

**PROCUREMENT ENGLAND LIMITED (PEL)**  
**Advisory Group Meeting (PELAG)**

**Friday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at NWUPC Offices, Manchester**

<b>Attendees:</b>	Paul Tomany [Chairman]	NWUPC
	Alan Brookes	TEC
	Kevin Casey	NWUPC
	Andy Davies	LUPC
	Chris Philpott	LUPC
	Colin Reeve	SUPC
	Frank Rowell	NEUPC
	Susan Wright	SUPC
	Judith Hoyle [Secretary]	NWUPC

**1. Introduction, apologies and Welcome by host Paul Tomany**

Paul welcomed Kevin Casey from Manchester (NWUPC), Chris Philpott from University of East London (LUPC) and Colin Reeve from Anglia Ruskin University (SUPC) along with the other Heads of Consortia and Alan Brookes from TEC. Alison Holmes from Durham (NEUPC) had sent her apologies.

**2. Election of chair for the Next 12 Months**

Paul asked the group for volunteers to chair the meeting as none were forthcoming he offered to act as Chair and was elected unopposed for the next 12 months.

**3. PEL Governance and Context**

Paul touched on how PEL was formed. The group studied the TORs. Frank suggested that as Hunter was on the Agenda and in the interests of rationalization of meetings, we could combine this group with UKUPC which would include Scotland and Wales. Susan does not feel that this group has the authority to extend membership to Scotland and Wales as the Board formed PELAG to focus on England. Andy supported Frank's view that we should extend the membership of PELAG however Paul said already have UKUPC and the operational group underneath that (JCG) that cover Scotland and Wales. There would also be the P-UK Advisory Group which would come out of the now disbanded ENP which would be a UK wide body. Chris would prefer to concentrate on how we make the consortia work together in England and use the contracts better so that institutions can benefit. We should be mindful of collaboration with Scotland and Wales whilst ensuring that services from our regional consortia are benefit their HEIs. It was felt that PELAG should remain an English focused group

**4. PELAG Terms of Reference**

These were agreed.

**5. The Role of PELAG as per TORs to be Defined and Agreed**

It was agreed that in terms of membership, the best idea would be to invite APUC and /or and other bodies if and when relevant i.e. when there was a item on the Agenda that could not be covered in UKUPC meetings. This was important as if in the future when GEM funding ceases and ,if the GeM database is no longer an option, we could look to Hunter as a possible contracts database.

**The recommendation was agreed that we invite other groups as and when appropriate. This would be put to the PEL Board for consideration. The Terms of Reference for PELAG would be amended, if agreed by the Board, to allow other bodies to be invited where relevant.**

**Action: PAUL TOMANY**

## 6. The Six Strategic Aims and their Development

These have now been approved by the PEL Board to take to the respective consortia. Chris thought that these aims seemed a bit narrow in their focus and could be seen to be business as usual with the consortia continuing to carry on as before. Andy confirmed the LUPC Board had seen the six aims and had no objections to them. Frank said the NEUPC Board had 'endorsed with clear expectations as recorded within the NEUPC Board minutes'. The SUPC Board has agreed them. Paul will circulate them to the NWUPC Board to be formally agreed at the next NWUPC Board Meeting in March. Once this is done the Aims will be circulated to member institutions in accordance with NWUPC's constitution and it up to each consortium how they disseminate PEL information. Susan pointed out that what we do not have in England are category strategies, apart from Estates. We do not have common KPI's that we are working to although there has been some work on this led by Frank. The benefit of category management is building an agreed and considered approach within and between each consortium. We need to be mindful of the expectations and needs of our Commodity Groups and Kevin emphasised that regional agreements are often better for institutions than national ones especially when getting SMEs on contracts. Our Contract Managers may need to be, where necessary, trained in Category Management techniques.

Colin stated that the new Spend Analysis Tool coming on board would collate all the data we need to take this forward. This could be used to put the category trees together. This would mean extra work for which some consortia may require external help. Susan would be happy for help, external if needed, to look at category trees as a basis to how we move forward together to achieve this. Paul suggested giving Spend 360 a spec to do some data analysis. Frank added that we need to define the categories and tell them what is in that category to do the commodity tree. This takes our data and tells us what we are buying which is a step in the right direction and can be used to provide the basis for a category strategies.

The option of outsourcing was discussed amongst the group but Frank suggested that he discuss with Paul Mander the possibility of this being done by the consortia. He added that if we are to provide data to a third party then member clearance would be required.

At Manchester around 80% of the spend is influenced mainly by local and then collaborative contracts, the other 20% is not governed by procurement. A contracting programme can be either category driven or member driven – the members drive what regional strategies will be implemented by their consortium. Colin pointed out that it is not just about price and a category management strategy would focus on the bigger picture i.e. extended warranties, better service etc. Susan proposed that we form an action plan for category strategies. Data mining would be used to identify categories and form the basis of the category strategies. A national category strategy would not automatically result in a national contract.

**Frank will speak to Paul Mander and have something developed within 3 months.**

**Action: FRANK ROWELL**

Paul asked the group whether we should compile a PEL Report to show what we have done so far. The more we have out there about our achievements, the better. This report should run up to July 2014. Paul to draft up a report in due course.

**Action: PAUL TOMANY**

Susan had requested that we make agreements easier to use and this will involve some uniformity on GeM. We need some standard guidance. She will arrange for a guidance document on how to populate GeM including the Buyers Guides for all four consortia.

**Action: SUSAN WRIGHT**

The Hunter User Group should also look at a standard way of putting information onto Hunter and to ensure some correspondence with GEM information and references. The Secretary would request that this is included on the Agenda at the next HUG Meeting in March. Susan suggested that our negotiated agreements could also be uploaded onto GeM.

**Action: SECRETARY**

Aim 4 – to explore and formalize further opportunities to collaborate – Paul will circulate details of the NWUPC Agreement with Fusion 21, once finalised, a body dealing with social procurement contracts.

**Action: PAUL TOMANY**

Alan would ask Richard Murphy for more information on his contacts with various government bodies.

**Action: ALAN BROOKES**

Aim 5 – establishing a set of KPI's – Susan feels that we need to adopt a standard set. She would look into the progression of the KPI's etc and circulate any documents from BUFDG PPG.

**Action: SUSAN WRIGHT**

Regarding the EMM, Susan advised that Steve Butcher had requested funding to re-do the portal as the BPI collection has nobody else willing to do it. UUK has now agreed that the responsibility for this will be handed back to HEFCE so Steve has put in a request for funding in order to carry this out. Susan will chase Steve Butcher for an update on this.

**Action: SUSAN WRIGHT**

Aim 6 – measure and report savings – we have some savings methodology within each consortium and as agreed via UKUPC. We also have a training programme so we are meeting Diamond Report recommendations. A Sustainability Policy/protocol has also been agreed.

## **7. Other English Spend and Website Developments**

We had talked about comparing Spend 360 data with Hunter MI. On the confidentiality of data Paul has been working with Angus Warren on this and hopes to issue an updated document soon. Regarding website developments, LUPC are using cloudBuy (ex @UK) for theirs and so far it is linking well. The other 3 English consortia are using H<sub>2</sub>O and if one consortium has a new development then H<sub>2</sub>O will offer it out to the other two. Paul offered to write something up on the H<sub>2</sub>O agreement the North West has and circulate it.

**Action: PAUL TOMANY**

The NWUPC website has been designed to have a contracts database within it which links up with GeM but can also be a standalone database that other consortia could use.

This would be a contingency fall back in case GeM is pulled in the future. Funding for GeM runs out in July 2016. Members discussed a PEL presence on each consortium's website, to have the same look on all four. The Comms Group would be responsible for this and will report into PELAG. Paul would arrange for a PEL presence on the NWUPC website.

**Action: PAUL TOMANY**

#### **8. Frequency of Meetings**

Chris suggested that these meetings should precede a full PEL Board Meeting. When the date for the Board Meetings have been arranged the Secretary will circulate a Doodle poll to set up a date for future meetings.

**Action: SECRETARY**

#### **9. Any Other Business**

Chris felt that a national contract should mean that - its where all four consortia agree to support it. Individual HEIs can then decide if it suits them or not. Individual HEIs would also have the option to form affinity groups and to opt into or out from whatever they felt. As the decision to go national should be predicated on agreement from all four consortia (via member approval) this offers the best option going forward. Andy supported Chris in this view.

#### **10. Date and Place of Next Meeting**

Date is dependent on when Board Meetings will take place. Alan kindly offered to host so the venue will definitely be TEC Birmingham.