

101332443
Revision 01

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Meeting:	Supply Chain Working Group
Date:	29 th July 2024, 12:00-14:00
Location:	MS Teams
Chair:	Ian Pease (SCC)
Attendees:	James Chandler (ESC), Steven Carroll (SZC), Carlie Betts (SZC), Ryan Phelan (SZC), Ashely Shorey Mills (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce), Tim Johnson (SZC), and Rob Wilson (SZC) – Secretariat
Apologies:	Isaac Nunn (SCC – Optional Attendee), Rebecca Calder (SZC – Optional Attendee), Damian Leydon (SZC – Optional Attendee)

Meeting Notes:

1 WELCOME, INTRODUCTION AND APOLOGIES

Ian Pease introduction as chair, reminder that chair is to alternate between SCC and ESC

Noted that meeting was unable to be recorded, minutes to be recorded by RW

Safety message from TJ, overview of increasing site activity and increased focus on plant people interface onsite

ACTION: Safety Message to be added as standing agenda item (RW)

2 REVIEW OF ACTIONS AT PREVIOUS MEETING

Request from ASM to ensure timely turnaround of minutes. RW outlined 2 week turn around for circulation of draft minutes. Detail included in revised Governance Group Protocol Document

ACTION: Revised Governance Group protocol document to be circulated with attendees following approval (RW)

Previous informal action relating to HPC contracts during first 4 years. SC highlighted that this wasn't recorded as a formal action but could be useful context for the Local Authority teams to plan their activities around other projects for the skills and types of businesses that may be required. From SZC side there is a plan including packaging strategy etc. JC flagged upcoming agenda item around Work Plan and that in lieu of not having granular detail in that plan then HPC information could be useful to show direction of travel.

3 WORKING GROUP ADMINISTRATION

RW introduction to the group, RW / colleagues Caitlin Murphy and Olivia Hart will be providing secretariat support to sessions moving forward.

Commentary around review of ToR for this session to ensure project structure and wording is appropriate for the current view which has moved on since First Commencement.

ACTION: Review of ToR to ensure alignment with project language and wider governance groups. SCWG to input into review ahead of formal sign off (RW)

JC suggestion that circulating agenda further in advance would be beneficial to group. SC highlighted that lots of the information is live, TJ agreed and that due to high pace of delivery information is rapidly changing. JC agreed, however some wider points around setting the agenda that goes beyond standard updates from either side. SC understood and confirmed that any specific requests should be raised in advance of session to ensure appropriate preparation for the discussion.

IP thanked SZC team for sharing the procurement schedule and raised that it would be valuable to distil reasoning behind unsuccessful tenders into some generic themes so that interventions can be put into place to support businesses. TJ agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

this would be useful and highlighted 'ripple effect' that decisions being made today won't be felt until several months down the line.

JC shared experience from ESEWG and benefits of a shared workspace to facilitate collaboration on live documents, currently a temporary solution in place but question on whether wider group would see benefit in formalising. ASM agreed there would be merit, but highlighted different requirements between the different governance groups and suggested that a shared space between the local authorities and the Chamber of Commerce could be valuable. SC agreed, not necessarily a need for SZC to also be involved in the shared workspace but could be added in the future if required.

ACTION: Set up shared workspace between Local Authorities and Suffolk Chamber of Commerce (JC)

4 SIZEWELL C AND SUPPLIER ACTIVITY

SC provided an overview of current project status. It is obvious from walking around site that activity is ramping up significantly and that local suppliers are involved everywhere including earthworks, catering, plant, and people to name a few. Although site works are still in the early stages, we have already surpassed last year's £100m of local spend included in the economic statement. Remarkably, this milestone has been reached in just Q2/Q3 of 2024, indicating that next year's statement is poised to tell an even more positive story.

SC gave two main points of feedback from experiences so far:

1. Overall, there are a lot of expensive bids being received. Can be a feeling that because there is a lot of opportunity for local business that companies are putting in higher prices. It should be noted that while we are motivated to use local, it must be in the context of value for money.
2. How to submit a tender. This is not a standard infrastructure project, it is a nuclear power station, albeit with a graded approach to what we are building

IP raised that it would be helpful to continue to get an overview of trends moving forward.

SC point that due to the high volume and changing nature of the work that feedback will be intermittent and we aren't looking at each individual tender and giving detailed feedback. However, what we can do is take generic feedback to ASM and the Chamber of Commerce to provide support to local businesses. IP agreed and commented this is also where the local authorities are then best positioned to provide long term support.

TJ added that if someone had asked where we'd have wanted to be in terms of information, data, process, understanding, and clarity on how to engage on supply chain then we're in a really strong position. TJ raised that there are still some obstacles, but large improvements are ongoing around the PQQ to better support the supply chain. Tender packages contain a lot of information, this has been fed back and SZC are working to improve the process. This was not information that was available c6 months ago showing that we are now in a stronger position to influence and improve. By working with the Local Authorities and the Chamber of Commerce we can ensure that the opportunities are going to the full potential supply chain more regularly, rather than just to those businesses that know how to respond.

SC summarised that work is progressing well, busy on site with high numbers but it is set up to be done safely with a focus on delivering the plan and delivering to budget.

5 SUPPLY CHAIN ACTIVITY REVIEW

SC gave an overview of the status of the Tender Event Schedule (TES), flagging that data is young and won't always be spot on due to changing programme but it is at a point where we have something that will continue to evolve and

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

improve. This gives ASM an indication of what the project is looking to procure and when, informing what ASM and the Chamber of Commerce team then look to do in terms of engagement.

ASM agreed that the data provided has improved and this first version gives a good indication of what is going to be procured over the next 6 months including Civils and MEH. Although the documentation is useful, a lot of the information was already known by the chamber and hence engagement activities were already underway, showing that the informal process was working. Key point is that when the data is refreshed we will start to see information for Mid-2025 which is when we need to get the formal process in place, working with the SZC team to look at where realistic opportunities are.

ASM commented that it was good to see local awards, admittedly more at T2 and T3 but some T1. Will be getting a contract award document for those winning within the project, but also how to partner with SZC T1s. Overall ASM stated that the pockets of information that the chamber has are positive.

ASM gave an overview of upcoming events, mix of roundtables webinars etc. with 2 existing videos, 2 more currently in production and 3 further in the pipeline, showcasing local businesses working on site and how they have been supported by SZC and/or the T1 suppliers.

IP raised a question around SZC Supply Chain Portal and the transition to CompeteFor. ASM responded that both are still running but CompeteFor is the long term route. There are some updates to CompeteFor to be put in place and it is a case of encouraging people to sign up. BIP are making updates currently and there is a plan for a webinar on how to use CompeteFor.

JC question on supply chain activity and how this information is presented at future SCWG, will feed into the monitoring section but useful information around business support activity carried out by the local authorities including contact information etc. SC responded that this data is readily available at T1, T2 more challenging.

JC question about whether a threshold of value where this information is captured, as local companies are likely to have smaller contracts. SC responded that we are capturing that data but the project is in many parts. Planning for the end of this year to have a dashboard detailing what contracts have been place, need to ensure that T1 are capturing required data. Question on what data is most helpful regarding local spend vs primary economic activity. IP responded that data is useful either way as it will enable the local teams to support those companies more widely. SC said data can be provided and will be in CompeteFor and reported every quarter as per the requirement. SC offered to share contractual requirements document which sets out what we are asking contractors to report on, this should help clarify what types of data are collected.

ACTION: SZC to circulate requirements document and discuss scheduling a separate session with Paul Warmington (SZC) to discuss the document in more detail (SC)

JC question around not limiting to just to CompeteFor but those not on that system as well. SC stated that moving forward nothing should be awarded that isn't on CompeteFor. Discussion in the room about whether this applies to replicated contracts as well, SC confirmed that any contract that is awarded should be on there.

ACTION: RP to clarify with Nadia following previous conversation

6 SUPPLY CHAIN WORK PLAN DEVELOPMENT

ASM outlined approach for 6 month work plan which will be developed and shared with JC and IP and brought to this meeting. Still working with SZC team to understand minimum standards, what is required of businesses, changes to PQQ discussed earlier should simplify what is required.

JC, appreciate early information and only first TES iteration but would be useful to know if the available information is suitable during the drafting process and making sure the Local Authority teams have the opportunity to feed in. ASM

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

responded that although information is not complete, there is more than previously and there will be a continuous push for more, working with CB and SC who highlighted that data is live and therefore continually updated.

Wider discussion between JC and SC about what information needs to be included in the plan, reference to example within DCO / DoO.

ACTION: Investigate requirements for 6 month work plan further and arrange follow up session on the work plan specifically if beneficial (JC)

7 SUPPLY CHAIN MONITORING

JC, need to be clear on what information would help local authorities to have discussions. Data sharing agreements are something that needs to be considered. SC unsure on current agreement regarding data sharing, lots of publicly available information is included on CompeteFor already. JC gave example of companies that may be setting up offices within East Suffolk, ESC would class that as inward investment and therefore would want to make sure that information is clear and that access is available.

ACTION: CB to raise with Rebecca Calder around data sharing, and information for those companies that were unsuccessful to engage about why, or if that hits confidentiality issues.

8 LOCAL SUPPLY CHAIN SKILLS PROGRAMME

JC: Ongoing point, programme cuts across ESEWG and this group because of the content being aimed at providing support to businesses. SC has discussed with G Hazlehurst, internally don't want to muddy the waters between the two groups, however alignment is important. SC will provide the continuity between the groups from SZC side.

SC – Programme needs to go on the agenda for the ESEWG, needs to be written in-between meetings, GH is the owner. SC is delivering supply chain benefit through contracts awarded, if it touches on skills, funds etc. then it needs to sit in ESEWG.

SC happy to have a separate conversations as part of the ESEWG if helpful.

ACTION: How can we make sure that groups interact with each other, need clarity on who is leading that programme development and how these groups talk to each other (RW, SC)

9 LOCAL AUTHORITY UPDATE

IP question as to whether this is a valuable agenda item. ASM and SC respond that it would be beneficial. ASM gave example of A12 upgrade programme, projects such as this within the local area should be discussed in this forum to help highlight the size of the market etc. IP happy to bring information to future sessions.

IP updated that economic strategy for Suffolk is underway with a draft plan by October, engagement has included 5 workshops across the county which have been well attended.

SC highlighted risk around needing clear understanding of which companies are winning work on what infrastructure and what the program looks like. If work has been lost due to performance issues, quality, safety etc. then that information will be of mutual benefit. Performance in these areas de-risks the project programme as well as future proofing businesses.

JC happy to bring updates to future meetings including evidence based economic data that can be tracked over time.

ACTION: JC to bring high level overview of economic strategy to next session and more deep dives can be scheduled if helpful

10 AOB

IP question to the group around meeting frequency and forward planning. Suggestion of 6 months with potentially having 'informal' sessions every 3 months. SC preference 12 months but happy to accommodate 6 month cadence if feeling that

101332443
Revision 01

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

would be more appropriate. ASM happy with 6 months and suggested that an interim session between Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, ESC and SCC could be beneficial.

IP approach for next meeting is to focus on quorate members availability, if individuals have challenges then a delegate can be proposed as per the ToR rather than responding to time consuming polls around availability.

Prospective date of next meeting for 3rd December

ACTION: RW to arrange next session and diarise future sessions at 6 month intervals (RW)

ACTION: ASM to book a room in order to host in-person (ASM)

ACTION: RW to review alignment with wider Governance groups to ensure appropriate information available at each session (RW)

Actions raised during the meeting:

Date Raised	Ref.	Description	Lead	Date Due
29 th July 2024	1	Safety Message to be added as standing agenda item	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	2	Revised Governance Group protocol document to be circulated with attendees following approval	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	3	Review of ToR to ensure alignment with project language and wider governance groups. SCWG to input into review ahead of formal sign off	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	4	Set up shared workspace between Local Authorities and Suffolk Chamber of Commerce	ESC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	5	SZC to circulate requirements document and discuss scheduling a separate session with Paul Warmington (SZC) to discuss the document in more detail	SZC	4 th Dec 2024 Ideally meeting with PW needs to be held sooner (ie within next 2 months)
29 th July 2024	6	RP to clarify with Nadia following previous conversation	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	7	Investigate requirements for 6 month work plan further and arrange follow up session on the work plan specifically if beneficial (JC)	ESC	3 rd Dec 2024

101332443
Revision 01

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

29 th July 2024	8	CB to raise with Rebecca Calder around data sharing, and information for those companies that were unsuccessful to engage about why, or if that hits confidentiality issues.	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	9	How can we make sure that groups interact with each other, need clarity on who is leading that programme development and how these groups talk to each other	SZC	3 rd ? Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	10	JC to bring high level overview of economic strategy to next session and more deep dives can be scheduled if helpful	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024
29 th July 2024	11	RW to arrange next session and diarise future sessions at 6 month intervals	SZC	31 st Aug 2024
29 th July 2024	12	ASM to book a room in order to host in-person (ASM)	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce	31 st Aug 2024
29 th July 2024	13	RW to review alignment with wider Governance groups to ensure appropriate information available at each session	SZC	3 rd Dec 2024

Author: Rob Wilson (SZC)