

Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 11th Board Meeting
Friday 11th November 2011, 09:30 – 12:30
Room 3/23, Great Minster House

Attendees

Mostaque Ahmed	Chair, DfT
Matthew Lugg	Leicestershire CC
Jason Russell	Surrey CC
Haydn Davies	DfT
Steve Kent	Cheshire West and Chester
David Hutchinson	HTMA
Eamon Lally	Local Government Group
Chris Mulligan	Atkins
Phil Dyer	Atkins
Lloyd Miles	Secretariat, DfT

Copies to: All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), James Kaye (DfT), Derek Turner (Highways Agency) and Paul Bird (Essex).

Item

1. Introductions and apologies

1.1 Introductions were made and apologies received from Derek Turner and Paul Bird.

2. Note of 10th Board meeting on 12th October

1.1 These were agreed, and will be published on the HMEP website.

3. Programme Management proposals

3.1 Atkins gave a presentation and outlined progress since the last Board meeting on HMEP programme management.

3.2 Key comments and observations from the Board were:

- Capturing the lessons learnt from previous efficiency programmes would be crucial to the success of HMEP;
- The accountability link between workstream group leaders and project managers should be retained;
- The need to link to the wider efficiency agenda across local government;
- Local authorities need to engage closely with their supply chain to identify efficiencies. There were already some good examples in the sector and these need to be captured and shared;
- Cultural change would be necessary to deliver many of the potential efficiencies. There were already a number of improved processes and systems delivering benefits across the sector, and the challenge was to

understand the variety of reasons why they weren't being more widely adopted;

- The proposed geographical split for engagement needed to be flexible enough to take account of the Board members areas of expertise. Atkins would help to map the existing regional groupings, how they could be utilised by HMEP and where gaps existed (**Action B10.1**), but it was known that some areas lacked an existing network of alliances and groupings;
- The programme could be seen as relatively resource intensive and there was question of how sustainable that would be in a post 2013 model, though this reflected its early stage of development and the problems encountered by previous attempts to get efficiency measures more widely adopted across the sector;
- The process for the health check and peer review would be critical, and must positively engage with the local highway authorities and be forward looking. LGG were helping to develop similar processes in other sectors and would share their emerging findings with HMEP (**Action B10.2**);
- Future decisions for the programme included the funding arrangements post 2013, and the move to a more sector led, self-sustaining programme.

3.3 Benefits realisation was a critical, but complex issue as the programme would need to demonstrate that it was adding value. HMEP would need to estimate potential savings early in business cases, and then consistently and accurately capture any that were subsequently delivered across the sector.

3.4 Stating actual financial savings would be attractive, but these would not always be easy to identify, capture and confidently claim that they were specifically due to HMEP. Any claims on benefits by HMEP should be a mutual process, highlighting the success of both the public and private organisations involved, and then clearly identifying HMEP's input and role.

3.5 Atkins also discussed the future management information that would be provided to the Board from the programme assurance group. A trial dash board summarising the programme position across a number of key areas would be provided for the next Board meeting (**action B10.3**).

4. HMEP coordination with Infrastructure UK and the Government Construction Strategy

4.1 There were various Government groups leading on efficiency. HMEP had already held meetings with IUK and Cabinet Office's GCS who appeared the most relevant to the programme. ML and JR would continue to lead with IUK and GCS respectively, and report if wider engagement was required.

5. Links to Devolved Administrations – Scotland's efficiency proposals

5.1 Scotland's maintenance sector were undergoing a review to consider the management and maintenance of all their roads. A report had been

published on 2nd November 2011 setting out 30 options which maximised and made best use of available resources. There was a high level of synergy with HMEP, and ML would lead on engagement with the Scottish review.

6. Project Approvals

WSG Brief 4-2-1 (WP3) Customer Quality Cost

6.1 SK had circulated a revised project brief concerning CQC, and comments had been received. While it would be difficult to identify financial benefits from this work, the work was needed to define non-tangible benefits across the programme and the sector, and could play an important role in the health check. The Board gave initial approval to allow the project to be further developed and costs finalised.

Blackpool Asset Management Proposal

6.2 Blackpool were a relatively small unitary authority, whose network was in poor condition but seen as a key economic asset. They had received Elements 2 funding from DfT to develop an asset management approach to highways maintenance. This had enabled Blackpool to build a business case within their authority for additional funding to be committed to address the network condition.

6.3 One of the conditions of Elements 2 funding was that recipients should act as a regional champion, working with their area, to disseminate improvements in highway maintenance achieved through better use of data. HMEP had been discussing with Blackpool a proposal to develop their approach with other authorities in the region.

6.4 Any development of the Blackpool proposal would need to be consistent with the wider asset management work already being developed by HMEP as part of the operational service delivery packages. Their approach for business case development was one of several that an authority could adopt to develop a business case for investment in their highway network.

6.5 The proposal would need to be developed in line with HMEP's proposed gateway process and clearly identify the possible benefits that could be applied to other authorities. The proposal was likely to have a direct relevance to smaller authorities, but initially it needed to identify whether it could be applied to other authorities/regions and potentially scaled up for larger areas. It was noted that the North West was also an area where HMEP's presence needed to be developed. SK/ML, who had visited Blackpool to see their approach, would discuss further with the authority on how their proposal could be taken forward by HMEP (**Action B10.4**).

7. Updates

- Operational Service Delivery and Potholes review

7.1 The emerging findings of the pothole review were now being finalised before being circulated to the Review's Board for comments. They would then be submitted to the Minister then published before Christmas.

- Business Improvement

7.2 The pilots were proving to be very resource intensive, with the SE7 more developed than AGMA. An initial supply chain conference had been held for the former, with a further event in November and emerging results becoming available in January.

- Engagement and Enabling

7.3 A new UK road conference was being publicised for February and were seeking HMEP involvement. The Institute of Asphalt Technology had also asked for a representative at their South East members meeting, and ML agreed to attend. It was noted that managing conference engagements was key to ensuring that HMEP gave a consistent message.

- Research and Data Management

7.4 A meeting was arranged next week with NHT and APSE to develop the survey work package.

8. Dates of next meetings

- Tuesday 6th December, 13:30, GMH (H5)
- Monday 30th January 2012, 10:00, GMH (3/23)
- Monday 19th March 2012, 10:00, GMH (H4)