

**TfSE Partnership Board
14 November 2022 (Virtual) 13:00-16:00
Minutes**

Partnership Board Members

Cllr Keith Glazier (Chair) Leader East Sussex County Council	Cllr Tony Page Deputy Leader Reading Borough Council (representing Berkshire Local Transport Body)	Daniel Ruiz Smart Mobility and Transport Lead Enterprise M3 LEP (jointly representing LEPs)
Cllr Lynne Stagg, Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation, Portsmouth City Council	Cllr Phil Jordan, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, Isle of Wight Council	Cllr Jamie Lloyd (Sub for Cllr Elaine Hills), Member of the Environment, Transport, and Sustainability Committee Brighton and Hove City Council
Heather Preen, Head of Local Communities and Partnerships Transport for London	Cllr Dan Watkins Deputy Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport Kent County Council	Cllr Eamonn Keogh, Cabinet Member for Transport and District Regeneration, Southampton City Council
Richard Leonard Head of Network Development, Strategy & Planning National Highways	Cllr Colin Kemp Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure Woking Borough Council (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)	Geoff French CBE Chair Transport Forum
Vince Lucas Director VA Rail LTD (jointly representing LEPs)	Cllr Joy Dennis, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, West Sussex County Council	Ian Phillips Deputy Chair South Downs National Park Authority (Representative from Protected Landscapes)
Cllr Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure, Surrey County Council		

Guests:

Steven Bishop, Director, Steer

Apologies:

- Cllr Alan Jarrett, Leader for Medway Council
- John Halsall, Route Managing Director for South East, Network Rail
- Cllr Edward Heron, Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment Strategy, Hampshire County Council
- Cllr David Monk, Leader, Folkestone & Hythe District Council, (jointly representing District and Borough Councils)

Officers attending Virtually:

Rupert Clubb, Transport for the South East
 Rachel Ford, Transport for the South East
 Sarah Valentine, Transport for the South East
 Emily Bailey, Transport for the South East
 Hollie Farley, Transport for the South East
 Mark Valleley, Transport for the South East
 Lucy Dixon-Thompson, Transport for the South East

Matt Davey, West Sussex County Council
 Nikki Nelson-Smith, Highways England
 Chris Maddocks, Reading Borough Council
 James Hammond, Folkestone & Hythe District Council
 Pete Boustred, Southampton City Council
 David Stempfer, Surrey County Council
 Lyndon Mendes, Surrey County Council
 Felicity Tidbury, Portsmouth City Council
 Richard Kenny, Hampshire County Council
 Dominic McGrath, Hampshire County Council
 James Hammond, Folkestone & Hythe District Council
 Andy Rhind, DfT
 Alexander Pringle, SDNPA
 Dee O'Rourke, Medway Council
 Colin Rowland, Isle of Wight Council
 Mark Prior, Brighton and Hove City Council
 Stuart Kistruck, Network Rail
 Ernest Amoako, Woking Borough Council

Item	Action
1. Welcome and Apologies	
1.1 Cllr Keith Glazier (KG) welcomed Partnership Board members to the meeting and noted apologies.	
1.2 Cllr Glazier welcomed Cllr Jamie Lloyd who is attending in place of Cllr Elaine Hills today as the Brighton and Hove City Council representative.	
1.3 Cllr Glazier introduced Stephen Bishop (SB), who will be presenting the final SIP.	

<p>1.4 Cllr Glazier also offered apologies from the following Board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ John Halsall, Route Managing Director for South East, Network Rail ○ Cllr Alan Jarrett, Leader for Medway Council ○ Cllr Elaine Hills, Member of the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee ○ Cllr David Monk, Leader, Folkestone & Hythe District Council, (jointly representing District and Borough Councils) 	
2. Minutes from last meeting	
<p>2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.</p>	
3. Declarations of interest	
<p>3.1 Cllr Glazier asked Board Members to declare any interests they may have in relation to the agenda. No interests were declared.</p>	
4. Statements from the public	
<p>4.1 Cllr Glazier confirmed that whilst no statements from the public have been submitted ahead of today's meeting, Members will be aware of letters received from Transport Action Network, South Coast Alliance for Transport and Environment, the South Downs Network and others.</p> <p>4.2 Cllr Glazier noted the recent consultation, that provided an opportunity for stakeholders to make their views known and although the consultation is now closed it is important Board Members consider the correspondence from parties as they consider the SIP.</p> <p>4.3 Cllr Glazier recognises the urgent need to address the climate crisis and that transport is one of the largest contributors to carbon emissions and that we must act now. Cllr Glazier informed the Board that the TfSE team would provide more information on the consultation and how feedback had been incorporated into the draft final SIP under item 6.</p>	
5. Lead Officer's Report	
<p>5.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) took introduced the item and guided the Partnership Board through the paper.</p> <p>5.2 RC noted that the substantive part of this paper reports on the progress of the SIP, which will be addressed within agenda Item 6 more fully.</p> <p>5.3 RC informed the Board of a recent invitation to meet the previous Secretary of State and DfT along with four of the other subnational transport</p>	

<p>bodies (STBs) to discuss issues that are pertinent to STBs and combined authorities.</p> <p>5.4 TfSE are also working with the DfT on how we can address issues concerning capacity and capability, noting that TfSE are already support local authorities via workstreams such as Bus Back Better, which looks to help implementation of bus service improvement plans (BSIPs).</p> <p>5.5 RC commented that there have been meetings with Great British Rail Transition Team (GBRTT), and noted that the legislative timetable has been slowed.</p> <p>5.6 RC further noted the works ongoing with other STBs, such as collaborative works with England's Economic Heartland and Transport East on Bus Back Better, and on a decarbonisation toolkit. In addition, all seven STBs are working collectively on an additional decarbonisation project.</p> <p>5.7 RC informed the Board of his recent attendance as the Business Service Association (BSA) to talk on the strategic investment plan, and at Highways UK specifically on local roads and maintenance.</p> <p>5.8 Recruitment has been a successful venture, and RC has thanked the Department for Transport (DfT) for their involvement in this process, and for the funding to enable us to improve our internal capacity and capability.</p> <p>5.9 Cllr Tony Page (TP) raised a query regarding the length of time for democratic process approval for the SIP and it was confirmed that it would be a 14-week window, excluding Christmas break.</p> <p>5.10 The members of the Partnership Board noted the activities of transport for the South East between September to November 2022.</p>	
<p>6. SIP Update</p>	
<p>6.1 Rupert Clubb (RC) introduced this item to the Board and provided an overview of the work and progress that has gone into the SIP from all stakeholders, highlighting the extensive background work that has formed the evidence base.</p> <p>6.2 The evidence base has been used to assess how best to create opportunities for active travel, public transport, and road safety.</p> <p>6.3 The interventions alone will not reach a net zero, which is why the global policy initiatives are vital to support the interventions.</p> <p>6.4 RC introduced Lucy Dixon-Thompson (LDT) who took the Board through the high-level statistics of the consultation, noting that TfSE held a public consultation for twelve weeks, which was conducted by our independent engagement specialist, ECF. The consultation had its own dedicated website on Engagement HQ, which was very well received.</p>	

6.5 Of the 641 consultation responses, 422 were completed via the survey platform, 88 were written responses via email or letter, and a further 131 were received via the Transport Action Network (TAN) campaign. Respondents included all constituent authorities, Transport for London (TfL) and England's Economic Heartland (EEH), National agencies, 22 district and boroughs, South East Protected Landscapes (SEPL), 2 local enterprise partnerships, 8 MPs and members of the public.

6.6 LDT provided the Board with quantitative response headlines, presenting the wide geographical reach via a scatter graph, which demonstrates the geographical spread of responses that the consultation received. It was noted that the concentration in London is a result of organisational addresses. LDT also explained that responses were also received by neighbouring authorities and STBs, which are do not appear within the map that pictures the south east region only.

6.7 LDT thanked Members and their officers for the works contributed to promoting the consultation via their communication platforms.

6.8 For the qualitative response headlines, LDT introduced Steven Bishop (SB) of Steer, who took Members through the key themes and responses that emerged because of the consultation.

6.9 For clarity, SB began by noting high level amendments that had been made to the SIP, such offering a clearer explanation on its function such as a new section in the introduction which sets out what the SIP is and what it is not. There has been the addition of signposting to the supporting documents to ensure further details on packages is easily accessed. A revision of monitoring indicators has been undertaken to better reflect the potential role that TfSE would play in monitoring and evaluation of the SIP interventions. Finally, we have expanded on 'Next Steps' to outline how the SIP itself will be taken forward and periodically refreshed.

6.10 Key themes that emerged included decarbonisation, public transport, and active travel to name a few. In addition to the thematic comments, 566 key stakeholder comments have been analysed and responded to on a line-by-line basis. This combined analysis has informed the proposed changes to the SIP.

6.11 SB provided an in-depth presentation on the responses taken to each key theme, to ensure that the narrative accurately reflects the analysis taken from the consultation.

Decarbonisation

For decarbonisation, notable updates include a reiteration of commitment to net zero carbon from travel in the region by 2050, and we have ensured content has been updated to ensure it reflects the urgency given to addressing the climate emergency. Further emphasis has been given to behaviour change, integrated planning and digital technologies.

Public Transport

For public transport, we have reiterated the importance of accessible, affordable, integrated, reliable and attractive public transport in all its forms and offered a clarification on what is meant by 'mass transit'.

Active Travel

We recognise the important role of active travel which must be in both local and regional connectivity, with the SIP identifying several enhancements to the National Cycle Network (NCN) while also supporting and helping better connect local infrastructure improvement schemes such as those contained within Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs).

Highways

Highways interventions have been clarified within the SIP, to ensure importance of integrated planning and digital technology reduce the need to travel by motorised methods. It has also been made clearer that the number of interventions within the plan focus on multi-modal, safety improvements, and delivery of freight. It was noted that these will also de-conflict strategic and local traffic around built-up areas, freeing up road space for active travel and public transport.

Connectivity

Our response to the connectivity theme has been to make it much clearer that the greater transport choices is imperative, with an emphasis on improved connectivity needing to be achieved through improved public transport infrastructure and services and active travel infrastructure before private cars, even where these are electric.

Costs and Benefits

Notable updates for the costs and benefits have been rectified to include commentary around the public health and personal wellbeing benefits of SIP interventions have been added. The potential for public transport to deliver benefits related to alleviation of cost-of-living crisis, supporting development and delivering affordable housing, and improving accessibility and reducing deprivation has been more clearly explained.

Rural Transport

Greater clarity has been offered on potential for transport to improve accessibility and help reduce deprivation in rural communities. There has been a commitment to develop a policy statement on rural mobility, which TfSE are engaging with other sub-national transport bodies (STBs) and local partners to understand the evidence underpinning the challenges and opportunities for rural transport and service provision.

Integrated Sustainability Assessment (ISA)

It was noted that while 1% of all comments related to the ISA, it was felt that these should be addressed. The context of the ISA has been updated to reflect the Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995. It was also noted that while some comments state that the document is too scientifically complex, it is a technical document that follows legislative guidance.

General Comments

We have developed a technical document which should provide readers with additional information about the interventions and evidence base used

in development of the SIP and individual proposed projects. Assessment of the deliverability of the plan has been made throughout the development of the SIP and supporting Area Studies programmes. Consideration has been given proportionately to affordability, engineering, feasibility, stakeholder acceptance and associated risks.

6.12 RF informed the membership that the next steps for the SIP will be for members to take it through their democratic processes prior to the March Board, where required. While this is underway, we will be working to update maps and final design work. As a result of the consultation, we will also be doing technical updates to our evidence base to ensure alignment. Finally, we will be presenting the final SIP for sign off in March 2023 and pending approval, will be submitting the final SIP to government.

6.13 Andy Rhind (AR) from the DfT welcomed the SIP, and amplified the purpose of the plan, which is to consider wellbeing, climate challenge, impact on environment, and strategic investment that will change and grow the region. It is not intended to replicate local plans process and delivery but can help with capacity and capability for constituent authorities.

6.14 Cllr Joy Dennis (JD) raised the question regarding the omission of some comments in the first iteration. RC assured Members that all have been incorporated and urged Members to refer to the documents on the TfSE website for the most up-to-date version to ensure completeness.

6.15 Cllr Colin Kemp (CK) supported the idea raised by AR that this strategic plan has added great value to the region, but suggested that an additional document that highlight the changes and responses could be made for local authorities that capture the amendments to the SIP.

6.16 Cllr Dan Watkins (DW) considers changes that have happened nationally and regionally over the last twelve months, such as the long-term funding offered for Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs) and cost of living crisis and how this will shape the strategic investment plan. KG noted that from conversations with the DfT, the recognition to support BSIPs is apparent.

6.17 Ian Phillips (IP), Deputy Chair for South Downs National Park Association, thanks TfSE for the opportunity to consult on this plan and the inclusion of their requests within the integrated sustainability assessment but proposes that decarbonisation and environment have reference to the Environment Act, section 62 included within the SIP. In addition, it would be useful to have a line including the natural capital costs associated with the physical infrastructure projects. IP thanks SB for his consideration to include further narrative within the SIP itself. RC confirms that as schemes are developed into individual business cases, they will have to comply with the Green Book, thus adopting the legislation set out by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

6.18 Geoff French (GF) raises a query for the DfT as to whether funding would be affected as a result of the upcoming budget announcement and cost of living crisis. AR remarked that a long-term plan has been requested

from government, and while the upcoming announcement may alter the prioritisation and delivery of the SIP, it will not alter the content of the plan. In addition, government have renewed their commitment to decarbonisation.

6.19 Councillor Tony Page (TP) supports CK comments on summary documents to demonstrate how consultation responses have been incorporated into the SIP. However, TP raises the recent acceleration of active travel since the Transport Strategy. TP noted that we must recognise those public concerns and offer a robust approach to delivery of schemes to ensure their multi modal ability. TP notes his own local authority are committed to delivering net zero by 2030, and therefore a 2050 ambition for the SIP offers an area of contention for councillors with the same commitment.

6.20 Councillor Jamie Lloyd (JL) noted his positivity for the consultation responses received regarding decarbonisation, active travel and environment. JL suggests collaborative working with Active Travel England and onboarding of the recent policy, Gear Change. RC notes that efforts have been made to onboard Active Travel England, but as they are at their early stages of establishment, we are yet to successfully engage.

6.21 Daniel Ruiz (DR), speaking on behalf of local enterprise partnerships (LEPs), notes that while he recognises that the final iteration of the SIP cannot incorporate consultation responses verbatim, he welcomes the amendments that have been included. DR suggests the SIP foreword could include the importance of balancing capital and revenue investment in terms of our strategies on all levels.

6.22 Vince Lucas (VL) would like tonality reflected in the final version of the SIP to acknowledge that the baseline that has been used is a pre-covid trajectory and wishes us to acknowledge that a post covid trajectory would be a new baseline.

6.23 RC notes in response to the perceived single mode nature of the Lower Thames intervention, that while TfSE support the Lower Thames Crossing in principle, we have outlined our view on the scheme in our consultation response to National Highways.

6.24 Regarding decarbonisation, during our work in developing our Transport Strategy, it was suggested that net zero by 2030 was unachievable. While this is the current trajectory, it is not to say that we are not making every effort to reach this as soon as we can, which is the rationale behind the inclusion of the global policies within the SIP.

6.25 In response to DW comments regarding concerns of public transport funding, RC notes that local transport authorities' engagement via ADEPT for example, offers a communication straight into the DfT, so that government are aware of these messages and strengthen the demand.

6.26 While schemes do include highway interventions, RC clarifies that there are not 50 new road schemes within the SIP. We are reflecting the DfT's expectations on how transport schemes will be developed and recognising moving local traffic through. Evidence of highways being

developed as multimodal corridors is already evident within the MRN and SRN schemes.

6.27 SB notes that in addition to the SIP, TfSE have pioneered an additional workstream on a decarbonisation pathway, which demonstrates what is required not just for TfSE, but also for local authorities, private sector and central government.

6.28 RF is happy to produce the documents that have been requested by Members. In addition, we support the suggestion of including narrative within the foreword with greater emphasis on the need to steady the network aspects. This will be further strengthened by a covering letter to DfT when we submit the plan to government.

6.29 RC reminds the Board that the Transport Strategy will be reviewed next year which will take into account policy changes and the same process will be taken for the SIP. The Board will be integral in every step of the review.

6.30 RC thanks all participants across the region that have worked together to form this plan. RC sought approval from the Board for delegation of minor changes in consultation with the Chair, which was agreed.

6.31 The recommendations were all agreed by the Partnership Board members, except for Brighton and Hove City Council, who abstained from this agreement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:

- 1) Note the results of the public consultation set out in the Consultation Report;
- 2) Agree the proposed responses to the main issues raised by those responding to the consultation; and
- 3) Agree the proposed drafting changes to the draft Strategic Investment Plan and Integrated Sustainability Appraisal.

7. SIP Delivery Plan Development

7.1 Sarah Valentine (SV) introduced this item and guided the Partnership through the paper.

7.2 SV provided the Board with the intended approach to the delivery of the SIP, which will take the work programme from strategy to implementation and will require a wide range of partners working together.

7.3 SV presented the delivery action plan development, which has commenced by stakeholder engagement with the different delivery partners, and results of these discussions will be collated into the Delivery Action Plan.

<p>7.4 In addition to the Delivery Action Plan, the development of an analytical framework is in progress. This is being developed to aid business cases, which will require a suite of analytical tools that will be collectively capable of assessing the impacts, benefits and costs of the schemes to provide the necessary assurance to the DfT and other funding/delivery partners that the schemes are worthy of delivery.</p> <p>7.5 A final development on the SIP next steps will be the monitoring and evaluation plan. This will relate to the key priorities of the SIP, ensuring our aims and objectives are being delivered.</p> <p>7.6 A robust approach is needed to ensure the successful delivery of interventions included in the SIP. A 'State of the Region' annual monitoring could add considerable value to TfSE and our partners by providing an annual report which collates and presents several big-picture metrics such as economy, environment, and social inclusion. This will also offer more specific transport-led outputs which are directly linked to the stated objectives of the Transport Strategy and the SIP. This report will set out trajectories for those metrics and demonstrate each year whether those are being met.</p> <p>7.7 The recommendations were all noted by the Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to: Note the outcome of the progress of the Local Capability workstream; and 2) Agree the funding allocation as set out in Option 1. 3) Agree to delegate authority to Lead Officer to undertake discussions with Solent Transport about their proposal and, in the event that the proposal cannot proceed as planned, delegate authority to the Lead Officer to implement Option 2. 4) Note the pipeline of proposals to be explored in more detail as part of the Centre of Excellence or in a future funding round. 	
<p>8. Technical Programme Update</p>	
<p>8.1 Mark Valleley (MV) introduced this item and guided the Partnership through the paper.</p> <p>8.2 MV discussed several work programmes that are being progressed by TfSE:</p> <p><u>Bus Back Better</u> DfT tasked STBs to offer support packages to their local authorities to aid implementation of their Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs),</p>	

irrespective of funding. Reconnaissance work has taken place to identify what support is required. Packages of support captured are set out in appendix 1 of agenda item 8, and will be delivered in phase 2 of the project before the end of the financial year.

Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy

The DfT funded STBs earlier this year to support an additional workstream that would look to develop a regional strategy for electric vehicle charging infrastructure, building on the good work that is already going on in local authorities. It will look at demand and outline potential locations of charging points. It has brought together constituent authorities and key stakeholders via forums to exchange information to encourage progress strategically.

Future mobility strategy

We are progressing with the implementation of this strategy, which was agreed by the Board in 2021, with WSP who are moving forward the action plan which includes servicing the future mobility forum and looking to produce some further technical studies.

Freight and Logistics Strategy

We have recently commissioned AECOM to identify the scale of lorry parking issues that currently exist in the TfSE area and are looking to engage with a supplier to help us move forward with a number of aspects of the action plan for the freight strategy. These include a property market review to identify potential further locations for regional distribution centres in the geography, the potential of coastal shipping in helping us encourage the shift from roads to more sustainable forms of transport. An important initiative to improve relationships between the public and private sector to overcome the freight blindness that public sectors can be accused of having.

Decarbonisation

We have been working with Transport East and England's Economic Heartland to develop a transport decarbonisation assessment tool that will help local authorities in moving forward with their updated local transport plans (LTPs) because of the new guidance, particularly the quantifiable carbon reduction guidance which will be asking local authorities to assess how their LTPs will deliver carbon reduction.

Local Capability

A number of projects are being funded by the grant funding that we received from the DfT earlier this year, to support local authorities capability. Training projects are being offered to Kent, Wokingham and Brighton and Hove. Within the Solent area, a refresh of their transport model is being funded. A further project to refresh guidance is being taken forward by Hampshire, which will support the region and feed into the foundation of a Centre of Excellence.

8.3 Ian Phillips (IP) queried whether the electric vehicle strategy would be looking at implications of providing charging points for terraced housing or private driveways. MV confirmed that the TfSE purpose of the regional strategy is to identify at a strategic level where charge points should be located.

<p>8.4 Geoff French (GF) invited MV to present the progress on these workstreams to the Transport Forum on 20 December 2022. MV welcomed the opportunity to provide an update.</p> <p>8.5 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the progress with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ongoing work to assist local transport authorities with the implementation of their bus service improvement plans (BSIP); 2) Developing an electric vehicle charging infrastructure strategy for the TfSE area; 3) Delivering TfSE's future mobility strategy; 4) Delivering TfSE's freight logistics and gateways strategy; 5) The joint work being progressed on decarbonisation; and 6) The work being progressed to develop local capability 	
<h2>9. Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Update</h2>	
<p>9.1 Hollie Farley (HF) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>9.2 Following the close of the draft SIP consultation, the communications and stakeholder engagement managers have been working extensively with ECF and stakeholders to analyse consultation responses and feed them into the final draft SIP.</p> <p>9.3 Further engagement has been undertaken as a result of the additional workstreams via Forums, which is helping to support development of each project.</p> <p>9.4 The University Roundtable meeting took place on 4 October. We presented an update on our SIP consultation and work on the electric vehicle charging infrastructure strategy. The intention is to have a face-to-face meeting in December, which will cover active travel and centres of excellence. Board members are welcome to attend this meeting.</p> <p>9.5 The communications and stakeholder engagement group continue to liaise virtually since the end of the SIP consultation and discuss its outcomes, and we intend to look to the future and discuss next steps for the SIP and its launch. A proposal for this launch will be presented to the Board in January 2023.</p> <p>9.6 A risk of stakeholder fatigue has been identified, so we are working internally to ensure we are operating in the most effective manner. On our database, we currently have 3400 individual stakeholders and 1200 organisations. There are 20 active stakeholder groups, covering everything</p>	

<p>from task and finish technical steering groups to partnership board. In the last two years, 14 task and finish stakeholder groups relating primarily to the area studies work have been initiated and closed. There are approximately 400 individuals involved in our current groups, representing 200 organisations.</p> <p>9.7 The result of this piece of work should mean that everyone is up to date and informed, while avoiding stakeholder fatigue by attendance at numerous TfSE meetings.</p> <p>9.8 For our upcoming events, Councillor Glazier has been invited to the Westminster Forum, which has been postponed to early next year, date to be confirmed.</p> <p>9.9 We are preparing for the second subnational transport body (STB) conference which will be taking place next year.</p> <p>9.10 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the engagement and communication activity that has been undertaken since the last board meeting.</p>	
<p>10. Financial Update</p>	
<p>10.1 Rachel Ford introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>10.2 Rachel provided an update to the end of quarter 2 against the forecasted budget and set out the forecast for the remainder of the financial year.</p> <p>10.3 The main expenditure to date relates to the delivery of our technical work programme, including the closure of the area studies. The other main area of expenditure is the TfSE staffing costs.</p> <p>10.4 To date, we have spent just over £1 million and £700,000 has contributed to the technical programme. The forecast has been updated in the paper to reflect the forthcoming onboarding of staff as a result of recent recruitment.</p> <p>10.5 The forecast for end of year expenditure is just under £3.5 million compared with an expected income of £3.9 million, and this disparity will be carried forward to maintain the reserve at the agreed level.</p>	

<p>10.6 For the next financial year, the DfT grant funding for the centre of excellence and common analytical framework has been carried over, at the request of DfT. This is to ensure we work in accordance with all seven STBs, to prevent misalignment. To date, we have made good progress on both of these workstreams, and to maintain momentum we have asked the Department to draw down smaller amounts to undertake some background research to put us in a good position for 2023/24. £40,000 will be used for the centre of excellence, and £20,000 for the common analytical framework.</p> <p>10.7 RF noted that constituent authorities local contributions have supported TfSE since its inception. We would like to continue the local contributions to form the basis of our business plan but recognise the financial strain that constituents face. As a result, we are proposing to keep local contributions at the same level that they have been at for the previous financial years. These are £58,000 for county council authorities and £30,000 for individual and unitary authorities.</p> <p>10.8 Intention is to bring a full budget report to the Board in January which will set out the workplan for 2023/24 for TfSE.</p> <p>10.9 The recommendations were agreed by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to 2) Note the current financial position for 2022/23 to the end of September 2022; 3) Note the update on grant funding from the Department for Transport; 4) Note the progress on the recruitment of additional staffing resource; and 5) Agree the local contributions for 2023/24. 	
<p>11. Governance Update</p>	
<p>11.1 Cllr Tony Page (TP) introduced this item and provided a verbal update on progress of the governance subgroup.</p> <p>11.2 Cllr Page noted the recent work undertaken with accountable body legal team to make the amendments to the revised constitution, which will be published onto the TfSE website.</p> <p>11.3 Due to resource pressured within the accountable body's legal team, the revisions to the Intra Authority Agreement (IAA) have been delayed, but the current IAA is still valid.</p>	

<p>11.4 The revised IAA provides additional protection to the accountable body when procuring consultants to offer advice to the partnership. The intention is to have the revised IAA for the January Board.</p> <p>11.5 Works will commence on developing the audit and governance committee with a view to holding the first committee meeting in April. This will be a formal subcommittee of the Board and will replace the current governance sub group.</p> <p>11.6 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to note the update on the governance work stream.</p> <p>1)</p>	
<p>12. Transport Forum</p>	
<p>12.1 Geoff French (GF) introduced this item and guided the Board through the paper.</p> <p>12.2 GF informed the Board of the recent Forum held on 8 November, which presenting the final draft SIP.</p> <p>12.3 GF reiterated the suggestion of bringing the technical progress update to the subsequent Transport Forum on 20 December, as it will be of interest to the membership.</p> <p>12.4 The recommendations were noted by all Partnership Board members.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <p>The members of the Partnership Board are recommended to:</p> <p>1) Note the recent meeting of the Transport Forum; and</p> <p>2) Note and consider the comments from the Forum</p>	
<p>13. AOB</p>	
<p>13.1 No other business was raised.</p>	
<p>14. Date of Next Meeting</p>	
<p>14.1 It was noted that the date for the next Partnership Board meeting will be Monday 23rd January 2023, 13:00-16:00.</p>	