

Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review

Document Control Sheet

Report Title Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review

Project Owner Tanya Sheridan

Reviewer Matthew Lugg OBE

Version 1.7

Status Final

Report Date 28 October 2016

Record of Issue

| Version | Status | Author | Date | Checked by | Date | Approved by | Date |
|---------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| 1.1 | Draft | Matthew Lugg | 07/10/2016 | | | | |
| 1.2 | Draft | Matthew Lugg | 09/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 10/10/2016 | | |
| 1.3 | Final draft | Matthew Lugg | 10/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 11/10/2016 | Matthew Lugg | 11/10/2016 |
| 1.4 | Final Draft | Matthew Lugg | 13/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 13/10/2016 | | |
| 1.5 | Final draft | Matthew Lugg | 25/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 26/10/2016 | | |
| 1.6 | Final draft | Matthew Lugg | 27/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 27/10/2016 | | |
| 1.7 | Final Draft | Maatthew Lugg | 28/10/2016 | Tenjoy D'Arcy | 28/10/2016 | Matthew Lugg | 28/10/2016 |

Distribution

| Date | Organisation | Contact | Format | Copies |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|--------|--------|
| 11/10/2016 | Greater Cambridge City Deal | Tanya Sheridan | Word | 1 |
| 14/10/2016 | Greater Cambridge City Deal | Tanya Sheridan, Graham Hughes and Antoinette Jackson | Word | 1 |
| 27/10/2016 | Greater Cambridge City Deal | Tanya Sheridan and Graham Hughes | Word | 1 |
| 28/10/2016 | Cambridgeshire County Council | Gillian Bealey | PDF | 1 |

Limitations

This report is presented to Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership in respect of Greater Cambridge City Deal External Review and may not be used or relied on by any other person. It may not be used by Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership in relation to any other matters not covered specifically by the agreed scope of this Report.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the report, Mouchel Limited is obliged to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of the services required by Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership and Mouchel Limited shall not be liable except to the extent that it has failed to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence, and this report shall be read and construed accordingly.

This report has been prepared by Mouchel Limited. No individual is personally liable in connection with the preparation of this report. By receiving this report and acting on it, the client or any other person accepts that no individual is personally liable whether in contract, tort, for breach of statutory duty or otherwise.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Document Control Sheet..... | 2 |
| Limitations..... | 3 |
| Executive Summary..... | 5 |
| Background..... | 6 |
| Purposes and conduct of the review..... | 7 |
| Findings and Recommendations..... | 8 |
| Resources..... | 8 |
| Systems & Processes..... | 11 |
| Technical Issues..... | 13 |
| Governance..... | 14 |
| Engagement..... | 16 |
| Relationships..... | 17 |
| Communications..... | 17 |
| Appendices..... | 19 |
| Appendix A..... | 19 |
| Appendix B..... | 21 |
| Appendix C..... | 22 |

Executive Summary

Programme Delivery Confidence

The Greater Cambridge City Deal is recognised by everyone involved as a fantastic opportunity to influence the future prosperity of Greater Cambridge, however no one underestimates the challenges of achieving a successful outcome. In this context it was always understood that delivering the first tranche of agreed transport infrastructure priorities was ambitious. As the work has progressed over the last two years there have been increasing concerns about deliverability of the transport work stream as it approaches a phase of statutory approvals. As a result, the Greater Cambridge City Deal has commissioned this Review, to get an external assessment of delivery confidence for this work stream and recommendations for addressing issues identified. This Review has shown there is also a clear consensus about why there is this lack of confidence which is based on a number of key issues:

- Lack of dedicated resources and insufficient resource
- Lack of strong dedicated technical leadership
- Weak systems and processes
- The need for a more up to date evidence base
- The need for more robust governance
- An inability among those delivering projects to articulate the overall vision and how their piece supports that
- Insufficiently developed working relationships between officers and members
- The need for a more proactive approach to communications

Each of these issues will be explored in more detail.

Despite the current lack of confidence, the programme appears broadly on track, however there is a general recognition based on the most recent experiences that this is unlikely to continue without resolving a number of these issues.

Soon after the Greater Cambridge City Deal was negotiated, there were extensive negotiations with the Treasury, Department of Communities and Local Government and Department for Transport on the Payment by Results mechanism, which HM Government would use to assess progress in 2019. Release of the second tranche of City Deal funding, worth up to £200 million, would depend on that assessment and the mechanism for that still appears quite loose. The main problem has been identified as that it will be too early in 2019 to demonstrate progress on the main overall objective of ensuring additional economic growth. Therefore, the key measure of progress is likely to be whether the programme's schemes are 'on track and on budget' based on the final business cases for each and, where implemented, they are delivering the projected benefits. Bearing this in mind, it is still possible, despite the lack of confidence, to meet this criteria providing the issues raised in this review are addressed.

Background

The Cambridge City Deal

The Greater Cambridge City Deal is an agreement set up between a partnership of local organisations and Central Government, to help secure future economic growth and quality of life in the Greater Cambridge city region. It is one of a number of City Deal, Growth Deal and Devolution Deal programmes in the UK and is potentially worth £1 billion over 15-20 years.

The Greater Cambridge city region has achieved global success as a world-leading research and technology hub, with the largest cluster of tech firms in the UK (known as the 'Cambridge Phenomenon'). Growth in Cambridge and the surrounding area has significant benefits for the Cambridge Area and the UK, but is now contributing to traffic congestion throughout the city, a shortage of new homes and affordable housing and a lack of relevant skills needed to support employment in a growing economy.

In 2014, the Greater Cambridge City Deal partnership successfully agreed powers and funding from Central Government for infrastructure improvements to help address the issues and secure future prosperity for the people of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

The five City Deal partners are:

- Cambridge City Council
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- South Cambridgeshire District Council
- University of Cambridge
- Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)

The agreement set up with Central Government will provide up to £500 million worth of funding over the next 15-20 years. An initial £100 million investment has been secured over the five years to 2020, to progress the first tranche of City Deal projects.

A further £200 million will be available from April 2020 and a final £200 million from 2025 if success can be proved in driving economic growth from each tranche of the City Deal programme. There is an aim to generate a further £500 million through local funding streams, bringing in a total investment of £1 billion.

Purposes and conduct of the review

Recommendations

There are 24 specific recommendations, these are set out in Appendix A.

Review objectives

To assess the delivery confidence for the Greater Cambridge City Deal transport infrastructure programme and provide assurance on the overall direction of this programme and its resourcing levels to ensure effective delivery and make recommendations.

The terms of reference are set out in Appendix B.

Conduct of the independent review

The interviews for this review were undertaken over four separate days from 19th to 26th September and were conducted by Matthew Lugg OBE.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix C.

The reviewer would like to thank everyone involved for their support and openness which has helped in the understanding and delivery of this review. Particular thanks go to Denise Evans for managing the logistics, which allowed the review to run smoothly.

Findings and Recommendations

Resources

The concern raised about the overall lack of resources was universal and this probably provides the greatest risk to delivery of the transport infrastructure programme. There are a number of specific issues which need addressing as well as the more general ones.

Overall resources

The County Council signed up to the City Deal in 2014 following an ongoing period of austerity and cuts in public finances. Like most other Councils Cambridgeshire had to deliver efficiency savings and the Economy, Transport and Environment (ETE) Department took its share and downsized its workforce.

The decision at the start of the programme was to keep management and delivery resources lean and that the City Deal transport workstream should be delivered alongside the County Council's existing transport capital programme resources although there would be a need to recruit some additional staff.

The type of skills required to support the transport workstream of the City Deal cover a range of technical transport specialisms, project and programme management disciplines and communication skills. The evidence is that as the programme and complexity has grown, additional resources are needed in all of these areas. It may also be beneficial to consider the longer term future resource requirements taking into account implications of the potential Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to be considered in November 2016 and the potential for Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council to share services. The recommended approach to identify the future resource requirements over the next five years is to undertake a workforce planning exercise which includes a skills audit. This analysis should also take into account the overall resource requirements provided both internally and externally.

Once there is further clarity of what the overall resource requirements are, consideration should be given to the development of home grown talent.

Recommendation 1

(a) Undertake a workforce planning exercise of the current and future GC City Deal transport resources which includes; a skills audit of current technical and project capability. (b) Also an analysis of the age profile in relation to succession planning and the scope for graduate training and apprenticeships.

Despite two recruitment campaigns, the Council has had limited success in bringing in new staff to support the City Deal. This is a reflection of the current national skills shortage in the construction industry as a result of all investment in infrastructure, particularly in relation to large projects such as HS2 and the increased funding for Highways England for the Strategic Network including projects like the A14 upgrade. This is made worse in Cambridge, as with other areas in the South East, by the high cost of living.

To try and improve the approach to external recruitment, a more specific recruitment campaign could be initiated that focuses on resourcing staff specifically for the City Deal initiative, rather than trying to recruit staff more generally to the County Council. This could provide a more attractive and exciting long term opportunity provided that the right level of remuneration could be offered but risks of over specialisation and drawing capacity away from other mainstream Council projects also need to be considered.

Recommendation 2

Review the current approach to recruitment and develop a targeted campaign for attracting specific resources to the GC City Deal transport workstream recognising the need to reflect the market conditions.

Dedicated staff

The City Deal transport workstream is being undertaken by the County Council through its existing organisational structure in the ETE Department. A recent analysis to identify the number of staff working on the City Deal revealed that there is only a limited number of dedicated staff, with most having only a proportion of their time allocated to this work. This in part reflects the fact that a wide range of specialisms are required for projects and full time posts can't always be justified in all of these areas.

The lack of particular dedicated staff resource means that the City Deal projects are being progressed alongside the County Council's transport capital programme. The inevitable consequence of this, compounded by the overall lack of resources, is that staff are continually having to juggle priorities. A number of these staff are often having to work long hours and are being put under enormous pressure to meet timescales which are unrealistic. The risk in this is that the quality of work is suffering and deadlines are sometimes being missed.

The County Council already has a large capital programme, including Ely southern bypass and the Kings Dyke scheme. In addition to these major projects, the Highways England Upgrade of the A14 will generate a lot of residual work for the County Council.

The resources contributing to the programme come from a number of service groups in the ETE Department particularly; Major Infrastructure Delivery and Transport and infrastructure Policy & Funding. Work is being undertaken on the various City Deal transport projects across all these groups. Having this fragmented structure in place for the City Deal work contributes to more silo working and causes a barrier to cross fertilisation. There also appears to be little collective ownership or a joint sense of being part of the City Deal programme. The SMART Cambridge workstream although part of ETE could also benefit from being closer to these teams.

The common consensus to address these issues is to create a dedicated City Deal core team with dedicated resource, recognising however, that a range of specialisms will still be needed that are best shared. This will help foster all staff to have a more collective ownership and should provide an improved working environment as long as it can be fully resourced. Experience on working on major projects and other

major initiatives shows that having all the team together in co-locations helps create a more “can do” culture.

Recommendation 3

Establish a separate dedicated co-located GC City Deal transport core team that is responsible for delivery of the agreed GC City Deal transport projects, draws on a range of transport expertise and is co-located with the Smart Cities workstream. If a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Combined Authority is established in November, consider how this may be aligned with any Transport programme it agrees and where there is scope to share services etc.

Dedicated transport technical lead

The lack of a full time senior officer to lead on the transport workstream is seen by many as a significant weakness to the delivery of the transport infrastructure programme. The current leadership rests with the Executive Director ETE but his time only allows him to spend 20% of it on the City Deal, in turn limiting his availability to interact with Members and lead the Transport programme. The Strategy and Development Service Director in ETE provides a higher level input of 70% and the Head of Major Infrastructure and Delivery (MID), 40% which again illustrates the lack of overall senior management dedicated leadership. The decision at the outset was to utilise existing resources and not create additional dedicated posts but this is now resulting in the pressure on all these managers being enormous and often they have to put in long hours to keep on top of the workload. This lack of senior managers’ capacity also affects their ability to effectively review reports and meet deadlines.

Recommendation 4

Appoint a full-time senior officer who is the dedicated transport lead i.e. a GC City Deal Transport Director who is accountable to the City Deal partnership and Executive Board.

Arrangements to secure external resources

The County Council is already working with a number of different transport consultants to support both its own transport capital programme and the City Deal work. The mechanisms to access this support varies, including a number of different framework contracts some specific to Cambridgeshire, others covering a larger area. The current integrated highway service provider is also able to provide technical support but the performance of the various providers appears to vary. This could be as a result of them only being commissioned on a specific project by project basis which can lead to a lack of continuity and knowledge transfer. There have been occasions identified, when this has led to mistakes being made or the consultant not being tuned in to some of the political nuances. As with the County Council, consultants are also struggling to attract resources as a result of a skills shortage.

Experience has shown that by developing a longer term arrangement with a single consultancy provider, a relationship is created that they will be prepared to invest in and can guarantee longer term dedicated resources within a culture of more collaborative working. Work to develop and secure this partner is already under way

by the Head of MID but this needs added impetus to deliver it as soon as possible. Given procurement timescales, that is likely to take at least 12 months.

Recommendation 5

Adopt a mechanism to secure a long term relationship with a single multi-disciplinary transport consultancy which can provide dedicated specialist resources to be co-located within the client organisation.

Systems and Processes

Programme Management

Any major programme of this scale and complexity would normally be expected to be managed under a regime of strict programme /project disciplines. Industry evidence demonstrates that major projects that adopt formal programme management and processes operate in a more efficient and effective way and have greater certainty of delivering successful outcomes.

The importance and the need to have these disciplines with the GC City Deal has already been recognised, with the appointment of a Programme Director assisted by some support staff. However the embedment and consistency of sound programme management disciplines across the transport work stream is patchy. Some projects are using sound project management processes and others are not.

The lack of consistent programme management practice is contributing to the inconsistency of documentation including the production of business cases, the accuracy of progress reports and the production of project plans. To address these weaknesses, all the City Deal project managers should be trained to an appropriate level of project management expertise e.g. PRINCE 2 and a more formal overall monitoring process of compliance should be instigated.

Recommendation 6

Adopt a comprehensive approach to programme management across all the transport workstream ensuring all project managers have the appropriate skills and all projects have a business case, a project initiation document and a project plan and that project objectives are agreed at inception and regularly communicated.

IT systems

The overall quality of management information for the City Deal transport work stream appears to be weak in relation to what would be expected for a programme of this scale and complexity. This results in insufficient information being available to provide enough confidence for the Executive Board that projects are keeping to programme and are within budget. By having improved management information, there will be better overall visibility of progress and earlier warnings of slippage. This should help avoid misconceptions about the timings of deliverables such as the status of reports for the Executive Board.

To provide this improvement to managing information across all the City Deal workstreams, an appropriate IT product should be purchased if necessary and should be consistently used.

The Team has recently started to use the ASTA programming tool that will provide programme information. This could be more widely and effectively used by its further roll.

Recommendation 7

Accelerate the roll out of the ASTA comprehensive programming tool which provides an early warning escalation process when there is slippage that may affect key milestones being met with a clear change control mechanism in place.

Quality Control

There is a general increase in concern, particularly from the Members, about the quality of Executive Board reports. The view is that they are not always well written, they include jargon and they don't describe the context of the particular scheme in relation to the overall objective. There are a number of reasons that can be attributed to why this is happening, some of which have already been referred to:

- The lack of resources to ensure that there is enough time to do this work properly.
- The lack of senior management time to properly sign off these reports.
- Last minute changes to what is required of reports or late requests for significant additional information to be added
- The need to improve overall quality control.

Recommendation 8

Improve the quality control of all the Board reports to ensure they are fit for purpose i.e. they are of the right quality, substance, technical jargon is avoided, a link between how a specific project contributes to the overall objective is highlighted and there is appropriate signed off.

Another good practice approach in effective programme management, is to have a web-based document management system where all the appropriate information is held and is accessible to the appropriate people. This will contribute to improving quality management to avoid individual documents being shared and amended without formal version controls. The system will enable wider visibility of all the key relevant programme documents to anyone involved and will provide a more efficient library system.

Recommendation 9

Consider having a SharePoint system or equivalent to enable all the GC City deal documents to be held in one place and be readily accessible to the appropriate people.

To further improve the consistency and adoption of good project management it may be useful to produce a good practice guide to ensure all project managers are aware of all key processes required to progress a project including:

- Commissioning technical support
- Producing various project documents – a business case, the Project Initiation Document (PID), a project plan
- Producing internal and external reports for the various forums
- Handling engagement and communication
- Undertaking Member briefings
- Approval processes

In addition to this, there should be a process to feedback lessons learnt to ensure there is a continuous improvement process.

Recommendation 10

Develop and disseminate a project manager’s good practice guide describing all the key stages in delivering a transport project which can be regularly reviewed following a formal debrief and lessons learnt process. This should if possible be harmonised across Transport programmes.

In addition to the good practice guide, there is also need to set out what is expected of officers when they are required to make presentations, given the public scrutiny the meetings receive, the communications opportunity and the particular needs of the partnership. This should cover the style of presentation being succinct, ensuring the context is demonstrated, avoid using jargon and making sure that opinion is balanced.

Recommendation 11

Introduce and disseminate better guidance to officers on what is expected from them when presenting at the Assembly and Executive Board and on key City Deal processes they should follow.

Technical Issues

The question about the overall appropriateness of the transport programme in relation to achieving the City Deal objectives from a technical transport perspective is outside the scope of this review. However, there were a number of concerns raised about whether the programme will deliver the outcomes and also whether the current sequencing was the best approach. There were two specific general concerns raised in relation to the technical process that are worthy of flagging. The first was around the current status of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire which was produced jointly by the three Councils in 2012 and adopted by the County Council in 2014. The concern is in light of the number of significant developments already happening on the ground and whether the strategy should now be reviewed as a result of the impact of these changes. A suggestion could be that only a light touch refresh is necessary at this time and that a review should follow the conclusion of the ongoing Local Plan examination in tandem with the planned review of the Local Plans in 2019.

Recommendation 12

Consideration needs to be given as to when to undertake a refresh of the transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to ensure it is up-

to-date and reflects the impact of any latest development patterns and other relevant changes.

The second technical issue raised on a number of occasions was about of the robustness of the various evidence and if it can be used as a basis for business cases in justifying the benefits of individual projects. For instance, there is concern that some of the transport models are using data over ten years old, although updates to these are in progress. There may be more scope to engage with the business sector to ensure this evidence is up to date.

Recommendation 13

More investment to be made to ensure the transport and economic evidence base is up-to-date. Synergies and co-investment opportunities with other bodies e.g. The LEP should be explored.

Governance

Constitution of the Executive Board

Although the City Deal is a partnership between five organisations, there is some concern from the LEP that two of partners don't have voting rights i.e. the University and the LEP. There is a fundamental reason for this in the way the City Deal Executive Board was constituted as legislation means that only the Councils are allowed to be given voting rights on Joint Committees (The Executive Board is a Joint Committee). The GC City Deal partners originally committed to form a Combined Authority to govern the GC City Deal, but this work has been put on hold pending the potential for a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. The general feedback is that the current arrangement works reasonably well and generally a consensus is reached. The LEP is concerned however, that despite this, the two non-voting partners are not able to assert their influence in the same way as the others.

Recommendation 14

The legislation under which the Executive Board was set up does not allow the Local Enterprise Partnership or Cambridge University representatives to vote. As future governance arrangements are developed, consider the question of how the Local Enterprise Partnership and, if it wants to, Cambridge University, might be given full voting rights on the Executive Board.

Decision making

Clear decision making and documentation of any changes is important to the success of any project or programme. Although there is a process in place for making decisions, it would appear that dissemination of those decisions to the delivery teams is patchy and could be improved. Given the complex nature of the programme, clear delegations are also needed as not all decisions, without creating significant delay, can be taken through the formal Board processes.

Recommendation 15

Ensure there is a clear decision-making process in place for the Board to demonstrate approval of the programme and projects and that it is followed and effectively communicated and appropriate delegations are put in place.

Change controls

It is important that appropriate protocols are followed in the development of projects and that formal processes such as change control are rigorously adhered to. It has been observed that even in the final run up to the publication of reports, substantial changes are being requested to the content and proposals in those reports and this can mean that insufficient time is available to fully assess those changes and their implications. Good practice is only to make such changes through a formal process and so as noted in recommendation 15, a clear change control process should be developed and agreed.

Recommendation 16

Ensure that if Board members request changes be made to reports, they only do so through the senior transport lead officer, who will consider whether those are appropriate and clearer rules around the Executive Board seeing and contributing to documents ahead of publication are agreed.

Successful report writing relies on a clear steer on the required contents of reports and decisions to be made. Whilst it is clear that decisions are only made in the formal Board meetings, it is considered that there is a need for more frequent informal meetings in advance of the Executive Board Meetings to provide officers with this clear steer and to avoid frequent, late comments on reports nearer publication. This again highlights the need for more available dedicated resources to be available to resource these briefings and the scale and size of the programme – Board briefings are arranged on a monthly basis.

Recommendation 17

Introduce more frequent briefing meetings for the Executive Board.

The frequency and timing of Board meetings is predetermined, however, it has been suggested that occasionally due to other external time constraints, decisions may have to be made at relatively short notice. To avoid delays, as a consequence, there may need to be a process for executive delegation of decision making in special circumstances. This would then avoid any delays in delivery due to awaiting final approvals.

Recommendation 18

In order to help expedite projects, there may be a need for a process to be put in place to achieve Board approval outside of the Board's meetings.

Considerable concerns were raised about the way both the Assembly and Board meetings are being managed particularly in respect of the public interaction. Some meetings are taking over five hours with up to 30 questions from the public. There are discretions for Chairs in the Joint Assembly and Executive Board Standing orders that could be applied to limit and manage the time for public questions and at least one of the City deal partner authorities restricts the time for public questions at Council meetings to a maximum of 30 minutes. The role of the chair is crucial in

ensuring the meeting is handled effectively and efficiently. There is a view that by improving the public consultation and engagement earlier on in the process, this may address some public concerns and avoid the amount of questions being raised at these meetings. There could also be a more efficient way to handle the questions by combining those that are asking a similar question on a similar theme as a single question. Changes are currently being made to standing orders that would allow more time between questions being submitted and Assembly and Board meetings, giving more time for combining and providing answers. When there isn't time to respond in the meeting to all the questions there should be a process to handle these outside the meeting through a response by e-mail for example.

Recommendation 19

Continue with changes to standing orders and put in place a strategy to improve the management of public questions and public speaking at Assembly and Board meetings.

Engagement

The need for a comprehensive approach to engagement with the public is an essential aspect of the consultation process. Recognising inevitably “you can't please all the people all the time”, the more understanding they have about the why, the what, the how and the when, the better chance there will be of getting residents on board. There is a general desire to improve consultation and engagement and the sooner this is undertaken in the process the better otherwise the public will feel it is a “done deal”. Two particular good examples of this engagement process are the local liaison and design forums. The view is that if more effort is put in to public consultation at the earlier stages in scheme development the less likely that there will be such local opposition and there would be some reduction in the amount of public participation that is experienced at the Executive Board. Improving the approach to engagement will also require resources with the right skills from both public relations and a technical perspective.

Recommendation 20

Review the approach to engagement on individual projects and recognising the benefits of local liaison and design forums if they are managed appropriately.

The importance of having the support of the business sector was considered essential in ensuring the delivery of the GC City Deal transport infrastructure. The Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership is the formal representative of the business sector on the Executive Board and issues about their lack of voting rights are picked up earlier in this report. The business sector through the LEP are keen to help, would welcome more engagement and could usefully provide more leadership.

Recommendation 21

Both the City Deal and LEP should consider how to improve engagement between the two partnerships.

Relationships

Successful projects and programmes require a clear understanding of objectives from all working on them and for everyone to be 'rowing in the same direction'. The reviewer has observed some instances where there has been confusion on these points between officers and Members and it is important that this is addressed quickly and the confidence is built up between the two groups. Taking on board the recommendations of this review will make an enormous difference in addressing the overall concerns and will go some way to rebuild confidence. However, more work to ensure there is a common understanding of how complex transport projects are developed, the necessary processes and the priorities of the Board members would be beneficial in further developing the confidence of delivery among Board and project teams.

Recommendation 22

Consider what actions could be taken to develop confidence and the relationship between officers and members. An away day for Board members to include key transport project staff would help to improve the overall understanding of Board strategy, investment priorities and ensure a mutual appreciation of the challenges involved in delivering major infrastructure projects. Similar relationship and confidence building approaches for the Joint Assembly should also be considered.

Communications

The need to improve the approach to the way communications is managed and delivered is another critical issue to be addressed for the success of the programme. Some interviewees felt that communications can be reactive putting the City Deal on the back foot. There is a need to more clearly articulate the vision as all too often there is lack of understanding of how individual schemes fit into the wider picture. For example having some imagery of what Cambridge will look like in 2030 may help to capture people's imagination of what the GC City Deal is aiming to achieve. The overall approach to communications should be articulating how all the transport related work streams are contributing to this future.

Recommendation 23

Review the overall approach to communications by developing a strategy that is joined up across all workstreams, articulates the vision (what Greater Cambridge will look like in 2030) and identifies a more proactive approach to how individual projects support the wider programme.

The issue about the overall lack of resources and whether they are dedicated to the GC City Deal or not has already been covered earlier in this report however there are similar issues relating to the available communication resources. There are a range of people involved in communications across the transport work stream who are managed independently from the Programme level strategic communication manager. This fragmentation appears to create a lack of joined up and consistent messaging. It is therefore recommended that the overall communication resources should be reviewed to ensure best use is being made of all the resource available.

Recommendation 24

Review and consider integrating the Communications resources across the Transport workstream to ensure they are more joined up and overall skills are more effectively utilised.

Appendices

Appendix A – Recommendations

| Ref | Recommendation | Priority: Critical, Essential, Recommended |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Resources | | |
| 1 | (a) Undertake a workforce planning exercise of the current and future GC City Deal transport resources which includes; a skills audit of current technical and project capability. (b) Also an analysis of the age profile in relation to succession planning and the scope for graduate training and apprenticeships. | (a) Critical (b) Recommended |
| 2 | Review the current approach to recruitment and develop a targeted campaign for attracting specific resources to the GC City Deal transport workstream recognising the need to reflect the market conditions. | Critical |
| 3 | Establish a separate dedicated co-located GC City Deal transport core team that is responsible for delivery of the agreed GC City Deal transport projects, draws on a range of transport expertise and is co-located with the Smart Cities workstream. If a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Combined Authority is established in November, consider how this may be aligned with any Transport programme it agrees and where there is scope to share services etc. | Critical |
| 4 | Appoint a full-time senior officer who is the dedicated transport lead i.e. a GC City Deal Transport Director who is accountable to the City Deal partnership and Executive Board. | Critical |
| 5 | Adopt a mechanism to secure a long term relationship with a single multi-disciplinary transport consultancy which can provide dedicated specialist resources to be co-located within the client organisation. | Essential |
| Processes & Systems | | |
| 6 | Adopt a comprehensive approach to programme management across all the transport workstream ensuring all project managers have the appropriate skills and all projects have a business case, a project initiation document and a project plan and that project objectives are agreed at inception and regularly communicated. | Critical |
| 7 | Accelerate the roll out of the ASTA comprehensive programming tool which provides an early warning escalation process when there is slippage that may affect key milestones being met with a clear change control mechanism in place. | Critical |
| 8 | Improve the quality control of all the Board reports to ensure they are fit for purpose i.e. they are of the right quality, substance, technical jargon is avoided, a link between how a specific project contributes to the overall objective is highlighted and there is appropriate signed off. | Critical |
| 9 | Consider having a SharePoint system or equivalent to enable all the GC City deal documents to be held in one place and be readily accessible to the appropriate people. | Essential |
| 10 | Develop and disseminate a project manager's good practice guide describing all the key stages in delivering a transport project which can be regularly reviewed following a | Essential |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | formal debrief and lessons learnt process. This should if possible be harmonised across Transport programmes. | |
| 11 | Introduce and disseminate better guidance to officers on what is expected from them when presenting at the Assembly and Executive Board and on key City Deal processes they should follow. | Essential |
| Technical Issues | | |
| 12 | Consideration needs to be given as to when to undertake a refresh of the transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to ensure it is up-to-date and reflects the impact of any latest development patterns and other relevant changes. | Recommended |
| 13 | More investment to be made to ensure the transport and economic evidence base is up-to-date. Synergies and co-investment opportunities with other bodies e.g. The LEP should be explored. | Essential |
| Governance | | |
| 14 | The legislation under which the Executive Board was set up does not allow the Local Enterprise Partnership or Cambridge University representatives to vote. As future governance arrangements are developed, consider the question of how the Local Enterprise Partnership and, if it wants to, Cambridge University, might be given full voting rights on the Executive Board. | Recommended |
| 15 | Ensure there is a clear decision-making process in place for the Board to demonstrate approval of the programme and projects and that it is followed and effectively communicated and appropriate delegations are put in place. | Critical |
| 16 | Ensure that if Board members request changes be made to reports, they only do so through the senior transport lead officer, who will consider whether those are appropriate and clearer rules around the Executive Board seeing and contributing to documents ahead of publication are agreed. | Critical |
| 17 | Introduce more frequent briefing meetings for the Executive Board. | Critical |
| 18 | In order to help expedite projects, there may be a need for a process to be put in place to achieve Board approval outside of the Board's meetings. | Essential |
| 19 | Continue with changes to standing orders and put in place a strategy to improve the management of public questions and public speaking at Assembly and Board meetings. | Critical |
| Engagement | | |
| 20 | Review the approach to engagement on individual projects and recognising the benefits of local liaison and design forums if they are managed appropriately. | Critical |
| 21 | Both the City Deal and LEP should consider how to improve engagement between the two partnerships. | Critical |
| Relationship | | |
| 22 | Consider what actions could be taken to develop confidence and the relationship between officers and members. An away day for Board members to include key transport project staff would help to improve the overall understanding of Board strategy, investment priorities and ensure a mutual appreciation of the challenges involved in delivering major infrastructure projects. Similar relationship and confidence building approaches for the Joint Assembly should also be considered. | Critical |
| Communications | | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------|
| 23 | Review the overall approach to communications by developing a strategy that is joined up across all workstreams, articulates the vision (what Greater Cambridge will look like in 2030) and identifies a more proactive approach to how individual projects support the wider programme. | Critical |
| 24 | Review and consider integrating the Communications resources across the Transport workstream to ensure they are more joined up and overall skills are more effectively utilised. | Critical |

Appendix B – Terms of Reference

| Review Objectives | |
|--|--|
| To assess the delivery confidence for the Greater Cambridge City Deal transport infrastructure programme and provide assurance on the overall direction of this programme and its resourcing levels to ensure effective delivery and make recommendations. | |
| Key Questions | |
| 1 | How high is current delivery confidence for the City Deal transport infrastructure programme being delivered on time and on budget, given current resources? What (if any) change in resources and/or ways of working are recommended to give a high delivery confidence? |
| 2 | Some projects are likely to fall behind currently-planned delivery timescales – how high are confidence levels that the project will be delivered in the timescales in the milestone plan? |
| 3 | Can we show that project objectives and economic benefit are driving decision-making, given that demonstrating this will be key to unlocking future funding? |
| 4 | The City Deal transport strategy is attracting criticism in some quarters from residents. Is the strategy reasonable and credible, given the agreement the City Deal partners have struck with Government and are we sufficiently well-placed to evolve that strategy going forward? |
| Principles | |
| The Review needs to provide objective external assurance consistent with a quick review over 7 days. Interviewees' comments to be treated confidentially, to ensure frankness and assist evidence-gathering. Confidentiality to client. No surprises. | |
| Key Outputs | |
| Review report | |
| Recommendations to provide delivery confidence, likely to command support if possible, but noting the importance of objectivity | |
| Report is to the Programme Director, but would be shared with the Executive Board | |
| Key Documents | |
| Greater Cambridge City Deal agreement between the 5 City Deal partners and the Government | |

| |
|--|
| Committee paper from January 2015 on the prioritisation of the first tranche of City Deal projects |
| Committee paper of June 2016 on Cambridge Access and tackling congestion |
| Transport infrastructure programme plans |
| The Assurance Framework agreed with the Department for Transport |
| Other Background |
| Transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire |
| Terms of Reference for the City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board |
| Milton Road scheme committee papers |
| Stakeholder critiques from press cuttings |
| Greater Cambridge City Deal website www.gccitydeal.co.uk |
| Greater Cambridge City Deal brochure |
| Evolution of the Executive Board's membership |
| Cllr Steve Count, leader of Cambridgeshire County Council, was replaced by Cllr Ian Bates in May 2016 as Cambridgeshire County Council representative |
| Cllr Francis Burkitt replaced Cllr Ray Manning as South Cambridgeshire District Council representative in February 2016 |
| Prof Nigel Slater replaced Prof Jeremy Sanders as the Pro Vice-Chancellor at Cambridge University in January 2016 and as a consequence replaced him on the Executive Board |
| John Bridge resigned as the Local Enterprise Partnership's representative in May 2016 and Mark Reeve now attends (he was the substitute) |

Appendix C - Interviewees

| Contact | City Deal Transport Infrastructure Programme Role |
|--------------------|---|
| Alex Colyer | Executive Director and Senior Lead officer for City Deal at South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Andrew Limb | Head of Corporate Strategy at Cambridge City Council, senior lead officer for the City Council and former Senior Lead Officer for City Deal |
| Antoinette Jackson | Chief Executive Cambridge City Council |
| Ashley Heller | Major Infrastructure team leaders |
| Beth Durham | City Deal Communications Manager |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Bob Menzies | Director of Strategy and Development at Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Brian Stinton | Major Infrastructure team leaders |
| Chris Malyon | Deputy CEO and Section 151 officer at Cambridgeshire County Council, also s.151 officer for City Deal |
| Claire Ruskin | Chair, Cambridge subgroup of the GCGP LEP |
| Cllr Ian Bates | Board member for Cambridgeshire County Council and also Chair of the County Council's Economy and Environment Committee |
| Cllr Kevin Price | Joint Assembly Chair and Vice-Chair who is also Deputy Leader of Cambridge City Council |
| Cllr Roger Hickford | Joint Assembly Chair who is also deputy leader of Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Cllr Francis Burkitt | Board Vice-Chair and City Deal Portfolio Holder at South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Gillian Beasley | Chief Executive Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Graham Hughes | Transport work stream lead and Executive Director, Economy, Transport and Environment department, Cambridgeshire County Council. Was heavily involved in City Deal negotiations |
| Jeremy Smith | Head of Transport Infrastructure Policy and Funding and lead author of the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire). De facto Project Manager for the 8-point plan on Cambridge Access |
| Cllr Lewis Herbert | Board Chair and Leader of Cambridge City Council |
| Mark Miller | Communications Manager Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Mark Reeve | Chair, Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership |
| Neil Darwin | Chief Executive, GCGP LEP |
| Professor Nigel Slater | Vice-Chancellor at Cambridge University |
| Richard Preston | Project Manager for Milton and Histon Road schemes |
| Stephen Kelly | Joint Planning Director for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council |
| Stuart Walmsley | Head of Major Infrastructure delivery |
| Tanya Sheridan | City Deal Programme Director |