Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 8th Board Meeting
Friday 5th August 2011, 09:30 – 12:30
Room 1/26d, Great Minster House

Present

Steve Kent	Chair, & chair work stream group 4
Matthew Lugg	Chair work stream group 1
Jason Russell	Chair work stream group 2
Julian Abel	Chair work stream group 3
David Hutchinson	HTMA
Paul Bird	Chair, Quality Assurance Group
Martin Duffy	Happold Consultancy
Gary Thompson	Work stream group 1
Sam Cunningham	Work stream group 2
Lloyd Miles	HMEP Secretariat

Copies to: All present plus Mostaque Ahmed, Emma Stranack and James Kaye (DfT), Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Tim Pemberton and Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester).

Notes & Actions

1. Note of 7th Board meeting on 29th June 2011

1.1 These were agreed, subject to minor corrections, and were published on the HMEP website on 10th August.

2. Action List Update

2.1 The action list was updated, as per version 12. Key actions were noted and included product design (No. 4.3), which would be discussed under WSG3 update, an HMEP risk register (7.1) which would be maintained by the Project Managers Group (PMG) for reporting to the Board and engagement with NHT (7.2) which would be discussed under WSG4 update.

3. Vision seminar & CIHT workshop

3.1 JR explained that there were a number of key issues emerging from the vision seminar:

- Programme management,
- Engagement with the pilots, early adopters and demonstrators,
- Clear message of what HMEP is.

3.2 The Board felt that other issues were also emerging:

- Benefits realisation, which can be very subjective,
- The tie-in between the emerging vision and DfT's commitment to remain engaged beyond 2013,
- Engagement with all local authorities to ensure that HMEP is fully utilised and adopted.

3.3   On the CIHT workshop, DH explained that this had focused on engagement between public and private organisations. The overriding issue was the need to develop more trust. There were a number of reasons why this was currently lacking, and these included cultural issues, a lack of knowledge and previous experience. All of these can have a long-term basis that is difficult to overcome.

3.4   But the key issue for better public-private relationships was seen as people. It was therefore crucial that HMEP avoids a rigid, mechanistic approach. Instead the need for change must be highlighted, with a long-term vision that emphasises a sharing of risk and responsibility, especially now that DfT was firmly committed beyond 2013.

3.5   Additional information on the responses to the CIHT survey was available, and it would be beneficial for this to be circulated to HMEP board members. Caution would have to be exercised in considering whether to circulate this information further. If it is to be released to a wider audience, it would need careful presentation as it was not an in-depth survey and included a number of anecdotal and impulsive responses. It would therefore need a commentary and explanation. The information does, however, add important contextual comment and, as such, it could prove valuable within the overall engagement process.

3.6   With the emerging vision, the question was asked whether existing project briefs now addressed the issues being raised. At the moment there was a focus on process, but it was emerging that people and culture are as important. Concern was also raised over work briefs duplicating existing knowledge and projects. However it was vital for HMEP to keep momentum and move projects forward, while addressing these points as the programme developed.

3.7   Other issues that the Board noted were:

- Need to ensure that those who had put themselves forward but were not currently involved in HMEP were kept engaged and not allowed to become dissatisfied. With HMEP being a long-term project there would be many opportunities to become directly involved as the inevitable turnover of volunteers occurred.
- Leadership from within local authorities was seen as another key issue.
- The need to ensure that HMEP moved away from being seen as a DfT project and one that was truly led by the sector.
- On local authority regions the aim would be to identify a lead authority within an area who would promote HMEP to the other authorities. However while many might be keen to engage with HMEP, they may be less interested in more onerous duties.

3.8   JR/SC would circulate a draft note on the wider issues and arrange a further facilitated vision seminar for the Board to attend and develop the emerging themes and vision (**Action 8.1: JR/SC to circulate vision note and arrange further seminar**).

4.   Work Stream Group Highlights, Risks & Approvals

Work Stream Group 1 & Pot holes review

4.1   Key issue for WSG1 was the proposed survey. This would be web-based and was currently being finalised, before being tested by 5 authorities. It would be revised if necessary before being circulated to all local highway authorities and a crucial issue was to ensure that it was sent to the right people.

4.2   It was noted that for some authorities the survey would be their first contact with HMEP so an appropriate approach would be necessary. Additional publicity would also be needed, which could be provided by the HMEP website and email updates.

4.3   It was agreed that WSG1 would proceed with their trial next week, and that WSG4 would not include their questions in the survey.

4.4   As surveys could be time consuming and demanding on recipients, other methods for obtaining information would need to be looked at (**Action 8.2: PMG to investigate all methods for HMEP to obtain data**).

Work Stream Group 2

4.5   The first WSG2 proposal was to procure professional programme management for HMEP that would manage risks, dependencies, milestones and benefits realisation. They would help manage various individual HMEP projects but more crucially the whole programme. Board approval was given to proceed with the first stage of procurement as per WGS2's proposals. After initial expressions were received, WSG2 would return to the Board with the outcome before seeking approval to proceed to the next procurement stage.

4.6   The second WSG2 proposal for business change management was also agreed by the Board. This would focus around the pilots, early adopters and demonstrators. The interaction between these 3 groups and HMEP as a whole would be complex and requires a discipline which a third party can provide.

4.7   WSG2 advised that they were looking at using one area as a pilot to develop skills and also had a possible gateway into the SW region.

Work Stream Group 3 & Programme Management

4.8   WSG3 would be re-titled 'Engagement & Enabling'.

4.9   The decision by DfT Strategic Communications not to proceed with the engagement of a third party to assist HMEP was noted. This now placed more risk and duties on DfT, and it was agreed that Strategic Communications should be invited to attend the next Board meeting (**Action 8.3: LM**).

4.10   The HMEP website would be re-assessed to take account of the emerging vision, and identify what various users required from it to ensure that it met their needs. It also required updating in places.

4.11   It was agreed that the PMG would identify forthcoming opportunities for HMEP at events, such as the NHT, AIA, and ICE (asset management) conferences (**Action 8.4: PMG**). LH was also being proposed as a key note speaker at the Adept conference.

4.12   The advocates script, Q&A and presentation would need to be updated for these events, and ensure that they matched the emerging vision work (**Action 8.5: LM**).

4.13   Product design was emerging as a key issue, and would need to be consistent across HMEP. WSG3 would be circulating a questionnaire to all WSG leaders and project managers to gauge what requirements were likely to be needed (**Action 4.3: JA/LM to finalise and circulate product design questionnaire**).

Work Stream Group 4

4.14   WSG4 were focusing on NHT engagement. SK was discussing with them, and other groups such as APSE and TAG, who were also engaged in surveys, how HMEP could gather the required information.

4.15   HMEP would also be attending the NHT conference with John Dowie the key note speaker. Martin Duffy was also due to speak, and would co-ordinate his address with DfT/HMEP.

4.16   On research issues they were trying to collate the existing research and identify gaps that HMEP could fill.

4.17   The Board approved both WSG 4-1-2 (NHT survey review) and WSG4's proposed Project Management costs.

5.   Quality Assurance Group

5.1   The QAG had held their initial meeting, and while their role was still developing it was noted that the programme itself was at an early stage. It was also recognised that for the group to add value a stronger framework was needed, and the vision outcome would be an ideal start to develop this.

5.2   THE QAG's role was likely to develop into programme assurance, rather than quality. The latter suggested a more detailed look at HMEP than was envisaged, and it was noted that the group would not be asked to retro-approve any briefs or commissions.

6.   Blackpool Asset Management Pilot

6.1   The example of Blackpool demonstrated both culture change and improved asset management, but the key outcome was that they were able to

engage the authority's leaders and achieve additional investment in their highways.

6.2   Their approach had been developed with Elements 2 money, and demonstrated an ambition and enthusiasm that HMEP were keen to showcase. Board approval was given for the potential of this example to be looked at further, and while HMEP cannot endorse specific products it can illustrate an approach and its benefits as part of a range of options.

7.   Contacts / leads and cross HMEP/WSG communications

7.1   It was noted that HMEP contact with organisations and local authorities needs to be co-ordinated to ensure that none are ignored and that the Programme has a single focal point for each. The PMG would take the lead in this (**Action 8.6: PMG to develop a contact/organisation database**).

7.2   CIPFA were an organisation that could offer efficiency opportunities around asset management and were keen to become involved in HMEP. They had five geographical centres across England and around 90 authorities were signed up as members (**Action 8.7: SK to circulate CIPFA details**).

8.   Any Other Business

8.1   It was noted that the HA were setting up a Steering Group to deal with HMEP issues, and MA would make contact (**Action 8.8: MA**).

9.   Date of next meetings

9.1   These were noted and agreed as below.

- Monday 12th September, 09:30, Room 2/16, GMH
- Wednesday 12th October, 14:00, Room 2/16, GMH
- Friday 11th November, 09:30, Room 2/16, GMH
- Tuesday 6th December, 13:30, Room 2/16, GMH

HMEP
14th September 2011