Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council

Programme update

Alyn Jones, Alastair Higton, Angela Farmer

Programme Progress Update

Programme Scorecard for month of June and PwC Monthly Report and half-year review

Alyn Jones/Alastair Higton

Key points for discussion:

1. Overall programme status: Amber

2. The programme is part of the overall approach to MTFP

3. Resourcing remains a challenge particularly in the Service Alignment workstream, however work continues to understand where these pressures are greatest and solutions being put in place now.

Ask of Scrutiny:

• To review and note the scorecard

Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council

LGR in Somerset - Top Level Programme Scorecard - Position as of End of Jun 2022   [USING AVAILABLE DATA]

	Overall RAG		Resources		Schedule	
	Last Period	This Period	Last Period	This Period	Last Period	This Period
Overall Prog. RAG	G	A	A	A	G	G
Assets Optimisation: Property	G	A	A	A	G	A
Assets Optimisation: Technical	A	A	G	G	G	G
Communities, Customers & Partnerships	G	G	A	A	G	G
Finance	G	A	G	A	G	A
Governance	G	G	A	A	G	G
People	G	G	A	A	G	G
Service Alignment	A	A	R	R	A	A

Escalations & Awareness

Awareness
Programme
•In regard to overall programme delivery, gaps remain in some delivery plans and all workstreams are working to ensure all milestones for these deliverables are known and added to the master data before the end of July

Governance
•Work is ongoing between PMO/Governance to provide Legal Services with the overview of all deliverables requiring a decision so that Legal Services can do an initial assessment of which deliverables require Legal advice/support. Critical that all WSs heed this assessment and seek legal guidance where required.

Finance
•Capital Programme – Interim resource appointed and in post to complete baseline assessment of capital programmes/bids across the 5 councils by end July. Sub WS is confident that Capital Strategy and investments for Yield Strategy will still be delivered within required timeframes.
•LGR Savings – The LGR programme is being used as part of the vehicle to deliver the MTFP to ensure that the alignment, design and development of services across the programme is progressed within the available budget envelopes. The Financial Strategy Report was approved by the Executive the July and the MTFP process will be launched with key stakeholders/managers 21st July.

Resource

Resources by Sub-Workstream	Last Period	This Period
Total Sub-Workstream Scorecards:	101	99
Sub-Workstreams Sufficiently Resourced	68	71
Sub-Workstreams with Borderline Resources	27	22
Sub-Workstreams Inadequately Resourced	6	6
No. of Products within Inadequately Resourced Sub-WSs	39	122
No. of Tranche 1 Products within Inad. Resourced Sub-WSs	13	4

Time

Time used and remaining until Vesting Day (April 2023):	Last Period (As of:) 31/05/2022	This Period (As of:) 30/06/2022
Time Used *(Since Oct 2021)*	242 Days (44%)	272 Days (50%)
Time Remaining	305 Days (56%)	275 Days (50%)

Product Delivery (Tranche 1 and 2)

All Workstreams	All T1 & T2 Products	Tranche 1	Tranche 2
Total Number of Products	245	179	66
Delivered	39	38	1
On Track	187	135	52
At Risk	0	0	0
Off Track	2	2	0
On Hold/Not yet Started	17	4	13

Milestone Delivery (Tranche 1 and 2)

All Workstreams	All T1 & T2 Products	Tranche 1	Tranche 2
Total Number of Products	712	504	208
Delivered	151	129	22
On Track	481	305	176
At Risk	9	8	1
Off Track	8	8	0
On Hold/Not yet Started	9	0	9

Programme Progress Update

PwC Monthly Report for June, and half-year review

Author:
PwC

Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council

Key points for discussion:

This is the seventh monthly report and half yearly report which is intended to:

- Set out emerging themes, insights and reflections as part of the 'critical friend' role the core team have been commissioned to provide, informed by outputs from workshops, 1:1 meetings and smaller working sessions; and attendance at the Programme Steering Group and Programme Board meetings;
- Provide an overview of some of the key activities that have taken place over the past month;
- Propose solutions to issues identified and suggested next steps.

This monthly report (June 2022) contains reflections from a particular point in time and recognises the progress that has been made against issues or risks highlighted in previous reports.

Ask of Scrutiny:

To review the contents of the report and where additional or different activity can improve delivery

Key insights: half year view

Over the course of our review of the LGR programme over the past six months, the programme has made significant progress in moving from planning and setting the foundations of the programme, to delivering over 400 products across six workstreams in earnest. There is a clearer prioritisation of activities and deliverables with a strong focus on achieving the Tranche 1 elements that are critical for vesting day. However, as to be expected with a programme of this scope and complexity, a number of issues remain that need to be addressed to (1) establish a safe and legal functioning authority on 1st April 2023, (2) deliver on the benefits of LGR based on the commitments made in the business case and to set a firm foundation for future transformation and financial sustainability for the council.

Key achievements include:

- **The Programme has a clear view of the 'minimum viable product' that needs to be delivered on vesting day in Somerset,,** and the transformational activity that will occur subsequently. This is demonstrated in the restructuring of the programme into three tranches, and prioritisation of over 170 products (including top approx. 49 products and subproducts) that must be in place by 1st April 2023.
- **The shift from 'planning' to 'delivering' the programme is mostly complete.** The programme management and reporting infrastructure (including processes and tools) has been effectively embedded, risks have been identified and managed, and all workstreams are now delivering tranche 1 and 2 products. 22 (5%) of products have already been delivered.
- **The Programme Board has developed a more focused approach in leading the programme**, making a number of key strategic decisions over recent months to guide the Programme Steering Group and six workstreams, for example around the activity analysis, target operating model, and MTFP.

There are five areas of improvement that the programme should focus on going forward:

- Whilst the programme is focused on delivering tranche 1 products to establish a safe and legal authority, **it is also essential that the foundations continue to be laid down for the transformation and financial sustainability in the new council.** This includes continuing to develop the target operating model and develop plans to transform and improve services across tranches 2 and 3. This will be required to realise the benefits that underpinned the original decision to proceed with LGR, and to address the emerging MTFP savings gap.
- **There should be a continued theme of developing a stronger central steer and and top down approach to driving the programme.** This should be centred around the rapid definition of the operating model for the new council and re-shaping the programme to align with it, so that there is clear accountability and ownership on delivering the operating model across the workstreams. This will also help to reinforce a focus around the savings and benefits that will be achieved as the operating model is in place.
- **Operational grip at the workstream level needs to be improved to allay concerns around whether reporting accurately reflects the status of the programme.** Based on programme reporting, the majority of workstreams are reporting as 'green' and on track, apart from issues relating to resourcing. The devolved model of delivery, with subworkstream leads responsible for delivering products (two degrees of separation away from workstream leads and the PMO) means visibility at the level of operational detail required to hold sub workstream leads to account is difficult. Incomplete work plans, missing milestones, and lack of clarity in the scope of products, means that reporting does not necessarily provide an accurate picture of the progress made. It is important that workstream leads and workstream PMO have oversight and manage progress across each subworkstream more closely.
- **There remain continued difficulties in identifying cashable and non-cashable benefits (e.g. a lack of service consolidation savings identified) and the proposed directive approach to identifying savings through costed service options should be pursued at pace.** There is agreement and clarity around the LGR benefits being incorporated within the MTFP, and a clear approach and plan around strengthening the assumptions around benefits for tranche 1 and tranche 2 products in June. However, workstreams have expressed difficulty in identifying and quantifying benefits, in part impeded by the complexity of the approach. This has created challenges around the development of the MTFP, and this has also been impacted by delays in the Finance workstream in developing the financial baseline. Plans are being developed for a more centrally-driven approach and ownership to the identification and tracking of LGR savings which needs to be a focus.
- **Resource gaps need to be managed on a ongoing basis, in order to not impede project delivery.** Resource constraints drive most instances where products are not on track. While initial efforts were made to collate resource bids and recruit staff to fill critical gaps, there must be ongoing management and monitoring of resource gaps, reflecting BAU issues, such as attrition. This must be owned by each workstream. In addition, there needs to be a more granular assessment of the impact of LGR activities weighed against BAU for each subworkstream (taking into account statutory and customer facing services), which will occur in June.

Overview:
June 2022

Summary for June 2022

Key headlines:
- The Programme is at a stage where it must balance the delivery of a safe and legal functioning authority with the requirement to identify LGR savings in the context of a widening MTFP savings gap, and define and set the foundations for the improvements and transformation that will occur post-vesting day. This requires a clear vision of the new council, which the operating model design will deliver. The Programme should bring together the operating model design, identification of savings, and tranche 2 and 3 planning as a combined piece of work. This should include key enablers, such as technology and its key related products (e.g. the applications roadmap and architecture) to inform opportunities to drive savings through self-service and automation.
- Programme leadership oversight and strategic steer have strengthened over the past few months, focusing on delivering tranche 1 products, facilitated by the new eight week forward view. LGR PMO provides check and challenge to each workstream on a monthly basis, and centrally coordinates key products, including the LGR savings, the operating model, activity analysis, dependency mapping, and change management.
- However, due to the fact that the Programme is devolved across two layers (workstream, and sub workstream - with the latter being responsible for delivering products), operational oversight at the workstream level remains inconsistent. Workstream PMO must oversee up-to-date work plans, with accurate milestones, and manage sub workstreams more closely, without relying on verbal updates. This will address issues where milestones are missing, not up to date, or where they are re-cast without central oversight. This will strengthen and improve workstream leads' ability to provide assurance of sub-workstream delivery. These themes were reinforced by the findings from the service standards deep dive.

Area of progress include:
- **Closer scrutiny of progress tracking:** The Programme scorecard shows that only four (out of 233) products are off track, with 32 (14%) delivered. The addition of an 8 week rolling plan shared with PSG enables focus on and scrutiny of imminent milestones and products due. LGR PMO has also proactively identified potential bottlenecks, where a significant number of products are due in October, November and January.
- **Clear approach to LGR savings:** there is a clear, centrally driven approach to the realisation and identification of savings. Savings will be split by service level, and Finance will provide workstreams with their savings targets, together with supporting guidance in July. Finance will retain central oversight and monitoring of the savings, while responsibility for the identification of savings will reside with the service leads. In the context of the widening MTFP gap, this requirement is broader than the LGR savings. It is important that transformation and alternative service delivery are explored as a key lever for realising savings, as many service standards are already operating at or near to the statutory minimum, which means that a reduction in service levels will not realise the savings required. The development of costed service structures and the activity analysis may also help to inform this work.
- **Identification and management of dependencies:** dependency mapping across products and workstreams, as well as at the programme level, has been complete, while outstanding data gaps need to be addressed to ensure all dependencies are comprehensively captured. Work is ongoing to embed the dependency management tool across all workstreams and subworkstreams.

Areas for consideration:
- **Continue to strengthen operational oversight at the workstream level:** Work plans (inc. milestones) and tranche 2 planning need to be updated and completed, otherwise they impede workstream PMO visibility of sub workstream progress, as well as impacting the accuracy of the scorecard reporting. It makes workstream PMO reliant on verbal updates from the sub workstreams, as opposed to a data-driven process, based on up to date project documentation, and milestones may be re-cast without central visibility. A programme of this scale and complexity, with sub workstreams leading product delivery, requires that workstream PMO has a comprehensive and accurate view of the status, risks, issues, and upcoming milestones of all sub workstreams.
- **Bringing together the activity analysis, operating model design, and MTFP to inform tranche 2 and 3 planning:** A range of core products that will inform the wider transformation of the new council post vesting day should tie in closely with the identification of LGR savings. The activity analysis will identify areas for investigation to realise further savings. In addition, operating model choices will be evaluated against indicative costs, so it is important that these parameters are set and consistent with the savings allocated to each service. Finally, technology as a key enabler in driving service improvements and efficiencies should be reflected in the technology strategy and applications roadmap.
- **Targeted approach to addressing resource constraints:** the ambiguity and lack of clarity around the extent and impact of the resourcing issue continues, with the majority of workstreams rating resources as amber, while maintaining that the majority, if not all products and milestones remain on track. It is not realistic to prioritise LGR above BAU activities across the board, and prioritisation should be done on a case by case basis for each sub workstream which is at risk of not delivering critical tranche 1 products without additional resource.

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Now that the MVP is in delivery, there needs to be a focus on defining and the completion of planning of tranche 2 and 3, and ensuring alignment between these and the design and phased implementation of the operating model and MTFP to enable the benefits of LGR and ensure the fiscal sustainability of the new council.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps from May	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
Programme leadership	• The May report identified a number of areas of the Programme that would benefit from central steer, leadership, and coordination. These 'central products' include the operating model, activity analysis, benefits and savings identification, and change management. These key areas would form the locus of strategic leadership that would drive the vision and direction of the overall Programme, and provide a balance to the devolved model of delivery, with leads at the sub workstream level delivering products. • In addition, the issue around how Adult, Children's Services, and Public Health are involved in LGR was raised as an ongoing issue, both with respect to the delivery of products (e.g. commissioning) and LGR savings. • Finally, there are a number of strategic design decisions that are occuring at the workstream level and are being reviewed and approved by the workstream boards, and it is important that there is clarity around what should go to PSG / PB and what remains signed off at a workstream level.	• There is a more balanced model of delivery, which enables workstreams to be responsible for the delivery of products, while reinforcing Programme Board and PSG's role in steering and coordination key cross-cutting and strategic 'central' products. • Initial planning has already begun to bring together the milestones for the operating model, MTFP, and activity analysis into a single timeline, which also includes key dependencies on products such as the corporate plan, and service standards. Building on this, more detailed planning needs to occur to bring together each of the 'central products' identified as a coherent whole and to ensure that they are jointly delivered, working towards the shared timeframes of Executive approval in October and approval by Full Council in November. • Together with the commitments in the business case, as the operating model is defined, this should help to set out a clear vision of what the future council will look like beyond 'safe and legal', and when the broader benefits of LGR will be felt by residents, staff and communities. • The issue relating to the involvement of Adult Services, Children's Services, and Public Health remains, and will also need to be addressed as part of the operating model design.
Progress against delivery: tranche 1,2,3	• The May report emphasised the importance of balancing the 'safe and legal' MVP for vesting day with scoping and defining the broader improvements that need to be achieved across tranche 2 and 3, in ensuring that the benefits underpinning the approval of the business case remain front of mind. • In addition, the length of time taken to scope and plan tranche 2 products was identified as an issue, as a range of key milestones will need to be achieved over the next six months in order to deliver tranche 2 products after vesting day, and a number of tranche 2 products are key enablers of tranche 1 products. • For some critical products (e.g. service standards), it is important to ensure clarity around what will be achieved, and what is and is not in scope. E.g the SAI workstream has reinforced that the service standards product will "ensure a level playing field, and not set out future service delivery".	• While the focus on the MVP has helped with prioritisation, there remains room for interpretation around what constitutes the MVP and what will be delivered by vesting day. While a change control process has been established, sub workstreams have shifted some milestones to later dates (e.g. CCP and SAI), and these were deemed below the threshold, and not raised to PSG or PB. It is important to assess the cumulative impact of these changes, and if they alter the 'MVP' for vesting day. Around 20 products were reprofiled between May and June. In the examples above, the workstream PMO does not have sight of these shifting dates. • Tranche 2 planning is in progress and not complete across the workstreams. For example only three workstreams have defined tranche 2 products for CCP, and planning for tranche 2 products is ongoing for the People workstream. • PSG now has sight of an eight week view of forthcoming products and milestones. It is important that all work plans and milestones are kept up to date by each sub workstream (and workstream), and that any changes are captured through the established change control process. This will enable PSG to strengthen its focus on developing solutions to the issues identified.

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Operational grip at the workstream level, in terms of their oversight and management of sub workstreams, remains an issue and needs to be strengthened to ensure that the Programme has an accurate and up to date view of the progress it is making. LGR savings need to be considered in the broader financial context of the emerging MTFP savings gap.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps from May	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
Programme and project management ways of working	● Work was ongoing to complete the dependency mapping across products and workstreams. The dependency mapping, together with the SAI deep dive for the service standards product, and the monthly assurance reports identified a range of issues relating to the quality and completeness of work plans, which directly impacts the visibility of the progress workstreams are making in delivering their products (e.g. missing or inaccurate milestones, and a clustering of milestones at specific dates (e.g. 1st January). ● It was suggested that, as part of the reporting process, workstream leads should provide more robust check and challenge with each sub workstream on the quality and completeness of their work plans, including activities and milestones.	● The dependency mapping is completed, and the focus is now on ensuring the dependency mapping tool is used and embedded within each of the workstreams and sub workstreams. Outstanding data gaps around milestones and products need to be addressed to ensure all dependencies are comprehensively captured. ● Across the dependency mapping, SAI deep dive into the service standards, and the monthly assurance meetings, there remains an issue around work plans and milestones being incomplete and not being kept up to date. This means that workstream PMO may not have an accurate view of the progress each sub workstream is making, and it impacts oversight from LGR PMO, due to inaccurate reporting. Several workstream leads and workstream PMOs said that they are unable to keep work plans and milestones up to date due to resource and time constraints. In terms of ways of working, workstream PMOs obtain verbal updates from sub workstreams and rely on sub workstreams to raise any issues or concerns. ● There remains a requirement for more robust, documented, check and challenge between workstream PMO and sub workstreams, to ensure that they are delivering products on time and to a high standard, and proactively managing risks and dependencies, and that the delivery of related products across sub workstreams is coordinated and joined up.
Benefits and LGR savings	● In the May report, there was clarity that the LGR savings process will be incorporated as part of the overall MTFP process, and savings have been split at the service-level. In addition, work was ongoing to combine the MTFP timetable with the activity analysis, operating model, and other key milestones. ● There was a suggestion that It may be helpful to establish a Finance-led group and governance arrangement (involving the People workstream and Benefits Lead) to drive and be held centrally accountable for the realisation of LGR savings, while recognising that workstreams have the understanding of their service required to identify savings opportunities. ● There was a recognition that a driver of the delays in relation to the identification of benefits was around Finance amalgamating budgets and providing a financial baseline and the People workstream having a clear view of the establishment (inc. vacancies). ● Finally, it was suggested that Finance should be involved and have sight of design decisions for key products that may impact MTFP (e.g. the IT applications roadmap).	● In June, the Programme has taken a more central and directive approach in identifying the LGR savings, as part of MTFP. The Finance workstream will provide the workstreams with details of the financial baseline and service-level savings targets, together with supporting guidance in July, while maintaining central oversight. Workstreams will also require an accurate view of the current establishment, and they will receive the outputs of the activity analysis in July to help to identify areas for investigation. Service leads within workstreams will be responsible for identifying savings beyond those specific to LGR, which is important because LGR savings should not be delivered in isolation of the broader financial context of the new council. ● This work needs to be conducted jointly and in parallel with the development of the target operating model and the scoping of the service improvements and transformation post-vesting day, as part of tranche 2 and 3 planning. ● Finance will commission external support to develop costed service envelopes, informed by benchmarking with other unitary councils. A significant portion of savings are stemming from SAI, which will need to be disaggregated and managed at the right level (e.g. clarifying ownership for identifying these savings at the sub workstream level).

Overview and progress made against next steps from May

Reflecting technology's role as a key enabler, once the applications architecture and roadmap is completed, it needs to tie in to a range of key strategic products, including the operating model, and the MTFP. Workstreams have reported amber on resources for several months, but prioritisation of LGR against BAU needs to occur on a case by case basis, and this requires a more granular understanding of the resource gaps.

Overview of issue	Suggested next steps from May	Progress made in June and suggested next steps
Technology	● The May report reinforced the strategic importance of the applications roadmap and architecture product, which was behind schedule due to delays in identifying a lead. Until the roadmap is completed, there will not be full visibility or clarity around the system and technology related activities required over the next 12 to 18 months (e.g which systems need to get migrated when). This is broadly being mitigated by not integrating any systems for vesting day (with knock on impacts to the SAI workstream), and focusing on core systems (e.g. ERP) and priority integrations. ● CCP is conducting a digital maturity assessment and the outputs of this assessment should directly inform the Applications Roadmap. ● It was unclear how the TDA reports to PSB / PB as a single voice around technology.	● An update on the IT architecture and status of technology products was provided to the workstream leads as part of the fortnightly workshop and a proposed migration approach was presented to PSG. ● Reflecting the strategic importance of the applications roadmap, it needs to tie in to both the Finance workstream (due to its impact on MTFP), the operating model (so that it is aligned with the phased implementation of the operating model, as a key enabler), and SAI (as it will directly impact the types of service improvements that will be facilitated by technology). ● The 'single voice' around technology could be strengthened from both a governance, and a strategic and operational perspective.The applications roadmap and architecture, together with associated products including the technology strategy, and technology change and adoption plan, should be owned and driven by a single strategic lead who is able to readily navigate across TDA and PSG, with oversight around how in flight and forthcoming technology products are (a) contributing to the technology strategy, (b) enabling the operating model, and (c) delivering against the three tranches of the LGR Programme.
Change management	● The May report identified instances where change management and communications activity was happening at a programme and workstream level, without central visibility and coordination. ● It reinforced the importance of having a central change management plan and capability that drives activity at the Programme level, supported by a strategic lead. The change management plan was in development.	● There is a more joined up approach around the change management, based on collaboration between the People workstream and LGR PMO. An assessment of people change across tranche 1 products has been completed to target support where change management is critical for the delivery of key products. Combined with technology change and adoption, this should inform the development of a programme-level change management plan, which is aligned to comms planning and activity. ● While each workstream now has a comms lead, there needs to be more consideration to how comms is delivered as one of a number of strands of change management, which also includes training and organisational development, ways of working and a culture, and tying this closely to benefits realisation.
Resource constraints	● The two key findings from the May report related to ensuring that the management of the resource bids was conducted on an ongoing basis, and that there needed to be a more granular understanding of the resource requirement across each workstream.	● The ambiguity and lack of clarity around the extent and impact of the resourcing issue continues, with the majority of workstreams are rating resources as amber, while maintaining that the vast majority, if not all products and milestones remain on track. ● It is not realistic to prioritise LGR above BAU activities across the board, and prioritisation should be done on a case by case basis for each sub workstream which is at risk of not delivering critical tranche 1 products without additional resource.

QA meetings: workstream specific insights (1/2)

The insights below reflect the key headlines from the monthly assurance meetings and workstream scorecards.

Overview of issue	Insights and suggested next steps
Asset Optimisation	● Out of 11 sub workstreams and 31 products, the "Applications Roadmap and Contracts Review, Integration Strategy and Systems Architecture, Integrated Lines of Business" subworkstream and its associated product is behind schedule, due to delays in onboarding a sub workstream lead. While delivery has now begun, only one milestone has been articulated: "Revised Detailed Work plan to be in place", which is on track. Given its strategic importance, this product should have a number of meaningfully articulated milestones that are closely monitored both by the workstream PMO and lead, as well as PSG. This is because this product will set out the ambition for what can be achieved by vesting day, and the broader three year roadmap from a technology perspective. ● It is important that this product is not developed in isolation, and is developed in parallel with a range of related products, including (1) the technology strategy, (2) the digital strategy, (3) consolidated management of in flight projects, (4) tech adoption and change plan. Combining the applications roadmap (and programme of work that will emerge from it) with the consolidated view of in flight projects will provide an overview of the cumulative workload and resource requirement. The change freeze on tranche 1 products will help prioritisation. ● The concept of technology as a key enabler in the operating model of the new council, service improvements in the SAI workstream and beyond, and in identifying efficiencies as part of MTFP needs to be more strongly embedded across the programme. The applications roadmap and programme of work to migrate/merge/consolidate 285 applications over the next three years needs to align to the phasing of the operating model, and tranche 2 and 3 planning.
Service Alignment and Improvement	● The SAI workstream has reinforced that its RAG rating as Amber for Schedule, Red for Resourcing, and Amber overall, reflects the chronic issue of sub workstream leads managing BAU against LGR Programme delivery, and has requested (a) a blanket commitment from Programme Leadership that LGR takes priority,and (2) that Member and political commitments are de-prioritised ahead of LGR delivery. ● Currently, four subworkstreams are behind schedule, however 0 products are at risk of not being delivered, and 0 product milestones are at risk of not being reached, providing an inconsistent view of the workstream status. The overall summary from the workstream leads is that delivery is progressing, even if milestones are re-cast. When milestones are re-cast, this needs to be made clear in the reporting, which should include any knock-on impact on dependent products. ● It is important that the SAI PMO has closer oversight of how each workstream is delivering to its work plan, and that these are not verbal confirmations, but robust checks and challenges against up to date work plans. These issues were reflected in the findings on the service standards deep dive, set out later in this report. ● The de-scoping of what will be delivered for vesting day needs further scrutiny. An example of this is the business support sub workstream, which has just been formed. Little consideration has gone into understanding how digital and tech-enabled self-service can define what the business support capability could look like.
Customer, Communities, and Partnerships	● There are concerns around whether the scorecard accurately reflects the progress made in this workstream, and whether the workstream lead and workstream PMO have sufficiently close oversight of how each subworkstream is progressing. There are a range of milestones, including those which are overdue, that are not up to date. 20 products do not have milestones assigned, at least two milestones have passed but which are still showing on track; any many imminent milestones will need to be updated or pushed back. Some products are not placed in a tranche. When asked about the status of each subworkstream, and whether the reporting is accurate, the workstream PMO said that they are reliant on what the subworkstreams are reporting back. ● Only three workstreams have defined tranche 2 products, and there remains some work to do to complete planning for these products.

QA meetings: workstream specific insights (2/2)

The insights below reflect the key headlines from the monthly assurance meetings and workstream scorecards.

Overview of issue	Insights and suggested next steps
Finance	• The Finance workstream has shifted from green to amber, due to delays in budget planning and monitoring relating to the amalgamation of the base budgets and the LGR savings. The current MTFP budget gap is approximately £45m, and issues around budget and savings are "clouding the rest of the workstream", which is now Amber across the board. The workstream is confident that they will not deliver LGR savings, which are rated red in the scorecard. • There is a recognition that, for a core set of savings to be realised, work needs to commence imminently (e.g. the £0.5m saving for asset rationalisation requires engagement with Members imminently as decisions need to be made in the coming months). To expedite and drive the LGR savings forward, Finance will provide workstream leads with service-level savings targets informed by benchmarked costed service structures, together with supporting guidance in July. • Similar to other workstreams, the workstream PMO does not have an accurate and up to date view of how each subworkstream is tracking against their work plan, and expressed that it would be difficult to have an eight week forward plan, due to resource and time constraints. • While the majority of products will fall in tranche 1 for this workstream, tranche 2 planning has not been complete, and only one tranche 2 product has been planned. • It is unclear how much progress has been made month-on-month relating to the ERP system based on the workstream scorecard, and it would be helpful to have a more granular understanding of the activities and progress made for that specific subworkstream.
People	• The workstream scorecard depicts a positive view of workstream progress, with no issues identified across the entire workstream (two issues are "in development"), all sub workstreams are on track apart from Health and Safety (which mobilised later), and all products (out of 55) and milestones (out of 126) are on schedule. However, the inaccurate recording of milestones (e.g. the T&Cs product is due for 1st July, the organisation design principles show they were completed in April, but they haven't commenced, and three tranche 1 products do not have a due date) needs to be addressed to strengthen the validity of the reporting. While acknowledging that the organisation design and tier 1 - 3 structures will be iterated based on a set of key dependencies around the CEX appointment and operating model design, it is important that an initial set of milestones can be defined, and adjusted when required. This is particularly important in the context of the assurances sought by Programme Board that tiers 1-3 are appointed before vesting day, with the workstream responding that this depends on whether there is external recruitment for these posts. • As with all other workstreams, planning for tranche 2 products is ongoing.
Governance	• There has been little change with respect to the Governance workstream's scorecard since last month. There is a continued focus on establishing the Transition and Implementation governance, all products are on track, and all workstreams are on schedule. While there is an acknowledgement that the amber status for resourcing reflects a three month forward view, and a set of longstanding issues relating to securing legal services skills and capability, as with the other workstreams, it is not clear at which point milestones will be eventually impacted by these resource constraints. • There are a number of subworkstreams that could benefit from the addition of more than a single milestone date to facilitate progress tracking (e.g. the Corporate Planning subworkstream has a single (and final) milestone relating to approval by Full Council in November). In addition, there is an insufficient level of detail around the EMS system, reflecting the six month lead in time and the fact that it needs to be in place ahead o the 2023 election in May. • As per other workstreams, tranche 2 planning has not been completed, and only two products have been identified for tranche 2.

Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council

Programme Progress Update

LGR Joint Scrutiny Committee Draft Forward Plan

Author:
Alastair Higton

Key points:

A draft forward plan for the Committee has been generated from milestones and decision points of critical Tranche 1 products.

Dates have been confirmed with Workstreams and validated by the PMO and Monitoring Officer.

Outstanding queries relating to Assets Optimisation and Finance are being worked through at pace, and a full workplan, with dates, will be uploaded onto the programme management system shortly, and reported to the Committee at the next meeting.

Ask of Scrutiny:

- To review and note the contents of the forward plan and propose any other topics that could come to the Committee

Together we are delivering your
New Somerset Council