Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 12th Board Meeting
Tuesday 6th December 2011, 13:30 – 17:00
Room H5, 1st Floor, Great Minster House

<u>Attendees</u>

Mostaque Ahmed	Chair, DfT
Matthew Lugg	Leicestershire CC
Jason Russell	Surrey CC
Haydn Davies	DfT
Steve Kent	Cheshire West & Chester
David Hutchinson	HTMA
Paul Bird	Essex CC
Chris Mulligan	Atkins
Phil Dyer	Atkins
Peter Everill	Atkins
John Gates	Norfolk CC (guest)
Lloyd Miles	HMEP Secretariat, DfT

<u>Copies to:</u>   All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), James Kaye (DfT), Derek Turner (Highways Agency) and Eamon Lally (LGG).

<u>Item</u>

1.   <u>Introductions and apologies</u>

1.1   Introductions were made and apologies received from Derek Turner, Eamon Lally and James Kaye.

2.   <u>Note of 11th Board meeting on 11th November</u>

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

3.   <u>The use of augmented reality technology in highways operations</u>

3.1   A presentation was given by John Gates, the winner of the NHT – HMEP competition. The competition challenged entrants to think 'outside the box' and deliver efficiency improvements in the highways maintenance sector. John's entry focused on the potential for using augmented reality in highways operations. The Board greatly appreciated the vision and knowledge demonstrated by John in his proposal, noted the potential for this technology to reduce costs and improve services, and thanked him for attending the Board meeting. Whilst it is for the market to develop products, there may be a role for HMEP to help raise awareness of innovative practices such as this (without endorsing any one particular commercial product).

4.   <u>Programme Management Proposals</u>

4.1   A number of documents had been circulated prior to the meeting and Atkins highlighted the key issues. On programme design, the major comments received and discussed at the meeting are below. Atkins will modify the documents where necessary (**Action B12.1: Atkins**):

  a) Will it be possible to raise public satisfaction under the severe financial constraints faced by the public sector? It was agreed that customer satisfaction including increasing public awareness of the issues involved and managing expectations would be key issues for the programme and local authorities, and this needed to be reflected in a minor change to the vision statement.
  b) The Design Assurance Group (DAG) would be smaller, and have balanced public - private representation. The Design Assurance Reference Group would provide a pool of expertise that would via engagement with the sector, assess and comment on HMEP proposals, and advise the DAG.
  c) It was agreed that HTMA would be the default representative of the private sector at Board level, though other organisations and representatives could provide input at a project level, and it was noted that they already were in many cases.
  d) The omission of the HMEP Champion was an error and would be rectified. The Board noted that engagement with Andrew Smith had been limited, and more specific tasks should be suggested as he would be key in raising the profile of the programme with groups such as SOLACE.
  e) The HMEP organisational chart would be amended as discussed as it would be needed for a variety of uses and audiences with a more detailed version being available for internal HMEP use.

4.2   It was agreed that as there were no further major issues raised, that the programme would now proceed on the basis of the proposals put forward. Any further comments should be sent to Atkins by Friday 16th December, and as HMEP progressed the structure would be modified as necessary (**Action B12.1: All**).

5.   <u>Engagement and Enabling</u>

5.1   It was agreed that Dana Skelley be formally approached to assist in the Engagement and Enabling work. The development of a practical engagement plan would be the next step for this group when it is reformed.

5.2   The issue of engaging with those authorities who faced significant maintenance challenges, and those who might not necessarily think HMEP was for them, was key. Approaches to such authorities by HMEP would need to be carefully handled, possibly on a sub-national basis, and the peer review process could be a key element of the HMEP 'offer'.

5.3   It was suggested that an article could be produced for the trade press on the recent strengthening of programme's structure, and a briefing for up and coming events including release of the OSD survey results, Elements 2

progress and the pothole reports. It was noted that for the trade press, updates which included specific deliverables such as potholes review progress report may be of more interest than purely covering issues such as programme structure. (**Action B12.2: ML/LM – Potholes progress report to be circulated to Board**).

5.4 Norman Baker had agreed to speak about HMEP at the LTT conference on 21st March and that could provide a good opportunity to refresh interest in the programme and highlight emerging products. The HTMA advised that their annual conference would be held on 1st October 2012. The Board agreed that proposals including specific material and a coordinated communications pack for the promotion of HMEP would be developed for the Engage and Enable group with specific inputs from DfT Strategic Communications and HTMA (**Action B12.3: DH/HD**).

6.   Benefits

6.1 The process for identifying, monitoring and recording benefits was key for the programme, and will help show whether HMEP is delivering the necessary ambition. It is also a key tool for the Design Assurance process.

6.2 The business cases for operational service delivery (OSD) were being reviewed and would be circulated by the end of the current week. These will be dynamic documents that can be developed as a project progresses. If take up is poor they should be able to assist in showing whether products had not delivered the expected benefits and if alternative options were needed.

6.3 Success must not just be through HMEP promoting its own outputs and products, but also promoting other case studies and examples were efficiencies had been delivered. Atkins advised that they were developing a template to capture good practice and this would be circulated to the Programme Assurance Group before comments were sought from the Board and the DAG (**Action B12.4: Atkins**).

7.   Dashboard

7.1 The Board discussed the first dashboard showing the currently available key programme indicators and were content with the format. A full version would be prepared for the meeting on 30th January by the Programme Assurance Group, but it was noted that it would be used for internal purposes only and would need careful handling (**Action B12.5: Atkins/PAG**).

8.   Cook Report on the Highways Agency

8.1 The Board noted the publication of Alan Cook's report on the HA, 'A fresh start for the Strategic Road Network', which made a number of references to how efficiencies could be gained by better links between the Agency and local authorities. The Government will in due course be

responding to the report. It was suggested that the report could be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting when Derek Turner was present.

9.   Project Approvals

WSG 4-1-4 Benchmarking and measurement

9.1   This work was aimed at bringing the survey work of APSE and NHT closer together which could then provide a more comprehensive data set across the country, and greatly assist HMEP identify the areas of greatest benefit. The Board gave initial approval to allow the project to be further developed, particularly around the area of benefits and costs.

WSG 1-1-1 Procurement Route Choices

9.2   There was insufficient time to discuss this proposal in detail. Instead comments from the Board should be returned by Friday 16th December (**Action B12.6: ALL**).

10.   Dates of next meetings:

- Monday 30th January 2012, 10:00, GMH (3/23)
- Monday 19th March 2012, 10:00, GMH (H2)
- Friday 18th May 2012, 10:00, GMH (H3)