

CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP

MINUTE OF MEETING

Meeting of: **JOINED UP FOR JOBS
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME PANEL**

Held at: Capital City Partnership, The Canon Mill, Edinburgh

Date: **10 June 2005**

Present:

Ken Shaw (Chair)	City of Edinburgh Council
Matthew Crighton	Capital City Partnership
Alister McInnes	Jobcentre Plus (JCP)
Sally McGreevy	Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh & Lothian

Apologies Bill Wilson Jobcentre Plus

Action

1 Waterfront Recruitment Centre Proposal

Sally McGreevy informed the Panel of the changes made to the proposal papers in response to the questions and points made at the meeting on 25 May 2005. These were:

- Inclusion of a paragraph explaining the need for the Administrator post;
- Making clear that the whole project includes one staff secondment from JCP and one from the Construction Academy.
- A section on JU4J Action Plan and Target Groups
- A section on Added Value Through IDP.

Sally explained that the targets are that 70% of the people entering jobs through the WRC would be previously unemployed, yielding figures of 140 out of 200 in Year 1 and 280 out of 400 in Year 2. Within it did not give numbers for recruitment for specific target groups because additional dialogue would be necessary to determine realistic targets. It was considered important that this should be done in order to show what would be the outcomes for JU4J of the proposed funding.

She explained that the additionality sought would come from pursuing JU4J priorities and from making links within the JU4J network; and that this could only be done if the posts of Co-ordinator and Administrator were in place. The revised budget identified a funding request to IDP of £41,336 in Year 1 and £41,311 in Year 2. It was explained that the basic function of the two other posts would be job-matching, in the case of the construction academy from a database of potential applicants maintained at the WRC.

Matthew Crighton asked whether the absence of the Construction Liaison Officer from the Year 2 budget meant that this post was for one year only. Sally replied that the Construction Academy/CEC intended to continue the secondment for the second year but the funding for this could not be guaranteed at this point. Matthew said he thought that the cost of the post should be in the budget which would then identify the requirement to secure funding for this.

Ken Shaw asked about the exit strategy after Year 2. Sally said that the intention is to continue with the WRC as long as there is a substantial number of jobs to be filled in the Waterfront Development. Once going the developers will be asked to continue the funding. Matthew suggested that the time to establish an agreement in principle with the developers was at start, when a sharing of the costs between the private and public sectors could be agreed. This would allow the establishment at the start of agreed criteria against which the developers will assess the case for funding.

More generally it was thought that the role of the developers and contractors was under-developed in the proposal, beyond the contribution of the Portakabin by Second Site; and that a greater contribution could be made by them. In particular the

role and contribution of Waterfront Edinburgh Limited was not clear. Matthew said that the developers and construction contractors should be asked to identify a number of additional opportunities for construction apprentices and trainees, which the construction academy and JU4J providers could then aim to fill. This would demonstrate a mechanism through which the aims of JU4J could be met.

As regards which organisation would employ the posts, Sally said that this was still under consideration. Ken queried the salary level of the Co-ordinator and whether it was to be assessed against a job description and person specification.

It was agreed that a case had been made in principle for IDP funding to the Waterfront Recruitment Centre, but that there were a number of outstanding questions raised in the meeting. In consideration of the issues, there was discussion about whether they should be addressed prior to agreement of IDP funding or as conditions of funding. Sally proposed that they should be included as part of the remit of the Co-ordinator, who would be expected to bring the necessary expertise and would have time to address them properly. Otherwise there would be considerable delay in bringing back a revised proposal. This approach was accepted by the Panel.

On consideration of the request for funding over two years, Ken Shaw proposed that the Panel should agree in principle to offer this, but that the second year's funding would be dependent on success in securing further funding for the IDP in the next financial year; and that there should be a report on achievement of objectives to trigger the second year's contributions. **This was agreed.**

The Panel agreed to allocate £41,336 to the Waterfront Recruitment Centre in the current financial year, on the assumption of receiving £60,000 from both CCP and CEC, on the following additional conditions:

- a) **That mechanisms for achieving the planned recruitment of unemployed people should be elaborated and within these targets of likely recruitment from target groups should be established.**
- b) **That agreement on specific contributions to the WRC from developers be sought; and that any criteria for such contributions be clarified, in particular as regards participation in the exit strategy.**
- c) **That developers and main contractors be asked to identify opportunities for recruitment of apprentices and other construction trainees and a plan be made for filling these in such a way as to help achieve JU4J targets.**
- d) **That the Job Description of the Co-ordinator should cover these activities and that they form early tasks of that post; that there should be consultation with the IDP on this job description; and that agreement is reached on the appropriate body to employ these posts.**
- e) **That the post of Construction Liaison Officer be included in the budget for both years.**
- f) **that an evaluation framework is established which incorporates the issues discussed in the meeting and a recording and monitoring system put in place to demonstrate outcomes**

It was further agreed to notionally allocate £41,311 from the next financial year's anticipated income, conditional on receipt of a report which adequately addresses the issue above and the need for an exit strategy.