Date: 31 March 2017

Subject: Collaborative Working in the Delivery of Highway Services

Report of: Tony Lloyd, GM Interim Mayor, Portfolio Lead for Transport and Jon Lamonte, Chief Executive, TfGM and Eamonn Boylan, Chief Executive, Stockport MBC

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report notes the progress to date in collaborative working across GM in the delivery of Highway Services and proposes that the next phase of collaboration be delivered under a Memorandum of Understanding signed by all 10 Local Authorities and TfGM.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Members are recommended to:

(i) Endorse the proposed partnership / collaborative approach to delivering highway services and approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for all 10 Local Authorities and TfGM with the aim of strengthening Highways collaboration across Greater Manchester.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Jon Lamonte 0161 244 1020  Jon.Lamonte@tfgm.com
Eamonn Boylan 0161 474 3000  Eamonn.boylan@stockport.gov.uk
**RISK/ FINANCIAL/ LEGAL CONSEQUENCES/DETAILS**

Risk Management – N/A  
Legal Considerations – N/A  
Financial Consequences – Revenue – N/A  
Financial Consequences – Capital - N/A

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKING/PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Does this report relate to a major strategic decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution (paragraph 14.2) or in the process (paragraph 13.1 AGMA Constitution) agreed by the AGMA Executive Board: | No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the AGMA Scrutiny Pool on the grounds of urgency? | No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGMA Commission</th>
<th>TfGMC</th>
<th>Scrutiny Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Greater Manchester has demonstrated that collaboration in the delivery of certain highway functions can deliver services that are nationally recognised as class leading. The combination of opportunities posed by devolution and the challenges of reduced revenue budgets and skill shortages, create an environment where increasing collaboration in all areas has the potential to deliver sustainable long term benefits.

1.2 Road users and customers across GM (as well as Government) are seeking more for less. Reductions in revenue funding have reduced the size of many highways teams, such that further cost savings would be difficult without impacting further on service delivery. It is a good time to think differently about how we can maintain local accountability supported by best practice service delivery.

1.3 In October 2013 GMCA gave approval to proceed with a review of highway services in GM. The review was led by TfGM in partnership with the 10 Local Authorities (LAs). The driver for this was a survey conducted in April 2013 of LAs which identified a number of challenges with respect to highway related services:

- Maintaining service levels with reducing revenue budgets;
- Developing skills to align with work requirements;
- Delivery of major projects;
- Addressing the maintenance backlog;
- Staff shortages in key areas;
- Managing peaks and troughs in workload;
- Maximising available funding opportunities;
- Condition of the network/depreciation of the asset, including public perceptions; and
- Protecting front line services.

1.4 In an attempt to address these issues, a shared services model was jointly developed by Bury, Rochdale, Manchester, Stockport and TfGM. The model continued to be developed until June 2016, when a variety of factors led to it becoming an unviable proposition.

1.5 The benefits of increased collaboration remain and this paper proposes a mechanism to build on the current collaborative successes across Greater Manchester. The proposal has the potential for GM to show leadership in identifying opportunities for efficiencies in the delivery of Highway Services.
1.6 This paper has been developed collaboratively through a series of monthly discussions that have taken place since November 2016. Representatives from all GM Local Authorities have taken part in these discussions and have agreed the content and the collaborative principles.

2. SUCCESS FACTORS

2.1 Many parties invested significant time and effort to develop the previous shared services model and the lessons learnt from that work have been captured to ensure that further attempts at collaboration have a significantly improved chance of success. The key lessons learnt were:

- All parties need to feel that they are contributing to the process to create a sense of ownership of the finished model;
- There is a need to build consensus at all levels of participating organisations to ensure that potential barriers are identified and discussed;
- A full endorsement of WLT and clear mandate from GMCA would help to maintain momentum when addressing significant challenges; and
- A more flexible model is likely to be more inclusive for Local Authorities (LAs).

3. CURRENT HIGHWAYS COLLABORATION IN GREATER MANCHESTER

3.1 Successful collaboration already takes place across GM in the delivery of Highway Services. Collaborative activity includes GM Urban Traffic Control, Traffic Forecasting, the GM Road Activities Permit Scheme and the GM Casualty Reduction Partnership. Local Authorities and TfGM work closely together to deliver these services in an efficient and effective way that also enables Greater Manchester to demonstrate leadership in relevant national forums.

3.2 The GM Casualty Reduction Partnership is one of the few national schemes where the surplus funds from the local driver training courses are recycled into local road safety initiatives. The GM approach is unusual in that it is self-financing and does not rely on contributions from local authorities; also the technical lead provided by the Joint Road Safety Group enables the partnership to take a more holistic view over road safety rather than just focussing on enforcement.

3.3 The GMRAPS scheme is the only joint permit scheme in England with a common operating platform and joint invoicing.
3.4 GM Urban Traffic Control are leading the industry in the integration and certification of red light cameras with LED signal heads.

3.5 Collaboration now also extends across the Key Route Network with the Control Centre providing a strong operational focus for combined working between TfGM, LAs, Highways England, GM Police, and bus operators.

3.6 Highways Group and Transport Growth Group are also delivering effective collaboration across a range of topics including the development of the 2040 Transport Strategy, the Highways Strategy and the Highway Delivery Plan.

3.7 Collaboration in the delivery of major highway infrastructure has also been successful. This has been evident in the preparation of DfT funding bids for GM schemes and in the programme management of significant schemes such as the Stockport Town Centre Access Plan, the SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road, the A49 Link Road and the Cross City Bus projects.

3.8 The GM Highway Strategy Board (GM HSB) was established in 2015 and has been seen as a national example of effective collaboration between local and strategic highway networks.

3.9 These collaborative activities currently deliver a range of benefits to GM that include:

- Improved technical delivery;
- Improved resilience;
- Improved succession planning;
- Improved funding for road safety;
- Revenue and skills retained within the GM family;
- A designed mix of central support and local delivery to suit available skillsets;
- Improved coordination of operational responses to planned and unplanned events.

3.10 Manchester City Council and Salford City Council are working jointly on highways delivery which may be scalable in the future.

4. THE SUCCESS OF THE GM HIGHWAY STRATEGY BOARD

4.1 The GM HSB is a partnership between Highways England, Greater Manchester Police and Transport for Greater Manchester, with representation from Greater Manchester Combined Authority.
4.2 The GM HSB was founded on a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and, with the appropriate governance and commitment, it has delivered a series of collaborative projects, many of which have already transitioned into ‘business as usual’.

4.3 It is proposed that we draw on the successful experience of using an MoU to drive collaboration with Highways England to strengthen collaborative working in the delivery of Highway Services across GM.

4.4 The GM HSB has grown through an incremental approach which has helped both the organisations and individuals develop their understanding and more particularly their relationships and levels of trust.

4.5 A significant part of the success of the GM HSB is founded on the fact that the thinking and development through phases 1 – 8 below has been done together with all partners based on an equal footing and having an equal say. This took time as relationships and trust needed to be built. Over the last eighteen months the sequential development of the following phases has established a successful partnership:

- Phase 1 – CEO’s confirmed the need and desire at the top of each organisation for a partnership / collaborative approach. (2014)
- Phase 2 – Developed and agreed the MoU committing each party to a further course of joint action, to develop governance arrangements and to flesh out areas for collaboration. (Spring 2015)
- Phase 3 – Formal signing of the MoU by CEOs. (May 2015)
- Phase 4 – Established the board, agreed Terms of Reference, agreed working group structures and headline areas of focus. (July 2015)
- Phase 5 – Populated working groups with leads and support from each organisation; established and agreed initial work plan with milestones and outputs; commenced activity and mobilised resources. (September 2015)
- Phase 6 – Established a project management approach to delivery of the outputs. (December 2015)
- Phase 7 – Project delivery, (current phase).
- Phase 8 – 12 month review of working arrangements (September 2016).

4.6 Although the development and delivery of the first 6 phases took over a year, the collaborative approach to working through issues served to strengthen relationships and build an effective partnership.

4.7 A diagram showing the current projects and governance arrangements for HSB is included at Appendix 1.
5. PROPOSAL AND INITIAL SCOPE

5.1 As a result of the success to date of the GM HSB, it is proposed that an MoU would form a sound basis to increase the collaborative efforts in the delivery of highway services in Greater Manchester. The combined forces of the ten LAs and TfGM would form a GM Highways Partnership which could develop and operate in a similar way to the Partnership between TfGM and Highways England.

5.2 The scope of the MoU is intended to be broad enough to include those areas where collaboration is likely to bring significant benefits. The scope is illustrated in Appendix 2 and summarised below:

- Skills Development - identifying subject matter experts in GM and developing processes, training plans and succession plans to retain skills within GM and to enable expertise and knowledge to be shared;
- Apprentice and Graduate Training – developing GM wide training plans and accredited courses that will allow graduates and apprentices to experience and develop the full range of LA highway skillsets;
- HMEP Efficiencies – Learning from best practice in other authorities and organisations to improve efficiency in Highways Maintenance;
- Asset Management Principles – developing a single consistent approach to asset management. DfT are publishing new intervention Codes of Practice founded on a risk based methodology. The new codes provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate effective collaboration in formulating a single GM wide approach;
- Network Development – Building on existing collaborative work in managing the KRN and developing a GM Highways Strategy;
- Delivering Large or Complex Projects – working collaboratively to identify the right resources to assist in the delivery of Major Highway Infrastructure;
- Sharing Technical Excellence and Resources – working to share best practice processes, procedures and policies through existing and future specialist sub groups;
- Collaborative Procurement – identifying highways ‘goods and services’ that can be collaboratively procured to leverage the buying power of the whole of GM; and
- Service Delivery Resilience – increased collaboration in the above areas will lead to improvements in recruitment, retention, and staff morale. Creating cross boundary incident plans will help to improve resilience in the event of major incidents such as flooding or extreme weather.
6. BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

6.1 Collaborative working is a key component of the DfT’s Highways Maintenance Incentive Fund and being able to evidence effective collaboration will be a significant aspect of raising GM assessment scores to grade 3. Failure to achieve a grade 3 for all Authorities could cost a total of £8.3m in reduced revenue from DfT over the next 4 years.

6.2 The benefits of collaboration listed below are based on the scope of the MoU that is attached at Appendix 4:

- Flexibility - Authorities will be able to collaborate on those areas that are appropriate for their needs;
- Low risk- The level of initial commitment is at each district’s discretion, and commitment can build as confidence in the collaboration grows;
- Potentially significant rewards – improvements in resilience, succession planning, technical capability and capacity;
- Local delivery – Collaboration retains skills and capability within the GM family, reducing the level of ‘bought in’ services to support core delivery;
- Low cost – The set up and administration costs of collaboration are nominal, and if any project requires funding, then that can be shared between collaborating parties; and
- Aligned with DfT and devolution agendas – DfT are looking to Combined Authorities (CA) to make best use of collaboration to demonstrate to other LAs how much more efficient a CA can be. They have funded HMEP for a number of years to stimulate collaborative working and awarded all CA’s a level 3 HMIF award this year on that basis. It is not expected that GMCA will receive an ‘automatic’ level 3 for 2017/18. It is expected that GMCA will have to evidence effective collaboration to score highly this year.

7. APPROACH

7.1 It is proposed that the Partnership develops using a similar approach to the development of the Partnership with Highways England and that a Director level board be formed to set direction and agree collaborative projects. A potential governance structure is shown at Appendix 3.

7.2 The board would agree and prioritise the collaborative projects and ensure that they deliver the desired outcomes.
Collaborative projects would be delivered by staff across GM and funded from each authority from staff time. Where appropriate, the board would agree costs and funding on a project by project basis.

The board would co-exist alongside other collaborative groups such as GM Highways Group and GM Transport Growth Group. The nature of collaborative projects is that they will improve the way in which we deliver highway related services. By focussing the board on improvement initiatives, any overlap with existing groups will be minimised. The potential for overlap will be kept under review as projects are developed.

It is proposed that the following phases would be worked through in line with the following indicative timescales:

- Confirm the need and desire at CEO and Director level of each organisation for a partnership / collaborative approach. (February 2017);
- Collaboratively finalise and agree the MoU wording committing each party to a further course of joint action, to develop governance arrangements and to prioritise areas of collaboration. (February 2017);
- CEOs sign the MoU. (March 2017);
- Establish the GM Highways Partnership Board (or other agreed title). (April 2017);
- Agree Terms of Reference. (May 2017);
- Agree working group structures and headline areas of collaborative focus;
- Populate the working groups with leader and support names from relevant organisations, establishing and agreeing initial work plan with milestones and outputs, and provide authority to commence activity;
- Establish a project management approach; objectives, schedules, risk / issues, deliverables, outcomes, reporting;
- Develop a Partnership Plan, project delivery and monitoring; and
- 12 month review of working arrangements.

NEXT STEPS

If members agree the principle of a partnership / collaborative approach, it is proposed that the nominated Director level representatives develop the MoU governance arrangements and prioritise areas of collaboration.
9. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1 Recommendations are set out at the front of this report.

Dr Jon Lamonte  
Chief Executive, TfGM

Eamonn Boylan  
Chief Executive, Stockport MBC
Appendix 1 – Example - Governance Arrangements for Highway Strategy Board

GM Highways Strategy Board

Project Governance
28 September 2016

Strategic Working Group

Project Title: Project S1 Modelling requirements

Project Sponsor: Highways England

Project Lead: Bruce Parker

Project Manager: Kristian Marsh

Project Scope: Long term vision for SRN and KRN through strategic modelling. Establish GM wide strategic level demand forecasts and impacts.

Tactical Working Group

Project Title: Project T1 Travel Demand Management

Project Sponsor: TIGM

Project Lead: Jim Duxford

Project Manager: Rachel Hutchins

Project Scope: Deliver congestion solutions at Salford West as pilot project for future joint TDM effort. Prepare generic TDM toolkit for national application.

Operational Working Group

Project Title: Project T4 Road Safety (Delegated to GM CRP)

Project Sponsor: TIGM

Project Lead: Angela Dobbin

Project Manager: Nadeem Mohammed

Project Scope: Prepare and implement a joint road safety action plan.

Air Quality Working Group

Project Title: Project O1 On road Incident Response

Project Sponsor: Highways England

Project Lead: Andy Bean

Project Manager: Kirsten Marsh

Project Scope: Investigation of joint initiatives to tackle AQ in GM, production of options with benefits and costs.
Appendix 2 – Areas of Potential Collaboration for GM Highways Partnership.
Appendix 3 – Proposed Governance arrangements for GM Highways Partnership

Quarterly Meeting

Highways Cooperative Board (Director Level)

Collaborative Projects

Skills Development
  Apprentice and Graduate Training Scheme

HMEP Efficiencies
  Asset Management

Network Development
  Major Projects Delivery and Pipeline

Sharing Technical Excellence
  Existing Technical groups

Resilience opportunities

Collaborative Procurement
Appendix 4 – Memorandum of Understanding
Greater Manchester Highways Partnership Board
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The Partners

This Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is made on 2017 between:

- Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
- Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
- Manchester City Council
- Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
- Salford City Council
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
- Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
- Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council
- Transport for Greater Manchester
- Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council

(together the Partners)

Context

There is already much collaboration that takes place across GM in the delivery of Highway Services. Collaborative ventures include GM Urban Traffic Control, Highway Forecasting and Analytical Services, the GM Road Activities Permit Scheme and the GM Casualty Reduction Partnership. Highways Group and Transport Growth Group are also delivering effective collaboration across a range of topics as well as the Highway Strategy Board which has been seen as a national example of effective collaboration between local and strategic highway networks.

This MoU is a mechanism to build on the existing collaborative approach and to bring greater efficiencies in the delivering of Highway Services across GM.

Working Arrangements

The Partners shall establish a ‘GM Highways Partnership Board’, co-chaired by one Director each from two of the Partners, the identities of which shall be agreed by the Partners from time to time. The co-Chair roles shall rotate on an annual basis, in such manner as the Partners shall agree. The GM Highways Partnership Board shall meet quarterly, with the purpose of identifying collaboration opportunities across the delivery of Highway services that are complementary and promote local and GM priorities, specifically focussing on:
• Skills Development
• Development of an Apprentice and Graduate Training Scheme
• HMEP Efficiencies
• Asset Management Principles
• Network Development
• Major Projects Pipeline
• Sharing of Technical Excellence
• Collaborative Procurement
• Service delivery resilience

**Status**
This MoU covers work areas which are the direct responsibilities of the Partners in their respective statutory geographic areas.

Save as provided below, this MoU does not and is not intended to create any legal relationship between the Partners. All matters described in this MoU are subject to appropriate corporate and regulatory authorisation and, where appropriate, formal agreement.

Nothing in this MoU shall affect the statutory or regulatory duties or responsibilities of any Partner and its existence does not preclude the taking of independent actions by the Partners where any Partner considers it appropriate to do so.

There is a working presumption that initiatives developed by the GM Highways Partnership Board are, in the first instance, delivered using existing resources through adjustments to normal business. However some initiatives are likely to be more significant in terms of expertise and resource and the benefits that will accrue in the longer term. These initiatives would be established as projects in their own right.

**Confidentiality Provisions**
The provisions below relating to confidentiality and the ‘Freedom of Information’ regime are legally binding.

Subject to any statutory, regulatory and constitutional requirements any commercially confidential information provided by one Partner to another in connection with this MoU shall not be disclosed by the Partner receiving such information.
If any Partner, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 receives a request for information relating to activities undertaken under this MoU, it shall inform the other parties of the request as soon as possible and discuss the potential application of any exemption from disclosure.

**Review**

This MoU, and the working arrangements defined within it, will be reviewed annually by the GM Highways Partnership Board.

The Partners have signed this MoU on the date set out above.
Signatories

Margaret Asquith, Chief Executive
On behalf of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council

Mike Owen, Chief Executive
On behalf of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council

Sir Howard Bernstein, Chief Executive
On behalf of Manchester City Council

Carolyn Wilkins, Chief Executive
On behalf of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council

Steve Rumbelow, Chief Executive
On behalf of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council

Jim Taylor, Chief Executive
On behalf of Salford City Council

Eamonn Boylan, Chief Executive
On behalf of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

Steven Pleasant, Chief Executive
On behalf of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

Theresa Grant, Chief Executive
On behalf of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council

Jon Lamonte, Chief Executive
On behalf of Transport for Greater Manchester
Donna Hall, Chief Executive
On behalf of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council

**Board Members**
The board will be Director led comprising of the following representatives, or their successors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Stephen Young</td>
<td>Director of Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>David Fowler</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Localities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Kim Dorrington</td>
<td>Director of Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>Carol Brown</td>
<td>Director – Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>Mark Widdup</td>
<td>Director of Neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Ben Dolan</td>
<td>Strategic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>Caroline Simpson</td>
<td>Director of Place Management and Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside</td>
<td>Ian Saxon</td>
<td>Assistant Executive Director - Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford</td>
<td>Richard Roe</td>
<td>Director of Growth and Regulatory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfGM</td>
<td>Andy Everest</td>
<td>Highways Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>Karl Battersby</td>
<td>Director, Economy and Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>