

**Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 16th Board Meeting
Friday 13th July 2012, Great Minster House**

Attendees

Mostaque Ahmed	<i>Chair, DfT</i>	Matthew Lugg OBE	<i>Leicestershire</i>
Jason Russell	<i>Surrey</i>	Haydn Davies	<i>DfT</i>
Steve Kent	<i>Cheshire West & Chester</i>	Dana Skelley	<i>Transport for London</i>
Paul Bird	<i>Essex</i>	Tony Gates	<i>HTMA</i>
Phil Dyer	<i>Atkins</i>	David Grunwell	<i>Highways Agency</i>
Chris Mulligan	<i>Atkins</i>	Lloyd Miles	<i>Secretariat, DfT</i>

Apologies: David Hutchinson (*HTMA*) and Eamon Lally (*LGA*).

Distribution: All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), Steve Berry (DfT) and Derek Turner (HA).

Item

1. Note and Actions from 15th Board meeting on 18th May 2012

1.1 These were agreed and will be published on the HMEP website, though note a number of actions in item **5 - Any Other Business** below.

2. Programme Management - Dashboard

2.1 The Board discussed the latest version of the Programme Dashboard, and key points are noted below.

2.2 Gateway Plan The Benchmarking and Measurement project was making progress, but it was key to engage all potential stakeholders. These included the HTMA, SE7, APSE, NHT, HA and others. Both the Design Assurance and Engage & Enable groups had an interest in the project (**Action SK/TP: B16.1**).

2.3 Risks Clarifying the criteria for efficiency proposals that could apply for HMEP support is being progressed by HD, PD and PB (**Action B16.2**).

2.4 Finances Costs overruns were being reported on a number of projects, though some were balanced by savings elsewhere. This reflected the developing nature of the programme since original estimates were obtained. Revised costs estimates for all projects now anticipating significant over or under spends (i.e. +/- 10%) were required from project managers and would be referred to the Board where necessary (**Action Project Managers/LM: B16.3**).

- 2.5 Engagement Progress A map showing the level at which authorities were engaged, including those not yet involved, would be developed by the E&E group (**Action LM: B16.4**).
 - 2.6 The E&E group were focusing on their regional communication networks, using existing ones wherever possible, to ensure that the programme accessed the whole sector.
 - 2.7 An issue was the potential time and commitment needed for individuals to become involved in the programme, especially in organisations where there were growing resource pressures. An option could be reimbursement of expenses, and possibly time.
 - 2.8 However at this stage the Board were uncomfortable with the precedent this would set. Instead HMEP communications should be developed so that a compelling case be made for an authority to commit resources to HMEP on the basis of the long-term efficiencies that all organisations in the sector needed to achieve. A starting point would be the paper that JR was presenting to Surrey regarding their HMEP involvement which would be circulated to the Board and E&E group (**Action JR: B16.5**).
3. **Stage 2 proposals update**
 - 3.1 JR confirmed that all the proposals were moving forward and being discussed with the relevant sponsors. Each phase would have project plans confirmed with their sponsor; these would be reviewed and reported on at relevant stages before an end-stage report was issued.
 - 3.2 SK confirmed that he was using Atkins to take the Knowledge Hub to a position where its development could be procured externally.
4. **Project Approvals**
 - 4.1 Creating the Culture for Delivery (TLHM): Gateway 1 - Design
 - 4.1.1 DAG had made a recommendation at their meeting on 26th June following which TLHM had amended their proposal. The issues raised by DAG, and the responses by TLHM, were then discussed by the Board.
 - 4.1.2 The Board felt that the revised project could now proceed with HMEP funding, but needed to ensure the wider applicability of the proposals. The development of the project, and its board, should involve authorities outside London. It was suggested that the SE7, AGMA and HA could be involved, and regular updates should be presented to DAG and the Board (**Action DS: B16.6**).

- 4.2 Collaborative Alliances Toolkit: Gateway 2 – Early Enabler
- 4.2.1 DAG had made a recommendation to the Board to proceed with the Early Enabler stage for the toolkit, but subject to a number of caveats. These were considered by the Board.
- 4.2.2 It was felt that requiring the toolkit document to be marked as ‘draft’ would create a false impression that it was still substantially work in progress. Instead it should be marked as ‘Version 1.0’ allowing a number of regions to start developing alliances using the toolkit. It would be made clear that the document could still be revised and updated, but that it was not now at a formative stage.
- 4.2.3 It was felt by the Board that this would also accurately reflect the early enabler stage – that organisations were obtaining early access to HMEP documents, with an appropriate level of support from the programme, but that they would feed back the learning process of using the toolkit.
- 4.2.4 As the document would be issued to a number of authorities within proposed alliances, withholding it from website publication would seem incongruous. But it would be presented with suitable wording that it was a version undergoing testing with a number of organisations.
- 4.2.5 It was agreed that the title would be amended to “Local Highway Authority Collaborative Alliances Toolkit”.
- 4.3 Standard Measures and Bill of Quantities: Gateway 0/1 – Define/Design
- 4.3.1 The Board were content with the DAG recommendation that the project proceed to its next stage, as outlined in the proposal, and report back to both groups as appropriate. It was again noted that others should also be involved, such as suppliers, HA etc, and that different organisations would need access to different levels of documentation.
- 4.4 Corporate Review: Gateway 1 – Design
- 4.4.1 The Board were content with the DAG recommendation that the project proceed to its next stage, as outlined. The Early Enablers identified were an appropriate mix of authorities, and a series of workshops had been arranged to develop the project before returning to DAG and the Board in September.
- 4.4.2 Key issues would include finding out what resources were needed for both engagers and HMEP to conduct a review, while the project would have strong links to CQC work as good evidence was important.

- 4.5 Benefits realisation (toolkit) and verification (short-term): Update
- 4.5.1 The Board were content with the DAG recommendation that these projects proceed to their next stages.
- 4.6 Post 2013: Gateway 1 – Design
- 4.6.1 A two stage process was being adopted – an initial view followed by a longer more comprehensive assessment. Currently the project team were consulting with stakeholders, though this was proving difficult to arrange in some cases and others wanted to focus on more immediate HMEP matters.
- 4.6.2 Themes such as the links between economic growth and maintenance; localism and client – provider collaboration were persistently being raised.
- 4.6.2 The current plan is to develop outline options for Ministers in September to provide some long term clarity for the programme. This would then be a substantive item at the 1st October Board meeting.
- 5. Any Other Business**
- 5.1 A status report on implementing the recommendations of the Potholes Review would be required at the next Board meeting (**Action ML: B16.7**).
- 5.2 HD confirmed that the revision of Well-maintained Highways, recommended in the Review, was being progressed.
- 5.3 The HTMA papers on risk management and client – provider relationships will be completed for the September/October DAG and Board meetings (**Action TG: B15.3**).
- 5.4 The role of HMEP in the next spending review process was noted and could be developed into a key theme for engagement with the sector (**Action E&E: B16.8**).
- 5.5 Product support being provided by HMEP for early engagers and post-release was an area that needed to be examined and a consistent approach and message developed (**Action E&E: B16.9**).
- 5.6 A number of the asset management projects had been developed without an Early Enabler stage as it was not clear that this would be needed, i.e. the projects were largely amalgamations and clarifications of existing technical guidance and quality assurance was already being provided by involvement of groups such as UKRLG. This would need to be handled within the current staged approach.

5.7 The strategic roads review was an on-going subject that had close links to HMEP and needed to be monitored.

6. Dates of next meetings

6.1 The next meetings had been arranged for:

- Monday 1st October, 13:30, Room 3/23, GMH, London
- Friday 30th November, 13:30, GMH, London