Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 10th Board Meeting
Wednesday 12th October 2011, 13:30 – 16:30
Room LG2, Great Minster House

<u>Attendees</u>
Mostaque Ahmed   Chair
Matthew Lugg   Chair work stream group 1
Jason Russell   Chair work stream group 2
Julian Abel   Chair work stream group 3
Steve Kent   Chair work stream group 4
David Hutchinson   HTMA
Paul Bird   Chair, Quality Assurance Group
Derek Turner   Highways Agency
Haydn Davies   DfT
James Kaye   DfT Strategic Communications
Kathie Gilley   Atkins
Chris Mulligan   Atkins
Lloyd Miles   HMEP Secretariat

<u>Copies to</u>:   All present plus Andrew Smith (Hampshire), Gary
Thompson (Leicestershire), Sam Cunningham (Surrey) Tim Pemberton, Jane
Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester) and Eamon Lally (Local Government
Group).

Notes & Actions

1.   <u>Note of 9th Board meeting on 12th September 2011</u>

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

2.   <u>HMEP Vision</u>

2.1   Atkins gave a quick overview of the outcomes from the second vision
workshop held on 16th September, as per their Output document. It was
requested that the outputs of the two workshops are combined into a
comprehensive pack and a summary slide be produced to enable Board
members to articulate the vision and the guiding principles of HMEP. It was
noted that the audience for this amended programme vision is those involved
in HMEP – it will therefore need to be suitably tailored for wider external
audiences to have maximum effect. It was also suggested that the words "By
2018" need to caveated with the message that we also expect to see
significant progress before this date. Otherwise the Board were content with
the HMEP vision and guiding principles as now documented.

3.   <u>Programme Review</u>

3.1   Atkins gave a presentation and overview of their emerging thoughts on
HMEP programme management following discussions with a number of
people. Their priority areas, as per the brief, were programme and change
management. Atkins noted that the Programme had made a rapid start,
generating goodwill across the sector and had built considerable momentum.

The suggestions for further improvement therefore need to be seen in that light.

3.2   The principal areas that Atkins had identified included programme design and outline, key issues & baseline documentation and benefits realisation. These would ensure that the programme had the right level of control and governance which would provide ongoing assurance that HMEP was delivering on the stated objectives. Mostaque emphasised the importance of workstream chairs ensuring that their project managers provide management information on a timely basis to Lloyd and Atkins. **Action 10.1: Workstream chairs to ensure that their project managers have provided Lloyd with the previously requested baseline information by 24 October.**

3.3   Atkins proposed a three stage process for HMEP's programme design (1) the design gateway (voice of the customer), (2) product development and (3) engagement. This would create a cycle of product identification and implementation, but also ensure that HMEP was delivering the right products to the sector.

3.4   The Board discussed the need for proportionality in any new proposals – greater central coordination in some areas would bring clear benefits but there was also a need to guard against creating excessive requirements from the centre and overly complex structures that might stifle innovation and pace in the workstreams. The terms and language used may also need adjusting in places to avoid misinterpretation.

3.5   The issue of ensuring that the programme continues to convey the appropriate level of ambition was raised. Linked to this is the need to provide a greater focus on benefits realisation, which is a complex area. It was preferable to have clear financial benefits articulated from the outset for all product development. However, for some interventions it was recognised that the benefits may not be easy to quantify at early stages and so an exclusive focus on quantifiable benefits could exclude some worthwhile options which have wider, less-tangible benefits. The Design Gateway would therefore need to consider how to handle this when reviewing business cases.

3.6   There was some discussion about whether HMEP should only be promoting products developed by HMEP workstreams or, additionally, pointing to wider best practice examples that already exist in the sector. It was noted that one of the key guiding principles agreed at the visioning workshop was: "identifying what already exists and finding practical examples of real-life improvements and success stories that demonstrate value to the end customer".

3.7   To date HMEP has largely focused on its own workstreams and there was some discussion of how existing examples of good practice can also be identified and promoted. As well as local authority examples, lessons could also be learned from the wider highways sector - HA Area 3 had many positive elements that could be applied more broadly. Engagement with the whole sector – authorities, industry and other organisations – was critical at all

stages of HMEP in order to identify existing sector best practice as well as maximise take-up of new products developed through HMEP.

3.8   Positive engagement with those not currently involved with HMEP, but who had expressed a desire to demonstrate and develop products or get involved in some other way, was also crucial. But this needed to be handled sensitively as further examination of case studies could reveal that claimed benefits were not so easily substantiated. Also, WSG teams and timelines could not always accommodate all who currently wanted to have an input, so at the programme level we need to think about ways of keeping interested parties engaged within the resources available.

3.9   Other key issues included succession planning, as the contribution individuals and organisations could make to HMEP would inevitably be limited by resources, and a managed turn-over would be needed to ensure that the programme retained momentum and developed a natural diversity. **Action 10.2: DfT and Atkins to meet to discuss emerging proposals for strengthening programme management and taking forward other outputs from the visioning workshop. Proposals would then be put forward to the Programme Board for agreement.**

4.   HMEP engagement with HA

4.1   DT advised that he would act as a gateway for HMEP engagement with the HA to ensure effective coordination and commitment from the HA.

4.2   DT handed out a presentation on existing and future HA frameworks that are available for use by LAs. DT talked through the main points in the presentation, with a particular focus on the new Asset Support Framework.

4.3   The Board welcomed the HA's commitment to engagement with the HMEP, noting the benefits to both local authorities and HA.

5.   Quality Assurance Group – Emerging options

5.1   A second meeting of the QAG had been held on 28th September and PB gave a brief overview on the developing proposals. The QAG's role was an emerging one, and much of the discussion in item 3 above about the design gateway and 'customer voice' would impact on its final role. But it was key that it did not become a burden or barrier to developing efficiency products and instead helped ensure that HMEP delivered its vision. **Action 10.3: DfT, Paul Bird and Atkins to develop a revised terms of reference for the group for agreement by the Board.**

6.   Workstream updates

WSG1 – Operational Service Delivery

6.1   Survey: ML gave a presentation on the response to their survey. Over 44% of authorities had responded in some form, and WSG1 were now encouraging the remainder to complete the survey where relevant. Some of the findings would be relevant to other workstreams.

6.2   Pothole Review: ML gave a presentation on the process adopted and emerging issues. The handling of the publication of the interim report would need to be agreed.

6.3   Asset Management Training: WSG1 were making progress with CIHT regarding the development of this brief.

6.4   Management of drainage assets: The Board considered WSG1's request for final approval of this proposal. After considering how this should be handled following the earlier programme discussions, it was agreed that some transitional arrangements may be required for this and other ongoing projects, but Board approval was given subject to commitment to strengthen the benefits realisation section of the business case.

6.5   UKRLG had also expressed a desire to develop a link with WSG1 regarding the asset management projects and ML would be taking this forward **(Action 10.4)**.

WSG2 – Business Improvement

6.6   WSG2 advised that they were focussing on two pilots, Manchester and the SE7. Building on the National Change Agent Programme in the housing sector WSG2 were looking at supply chain issues, and an initial event had been held with all the SE7 authorities and suppliers.

6.7   Despite fears that insufficient authorities would be interested, WSG2 now potentially had more requests than they could resource, so some prioritisation would be needed. Emerging issues include the need for a strong will across all the authorities and key personnel to pursue these types of arrangements, while stakeholder management was very intensive. Key outcome for WSG2 would be a methodology with lessons learnt that could be followed by other groups.

WSG4 – Benchmarking and data management

6.8   Engagement has been identified as a key area, and WSG4 had been attempting to map how authorities reported their maintenance data. Three core groups – NHT, APSE and LOTAG – had been identified, while WSG4 were also looking at how the NHT work on cost, quality and customer benchmarking could be adopted as a sector wide standard. WSG had developed a number of proposals but identifying financial benefits regarding this work would not be easy. **Action 10.4: WSG4 to refine proposals on surveys and CQC and resubmit to the Board for consideration**.

7.   <u>AOB</u>

7.1   HMEP had sponsored the NHT conference held on Monday 10th October, and provided the prize money for their innovation competition. The winner was John Gates from Norfolk County Council who developed an outline of using GIS and other data via portable computers to provide augmented reality regarding highways. As previously decided the winner

would be invited to attend a Board meeting and present his proposal **(Action 10.6)**.

8.   <u>Dates of next meetings:</u>

- Friday 11th November, 09:30, GMH (3/23)
- Tuesday 6th December, 13:30, GMH (H5)
- Monday 30th January 2012, 10:00, GMH (3/23)
- Monday 19th March 2012, 10:00, GMH (H4)

HMEP