

HMEP 5th Board Meeting: Tuesday 22nd March, 11:00, Room 3/24a, Great Minster House

Present: Mostaque Ahmed (MA), DfT (Chair)
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)
David Hutchinson (DH) (HTMA)

Copies to: To all present plus Simon Lydiard, Tim Reardon and Andy Bailey (all DfT), and Mike Bordiss (Chair HELG)

Actions & Notes

- 1 Note of Previous meeting (24th February 2011)
 - 1.1 These were agreed.
- 2 Actions and Archive List
 - 2.1 These were updated, please see attached version 7.0.
- 3 HMEP Announcement and HTMA Conference
 - 3.1 It had been agreed to formally launch HMEP at the HTMA Conference on Wednesday 6th April at the QEII Conference Centre in Westminster. DfT Minister Norman Baker MP would be making a key note speech regarding the launch.
 - 3.2 The speech would also announce that HMEP would be looking at potholes, using all the core principles of the Programme. A study needed to be set up within a month of the launch and possible candidates for project leader were discussed. **Action 4.9: The Board would need to identify a study leader and programme board to undertake the pothole study.**
 - 3.2 The interim website would also go live at the same time, and this could include draft documents intended for discussion and comment. **Action 5.1: LM would circulate the draft pages of the website for comments by close Tuesday 29th March.**
4. Quality Assurance & HELG
 - 4.1 The Board reinforced the need to get independent quality assurance for the programme content and the right mechanism to achieve assurance. It was noted that a number of parties had expressed strong reservations about the ability of HELG to respond to this important requirement within the timescales required by HMEP. It was also felt

that central government sponsorship should be focused on a single over-arching efficiency programme (HMEP) and the separate existence of HELG could confuse that message. It was concluded that DfT should withhold sponsorship of HELG and consider alternative mechanisms to provide assurance.

- 4.2 The Programme Board wanted to record its thanks to HELG for its endeavours in raising the profile of the efficiency agenda. It would particularly like to record its thanks to HELG Chair, Mike Bordiss, whose commitment to the efficiency cause has been considerable.

Action 4.7: MA to write to Chair of HELG on behalf of the HMEP Programme Board notifying withdrawal of sponsorship of HELG.

5. Project Management Support

- 5.1 ML advised that he would be interviewing potential candidates for the post in WSG1 on 29th March. WSG2 and 4 advised that they were likely to split the support across a number of posts (**Action 3.9**).

6. Delivery Plan

- 6.1 DfT had prepared a simple delivery plan based on the information so far provided in the WSG briefs. This would be developed further, but it was noted that product release dates need to be carefully considered so that links across briefs are highlighted, but the message does not become overwhelming, i.e. discrete bite sized chunks were needed on each occasion. **Action 5.2: WSG leaders to consider and update draft delivery plan and return by Friday 1st April.**

7. Post 2013 Structure

- 7.1 Initially DfT had looked at the post 2013 entity operating under a concession or a licence, but were now considering a joint venture model. This would retain the DfT's involvement in HMEP but with greater emphasis on sector ownership. **Action 5.3: JA to prepare a Joint Venture proposal for the Secretary of State.**

8. Pilot Site

- 8.1 Following their meeting with the Cabinet Office, DfT were keen to develop a pilot site that could adopt and demonstrate the benefits of HMEP. One region was suggested, and was likely to be taken forward, but it was also crucial to identify areas that covered all of England.

9. Highways Agency

- 9.1 DfT still await a formal response from HA on their engagement in HMEP. The view was reinforced that HA, as sector leaders in many of the areas of good practice, had a great deal to contribute. **Action 5.4 + ML will speak with Steve Gooding about HA engagement on HMEP, JA will provide ML with latest copy of DfT correspondence with HA.**

10. Quick Wins
- 10.1 DfT were trying to identify quick wins (early successes) that could be placed on the HMEP website. HTMA agreed to provide a list of their top advice on how to do things more efficiently by Friday 25th March, and these would be cleared by all WSG leaders before being placed on the website (**Action 5.5**).
11. Work Stream briefs – Common Themes
- 11.1 WSG leaders for 1, 2 and 3 talked through their draft briefs as presented to the Board. It was agreed that these would all be taken forward for further development, with any suggested changes discussed at the meeting. They would be placed on the interim website in draft form for further comments and discussion (**Action 2.15**).
- 11.2 The web versions would have any cost estimates removed, but should identify project leads, and any vacancies, wherever possible. Titles of the work streams across the project documentation would be changed to reflect those now being used by the group leaders.
- 11.3 In the risks section, ‘mitigation’ would be used instead of ‘containment’, and the classification would be low (L), medium (m) or high (h).
- 11.4 DH confirmed that all input from HTMA represented the view of all its members and could be taken as representing the views of the highway management and maintenance industry.
12. Work Stream Group 1 – Operational Service Delivery
- 12.1 It was proposed that HMEP needed some kind of database to fully understand the picture for local authorities across England. Initially this could cover how they operated such as DLO, TMC and when their key renewal dates were, but later expanded to more information, possibly utilising the NHT data. **Action 5.6: ML would start the initial process using existing knowledge that others on the Board could add to.** (See also item 14.1 below).
- 12.2 ML would also be producing briefs for asset management, including the issues of whole government accounting and deterioration modelling (**Action 2.15**).
- 12.3 SK raised the issue that LA accounting practices which build in inefficiencies also need to be looked at. These included delayed budget approvals and late engagement of partners in work programmes.
13. Work Stream Group 2 – Business Improvement
- 13.1 JR had developed a flow diagram, which while it was originally developed for WSG2, could be extended to cover all of HMEP. It would be used to show how the programme can be applied to local authorities, and help show how the different work groups and streams were linked. It could also be further split into a high, senior level diagram and one aimed for practitioners. **Action 5.7: JR would**

develop the diagrams further for the launch of HMEP, but longer – term it would be taken forward by the sub-programme board.

13.2 It was agreed that Senior Management Skills would be moved from WSG3 to WSG2.

14. Work Stream Group 4 – Research and Data Management

14.1 SK agreed to circulate proposals for a phased approach for obtaining benchmarking figures on costs and performance. NHT were also very keen to get involved (**Action 5.8**). (See also item 12.1 above).

14.2 Other issues that would need further discussion at future meetings included the role of the utility companies and how tangible benefits from the programme could be measured.

15 Date of next meeting

15.1 The next Board meeting would be Monday 9th May at 09:30 in GMH. Meetings would be arranged for June and July in due course, though it may be possible to move to bi-monthly meetings in the future.

**HMEP
29th March 2011**