



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Monday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2023**

Venue:	Bourge Viersen Room, Peterborough Town Hall, Peterborough	
Time:	11.00 – 14.02pm	
Present:	Cllr Andy Coles Cllr Mohammed Haseeb Cllr David Brown Cllr Charlotte Cane Cllr Maureen Davis Cllr Anne Hay Cllr Tim Griffin Cllr Martin Smart Cllr Martin Hassall Cllr Judith Rippeth Cllr Aiden Van de Weyer Cllr Michael Atkins Cllr Mark Goldsack	Peterborough City Council Peterborough City Council East Cambs District Council East Cambs District Council Fenland District Council Fenland District Council Cambridge City Council Cambridge City Council Huntingdonshire District Council South Cambs District Council South Cambs District Council Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridgeshire County Council
Apologies	Cllr Jon Neish	Huntingdonshire District Council
Also attending:-	Cllr Anna Smith	Chair for Transport & Infrastructure Committee

### Minutes:

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>
1.1	Apologies received from Cllr Jon Neish.
<b>2</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>
2.1	No declarations of interest received.
<b>3</b>	<b>Public Questions</b>
3.1	No public questions received.
<b>4</b>	<b>Minutes of the Previous Meeting &amp; Action Log</b>
4.1	The minutes from the meeting held on the 24 <sup>th</sup> July were approved as a correct record and the action log was noted.
<b>5</b>	<b>Performance Management Framework and Corporate Performance Report</b>
5.1	The Committee received the report which presented members with the Performance Management Framework, the Corporate Key Performance Indicators, Most Complex Programmes and Projects performance information and an update on the planned evaluation of the impact of the Combined Authority's Devolution Deal.
5.2	The following points were raised during the discussion:-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers advised that in relation to Metric 16 in the report the number of waivers submitted should be 2 not 1. This should give an amber RAG rating not green.</li> <li>• Members queried how useful the data used for the state of the region was given it was from 2021 and officers agreed to feed this back and to look into whether more recent data may be available.</li> <li>• Members commented that it may be better to use comparable data from other local authorities with comparable demographics rather than comparing with the national average. Officers advised that Oxfordshire had been used in the past by Cambridgeshire County Council.</li> <li>• In response to a query around how confident were officers about the green rating for the bus reform; officers advised that the information had been pulled together from a combination of data sources but that this could be checked and feedback provided to members.</li> <li>• Members commented that in the past regarding the Net Zero programmes there had been issues getting sufficient contractors to produce the insulation required and queried whether this was still the case; officers advised that the rating given for Metric 10 had been approved in conjunction with national government.</li> <li>• In response to a question about how the assessment of teams' performance and budget management would be reported back to the Committee; officers advised that they would check with HR to see if the new LEAP programme could be utilised going forward.</li> <li>• Officers advised they were confident that the performance framework in place would provide the guidance they required however the capacity would need to be reviewed.</li> </ul>
5.3	<p>The Committee RESOLVED:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Note the draft Performance Management Framework and plans for further development.</li> <li>b) Scrutinise performance information relating to the Combined Authority's Corporate Key Performance Indicators.</li> <li>c) Scrutinise performance information relating to the Combined Authority's Most Complex Programmes and Projects.</li> <li>d) Scrutinise performance information relating to the Combined Authority's Headline Priority Activities.</li> <li>e) Note progress to evaluate the impact of the Devolution Deal Investment Fund in a Gateway Review.</li> <li>f) Review and comment on the relevance and accessibility of the performance information presented in this report.</li> </ol>
5.4	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Officers to check the data provided for the bus reform RAG rating and provide feedback to members.</li> </ol>
<b>6</b>	<b>Improvement Framework with specific focus on project plans and delivery</b>
6.1	<p>The Committee received the report which provided an update on the progress in July/August against the key concerns and observations identified by the External Auditor in June and October 2022, the Best Value Notice received in January 2023 and DLUHC in February 2023. The report also provided detail on the 'deep dive' into the Project plans and delivery Improvement plan to be considered at the meeting on 18 September.</p>
6.2	<p>The following points were raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were advised that the report stated that time period covered was for June however this was an error, and the report covered the period from July through to August for members consideration.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were advised that there had been two risk management training sessions; the Audit and Governance Committee had received training as had project managers and nominated constituent council officers; this would help to embed the work being done on risk. There was also new software which meant that all registers were recorded, and this would provide greater transparency.</li> <li>• Officers agreed to share the risk appetite which was part of the risk framework report with the Committee members.</li> <li>• Officers advised that the corporate risk register was now considered to be in a good place, however the service level registers needed further work as there were some gaps such as scores and risk owners missing. There would be work done over the next couple of months to ensure that the register and the new software was up to date and that staff were trained.</li> <li>• In response to a query around reassurance that risks were escalated from service level registers to the corporate level register, the officers advised that there were monthly meetings where the PMO, finance officers and Corporate Management Team would review risks to ensure they were happy with where they were on the registers.</li> <li>• In response to a question about how to make the processes more understandable to members of the public; officers advised that once the SAF had been approved that guidance would be provided and there were plans for the development of a place on the CA website which would be written in plain English to ensure other organisations could clearly understand the processes required to submit ideas for consideration. There would be public, member and officer specific guidance, there would also be a reworking of the Project Management Office to become an enabling team to support the process and there had been discussions with the Communications team on how best to promote this.</li> <li>• The Single Assurance Framework had been specifically developed to ensure the steps were as simple as possible and this had been tested with officer groups from constituent councils.</li> <li>• Officers advised that it was the intent that members of the public should be able to access information regarding what has been done in their area, what was planned for their area and what was currently being delivered.</li> <li>• Officers advised that there was work being done to deliver a performance dashboard that could be put on the website for members of the public to access.</li> <li>• In response to a question about whether the Combined Authority was signed up to the Plain English campaign officers advised they would check this and provide a response to members but could assure members the intention was to write in plain English standards, using best practice from other Combined Authorities; for example, the West Midlands CA had put considerable work into creating accessible documents around assurance frameworks.</li> </ul>
6.3	<p><b>RESOLVED:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Note the progress against stated areas of improvement identified by the External Auditor in June 2022 and Best Value Notice received in January 2023 as reported to the CA Board on 31 May 2023.</li> <li>b) Consider the development of the Project plans and delivery plan to address identified areas of improvement</li> </ul>
6.4	<p><b>ACTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Officers to circulate the risk appetite report to members.</li> <li>2) Officers to provide a response to the Committee on whether the CA was signed up to the Plain English Campaign.</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Bus Network Review</b></p>

7.1	The Committee received the report which provided an overview and the CPCA Board paper which provided the detail of the recommendations and considerations for the bus network review.
7.2	<p>The following points were raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair for the Transport &amp; Infrastructure Committee was in attendance and highlighted to the Committee that the approach that the Combined Authority was taking was very different to a purely commercial approach. There would be a lot of work done in engaging the local communities over the coming months.</li> <li>• In response to a question about the Demand Responsive Travel and whether it was being ambitious enough, officers advised that there were constraints and there was a big ambition to deliver on Demand Responsive Travel alongside the Bus Reform and that officers were considering pilots.</li> <li>• The focus was currently on designing the network to encourage people to use public transport and making best use of funding to ensure people could access essential services.</li> <li>• The CA was reliant on the communication of the bus operators, but officer would work to try and get information out to members of the public quicker. Once the CA was in control of the network they would be in a better position to communicate any changes.</li> <li>• In response to a question about consultations that had been carried out the Committee were advised that consultations were usually done through elected members, parish councils and relevant community groups.</li> <li>• In response to a question about the seven routes that had not been assessed officers advised that this related to the provision of information from the bus operators. Officers hoped to bring back further information on this in November.</li> <li>• Members commented it was difficult to assess the plans when there were still gaps and requested that officers think about the network as a whole. The Transport and Infrastructure Chair advised that the reason why greater reform was wanted was to have greater strategic control over the network; currently the authority was massively restrained by the system.</li> <li>• Officers advised that they would look to bring together the strategic information alongside the individual metrics for different routes and take into account consistency and behaviours to ensure any decisions taken would help ensure that people have confidence in the bus network.</li> <li>• In response to a question about funding and the use of the 12% precept the Transport &amp; Infrastructure Chair advised that the precept had been used as a necessity to specifically fund 25 bus routes that Stagecoach had planned to remove. Moving forward the Combined Authority needed to look at all funding mechanisms available.</li> <li>• The Executive Director for Place and Connectivity advised the Committee that the CA had responsibility for passenger transport and there was an expectation from central government that either enhanced partnerships or franchising were considered. The Board would be considering the Outline Business Case on Wednesday with a further decision to be taken on this in January 2024.</li> <li>• In response to a question about TING the officers advised that it was costing a lot per passenger and officers were looking at how to provide better value for money around this and to also ensure it did not take journeys away from other services.</li> </ul>
7.3	<p>The Committee RESOLVED:-</p> <p>a) To note the Bus Network Review</p>
8.	<b>Increased Connectivity Priority Area – focus on Powered Two Wheelers and Road Safety</b>

8.1	The Committee received the report which provided an update on the development of the e-scooters, including the emerging position with regards to the legislation and provided an update on the work of Vision Zero in addressing a key performance indicator for the Combined Authority to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on the region's road network.
8.2	<p>The following points were raised during the discussion:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers advised that they were waiting for further powers from government in relation to enforcement of the use of private e-scooters. Liaison between the police would be needed to understand where problem areas were and how to educate people on consequences of irresponsible behaviour.</li> <li>• The Chair for the Transport &amp; Infrastructure Committee advised that the CA's role was around licensing of the scooters and enforcement would be for the police however, there was dialogue that was required to put pressure on with the police and also central government.</li> <li>• Members requested that schemes such as VOIE be rolled out further as this may help to reduce the use of illegal e-scooters and they helped to reduce carbon emissions. Officers advised that they were limited to the location of the VOIE pilot but that they would be looking at travel hubs in the future.</li> <li>• Officers agreed to look into the national context of the e-scooters and whether this was a nationwide issue.</li> <li>• In response to a question about whether the VOIE scheme had been offered to corporate users; officers agreed to feedback this point to VOIE.</li> <li>• Officers advised that part of the contract when people signed up to use VOIE was that they had to sign a third-party liability but acknowledged that this may need to be made more prominent.</li> <li>• Officers advised that they were looking at the interrelationships between different road users to ensure the right traffic was on the roads. When devising schemes, the CA would work with partners to understand what the purpose of the scheme was and to help resolve any conflicts. Schemes were driven by the two Highway Authorities. The Transport &amp; Infrastructure Chair advised that as part of the LTCP being considered by the CA Board on Wednesday each constituent authority had an appendix which detailed a range of schemes put forward which the CA would seek to champion; these had been done in consultation with each individual constituent council. There was a lot of opportunity to improve transport across the region.</li> </ul>
8.3	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Note the developing e-scooter scheme and associated legislation.</li> <li>b) Note work on Vision Zero</li> </ol>
8.4	<p>ACTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Officers agreed to look into the national context of the e-scooters and whether this was a nationwide issue and feedback to Committee.</li> </ol>
9.	<b>CA Board Agenda</b>
9.1	The Committee had no questions to submit to the CA Board for their meeting on Wednesday.
	<p style="text-align: center;">---o0o---</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cllr's Haseeb, Van De Weyer and Hassall left the meeting at the break.</p>

	<p>To ensure that decisions could be made while the Committee was still quorate the Committee agreed to re-order the agenda items. Taking items 11 and 12 before resuming the agenda order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">---o0o---</p>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Access to Information Protocol</b>
11.1	The Committee received the report which set out the protocol that could be adopted by the Combined Authority to clarify the rights of members to access to information held the Combined Authority.
11.2	Members queried why the protocol did not state that members would be provided with a written explanation when information could not be provided and were advised that this was in the CA Constitution and was explicit in the 2017 Order.
11.3	Members requested that a line be added to the protocol that made it clear what the legislation dictated.
11.4	<p>Cllr Rippeth proposed and was seconded by Cllr Hay that a statement be added to the protocol that stated that O&amp;S members would be provided with information requested unless provided with written reasons why they could not receive the information requested.</p> <p>With 9 votes FOR and 1 ABSTENTIAN the motion was CARRIED.</p> <p>The Monitoring Officer advised she would amend the wording in consultation with the Chair before it was taken to CA Board on Wednesday.</p>
11.5	<p>The Chair and Monitoring Officer agreed the following wording be added to the protocol:</p> <p>The CPCA will adopt a default position of sharing information held on request, with overview and scrutiny committee members. However, there may exceptionally be instances where confidential and exempt documents cannot be provided to members for example because this may result in legal proceedings against the CPCA, if confidentiality is breached. In those instances, where it is determined that a copy of a document or part of any such document cannot be shared with overview and scrutiny committee members, officers should provide the overview and scrutiny committee with a written statement setting out its reasons for that decision.</p>
11.6	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Endorse the Access to Information Protocol with the amendment agreed.</li> <li>b) Recommend to the Combined Authority Board to approve and adopt the Protocol and to delegate to the Monitoring Officer to circulate the Protocol to all members and substitutes of the Combined Authority Board, Business Board and Committees as a reference point for members.</li> </ul>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Appointment of Rapporteurs to Thematic Committees</b>
12.1	The Committee received the report which requested that the appointments made to the Skills and Employment Committee were ratified and that nominations for the rapporteur roles for the remaining committees were received.
12.2	<p>RESOLVED:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ratify the appointments of Cllr Coles and Cllr Rippeth as the rapporteurs for the Skills and Employment Committee.</li> <li>b) Appoint Cllr Goldsack and Cllr Hassall as the rapporteurs for the Environment and Sustainable Communities Committee</li> <li>c) Appoint Cllr Neish and Cllr Van de Weyer as the rapporteurs for the Transport &amp; Infrastructure Committee</li> </ul>

<b>10.</b>	<b>Corporate Strategy &amp; Medium Term Financial Plan Refresh Process</b>
10.1	The Committee received the report which provided Overview & Scrutiny with a draft timeline and process to refresh both the Corporate Strategy and the MTFP and provided an opportunity for Overview & Scrutiny to make any comments or recommendations on the process before it is considered for approval by the Combined Authority Board on the 20th September.
10.2	RESOLVED:-  a) To note and comment upon the proposed timetable and process to refresh the Corporate Strategy and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).
<b>13.</b>	<b>Combined Authority Forward Plan – Lead Members’ Updates</b>
13.1	The Chair invited the rapporteurs to provide any feedback on any areas of interest to the Committee.
13.2	Cllr Coles as one of the rapporteurs for the Skills and Employment Committee advised that there was an interesting piece of work ongoing regarding the review of the performance of Growth Works and a TUPE process was underway to get staff moved over to the Combined Authority.  The other item of interest was a report which provided information on FE provision costs which it would be worth keeping an eye on.
13.3	There were no further updates from the rapporteurs.
<b>14.</b>	<b>O&amp;S Work Programme</b>
14.1	The Committee received the report which requested they note the draft work programme for the municipal year 2023/24 as shown at Appendix 1 and discuss items for the work programme.
14.2	The following points were raised during the discussion:-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members requested that officer look into how best the Committee could manage scrutinising the large number of items going to CA Board in November. Officers advised that they would provide options for how best to manage the workload for consideration at the informal session in November.</li> </ul>
14.3	RESOLVED:-  a) To note the work programme
14.4	ACTION  1) Scrutiny Officer to look into options for how best to manage the scrutiny of the CA Board agenda and the forward plan.
<b>15.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>
15.1	1 <sup>st</sup> November – Informal O&S Meeting via Teams 27 <sup>th</sup> November – Public meeting at Huntingdonshire DC at 11am.

Meeting Closed: 14.02pm

Chair