Programme and Project Management Centre of Expertise

An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

Gateway Review

PROGRAMME: Social security Programme

**Gateway Review 0
(Strategic Assessment)**

Report Status:	Final
Date/s of Review:	30/09/15 to 02/10/15
Draft Report Issued to SRO:	02/10/15
Final Report Issued to SRO & Copied to PPM-CoE:	06/10/15
Delivery Confidence Assessment:	**[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**
Senior Responsible Owner:	Stephen Kerr
Scottish Government's Accountable Officer:	Sarah Davidson
Organisation's Accountable Officer:	Lesley Fraser

Contents

1.   **Background**

1.1   **Aims of the Programme**

1.1.1   To prepare and deliver devolved welfare powers to Scotland that link to a wider range of responsibilities. These include various aspects of health policy, as well as the integration of health and social care; housing policy; employability policy; the relationship between Scottish Government and local government; digital public sector strategy; carers policy; childcare policy; and fuel poverty policy.

1.2   **Driving Force for the Programme**

1.2.1   On 27 November 2014 the Smith Commission published a report that proposed the devolution of some welfare powers to the Scottish Parliament, to supplement the existing discretionary powers. The Scotland Bill 2015, currently making passage through the UK Parliament, sets out amendments to the Scotland Act 1998, with the aim of devolving many of these powers to the Scottish Parliament.

1.3   **Procurement/Delivery Status**

1.3.1   The Programme is at the initiation stage and currently establishing a delivery and procurement strategy.

1.4   **Current Position Regarding Gateway Reviews**

1.4.1   This is the first Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment of the Programme.

2. Purpose and Conduct of the Review

2.1 Purpose of the Review

2.1.1   Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment. This is a programme-only Review that sets the programme in the wider policy or corporate context. This Review investigates the direction and planned outcomes of the programme, together with the progress of its constituent projects. It can be applied to any type of programme, including policy and organisational change. The Review is repeated throughout the life of the programme from start-up to closure; an early Gateway Review 0 is particularly valuable in that it helps to confirm that the way forward is achievable, before plans have been finalised.

2.1.2   A full definition of the purpose of a Gateway Review 0 is attached for information at **Appendix A**.

2.1.3   This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programme's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over a three to four day period, and is delivered to the SRO immediately at the conclusion of the review.

2.2 Conduct of the Review

2.2.1   The Gateway Review 0 was carried out on 30/09/15 to 02/10/15 at Victoria Quay, Edinburgh.

2.2.2   The Review Team members and the people interviewed are listed in **Appendix C**.

2.2.3   The Review Team would like to thank the SRO, the Social Security Programme Team and all interviewees for their support, openness and candour, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the programme and the outcome of this review.

3. **Gateway Review Conclusion**

3.1 **Delivery Confidence Assessment** The Review Team finds that the delivery confidence assessment for Tranche 1 of the Programme is **[redacted under s30(b)(i)].**

The Scottish Government's Social Security Programme (the Programme) has got off to a good start since it was initiated in July 2015. Tranche 1 of the programme is being progressed with energy and commitment under a capable leadership team. A substantial amount of groundwork has been completed, including the population of key Programme, Project and Programme Management Office roles.

Two key projects, the Vision and Delivery Options Projects, are progressing well and to time. Interviewees confirmed that progress towards the outputs of Tranche 1 are actively being progressed and are on track to meet target timescales. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]** detailed project plans, where they exist, do not have a consistent structure and are not integrated.

Other key work-streams, including process analysis, have started and are showing signs of a structured and methodical approach.

The Programme Office has started to build a programme environment with many of the essential programme management documents already existing in early draft form. Reporting processes and templates are at an early stage of maturity and will need bedding in as operational disciplines mature and become daily practice.

The above DCA relates to the successful completion of Tranche 1: both the deliverables to be completed during Tranche 1, and of the work required during Tranche 1 to prepare for Tranche 2 and beyond. It is predicated on the programme and constituent projects immediately establishing detailed plans, with critical paths and milestones.

Existing issues apparent with Tranche 1 that affect deliverability include: uncertainty around the fiscal framework, lack of robustness of timeline plans, complexity of the evidence required to support delivery options appraisal, and the challenge of building cohesion and a common understanding among a rapidly expanding team.

A second Gateway 0 – Strategic Review needs to be undertaken in early-mid February to assess progress and ensure critical issues are being resolved. This review needs to cover the whole life of the programme.

The Review Team are deeply aware of the significance of this programme to Scotland, the complexity of the challenges and the exposure to social, financial and reputational risk that the Programme brings. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**

Recommendations in this report are mainly focused on ensuring programme capability is in place to effectively manage the full programme to successful completion.

The Delivery Confidence assessment RAG status should use the definitions below.

RAG	Criteria Description
Green	Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly
Amber/Green	Successful delivery appears probable however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery
Amber	Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible
Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on project/programme definition, schedule, budget required quality or benefits delivery, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The Project/Programme may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed

3.2   A summary of the Report Recommendations is available at **Appendix B.** The Scottish Government is committed to learning lessons from programme and project delivery. To facilitate this, the recommendations from this report have been categorised to align with the Scottish Government's PPM Principles. The SG's PPM Principles are listed at Appendix D. This allows the SG's PPM-CoE to analyse lessons across various reviews and present them in non-attributable reports.

4. Findings and Recommendations

4.1 Policy and business context

4.1.1   The Scotland Bill 2015-16 was published on 28 May 2015. The Bill provides for the devolution to the Scottish Parliament and Scottish Government of a range of new powers, including new tax raising powers, social security powers and powers over Scottish Parliament and local government elections in Scotland. In addition, the Bill provides for a new fiscal framework for Scotland, consistent with the overall UK fiscal framework.

4.1.2   The Scotland Bill, when enacted, will set out the parameters within which the Scottish Government's approach to social security in Scotland can develop.

4.1.3   The Scottish Government believes the Scotland Bill is either unclear or did not go far enough and have published proposed alternative draft clauses for those areas. The Scottish Government has been working with the UK Government to discuss these amendments. The aim of the Scottish Government is to secure a Bill, and an accompanying fair financial agreement with the UK Government, that it can recommend to the Scottish Parliament.

4.1.4   To oversee the work on social security, a Joint Ministerial Working Group on Welfare (JMWGW) between the two Governments has been established. The JMWGW provides a forum for discussion and decision-making to ensure the implementation of the welfare-related aspects of the Smith Commission Report.

4.1.5   There is solid evidence of the collaboration and cooperation between the Scottish Government and the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). There is a desire expressed by both organisations to work together to ensure success of the Programme.

4.1.6   The Scottish Parliament has established Welfare Reform and Devolved (Further Powers) Committees to further steer the work associated with the Social Security Programme.

4.1.7   A Programme Board, chaired by the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Welfare, has been established to oversee governance and management and support the SRO in leading the Programme. However, the collective experience of the Review Team shows that this Programme needs to address the most complex of technical process challenges. Additionally it has very high social, financial and reputational risk.

4.1.8   **With a programme carrying this magnitude of corporate risk, and having regard to the wider implications for the Scottish Government, the Review Team would expect to see a governance structure led by a Director General having at least SRO responsibility and possibly also chairing the Programme Board. In this context the Review Team question the necessity of the Assurance Board in driving this programme forward.**

4.1.9   Given the complexity of the Programme we believe it is essential to establish a delivery group chaired by an experienced, full-time, Programme Director. This will drive delivery and accountability, bringing all projects and work activity together to ensure a coherent approach and ensure that activity is monitored, measured and controlled. Alongside the requirement for robust programme management structures, one of the areas of capability that the Programme needs to deliver is a future "business as usual" structure that is fit for purpose.

4.1.10   Projects have been established **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. A consistent approach to project initiation, governance and closure needs to be refined.

Recommendation 1:
Review the overall governance structure, including the seniority of leadership and ownership of decision-making, to reflect the corporate risk profile of the Programme. Critical

4.1.11   The Programme has progressed well by filling roles in key projects and the Programme Management Office. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**

4.1.12   The Programme has started to build an infrastructure of key roles, including the resourcing of the Programme Management Office (PMO). The Review Team are aware that significant work is needed during Tranche 1 to fully identify the resource needs across the remainder of the Programme.

4.1.13   The Programme has established a Risk, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies (RAID) process and log. This is commented on further in section 4.4.

4.2   **Business case and stakeholders**

4.2.1   The Programme is in the very early stages of development and, as a consequence, programme management structures have not yet embedded.

4.2.2   A Programme Office Product Flow Diagram illustrates the key activities anticipated to the end of Tranche 3. This is a very high-level programme overview with no critical path, specific target dates or dependencies identified.

4.2.3   Currently, the programme is constructed into four Tranches. A Business Case has been developed for Tranche 1 and this document specifies the objectives and outputs of two key projects: the Vision and Delivery Options for the Scottish approach to Social Security.

4.2.4   The Business Case sets out the strategic context for the projects contained within Tranche 1. This largely relates to the political drivers, however the business case does not overtly reference the wider projects contained within the programme or how Tranche 1 outputs will build on and shape future activity.

4.2.5   Interviewees confirmed that progress towards the outputs of Tranche 1 are actively being progressed and are on track to meet target timescales. Verbal feedback also confirmed that there is a good understanding of the importance of tranche 1 and this is viewed as the cornerstone of the programme.

4.2.6   The Programme Office Flow Diagram highlights the Outline Programme Business Case as another key deliverable to coincide with the outputs of Tranche 1 during late December. This appears to be a very ambitious timescale as this is dependent on the identification of a preferred and costed option. At this stage, the Outline Programme Business Case is likely to identify a preferred option and some known high-level costs, and provide a framework for improving the understanding of costs over the course of Tranche 2.

4.2.7   The Full Programme Business Case is scheduled to be completed during Tranche 2. Again, this appears to be an aggressive timescale for delivery given the scale of the programme and the development work to be undertaken, not least affordability considerations and the enabling legislative activities required.

4.2.8   The content of future tranches is still under development and it is anticipated that this programme maybe implemented over a 5 – 10 year horizon. It is unclear whether it is intended to produce individual business cases by tranche or by project. The formulation of business cases would be strengthened by utilising HM Treasury 5 case model. This model will assist with clarity of the evidence base, the robustness of the appraisal undertaken and its overall presentation.

4.2.9   External stakeholder groups have been identified and a strategy paper on the organisation's approach to public and civic engagement, to inform policy development, has been prepared. This document identifies the key messages to be conveyed and the main audiences identified for consultation and feedback. Interviewees described the action that has commenced and this information has been included in the draft Stocktake paper.

4.2.10   Interviewees gave examples of specific stakeholder and communication activities that have taken place. It is noted, however, much of this work is directed towards external stakeholders and there was less evidence of consistency with internal stakeholder communication **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**

4.2.11   A communications strategy requires to be developed to raise awareness and support the development of the programme overall. This document should articulate the planned activities for internal and external communications. Specifically, this plan should address the importance of engaging the wider division as a key mechanism to support the change management process that this programme requires.

4.2.12   Consideration should be given to developing a joint communications strategy and action plan with DWP. Given the likelihood of sustained media interest in the use of the new powers, additional specialist resource in communications and marketing will be required alongside the existing stakeholder engagement team.

4.2.13   DWP and other Scottish Government stakeholders were interviewed during the review and gave wholehearted support to the programme. DWP in particular is committed to entering a joined up approach to programme planning and communications. Other third party stakeholders were not interviewed as part of this review.

Recommendation 2:
Develop a detailed strategy and action plan to enable the recruitment of specialist resource to support stakeholder engagement and communications. Essential by the beginning of Tranche 2

4.3   Management of intended outcomes

4.3.1   The programme brief identifies the measureable improvements anticipated from implementing the social security programme. However, it is not clear how these benefits will be measured, what monitoring systems are in place, or when the benefits will accrue.

Recommendation 3:
Create a benefits realisation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework to track and measure improvements and inform the Programme Business Case. Critical

4.3.2   Outcomes and deliverables for Tranche 1 are clear and interviewees indicated a high level of confidence that these will be delivered.

4.3.3   Given the early stage of the programme, other projects and deliverables are under development. It is noted that a programme plan is planned to be delivered as part of Tranche 2. It is important that this document identifies both the main outcomes desired and the relationships between these outcomes across the range of projects to be developed in future tranches.

4.3.4   An integrated programme plan, highlighting outcomes and interdependencies, would assist with the communication, monitoring, management and review of anticipated outcomes.

4.4   Risk Management

4.4.1   The PMO has produced a detailed programme Risk Log (as a component of RAID), using a recognisable template and standard approach for classifying and profiling the individual entries. Many of these risks are high-level and strategic and are expressed in relatively broad terms (e.g. 'Sufficient financial resources to deliver Ministerial priorities'). Such risks are likely to endure through the life of the Programme and will therefore require continuous oversight at Programme Board level. We believe it would be helpful for the Programme to distinguish between risks of this nature, which need to be monitored and contained at senior levels, from those where mitigation/elimination actions are more immediate.

4.4.2   While we were told that the management of risks takes place at project/workstream level, we saw no evidence that this activity is occurring actively or systematically at Programme level. This is a key element of a robust governance regime, which we would expect to see taking place regularly and with an appropriate degree of senior management attention and input. An effective risk management process should also establish a clear approach to identifying those risks that are genuinely programme-level in character, as well as criteria for escalating items from

individual projects. Guidance and training for relevant staff in the Programme to ensure a common understanding of the approach will help to underpin this.

Recommendation 4:
Establish a rigorous risk management process incorporating appropriate definitions and escalation criteria, and ensure that this is operated effectively at all levels in the Programme. Critical

4.5   Review of current outcomes

4.5.1   The generally held view of the interviewees is that the Programme and the constituent projects and work activities are broadly on track. There is substantial evidence of programme wide commitment and a strong will to succeed. Whilst all interviewees are confident that Tranche 1 will deliver on time, in the absence of a detailed Programme (and constituent projects) Plan, deliverability of Tranche 1, and the quality of the output, is to some extent, subjective.

4.5.2   Notwithstanding the lack of a detailed Programme Plan, all interviewees expressed confidence that Tranche 1 will achieve the required outcomes and there are strong indications that the Vision Project will deliver for 8th December, as expected.

4.5.3   The documentation shared with the Review Team prior to the review did not include a firm milestone for the delivery of the Delivery Options Project. However, this is seen as running in parallel with the Vision Project and is likely to evaluate a long options list to identify one main option by the end of 2015, with further work in the early part of 2016 to develop that option further.

4.5.4   Overall the Review Team commends the progress made by the Programme in a short timescale, to establish core capability, initiate stakeholder consultation and move forward on two key projects.

4.6   Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes

4.6.1   Good progress has been made over recent weeks in building up resource in the various teams – particularly the PMO - to help ensure that key Tranche 1 outputs are delivered on time and to the required quality. New staff appear to be integrating well with the existing teams, **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. Roles and responsibilities may need to be clarified to avoid duplication or confusion.

4.6.2   **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. We **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]** believe that the programme should immediately identify, and plan the deployment of, additional skilled and experienced delivery resource that we would expect to see on a government change programme of this scale, complexity and criticality. It is clear that once Tranche 1 has concluded at the end of the calendar year and Ministerial decisions have been taken on delivery options, work will ramp up significantly and the pressure on all teams will intensify. To meet these increased demands, the Programme must ensure that the right programme structure is in place, adequately resourced in the right areas and at the right level of seniority. This should include a

further expansion and strengthening of the PMO to ensure that all core functions – planning, reporting, risk management, financial control, Programme Board secretariat etc – are carried out to the appropriate professional standards and in line with the agreed decision-making cycle.

Recommendation 5:
Develop a resource plan identifying the roles and functions required to deliver Tranche 2 and beyond, making clear the seniority of any new posts and the timescales for recruiting and deploying the staff to fill them. Essential by the end of Tranche 1

4.6.3   A number of interviewees commented that, while they had developed implementation plans for their own individual areas, they were not sighted on, nor were they feeding into, any form of overarching programme plan. They did not therefore have a clear picture of the programme as a whole: ie, its constituent work-streams/projects, what is being delivered, when and by whom, the connections between them, and the 'critical path' for successful delivery. The current programme overview diagram does not provide such a view, and is certainly not of sufficient breadth and detail to enable the Programme Board to direct and control progress effectively.

4.6.4   For a major initiative like the Social Security Programme, we would expect a comprehensive programme plan to be in place, clearly identifying key deliverables, milestones, decision points, and interdependencies. We believe that this core product should be developed immediately, providing as clear a forward view as is possible at this stage of programme delivery. This will be an evolving document and should remain subject to regular review and revision as necessary as the programme progresses through its lifecycle.

Recommendation 6:
Develop an overarching programme plan of sufficient breadth, depth and detail to enable progress on delivery to be monitored and controlled effectively. Critical

5.   **Previous Gateway Review Recommendations**

5.1   Not appropriate

6.   **Next Gateway Review**

6.1   The next Gateway Review 0 – Strategic Assessment is expected in early/mid February.

7.   **Distribution of the Gateway Review Report**

7.1   The contents of this report are confidential to the SRO and their representative/s. It is for the SRO to consider when and to whom they wish to make the report (or part thereof) available, and whether they would wish to be consulted before recipients of the report share its contents (or part thereof) with others.

7.2   The Review Team Members will not retain copies of the report nor discuss its content or conclusions with others.

7.3   A copy of the report is lodged with the Scottish Government's Programme and Project Management Centre of Expertise (PPM-CoE) so that it can identify and share the generic lessons learned from Gateway Reviews.

7.4   The PPM-CoE will copy a summary of the report recommendations to the Scottish Government's Accountable Officer, and where appropriate, to the Organisation's Accountable Officer where the review has been conducted on behalf of one of the Scottish Government's Agencies, NDPBs or Health Sector organisations.

7.5   The PPM-CoE will provide a copy of the report to Review Team Members involved in any subsequent review as part of the preparatory documentation needed for Planning Meetings.

7.6   Any other request for copies of the Gateway Report will be directed to the SRO.

Appendix A - Purpose of a Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment

- Review the outcomes and objectives for the programme (and the way they fit together) and confirm that they make the necessary contribution to the overall strategy of the organisation and its senior management
- Ensure that the programme is supported by key stakeholders
- Confirm that the programme's potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of Government policy and procurement objectives, the organisation's delivery plans and change programmes, and any interdependencies with other programmes or projects in the organisation's portfolio and, where relevant, those of other organisations
- Review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the programme as a whole and the links to individual parts of it (e.g. to any existing projects in the programme's portfolio)
- Review the arrangements for identifying and managing the main programme risks (and the individual project risks), including external risks such as changing business priorities
- Check that provision for financial and other resources has been made for the programme (initially identified at programme initiation and committed later) and that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised
- After the initial Review, check progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes
- Check that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcome
- Where relevant, check that the programme takes account of joining up with other programmes, internal and external
- Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability.

Appendix B - Summary of Recommendations

Ref No.	Report Section	Recommendation	Status (C.E.R.)	Aligns with SG PPM Principle No.(s)	Action Plan*
R1	4.1.10	**Review the overall governance structure, including the seniority of leadership and ownership of decision-making, to reflect the corporate risk profile of the Programme.**	**Critical**	1	
R2	4.2.13	**Develop a detailed strategy and action plan to enable the recruitment of specialist resource to support stakeholder engagement and communications.**	**Essential by the beginning of Tranche 2.**	8	
R3	4.3.1	**Create a benefits realisation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework to track and measure improvements and inform the Programme Business Case.**	**Critical**	4	
R4	4.4.2	**Establish a rigorous risk management process incorporating appropriate definitions and escalation criteria, and ensure that this is operated effectively at all levels in the Programme.**	**Critical**	5	

R5	4.6.2	**Develop a resource plan identifying the roles and functions required to deliver Tranche 2 and beyond, making clear the seniority of any new posts and the timescales for recruiting and deploying the staff to fill them.**	**Essential by the end of Tranche 1.**	7	
R6	4.6.4	**Develop an overarching programme plan of sufficient breadth, depth and detail to enable progress on delivery to be monitored and controlled effectively.**	**Critical**	6	

Each recommendation has been given Critical, Essential or Recommended status. The definition of each status is as follows:

CRITICAL - Critical for immediate action, i.e. to achieve success the project should take action immediately to address the following recommendations:
ESSENTIAL - Critical before next Review, i.e. the project should go forward with actions on the following recommendations to be carried out before the next Gateway Review of the project:
RECOMMENDED - Potential Improvements, i.e. the project is on target to succeed but may benefit from uptake of the following recommendations.

Each recommendation has been aligned with one (or more) of the Scottish Government's PPM Principles (Appendix D list the principles)

*ACTION PLAN - You must within three weeks of the final Report update Appendix B with your intended actions for addressing each recommendation. You should then share it with the relevant SG Accountable Officer and copy it to the PPM-CoE. Thereafter you are responsible for implementing the actions in response to the recommendations and for further circulation of the report as necessary. If the review has identified serious deficiencies or difficulties (including probable failure to meet the planned budget) within the project the Accountable Officer should inform the relevant Minister/s.

Appendix C - Review Team and Interviewees

Review Team:

Review Team Leader:	**[redacted under s38(1)(b)]**
Review Team Members:	**[redacted under s38(1)(b)]**
	[redacted under s38(1)(b)]

List of Interviewees:

Name	Organisation/Role
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Social Security Programme Manager
Stephen Kerr	SRO, Head of Social Security Policy and Delivery Division
Lesley Fraser	Director for Housing, Regeneration and Welfare
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Senior Economist, Communities Analytical Services
Lisa Baron-Broadhurst	DWP Programme Manager
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Head of Unit, Ill Health and Disability Benefits Unit
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Social Security Programme Business Analyst
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Vision Project Manager
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Delivery Options Project Manager
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Devolution Director, DWP
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Head of Legislation, Finance & Delivery
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Manager, Communications & Stakeholder Engagement
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Communications & Stakeholder Engagement
Ann McVie	Head of Unit, Low Income Benefits Policy Unit
[redacted under s38(1)(b)]	Director of Financial Strategy

Appendix D - Scottish Government - Programme and Project Management Principles

1. *Governance.*
   - Our approach to managing programmes and projects is proportionate, effective and consistent with recognised good practice.

2. *Business case.*
   - We secure a mandate for our work; identify, record and evaluate our objectives and options for meeting them; and ensure that we secure and maintain management commitment to our selected approach.

3. *Roles and responsibilities.*
   - We assign clear roles and responsibilities to appropriately skilled and experienced people and ensure their levels of delegated authority are clearly defined.

4. *Benefits.*
   - We record the benefits we seek, draw up a plan to deliver them and evaluate our success.

5. *Risk.*
   - We identify, understand, record and manage risks that could affect the delivery of benefits.

6. *Planning.*
   - We develop a plan showing when our objectives will be met and the steps towards achieving them, including appropriate assurance and review activities, and re-plan as necessary.

7. *Resource management.*
   - We identify the financial and other resources, inside and outside the organisation, required to meet our objectives.

8. *Stakeholders.*
   - We identify those affected by our work and engage them throughout the process from planning to delivery.

9. *Closure.*
   - We ensure that the transition to business as usual maximises benefits and that operational delivery is efficient and effective.

10. *Lessons learned.*
    - We record lessons from our programmes and projects and share them with others so they may learn from our experience.