

MARKET TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MTAC)

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 26 March 2001

Present	Paper
Bob Ryder, DETR – Chair Chris Baker, DETR David Simpson, SSE David Payne, DTI Deborah Brown Frans Berkhout, SPRU Terence Ilott, DETR Tim Curtis, EST Owen Emery, DETR – Secretary	Market Transformation Programme: Future Development (DETR)

Membership matters

1. Apologies had been received from Teresa Smallbone.

Future Development

2. The current Market Transformation Programme (MTP) lead contract would end in September 2001 and DETR would shortly begin a tendering exercise. In preparing this, account would need to be taken of Professor John Chesshire's recent independent review of the MTP. DETR would then need to make recommendations to Ministers on the future shape and direction of the MTP, with a view to securing the necessary resources and buy-in from relevant partners.
3. The purpose of this meeting was to seek MTAC's advice in the preparation of three key documents:
 - An options paper for the future development of MTP, for subsequent discussion with other parts of Government, agencies and advisory bodies - leading to recommendations to Ministers.
 - A revised MTP ROAME statement, setting out the rationale and general management arrangements for spending public money and providing a formal reference for the Committee.
 - A draft 2001 tender specification for the MTP Lead Contract.
4. This raised two broad categories of issues for consideration:

- Policy – the scope, aims and objectives for the MTP, looking ahead 1-5 years, and how it might achieve greater integration with other government policy divisions and with outside organisations.
- Operational – the structure of the MTP and its day-to-day management; what changes should be made; what should be included in the tender specification.

5. MTAC's discussion centred on the following questions:

(a) What improvements could be made to the present way of arranging and managing things, if the MTP were simply to continue with a similar level of resources and responsibilities as now?

(b) What incremental changes there should be to the scope and coverage of the MTP, if additional resources could be secured?

(c) What type of contract and management arrangements would give the flexibility to allow such incremental expansion, and would help to ensure good strategic control of it?

(d) What form of strategic 'ownership' and direction should be sought, especially if the MTP were to be expanded?

(e) What type of practical structure would get the best buy-in from all the potential customers and partners for the MTP?

6. MTAC's comments in connection with each of these questions can be summarised as follows:-

(a) No major flaws in the existing arrangements were perceived. Indeed, one of the MTP's particular strengths was its ability to measure impacts through (eg) databases. However, there was felt to be a need for greater impartiality in Lead Contractor management of the MTP.

(b) The MTP's focus needed to be broadened away from a sector-based product approach, with greater emphasis being given to (eg) consumer lifestyle issues. The MTP also needed to feed into the wider debate on resource and energy efficiency, with particular attention being given to "water and other resources" (cf the current ROAME statement). Clarification of its over-arching policy would be essential to secure effective business involvement, and there was a real opportunity for the MTP to influence the IPP debate at European level and, hence, gain international recognition. However, the general consensus was that the MTP should not become a delivery programme: its aims should be to inform and influence policy measures which were delivered by other programmes, and to facilitate better co-ordination between these delivery programmes.

(c) The successor Lead Contractor needed to be less technical in their approach to MTP management; and capable of facilitating the MTP's expansion into non-energy areas (eg the WEEE Directive, water issues and DTI IT policy). More immediately,

resource issues should be clarified before tender invitations were issued for the successor Lead Contract.

(d) MTAC itself needed to adopt a more strategic approach to its oversight of the MTP, perhaps through becoming an annual or twice-yearly forum for reviewing outcomes and outputs, rather than considering detailed proposals in advance as at present.

(e) There was a need to create more "buzz" about the MTP in order to persuade stakeholders to buy into the process. This might be achieved through an expansion of MTAC membership so as to be more representative of all relevant stakeholders.

7. DETR would now develop the 3 documents referred to in paragraph 3 above and seek Ministerial views on the way forward for the MTP, in the light of MTAC's comments. There was a particular need for an initial draft of the specification for the successor Lead Contract to be ready by Easter, so that subsequent DETR pre-tendering procedures could be completed - and tenders invited - by mid-May, in accordance with the timetable.