

Attendees: Hilary Hurrey (Action Sustainability), Emma-Jane Allen (Action Sustainability), Aaron Reid (Balfour Beatty), Jo Gilroy (Kier), Kris Karlake (BAM), Antony Lavers (Taylor Wimpey), Daniel Harvey (Wates), Warren Edwards (Laing O'Rourke), Michael Cross (Willmott Dixon)

Apologies: Alice Hands (Sir Robert McAlpine), Nathalie Ritchie (National Grid), Ian Heptonstall (Action Sustainability), Jade Hunt (Kier), Cara Palmer (Wates), John Dwyer (Telford Homes), Cyndie Mudaly (ENGIE), Lauren Adams (ENGIE)

1. Operational Update:

Hilary reported the progress against targets to date.

Unfortunately, BRE will not be renewing their Partnership with the School this year.

Hilary reported that the assessment figures, when comparing them to the same time period this time last year, were down. There were a few reasons for this: some Partners who had been strongly encouraging their supply chain to complete assessments in 2018 were no longer doing so this year due to focus moving to other areas; some Partners have been holding off encouraging their supply chains to assess as they are waiting for the launch of the new platform and its enhanced functionality.

Hilary reported that the team were already looking into incentives and other ways that the School communications can support campaigns to increase assessment numbers. Work was also going into looking at new ideas and messaging as well as looking at what was the School team doing differently to this time last year.

2. Strategy 2025 Update & Recap

Hilary provided an update on the Strategy 2025.

The 'Upper School' (working title only – this will be changed in time) is being led by Shaun McCarthy. He is currently developing this concept with two other Board members and is having several conversations amongst Partners. There will be a workshop staged once the proposal has been developed for feedback.

The Certified Qualifications needs development and research which will be done in the coming months. Hilary is currently going through the registration process to become an Accredited Training Organisation (ATO) with CITB as a start.

Actions:

- ✓ Hilary Hurrey to ensure the members of the Operations Group receive details of the workshop around Upper School.

School Ambassadors

The group was asked to feedback on the paper circulated on the scope of an Ambassador.

The overarching comments were:

- Ambassadors should be members not Partners (i.e. should not be limited to Partners). Partners, being larger organisations, will likely have people in a similar guise (a subject

matter expert) so there is potentially no added benefit/ value for them. What would they do differently as a result of being an ambassador?

- There needs to be a very clear value proposition which is currently not clearly articulated in the current paper. This needs to demonstrate the value to the individual, the organisation, and the School.
- A benefit for Ambassadors is could be attending leadership group meetings and SIG's thereby giving them exposure that they would not normally get.
- By allowing members to become Ambassadors and upskilling them allows for capacity to be built in the supply chain. This builds a talent map which is of benefit to Partners.
- There needs to be limited places to create a sense of competition. This would also allow Partners to be able to mentor the ambassadors.
- Provide an incentive to become an Ambassador by upskilling subject matter experts e.g. to teach.

Actual feedback listed below:

Ideas	Challenges
Ambassadors should be Members of the School (not Partners). This could provide Partners with a 'talent map' of good SME's within the Supply Chain e.g. find new suppliers; find best in an area.	Benefits need to be split out between Partner, member and School.
Members should be ambassadors (free) and could be related (or another level) to silver and gold status.	Why exclude individuals from member organisations as the key here is the knowledge of the individual? Start down the supply chain and across organisation. Limit it to x number/ subjects
Benefit to members – get a seat in front of Partners	Why would someone volunteer?
Key benefit to members will be to be part of the conversation with Partners; ability to influence and drive	Why such large numbers? 3,000 by 2024 – that's 34 Ambassadors per Partner
Partner mentor allocated to each Ambassador.	It should be free to members and if monetise, the Partners should pay for ambassadors.
Competition: limiting number of spaces to be an ambassador Continue being active as an Ambassador	Benefit split Charge post build/ Bono value Articulate offer/ package
Should our Partner ambassadors aim to create ambassadors/ champions in their supply chain? This is not something we currently do	What would our 'experts' do that they don't do already?
Can we help to develop ambassadors training skills i.e. presenting, facilitating etc rather than just technical skills	Can there be another 'value' proposal for this
How about external ambassadors i.e. supply chain	

Partner value

The group was asked to feedback on the slides outlining the monetised value the School provides Partners. The group were happy with the slides and only suggestions made were:

- Presentation needs to be punchier – perhaps an infographic
- Change the row on supplier days from ‘speaking at’ to ‘hosting’

Actions:

- ✓ Hilary Hurrey to develop the Ambassador offering further.
- ✓ Emily McBride to develop infographic options for the Partner value and circulate amongst the Operations Group for feedback.

3. What can the School do to make Partners more accountable?

EJ updated the group on recent discussions with both the Homes and Construction Leadership Groups – key points below:

- General consensus amongst both groups that the School needs to look at how it can make its partners more ‘accountable’.
- The School is ‘too nice’ – there are no consequences if actions aren’t completed by partners
- This feedback was from a range of partners including the very engaged, to those who are struggling to secure internal buy in / engagement
- The value presented by the School is significant, yet most partners aren’t maximising the opportunities available
- The groups would like the School to consider how it can make its partners more accountable

A small workshop followed the introduction. Partners were split into 2 groups and asked to note ideas on:

1. What could the School do to make the partners more accountable?
2. What are the resulting challenges?

Responses captured on the worksheets detailed below:

Idea	Challenge
Ranking of partners extracting most value (top 10 anon)	School resource
Action planning with partners each year using the ‘monetisation of value’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of alienating partners – important to be proactive not reactive • Resource intense – partners would need more touch points with the school
Recognition of partners e.g. Bronze, Silver, Gold or those who are doing the most in	Could be resource intense

Idea	Challenge
each of the following areas: internal use of school resources, collaboration with the school, supply chain engagement, advocacy	
Internal org reporting	Internal resource
Peer benchmarking – share what other partners are doing	Risk of alienating partners.
Tiered partner membership	Could alienate partners
Development of case studies showing partner value (looking at internal use, supply chain engagement, collaboration with the School and advocacy)	
CE-100 model – tapping into CEO advocacy through partners.	Budget / access to CEOs
Run CEO event (majority of partner representatives have access to CEO level within their business)	
Different levels of access based on engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different motivation for different partners • Mixed message – why would we not give access to all resources to everyone
Minimum engagement targets to get a place on the Leadership Groups or Board	Is there a waitlist of companies waiting to join?!
Board selection process to include how embedded the School is within their organisation	
Board members required to demonstrate how they have embedded the School within their organisation each year to retain their place	

Key points:

- The idea of ranking and recognising the most engaged partners was supported by all. Important to rank against peers e.g. contractors ranked against other main contractors etc. Important to consider data protection.
- Important to be proactive rather than reactive. E.g. at beginning of year have an action planning session with the school to look at how you get max value from the School. Where

do you want to get value? Need to avoid reactive approach as this could risk alienating partners

- Advocacy – interesting to look at the Ellen MacArthur CE 100 model. How could this model work for the School?
- Engaging CEOs could be key (linking to the above) – if CEOs are advocates then people take ownership and the School would become embedded. Through the School's partner representatives there are good links to CEO level (not in all, but in most). Important to remember that different CEOs will be motivated by different things – majority of partner representatives will be aware of what motivates their CEO
- Different partners will have different motivations / different drivers for becoming a Partner
- Ultimately Partners should be leading, rather than asking the School to lead on their behalf
- Should part of the board selection process include how embedded the school is within their organisation? Should board members be required to demonstrate how they have embedded the School within their organisation each year to retain their place on the board?

Actions:

- ✓ EJ to develop a briefing paper on the idea of ranking / recognising partners for their engagement with the School.
- ✓ EJ to ensure that creating a monetisation tool that sits on a partner dashboard that shows the 'value' they have got each year through the School to the web platform is added to the web development 'wishlist' for the future. This would be very well received and help to drive engagement / buy in / accountability.
- ✓ Hilary to share the above feedback with the Board as this ties into the Partner Management priority.
- ✓ Hilary/ EJ (via other sector leads) to plot the Partners within each market sector group on the Partner Maturity Matrix (albeit anonymously) and share with the group – this will help drive engagement / accountability

4. Web platform update

Emily provided an update to the web platform and did a live demo of the site.

The group expressed concerns that the current launch date of early September is unrealistic.

Actions:

- ✓ Hilary to speak to Ian and Wendy (leading on the web development) to establish whether September is a realistic date. A communication must go out to all Partners to manage expectations. This is particularly important as many Partners are feeding back that they are holding back on promoting the use of the School to their supply chains.
- ✓ Hilary to report back on how many levels there are on the Business Units on Partner dashboards. This includes providing an explanation as to how the business units are structured; in particular around permissions (e.g. it is important that the admin for each business unit is unable to affect other business units); also understanding on the functionality around emailing priority suppliers and when they are split between business units e.g. the Admin for business unit may have a cross over with business unit 3 suppliers. The activity of that supplier needs to be recorded in both business units.

- ✓ Emily to add to the development wish list, investigating the feasibility of linking social media platforms, e.g. Linked In, to the School site so the ability to share engagement is made easier.
- ✓ School to accept the offer from Daniel at Wates to test the website before going live.

The date of the next meeting will take place on Tuesday 24th September 10.30am – 12.30pm, London venue tbd.