

WATER HUB CLIENT PRODUCT GROUP QUARTERLY MEETING

Date: Wednesday 30th August 2017

Time: 09:30 – 16:30

Venue: United Utilities: Thirlmere House, Lingley Mere Business Park,
Great Sankey, Warrington, Cheshire, WA5 3LP

Invitees:

Jon Rains (Chair)	(JR)	Buildoffsite (MottMacDonald)	
John Browne	(JB)	United Utilities	
Derek Keeling	(DK)	Welsh Water	
<i>Moray Cotter</i>	<i>(MC)</i>	<i>Thames Water</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
<i>Chris Peel</i>	<i>(CP)</i>	<i>Anglian Water</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
<i>Iain MacDonald</i>	<i>(IM)</i>	<i>Scottish Water</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Stephen Wright	(SW)	Yorkshire Water	
<i>Adrian Cross</i>	<i>(AC)</i>	<i>Northumbrian Water</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
James Ogden	(JO)	Southern Water	
<i>Charlotte Davidson</i>	<i>(SD)</i>	<i>Severn Trent</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
<i>Martin Vickers</i>	<i>(MV)</i>	<i>South Staffs Water</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Jack McCarey	(JM)	South West Water	
Louise Smith (Notes & Actions)	(LS)	Buildoffsite	

Guests

Sean McCarthy	(SM)	Offsite Management School	(Items 1 – 6)
David Marsh	(DM)	Laing O'Rourke	(Item 8)

Agenda Item		Actions
1.	<p>Welcome & Introductions</p> <p>JR welcomed the group and thanked them for attending. Apologies were noted as above.</p> <p>Participants then introduced themselves and gave a brief overview of their roles and interests (see agenda item 4 – Front of Mind).</p> <p>Apologies were noted as above.</p>	
2.	<p>Competition Acts Agreement</p> <p>Competitions Act Agreement was accepted by all.</p> <p>It was agreed that there is a need to keep discussions around the supply chain generic in order to ensure compliance with the Competitions Act.</p> <p>JR to write guidance in constitution re. supply chain/confidentiality and use of percentages</p>	JR

Agenda Item		Actions
3.	<p>Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the Client Product Group Conference Call on 2nd August 2017 were reviewed and agreed. The actions were reviewed; the log was updated accordingly and is attached as a separate document.</p>	
4.	<p>Front of Mind</p> <p>Buildoffsite (BoS): JR gave an introduction to I3P (https://www.i3p.org.uk/) and explained the projects roadmap which is aligned to AMP7/SR21 and Construction 2025 targets.</p> <p>There was a discussion around access to meetings, info and BoS website for non-BoS Members. LS explained that BoS is an independent organisation which is hosted by CIRIA and that their membership, data, system and process are not shared. BoS use the CIRIA accounts department as they do not have an accounts team of their own. LS to arrange a discussion with Tim Hall/JO to BoS in view of their CIRIA membership.</p> <p>United Utilities: JB is excited about how the group can work together and what projects they can undertake. Discrete offsite construction is going well but less so by traditional construction.</p> <p>Southern Water: JO advised that they are looking at engineering construction efficiency levers for AMP6 and at achieving £120 million efficiency savings.</p> <p>Sees the challenges as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you measure offsite construction in isolation? • Would like to see tangible outcomes; Southern have measured intangible costs, which might be useful for business case project. • Need for a common nomenclature across the client group • Different approaches to methodology across the client group <p>South West Water: Use offsite on a piecemeal basis at the moment. Here to understand what is happening with the group.</p> <p>Offsite Management School: SM explained that he is Chair of the Offsite management School, which is part of the Supply Chain Sustainability School. He will be presenting later and wants to see how we can work together to deliver the skills required for Offsite Construction.</p> <p>Welsh Water: DK advised that his front of mind is DfMA and standard products. He sees the challenge as persuading people to use off-site products.</p> <p>Yorkshire Water: SW introduced himself as the Standard Product Manager. Yorkshire Water have a growing portfolio of standard products with a team wrapped around engineering and procurement. SW is also working on AMP7 and looking at smart infrastructure.</p> <p>Challenges:</p>	LS

Agenda Item		Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also being challenged on business cases and is responding to demonstrate both the indirect and direct savings. • Resistance from the supply chain. <p>All agreed that fragmentation is a problem for the entire water industry and there is a need to agree collectively what are products and key terms.</p> <p>General: There was a discussion around storing data on the Buildoffsite website. It was AGREED that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard products spreadsheet should be removed from the BoS website. • The photos on the BoS Water Hub area should be refreshed. All to send suitable photos to LS. • JR/SW to send non confidential documents currently on Yorkshire Water SharePoint site to LS to upload to BoS website. • LS to look feasibility of setting up a secure area of BoS website for water client group confidential documents. • As an interim arrangement. client confidential information should remain shared via the Yorkshire Water SharePoint site • SW to look at 3rd party systems for sharing client confidential information 	<p>LS</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>JR/SW</p> <p>LS</p> <p>SW</p>
5.	<p>Water Company Standards</p> <p>JR gave a quick background to this. Amie Ladyman from Anglian Water gave a presentation to the Water Hub Client Product Group on 24th May, which compared and contrasted standards with a view to standardising products across companies. The work also looked at the blockers to achieving standardisation.</p> <p>This work and been put on hold because of the disparity and complexity of technical terms. It was AGREED that this work should be put on hold until a common terminology has been agreed between the various client group members. JR to advise CP.</p> <p>All AGREED that the approach is to first standardise and then configure.</p> <p>There is a need to pull together a document of terminology/glossary of terms that is water specific. This should be client led and should include best/good practice from other areas. This to be covered further in agenda item 9.</p> <p>The meeting brainstormed some term that they would like defined. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Product • Standard Product • Standard Asset • Configuration • Module 	<p>JR</p>

Agenda Item		Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Super module • Component • Sub-Assembly • Assembly • Standard Design • Standard Solution • Minimum Asset Standard • Reference Design • Signature Design • Level of Development • Maturity Level • Offsite • DfMA • Productisation • Variants 	
6.	<p>Offsite Management School (OMS)</p> <p>SM gave a presentation on the Supply Chain Sustainability School/Offsite Management School. This will be circulated to the group and published on the BoS Website.</p> <p>Both parties agreed that there is a strong desire for the water hub to collaborate with OMS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that all water companies would aspire to have their supply chains accredited as silver as OMS silver status. • JR to check if terminology used by OMS BIM Special Interest Group aligns with BIM4Water terminology. • JB to follow up with OMS re. lean construction • JR to discuss further with SM the links between BoS Water & OMS. • It was suggested that learning and sharing aspect of the group's Comms Plan can be done via OMS. SM agreed that OMS are happy to do this if learning is free at the point of access. • Discussion around skills plan as part of the roadmap project. There was a consensus that OMS should be the "route to market" for people strand of the projects roadmap. JB to Explore and clarify links between OMS and the BoS Water Hub and write a briefing/proposal. • JB/DK to liaise with SM to review offsite content from OMS website (what is relevant when you are building a product within the water industry) and produce review for Group. Review to be used for gap 	<p>ALL</p> <p>JR</p> <p>JB</p> <p>JR</p> <p>JB</p> <p>JB/DK</p>

Agenda Item		Actions				
	<p>analysis between d competencies required for offsite construction in the water industry and content/e-learning available on OMS website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM advised an approx. cost £10 – 20k to develop a 1 hour e-learning module. • There was a discussion around influencing the supply chain to obtain gold, silver or bronze accreditation from OMS vs using assessments at client meetings as the best way to assess OSM competencies. • All agreed to take some OMS modules to upskill and assess the e-learning modules. • SM agreed to assist with the supply chain project on the roadmap. 	ALL				
7.	<p>Roadmap</p> <p>JR talked through the innovation mapping slide and the i3P/CLC slides and will circulate these to the group.</p> <p>JO advised that Southern Water will shortly be launching waste water and water project “20 to 0”.</p> <p>DK advised that Welsh Water have launched an improved standard product tracker.</p>					
7.1	<p>Projects: Efficiencies & Supply Chain Mapping</p>					
	<p>The consensus was that there is need to know baseline and efficiency groupings. Currently efficiencies are only measured if they are on the critical path.</p> <p>JR advised that the common efficiency drivers are cost/time/quality/safety.</p> <p>JR left the meeting for a period but requested SW lead the discussion focussing on mapping and efficiency streams.</p> <p>Supply Chain Mapping: It was agreed that the group would share supply information between themselves as this is public knowledge. All to send to SW details of offsite designer, suppliers, contractors. It was clarified that this did not constitute agreement to influence the entire supply chain and all were mindful of complying with the Competition Act.</p> <p>Efficiencies Mapping:</p> <p>There was a discussion around the standard metrics required in order to compare values. The following metrics for efficiency drivers were discussed.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1883 1342 2007"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 1883 496 1951">Efficiency Driver</th> <th data-bbox="496 1883 1342 1951">Possible Metrics</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1951 496 2007">Time</td> <td data-bbox="496 1951 1342 2007"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manpower on site </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Efficiency Driver	Possible Metrics	Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manpower on site 	
Efficiency Driver	Possible Metrics					
Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manpower on site 					

Agenda Item			Actions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule savings • Critical path 	
Cost		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capex (Direct costs) – Labour/plant/materials (NEC) • Capex (Indirect costs) - prelims (fleet, parking, huts, design cost %) 	
Quality		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to measure but could be costs saved on snagging 	
Environment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon footprint • Pollution • Waste to landfill • Disturbance • Noise, disruption • Fewer deliveries to site 	
Safety		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accident frequency rate reduced and man hours saved 	
	<p>JO agreed to lead on the Efficiencies workstream and will circulate the list of assumptions used to baseline Southern Water costs</p> <p>The aspiration for this workstream is that, by 2025, OFWAT will recognise standard offsite metrics.</p>		JO
8.	<p>Configurator</p> <p>DM demonstrated the configurator system used at Davyhulme. Client group were interested in how they could access this from their various organisations and will follow up with DM on an individual company basis.</p> <p>JB advised that he was able to demonstrate tangible, significant savings through the use of this technology.</p> <p>It was suggested that DM visit AMRC in Sheffield and look at their VR system.</p> <p>The group thanked DM for an interesting and stimulating presentation.</p>		
9.	<p>Terminology</p> <p>JR rejoined the meeting. Following on from discussions under item 5 of the agenda.</p>		
9.1	<p>Asset Hierarchy</p>		
	<p>There was a discussion around the asset hierarchy definitions agreed at the previous Client Group Meeting on 24th May. JR advised that Asset had been chosen as the top level of the maturity hierarchy as an asset was a tangible item which links to accounting and sits on corporate balance sheets.</p> <p>There is some leeway on the order of the definitions and also leeway to define/use module and super module as terms above Asset. The following “rough” definitions were discussed:</p>		

Agenda Item		Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module - a collection of assets • Super Module – collection of modules <p>JR advised that BIM4Water are using the definitions agreed at previous meeting i.e Part/Component/Sub-Assembly/Assembly/Asset.</p> <p>It was agreed that BIM4Water should be invited to next meeting.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Client Group is unlikely to apply the term standard product to part or component and that they should be looking to benchmark only products from sub-assembly upwards</p>	JR
9.2	Product Maturity	
	<p>There was a discussion around starting the maturity level at 0 for ideas/concepts.</p> <p>The group also discussed using the Technology Readiness Levers definitions. All agreed to consider the challenges to the definition of maturity level. SW to take forward.</p> <p>JR to draw diagram of products/product maturity and circulate.</p>	SW JR
9.3	Definitions	
	<p>Standard Product: It was AGREED that this definition should be modified to “An asset, assembly, sub-assembly, component or part inclusive of supporting information which is designed once and used many times, with a level 3 or 4 maturity.” JR to modify the definition.</p> <p>Offsite: It was AGREED that this definition should be modified to “A delivery process that is undertaken in a controlled (factory-type) environment.”</p> <p>Reference Designs: JR to liaise with CP to define this.</p>	JR JR
10.	<p>AOB/Roundup</p> <p>JR to look at setting up Director level conference in 2018, possibly part of Project 13.</p> <p>DK: good progress made, but still work to do on terms etc. DK is adaptable and may be able to change Welsh Water terminology to suit agreed definitions.</p> <p>JM: stimulating meeting</p> <p>JO: Pleased at tangible process. Benefit of this group is access to the people around the table. Wants to know how this fits with other, different bodies doing the same thing. Impressed with OMS and route to market for skills. Interested to see where client group fits with OMS going forward. JR to list other offsite bodies and work that they are doing.</p> <p>JO offered Southern Water as a meeting venue</p>	JR JR

Agenda Item		Actions
	<p>JB: Need to define things before broadening them out. Wants to see progress on terminology and roadmap.</p> <p>Items for next agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are projects/roadmap going to be delivered? • End objectives to be filled in on roadmap. • What does good look like? <p>Meetings to be arranged at Southern Water and Welsh Water. LS to liaise with JO and DK</p>	LS

LS
01/09/17

Circulation:

Invitees
Website

Encs: Client Product Group Action Log
Photos of flipcharts from meeting
Offsite Management School Presentation

2017/8 Client Product Group Conference Calls

- Wednesday 25th October 2017
- Wednesday 24th January 2018

Time: 9am-10am
Skype details to be advised

2017 Client Product Group Meetings

Wednesday 29th November, 9.30am – 4.30pm, Scottish Water, Glasgow

2018 Client Product Group Meetings

Dates to be confirmed but venues to include Southern Water and Welsh Water