

## Swansea Bay City Deal Independent Review

PC828D002 v1.0

26th February 2019



---

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

In January 2019, Actica Consulting Ltd was commissioned jointly by the Welsh and UK Governments to undertake a rapid, independently led Review of the arrangements for the delivery of the £1.3bn Swansea Bay City Deal<sup>1</sup> (SBCD). The Review was to provide both the Welsh and UK Government Ministers with an assessment of the deliverability of the Deal.

### The Swansea Bay City Deal

The Swansea Bay City Region is a critically important driver for the Welsh and UK economy. It is a region with strong urban centres complemented by a wider rural landscape and a significant coastal footprint that has created a diverse economic profile with numerous opportunities and challenges.

The City Deal aims to provide the region and its partners with the new ways of working and resources to unlock significant economic growth across the Swansea Bay City Region. Both the Welsh and UK Governments have committed jointly to invest, subject to submission and approval of full business cases for the 11 constituent projects. This investment is also subject to agreement of governance arrangements for the Deal to support and further build on the Region's strengths which include health, energy and manufacturing: underpinned by a world-class digital infrastructure, successful universities and innovative health boards. The Deal's Heads of Terms - signed on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 by the Welsh Government, the UK Government and all 4 Regional Local Authorities - committed the Governments to jointly fund the Deal with £241M (£125.4M from Wales and £115.6M from UK) over 15 years to achieve 9,000 new jobs and a £1.8Bn uplift in Gross Value Added. The Local Authority and local partners from the private and public centre will also contribute funding. The intention is that the total funds from all sources over the period will be of the order of £1.3Bn.

### Review Team Findings

The Review Team are confident that both Governments are committed to the success of the City Deal. We note also that Regional Partners are invested in delivering a portfolio of programmes in the spirit of the Heads of Terms outcomes. We are convinced that the Swansea Bay City Deal will have a positive impact on the region. We observe that within a healthy portfolio, programmes and projects will evolve and, in some cases, change radically to meet changing circumstances. Some will succeed while others may not. It is our view that as issues of expertise and authoritative independent management are addressed, the relationship between all parties will mature, increasing collaboration and resulting in a slicker process with an increased focus on the delivery of outcomes at pace. Commitment of funds in the short term is critical: both to give confidence to all parties and to ensure that the financial exposure of Local Authorities remains manageable. In the longer term the portfolio will grow stronger as the opportunities available to the City Deal are further explored.

The report makes 7 recommendations to improve the deliverability of the Deal's outcomes which are tabulated below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contract Award C299/2018/2019 dated 10 January 2019: Contract to commence wef 14 January 2019.

ID	Recommendation	Urgency
1	Pre-scrutiny should be encouraged but direct and regular face-to-face contact between those writing the Business Cases and those providing comment upon them and advising those who will grant approval is essential.	Urgent by end March 2019
2	The Regional Office should be designated as a Portfolio Management Office, leavening their skills with experienced Portfolio/Programme/Project Management (P3M) specialists.	Important by end June 2019
3	The City Team should (with the support of the Welsh Government Assurance Hub and IPA as necessary) put in place a best practice Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP) for the Portfolio. All parties should specifically consider the OGC Gateway™ Review process as a key part of that plan.	Important by end March 2019
4	Under the chair of the JSC each SBCD board should consider the TORs and ways of working of each to ensure that they work as intended. In doing so they should take account of this review and of the outcome of the audits currently being undertaken.	Important by end March 2019
5	A Portfolio Director should be appointed before May 2019 to ensure continuity of Swansea Bay City Deal leadership and independent authoritative advice to the Boards.	Urgent by end April 2019
6	The SBCD should be managed as a Portfolio not as a set of predetermined and immutable projects.	Important by end June 2019
7	For Yr Egin and Swansea Waterfront, the two business cases which we consider are close to final approval, senior UK Government and Welsh Government and Local Authority officials should aim to reach a swift conclusion to ensure that funding can flow as needed.	Immediate

---

## Addressee

	Name	Date
Prepared by	Actica Consulting	24/02/2019
Delivered to	UK and Welsh Governments	26/02/2019

## List of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Addressee</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Scope of the Review	1
1.2 Methodology and Approach	1
1.3 Considerations	2
<b>2 Background to this Review</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 The Swansea Bay City Region Deal	3
2.2 Timeline	3
<b>3 Review Observations, Analysis, Key Findings and Recommendations</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Introduction	5
3.2 Progress	5
3.3 Project Approval Process – Governance and Assurance	6
3.4 Swansea Bay City Deal Governance	9
3.5 Swansea Bay City Deal Business Cases	11
3.6 Swansea Bay Future Programme delivery capability	12
3.7 Way Forward	13
<b>A Confidence in the Deliverability of Planned SBCD Outcomes</b>	<b>14</b>

INTENTIONALLY BLANK





---

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Scope of the Review

1.1.1 In January 2019, Actica Consulting Ltd was commissioned jointly by the Welsh and UK Governments to undertake a rapid, independently led, joint Government Review of the arrangements for the delivery of the £1.3bn Swansea Bay City Deal. The main focus of the review was:

- a. The alignment of the constituent projects to the overall strategic objectives of the City Deal, to ensure that the benefits can be realised.
- b. The overall risks to delivery of the City Deal, including the appropriateness and deliverability of the constituent projects, in particular focussing on those that have started their delivery lifecycle as the first tranche of projects.
- c. The interactions between the Joint Committee and City Deal governance structures with the regional governance structures to make recommendations on the provision of robust assurance.
- d. The overall due diligence practices in operation on the first tranche of projects and whether these have received the appropriate level of financial assurance.

1.1.2 The Review was to deliver a joint report to both Governments within six working weeks, recognising a balance between urgency and comprehensiveness.

1.1.3 The Review Team was asked to make any recommendations that would improve the deliverability of the outcomes of the Deal.

1.1.4 It was noted that whilst the Review should provide specific recommendations for action, all final decisions would rest with Ministers or the Joint Committee as appropriate.

1.1.5 Finally, the Review Team was informed that the development of the Business Cases, recommendation of any individual Business Case for release of funding or consideration of alternative projects was out of scope.

## 1.2 Methodology and Approach

1.2.1 The Review Team adopted a three-stage approach based on proven well established independent peer review techniques, consisting of Discovery, Analysis and Output phases.

1.2.2 Discovery: A period of learning and engagement consisting of an Initiation meeting, pre-reading of programme documentation and Interviews with Stakeholders.

1.2.3 Analysis: A period of reflection on the findings of Discovery, cross-referencing the interview evidence with a thorough assessment of the documented processes and procedures to eliminate any biases or blind spots. This analysis was also to reflect upon the practical delivery of the programme outcomes and the governance.

1.2.4 Output: The compilation of the findings and recommendations into a report based around the key questions laid out in the Terms of Reference, with the final report issued at Ministerial level.

1.2.5 It is important to note that the final report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programmes' status at the time of the review.

### **1.3 Considerations**

1.3.1 The Review's conclusions and recommendations need to be understood and taken within the context of its constrained scope and methodology and the limited due diligence possible in the available timescales. Its Recommendations are graded 'Immediate' (do now), 'Urgent' (do by...), and 'Important' (do by...). To ensure focus we have limited the number of recommendations. There are a number of incremental improvements and some implied recommendations within the report which we would expect the Portfolio Director and an appropriately experienced team to take forward as a matter of normal business.

1.3.2 The Review Team would like to thank all of the stakeholders who attended for interview for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Programme and the outcome of this Review. Particular thanks go to the Swansea Bay City Deal Regional Office Secretariat for managing the key logistics for the review and coordinating the Regional interview process.

1.3.3 It is important to note that this report looks forward rather than back and focuses on the lessons learned (and hence actions that could be taken) by all parties to move the City Deal Forward. Suggestions for improvement by Stakeholders, reflecting their recent experience of the City Deal, have informed our recommendations.

1.3.4 The Review Team would also like to make it clear that this is an independent and objective review, not an audit. It does not, in any way, consider any implications arising from the recent publicity around the Life Science & Wellness Village programme, which is subject to internal audit by the University, the Local Authorities and to an external audit by the Wales Audit Office.

---

## 2 Background to this Review

### 2.1 The Swansea Bay City Region Deal

2.1.1 The Swansea Bay City Region is a critically important driver for the Welsh and UK economy. It is a region with strong urban centres complemented by a wider rural landscape and a significant coastal footprint that has created a diverse economic profile with numerous opportunities and challenges.

2.1.2 This City Deal aims to provide the region and its partners with the new ways of working and resources to unlock significant economic growth across the Swansea Bay City Region. It is a Deal where both Welsh and UK Governments have committed to jointly invest, subject to the submission and approval of full business cases in relation to the eleven identified projects and the agreement of governance arrangements for the deal. This is made up of £241 million of government funding which is intended to unlock other private and public sector funds on specific interventions which seek to support and further build on the region's strengths which include health, energy and manufacturing sectors and are underpinned by a world-class digital infrastructure, successful universities and innovative health boards. The City Deal is structured around eleven project proposals, set against four themes, with major investment in the region's digital infrastructure and workforce, skills and talent underpinning each.

2.1.3 The Deal provides an opportunity to continue tackling the area's barriers to economic growth through: developing higher value sectors and higher value employment opportunities to match; increasing the number of businesses within these sectors to widen the economic base; and improving the region's Gross Value Add level against the UK average.

2.1.4 As well as taking forward projects and programmes to drive economic growth, the City Deal commits local leaders and partners to implementing effective leadership across the City Region. In agreeing this deal, the four local authority leaders across the Swansea Bay City Region have agreed to create and have setup a regional Economic Strategy Board and a Joint Committee to oversee the delivery of this City Deal.

2.1.5 Local partners within the Swansea Bay City Region estimate that this City Deal will lead to:

- a. Funding of nearly £1.3 billion for interventions to support economic growth;
- b. Over £600 million of direct private sector investment leveraged to deliver interventions;
- c. Investment spread across the whole of the region to ensure all localities and citizens can benefit;
- d. An overall increase to the economy of over 9,000 gross direct jobs;
- e. A contribution to regional GVA of £1.8 billion.

### 2.2 Timeline

2.2.1 Swansea Bay City Region Board published its vision document 'An Internet Coast' in February 2016. Shortly afterwards the Welsh and UK Governments opened negotiations on a City Deal for the region in March 2016.

2.2.2 On 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 the Heads of Terms for the £1.3bn City Deal were signed. This document provided the foundations for the City Deal and confirmed the joint commitment among the

four local authorities and the Welsh and UK Governments to ensure full implementation of the Swansea Bay City Region City Deal. This was subject to funding conditions set by Government being met. The Heads of Terms document also referenced a wider suite of control and governance documents, laying the foundations for the City Deal.

- 2.2.3 Over the next 15 years, the City Deal aims to boost the local economy by £1.8bn. It will be underpinned by £125.4m Welsh Government funding, £115.6m of UK Government funding, £396m from the four local authorities and other public sector bodies in the region together with £637m from the private sector.
- 2.2.4 In July 2018, all four local authorities approved their Joint Committee Agreement. This legal agreement establishes the key governance structures such as the Joint Committee, the Economic Strategy Board and Scrutiny Committee and commits the four local authorities to work together over the 15 years of the Deal.
- 2.2.5 The Regional Office was established using staff redeployed from Carmarthen County Council (CCC) to provide a secretariat function. The Office also provide this function for CCC projects without the Swansea Bay City Deal (SBCD).
- 2.2.6 The provision of Government funding is subject to the agreement of governance arrangements for the Deal and the submission and approval of full business cases in relation to the eleven identified projects, as was set out in the Heads of Terms. To date none have been submitted formally.
- 2.2.7 In January 2019, the rapid, independently led, joint Government Review of the arrangements for the delivery of the £1.3bn Swansea Bay City Deal was commissioned: the outcome of which is this report.

---

## **3 Review Observations, Analysis, Key Findings and Recommendations**

### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 This section summarises the Review Team's Key Observations following stakeholder interviews, along with specific recommendations on how to move the programme forward.

3.1.2 The Swansea Bay City Deal (SBCD) Portfolio is currently faced with the following issues:

- a. A perception that the Portfolio is not making sufficient progress since the Heads of Terms were signed on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017;
- b. Events have called into question governance and have led to wider concerns regarding assurance and confidence in the Region's ability to deliver the anticipated outcomes;
- c. Local Authorities will incur, on programmes already started in good faith, unanticipated borrowing costs and greater restrictions on their borrowing next year if Government funding is not made available as expected.

3.1.3 Consequently, both Governments, who remain committed to the success of the Deal, seek practical recommendations that may be implemented in the short/medium term.

### **3.2 Progress**

3.2.1 The Review Team found that there is a view that progress of the SBCD has been unduly slow in comparison with other city deals in Wales. Some have expressed a view that the Heads of Terms were perhaps immature compared to those agreed subsequently; others have argued that they were only ever meant to be a loose framework. We have heard that the signing of the Heads of Terms was preceded by volatility in the City Deal management team and this caused a hiatus post signing which impacted on the drawing up of the Joint Committee Agreement (JCA). The construction of this deal is different from earlier city deals. It is project-based, with each project requiring the approval of both UK and Welsh Governments. This additional approval level has added a level of due diligence and a demand for assurance which the SBCD has found difficult to supply and consequently the relationship between the City Deal and the two Governments has suffered. We note that in later City Deals, certainly where they have been centred on one urban centre, quicker progress has been made.

3.2.2 Since the Heads of Terms was signed by all parties on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 in Swansea, the participants in the City Deal (the four Local Authorities, the two Health Bodies, and two Universities) together with the two Governments have, under a JCA, set in place a Governance regime that is acceptable to them all. This includes the establishment of the Regional committees - Joint Committee (JC), Economic Strategy Board (ESB) and Programme Board (PgBd) - and the appointment of individuals to key posts. In parallel, the parties at the sub-regional level were crafting the final shape of individual projects and obtaining a bespoke combination of various public and private funding streams: each of which requires negotiation with, and agreement by, individual bodies with their own approval process. As the projects matured, the Local Authorities have been leading on the construction of a Business Case for each project that is acceptable to the Regional Committees and both Governments.

- 
- 3.2.3 The JC and ESB have met formally five times and three times respectively, with the last two meetings approving three of the eleven projects. These projects still require the agreement of the two Governments and of the lead Local Authority.
- 3.2.4 The Review Team considers that, whilst there might have been a desire to progress faster, it is understandable that four Local Authorities, working with two Universities and two Local Health Boards would spend 17 months setting up and staffing the SBCD management and financial structure.
- 3.3 Project Approval Process – Governance and Assurance**
- 3.3.1 The process by which Business Cases are presented formally to the two Governments does, as mentioned above, appear to have presented all concerned with difficulties: particularly when the approval process was placed under severe pressure by the perceived need to gain approval urgently in order to release funds quickly.
- 3.3.2 The presentation of a Five Case Business Case model - in line with HMT 'Green Book' guidance - to the two Governments is an implied requirement of this City Deal. It is not clear to the Review Team when this became clear to the City Deal participants. While the Local Authorities and the Regional Office are familiar with raising cases for European, Lottery and Welsh Government grant funding, the requirements of the 'Five Case Model' appear to have been less well understood.
- 3.3.3 Concerns regarding the progress of business cases arose and led to a decision by the Welsh and UK Governments to supply training and support. This was we understand helpful, but we would argue there is no substitute for expertise and experience when drafting an appropriate case which is proportional to the scope and risk of the project. The two Governments also offered to receive draft copies of the Business Cases for circulation to officials within their Departments before formal submission. This pre-scrutiny approach is used by many Central and Devolved Government Departments to ensure a smooth path to the formal approval of a Business Case.
- 3.3.4 In this situation it did not work well: there was a lack of understanding of the process at the Regional and sub region level who appear not to have had sufficient clarity and transparency regarding the approvals procedures to be followed between SBCD and Welsh/UK Governments. Some business cases were sent for pre-scrutiny through the Regional Office, whereas others were sent, out of process, direct from a Local Authority. We understand that on receipt by Welsh/UK Governments, the business cases were distributed to all those Groups or Departments with a policy interest. Comments received from those Departmental officials were collated and returned. Because the formal response on the submission was made only when all officials had responded, the collated response sometimes took months to issue. In one case the response took three months to return as an e-mailed matrix with a large number of comments reflecting individual opinions that did not appear to have been triaged, coordinated or prioritised. This caused frustration and distrust.
- 3.3.5 We understand that for other City deals in other regions of the UK there is a strong face-to-face relationship between the Programme Management Office (PMO) and relevant projects teams from the Region with the UK Government Ministry of Housing, Communities and local Government (MHCLG) and tightly focused pre-scrutiny business cases meetings ('Business Case Working Groups') are a regular occurrence. This has not been the case with SBCD. A few very large meetings between parties were held in the autumn but these did not seem to move the

---

projects forward, leaving the Region and the project teams reliant on the emailed comments from individual policy areas. Some of the comments were along the lines of “it would be beneficial to the case if the connection was made to XYZ policy”. These were not fundamental to the strength of the Business Case: they served only to influence the quality of the text rather than addressing quantitative programme/project Cost, Time, Performance, and Risk issues. The Review Team also observed that, while attention was focused on the main text of the business case, key annexes received less attention: for example, the Review Team saw no evidence that a critical missing annex on Benefits Management was flagged. Consequently ‘final’ but incomplete Full Business Cases (FBCs) have been approved by the JC and formally submitted to the Approving authority. This is not good practice, and has led to a position where the Business Cases lack important underpinning information regarding benefits, risk etc. We would expect that such information would inform the quantitative aspects of the Full Business Case.

- 3.3.6 However, it is important to note that there were also some very pertinent and constructive points around financial treatment which should have been identified by the SBCD and addressed during an earlier stage in the normal course of business case development. The projects should have been challenged by the Regional Office but they were not. This is we think a window to the source of the real problem - namely the nature of the Regional Office.
- 3.3.7 Many consider the Regional Office to be Programme Management Office (PMO). It is not, it is primarily a Secretariat. It does not include Portfolio/Programme/Management (P3M) specialists. This a major issue because it cannot operate as a centre of excellence with the opportunities to learn lessons for the portfolio as a whole, or provide Portfolio/Programme Management support and assurance (without recourse to external support), or give independent briefing to the City Deal Boards. As a result, the Regional Office is unable to fulfil the role that many assume it has. A combination of its inability to provide a regional tier of support advice and assurance combined with confusion over its role has been at the heart of much of the unease we have heard expressed regarding progress. There needs to be an authoritative tier of assurance and support to the individual programmes and also to the decision-making boards. We believe that a reconstituted P3M office with strong professional and independent leadership is key to delivery. The regional organisation would require additional funding to offer full PMO services. As confidence is built this will satisfy much of the two governments need for assurance and the need for extensive government involvement in the detail will reduce.
- 3.3.8 Expectations of the parties regarding the pre-scrutiny and actual scrutiny procedures were also different. This combined with a disjointed process led to misunderstandings, delay, frustration, and blame. Pre-scrutiny is good practice but the process needs to be transparent, collaborative, and intelligently managed.
- 3.3.9 In summary, the expectations of those providing the business cases for pre-scrutiny were not aligned with those receiving them. The attempt to solve the issue of a lack of expertise and experience at the Regional level by circulation of the business cases for comment by the Governments was not effective and probably could not be in the absence of a Regional PMO.
- 3.3.10 Collaborative work is needed between the SBCD members and Welsh/UK Governments to improve the Approvals process and especially the value-add of pre-scrutiny activities. The Review Team understands responsibility for City Deals is being transferred to the Economy, Skills & Natural Resources Department under the Deputy Director in Welsh Government. The Review Team supports the change as this moves responsibility from a policy-focused area into

a delivery-focused area. However, we do have a concern that this transfer, and the concomitant reorganisation, will be a distraction for the approval of two Business Cases that are very close to being finalised

- 3.3.11 The desire to spend the Governments 'in year funding' for FY 2018/19, coupled with the need to ensure that time-sensitive European funding is 'locked in' to individual projects has placed a severe time pressure on the projects and the approval bodies. Meetings of the Regional committees have taken place 'back to back' to maintain pace and incomplete business cases have been provided to the boards without prior circulation. Boards were not given adequate time to read and understand the proposals adequately nor were they provided with independent expert advice on those cases. They were therefore not in a position to provide a level of challenge which we would normally expect. We also have a concern that such a detailed (but arm's length) level of scrutiny by the two Governments sent the wrong message to the SBCD, giving the JC a licence to approve the business cases swiftly on the understanding that the two Governments were generally satisfied with them.

**Recommendation 1:** Pre-scrutiny should be encouraged, but direct and regular face-to-face contact between those writing the Business Cases and those providing comment upon it and advising those who will grant approval is essential. (URGENT - by end March 2019)

**Recommendation 2:** The Regional Office should be designated as a Portfolio Management Office, leavening their skills with experienced Portfolio/Programme/Project Management (P3M) specialists. (IMPORTANT by end June 2019)

- 3.3.12 The Review Team found no evidence that the City Deal has an Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP). This would be good practice. As would the application of the OGC Gateway™ Review process. This internationally recognised process exists to provide Governments and Departments with external assurance, and has been used successfully by the Welsh Government on both its own and Local Authority major infrastructure projects (e.g. Vibrant and Viable Places, 21 Century schools) through its Assurance Hub. However, the Review Team was unable to establish any evidence that it had been used anywhere within the SBCD portfolio to date. Reviews can be organised by the Welsh Government Assurance Hub, ideally in line with an IAAP but if necessary, at relatively short notice. Amongst other things, this would provide the Welsh/UK Governments with an independent and objective Delivery Confidence Assessment per SBCD programme/project, or indeed of the SBCD portfolio overall. As a minimum the approach is valuable at key Approval points (such as OBC, FBC) but offers maximum benefits when used throughout the lifecycle. Peer Reviews also offer the opportunity for those engaged on other more progressed City deals nationwide to share knowledge. We would see the responsibility for this lying with the Regional Office.



**Recommendation 3** The City Team should with the support of the Welsh Government Assurance Hub and IPA as necessary put in place a best practice Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP) for the Portfolio. All parties should specifically consider the OGC Gateway™ Review process as a key part of that plan. (IMPORTANT - by end March 2019)

### 3.4 Swansea Bay City Deal Governance

- 3.4.1 The Review Team notes that the recent governance concerns regarding the Life Science & Wellness Village programme have been addressed by all parties. This issue has been given a high priority by the Region who assembled the Joint Scrutiny Committee in December 2018 and have appointed an internal regional audit team with members from the four Local Authorities to investigate. The University is carrying out an investigation and the Welsh Audit Office has also initiated an inquiry. We recognise that the restoration of public confidence may take some time. That said, the Review Team notes that the current publicity surrounds the alleged actions of individuals. As yet we have not heard evidence that these allegations undermine the business fundamentals of that particular project and certainly, we believe should not undermine delivery of SBCD outcomes as a whole. We suggest that the implementation of the recommendations we make within this report, supplemented by any audit findings, should provide a basis for confidence in future governance.
- 3.4.2 The ways of working of the committees are still evolving. We have discussed options with members but we do not feel it would be helpful at this stage for us to direct them to a solution - particularly with the results of the audit investigations awaited. We have a view that for the efficient conduct of business, smaller committees are better than larger ones and that it would be best not to duplicate membership. We are concerned that the level of challenge within the City Deal is low, in particular that there is no incentive for members of the JC to robustly test each other's proposals. Where one committee advises another there should be time and space between those committees for that advice to be considered and discussed as needed. Furthermore, an approval audit trail is currently established through examination of the various approving committees' meeting minutes. It might be simpler and more transparent for each FBC to have an accompanying Approvals Sheet to be signed and dated by the authorised persons.
- 3.4.3 Finally given the scarce resource of the ESB we believe that their time considering strategic issues should not be diluted by the detailed consideration of final business cases. Rather, their role should be focused, as we understand was originally intended, on identifying opportunities, and providing private sector insight and advice.

**Recommendation 4:** Under the chair of the JSC each SBCD board should consider the TORs and ways of working of each to ensure that they work as intended. In doing so they should take account of this review and of the outcome of the audits currently being undertaken. (IMPORTANT - by end March 2019)

3.4.4 It is our view that the appointment of an independent Portfolio Director (PfD) supported by a Regional Office will be better able than the current arrangements to support projects through a combination of advice and appropriate challenge and, importantly, ensuring that all committee members are well informed. The CEO of Carmarthenshire is to retire in the summer of 2019. Heavily involved in driving its inception and supporting it since, he has been highly prominent within SBCD for some years. We suggest therefore that his departure provides an opportunity to appoint a PfD for the SBCD with equal status to the four Local Authority Chief Executives. We suggest that the PfD should report to the JC and in turn be responsible for the Regional Office team (a PfMO in line with Recommendation 1 above). The 'person specification' for such a PfD would need to be carefully considered by the JC and the ESB. Clearly, they would need solid P3M skills and a track record of delivering major public-private programmes. They would also need to be able to command respect in the Local Authorities, Central Government and the Private Sector alike.

**Recommendation 5:** A Portfolio Director should be appointed before May 2019 to ensure continuity of Swansea Bay City Deal leadership and independent authoritative advice to the Boards. (URGENT - by end April 2019)

3.4.5 The SBCD is seen by many as a Programme containing a set of predetermined immutable projects with perhaps some synergistic relationships and dependences which taken together deliver an outcome (jobs/GVA). This view carries the danger that projects agreed years ago may not offer the best prospects today (or tomorrow). There is a danger of stagnation and missing out on new opportunities. We would suggest that it is better to look at the SBCD as a portfolio with programmes (and projects) kept under review with funding switched to those considered most likely to deliver the agreed outcome(s). In this scenario we would expect some individual programmes and projects to fall away as other more worthy programmes were identified and prioritised. This is a healthy process. The ESB could play a key role in actively seeking and identifying new projects and supporting the SBCD team in evaluating respective benefits. Overall, we believe that this approach offers the best chance to deliver the intended outcomes. We would also expect such competition to increase the level of robust challenge to business cases which would incidentally be beneficial in providing an increased level of due diligence and assurance. The Heads of Terms allows for this approach but the opportunity has been downplayed.

**Recommendation 6:** The SBCD should be managed as a Portfolio not as a set of predetermined and immutable projects. (IMPORTANT by end June 2019)

### 3.5 Swansea Bay City Deal Business Cases

3.5.1 There are two business cases Yr Egin (Creative Digital Cluster) and Swansea Waterfront where we detect the parties are close to an agreement. Having undertaken a deep-dive into their status, they are in our view broadly fit for purpose, have been approved by the Region and formally submitted to the Governments (although we understand that for reasons of (in)completeness they have been withdrawn and will be resubmitted).

3.5.2 Our understanding of the current status of these two business cases is provided in the table below:

ITEM	YR EGIN FBC	SWANSEA WATERFRONT FBC
VERSION NUMBER	V9.6	V18
DATE	3 Aug 2018	28 Nov 18
APPROVALS	ESB Review 8 Nov 18 PgBd Review 22 Nov 18 JC Review 22 Nov 18	ESB Review 8 Nov 18 PgBd Review 22 Nov 18 JC Review 22 Nov 18
STRATEGIC CASE	Complete	Complete
ECONOMIC CASE	Complete	Complete
COMMERCIAL CASE	Complete	Complete
FINANCIAL CASE	Complete	Complete
MANAGEMENT CASE	Complete	Complete
OPTIMISM BIAS	10% but a very round figure	10% but a very round figure
RISK MANAGEMENT	5x5 estimation but more qualitative than quantitative	5x5 estimation but more qualitative than quantitative
GENERAL COMPLETENESS	Cross-references blank Missing template elements No IAAP	No obvious blanks, but does not address all best practice aspects e.g. IAAP
KEY MISSING APPENDICES	Benefits Register - seen in Draft	Benefits Register - not seen

3.5.3 For these two business cases, which we consider are close to agreement, senior UK Government and Welsh Government and LA officials with the authority to 'do a deal' should meet in one location and together with appropriate experts address any substantive issues aiming to reach a swift conclusion. This meeting should be independently chaired and minuted by the Regional Organisation to both record agreements and take note of agreed actions, those individuals tasked and the required date recorded. The Accounting Officers' responsibilities for financial regularity and commercial propriety need to be satisfied. However, we suggest that this could be achieved with careful and appropriate use of a caveated Approval (e.g. a phased funding release to award SBCD FY 2018/19's and possibly some of FY 2019/20's funding) on the proviso that SBCD work with the two Governments to instigate a good practice approach to, for example, benefits management, within a specified timeframe and to apply this learning to later Tranches of work. We would suggest that the absence of important but essentially technical components of Five Case Business Cases can be worked through jointly: particularly where the expertise and experience currently lie with Governments (such as the approach to monitoring benefits including sustainable job creation).

The release of funding in future might also be tied to delivering the recommendations of this report.

- 3.5.4 In summary a collaborative approach should be applied in future to ensure that the intention of the Heads of Terms is upheld. If it is not possible to deliver some elements of otherwise viable business cases before the end of this financial year, immediate consideration should be given to a conditional release of funds. This would be concomitant on all parties working collaboratively to reach an agreed position on benefits modelling and monitoring.

**Recommendation 7:** For Yr Egin and Swansea Waterfront, the two business cases which we consider are close to final approval, senior UK Government and Welsh Government and Local Authority officials should aim to reach a swift conclusion to ensure that funding can flow as needed. (IMMEDIATE)

- 3.5.5 Annex A specifically looks at the Review Teams assessment of the deliverability of the planned Swansea Bay City Deal Outcomes and the status of the 11 programmes and projects as a whole.

### **3.6 Swansea Bay Future Programme delivery capability**

- 3.6.1 The majority of the stakeholders interviewed were enthusiastic about the SBCD and the opportunities it offers for the people in the area. Governments remain solidly behind it. Notwithstanding our concerns, regarding the lack of PPM expertise and experience of the Regional Office mentioned above, the Review Team was struck by the high calibre of those people responsible for its successful delivery and in particular by those who are involved in its development and support without remuneration. Equally, the Local Authorities and other public bodies in the SBCD area have demonstrated that they have the capability to deliver substantial projects: whether this be Local Authorities under the Government-led 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools or Vibrant and Viable Places programmes; or locally driven schemes involving multiple sources of funding and interests. Local Authorities are well-experienced in delivery of infrastructure projects. Health and Education institutions likewise have delivered major infrastructure schemes over many years. Where they have less experience is in the programmatic aspects of long-term benefits management within the transformation programmes that such infrastructure projects enable. This may be why benefits management appears to be presenting a problem for them.
- 3.6.2 The Review Team considers that SBCD can, provided our recommendations are followed, deliver on the broad promises set out in the Heads of Terms in March 2017. It is not possible to say whether these activities will deliver the full economic benefit aspired to and underpinned by the original economic model. The SBCD offers an opportunity to maintain partnership working in the region and expand upon it. There is an opportunity to stimulate the local economy and create sustainable jobs. The eight partners have a good track record of regeneration and building infrastructure and have the necessary capabilities to deliver it. The Government funding is not large but it is significant. It is required to build confidence and to leverage private funding and collaboration. There are large benefits on offer for the people in the region although the specific value is yet to be confirmed.
- 3.6.3 In order to deliver the intended benefits, the SBCD needs to keep its cohesion, which does face a number of risks. For example: a combination of concerns over funding and of the much-

---

publicised concerns on the Wellness Village could cause a loss of confidence within the Region; or the loss of a key Local Authority partner could prove severely damaging to confidence of non-public partners. In this context, real progress must be demonstrated and we suggest that the time for exchange of emails and revised business cases has passed. The approval of at least some projects this year is critical both financially and to build confidence. The financial risk to the two Governments is minimal because of the way the SBCD is structured and a failure to meet specified conditions can result in the withdrawal of funds. Some Local Authorities are already financially exposed, having borrowed funds to commence projects at risk, while others could lose critical funding streams if the Government funding fails to materialise in a timely manner. The aim should therefore be to release funds in this financial year.

### **3.7 Way Forward**

- 3.7.1 We have outlined above our key recommendations but here we summarise them in chronological order. The most important is that the Regional Office be reconfigured as a P3MO with a strong and independent leadership.
- 3.7.2 To demonstrate Government commitment in the short-term funding must be seen to flow. A way of achieving that while managing the issues and risks through collaboration must be found.
- 3.7.3 In the medium term the parties to the agreement need to continue this collaboration. Greater delivery professionalism is needed at the Regional level to ensure that all parties speak the same language. To a large extent these two things go together. The Welsh Government have made an important start in reassigning the responsibility for City Deals in Wales to a delivery focused department. The Region must step up likewise and ensure that the Regional Office has the authority, the experience and the expertise to broker a strong professional relationship with that department and the UKG's MHCLG.
- 3.7.4 Concerns over governance and assurance must be addressed. We have made a number of proposals and these will need to be considered with the outcome of the various ongoing audits. All parties need to cooperate proactively to ensure that a process is developed and behaviours are such that all can have confidence in the Region's ability to manage the substantial funds available to City Deal. We believe that a reconstituted PfMO with strong professional and independent leadership is key to this because it will provide an authoritative tier of assurance and support to the individual programmes and to the decision-making boards. An IAAP will give structure to the assurance approach. As confidence is built this will satisfy much of the two Governments' need for assurance and they can draw back from the detail.
- 3.7.5 In the longer term the SBCD should seek to run the programmes within a portfolio and identify other programmes for it using the ESB as a fulcrum to lever positive benefits for the region.

## A Confidence in the Deliverability of Planned SBCD Outcomes

- A.1.1 This Annex specifically looks at the Review Team’s assessment of the deliverability of the planned Swansea Bay City Deal Outcomes as a whole.
- A.1.2 This assessment found that there is no clear Portfolio/Programme Mandate for the SBCD that identifies required outcomes, dependencies, timelines, constraints, risks etc. The nearest available document to a Mandate is the Heads of Terms (signed by senior political leaders) that lists the SBCD’s 11 constituent projects and suggests that the anticipated SBCD investment (Central Government, Local Government, and Private Investment) would support the creation of over 9,000 additional jobs (i.e. 3% over the current 302,000) and contribute to increasing GVA by £1.8 billion. The Heads of Terms further commits the Welsh/UK Governments to up to £241M of direct funding over 15 years but is silent regarding spend profile.
- A.1.3 Since the Heads of Terms new-job/GVA outcomes were based upon the SOBCs/OBCs available at the time, and in many cases nothing has changed regarding individual projects since then, it is difficult for the Review Team to gainsay it based on the available information.
- A.1.4 All parties were taking a significant strategic risk when the SBCD was launched without any Portfolio/Programme/Project Management (P3M) work having been done to establish the top-level (top-down) plan, risks, issues, opportunities, benefits, resources etc. Best practice, followed by a number of UK Government Departments and supported by the Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA), would be to carry out a formal strategic assessment bringing together those responsible for policy and those responsible for delivery. This is especially critical when amongst the 11 projects there are 3 cross-cutting regional, notionally enabling projects: Digital Infrastructure, Skills & Talent and Homes as Power Stations.
- A.1.5 The Review Team has not seen the detailed economic models for each of the 11 Swansea Bay City Deal Region projects so is not in any position to comment on the Heads of Terms assertion (based on the 11 SOBCs/OBCs) that *“The Swansea Bay City Region believes that this investment will support the creation of over 9,000 additional jobs and contribute to increasing GVA by £1.8 billion”*.
- A.1.6 An alternative approach to assessing deliverability is to adopt a bottom-up approach and use the IPA guidance on assessing Delivery Confidence against each of the 11 projects: assessing delivery against the four dimensions of Time (vs Plan), Cost (vs Budget), Benefits Delivery (i.e. Performance) and programmatic Process. Such a detailed appreciation was not practical within the strict time-bounds of the review as each of the 11 projects approaching FBC approval would be subject to a separate 3-day Gateway™ 3 Review by a team of 3 people.
- A.1.7 The Review Team noted that all SOBCs/OBCs were very light on detailed planning, risk/issue management and benefits management; however, that would not be surprising at this early stage. The FBCs seen during the week of the Review (Yr Egin and Swansea Waterfront) had improved in this regard though were still immature regarding benefits management. The Review Team has seen a Draft Benefits Register for Yr Egin which is a promising start, albeit clearly a work in progress. The Review Team has not seen a Benefits Register for Swansea Waterfront. The optimism bias @ 10% looks more like a contingency figure than an HMT Green Book assessment. However, these projects (and certain other single Authority projects) were proceeding, despite the lack of promised Welsh/UK Governments funding, at Project

---

Partner risk thus maintaining planned timelines albeit at increasing financial exposure via increased borrowing (incurring unbudgeted interest charges and concomitant cost risk). Overall, the Review Team considers that Yr Egin and Swansea Waterfront would probably rate an 'Amber' DCA which is typical for an infrastructure-enabled economic transformation programme at the FBC stage of evolution. The balance of projects would be Red.