

**Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 13th Board Meeting
Monday 30th January 2012, 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 & Chester</i>	David Hutchinson	<i>HTMA</i>
Paul Bird	<i>Essex CC</i>	Derek Turner	<i>Highways Agency</i>
Phil Dyer	<i>Atkins</i>	Chris Mulligan	<i>Atkins</i>
Lloyd Miles	<i>HMEP Secretariat, DfT</i>		

Apologies

Apologies received from Dana Skelley, TfL.

Distribution: All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), James Kaye (DfT), Eamon Lally (LGG) and Dana Skelley (TfL).

Item

1. Note of 12th Board meeting on 6th December 2011

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

2. Programme Management

2.1 The Board discussed the Dashboard which provided a summary of key programme information. Following the dummy page last month to get feedback on the format, this was the first version to be populated with data from the programme. It should be noted that the Milestone Baseline Dates for projects are taken from the recently updated business cases, but are now the dates against which progress will be monitored. It is important that workstream chairs quality assure these, e.g. it was noted that the potholes review product launch is shown as May 2012 when in fact it has been agreed that the report would be ready by the end of March.

2.2 Areas that would require further development included benefits and risks/issues. For benefits, it was noted that it would also be useful to estimate the non-cashable benefits (including savings to the private sector). There was also a discussion about tracking benefits actually realised as projects are rolled out to the sector – the challenge would be to identify practical ways of capturing these without creating too many burdens for the programme and the sector. On risks, further work is required to differentiate between risk to individual projects and their relationship to risk to the overall programme. Similar considerations apply to issues.

2.3 Consideration will be given to including limited additional management information on the rear page of the dashboard report, whilst sticking to the one sheet of A3, perhaps including some engagement indicators (e.g. website hits, number of local authorities actively involved with HMEP). It should also be noted that some projects managers were also adopting similar dashboards for their projects.

3. Design Assurance Group (DAG) Update

3.1 The DAG had held a meeting on 25th January to confirm its membership and approach. They would not be looking in depth at all the details of the programme. Instead they would adopt a light touch approach to ensure that HMEP delivers the efficiencies available given the challenges faced by the sector, and thus contribute to the economic growth that is now a key focus for the Government. DAG had completed initial assessments for most of the current projects, and would be providing comments back to the Board in due course, though a number would require more detailed analysis (**Action 13.1: DAG to circulate meeting notes and initial project verdicts to Board**).

3.2 A key issue emerging for the group, and for the programme, is how best to measure benefits. Double counting, and over-estimates, should be avoided, but HMEP must not be over cautious on what its outputs can deliver. The wider ambitions of the programme, including behavioural and culture change, could potentially deliver the biggest efficiencies but would be the most difficult to forecast the monetised benefits accruing from a specific project.

3.3 It was also critical to ensure that the programme reached the whole sector, and especially the authorities that were not currently focused on highway efficiencies. These need to be engaged but within the framework of the Government's localism agenda. It was also important that all delivery options, including direct labour organisations, were covered by HMEP.

3.4 HMEP also needed to build on the emerging arguments that good road condition has strong economic benefits. The Scottish roads efficiency project has made such a case, and this would need to be looked at to see whether it can also be adopted by HMEP. The Department has also developed detailed economic analysis of the benefits from major schemes – including maintenance ones - and would investigate how this can applied to more routine spend (**Action 13.2, DfT**).

3.5 Good data was increasing being identified as a requirement for HMEP to understand how its programme can engage the whole sector, using existing data wherever possible. The ADEPT survey of how local authorities are proposing to deal with Spending Review challenges was one possible source, and ML would provide a sample of the data received, while DfT would consider other existing sources such as APSE and TAG (**Action 13.3, ML/DfT**).

4. Programme Management Board Report

4.1 JR gave a presentation on progress so far and next steps. DfT would take an increasing lead role in programme management, now that the new structure and systems were bedding down. It was also noted that the sub-national engagement for HMEP, the post 2013 model and links to other government efficiency initiatives would be key to the development of the programme.

5. Engage and Enable update

5.1 HD gave a presentation on progress so far and next steps. An additional meeting would be held after the Board session to discuss in detail the development of this area.

6. Procurement and the Highways Sector – Government Initiative

6.1 Several Board members had attended a meeting at Number 10 regarding public procurement in the highways sector, working with the supply chain and supporting growth, and the presentation given was discussed. The initiative had clear links to HMEP and other Government efficiency measures, and JR would be submitting a paper summarising his supply chain review work to the Cabinet Office. On issues such as future contract work pipelines, this had strong links to item 3.5 above, and the LGG would also have a strong interest.

7. AOB

7.1 The issue of HMEP liaison with Infrastructure UK was discussed.

7.2 It was confirmed that DAG were looking at the business case for the Blackpool asset management proposal but would seek further details from the promoter and will report to the Board in March with their recommendations.

7.3 ML advised that they were now nearing completion of their assessment of the survey undertaken last Autumn and these would be available for publication soon.

8. Dates of next meetings

- Monday 19th March, 10:00, Room H2, GMH
- Friday 18th May, 10:00, Room H3, GMH