

**Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 14<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting**  
**Monday 19<sup>th</sup> March 2012, 10:00 – 12:00**  
**Room LG1, Great Minster House**

Attendees

Mostaque Ahmed	<i>Chair, DfT</i>	Matthew Lugg	<i>Leicestershire CC</i>
Jason Russell	<i>Surrey CC</i>	Haydn Davies	<i>DfT</i>
Steve Kent	<i>Cheshire West &amp; Chester</i>	David Hutchinson	<i>HTMA</i>
Paul Bird	<i>Essex CC</i>	David Grunwell	<i>Highways Agency</i>
James Kaye	<i>DfT Strategic Communications</i>	Dana Skelley	<i>Transport for London</i>
Karen Hilling	<i>Atkins</i>	Phil Dyer	<i>Atkins</i>
Lloyd Miles	<i>HMEP Secretariat, DfT</i>		

Distribution: All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), Eamon Lally (LGG), Tony Gates (Balfour Beatty) and Derek Turner (HA).

Item

**1. Note of 13<sup>th</sup> Board meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2012**

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

**2. Programme Management – Dashboard**

2.1 The Board discussed the latest version of the Programme Dashboard. Key points included:

- The Benefits table had been expanded and now included columns to identify amount realised to date and non-cashable benefits. These would now be reviewed and data added where possible.
- Risks and issues were now being identified, but greater detail was requested. Both registers would be circulated to the Board. The Dashboard needed to show risk ratings post-mitigation and the highest risks should be put as agenda items in future Board meetings (**Action 14-1: LM**).
- A product 'roadmap' was also provided, but it was noted that some data was out of date and was being amended. Further discussion would be held regarding the release of HMEP outputs under the Engagement section.
- A schedule of meetings for the rest of 2012 would be developed.
- An update will be emailed shortly on the NHT survey and the CQC work (**Action 14-2: SK**).

**3. Engagement and Enabling Group update**

3.1 The Board were updated on some key points, including:

- Product grouping and release schedule needed to be considered;

- Whilst there was some good feedback on HMEP from the wider sector, there were also some poor perceptions which should be addressed.

3.2 A Communications Strategy had been produced early in 2011, but this needed to be revised based on the emerging discussions on how HMEP should engage and enable on efficiency advice and solutions.

3.3 It was key that HMEP was presented as a whole programme and not just a series of individual products in isolation. But it was also essential to demonstrate progress since last year's launch, and meet demand for assistance where it was requested. Otherwise there was a risk that the programme would be continually overtaken by events as products were developed. This could be achieved by undertaking 'pilots' or having soft launching via early adopters (early enablers) where there is known demand for specific products/tools that become available, with a full release later, which could build the programme's credibility and show a coherent approach.

3.4 In launching individual products/tools, it was important to set the wider HMEP context and signpost other tools and resources that are in development thereby showcasing the overall efficiency offer. This would be key to HMEP's credibility. The programme must offer genuine examples of good practice, and offer a choice of options to match the various requirements of the sector. This would demonstrate a true customer focused approach.

3.5 There is already desire for HMEP products, i.e. collaborative alliances were being established in new areas and they were now seeking guidance, while other authorities were waiting to use the standard documents for new contracts. This take up needs to be correctly articulated; that it was the start of HMEP's assistance, rather than the final offer. **Action 14-3:** ML would share information on prospective take-up of HMEP products with DAG.

3.6 The issue of whether HMEP was doing enough to capture existing good practice and build on this was raised. Some had the perception that the programme was too focused on delivering 'new' advice, rather than promote existing examples.

3.7 It was also felt that while the programme had progressed greatly from its origins, it retained a heavy bias towards public bodies. To deliver really significant efficiencies the programme would need to be widened to include the whole highways maintenance sector, including private companies.

#### 4. Design Assurance Group (DAG) update

4.1 DAG were assessing what more could be done, beyond the tools and products currently being developed, to meet the challenges faced by the sector. More work was needed on benefits which should be baselined. Early adopters and pilots would be key for wider engagement, and market intelligence would be crucial to this, along with a wider 'sector' approach,

rather than just a series of individual products. Currently engagement with the sector, including private companies, also appeared fragmented. The group would be spending a whole day reviewing the work programme before reporting back to the Board in May.

4.2 Communications between DAG and the wider programme also needed to be strengthened. It was essential to the group that projects returned on a regular basis at key stages (gateways), with Advocates/Programme Managers attending meetings to help discussions.

## 5. Updates

### Potholes Report

5.1 The final report had now been drafted, with recommendations discussed and agreed with the pothole board. **Action 14-4:** Comments from the HMEP Board were requested by Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March.

5.2 The aim of the report was to both give the public, senior local officers and politicians evidence that strategies were available and being used to improve road condition, and to illustrate to the maintenance sector that an asset management approach was the way forward.

5.3 Although the review has not quantified the benefits in the same way as other specific HMEP products, it was seen as a key signposting project to illustrate how maintenance can be improved. Other areas of HMEP, and outside bodies, would be taking forward the specific actions identified in the report, and these would show the benefits available.

5.4 The Minister would be discussing the emerging findings at the LTT conference on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> March, when ML and JR were also speaking. The need for a consistent HMEP message (without too much repetition) was noted.

5.5 Once published the report and associated case studies would be available on the DfT/HMEP website, but it would be followed up by an action plan and a further meeting of the pothole board in April.

### Post 2013 options

5.6 The options outlined in the paper were discussed. A group would be established to review and take these forward, with the aim of developing a recommendation on the direction of travel for the Board to consider by September.

### Health Check

5.7 The first workshop had been held, with a follow-up one planned in mid April. Initial ideas would be developed in June/July, then tests held with pilot authorities. There was already enthusiasm within the SE7 to pilot the process,

and expectations would need managing. JR confirmed that the LGA were involved in the project.

5.8 It was also noted that as a key 'shop window' into the wider HMEP offer, quality would be critical, and that it needed to cover a wide range of scenarios and challenge the sector's existing thinking.

#### Knowledge Hub

5.9 The first meeting of the group developing the knowledge hub would be held on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> March. Key challenges would be defining what it is, what would be available, and how.

#### IUK & NIEP update

5.10 Improvement and efficiency partnerships still existed in some areas, or had been succeeded by other organisations. Close links were needed to avoid duplication between the two programmes. The development of the 'pipeline' was also discussed and would be taken forward based on data collated by ADEPT.

### **6. Efficiency Proposals**

#### Blackpool

6.1 DAG had looked at the proposal in depth and now reported back to the Board. The Board noted the enthusiasm of the promoters, and the hard work they had put in to develop their approach for wider adoption.

6.2 The next step for the Blackpool proposal would be key. However, it was felt that HMEP should not be funding the development of this approach within a few authorities. Instead it should be developed more as a case study for authorities to consider and adopt, if they felt it was suitable for them.

6.3 This approach would need careful consideration of how HMEP approved any funding, as a precedent could be set for future detailed studies. **Action 14-5:** SK and PB would liaise before discussing with Blackpool the next steps.

#### Nu-phalt

6.4 The Board felt that examples should be presented by customers rather than the sellers, otherwise HMEP would be endorsing commercial products which was not its purpose. But it was agreed that the programme should be pointing to other bodies who may be better placed to advise on products and research. The role of the Road Surface Treatment Association (RSTA) could be explored regarding this product, and as a possible development for the knowledge hub. **Action 14-6:** HD would draft a response to Nu-phalt in consultation with DH and SK.

### TLHM training proposal

6.5 DS presented the TLHM proposal for a toolkit. The focus was on training, and developing regional hubs, and it was felt that both the proposal and HMEP would benefit from mutual engagement. HMEP funding would be requested to develop the approach into a national model, but not the training itself which would be authority funded. The proposal would be piloted in London before wider role-out. **Action 14-7:** ML/JR would liaise with DS to develop the proposal, and then it would be considered by DAG and the Board at their next meetings.

## **7. AOB**

7.1 After a short discussion, it was agreed that the HTMA (as representatives of the private sector) would have a second seat on the HMEP Board to provide an improved public/private sector balance.

## **8. Date of next meetings**

- Friday 18<sup>th</sup> May, 10:00, Room H3, GMH
- Friday 13<sup>th</sup> July, 10:00, Room 3/23, GMH