

## Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 22<sup>nd</sup> Board Meeting Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013, Great Minster House

### Attendees

Stephen Fidler	<i>Chair, DfT</i>	Matthew Lugg OBE	<i>Mouchel / DfT</i>
Jason Russell	<i>Surrey CC</i>	Steve Kent	<i>Cheshire W &amp; Chester</i>
David Grunwell	<i>Highways Agency</i>	Tony Gates	<i>HTMA</i>
Haydn Davies	<i>DfT</i>	Dana Skelley	<i>Transport for London</i>
Geoff Allister	<i>HTMA</i>	Paul Bird	<i>Essex CC</i>
Sam Cunningham	<i>Surrey CC</i>	Sue Percy	<i>CIHT</i>
Philip Dyer	<i>Atkins</i>	Nicky Bruncker	<i>Atkins</i>
Andrew Hughill	<i>Atkins</i>		

### Apologies

Eamon Lally            *LGA*

Distribution: All present and apologies, plus Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), Vicki Trust (Surrey), Steve Berry (DfT) and Design Assurance Group (DAG) members.

### Agenda

#### 1. **Introductions**

1.1 Introductions were made.

#### 2. **Note from 21<sup>st</sup> Board meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013**

2.1 These were agreed and have been published on HMEP website.

2.2 Action B21-1 to identify nominees for the Design Assurance Group (DAG) had been completed. The HTMA had put forward two additional members (and one substitute/deputy):

- Richard Chinn – Mott McDonald
- Peter McDermott – C2MH
- Substitute/Deputy - Matt Stacey – BAM Nuttall

DAG would need to formally accept these nominations at its meeting on 6 September (**Action B22-1 HD/Paul Bird**).

2.3 Action B21-5 to engage more directly and co-ordinate efforts with AIA/RACF/ADEPT etc. A meeting of representatives from HMEP/AIA/ADEPT/DfT had been held where a willingness progress joint use of the ALARM survey results was expressed, including analysing and using the specific HMEP questions included in 2013, and any survey changes for 2014. It was recognised that all four organisations had different priorities and there would always be some need for separation regarding the survey and the messages when its findings are published. The AIA also offered to support other appropriate research. The HTMA also reported that they had had a meeting with the AIA.

All other actions had either been completed or if not would be raised within the meeting's agenda

### **3. Programme Dashboard**

3.1 An updated version of the Programme Dashboard was not available.

### **4. Benefits**

4.1 PD gave an update on the latest benefits dashboard. The main reason for the overall downward adjustment was because a common baseline for LA's highways maintenance spending had been adopted across all projects.

4.2 It was noted that HMEP at both project and programme level still demonstrates very robust value for money in terms of benefit cost ratio. It was accepted that it was hard to quantify in monetary terms the benefits of projects that principally had an enabling function.

4.3 The need to refresh business cases annually was seen as desirable. As important was having a robust information on savings achieved by use of products and on how many LAs (or their contractors) were using the products. Atkins reminded the meeting that a toolkit for users to capture benefits is available

4.4 The deep dive review of three projects had now been completed. Atkins would circulate to the Board the outcome of the reviews (**Action B22-2 PD**).

4.4 It was agreed that the Board would revisit the suggested benefits monitoring service once the reports of the three deep-dive reviews had been considered. It was considered important to avoid the benefits monitoring service absorbing an inappropriate amount of programme support resource.

### **5. Refreshing HMEP for 2013/14 & 2014/15**

5.1 The outcomes from this session are the subject of a separate note and follow-up actions.

### **6. Programme Support**

6.1 JR explained the outcome of the competitive process undertaken by Surrey CC to procure a new call-off contract for programme support. The new contract for programme support had been won by Atkins. It should be noted that Atkins will have to prepare costed proposals for packages of work under the contract. The nature of the packages will be largely based on the outcomes of the 'Refreshing HMEP' session and its follow-up actions.

### **7. Projects requiring decision or for information update**

7.1 JR explained the outcome of the competitive process undertaken by Surrey CC to procure a new call-off contract for programme support. The new contract for programme support had been won by Atkins. The following projects, and respective DAG recommendations or observations, were considered.

## 7.2 Business Change (Sponsor: JR) - Update

7.2.1 PD explained that in the short-term the 3 regions that had been approached seeking views on what business change support they wanted, only the NE had made a clear request. The East and NW were not sufficiently advanced as potential regional or other alliances, to formulate a clear request for support.

7.2.2 ML indicated that the West Midlands was now a region potentially seeking HMEP business change (or other) support as its original funding from another source was exhausted. This presented an opportunity to better align HMEP with the West Midlands Highways Alliance. He also said that the SW had requested support.

7.2.3 It was agreed that the longer term direction of this project would now be significantly influenced by the outcome of the Refreshing HMEP Session and its follow up actions. It would therefore probably need to be reconfigured and then be reconsidered by Board via DAG (**Action B22-3 JR/PD**).

## 7.3 Good Practice Network (Sponsor: SK) – Gateway 1 to Design

7.3.1 SK explained that following comments on the proposal from the DAG meeting on 21 June, Atkins had arranged a meeting with Measures2 Improve, who work on behalf of the National Highways and Transportation Network (NHT) and The Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE). The primary purpose of the meeting was to meet the request from DAG to ensure that the proposal complimented rather than duplicated the wider HMEP programme. A secondary purpose was to ensure that the project better complemented the activities of the Engage & Enable Group.

7.3.2 There had been some difficulties following the meeting, possibly as a result of a misunderstanding. SK agreed that he would liaise with the parties involved (M2I-NHT/APSE/Atkins) to resolve these difficulties and would circulate a revised Gateway 1 proposal to DAG. It was noted that this would extend the timescale for progressing this proposal, but given the wider refresh of HMEP taking place this was not considered to represent a significant risk to the programme (**Action B22-4 SK**).

## 7.4 Client – Service Provider Collaboration Toolkit (Project Sponsor: TG): Gateway 2 to Early Enabler

7.4.1 Subject to the correction of some minor typographical errors and ensuring the document complied with the accessibility requirements of

public body websites, the Toolkit would be made available via the HMEP website. (**Action B22-5: TG then DfT**).

## 8. Any Other Business

### Strategic Review

- 8.1 The Strategic Review (SR) project was discussed,. JR and PD confirmed that four pilots had been completed (Surrey, Blackpool, Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire, albeit the action planning day was outstanding for Cambs). Northumberland was next, and the sixth one had been delayed. The methodology developed based on the LGA model was considered sound. The LGA had been asked to be the delivery agent for future SRs, potentially via a service level agreement. The cost charged by LGA to provide a review is c £10 per review
- 8.2 There is a lot in interest from LAs in having a review, but there is for instance a need to build up the pool of peer reviewers in particular. The LGA is also likely to have similar resource limitations. This would suggest that currently there is only capacity for about 5 a year. It was suggested that a condition of having a review is that you'll subsequently provide a peer reviewer.
- 8.3 It was suggested that HMEP and LGA publicise service to gauge demand. The question remained as to whether HMEP should fund wholly or in part the cost of reviews.
- 8.4 JR asked for nominations for potential peer reviewers, including portfolio holders (**Action B22-6: All to JR**).

### Agenda Items for Next Board

- 8.5 The following items were suggested:
  - I. Strategic Review (JR)
  - II. Annual Plan (HD & Atkins) – related to Refreshing HMEP Session and follow-up action
  - III. Segmentation of Local Authority Market for HMEP Purposes (Sponsor Needed)
  - IV. Credibility and Evidence Base (Atkins)

## 9. Dates of next meetings

- Friday 18<sup>th</sup> October, 10:00, GMH
- Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> November, 10:00, GMH