

HMEP 6th Board Meeting: Monday 9th May, 09:30, Room LG3, Great Minster House

Present: Mostaque Ahmed (MA), DfT (Chair)
Andrew Smith (AS), Hampshire, HMEP Champion
Matthew Lugg (ML), Leicestershire CC (Chair WSG1)
Jason Russell (JR), Surrey CC (Chair WSG2)
Julian Abel (JA), DfT (Chair WSG3)
Steve Kent (SK), Chester & Cheshire West (Chair WSG4)
Lloyd Miles (LM), DfT (Secretariat)
Richard Buckley (RB), DfT, Strategic Roads Review Team (part)
David Hutchinson, (DH) (HTMA)
Tim Pemberton, Cheshire West and Chester Council, WS Group 4
Gary Thompson, Scott Wilson/Leicestershire CC, WS Group 1
Sam Cunningham, Surrey County Council, WS Group 2

Copies to: To all present plus Simon Lydiard, Tim Reardon and Andy Bailey (all DfT).

Actions & Notes

1. Introductions

1.1 Introductions were made.

2. Strategic Roads Review (SRR), HA & HMEP

2.1 RB outlined the strategic review of the HA. The review was at its very early stages, though the timeframe was challenging with the findings due with the Secretary of State in October 2011. The review was keen to engage with HMEP and while there might not be a formal call for evidence, they would welcome the Board's early input. **Action 6.1: HMEP comments on SRR to LM by 3rd June to collate and forward to SRR (ALL).**

3. Note of 5th Board meeting on 22nd March 2011

3.1 These were agreed and would be published on the HMEP website in due course.

4. HMEP Governance

4.1 It was unanimously agreed that David Hutchinson would become a full member of the Board. This reflected the valuable contribution he had made on behalf of the HTMA, and the collaboration necessary between the private and public sectors for HMEP to be a success.

4.2 Engagement with the Highways Agency needed to be formalised and their valuable input into the programme established. **Action 5.4 (MA/JR).**

4.3 The Board were advised that proposals were being taken forward to second ML to HMEP on a part-time basis. This would enable him to lead and provide expert advice on a number of key issues, such as potholes, pilot sites, Elements 2 and the post 2013 joint venture.

5. National Improvement and Efficiency Partnership (NIEP)

5.1 AS updated the Board on progress with NIEP. A draft end of term report was due with the Secretary of State (for CLG) and would be published in September. It was then proposed that NIEP would form part of the national procurement agency.

5.2 Private sector input was key to NIEP, and the 20 biggest suppliers were involved, while Ministers themselves were very receptive to their views. A key issue for local authorities was resolving the conundrum between retaining sovereignty and combining services for greater efficiencies and purchasing power, while whole life costs were also a crucial factor.

5.3 10 lead authorities would be identified as possible pilots and HMEP would look to utilise these, possibly to gain greater regional access. It was vital that HMEP was seen as part of the wider efficiency agenda.

5.4 AS advised that CIPFA would be holding a national conference in Harrogate aimed at Chief Executives which would be good opportunity to promote HMEP. **Action 6.2: AS would provide details of the conference and LM would provide a short briefing on HMEP (AS/LM).**

6. Feedback since launch of HMEP, including discussion on HTMA survey results and future press strategy

6.1 The detailed results of the HTMA conference poll were noted, especially the response to the question of HMEP take-up.

7. Action List: Update

7.1 The action list was updated, as per version 9 attached. There would also be a Gateway Review of HMEP, possibly in the Autumn, and various project documents would be needed for his. **Action 6.3: Further updates on Programme Documents to be provided to LM (Project Managers Group (PMG)).**

8. Work Stream Group Update (WSG leaders)

8.1 *Work Stream Group 1*

8.1.1 The first of the two-monthly project boards had been held, and WSG1 would be managed using Prince principles. WSG1 hoped to be commissioning work soon, and further briefs and papers would be places on the website in due course.

8.1.2 A key area not yet taken on board by HMEP was the role of utilities companies. DH advised that CIHT were proposing a meeting where highway authorities, contractors and utilities would openly discuss their issues and this would be a good opportunity for HMEP to raise its interest and profile in this

area. **Action 6.4: Ensure HMEP interest and representation at any proposed utilities meeting (DH).**

8.2 *Work Stream Group 2*

8.2.1 JR had split his WSG into 4 stages; initial proposal, roll-out, initial assessment then handover to HMEP. A series of workshops were being held to start this process, while the use of pilots to develop the tools was being looked at.

8.2.2 The Board discussed the proposals circulated in advance regarding the procurement of Legal Services. Issues discussed included whether a wider procurement of legal advice for other work streams would have benefits, but the uncertainty and time delay were factors against this option. The Board agreed that WSG2 should proceed with the proposed invitation tender, and return when tenders had been submitted and assessed.

8.3 *Work Stream Group 3*

8.3.1 JA was proposing that a series of short videos be posted on the HMEP website with various people extolling the virtues of HMEP and efficiency. Arrangements were being made with suggested participants, including AS. **Action 6.5: (JA/LM).**

8.3.2 WSG would be developing an action plan on communications for the next 6 months, which included the LGG communications proposals and the need for consistent messages and branding across HMEP. **Action 6.6: Draft Delivery Plan to be circulated in advance of the next Board meeting (JA).**

8.3.3 JA would be meeting with SOLACE (Society of Local Authority Chief Executives) and an issue would be a proposed survey of chief executives, and whether this would reach the target audience or if a conference type event might be a better option. Guidance, possibly through the LGG, was also an option being looked at.

8.3.4 It was proposed that to follow up the launch of HMEP a joint letter from AS and Norman Baker be sent to all Chief Executives. **Action 6.7 (JA).**

8.3.5 It should be noted that DfT's website would be revamped and rebuilt during May and June, and after this week no changes could be made to the content (unless in very exceptional circumstances) until the site is re-launched in mid June.

8.4 *Work Stream Group 4*

8.4.1 SK advised that for the CQC element existing information would be reviewed in the light of how it can be extended. On benchmarking a number of groups already operated at different levels and key was how HMEP can build on this. On future proofing, a meeting with TRL had been arranged.

8.5 *General Issues*

8.5.1 DH emphasised that it was key for the right representative from HTMA to be identified for the appropriate work stream, but that they would be representing the whole industry and not just their company or sector.

8.5.2 To assist in future meetings, the PMG would produce a one-page update proforma that can be completed for each WSG to be circulated before each meeting. This would highlight progress on key issues and exceptional items. **Action 6.8: WSG progress report to be developed for Board reporting and used for the next meeting in June (PMG).**

8.5.3 The issue of liability [*regarding HMEP products or contractual spend?*] was raised. If necessary suitable wording/action in the HMEP process would be provided. **Action 6.9: Liability issue would be raised with DfT legal (LM).**

9. Programme Management and Project Support

9.1 Draft terms of reference had been circulated for the PMG and comments were due back with LM by Tuesday 24th May. **Action 6.10 (ALL).**

9.2 The proposed PMG would meet soon, and lead on the development of a number of areas. This included the benefits evaluation model, the information database and the roadmap. **Actions 6.11: PMG to take forward various tasks, as specified by the Board (PMG/Board).**

9.3 At present Project Managers would not attend the Board Meetings, unless on specific issues or as a deputy for their WSG leader.

10. Other issues

10.1 *Audit Commission*

10.1.1 The Audit Commission had welcomed HMEP's comments on the draft report that was now due to be published on Thursday 26th May. Unfortunately due to confidentiality assurances given at the time of the surveys they would not be able to share this data with HMEP.

10.2 *Quality Assurance.*

10.2.1 Paul Bird from Essex CC had agreed to lead on this key issue, and would be invited to attend a Board meeting at a later date. A proper framework that ensured a coherent output from HMEP was needed, though it was noted that this could be expensive. The close links to benefits evaluation was also noted.

10.3 *Early successes and updates for HMEP website*

10.3.1 A number of early successes had been placed on the website, and the template would be re-circulated for any further suggestions.

10.3.2 Some concern was raised over the presentation of the early successes, and whether they were being quality assured (all are circulated to the Board for comments before publishing). Other issues included ensuring a consistent message was being portrayed across a disparate group. This would need to be looked if further examples were posted on the website. **Action 6.12: Further early successes were requested, though the presentation of these would need to be looked at if significant numbers were placed on the site (ALL/LM).**

11. Date of next meeting

11.1 The next meetings were booked for Wednesday 29th June, 09:30, GMH and Friday 5th August at 09:30, GMH.

HMEP
13th May 2011