

| Option | Pros | Cons |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Just be a member of Bucks TVLEP | <p>Bucks TVLEP remains and keeps the existing partnership arrangements in place</p> <p>Bucks LEP rated as good in the 2018 audit by Central Government in the deep dive process</p> | <p>Does not reflect the true functional economic geography of the area (north and south Bucks have different needs)</p> <p>Would mean being a part of one of the smallest LEP (37th out of 38 LEPs and almost 30% smaller than Oxfordshire's)</p> <p>BTVLEP needs to be formally constituted as a legal entity</p> |
| 2. Just be a Member of SEMLEP | <p>SEMLEP remains and keeps the existing arrangements in place</p> <p>Better reflects the real functional economic geography of the area and reflects one of the key arguments made in the district councils Unitary proposal</p> <p>Links the Vale with the other areas in SEMLEP that are also experiencing growth and connected through work on the NIC corridor</p> <p>It is already a legal entity</p> <p>SEMLEP rated as good or exceptional across all themes evaluated by Central Government in the deep dive process. While the overall RAG score is good in many areas SEMLEP goes above and beyond requirements</p> | <p>Would require the County to be in two LEPs if the southern districts were to be part of the Berkshire TV LEP</p> <p>Would need to make arrangements for the Enterprise Zones management to be transferred to SEMLEP</p> |
| 3. Merger of Bucks TV LEP and SEMLEP | <p>Would create a larger LEP that reflects the lower tier/unitary membership of the Central Area Growth Corridor</p> <p>Would avoid BCC needing to be a member of two LEPs</p> <p>SEMLEP's legal body and articles could be easily amended to reflect new membership and arrangements</p> <p>SEMLEP experienced in managing merger situations and this could be implemented in a relatively short timeframe</p> | <p>Would require clarity about how the Membership and representation of a wider geography would work</p> <p>May result in the southern district areas feeling on the edge as it covers a number of functional economic areas</p> |

| Option | Pros | Cons |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4. Merger of Bucks TV LEP and Ox LEP</p> | <p>Would create a larger LEP with synergies between some elements and cross overs of some of the Central Corridor group</p> <p>Would avoid any authority being a Member of two LEPs</p> <p>Existing legal entity of OXLEP could be used and amended</p> | <p>Does not reflect the real functional economic area for the Vale or Southern Bucks areas.</p> <p>Would require clarity over how the Membership and representation of a wider geography would work</p> <p>Would be a combination of functional economic areas and areas on the edge may not feel represented</p> <p>Not currently seen by OXLEP as an option to be pursued with the current arrangements on the growth deal with central Government</p> |
| <p>5. Creation of “Super LEP” – a merger of Bucks TV LEP, SEMLEP and Ox LEP</p> | <p>Would fully reflect the central growth area membership and provide a good joined up approach in response to the Corridor activity</p> <p>Would create one of the few ‘super’ LEPs that should attract significant investment and Government attention</p> <p>Existing legal status of SEMLEP or OXLEP could be used and amended</p> | <p>Would require clarity over how the Membership and representation of a wider geography would work</p> <p>Would be a combination of functional economic areas and could possibly cover too large an area</p> <p>Areas on the edges may not feel fully engaged/represented</p> |