

Kick off-meeting logistics

Meeting No and Title:	1. Workload volumes		
Date	08/06/2017	Location	EY Office Birmingham – CR6
Start Time	10:00am	End Time	12:00pm
Attendees	Apologies		Tentative/Unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		None
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

Workshop logistics

Date & Time	14/06/2017 10am – 5pm	Location	Brindley Room, 11 th Floor, The Cube, Birmingham
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		
Objective	To agree workload volumes for RIP/Ops RtM		
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All inputs provided on time • Full attendance and engagement • All data received is accurate 		

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	Which RIS1 schemes are within the scope of the Design Partner contracts?
2	What is the latest forecast for levels of RIS2 spend / activity within each of the regions?
3	What is the likely volume of Operations schemes in each region for RIS1 and RIS2?
4	How will the Operations schemes be programmed to evidence forward workload?
5	What is the projected spend for LA works? What has been sourced by LA's within HE to date?

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	RIS1 Analysis - Schemes to be delivered within RtM by region, value, time, PCF stage	█	12/06/17 COP
2	Volume from OD for RIS1 and RIS2 by region, value, time	█	12/06/17 COP
3	Volume for LA works for RIS1 and RIS2	█	12/06/17 COP
4	RIS2 input from Capital Planning Team by region, value, time, PCF stage	█	12/06/17 COP

All inputs to be sent to: **Lizz Robinson by COP Monday 12/06/17**

All inputs to be collated and distributed by: **Saavan Thakrar Tuesday 13/06/17 Middy**

Expected Outputs from Workshop			
1	Understanding of work volumes and values from contract award to RIP and OD for RIS1 by region		
2	Agreed assumptions for RIS2 overall spend by region		
3	Agreed assumptions for RIS2 spending profile by region		
4	Delivery profile per region across the 8 years that then informs tenders		
5	Data for Workshop 2,3 & 4		
Outputs required for			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracting Strategy Packaging Strategy Data Room Req's Commercial Strategy Supplier Dev Plan Contract and Works Information Procurement Strategy 			
Follow Up Actions:		Owner	Due Date
1	█ to follow up on appropriate contact for all Local Authority related queries to understand potential LA requirements	█	12/06/17
2	█ to follow up with █ on Local Authority contact to understand potential LA requirements	█	12/06/17
3	█ to contact and update Kieran Rix on outcome of kick-off meeting 1 to seek from him	█	12/06/17

4	██████ to contact ██████ in order to update supplier segmentation to reflect RIP/Ops	██	12/06/17
5	██████ to clarify whether 'DP' denotes 'Delivery Partner' or 'Design Partner'	██	12/06/17
6	██████ to check accepted attendees prior to workshop	██	12/06/17
7	██████ to chase ██████ for a name from SCD	██	12/06/17
Meeting discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ██████ Key risk for the programme is the sign-off of decisions. Workshop pack should be circulated to everyone in RtM so people are aware of which sign-off is required and by when. This is especially important since the DDWs are only taking place once and it is therefore critical that decisions are made on time. • ██████ Consensus is unlikely to be reached at all of the workshops, especially on the commercial side. Contingency time should therefore be built in to the plan. • ██████ Alignment is required with the commercial team; the workshop plan assumes all teams are aligned and agree on decisions, which may not be the case. • ██████ Clarity is required on how the current workload volume figures have been calculated. The figures need to be tested and updated. A view of the PCF stage is required within the analysis. • ██████ It is important to understand the level of detail required in each contract, otherwise the new structure may end up similar to CDF. • ██████ There may be issues with local authorities if they are reluctant to use RtM. Without early engagement they are likely to use their own procurement vehicles. • ██████ 'Timing profile' refers to the delivery profile (across the 8 years), which will then inform the tender profile. 			

Meeting No and Title:	2. Contract Scope		
Date	08/06/2017	Location	Turner & Townsend, 45 Church Street, Birmingham
Start Time	14:00pm	End Time	15:30pm
Attendees	Apologies	Tentative/Unknown	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 	None	
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

Date & Time	15/06/2017	Location	Room 10-CR3A, Atkins, The Axis, 10 Holliday St, Birmingham B1 1TF
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		
Objective	To agree the contract scope for RIP/Ops RtM		

Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All inputs provided on time • All data received is accurate • Full attendance and engagement at the workshop
--------------------	--

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	What is the scope of works of the different contracts?
2	What type of contracts will be used?
3	Scenario testing for all PCF stages regarding the design partner
4	What is the scope of any incumbent or existing designers?
5	How do we address legacy schemes and contracts?
6	How will the design partners contractually work with the construction partners?
7	Will contracts be available to Local Authorities?
8	How will there be access to assets to carry out necessary surveys?
9	How are the following new relationships being procured: I. Development Designers? II. Programme Support Partner?
10	How will we ensure that the timing of all procurements aligns?
11	How will the product management be aligned to RtM?
12	What support is required from contractors and specialist during options phase?
13	Why aren't HE engaging contractors from inception?

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	Updated PCF	██████████ (HE)/OH	13/06/17 12:00pm
2	Understanding of CDF lessons Identified	N/A	13/06/17 12:00pm
3	Output from Workshop 1	████	13/06/17 12:00pm
4	Existing contracting terms for design work ongoing	████	13/06/17 12:00pm

All inputs to be sent to: **Ola Haidar by COP Tuesday 13/06/17**

All inputs to be collated and distributed by: **Saavan Thakrar Wednesday 14/06/17 Midday**

	Expected Outputs from Workshop
1	Agreed scope of Design
2	Agreed scope of Client
3	Agreed scope of Construction
4	Agreed scope of Development
5	Scope of ECI (e.g. Design Partner accountable for Outline Design, etc.)

6	Scope document strategy
7	Handover Strategy
Outputs required for	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracting Strategy • Technical Specification • Performance Management Specification • Supplier Dev Plan • Transition Plan 	

Meeting discussion:

- [REDACTED] Definition of the contract scope needs to reflect the fact that this is a live project and therefore we need to clearly map the transaction against different scenarios (i.e. current scheme pipeline and in which PCF stages they are). Schemes need to be categorised based on maturity to determine how the new contracting model will enable with delivery of these schemes – need a transition plan that describes how the contract will operate on a scheme by scheme basis, for RIS1 schemes but also for schemes that are not within the project lifecycle yet.
- [REDACTED] There is no requirement under CDF for novation of designs. Need to address concern that the new operating model may lead to ‘forced marriages’ between suppliers; as was the case under CDF. Note: Need to consider CDF lessons identified.
- There was agreement around the room that the new operating model put forward as preferred model within the SOBC will require further detailed design. Part of the purpose of the workshops is to finalise the operating model prior to formation of the OBC.
- [REDACTED] there needs to be a balance between taking feedback from supplier engagement day and HE’s interest, HE. Enough risks need to be identified prior to engaging suppliers.
- [REDACTED] Engagement with specialists should be mapped out (who we are engaging with, why & when)
- During the contract scope workshop no.2, there is a need to understand what scope client is retaining in order to assess whether it makes sense to transfer some of these to suppliers.

Kick off-meeting logistics

Meeting No and Title:	3. Partnership model		
Date	08/06/2017	Location	Turner & Townsend, 45 Church Street, Birmingham
Start Time	15:30pm	End Time	17:00pm
Attendees	Apologies		Tentative/Unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• [REDACTED]• [REDACTED]		None
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introductions2. Background and context3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made)4. Confirm expected outputs5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates)6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW)7. Confirm workshop date and location		

Workshop logistics

Date & Time	20/06/2017	Location	Bedford (TBC)
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		
Objective	To agree on the Partnership model for RIP/Ops RtM		

Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All inputs provided on time • All data received is accurate • Full attendance and engagement at the workshop
--------------------	--

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	What are we contracting for on Day 1?
2	Is novation or nomination preferred and in which scenarios?
3	Is there any benefit to JV's at Construction? What are the risks/benefits?
4	Do we want to consider project based insurance?
5	In what circumstances will a contractor be able to appoint their own designers as opposed to novation/nomination?
6	What is the best approach for meeting the objectives for RtM?
7	Can we deal with uncertain workload? If so, how?
8	How does the model accommodate for change in volumes due to under-performance within regions?
9	How does the model recognise the varying maturity of schemes within PCF?
10	How does work get allocated between partners based on performance?
11	How do undefined schemes get allocated?
12	How do we appoint a D&B contract where we are nominating a designer, but this has not been done yet (day 1)?
13	How do we contract with T2/3 (category Management)?

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	Project insurance	●	16/06/2017
2	Paper on JVs	●	16/06/2017
3	Paper on novation	●	16/06/2017
3	Awareness of Major clients research report	●	20/06/2017
4	Industry knowledge (IPA, etc.)	●	20/06/2017
5	Output from workshops 1 & 2	●	16/07/2017
6	Overarching value and spend profile for each region (for RIS1/2) based on output of workshop 1	●	19/07/2017
7	OJEU Legislation around uncertain workload	●	16/06/2017
8	Scenario contract model visual	● ●	16/06/2017

All inputs to be sent to: **Ola Haidar by 16/05/2017**

All inputs to be collated and distributed by: **Saavan Thakrar by 19/06/2017**

Expected Outputs from Workshop	
1	Agreed Contract model
2	Agreed interfaces
3	Agreed change management protocol

4	Approach to transition
5	Recommendation on JVs to SRO
6	Test against Supplier Market
Outputs required for	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Packaging Strategy • Performance Management Specification • Supplier Dev Plan 	

Follow Up Actions:		Owner	Due Date
1	██████████ to circulate lessons identified and major client research documents to workshop attendees	██████	13/06/17
2	██████████ to contact BLP (regarding research OJEU legislation prior to workshop)	██████	13/06/17
Meeting discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus around the room was that the workshop may need to be split into two workshops. Furthermore, the packaging element of the workshop may be better placed in workshop 1. Workshop 1 content amended accordingly and attendees notified of the changed. • Agreement was reached that a 'transition plan' is unlikely to be delivered as an output from the workshop. The output was changed to 'approach to transition'. 			

Kick off-meeting logistics

Meeting No and Title:	5. Ops Integration and role of CWF		
Date	08/06/2017	Location	The Cube Birmingham
Start Time	15:00pm	End Time	17:00pm
Attendees	Apologies		Tentative/Unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		None
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

Workshop logistics

Date & Time	21/06/2017	Location	Bedford (Ash – 1 st Floor)
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		
Objective	To agree fundamental Operations considerations for inclusion in the RIP/Ops RtM model		
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All inputs provided on time • All data received is accurate • Full attendance and engagement at the workshop 		

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	How will the governance of unplanned works be managed to determine the optimal procurement route?
2	What are the key decision points that inform this governance process?
3	What supporting data is required to support the apportionment of unplanned capital works between MP/Ops?
4	How will “designing for maintenance” be integrated into the development process for MP schemes?
5	How can the Whole Life Cost estimating process be improved?
6	How can Ops Area teams / HE Ops Asset Managers / M&R Contractors be integrated into the development process?
7	How can Technical Surveys and Testing, sitting within CWF, be leveraged across MP schemes, prior to PCF Stage 5 (detailed design) to reduce contract risk?
8	What provisions need to be made to allow an existing regional MP Term Contract arrangement to accommodate unplanned capital maintenance?

Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1 Pre-workshop Minutes	●	16/06/2017
2 Preparatory unplanned capital maintenance governance doc	●	20/06/2017
3 Asset Management Plan	●	16/06/2017

All inputs to be sent to: **Caleb Butler by 20/05/2017**

All inputs to be collated and distributed by: **Piero Romoli by 20/06/2017**

Expected Outputs from Workshop			
1	Agreed Contract model		
2	Agreed interfaces		
3	Agreed change management protocol		
4	Approach to transition		
5	Recommendation on JVs to SRO		
6	Test against Supplier Market		
Outputs required for			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Packaging Strategy• Performance Management Specification• Supplier Dev Plan			
Follow Up Actions:		Owner	Due Date
1	██████████ to circulate preparatory unplanned capital maintenance governance document for comment.	OH	16/06/17
Meeting discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explain obligation on designers to recognise whole life cost scenarios under existing contracts, however agreed a WLC position would be better developed with the inclusion of asset manager/Ops designer/M&R contractor input.• Agreed that a mechanism to vary an existing scope of work to accommodate unplanned maintenance needs to be considered.• Advised consideration of a payment mechanism that facilitates the procurement of specialist Ops M&R contractor input on a time charge basis to support design development.• Advised that a governance process to support the appropriation of capital maintenance works across the portfolio needs to include decision points that map back to fundamental design principles stated in the SOR.			

- Agreed the need to provide broader/ease of access access to Technical Surveys and Testing, currently positioned in CWF model – must consider the scenario where TST services wish to be purchased in an area not currently served by a CWF arrangement.

I- Commercial framework – Workshop no.6:

1. Incentivise mechanism:

- What do we want to incentivise and how will this be practically applied?
- Do we want to incentivize at program level (the group of schemes included in a given contract)? If so, do we want a Program Level Incentive Fund? – **Action: Ask [redacted] whether we can incentivise on a program level (across suppliers) given that it is a contract, not a framework?**
- Building on the previous answer, how will a contractor be incentivised to share best practice across the RIP program? Do we create a community? How would it look like?
- Will there be a specific commercial incentive (e.g. savings based on innovation) or are we only adopting performance management specs?
- The SOBC references windfall gain during stages 0-2: Do we want to incentivize designers during optioneering? Do we incentivize designers and contractors separately? Do we want to incentivise suppliers during development phase? Should the development phase have pain/gain share to create commercial tension?
- How should the incentive model assure HE objectives or license requirements? (i.e. current schemes estimates could be above levels of funds available to HE – pre/post efficiency level).
- Which scheme cost do we want to incentivize the supplier against (e.g. employer's risk, inflation, stats, etc.) How will an incentive model assure efficiency targets? How are efficiencies measured and reported? Do we want to incentivize savings, or do they need to be demonstrable and linked to an efficiencies register? How do we incentivize against savings (against the budget scheme) and against efficiencies?
- How will scheme budgets recognize whole life cost?
- Key question: how do we want the performance management framework to inform the incentive model?
- Should performance scores influence pain/gain model or are they independent from the incentive mechanism but inform future allocation of work?
- What do we mean by setting a lump sum fee and how do we set it?
- How should the incentive model recognize the transition plan? How would the different stages of the scheme be considered? At what point does a development phase incentive become a requirement? (e.g. if a scheme is in stage 4, is it meaningful to incentivize?)
- Do we need to separately incentivize time? LDs? Is there a benefit in increase in gain share for early delivery?

Payment mechanism

- Key question: do we aspire to pay actual cost or do we want to fix some rates deemed to be costs?
- What is the timing for any incentives becoming due? How is perceived gain drawn down on?
- Will we pay for co-location during the development phase (between supplier and contractor)? How will co-location cost be reimbursed if HE is paying for it?
- If the fee is a lump sum, when do we draw down on it? Is that post NTP?
- Over and above co-location, how should contractors and designer recover cost (fee, OH)?
- What ceiling rate would we look to ascertain during tender assessment and award? Do we mirror CDF ceiling rate? What's the indexation strategy?
- How will we pay tier 2s? Do we need to specify some flow down obligations?
- Need to specific requirement for Project Bank Account
- Do we want an earned value based mechanism? Do we need to include PDP requirements?

- Shall we use the HE bespoke schedule of cost components or do we develop a new one?
- What level of detail we need with invoices/application for payment?
- Will the designer be treated as principal designer or as a subcontractor? Are they paid in accordance with the schedule of cost component? Recognising associated companies and not paying fee on fee?
- Do we request performance security (bonds etc.)? What insurances do we request?

Change management

- Will be mainly a function of the incentive model and partnership model
- How will we define the scheme budgets? – needs to be linked to governance
- Would we want to change the elements that we include in the scheme budget pre and post NTP? Is it worth keeping inflation excluded and transfer risk again at NTP? (*note: although it does complicate incentive model*)
- Protocol for incorporating schemes
- What are we doing with clause 60.1 (CEs), are we adjusting scheme budgets and /or total price?
- Can we have additional compensation events recorded at NTP as it would be a change to 60.1?
- Will the fee get adjusted for CEs? Are we only fixing the fee against the defined cost?

Commercial management and reporting

What commercial reporting requirements are required during the development, phase, option phase and construction phase? What frequency? Criteria: performance, cost, program?

Financial assessment

- Are sample schemes essential? HE working principle is no...
- What commercial elements of the submission can create any meaningful and sustainable commercial tension?
- If JVs are allowed, it needs to be documented in the contract how they are allowed to operate.
- NTP gateways requirements clearly set out in ITT?

II- Performance management – no.7:

- Are we using CPF? If yes, how do we adapt it?
- Should performance management be at scheme level or program level?
- Will there be KPIs? Will KPIs will be used to allocate future work? Are we using performance for future award? If yes, can we do that from an OJEU perspective? How is replacement assessed? Is it done through the project incentive level mechanism? When would poor performance preclude an existing contractor from undertaking future work?
- Requirement for sharing best practice/performance across the programme? Can we measure performance in a pan-region approach?
- How can the performance management assure specific commercial and design products during delivery?
- Intervals of performance assessment?
- How will performance criteria be re-assessed?
- How do we measure performance of the designer that is being novated? Or are we simply measuring the contractor's performance through the D&B?

Miscellaneous:

Category management: when will the pavement framework be awarded? Is it going to be allocated work? What requirements need to be included in the ITT? Timeframes? Would be have the rates agreed with the pavement contractor?

Kick off-meeting logistics

Meeting No and Title:	Kick-off meeting 8: HE Operating Model		
Date	22/06/2017	Location	EY Birmingham – MR1
Start Time	11:30AM	End Time	13:30PM
Attendees	Apologies		Tentative/Unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

Workshop logistics

Date & Time	06/07/2017 10:00AM-17:00PM	Location	EY 1 Colemore Sq
Attendees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] 		
Objective	To understand alignment required between PDP op model & RIP/Ops solution and capability deficit within HE		
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All inputs provided on time • All data received is accurate • Full attendance and engagement at the workshop 		

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	What is the output from the PDP and how do we incorporate it into RtM?
2	What are the capabilities required for management of the RtM contract?
3	What are the resource expectations for contract management?
4	How will the regional split of DP's be replicated within HE?
5	What is the role of HE with the suppliers? What are the "touch points"?
6	What is the behavioural change required for successful application of RtM?
7	How will HE need to strategically change to adapt to the RtM contract?
8	What is the regular communication and engagement required between RtM & PDP?

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	CDF Remaining Spend Analysis (SOBC phase) – Possibility of removal due to commercially sensitive information.	█	03/07/2017
2	Statement of Requirements (SOBC phase)	█	03/07/2017
3	Output Workshops 1 – 5	█	03/07/2017
4	RtM / PDP model overlay	█	03/07/2017
5	SA4 Draft version of RIP operating model	█	03/07/2017
6	SA3 Capability deliverables	█	03/07/2017
7	Lessons learned from CDF and Major Project Research	█	03/07/2017

All inputs to be sent to:

Expected Outputs from Workshop	
1	Alignment of PDP Operating Model with proposed RIP-Ops Routes to Market solution
2	Understanding capability deficit (existing vs. forecast)
3	Technology considerations for WI (systems)
Outputs required for	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HE Target Operating Model Capability Assessment HE Business Transformation Strategy 	

Follow Up Actions:		Owner	Due Date
1	█ to provide output from the capability workstream	█	03/07/2017
2	█ team to overlay RIP services in PDP op model with RtM model to understand overlap	█	03/07/2017
Meeting discussion:			

- [REDACTED] Provided an overview of RtM and the SOBC & SOR stage. Explained the necessity for RtM to align with PDP.
- [REDACTED] Explained that the PDP RIP Op model has been shared with RtM, but explained that cautioned had been expressed when using this as a basis for formal decision making as the model had not yet been signed off by HE leadership.
- [REDACTED] Explained the aim for the workshop which is to understand what the PDP have done and how we can use that information to inform the RtM approach & solution development.
- [REDACTED] Explained how the op model was created and assessed within PDP, having started in October 16, the process technical completed in March 17:
 - SMP have signed off the Model; RIP have not officially signed it off (awaiting confirmation from David Haimes, RIP Programme Director). However, there is very little difference in content between the SMP & RIP op models.
 - An overarching 'design service' for all Major Projects was initially floated as an idea; however this was not adopted as HE stated the need for greater control within each programme. Therefore within the op model there is some duplication in governance, controls etc. between SMP & RIP.
 - An opportunity for synergies between SMP & RIP has been identified e.g. using the same supplier for design of SMP & RIP projects [REDACTED] Confirmed this had also been identified through the RtM programme, however received feedback that this would prove inappropriate given how different the design work for each programme is; HE advised few synergies would materialise)
 - Each MP has a 'service catalogue', grouped under 'functional blocks'. Within each service the People, Organisation, Process, Information Technology requirements are considered.
 - The model only looks at HE activities, not supplier/contractor activities. Where an activity is outsourced, the Model activity refers to the management, by HE, of that activity.
 - The Model largely aligns with HE's organisational structure.
 - A key design principle for the Model was to manage services within HE as much as possible, rather than to engage in outsourcing.
- [REDACTED] Explained that not all of the services highlighted (red) within the op model currently exist.
- [REDACTED] Explained that PDP have conducted a service maturity assessment for all services within the Model and ranked them from 1-5. Furthermore, each service has been ranked by the HE Exec. (<6 months, 6-12 months, >12 months) according to the priority for service improvement, to inform make-buy decisions.
- [REDACTED] Highlighted that having 'national design services' & 'regional design services' for RIP within the op model may result in duplication given the description of the services provided; Furthermore, in the new op model there seems to be a single PMO for RIP; however, there are currently regional PMOs in place. These inconsistencies need to be worked through in order better understand how the RtM solution can be informed by the work that has resulted in the Model shown.
- [REDACTED] Explained that a 'POPIT' (processes, outputs, people, inputs, technology) for RIP services has not been developed yet; further confirmation was provided that in some cases duplication of functions is to support security of supply [REDACTED] Agreed that this would be useful to have to understand what needs to go into the Works Information).
- [REDACTED] Explained that the PDP Model for RIP can feed into RtM's understanding of what the RtM Programme Support function will look like; for consistency we should try to align with PDP in terms of the language we use for each of the services within this function.
- [REDACTED] Highlighted the requirement to have an understanding of the **capability** required to deliver each of the services in the Model: currently RtM does not have this view.
- [REDACTED] Explained that a piece of work is being done by PDP to understand capability and skills of resource within MP. SA3 is looking at the skills gap between current resources and resources required under the desired op model (to be confirmed with David McNerney).
- [REDACTED] Suggested key contacts for further RtM engagement with PDP:
 - [REDACTED] (RIP implementation manager)
 - [REDACTED] (Lead for SA3 – Capability workstream)
 - [REDACTED] (Service area ranking knowledge)

Meeting No and Title:	DDW9 Selection Procedure		
Date	22/06/17	Location	EY Birmingham
Start Time	14:30	End Time	17:00
Attendees	Apologies	Tentative/Unknown	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ██████████ ██████████████████ ██████████ ██████████████████ ██████████ ██████████████ ██████████ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ██████████ ██████████████ ██████████ ██████████████ 	None	
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

[illegible]

Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preceding workshops will produce clear conclusions and decisions which will feed into DDW9 and DDW10 The decision on usage of Start 3 will be made prior to the workshop therefore the workshop will focus on mechanics of including start into pre-qualification DDW10 will cover all aspects of ITT therefore this will not be included in DDW9
--------------------	---

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	Which procurement procedure will be used for procuring the DP's?
2	Packaging strategy input into SQ construct as per Workshop 3
3	PCR Regulation 53 (What, how much and where?) and the effect on the Programme
4	Standard CCS SQ or bespoke?
5	Financial evaluation e.g. threshold, commercial evaluation
6	How will process work for questions following SQ?
7	Supplier launch day
8	Structure of design SQ
9	How will the contractor SQ be structured?
10	What systems are required to support the process? AWARD? Bravo?
11	Resource planning for Stage 3- who owns it and commitment of resources for different stages? Who owns shortlisting? Does it sit with SCD or AP's team?
12	Risk policy, capability, BIM, asset and route wide specific technical experience

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	Template showing HS2 pre-qualification, what HE typically in SQ's ask to be circulated	█	30/06/17
2	Find and circulate paper showing pros and cons of Open vs Restricted (guidance note showing decision tree)	█	30/06/17
3	Key decisions from previous workshops	█	06/07/17
4	Start 3 Board Paper and recommendations	█	30/06/17
5	Map of packaging strategy (post 29 June workshop)	█	02/07/17
6	Procurement plan - Have started an activity schedule to show how to get to agreed selection criteria and OJEU for prep of ITT and SQ, have a session with █ and █ to discuss this.	█	04/07/17
7	Create brief paper showing what output should be from SQ, including best practice from other organisations	█	03/07/17

Expected Outputs from Workshop				
1	Agreement of PCR route			
2	SQ programme and responsibility of production			
3	Ownership of different stages/elements of SQ e.g. EDI people will assess EDI			
4	Agreed approach on how to incorporate scoring from Start 3 into pre-qualification process			
5	Agreed template of selection questionnaire (SQ)			
6	Packaging strategy impact on SQ design			
7	Confirmation that separate procurement for design/design assurance and D&B			
8	The workshop needs to consider local authorities and how to include this in OJEU			
Outputs required for				
• DDW10 Evaluation Strategy				
Follow Up Actions:			Owner	Due Date
1	Consult with Matt O'Toole prior to workshop about suitability of questions which will be included in SQ		█	03/07
2	Schedule workshop preparatory session prior to workshop		█	27/06/17
3	Reach out to Nicky Ensert who has documented how HE intend to measure and manage various policies for inclusion in RtM procurement documents.		█	27/06/17
4	Send spreadsheet from pavements work showing list of policies to █		█	27/06/17
5	Consult relevant areas (e.g. EDI) on strawman of selection questionnaire before workshop		█	05/07
Meeting discussion:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">█ Explained that there might be people who want to join in for their specific areas of expertise and not necessarily the whole workshop.Section 3 of Crown Commercial Service guidance will be updated in July.█ Explained that we could start off using Crown Commercial Service guidance and further include additional content as required. Confirmed HE needs to go to DfT for go ahead on selection questionnaire and work closely with Crown Commercial Services, to prevent challenge. Confirmed this dialogue has already been initiated.█ Explained that HE can have supporting document saying what the review panel will do with each answer, section 3 can be tailored and will include typical legislations and memberships in addition to what HE wants to include e.g. Start 3, EDI, Behavioural elements.There is an internal paper, currently in circulation that makes a recommendation on usage of Start 3 and associated risks. The paper will be presented to the Exec. for review – date TBD.The group agreed that Start 3 would act as a barrier for suppliers who have not completed it█ Outlined Start 3 may pose a risk where organisations who don't make it through selection process could challenge on the basis of fairness because HE have been working with other suppliers for c. 3 years.█ Explained that it would be a challenge to do a single competition with more than 6 regional lots.█ Confirmed that there is information on what is typically included in selection questionnaire from HS2, Crown commercial Services and details on bidding models, position on JV.█ Explained that Finance won't want to contribute to this session directly and the financial acceptability test should not be different from what is usually done. Confirmed that once the principles had been determined this would then be tested with the internal finance/procurement point of contact for validation.█ Confirmed that he has access to information on schemes that contractors have worked on and their measured performance.█ Confirmed that the SQ would be done at the end, if an Open Procedure is followed.█ Explained that we need analysis on how big the pool is but we can't get that until packaging strategy is finalised.█ Confirmed that packaging and analysis required to make the decision on whether HE manages individual bidders across separate.				

- [REDACTED] Explained that we need to consider the structure of ITT and need to nail down if it is D&B route as this will have huge impact on Works Information.
- [REDACTED] Asked if we think we can run a single competition that covers all contracts as a separate procurement, for each region or each package would require additional resources.
- [REDACTED] Confirmed that some questions in the SQ will be experiential.
- [REDACTED] Suggested that there should be something about the three imperatives and a need to have the same thread throughout from SQ to ITT.
- [REDACTED] Explained that through CDF, suppliers were scored low for not demonstrating HE experience.
- [REDACTED] Explained that assessment of previous projects was on relevance of work, irrespective of the sector.
- [REDACTED] Explained that some of the elements that are in the SQ should not be used to set a HE policy. If HE has a policy in relation to a certain element, advised we should test it.
- [REDACTED] Highlighted that there is a risk of asking suppliers to comply with different policies that are not being adhered to on other HE schemes.
- [REDACTED] Highlighted the risk of asking suppliers to comply with elements that do not have well developed policies in HE.
- [REDACTED] Confirmed the need to produce procurement programme/plan and that some work has been done to produce an activity schedule to show how to get to agreed selection criteria and OJEU.
- [REDACTED] Confirmed that if HE decide to use an Open Procedure the selection procedure will follow crown standard.
- The workshop needs to consider local authorities and how to include this in OJEU.
- **The group flagged the following risk needs to be highlighted to Exec:**
 - **SQ, Contract Notice, ITT need to be published at the same time after all governance has been completed.**
- **The group flagged a need to confirm if it was agreed that the RtM programme would progress at risk.**

Additional Questions

- Are there any special technical requirements that we may need to think about for RIS 1 or RIS2? (Who do we need to consult?)
- What do we need to obtain from interested contractors to allow us to judge technical capability in particular in terms of past schemes?
- What is a differentiator for the ITT stage?
- What kind of expertise do HE have in-house for Bravo training?
- Would you have separate procurement for design and construction?"

Meeting No and Title:	KO10- Evaluation Strategy		
Date	23/06/17	Location	Zephaniah- The Cube
Start Time	09:00	End Time	11:00
Attendees	Apologies		Tentative/Unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] 		
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Background and context 3. Agree purpose and objective of the Design Decision Workshops (including questions to be addressed/decisions to be made) 4. Confirm expected outputs 5. Confirm inputs and preparation required (with owners and dates) 6. Confirm attendees (engagement required before the DDW) 7. Confirm workshop date and location 		

[illegible]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED]
Objective	To create a structure for how we assess tender, creating key principles on commercial and quality assessment
Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workshop will be more high level and focused on the structure of the evaluation strategy • The outcome of performance management workshop (DDW9) will feed into DDW10

Workshop content

	Questions to be addressed/decisions to be made
1	Will we cap the number of regions a DP can bid for/be awarded?
2	What HE process is currently in place for evaluation and is fit for purpose on RtM?
3	What is the breakdown for evaluation, price and quality test?
4	What is the extent to which we can assess across a series of lots?
5	Can we have common quality questions across a series of lots and questions that relate specifically to a regional lot?
6	How do we support category management in the assessment/procurement?
7	Does Quality Assessment focus on Highway Imperatives, process procedure or evidence?
8	Are we looking to get a set of quality promises that can be managed over the 8 years?
9	How is the expected performance going to be aligned with quality submissions provided by suppliers?
10	How can the quality and methodology submissions be used to assess commercial tension?
11	How will behavioural assessment be utilised in the selection process?

	Input/Content to be prepared	Owner	Due Date
1	Draft commercial model and proposal for commercial assessment	[REDACTED]	7/07/17
2	Proposal for quality submission key themes that may support the Value for Money agenda while maintaining commercial tension	[REDACTED]/Commercial Team	7/07/17
3	Outputs from workshops 1-9.	[REDACTED]	6/07/17
4	Feedback from PAB on A303 assessment	[REDACTED]	
5	Options on how to assess quality	[REDACTED]	1/07/17
6	Strawman that outlines principles of what is considered an effective procurement exercise to present at workshop	[REDACTED]	07/07/17
7	Circulate analytical assurance framework to participants	[REDACTED]	07/07/17
8	Assess SOBC for behavioural values that need to be considered in RtM Performance Management	[REDACTED]	30/07/17

All inputs to be sent to:

Expected Outputs from Workshop	
1	Draft Evaluation Strategy –
2	Agreed thresholds and mitigations if requirements are not met
3	Behavioural assessors approach
Outputs required for	
• RtM Delivery Strategy – Statement of Requirements update	

Follow Up Actions:		Owner	Due Date
1	Send updated attendees to PMO who will update invite with attendees and agenda	█	26/06/17
2	Ensure that █ GCO office attends workshop	█	27/06/17
3	Schedule a follow up meeting to discuss approach for running workshop	█	26/06/17
4	Session with █ Behavioural with █	█	27/06/17
Meeting discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> █ Stated need to ensure that workshop attendees especially those from the wider business know that content discussed at workshop is sensitive and need to be aware of conflict of interest. On this basis, suggested removing █ from list of attendees from RtM workshops. █ Confirmed that Contract notice and PQQ will go out at the end of September and ITT will go out at a later date than SQ and contract notice. █ Explained that the workshop should address how we are going to assess suppliers, suggesting there should be a separate workshop to address the capacity required to deliver Programme requirements; therefore, the focus of DDW10 should be to establish the general principles on how to assess quality and financial suitability. █ Advised performance should have a clear linkage to the questions asked in the quality submission. █ Asked what quality submission products can help support commercial tension and Value for Money in addition to measuring supplier performance. █ Highlighted the need to consider financial and quality assessments that are complimentary of each other in aligning the supplier responses with the strategic objectives of HE. █ Highlighted that procurement documentation needs to be as complete as practicably possible. █ Concurred that it is crucial to show that HE are making it easy for suppliers to bid. █ Questioned how the assessment process would be structured, urging the early planning of the resource required, with the requisite space to support the evaluation effort. █ Explained that we need to think of how to use Bravo in a more flexible way to support a more agile approach to procurement. █ Asked how current processes and platforms need to be modified to lessen the burden placed on suppliers throughout the procurement process. Further questioned the commercial criteria that needs to be considered. █ Explained that it is possible to request quality commitments that create commercial tensions not otherwise delivered through the pricing of sample schemes, for example, asking bidders to submit a standard organisation design model indicating specific personnel that would fill programme critical roles. █ Recommended that the commercial assessment could be more qualitative yet still part of financial model, based on the assumption that agreed quality products could be received and scored as part of the Value for Money assessment. Suggested embedding these products post-contract would deliver improved value over the life of a contract. Commented that the fee would still need to be carefully managed to maintain commercial tension. █ Suggested, when discussing the use of Category Management, asking suppliers to demonstrate where they have effectively utilised enabled frameworks in the past. █ Explained that the learnings from CDF must be fed into the Evaluation Strategy. █ Highlighted a need to consider what kind of behaviours we are hoping to achieve, how to assess them and confirmed that she has a lot of data on behaviour which needs to be fed into RtM. Further commented that the workshop should cover expectations of client experience. 			

- [REDACTED] Confirmed that in the past the behavioural assessments have placed specific focus on sustainability, with interviews and assessments used as the process to validate tender responses. Advised looking at the SOBC to assess the behavioural values the programme should seek to promote.
- [REDACTED] Explained that the workshop discussion should cover balance between quality and price. Advised the consideration of common questions across lots, depending on the service being procured, to lessen the evaluation effort.
- [REDACTED] Explained that we need to consider whether the process should feature a set quality threshold.
- [REDACTED] Suggested that there should be a threshold for each section of questions and cautioned against introducing new content in the ITT that hasn't been mentioned previously.
- [REDACTED] Explained that working principles on data thresholds need to be established and agreed.
- [REDACTED] Highlighted a need to ensure all workshop participants have an understanding of the analytical assurance framework.
- [REDACTED] Explained that Health & Safety should cover statutory requirements of being a Principle Contractor, including how a supplier will develop H&S culture over the 8 year contract term and meeting HE H&S achievements for the duration of the contract.
- [REDACTED] Suggested, as a possible form of assessment, asking suppliers to describe Health & Safety incidents they have experienced and how these have been managed.
- [REDACTED] Explained that past performance data needs to be considered at the PQ stage
- [REDACTED] Confirmed [REDACTED] to facilitate workshops 9 & 10
- [REDACTED] Asked if we have a document that outlines principles of what is considered an effective procurement exercise. In addition to presenting this, the context needs to be explained at the start of the workshop.
- [REDACTED] Agreed to take this on in AP's absence.