

CECA Consultation response

Civil Engineering Contractors Association
1 Birdcage Walk
London
SW1H 9JJ

22 September 2017

Dear Sir / Madam

[GLA 81010 - Infrastructure Coordination Unit PIN](#)

The Civil Engineering Contractors Association (CECA) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the above named PIN.

CECA is the representative body for companies who work day-to-day to deliver, upgrade, and maintain the UK's transport and utility networks.

With more than 300 members throughout England, Scotland and Wales, we represent firms who together carry out up to 80 per cent of all civil engineering activity in the UK, in the key sectors of transport, energy, communications, waste and utilities including electricity and water.

Our members include some of the largest construction firms as well as a range of small specialist and regional contractors. Our industry supports the employment of over 200,000 people in the UK with annual activity worth £25 billion.

CECA is supportive of the proposal and we have focused our response on the areas in which we feel we can add value.

We trust that you find our comments helpful and that they will be taken into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Marie-Claude Hemming
Director of External Affairs
Civil Engineering Contractors Association

- a. **Governance - how could buy-in to a more coordinated approach as described be achieved, assuming that there will be little or no scope for primary legislation? For instance, should there be an initial agreement across the main utility providers and developers to participate?**

CECA agrees that there will be little scope for primary legislation to establish this unit, and is fully supportive of a voluntary agreement of all parties working together. We believe that to ensure success: industry, utility providers, developers and local authorities should be guided to understand the benefits of such an arrangement. While it is unlikely that every stakeholder will become involved at the very start, CECA suggests that targeting larger bodies in the first instance will encourage others to see the benefit of supporting the unit. CECA further suggests that supporting the unit eventually becomes a pre-condition in the procurement process.

- b. **Funding - how could such coordination activity be self-funded from the benefits to participants that it is meant to generate? Could Section 106 and/or Community Infrastructure Levy be partly used to help fund this approach? Could the lane rental scheme surplus income be used? A high-level funding model would be helpful.**

CECA believes that the new unit must be self-funded. We envisage that when it is fully functional the savings made from the reduction of wasted costs would in part help fund coordination activity.

- c. **Scope - what would be the appropriate extent of activity to be coordinated?**

CECA believes that the goal must be that all infrastructure projects within the GLA region be coordinated by the new unit. However, we envisage that this will be a step by step basis as more bodies support the unit. CECA is keen to understand, however, whether the Mayor's Office could play a role here in encouraging parties to become involved.

- d. **Precedents - where do such approaches already exist and work on the ground, either in whole or in part, both in London and in other parts of the UK? International experience may be useful where it can be translated into the UK context.**

CECA believes that the establishment and activity of the Olympic Delivery Authority for the 2012 Olympic Games provides valuable lessons to be learnt for the delivery of world-class infrastructure in London.

e. Benefits - what do you see as the benefits for industry and/or for the wider public good?

CECA believes that the establishment of the new office will reduce: disruption, delay, costs, and drive forward: savings, greater efficiency and improved use of resource. This will benefit industry, business, the tax payer and the general public.

f. Monitoring and evaluation - how would benefits be assessed?

CECA believes that benefits must be assessed in terms of benefit-cost. CECA members would envisage the unit delivering financial savings to both industry and the tax payer. Examples for assessment should include reduced procurement costs in terms of time and money for civil engineering contractors; reduced lane rental costs as well as improved project delivery and disruption times.

h. Practicalities - where should team(s) be based? What other requirements would ensure its success, such as local consolidation sites?

CECA does not have a view as to where the team should be based. However, we are supportive of local consolidation sites as these have a proven record of success.

i. Team composition - what fundamental skills are required within a PMO? What arrangements do you suggest to recruit the relevant people?

We suggest that the new team includes the following skills: collaboration, management and communication.

k. Suggested initial approach - should this be piloted in one area in London? If so, indicate potential sites.

We believe a pilot around a cluster of ongoing work would be a worthwhile initial approach. Suggested site clusters include Barking Riverside and the HS2 enabling works.

l. Outcome or output based approach - how could the office meet other targets (e.g. reducing HGV movements, air quality improvements, fewer street works and lane closures, better public information)?

CECA suggests both outcome and output approaches would be suitable in order to ensure both short and long-term targets are met.