



MINUTES

24th May 2013, 2.00 pm,
Morrell Room, 2nd Floor West Offices

Present: Tracey Carter, Ian Floyd (Chair), Stewart Halliday, Ann Starkie (Minutes), Graham Terry, Steve Waddington, Chris Weeks.

Apologies: Alice Beckwith, Kevin Hall.

Item	Subject	Action By
1.	<p>Minutes of last meeting (26 April 2013)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CW made following points: Item 3 – core & variant bids - being picked up by ZC with Addleshaw Goddard (AG). Brian Gray has sent instruction to AG today re: change of use of land at St Aelred's and Lowfield. Item 4 – Debbie on leave, will come to next Board meeting to explain financial model. Item 7 – Graham now chairing Project Team. 	ZC/AG
2.	<p>Programme Highlight Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CW explained that the key issues highlighted in blue featured as agenda items for discussion. IF asked whether the RAG statuses shown were truly reflective of where the project was at. At a high summary level by work stream – yes, but agreed that with further development and definition of the project plan/work packages, etc it will be possible to produce 'finer grain' updates on different elements of the project. 	AB/CW
3.	<p>Revised Programme Structure / Roles and Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership at AD level – GT or TC? Discussion around workloads and capacity to fulfil the role of driving the project. GT agreed to lead but flagged the need for the project team/structure beneath him to be clear and resourced properly. Agreed that this third iteration of the Project Board now feels right in terms of membership and far better placed (than previously) now that all Technical Leads in the project team are line managed by an AD in the Board. Agreed that AB/CW will need to liaise with the relevant AD if there are issues to escalate rather than channel all through GT. Programme Manager role – AB. Related to previous bullet point, discussion centred upon the need for AB's time to be focused on the EPH project (especially in the next year of the procurement exercise) rather than care pathways/integration with Health work. Separate discussions around that work needed between GT/SH/AB now that Becky Allright (Joint Commissioning 	GT/SH/AB

Item	Subject	Action By
	<p>Manager) is in post. AB to focus on the corporate (asset delivery) side of the project, and CW on the EPH/Adult Social Care side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagram needs tweaking to show membership & approach of Project Team – ie chaired by GT, meeting fortnightly. 	AB
4.	<p>Project / Resource Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Leads' capacity – SW flagged his concern at the number of hours in the resource plan expected of PLS and pressed for greater clarity about the exact timing of the 'chunks of time' required. He recognises the EPH project as a corporate priority but this needs to be balanced with the impact on delivery of other corporate priorities – in SW's case 'Get York Building', for which PLS is the lead. • FM gap – Natalie to remain involved until she leaves CYC at end of June. TC to explore options further including bringing Natalie back on a consultancy basis for key FM inputs/meetings as part of the dialogue process. • Legal Support – recognised that this project will require both a strong internal and external Legal input. CW raised concerns about EK's capacity once the 6 week back-filling locum placement finishes in mid-June. IF reassured that additional resource is being brought into Glen's team and that EK will have the necessary capacity to support the EPH project. • Commercial/Procurement expertise – significant discussion about the need to identify and bring in an expert/specialist who has previous experience in commissioning care homes/villages – someone who has 'got the t-shirt' and has credibility within the market we'll be dealing with – the Andy Farr (Community Stadium) equivalent of the care home/village world. Will give us (CYC) and the market (bidders) confidence that we're going about things in a sensible way. Agreed that GT will initially explore with JRF colleagues (Nigel Ingram and John Kennedy). May be that we're after a 'poacher turned gamekeeper'. • Other specialist support/expertise – also needing to specify/procure additional specialist advice – Technical (Ian Asher), Dementia (Ann Ferguson). • Ad hoc Admin resource – for minute taking/back-up during the procurement exercise and Competitive Dialogue sessions especially. SH stated that AB will have access to admin resource/capacity from within OCE. • IF suggested we engage with Internal Audit early in the process so that they are aware of the project/procurement exercise. 	<p>AB/ZC</p> <p>TC</p> <p>AB</p>

Item	Subject	Action By
5.	<p>Procurement Documentation – issues requiring a steer from Board:</p> <p>a) <u>Capital Receipt – options paper</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board were not overly keen on the approach recommended in the paper. They would prefer to keep things simpler/vaguer at this stage, and would like to hear options from bidders. Could ask for an upfront payment with the remainder paid in stages or at a later date. The full financial evaluation model will need to include three elements – capital costs; revenue costs; capital receipt for the ‘other housing’ land at Lowfield. <p>b) <u>PQQ Evaluation Model</u> – draft weightings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussion around weightings although it was acknowledged that it was difficult without clear definitions of what was being considered under each heading. As a steer for relative importance of the different elements though the Board suggested a re-casting of weightings along the following lines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Care = 40% ○ Design and Construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall scheme design = 10% (integration/cohesiveness) ▪ EPH = 20% ▪ Housing = 20% ○ FM = 10% - score reduced because it is a PQQ. <p>c) <u>Financial parameters of bids</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that a separate meeting will be needed next week to agree/confirm our approach to this issue (IF/TC/DM/AB?). The discussion at Board suggested that we set the parameter as the Revenue funding available – (slightly above) £5.4M per annum to fund both the operational running costs of 162 places and the capital repayment costs (we will need to indicate the rate at which we can borrow). <p>d) <u>How/when to drop to 2/3 bidders</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF requested that a short paper be prepared and circulated to Board members detailing the pros/cons and risks of down-selecting at different stages of the procurement process – PQQ; ISOS; ISDS; Final Bid. We should also seek a steer on this issue from JRF/external specialist (see Item 4) and V4. 	<p>AB/ZC</p> <p>AB</p> <p>AB/ZC</p> <p>AB</p>
6.	<p>Key Risks – from p.3 of Programme Highlight Report:</p> <p>1. The Board briefly looked at section 5 of the draft MOI for a sense of what (at a high level) we are looking to procure. Agreed that the review of such documents should sit at Project Team level (where both GT/TC sit) and only unresolved issues get escalated to Board for decision. The next Project Team on Tues 4th June will aim to sign-off the three documents – OJEU Notice / PQQ / MOI - to be</p>	

Item	Subject	Action By
	<p>issued to market asap after Cabinet on 4th June.</p> <p>2. Project resourcing – see Item 4.</p> <p>3. St Aelred’s playing field issue – Risks of going out to market ahead of internal (CYC/St Aelred’s) and external (SoS) clearance acknowledged by Board. PC meeting with St Aelred’s Chair of Governors, and then attending St Aelred’s Governors’ meeting on Mon 10 June. Information session for St Aelred’s parents organised for Thurs 13 June - invite letters were sent on 23 May. Kevin’s influence with Head/school will be important. IF to be copied in if/when any further ‘chasing’ e-mails are required to Brian Gray in Legal around the application for change of use of the land at St Aelred’s and Lowfield.</p> <p>4. Site investigation & archaeological reports at Burnholme – Ian Asher has suggested that the results of the site investigation report will be available end of June, and that (whilst the final report will not be complete) we will also have had an indication from the Archaeologists of any significant issues by the end of June. The Board acknowledged the risk of pressing ahead with going out to the market ahead of these reports being available but did not want to delay until ‘clearance’ was received. The Board agreed that (in the interests of consistency with previous public announcements, and not drawing attention to the St Aelred’s playing field issue) we should talk about the ‘Burnholme’ site rather than the St Aelred’s site in the procurement documentation.</p>	AB/ZC
7.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other business. 	
8.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wed 26 June, 2-4pm, Morrell Room (S014) • Debbie Mitchell to attend to ‘walk-through’ the Financial Model. 	