



Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme

**Board Meeting**  
**Thursday 30 January 2014**

Present		
Stephen Fidler	DfT	Chair
Louise Ivison	DfT	Minutes
Geoff Allister	HTMA	
Paul Bird	Essex CC	
Haydn Davies	DfT	
Steve Kent	ADEPT	
Matthew Lugg	DfT / Mouchel	
Kamal Panchal	LGA	
Sue Percy	CIHT	
Jason Russell	Surrey CC	
Dana Skelley	TfL	
Chris Hedges	Atkins	For item 6

Apologies		
Tony Gates	HTMA	
David Grunwell	Highways Agency	

1. Notes of the last meeting	
<p>All actions were reported as completed or progressing, with the exception of 4.7 – SK to provide advice to Laura Cameron (Atkins) on lessons learnt from the ADEPT conference / Twitter. <b>Action: SK to follow up.</b></p> <p>Notes of the last meeting were agreed.</p>	<b>SK</b>
2. Introduction and objective of the meeting	
<p>All agreed the focus of the meeting to be on: prioritisation, allied with challenge to the programme costs and scope.</p> <p>This will enable the programme to work on delivering the excellent work in the annual plan, for which SF expressed his thanks to the Board.</p>	

### 3. Project Proposal Outlines

Each of the Annual Plan projects was introduced. Key points raised and actions are listed below:

#### 1. HMEP Sustainability

SF proposed a meeting to brainstorm some of the options for this project, and noted that the budget for this would be substantially reduced. **Action: SF to follow up.**

SF

#### 2. Sector Segmentation

It was agreed that this would be the foundation for a lot of the other projects and work, and will help HMEP to understand how it can get best value for its money.

It was noted that this could well become part of another project – either from the outset, or as a follow-up once the initial analysis is done.

#### 3. Energising Leaders

The themes of this project are to find, engage and energise leaders. All agreed that this project is about people and attitudes, rather than processes, and may involve only three or four key people in each region.

#### 4. Good Practice Network

This project should ensure that people connect with key networks, and that these networks connect with each other. It was emphasised that this should particularly be bottom-up – i.e. people making useful links with each other.

It was acknowledged that this project may not be so essential if we get the marketing and communications right.

#### 5. Engagement

#### 6. Re-connecting Organisations

#### 7. Marketing and Communications

#### 8. Website and Social Media

All agreed that getting this right would be a catalyst for generating more engagement and achieving our objectives. The website and social media needs to be a platform that connects all the other elements of HMEP together.

Two additional ideas were suggested:

- Should we focus on this as a 'self-help' tool, as the most efficient means of supporting people?
- Could we offer 'social networking' on this, so that people can identify people to connect with?

#### 9. HMEP Support

This project involves tailored support for individual local authorities, using a structured approach.

This will involve working with Infrastructure UK, the LGA, Local Partnerships, the Cabinet Office and others, and will include activities such as peer reviews, gateway assurance reviews and contract reviews.

A number of related ideas were discussed:

- Will a review of DfT's funding arrangements create a lot / too much demand for this service?
- Is giving individual 'pockets' of tailored support efficient? Could we share the information and advice, so that other authorities can learn from it, even anonymously?
- Could we ask authorities to pay for this? On a model of 'if you make savings, you have to share some of those with HMEP'?
- As part of the DfT funding model for local authorities, should it be mandated that you must have had a Peer Review to access maximum funding?

It was also noted that the benefit of being a peer review assessor, for staff's own development, should be encouraged.

**Action: JR to look into ensuring that the above happens, and to ensure that the project is sustainable.**

JR

## 10. Measuring Improvement and Benefits

Three main ideas were proposed and discussed::

- Assessing the benefits of products – could be done through going back over business cases and speaking with the people who've benefitted from projects.
- Efficiencies delivered – could be measured by how much authorities reduced their efficiency gaps.
- Measuring and demonstrating efficiency – could we come up with some efficiency indicators, which each authority should complete? Maybe using nationally-available statistics.

It was noted that Cost, Quality, Customer (satisfaction) CQC is what members and the public usually focus on; financial efficiency of providing the service is a secondary consideration especially to the public, HMEP should recognise this. All agreed that HMEP could potentially accept (one or a combination of) a financial saving, an improvement in quality, and an improvement in customer satisfaction as a measure of improvement.

## 11. Managing HMEP Products

All agreed that the focus of our efforts should be on those existing resources that are having the greatest impact.

Two ideas were suggested:

- Should HMEP move towards products becoming chargeable resources, to pay for their continued upkeep?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there gaps in the resources, which we should fill? HMEP should be alive to new case studies / research / etc. However, all agreed not to intensively create new resources without clear demand.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. High-level timeline</b>	
<p>The high-level timetable was shown to the Board.</p> <p>All agreed that it does not currently make clear where the lead edge is, or where the dependencies are.</p> <p>All agreed that it is important to establish what we need to do first, and what we can afford to wait a bit longer for. The importance of achieving key deliverables at an early stage – not just by the end of the programme – was stressed. <b>Action: HD to list the ‘quick wins’ and when each will be realised.</b></p> <p>All agreed that the focus of the next meeting should be on ensuring that we have the right priorities and the right plan.</p>	<b>HD</b>
<b>5. Working arrangements</b>	
<p>A paper on proposed working arrangements for delivery of the Annual Plan was presented to the Board. A number of elements were discussed:</p> <p><u>Leadership Team:</u> It was noted that CIHT are not represented in the proposed new Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Executive Board:</u> It was noted that the Highways Agency are not shown as represented on the Executive Board. This reflects their current involvement which is likely to continue to be more on individual projects than at the leadership level.</p> <p><u>QA Group:</u> All agreed that the LGA do not need to be represented on the group. <b>Action: HD to remove the LGA from this group.</b></p> <p>Questions raised whether the QA Group structure is too top-heavy, and will slow down getting products out quickly. A number of developments were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could QA be built into teams’ existing work? However, if quality is compromised, the credibility of the programme would be lost?</li> <li>Is QA as essential now that we’re not producing nearly as many products?</li> <li>Is the QA group still essential as a ‘customer/senior user’ check on products and outputs?</li> <li>Could the QA group be more of a customer satisfaction group?</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: HD and PB to consider how a QA or similar group could be best set up to address these issues.</b></p>	<b>HD PB</b>

<p><u>Reliance on individuals:</u> Whether HMEP is too reliant on individuals to deliver things as an addition to their regular jobs, as opposed to them having a specific remit as part of their day jobs, was discussed. <b>Action: SF to consider how we address this.</b></p> <p><u>Website:</u> Whether the website work is so central to the programme that it should be treated slightly differently to other projects was discussed. Options included this being overseen outside of the three sub-groups, and thus moving into the 'cross-cutting' sub-group with the Annual Plan, Business Plan and Sector Segmentation. <b>Action: SF to ensure that the website is reviewed at the Leadership Team and promoted through the sub-groups.</b></p> <p><u>Division into themed sub-groups:</u> All agreed that division by theme was a good idea, and that the budget should be divided into the three sub-groups and controlled by their Convenors.</p> <p><b>Action: Three groups to start working informally in this structure, to test it, prior to it being formally signed off as the way forwards.</b></p> <p><b>Action: Approach SF or HD if you would like to be the Convenor for one of the three sub-groups.</b> Agreement will be sought from the Board before final decisions are made.</p>	<p>SF</p> <p>SF</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p>
<p><b>6. Determining project priorities</b></p>	
<p>The analysis of the future budget undertaken by Atkins was presented to the Board.</p> <p>All agreed that the Board should consider, for all projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reassessing scope</li> <li>• Reducing budget</li> </ul> <p>Prior to doing this, it is fundamental that the Board understands the basis for the costs budgeted.</p> <p>All agreed on a set of <b>actions</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atkins to devise a template for project sponsors to complete for each project. This should include outcomes to be delivered, quick wins, and a breakdown of the budget and how it was calculated.</li> <li>• Project sponsors to a) confirm they understand the figures on their template, and b) identify where they may be able to make savings, bearing in mind an overall budget reduction of 25 to 30%.</li> <li>• HD and LI to compile the completed templates.</li> <li>• SF to produce a proposal(s) for dividing the remaining programme budget between the three sub-groups, using the completed templates as an indicator of budget required for each.</li> </ul>	<p>CH</p> <p>TG,ML JR,SK HD,LI</p> <p>SF</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board to agree (by email and/or teleconference) a proposal for how the budget will be divided into the three sub-groups.</li> </ul> <p>Once the budget is divided into the three sub-groups, the Convenor of each will decide how the budget is divided between the projects.</p>	
<b>7. Confirm decisions made</b>	
<p>All agreed that this had been covered in the above items.</p>	
<b>8. AOB and close</b>	
<p><u>Roadshows</u>: All supported the Engage &amp; Enable Group's proposal to target some workshops / communications for elected members. <b>Action: KP to promote the Roadshows to the LGA Board Members.</b></p> <p>SF expressed his thanks to all those involved in the Roadshows.</p> <p><u>LGA Conference</u>: It was agreed that HMEP could have exhibition space at this event, and that fringe events are likely. <b>Action: HD to liaise with KP on this.</b></p>	<p>KP</p> <p>HD KP</p>