

Float / File 45

013a

Distribution - see list attached

From: Clare Williamson

Date: 9 May 1995

**PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING <sup>9 MAY</sup> ~~10 APRIL~~ 1995**

1. I attach a note of the Programme Management Board Meeting held on Monday.
2. The next meeting will be held on 12 June at 1 pm in Terminal House. Andrew Stott will chair.

**GRO**

Clare Williamson  
BA BDB  
Room 504  
Golden Cross House

**GRO**

**DISTRIBUTION - PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETINGS**

**Andrew Stott**

**Pat Dugdale**

**Pat Kelsey**

**Tony Johnson**

**Jan Challis**

**Robin Niblock**

**Kevin Lawrence**

**Peter Hull**

**Bob King**

**David Miller**

**Derek Selwood**

**COPY: PSO TEAM LEADERS**

**Bob Burkin**

**Liz Blackburn**

**Gillian Clelland**

**Joan Robinson**

**David Anders**

**Clare Williamson**

**FLOAT, FILE 045**

**NOTE OF PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING HELD ON 9 MAY  
1995 AT 1 PM IN TERMINAL HOUSE**

**Present:**

**Pat Dugdale . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Pat Kelsey . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Jan Challis . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Tony Johnson . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Robin Niblock . . . . . CAPS (ITSA)**  
**Peter Hull . . . . . BSB (CAPS)**  
**Bob King . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Dave Miller . . . . . BA/POCL**  
**Derek Selwood . . . . . PA**  
**Clare Williamson . . . . . BA/POCL (minutes)**

**Apologies received from Andrew Stott and Kevin Lawrence - CAPS (ITSA)**

**1. Matters Arising**

1.1 There were no matters arising

**2. Planning progress report [ paper 5/95]**

- 2.1 Bob Burkin and Tony Hodgeson presented this report. Its purpose was to outline progress made in April, seek agreement of the format for the risk report, and for what parts of the report would go forward to the PSC. The plan had not yet been baselined.
- 2.2 Tony Hodgeson had been working for the planning team by liaising with CAPS in Preston. He had identified the following four main areas of concern:
- 2.3
- i) definition of the functional requirements of BA and ITSA was needed. The FSR for the payment repository had not been signed off and requirements for the payment data repository had not been specified.
  - ii) lack of a confirmation of the order of benefit rollout, leading to a number of lower level risks including implementation and resource issues.
  - iii) integration of rollout of BA benefits with the PFI supplier and POCL needs
  - iv) co-ordination on BA/ITSA side. There were a number of separate programmes, some integration, but no overall programme of activity.
- 2.4 Peter Hull emphasised regarding i) that the user assurance committee had refused to give sign off to the FSR as there was a lack of clarity of the user requirements since the end users had not been fully or timeously consulted and there was a question as to whether the functionality proposed would meet the need. That is, the

existing user requirement in the CAPS FSR did not contain any proposals which should not be included, but it might not be sufficient. He expressed the view however that this was not a 'showstopper' and Robin Niblock confirmed that ITSA were continuing work on a modular basis.

- 2.5 The proposed Payment Data Repository was a separate issue and had no user requirement. Ian Stewart had proposed that CAPS should press ahead, but that no major decisions should be made in the interim. Ian had commissioned some work from PA consultancy to study the wider BA programme, and this had resulted in the commissioning of two further pieces of work, on the project structure and on the achievable timescale for the programme.
- 2.6 David Miller was concerned that this would result in a delay to the programme. The senior BA position was that as much as necessary of CAPS for plastic card payments to be made would be delivered by Spring 1996. Delay related to the sign off of the FSR was unlikely to impact this.
- 2.7 Another possible source of delay to the programme was that HMT would want all elements of CAPS taken forward as a PFI. If that happened CAPS would be delayed. It was however possible that a short term alternative could be used, putting one benefit onto plastic payment but bypassing CAPS. This would also mean that objectives such as the accountancy ones would be delayed. This PFI decision was outwith the programme's control. In the meantime, progress on CAPS had not been impeded but contingency options would need to be considered when the PFI position was clearer.

#### **AP 1. PD to investigate progress of meeting with HMT on PFI for CAPS**

- 2.8 It was agreed that the report to the PSC should reflect all four of Tony Hodgeson's areas of concern and any information then available about the PFI position as risks.

#### **AP2. BB to reflect these areas in PSC report**

- 2.9 Regarding points ii) and iii) Robin Niblock raised the concern that CAPS still lacked information as to functionality required, but particularly on the order of rollout. Tony Johnson was in charge of implementation pro tem, but action was needed to pull together the outstanding questions and constraints from the various strands of the programme. David Miller had staff coming in to these areas shortly.

#### **AP 3. DM and TJ to meet and match up requirements and take forward.**

- 2.10 It was noted that a revised work breakdown structure was needed, and a new organisation chart. This should be produced rapidly without regard to how soon various strands might alter.

#### **AP 4. BB to gather information for revised organisation chart (to be produced by GC) and work breakdown structure to be produced by 15/5**

- 2.11 Pat Kelsey pointed out some drafting changes needed to the Executive summary of

the report:

Only 'some' not all of the suppliers wanted an early award of contract. The use of the name 'POWERBASE' had not been firmly agreed pending legal advice.

The procurement dates would be reviewed once the supplier proposals 'had been received *and evaluated*'.

- 2.12 Robin Niblock also wanted redrafting of paragraph 3.5, as decisions had not been reached with DITA - rather a range of options had been settled on.
- 2.13 It became evident in discussion that there was a lack of clarity about the terms of reference of the PMB and about the purpose of PMB meetings. There was also some uncertainty as to the actions which the PSC were expected to take. If drafting in committee were to be avoided, a mechanism was needed to take on drafting points but this could not impact in the timetable for reports and meetings.

**AP 5. BB to consider introduction of a mechanism to include or consider drafting points to the planning paper before the PMB meets.**

**AP 6. JC to continue work to consider terms of reference of PMB, purpose of PMB meetings, communications and management mechanism for next PMB**

- 2.14 There was some discussion of the proposed date for Award of Contract, which was currently taken to be still December 1995. Intervening events such as the delay to the issue of the SSR had meant there was some compression of other activities such as the demonstrator and negotiation phase. The procurement board would be discussing this issue on 15 May. Notwithstanding this uncertainty, and the consequences for change control procedures, it was agreed that the plan tabled should be baselined.

**AP 7. BB to baseline plan using existing AoC date**

**AP 8. BB to rework presentation of Gantt chart and redraft executive summary**

**AP 9. BB to edit risks analysis so as not to identify particular groups within programme as responsible for areas of risk where this had not yet been decided but was provisional.**

**AP 10. BB to pursue correction of milestone dates with PK**

**AP 11. BB to prepare a draft PSC paper by 15 May comprising executive summary, milestones and gantt chart, and highlighted risks analysis for AS.**

### 3. Finance [paper 6/95]

- 3.1 Liz Blackburn presented this paper. The BA budget allocation for 95/6 had not yet been made, so the split made for this report had been based on budget bids. Once the allocation was made, budgets would be devolved to team leaders, and these

would be explained individually. The POCL budget had been allocated and profiled, but globally, without splitting out the joint cost areas.

- 3.2 Staffing resources in finance team for this work were scarce. The team presently consisted of Liz Blackburn and Lindsay Armstrong.

**AP 12. BK to pursue early release dates for provision of POCL staff, in the meantime Clare Howling to be made available as soon as she rejoined the programme.**

- 3.3 There was already a forecast overspend, mainly related to Terminal House costs. POCL alone could be overspent by up to £1m within the financial year.
- 3.4 It was agreed that a recovery plan might be needed, but that the first step would be to correct and check the current figures to assess the size of the problem. The costs for Terminal House could not now be reduced, but should not be further increased. The work needed a change control process.

**AP 13. Finance team to work to get checked and revised figures to next meeting , pending availability of resources**

**AP 14. CW to copy financial reporting proposals paper from last PMB meeting to TJ, DS and DM**

- 3.5 Liz reported that the proposals for monitoring consultancy were being reworked after discussion with procurement experts and would be available to MT members around 15/5 for review.

**4. Any other business**

- 4.1 The next meeting would be held on 12 June at 1pm in Terminal House. Andrew Stott would chair the meeting, and the agenda should be timed to allow around 2½ to 3 hours discussion time.

**AP 15. CW to copy timetable for future PMB meetings to TJ and DS**

**5. Communications**

- 5.1 It was agreed that the issue of a projected overspend, and the tight but fixed end date for the procurement process (ie still December 1995) should be communicated to programme members.

**AP 16. GC to incorporate these two points in the programme newsletter.**

**AP 17. GC to discuss with BB section 3 of the progress report as a potential source for information in the newsletter.**

## 6. Meeting Review

+

action in hand to establish purpose  
good at chairing

-  
timescales  
? purpose of meeting  
more needed on progress  
poor preparation / ? documentation

### Improvement opportunities:

1. Proper meeting process, what's going in , how reviewed first and action needed with it.
2. Up to date attendance list and responsibilities needed\



## **SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS**

- 1. PD to investigate progress of meeting with HMT on PFI for CAPS**
- 2. BB to reflect areas of concern in PSC report**
- 3. DM and TJ to meet and match up requirements and take forward.**
- 4. BB to gather information for revised organisation chart (to be produced by GC) and work breakdown structure to be produced by 15/5**
- 5. BB to consider introduction of a mechanism to include or consider drafting points to the planning paper before the PMB meets.**
- 6. JC to continue work to consider terms of reference of PMB, purpose of PMB meetings, communications and management mechanism for next PMB**
- 7. BB to baseline plan using existing AoC date**
- 8. BB to rework presentation of Gantt chart and redraft executive summary**
- 9. BB to edit risks analysis so as not to identify particular groups within programme as responsible for areas of risk where this had not yet been decided but was provisional.**
- 10. BB to pursue correction of milestone dates with PK**
- 11. BB to prepare a draft PSC paper by 15 May comprising executive summary, milestones and gantt chart, and highlighted risks analysis for AS.**
- 12. BK to pursue early release dates for provision of POCL staff, in the meantime Clare Howling to be made available as soon as she rejoined the programme.**
- 13. Finance team to work to get checked and revised figures to next meeting , pending availability of resources**
- 14. CW to copy financial reporting proposals paper from last PMB meeting to TJ, DS and DM**
- 15. CW to copy timetable for future PMB meetings to TJ and DS**
- 16. GC to incorporate these two points in the programme newsletter.**
- 17. GC to discuss with BB section 3 of the progress report as a potential source for information in the newsletter.**