

## BOEP Debt Review – Workflow Management Tools - Terms of Reference

<b>Change Initiative/Project</b>	<b>Debt Workflow Management Tools</b>	<b>ResultsChain Ref</b>	<b>I-18 &amp; I-24</b>
<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>TBA</b>	<b>Project Lead</b>	<b>TBA</b>
<b>Programme Alignment</b>	<b>BOEP</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Draft 0.1</b>
<b>Author</b>	<b>Irene Loader</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>30<sup>th</sup> November 2009</b>

**Section 1. Proposed Change Description**

<b>Background –</b> briefly describe what is behind the need to change, how this proposal emerged, any issues/problems it is addressing etc.	Several departments across POL (including Royal Mail Group) are involved in managing and recovering debt and losses arising from Sub-postmaster, Crown Offices and Multiple Partner activities. These departments will all have their own individual role to perform. As a result, there are many hand-offs throughout the lifecycle of the process. The current process is fragmented and generally silo working. Individuals and teams require various pieces of information at various points in the process to effectively perform their role and complete their activities. At present, each area will create their own cases as they become involved in the debt processes and store information about the case in a variety of systems and media. One such database being used by security is Grapevine. It is understood there are others used by Legal services and for most information is recorded locally on spreadsheets, word documents and the like. There is no unique reference ID created for a case and therefore, searching for information across areas is very difficult. Not all information about a case is stored electronically and for some they are only known by the individual dealing with it. Additionally, there are currently a lot of paper copies being stored. Some of which are required for legal reasons and there is a need to provide evidence of transactions, TCs and other related evidence to support the case. The reliance on paper often results in delays in getting the relevant information and can often result in further requests from Tracing Agents and Solicitors. It has been identified through the initial debt reviews that there is a need to improve the knowledge share of case information enabling multiple people and departments to input and view a single case. It is also recognised, that with technology advancements, it may be possible to reduce the reliance on paper documents and to move to electronic transfer of documents where legally applicable and practical to do so.
<b>Proposed Change –</b> briefly describe the change, that is being proposed, what will be different, give examples where possible etc	The proposed change is to rationalise the existing methods of capturing, recording and retrieving information about debt cases and develop a unified, on-line Case and Workflow Management solution that can be used by all relevant stakeholder groups. This should enable each Case to be given a unique reference number enabling multiple users to add, view and edit information captured by others. The solution should have inherent workflow processes built into it to enable smooth transition of processes and to ensure key activities and approvals are performed. The solution should also incorporate the facility to scan in relevant documentation, where practical, so that evidence and associated paperwork can also be viewed by others without having to send for the originals from originating departments and be directly associated with the case. The solution should enable variable permissions to be set depending on the role performed. It should enable the user to search on-line for key information using a variety of search criteria and for them to then add further information, make additional comments etc. The initial work proposed is to conduct feasibility into the options to consolidate and streamline case working practices across the organisation. One of the options to explore maybe the use of existing capability within Credence.
<b>Change Scope -</b> identify the key areas, processes, and systems etc that are proposed to be in scope. Also note any explicit and relevant areas that are out of scope and why.	<p>The scope of this would be contained to the areas that perform a role in the management of debt and losses. The following are initial thoughts on the key areas involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security &amp; Investigations</li> <li>• P&amp;BA Debt Management Teams – Current, Former, Multiples, Crowns</li> <li>• P&amp;BA Branch Investigation Team</li> <li>• Legal Services</li> <li>• Branch Conformance Team</li> <li>• Network Support Team – Audit</li> <li>• Contract Management</li> </ul> <p>The processes and existing media that this would cover will be identified as part of the Feasibility study.</p>



## BOEP Debt Review – Workflow Management Tools - Terms of Reference

<b>Section 2. Proposed Outcome/Benefit</b>	
<b>ResultsChain Outcome</b> – note the identified outcomes as identified via the ResultsChain exercise	<p><b>Primary Outcome:</b> O-81 Increased accuracy, validity and consistency of information captured, used to resolve/settle cases O-68 Ability created to electronically submit, track and store key and supporting documents</p> <p><b>Associated Outcomes:</b> O-55 Increased automation, enhanced and streamlined debt management tools O-193 Enhanced, streamlined and consistent debt management processes created across the organisation O-16 Increased effectiveness of debt recovery processes across the organisation</p>
<b>Benefits</b> – describe any additional high level benefits that this initiative will deliver	<p>Detailed benefits (tangible and non tangible) will be identified as part of the feasibility. The Following are initial thoughts on benefits that could be achieved additionally to the outcomes detailed above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased knowledge share across key stakeholder groups</li> <li>Increased efficiency of knowledge processes which should lead to a decrease in operating costs to seek/establish information already known</li> <li>Potentially decreased time to resolve matters, issues</li> <li>Potential headcount saving across teams due to “wastage” being removed from the workflow</li> </ul> <p>Decreased paper storage costs</p>
<b>Consequences of Not Progressing Initiative</b>	If this initiative is not progressed, then the implications would be continued silo working on the same case by various teams, fragmented information held by POL related to the same case, continued delays in getting relevant information to the various parties requesting information and an incomplete picture of a particular case. It is unlikely that many more efficiencies will be gained throughout the end to end process without a tool that would support better workflow and sharing of information.
<b>Section 3. Work Plan</b>	
<b>Activity and Deliverables</b> – describe the deliverables expected	<p>The primary activity is to conduct a feasibility study that will explore the options to achieve the desired outcomes and benefits and will recommend the preferred option. It will review in some detail the current processes, practices and systems, identifying existing issues and problems and identify where there are good practices that could be leveraged.</p> <p>The main deliverable will be a Feasibility Report which will be in line with the standard POL Feasibility Report template.</p>
<b>Timescales</b> – if there is a target timescale to complete this then please state here	<p><b>Planned Start:</b> 2<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2010</p> <p><b>Planned Finish:</b> 31<sup>st</sup> Mar 2010</p> <p><b>Estimated Effort in Days:</b> This is a complex area and will take some time to fully understand the existing methods, understand the requirements and identify, evaluate the options. It is estimated that a minimum of 60 days effort will be required to conduct the feasibility.</p>
<b>Resources</b> – identify any known resources planned to work on the initiative	TBA
<b>Priority</b> - indicate the ranking of the initiative	This initiative ranked 6 <sup>th</sup> overall in terms of the most important initiatives evaluated in the Debt workshop on the 21 <sup>st</sup> Sept 2009. It ranked no 1 and 3 <sup>rd</sup> in terms of the top four Initiatives that will increase the success of recoveries in a cost effective way.
<b>Key Stakeholders</b> – identify any stakeholders that will need to be involved – internal and external	<p>The following are key stakeholders initially identified who will be required to input to the initiative and review the recommendations. It is not known at this stage the level of sign-off required in terms of the options/solutions. This will be determined as part of the feasibility.</p> <p><b>Internal Stakeholders (POL/RMG):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alison Bolsover – P&amp;BA Branch Conformance &amp; Liaison</li> <li>Cathy MacDonald – P&amp;BA Fraud &amp; Conformance team</li> <li>Paul Dann – P&amp;BA Current Agent Accounting</li> <li>Jackie Witham – P&amp;BA Former Agent Accounting</li> <li>Andy Hayward – Security &amp; Investigations</li> <li>Joanne Hancock – Security &amp; Investigations</li> <li>Mandy Talbot – Legal Services</li> <li>John Breeden - Network – National Contract Manager</li> <li>Gayle Laverick – Network Coordination Manager</li> <li>Andy Bayfield – Network Support</li> </ul> <p><b>External Stakeholders:</b></p>

BOEP Debt Review – Workflow Management Tools - Terms of Reference

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Potentially CSC and/or Steria to review system options e.g. Credence</li><li>• Current Database Suppliers e.g. providers of Grapevine</li></ul>
--	---