

**Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 9<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting**  
**Monday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2011, 09:30 – 12:30**  
**Room 2/16, Great Minster House**

Attendees

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Mostaque Ahmed   | Chair                                   |
| Matthew Lugg     | Chair work stream group 1               |
| Jason Russell    | Chair work stream group 2               |
| David Hutchinson | HTMA                                    |
| Paul Bird        | Chair, Quality Assurance Group          |
| Eamon Lally      | Local Government Group                  |
| Gary Thompson    | Work stream group 1                     |
| Sam Cunningham   | Work stream group 2                     |
| Tim Pemberton    | Work stream group 4                     |
| John Dowie       | DfT, Director of Local Transport (part) |
| Lloyd Miles      | HMEP Secretariat                        |

Copies to: All present plus Steve Kent, Emma Stranack, Julian Abel and James Kaye (DfT), Andrew Smith (Hampshire) and Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester).

**Notes & Actions**

1. Note of 8<sup>th</sup> Board meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2011
  - 1.1 These were agreed, and will be published on the HMEP website.
2. Action List Update
  - 2.1 Nothing to report. The action list would be maintained by the Project Managers Group for reporting to the Board.
3. Work Stream Group Highlights, Risks & Approvals

*Work Stream Group 1 & Pot holes review*

- 3.1 WSG1's survey had now been issued to 153 highway authorities. It had been slightly delayed due to considerations about its length, which had led to more pilots being undertaken. It was issued by email and used SurveyMonkey, with a deadline of 30<sup>th</sup> September. Other groups had been consulted to avoid duplication, and had given their support to the survey.
- 3.2 On the procurement route choices work package discussions were being held with the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation. The asset management briefs were all proceeding with the exception of the Accredited Practitioner Training, and it would be key to engage the right stakeholders. There has been some slippage in the overall programme from the original, but the longer timeframe for DfT engagement meant that timescales could now be more pragmatic.

3.3 Good progress was being made on the pot holes review. A workshop was held on 5<sup>th</sup> September and an interim report was due to be agreed on 24<sup>th</sup> October, before going to the HMEP Board and on to Ministers. The final report will focus on good practice, asset management and existing knowledge rather than new methods and standards. It was noted that the publication of the interim report, and the final report in the Spring, would need sensitive political handling.

#### *Work Stream Group 2*

3.4 The early focus for WSG2 were the pilot schemes. The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) were very enthusiastic with all members likely to participate. Initially they would be looking at a supply chain review, though the procurement and legal issues are complex.

3.5 Other areas being looked at for pilots, both for topics and geographical locations, included employment and skills, the SE7 (with a supplier conference) and the North East. The intention was to get a broad geographic and contractual mix. These pilots would also offer the potential for other WSGs to trial products as they are developed.

3.6 The Board discussed the tender from Atkins regarding the programme and change management. The bid included figures based on Atkins estimate of the total work required, but more importantly work would be charged as it was required and this could be monitored as the scope for both elements became clearer. It was also noted that Atkins would need to develop strong links to the Quality Assurance Group. The Board agreed that the contract should be awarded.

#### *Work Stream Group 3 & Programme Management*

3.7 The Board noted with regret Julian Abel's decision to leave HMEP, and their strong appreciation for his enthusiasm and hard work that had been critical in establishing the programme from its early beginnings.

3.8 Julian would remain in post until he found alternative work, and a smooth transition would be essential. DfT would retain the post of HMEP programme manager. Options were considered by the Board for leading WSG3 and also wider Board representation. Engaging with the sector, especially local authorities, is critical to the programme, but also a complex area to manage and any replacement and additional Board members will need full consideration of the potential impacts.

3.9 EL advised that the LGG Board, following the severe winters and subsequent damage to roads, now had a keen interest in road maintenance. The case study element was seen as key as this could demonstrate the potential of good practice in delivering real efficiencies.

3.10 A list of autumn conferences had been circulated, and any further additions were requested (**Action 8.4**). Core briefing was also available, on CW&C's sharepoint and on the HMEP website, though this would need

updating following the completion of the vision work, and as HMEP products became available. An initial Forward Look for a communications plan was also circulated.

3.11 It was noted that the LGG conference in July would be a good opportunity to publish some of the emerging outputs from HMEP, while the outcome of the vision work could be shared with LGG once completed (**Action 8.1**).

3.12 DfT had met with the HA regarding their engagement with HMEP, and it was agreed that Derek Turner, Director of Network Operations, would be invited to attend the next Board meeting as a guest.

#### *Work Stream Group 4*

3.13 NHT engagement remained a priority, and their conference on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October would have a high HMEP profile.

3.14 It had been agreed to use CW&C's sharepoint to keep key core documents that would be accessible to all WSG leaders and project managers.

#### *Quality Assurance Group*

3.15 It was noted that the vision output and programme management work would be key to ensuring that the QAG had a focused role within HMEP. The next QAG meeting was on 28<sup>th</sup> September, with an agenda yet to be finalised, but Atkins support would be needed to ensure the meeting delivered key outcomes.

#### 4. CEO letter – responses and way forward

4.1 The proposal for dealing with the responses to the CEO letter was agreed, however rather than establish a separate group to manage this, support would be provided by the QAG.

#### 5. Update on Project Managers Group

5.1 The guide to HMEP – who is contributing to each WSG – is still essential to map who is supporting the programme and any potential gaps or overloads. Requests for grant payments were also needed for the financial year to date.

#### 6. AOB

6.1 John Dowie introduced himself to the Board, and outlined how he saw the programme developing.

6.2 ML mentioned that he was progressing the outcomes of the Elements 2 work, and would be circulating a list to the WSGs to help identify where work can be adopted and developed by HMEP.

6.3 Benefits realisation remained a crucial issue, and was likely to involve the QAG, Atkins and the project managers group.

6.4 Procurement and the ability of smaller businesses to access the process was raised as a concern, especially where framework arrangements were used to award contracts. Any large supplier should be encouraged to use smaller consultants where they can add value and sector knowledge.

6.5 The Efficiency and Reform Group at Cabinet Office were liaising with WSG2 to map out where each programme overlapped and identify synergies. Infrastructure UK would also be similarly engaged.

7. Dates of next meetings:

- Vision Workshop; Friday 16<sup>th</sup> September, 09:45, Room LG2, GMH
- Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> October, 13:30, Room 1/23a, GMH
- Friday 11<sup>th</sup> November, 09:30, Room 2/16, GMH
- Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> December, 13:30, Room 2/16, GMH

**HMEP**  
**7<sup>th</sup> October 2011**