

Programme and Project Management Centre of Expertise
An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider



The Scottish
Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Gateway Review

PROGRAMME: Social Security Programme

**Gateway Review 0
(Strategic Assessment)**

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Report Status: | Final |
| Date/s of Review: | 02/03/16 to 04/03/16 |
| Draft Report Issued to SRO: | 04/03/16 |
| Final Report Issued to SRO & Copied to PPM-CoE: | 09/03/16 |
| Delivery Confidence Assessment: | [redacted under s30(b)(i)] |
| Senior Responsible Owner: | Stephen Kerr |
| Accountable Officer: | Sarah Davidson |
| Scottish Government Director | Lesley Fraser |

OGC Gateway™ is a trade mark of the Cabinet Office and is used here by the Scottish Government Gateway Hub with the permission of the Cabinet Office.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. <u>Background</u> | 5 |
| 2. <u>Purpose and Conduct of the Review</u> | 5 |
| 3. <u>Gateway Review Conclusion</u> | 7 |
| 4. <u>Findings and Recommendations</u> | 9 |
| 5. <u>Previous Gateway Review Recommendations</u> | 17 |
| 6. <u>Next Gateway Review</u> | 17 |
| 7. <u>Distribution of the Gateway Review Report</u> | 17 |
| Appendix A - Purpose of a Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment | 18 |
| Appendix B - Summary of Recommendations..... | 19 |
| Appendix C - Review Team and Interviewees..... | 21 |
| Appendix D - Scottish Government - Programme and Project Management Principles | 22 |

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 has successfully delivered Tranche 1 and has decided on establishing an Agency as the delivery vehicle. Tranche 2 is in the process of being redefined.

1.4 **Current Position Regarding Gateway Reviews**

1.4.1 This is the second Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment of the Programme. The first was carried out on 30/09/15 to 02/10/15 at Victoria Quay, Edinburgh.

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 02/03/16 to 04/03/16 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. We are particularly grateful to the PMO for support throughout the review.

3. Gateway Review Conclusion

3.1 Delivery Confidence Assessment The Review Team finds that the delivery confidence assessment for Tranche 2 of the Programme is **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**.

3.1.1 The above DCA relates to the successful completion of Tranche 2, which still needs further definition before a more positive assessment can be made. The Review Team recommend an Assurance of Action Plan within the next 3 months to better assess the delivery of Tranche 2.

3.1.2 Following the last Gateway Review 5 months ago, the Programme has made considerable progress.

3.1.3 The Vision Project and Stage 1 of the Delivery Options Project have been completed, concluding in a decision to establish an Agency to administrate the payment of benefits to 1 in 10 of Scotland's People. This work was driven by a political imperative to make an early announcement to establish a delivery strategy, and has meant the Programme has been unable to follow through on a number of the recommendations from the previous Gateway Review.

3.1.4 During this period the Programme has also needed to focus on building one of the key foundation stones for success, that of establishing the necessary capability within the Programme. This 'investment in the future' was essential, but has also resulted in less progress in other areas. Specifically, the need to produce a more detailed programme plan than the key milestones map that now exists.

3.1.5 The Review Team is aware of the wider change agenda of the Scottish Government. SG2020 will provide clear opportunities for resourcing of the Programme if decisions are taken in a timely manner and resources quickly identified and released to support the Programme.

3.1.6 In summary, there is a generally held view amongst stakeholders that good progress is being made. Forward momentum has been established and the Review Team consider the effort expended in the last few months will enable more rapid progress in the future. This view is supported by the impressive commitment and enthusiasm of Programme Team members who hold a positive view of the very considerable challenges ahead.

3.1.7 The fiscal framework agreement included a commitment that the UK Government would provide £200 million as a contribution to the costs of implementing the new powers and £66m per annum to administer them. The Scottish Government's estimate, based on information from DWP, was that implementation of the Social Security powers would cost more than double this (implementation and administration). It is expected that there will be a review of spending plans following the May 2016 Scottish Parliament election, and this will determine the funding available for the Programme.

3.1.8 **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**

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 The Review Team commends the programme on the early establishment of an organogram of the future organisation that has enabled the appointment to key posts.

The previous experience of the Non-Executive Directors has enabled valuable insights as well as providing coaching to improve the capability of other Board Members.

3.3 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 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. Alongside the Bill, the UK and Scottish Government have agreed a new fiscal framework for Scotland, reflecting the new powers. This includes an agreement on how the implementation costs will be shared between the two Governments.

4.1.2 The fiscal framework agreement included a commitment that the UK Government would provide £200 million as a contribution to the costs of implementing the new powers, but the Scottish Government's estimate, based on information from DWP, was that implementation of the Social Security powers would cost up to £350 million. It is expected that there will be a review of spending plans following the May 2016 Scottish Parliament election, and this will determine the funding available for the Programme.

4.1.3 Following agreement of the fiscal framework, the Scottish Government has recommended that the Scottish Parliament give its consent to the Bill. Royal Assent is expected by the end of March 2016.

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 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. This is a critical relationship for 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. The Scottish Election in May 2016 will see new committees being formed, but it is expected that the implementation of the social security powers will remain a major focus for the Parliament.

4.1.7 A Programme Board, chaired by the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Welfare, has overseen the first stage of the programme. As recommended by the previous Gateway review, the resourcing of the Programme has been reviewed. A separate Social Security Directorate is being established led by an SCS2 Director, and the size of the programme team has been expanded.

As a result, the governance of the Programme is being reviewed, and we welcome the suggestion that the Director General for Communities should in future chair the Programme Board, giving the Programme greater senior visibility and influence.

4.1.8 The current Board has met three times, **[redacted under s30(b)(i)].** **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]** we welcome the suggestion that the Board be reformed under the leadership of the SRO and Director General for Communities. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. The involvement of experienced Non-Executive directors is a major advantage, but there is a risk that this or a future Programme Board becomes too reliant on their advice.

Recommendation 1: Set up a development programme for the Board including one or more residential Away-Days to reinforce understanding of roles and responsibilities and build a team. Critical once the Board has been reconstituted.

4.1.9 We were told that the importance of the Programme to the Scottish Government was better recognised at all levels of the organisation since our last Review, and this was reflected in the commitment to provide the necessary resources. The scale of the challenge, and the social, financial and reputational risks involved, is becoming clearer as work on the programme develops.

4.1.10 The key roles of Programme Director, Chief Digital Officer and Shadow Agency Chief Executive are being filled **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. **SG recognises it is important that the people with the right skills and proven track record are recruited for these important roles, and this should not be unnecessarily constrained by Civil Service pay scales.**

4.1.11 The Director General for Communities currently chairs an Assurance Board, which is responsible for the strategic alignment of Social Security delivery in Scotland. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]** we support the intention to review the future of the Assurance Board in the light of the changes to the Programme Board.

4.1.12 The Programme has done some good work to establish the key areas of work needed for the next stages of the programme, but further consideration is needed on the right structure of projects within the programme, so that there are a manageable number of coherent projects and clear processes to ensure communication and accountability. We welcome the recent increase in resources for the programme management office, which will enable them to support the projects, and hold them to account, more effectively. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. The PMO should be in a position to monitor, manage and control the elements of the Programme, and developing a stronger relationship with projects should be a priority for the expanded team.

4.2 Business case and stakeholders

4.2.1 For reasons noted earlier, the team has neither had the time nor resources to prepare an Outline Business Case (OBC) for the programme as a whole or any of its constituent parts.

4.2.2 A stage 1 options appraisal has been undertaken to identify a shortlist of strategic delivery options for Ministers to consider and this identified the preferred option to establish a Scottish Welfare Agency (the Agency). This has now been publicly announced by Government. Interviewees considered this options assessment to largely address the strategic case of the programme. It is intended that this will now be used as a building block for the second stage of the options appraisal, which will identify the tactical options and planning required to establishing and implementing the new Agency by 2019/20. This subsequent exercise will assist in the partial development of the economic case. It is currently unclear when the first iteration of the OBC will be available.

4.2.3 The OBC 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. An outline of content should be constructed that defines both the integral elements and level of detail to ensure there is a common understanding of requirements of the business case and the individual contributions needed.

4.2.4 It is recognised that the Programme is of a scale and complexity that the Scottish Government has not yet experienced. For this reason, embedding programme management structures and disciplines is imperative to ensure robust planning and successful delivery.

4.2.5 A high-level milestone plan has been developed. This document broadly identifies key deliverables across a number of areas of programme development anticipated to 2022. Whilst this document provides an overview of programme activities, there is no clear critical path or dependencies identified. Feedback from interviewees on the usefulness of this document was mixed. Some members of the Programme Board found it very useful, others commented that it was not well understood and therefore of limited value overall.

4.2.6 A comprehensive programme plan has not yet been developed, despite this being a key recommendation from the last Gateway 0 Review in October 2015. All interviewees agreed that this is a critical tool to support the management and development of the Programme.

4.2.7 Initially the Programme was set out in tranches. The Review Team was provided with a preliminary schematic of Tranche 2, showing a total of 14 projects and c71 workstreams. The key outputs and timescales of delivering this phase of activity are unclear. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. All interviewees expressed a view on the deliverables expected from Tranche 2, however, there was no consistent understanding of these outputs, the scope of the phase or the timescales. Additionally, there is no indication of focus for future tranches at this stage. There does not appear to be any alignment between the Tranche 2 schematic and the high level milestone plan.

**Recommendation 2: Develop an Outline Business Case for the Programme.
Critical**

**Recommendation 3: Establish an overall Programme Plan with key milestones, deadlines and dependencies to enable effective management and control.
Critical**

**Recommendation 4: Scope Tranche 2 to define deliverables, timeframes and ownership to ensure progress can be monitored, reviewed and managed.
Critical**

4.2.8 The Department of Work & Pensions (DWP) is the key partner in the successful delivery of the programme. The support and co-operation of DWP is critical both in terms of information exchange and joint planning. Interviewees described active engagement with DWP and recognised the need to demonstrate a collegiate approach, bound by shared interest in success. It is noted, however, that the strength of relationships between the Scottish Government with DWP counterparts is varied. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**.

4.2.9 DWP and other Scottish Government stakeholders were interviewed during the review and gave wholehearted support to the programme. DWP in particular is committed to active engagement and a joined up approach. Consideration should be given to strengthening joint programme planning. Other third party stakeholders were not interviewed as part of this review.

4.2.10 External stakeholder groups have been identified and an engagement plan to inform policy development has been prepared. This document identifies the key messages to be conveyed and a classification of stakeholders based on their level of influence and interest. The Stakeholder Engagement Strategy is in draft form and the specific actions with stakeholders have still to be identified.

4.2.11 Interviewees gave examples of specific stakeholder and communication activities that have taken place since the last Gateway 0 Review. This included the introduction of an e-newsletter and website developments. Internal communications working groups have also been set up with each of the policy areas and a branding project is planned.

4.2.12 To further support stakeholder engagement, draft consultation and communication strategies have been drafted. These have yet to be actioned.

4.2.13 The draft communications strategy has been drafted to raise awareness and support the development of the programme overall. This document articulates the planned activities for external communications. Consideration should be given to the role of the Communications Team in supporting change management within the new Social Security Directorate.

Recommendation 5: Deliver detailed action plans to support stakeholder engagement and communications. Essential as an integral part of the Programme Plan

4.3 Management of intended outcomes

4.3.1 The key outputs of Tranche 1 have been successfully delivered.

4.3.2 As noted in the last Gateway 0 Review, a range of Measureable Improvements have been anticipated from implementing the social security programme. However, these are still high level and generic, therefore is not clear how these benefits will be measured, what monitoring systems are in place, or when the benefits will accrue.

Recommendation 6: Create a benefits realisation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework to track and measure improvements and inform the Programme Business Case. Critical

4.3.3 The outcomes and deliverables from Tranche 2 are not well articulated or consistently understood. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**.

4.3.4 The absence of a programme plan is a significant risk. In particular, decisions may be taken without a full understanding of dependencies. This could ultimately have adverse impact on the practical implementation of the Programme. This document is crucial to the effective and efficient management of the programme, both the main outcomes desired and the relationships between these outcomes across the range of projects to be developed in future tranches.

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

4.4 Risk Management

4.4.1 The PMO has made good progress by producing a RAID (Risks, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies) management strategy setting out processes for identifying, documenting and managing risks, with clear escalation routes. The Programme RAID register follows Scottish Government practice of expressing risks in positive terms and describes risks at a high level. This can mean that the impact of the risk and the need for mitigating action is not immediately obvious from the register. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. The PMO are working with projects to identify and report regularly on risks, but this is not happening in all cases.

4.4.2

4.4.3 **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. The expanded PMO needs to help projects to understand the value of risk management and how their contributions add to the wider success of the Programme.

Recommendation 7: Conduct a series of workshops with programme board members, project managers and other stakeholders, to identify risks and ensure that the risks considered most serious are appropriately reflected in the RAID. Critical

4.5 Review of current outcomes

4.5.1 Following the last Gateway Review 5 months ago, the Programme has made clear progress. The Programme has produced a high-level map of key milestones and product deliverables. This is acting as a catalyst to defining a more detailed plan. However, although the Programme (and constituent projects) still lacks a detailed plan, progress is seen in the development of an organogram of the future organisation, along with the fulfilment of key posts specified. This focused effort of building capability has inevitably resulted in less progress being achieved elsewhere in, for example, producing an integrated programme and project plan and the other recommendations from the Gateway Review.

The Programme Team members are showing impressive commitment and enthusiasm and hold a positive view of the challenges ahead in spite of the lack of clarity and detailed information regarding the enormity of future work required.

4.5.2 The Vision Project and Stage 1 of the Delivery Options Project have been completed concluding in a decision to establish an Agency to administer the payment of benefits to 1 in 10 of Scotland's people. The decision to form an Agency is a major milestone and the agreement that the Agency is the future delivery model will enable the Programme to focus effort on defining options for bringing the Agency to full operational readiness.

4.5.3 Overall the Review Team commends the early appointment of a Director of Social Security, and a number of other key staff, to enable work to progress quickly in building a solid foundation for the establishment of the Agency. A small number of key senior executive posts still need to be filled and the Review Team are greatly assured that the Scottish Government are very aware of the risks of any delay in making these appointments. This early focus on building capability, whilst temporarily slowing momentum in other areas, will enable more rapid progress to be made in the immediate future.

4.5.4 It is also evident to the Review Team that SG in general, and the Programme in particular, understands the need for a strong and capable Programme Management Office. We have heard of future plans from the PMO and endorsed these.

4.5.5

4.6 Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes

4.6.1 Due to the many unknowns at the start of the Programme, it was decided to take an incremental approach to programme planning and implementation. The initial programme phases were referred to as Tranche 1 and Tranche 2. The Review Team support this approach as it enables emerging detail (in a changing landscape) to be managed effectively. However, there is a growing diversity of opinion with stakeholders about what constitutes Tranche 2, its scope and timeframes. This needs to be addressed quickly to remove ambiguity and enable the PMO and Programme Director to monitor, review and manage progress.

4.6.2 Taking this work forward, it is essential to create a more detailed Programme Plan and critical path that establish further tranches, their deliverables, timeframes and ownership. This will enable additional detail to be added as it becomes available. It will also enable 'what if' scenario planning to be undertaken. A tool such as Microsoft Project will be essential for this work. It will enable the PMO to provide valuable and powerful data to the Programme Board and SG Executive Team to ensure decisions are well informed.

4.6.3 An early decision needs to be taken on IT strategy and the extent to which external procurement is required. This is a major risk to the deliverability of the Programme and is likely to be an extensive activity and will need considerable forward planning.

4.6.4 The Review Team has heard of good work at programme and project levels from policy development through to operational planning. There is a risk that more attention is being paid to the policy and legislation workstreams, which are more familiar, than to the planning and analysis needed to develop large-scale operational delivery capability. A lack of clear understanding of how decisions in one area can affect deliverability in another is a significant risk. This could be mitigated by adding to the programme's capacity in the area of operational delivery, for example, by ensuring that the Shadow Chief Executive of the Agency is someone with a track record of success in this area.

4.6.5 It is unclear how well all this work is being integrated, shared and coordinated. **[redacted under s30(b)(i)]**. We are aware that work is ongoing to address these issues. This includes the creation of a Project Management Pack. We commend this approach.

Other opportunities to improve integration, coordination and communication would include:

Reviewing the induction of new staff by including a Social Security element, that ensures staff are aligned to the necessary ways of working within the Programme; and

Adopting Board Briefings that specify the purpose of the paper and actions required by the Board. This will enable Members to prioritise their work and attention as necessary.

Establishing a Delivery Group, comprising project managers, that meet regularly to share experiences, update each other on progress made and ensure coordination and uniformity of approach – where that adds value; and

Adopting tighter disciplines regarding Board Actions, including unique action identifiers, specified deadlines and individual, accountable, owners of actions.

4.6.6 The Review Team is aware of the wider change agenda of the Scottish Government. SG2020 will provide clear opportunities for resourcing of the Programme, however this change management process needs to be carefully planned to avoid the risks of detracting from efforts overall.

5. **Previous Gateway Review Recommendations**

5.1 The Review Team have seen an Action Plan related to the previous review. All six recommendations were accepted and an action plan developed for each. Of the six recommendations, two are nearing completion (Governance and Resource Planning) with the rest are incomplete for the reasons noted earlier.

6. **Next Gateway Review**

6.1 The next Gateway Review 0 – Strategic Assessment is expected following the Strategic Spending Review, budget allocation and the completion of an Outline Business Case for the establishment of the Agency.

6.2 The DCA of this review being [redacted under s30(b)(i)] requires an Assurance of Action Plan to be undertaken after about 3 months (beginning/middle of June).

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 | 4.1.9 | Set up a development programme for the Board including one or more residential Away-Days to reinforce understanding of roles and responsibilities and build a team. | Critical once the Board has been reconstituted | 3 | |
| R2 | 4.2.7 | Develop an Outline Business Case for the Programme. | Critical | 2 | |
| R3 | 4.2.7 | Establish an overall Programme Plan with key milestones, deadlines and dependencies to enable effective management and control. | Critical | 6 | |
| R4 | 4.2.7 | Scope Tranche 2 to define deliverables, timeframes and ownership to ensure progress can be monitored, reviewed and managed. | Critical | 6 | |
| R5 | 4.2.13 | Deliver detailed action plans to support stakeholder engagement and communications. | Essential as an integral part of the Programme Plan | 8 | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|--|-----------------|---|--|
| R6 | 4.3.2 | Create a benefits realisation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework to track and measure improvements and inform the Programme Business Case. | Critical | 4 | |
| R7 | 4.4.2 | Conduct a series of workshops with programme board members, project managers and other stakeholders, to identify risks and ensure that the risks considered most serious are appropriately reflected in the RAID. | Critical | 5 | |

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 |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Stephen Kerr | Head of Social Security Policy and Delivery Division, SRO Social Security Programme |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Social Security Programme Manager |
| Lesley Fraser | Director for Housing, Regeneration and Welfare, Chair Social Security Programme Board, Member Social Security Programme Assurance Board |
| Sarah Davidson | Director General of Communities, Chair Social Security Programme Assurance Board |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Head of Health and Disability Benefits Unit, Social Security Policy And Delivery Division |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Head of Low Income Benefits Unit, SSPD |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Head of Legislation, Finance & Delivery Unit, Social Security Policy And Delivery Division |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Head of Communications, Stakeholder Engagement and Reporting Team |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Non-Executive Member, Social Security Programme Board |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Social Security Programme Office Manager |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Business Architect/Analyst, Social Security Policy And Delivery Division |
| Lisa Baron-Broadhurst * | Programme Director, Scottish Devolution (DWP) |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Head of Communities Analytical Services, Member Social Security Programme Board |
| [redacted under s38(1)(b)] | Director of Financial Strategy, Member Social Security Programme Board |
| Andy McClintock | Deputy Chief Information Officer, Member Social Security Programme Board |

* by telephone ** by videoconference

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.