

In attendance: Kevin Hall (Chair), Tracey Carter, Ian Floyd, Graham Terry, Alice Beckwith, Chris Weeks, Debbie Mitchell (part), Ann Starkie (note taker)

Apologies: Stewart Halliday, Steve Waddington

Item	Subject	Action
1.	<p><u>Minutes of last meeting - 24 May 2013</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed as an accurate record. 	
2.	<p><u>Highlight Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CW explained that the two Risks of greatest concern – Project Resources/Procurement Next Steps and Consent for change of use: St Aelred’s playing field – are on the agenda as individual items. Celebrated two key achievements – (1) the relatively smooth passage of report through Cabinet on 4 June; stakeholder reaction; and balanced media coverage, and (2) the issue of the OJEU Notice and PQQ/MOI soon after Cabinet. <p><u>Communications – Information Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important next phase comms wise now we’ve gone public with report. Big push needed to bring key stakeholders up to speed on plans Road shows in the 7 EPHs for all EPH staff starting next week. Sessions also booked late July for Care Management colleagues in Kathy Clark’s area, and the EPH Wider Reference Group. Discussion about risks of potentially sharing too much information about CYC aspirations in the public domain early in the procurement process, and raising expectations that – if the bids are unaffordable – we may not be able to meet. Difficult, but it will be important to strike a balance between building understanding, enthusiasm and ‘buy-in’ to the new plans and talking ourselves into a public position which bidders know we can’t step back from. Re: managing expectations, GT stressed that we have been consistent in messaging that we need good quality but which are also affordable. GT will attend a YOPA public meeting on 15 July to talk about the programme. CW has written a ‘plain English’ document, including design principle diagrams, that outlines – at a high level – CYC’s aspirations/minimum requirements to be included in the specifications to short-listed bidders in late August. Board discussed and agreed that this could be used as a script/prompt for the EPH Staff/Care Management sessions but, at this stage, it should not be made public or shared with politicians and the wider community. GT suggested (and Board agreed) that we will however need to share our aspirations with the EPH 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p>Wider Reference Group as part of our ongoing dialogue with that group.</p> <p><u>Residual Land Valuation – page 5, 2nd bullet point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EC Harris modelling had suggested a negative value for the ‘other housing’ element of the Lowfield site. As a result, we left quite things open in the MOI, suggesting that a capital receipt would be expected but not providing any sort of guide figure. 	
3.	<p>Key Risk 1 – Project Resources/Procurement Next Steps</p> <p><u>Procurement Next Steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant work still to do on the evaluation criteria/model and the ITPD document. The size of the ITPD task has been underestimated and it ideally needs doing by 26 July. Deadline for completion of specs was 30 May, but all three still not complete. Lack of internal legal support at this stage (finishing/cross-referencing specs, and – in time – commenting on contracts drafted by AG) is a significant gap/problem. • Agreed that IF/AB will meet on 1 Jul to agree a plan for managing these risks outside of this meeting. • AB to send info on Gateway approach to Board and discuss with Kieron/V4. <p><u>Technical Leads</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FM - Natalie. AB to send days/dates that Natalie is required for EPH project to TC. <p><u>Admin Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that a temporary admin post is required for managing admin around the Competitive Dialogue process (booking & minuting meetings, etc) <p><u>JRF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT to follow up his initial conversations with Nigel Ingram of JRF around their possible advice/input to key stages of the procurement/CD process. 	<p>AB / IF</p> <p>AB</p> <p>AB</p> <p>AB</p> <p>GT</p>
4.	<p>Key Risk 2 – St Aelred’s playing fields / Burnholme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with AG scheduled for 3 Jul (PC/TB/BG/IA/AB) to bottom out what’s still needed before application for consent to change of use can be made to DfE. KH/TC stressed importance of Vicky Japes/Sport England in that meeting and this process. If Sport England aren’t engaged/happy with our proposals their influence on the success of our application will be far more significant than that of the St Aelred’s governors. CW/AB to ensure VJ is invited to next week’s meeting and is fully aware of improvements (sporting provision wise) being offered on the site (ie to Applefields, St Aelred’s and the wider community). • MOI document identified St Aelred’s playing field as our preferred site but acknowledged wider Burnholme College site as a fall back option. • Discussion about timescales, cost involved in demolishing buildings, access and noise issues. 	

Item	Subject	Action
	<p><u>Comms issue</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CW reported 18 June phone call from a disgruntled resident at Darnbrook Walk & asked Board for a steer on whether to stage a similar info session for local residents as was held for St Aelred's parents, or to invite them to the wider Burnholme site consultation tentatively being planned by Philip Callow to tie in with a Sat 27 July community/consultation event being held at Burnholme College for the Tang Hall/Big Lottery project. KH preferred the idea of a stand at an open day event rather than writing to everyone, but suggested that we needed to better understand the focus/format of the 27 July event before proceeding as there was a danger that the wider Burnholme site/EPH project/s could be misinterpreted and confused with the lottery project. 	CW/PC
5.	<p><u>Contract Management Structure</u> Discussed following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper from Addleshaws outlining their recommendation regarding the contractual structure. This was subsequent to a meeting held with Andrew Pettinger and Sara Garbutt from Addleshaws and AB, CW, Zara Carter and Glen McCusker. • AB had steer on paper from internal legal (Ruth Barton) who thought structure looked acceptable. Wider meeting with tech leads to be arranged and feedback to be circulated to board • ITPD – AB to speak to Addleshaws about this for steer re whether the Contractual Structure needs to be included within the doc • Also discussed FM – to include soft and hard FM, the diagram and the link between cleanliness and care in the document. 	AB
6.	<p><u>Financial Model</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Model has been circulated. Noted that a lot of assumptions have been made, examples as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Revenue – current EPH budget ➢ Running costs – based on work done by Pinders as well as own work. Excludes recharge budgets. ➢ Ongoing costs – assumes 76% of staff will transfer and 12% drop each year. £100,000 allowed for redundancy in early years. • There was further discussion about budgets, affordability and charging policy. DM talked about 2 savings in previous budget which won't be delivered, one of £800,000. DM said that there needed to be a plan for this. Further discussion about costs of remaining in business once home is closing. Concerns expressed that costs of running business remain but income drops immediately. • Clarified that there is not a link between purchasing and selling beds. • In summary DM to remodel based on discussion about beds and to insert a contingency line. <p><u>Bidding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC highlighted need to stipulate what we are specifying as a core bid. 	DM

Item	Subject	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion about minimum room size as well as process and core and variant bids. AB to action. • Further discussion about evaluation model and weightings. IF wants to clarify what happens if for example someone bids '45' and we have stipulated '50'. • KH highlighted need to leave open to own ideas otherwise innovation will be limited. <p><u>Other points to note</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £200,000 on health. • Capital budget assumes £1.8 million professional fees. • Repayment costs. • Realisation Capital and receipts. 	AB
7.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 	
8.	<p>Date of next meeting – 1/8/13</p>	