere have focused on assessing improved access to employment opportunities – irrespective of where the jobs are physically located within the City Region. Although consideration has been given to a job location programme minimum, this has been broadly rejected elsewhere as providing too much of a constraint on achieving the overall lead metric of maximising net GVA. It has recently been chosen as a minimum in South Yorkshire – reflecting the fact that business rates have been localised in England. Is access to employment opportunities the preferred option for the Clyde Valley Region?

3.3 Geographic spread of benefits

This paper suggests that there should be a programme minimum to ensure that the population of all Councils participating in the Fund benefit by at least half the average. Does this appear to be a sensible approach and percentage?

3.4 Targeting deprivation

This paper also suggests that an additional programme minimum should be introduced to target deprivation and proposes targeting the 25% most deprived data zones within the Clyde Valley Region – some 23% of the population if all authorities participate. Would this be acceptable?

3.5 Youth unemployment

Having looked at youth unemployment in particular, there would be a technical way of measuring a programme minimum along these lines. There is not a direct correlation between overall deprivation spread and areas of highest youth unemployment. Does the Clyde Valley City Region wish to pioneer such an approach – recognising that this will add a further layer of complexity and further constrain the overall lead metric? Or should youth unemployment be targeted through an enlarged geography linked to the deprivation minima above. ?

3.6 Summary of proposed objectives and criteria

Based on discussions with Clyde Valley authorities to date and this paper's analysis, the following table summarises suggested Clyde Valley objectives/metrics for measurement, along with a brief description of how each would be measured.

| Role | Objective | Criteria / measure | How measured? |
|---|--|--|---|
| Primary metric for scheme prioritisation subject to overall funding constraint at programme level | Economy - Maximise net GVA at a Clyde Valley level | Net Clyde Valley GVA relative to NPC of whole life cost (Capex <i>plus</i> Opex <i>minus</i> Third Party Contributions <i>minus</i> other revenues) | Net GVA measured Economic assessment model/ whole life cost based upon individual scheme appraisals |
| Minimum metrics that must be delivered at the fully funded programme level | Balanced growth (i)- Ensure that all districts benefit from participating in the Clyde Valley Region | Improvements to employment accessibility in any council area being at least half the average of the Clyde Valley Region | Economic assessment model |
| | Balanced growth (i)- Improve accessibility to jobs for those in deprived areas] | Better than average improvement in employment accessibility for residents in the most deprived [25%] of Clyde Valley communities and areas of high youth unemployment (measured on a SIMD basis) | Economic assessment model |