

Meeting	OLC	Agenda Item No.	4
		Paper No.	89.4
Date of meeting	9 July 2018	Time required	15 Minutes

Title	Modernising LeO Programme Quarterly Report
Sponsor	Rob Powell, Chief Executive and programme SRO
Status	OFFICIAL
To be communicated to:	Members and those in attendance

Executive summary
<p>We agreed to provide a quarterly Modernising LeO programme update to Board, of which this is the fifth, covering Q1 2018-19. This paper covers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. programme status update Q1 2018-19; 2. programme risks; and 3. next steps. <p>Appendix 1 summarises programme status, risks and issues.</p> <p>The paper also describes the activities planned for the forthcoming quarter, during which we will focus on project delivery and programme level dependency planning.</p> <p>Appendix 2 summarises lessons learned from Phase 1.</p>
Recommendation/action required
Board is asked to NOTE the content of this paper and COMMENT on the issues highlighted.

2 July 2018

Q1 Modernising LeO programme update

1. Programme status update

In Q1, the programme focussed on two areas: rolling out the new process, staffing model and case management system, and ensuring they are working effectively; and undertaking the planning work for Phase 2 of the programme, informed by the lessons from the Gateway Review, recommendations from the Internal Audit and our internal lessons learned process.

The first phase of the programme is being closed down, while the second phase is being initiated. Overall its status is green pending a thorough review of the plans of individual projects, dependencies and risks.

The work streams that formed part of Phase 1 – unITe (Unified IT environment) and Enhance - are currently going through a closure process with final meetings taking place in late June and July. Outstanding activities are small scale and have either been handed over to business as usual or Phase 2 of the Programme.

The Lessons Learned Report for Phase 1 was reviewed by the Programme Board when it met on 28 June and a summary of the full report is provided as **Appendix 2** of this paper.

The Programme Board also reviewed the Project Briefs for each of the 12 projects that make up Phase 2 of the Programme. These are grouped as follows:

a) **Better Service work stream – all projects in start up**

Enhance new CMS – to progress outstanding issues from Phase 1 including de-scoped areas of the business process, such as Service Complaints.

Decommission Old CMS – to move users from the old to the new as soon as practicable and then to safely decommission the old system.

Develop CAT and improve website – to produce a Customer Assessment Tool for use via the public website and make improvements to the customer interface and content.

Grow our People – to explore career pathways, support etc to develop Operational staff

Scheme Rules Review – to conduct a review of the current scheme rules

Process Changes – to make further refinements and improvements to the Operational business processes, building on what was done in phase 1

b) Data, Information and Records work stream – two projects in start up

Records and Information Management – pending the arrival of our permanent Data Protection and Information Compliance Officer

MI Step Change – to deliver the BI solution and improve the way in which LeO uses the management information it has

Data Quality – to improve the quality of the data that LeO has to draw on.

c) People and Workplace work stream – both projects in start up

Attract and Retain Great People – to further exploit our employee value proposition, develop strategic partnerships to improve our pipeline of staff with universities and enhance our recruitment process.

Build our PPM Capability – establish a PMO, undertake a Gateway 5 review and a Gateway 0 review of Modernising LeO.

2. Programme risks

The major programme risks appear in **Appendix 1**. These are due to be reviewed in July once the scope, plans and risks associated with the Phase 2 projects are understood. There are no open issues currently for the Programme.

3. Next steps

During Q2 the projects will move into delivery phase, with the exception of the Better Records and Information Management project that will move into start up when the new Data Protection and Information Compliance Officer joins LeO in August. A programme wide planning exercise will be undertaken to identify dependencies, assure project level plans/resources and inform the communications plan. Programme Risks will also be reviewed.

Appendix 1 - Current status updated 20/06/18

	Overall status	Comments	Project	Status	Comments
Better Service	G	The work stream is now at Green. All projects are in start up with most Project Briefs created, project boards being set up, risks and plans being created.	Enhance new CMS	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled.
			Decommission old CMS	A	Project Brief currently being finalised following discussions with the OLC Chair about options, approaches, costs and impact on performance in light of initial discussions held with the business and IT.
			Customer Assessment Tool and website	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled.
			Grow our People	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled
			Scheme Rules Review	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled
			Process Changes	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled
Data, Information and Records	G	The work stream is now at Green. Most projects are in start up with Project Briefs created, project boards being set up, risks and plans being created.	Records and Info Mgmt	On hold	Pending arrival of DPICO
			MI Step Change	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled. Initial scoping meeting held with supplier for BI solution.
			Data Quality	G	Project Brief created, further work on hold pending appointment of a project manager.
People and Workplace	G	The work stream is now at Green. All projects are in start up with Project Briefs created, project boards being set up, risks and plans being created. PPM Project has delivered to schedule so far.	Attract and Retain	G	Project Brief created, project boards to be scheduled.
			Build our PPM Capability	G	Project Brief created, project boards scheduled, PMO in place, PPM methodology communicated to project teams, intranet presence in place.



Programme risks

Risk	Description	Likelihood	Impact	Trend	Mitigation
Insufficient resources to manage and deliver Programme	Insufficient PMO, PPM support and delivery team members with the right depth of skills and expertise to deliver projects and maintain control of programme and projects	L	M	↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge of project/resource plans by Delivery Boards Additional short-term programme meetings in final phase of CMS development to mitigate risks during final preparation for go live Continued upskilling for staff, use of Change Agents for UAT/training Refocusing and more robust prioritisation framework for Phase 2
Inadequate communication and engagement with staff leads to resistance	Staff do not understand what the programme is trying to achieve and resist change	L	L	↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communications and engagement plan Regular meetings with people managers, change agents
Ineffective leadership of and support for the programme including lack of vision	Leadership of the programme is ineffective and leaders fail to demonstrate their commitment	L	L	↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Board, SRO, Board sponsor and PM roles Reinforced change agent roles Regular engagement with People Managers
Scale of ambition is too great and places an excessive burden on the organisation and its people at a time of increased demand for our services	Projects slip because we are trying to do too much and not embedded because they are insufficiently business-driven	L	M	↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme split into phases; staffing model brought forward, dependency maps, resource staffing change Deliverables cross checked for business relevance Increased communications Personal commitment to new ways of working from influencers
Scale of change negatively impacts performance	Service quality and performance are negatively impacted during each phase of transition beyond what is acceptable	H	H	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More positive changes introduced early Include more contingency/resilience in resource plans and timetables Ways of working adapted to reflect lessons learned during early stages
Direct financial costs slip or scale of changes prove unaffordable	Various costs cannot be confirmed until implementation and there is little contingency for slippage	L	L	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMS Phase 2 final costs agreed, separate controls over BI MOSCOW analysis used to prioritise Adoption of additional work in house
LeO fails to address MoJ requirements	MoJ has requirements for IT delivery, security and procurement that need to be complied with	L	L	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular engagement with MoJ Digital, Procurement, Strategy and Security

Appendix 2 Lessons Learned Phase 1

Programme Overview

The programme was initiated to deliver LeO's strategic objective to Modernise LeO and improve performance through a more integrated, effective and flexible business process supported by modern IT and ways of working. It was delivered through three work streams – Enhance (Data Assurance, Customer Journey, People, Technical, and Business Intelligence and Data); unITe (Telephony, Infrastructure, CMS, End User Devices, intranet, Work Pro, Website); and People and Ways of Working (Attract and Retain, Developing our People and Ways of Working).

Executive Summary

The scope of this report is limited to programme level lessons or individual project lessons significantly impacting the programme. It reflects Gateway 4 Review and Internal Audit recommendations.

Overall Review

The general consensus is that the programme achieved a huge amount in a short time with limited resources and programme/project management experience. The first phase of the programme brought about changes in infrastructure, telephony and hardware which stabilised the environment in which staff were working to the extent that the 'IT issues' that impacted case handler productivity largely disappeared.

The programme also delivered new business processes and the associated Case Management System to a high level of quality. The programme learned the lessons of the previous Case Management System project and put emphasis on thorough testing of the system before deployment and on training staff in using the system within the context of the new business processes. Alongside all this activity a new staffing model and regular recruitment campaigns were delivered and the office space reconfigured to release a quarter of the space. This level of change inevitably had an impact on performance and on staff motivation although improved communications in later in the programme helped reduce that impact.

During the course of the programme LeO improved its maturity in how it manages change, how it communicates with its staff and how it manages programmes and projects which will inform phase 2.

Governance

In general the programme mechanism worked well, as evidenced by the Internal Audit report, although it could have been improved by more clarity on escalation routes, decision making points and dependencies all of which would help to reduce silo working and improve change control.

The Internal Audit report noted that the framework of governance, risk management and control is adequate and effective. Programme Assurance was effective and worked well.

Ownership of vision, deliverables, products and decisions was not always clear. We could introduce design authority disciplines and RASCI matrices to mitigate this effect. More effort should be put into documenting changes and decisions, and using simple feedback methods would help communicate these.

Programme vision, ownership of products, audit trails, communication between work streams and projects, risk management, and prioritisation are all areas where we could do better in phase 2.

Change Control

In general projects stayed on track although this could be improved by applying design authority disciplines to the programme. We should define project, work stream and programme scope more fully at the outset.

The Gateway 4 Review recommended a formal change control process, introducing tolerances and making sure documentation is up to date.

Communications and Engagement

The programme understood the need for effective communications and attempted to communicate the right information at the right time although this was sacrificed at times due to pressures to deliver and the

competing pressures from business as usual. We should build in communications opportunities at all levels of Phase 2 and include a nominated Communications Lead at Programme Board.

Communications around testing worked very well and we should learn from that, involving more people on a low impact basis to both spread the load and raise awareness. We should focus a little more on what is important from an individual's point of view, think more about audience. The Gateway 4 Review recommends surveying to test specifically how changes have landed in the organisation.

Resources

The resources were dedicated, professional and achieved a huge amount. A consistent theme has been the challenge of accommodating programme activities alongside 'the day job'. We underestimated the impact of this on individuals, and had limited scope to ring-fence resource given LeO's limited resources. In Phase 2 we should, as far as possible, resource projects so that the Project Executive, Business Owner, Project Manager and Content Lead are not the same person.

Lead in times with procurement, finance and MoJ need to be better understood and built in to planning.

We placed a heavy burden on a small number of staff who became single points of failure for specific projects and across the programme. We didn't allow enough time to support, manage and develop those staff. Having said that those staff delivered brilliantly time and time again. The Gateway 4 Review recommends succession planning for key roles, scenario planning and resource planning.

Delivery

The programme delivered all of the intended changes and outputs. The range and volume of inter-dependent projects delivery, as well as the collective effort over 18 months, was significant.

Most lessons related to delivery were derived from the CMS project which had a huge impact on the delivery of a range of other projects.

Those projects with clearer scopes defined from the start found it easier to maintain momentum and to communicate progress.

Programme and Project Methodology

Our maturity in this area has improved hugely in no small part due to the efforts of workstream leads Michelle Hitchman and Andrew Burford, and a highly skilled and experienced programme manager (Emma Ireson) managing the programme and developing our PPM capability from a low base. The new PMO should provide more guidance and support to those running projects and work streams in Phase 2 particularly for role descriptions.

A more robust approach to scope setting, planning and managing dependencies within the programme and externally to the programme needs to be developed alongside better resource planning.

The Gateway 4 Review recommends considering ownership of risks, a clearer process for escalation of risk to the programme board and documenting interdependency risks. It also recommends the creation of a RASCI matrix for phase 2 of Modernising LeO as well as a Gateway 5 and Gateway 0 reviews.