

<b>Committee</b>	Executive Scrutiny Committee	<b>AGENDA ITEM 7</b> <b>ES/037/11</b>
<b>Date:</b>	23 June 2011	

## **Transformation Programme Scrutiny Review: Risk Management and Governance Report**

Enquiries to <b>Hannah Cleary</b>	<b>Governance Officer</b>	Extn <b>20526</b>	Telephone no <b>01245 430526</b>
--	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------------

### **Action**

The Committee is invited to consider and agree the below report, including the Executive Summary, in order that a response from the Cabinet Member may be brought to a future meeting.

### **Introduction**

Since December 2009 the Executive Scrutiny Committee has undertaken a scrutiny review of the Council's Transformation Programme – a significant project that aims to radically change the way public services are delivered and respond to significant financial challenge.

The Committee agreed a scoping document, setting out the focus for a review into the Risk Management and Governance elements of the Transformation Programme on 30 November 2010 (ES/34/10, minute 74), and Mr Keir Lynch, Executive Director for Transformation, and Mr Ian Hollingworth, Head of Commercials and Reporting, attended the 26 April 2011 meeting to give evidence, in addition to providing a briefing paper (report ES/021/11) that is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

This report sets out the evidence taken by the Committee and an Executive Summary of its findings and recommendations in relation to this topic.

### **Executive Summary – Findings and Recommendations**

The Committee found that the Council had identified a number of key risks in delivering the Transformation Programme and was taking pro-active steps to minimise these risks.

The Committee particularly welcomed the commitment to developing staff in order to reduce over-reliance on a small key group and third parties, something the Committee believed was critical to the success of some ambitious but fundamentally deliverable projects.

Whilst the risks relating to capacity and delivery of the overall programme remained, the Committee found that the governance structure provided stability and robust challenge to projects, and would ensure risks were mitigated.

The Committee found that there was a weakness that the Outcomes Board may not receive the same information as other Boards, although it was reassured that through independent and transparent reporting, including the rigidity of the templates used to demonstrate financial information, this risk was being managed effectively.

Whilst the Committee understood the rationale of using a range of third parties to provide capacity and capability for the programme, and welcomed the financial savings that had been realised through this strategy, it noted that the Council had originally sought to procure this support from one provider.

The Committee **recommended** that the Boards were used to advise Cabinet Members in relation to decision-making to ensure the continuation of good governance and accountability.

The Committee was pleased to note that the Council was engaging with the Unions and sharing information with them at an early stage.

## **Evidence**

The Transformation Programme is governed by three Boards:

- i) The Directions Board sets the direction for the overall vision, policy, and priority for projects. The Membership of this Board is the Political Leadership Team (Cabinet Members) and the Corporate Leadership Team (Senior Officers).
- ii) The Delivery Board is responsible for the delivery and monitoring progress of Transformation Programme projects. The Membership of this Board is Senior Officers.
- iii) The Outcomes Board assesses and approves business cases for projects, ensuring successful cases align with the delivery of the overall programme and will contribute to savings. The Board assess the tangible and intangible benefits of each project and also allocates the funding to successful projects. The Membership of this Board is Cabinet Members and Senior Officers.

The Committee felt that the roles of the Directions Board and Outcomes Board were of similar nature and asked whether there was any scope for amalgamation. Mr Lynch explained that whilst there was potential scope for one Board to discharge both functions, different skills were required by each Board in order to successfully discharge their varying functions. The Committee noted that over the past 12 months the focus of the Outcomes Board had changed from considering business cases to 'calling-in' projects that were already underway for review and robust challenge.

The Committee asked how the Boards were supported to reach a consensus. Mr Lynch explained that whilst there was no formal voting system, the reports presented at the meetings all used the same templates that had been formatted to support good quality decision making. Report templates for financial information were rigid and did not allow for any flexibility in relation to reporting savings targets.

The Committee expressed concern that decisions might be being taken by Boards, but were reassured by Mr Lynch that Cabinet Member Actions flowed from the agreements that were reached at Board meetings, with some decisions being taken by full Cabinet. The minutes of the PLT/CLT meetings were also available to view.

The Committee was concerned that the Outcomes Board did not have access to the same information as the Delivery Board and that this could be detrimental to decisions being taken by Cabinet Members. Mr Lynch agreed that this could be perceived as a risk, although reporting to the Delivery Board had been aligned with the other Boards and project managers were independent.

The Committee asked for further information about the risks and challenges that had been encountered, and whether any of these had been foreseen. Mr Lynch explained that one of the main areas of concern related to the Council's capacity to deliver the level of change required. Whilst there was ambition and ideas for changing the delivery of services, execution was critical. There was the potential for over-reliance on a small number of key staff, for example in areas such as Adults, Health and Community Wellbeing, where only a few staff had the required knowledge of how teams operated. The Council had engaged Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) to provide additional capacity, alongside developing the knowledge of other Council staff to reduce reliance on the small, key group.

The Committee requested further details about the significant reductions in consultancy fees that had been achieved through engaging a range of third parties and the nature of the work that was being undertaken by them. Mr Hollingworth explained that the use of consultants was regularly challenged and contractual arrangements had been reviewed, resulting in one example of a £1.3 million spend against a potential spend of £25 million. Wherever possible the Transformation Programme was being delivered using existing internal resources, but where capacity and capability needed to be increased then the Council looked towards third parties. The Council has a partnership agreement with IBM and has worked with them on procurement projects and the data centre migration following the return of IT services in-house. Whilst there was a partnership agreement

with IBM, which included the option for IBM to propose projects or business cases to be delivered, the Council was not obliged to utilise them and no other mutually agreeable business cases had been found to date. PWC have recently been engaged to support the New Ways of Working (NWoW) initiatives and it remained in the Council's interests to consider a range of providers for future work. It was confirmed that the predominant source of funding for the Transformation Programme was being sourced from the Waste Reserve that would be replenished in the future.

---

# APPENDIX 1

		<b>ES/021/11</b>
		<b>Agenda Item 4</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Executive Scrutiny Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>26 April 2011</b>	
<b>Transformation Programme Scrutiny Review: Governance and Risk Management</b>		
<b>Enquiries to:</b>	<b>Hannah Cleary, Governance Officer 01245 430526</b>	

## Introduction

This paper has been prepared using the questions set out in the scoping document agreed by the Committee on 30 November. Mr Keir Lynch, Executive Director for Transformation, and Mr Ian Hollingworth, Head of Commercial and Reporting, will be in attendance.

## Governance

### **1. What are the terms of reference and meeting cycles for Boards governing the Transformation Programme? What is the Membership?**

The Transformation Programme is governed by three boards.

**The Political Leadership Team - Corporate Leadership Team (PLT - CLT) (a.k.a. Directions Board)** carries a regular agenda item that primarily focuses on the progress towards the ECC Target Operating Model (TOM).

There are frequent presentations from the Transformation Support Unit (TSU) Design team relating to the TOM.

These meetings inform the various directorates and TSU on the type of projects that must be undertaken in order to deliver the TOM and the transformation savings.

The **Outcomes Board** meets monthly to approve Business Cases for projects that align with the delivery of the TOM and contribute to the transformation savings target.

The board receives a pack of information that maintains a full audit trail of Business Cases, information on any Variances that need to be approved, a Forward Plan of activity and commentary from Finance on the current position on Cost and Benefits.

The Board can also choose to “call in “ projects to scrutinise delivery versus plans.

The Outcomes Board is the only board where funding for projects can be approved.

The **Delivery Board** meets fortnightly to monitor and ensure delivery of individual projects approved by Outcomes Board. The boards roles and responsibilities are to:

- Monitors and track all Transformation Projects
- Drives the delivery through its review of progress
- Overcome any issues that may be preventing projects from progressing

<b>PLT – CLT Directions Board Membership</b>
Political Leadership Team
Corporate Leadership Team
<b>Outcomes Board Membership</b>
Councillor David Finch, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and the Transformation Programme (Chairman)
Councillor Peter Martin, Leader of the Council
Councillor Derrick Louis, Cabinet Member for Major Projects and Commercial Services
Cllr Norman Hume, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation
Joanna Killian, Chief Executive
Margaret Lee, Executive Director for Finance
Jenny Owen, Deputy Chief Executive and Commissioning Director for Adults, Health and Community Wellbeing
Robert Overall, Executive Director for Environment, Sustainability and Highways
Keir Lynch, Executive Director for Transformation
Ian Hollingworth, Head of Commercial and Reporting
<b>Delivery Board Membership</b>

Anthony Doyle, Chief Procurement Officer

Dan Gascoyne, Assistant Director for Partnership Delivery

Ian Hollingworth, Head of Commercials and Reporting

Jo Smith, Director, Essex Property and Facilities

Gill Furlong, Interim Chief Information Officer

Julie Ellis, Change Director

Liz Chidgey, Deputy Executive Director, Adults, Health and Community Wellbeing

Margaret Lee, Executive Director for Finance

Maxine Taylor, Head of Corporate HR Services

Peter Lewis, Interim Assistant Director, Financial Strategy

Vicky Branchett, Head of Transformation Design

Wendi Ogle-Welbourn, Director for Commissioning, Schools, Children and Families

**2. What has been the cost of the governance support arrangements? Has this proved to be value for money?**

Internal costs of meetings have not been taken into account when addressing this question.

The Corporate Programme Office (CPO) within the TSU is the single focal point of governance support.

Currently the team consists of 5 FTE and they will operate from a budget of £279,000 in 2011/12.

The CPO key responsibilities are:

- Manage a weekly review of project delivery progress
- Provide Weekly Management Information on an exception basis
- Ensure Project and Programme risks are entered into JCAD and updated in a timely manner
- Creation of reporting and analysis on the transformation programme both current and future, including demand management for TSU resources.
- Successful Management of Directions, Outcomes and Delivery Boards.
- Central source of information for communications.

The CPO also maintains a strong link to Finance in their role on reporting on costs and benefits.

Within the CPO is the role of Commercial Management of any 3<sup>rd</sup> party organisation assisting with Transformation e.g IBM, Deloitte, PWC

This role

- Provides commercial leadership for all aspects of the ECC transformation
- Maximises the value from third party transformation partners and suppliers ensure that commercial risks to the Authority are minimised.

In dealing with various 3<sup>rd</sup> parties this role has resulted in significant reductions in the cost of consultancy fees running into many millions of pounds.

Given the team size, the reporting output, governance control and the savings from 3<sup>rd</sup> party contracts the team provide excellent value for money.

An external audit awarded the team with a rating of “substantial assurance” in the governance arrangements.

### **3. How do the decisions made by the Boards feed into the officers that manage the delivery of the projects?**



The Head of Transformation Commercials and Reporting and a member of the CPO attends the Outcomes Board and will cascade decisions into the relevant officers immediately the meeting has finished.

**4. Have there been any changes made to the Board structure since their implementation in 2009?**

No material changes have been made – the Directions Board is now more commonly referred to as PLT/CLT but the structure remains the same.

**5. How are third parties contributing to the Programme?**

Wherever possible the programme is being delivered using ECC resources, but where capacity and capability need to be increased then ECC has the option to look towards 3<sup>rd</sup> Parties.

ECC has a Partnership Agreement with IBM and has worked with them on a number of projects to date notably:

- Data Centre Migration following in sourcing from BT
- Procurement

IBM can propose projects or Business Cases to be delivered under this agreement but it remains with ECC to decide if the projects provide value for money. There is no obligation to use IBM.

IBM has worked well with ECC procurement teams and has contributed to the achievement savings for 09/10 and 10/11

Recently ECC has procured 3<sup>rd</sup> party support for a number of NWOW projects. This support will be provided by PWC.

**6. How much are the actual and forecast revenue costs for delivery of the Programme between 2009 and 2013? Have extra costs been incurred that were not anticipated?**

09/10- £6.3M (£3M in the statement of accounts as drawn from Transformation reserve, however an additional £3.3M was drawn from was reserve)

10/11- £11.5M Forecast

11/12- £19.2M Approved

12/13- 5M Approved

There have been no costs incurred that have not been approved. Delivery of the project on cost is closely managed and monitored by the portfolio manager and finance teams

to report senior management. As unexpected costs are a deviation from the business case's approved cost and benefit schedule the project will have to request a change control from Outcomes Board, at which point the project is reassessed for ongoing viability.

#### **7. How are the savings figures being verified by the Boards?**

Outcomes Board (Chaired by Councillor David Finch) perform the scrutiny and challenge role with respect to the formation of the business case and the benefits contained within. Delivery Board (chaired by Margaret Lee) monitor the project's benefit delivery on a fortnightly basis to ensure the projects are delivering the approved benefits to the agreed timeline. Once again, should any issues be highlighted in Delivery Board, they will be referred back to Outcomes Board to go through the change control process.

#### **8. How are outcomes of individual projects including those in TS1 and TS2 verified by the Boards?**

Project Deliverables are agreed with the Project Sponsors and reported (as part of the CPO Reporting process) to the Delivery Board and Outcomes Board.

The Reports provide info on project Highlights and Lowlights. In addition Financial reporting is provided on delivery against Cost and Benefit.

### **Risk Management**

#### **1. What are the risks associated with moving to a new Target Operating Model and how are these being managed?**

Programme Risks are entered into JCAD and reported to the CLT on a regular basis. Mitigating actions are in place against all the risks; the key identified risks are:

- Reduction in sense of direction and cohesion – managed by regular updates to boards and ongoing communication to stakeholders
- Gaps in capability and capacity to deliver the change – managed by greater management of resources and SME's within directorates, running recruitment campaigns or using 3<sup>rd</sup> parties when required.
- Cultural resistance to change – managed by using emerging talent in the organisation as change agents, increasing the significance in the role of the sponsor
- Poor quality of Business Cases – managed by scrutiny from TSU and Finance, ensuring full sign off by Sponsors and Member responsible as part of governance, creation of Pre Scrutiny meeting chaired by Cllr Finch and greater accountability on authors

**2. How will the future significant people change be managed? Are resources and capacity available to support the change agenda, respond to employment issues and provide a support service to enable staff into new employment?**

Appropriate resources and capacity will be secured both internally and/or externally to ensure a smooth transformation which minimises any potential service delivery disruption. Specifically this includes the following activities:

Engagement

- Engagement well understood by DLT and Directorates and action planning involves improvements as a direct result of the staff survey across all directorates –many staff (especially Talent Pools) involved
- Better communications to staff–more visible senior leaders (regular f2f briefings) and communications in general to staff –part of the item above
- Improved recognition in some areas, such as ESH ‘Thumbs Up!’ scheme
- Appointment of Change Managers in larger projects resulted in attention to the behaviours and culture of change –not just structure (NWOW, ESH etc)

Learning and Development

- Specific training set up for Change programmes/transformation on:
- Change for managers, Change for Teams, Interviewing Skills, Application writing and Interview skills, Managing following Change, Leavers support
- Some local improvements, such as: line management behaviour training (NLP) being tried in ESH (not yet started, but communicated widely)-done through Change managers in ESH.
- Succession management planning to reduce institutional knowledge drain, to prevent the need to re-employee laid-off staff as contractors or engage consultants on a temporary basis at an extra cost to fill gaps.
- Each DLT and CLT have prepared succession plans for key positions and a management tool has been created to provide MI each month to each DLT via business partners.
- Investment in existing staff to increase their ability and skills

Specifically BPs have:

- Strongly linked survey results/engagement/performance – driven improvements through actions plans (inc recognition e.g. ‘Thumbs Up’)
- Been included in making changes to support materials to managers/leaders – emphasis on what consultation is for and how to make a contribution
- Set up ‘employee consultation groups’, where appropriate
- Linked closely with Internal Communications team

- Ensured communications at end of consultation to 'close' including any changes that were made as a result
- Ensured leaders have been visible -in more 121 briefings for staff

#### Other Measures:

- A comprehensive programme of courses has been set up to compliment current business and personal development requirements.
- An MI toolkit which includes staff absence will alert each DLT to any prominent wellbeing issues.
- To monitor staff wellbeing using current tools, including stress risks assessments and to act on any areas of concern
- Effective process in place for consideration of expenditure on early retirement and severance packages and the impact on service delivery fully considered.
- Safer recruitment/induction policy/pay and rewards strategy to prevent the loss of key personnel and to ensure the ability to recruit staff with key skills and ability required by ECC.
- ECC is working in partnership with Capita to recruit the best staff including those areas which are difficult to recruit.
- The Corporate services team have prepared a number of papers which attempt to improve our pay and reward strategy.
- Effective internal challenge to transformation plans and workforce cuts to ensure the assessment of associated risks consideration of potential impact.
- Formation of transformation advisory board consisting of experts in their fields and chaired by Cllr Martin. This group will provide independent challenge and also consider risks across the transformation piece.
- Staff consultation and welfare issues monitored to ensure productivity is maintained and absence management policy is enforced.
- Outcomes based performance management to ensure tracking against deliverables.
- New performance process to deliver clearer sharper, robust and focused objectives.

A Redeployment policy which provides a framework for managing change in a fair and consistent way. ECC is committed to providing a framework for organisational change, that:

- is clear and transparent;
- is fair and equitable;
- ensures the right skills are in place

- minimised redundancy

**3. The Council is confident that the £300 million savings will be achieved. Are there risks associated with delivering these savings and what are the contingency plans?**

With any programme there are risks, these are identified through the programme at a Strategic and Operational level. Information is regularly captured as part of the reporting cycles for Delivery Board and Outcomes Board such that visibility to such risks is given as soon as it occurs. This enables an informed debate on actions to mitigate such risks should they materialise.

£150m of the savings are due to come from procurement activities, as such a Procurement Steering Group has been created to manage the delivery of this number and overcome any issues that may prevent successful delivery.

**4. How will the Council ensure that the public understands the changes to the organisation and is able to contribute to them?**

Projects within the programme may have External Communications partner as part of the delivery team in order that messages can be relayed to the public in a clear and coherent fashion. Consultation over proposals has been undertaken where appropriate.