



PEL BOARD MEETING

Friday 27th March 2015
UCL, 1-19 Torrington Place, London

Present:	Rex Knight	Chair	SUPC	RK
	Julie Barker	Chair	TUCO	JB
	Andy Davies	Head	LUPC	AD
	Geoff Hope-Terry	Chair	NWUPC	GHT
	Judith Hoyle	Minutes	TUCO	Sec
	Hari Punchihewa	Chair	NEUPC	MR
	David Sanders	Chair	TEC	DS
	Andrew Young	Chair	LUPC	AY

1 Welcome and Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies.

2 Draft Minutes of the last Meeting to be Approved and Matters Arising

These were formally approved. There had been some discussion around having a stand at the AUDE Conference – both TUCO and TEC have their own stands there at the AUDE Conference the following week. AD had looked into this and a stand would cost £6K. We could look into the possibility of having a PEL stand next year which would cost £1K each. JB has had dialogue with the Chair of AUDE. Patrick Finch, a member of the TEC Board, is also a part of the AUDE Executive. RK will contact the Chair of AUDE.

Action: RK

The Director of Estates at Essex is on the SUPC Board. AD has spoken to the Director of Estates at Roehampton, who is also the Chair of the AUDE London region. JB commented that AUDE were trying to engage with BUFDG to get a procurement person on the group. She will check out when the next meeting of the AUDE group is.

Action: JB

3 PEL Implementation Plan

AD referred to Action Point 2 on the Plan – National Category Structures. He views this as vital as we now have the opportunity to have a formal category structure. This was due to be delivered during the first quarter of 2015 – the Estates Category is virtually in place now. RK commented that if this could be in place by the end of Quarter 2, then that would be satisfactory but he does not wish to wait until the end of the year. GHT enquired whether this process could be done more quickly if extra resources were brought in. For example AD has Mike Kilner leading the country on the ICT Strategy. RK asked AD to feed back to fellow Heads that if there is no way of accelerating this then what would be the impact on the rest of the plan?



On the ICT Strategy there is a particular business risk that AD wished to highlight. We need to ensure that we are co-ordinated in our spend analysis, our contracts database and our e-Procurement along with Hunter. We need to make sure that all these systems are integrated. The risk here is that UniBuy is managed by JISC – who have withdrawn from UniBuy and we do not even have a copy of the contract, which ends in June 2016. This is business critical and we must ensure that we have continuity after that. One option is to renew terms with CloudBuy but we would actually prefer to commission our own database, even though we only have one year to do this. The risk is therefore how much time we have available for this and it amounts to our biggest business risk. RK commented that this should be on the Risk Register for all consortia.

HEFCE originally set this up with JISC but have now refused to continue funding it. HP added that the North East is using Spikes Cavell and when he looked at alternatives he was met with strong resistance. AD remarked that Frank Rowell of NEUPC is looking at Line Item Detail but most institutions are not at that level of complexity yet. GHT suggested getting the PEL Advisory Group to look into this. HP would like to look at how we get the systems connected. GHT suggested using this plan to highlight risks such as this. He asked for a RAG system to state where we are with regard to the target date.

PEL KPI's

We have set the 2013-2014 baseline from which we can measure progress. AY asked about showing data from previous years to look at the comparisons. AD replied that we can do this for last year because we have Hunter. Spend and Savings is straightforward but Take Up is more difficult. GHT asked if it would be possible to go back another two years then we will have three years in total. We should look at what we can do in terms of base data – do we want to move from, say 63% this year to 70% next year, for example? RK asked what “Agreements in Progress” involves. AD responded that this is when the value of the procurement project is in progress. Some of that will be renewals so this is not necessarily “new” spend, rather a representation of the work that we are doing currently. RK questioned whether there is anything else that we should be measuring that we are not. GHT asked whether there is any benefit in having something on there around Shared Services. AD would look at previous years’ data then we can have a discussion at the next meeting on target setting.

Action: AD

4 Communications Plan

The Communications Report had been sent to AD. With reference to the draft PEL Annual Report, RK asked whether this looks like the kind of report we could issue to the consortia members in order to raise the profile of PEL?

AY explained that Nicola Dandridge, Chief Executive of UUK attended the LUPC Conference on the previous day. She gave some insight as to what is going to happen to BIS after the Election, ie they are probably going to lose over a third of their money. She seemed keen to talk to them further about what messages she can take away. RK asked for any comments to be fed back to Marion Hutchins. The group studied the survey, which gave a predictably low score in relation to PEL. DS asked for the Communications Report to be circulated to the group. GHT enquired as to how we take forward the engagement with UUK. RK asked if we can pick up on the idea of the one page infographic for Nicola to carry around with her. We need to ensure that we are not just replicating the messages contained within the Diamond Report.



5 Re-Branding Regional Consortia

GHT feels that this is a very good idea and discussed it with the North West Board but their view was that this is not the right time. There was simply no appetite to do this at this stage. He would in fact prefer a strapline, for example “NWUPC – a Member of Procurement England Ltd”. DS asked AD what his objections were to this. AD replied that :

- We would be throwing away a brand which has taken 20 years to establish, for one which nobody knows and it sounds like more of a national than regional body. We have a big enough workload as it is without having to manage a new brand. We all have “universities purchasing consortium” in our names, which binds them all together.
- More than half of LUPC members are not HE and do not really care what PEL is.

RK still believes that this is an excellent idea and asked whether the group are ready to push this. AY believes that the strapline idea is excellent. JB stated that TUCO would not consider re-branding when they only re-branded two years ago and procurement is only a small part of what they actually do. RK questioned whether we consult with our respective Boards or just add “a member of Procurement England Ltd” as a strapline. The best of both would be regional identity with a national connection. RK promised to sound out the SUPC Board about both options. Bearing in mind what may be happening with BIS he feels that building the brand strength long term would be the way to go. He asked everybody to consult their respective Boards about adding the strapline.

JB feels that we should however be using established brands to market PEL. People look at the procurement landscape and wonder what all the various organisations are doing. AD stressed that the majority of LUPC’s contacts on their database do not know what PEL is. HP feels that this could be because PEL is new. DS wished to stress that TEC and TUCO are a part of this group as they are not usually associated with the purchasing consortia. He is willing to sacrifice some of the TEC identity to join together and act as one body for procurement. JB emphasised that collaborative procurement has been in TUCO’s blood for many years. RK feels that more work on the strapline is needed.

6 Sharing Consortia Strategies

RK explained that we feel it may be a good idea to share our consortia strategies to give us some ideas on such things as Shared Services. It may be better to have a consolidated plan rather than have one plan for PEL and another for all the consortia. LUPC are in the process of re-working theirs at the moment. GHT asked if all the Heads are aware of each other’s strategies. NWUPC have a strategy in place which is very simple and easy to share. TEC called theirs the Five Year and Two Year Business Plan. AY feels that LUPC’s draft strategy is mature enough to share as it is. RK asked if we can share these and look at how they may be articulated – we cannot have one document but we can link these together. Each consortia to e-mail their strategies around the group.

Action: All

TUCO had a Business Plan rather than a strategy and Mike Haslin would be asked to extrapolate the relevant parts.

Action: JB



7 Joint Meeting of PEL and Consortia Boards

RK believes that this would be a very positive thing to do in view of all the above subjects discussed. AY agrees that it would be a good message to say that our collective Boards have met. RK would prefer to have this more as a 'conference' or 'workshop' rather than a meeting and also to get some high profile involvement. Earliest dates for this would be Autumn 2015 or possibly Spring 2016. Suggested guests asked to attend would be Nicola Dandridge from UUK or Professor Sir Ian Diamond.

8 Any Other Business

As there was no other business, the meeting was duly concluded.

9 Date and Location of Next Meeting

Friday 5th June 2015 at UCL London commencing at 11.00 am. It was agreed that the Board would continue to invite a 'guest' Head of Consortia. In the absence of DS, June's meeting would be attended by Richard Murphy from TEC.