



PEL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

Wednesday 29th July 2015 at TEC Offices, Birmingham

Attendees:	Paul Tomany [Chairman]	NWUPC
	Alison Holmes	NEUPC
	Richard Murphy	TEC
	Frank Rowell	NEUPC
	Susan Wright	SUPC
	Judith Hoyle [Secretary]	NWUPC

1. Introduction, apologies and Welcome

There were apologies from Kevin Casey, Andy Davies, Mike Haslin, Chris Philpott and Colin Reeve.

2. Minutes of the Meeting and Matters Arising

These were taken as agreed.

Paul mentioned that he would like to step down as Chairman of the Group and asked if there were any volunteers to take this over. Susan suggested putting a memo round to everybody to see if anyone would like to do it.

3. PEL Board Meeting

Richard reported on the June Board meeting. There was £1 billion going through in terms of spend. The Board were looking for some more granularity but Richard explained that this was not necessarily possible. He also mentioned the idea of a Joint PEL Board/Consortia Meeting suggested for November but to date nothing has been arranged for this. The group generally felt that a meeting such as this was not necessary. It was also felt that any involvement by any consortia boards with the contracting program was not welcome. Paul stated that he would rather spend time doing a contract worth £1 million that everybody uses rather than a contract worth £10 million which nobody wants but which is in the plan. He has concerns about the PEL Contracting Plan – this cannot be imposed if it covers areas that nobody wants. Susan questioned how we prioritise and make sure that we are not missing anything in areas where there is no contract but a requirement for one. Paul pointed out that under the new EU Rules you have to justify why you are doing any national contracts and the push within his consortium is sub-regional contracts. We need to reassure people that we are operating at optimum level.

The general feeling was that FDs do not know enough about collaborative procurement and BUFDG do not understand the complexities involved. HEPA was originally brought in to push professional procurement especially CPD not be involved operationally. The main question is, how do we get the “communication” out there? We need to get some uniformity as to how we are doing our category planning. Alison feels that we need to be in people’s faces all the time.



We must have constant communication to the HE community, the wider sector, government bodies and agencies so the success of collaborative and institutional procurement in HE is acknowledged.

There was a lot of focus on the KPIs and members asked whether the targeted spend goes there. Susan is of the opinion that the Joint Contracting Plan is not, in its present state, a document which we can present to anybody.

Frank announced that he had recently attended the Midlands Finance Directors' meeting but had struggled to report on the information as it is not well maintained and the information is not being loaded onto Hunter. Susan added that she will be attending the UniProc Meeting on Friday 31st July so she has taken some figures from Hunter but the report itself can be improved and the presentation certainly needs improvement. PEL must have efficient marketing.

It was reported that PUK have only had one meeting this year and they do not expect to hold any more than another two meetings. It was felt that TEC and TUCO had a slightly different agenda from the other four consortia as they are specialist procurement bodies.

4. EMM Survey Update

Paul announced that he used this to gauge levels of collaboration within the sector. Many universities do not include such collaborative activities as N8, HVLE, UMI etc. when reporting on their figures. How can institutions give 100% commitment when in reality they have no idea what their end users are going to do? Frank believes that there is a direct correlation between the institution and the Head of Procurement. Alison questioned why people become members of the consortia when they have no intention of taking these agreements forward and using them. What is being done about the institutions who are nowhere near the 30% target and have no intention of doing anything about it? Nothing is being done about the institutions who are not even trying to get near the 30%. Within the NHS, if Trusts are doing their own contracts then their funding is cut. How do we get the people who have not bought into this brought into account? Paul is of the opinion that the reason for the uptake in the North West is the support of the various FDs. Frank added that often people will not use the framework if their favorite supplier is not on there.

Regarding the survey itself one thing that it demonstrated is some of the UniProc and Russell Group universities do not collaborate to a great extent. There is currently something of a debate as to who wishes to take ownership of the EMM survey and what it should be used for. Heads of Procurement want to use the survey in their report to their FDs but feel that it is not fit for purpose. HEFCE have stated that they may do one more survey then that will be the last one in the current format as their remit was just to report at a sector level to government. There will be a meeting on 3rd September which Paul and Susan will attend to discuss ownership of this going forward. The Group felt that the two surveys run under PEL have been the best surveys ever and have shown progress from the first to the second Diamond Report and feel that consequently they should retain ownership of this under the PEL banner.

5. PEL Communications Group

Susan wished to minute thanks from the group to Marion Hutchins for all her work on the PEL Annual Report. Paul asked whether we should be looking to do quarterly newsletters, even if they are electronic.



Durham are looking to be in their quarterly dialogue about procurement, this then becomes what people expect to see. Paul feels that there is a difference between Marketing and Communications. NWUPC have a monthly e-Newsletter with procurement news and the hard copy of their newsletter is more human interest and procurement success stories. We need to produce items from PEL that people will actually read and we need to be steering the content.

It was agreed to have up to three PEL publications a year and each has a marketing story in it about each of the six PEL members. People in general do not want everything merged into PEL, they just want more of a consistent approach. The group feel that we need to have at least two communications per annum. Information should be sent to the PEL Board and wider sector bodies if they choose not to read it that is up to them. Paul volunteered NWUPC to keep the PEL documents up to date.

6. PEL Vision Implementation Plan

Regarding actions, the PEL Contracting Plan had been agreed and the work on the Category Analysis had been started. Paul will report back that the Implementation Plan is going well and will write a progress report on this to the PEL Board for their next meeting. Alison asked whether we can get Karel Thomas to put this in the BUFDG Report? It was felt that everyone is actually doing what is in the plan but not telling people. There will be a link on everybody's website to PEL and what we do. Paul asked that TUCO arrange to have a link from their website to the PEL page. Frank is happy to link into the PEL page but there needs to be a consensus amongst everyone.

Updates were as follows:

Action 1

Agreed

Action 2

Started with Category Analysis but we need validation from everyone as to Category Profiles. Whatever we have nationally we should also have locally. We need to identify for each one what is ticked off and what is not.

Action 3

Estates and Labs are very well developed. We have a new UK Professional Services Group and have identified a new Global Mobility Contract for staff working abroad. The TORs for the Professional Services Group were not for a category group. Frank will send these round again. We need to get something standardized.

Action 4a

This will be pushed through.

Action 6

This needs to be re-worded.

Action 7

This has not been done yet.

Action 8

Paul has looked at his Commodity Groups becoming Category Groups.

Action 9

This has been done.

Action 9a

This has been done.



Action 10

More work on this is required.

Action 10a

Done.

Action 10b

Done.

7. Report from Joint Contracting Group

Frank reported that the Standard Buyers Guide and Briefing Sheets have been adopted. Work is continuing with the Estates Category Group. They are now looking to standardize the ITT documentation. Scotland are not part of the above as they have their own set of laws but the other five regional consortia are in. They are all starting to use the Sharepoint Repository for document storage. We need to link the JCG into the Category Groups that we have. There can be scope for setting up an English (PEL) Contracting Group. Scotland have done their category structures therefore it may make sense to have a PEL Contracting Group. Susan asked if we are likely to be reviewing the terms of the JCG. Previously, where there were UK wide categories, it was felt that there should be a UK wide agreement. Scotland have not put through their new regulations yet and they will be radically different from the English ones. Frank believes that we should inform Scotland of the Contracting Plan which goes out to the Category Groups to see if there are any opportunities for collaboration.

Paul is currently under pressure to let an audit tender for England and Wales which would fly in the face of the APUC agreement. We need to sell this to the PEL Board. Frank suggested having an English Joint Category Group which brings all the various Category Groups together. In which case, the JCG would not need to fold as there cannot be two groups. It was therefore agreed to wind up the Joint Contracting Group and put an English Joint Category Group together. This would be put to the PEL Board and Frank would lead on this.

Action: FR

8. Any Other Business

Richard stated that the Communications Plan talks about procurement and the difficulty with TEC is that they struggle with Contacts Databases so there is a possibility that PEL are being communicated via other channels. Could we throw each other's CRM or Contacts Databases together to share this information? Paul was happy for members to have access to NWUPC's and SUPC are also happy to do this.

Paul mentioned that NWUPC had agreed to get the T&Cs standardized but with the new EU Regulations coming in, these have had to be changed. They are currently working on the new documents and once they have done these, they are happy to share them. If any Terms and Conditions need to be changed then whoever is leading on that particular contract needs to seek the correct professional advice.

The Joint Contracting Group have responsibility to identify anything that needs to be updated. NWUPC are hoping to get a full set reviewed then will share them with everybody but if after that anybody wishes to change them, then Martin Vincent will not take legal responsibility for any changes. The T&Cs have become much more important in the PCR 2015 so they have to be current and relevant right from the date you publish your Contract Notice. These documents needed to be re-done as they had to be consistent.



In the case of any future challenges, each consortium will have to seek its own legal advice. Any T&Cs from before February this year would be used at your own risk. Paul will also e-mail everyone to let them know once NWUPC had devised new ITTs.

SUPC are revitalizing their Sustainability Group and looking at a PEL Sustainability Award for suppliers. TEC had a Sustainability Champion at the Green Gown Awards. NWUPC are already doing something similar across the sector with Rexel and one with a stationery supplier. Alison does an annual award at Durham but there was not sufficient interest in progressing Susan's suggestion.

Susan enquired whether anybody had anything to go on the PEL Stand at COUP. Paul will speak to Andy Wojciechowski to get a one page newsletter out in time for COUP.

Action: PWT

Susan will work on updating the Contracting Plan.

Action: SW

9. Date and Place of Next Meeting

Secretary to circulate a Doodle poll to confirm date of next meeting later in the year.