<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Name</th>
<th>Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>Norfolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 8 – Delivery Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Healthcheck (Jan 2015)</td>
<td>Post Gateway 3 and prior to submission of final request for funding support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Gateway Review 3 (Jan 2014)</td>
<td>Investment decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1 Healthcheck (Jan 2015)
Healthcheck
Post Gateway 3 and prior to submission of final request for funding support

Authority Name: Norfolk County Council
Project Name: Norwich Northern Distributor Road

Version number: Final
Date of issue to PO: 19th January 2015
Project Owner: David Allfrey
Healthcheck dates: 13th and 14th January 2015

Healthcheck Team Leader:
Hazel Nickless
This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the Project’s status at the time of the Healthcheck. It reflects the views of the independent Review Team, based on information evaluated over a two-day period, and is delivered to the Project Owner after conclusion of the review.

This Healthcheck has been derived from OGC’s Successful Delivery Toolkit, which is a Crown Copyright Value Added product developed, owned and published by the Office of Government Commerce. It is subject to Crown copyright protection and is reproduced under licence with the kind permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Office of Government Commerce.
DELIVERY CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

The Review Team was impressed by the continuing wide-ranging, committed and convincing support for the Project.

Since the Gateway Review in January ‘14, the Project Team has implemented each and every recommendation made in the report of that Review. Moreover, the outstanding actions from the previous Gateway Review, mentioned in that Report, have also been implemented. The Review Team finds that the Project is now very well managed and resourced and that all possible steps to facilitate delivery, insofar as matters are within the control of the Project, have been taken. The governance arrangements that have been put in place ensure that the Project is managed in accordance with recognised best practice, with demonstrable benefits to the Project. The Project Team, under the guidance of the SRO and with the support of the Project Board, has clearly worked very hard to deal with the requirements of the DCO examination; in working with the contractor to agree final target costs; and subsequently to complete the final application for funding support. Based on the information made available prior to and over the period of the Healthcheck, the Review Team believes that the Project Team has done all that it can to deliver the Project and to manage the major risks that remain; namely the granting of the DCO and securing funding support from DfT.

The Delivery Confidence Assessment is given on the basis that, although it is acknowledged that the DCO and DfT approvals are fundamental risks to the Project, the authority has done all that can be done to mitigate these risks, which, ultimately, are now outwith the authority’s control. All matters within the control of the authority appear to be being managed in accordance with best practice by a dedicated, committed and very hard working Project Team, now supported by a suitably constituted and effective Project Board.

Summary of report recommendations

The Review Team makes the following recommendations that are prioritised using the definitions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical /Essential / Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>That the Project secures the services of personnel having recent experience of working for the Highways Agency in its dealings with Balfour Beatty in the delivery of the works to the A11, in order to strengthen its negotiating position with the contractor in developing the target costs, and in appropriate management of potential cost increasing issues as and when they arise during the construction period.</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>That the Project Team and Project Board work to develop, and then implement, a strategy to manage the delivery phase of the Project; making appropriately skilled personnel available to the Project and, where appropriate, backfills roles to ensure that staff are not conflicted in the discharge of their current roles and facilitating business as usual.</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>That the authority shares its experience of establishing and delivering</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Project through a suitable forum, so that other public authorities in the UK may benefit from the experience and lessons learned.

Notes:

Critical (Do Now) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately

Essential (Do By) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future.

Recommended – The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.
BACKGROUND

The aims of the project:

The Northern Distributor Road (NDR) project (the Project) is a key element of the preferred Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS), which the Review Team is advised, will impact upon the delivery of other key elements of the NATS strategy. The NDR is also central to the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, which has been developed by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council, working together with Norfolk County Council as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. At Postwick the NDR will link with the A47 and wider Trunk Road network via a significant junction upgrade (called the Postwick Hub). The Review Team understands that the Postwick Hub junction improvement is essential to overcome existing capacity problems and to provide appropriate infrastructure for planned major developments. Postwick Hub has, since the last Gateway Review, received all necessary consents, including funding support from DfT and construction is well underway.

The driving force for the Project:

The driving force of the NDR, as a key element of the wider plans referred to above, is the economic development of the Norwich area; particularly to the north and east of Norwich. The population of the Norwich area is approximately 230,000 and is expected to rise to 280,000 by 2025 with the planned housing growth.

Current position regarding Local Partnerships Gateway Reviews:

A Gateway 3 Review (Investment Decision) was undertaken by Local Partnerships in January 2014. A full summary of recommendations, progress and status from the last Review can be found in Appendix C. The remit of the Review Team in carrying out the Healthcheck, the subject of this Report, was to establish to what extent the authority had accepted and implemented the recommendations made pursuant to Gateway 3.

Conduct of the Healthcheck Review

This Local Partnerships Healthcheck was carried out from 13th January 2015 to 14th January 2015 at The County Records Office Martineau Lane Norwich. The team members are listed on the front cover.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The Review Team would like to thank the Project Owner and the Project Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team’s understanding of the Project and the outcome of this Healthcheck. We would also like to extend our appreciation to all those who took time out from their busy day and participated in our interviews. Special thanks are due to Debbie Reilly for the hospitality arrangements as well as to the staff at the Norfolk Records Office who made the Review Team very welcome.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Current position:

Following a procurement process completed in 2008, Birse Construction (now Balfour Beatty) was appointed pursuant to the New Engineering Contract (NEC) 3rd Edition Option C. The Project Team has clearly worked very hard to produce the detailed authority requirements, relating to the design of
the NDR, in order that target costs can be agreed with the contractor. The original regional Birse team is being supplemented by the Balfour Beatty Major Projects Team to finalise the target costs and to deliver the construction phase of the NDR in due course. The achievement of affordable target costs, and the maintenance of value for money during the construction period is a significant risk to the authority. However, the authority has fully resourced the process and understands what needs to be done to minimise the risk of an unaffordable target cost being proposed by the contractor, and of deal creep as the construction is carried out. The authority has available to it the experience gained by personnel working for the Highways Agency on the recent works carried out by Balfour Beatty on the A11.

**Recommendation**

That the Project secures the services of personnel having recent experience of working for the Highways Agency in its dealings with Balfour Beatty in the delivery of the works to the A11, in order to strengthen its negotiating position with the contractor in developing the target costs, and in appropriate management of potential cost increasing issues, as and when they arise during the construction period.

### 3: Review of Current Phase

**Project Management and Governance Arrangements**

Consideration of the recommendations made following Gateway 3 indicates that there were serious shortcomings in the Project governance arrangements. However, the Review Team finds that every recommendation has been acted upon, with the result that the Project now has in place governance arrangements that reflect recommended best practice. The Review Team was advised throughout the Review that the changes in governance have resulted in better communications between the various elements of the team, better forward planning and budgetary management, utilisation of the communications strategy, particularly during the DCO examination period and generally, team members feel more assured in that decisions are being taken at Project Board level which, in turn, ensures that wider political support for the Project remains in place. The Project is also benefitting from lessons learned in the construction of the Postwick Junction, with consequential changes having been reflected in the construction programmes.

The Project Board provides a connection to the NATS Board ensuring that the overall strategic plans are constantly taken into account. The authority is also proposing to establish a Major Infrastructure Board (MIB) that will have an overview of all major (in terms of strategic as well as financial significance) projects across the whole of the county. The NDR Project Board will be represented at this MIB, reflecting the significance of the NDR in the overall strategy. The development of the MIB is another manifestation of the best practice and joined up thinking in this element of NCC’s overall services delivery.

**Planning and Funding**

The Project Team has clearly put in a considerable amount of effort in working with PINS during the examination of the application for the DCO for the NDR, and has now done all that can be done. The matter now lies with the inspectors who have until the end of March to submit their report.

If the Project receives DfT approval, DfT will be providing the major part of the funding for the Project. DfT has three approval stages: Programme Entry, Conditional Approval and Final Approval. The Project was granted Programme Entry in 2011. The authority elected to omit the Conditional Approval Stage and will shortly be submitting the Business Case for Final Approval. As part of this process the Council will share the draft Final Business Case with DfT during its development and in advance of
final submission, which should facilitate the overall process. DfT personnel have been very supportive in dealing with the authority so as to ensure that the authority is fully aware of the DfT process requirements so that the progression of the application can be as smooth as possible. However the process provides that the Final Business Case will not be considered by DfT until the DCO is in place. Because of timing issues, taking into account the real possibility of a call for Judicial Review and the purdah period resulting from the forthcoming General Election, it is most likely that final approval for the Project will not be granted (assuming that the Project is approved) until after the General Election. Final Approval is required prior to DfT releasing funding to the Council for the Project.

Despite that fact that the greatest risks to the Project are failure to secure the DCO and/or failure to secure DfT funding support, the Review Team considers that the Project Team, supported by the Project Board, has done everything possible so try to secure a positive outcome; accordingly, no recommendation is made with regard to either the application for DCO or DfT approval.

4: Risk Management

Since the last Gateway Review an experienced and appropriately qualified project manager has been assigned to the Project, who acts to provide an overview of all of the different work streams, and ensures a cohesive approach to risk management.

The overarching Project Risk Register is populated by the various teams and kept fully up to date. It is used as a working tool and is owned by the Project Board, enabling proper consideration of key risks and appropriate mitigation measures being taken with the full knowledge and support of the Board. The Review Team is assured that the NDR Project Board has a comprehensive understanding of all relevant issues and is fully able to make informed decisions.

Financial input is apparent at both project management level, demonstrated by forward planning and ensuring that budgets are in place for the various work streams; and at Project Board level, ensuring that funds are made available to the Project. The Review Team is of the opinion that the Project is well funded and prudently managed, with funding being an appropriately managed function within the Project at both Team and Board level.

The Project is based upon the assumption that the Project will be funded by a capital contribution from the NCC, and that funding will be made available by Central Government. The Review Team is assured that the NCC contribution is committed and deliverable. The Project Team has prudently produced a paper that considers alternative funding solutions, should DfT not approve funding support for the Project. However, the paper indicates that none of the proposed solutions appear to be a realistic solution to this significant risk. As indicated above, although the risk of DfT not approving funding support for the Project is a significant risk to the Project, as the Project Team and Project Board appear to have taken all reasonable steps to mitigate this risk, no recommendation is made.

Project Resources in the Delivery Phase of the Project

The Project is now (subject to matters now outside the control of the authority) rapidly moving towards the construction phase, where clear roles and responsibilities are essential to avoid costly errors. The authority will need to forward plan to ensure that sufficient numbers of appropriately skilled personnel are available to enable the authority to deliver the best possible outcome for the public sector, in terms of delivery of the required solution, on time and within budget and demonstrating value for money.

The Review Team is pleased to report that Senior members of the wider Project Team have anticipated this need and are currently developing a strategy to take the Project forward if all necessary consents and approvals are in place, enabling the Project to move swiftly and efficiently into the construction phase. The Project has available to it many highly skilled members of staff, supplemented by external consultants. However mobilisation of suitably skilled personnel, dedicated
to the NDR could have an impact on the ability of such personnel to discharge their current responsibilities. Consideration should be given to backfilling where required to enable personnel to devote appropriate time to the NDR, without undue stress and a negative impact on business as usual.

**Recommendation**

That the Project Team and Project Board work to develop, and then implement, a strategy to manage the delivery phase of the Project; making appropriately skilled personnel available to the Project and, where appropriate, backfills roles to ensure that staff are not conflicted in the discharge of their current roles and facilitating business as usual.

**Communications**

The Review Team finds that an effective communication strategy has been developed and implemented, which has proved to be of significant value during the examination for the DCO. In moving forward, the public profile of the Project will inevitably be raised, for example, by virtue of the confirmation of Project funding approvals, confirmation of the DCO, and commencement of site works and construction. Each of these matters will need to be sensitively managed and, to that end, communications with stakeholders, including the local business community, will become increasingly important in order to promote the positive aspects of the Project as potential construction impacts, such as noise, nuisance, dust and the presence of construction plant on local roads, start to prompt complaints and potential adverse publicity. The Review Team is assured that the authority is fully aware of the ongoing communication requirements of the Project and how those requirements will change as the Project moves forward. Elements of the communications strategy identify significant and differing requirements, and appointments have been made with entities having appropriate skills necessary to discharge all communication requirements. The Review Team is assured that the authority is now fully aware of the Project needs with regard to communications, that all reasonable steps have been taken, and that resources are in place to manage the communication requirement as the Project develops. Accordingly, no recommendation is made.

**Knowledge Sharing**

The Review Team is of the opinion that the authority has made significant efforts to manage the difficult elements of this significant Project. Successful steps have been taken since the last Gateway Review to manage the communication and governance (including financial governance) elements of the Project, at the same time as dealing with the demanding and complicated process requirements of the DCO, something that the authority has not done before and may never have to do again. As well as commending the authority for the way it has managed the Project, the Review Team considers that other authorities within the UK could benefit from the authority’s experience of the DCO process in particular, and we would urge that the authority makes its experience available to other authorities embarking on similar major projects.

**Recommendation**

That the authority shares its experience of establishing and delivering the Project through a suitable forum, so that other public authorities in the UK may benefit from the experience and lessons learned.

The next Gateway Review will be agreed with the County Council in due course.
APPENDIX A

Purposes of OGC Gateway™ Healthcheck Review

Guidance from OGC as to when it is appropriate to carry out a Healthcheck, as opposed to a specific Gateway™ is set out below.

The healthcheck process will normally be applied under the following circumstances:

- where a project has been deemed significantly low risk that a full Gateway review would add no greater value;
- where a programme/project requires additional assurance on one or two main points of delivery, rather than on all the elements covered by the normal Gateway™ review process – in which case a healthcheck could cover these elements in-depth;
- where a programme/project requires assurance between Gateway™ reviews;
- where a programme/project requires assurance, but has not undergone any previous Gateway™ reviews, and is sufficiently past the point at which the Gateway™ review process may be applied (in which case the Hub may agree to the healthcheck process being used if it is felt it will add value).

APPENDIX B

Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Allfrey</td>
<td>Project Owner. Major Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Haverson</td>
<td>Major Projects Support Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Barnard</td>
<td>NDR/NATS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kemp</td>
<td>Project Team Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby Coke</td>
<td>Leader of UKIP Party and Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McCabe</td>
<td>Director of Environment, Transport and Development NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Jessop</td>
<td>Assistant Director Highways and Transport NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Skiggs</td>
<td>Finance Business Partner CES NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona McDiarmid</td>
<td>Assistant Director Economic Development and Strategy NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Birchall</td>
<td>Senior Media and Public Affairs Officer NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Frith</td>
<td>Associate Mott McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Taylor</td>
<td>Contracts Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Henry</td>
<td>Preconstruction Manager Balfour Beatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Kirby</td>
<td>CEO Broadlands District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Sunderland</td>
<td>DIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

**Recommendations from previous Local Partnerships Gateway Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that an up-dated Project Business Case is maintained and a comprehensive Benefits Realisation Plan is now prepared including appropriate performance measures.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that a comprehensive delivery plan supporting a realistic forward programme for the Project is developed and regularly up-dated and that it is communicated to all members of the integrated Project Team.</td>
<td>Complete and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that the Council immediately reviews project management and governance arrangements, re-defines project roles and responsibilities in the light of a capacity and skills assessment, and strengthens project management processes and controls including the measurement of suppliers’ performance.</td>
<td>Complete and continuing as the project phases change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that a common risk management methodology process is developed and adopted at all levels within the proposed integrated Project Team; a more detailed quantitative risk analysis is carried out as a priority; and that active management of each risk is undertaken at Project Team and, as appropriate, Project Board levels.</td>
<td>Complete and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now reviews the practicalities of achieving the intended funding approvals' programme and develops a contingency plan should it not be possible to secure DfT funding during the currency of its current grant regime.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now develops a detailed tactical communications plan, including for the management of the realisation of the principal Project risks, in association with Birse Civils and with the engagement of the Council’s Communications Officer.</td>
<td>Complete and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that a resources and full financial review of the Project, including the implications associated with the key Project risks, is undertaken and that corresponding detailed budget allocations are made.</td>
<td>Complete and implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Gateway Review 3
Project Name: Norwich Northern Distributor Road
Gateway Number: LP228G300

Gateway Review Team Members:
Jeremy Seldon
Graham Stagg
Kirstie Turner

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the Project's status at the time of the Review. It reflects the views of the independent Review Team, based on information evaluated over a three to four day period, and is delivered to the Project Owner immediately at the conclusion of the review.

This Gateway Review has been derived from OGC’s Successful Delivery Toolkit which is a Crown Copyright Value Added product developed, owned and published by the Office of Government Commerce. It is subject to Crown copyright protection and is reproduced under licence with the kind permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Office of Government Commerce.
DELIVERY CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Confidence Assessment</th>
<th>Amber/Red¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Review Team was impressed by the wide-ranging support for the Project.

The Review Team finds that the Project has made significant progress in advancing delivery of the scheme with the benefits of Early Contractor Involvement, especially in respect of the proposals for the Postwick Junction. Nevertheless there is evidence of serious weaknesses in project management and project governance arrangements. It is essential that decisions are taken to rectify those short-comings as a priority.

The Review Team finds that the current arrangement whereby un-minuted meetings and consequent decision making takes place between the Project SRO and the Council’s Director of Environment, Transport, Development and Waste, does not provide an auditable record of decision making and is not conducive to best practice. This has resulted in several significant short-comings of project management. The Review Team considers that this position needs to be addressed by the establishment of a Project Board, and that Board should be the sole body tasked with project development and delivery, providing overview and leadership for this nationally significant Project.

Although an over-arching Project risk register has been produced, it is far from comprehensive and a process of robust risk management needs to be developed and utilised. In particular the Project Board will need to receive regular reports in respect of high-level risks and ensure that appropriate actions are taken.

Exemplars of good practice applied are:

- Adoption of the ECI procurement model
- Detailed Contract and Construction Programme management including the detailed

¹ The Delivery Confidence assessment RAG status is based on the following definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green</strong></td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber/Green</strong></td>
<td>Successful delivery appears probable however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber/Red</strong></td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td>Successful delivery of the project/programme appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on project/programme definition, schedule, budget required quality or benefits delivery, which at this stage does not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The Project/Programme may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
risk allocation and management matrices currently being used to proactively identify and manage risks to the construction programme and to inform the target price cost reduction sharing arrangements.

Summary of report recommendations

The Review Team makes the following recommendations which are prioritised using the definitions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Critical/Essential/Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that an up-dated Project Business Case is maintained and a comprehensive Benefits Realisation Plan is now prepared including appropriate performance measures.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that a comprehensive delivery plan supporting a realistic forward programme for the Project is developed and regularly up-dated and that it is communicated to all members of the integrated Project Team.</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that the Council immediately reviews project management and governance arrangements, re-defines project roles and responsibilities in the light of a capacity and skills assessment, and strengthens project management processes and controls including the measurement of suppliers' performance.</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that a common risk management methodology process is developed and adopted at all levels within the proposed integrated Project Team; a more detailed quantitative risk analysis is carried</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
out as a priority; and that active management of each risk is undertaken at Project Team and, as appropriate, Project Board levels.

5. The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now reviews the practicalities of achieving the intended funding approvals’ programme and develops a contingency plan should it not be possible to secure DfT funding during the currency of its current grant regime. Critical

6. The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now develops a detailed tactical communications plan, including for the management of the realisation of the principal Project risks, in association with Birse Civils and with the engagement of the Council’s Communications Officer. Essential – at the earliest possible opportunity

7. The Review Team recommends that a resources and full financial review of the Project, including the implications associated with the key Project risks, is undertaken and that corresponding detailed budget allocations are made. Critical

Notes:
Critical (Do Now) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately
Essential (Do By) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future.
Recommended – The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.
BACKGROUND

The aims of the programme:

The Northern Distributor Road (NDR) is a key element of the preferred Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) which, the Review Team is advised, will impact upon the delivery of other key elements of the strategy. The NDR is also central to the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk which has been developed by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council, working together with Norfolk County Council as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership. At Postwick the NDR will link with the A47 and wider Trunk Road network via a significant junction upgrade (called the Postwick Hub). The Review Team understands that the Postwick Hub junction improvement is essential to overcome existing capacity problems and to provide appropriate infrastructure for planned major developments. Postwick Hub has received Planning Permission and the Public Inquiry for the Side Roads Order finished at the end of July 2013, it is anticipated that construction could commence on the Postwick Hub Junction in March/April of this year.

The driving force for the programme:

The driving force of the NDR is the economic development of the Norwich area, particularly to the north and east of Norwich. The population of the Norwich area is approximately 230,000 and is expected to rise to 280,000 by 2025 with the planned housing growth.

The procurement/delivery status:

Following a procurement process completed in 2008, Birse Construction was appointed pursuant to the New Engineering Contract (NEC) 3rd Edition Option C. The contract has two stages, the first stage of Early Contractor Involvement being underway, with target costs having been agreed for Postwick junction. Design of the NDR is underway and costing is to be completed. The County Council Project Team is confident that the contract will allow the successful construction of the Project.

Current position regarding Local Partnerships Gateway Reviews:

This is a Gateway 3 Review (Investment Decision) and the third Local Partnerships (formerly 4ps) Gateway Review of the Project that has been undertaken. The last such review was a Gateway 1 Review which was carried out between 13th and 15th May 2008.

Whilst a number of the recommendations made in the Gateway 1 report have been addressed, the Review Team has received no evidence that the recommendations of that report which have not been fully implemented, have nevertheless received proper and due consideration. A documented audit trail supporting any such consideration and corresponding decision has not been made available to the Review Team. The Review Team is aware that former senior Project Team members have left the Project, with no apparent succession planning, which could account for the position. Nevertheless, it is felt that, the apparent failure to implement the more significant recommendations could account for the lack of formal governance identified in this review. The recommendations concerned are as follows:

- The risk register needs to be refined by involvement of people with a wider ranging perspective of strategic risks [Recommendation 5]
- A comprehensive prioritisation, escalation and mitigation system needs to be put in place in line with best practice as set out in OGC management of Risk guidance [Recommendation 6]
- NCC adopt best practice as set out in OGC Prince 2 project governance [Recommendation 7]
- The review team recommends that NCC carry out a skills audit [Recommendation 8]
- Reporting lines and authority of Mott MacDonald personnel should be set out clearly [Recommendation 10]
A full summary of recommendations, progress and status from the last Review can be found in Appendix C.

As part of the current Gateway 3 Review, the Review team has considered the Gateway 1 recommendations and any aspects outstanding in reaching our conclusions and formulating our recommendations.

**Purpose of the Review**

The primary purpose of a Local Partnerships Gateway Review 3 is to confirm the business case and benefits plan now that the bid information has been confirmed and check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement process.

Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Local Partnerships Gateway Review 3.

**Conduct of the Review**

This Local Partnerships Gateway Review 3 was carried out from 20th January 2014 to 22nd January 2014 at The County Records Office Martineau Lane Norwich. The team members are listed on the front cover.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The Review team would like to thank the Project Owner and the Project Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review team's understanding of the Project and the outcome of this Review. We would also like to extend our appreciation to all those officers and members of the County and District Councils, and to the representatives of the Department of Transport, Motts, Birse Civils, Pinsent Masons and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership who participated in our interviews. Special thanks are due to Debbie Reilly for the hospitality arrangements as well as to the staff at the Norfolk Records Office who made the Review Team very welcome.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1: Business case and stakeholders

Business Case

The justification for the Project is provided in the Project Business Case, which was last up-dated in 2011 to inform the Council’s application to DfT for conditional funding approval for the NDR. This resulted in the Project securing Programme Entry; when the application is made for Final Funding Approval it will be important that a further up-date of the business case is prepared both to support the Council’s investment decision, and the future assessment of benefits’ realisation. Once the NDR secures Planning Permission, that business case will form part of the submission to DfT for Final Approval.

The Review Team recommends that an up-dated Project Business Case is maintained and a comprehensive benefits realisation plan is now prepared including appropriate performance measures.

Stakeholders

The Review Team interviewed a range of stakeholders, including representatives of Broadland District Council and Norwich City Council, and established that there is strong support for the NDR. All those interviewed appeared to be aware of the key challenges that could affect successful Project delivery.

The Project Team supports an on-going regular briefing arrangement for the County Council’s Cabinet, the partner district councils, the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and the NATS Board. It will be important to maintain these briefings as the Project moves forward into and through construction as part of a Stakeholder Management Plan within the Project overall Communications Plan.

2: Assessment of the proposed solution

The Business Case produced in 2011 justifies the need for the NDR, as part of the overarching economic development of the area, and has been evaluated by DfT as part of the bid for funding bid. It was made clear to the review team that, as part of the bid for the Full and Final Funding Approval the case for the NDR will have to be restated with the emphasis being that it is a key element of the whole economic development objective and not a project in isolation. The solution will have been considered as part of the overarching context in which the Postwick Junction sits at the Public Inquiry for Postwick Junction. However, it is highly likely that the rationale of the NDR will be tested if the scheme proceeds to Examination as part of the Development Consent Order process. The Business Case will also need to be maintained to support the DfT Full and Final Funding Approval submission. The Review Team has seen no evidence of a benefits realisation plan for the Project it is therefore recommended that a plan is put in place to evidence the impact of the Project, and that baseline monitoring is undertaken prior to the start of construction. This plan will also be required by DfT as part of the application for Full and Final Funding Approval.

The Review Team understands that a specialist resource has been brought into the Project to produce the over-arching programme of delivery. The Review Team has seen evidence that detailed project plans exist for the differing elements of the Project, e.g, design and construction, and these elements
are being managed separately. These plans need to be brought together in an over-arching realistic Project delivery plan that can be base-lined, allows activities to be co-ordinated and for progress to be tracked by the Project Manager.

The Review Team has seen evidence of a successful working relationship with Birse Civils. The Early Contractor Involvement stage appears to be well managed by the staff involved, for example, cost-saving suggestions are being reviewed, investigated and decided upon. Buildability of the scheme is being assessed. There needs now to be review of skills and experience available with regards to contract management especially with the likely imminent start of construction of the Postwick Junction improvements. In this context, there are some concerns around the availability of resources to continue to support the delivery of the Project.

**The Review Team recommends that a comprehensive delivery plan supporting a realistic forward programme for the Project is developed and regularly up-dated and that it is communicated to all members of the integrated Project Team.**

The Review Team understands that discussions are currently on-going with Mott McDonald to formally extend their support to the design team for the Project following the re-procurement of the Council’s Framework Agreement. Along with the project governance arrangements recommended in this report it is important that a Project of such significance to the County Council is adequately resourced to support delivery, especially considering the challenging timescales to which the Project is working. In addition, succession planning and contingency arrangements need to be considered. A skills’ audit should be undertaken of Project staff and plans put in place to address any shortfall.

### 3: Review of Current Phase

**Project Management and Governance Arrangements**

The Council has undertaken a procurement using the Engineering and Construction Contract adopting an ECI approach and has engaged Birse Civils to deliver the main highway works.

The Project Team has indicated that detailed design of the Postwick Junction has been completed and that the Council’s in-house design teams are now progressing the design of the distributor road itself apart from the rail over-bridge being designed by Motts.

On a project such as this, which incorporates a rail bridge as well as other structures, water courses and utilities’ services, it is critical to map accurately and control the design interfaces between the professional disciplines applied to the Project. In this regard the Review Team established that design integration and co-ordination across the Project is being well led, although internal communications across the separate design teams could be improved to the benefit of efficient and effective working.

Although some project management and governance arrangements are in place, these are in urgent need of review to address the distinct requirements at this stage of the Project. To this end, terms of reference, composition and functioning of a Project Board in line with best practice need to be addressed, and that Board should be the sole body tasked with project development and delivery, providing overview and leadership for the Project. Membership of the Board should have regard to its particular detailed responsibilities which will include overview of project management functions notably in relation to programme, resources and risk management; budget management; communications; reporting and disclosure; and project assurance. Whilst there is evidence of consultation with other directorates of the County Council on various key issues, the Review Team is of the view that, given the responsibilities of the Board, its membership should include wider corporate involvement and at least financial and legal services’ representatives and to provide for neutral challenge would appear to
be appropriate. OGC Achieving Excellence in Construction Procurement Guide 02, “Project Organisation, Roles and Responsibilities” provides relevant guidance.

The Review Team finds that the absence to date of formally approved minutes and a corresponding audit trail of key decisions distributed to members of the Project Team is a significant weakness that needs immediate attention. The proposed Project Board meetings should be appropriately administered ensuring detailed Board papers and clear and accurate recording of minutes. In this latter respect the legal framework in which the Council has to carry out its functions, especially in respect of the Freedom of Information Act, Environmental Impact Regulations and procurement rules make it essential that an auditable decision trail is maintained. This should also facilitate the dissemination of Project information to all team members, the Review Team having identified failings in internal communications, leading to some confusion and lack of awareness amongst team members.

There is evidence of lack of precision in the definition of some key Project roles and responsibilities, and this been exacerbated by an apparent mis-application of the titles of certain team members. It is important that all roles and responsibilities for both the Project Board members and the Project Team are now clearly defined, understood and agreed. It would also be beneficial if the required skills, experience and authority profiles for each of the key positions within the project management and governance structure were defined so that any short-comings can be appropriately addressed through directed training or other support. Additionally, it is considered that a capacity and skills assessment should be undertaken to ensure that this process is clearly focused, maximises the potential of the Project Team and places the Council in the strongest position as it moves forward on ECI.

The technical day-to-day project management arrangements and processes, including regular formal integrated Project Team meetings, do appear to be working effectively. There is also evidence that the management and control of suppliers (principally Motts) could be improved. Project management processes should now be encapsulated within a Project Delivery Plan and include the full co-ordination and integration of the design management process.

The Review Team understands that the Northern Distributor Road is a priority for the Council. In this regard the Review Team has found there to be substantial support for the Project across the County Council and from its Norwich Area Transportation Strategy partners. Funds for the Postwick Junction are in place, and funding for the new road is expected to be drawn from DfT grant and proceeds of the Community Infrastructure Levy across the partner district councils, with the balance being met by the County Council. With any project that has multiple stakeholder involvement, the ability to effectively manage the project, and all relevant interests in the project, is key to managing expectations and thereby maintaining support for the project.

**The Review Team recommends that the Council immediately reviews project management and governance arrangements, re-defines project roles and responsibilities in the light of a capacity and skills assessment, and strengthens project management processes and controls including the measurement of suppliers’ performance.**

**4: Risk Management**

The Council has in place certain limited strategic governance arrangements which to date appear to have overseen the achievement of Project key milestones within the Project. At the technical level teams appear to have progressed well and adopted common and proven methodologies to determine priorities and maintain control.

There is evidence of some confusion with regard to the role and responsibilities of the Project Manager and Senior Responsible Officer (SRO), and what arrangements will be in place at the end of the current secondment arrangements, to provide continuity in the project manager role. The Project is of
high value and complexity and there is serious concern that project management needs to be better resourced and that existing structures would benefit from a review of future needs.

The Review Team acknowledges that project governance structures are often modified to fit local cultures and practice, and that this often works. However, the Review Team is concerned that the absence of a dedicated Project Manager reporting to a Project Board is having a detrimental impact on the overseeing and control of the Project and its associated risks and key decisions by key personnel in the Council.

The existing project management structure supports a significant gap between the SRO and the NATS Board, and there would appear to be no formal recording of process and recommendations made to the NATS Board, prior to submissions being made. The Review Team acknowledges the role of the NATS Board but would recommend a dedicated NDR Project Board constituted of appropriate staff be put in place between the SRO and the NATS Board, to ensure that all information submitted to the NATS Board has the benefit of scrutiny by all departments relevant to the Project. It is unclear, what, if any, decision making power is delegated to the NATS Board, (or could be delegated to any NDR dedicated board). Whilst it is usual for significant (generally involving funding) decisions to be made by members, a scheme of delegation to a project board, clearly indicating what decisions may be made at board level, improves project delivery, provides a clear audit trail and maximises senior officer and member time and input.

There is significant reliance on suppliers and contractors to manage key parts of the Project although this system appears to be working well. However the Review Team could find little evidence of measurement of supplier performance and assurance within the current project management processes.

The Review Team has seen evidence of notable risk management practice at the technical design elements of the Project, particularly where contractors and suppliers are working with the Council’s Project Team. Whilst a risk register is apparent at the NATS Project Board level, the risk register is not populated or maintained in accordance with recommended practice, and it is unclear to what extent (if at all) the risk register is utilised as a project management tool, and how mitigation actions are resourced, implemented and evaluated.

A number of significant risks appear to have been omitted from the strategic risk register, and there is a lack of clarity with regard to how risks are scored, monitored and, where appropriate, escalated. It is apparent that the Council maintains ownership of the risk register but a high proportion of risk ownership is vested in personnel from contractors and suppliers, and it is unclear how these risk owners are held to account. It is a concern that some of the strategic risks in a project of this value and complexity would normally warrant project board level exposure and discussion. However within the current governance and risk management structure, it is difficult to determine how this takes place and to what extent key decisions are formally made and recorded.

A repeating theme made apparent to the Review Team relates to project resources (including personnel) being over stretched with no direct link from the risk register to associated resource plans and mitigation activities.

The Review Team established, surprisingly for a project of this level of complexity, value and strategic significance, that the Project risk register has not been maintained as a "live" document and management tool. The regular review, prioritisation and management of high-level risks by the proposed Project Board would assist in facilitating their resolution and provide an appropriate audit trail of decision-taking. In this context it is important to establish contingency plans for all high-level risks. The approach to risk management will also support the Council in the management of potential Freedom of Information Act (FoIA) / Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) requests or future possible challenges relating to key Project decisions and corresponding cost consequences.
The Review Team recommends that a common risk management methodology and process is developed and adopted at all levels within the proposed integrated Project Team; a more detailed quantitative risk analysis is carried out as a priority; and that active management of each risk is undertaken at Project Team and, as appropriate, Project Board levels.

The OGC Achieving Excellence in Construction Procurement Guide 04, “Risk and Value Management” provides a brief overview of the risk management processes that should be in place for a project of this scale.

The Review Team found that, in accordance with the principles of ECI, the Contract risk analysis has been extended qualitative/empirical model to a quantitative model providing a clear indication of likely out-turn costs within appropriate confidence limits. This provides the information necessary to feed into the target costs to be agreed with Birse Civils and is an example of best practice within the Project.

5: Readiness for next phase

Project Resources in Moving Forward

The Project is now rapidly moving towards the construction phase where clear roles and responsibilities are essential to avoid costly errors. This is a significant project for the County Council which includes innovative features such as ECI, target costing on the basis of actual costs and open book accounting. The OGC Achieving Excellence in Construction Procurement Guide 2, “Project Organisation – Roles and Responsibilities” provides clear guidance on the key roles within the Client’s project organisation and includes maturity matrices against which the skills and experience of existing staff can be compared so that any gaps can be identified and addressed.

On the basis that ECC Option C is going to be adopted, the success of the Project will, in part, depend on the adoption of a partnering culture and collaborative working principles. This culture and method of working does not happen by accident. Success often requires investment in independently facilitated/coached workshops to develop teambuilding, trust and aligned interests. OGC Achieving Excellence in Construction Guide 05, “The Integrated Project Team, Teamworking and Partnering” provides relevant guidance.

Department for Transport (DfT) Approvals

DfT is providing the major part of the funding for the Project. DfT has three approval stages: Programme Entry, Conditional Approval and Final Approval. The Project was granted Programme Entry in 2011. Having already invited tenders and appointed Birse Civils, the Council is now pursuing the option of omitting the Conditional Approval stage and moving directly to Final Approval. As part of this process the Council intends to share the necessary business case with DfT during its development and in advance of formal submission, which should facilitate the overall process.

Final Approval will not be considered by DfT until the Development Consent Order is in place which, is not expected to be until April 2015. As part of this process DfT will need to remain satisfied that the Project continues to offer value for money. This will require further work to establish the BCR (benefit cost ratio) appropriate at the time. Final Approval is required prior to DfT releasing funding to the Council for the Project. Unfortunately, on the basis of the current Project programme this means that the Secretary of State’s corresponding decision will not be taken before the purdah period, prior to the general election in May 2015. Regardless of the outcome of the election and any change in support for this and similar projects, the current funding regime will cease in favour of a new funding arrangement to be exercised per the Local Enterprise Partnership and for which the Northern Distributor Road may be eligible; the details of the new arrangements are at this time uncertain. If the current Project
timetable cannot be advanced (which looks unlikely), then it is recommended that the Council considers what contingency arrangements it might now prepare so that the consequent delay to the Project is minimised and the potential for continuing grant support for the Project is maximised.

The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now reviews the practicalities of achieving the intended funding approvals’ programme and develops a contingency plan should it not be possible to secure DfT funding during the currency of its current grant regime.

In moving forward, the public profile of the Project will inevitably be raised, for example, by virtue of the confirmation of Project funding approvals, confirmation of the Development Consent Order, contractor appointments for the main highway and bridge-works, and the subsequent commencement of site works and construction. Each of these matters will need to be sensitively managed and, to that end, communications with stakeholders, including the local business community, will become increasingly important in order to promote the positive aspects of the Project as potential construction impacts, such as noise, nuisance, dust and the presence of construction plant on local roads, start to prompt complaints and potential adverse publicity.

To communicate effectively, it is essential to establish a strategy outlining the principles to be adopted as well as the detailed aspects of communications, methods and timings, which will be needed to deliver messages in an efficient and timely manner. The existing communications plan provides a useful framework for the necessary detailed tactical communications plan now needed to be developed in association with Birse Civils.

The Review Team recommends that the Project Team now develops a detailed tactical communications plan, including for the management of the realisation of the principal Project risks, in association with Birse Civils and with the engagement of the Council’s Communications Officer.

The Project Team is now working with Birse Civils and Motts in the development of final detailed design drawings and specifications. A set of comprehensive and robust management plans is a pre-requisite for a successful contract engagement process, as well as the subsequent construction phase. In this context it will be important to establish plans for the management of these future phases of the Project and therefore, to enhance the prospects for success of the Project, the preparation and adoption of these plans should now proceed.

On-going budget provision and contingency

Whilst the Project retains strong support across the Council and from the public and the forward costs’ profile for the Project has been approved by the County Council, steps now need to be taken to arrange that the necessary budgetary provision exists in the medium-long term. To that end it is understood that the County Council is intending to formalise its agreements with the partner district councils that CIL monies will be available to support any necessary borrowing that the County Council has to secure to fund construction of the new road.

For the future, it will be important to have appropriate and confirmed budgetary provisions for the Council’s resources, its advisers, the construction costs including land and compensation) and necessary contingencies. Additionally, if the forward Project programme is to be achieved and value-for-money assured it will be important to ensure that the staff resource requirements of the Project are provided, and that succession planning arrangements for key Project posts are developed.
The Review Team recommends that a resources and full financial review of the Project, including the implications associated with the key Project risks, is undertaken and that corresponding detailed budget allocations are made.

The next Gateway Review will be agreed with the County Council in due course.
APPENDIX A

Purpose of the Gateway Review 3: Investment decision

• Confirm the business case and benefits plan now that the bid information has been confirmed.

• Check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement process.

• Confirm that the recommended contract decision, if properly executed within a standard lawful agreement, is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and will provide value for money.

• Ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion, including contract management aspects.

• Ensure there is continuing support for the project.

• Confirm that the approved procurement strategy has been followed.

• Confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the client and the supplier or partner are sound and achievable.

• Check that the business has prepared for the development (where there are new processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services/facilities.

• Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business) and that these plans are shared with suppliers.

• Confirm that the technical implications, such as ‘buildability’ for construction projects; and for IT-enabled projects information assurance, the impact of e-government frameworks (such as e-business and external infrastructure) have been addressed.
## APPENDIX B

### Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Allfrey</td>
<td>Project Owner. Major Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Haverson</td>
<td>Major Projects Support Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Barnard</td>
<td>NDR/NATS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kemp</td>
<td>Project Team Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Harrison</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport, Development and Waste NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McCabe</td>
<td>Interim Director of Environment, Transport and Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Timmins</td>
<td>Head of Finance NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Gibson</td>
<td>Acting Managing Director NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark North</td>
<td>Engineer bridge Networks NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona McDiarmid</td>
<td>Assistant Director Economic Development and Strategy NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Starkie</td>
<td>New Anglia LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick McDonald</td>
<td>Pinsent Masons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Langlands</td>
<td>Media and Public Affairs Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Frith</td>
<td>Associate Mott McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Taylor</td>
<td>Contracts Manager NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Henry</td>
<td>Birse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Watt</td>
<td>Heard of City Development Services Norwich City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Courtier</td>
<td>Head of Planning Broadlands District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Proctor</td>
<td>Leader of the Broadlands District Council and Policy Portfolio Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Nobbs</td>
<td>Leader of the Council and Leader of the Labour Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Sunderland</td>
<td>DfT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Recommendations from previous Local Partnerships Gateway Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the MSBC is revised and amended to address the issues in Section 1 and that the executive summary forms the principal document explaining the scheme to key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Delivered. Revised Business Case with comprehensive Executive Summary submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the Project Team enlists the help of some internal and external stakeholders in the development of the MSBC.</td>
<td>Evidence of greater collaborative working through various initiatives, including the Greater Norwich Growth Board which has, as a key element, development of the NDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That a process to obtain stakeholder sign off should be put in place.</td>
<td>See comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the MSBC is amended to reflect fully the importance of the NDR as a key delivery project for local, county and regional plans / policies to maintain the current 1A priority status.</td>
<td>See comment above. This was also expressed in detail in the revised, submitted and approved, at entry level, Business Case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The risk register needs to be refined by involvement of people with a wider ranging perspective of the strategic risks</td>
<td>There appears to be a wider involvement in the development of the risk register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive prioritisation, escalation and mitigation system needs to be put in place in line with best practice as set out in OGC Management of Risk guidance.</td>
<td>There is clear evidence of best practice in relation to the design and construction elements of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC adopt best practice set out in OGC Prince 2 for project governance</td>
<td>Governance structures according with the Council’s adopted practices appear to be in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That NCC carry out a skills audit.</td>
<td>The Review Team has not seen the outcome of any such skills review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC officers should be present at meetings with stakeholders unless alternative arrangements have been agreed in advance with the stakeholder.</td>
<td>The Review Team understands that this is the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting lines and authority of Mott MacDonald personnel should be set out clearly.</td>
<td>The Review Team has not seen the outcome of any such directive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>