

June 2011

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Better Deal for Residents Programme
Standing Scrutiny Review
Interim Report – Programme Management

Members of the Challenge Panel

Councillor Stephen Wright (Chairman)

Councillor Nana Asante

Councillor Kamaljit Chana

Councillor Ann Gate

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Councillor Paul Osborn

Councillor Bill Phillips

Councillor Krishna Suresh

Community Co-optees:

Seamus English

Elizabeth Hugo

Rita Jourdan

Linda Robinson

Final Version

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	1
SUMMARY.....	2
BACKGROUND.....	4
OBSERVATIONS.....	5
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	12
APPENDIX – BDFR SCOPE.....	14

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the first report from the Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review. This review has been established to consider the implementation of the Council's 'Better Deal for Residents' programme and the impact of this programme on residents, staff and partners. It is perhaps the most ambitious transformation programme that the council has ever undertaken and as such warrants significant scrutiny. For this reason, the Overview and Scrutiny committee has decided to establish a long-term project which can continue to monitor the impact of the programme throughout its life.

The review group was established in September 2010 and we are pleased to be joined by a number of local residents who have brought an intensification of our focus on the impact of the programme on the people for whom the 'better deal' is targeted. As its first task, the group has decided to consider the robustness of the Council's project/programme monitoring process. This report represents the conclusions of this initial investigation.

We are grateful to all officers who have helped us with the investigation. In particular, we would like to thank:

- Bridget Bergin, Service Manager, Partnership Development
- Maggie Challoner, Service Manager, Residents' Services
- Carol Cutler, Director Customer Service and Business Transformation
- Catherine Doran, Corporate Director, Children's Services
- Brendon Hills, Corporate Director, Community and Environment
- Ben Jones, Senior Project Manager, Customer Services & Business Transformation
- Mala Kripalani, Service Manager, Programme Management Office
- Marianne Locke, Divisional Director, Culture and Community Services
- Jim Marsh, Programme Manager
- Lora McGann, Project Manager
- Paul Najsarek, Corporate Director, Adults and Housing
- Paul D Newman, LEAN Practitioner
- Jonathan Price, Policy Development Manager, Adults and Housing
- Andrew Trehern, Corporate Director, Place Shaping
- Ghan Varsani - Programme Director Capita - Harrow Business Unit

Also, on behalf of the BDfR Standing Scrutiny Review Group, we would like to give very special thanks to Lynne Margetts, Service Manager, Scrutiny for the dedicated and tireless way she has assisted in the planning, setting up and documenting of meetings and in the preparation of this and other reports. She has given excellent advice and support to myself and the group and she will be sadly missed.

With the completion of this phase, we now embark on the next phase of the project during which we will consider the impact of the programme, how far it is achieving its purpose and the extent to which it is engaging with residents.

Cllr Stephen Wright
Chairman of the Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review

SUMMARY

The council needs to find significant savings over the next three years and to achieve those savings the council has embarked on a programme to fundamentally transform the organisation and its structures and to broker a new relationship with residents. The Better Deal for Residents programme is the means by which the council hopes to make these major service reconfigurations. Such a significant change programme requires a high level of scrutiny to ensure that the change proposals and their impact are in the best interests of residents, partners and service users and are clearly understood. It is for this reason, that a Standing Review has been established with residents at the heart of the BDfR programme.

Appendix 1 sets out the terms of reference, scope and objectives of the BDfR Programme Standing Review. It is intended that the Standing Review will add real value by considering the impact of the programme, the extent to which resident opinion has informed the project, and the extent to which residents' behaviour can be influenced. However, the Standing Review group needed to satisfy itself that the project management process in place was sufficiently robust to ensure that projects deliver the fundamental change that can ensure the viability of the organisation and our services for the future. Therefore this phase of the project has focussed solely on the competence and implementation of the council's project management processes.

The Review Group has received presentations from representatives of the Customer Service and Business Transformation unit on the council's management of Capita projects and on the Programme Management Office, an unit set up two years ago to support and coordinate BDfR projects within the Directorates. We also examined the Project Management Document templates created by the PMO to introduce standards and conformity to project documentation. We have made a number of recommendations on these templates within the body of this document.

To get a better understanding of BDfR projects we also received presentations from operations managers who were managing current transformation projects within the BDfR programme. The Group also needed to get further background on project management, controls and standards within the Directorates and representatives from the group (Cllrs. Wright and Phillips) held meetings with the Director of Customer Services and Business Transformation and four Corporate Directors. These meetings were fully documented and circulated to the Review Group.

These meetings suggested there were issues with the overall vision and objectives of the BDfR programme, its governance and political oversight, and cultural issues relating to project management within the organisation and the apparent poor utilisation of the PMO. The PMO is a corporate resource with qualified project managers that can assist Directorates identify and plan their change projects using PRINCE2, LEAN and other transformation methods. Even so, we were told by some Directorates management that they wanted to develop their own 'in house' project management skills and resources.

We also found significant differences between the way projects are managed within the BDfR programme and other projects that fall outside the BDfR Programme managed within Directorates. The PMO has the capability to ensure projects are implemented using the same standards and common language across the whole council. However, the meetings and a review of project documentation reveals there is variation in the way the project management processes have been adopted.

We also found issues with project governance. Whilst we are happy with the officer structures in place we feel there is a deficit in democratic accountability. The group was advised that full business cases are agreed at Cabinet but this appears to be the only opportunity for political oversight of the programme. We recommend the engagement of cabinet and portfolio holders is enhanced and would suggest the setting up of an Advisory Panel in order to provide cross party member advice to Cabinet.

We are also aware that there is no formal or 'constitutional' opportunity for the BDfR programme to be considered and challenged by the scrutiny function. This is the most ambitious transformation programme undertaken by the council and lies at the core of the council's work programme. We therefore believe that 'challenge' to the programme by scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.

Finally, a requirement for further improvement in the corporate culture for customer satisfaction and resident involvement has been identified. Greater clarity on the council's ambition for customer satisfaction levels is required in identifiable and measurable terms so that improvements can be monitored and recorded.

In all, there are sixteen recommendations made by the Review Group.

BACKGROUND

What is the Better Deal for Residents (BDfR)

The council needs to find significant savings over the next three years. Whereas in the past, it might have been feasible to reduce spending on a service-by-service basis, the extent of the savings required means that many services will no longer be viable if cuts are delivered in this way.

(http://www.harrow.gov.uk/news/article/280/people_power_key_to_transforming_services_says_new_leader). As a result the council has embarked on a programme to fundamentally transform the organisation and its structures and to broker a new relationship with residents. The BDfR programme is the means by which the council hopes to make these changes. The programme comprises a range of projects designed to deliver major service reconfiguration. Such a significant change programme warrants a high level of scrutiny to ensure that proposals made are those in the best interests of residents and that the impact of change on residents, partners and service users is clearly understood. It is for this reason, that a standing review has been established.

Why consider project management

The review group is aware that the council has a dedicated programme office in place whose key responsibility is to monitor the high risks projects and identify the key issues and interdependencies of the BDfR and ensure the successful delivery of the programme. As such, it would not be appropriate for the review group to also monitor the delivery of the programme. Instead, the review can add real value by considering the impact of the programme, the extent to which resident opinion has informed the project and the extent to which residents' behaviour can be influenced. However, the group wished to satisfy itself that the project management process in place is sufficiently robust to ensure that projects are meeting these key objectives and delivering the fundamental change that can ensure the viability of the organisation and our services for the future. Thus, this first phase of the project has focussed solely on the competence and implementation of the council's project management process. The full scope for the project is included as Appendix One.

What the group did

The group considered two fundamental questions

- Is the council's project management process fit for purpose and how does it compare with what is considered industry standard?
- How well is this process embedded in the organisation?

In order to answer these questions the group undertook the following:

- To ensure everyone on the review group had a similar understanding of transformation and project management, the review chairman described the key aspects of process transformation and managing transformation projects.
- The group received presentations from representatives of the Programme Management Office and from project managers from a sample of current projects,
- Group representatives, Cllr Wright and Cllr Phillips, met with Carol Cutler, Director of Customer Services and Business Transformation and Corporate Directors – Catherine Doran, Children's Services, Brendon Hills, Community and Environment, Paul Najsarek, Adults and Housing and Andrew Trehern, Place Shaping, to discuss project management within their Directorates.

The pages which follow outline the group's initial findings.

OBSERVATIONS

Our deliberations during this initial phase lead us to the following observations:

- **Nature of BDfR**

There appears to be a lack of clarity on the overall vision, ambition and objectives of the BDfR programme. It appears to be a random collection of projects badged as BDfR and as such, the group is concerned to understand how a project becomes designated as a BDfR project. We feel that there should be some clarity regarding the overall composition of the programme and how it is constituted if it is to be properly managed.

We understand that many projects do not fall within the BDfR programme and thus, will not be managed /coordinated via the PMO. The need for a professional and consistent approach to project management across the organisation is essential and we would emphasise the need for a single, corporate project management process regardless of the status as a BDfR project.

We are also concerned that what constitutes a 'Better Deal for Residents' from the council's perspective, may not constitute a Better Deal from the perspective of residents. For example, we were advised of circumstances which might deliver a saving for the authority but in which the benefit to residents, perhaps in terms of a saving passed on for investment elsewhere or as a reduction in Council Tax, is not immediately obvious. During the course of our deliberations, we have noted that the key driver of the programme is the need to deliver savings. Whilst we have no issue with this, we think it would be helpful if the programme were designed with a very clear focus on how residents themselves might like to see savings delivered, the council can identify the 'end' but residents should be able to influence/determine the 'means'. With this in mind we would welcome more transparent, co-ordinated and more strategic engagement with residents at the commencement of future projects in order to negotiate a clear and agreed approach which can ensure residents' future commitment to change. This would also link in with the council's initiative "Lets Talk" in terms of consultation with residents over priorities.

- **Culture within the Organisation**

It is evident in some Directorates that there is a lack of recognition of project management as a professional skill. Often, operations managers are asked to manage Directorate transformation projects. However, when time and resource conflicts arise this can lead to contention between the delivery of the operational service and maintaining the project timetable and in these circumstances, best practice project processes, controls and quality of documentation can often be set aside.

We were also advised of the belief that it is necessary for projects to be led by the 'most powerful' rather than the 'most skilful' which again suggests a low regard for the skills of a professional project manager. In these circumstances it will often be the case that operational managers who provide project management will not have received the appropriate level of training.

The PMO is a corporate resource with qualified project managers that can assist Directorates identify and plan their change projects using PRINCE2, LEAN and other transformation methods. The PMO has developed a set of project management guidelines embedded in the Project Management Toolkit. Part of its role is to ensure that

a standard project management process is adopted across the council. Even so, our evidence indicates the practice is variable across the Directorates. For those non-BDfR projects managed within the Directorates the project documentation examined indicates the completion of formal project documentation as recommended within the Toolkit is not universal. This effectively undermines the process and its credibility. The review group feels it is unfortunate, though predictable, that the corporate Project Management Toolkit maintained by the PMO is not mandatory.

Often the review group heard the PMO's role described as 'administrative' or 'secretarial'. In our view this indicates a failure to recognise and make best use of the significant investment in project management skills developed within the council to support the BDfR delivery.

This cultural deficit is further illustrated in the organisation's approach to the delivery of LEAN projects. Having invested significant resources in the training of Directorate staff to become Green Belt ¹ practitioners, in practice, the practitioners can rarely be released from their contractual / operational duties in such a way as to make the delivery of projects practical. The organisation has thus failed to create a sustainable environment within which the LEAN methodology might deliver important improvements to our services and significant savings for the organisation.

The review group believe the PMO is the element which can bind together the energy being generated via BDfR and ensure that the council as a whole is able to benefit from the change being delivered, with opportunities and risks respectively shared and controlled. We were pleased to hear from some officers interviewed that the PMO had successfully supported a change in the culture for parts of the service enabling a more positive approach to project management methodology.

We asked if enhanced authority for the PMO would be beneficial to the organisation in terms of ensuring a professional focus for project management. We were advised that this could only be secured if this is '*what the organisation wants*'. Increased authority for the PMO must be coupled with increased appreciation of the value of project management skills. Within this culture it has not been possible for the skills and competencies of the PMO to be properly utilised. We feel the PMO has significantly more to offer.

As a corporate resource we believe the PMO skills set should be continually developed to provide wider capability and advice. For example, we suggest the PMO examines transformation methods such as 'Sprint' that has been developed specifically for local government change programmes. Additionally, tools to manage "Knowledge" based projects such as Microsoft Exchange integrated with SharePoint for "Collaborative" working and "Agile" project methods for use in high risk projects where there is a high degree of human interaction (e.g. staff and/or public) should also assessed for adoption.

¹ Green Belt – Denotes mid level training that enables practitioners to use a blend of Lean and Six Sigma steps to develop process improvement solutions.

- **Corporate Project Management Process**

We have reviewed the project management process operated via the project management toolkit by the PMO and have identified an effective process in place subject to the proposals outlined below. However, we have concerns with regard its implementation across the council.

We also believe there is an effective process through which Capita projects are delivered and monitored. These projects require:

- Strategic business case – (SBC)
- Outline business case – (OBC)
- Full business case – (FBC)
- Project initiation document – (PID)

There also appears to be a rigorous and effective process in place holding Capita to account although we are concerned about the apparent lack of Member involvement. As a commercial organisation, managed through tight financial controls and fixed price contracts, Capita are acutely aware of the importance of effective project management as failure for them equates to loss of profit. No variations to contract, no progress through gateways can happen without the specific sanction of the Director Customer Service and Business Transformation subject to satisfactory completion of each of the stages outlined above. This enforces minimal deviation from project milestones. However, we have also been appraised of some drawbacks of working with Capita such as the lack of an intuitive approach to the council's function / purpose and the commercial imperative.

Additionally, we are concerned as to how consistently this process is implemented for non-capita projects. We have noted above our concerns with regard to the culture of the organisation and we will set out our recommendations on how to improve documentation later in this report. Here, we discuss our concerns with regard to consistent application of the process.

Corporate Directors have told us they are keen to develop their own project management skills within their Directorates. Whilst we recognise the usefulness and sustainability of a 'grow your own' culture, it is important that officers, who take on project management responsibilities, are properly trained and follow standard project management processes. However, from our discussions at all levels in the organisation and from documentation reviewed, it is evident that there is variation in the way the project management processes have been adopted. The importance of implementing a council-wide process is not to stifle creativity but to ensure that processes are implemented using the same standards and common language across the whole council. Instead, we have been advised of 'modifications' to the corporate process by a number of officers. Whilst one size might not fit all, and indeed the process must be proportionate to the risk carried by individual projects, nonetheless, the core components of the project management process utilised across the organisation must be consistent and transparent. For example, we could not identify any consistent approach to deciding on the level of risk associated with individual projects. To ensure the consistency of project management operating in the organisation, we believe the processes utilised by the PMO should be adopted for all projects that sit outside the BdFR.

It is our view that:

- There should be a single, professionally-led project management process,
- This process should be applied proportionately,
- There must be clear guidance on what constitutes large/high risk projects, and this should be overseen by the PMO,
- Any deviation from the corporate process must be confirmed by the Corporate Strategy Board.

- **Comments on the PMO process**

We believe an effective corporate Programme Management Office is essential if the council is to deliver the level of change envisaged in the BDfR. Service areas must be properly supported to deliver the change programme using a single process, a single language and defined standards. We also believe the project management process must add value to the organisation and not make unnecessary demands on service areas attempting to maintain day-to-day service operations whilst at the same time transforming services. The processes and services offered by PMO should be recognised by the organisation and we would urge discussions to broker a new contract through which the skills of the PMO are adopted more widely. We are happy to report that the PMO has responded positively to suggested improvements in its processes.

If Directorates are to utilise the PMO and its processes, then we feel the PMO must demonstrate its 'value add' to the project management process for the Directorates. Specifically, we are aware that in all circumstances, the cost of utilising Capita to deliver a project is fully accounted for in the business case. We feel that similar accounting arrangements (for the costs of the PMO) should be in place to strengthen the PMO's case.

The PMO has developed standard documentation within its Project Management Toolkit for use in defining new projects which recommends the production of, for non-Capita BDfR projects, a business case and project initiation document. Documentation for both Capita and non-Capita projects is generally robust but there are a number of additional sections we would like to see within the documentation:

- **Baseline** – to identify key baseline information for the current service/s. Objectives for the transformation project can only be set and measured against the current baseline. For example:
 - Definition and scope of service/s to be investigated,
 - The annual cost of delivering the service/s, any revenue income, other relevant financial information,
 - Time to deliver the services, i.e. the end to end process (e.g. from initial customer contact to service delivery),
 - Resources employed – full-time/temporary/contract staff, technology, equipment, etc.

A baseline is required to set meaningful objectives (i.e. quantitative targets) and as a measure against which to evaluate project success or failure. We note that a central component of the LEAN process is the identification of detailed baseline information at the start of a project. Although some officers have suggested the collection of baseline information might be too time-consuming, we would argue this is basic information that should be readily to hand and is required for successful project management and the achievement of the desired outcomes.

- **Transformation Objectives** – Using the baseline information, clear, measurable objectives should be identified within the PID and business case before the project commences and against which the project milestones and outcomes should be measured. For example, it is not sufficient to say at the end of the project 'this is what we have achieved'. Project success should be assessed based on achieving challenging targets set at the start of the project.
- **Impact on Residents/Partners** – The PID/business case should clearly identify the impact BDfR projects will have on residents, partners or staff. Impact can be both positive and/or negative in terms of the change in services provided. The potential impact must be clearly identified early in the document so that senior management can take a view on the appropriateness of project implementation. We note the project documentation includes the need to address equality impacts but this assessment appears too narrow in definition and often peripheral to the project process. We would suggest that as a minimum, residents' views on the viability and usefulness of a project should be considered at project inception – we consider that the council's ambition to be a 'listening and leading' authority make this focus essential for all projects.

We are advised that whilst a 'lessons learnt' process is in place for Capita-led projects, a similar process is not in place for other projects. We were also advised that the 'lessons learnt' for Capita projects are not widely shared. We consider such sharing of project outcomes would be useful in supporting the development of the council's project management capability.

We are concerned that ongoing monitoring of the project following implementation is not uniform across the organisation. This is an essential phase of the project to ensure the benefits initially achieved are being maintained some months later. The absence of such monitoring and reporting may result in the service delivery sliding back to previous methods and the benefits of transformation lost. We discuss the governance arrangements in more detail below.

- **Governance**

The review group was advised of the governance structure outlined below:

- **CSB Programme Board** provides overall direction and control over the programme and final accountability for implementation. It is comprised of all members of CSB. The PMO is responsible for:
 - Monitoring projects
 - Flagging up issues
 - Disseminating decisions from the board throughout the organisation
 - Determining the agenda of the board
- **Design Board** – considers cross cutting issues, the PMO helps to identify inter-dependencies, flag up issues, determine agenda,
- **Better Together Board** – considers activities to improve engagement with residents, the PMO provides support to the board,
- **Strategic Procurement Board** – recently established to support the delivery of outcomes from the programme through the procurement process. Although this will be supported by the PMO, there hasn't been a great deal of input as yet,

- **Place Shaping and Property Board** – considers the strategic property issues that are emerging from the programme. The PMO help determine agenda, flag up issues and interdependencies and run specific planning sessions.

Below these high level boards that have representation from all Directorates, there are Directorate-led boards based on Departmental Management Teams. These boards:

- Lead and direct all elements of BDfR projects through a Directorate work plan,
 - Ensure that each project has the required project management resource,
 - Ensure that all projects are properly managed and controlled,
 - Ensure that all projects are sufficiently financed,
 - Identify and manage project risks and issues,
 - Submit proposals to the programme board for maintaining progress or request redirection.
- Whilst we are happy with the officer structures in place we feel there is a deficit in democratic accountability. The group was advised that full business cases are agreed at Cabinet but this appears to be the only opportunity for political oversight of the programme. We suggest the involvement of cabinet and portfolio holders be enhanced and would further suggest an Advisory Panel be set up under the chairmanship of the Leader of the Council in order to provide cross party member advice to Cabinet. There needs to be clear Member involvement at inception, during the implementation, and then sign-off and review of the project process and, for robustness, Member involvement ought to be formalised through Cabinet and/or other meetings including Portfolio Holder Decision meetings. This formalisation of Member oversight also enables public and other councillors to formally question and challenge project management in an open and transparent way, improving accountability and reducing the democratic deficit.
 - We are also aware that, to date, there has been little consideration of the BDfR programme by the Scrutiny function. This is the most ambitious transformation programme undertaken by the council. Moreover, it lies at the core of the council's work programme. We therefore believe that greater 'challenge' to the programme by Scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.

- **Culture and Resident Perspective**

The Review Group believe there has been a definite improvement in the culture and performance of the council regarding customer satisfaction and resident involvement but there is still considerable room for improvement. The culture of the organisation needs to change further to be more focussed on resident / customer satisfaction, for example, where staff should be willing to take personal responsibility for issues which are raised with them by residents.

This type of cultural change starts at the top. Senior managers and councillors should make the council's ambition on customer satisfaction and the need for a change in culture absolutely clear. Some 'first principles' need to be established outlining what the organisation is trying to achieve and a baseline against which performance improvements can be identified and measured. The council must be able to measure improvement and ongoing monitoring of performance and customer opinion is required.

This will include Access Harrow and all other types of resident contact with the council including One Stop Shop, email and post.

Councils must make clear their ambition and provide training to improve customer service as in many cases, residents have no alternative providers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Better Deal for Residents programme standing review makes the following recommendations:

1. There is wide recognition in the Scrutiny Review group that the council needs to be transformed to a resident centred organisation. In particular, that a culture of residents satisfaction should be at the heart of all council activities including the Better Deal for Residents programme. Their views and experiences must drive the programme. As such the council should develop a mechanism for engaging with residents at the outset of a project and their views must be clearly evidenced in all project management documentation.
2. There should be a single project management process operated across the organisation. This process should be applied proportionately with advice from the PMO. Any deviation from this process must be sanctioned by the Corporate Strategy Board.
3. The council's method for managing projects (Prince 2) and the Project Management Toolkit should be mandatory for all but the smallest quality improvement projects and in particular, for those projects which will impact residents or other partners,
4. Existing project management and other transformation skills within the PMO are under-utilised. The PMO needs to re-assess the scope of its product and service offerings and 'market' its skills and capabilities through continuous dialogue and communication with directors and operations management. Ongoing support should help to boost team confidence and greater communication at director level will ensure the development of improved relationships.
5. The cost of running the PMO should be more transparent in order to demonstrate the 'value added' to its service delivery processes,
6. As a corporate resource, the PMO should continually develop its skills knowledge and expertise in transformation methods and knowledge management tools.
7. The PMO should develop formal training programmes covering sub elements of Prince 2 methodology including methods, standards, quality management, Toolkit documentation, risks/mitigations, LEAN and other new methods.
8. Changes to the Project Management Toolkit documentation are required:
 - Baseline information covering the current service/s, performance, costs, resources, etc, to be included;
 - The impact on residents and other partners from the Better Deal for Residents projects must be considered early in the project definition. Whilst the council must improve its own practices, it must do so from the perspective of the impact on residents and be built into the project management templates;
 - A clear statement of objectives that act as targets for transformation;
 - Guidance on post implementation monitoring to ensure new processes are embedded.
9. An Advisory Board should be set up under the chairmanship of the Leader to provide political oversight of the BDfR and provide cross party Member advice to Cabinet.

10. Additional points of political oversight, reporting and challenge should be built into the inception, implementation, sign-off and review of projects.
11. Non-BDfR projects should have corporate scrutiny and be managed through the corporate process. Many Directorate projects have little or no visibility and therefore escape proper executive scrutiny. The council needs to decide how it should manage Directorate projects that are non-BDfR or Capita-led to ensure consistency of standards, delivery and outcomes,
12. The criteria to identify Better Deal for Residents projects should be clearly defined and agreed.
13. The direction whereby Directorates seek to develop their own project management skills should be resisted. This will result in a duplication of skills, added costs and potential for diversity in project management standards and controls (the 'silo' effect),
14. Whilst the current remit of the PMO does not include management of individual projects, their project management skills should be more effectively deployed to provide Directorates with assistance with the following (we acknowledge that many of these activities are already undertaken by PMO staff):
 - Project identification, definition, scoping and objectives;
 - Sizing, complexity, risk (i.e. is it a Capita, Directorate or department project);
 - Categorisation of BDfR projects;
 - Confirm project mandate – Member / Officer authorisation path;
 - Plan project and resourcing (activities, leadership, skills, knowledge requirements);
 - Agree appropriate documentation (BC/PID) proportionate to the size and complexity of the project. For BDfR projects ensure impact on residents and other partner groups are fully identified and articulated;
 - Provide support and guidance for the delivery of a single standard project management process, (ensure appropriate PRINCE2 project management standards are required and maintained for all projects except those defined as small, low risk, quality improvement changes. (Clarification on the definition of projects by size, risk and impact is necessary);
 - Influence and support the cultural shift of the organisation;
 - Deliver Project Management and skills training, i.e. PRINCE2 methodology;
 - Coordinate cross-Directorate projects within the programme to ensure they are delivered in full cognisance of each other with risks and opportunities fully visible;
 - Monitor the progress of individual projects against stated milestones and objectives;
 - Manage the effective delivery of the overall programme;
 - Support the project boards to deliver effective governance;
 - In some circumstances, provide direct project management support.
15. Recommend that greater 'challenge' to the programme by Scrutiny would assist the council in ensuring residents' interests are central to proposals and that the right decisions are being taken.
16. Further improvement in the corporate culture for customer satisfaction and resident involvement has been identified. Greater clarity on the council's ambition for customer satisfaction is required in identifiable and measurable terms so that any improvement can be monitored and proven.

APPENDIX – BDFR SCOPE

BETTER DEAL FOR RESIDENTS PROGRAMME STANDING REVIEW - SCOPE

VERSION NUMBER – 5

VERSION HISTORY

Initial draft

Version 2 – considered at review group meeting on 18th November

Version 3 – amended after further discussions with the Chairman 23rd November

Version 4 – final version agreed by the review group on 16th December

1	SUBJECT	Better Deal for Residents Programme
2	COMMITTEE	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	<p>Councillors Cllr Nana Asante Cllr Chana Cllr Ann Gate Cllr Macleod-Cullinane Cllr Osborn Cllr Phillips Cllr Krishna Suresh Cllr Wright (Chairman)</p> <p>Co-optees Rita Jourdan Hema Mistry Elizabeth Hugo Linda Robinson Abigail Matsika Seamus English</p>
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	<p>1. To consider the content of the Better Deal for Residents programme in terms of ambition, relevance, appropriateness</p> <p>2. To ensure effective project management processes are in place for the programme</p> <p>3. To consider the impact of the programme on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Council – is it achieving the outcomes envisaged – linked to the effectiveness of project management processes; • residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what impact are the changes having and how are these being mitigated – Better Together/Big

		<p>Society;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ how far do residents understand/appreciate the need for significant change, are their opinions being taken into account, are they being actively engaged/convinced in the delivery of change; ● partners – are we working more efficiently with partners to deliver change, what is the impact on their services; ● managers – how well are they being supported in delivering change whilst at the same time being subject to that change.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	<p>Review is able to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Programme delivers real change in service delivery; ● Programme delivers anticipated savings; ● Programme delivers change in residents'/service users' attitude to service delivery and responsibilities.
6	SCOPE	The content of the Better Deal for Residents Programme
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	From relevant service area
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Service Manager Scrutiny
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	From within Scrutiny Team
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Residents ● Partner organisations ● Service users
13	METHODOLOGY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consideration of the detail of the programme ● Investigation of the effectiveness of the performance management of the programme to ensure best practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ examination of a number of cases studies with relevant project directors ○ consideration of the overall PMO performance

		<p>management process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular updates on progress – to include achievement of anticipated savings • Parallel investigation of the impact of the programme on residents and partners (including voluntary sector) • Investigation of particular areas under the 3rd priority 'Building on the community spirit of residents to be more involved in the future of the Borough'
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	It is anticipated that the Better Deal for Residents programme will deliver significant change in the way the council organises itself to deliver services to local people. Harrow is an extremely diverse borough and the organisation cannot make assumptions about service needs of the population. As such changes to services and changing the expectations and behaviours of our residents will need to reflect the differing needs and experiences of the population. The council must be able to assure itself that adverse equalities implications for staff or on residents are identified and where possible, mitigated. The review will monitor this.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	
16	SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS	This could be a component of the project in so far as the Better Together stream is implemented.
17	TIMESCALE	Ongoing
18	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	The project will be delivered from within the existing scrutiny budget
19	REPORT AUTHOR	Lynne Margetts
20	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	<p>Quarterly reports on progress to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Interim report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2011</p> <p>Outline of final formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Service Director [] TBC</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [] TBC</p> <p>To CMT [] TBC</p> <p>To Cabinet [] TBC</p>
21	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals)	TBC