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Executive Summary

This report has been jointly commissioned by the Regional Transport Forum working in partnership with Regional Cities East, through the Capacity in Urban Renaissance in the East programme.

It aims to provide a baseline study of the shared activities undertaken by transport authorities in the East of England to deliver their transport responsibilities. It does not aim to provide a vision of what a new shared activity model could look like but rather to examine what is already happening, the context for it and suggest some next steps.

The report contains 19 case studies from across the region and 9 national examples. These 19 cases studies all contribute to key objectives of:

- Efficiency
- Performance
- Resilience
- Delivering sustainable growth

The 19 examples cover a range of transport related activities, involving all the 11 transport authorities in the East, and include macro and micro scale activities as well as strategic and operational. Some are long standing, others are short term.

The analysis indicates that objectives have been largely met and experiences are positive. Efficiency is the key driver but this could be better evidenced. Shared procurement has offered the greatest savings and joint bids have successfully generated income. Models vary but the case studies are largely about collaboration rather than delivering transport services across more than one authority. The report offers national examples, suggestions for addressing issues that have arisen, looks at how key drivers have been responded to and examines the gaps in the current shared activity. 18 possible next steps are proposed for consideration by partners: extending shared procurement, joint bid development and low carbon working are popular topics for extending current shared activity.

The report has 4 sections:

1. The introduction sets out the objectives for the report, the reasons for the commission and the methodology used to undertake the research and prepare the report.

2. The context describes the growth of shared services in public sector provision in the last decade and the increasing emphasis on it as a response to the current cuts. It also looks at the transport context in the East and the priorities that are being addressed by the 11 transport authorities.

3. The case studies are presented as brief summaries in alphabetical order of the local authority who supplied the example. There is a section summarising 9 examples from elsewhere in the UK with shared services generally quite different to those supplied from the east. This is followed by analysis under 10 headings to draw out the key lessons and aspects from this activity.

4. The final section proposes 18 possible actions to begin to build on this baseline report and move the shared activity agenda forward within transport services.
1. Introduction

a. Background

Regional Cities East (RCE) was established in 2005 by the six local authorities of Colchester, Ipswich, Luton, Norwich, Peterborough and Southend, working with the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) to share best practice and collaborate on joint ventures, to deliver economic and housing growth more quickly and to a higher quality than working independently.

In early 2010, Regional Cities East Board sought to explore shared service models to improve performance and efficiency in three key areas for the cities’ growth agenda: carbon management, arts and culture and transport services. Investment in transport infrastructure has been a key work stream for RCE since its inception in 2005. The Bigger Thinking for Smaller Cities paper (2009) explains that growth in smaller cities is more sustainable than in larger cities where the carbon footprint and inequalities are generally greater\(^1\) but they are held back by a lack of investment in infrastructure which cannot be funded or delivered locally. RCE have worked with local partners to seek improvement to the Great Eastern Mainline. This focus on shared services within transport services is another approach to working within the sector.

With the support of Improvement East (IE), the East of England’s Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership, RCE had established the Capacity in Urban Renaissance in the East (CURE) programme in 2009. With the Coalition Government’s programme, in 2010/11, the primary focus of the CURE programme became scoping and developing shared service models with partners on the three service themes: carbon management, transport and arts and culture.

The objectives for RCE Board members\(^2\) in wishing to develop shared services are:

- Achieving quantifiable efficiency savings
- Improving performance including putting the customer at the centre of the service
- Improving the resilience of the service
- Enabling the delivery of sustainable growth of housing and jobs in the participating cities

RCE has sought to work in partnership with the Regional Transport Forum (RTF) to progress exploring shared service models for transport services. The RTF is the strategic regional transport board, originally established within the Regional Assembly framework, comprising the portfolio holders and transport directors of the eleven transport authorities in the East of England. At the initial presentation to the RTF in September 2010, it was agreed that RTF and RCE should work together to explore existing levels of collaboration and identify scope and opportunities for further shared service development. Following an update RTF discussion in January 2011, this full report was sought for the March 2011 RTF meeting.

This report forms the key output from the joint work between the members of RTF and RCE and is one of the key outputs of the CURE programme which ends on 31 March 2011. Updates on progress on the carbon management shared service work and arts and culture issues will be available from the RCE website (www.rce.org.uk).
b. Objectives for the study

RCE has six members of which three: Luton, Peterborough and Southend are transport authorities. Colchester, Ipswich and Norwich are second tier authorities within county structures. It was important to ensure that the work recognised the differing constituencies. It was agreed that as in many areas of public policy, impacts in one location are often achieved by working with partners outside that direct location and of course, for example, to impact transport services within Ipswich it is necessary to engage with Suffolk County. In this case, RCE was, with Improvement East support, acting as a catalyst for progress on the wider shared service agenda and engaging authorities that impact on that transport agenda in those locations. One of the objectives of the work was therefore to involve all partners across the 11 authorities.

Through regular discussions between RCE and RTF during the autumn 2010, the following specific objectives were set for the joint project. The CURE programme should:

- Produce a baseline report on shared transport services in East, setting out current activity and good practice
- Capture the shared activity that has taken place within the RTF
- Offer examples from elsewhere in UK
- Identify opportunities and actions for future development of shared activities
- Report to RTF on 11 March 2011

c. Methodology

A brief RCE paper was circulated to the officer meeting (Strategic Transport Sub Group) of RTF in August 2010 by the Sectariat of the RTF. This contained a draft questionnaire to capture the work already being delivered in partnership across the region on transport activity. With officer support, the paper was refined and was presented by the CURE programme director to the RTF meeting on 10 September. The meeting welcomed the focus and encouraged completion of the questionnaire and further analysis work by CURE. 6 questionnaires were returned and the responses were therefore from those authorities that were able to participate at this stage. The results were presented alongside national examples of shared transport services in a report on 5 November to Strategic Transport Sub Group. That meeting concluded that a baseline report, developing the questionnaires’ material into case studies, would be welcomed. The report should establish the good practice to date, compare with other parts of the UK and then identify opportunities to extend best practice. In addition to detailed research, fourteen telephone interviews and two face to face interviews have been undertaken from December 2010 to February 2011 to explore the case study material with each set of notes being sent to the interviewee before inclusion in the report, for accuracy checks. In order to maximise response rates, requests to participate and submit material were made both electronically and at the meetings above. The RTF meeting on 14 January verified the way forward and looked forward to the final draft report to their 11 March meeting. We wish to acknowledge the time of all contributors to the report.
2. Context

This section covers an overview of the development of shared services in local authorities and gives the background to transport services and the pressures that highways and other related services are under.

a. Local authority shared service development

Drivers

In 2011, radical approaches to public service delivery are being focussed upon with the 2010 Spending Review and subsequent Local Government Finance Settlement announced in December 2010. One aspect of this approach is sharing services with other authorities, aiming to cut costs and protect and improve performance. Shared services are not new however and local authorities have been looking at how they can improve service efficiency and effectiveness for many years.

Since 1997, the Labour Government produced White Papers setting out how quality public services should be delivered through greater accountability, local leadership and choice. This was consolidated in the 2003 Local Government Act which provided greater flexibilities for local authorities to look at different methods of delivering their services, including sharing these responsibilities. It was also in 2003 that Sir Peter Gershon, at the Office of Government Commerce, was asked to explore how public resource could be better channelled into front line services, by achieving efficiencies elsewhere. The Gershon Commission reported that £20B of auditable efficiency gains were achievable and that finding drove the Comprehensive Spending Reviews of 2004 and 2007 to reduce the use of resources, minimise costs and improve quality. Included in the types of action that the Gershon Review anticipated was joint procurement, purchasing consortia and shared services, particularly corporate and back office services.

With the requirements for Gershon efficiency savings, coupled with rising service costs, more local authorities were seeking new ways of delivering services including jointly with other local or public authorities. Joint Service Centres were piloted to offer streamlined customer focussed services from a number of public facing agencies and the voluntary sector providers. Capital investment was available to create new accessible centres but much of the savings were achieved around reduced duplication and joint management. The other main focus at this time was on sharing back office responsibilities which did not directly impact on the customer but freed up resource for it. These customer centric approaches were later picked up in the Labour Government’s Total Place approach launched in 2009.

The report “Total Place: a Whole Area Approach to Public Services” by HM Treasury was published in March 2010 and sought to consolidate and advance much of the progress of the last ten years. Total Place aimed to be “the next big step in how we do things”. It proposed a “whole area” approach with better public services at less cost, reducing duplication and bringing different agencies together in a customer centric way: “putting the citizen at the heart of service design.” The report was based upon the learning of pilots across the country involving 63 local authorities and hence covering over 11M people: “The pilots demonstrated that there are real service improvements and savings to be made...”. There was one pilot in the East of England involving Luton and Central Bedfordshire. The report sought to build upon the benefits and where outcomes were positive the government
intended to offer greater freedom from controls, freedom to collaborate and drive growth. Transport services were not specifically examined in the Total Place report.

The Total Place report set out the efficiency benefits of sharing or joint services focussed on the local area and the customer as:

- Pooling or aligning budgets
- Better targeting
- Reduce duplication
- Joining functions
- Joining or aligning reporting and inspection
- Focus on prevention rather than reaction

The main service areas of savings identified in the report are even more relevant today:

- Front line services
- Back office services
- Shared management
- Better outcomes for less cost

The announcements in the Local Government Finance Settlement⁷ bring immediate and ongoing challenges. The Local Government Association report⁸ that “Local Government will have to cover a shortfall of £6.5B in 2011/12” and describe the settlement as “the toughest in living memory”. The settlement announcement in December 2010 suggested that local authorities will need to respond by:

- Sharing services
- Cutting out waste
- Improving procurement
- Bringing senior pay in check

The Local Growth White Paper⁹ and Localism Bill¹⁰ both add extra dimensions to the pressures on local authority departments. The Growth White paper sets out the new approach to economic development, through Local Economic Partnerships, and indicates the end of the regional government tier. Alongside the Localism Bill, changes are proposed to planning to support growth and greater flexibility is proposed for local authorities through the Duty to Co-operate with other local and public authority bodies and the general power of competence to act more flexibly. Both changes permit local authorities to consider radically different models of delivering the 700 or so services that most local authorities deliver¹¹.
Summary

The move to shared service models has been evolving over 10 years but has gained momentum in 2010. The potential benefits have been evidenced above. The current finance settlement coupled with other policy and the need for infrastructure investment for economic growth, set a background to the consideration of sharing transport services in the east and elsewhere in the UK.

The current political and financial context suggest that it is important to consider existing practice and the different approaches, models and benefits of shared services as one method of protecting customers interest and service delivery performance.
b. **Transport Context**

This section covers the transport context for considering shared services for transport services. The role of transport is essentially to allow people and goods to travel from A to B safely and reliably locally, regionally or beyond. Increasingly it is considered that this should be achieved without damaging the environment.

**National Strategy**

The DfT’s 2007 Strategy “Towards a Sustainable Transport System – Supporting Economic Growth in a Low Carbon World”\textsuperscript{12} stated that “the Eddington study confirms that transport is vital to the economy.” The strategy set out a basic principle that the Labour government believed delivering CO\textsubscript{2} reductions and economic growth are both essential and mutually consistent. This has been extended within the Coalition Government’s broad approach.

The December 2010 publication by DfT “Delivering Sustainable Transport for Housing Growth: case studies from local communities”\textsuperscript{13} continues the theme stating that “effective, sustainable transport is an essential part of any community......providing the arteries to support economic growth.....linking people to jobs and services”, whilst acknowledging the problems of congestion and pollution. The strategy sought low cost high value solutions and supported a shift from the car to public transport, walking and cycling, for which there must be a “willingness to work across local authority boundaries.” One of the eleven case studies focussed on cross boundary working between three authorities in the Mid Mersey area: Warrington Borough Council, St Helens Metropolitan Council and Halton Borough Council and the lessons from this are picked up in the national case study section of this report.

In January 2011, the Coalition Government published its White Paper “Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon: Making Sustainable Transport Happen”\textsuperscript{14}. In keeping with the drive for localism and the Big Society, this approach aims to achieve a short term boost to growth and early reductions in carbon by supporting local investment to offer greater choice particularly on short journeys, working with the voluntary, community and social enterprise sectors. Two thirds of car journeys are less than five miles and the government seeks to offer “choices that deliver a shift in behaviour” to walking, cycling or public transport, building on successful models across the country. To support this, a £560M Local Sustainable Transport Fund has been established. This local approach is then set alongside national support for electric vehicles, single journey ticketing and other initiatives that will enable growth and reduced carbon emissions.

In terms of major capital investment, a detailed programme of schemes, identified via the now abandoned Regional Funding Allocation process, had been identified by the Regional Bodies and Local Authorities for the period to 2014. However, in 2010/11 the coalition Government undertook a review of the programme. Although the A11 Fiveways to Thetford HA scheme was retained, and the Ipswich Fit for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century scheme was approved, other schemes were reallocated into either a ‘development pool’, a ‘pre-qualification pool’ or were dropped from this spending review period.

**Eastern transport issues**
The East of England is home to some 5.5M people who wish to move around locally and regionally, nationally and internationally. It is a diverse area with a rural north and congested south in an arc around London. It has small cities, many of which have shown the highest levels of growth in the 1998-2008 period and continue to offer greatest opportunities for sustainable growth.

This growth has been hindered by the road and rail infrastructure. Nationally, for passengers, road dominates with 87% of passenger kilometres travelled on roads in 1996 but in the East, where the public transport infrastructure is weak, this percentage is likely to be higher. The major road routes have a radial pattern down the M1, A1(M), M11 and A12 with only the heavily congested M25 and A14 as cross routes.

Work by EEDA in their Transport Economic Evidence Study (or TEES) showed that this congestion is currently imposing significant costs on the economy of around £1bn per annum and that this will rise to more than £2bn per annum by 2021 in a ‘business as usual’ scenario.

Rail passenger numbers have grown substantially in the last decade but once again both the rails, station and carriage infrastructure are under severe pressure on the radial routes into London. The governance remains complex with Network rail operating the track and 11 operating companies supplying the train services.

Freight has likewise increased on both road and rail although the East of England has secured investment into the Felixstowe/Nuneaton line which will see substantial increases in capacity for freight and should remove thousands of lorries from the roads and specifically the A14 each day once it is completed.

The rural nature of the region and the radial road and rail links put the public transport under considerable pressure and 2010 budget cuts will make the existing network even harder to sustain, let alone improve. There are 20 urban areas with frequent and regular urban bus services but many others with rural mini bus services. The most rural areas of North Norfolk and Suffolk have weekly services and a dependence on the voluntary sector to supply essential transport. Some locations have Park and Ride schemes but these like approaches to parking are all agreed locally taking account of local political and economic considerations. All will be subject to review with spending cuts.

The East of England is the region at greatest risk of climate change and flooding due to its low levels above sea level. “The Path to Low Carbon” says “if we do not follow the low carbon path and fail to become a well adapting low carbon region we put our heritage, security and prosperity at serious risk”. The implementation plan seeks a shift to “more appropriate, efficient modes” throughout the region.

The contribution of the transport sector to the East of England’s carbon footprint is analysed in much greater detail in EEDA’s Transport and Carbon Study (TraCS). In 2009, EEDA with Atkins and the University of Aberdeen published the Study. This report showed how in the East, road transport emissions are 33% of the total regional emissions, 9% above the national average due to the dependence on the car. The report concluded that “large and dramatic change is required” and looks at three scenarios which all fall short of the Climate Change Act 2008 obligations to cut emissions to 80% of 1990 levels by 2050. This is an issue which needs to be actively delivered from
now if targets are to be achieved but for which there is a decreasing resource to undertake policy and implementation.

Local Authority Transport Services

Each of the eleven transport authorities in the East of England has a wide range of responsibilities covering:

- Strategic planning, including the preparation and delivery of the Local Transport Plan 3 which runs from 2011 to 2016
- Major road improvement schemes
- Highway maintenance, including resurfacing, repairing, drainage and cleansing and winter maintenance – local authorities are responsible for 95% of the UK road network
- Public transport including buses, connections with rail, community transport
- Road safety
- Parking policy and provision

The scope of this report has not included examining how these services are delivered by each authority. Rather the focus has been on looking at how any of these services are currently delivered by joining up with another authority and whether than has delivered benefits in terms of cost, performance, resilience and growth.

Financial Context

As with all departments within local authorities, there is a huge financial squeeze on transport service provision.

As mentioned earlier, a programme of schemes had been identified by the Regional Bodies and Local Authorities for the period to 2014. In the coalition Government review the A11 Fiveways to Thetford scheme and the Ipswich Fit for the 21st Century scheme were approved but other schemes were reallocated into either a ‘development pool’, a ‘pre-qualification pool’ or were dropped from this spending review period.

Cuts in Local Authority budgets via the Local Government Finance Settlement announced in December 2010 were harsh. Over the four years of the spending review period, the LGA states that £164M has been cut for roads spending with £65M cut in 2011/12\textsuperscript{21}. These are reductions from £871M in 2010/11 to £707M in 2014/15; this is a 19% in absolute terms and with construction inflation running at higher levels it is a real cut of much greater proportions.

As well as the impact on road maintenance and new schemes to facilitate shift from car to public transport, the cuts are forecast to hit bus travel especially in rural areas where costs are highest per passenger and concessionary fares schemes, which remain underfunded. Road safety grants were also removed at the beginning of the Coalition term having an early impact on casualty reduction partnerships, road safety and the use of safety cameras.
The Regional Transport Forum has been actively considering its future in 2010 and has decided to continue for 2011/12 as an important network for policy development and sharing expertise. This is regarded as critical as a new landscape develops without the regional tier of EEDA and the Government Office for the East and with new partnerships such as the Local Enterprise Partnerships. LEPs are likely to play a role in transport planning due to their economic growth aspiration.

The transport landscape of the East, with the prevailing situation of cuts and challenges, form the backdrop to the current consideration of shared activities. It is a tough background but one which also drives a serious consideration of what is happening on shared activities and how that may be a platform or exemplar for further efficiencies going forward.
3. Transport Shared Services in the East

This section will offer an overview of the questionnaire results and interviews and then present the case studies offered by the local authorities. Finally an analysis of the case studies is provided as a basis for considering future opportunities for shared service development in this service area.

a. Overview

The report focuses on transport activity as the primary focus of the shared work. 19 cases studies are presented. Of the eleven local authorities, 7 responded offering examples across the service but they do cover each of the 11. There is a mix of operational and strategic examples.

There are examples where transport services are one element of a much wider customer service contract which are worth further consideration but are not the main topic of the research here. Within the East of England one of the earliest and largest shared service models combines sharing services with joint procurement. Customer Service Direct is a joint venture partnership with BT, Suffolk County Council and Mid Suffolk District Council and was established in 2004 to deliver ICT, HR and Finance across the two councils alongside customer services. The company has now expanded to 900 staff and offers transactional and other services including adult social care assessment services across Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and Cambridgeshire. The customer service information covers transport services and the website and call centre offer advice and information on highways maintenance issues as well as taking reports on current issues and problems.

The Chief Executive of Customer Service Direct, Bridget Taylor, at the “Delivering Services Differently” EELGA Conference in January 2011 listed the benefits of sharing activities in this way as:

- cost reduction
- single infrastructure and platform
- shared investments in improvements
- performance improvement
- resilience
- professional expertise.

Looking at the transport focussed case studies supplied by the RTF members, as the Table 1 below shows, the key driver is efficiency and all questionnaire respondents replied that efficiency and cost saving is the primary motivator, particularly through joint procurement or sharing set up costs. The comments on the earlier questionnaires and reiterated in the interviews were that the key objectives were:

- Efficiency, cost reduction, buying more for less, enabling more money to go to the front end of services by reducing the costs of back office activities
- Best value, value for money
- Sharing best practice through partnership working
• Ensuring a better quality physical fabric than would otherwise be possible

From the questionnaires, greatest inter authority collaboration is recorded on:

• Joint procurement
• Real Time Passenger Information
• Casualty reduction and road safety partnerships including safety cameras

Additionally, several councils are collaborating on:

• Civil protection or emergency planning
• Highway services delivery
• Concessionary fare schemes
• Patient and school transport schemes
• Major schemes

Other examples of joint activity that were included noted by at least one authority on the questionnaires were:

• Low carbon projects
• Traffic signals
• Lift share schemes
• Cycling initiatives
• Access and rights of way
• Procurement
• Call connect services
• Bidding and business case development
• Joint improvement schemes
• Traffic signals

In looking to group the case studies, we have used the criteria set out by the RCE Board in June 2010. They wished to explore shared activities to see if the following benefits were achievable:

• Achieving quantifiable efficiency savings
• Improving performance including putting the customer at the centre of the service
• Improving the resilience of the service
• Enabling the delivery of sustainable growth of housing and jobs in the participating cities

The table shows that all are demonstrated in the case studies and are delivered currently by shared activity in the region. The next section sets out the 19 case studies listed below.
b. **Case Studies from the East of England**

Table 1: Case Study showing key drivers for the shared activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Contributing Authority/Agency</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Performance and customer focus</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Low carbon growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1/A5 link</td>
<td>Central Bedfordshire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaSTS</td>
<td>EEDA/Highways Agency</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evalu8</td>
<td>EEDA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access Forum</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Share</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional permit</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualty Reduction Partnership</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real time Passenger Information</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight rail improvement</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Highway Agreement</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-emergency patient transport</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Highways Alliance</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Highways Alliance</td>
<td>Regional Transport Forum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Essex Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Southend</td>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Meetings</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casualty Reduction Board</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Real Time Passenger Information</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Protection</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X – indicates a greater driver than a small x
Case Study  
Details provided by: Jim Tombe, Central Bedfordshire Council

Name of case study: M1/A5 link road

Project description: The scheme is to relieve congestion in Dunstable by constructing a northern Dunstable bypass, linking the M1 and A5. The project is being jointly developed by the Highways Agency and Central Bedfordshire Council, involving Luton BC. A key collaboration has been around the brokerage that Central Bedfordshire has undertaken with landowners and DfT that the scheme is deliverable on time following the November 2011 public inquiry.

The partnership includes: Landowners across the route working as a consortium with Central Bedfordshire and Highways Agency under a full head of terms agreement. Monthly meetings are held to bring together partners. This has enabled effective and informed Government Office and ministerial meetings to be convened.

The structure is: There is a consortium of landowners for each parcel of land. There are about 15 landowners involved. This then informs regular governmental meetings which will inform the priority the scheme is given for future funding particularly by improving the schemes deliverability.

It has been going for: 5 years

What are the key benefits of the brokerage role:

- Effective communications and relationship management
- Development of a joint communications plan
- Enables effective leadership and joined up policy development
- Effective dialogue with the landowners
- Encourages confidence in the landowners and government
- Enables easy distribution of information and updates and easier to handle disputes as relationships already exist
- Enables of earlier delivery of the scheme
- Offers greater likelihood of the funding being retained for this project
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Chris Shaw, Highways Agency & Mike Salter, EEDA

Name of case study: Delivering a Sustainable Transport System – East of England (DaSTs)

Project description: The DfT published *Delivering a Sustainable Transport System* in November 2008. In December 2009, the regions were asked to take forward the ‘Cities and Regional Network’ strand. The East of England Development Agency (EEDA) and the key agencies, including GO, Highways Agency, EELGA and the Environment Agency, established a regional steering group to manage a programme of seven individual regional studies focused on specific geographies or themes, which would then inform a regional overview document. The activity was concentrated between January and May 2010; the reports were submitted to DfT at the end of phase 1 to influence priorities for the spending review 2014-19.

The lead organisation was EEDA and a regional steering group was established to ensure all key regional players contributed to the achievement of the 5 national goals through the proposed transport solutions. A lead authority was established for each of the seven individual studies, who then worked with a steering group to review existing data and studies and propose sustainable transport solutions for current challenges. The lead authorities were also charged with ensuring consultation with a range of stakeholders including the private, voluntary and other public sector interests. The reports were submitted by early June 2010 so the activities, co-ordinated by EEDA, were managed for about 5 months.

What are the key benefits of the shared activity during the DaSTS process are:

- Bring people together in new programme structure to focus on specific goals of the DfT programme
- Ensured each authority and agency could bring their existing knowledge, studies and expertise to influence the discussions
- Local focussed activity was locally lead e.g. Essex County Council lead the A12/Great Eastern MainlineCorridor Study
- Locally focussed steering groups enabled local consultation and engagement
- Regional steering group enabled consistency and fit with regional strategy and priorities as well as fit with the national goals
- Locally empowered steering groups were able to use consultants from their own panels with whom they are used to working to speed up the process and enable closer working
- Work was completed to a high standard and on time
- Project management was centrally co-ordinated and resourced
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Jeff Laidler, EValu8 Transport Innovations Ltd

Name of case study:  EValu8  [http://ns1.uoh.org.uk/about-evalu8](http://ns1.uoh.org.uk/about-evalu8)

Project description:  EValu8 is the East of England’s Plugged in Places project, delivering electric vehicles recharging infrastructure across the region. Funding for the project covers 600 double headed recharging posts.

Partnership began: in February 2010 to develop and submit the bid to the Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) which was confirmed in December 2010. The project runs for 2 years until Spring 2013.

The partnership includes: 120 partners of which the split is roughly 50:50 private to public. The project was initially lead by EEDA and with its abolition, the new lead partner is a new delivery vehicle: Evalu8 Transport Innovations Ltd, which is a not for profit company set up and underwritten by the University of Hertfordshire to deliver the project. The partners include:

- Vehicle Manufacturers including Ford, Vauxhall, Lotus and Nissan
- UK Power Networks (Distributed network Operator)
- Local authorities including all 11 of the East of England’s Local Transport Authorities
- NHS
- Parish councils and community groups
- European partners including Stuttgart and Turin
- EEDA

The structure is: a Board for the company which meets quarterly. The project is managed by a business lead steering group of 21 partners which also meets quarterly. 3 staff are currently managing the business on a day to day basis covering project management, communications and technical aspects. Wider stakeholder engagement has involved a range of stakeholder events during the bidding process and will continue with consumer engagement during project delivery to build the market for electric vehicles.

The key benefits and added value of the partnership are:

- National impact was the key to a successful bid and hence the broad regional business partnership which was established initially by EEDA
- Business benefits flow from the project: building upon the region’s significant innovation capabilities, the network of recharging posts will be used as a network to
enable innovative business to develop and integrate new products, services and technologies in the rapidly emerging global electric vehicle economy

- Local transport plans (LTP3) set out how local authorities are going to deliver carbon reduction and the project has to connect with these to ensure joint delivery of this objective and local activity. The partnership also allows the quality and developments of the best and most advanced local authorities to be shared with the rest, thereby generating a step change in carbon reduction across the region.

- NHS involvement shows how the project operates and achieves benefits in a number of ways. The NHS impact can be felt as the region’s biggest employer, showcasing the health benefits and rolling out the electric car use to their fleet and commissioned services.

- Key partners include BRE who promote the connection with the built environment and Millbrook Proving Group which is promoting itself as a stated UK centre of excellence for the testing and development of electric vehicles.

- On the back of the successful East of England bid, 5 Nissan Leaf and 2 Peugeot iOn dealerships have already been announced in the region.

- Consistent messaging and marketing across the partners and the region.

- Robust business model for future delivery.
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Keith Dove, Luton Borough Council & Jim Tombe, Central Bedfordshire Council

Name of case study: Central Bedfordshire and Luton Local Access Forum  

Project description: The two local authorities jointly work with the members of the Forum including private landowners, entrepreneurs and people representing the users of facilities including walkers, disabled users, cyclists and horse riders. The Forum consists of 22 members, all volunteers giving their time and experience to improving countryside access for the future. The Forum meets at least 4 times a year and produces an annual report. The principle work of the Forum is to produce and monitor Rights of Way Improvement Plans. Each authority has produced its own plan.

The partnership includes: Central Beds and Luton jointly work with the members of the Forum including private landowners and voluntary groups. The Secretariat for the group, based at Central Beds together with a small budget for hire of meeting venues and joint work/publications, is jointly funded by Luton and Central Bedfordshire, at a cost of approx £11,000 per annum for each authority.

The key benefits:

- Rights of way cross boundaries and it makes sense to undertake this work collaboratively
- Ensures a coordinated approach to delivery of green infrastructure around housing growth in the south of the county
- Ensures a sharing of ideas and the development of policy
- Costs are shared by having a joint forum and Secretariat
- The requirements are less onerous on private and voluntary sector partners who can attend fewer meetings as a result of this collaboration
- Joint studies, projects and publicity material can be produced where there are benefits – for instance on the joint development of green space strategy and leaflets about the work of the Local Access Forum and its annual reports.
- Allows the flexibility for each Council to undertake its own projects and each Council still produces its own Rights of Way Implementation Plan
Case Study  Details provided by: Keith Dove, Luton Borough Council & Jim Tombe, Central Bedfordshire Council

Name of case study: Bedfordshire Lift Share Scheme

Project description: This project is one element of the Council’s work place travel plan for the authorities’ employees, aiming to become operational in early 2011. The aim is also to set up a similar scheme for other employers in the area covered by the Partner Councils (to become operational in April 2011). The individual partner Councils can offer incentives. For example Central Beds Council have offered a free £5 staff restaurant voucher for the first 20 staff who match lift-share journeys. Other possible incentives include priority parking spaces for lift-sharers in staff car parks.

The partnership includes: This is initially Central Beds and Luton with Central Beds taking the lead. There is no formal partnership.

The benefit of sharing the scheme with Central Beds is sharing software and licence costs between partners; otherwise full start-up and licence costs would have to be met by an individual authority and would have been prohibitive. The intended key benefits of the system are:

- Fewer cars on the roads
- Less congestion
- Less wasted time
- Lower carbon reduction

Costs: The costs of the scheme are budgeted at £2,200 for software and licence for first 2 years, and £400 per year after that for Licence, split equally between the 2 Councils. If the scheme were extended to all commercial premises in the area of the partner authorities, the cost rises to £9,000 for software and licence for first 2 years, and £600 per year after that for Licence, split equally between the 2 Councils. Marketing costs are met locally.
Case Study  Details provided by: Keith Dove, Luton Borough Council

Name of case study: Regional Permit Scheme

Project description: The most effective way to actively manage road works on the public highway where congestion is a problem is by the introduction of a Permit Scheme. Permits schemes require a response by the highway authority to the works promoter as to whether they are allowed to work on the highway and enables enhanced co-ordination and control of all works on the highway.

The partnership includes: Luton, Bedford Borough, Southend, Peterborough and Herts County Council as a sub-regional partnership facing similar issues and congestion levels. Originally a broader regional scheme was considered by the range of road and congestion issues meant that the same permit conditions were not applicable across the network. Graham Turner from Luton is chairing the monthly Steering group and each Council is providing its own officer resources to develop the Scheme. Process expected to be completed by end of December 2011 and is programmed to be up and running in Luton by 1 April 2012.

What will be the key benefits of the sharing the permit system:

- the costs of developing the Scheme (which requires an Act of Parliament) and are therefore high are shared by several authorities
- the consultations with utility companies can be shared by the authorities during 2011

Costs:

- The permit scheme should be cost neutral as the costs of the permit pay for the service
- Scheme set up costs are high; Herts are contributing £127k and the other Unitary Councils £42k split equally between them.
- The council funds are being used to fund consultancy support for the Project Management of technical/legal work that needs to be undertaken.
Case Study  Details provided by: Keith Dove & Christine Davy, Luton Borough Council

Name of case study: Bedfordshire and Luton Casualty Reduction Partnership
http://www.drivesafely.org/

Project description: This partnership started in 2002 to oversee the provision of fixed and mobile safety cameras in Bedfordshire and Luton. In April 2007, the Government changed the way the partnership was funded from a system of direct recharging to the Department for Transport to a Road Safety Grant paid to local highway authorities. The scope of the partnership was also widened to include other casualty reduction initiatives. Part of the Road Safety Grant is used to fund safety camera operations in Bedfordshire and Luton. The fines, from the penalty notices, go to HM Treasury. This grant funding is being withdrawn by the Coalition Government and it is unclear how this may proceed.

The partnership includes: Bedfordshire and Luton Casualty Reductions Partnership includes Bedford Borough Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Luton Borough Council, Highways Agency, Bedfordshire Police, Bedfordshire and Luton Fire and Rescue Service and the HM Court Service. There is no formal lead partner however; Basil Jackson from Central Bedfordshire Council chairs the Steering Group.

The structure is: The three local authorities are the funding partners for the enforcement of the speed and red light cameras. The Highways Agency fund enforcement of road works on the M1 and other trunk roads. With other road safety projects, all partners (except HMCS) contribute either with staff resources or funds. Until the cut in funding in June 2010, the three authorities funded the Police and HMCS £1,450,000 through the Road Safety grant for the camera enforcement. The Police employed 24.5 staff and the Courts employed 5.5 staff from this. Due to the reduction in funding, this has been cut to 8 staff at Bedfordshire Police and 3.5 staff at the Courts.

What are the key benefits of the:
- the reduced speeds
- improved safety of road users and pedestrians (see the data table below).
- Joint projects have also been developed and delivered e.g. Belt up for Life and Motorcycle Training Matters.

The costs have been funded from the Road Safety Grant and it would be anticipated that greater value has been achieved through collectively undertaking these tasks than doing them individually. The following figures compare 2007-9 compared to 1998-2000 annual averages

5.1 Area-wide, there were 121 fewer KSI casualties on all roads in Bedfordshire, including 48 fewer KSI casualties at camera sites per year
5.2 At all camera sites:
   Personal Injury Collisions (PIC) have decreased by 36% or 112 collisions per year.
   KSI casualties have decreased by 59% or 48 people per year.

5.3 At fixed camera sites,
   KSI casualties have decreased from 34 to 10.7 – a reduction of 69% or 24 people per year.

5.4 At mobile camera sites,
   KSI casualties have decreased from 46.7 to 22.7 – a reduction of 51% or 24 people per year.

5.5 Over the same period, KSI on all roads (including camera sites) have decreased from
   384 to 263 – a reduction of 32% or 121 people per year.
Case Study  Details provided by: Keith Dove, Luton Borough Council & Jim Tombe, Central Bedfordshire Council

Name of case study: Bus Real Time Passenger Information

Project description: There is a current contract with 5 authorities (with a 6th authority joining early 2011) to supply RTPI displays at bus stops, providing information to passengers as well as allowing operating companies and local authorities to track the vehicle journeys. The aim is to make bus travel more popular by providing real time information and achieve modal shift away from the car. The system is flexible in that prices are agreed across the partners but each LA can then negotiate with the provider for its own contract at the bulk prices.

The partnership includes: 3 Bedfordshire Council’s, Central Bedfordshire, Bedford Borough and Luton Borough, Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. Northamptonshire County Council has confirmed joining the consortium with an amended agreement in place by early 2011. The lead partner is: Cambridgeshire County Council.

The structure is: a Joint procurement partnership with partnership and Board meetings being held monthly. Whilst the supply Contract is just between Cambridgeshire CC and ACIS, the Partnering agreement enables the partner authorities to be involved in any contractual decisions. The partnership has been going for 3 years with a new contract agreement put in place in June 2010.

Costs: The whole system costs (servers, radio masts, transmitters etc) are shared equally amongst all the partners. Each partner then covers their own costs for on-street RTPI displays and on vehicle equipment / additional base stations. Also provides data sharing capability for cross border services. Total annual system costs are £134,300 for 2010/11 which equates to £22,400 between each partner authority.

What are the key benefits of the system:
- VFM through joint procurement and cheaper prices
- Capture real time data
- For the operating company, the ability to track vehicles and respond to problems
- Achieve modal shift
- Scale of outcomes and impact across large part of region

For Luton and Central Bedfordshire
- Leading to upgrade of 250 bus stops on the Luton Dunstable bus way corridor and minor route upgrades throughout Central Bedfordshire as and when developer funding permits.

Case Study  Details provided by: Tim Cook, Network Rail
Name of case study: Freight Rail Route Upgrade from Felixstowe to Nuneaton

Project description: The project aims to upgrade the capacity between Ipswich and Peterborough from 10 container freight trains per day to 24 per day which will reduce carbon emissions by taking vehicles off the roads, reduce congestion and provide a more reliable freight service to the Midlands from the east coast ports.

The joint working was undertaken to secure funds to deliver the upgrades required and to maximise the impact of those upgrades. EEDA lead regional studies on the ports and freight network to enable robust lobbying by regional and local players to secure £81M of Transport Innovation Fund monies, announced in October 2007. Subsequently East of England lobbying sought to achieve an allocation in the Rail Regulators allocation of monies through the five year funding allocation. Most recently, a working group was established to prepare a bid for EU funds, submitted by DfT. Network Rail wrote the bid but all parties were engaged in working with national and European partners to secure the funds for the projects. In 2008, £7-8M was agreed by EU which has allowed an improved upgrade to be delivered earlier. There was not a formal project structure but using existing regional and collaborative structures to achieve the best outcomes for transport in the region.

The improvements have been discussed over a 15 year period and the Regional Transport Forum has been engaged on this agenda actively to seek to prioritise and then secure funding. The RTF enabled cross agency and regional information and debate and energise organisations to support funding applications.

What are the key benefits of the shared activity are:

- Secure national and EU funding
- Pool expertise and make the best use of key research findings to influence outcomes
- Targeted energy around key opportunities
- Using existing and ongoing shared work at RTF to undertake particular tasks
- Using EEDA’s budget and research expertise to demonstrate benefits in the region
- Ensure that individuals from diverse organisations were properly informed and working as a team to achieve particular goals
Case Study  
Details provided by: Chris Mitchell, Norfolk County Council

Name of case study: Norwich Highways Agency Agreement

Project description: Norfolk County Council is the upper tier authority and hence the highways authority but they delegate certain powers under a 4 year agreement to Norwich City Council. Under the agreement, there is a set of functions which the City undertake and due to economies of scale another set which the county undertake. The City highway network consists of 380km of road, 50km of detached footways and 14km of detached cycleways. The agency arrangements for 2010/11 involve the City Council in managing £3.7m of capital expenditure, £2m of routine maintenance covered by an agency fee of £550k. The City Council employs approximately 25 highways technical staff and 34 parking staff to deliver the agency programme.

The City Council roles include:

- Front of house and day to day maintenance
- Programmed maintenance and network management
- Highway management e.g. licensing
- Highway development control
- Highway improvement schemes
- On street parking operations and enforcement
- Liaison with planning & strategic planning functions

The County Council roles include:

- Street lighting
- Accident investigation
- Major projects
- Electronic control of traffic signals

The Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee are the formal governance board of the agreement and comprise 12 members with 4 voting members; 2 from each authority. This structure has been running since 1997. This is an open committee which the public can attend. It is a joint agreement. It is reviewed every 4 years and has been running since 1974. The next agreement will run from 2011 to 2015 and is going through committees at present.
What are the key benefits of the agreement:

- Enables better linkage with strategic planning role and hence allows transport to be close to city’s economic development role
- Decision making at the most local level
- Integration with other street scene functions such as parking and street cleansing
- Partnership working
- Retains economy of scale where this offers to generate efficiency and best value
- Good governance and fit with the democratic process
- Effective performance management
Case Study  Details provided by: Tracy Jessop, Norfolk County Council

Name of case study:  Norfolk non emergency patient transport
http://www.nnuh.nhs.uk/page.asp?ID=67

Project description:  The project covers transport services for non urgent health appointments, adult social care activities and wellbeing activities such as shopping. It includes services paid for by the client and the commissioners. The project has brought together both the supply and demand side and manages it together so there is one call centre handling all the bookings and demand and one system handling the vehicles, assignment of journeys and resources.

The partnership includes:  Norfolk County Council as the commissioner of adult social care; East of England Ambulance Trust and Voluntary Norfolk, who manage the volunteer drivers. All the three organisations have a distinct role in the service delivery. The structure remains informal and flexible but demonstrates savings and is driven by strong leadership from within. Any cost savings are accrued by the individual organisations; there is not a shared budget. The model has grown incrementally with aligned budgets and shared management.

It has been going for: 6 years as a partnership and as a shared service for 3 years since 2007/8

What are the key benefits of the shared service are:

- Cost reductions in vehicles, staffing, procurement and shared office space. Overall service is £10M per year across the partners which has not increased despite increase in numbers using the service and 8% transport inflation. £150,000 annual savings are estimated.
- Reduction in number of vehicles in total and on the roads at any time leading to carbon footprint reduction; less vacant space in vehicles
- Common quality standards across the services with joint training
- Support for health prevention and management outside the acute hospital stay situation which takes pressure of acute budget
- Pooled volunteers, managed collectively with improved volunteer recruitment
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Barry Kirk, Peterborough City Council

Name of case study: Midlands Highways Alliance  

Project description: The Alliance was formed to establish frameworks for highways related procurement in order to achieve significant efficiency savings. There are frameworks established for certain sizes of contracts but the one that Peterborough has used the most is the medium scheme framework element, which covers contracts up to £12M. The framework was subject to the OJEU process and subsequently a participant local authority only needs to undertake a short procurement exercise to select a contractor for any project.

The partnership comprises the following authorities:

- Derby City Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Leicester City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Milton Keynes Council
- Northamptonshire County Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Peterborough City Council
- Rutland County Council
- Staffordshire County Council
- South Derbyshire District Council
- The Highways Agency

The lead authority is Leicestershire CC and the Alliance is chaired by Matthew Lugg, Director of Environment and Transport.

The Midland Highway Alliance was formally launched in July 2007. It has grown incrementally, has 6 work streams, lead by different authorities, overseeing the different elements. Most recently the Alliance is adding professional services and skills academy elements.

What are the key benefits of the Midlands Highways Alliance are:

- Overall savings are aimed to be £16.75M by 2013; in the first two years, up to summer 2009, £2.42M savings were achieved
- Quicker & cheaper procurement
- Early involvement of the contractors and ongoing relationships with contractors who have worked to resolve under-performance
• Flexibility – authorities can choose to opt in and out according to the needs of their scheme
• Best practice across the authorities with continuous improvement sought
Case Study  Details provided by: A Jefford CWC Ltd

Name of case study: Eastern Highways Alliance (EHA)

Description: The Alliance was formed to establish procurement frameworks for transport projects and also to identify and promote best practices in the procurement and delivery of highway maintenance activities. Both these strands are seeking to improve efficiency, reduce costs and improve service delivery. Top priority is to establish a framework involving contractors who will construct highway/transport works up to the value of £15m. “Design and Build” will also be available.

The framework will operational by April 2012 and its procurement will start with OJEU notification in May 2011.

The Alliance comprises the following authorities:

- Bedford Borough Council
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Central Bedfordshire Council
- Essex County Council
- Hertfordshire County Council
- Luton Borough Council
- Norfolk County Council
- Southend upon Sea Council
- Suffolk County Council
- Thurrock Council

Cambridgeshire led the formation of the Alliance and the identification of its key activities. It has been “operational” since September 2010. Hertfordshire are leading on the procurement of the Framework. The EHA Executive Board is chaired by Colin Chick Corporate Director, Environment and Regeneration, Luton Borough Council on behalf of EEDET (East of England Directors of Environment and Transport).

As finance is limited the Alliance decided to concentrate, in its first year, on procuring the Framework. Several authorities are currently devoting staff time to shaping the contract documents for the Framework. It is hoped, in the next financial year(2011/12), to develop its work on best practices in term maintenance.

The key benefits of the Eastern Highways Alliance are:

- Savings from using the Framework between 2012 to 2016 are expected to include procurement savings of 3.5% ie £3.5m and scheme delivery savings of 6% ie £6m, giving total savings of £9.5m from an expected “throughput” of £100m.
- Quicker & cheaper procurement
• Design capability, cutting out the need for further procurement and delivering good integration between “designers” and “builders”
• Early involvement of the contractors and ongoing relationships with contractors who have worked to resolve under-performance
• Flexibility – authorities can choose to opt in and out according to the needs of their scheme
• Value for money comparisons between works delivery using the Framework and Authorities existing delivery arrangements
• Best practice across the authorities with continuous improvement sought
Case Study  
Details provided by: Paul Mathieson, Southend Council

Name of case study: South Essex Rapid Transit (SERT)  
www.sert.org.uk

Project description: SERT will be an innovative form of public transport that delivers most of the features of a tram at a lower cost, using dedicated lanes and GPS, offering fast and reliable journey times with “real time” information at stops. Initially it will focus on Basildon, Southend and Thurrock and will connect with other public transport in Essex.

Partners: SERT is a “flagship project” of the Thames Gateway South Essex (TGSE) Transportation Board Partnership, which includes the three Authorities of Essex, Southend and Thurrock, Districts, the Highways Agency, DfT and HCA and representatives of freight and transport operators. The Board oversees the development of SERT to ensure that it meets the requirement of supporting employment growth and new housing. Studies have shown that across TGSE further growth cannot be reliant on increasing car use and efficient, quality public transport provision will be essential in offering a viable alternative.

The project is currently in the DfT Development Pool with a decision from DfT expected in December 2011 based upon a modified scheme.

The SERT partners are have also received co-funding from the Interreg 4b NW Europe project “Boosting Advanced Public Transport Systems (BAPTS).  
www.bapts.eu  

This brings expertise from Europe to the project and the opportunity to share knowledge across project partners.

The key benefits of the joint TGSE and SERT partnership are in demonstrating that:-

- collaboration is the key to government approval
- there is a need to achieve greater value for money which requires less national government funding and this is only possible with strong partnership working and joint bidding
- across a wider sub-national area collaboration is essential in bringing forward projects of this scale that cross authority boundaries
- collaboration is essential for successful EU funding bids
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Neil Hoskins, Programme Manager Cycle Southend, Southend Council

Name of case study: Cycle Southend [http://www.cyclesouthend.co.uk/](http://www.cyclesouthend.co.uk/)

Project description: Southend is one of 18 Cycling demonstration towns in the UK. The scheme was funded by Cycling England to invest in infrastructure and behavioural change in the town. The aim was to replicate the investment that has been made in European towns and achieve a reversal of the downward cycling trend. Recent surveys indicated that not only had Cycle Southend reversed this trend of cycling within the borough, but had increased cycling on the previous high levels seen in 2000. This was achieved with a mixture of targeted infrastructure provision and a very successful marketing and promotional campaign. Our Bikeability training campaign has seen a huge increase in the numbers of children trained, rising from 300 in 2007 to an average of 1600 per year for the last three years. Working alongside the Cycle Southend team, Sustrans Bike It officer targeted getting children to cycle to school. This project has proved to be as equally successful with an increase of 18% of children regularly cycling to school. The team also organised an event in Chalkwell Park to charge a battery using pedal power alone. This battery in turn powered the main stage at the Village Green Festival. On the infrastructure side the team designed and constructed a 2 km long cycle path running along the Western Esplanade, which became an instant hit with up to 600 cyclists using it in the height of the summer. Given the abolition of Cycling England by the Coalition Government, Cycle Southend reviewed the partnership and funding elements of the project. This review led to the submission of an Interreg 2 Seas joint bid.

The joint bid partnership includes:

Southend, Cambridgeshire County Council and SUSTRANS to form the UK dimension of the Interreg 2 Seas bid. European partners include authorities from Boulogne, France; Middelburg, Netherlands; and Kortrijk, Belgium. The joint bid is for £1M and the decision will be made in June 2011. It seeks funding for good practice sharing, brainstorming solutions and exchange visits. For the UK, partners will benefit from the expertise of 30-40 years of this kind of approach and investment.

The bid has been jointly prepared and was submitted at the end of January 2011. If successful the project will run for 3 years.

The key benefits of the partnership are:

- The EU funding application would not be possible without a partnership approach
- Gain from knowledge and expertise in Europe
- Could provide alternative funding in lieu of government funding
Case Study  Details provided by: Peter Grimm, Suffolk County Council

Name of case study: Cross boundary joint portfolio holder meetings

Project description: Suffolk County Council work closely with their neighbouring authorities to ensure good practice, effective operations and smooth governance. Joint meetings are held quarterly to involve portfolio holders and senior officers from the authorities covering national issues, major schemes, studies and more local issues with cross border implications.

The meetings have been going for over 10 years and are referred to in the first LTP

What are the key benefits of the joint working are:

• Best practice and information is shared
• Common awareness and agreed approach to dealing with issues
• Understanding of a different perspective/approach.
• Planning can be managed together
• Community engagement and consultation is more effective
• Public communication is handled collectively
• Procurement can be managed jointly or by a lead partner, as agreed
• Duplication is avoided

Although cost benefit data is not available, specific examples of the benefits include:

1. An agreed and joint approach with Norfolk:
   • to support the completion of the A11 Fiveways to Thetford trunk road improvement;
   • to develop a transport strategy for Brandon;
   • for a joint management strategy for the A140;

2. A joint approach with Norfolk and Essex for passenger services on the Great Eastern Main Line (GEML)

3. A joint approach with Norfolk to promote Wi-Fi facilities on services on the GEML.


5. Agreement with Cambridgeshire to promote an A14 Alliance.

Case Study  Details provided by: Mat Kiely, Thurrock Council
Name of case study: Essex Casualty Reduction Board
http://www.drivingcasualtiesdown.org/

Project description: The Essex Casualty Reduction Board (ECRB) is a high-level performance management board that oversees the performance against targets relating to casualty reduction, including the Essex Safety Camera Working Group.

The partnership includes: Membership of the Board comprises a member and / or lead officer from each of the core partner organisations. The core partner organisations currently include:

* Essex County Council
* Southend Council
* Thurrock Council
* Essex Police
* Essex County Fire and Rescue Service
* East of England Ambulance Service
* The Highways Agency

The partnership began on an informal basis in the early 1990s when safety cameras were first introduced and it was formalised in April 2000, when the partnership agreed to participate in DfT’s cost recovery process. It was named the Essex Safety Camera Working Group from 2007.

The lead partner is: Essex County Council. The formal partnership Board meets quarterly. A subcommittee of the Board is the Essex Safety Camera Working Group which aims to maximise the casualty reduction potential of safety cameras working with the court system in addition to the other partners.

What are the key benefits of the Essex Safety Camera Working Group: The cameras were procured collectively ensuring the best price. The location of the cameras was considered collectively across boundaries. The administration is undertaken by the County and Police on behalf of all partners. The impact is hard to evaluate and there is no cost benefit information available within Thurrock, as opposed to some local spending on awareness raising campaigns and traffic calming where the impact has been easier to demonstrate. Thurrock see the benefit of partnership working has been a lower overall cost to each individual council, better outcomes and more joined up approach that would have been possible as an individual Council. Nationally cost benefit analysis used by Thurrock from DfT suggest that for £1 spent on cameras there is £2.70 worth of benefit to the public purse.

Costs: Thurrock has committed around £0.5M per year into the partnership up to 2009/10.
**Case Study**  
Details provided by: Mat Kiely, Thurrock Council

Name of case study: Essex Real Time Passenger Information

Project description: Essex County Council, Southend Borough Council and Thurrock Council are in a partnership for the provision of Real Time Passenger Information. The Real Time Passenger Information system was originally installed in 1999 by Siemens VDO who have since become Trapeze ITS. There are currently 421 buses fitted with on-board equipment operated by 7 bus companies from 14 depots, 269 on-street display signs and 12 radio base stations. Procurement is currently underway for next contract.

The partnership includes: Essex County Council, Southend Borough Council and Thurrock Council

The lead partner is: Essex County Council

The structure is: The partnership is formal and has been running for 11 years. It was one of the first partnerships and contracts of this sort. The contributions for partners reflect the populations of the councils: approximately 80%:10%:10%. Partners meet monthly and focus both on strategy as well as maintenance.

What are the key benefits of the Essex Real Time Passenger Information partnership: Procurement costs are shared and Essex undertakes the administration for the scheme, involving the partners regularly and as necessary. A RTPI scheme for Thurrock would not have been economical or practical without collaboration with partner authorities. Lessons have been learnt through being one of the earliest such schemes; partners have recognised the benefits of shorter contracts to ensure they can take advantage of changes in the technology and price in this rapidly advancing sector.

Strong working relations with Essex has resolved a long standing recruitment issue for Thurrock where the Head of Passenger Transport from Essex CC is now contracted to spend one day a week at Thurrock handling their passenger transport issues. Additionally Thurrock benefit from access to the larger transport team at County Hall. Thurrock pay for the Head of Service time but having failed to recruit on two occasions, the expertise and duties are now covered in this way, avoiding further recruitment, vacancy and service delivery costs.

Costs: Thurrock BC allocates between £100k and £125k pa to RPTI. These costs are likely to change in light of the new system procurement.
Case Study   Details provided by: Mat Kiely, Thurrock Council

Name of case study: Essex Civil Protection
http://microsites.essexcc.gov.uk/microsites/essex_resilience/cca.htm

Project description: The aim of the partnership is to oversee the civil protection plans and responses.

The partnership includes: The Essex local authorities, the emergency services, NHS bodies and relevant government agencies. There are agreements in place with London authorities.

The lead partner in the Essex Resilience Forum is Essex County Council.

What are the key transport benefits of the Essex civil protection arrangements: There are agreements between the local authorities to come to each other’s aid in an emergency e.g. by providing signage, sandbags, cones, grit, staff. Since the plan has been in place, the agreements have not been tested, other than in scenario planning, but Thurrock do not have to buy and store as much unused equipment, by being able to draw upon the supplies of other larger authorities. Thurrock benefit from the larger scale planning and responses that can be co-ordinated, across a number of local authorities, instead of having to undertake all these tasks themselves.

Costs:

It is understood that there is not a financial contribution to the partnership as the sharing of mutual aid is key. Clearly Thurrock does budget for the stocks of signage, cones, grit, sandbags that they hold as part of their commitment but this is lower than without the partnership support.
This section provides some short summaries of shared transport activities that are being or have been delivered in other parts of the UK. The scope of this project has not permitted further research but this allows a view to how shared services have been taken forward elsewhere on this agenda and provides the basis for further research where examples have a particular relevance. Other examples could be drawn from EU collaborations but this has not been possible within the terms of this project.

During the last government’s initiatives, through the Improvement and Development Agency for local government (IDeA), research and pilot work was undertaken to share best practice and inform others of the benefits. An early transport related example was published in 2005 in a 4ps policy briefing “Joint Procurement or Procuring Jointly” which looked at the formal partnership relationship between North Tyneside Borough Council and Newcastle City Council to procure a £250M contract to replace and maintain street lighting. The report sets out the benefits and how a shared service relationship should be managed including apportioning costs and a heads of terms agreement setting out the objectives for the project, budgets and selection criteria.

Within London, Capital Ambition, the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership for London, has a number of examples with further details on its website http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/capitalambition/projects/themes/infrastructuretransport.htm including:

- Work on an asphalt specification tailored to the needs of all highway authorities in London, enabling the industry to concentrate on producing materials more efficiently
- Developing a business case for a shared back office for parking, and a blueprint for local authorities to conduct similar studies on their own parking services
- Harmonising parking equipment, services, controls and practices across London so that there is a more consistent customer experience, and making cashable savings

Another project that is being considered in London is a Passenger Transport Commissioning Hub, proposed by LB Croydon and Sutton, to jointly procure transport for children and adults with special educational needs for efficiency benefits, as well as putting a customer focus at the heart of new service delivery. It offers scope for broadening to non-emergency NHS transport and more effective brokerage with customer groups and voluntary sector service providers. Costs for the project are around £200,000 with savings anticipated at over £1m per year.

The Road Safety Time Bank was developed by the six 2006 road safety beacon councils and project managed by one of them: Northamptonshire County Council and its partners The Time Bank is a members – based hub. The concept can map the total skills, knowledge and production capacity of road safety teams across the country and encourage and manage the ‘trading’ of time and expertise between multiples of authorities. The Road Safety Time Bank will ensure that any road safety team is able to access a range of good practice examples, support and expertise.

The Kent Highways Service opened their Traffic Management Centre in 2006. The aim is to manage the road network, ease congestion and provide information to the travelling public. It monitors
traffic flow and then actively manages the traffic lights, bus services and real time information. Additionally it provides and maintains low carbon transport system equipment such as traffic signals, pedestrian signals, CCTV cameras and message signs.

In South Yorkshire, five partners pooled their capital funding to deliver LTP2 and were able to fund more regionally significant priorities in each location than would have been possible individually. A full list of the costings, projects and benefits are available on their website: http://www.southyorks.gov.uk/embedded_object.asp?docid=9148&doclib

Mid Mersey Growth Point covers Halton Borough Council, St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council and Warrington Borough Council. The joint working between these authorities was examined as a case study of the DfT “Delivering Sustainable Transport for Housing Growth: case studies from local communities”\textsuperscript{13}. The lessons from this case study were:

- Inconsistencies in highway development control policies and overall approaches made it hard to co-operate to achieve housing growth

- The number of other influences, on each local authority, was multi-fold but different in each location and the focus of growth point allowed an examination of common links and priorities and a focus on these.

- Good practice is shared during joint working including innovative ideas that may have just remained in one authority without collaboration. Each authority can take on the best practice of the best.
Many of the examples in the case studies have run for many years: the longest since the 1970s with the Norwich City Highways Agreement. Others are short term projects that have seen a shared activity for a task and finish type task. All have delivered positive outcomes. The operational and strategic examples give a strong basis for considering future shared service approaches.

This section considers the 19 case studies and national examples and draws conclusions about the range of activity and its success in the East of England as well as offering ideas from the research as to how shared activities may be pursued. The key issues are:

1. Benefits: Efficiency, performance, resilience and sustainable growth
2. Business Case Development
3. Models for Shared activities
4. Joint procurement
5. Joint bidding
6. Ensuring localism
7. Promoting best practice
8. Wider partnerships
9. Overcoming obstacles
10. Gaps and opportunities

1. Benefits

In considering the case studies and the objectives for each, they have achieved their goals. However, although this broadly seems to be the case and is in the view of the interviewees, this is not always well evidenced.

Some models were generated because government expected partnership delivery such as on casualty reduction partnerships or DaSTS and others came from more local circumstances. Efficiency was the key benefit noted in the case studies, although it was also about better quality outcomes.

Improved performance was not always a stated goal but seems to have been achieved. It was generally seen as a secondary driver but was significant in at least 15 of the case studies. In most cases the project would not have been delivered any other way and so performance was improved from the customer perspective as the service or activity just would not have been there otherwise.

Resilience is rarely mentioned but is implicit in the project by allowing resources to be well managed where otherwise resource would not have been available to do so.
The focus on low carbon sustainable growth can be seen in at least 8 of the case studies particularly the regionally or sub-regionally focussed partnership funding bids which were of course designed to respond to the national and EU priorities of low carbon economic growth.

The major procurement contracts also enable the growth through allowing local schemes to be competitively and therefore speedily delivered. RTPI facilitates movement from new developments to existing towns and cities through public transport routes. Similarly the South Essex Rapid Transit scheme aims to do just that. Research from Europe\textsuperscript{16} shows how significant the public transport infrastructure investment is in European cities to facilitate substantial and sustainable growth.

In looking to promote electric cars, Evalu8 is a two year joint project that has ambitious targets and has already achieved the funding to deliver 600 electric recharging posts, involving over 100 multi-sector partners with 21 on the business lead steering group. If the 2008 Climate Change Act targets are to be met, as the TRACs report\textsuperscript{20} indicates, a step change is required and a joined up approach is key. How this may happen with EEDA’s abolition is another aspect to consider for RTF going forward.

Several case studies contribute to the carbon management challenge to bring down carbon emissions to 80% of 1990 levels by 2050 including:

- Bedfordshire Lift Share Scheme.
- Felixstowe Nuneaton rail improvements achieved significant national and EU funds to move freight from the A14/M6 to rail.
- Cycling Southend

2. Business case development

Clarification of the objectives at the outset of any shared service initiative is critical for its success. These should be set out in the early stages by developing a business case for a shared service. For local authorities wishing to develop a business case for a shared service model, Improvement East provided funding to Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council to produce a guide to the process from their own experience of exploring shared corporate, transactional and support services: “A Guide to Shared Service Business Case Development”(2008)\textsuperscript{23} which is available at www.improvementeast.gov.uk.

The guide sets how the strategic and detailed business case was developed and what are the critical success factors in the process. The objectives that were set out between the two local authorities and, initially also involving Dacorum Borough Council, were three common themes:

- Resilience
- Performance
- Efficiency

As the detailed business case was developed by late 2007, specific objectives were developed and the partnership proceeded to implementation in February 2008. The guide is very helpful for
officers embarking on these processes for the first time and fits with standard local authority project management approaches.

In line with the stated three objectives of the Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council example, they identified the quantifiable benefits in the strategic business case as:

- Efficiency – aiming at total savings in the 7th year (by 2013/14) as £3.2M pa
- Performance – aim for the service to reach the best practice of those councils in 1-2 years and look to reach best in local government beyond
- Resilience – having a joint pool of skilled resource that can meet peaks and staff absence and turnover more effectively

In order to ensure that these benefits are captured for any shared service, they should be properly set out in a strategic and then detailed business case. It is important not to overburden a shared activity with too much bureaucracy but it is also important to ensure common objectives and benefits are sought and monitored against.

3. Models of sharing activities

In most of the case studies, partnerships and shared activities are informal. In some cases, there are formal contracts within informal partnerships and activities are aligned to achieve a better outcome. In the Norfolk patient transport example, arrangements have remained deliberately informal and budgets are aligned rather than pooled. In other cases, a joint bid has been submitted and there is a joint project management structure for delivery but joint ventures are not typical.

There are many different models across the region and the country. There do not seem to be clear definitions of each model set out in the literature and there are blends rather than distinct models being applied. It is worth considering the different approaches that are being operated:

- Partnership working – different authorities working together to achieve common goals. This may take a variety of forms and may be a precursor to activities being jointly funded or procured or jointly provided. More commonly it is where authorities come together around a particular issue, service, bid or funding stream to deliver a joined up response. Typically each authority will have its own budget and staff for the core activity but some funding will be provided to facilitate the partnership or fund particular projects. Examples show this has operated strategically and operationally and achieved significant outcomes in delivering joined up responses and co-ordinated actions, as well as drawing in national and EU funding. Indeed RTF itself is a key example of this approach.

- Shared services – these services are where a service is identified and steps are taken to redesign it with another provider, either another authority, a public agency or the voluntary sector with whom it is then delivered. There are several different models this may then take and may include:

  o one council delivering on behalf of another under contract;
• third parties (either a private company or another public body) providing services to one or more councils under contract

• joint venture routes.

The Northamptonshire Time Bank models offers a joint partnership approach building on the best practice and expertise of each partner. In the East, a partnership model which offers many of the attributes of the shared service model is one that has been used by the Essex Legal Services Partnership, which has also received support from Improvement East for its development. The 14 participant local authorities have established a partnership and project management system to operate an internal market place for legal services within Essex. For instance, if local authority A wants some legal services not available in house they can “buy” this service for a previously agreed rate from local authority B. Additionally, higher level services (e.g. QC services) are procured collectively reducing cost and administration. This market is operated by a part time “practice manager” with a part time senior advisor working to a partnership board. The key operating platform is an intranet which operates across the different IT systems of the authorities. To ensure consistency, high performance and continuous improvement as well as efficiency savings, legal training and update is operated across the partnership rather than by individual authorities.

As well as considering the final model that is aspired to, it is also worth considering the route to reach that model. One route is set out in the Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council guide but some may prefer a more incremental model where services are shared according to a number of criteria and grow over time according to the viability of the business case, with factors being:

- The number of authorities that wish to participate
- The service areas that may be involved
- The type of operations to be included
- The extent of that service that is/can be provided through a shared service model
- The scale, type and cost of the model considered

Both the Customer Service Direct model and the Essex Legal Services Model have grown over time, reviewing the initial scope, business case and partnership. There are a number of models where staff resource is shared. In Essex, Essex County lead on a number of initiatives to which Southend and Thurrock contribute and then gain access to Essex staff. This is paid for through contributions by those local authorities to Essex, in proportion to their population. The head of transport passenger services at Essex has covered a long term vacancy in Thurrock, which Thurrock then pays for. In the safety camera partnerships, some staff have been seconded to undertake particular roles at the partnership but staff remain in their own organisations paid for up until now by the road safety grant. In the Norfolk patient transport example, joint management systems exist but each organisation continues to employ staff to provide the service but in a different configuration to previously.

4. Joint Procurement
Any of these models may include joint procurement. The greatest savings have been achieved here. Joint procurement also has different approaches: there may be joint procurement and then once the procurement is finished each authority draws down the benefits individually, as the Alliance case studies work or the activity may be jointly procured and delivered so the joint work continues until the end of the contract, like the North Tyneside/Newcastle example.

Joint initial procurement is often a key incentive for establishing a shared project. Economies of scale bring benefits to many Councils that could not otherwise undertake a project. Set up costs prevent many new initiatives happening – where these have been shared, innovation has continued. The regional permit scheme and the Luton and Central Beds Lift Share scheme both indicate the importance of sharing upfront costs.

Joint procurement is the most favoured model in the east and achieves cost savings at a number of points in the process. On the back of the success of the Midlands Highways Alliance in which Peterborough participates, the Eastern Highways Alliance is being established to be operational in 2012. The benefits of these models are shown in many of the cases studies on RTPI, cameras as well as major scheme and maintenance contracts. Both the prices from a larger order and the costs of the procurement are lower as well as achieving other benefits from relationship management and long term relationships with contractors. The flexible contracts that are produced that allow local authorities to opt in or out in their own time has produced value to many local authorities at the time they have needed those benefits e.g. Peterborough from the Midlands Highways Alliance and Luton from the Cambridgeshire lead RTPI scheme.

5. Joint Bidding

A number of the case studies relate to joint bidding for national or EU funds and the importance of collaboration in developing a successful bid. This has brought considerable income to projects.

The Government is increasingly looking at how better value for money can be achieved and if a scheme can we delivered with less funds from the national pot it is more likely to be successful. This is only likely to occur where bids are possible to the EU or costs can be shared between a number of partners.

A number of local authorities are building up expertise of making EU bids and others remain concerned about the project development costs and administration required in managing an EU funded project. As national funds are constrained, it is worth considering how the expertise can be shared and the maximum amount of EU funding drawn into the region.

As well as the preparation of the bid documents, the case studies point to the importance of influencing and joint communication planning to ensure appropriate involvement of stakeholders to put across key messages about the bid or project. This is illustrated by the Central Bedfordshire example for the M1/AS link and also the role of the RTF in the Felixstowe/Nuneaton improvements.

6. Ensuring Localism

The case studies have shown how it is possible to achieve the benefits of sharing and the economies of scale and yet still the principles of localism can be fulfilled. In the joint procurement examples, the participants benefit from a collective procurement and cheaper contract but only actively use
the contract in the place and at the time it suits the participant authority. Local decision making is valued in all the case studies.

Another aspect is to ensure that this local decision making is visible to the public who may quite reasonably perceive that the government is looking for localism with one hand and economies of scale with the other. The Norwich City Highways Agreement case study sets out the governance arrangements and how both councillors and the public can participate and learn about the work of the agreement. The representation of the Board and the access to the public to the papers, the meetings and their representatives are all written into the agreement, which is then reviewed on a four yearly basis.

The approach to research and development during the DaSTS project also values the local contributions and makes them key to driving the quality of the project whilst bringing a number of local projects together to gain a collective advantage. Locally, individual authorities who lead different elements worked with consultants that they knew, with data that they were familiar with and undertaking consultation with their stakeholders. At regional level, this was project managed to generate a regional submission that added value from bringing the best of each local example to the regional submission.

Some of the examples show the value of regional bodies in establishing partnerships, pulling together bids or resources. This is worth considering as the impact of the abolition of EEDA and the Government Office is considered and the RTF thinks about its future role 2011/12 and beyond.

The most extensive and collaborative projects all mention the need for local leadership and vision in delivering the new model and how much learning has been done by officers during the process. This is highlighted within the Norfolk case study where the vision of individual managers was critical to the shared service and is also noted in the Watford Borough Council /Three Rivers District Council Guide.

The collaborations themselves enabled greater leadership. Improved communications and high quality relationships between partners at politician and officer level are noted in a number of examples through Suffolk and Central Bedfordshire among others. By working more closely with partners, problems are solved and those solutions are seen as better than otherwise. Best practice is shared and significantly, greater influence is achieved with funders and government. This is shown through the work of the RTF on the Felixstowe Nuneaton line both with national government and for EU funding.

7. Promoting best practice

Reaching the quality of the best partner is noted and this has taken place either by buying in the service of the best partner or by amending the approach to match the best practice as the Mid Mersey example suggested. The Thurrock team have been able to arrange cover of a long standing vacancy through joint work with Essex. In Norfolk the best practice from the ambulance service, county council and voluntary sector has been brought together to provide a high quality joined up service, taking the best from each but also allowing joint training and investment in service delivery that would not have been possible otherwise.
The Total Place pilots and report demonstrate the duplication that occurs particularly between several public authorities but also within. Every operational case study or questionnaire response notes the reduction of duplication or the avoidance of duplication by the shared activity, contributing to a better service to the public and releasing efficiency savings.

8. Wider partnerships

In Norfolk, we have the only example in the report of joint working with the voluntary sector. The voluntary sector participates in partnerships but in Norfolk are delivery partners bringing volunteers to run part of the patient transport service. With the 2011 Transport White paper\textsuperscript{14} we noted the Big Society theme running through and the expectation that for successful Local Sustainable Transport Fund bids they would need to be collaborative not only with local authority partners but also voluntary, community and social enterprise sectors.

Many of the schemes of course include working with the private sector as contractors through joint procurement and some of the benefits indicate the value of longer term stable relationships with partner contractors in the sector. In Peterborough, officers note that where problems have occurred with one contractor through the Midlands Highways Alliance the relationships through the framework have meant that it has been much easier to ask another contractor to step in and resolve the issue. Strong long term partnership arrangements have been enabled by the Alliance and it is of course intended that similar benefits will be gained from the Eastern Alliance.

As public organisations look to externalising more services and greater joint procurement, this “partnership” approach is significant. A 4ps and Sheffield City Council briefing paper in 2006\textsuperscript{25} sets out the ‘Strategic Partnership Framework’ that is in place between the City Council and Liberata to focus on performance and achieving targets. The contract was originally about cost cutting in 1998 when back office activities were outsourced but five years on the relationship was one of joint delivery to achieve process and system improvements for customers, contributing to their “excellent CPA rating” in 2005.

9. Obstacles

“Shared services between councils can be complex and challenging.”\textsuperscript{23} There are many practical, legal, staffing and technical issues which need to be considered but from the examples above have been largely successfully overcome. Of course we have not captured those shared activities that fell along the way. By retaining staff resource within individual organisations and not developing such wholly shared models as elsewhere in the local authority service agenda some of the more complex obstacles have been avoided. From the breadth of the research and the case study interviews, these may include:

- Internal capacity to fund the set up costs
- Legal restraints
- Organisational culture
- Data collection and knowledge about existing service costs
- ICT issues
- Political agenda and change
- Conflicting priorities
• Change resistance
• Inadequate project management
• Remaining focussed on the business case
• Commitment and leadership
• Communications and engagement
• Fear and lack of positive vision for local services in current climate – “freeze”

Using the Watford Borough Council/Three Rivers District Council Guide, the best approach to tackling these and other obstacles is a robust risk analysis and risk management plan. Set up costs are a barrier but by avoiding high consultancy costs, using these kind of guides and local expertise, this can be kept in check. Legal restraints are reducing with the introduction of the Localism Bill, as greater freedoms are being given to local authorities. Organisational culture needs to be developed taking the best of the participating authorities and addressing the difficulties. With such transformation in the public sector, culture is going to be changing anyway. Many of the items above can be tackled through effective project management and business planning and ensuring communications plans are thoroughly designed and implemented from early in the process. A robust business case will have to include knowledge about the existing service. Portfolio holders and members should be engaged early, proposals should be tested out with IT, technical, HR and union representatives. Conflicting priorities should be addressed in a strategic high level business case and if deal breakers are highlighted, the proposal can be dropped before too much cost is incurred. Leadership is essential during any change process particularly with the current cutbacks and service changes. To develop a positive vision for a new service model is critical and a key role for the project board and sponsor. Setting up a shared or collaborative service is a challenging process but can offer positive outcomes and barriers can be overcome with flexibility and effective project management.

10. Gaps and opportunities

Looking at the case studies as a whole, they cover a broad range of topics at an individual project level and at regional level there are a number of projects that have benefitted from collaboration. Other than the Eastern Highways Alliance, there is not a regional approach to developing shared activities on this agenda and this project is the first time the benefits of and the lessons from the shared activities have been collated. It would be worth considering the benefits of a RTF approach on shared activities.

From questionnaire responses and interviews, three areas were consistently mentioned as offering the potential for further development:

• Further procurement through the Eastern Highways Alliance
• Low carbon developments
• Funding and bid writing

Other questionnaire ideas included extending existing projects and fresh projects:

• Developing professional services contract for specialist skills including modelling
• Fleet management
- Private sector engagement
- Freight transport work

From examining the evidence collected in the report, potential for further regional or sub-regional shared activities would include:

- Looking at joint LTP3 delivery using South Yorkshire model as a basis for a shared activity
- Considering how Local Sustainable Transport Fund and the 2011 White Paper can be delivered jointly
- With the changes to the road safety funding, learning about the Northamptonshire model and how that might work in the east
- New models for concessionary fare management
- New models for parking as proposed in London may have value in areas where similar issues are faced.
- Communication and stakeholder management has been successful in a number of key case studies, this could be collated in a collective approach to relationship management and joint messaging
- The Essex Legal Services Partnership has commissioned a joint training programme for all participating authorities to save money and duplication as well as adding consistency. A joint training approach with EELGA may offer value.

In considering any of these options, it will be important to consider all the options for moving forward. In many cases, it will be of considerable value to talk in detail to others authorities who are already delivering in this way.

Conclusion

The case studies show that the thematic objectives of efficiency, performance, resilience and sustainable growth are currently met through the shared service activity. They also indicate there is scope to go further through broadening the activity and greater business case development. We see breadth of shared activities on a number of themes and topics, at strategic and operational level that are delivering benefits for the partners. Given the drivers set out in the earlier part of the report, it would suggest that there is scope to look strategically at the opportunity and achieve greater benefits for transport services in the region.
4. Opportunities & Next Steps

This section responds to the conclusions of the case studies and the drivers from the earlier sections to make recommendations for the Regional Transport Forum and their members to consider as next steps. The list offers a range of activities which could assist individual local authorities or the regional group to explore shared service further. The recommended actions do not offer a vision at local or regional level but do offer practical suggestions for reaching a vision for shared services either across a broad service area or for some specific activities.

Table 2 below offers some initial actions to be considered by the Regional Transport Forum and partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify at regional or sub-regional level which areas offer greatest potential benefits</td>
<td>1. Have a debate around this report and develop a RTF response to the issues and findings</td>
<td>RTF</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Hold a special RTF session on this report and the case studies and invite speakers to debate the best opportunities for shared services. This could include visiting speakers from national case studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hold an event to focus on one topic and look at how a shared service could develop and start to map out a strategic business case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Hold a local version of the events described above with key local partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on a service area and develop a proposal for a shared service</td>
<td>5. Undertake a structured service review of one or more transport services to examine cost and performance and plan for a different service approach, perhaps using an existing toolkit</td>
<td>LAs – may connect with work PWC are doing with Climate East</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Set up discussions with Eastern Highways Alliance to look to develop the model more quickly and more extensively</td>
<td>RTF</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Explore how greater collaboration could deliver on the carbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify further joint bidding opportunities</td>
<td>8. Review funds available and existing bids to provide baseline of current picture and share best practice and understanding the gaps with all RTF members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Hold a joint session with EU funding team to explore how RTF could build on success to better access funding in future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Look at setting up joint funding team from several authorities to participate in joint bids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Talk to DfT about the benefits of sharing bidding resource and how this could develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Promote best practice | 12. Set up ½ day visits for RTF members to national or regional case studies of interest |
| | 13. Looking at the lessons learned from the Total Place pilots for transport services – Luton and Central Bedfordshire may be able to offer some advice on this as pilot authorities |

<p>| Developing wider partnerships | 14. Set up a joint RTF/DfT meeting to discuss opportunities for extended shared services, involving EELGA |
| | 15. Consider how the Voluntary and Community Sector role could be |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivering sustainable growth</th>
<th>16. Develop a joint stakeholder communication plan</th>
<th>17. Develop/Commission joint training activities across the members of RTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Set up a joint LEP/RTF/LAs meeting to discuss how transport services may work in the new landscape and how they may work jointly to deliver jobs and housing growth</td>
<td>RTF/RCE</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

1. Questionnaire
2. References
3. List of consultees
4. List of meetings attended
Appendix 1 : Questionnaire for Regional Transport Forum Local Authority Members:

1. Name of Local Authority

2. Name and job title of person completing questionnaire

3. Contact details for person completing questionnaire

4. Name and Contact details of an officer at your local authority who leads on the shared service agenda

5. Please list any arrangements that your local authority has for sharing transport related services with other local authorities (this may include delegation arrangements as well as upper/lower tier and cross border activity)

6. Please indicate the objectives for each of the above examples of shared activity

7. Please indicate if you are aware of any discussions related to sharing services on transport issues in the future with other local authorities or public bodies

8. Please indicate any high level key objectives that your local authority would have from sharing transport services
9. Please indicate any policy areas or delivery areas that might be of particular interest to your local authority (either from the attached paper or other areas you may be aware of)

10. Any other comments/suggestions

Thank you for your time. The results of this questionnaire will be available to Regional Cities East and Regional Transport Forum.

Please complete and return to:

Judith Barker
Regional Cities East
EEDA
Victory House
Vision Park
Histon
Cambridge
CB24 9LZ

Or via e-mail: judithbarker@live.co.uk
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Appendix 3 : Participants

The questionnaire was sent to all 11 Local Authority members and other agencies through the Regional Transport Forum. Questionnaire and Interview responses were received in alphabetical order from:

Central Bedfordshire Council – Jim Tombe

East of England Development Agency – Jeff Laidler and Mike Salter

Eastern Highways Alliance - Alastair Jefford

Highways Agency – Chris Shaw

Luton Borough Council – Christine Davy and Keith Dove

Network Rail – Tim Cook

Norfolk County Council – Tracey Jessop and Chris Mitchell

Peterborough City Council – Barry Kirk

Regional Transport Forum – Paul Mathieson

Southend Council – Neil Hoskins and Paul Mathieson

Suffolk County Council – Peter Grimm

Thurrock Council – Mat Kiely

Appendix 4

List of meetings attended by CURE programme director in the business of preparing the report:

10 September 2010 - RTF

14 October 2010 – Meeting with RTF Secretariat

5 November 2010 – STSG

14 January 2011 – RTF

17 February 2011 - Meeting with RTF Secretariat

11 March 2011 - RTF