



PEL BOARD MEETING

Monday 2nd June 2014 at 09.30 hours
G14 Committee Room, University of London



Present:	Rex Knight	Chair	SUPC
	Andy Davies	Head	LUPC
	Geoff Hope-Terry	Chair	NWUPC
	Judith Hoyle	Minutes	NWUPC
	Andrew McConnell	Chair	NEUPC
	Marcus McDonald	Chair	LUPC
	Richard Murphy	Head	TEC
	Hari Punchihewa	Chair	NEUPC
	Frank Rowell	Head	NEUPC
	David Sanders	Chair	TEC
	Paul Tomany	Head	NWUPC
	Susan Wright	Head	SUPC
	Guests:	Bernarde Hyde	
Iain Littlejohn			SUMS

1 Election of Chair

RK was formally elected as Chairman by the Board.

2 Election of Chair

There was no apologies for absence. HP attended his first meeting as new Chair of NEUPC to replace outgoing Chair Andrew McConnell. RL wish to formally record the Board's thanks to Andrew for his work on the Board. MM announced that this would be his last meeting as Chair of LUPC and that his successor would be appointed at the next LUPC Board Meeting in mid-June. Formal thanks were recorded to MM for his hard work and support of the Board. RK welcomed our guests from SUMS – Iain and Bernarde.

3 Declaration of Interests

There was no declaration.

4 Draft Minutes of the last Meeting and Matters Arising

SW requested that we include some wording on not sharing documents with any other body prior to ratification by the Board. This to be recorded under Matters Arising and not as any change to the Minutes. Otherwise the Minutes were taken as read.

5 Terms of Reference for PEL Board and Operations Group

PWT alluded to the suggestion that we invite other bodies for specific items so he will amend the Terms of Reference accordingly to include other bodies as and when necessary.

6 Discussion on SUMS Consultancy Report

PWT gave feedback from the PEL Advisory Group – the main points being that the North West and Southern are happy to move forward with most of the points in the report however the North West would not accept mandating by a consortium.

Regarding KPIs and making contracts easier to use we are doing this at the moment and we are almost there. The protocol of working together was agreed the day after the PELAG meeting by the Heads of Consortia. He mentioned that the Joint Contracting Group is doing some very good work towards Category Management. We can bring some of the SUMS Report into the JCG Category Management work. This would operationally overcome the differences between the four consortia regarding the mandatory part. SW feels that the category management should be mandatory but also to respect the wishes of the members of a particular consortium. FR believes that the success of this depends on how this is sold to the members. Rather than mandating we could have a Memorandum of Understanding. There are also issues surrounding the subject of rebates. We may be stepping on some consortium toes regarding ownership of some categories. AD added that there is no common agreement as to whether change is absolutely necessary; some people are happy with things the way they are. PWT pointed out that Manchester as the North West's biggest member, is adamant that they will not be told what to do by the consortium.

FR has been developing categories structures with the JCG. We must look at what is most effective and efficient for the sector as a whole. DS questioned why the North West would not be happy with this. Using stationery as an example, can we not just concentrate on producing the best contract for the sector, whether that be regional or national? PWT feels that support from the membership offers the best deal. GHT referred to the savings reported and felt that having one national deal would not make any difference to these. The main focus should be the high value areas such as IT. He believes that PEL should be looking at areas which are not currently covered. Why put a lot of effort into something which would only move us forward slightly? AD is of the opinion that if members are not willing to change then we will achieve nothing.

AM remarked that some HEIs are already at 30% collaboration so it must be achievable with our existing toolkit. SW pointed out that the larger research institutions have a different spend profile so research does not lend itself to collaboration. We cannot spend £½ million without knowing what the incremental will be. He added that other services and other assets ie the N8 Group is all about collaboration. RK emphasised that there are large areas untouched by the purchasing consortia at the moment. GHT stated that we have some areas which may not be as important but they work well for us – we need to look at the people who are getting better results. We can look at TEC as an example – they have experience of this which we need to replicate in areas such as libraries and IT. RM advised that this is an ongoing process with institutions as they are up against the private sector organisations. Institutions ask him what the benefits are of using TEC. PWT advised that NWUPC's biggest collaborative partners are SUPC and APUC. Everybody is using the LUPC NDNA agreement, so there is already a huge amount of collaboration going on.

MM drew attention to the fact that across the country only around 10% of the spend is collaborative. At RCM they are prepared to follow the recommendations of the report to increase collaborative spend. If some consortia are happy as they are then they should be allowed to get on with it. AM agreed that the category management is a stumbling block but other areas are something we have already bought into eg KPIs. SW stressed that it is the marketing of this which is critical. Out of SUPC's 80 contracts only 40 are used by other members. If we do not agree what the outcome is then we are never going to get there. SW had assumed that we were all in agreement with category management but RK does not feel that this is in fact the case. FR added that we do not have a sector sourcing plan in order to manage the spend.

HP explained that from his aspect as a member the figure is around 20% in total but some are less and some are more.

We need to find out why certain agreements are not being used. Institutions may have a very valid reason for not using a consortium deal. Sometimes they can get a better deal with their own purchasing power. By having a collaborative approach, can we address these issues collectively? PWT explained that by obtaining pre-commitment you can tailor the contract to gauge the actual needs of the members. He is not averse to change but we must take the institutions with us.

IJ advised that he does not believe in mandating, more of what PWT is describing as 'commitment'. This is a change management project not a technical procurement project. Once you decide to pursue this then you must pursue it all the way. We need to understand more about what people are spending in different areas and this will come out from doing the structure analysis. Little had been done on resourcing. As estimates were on the high side, he suggested using external resource because all the consortia are very busy. Coming up with the right category tree is the easy bit but then you have to persuade them that this is the right strategy.

RK confirmed that we do not have enough agreement between us as to how we go forward. Do we wish to commit to the areas where we have broader agreement then get the Board to meet up again soon? FR advised that the JCG have agreed a category tree for Estates and ICT as a starting point. SW feels that we also need to agree on some common procedures. AM questioned whether we need more resources to carry this out. MM stated that we have the skill bases within our organisations but not the time and unless we employ external resources we will move forward too slowly. FR added that we had agreed to hold some workshops to develop this further. RK believes that we need to let the Heads of Consortia go away and think about this. He asked whether the Chairs would agree to putting in, say £30K each to achieve these objectives but FR feels that this could be achieved with existing resources.

RK suggested holding the next meeting in September or early October and having a report from the Advisory Group on the work which has already been done. FR will employ someone on a short term contract (approximately 3 months) with the other consortia contributing to the costs. He will undertake category strategies for everything and SW will be involved on the laboratory side. SW asked whether we would be looking at engaging with our members as to why they are not using the contracts. FR stated that there is a tool already in existence for recording and capturing this. RK asked for Heads of Consortia to pass on any good practice. IJ suggested that this be noted for each area. RK confirmed that PELAG would be asked to come up with an Action Plan before the next meeting.

Action : PEL ADVISORY GROUP

7 Sub-Group Reports

PEL Comms Group

FR announced that NEUPC will be appointing a Comms/Marketing person. They have ToRs and are looking at a marketing plan. The Board felt that a PEL logo was not important at the moment. We need some 'good news stories' from each consortium to put into a repository. AM asked to be kept updated of developments and this will be done via the consortium.

PEL Advisory Group

This had already been covered previously.

Additional Strategic Activities Working Party

The 3 members – AD, RM and FR are working on a date to meet up for the first time.

8 Lessons from the PMA Reports

GHT would like to see something that shows where everybody is and what we can learn from them. LUPC, NWUPC and SUPC have shared their results and who was stronger in which areas. The consortia compared very well with the institutions. AM asked for this information to be circulated as the Heads of Consortia had already seen this. PWT promised to circulate all the results to the Board.

Action: PWT

NEUPC had planned another assessment in September as there were two main areas for improvement – Communications Strategy and Spend Analysis.

9 Update on GeM

The GeM Team in Cardiff will wind up at the end of July and the Supplier Adoption Team at the end of June. There was talk of Cloudbuy taking over this until September 2016 but SW has told them that they must consult with the Heads of Consortia. RK confirmed that we will send a letter on behalf of PEL to JISC to escalate this.

Action: RK

FR would like to develop our own but instead of having fragmented systems we would just have the one. MM feels that we need to have a plan for what happens after September 2016. SW thinks that we need a proper technology system which brings everything together. AM feels that the funding model of GeM was never sustainable from the outset.

10 Reporting on Progress Towards the 30% Target

AM would like to have a date as to when the data will be available. The collaborative spend has to come from the HEIs. If we have the Spend Analysis Tools then can we not use them for this. PEL can take more of a lead role in getting the consortia to calculate the spend using the analysis tools.

11 HEPA Update

The website has improved and there has been a huge step forward. There is the A to Z Procurement Journey Tool and there is also the online Competency Tool. They will be having five online training modules available to members. Networking events are running quite well and face-to-face training has started to pick up. 196 delegates have attended the 7 courses. They are now in the process of setting up the Calendar of Events for 2014-2015.

12 Proposal for TUCO to join PEL

GHT reported that TUCO would like to be part of PEL in the same way that TEC is, so we can use a similar MoU. Members agreed that they were happy with that recommendation so GHT will inform TUCO accordingly.

Action: GHT

13 Sharing out PEL Costs

GHT feels that these costs should be shared amongst the consortia. At the last meeting it was decided that a decision regarding the budget should be suspended for now. AD confirmed he will invoice the other consortia for costs incurred in the original setting up of PEL. It was agreed to do one transaction at the end of the year.

14 Any Other Business

RK reported that P-UK had met recently and that he had attended on behalf of PEL. There had been some discussion regarding the cessation of operations with ENP. When RK has received the Minutes he will circulate them to the Board.

Action: RK

PWT referred to the EMM Survey which will be open to everyone in England only. He asked that the Heads encourage their members to reply. MM asked him to make sure that the request comes from a North West e-mail address to encourage a better response. PWT will send this to Heads of Consortia and ask them to forward it to their members.

Action: PWT

RK wished to reiterate his thanks to AM and MM for their contribution to PEL.

RM mentioned that after the last meeting he had circulated a revised MoU. He will re-send this to RK to sign for TEC and then will amend the wording for TUCO.

15 Date and Location of Next Meeting

The Secretary will circulate a Doodle poll for late September (not the 29th) avoiding any Monday. RK kindly offered to host the meeting again and the start time was confirmed as 11.00 am.