All-Party Parliamentary Group

Post-Brexit Funding for Nations, Regions and Local Areas

Report of an initial inquiry into the UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND

November 2018

UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND
An initial report

APPG on Post-Brexit funding

The All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Post-Brexit Funding for Nations, Regions and Local Areas was established in Westminster in June 2018. Its Chair is Stephen Kinnock MP (Lab) and its Vice-Chairs are Bill Grant MP (Con), Chris Stephens MP (SNP), Jo Platt MP (Lab) and Anna McMorrin MP (Lab).

The aim of the group is to help shape plans for the UK funding that is intended to replace the EU funding for national, regional and local economic development that will disappear following Brexit.

At its inaugural meeting the Group initiated an Inquiry to assess the views of stakeholders in the parts of the UK that currently benefit substantially from EU funding. The aim was to produce a report that could be fed into government at an early stage to try to influence the UK government's proposals, which are expected to be set out in a consultation towards the end of the year.

Background

In recent years the EU has been the biggest single financial contributor to regional and local economic development across the UK. In the present EU spending round (2014-20) the UK receives £9bn from the EU Structural Funds, or around £1.3bn a year[1].

The EU funds are predominantly targeted at less prosperous areas. Most parts of the North, Midlands, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland presently benefit massively from the EU funds. This is at risk. Local authorities and the devolved administrations are already agitated about the possible outcomes.

Assuming Brexit goes ahead, the UK will eventually stop receiving EU funding to support regional and local economic development. Under the 'divorce bill' deal agreed in December 2017, the UK will continue to draw on EU funds as normal up to the end of 2020, even though Brexit itself is expected in March 2019. In July 2018, in a written statement to Parliament, the government added that in the event of a 'no-deal' Brexit the Treasury will underwrite all the funding that would have come to the UK in the present 2014-20 EU spending round.

[1] Figures here are for the sum of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF).

There is therefore no immediate threat to EU-funded programmes but after the end of 2020 there will presently be no new money.

The Conservative manifesto for the 2017 general election promised to set up a new *UK Shared Prosperity Fund* to replace the EU funds. The intention is that the new Fund will “reduce inequalities between communities across our four nations” and that the Fund will be “cheap to administer, low in bureaucracy and targeted where it is needed most”.

A written statement to Parliament from Secretary of State James Brokenshire MP, on 24 July 2018, confirmed the commitment to the new Fund but added little detail. Nearly everything about the Fund is still to be worked out leaving huge unresolved issues:

- How much funding will be available?
- How will it be divided up across the country?
- What activities will be eligible for support?
- Who will take the decisions about how the money is spent?

The replacement for the EU funds is entirely a domestic UK matter. It does not depend on negotiations with Brussels. Nor does replacing EU funds necessarily require ‘new money’. In theory there is more than enough available to pay for the Shared Prosperity Fund from the funds that will no longer be paid over to the EU, though there are of course competing claims on this pot.

The present Inquiry

Following the formation of the APPG in June, we wrote to a wide range of stakeholders inviting written submissions. We particularly targeted the parts of the UK that currently benefit substantially from EU funding but also invited submissions from national bodies and thinks tanks with a wider remit.

The APPG has received 80 submissions from an exceptionally wide range of organisations and locations, including a large number beyond our initial circulation list. A list of the organisations submitting evidence is included in the appendix. The list includes local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships, the TUC, Mayoral Combined Authorities, devolved administrations and others. Several of the submissions were made on behalf of large coalitions of partners, in the North East for example. The geographical spread includes responses from all four nations of the UK. We are immensely grateful to those who took the time to respond.

We are confident that the Inquiry has collated views from across the main players in EU funding for nations, regions and local areas and that we can therefore make recommendations to government from a well-informed standpoint.

The call for evidence asked 18 specific questions and the report is organised around the responses.

1. *What would be an appropriate annual budget for the new UK Shared Prosperity Fund?*

At present, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) make a combined contribution to UK national, regional and local development of around £1.3bn a year. Looking ahead beyond 2020, and allowing for inflation, the UK Shared Prosperity Fund would need to be worth around £1.5bn a year to match this funding stream in real terms.

In recent years there has been little evidence of convergence in prosperity across the UK with the gaps in GVA per head – the most commonly used indicator of the strength of local economies – if anything tending to widen since the financial crisis. This is not because EU-funded regional policies have been failing: on the contrary, independent evaluations suggest that they have raised output and employment. There are deep-seated imbalances in the UK model of economic growth with London and parts of the South East tending to pull away from the rest of the country.

Just about all the contributors to the Inquiry therefore argued that the UK Shared Prosperity Fund should be worth, at a minimum, £1.5bn a year in order to match in real terms the present scale of ERDF and ESF funding.

Predicting exactly how much the UK would have received from these sources after 2020, if the UK had remained an EU member, is not possible at this stage because the EU budget for 2021-27 remains under negotiation.

However, many contributors noted that if the UK Shared Prosperity Fund also takes over other financial responsibilities – for example the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) – its budget would need to be proportionally larger. Additionally, if the UK Shared Prosperity Fund incorporates any existing UK funding streams there would need to be a further proportionate increase in its budget.

We recommend that the annual budget for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund is no less, in real terms, than the EU and UK funding streams it replaces.

2. *Should there be a multi-annual financial allocation, and if so why and for how long?*

At present, EU funding to the UK operates on a seven-year cycle, with seven-year financial allocations to different parts of the UK. The present cycle covers 2014-20 and, as noted earlier, has now been underwritten by the Treasury.

There is unanimity among the contributors to the Inquiry that the UK Shared Prosperity Fund should operate on the basis of multi-annual financial allocations. This is seen as allowing for the proper planning and implementation of projects, especially schemes of a more ambitious or transformational nature.

There is also strong support for the retention of seven-year financial allocations because they provide continuity and certainty, and for retention of the flexibility for spending on agreed projects to roll on for up to three years beyond the end of each programme period. Some would support ten-year allocations, though none less than five years.

We recognise that lengthy financial allocations of this kind do not fit neatly with UK Spending Reviews, which typically cover four or five years and can also be triggered by changes in government. We recognise, however, that in the context of regional and local economic development there is considerable merit in lengthier spending programmes.

We recommend that the UK Shared Prosperity Fund operates on the basis of multiannual financial allocations of the longest practicable duration.

3. *Would it be appropriate to roll in other budget lines (e.g. the Local Growth Fund in England) into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund?*

A range of funding streams from the UK government and the devolved administrations also contribute to regional and local development and sometimes act as the 'matching finance' for EU-funded projects. There has been discussion of the possibility of rolling in some of these other budget lines into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

Among the contributors to the Inquiry there is no unanimity on the issue of rolling in other budget lines. Some oppose this approach, seeing it as dilution of the new Fund's purpose, which is to replace EU monies. Others see some merit in the idea and the Local Growth Fund, which supports infrastructure investment in England, is seen as the most likely candidate. They see a single larger pot as easier to administer. The inclusion of budget lines intended for specific places (e.g. the Coastal Communities Fund) would nevertheless be opposed.

There is however a widely held fear that the inclusion of the Local Growth Fund (or any other existing budget line) within the UK Shared Prosperity Fund might lead to a reduction in the totality of funding. Additionally, there is recognition that to roll in other budget lines, such as the Local Growth Fund, would reduce the scope for finding matching finance for some projects so long as this continued to be required. These are legitimate worries.

We recommend that if other existing budget lines were to be included in the UK Shared Prosperity Fund the total budget of the new Fund should be increased by the full value of those additional budget lines, and that the present rules on matching finance for projects should be adjusted accordingly.

4. *How should the UK Shared Prosperity Fund be divided up between the four nations of the UK?*

5. *Would rolling forward the existing shares going to England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland be a sensible way forward?*

These two questions are best taken together.

At present the scale of EU funding going to the each of the four nations reflects a mix of factors: the EU's allocation of regions into different categories, the allocation of funding within those categories, and the UK government's decision last time round to share the small percentage reduction in EU funding equally across the four nations.

Post-Brexit, there is of course no need to be tied to EU allocation procedures. There is therefore some support – in England it has to be said – for taking a fresh look at the data and allocating accordingly between the four nations.

This view is not shared by contributors to the Inquiry from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. From these parts of the UK the strongly held view is that not just the share of the new Fund but also the absolute amounts (adjusted for inflation) should be no less than the present EU funding. The sensitivity on this point appears considerable.

There is support for this position in that the underlying economic geography of the UK has not changed radically in recent years. A new formula would therefore probably result in modest adjustments to the sums going to each of the four nations but probably keep no-one happy.

We recommend that, for the moment, the UK government adopts a pragmatic approach and rolls forward the four nations' existing shares of EU funding into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

6. *Should the allocations within the devolved nations be an entirely devolved matter?*

The present EU allocations to component parts of Scotland and Wales are to a large extent the result of EU decisions. West Wales & the Valleys, for example, receives especially large sums (around £1.8bn over the 2014-20 period) not because of decisions by the UK or Welsh Governments but because its low GDP per head qualifies it as a 'less developed' region under EU policies. Likewise, the Scottish Highlands & Islands receive additional funding because of EU policy on areas with a low population density.

Beyond Brexit there is no need for financial allocations to areas within the devolved nations (or indeed within England) to take account of EU priorities.

Even though the UK government's intention is to establish a UK Fund, there is no compelling reason why it should earmark parts of the pot for specific areas within the devolved nations. This view is endorsed by most, though not all, of the contributors to the Inquiry from the devolved nations.

We encourage the UK government to recognise that, within the framework of agreed guidelines, the allocation of the funding to local areas within the devolved nations should be a devolved matter.

7. *In England, should the funding to local areas be allocated by an appropriate formula, and if so what are the best statistical measures?*

In the 2014-20 EU funding round, each of England's 38 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas receives a fixed financial allocation, in euros, from the ERDF and ESF. The formula underpinning the present allocation is complex, bringing together EU allocations to its three categories of regions ('less developed', 'transition' and 'more developed'), the UK government's decision to favour less prosperous areas within the last two categories, and previous financial allocations.

The case for rolling forward these allocations is poor. There is no need to be bound by EU priorities, the relative prosperity of areas has shifted, the data driving the 2014-20 allocations is highly dated, and there was a serious error in the allocations to the Liverpool and Sheffield City Regions (they were badly short-changed) which neither has forgotten.

The contributors to the Inquiry strongly support a needs-based allocation formula in England. There are diverse views on exactly what that formula should be. That GVA per head should be a key part of the formula is accepted by most. Other suggestions include unemployment, employment rates, economic inactivity, median earnings, skills, the business stock and the Indices of Deprivation.

We recommend that the UK government deploys a robust formula, using up-to-date statistics, to allocate the UK Shared Prosperity Fund within England.

8. *Is there any role for competitive bidding between areas for funding?*

Within the present EU-funded programmes competitive bidding takes place between individual projects. In England, the Local Growth Fund has also been allocated between LEP areas by a competitive bidding process. The allocation of EU funds between areas, however, has always been formula-based.

Many of the contributors to the Inquiry were quite blunt on this point: they see no role for competitive bidding between areas for funding from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. Competitive bidding is seen as hugely wasteful of time and resources, open to favouritism, and likely to deflect from a strong focus on raising the performance of the less prosperous parts of the country, not least because it is often easier to argue for ‘quick wins’ in the places where the economy is strongest. This assessment seems reasonable.

Among the minority who see merit in an element of competitive bidding it is still seen as something that should be marginal to the main, formula-driven basis of funding allocation, perhaps reserved for experimental measures or for initiatives that might only have relevance in a small number of places.

We recommend that if any element of competitive bidding were to be incorporated into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund it should be marginal to the main formula-based allocation.

9. *In England, should sub-regions (e.g. LEP areas, combined authorities) be the basis for financial allocations, as with EU funding at present?*

There is agreement among contributors to the Inquiry that in England sub-regions are the geographical unit to which financial allocations should be made. Local economies operate at this scale, generally spanning several local authorities but stopping short of standard statistical regions.

In practice, too, the economic diversity of England is especially marked at the sub-regional scale. Within several regions there are both prosperous and deprived sub-regions.

The contributors to the Inquiry have mixed views however on the merits of the present LEP geography. Where there is a combined authority and a LEP with the same boundaries, and where cooperation and administration has matured, greater confidence is expressed in this framework. Elsewhere, there seems to be greater unease. Some county councils, for example, clearly feel they should be more central to the administration of funding.

In July 2018 the UK government published its review of Local Enterprise Partnerships, intended to initiate adjustments to LEP boundaries and improvements to their administrative structures and accountability. If these reforms are implemented some of the concerns about LEPs may recede. In practice, however, if the intention in England is to allocate the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to sub-regions there presently seems little practical alternative to the use of LEP areas.

We recommend that sub-regions, most probably revised LEP areas, remain the basis for financial allocations to areas within England.

10. *As with present-day EU funding, should economic development and convergence remain the primary objectives of the new Fund?*

The Conservative manifesto defined the purpose of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund as being to “reduce inequalities between communities across our four nations”. The ministerial statement in July 2018 re-affirmed this commitment to tackle these inequalities.

This focus on narrowing the differences in prosperity and well-being between places is endorsed by contributors to the Inquiry.

There is strong support for maintaining economic development at the heart of the objectives for the new Fund but there is also a view among contributors that ‘inclusive growth’ – making sure the benefits of a growing economy filter through to those most in need – has an important place in the Fund.

We support the government’s intention to make narrowing the differences in prosperity across the UK the key objective of the new Fund.

11. *Are there activities beyond the scope of present-day EU funding that should be supported?*

Over the years the activities eligible for financial support from the EU have become more restrictive. Whereas at one time it was normal to use substantial ERDF funding to support infrastructure investment, in most of the country the focus in the present round has had to be on R&D, business support, the low-carbon economy and environmental improvement. There are also tight restrictions on financial aid to businesses.

The view of most contributors to the Inquiry is that the shopping list of activities on which EU funds can be spent has become too restrictive and that the creation of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund allows a fresh start. There is a widespread view too that local players know their area best and are best placed to judge exactly what is needed. This adds up to a powerful call for greater flexibility on spending.

Kent County Council made a special plea to help offset the expected costs of Brexit – their ports are in the front-line – and a number of players in Northern Ireland made the case for addressing the special needs of the border with the Republic of Ireland, including the loss of EU-funded Peace and Cross-Border initiatives. These seem in principle to be special cases, tied directly to the consequences of Brexit, that the UK government ought to address, though not necessarily through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

We recommend that local partners are given flexibility to define the types of projects on which the UK Shared Prosperity Fund is spent, so long as the activities remain consistent with the wider objectives of the Fund.

12. *Should there be guarantees that specific activities supported at present by EU funding (e.g. ESF support for training) will continue to receive funding?*

Most contributors to the Inquiry want to see local flexibility to determine local spending priorities, with little if any constraint, and therefore do not support the idea that specific funding should not be earmarked for specific purposes. In England, there is an expectation that the Local Industrial Strategies, intended to be in place in all areas by 2020, will set the framework within which local partners can then determine local spending priorities.

An exception applies to a number of organisations that make extensive use of European Social Fund (ESF) monies or act as representative bodies for these organisations. They have a worry that ESF-funded activities, which currently account for around 30 per cent of the combined ERDF/ESF spend across the country but substantially more in London, might be squeezed out. Some of these activities address the skills needs of the most marginalised in society. Whether a squeeze of this kind is ever likely to happen is unclear, especially as the emphasis of the UK government and devolved administrations on skills as a driver of productivity seems likely to figure in most plans. Nevertheless, the concern is real.

We recommend that requirements to fund specific activities should be kept to a minimum, but we would also expect the spending plans of local partners to be a balanced portfolio.

13. *As a UK fund, should the UK government set the broad guidelines for the priorities to be supported by the Shared Prosperity Fund?*

14. *What role should the devolved administrations play in setting the broad guidelines?*

These questions are best taken together.

The present arrangement for managing the EU Structural Funds is that the UK government draws up an over-arching plan in agreement with the European Commission.

This arrangement will not be required following Brexit but the assumption of nearly all contributors to the Inquiry is that the UK government will set broad guidelines for the new UK Shared Prosperity Fund. In effect, the UK will simply replace the EU as the source of funding. The primary concern of contributors is therefore that the guidelines are set in very general terms, allowing plenty of scope for local flexibility.

This view is not shared by the Welsh Government. Their view, supported by Wales TUC, is that there should not be a ‘UK’ fund. Rather, the EU funding that would have come to Wales should be replaced by an additional block grant from the Treasury which would then be for the Welsh Government and Welsh Assembly to manage as they see fit. Regional development is a devolved matter, the Welsh Government points out, and they would not wish to see EU rules replaced by UK rules.

The Welsh Local Government Association sees “no potential underlying conflict in the existence of broad UK-level guidelines and the ability of the devolved nations to determine the detail in partnership with their regional and local stakeholders”.

The way forward proposed by the Welsh Government has a number of implications: the financial allocation would have to be outside the Barnett formula (otherwise, as a major recipient of EU funds, Wales would lose out); the allocation would have to be revised over time in the light of changing economic performance; and as a block grant Wales would be free to spend the money in whatever way it saw fit, not just on regional and local development.

This is not of course what the UK government is presently proposing, and in the absence of a submission we are unclear where the Scottish Government stands on this issue.

Nevertheless, there is clearly force and logic behind the idea that the devolved administrations should be free to manage their own regional development programmes. This would reflect both the spirit and the letter of the current devolution settlement.

Added to this, there are substantial administrative attractions in disentangling the four nations’ components of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund if in England the objectives and financing were to be complicated by rolling in other Westminster budget lines.

We expect the UK government to respect the devolution settlement and therefore any guidelines for the Fund as a whole should be kept at a strategic broad level and agreed jointly between the UK government and the devolved administrations.

We also recommend that, within the framework of the agreed guidelines, the UK government should transfer responsibility for the detailed design and delivery of the relevant parts of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to the devolved administrations and their partners.

We further recommend that, reflecting this devolved responsibility, the Fund should be re-branded to reflect the four nations, i.e. UKSPF England, UKSPF Scotland, UKSPF Wales and UKSPF Northern Ireland.

15. *How should the impact and desired outcomes of the Fund be defined and measured?*

At the present time, the administrative architecture of the EU funds places strong emphasis on identifiable project outputs.

The view of many contributors to the Inquiry is that the current emphasis on outputs needs to be tilted toward 'outcomes', for example to measuring the impact on key economic variables. There is also a view that defining the target outcomes should be primarily the responsibility of local partners, who are best placed to identify what these should be. Contributors argue strongly that a 'one size fit all' approach to the UK Shared Prosperity Fund would be wrong because needs and opportunities vary such a great deal across the country.

We recommend that there is a strong emphasis on allowing local partners to define and measure target outcomes.

16. *How can the promise that the Fund will be "cheap to administer, low in bureaucracy" best be delivered?*

EU funding is presently regarded as something of a bureaucratic nightmare, with so many hurdles to overcome. The Federation of Small Businesses, for example, reports that many firms are simply put off by the amount of paperwork. The urgent need to simplify administrative processes – and speed them up – is widely recognised by contributors to the Inquiry.

A number of contributors note that the removal of the EU from the jigsaw will, at a stroke, simplify matters. In particular, the EU has imposed meticulous auditing requirements that were designed to stop fraud in other EU states and are unnecessary in a UK context. But there is a view that simplification needs to go further and, in particular, government departments need to devolve more responsibility (and trust) to local players, especially where well-proven administrative structures are in place.

We recommend that the UK government and devolved administrations work with local players to seize the opportunity to design a simplified administrative structure that works.

17. *Where should local authorities fit into the management of the new Fund?*

There are varying perspectives among contributors to the Inquiry about the current role of local authorities in managing EU funding.

Broadly, in the parts of England where there are now combined authorities and LEPs with coterminous boundaries there appears to be a degree of comfort about the ability of local authorities to input into decision making, and a desire to maintain and strengthen these arrangements. Elsewhere there can be more unease. Some county councils, for example, feel their expertise and capability is marginalised, a view shared by London boroughs.

This is not just a problem in England: several local authority contributors from Scotland and Wales also express concern at the centralisation of EU programme management and at the need for stronger adaptation to local circumstances. Resolution on this point is clearly a devolved matter.

In England, the reform of LEPs announced in July 2018 should strengthen their competence but not necessarily their accountability to local authorities. Yet it is local authorities that are democratically accountable to local people.

We recommend that the management structures for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund make greater efforts to engage local authorities.

18. *How should programmes and projects be monitored and evaluated?*

There is a substantial body of experience in monitoring and evaluating EU-funded programmes and policies. One of the messages from contributors to the Inquiry is that the UK government and the devolved administrations should not seek to 're-invent the wheel'. There is a lot of existing good policy and practice on which to build.

Broadly, the view from contributors is that projects should provide basic key performance updates to managing bodies (for example to LEPs in England) that can then be compared against agreed targets. Evaluation should be at both project and programme level, and on-going.

There is also a view that the changeover to the new Fund can be used to place greater responsibility on local partners to set their own targets and milestones in the light of local circumstances.

We recommend that the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects aims to build on the experience with EU funding.

Summary list of recommendations

Overall budget

We recommend that the annual budget for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund is no less, in real terms, than the EU and UK funding streams it replaces.

We recommend that the UK Shared Prosperity Fund operates on the basis of multiannual financial allocations of the longest practicable duration.

We recommend that if other existing budget lines were to be included in the UK Shared Prosperity Fund the total budget of the new Fund should be increased by the full value of those additional budget lines, and that the present rules on matching finance for projects should be adjusted accordingly.

Allocation across the country

We recommend that, for the moment, the UK government adopts a pragmatic approach and rolls forward the four nations' existing shares of EU funding into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund.

We encourage the UK government to recognise that, within the framework of agreed guidelines, the allocation of the funding to local areas within the devolved nations should be a devolved matter.

We recommend that the UK government deploys a robust formula, using up-to-date statistics, to allocate the UK Shared Prosperity Fund within England.

We recommend that if any element of competitive bidding were to be incorporated into the UK Shared Prosperity Fund it should be marginal to the main formula-based allocation.

We recommend that sub-regions, most probably revised LEP areas, remain the basis for financial allocations to areas within England.

Activities to be supported

We support the government's intention to make narrowing the differences in prosperity across the UK the key objective of the new Fund.

We recommend that local partners are given flexibility to define the types of projects on which the UK Shared Prosperity Fund is spent, so long as the activities remain consistent with the wider objectives of the Fund.

We recommend that requirements to fund specific activities should be kept to a minimum, but we would also expect the spending plans of local partners to be a balanced portfolio.

Management

We expect the UK government to respect the devolution settlement and therefore any guidelines for the Fund as a whole should be kept at a strategic broad level and agreed jointly between the UK government and the devolved administrations.

We also recommend that, within the framework of the agreed guidelines, the UK government should transfer responsibility for the detailed design and delivery of the relevant parts of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to the devolved administrations and their partners.

We further recommend that, reflecting this devolved responsibility, the Fund should be re-branded to reflect the four nations, i.e. UKSPF England, UKSPF Scotland, UKSPF Wales and UKSPF Northern Ireland.

We recommend that there is a strong emphasis on allowing local partners to define and measure target outcomes.

We recommend that the UK government and devolved administrations work with local players to seize the opportunity to design a simplified administrative structure that works.

We recommend that the management structures for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund make greater efforts to engage local authorities.

We recommend that the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects aims to build on the experience with EU funding.

APPENDIX: List of organisations making written submissions

Argyll and Bute Council
Association of Colleges
Barrow in Furness BC
Blackpool BC
Centre for Cities
Centre for Cross Border Studies
Comhairie nan Eilean Siar
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA)
Cornwall Council
Cornwall and Isles of Scilly LEP
Copeland BC
Coventry City Council
Cumbria County Council
Doncaster MBC
Durham County Council
East Ayrshire Council
East Border Region
East Dunbartonshire Council
East of Scotland European Consortium
East Lancashire Chamber of Commerce
East Midlands Chamber
English Intermediate Bodies Network
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Employment Related Services Association / NCVO
Federation of Small Businesses
Give us a Chance
Glasgow City Council
Greater Lincolnshire LEP
Greater London Authority
Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Highlands and Islands of Scotland European Partnership
Highland Council
Humber LEP
Industrial Communities Alliance
Institute of Economic Development
Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Kent County Council
Key Cities Group
Lancashire County Council
Lincolnshire County Council
Liverpool City Region Combined Authority / Liverpool City Region LEP
Local Government Association
London Councils
Mencap
Merthyr Tydfil CBC
Midlothian Council

Neath Port Talbot CBC
Norfolk County Council
North Ayrshire Council
North East Brexit Group
Northern Ireland Local Government Association
Orkney Islands Council
Perth and Kinross Council
Plymouth City Council
Portsmouth City Council
Preston City Council
Prince’s Trust
Rotherham MBC
Scottish Cities
Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
Sheffield City Region
Shetland Islands Council
South Ayrshire Council
South Lanarkshire Council
South Tyneside Council
Sunderland City Council
Telford and Wrekin Council
Tees Valley Mayoral Combined Authority
Torbay Development Agency
Torfaen CBC
TUC
University of the Highlands and Islands
Wales Council for Voluntary Action
Wales TUC
Warrington BC
Welsh Government
Welsh Local Government Association
West Dunbartonshire Council
West of Scotland European Forum
West Yorkshire Combined Authority / Leeds City Region LEP