

Notice of Meeting

Highways and Growth Select Committee



SURREY

Date & time

Thursday, 18
October 2018 at
10.00 am

Place

Ashcombe Suite,
County Hall, Kingston
upon Thames, Surrey
KT1 2DN

Contact

Richard Plummer
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8213 2782

richard.plummer@surreycc.gov.uk

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:

@SCCdemocracy

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email richard.plummer@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Richard Plummer on 020 8213 2782.

Elected Members

Mr Stephen Cooksey, Mr Paul Deach, Mr Matt Furniss, Mr Bob Gardner (Chairman), Mr Andy MacLeod, Mrs Tina Mountain, Mr John O'Reilly (Vice-Chairman), Dr Peter Szanto, Ms Barbara Thomson and Mr Richard Walsh

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee is responsible for the following areas:

- Highways
- Major infrastructure
- Investment/Commercial
- Strategy (including Assets)
- Economic Growth
- Housing
- Local Enterprise Partnerships

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

To report any apologies for absence and substitutions

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 10 MAY 2018

(Pages 5
- 12)

To agree the minutes of the previous meeting of the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter:

- i. any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or;
- ii. other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest;
- as well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner); and
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

4 QUESTIONS & PETITIONS

To receive any questions or petitions

Notes:

1. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (*12 October 2018*).
2. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (*11 October 2018*).
3. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

5 RESPONSE FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE

There have been no responses from Cabinet to Issues Referred by the

Select Committee.

6 SURREY EMPLOYMENT AND SKILLS

(Pages
13 - 28)

Purpose of the Report: To respond to the interest of the Highways and Growth Select Committee in understanding how the Council works with local businesses and partners to address skills gaps and future workforce demands in Surrey.

7 OVERVIEW OF HIGHWAYS CONTRACTS

(Pages
29 - 32)

Purpose of report: To provide members with an overview of the current contract arrangements across Highway services and improvements made to date. The report will also outline the Service's journey towards retendering when the current contracts come to an end many of which do so in April 2021.

Annex A to follow.

8 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

(Pages
33 - 36)

The Select Committee is asked to review and approve the Forward Work Programme and provide comment as required.

9 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Select Committee will be held 6 Demember 2018 in the Ashcombe Suite at County Hall.

**Joanna Killian
Chief Executive**

Published: Wednesday, 10 October 2018

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 10 May 2018 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey, KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Date Not Specified.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Bob Gardner (Chairman)
- * Mr Wyatt Ramsdale (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Mary Angell
- * Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mr Paul Deach
- * Mr Jonathan Essex
- * Mr Matt Furniss
- * Mr Eber A Kington
- * Mrs Bernie Muir
- * Mr John O'Reilly
- * Mr Stephen Spence
- * Mrs Lesley Steeds
- * Mr Richard Walsh

Substitute Members:

Mr Bill Chapman
Mr Richard Wilson

9/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1/18]

Apologies for absence were received from Richard Wilson and Bill Chapman.

10/18 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 28 FEBRUARY 2018 [Item 2/18]

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved with one amendment.

11/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3/18]

Paul Deach declared a historic pecuniary interest as a former social media consultant for the Surrey Wildlife Trust. He noted that he no longer had an interest in this area.

Stephen Spence declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Rambler's Association.

Bernie Muir declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Rambler's Association.

12/18 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4/18]

There were no questions or petitions received.

13/18 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5/18]

There were no responses from Cabinet.

14/18 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6/18]

Members questioned the status of the recommendation of 11 October 2017. The Chairman noted that there had been an update and discussion on this in February and that the committee had scheduled a discussion on fly-tipping at its December 2018 meeting to follow up on this recommendation.

Members noted and approved the forward plan and recommendations tracker.

15/18 UPDATES FROM MEMBER REFERENCE GROUPS AND TASK GROUPS [Item 7/18]

Declarations of interest:

Paul Deach disclosed a historical interest as a former media consultant for the Surrey Wildlife Trust.

Witnesses:

Bob Gardner

Wyatt Ramsdale

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. The Chairman of the Countryside Management Member Reference Group noted that the group had been working with the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to develop a robust and sustainable business plan. He noted that there had been historic work undertaken regarding countryside car parking, which had been developed and implemented by the service.
2. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that there had been significant concerns regarding the viability of the SWT Business Plan. It was noted that the business plan was being refreshed and that there would be a rolling three year business plan that Members were invited to comment on. It was noted that this was aimed at improving commercial viability.
3. The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that the SWT needed to become more proficient at being a commercially viable organisation, but stressed that they were very good at the role of countryside management. Members stressed that there needed to be a balance found, due to the SWT being a service provider, rather than a primarily a profit making organisation.
4. Members noted that there would be an update on the work of the Basingstoke Canal Task and Finish Group at the next meeting of the Committee.

5. Members noted that the Waste Local Plan Consultation item further in the agenda would update the Committee on the work undertaken by the Waste Management Member Reference Group.

16/18 TACKLING SINGLE USE PLASTICS [Item 8/18]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

Sarah Kershaw, Directorate Alignment Manager
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment
Jason Russell, Deputy Director Environment & Infrastructure
Lesley Harding, Head of Place Development

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers outlined the impetus for the creation of a single use plastics policy, highlighting the motion of Full Council in March 2018 to tackle the prevalence of single use plastics in Surrey. Members noted that there was wide ranging political support for the resolution of this issue as a result of this. It was stressed that the Council needed to lead by example on this issue.
2. It was highlighted that the strategy was planned in two separate phases: Phase One of the plan was clarified as being the strategy to tackle single use plastics within the organisation of Surrey County Council. Phase Two of the plan was aimed to be a wider Surrey strategy. Officers noted that the expected timescale for completion of Phase One was October 2018.
3. The Committee expressed the need for additional impetus on this project and stressed the requirement to engage with the project with as much alacrity as possible. Officers noted that work had been undertaken to analyse “quick wins” which had immediate effects. It was also highlighted that scoping work had been undertaken with departments in Surrey County Council and that officers had been approached through internal forum to identify additional ideas. The Cabinet Member stressed that the Council motion was quite recent and that there had been significant amounts of work undertaken in a relatively short space of time which emphasised the political impetus and importance of this issue for officers and Members.
4. Officers noted that there were wider implications which needed to be considered when undertaking this project, noting that there were some difficulties in removing plastics in some areas, due to statutory requirements and unforeseen cost implications. It was also noted that there may be some unforeseen costs that would be analysed as part of Phase One.

5. Members questioned whether there had been a project manager appointed for this project and how much that this would cost the Council. Members also questioned the resources available to the service to undertake this task. Officers noted that there was an available resource of £30,000 for a project manager and also identify other wider costs for this project. The Cabinet Member for Environment noted that there was a need to recruit good people to manage a project of this nature to ensure a successful conclusion.
6. Members noted that it could work with partners to gather knowledge and ideas, noting that some partners would have already available resource and ideas. Members also questioned whether the service had talked with partners and schools to determine what they are doing and offer suggestions. It was stressed that there was an important need to work with schools and partners.
7. Members suggested that there would need to be a strong communications campaign in order to change attitudes on this issue, noting that there was a need for a culture change in how single use plastic is perceived and utilised, particularly as part of Phase Two. Officers explained that an external communications campaign was currently in development and aimed to link with partners to achieve this in the long term.
8. Members suggested that there could be incentives to officers as part of Phase One to encourage the culture change away from single use plastics. Members proposed that the organisation could look at the potential of working with partners to provide multiple use cups and mugs to officers to encourage this culture change. It was also suggested that this could include Surrey County Council branding to promote multi-use cups across the county and encourage culture change.
9. Officers noted that there was a milestone action plan being developed as part of phase one which would include timescales and thresholds of success for the project.
10. It was suggested by the Committee that the service could work to benchmark and incorporate the work of other authorities, partners and commercial organisations that have undertaken any similar project. Members also suggested the potential to be host to a workshop event with partners and other organisations to share good practice on this.
11. Members questioned whether there were any contractual arrangements that were slowing down schemes to reduce single use plastics in the organisation.
12. The Committee asked whether there was a potential to appoint officer champions for single-use plastics throughout the organisation to promote change.

13. Members questioned whether they had received any confirmation or direction from the Secretary of State for Environment following the letter sent by the Cabinet Member for Environment. The Cabinet Member noted that he was awaiting response from the Secretary of State and noted that a response could open further opportunities

Recommendations:

That the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee:

1. Supports the development of the policy over the next few months by forming a Member Reference Group;
2. That officers continue to communicate with schools and partners and other authorities as part of the development of an action plan;
3. That officers incorporate into the timeline for Phase One plans to undertake benchmarking and learning exercises with other authorities, partners and local businesses with an aim to feedback, incorporate and share ideas;
4. That the committee receive a brief update report in six months regarding progress of phase one and future plans.

17/18 REVIEW OF THE SURREY WASTE PLAN: CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PLAN [Item 9/18]

Declarations of interest:

None

Witnesses:

Paul Sanderson, Minerals & Waste Policy Team Manager
Phil Smith, Environmental Assessment Officer
Jason Russell, Deputy Director Environment & Infrastructure
Lesley Harding, Head of Place Development
Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers clarified the role of Surrey County Council as the waste planning authority. It was noted that the development of this plan had been a long process and involved a significant consultation, which was open for 14 weeks. It was noted that the consultation response had been strong and had raised several key issues.
2. It was noted that service would be putting forward a submission plan in for consultation in Autumn 2018, noting that there had been a revision in the timetable resultant of the need to adequately review the consultation responses.
3. Members questioned the number of responses and whether they were within expected parameters. Officers noted that response had been

good and that they also included a high number of interested organisations as well as individuals. It was noted that the consultation responses reflected the locations of the sites that were proposed, and that the distribution of responses was to be expected.

4. Members raised the suggestion of “Land adjacent to the A25 and A22 next to Streets Court which was used when the M25 was being modified and now sits vacant,” that was in the consultation report and questioned why there was little detail on the reasoning for rejection. Officers acknowledged the lack of information, but clarified that the site was rejected based on deliverability and the requirement for the site to be returned to its previous state as a Green Field site.
5. Members questioned whether there were any significant variations on the previous plan that had been made as part of this submission, and how changes would affect members of public. Officers noted that there had been updated evidence and modifications based on changes in government policy from the last plan. It was explained that there was updated emphasis in the plan to recover and recycle waste rather than to landfill.
6. Officers explained that there had been site assessments and environmental assessments undertaken and that local transport plans would need to be flexible to account for changes in traffic. It was also noted that sites had taken into account the plans for Crossrail 2 and the Transport for London (TfL) had been involved in consultation.
7. Members expressed the need for transparency creation of future consultations and ensure that members of the public can understand what is being asked of them. Officers noted these comments and expressed the wish to improve upon consultation in future to alleviate these concerns.
8. Members of the committee expressed concern regarding the flexibility of the plan to allow the executive to have significant decision making powers regarding waste management facilities with little consultation from members of the public. Officers noted that the plan may in future have some restriction on the type of facility that is being created, but retains flexibility.
9. Members questioned the idea of self-sufficiency and how this was attainable. Officers noted that self-sufficiency of waste management incorporated commercial and industrial waste.
10. Officers noted the work undertaken with the Waste Management Member Reference Group and thanked the group for their contribution to the development of the plan. Members noted that the Member Reference Group should continue to support development of the consultation plan.

Recommendations:

That the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee:

1. Notes the level and depth of response to the consultation on the draft Surrey Waste Local Plan and supports the work being undertaken to prepare a submission draft Surrey Waste Local Plan in light of responses received
2. Recommends that the Waste Management Member Reference Group will continue to monitor the submission plan in Summer 2018 prior to further consultation by E&ISC in September 2018.

18/18 CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND THE ROLE OF VOLUNTEER AND PARISH COUNCIL INPUT IN MAINTAINING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY [Item 10/18]

Declarations of interest:

Stephen Spence declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Rambler's Association

Bernie Muir declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Rambler's Association

Witnesses:

Steve Mitchell, Countryside Access and Operations Manager

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager

Jason Russell, Deputy Director Environment & Infrastructure

Lesley Harding, Head of Place Development

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment

Key points raised in the discussion:

1. Officers explained that there was a backlog of delivery for public rights of way. It was also noted that there were issues regarding closures of public rights of way, such as footbridges. Officers highlighted that one of the key challenges for the maintenance of public rights of way was the reduction in funding maintenance by 50%.
2. Members questioned how much funding was required to improve and resolve maintenance issues and what resource was required to resolve the backlog. Officers noted that estimates on required funding had been made based on outstanding work but that there were no precise figures available.
3. Members asked whether the backlog in maintenance would cause significant issues in the long term and whether there was a potential to invest to save in this area and restore funding to previous levels. Officers noted that there had been some consideration on this but that there also had been liaising work undertaken with partners, volunteers and District and Borough authorities to alleviate pressure.
4. Officers noted that the service had been using an interactive web form to collate information of areas that required work. The interactive map allowed the public to see what issues had been reported. Members

suggested that this could be spread wider than it is currently, noting that County, Borough and District and Parish Councillors could be useful conduits for the information held on this resource. It was also suggested that volunteer groups and rambling associations could also be supplied this information to ensure that this work is more appropriately targeted.

5. The Cabinet Member for the Environment noted that there would be work undertaken with the directorate to ascertain whether there was budget available in the next financial year to alleviate some of the issues raised.

Recommendations:

That the Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee:

1. That the Cabinet Member for Environment works with Members from borough, district and parish authorities to look at the potential to achieve joint funding and explore developing an initiative to increase funding to this service to restore more rights of way
2. That the report is circulated to Local Committee Chairmen to ensure better linkage with Local Committees;
3. That the service circulate wider the link to the interactive web form to County Councillors, to volunteer organisations and to interested parties
4. That a list of current issues in public rights of way be circulated to all Members

19/18 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 11/18]

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 6 September 2018 at County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 1.14 pm

Chairman

Highways and Growth Select Committee

18 October 2018



Surrey Employment and Skills Board

Purpose of report

1. To respond to the interest of the Highways and Growth Select Committee in understanding how the Council works with local businesses and partners to address skills gaps and future workforce demands in Surrey.

Introduction

2. The report briefly outlines the work of the Surrey Employment and Skills Board (ESB) and covers the background, aims and strategic impact of this initiative in addressing the skills challenges facing Surrey employers from the perspective of key stakeholders, from both public and private sectors.
3. The Surrey Employment and Skills Board (ESB) was established by Surrey County Council in 2013, to provide a collective voice of employers on skills issues that impact the economic growth and productivity of Surrey's public and private sector organisations.
4. The ESB aims to bring together expertise, knowledge and experience in Surrey to influence the skills agenda within a landscape that is rapidly changing and challenging for employees. Recently the focus has been on major initiatives such as the apprenticeship levy (**Annex 2**) and T-levels (**Annex 3**). It is a platform to collectively discuss and develop employee-led solutions to help address the growing skills needs and highlight gaps in local education and workforce training provision from the perspective of employers.
5. The board is chaired by Bob Pickles, Head of Corporate and Government Affairs, Canon (UK) Ltd, with representation, at a senior level, from the Surrey business community, Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), Surrey County Council, Districts and Boroughs, Higher and Further Education, Surrey Head teachers and NHS representative (**Annex 1** for a list of members and representative bodies). All board members volunteer their time to participate in ESB activities, including attending quarterly meetings. See **Annex 4** for the ESB Terms of Reference.

6. The county council's Chief Executive has been a member of the board since it was established and both the Leader, Cllr David Hodge and Deputy Leader, Cllr John Furey are advocates of the ESB, including creating a new post (0.8 FTE) to facilitate the delivery of ESB initiatives for the period Feb 2018 – Feb 2020. Having this dedicated resource has meant that the ESB can quickly react and investigate employer-led skills issues in order to create proposals and solutions to share with both the LEPs and Government.
7. The aim of the ESB is to be the voice of Surrey employers in working with the government to develop solutions to improve workforce skills to meet future demands and enable increased productivity and growth by:
 - a.) representing the skill needs of Surrey employers to influence government policy; and
 - b.) facilitating better relationships for local employers with key skills stakeholders including education/training providers, local people and relevant skills organisations.

The Work of the ESB

8. Recently the ESB has focused on the following initiatives and this work will continue during 2019:
 - a.) Responding to Government consultations – providing a collective view on skills and employment issues for Surrey on inquiries such as T-levels and careers and education information advice and guidance and **[Annex 3]**.
 - b.) Working with the Local Enterprise Partnerships to articulate Surrey skill priorities – the ESB works closely with both Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 LEPs to balance the needs of Surrey across the two LEP boundaries. We have provided skills advice and steer to both LEPs for the development of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and will increasingly work collaboratively with both as key advisor and skills partner for the Local Industrial Strategies (LIS).
 - c.) Source funding opportunities to conduct initiatives, such as increasing the progression rates of Key stage 5 pupils into apprenticeships. This is a new project with pilot funding from the Higher Education Outreach Network (HEON) and in collaboration with business, training providers and local secondary schools.
 - d.) Delivering business-led intelligence on key skills and employment issues, such as the apprenticeship levy.

Challenges and Opportunities for the Board over 2019/20

Challenges

9. Influencing Government on apprenticeship levy and other major policy initiatives.
10. Expand business representation on the ESB and visibility of ESB work with Surrey employers and local authorities.

Opportunities

11. Collaborate with the LGA on employer-led solutions to debug the Apprenticeship Levy
12. Develop our influencing relationship with C2C and EM3 LEPs as they develop their skills agenda & initiatives for the Local Industrial Strategies
13. Collaborate with skills partners to pilot initiatives on key topics, such as young peoples' progression to apprenticeship, employer engagement with T-Levels, apprenticeship transfer, etc.

Case Study: Solutions to Debug the Apprenticeship Levy

14. A key focus for the ESB Board is currently on the Apprenticeship levy. Since April 2017, all employers with a pay bill of over £3 million, pay 0.5% levy to use on apprenticeship training. The ESB has conducted interviews with Surrey levy payers and identified a set of employer-led solutions to help maximise the value of the levy to build talent pipelines and develop workforce capabilities and skills (see summary report in **Annex 2**).
15. This work has been presented to the Local Government Association (LGA) in a meeting with the Chair Lord Porter. We will continue to work with the LGA to highlight the way that the proposed changes to the operation of the levy could be made to work in Surrey to show the scale of the opportunity and the potential benefits for productivity and growth.

Conclusions

16. The Surrey ESB provide a collective platform to gather intelligence from Board members on future skills needs and gaps; help shape government thinking and policies about skills to benefit Surrey employers; and provide a vehicle supporting local employers in some of the challenges they face with employment and skills.

17. By working in collaboration with other organisations such as the LEPs, LGA and other industry bodies we can stretch our reach and grow our influence.

Recommendations

18. That the Highways and Growth Select Committee:

- a.) Endorses the work of the Employment and Skills Board in providing a collective voice for employers, training providers and local authorities to secure beneficial changes in the wider skills system;
- b.) Helps to develop further relationships with Surrey employers;
- c.) Ensures that sufficient resource is allocated to the Employment and Skills Board (ESB) to guarantee that it can effectively outreach to businesses and partners.

19. That the Employment and Skills Board will:

- d.) Provide an update on progress to the Select Committee in September 2019.

Report contact:

Paula Neal, Skills for Business Relationship Manager, Economic Growth, Surrey County Council

Contact details:

Mobile: 07967 767605

Email: paula.neal@surreycc.gov.uk

Sources/Background papers and information:

Appendices:

Annex 1 – Surrey Employment and Skills Board Membership

Annex 2 – Apprenticeship key facts and ESB report: Solutions to Debug the Apprenticeship Levy, Insights from Surrey Levy Payers, 10 September 2018

Annex 3 – T-Levels: Key Facts and Surrey ESB response to Government consultations Feb 2018

Annex 4 – Surrey Employment and Skills Board, Terms of Reference, September 2018

Annex 1: Surrey Employment and Skills Board

Membership includes representatives from:

a. Surrey business community

Organisation	Member	Job title
Canon UK & Ireland	Bob Pickles	Head of Corporate & Government Affairs, (ESB Chair)
BDO UK LLP	Nick Poulter	Business Assurance Partner
Jellyfish Digital Agency	Rob Pierre	Co-founder & CEO
Federation of Small Business (FSB), and WS Planning & Architecture	Brain Woods	Chair for the South East Region FSB Managing Director
Surrey Chambers of Commerce	Louise Punter	Chief Executive
Institute of Directors (Surrey IoD)	Janet Preston	Education Liaison Officer

b. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)

Organisation	Member	Job title
Coast to Capital	Kirsten Trussell	Head of Strategy and Policy
Enterprise M3	Sarah Carter	Head of Skills

c. Surrey County Council

Organisation	Member	Job title
Surrey County Council	Joanna Killian	Chief Executive
Surrey County Council	Kevin Lloyd	Head of Economic Growth

d. Districts and Boroughs

Organisation	Member	Job title
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	Kathryn Beldon	Chief Executive
Guildford Borough Council	James Whiteman	Managing Director
Tandridge District Council	Louise Round	Chief Executive

e. Higher and Further Education

Organisation	Member	Job title
University of Law	John Watkins	Director of Employability (ESB Deputy Chair)
Brooklands College	Gail Walker	Principal & CEO

East Surrey College	Jayne Dickinson	Principal & Chief Executive
NESCOT	Frances Rutter	CEO & Principal
Association of Learning Providers Surrey (ALPS)	Sue Taylor	Network Manager

- f. **Surrey Head teachers** We are currently seeking a new member
- g. **NHS/Social Care** We are currently seeking a new member

Annex 2:

The Apprenticeship Levy - Key facts:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/apprenticeship-levy-how-it-will-work/apprenticeship-levy-how-it-will-work#pay-apprenticeship-levy>

The apprenticeship levy was introduced in England in April 2017

Employers with a PAYE bill over £3 million pay the levy at a rate of 0.5% monthly (including a £15k levy allowance each tax year); non-levy payers are those with PAYE bills of less than £3 million.

The levy is paid on a monthly basis and is accumulative.

Levy payers can access their levy fund via a digital account and can draw down on their levy contribution (which includes a 10% government top-up) to pay for apprenticeship training with registered providers
<https://findapprenticeshiptraining.sfa.bis.gov.uk/>

Non-levy paying employers receive 90% government funding and co-invest 10% to pay for apprenticeship training.

Levy funds will expire after 24 months if it is not used for apprenticeship training. For example, apprenticeship levy paid by an employer in May 2017 will expire in May 2019 and thereafter will continue to expire on a monthly basis.

Analysis of data from the Education and Skills Funding Agency, by the Open University, in April 2018, revealed that levy paying employers had only used 8% of the total £1.8 billion levy payments.
<http://www.open.ac.uk/business/sites/www.open.ac.uk.business/files/files/apprenticeship-levy-one-year-on.pdf>

Latest government statistics, show an overall 30% drop in apprenticeship starts since the levy was introduced.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/apprenticeship-and-levy-statistics-august-2018>

Time period	Number of apprentice starts
August 2017 – May 2018	315,900
August 2016 – May 2017	457,200

Solutions to Debug the Apprenticeship Levy

Insights from Surrey Levy Payers | 10 September 2018 | Summary

AIM

To identify employer-led approaches to reform the operation of the apprenticeship levy to enhance its effectiveness, secure greater involvement of levy paying and non-levy paying businesses in the system and increase the volume and uptake of apprenticeships.

The proposals set out below reflect the experience of the last 18 months since the levy was launched with many Surrey businesses still struggling to spend their levy pot. They reflect detailed discussions with a sample of Surrey levy payers from both public and private sectors.

The levy is adding value and some firms are using it as a catalyst to kick start their own processes and change attitudes. However, there are significant glitches in the levy design; lack of consistent, comprehensive and practical information and advice and delays in developing some of the core apparatus, particularly standards, which have slowed adoption and inhibited use of the levy.

PROPOSALS

- 1. Managing the complexity at the start:** Organisations in general are committed to spending the levy but the infrastructure, responsibilities and resources required to set-up and effectively manage the levy are not well understood which has delayed apprenticeship starts.

Recommendations:

For future organisations entering the levy, introduce a smaller % of contribution during the 'set up period' (like an auto enrolment), to give them time to build-up and get ready before the first full levy payment is taken.

For current levy payers, enable them to use a proportion of their fund to off-set the resource costs required to establish a quality apprenticeship programme that meets future skills needs, for example, 5% to meet a targeted number of apprentice starts during the first five years.

- 2. Supporting business with Information, Advice & Guidance:**

Apprenticeship training providers' have had to hand-hold businesses through the levy set-up and management and are the 'go to' point of contact for support throughout the process. This is not sustainable.

Recommendations:

The current gov.uk website and helpline do not provide the level of advice and support needed. Better digital solutions/apps are required to help business navigate through each stage of the levy process, including practical guidance on 'how to do...' via online tutorials.

Reinvest a proportion of unspent levy funding into practical business support (webinars, workshops etc.), at the local level, facilitated by Industry Federations, Training Providers, and Association of Learning Providers (ALP).

- 3. Overcoming 20% off the job for upskilling existing staff:** 20% off the job training (a prerequisite of apprenticeship standards) is a major barrier for many organisations. Most accept off the job training for 'early careers' but not for upskilling or retraining existing staff. Yet levy payers with large budgets need to spend the levy on existing staff.

Recommendations:

Provide greater clarity on what is 'off the job training': it is misconstrued as a day off site per week.

Greater investment in online training tools and apps for apprenticeship delivery to manage the time demands of 20% off the job training alongside employee workload and demands.

Ring fence a portion of the levy to expand the opportunity for wider training including short-term professional courses to meet specific employee and business needs.

- 4. Maximising the levy transfer:** Since July 2018 it has been possible to transfer levy funding (up to a maximum 10%) to multiple other organisations. None of the companies within this study, apart from Surrey County Council, were aware of the option. It has huge potential to support supply chain, local businesses and/or charities as part of their corporate social responsibility.

Recommendations:

Increase the transfer funding percentage, e.g. up to 40%, since it is expected that many organisations will have a large underspend, to allow for greater flow of levy funding to help develop and grow vital skills within local communities.

Explore and pilot innovative models of apprenticeship training provision using levy transfer for vital skills needs, e.g. social care, to support local organisations in this sector, for example, creating shared apprenticeship schemes or a brokerage service to build cohorts of learners from different local businesses with the same skill needs.

- 5. Slow the ticking clock:** Many parts of the system are still missing or in need of refinement e.g. apprenticeship standards (including higher levels) are not ready or unavailable locally and some are not fit for purpose and require adaptation to meet business needs.

Recommendations:

Extend the levy period by a further 24 months, before funds start to expire, to support the transition between existing frameworks to new standards.

Soften the spending rules, to provide more flexibility, to include all elements that are needed to support the set up and management of an apprenticeship programme, e.g. administration costs, salaries,

back filling 20% off the job, resources required to facilitate levy transfer, etc.

Use the levy to support the full costs (including salaries) of priority groups, such as NEETs, including the use of traineeship as a stepping stone to an apprenticeship.

Improve and streamline the process and timescales of developing and launching new standards and better manage business expectations.

Provide transparency about what the government is intending to do with the unspent levy. Being aware of how the government is planning to use it may be seen more favourably by levy payers rather than as an additional business tax.

Local Authorities, LEPs and business support organisations could play a role in helping direct skills funding (both levy transfer and unspent levy) to support local initiatives such as social care apprenticeship training, local Information Advice and Guidance campaigns, increasing the uptake of priority groups into apprenticeships, etc.

Annex 3:

T-Levels - Key Facts:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-t-levels-mark-a-revolution-in-technical-education>

T-Levels (Technical) qualifications will be piloted in 54 schools/colleges in 2020, including one Surrey School, Salesian School in Chertsey.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/providers-selected-to-deliver-t-levels-in-academic-year-2020-to-2021/providers-selected-to-deliver-t-levels-in-academic-year-2020-to-2021>

Aimed as an alternative to taking A-Levels, completed over 2 years, post-16 in schools and colleges.

Courses will be co-designed with employers.

The first courses will be in construction, digital and education & childcare. Further courses will be rolled out with more providers, from 2021, in subjects such as engineering, design, finance, etc.

T-Levels include a compulsory work placement, between 45 – 60 days, to give young people the experience and wider skills they need to be ready for the world of work.

Standards will be assured by Ofqual and the Institute for Apprenticeships (IfA)

T-Levels: Surrey ESB response to Government consultations Feb 2018

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/implementation-of-t-level-programmes>

The Surrey Employment and Skills Board welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the implementation of T level programmes.

The Surrey Employment and Skills Board was established in April 2013 and brings together representatives from business, education and the public sector to provide a strategic view on the skills and employment issues.

A high quality and responsive skills system is critical to wider economic success and is key to increasing productivity. The Surrey area has an economy worth over £40 billion per year and is home to many national and international businesses.

The county already has a highly skilled population. However, many businesses struggle to recruit staff with the right qualifications. There is an increasing demand for a talented STEM workforce, with increasing

emphasis on higher level skills to support productivity growth. Surrey already operates close to full employment but forecasts suggest a further significant increase in jobs, which will mean that businesses, FE colleges, providers and higher education institutions will need to work collaboratively to develop an effective response.

The proposals for a new system of technical education are broadly welcomed by the ESB. Technical provision needs to be high quality and it needs to deliver genuinely good labour market outcomes. We feel that the proposed T levels could offer a transformational change to the education system and, alongside the apprenticeship reforms, go some way to ensuring that technical qualifications are recognised as a credible alternative to academic routes if they are implemented in a way that reflects practical realities, including on funding, and that there are progression routes available. It is also welcomed that there will be clear progression routes from a T level to apprenticeships and higher level apprenticeships.

The development of the T level programme will require considerable business input. It is identified that T levels will be developed by experts in industry and this is welcomed. However, it will be important to have a broad range of businesses involved in this process and we feel that it is crucial to have small businesses represented in the process as well as large companies.

The introduction of T levels will have an increased requirement for formal work placements in an external workplace environment, for 45-60 days for each student. There will be additional demands for FE colleges and providers to work with employers. It is recognised that there is a capacity and delivery fund to support institutions to develop relationships for the work placements, but this equates to a relatively small amount of funding for each college. There is a need to ensure that providers are properly resourced to develop, deliver and monitor the work placements to offer businesses an appropriate level of support and to ensure that there is an appropriate level of quality assurance. There is also a need to ensure that the enormous need for work placements could easily displace apprenticeship opportunities.

The T level offer needs to be communicated in a consistent and clear manner to businesses. The benefits to businesses will also need to be articulated to ensure that companies are encouraged to take part in the delivery of the programme. This is particularly important for small businesses to ensure that the process does not add unnecessary bureaucratic demands and demonstrates the value of their involvement. Consideration should be given to implementing initiatives to help reduce the bureaucracy for smaller companies, for example risk assessments and safety checks undertaken by one school could be used by other schools in the area.

There are still a number of areas in the consultation that require further detail. Specifically, there are issues around ensuring that quality assurance for the employer based projects is undertaken in a consistent manner and delivers high quality opportunities for the student.

There are also issues relating to the payment of expenses to students. We agree that financial constraints should not restrict the uptake of work placements and there should be no additional financial burden to the student or business. The document outlines that if the business is unable to pay the student, the college or training provider should pay for the additional costs. This would be covered by the capacity and delivery fund. However, as outlined above the fund will already have a number of purposes and it is unreasonable to expect providers to cover travel and subsistence costs through this route. This may also restrict severely the geographic range of employers involved.

There are also concerns around equivalence. For example, it is unclear whether a Level 3 T level in electrical installation (with 60 days' work experience) will offer the same level of qualification as a Level 3 electrical installation apprenticeship. The relationship between T levels and apprenticeships needs to be clarified and employers will need to be given certainty if both qualifications give the impression of achieving a Level 3 qualification.

It is critical that the implementation of the new system of technical education is accompanied by an improvement in the provision and quality of careers and education information, advice and guidance (CEIAG). Currently the provision of CEIAG is fragmented and disjointed, delivered by various different delivery bodies at national, regional and local level. The patchy and inconsistent advice does not enable young people (and their parents/carers) to make informed choices. The new T level qualification will give parity to technical education and it is essential that it is offered as a real alternative to all young people and their parents/carers. The progression routes from a T level qualification also need to be communicated through CEIAG.

This page is intentionally left blank

Surrey Employment and Skills Board: Terms of Reference

Context

Surrey County Council has identified economic prosperity as a key priority, both to secure an increase in the size and value of the economy and to generate employment. This vision is recognised by partners across the county.

The Surrey Employment and Skills Board was established in April 2013 to understand, articulate and promote the skills needs of businesses within the Surrey area and opportunities for residents to meet them. The Board will also ensure that a collective Surrey input is presented to Coast to Capital and Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnerships on skills issues. The Board will support initiatives that will:

- raise skills levels and meets the current and future needs of businesses; and
- ensure that the skills system is flexible and responsive to changing requirements in the local economy to support economic growth and enhance participation in the workforce

Purpose

The purpose of the Employment and Skills Board is to:

- articulate current and future employer demand for skills, including skills gaps and shortages particularly in key sectors and the supply chain;
- improve joint working between employers and colleges, universities and training partners to better meet the needs of local employers;
- provide a collective Surrey response to skills issues to the LEPs;
- influence funding decisions relating to skills and employment priorities, ensuring that delivery is targeted to agreed priorities;
- promote better informed career choices for young people; and
- develop employment support arrangements.

Membership (representatives)

Chair: Bob Pickles (Canon UK)			
Deputy Chair: John Watkins (University of Law)			
Employers/Business	Training Providers, Schools, Colleges & Universities	Public Sector	Local Enterprise Partnerships
Nick Poulter (BDO) Janet Preston (Cold Fuzion / IOD) Rob Pierre (Jellyfish) Louise Punter (Surrey Chamber of Commerce) Brian Woods (FSB) NHS Rep (vacancy)	Sue Taylor (ALPS) Frances Rutter (NESCOT) Jayne Dickinson (East Surrey College) Gail Walker (Brooklands College) Schools Rep (vacancy)	Joanna Killian (Surrey County Council) James Whiteman (Guildford BC) Kathryn Beldon (Epsom and Ewell BC) Louise Round (Tandridge DC)	Sarah Carter (Enterprise M3) Kirsten Trussell (Coast to Capital)

Chair and Deputy Chair

The Chair of the Board will be a prominent business leader. This ensures that the Board will be focused on addressing employer needs, whilst drawing on the expertise of colleges, schools and providers to represent the requirements of learners.

The Chair and Deputy-Chair will be elected for a term of two years on a simple majority of those members present and voting.

The last election took place in the December 2017 meeting and the next meeting will be scheduled nearest to the 2 year anniversary.

In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair will Chair the meeting

Roles and Responsibilities

Board members are responsible for providing a collective input from Surrey to the two Local Enterprise Partnerships (Enterprise M3 and Coast to Capital) and will support the development and implementation of the skills strategies. Board members will also play an active role in raising awareness of the Employment and Skills Board and its activities.

It is recognised that there will be limited time available from representatives and so the agenda will be focused and meaningful.

Deliverables

- Evidence base to set out the skills supply and demand issues facing employers and providers;
- Communicate the role of the Employment and Skills Board;
- Give the Surrey perspective to the LEPs in the development of key strategies
- Maximise the amount of skills investment in Surrey

Requirements of Members

- Personal commitment to the Surrey Employment and Skills Board;
- Attendance at meetings and contribute actively to the discussion; and
- Feed back to relevant network groups on the progress of the Board.

Resources

Surrey County Council will provide the secretariat for the Employment and Skills Board and a dedicated, funded, resource to support the Surrey Employment and Skills Board for the period up until February 2020. Other partners will contribute to the work of the Board by leading on particular areas, offering staffing and financial resource and contributing to relevant task groups.

Measures of Success

- Analysis of current provision in the county and awareness of gaps and duplication has influenced LEP plans and those of providers and employers;
- Increased levels of awareness of the ESB with key stakeholders;
- Inclusion of Surrey schemes and projects in the LEP Strategic Economic Plans and strategies;
- Level of funding secured for skills projects in Surrey; and
- Attendance of ESB members.

Highways and Growth Select Committee

18 October 2018



Overview of Highways Contracts

Purpose of report:

To provide members with an overview of the current contract arrangements across Highway services and improvements made to date. The report will also outline the Service's journey towards retendering when the current contracts come to an end many of which do so in April 2021.

Introduction:

- 1) In 2011, following a series of competitive tenders Surrey County Council's Highway Service entered into new contracts to deliver a number of services on behalf of the Council. Many of these contracts were let for a period of up to 10 years (including extensions where awarded).
- 2) The majority of the arrangements will come to an end in 2021 and will require significant planning and investment of resource to ensure any future model is fit for purpose, addresses the needs and objectives of the council and residents whilst allowing sufficient flexibility for future changes in budget, scope of services and council priorities.
- 3) To that end, work has recently commenced supported by the Council's procurement team to identify strengths in the current arrangements which we would want to keep and maximise whilst seeking opportunities to make improvements in any new set of arrangements.

Current Position

- 4) Just prior to the above contract awards (paragraph 1), the Council had entered into a Public Finance Initiative (PFI) contract for Street lighting and this was excluded from the remaining contracts. It should be noted that at the time of the award, budgets for Highways maintenance and particularly for new infrastructure such as traffic calming, junction improvements and so on were reducing and in some cases forecast to cease and contracts were let accordingly. The current contracts are as follows:

Contractor	Service Areas
Kier Highways	Core Maintenance Contract covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate and Emergency Response • Safety Defects • Minor Planned Maintenance • Micro surfacing • Footway surfacing • Footway reconstruction • Carriageway reconstruction including Local Strategic Repair (LSR) • Civil engineering (ITS, Sustainable Transport Improvements and Major Schemes) • Structures Inspections and Maintenance • Structures Repairs/construction • Traffic Sign repairs
Kier Highways (in partnership with Flowline)	Flood Prevention covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gully cleansing and maintenance • Soakaway maintenance • Drainage Jetting and CCTV investigation
Hazel and Jeffries, Kiely Bros RMS	Surface Dressing
Advanced Tree Services Burleys City Suburban Tree Services Connick Tree Services County Tree Services Elmbridge Tree Services Glendale Maydencroft	Arboriculture Maintenance
Wilson & Scott	Lines and Marking refresh
Siemens	Traffic Signals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Signal inspection and repairs • Infrastructure Upgrades
District & Borough Councils	Environmental Maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass cutting • Weed control
Atkins	Professional Services including design

Contractor Performance

- 5) In general terms, supplier performance across all areas would be considered to be good with very strong examples of performance such as 96% of immediate response events attended within 2 hours in July and August, 100% of high risk safety defects repaired within 5 days in the same months and in excess of 99% of street lights in operation every month over the past year.
- 6) Inevitably there are areas to improve which at present include elements such as the end to end Commissioning and Delivery of Committee funded improvement schemes, increasing the number of gullies cleaned on the first visit (by avoidance of parked cars etc.)

and reducing some of the manual steps in the payment process with Kier through automation where possible.

- 7) The nature of the arrangements has changed over the past 8/9 years with many improvements made. These improvements coupled with Highways' commitment to delivering continuous improvement puts the Council in a strong position to use this as a solid foundation for developing a solution for 2021 and beyond incorporating opportunities for improvement.
- 8) One of the key successes of the current arrangements was relocating the majority of officers within Highways from a number of non-operational locations to co-locate with the main contractors (Kier – formerly May Gurney and Skanska) at Merrow¹. This goes beyond simply being based in the same location but extends to functional teams of each organisation often working in the same room and has removed some of the conflicts that might naturally arise when working remotely from the other party and has led to increased collaboration with the contractors and with other council teams.
- 9) A number of improvements have been made since this suite of contracts began in 2011, some of which have arisen from challenges in delivering the services either on the part of the Council, the Service provider or a combination of both. Other improvements have come about through innovation on the part of Council Officers or within the Service Provider and supply chain.

Re-procurement:

- 10) There are a number of contract model options available to the Council in the future. Analysis over the coming months for each of the contracted activities will evaluate current performance, any recent improvements and any opportunities we might seek to explore to make improvements. This could lead to similar approach in the future for an activity to how it is currently delivered. Equally there could be a benefit to doing things differently with a greater or lesser set of activities delivered within that model.
- 11) Initial analysis will focus on the activities provided by Kier Highways as this forms the bulk of the contract spend within Highways and cover a wider variety of activities.

Conclusions:

- 12) The Council set out to address a number of objectives in transitioning from the previous contract arrangements (pre-2011) to the model it currently works to. These included increasing access to specialist suppliers delivering certain work, adopting emerging technologies to save time and cost in delivering services to ultimately improve the outcomes on the network for residents and the travelling public.

¹ There are satellite offices of SCC Officers at both Godstone Depot and Bagshot Depot where teams including Area High Teams are better placed to serve the local area than being based centrally

- 13) Despite having the option to extend most of these contracts from the initial 6 year term up to the maximum 10 years, the Council has not always done so if this was not in the it's best interest. Where the decision to extend has been taken, it has resulted from a review of the services being delivered and seeking improvements which have been embedded into the extension agreement(s) – in addition Highways Officers have sought external validation of the ongoing Value for Money of the contracts through a combination of audit, benchmarking and market testing.
- 14) Highways has a “good handle” on its contracts and is well placed to develop a robust strategy for the delivery of services from 2021 and beyond. Not only have recently delivered improvements provided a solid base upon which to build, but there is time to explore alternative options to deliver aspects either where they are currently under performing or simply to enjoy an improved outcome from a different approach whether it be through different delivery model or through wider innovation in the sector.
- 15) Whilst there are 2½ years before the existing arrangements come to an end, allowing for a sufficient mobilisation period and time to properly complete a competitive tender, it is an appropriate time to begin asking these questions.

Recommendations:

- 16) Note the content of the report and associated presentation delivered at the Select Committee meeting.
- 17) Agree the role that the Select Committee will have in supporting, scrutinising and assuring the Highways Service development and procurement of new contract solutions for 2021 and beyond.
-

Report contact: Lucy Monie – Head of Highways and Transport – 0208 541 9896

Contact details: Paul Wheadon – Business Improvement and Consultancy Manager – 07875 650975

Sources/background papers:

ANNEX A – Examples of Service Improvements

Glossary of acronyms:

LSR – Local Structural Repair

ITS – Integrated Transport Scheme

PFI – Private Finance Initiative

Highways and Growth Select Committee

18 October 2018



Forward Work Programme

1. The Forward Work Plan is attached for the Committee's reference.

Report contact:

Richard Plummer, Democratic Services Officer

Contact details:

Tel: 020 8213 2782

Email: richard.plummer@surreycc.gov.uk

Annexes

- Annex A – Forward Work Programme

This page is intentionally left blank

Highways and Growth Select Committee

Forward Work Programme

2018/2019

Highways and Growth Select Committee (Chairman: Bob Gardner, Vice-Chairman: John O'Reilly)

Date of Meeting	Scrutiny Topic	Description	Outcome	Method	Officer
December 2018	Highways Improvement Contract Review	To review the current measurements of performance of the Surrey Highways Improvement contract and determine success against performance criteria and customer satisfaction rates.	To provide the Committee of current performance and success of the Highways Improvement Contract with the aim of aiding the development of the new Highways Improvement Contract in 2021.	Formal report	Head of Highways & Transport
December 2018	Affordable Housing	To review current provisions for encouraging affordable housing in Surrey for residents and employees of Surrey County Council and ascertain current levels of affordable housing for residents and retirees in the County.	To understand the context of affordable housing in Surrey for residents, employees of Surrey County Council and retirees, and assess potential alternative options for provision.	Formal report	
Early/Mid 2019	Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)	To undertake scrutiny of the output and impact of the two	To understand the work underpinning investment in	Stakeholder Engagement with LEPs /Formal report	Head of Economic Growth

		LEPs that cover Surrey and identify any gaps in provision and better ways of working.	Surrey's economy and investigate the impact of LEP spending in the county.		
Early/Mid 2019	Transport for the South East (TfSE) Strategy	To review the Strategy for TfSE and ascertain the effects that this will have upon Surrey's infrastructure.	To understand the impact that the TfSE Strategy will have upon current infrastructure, determine the impact will for Surrey and make suggestions as to how the strategy can further benefit partners upon the start of its full operation in 2019.	Stakeholder Engagement with TfSE/ Formal Report	Head of Economic Growth
Mid 2019	Place and partnerships	The Council has entered into numerous partnerships across its many functions. The Committee will review the approach taken and impact of these partnerships.	Review the Council's partnerships with other organisations, how they are developed and what they deliver for residents.	Formal report	Head of Economic Growth
Task and Finish Groups					
	Air Quality			Joint T&FG with Environment. Needs to be scoped.	
Future items in Development					
TBC	Surrey Investment Strategy	To review the process, return objectives and contingencies that are utilised in the strategy to invest in new assets and determine the effectiveness of this process.	In Development		