

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (5)
At Dorset House, Bournemouth.
Monday 19th November 2007, 1400

AGENDA

1. To approve minutes of the last meeting, 5th November 2007

2. Action Items arising from previous minutes
 - 2.1 To receive NFDC's proposal to carry out Scoping Study.

3. To decide whether to accept the proposal of Mouchel or NFDC.
(NFDC to be asked to withdraw and not to take part in discussion or vote on this matter)

4. AOB

5. Date of next Meeting:
? Monday 14th January 2008, 1400 at Bournemouth

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING
DORSET HOUSE - MONDAY 19th NOVEMBER 2007**

Present:	Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
	Dick Appleton (DA)	Poole Harbour Commissioners
	Sarah Austin	Poole Borough Council
	Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
	Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
	Andrew Gill (AG)	Environment Agency
	Ashley Harman (AH)	Christchurch Borough Council
	Andrew Ramsbottom	Poole Harbour Commissioners
	David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
	Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)

Apologies:	Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
	Andrew Colenutt (AC)	New Forest District Council
	Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
	Helen Powell (HP)	Natural England
	Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
	Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council

1. Minutes of Last Meeting on 5th November 2007

- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed but it was noted that Steve Woolard did not in fact attend the meeting as indicated in the minutes.

2. Presentation by New Forest District Council

- 2.1 SC outlined the benefits of utilising the resources and expertise of NFDC's coastal management team for the initial procurement work and scoping study. SC explained that NFDC had very good local knowledge through the Regional Monitoring Programme and had acquired a great deal of experience by being the lead authority for the North Solent and mainland SMP.
- 2.2 Other benefits included a detailed knowledge of the EU tendering process, partnership working and stakeholder engagement. SC also drew attention to the fact that NFDC's charge-out rates would not include a profit element and that there were also advantages to having a Steering Group member undertaking the work.
- 2.3 SC said that the proposal had three main elements:-
(a) OJEU advertising procedure;
(b) Contract document preparation, tender evaluation and award;
(c) The scoping report.
- 2.4 It was noted that the pre-qualification questionnaire would not have to be prepared from scratch and that the tender documentation could also be based on what had been done previously. Tenders could be evaluated on a 40% 60% price/quality basis measured against the criteria which would include such

factors as resources, experience, contract management, quality assurance and health & safety.

- 2.5 The interview process would be conducted by the Group with the tender reporting and contract award being dealt with by Bournemouth Council as the lead authority.
- 2.6 SC said that the DEFRA guidance would be used for the scoping report. The guidance provided a good basis for data gathering and key stakeholder engagement through questionnaires and an information leaflet. This would then feed into the tender document and brief. It was proposed that, taking account of the statutory time periods, the tender list would be available by the end of February. Allowing a month for the return of the questionnaires and stakeholder input the tender could be awarded in June.
- 2.7 SC said that the resources of the NFDC team at Lymington (i.e. AB, SC, PF and AK) would be available for the work and that their specialist skills were shown in the paper he had circulated.
- 2.8 SC said that the total fees for the three key processes were estimated at £23K and that it had been possible to keep the costs down compared with Mouchel because of the work already completed.
- 2.9 Stakeholder engagement would be facilitated through the questionnaire and an accompanying information leaflet which would introduce the SMP, define the area of coastline involved and explain how stakeholders could get involved. The cost of printing and distributing the leaflet had not been included in NFDC's fees.
- 2.10 DA queried whether the existing stakeholder list included Poole Harbour. The need to overlap the boundaries to avoid omissions in the consultation process was also noted.
- 2.11 Attention was drawn to the need to ensure that the NFDC proposal covered the same work as Mouchel. The fewer hours in the NFDC submission reflected their different starting points. The longer time periods allowed for by NFDC were commended by the Group as providing a more realistic timescale for the work to be completed properly.

3. Consideration of NFDC's proposal to carry out the pre-award work

- 3.1 The NFDC officers withdrew from the meeting so that their proposal could be considered.
- 3.2 DH emphasised the importance of making a decision now to either accept NFDC's proposal or Mouchel's. DH also drew attention to the need to ensure that the Group were comparing like with like.
- 3.3 Various factors were discussed regarding the relative merits of the two proposals. Mouchel's need to make a profit as opposed to NFDC was queried.
- 3.4 DH asked the members present to vote to accept either Mouchel's or NFDC's proposal for the pre-award work and scoping study. The decision of the Group was to offer the work to NFDC.

- 3.5 It was noted that a formal proposal should be invited from NFDC by Bournemouth Council which DH said he would refer to the Council's legal team for consideration. The need to notify Mouchel of the outcome was also acknowledged.
- 3.6 The NFDC officers were invited back and advised of the Steering Group's decision.

4. Website presentation by Sarah Austin

- 4.1 SA demonstrated what had been done for North Solent and suggested the website was hosted on the same website as 'poolebay.net'
- 4.2 Various options were presented and the need for a new domain name and hosting plan were noted.
- 4.3 SA explained that based on her hourly rate of £29.58 the overall costs would be approximately £1,000 as a lot of information needed to be put on the website.
- 4.4 Consideration had to be given to the type of audience the website was aimed at which would include local residents and the educational sector. The importance of having a soft approach to avoid the site being off putting was also stressed.
- 4.5 It was agreed to accept Poole Council's offer and to invite a formal proposal from them to establish and maintain the website.
- 4.6 It was agreed that the website should be 100 megabytes, be entitled 'www.twobays.net' (unless a better suggestion was made within the next week), have an on-line consultation facility and a logo that linked in with the leaflet.
- 4.7 It was also agreed that Steering Group members should check the website and contact SA direct with any amendments or suggestions.
- 4.8 Attention was drawn to the need to look at North Solent's website and the links with other websites, such as DEFRA and SCOPAC.

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1 There was no other business.

6. Date of Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next meeting is to be held at 2.00 pm on Monday 14th January 2008 at Dorset House.