

Attendees: Chair: Shaun McCarthy (Action Sustainability), Dale Turner (Skanska), Martin Gettings (Canary Wharf Group), Julia Barrett (Willmott Dixon), Graham Edgell (Morgan Sindall), Dan Evans (Speedy Services), Aaron Reid (Balfour Beatty), Marcus Bennett (CITB), Carol Williams (Laing O'Rourke), Keith Chanter (EMCOR), Victoria Hughes (VINCI Facilities), Ian Heptonstall (Action Sustainability), Hilary Hurrey (Action Sustainability).

1. Introductions

Shaun welcomed both Marcus Bennett and Carol Williams to the Board.

2. Review of actions

Hilary reported on progress against actions from the last meeting. All items were being progressed or addressed within the agenda.

3. School Partnership Value

Partner Value 2020/21

Ian ran through the key points on the presentation.

Agreed:

- ✓ The introduction of the Partner Relations Manager role has proved successful in relation to retention and providing Partner with value. Further resources have been assigned this year with the increase in the number of Partners.
- ✓ The value exercise allows for areas of where each Partner organisation is doing well, but also not so well. It is important that areas where further value can be received is highlighted in the individual meetings that take place.
- ✓ Attributing 'value' received from being part of the various leadership groups and encouraging Partners to therefore join these groups to maximise their value from the School should also be considered.
- ✓ A huge thanks to Becky Bryant (Partner Relations Manager) who undertakes the mammoth task of calculating the value for all Partners. Since Becky has been in place there has been a huge step forward in the value and retention strategy.

Partnership Pricing model

The current pricing model has the potential to cause a barrier to further collaboration when the number of groups a Partner has paid to engage in is reached. The delivery team are finding that the majority of Partners when they have a fourth group they want to join are dropping a group as opposed to paying the additional fee and upgrading to five groups. Main discussion points were:

- ✓ If we were able to demonstrate the value for each group this would help as we would be able to encourage engagement to produce added value and so it doesn't become a cost issue.
- ✓ The idea of a Gold, Silver, Bronze Partner comes across as elitist and should not be considered.

- ✓ There could be a standard entry fee to join the School. A nominal cost is then introduced for each group. This again links to demonstrating the value for each group.
- ✓ A question was posed around the continuity of attendance in the SIG's (Wellbeing & CAG). This will be explored further however the feeling is that there is continuity happening.
- ✓ One size does not fit all so a 'pick and mix' model could work.
- ✓ There is a big jump in price between the 3 to 5 groups with no option to join 4 groups.
- ✓ The current model means the cost sits with one budget however the benefit is realised across the business. If a standard fee with top up was introduced this could allow other parts of the business to invest in areas of interest which fit, also spreading the cost across departments.
- ✓ Should a payment in kind model be considered for those Partners who lead and engage heavily with the School e.g. Chair meetings etc. There is a point around those who want to lead and those who want to follow. Potentially a discount could be introduced as part of that. This model would need to be formalised.
- ✓ Following on from above, is it important to have the right people in the room. The groups need/ want the influencers and mover and shakers. These should be identified.
- ✓ There are some Partners who do just want the badge and kudos of being part of the SCSS and therefore just sponsors of the School.
- ✓ Its important not to overcomplicate – a standard fee would solve this.
- ✓ There are however other valuable add ons: Performance tool; LMS; other specific value add needs.

Agreed:

- ✓ The current model does need review.
- ✓ There is a desire to keep the School as a collaboration not a service model.
- ✓ The introduction of a flat fee with bolt ons should be explored.
- ✓ The value in kind model needs thought.
- ✓ There is no appetite for grades of membership as this moves away from a collaborative model.

Actions

- Ian to develop recommendations for the next Board meeting in July for further discussion.

4. Our Learning Priorities

Ian and Marcus talked through the current structure of the CLC and identified areas where the School had relationships/ influence. Marcus outlined the emerging skills priorities for CITB. Points from the discussion were:

- ✓ We do need to get better at influencing the CLC.
- ✓ Marcus pointed out that on the skills list, scaffolding is replaced with 'Plastering & boarding'.

- ✓ The list is not a list of occupational training it is about skills. E.g the School does not need to train bricklayers in how to be the best in laying bricks but around 'meta competencies' such as communication, how to treat people, logistics etc.
- ✓ Though there is alignment in the School in the areas highlighted, Retrofit is missing.
- ✓ The School is progressing and developing around the topic of Wellbeing and will be collaborating with Lighthouse and the Samaritans to host new resources being developed.
- ✓ There should be some funding available with CITB around Retrofit. This would likely focus on Retrofit Co-ordinators/ Assessors and providing them with the sustainability skills to produce reports on all elements of the work that is required.

Agreed:

- ✓ The School should be involved in the CLC CO2 Champions Network. Martin and Ian will include this as an agenda item at the next CAG meeting.
- ✓ The growth in our learning content does align with our mission and eight guiding principles.
- ✓ When new content is being introduced there should be a fixed fee introduced which contributes to the development and maintenance costs. However, Wellbeing should be considered as part of the core fee.

Actions

- The School to develop an "offer" document for the Retrofit "School" - see next item.
- Proposals for a suitable fee structure to ensure full cost recovery for new content will be developed for the next Board meeting.

5. Retrofit

Ian summarised the slides sent in the pre-read around retrofit. Discussion points were:

- Retrofit should not be limited to just housing, it should include other buildings.
- It is a growing area and the School should develop learning in this area.
- It will be important to follow the funding; housing associations are unlikely to fund however Government and City of London do have funding available. The Mayors office has approached Morgan Sindall already around a retrofit project.
- Product manufacturers are a potential revenue stream.
- Private housebuilders currently don't have an interest in retrofit as their focus is on new builds.
- Government has made a legal commitment around retrofit so they have got to do something. The industry will need to respond. It was important to find a route where Housing Associations could get involved.
- Retrofit could be a 'label' as such - is it not just net zero building. Whether or not it is retrofit or new buildings the skills are generic (circularity, social value, metaskills).

Actions

- The School will look at how to develop Retrofit in terms of learning and funding within the School.
- School to explore funding opportunities with BIES, CITB, Local Authorities, manufacturers etc.
- Graham will report back on the meetings he is having with the Mayors office.

6. New Groups

Interiors

Ian and Graham reported back on progress to date. Two meetings have taken place to date and the School is collaborating well with FiS.

Utilities Client Group

Shaun reported on the development of a Utilities group. This has been formed for as a subgroup of the Infrastructure group. The clients are keen to collaborate and there have been discussions around dashboards, pooling workshop, and performance measurement.

Agreed:

- ✓ There was an appetite for this group and it has the strong potential to create a new income stream.
- ✓ Telecoms should be considered for this group as well.

Heritage

Ian gave an overview of the Heritage work to date. There is also a bid developed for some Lottery funding to continue the Heritage work over the next three years. This is the first time we have gone through the process with the Lottery which has been interesting to explore.

Social Value/ PPN

Shaun presented on the proposal to have a Social Value SIG set up. There has been a lot of support from the leadership groups who have also been presented to.

Agreed:

- ✓ The Board agreed with setting up a Social Value SIG.
- ✓ It was important to gain an understanding of what the clients are doing/ how they are responding.
- ✓ There has been little guidance to enable the supply chain to answer related questions in their tenders.
- ✓ A common language is important to adopt.

Actions:

- Victoria will speak with Ian and Graham on the work she has been involved in on interiors.
- Shaun will progress setting up a Social Value Special Interest Group.

7. Learning Management System

Due to timings this item will be discussed at the next Board meeting. It is not time critical.

8. Operational Update

Any questions around the operational update can be emailed direct to Hilary@supplychainschool.co.uk

9. AOB

Date of next meeting:

Tuesday 13th July, 10am – 1pm: Virtual via Zoom