GBSLEP Strategy for Growth Consultation Questionnaire

The Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership is currently developing its strategy for growth. You can make a valuable contribution to the Strategy's development, by letting us know your views on how the LEP can best facilitate future economic growth and success in the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP area.

LEP area.		Ţ.	
A. Respondent Details			
1. Name			
2. Please provide an email address and		ephone number so that we are able	to
contact you if we need to clarify any po a) Email address	ints		
b) Telephone number			
3. We are seeking consultation response representing the views of organisations Responding as a private citize	(in the en (go	e private, public or third sector). Are to 4)	
Responding on behalf of an or	rganis	ation (go to 5)	
4. I am completing this questionnaire as	s a res	sident of:	
Birmingham		Solihull	
Bromsgrove		Tamworth	
Cannock Chase		Wyre Forest	
East Staffordshire		Other (please specify below)	
Lichfield			
Redditch			
5. I am completing this consultation res	pons	e on behalf of the following organisa	tion:
a) Name of Organisation			
b) Location			
c) Approx number of employees (please ci	ircle):	1-9; 10-49; 50-99; 100-249; 250+	
C Contact that may appear in attach an appearance	in-		
6. Sector that my organisation operates Manufacturing - Private Sector	1111	Social Enterprise	

Voluntary Sector

Financial, Professional or Business

Services - Private Sector

Digital or Creative Industries – Private Sector	Further/Higher Education – Public Sector
Life Sciences – Private Sector	Health – Public Sector
Tourism and Hospitality – Private Sector	Local Government – Public Sector
Retail or Distribution – Private Sector	Other (please specify below)
Other Private Sector (Please Specify):	
Membership Organisation/ Association	

B. Strategic Approach (pages 3-10)

7. Page 5 sets out the role of the GBS LEP. Do you agree with the role of the LEP as articulated here or have any comments relating to this?	
9 The CBSI EB consultation White Ba	may acts out the key chicatives (page 6 green
	per sets out the <u>key objectives</u> (page 6, green deliver success. Do you agree with these em modified?
a) A radical shift in the skills profile across the LEP, making skills relevant business opportunity	Comments:
b) An overhaul of the whole ecosystem of business support , from regulation to finance	Comments:
c) Game-changing improvements to connectivity, both in a global and local sense	Comments:
d) Strategic development of housing and employment land targeted at future growth	Comments:
e) Expansion of key leading sectors	Comments:
Any further general comments on key	objectives:

9. The GBSLEP consultation White Paper sets out the <u>strategic approach</u> in order to
deliver the key objectives – grouping activity under 3 broad pillars of activity
(Business, People and Place) along with cross-cutting activities that support all the
three themes grouped as Foundation Stone activities. Do you agree with this approach
or would you like to see it changed? Please supply details:
10. In the <u>Transformational Activity</u> section (page 10) the GBSLEP consultation White
Paper sets out how key actions will contribute to the high level ambitions of the
GBSLEP. Do you believe these high level ambitions are ambitious enough; achievable;
the correct ones? Do you have any comments on the key actions:
11. Do you have any further comments relating to this section of the GBSLEP
consultation White Paper?

C. Business (pages 11-16)

12. The White Paper identifies three priority outcomes for the business pillar. Do you agree with these objectives or would you like to see them modified?		
B1) An environment where businesses are enabled to start, grow and succeed, through integrated and locally relevant support and access to finance.	Comments:	
B2) Global leadership in key sectors, driving jobs and GVA growth within the GBS LEP.	Comments:	
B3) Significant new inward investment into the GBS LEP area.	Comments:	
Any further comments relating to key	priorities in the Business pillar:	
	tified to deliver the sub-outcomes. These	
actions have been allocated a suggest	ted priority rating. Do you agree with these	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ted priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest	ted priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	

14. Immediate actions have been identified to deliver the sub-outcomes. Do you have a view on who should be <u>leading</u> on any of the specific actions listed?
15. Do you have any further comments relating to the Business section of the GBSLEP consultation White Paper ?

D. People (pages 17-19)

16. The White Paper identifies two priority outcomes for the People pillar. Do you agree with these objectives or would you like to see them modified?		
PE1) A world-class talent pool underpinned by a world-class skills system	Comments:	
PE2) Significant new jobs creating a more competitive, more prosperous and more inclusive economy	Comments:	
Any further comments relating to key p	oriorities in the People pillar:	
17. Immediate actions have been identified to deliver the sub-outcomes. These actions have been allocated a suggested priority rating. Do you agree with these priorities? Are there any specific changes you would make to the individual priority ratings in the People section – and why?		
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	
actions have been allocated a suggest priorities? Are there any specific char	ed priority rating. Do you agree with these nges you would make to the individual priority	

18. Immediate actions have been identified to deliver the sub-outcomes. a view on who should be <u>leading</u> on any of the specific actions listed?	Do you have
19. Do you have any further comments relating to the People section of the consultation White Paper ?	ne GBSLEP

E. Place (pages 20-25)

20. The White Paper identifies four priority outcomes for the Place pillar. Do you agree with these objectives or would you like to see them modified?		
PL1) Stronger connectivity; both within the GBS LEP, and between national and international markets	Comments:	
PL2) A network of vibrant local centres and economic 'landmarks' that provide a focus for economic activity and excellence	Comments:	
PL3) A clear sense of place attracting investors and visitors, and benefiting those who live and work here	Comments:	
PL4) A successful 'City Centre Enterprise Zone' and 'Enterprise Belt attracting' economic growth and supporting LEP-wide priorities	Comments:	
Any further comments relating to key	priorities in the Place pillar:	
21. Immediate actions have been identified to deliver the sub-outcomes. These actions have been allocated a suggested priority rating. Do you agree with these priorities? Are there any specific changes you would make to the individual priority ratings in the Place section – and why?		

22. Immediate actions have been identified to deliver the sub-outcomes. Do you have a view on who should be <u>leading</u> on any of the specific actions listed?
23. Do you have any further comments relating to the Place section of the GBSLEP
consultation White Paper ?

F. Supporting Foundations (pages 26-28)

24. The White Paper identifies three priority cross cutting outcomes listed in the Supporting Foundations section. Do you agree with these objectives or would you like to see them modified?		
S1) The GBS LEP is based upon, and leading, strong partnerships across the region and with Government	Comments:	
S2) The GBS LEP is actively developing and seeking out new funding and support mechanisms, to help deliver the priorities of the partnership	Comments:	
S3) The GBS LEP maintains a sustainable approach to economic growth	Comments:	
Any further comments relating to key section:	priorities in the Supporting Foundations	
25. Immediate actions have been iden	tified to deliver the sub-outcomes. These	
actions have been allocated a suggested priority rating. Do you agree with these priorities? Are there any specific changes you would make to the individual priority ratings in the Supporting Foundations section – and why?		

ations section

27. Page 29 sets out the GBSLEP's ambitious vision for 2020. Do you believe this is the right vision for the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP area? Is the scale of ambition correct? 28. Page 30 sets out the GBSLEP's vision for 2015 and 2012. Do you believe this is the right vision for the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP area? Is the scale of ambition correct?

This page is intentionally left blank