

Management Board

Savings programme

Purpose and matters for decision

1. This paper asks the Management Board to consider and agree four matters relating to the savings programme:
 - a) Governance of the seven strands: Does the Board agree with the recommendation made at paragraph 3 in relation to programme governance? Are the groups identified in paragraph 5 correct as those responsible for each strand and should there be a savings team presence on each group?
 - b) Resourcing: The Board is asked to note the arrangements for resourcing the work required and to confirm the lead individuals for each of the seven strands (see paragraph 7).
 - c) Policy direction: The Board is asked to agree that two matters requiring policy direction – senior staffing review and market testing - should come to special meetings of the Board. The Board will be invited to discuss a possible third area requiring Board attention. (See paragraph 9).
 - d) Terminology: The Board appears no longer to favour the current “savings” terminology and is asked to consider alternatives. (See paragraph 10).
2. The first three matters are urgent if the savings programme is to make sufficient progress over the next few months; the fourth can wait.

Governance

3. The Savings Programme Board recommends the second of the governance models outlined in Annex A for the next phase of the savings programme (referred to as “active assurance”). In coming to that view the Savings Programme Board recognises that the seven strands are at different levels of maturity (some have existing boards and leaders, others are just starting), and that we need to achieve a balance between good coordination while not adding layer/s of bureaucracy. The Programme Board nevertheless takes the view that taking too passive an approach to assurance at this stage risks, for example, duplication of effort and poor management of dependencies. The recommended model is therefore more towards the active than passive end of the spectrum.
4. The implications of this approach are that the Management Board retains control of all matters of policy in relation to seven strands and acts as a point of escalation from the Savings Programme Board for resolving problems over dependencies, risks and resourcing, for example. The Savings Programme Board would be responsible for managing dependencies, programme-level risks, appraisal of benefits and savings.

The Management Board is asked to agree this governance model, which can be fine-tuned as work develops.

5. From discussions with DGs and the Director of PICT the boards/groups identified below are understood to be responsible for developing options for the relevant strand as indicated. Different arrangement may be required when it comes to delivery. In line with the savings programme team having a more active than passive role in programme assurance, it is recommended that a savings team member sits on each group. In many instances this is already the case. This will enable them to support and challenge the groups and manage dependencies and programme risks in a more dynamic way than would be possible from just receiving written reports.

The Board is asked to confirm that the identified groups are correct and that a savings presence on all groups is appropriate.

- Print to web (owner Robert Rogers): Printing and Publishing Management Group (PPMG), existing group chaired by David Natzler, with savings presence already there (passing from Andrew Walker to Myfanwy Barrett).
- ICT strategy (owner Joan Miller): ICT strategy board, existing group chaired by Joan Miller. Savings presence being discussed with Joan Miller.
- Estate, market testing, income generation (owner John Borley): to be managed together through a new group, as a replacement for Facilities Transformation Programme which has been closed. Elizabeth Honer to continue as savings presence.
- Public engagement (owner John Pullinger): Group on Information for the public (GIP), existing group chaired by John Pullinger. Savings presence being discussed with John Pullinger.
- People and work (owner Andrew Walker): management yet to be confirmed.

Resourcing

6. The savings team need to know urgently who they should be talking to below DG level about the work now required. The prevailing assumption at the Programme Board was that it was for the relevant DG to decide how to resource their strand, working within existing HR policies and procedures where new roles were required. The Programme Board discussed whether there might be some merit in the lead coming from a department other than the DG owner for some strands, where work has not yet started.
7. **The Board is asked to confirm the above assumption as well as the leaders identified below:**
- Print to web: David Natzler as chair of PPMG
 - ICT Strategy: [s.40]

- Estate: James Robertson
 - Market testing: John Borley proposes to appoint through House-wide competition
 - Income generation: Sue Harrison
 - Public engagement: [to be confirmed at the meeting]
 - People and work: Philippa Helme to lead review of senior staffing; other elements likely to be led by Director of Change.
8. The savings team propose to hold a “start-up” meeting of all strand leaders (i.e. those named above) in early April to discuss: what work/deliverables are required, by when; the support they can expect from the savings team (including from HR, finance, procurement, communication); the information that will be required by the savings team; an initial identification of dependencies and risks; and a discussion of any resourcing issues. Issues of note will be escalated to the Programme Board and/or Management Board as appropriate.

Strands for further Management Board discussion - policy

9. In line with the proposed governance model, it is recommended that the Management Board discusses the policy relating to two of the strands: the senior staffing review and market testing. All other strands have recently been discussed by Management Board. If the Board agrees, it is suggested that two special meetings of the Management Board are arranged: 1 April for market testing; after the Easter recess for the senior staffing review.
- Does the Board agree to hold special meetings to discuss its policy on market testing and the senior staffing review?**

Terminology

10. Recent discussions suggest that the Board no longer favours the current terminology: savings programme; redesign etc. Some of this can simply be avoided, for example by finding other ways to describe the current phase of work. “Savings” is more difficult to avoid as it is now widely used, for example to refer to the programme, the programme board and even the programme Director. The Board is asked to consider if it wishes to make a change to reflect the more positive aspects of the programme (e.g. Business Development). The disadvantage is that people can be cynical about re-branding and old terminology tends to persist informally regardless.
- Does the Board wish to change the name of the programme?**

Elizabeth Honer
Director of Savings
17 March 2011