

Centre of Expertise: Programme and Project Management
An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider



Gateway Review

PROGRAMME: eCare Programme

**Gateway Review 0
(Strategic Assessment)**

Report Status:	Final
Date/s of Review:	16/09/09 to 18/09/09
Draft Report Issued to SRO:	29/09/09
Final Report Issued to SRO & Copied to Centre of Expertise:	TBC
Delivery Confidence Assessment:	Amber/Red
Senior Responsible Owner:	George Whitley
Scottish Government's Accountable Officer:	Linda Herbert
Organisation's Accountable Officer: (where appropriate)	David Munro

OGC Gateway™ is a Trade Mark of the Office of Government Commerce, and is used here by the Scottish Government Gateway Hub with the permission of the Office of Government Commerce.

Contents

1. Background	4
2. Purpose and Conduct of the Review	4
3. Gateway Review Conclusion.....	5
4. Findings and Recommendations.....	7
5. Previous Gateway Review Recommendations	17
6. Next Gateway Review	17
7. Distribution of the Gateway Review Report.....	17
Appendix A - Purpose of a Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment	19
Appendix B - Summary of Recommendations	20
Appendix C - Review Team and Interviewees.....	23

1. Background

1.1 Aims of the Programme

The eCare Programme is intended to support better service delivery to the citizen/client/patient enabled by the use of IT. The IT element is based around the national messaging framework (the eCare framework) Implementing this and adapting the business processes to make use of it, will enable local agencies to share information in ways that are not supported by manual processes. In turn this will provide 'the business' with opportunities to improve its ways of working and enable the delivery of key policy deliverables such as *Better Health, Better Care, Getting It Right For Every Child (GIRFEC)* and public service reform and efficient government.

1.2 Driving Force for the Programme

In January 2006, the Scottish Executive announced plans to mainstream the use of the eCare Framework to facilitate information sharing between public sector agencies. At the same time, the local delivery of this was to be managed by 14 local Data Sharing Partnerships (DSPs). The partnerships are supported by TTD and are responsible for coordinating local information sharing initiatives in line with national policy priorities.

1.3 Procurement/Delivery Status

There are no procurement activities ongoing for this Programme at this point.

1.4 Current Position Regarding Gateway Reviews

This Gateway 0 Review is the 2nd such review, following a previous Gateway 0 review held in January 2008.

2. Purpose and Conduct of the Review

2.1 Purpose of the Review

2.1.1 Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment. This is a programme-only Review that sets the programme in the wider policy or corporate context. This Review investigates the direction and planned outcomes of the programme, together with the progress of its constituent projects. It can be applied to any type of programme, including policy and organisational change. The Review is repeated throughout the life of the programme from start-up to closure; an early Gateway Review 0 is particularly valuable in that it helps to confirm that the way forward is achievable, before plans have been finalised.

2.1.2 A full definition of the purpose of a Gateway Review 0 is attached for information at **Appendix A**.

2.1.3 This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programme's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over a three to four day period, and is delivered to the SRO immediately at the conclusion of the review.

2.2 Conduct of the Review

The Gateway Review 0 was carried out on 16/09/09 to 18/09/09 at the Office of the Scottish Government, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ.

2.2.1 The Review Team members and the people interviewed are listed in **Appendix C**.

2.2.2 The Review Team would like to thank the SRO, the eCare Programme Team and all interviewees for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Programme and the outcome of this review.

3. Gateway Review Conclusion

3.1 **Delivery Confidence Assessment.** The Review Team finds that overall delivery confidence assessment to be; **Amber/Red**.

The eCare Programme is at a significant crossroads with key decisions to be made over scope, structure and even the future requirement for the Programme.

There is little doubt that any initiative that can introduce a capability for the different service groups to share information and data will create the environment for improvements to the services that are encompassed by the SG policies on the protection of vulnerable children and adults.

The Review Team commend the original intended outcomes and the approach of the central Programme to fund the development of 'adaptors', which at a stroke helped to gain momentum and circumvent issues that have delayed or derailed similar initiatives.

An issue is that the Programme has seemingly been going on 'too long' on a rolling basis without appropriate 'stock takes' of its purpose and scope. A central team has been working with obvious commitment and enthusiasm to introduce the eCare platform, but the implications on and requirements of the organisations to plan business change activities in parallel seem not to have been allocated with sufficient planning and accountability. There is a sense that the Programme is seeking to maintain momentum through a push from the centre, through resources and funding, with 'pull' from the business, whilst significant where it exists, being isolated. The focus of the Programme has reduced to a technology rollout, away from the original intended outcomes.

The Review Team have brought forward a number of findings and recommendations listed in the appropriate sections of this report, with the summary being that consideration should be given to the future scope and structure of the Programme and in particular to the need to secure the engagement of the business stakeholders against both the current and any future scope. A key issue would be the establishment of a governance structure that could deliver on business accountability in parallel with reviewing the activities of the central team.

Should the conclusion be that the eCare Programme should not continue beyond its current scope, the Review Team would consider that an opportunity has been missed to enable the sharing of information and data across service groups such that the risks to the protection of vulnerable children and adults would have been reduced. That said, a Programme of this nature cannot be implemented without the service groups driving the requirements and demonstrating a commitment to making the business process changes.

Should the Programme continue to proceed without this commitment then it is likely to introduce limited and fragmented capability with solutions reducing in their usage and potentially becoming blockers in the future if the standards and formats introduced do not match those of other initiatives.

There is clearly a need to manage the activities carefully over the period up to April 2010 to deliver parallel outcomes of determining the future scope and structure, but also completing the planned rollout. Any considerations over the future of the Programme should be strictly separated from the ongoing implementation to avoid distraction.

The single most beneficial input to the future decision on a next stage would be the successful implementation of not only the eCare platform to the intended DSPs, but to the business utilisation. In this sense the focus of the implementation workstreams is to complete the rollout and complete it fully with business benefits being evidenced, both by quantification and by case studies that demonstrate the extent to which services have been improved.

It was evident to the Review Team that the SRO had already been giving consideration to a number of the issues and this report hopefully provides input to those deliberations.

The Delivery Confidence assessment RAG status should use the definitions below.

RAG	Criteria Description
Green	Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly
Amber/Green	Successful delivery appears probable however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery
Amber	Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present

	a cost/schedule overrun
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible
Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on project/programme definition, schedule, budget required quality or benefits delivery, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The Project/Programme may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed

3.2 A summary of the Report Recommendations is available at **Appendix B**.

4. **Findings and Recommendations**

4.1 **Policy and business context**

There are many case studies that demonstrate that it is self-evident that a capability to share information and data in ways that were envisaged at the commencement of the eCare Programme would provide a technological capability to enable improvements to the services that support the protection of vulnerable children and adults.

The SG has brought out policies as a matter of priority to bring about improvements to the working of different groups that provide service in these areas and the eCare Programme was initiated to provide the organisations with a data sharing platform for this purpose.

The concern for the Review Team is the level to which the organisations remain committed to eCare as an enabling capability to improve these services and the manner in which the Programme is seemingly entrenching back to simply a rollout of technology without the business change activities being planned that would exploit the capability of the eCare platform.

This issue is discussed more fully elsewhere in this report.

Recommendations:

None

4.2 **Business case and stakeholders**

The eCare Programme is funded up to the end of its current phase. Whether there is a need to bring forward business case(s) with respect to future phases will be dependent on the outcome of decisions on scope discussed elsewhere in this report and if such was the case would likely be considered in a future review.

With regard to stakeholders, the need for the Programme to review its scope and governance, including stakeholder representation, is covered elsewhere in this report.

4.2.1

Recommendations:

None

4.3 Management of intended outcomes

The Review Team finds that the eCare Programme is at an important crossroad in its lifecycle with important decisions required to validate its future purpose and scope.

At the time of the previous Gateway Review 0, the Programme was seen as providing a strategic IT platform to support a national messaging framework, enabling the implementation of Scottish Government policies where these would be supported by the improved sharing of data between community groups and agencies.

Single Shared Assessment (SSA) and Child Protection Messaging (CPM) were seen as initial business processes to be supported. The expectation at the time was that organisations, supported by the eCare programme, would adapt their business processes to take advantage of the capability once the eCare platform was implemented. This approach would ensure that the programme remained 'business led / IT enabled' with the programme entering into planning with new business /policy areas to expand the use of the eCare platform. At the time of the previous review, eCare capability had been introduced to 2 partnerships, with the intention being to develop these 2 partnerships to be 'beacons' of best practice to inform the business exploitation of the planned introduction of the eCare platform to a further 12 partnerships.

The current position is that the Programme has fallen significantly short of this intended outcome, both in terms of the rollout of the eCare platform, where it remains that the eCare platform capability is still only introduced to 2 partnerships. Just as importantly, the utilisation of the platform by the business organisations seems to be inconsistent and with possibly reducing commitment to implementing the business change required to utilise the platform for service improvement.

The Review Team are concerned that the Programme is reducing down to a technology rollout only, with the business benefits only being enjoyed in limited areas where implementation has been largely completed.

A common theme throughout this Gateway 0 Review is the need for all stakeholders to reaffirm their acceptance, or not, that the establishment of the eCare framework is a key enabler to the provision of better services in respect of vulnerable children and adults through the use of IT.

Such reaffirmation is essential because the outcomes originally envisaged and clearly possible from such an initiative can only be realised if it is appropriately placed, either at the heart of plans to deliver against SG policies, or positioned within a portfolio of similar initiatives ensuring consistency and interoperability. This is especially the case where improving service delivery requires the sharing of information and data between different agencies and where such data may be held in different systems with established sharing processes are established.

Without such reaffirmation, not only will the Programme be unlikely to deliver against its intended outcomes, the outcome may be to worsen the capability to share data due to the inconsistency and confusion that will proliferate with some systems varying in their standards and interoperability meaning data cannot be easily shared and, as importantly, the business change activities required to take advantage of the IT enabled opportunities not being implemented.

The Review Team are concerned that the 'tide' is against the Programme because of the factors already mentioned and also because of the following significant factors that will seemingly further impair the ability for the Programme Team to achieve its objectives:

- Removal of discretionary budget from the Programme control;

This action would seem to the Review Team to be a sensible step, placing the budget with the business organisations and thereby ensuring that the business benefits of the Programme become self-evident in the way the business organisations demonstrate commitment through the provision of funding. Whilst this would seem to be the intention, the Review Team have seen no evidence that the process through which this funding will be drawn down has been agreed, leaving the Review Team concerned that the budget will not be available as / when required to support its Programme Plan. If the SRO, through the Programme Board determines that there is a future scope for the Programme, then such processes should be clearly documented and agreed at appropriate management levels,

- Reduced levels of confidence and commitment from key stakeholders.

An initiative such as eCare would always be significantly dependent upon the recognition by business organisations that it provides IT enablement and realises business benefits for them that they would likely not be able to otherwise achieve. The lack of progress in the business change activities is one indicator of a lack of the necessary level of support being actually forthcoming. The Review Team found evidence in a number of interviews of a significant and seemingly increasing level of 'calling into question' the future purpose / benefits of the Programme.

This situation means that the Programme is in the invidious position of having, on the one hand, some business 'champions' where the capability has been implemented

and programme funding was available, whilst on the other hand having a set of 'unconvinced' organisations, particularly where implementation is still to take place.

These concerns over the support for the Programme from business organisations, whether stated or, at least as worryingly, through lack of business change progress, manifest even in the current limited scope of implementing the eCare platform for SSA and CPM in support of GIRFEC. Given this background, the Review Team would recommend that no further expansion of the eCare platform rollout be committed before a fundamental review of the Programme's scope is carried out by the Programme Board to determine whether the Programme remains a strategic priority.

Should the SRO, through the Programme Board determine that eCare should be further rolled out, the structure and governance established should ensure greater clarity of how organisations would engage with the team and commission such activity. It will be important that future expansion is commenced following a clear statement of responsibilities and associated cost implications on all parties and the plans should include accountability on the business organisation(s) to deliver against business change plans in parallel with the eCare rollout.

Should the SRO, through the Programme Board determine that the rollout of the eCare platform should cease following achievement of its currently ongoing implementation activities, or some earlier point, then it will be important that:

- Organisations / Data Sharing Partnerships where the capability is already established and in use, are able to receive appropriate levels of support for the eCare platform and as appropriate from the eCare Programme Team;
- Organisations in the process of achieving implementation are supported up to the point of 'go-live' and able to receive appropriate levels of post implementation support.
- Areas not yet at a point which dictates implementation should proceed are 'closed down' in a structured fashion, ensuring that should there be a future take-up then the work to date is not lost.
- That the programme documents all aspects of the programme that would enable the 'restart' of the programme as required at some future point.

In summary, in recognition of the focus across SG on the protection of vulnerable children and adults, the Review Team would expect the SRO and stakeholders, through the Programme Board, to determine either:

1) That the eCare Programme should be constrained to the current implementation scope, e.g. 9 DSPs and plan for the cessation of rollout at that point, including:

- A plan for the closure of the Programme and the transfer of maintenance and support services to an established service provide;
- A plan for the business change activities within each DSP that would ensure that the framework was utilised in these DSPs;
- Identification of alternative / replacement capability that would support the intended outcomes of improving information and data sharing between the business and service groups.

Or:

2) That the eCare Programme should have a scope of implementation beyond the current 9DSPs and that it should be structured to:

- Have a workstream to manage the increased technology rollout;
- Separately have a workstream to manage the business change activities;
- Operate a governance structure that provides for the decision making and accountability across both areas;
- Coordinate with other programmes and authoritative bodies in key areas, e.g. Health, to ensure cohesion and convergence in plans and standards.

4.3.1

Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: (Essential)

That the SRO / Programme Board determines the strategic purpose of the eCare Programme and the delivery targets for the short and medium term in respect of both Business Change and eCare platform rollout.

Recommendation 2: (Essential)

That the Programme Team document its key processes in respect of new business take-on to ensure there is clarity on the responsibilities of the 'business' and the programme team and the associated budgetary implications. Governance processes should also be defined to ensure that activities are not commenced without confirmation of budget and resourcing for the full lifecycle of business and Programme responsibilities.

Recommendation 3: (Essential)

That the Programme Team document the actions required to 'freeze' the scope of the eCare platform rollout at a point in the spring / summer of 2010 whilst ensuring sustainability for those areas either implemented or in advanced stages of implementation.

4.4 Risk Management

The Review Team recognise that the Programme has an established risk register and management processes. The recommendations of the Review Team identify areas to be addressed that if taken up would mean that the risk register and associated management processes should be the subject of considerable change. Accordingly the Review Team suggest that this is an area for focus at the time of any future repeat Gateway 0 review.

4.4.1

Recommendations:

None

4.5 Review of current outcomes

For the purpose of this Gateway 0 Review, the current outcomes are defined as the achievement of the rollout of the eCare platform to 9 Data Sharing Partnerships which the Programme Plan shows to be achieved in the period up to spring 2010. This is in recognition of concerns of the Review Team over the need for the stakeholders, through the Programme Board to confirm the requirement for any further rollout beyond this scope. Accordingly, the Review Team regard the focus of the current phase to be the completion of the planned implementation activities.

The Review Team are concerned over the level to which the Programme planning and governance has allowed a (seeming) lack of engagement by the organisations in respect of performing their responsibilities without escalation / resolution to / by the Programme Board.

Such a lack of visibility inevitably leads to implementation entrenching back to 'platform only' and a failure to provide for the strategic activities that would facilitate exploitation of the initial rollout and the planning for future expansion. These concerns would include the areas of planning for, realising and recording business benefits to inform the business Programme Team to take action to ensure that the organisations actively plan to realise and quantify benefits from the current implementation. If the Programme proceeds to a wider implementation then such activities should inform future plans.

The Review Team are aware of the recent changes in the reporting of the Programme to the Programme Board. These changes came about because of concerns over the level to which the positive reporting of the progress on eCare platform rollout masks the level of progress with regard to business utilisation of the platform.

Whilst the Review Team recognise that these changes to reporting have indeed provided some much needed focus on the 'actuality' of business take-up, the Review Team find that still more needs to be done in this area, particularly in the areas of the definition and associated measurements of 'Go-live'.

The Review Team are concerned that with the current focus of the reporting being on the progress of implementation, there is a seeming absence of the necessary commitment to the business change activities that will actually deliver the service improvements. The governance structure also seems solely focused on reviewing the platform rollout, whilst avoiding the difficult decisions to be made on resourcing and funding business change.

The Review Team feel a regime of reporting against pre-determined metrics to provide clear recognition, separately, of progress on the rollout of the eCare platform and the progress on business change / business take-up, will expose the lack of momentum and planning of business change activities. The current situation has reached a point at which the Programme Team is trying to achieve business change for the organisations rather than support the established business change plans of the organisations.

There clearly exists a risk that even if the implementation of the eCare platform is constrained to the end of this phase, then without the business take-up and business change, the legacy will be an expensive IT implementation with significant onward support costs and highly restricted benefits directly attributable to the framework.

Whilst the future plans for the Programme are discussed elsewhere in this report, it is necessary for the SRO and the Programme Board to take action to ensure that the investment to date secures business and service benefits.

The Review Team found evidence of a lack of consistency in the views of stakeholders to the suitability of the eCare platform for use in delivering SSA. This is a fundamental issue because if there is not an intention to use eCare as a platform to support SSA, either as the primary platform or as part of a portfolio of interoperable platforms, then this should be clearly stated. This issue is seen by the Review team to be indicative of a wider concern about the risk of the eCare Programme becoming simply an IT rollout and not enjoying the level of business support that would secure the business change required to utilise it in improving services to vulnerable children and adults. The Review Team are not commenting on whether the business should use the platform, just that a decision should be actively made and the consequences of that decision on services be understood.

A key finding of the Review Team of this current phase is that the scope should be carefully constrained so that it comes to a managed end and that the theme is very much one of –‘complete the current DSPs and complete them really well’

If the Programme were to establish a minimum 2 DSPs that were not only making use of the platform but were actively changing business processes to improve services that demonstrably brought about benefits with regard to the protection of vulnerable children and adults, then this would in itself be the evidence needed to secure future stakeholder support and commitment to the Programme. It follows that if the Programme cannot achieve this minimum position then other questions are posed with regard to its strategic position.

4.5.1

Recommendations:

Recommendation 4: (Essential)

That the SRO, through the Programme Board and supported by the Programme Team, determine the business change activities required to secure business and service benefits from the initial rollout of the framework to 9 DSPs. That the business change activities be reflected in the Programme plan, separately to the platform rollout, including accountability and governance within the organisations for the activities.

Recommendation 5: (Essential)

That the SRO further refines the requirements for reports from the programme team to the Programme Board, separately demonstrating the progress in respect of the eCare platform rollout and the business utilisation and business change activities. This reporting should establish a capability to track ‘platform Go-Live’ and ‘Business Go-Live’. An initial report should be produced early to establish the ‘reality’ of the current position.

Recommendation 6: (Essential)

That the Programme Team develops the Programme Plan to clearly distinguish between the focus on the implementation activities and the strategic decisions required over the future scope of the Programme. A revised Programme Plan should include responsibilities that ensure the capture of business benefits and experiences from the implementations to inform the justification of and planning for potential future eCare implementations in support of SG policies.

Recommendation 7: (Critical)

That the SRO reviews the representation, structure and timing of Programme Board meetings to ensure that it can provide the decision making function required by the Programme. Such a review should also inform the separate recommendation on the reports from the Programme Team to the Programme Board to support decision making.

Recommendation 8: (Essential)

That the Programme Board reviews the continued suitability of SSA to be a primary eCare product and sets out associated implications for the implementation plan. The associated implications for the support to the policies in respect of the protection of vulnerable children and adults should be considered as part of this review.

4.6 Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes

For the purpose of this review, the next phase is defined as the period following completion of the current implementation plan which would see the eCare platform operational in 9 DSPs, or at an earlier point is that scope is further constrained.

The need to address key issues with regard to scope, stakeholder commitment and business utilisation suggest that the requirement for the Programme to extend beyond the current phase is itself open to some question. At the least it will be important that key lessons in the areas of governance and business change planning are addressed and inform any future plans and structure.

The Review Team have received some indication that, subject to the Programme continuing, the next Gateway 0 review may be scheduled for the early summer 2010, when the detailed planning of any next phase would be advanced. Accordingly and in recognition of findings and recommendations elsewhere in this report this section is limited to some complementary findings and recommendations with regard to preparation for work in the next phase.

Should the SRO, through the Programme determine that there will be a next stage of eCare platform rollout, it will be then important to ensure that the manner in which the Programme was structured and governed in this current phase enabled clarity on the areas of scope, benefits, risks and responsibility.

It will be important to gain separation between a group that is driving eCare platform rollout and another implementing business process change. These could either be seen as discrete projects or as workstreams within the same Programme structure,

but it will be important that the management structure supports the ability to individually progress and to have progress reviewed, whilst highlighting and coordinating dependencies.

The SRO may wish to consider a number of approaches to the Programme structure. They would seem to vary between:

- One central team doing both eCare platform rollout and Business change working with business representatives. The increasing devolvment of accountability and budgets would be a factor in the appropriateness of this approach;
- A central team delivering the IT platform as a technology capability only, having no involvement in business utilisation which would be the responsibility of the service groups. Such a constraining of scope could lead to consideration of the activities being contracted out to established service providers;
- A coordinated central Programme but with clear separation between workstreams, with probably the business change workstream being led by a business representative on a secondment. Such an individual would need to be particularly well placed in their knowledge of the business processes and in their credibility with senior business stakeholders, being positioned to force decisions through.

The Review Team do not offer solutions in respect of the Programme structure, with these examples only being given to demonstrate that there will be a number of ways of addressing the structure. It is just important that the future structure is determined on a basis of its ability to manage outcomes and does not simply 'roll' on from the current structure.

Another important factor to note is the importance of ensuring that any programme, business function or group that have any responsibility for data and information management communicate effectively to ensure cohesion and interoperability of standards, formats etc. A particularly noteworthy aspect of the eCare Programme is the way that they have ensured early progress through the use of 'adaptors' allowing existing data to be shared onto a consistent platform.

This approach is very pragmatic, although the Review Team found some evidence of the need to ensure that the standards in relation to the specification of adaptors are carefully considered by both Technical and Business Authorities. Whether, with foundation or not, a number of stakeholders were concerned that adaptors were 'over-specified' increasing costs and delivery times. Ensuring that the specification and associated standards are underwritten by an authoritative body would remove this debate and ensure that specifications are cost effective whilst being future proof.

As part of planning for the eCare platform to be sustainable on a technology footing and to plan for any future convergence with other data and information strategies, the Programme should establish a technical strategy, mitigating the risk that the platform might not be 'future-proof'.

4.6.1

Recommendations:

Recommendation 9: (Essential)

That the SRO reviews the structure of the Programme workstreams and management arrangements to ensure both parallel progress and achievement of Business Change and eCare platform rollout.

Recommendation 10: (Essential)

That the SRO secures a 'Technical Strategy' for the eCare platform to provide confidence of the current eCare platforms ability to support the level of interoperability required for inter-Agency messaging and establish a forward path for the development of the eCare platform. A further consideration is to agree where the long-term responsibility for maintenance of the eCare platform should reside.

5. Previous Gateway Review Recommendations

The Review Team saw evidence that the Programme had reviewed the recommendations of the previous Gateway 0 Review at the Programme Board and reported the action plan to that group, although it should be noted that some of the recommendations of this Gateway Review fall into the same areas.

6. Next Gateway Review

The next Gateway Review 0 is expected in the early summer 2010.

7. Distribution of the Gateway Review Report

7.1 The contents of this report are confidential to the SRO and their representative/s. It is for the SRO to consider when and to whom they wish to make the report (or part thereof) available, and whether they would wish to be consulted before recipients of the report share its contents (or part thereof) with others.

7.2 The Review Team Members will not retain copies of the report nor discuss its content or conclusions with others.

7.3 A copy of the report is lodged with the Scottish Government's Centre of Expertise (CoE) for Programme and Project Management so that it can identify and share the generic lessons learned from Gateway Reviews. The CoE will copy a summary of the report recommendations to the Scottish Government's Accountable Officer, and where appropriate, to the Organisation's Accountable Officer where the review has been conducted on behalf of one of the Scottish Government's Agencies, NDPBs or Health Sector organisations.

7.4 The CoE will provide a copy of the report to Review Team Members involved in any subsequent review as part of the preparatory documentation needed for Planning Meetings.

7.5 Any other request for copies of the Gateway Report will be directed to the SRO.

Appendix A - Purpose of a Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment

- Review the outcomes and objectives for the programme (and the way they fit together) and confirm that they make the necessary contribution to the overall strategy of the organisation and its senior management
- Ensure that the programme is supported by key stakeholders
- Confirm that the programme's potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of Government policy and procurement objectives, the organisation's delivery plans and change programmes, and any interdependencies with other programmes or projects in the organisation's portfolio and, where relevant, those of other organisations
- Review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the programme as a whole and the links to individual parts of it (e.g. to any existing projects in the programme's portfolio)
- Review the arrangements for identifying and managing the main programme risks (and the individual project risks), including external risks such as changing business priorities
- Check that provision for financial and other resources has been made for the programme (initially identified at programme initiation and committed later) and that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised
- After the initial Review, check progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes
- Check that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcome
- Where relevant, check that the programme takes account of joining up with other programmes, internal and external
- Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability.

Appendix B - Summary of Recommendations

Ref No.	Report Section	Recommendation	Status (C.E.R.)
R1	Management of intended outcomes	That the SRO / Programme Board determines the strategic purpose of the eCare Programme and the delivery targets for the short and medium term in respect of both Business Change and eCare platform rollout.	E
R2	Management of intended outcomes	That the Programme Team document its key processes in respect of new business take-on to ensure there is clarity on the responsibilities of the 'business' and the programme team and the associated budgetary implications. Governance processes should also be defined to ensure that activities are not commenced without confirmation of budget and resourcing for the full lifecycle of business and Programme responsibilities.	E
R3	Management of intended outcomes	That the Programme Team document the actions required to 'freeze' the scope of the eCare platform rollout at a point in the spring / summer of 2010 whilst ensuring sustainability for those areas either implemented or in advanced stages of implementation.	E
R4	Review of current outcomes	That the SRO, through the Programme Board and supported by the Programme Team, determine the business change activities required to secure business and service benefits from the initial rollout of the framework to 9 DSPs. That the business change activities be reflected in the Programme plan, separately to the platform rollout, including accountability and governance within the organisations for	E

		the activities.	
R5	Review of current outcomes	That the SRO further refines the requirements for reports from the programme team to the Programme Board, separately demonstrating the progress in respect of the eCare platform rollout and the business utilisation and business change activities. This reporting should establish a capability to track 'platform Go-Live' and 'Business Go-Live'. An initial report should be produced early to establish the 'reality' of the current position.	E
R6	Review of current outcomes	That the Programme Team develops the Programme Plan to clearly distinguish between the focus on the implementation activities and the strategic decisions required over the future scope of the Programme. A revised Programme Plan should include responsibilities that ensure the capture of business benefits and experiences from the implementations to inform the justification of and planning for potential future eCare implementations in support of SG policies.	E
R7	Review of current outcomes	That the SRO reviews the representation, structure and timing of Programme Board meetings to ensure that it can provide the decision making function required by the Programme. Such a review should also inform the separate recommendation on the reports from the Programme Team to the Programme Board to support decision making.	C
R8	Review of current outcomes	That the Programme Board reviews the continued suitability of SSA to be a primary eCare product and sets out associated implications for the	E

		implementation plan. The associated implications for the support to the policies in respect of the protection of vulnerable children and adults should be considered as part of this review.	
R9	Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes	That the SRO reviews the structure of the Programme workstreams and management arrangements to ensure both parallel progress and achievement of Business Change and eCare platform rollout.	E
R10	Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes	That the SRO secures a ‘Technical Strategy’ for the eCare platform to provide confidence of the current eCare platforms ability to support the level of interoperability required for inter-Agency messaging and establish a forward path for the development of the eCare platform. A further consideration is to agree where the long-term responsibility for maintenance of the eCare platform should reside.	E

Each recommendation has been given Critical, Essential or Recommended status. The definition of each status is as follows:

CRITICAL - Critical for immediate action, i.e. to achieve success the project should take action immediately to address the following recommendations:

ESSENTIAL - Critical before next Review, i.e. the project should go forward with actions on the following recommendations to be carried out before the next Gateway Review of the project:

RECOMMENDED - Potential Improvements, i.e. the project is on target to succeed but may benefit from uptake of the following recommendations.

Appendix C - Review Team and Interviewees

Review Team:

Review Team Leader:	George Whitley
Review Team Members:	Linda Herbert
	David Munro

List of Interviewees:

Name	Organisation/Role
Craig Russell	SRO, member eCare Programme Board
Robert Forman	Programme Manager
Arlene Stuart	Implementation Manager
Steve MacGregor	Data Sharing Manager (Highland)
Ken MacDonald	Assistant Information Commissioner (Scotland)
Harriet Dempster	Director Social Work (Highland), President of ADSW
George Brechin	Chief Executive NHS Fife, Chair eCare Programme Board
Lesley Fraser	SRO - Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC), member eCare Programme Board
Edith Young-McArthur	Data Sharing Manager (Forth Valley)
Jacqui MacNair	Practitioner
Audrey Brogan	Practitioner
Paul Rhodes	eHealth Programme Director, member eCare Programme Board
Blythe Robertson	Communications Officer
Mike Martin	SRO - Single Shared Assessment (SSA), member eCare Programme Board