

HMEP 2nd Board Meeting: Thursday 16th December, 10:00am, Room 4/09B, Great Minster House

Present: Mostaque Ahmed, DfT (Chair)
Matthew Lugg, Leicestershire CC (Chair WS1)
Jason Russell, Surrey CC (Chair WS2)
Julian Abel, DfT (Chair WS3)
Mike Bordiss, Chair HELG
Paul Hardy, EXP consultancy
Lloyd Miles, DfT (Secretariat)

Notes: To all present plus Andy Bailey, Mike Acheson, Tim Reardon (all DfT).

Actions & Notes

1. General Matters

- a) It was noted that Work Groups and individual streams can be large areas of work, and that Group Chairs had finite time to take them forward. Each group could operate with its own Project Board and own project management resource which the Programme Board agreed in principle could be funded from HMEP funds. (1) Chairs need to outline their proposals and costings for the Programme Board to consider, and (2) JA to review potential for advance payment of associated costs before the HMEP budget becomes live in April 2011 **(ACTION: JA/Group chairs by 26/1/11)**
- b) Other groups need to be involved, including HTMA, HA, TfL, OGC and TAG to understand existing efficiency measures. A scoping exercise of the current efficiency initiatives and how they and other organisations can contribute to HMEP would be undertaken (including whether individuals can participate as work stream leaders or advisers) **(ACTION: LM/ALL by 24/2/11)**

2. LGA engagement and communications with local highway authorities

- c) DfT outlined the outcomes of their discussions with the LGA on 1st December. LGA had proposed a co-Chair arrangement, with Andrew Smith being invited to take that role. LGA were also keen on political representation. This would be discussed in more detail at a later stage. Jo Webb (LGID) would be invited to contribute to Work Group 3 (Communications). **(ACTION: JA to invite Andrew Smith and Jo Webb as agreed, by 21/1/11)**
- d) The method of communication with 150+ highway authorities was key to HMEP and especially with those authorities who were least engaged with the highways community. A sub group would be established with

- e) The Audit Commission to be invited to attend the next Board meeting to discuss progress with their own highways maintenance review and their emerging findings **(ACTION: LM by 7/1/11)**
- f) HTMA's role in HMEP was discussed. They are a key player in the industry and would have a significant role in HMEP as they represented the majority of main suppliers. Options for their role on the Project Board were considered. It was agreed to take up the HTMA offer of representation on the work stream groups. Further thought was required on the role of any non-executive representation on the Programme Board. In the interim, David Hutchinson (HTMA) would be invited as a guest. **(ACTION: JA to write to HTMA by 31/12/10)**

3. Core Documents

- g) One change to the Terms of Reference was agreed, otherwise these could now be finalised (though future revisions could be considered). A complete set would be circulated to all **(ACTION: LM by 7/1/11)**.
- h) The Communications and Post 2013 documents would be managed via separate arrangements, as noted elsewhere.

4. Benchmark/Audit procurement paper

- i) A paper proposing a HMEP benchmark/assessment tool had been circulated. The proposal was to issue an invitation to tender in the coming months for a range of tools which will help authorities assess where they are on the efficiency path and develop a learning programme. **(ACTION: LM to circulate the OGC tool, LM/JR to develop the procurement specification by 24/2/11)**
- j) The assessment tool to cover both capability performance and costs. However, the latter element would be developed later in the programme.
- k) CSS Wales had undertaken an assessment for 20 out of their 22 authorities, which involved self-assessment and a workshop. The HELG performance assessment tool would also be looked at, and any benefits for HMEP identified **(ACTION: MB to circulate HELG tool. PH to circulate CSS assessment tool – by 21/1/11)**.

5. Causes of inefficiency

- l) JR led the discussion, which covered various issues including finding examples of where contracts had failed, identifying both common and unique problems for highways maintenance, obtaining evidence to show how authorities can be more efficient, and the lack of broader skills in the maintenance community, especially commercial **(ACTION: JR to circulate a draft paper for comments)**.

6. Validation of HMEP

- m) Stakeholder engagement was key, and especially identifying how this could best be done and how to achieve 'buy-in'. There were strong links to the communications stream, and presentational issues
(ACTION: JA/MB to take forward by 26/1/11)

6. Progress on Work Stream grids

- n) The action for each Group chair to develop a schedule and cast list had been carried forward from the last meeting and needed to be completed for the January meeting **(ACTION: ML/JR/JA by 26/1/11)**
- o) Each work stream package to have a work stream brief. **(ACTION: Chairs to progress development of work stream briefs by 26/1/11)**

7. Post 2013 structure

- p) The post 2013 structure was a critical element to HMEP, to ensure that the structure would continue post DfT funding. The current phase was in many ways transitional, and a clear way forward would be needed by Autumn 2011.
- q) Comments on the *Post 2013* paper had been received. The paper would be re-circulated for any final comments. **(ACTION: JA initially by 7/1/11 with further comments by ALL by 21/1/11)**

8. AOB & date of next meetings

- r) Document Control: All documents would be referenced – date and version number –to ensure that the latest version was being used.
- s) Next meetings were confirmed as:
- Thursday 26th January 2011, 14:00, GMH
 - Thursday 24th February 2011, 14:00, GMH
 - Tuesday 22nd March, 11:00, GMH

**HMEP
28th March 2011**

Outstanding actions from previous meeting (23rd November)

Content of Work Stream briefs and populating Work Stream briefs

- (i) JR had prepared a *matrix for Group 2* and its work streams. This would be adopted as a framework for the other Work Groups (**ACTION: ALL**).
- (n) On Design Standards, DfT were undertaking some work with Atkins which may be relevant. DfT would advise (**ACTION: LM**).
- (o) On asset accounting treatment, DfT would advise on possible gains through the work being undertaken by CIPFA (**ACTION: JA**).

Evaluation and benefits realisation

- (q) DfT would circulate an outline 'evaluation of benefits framework' before the next meeting. This would cover the Programme and each work group, so would need to be adaptable. Benefits would be cash and non-cash, while also might be applicable beyond the maintenance sector (**ACTION: LM**).
- (s) It was suggested that the RIEPs may have done similar work that could be utilised, while Jim Stevens (Bucks) could be a useful contact (**ACTION: LM**).

Champion and Advocates issues

- (u) DfT confirmed that they were preparing an advocates package that would include key messages and core briefing (**ACTION: LM**).

Programme Communications Strategy (Website, other media opportunities, key messages/briefs, Q&A etc)

- (w) A communications grid would be developed, showing key events and opportunities and who would be best placed to exploit the event (**ACTION: LM**).
- (x) DfT would prepare a paper on the opportunities for a conference/roadshow to promote the HMEP to the maintenance sector, possibly with a third party as sponsor (**ACTION: JA**).
- (z) DfT advised that they were developing an interim website to help promote the HMEP. Links to other websites, plus the core HMEP papers, would be key items (**ACTION: LM**).
- (aa) DfT were also preparing possible articles for Local Transport Today and the LGA's weekly news (**ACTION: JA/LM**).