

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment

Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme

Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED



CabinetOffice

Version 4.0 (High Risk Delivery Confidence) June 2008

© Crown Copyright 2007

This is a Value Added product, which is outside the scope of the HMSO Core Licence

OGC Gateway™ Process

Review 0: Strategic assessment

Version number: Final

Date of issue to SRO: 5th March 2013

Senior Responsible Owner: David Natzler

Department: Department of Chamber and Committee Services

OGC Gateway™ Review dates: 26th to 28th February 2013

OGC Gateway™ Review Team Leader:

[REDACTED]

OGC Gateway™ Review Team Members:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED****OGC Gateway Delivery Confidence Assessment**

<u>Delivery Confidence Assessment</u>	Amber
<p>The Review Team concludes that successful delivery of the Procedural Data Programme (PDP) remains feasible. While the programme has been challenged by significant issues throughout its lifecycle, the review team is pleased to note that the programme is now making greater progress, most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The products already delivered are considered intuitive and easy to use; • Business users are engaged, heavily involved and ready for change; • There is a maturing business and technical understanding of the solutions available and the capability to deliver them; • This evolving maturity, together with the guidance of the programme manager, has resulted in increased pace and positive impact on delivery. <p>While the Review Team remains optimistic that the programme will achieve delivery after programme closure at the end of March 2013, there are a number of issues which threaten this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimating of applications development effort remains a concern; • Retention of resources with the required skills remains a risk; • Deployment of applications to the live environment seems unduly complex; • There is a perception that Parliament will not realise the programme benefit of delivering re-usable data; • Benefits management is not in place; • Concerns about the effectiveness of programme governance in resolving issues in a timely manner; • Transition planning is not well advanced, despite imminent programme closure. <p>We make recommendations later in this report that we believe help address these issues and will improve the likelihood of eventual programme success.</p>	

The Delivery Confidence assessment RAG status uses the definitions below.

<u>RAG</u>	<u>Criteria Description</u>
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

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED****Summary of Report Recommendations**

The Review Team makes the following recommendations, which are prioritised using the definitions below.

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Critical/ Essential/ Recommended
1.	The SRO should initiate a business-led benefits realisation activity and communicate the results.	Initiation Essential by 31 st Mar 2013
2.	The SRO should ensure the governance roles and responsibilities for the delivery of unfinished PDP projects are clearly documented and understood by key stakeholders.	Essential by 31 st Mar 2013
3.	The Programme Manager should produce a programme quality plan for unfinished PDP projects.	Essential by 31 st Mar 2013
4.	The SRO should ensure the delivery of a Transition Plan.	Critical
5.	The Programme Manager should ensure the completion of targeted Lessons Learned workshops and publish the results.	Recommended

Critical (Do Now) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately

Essential (Do By) – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future. [Note to review teams – whenever possible Essential recommendations should be linked to project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]

Recommended – The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation. [Note to review teams – if possible Recommended recommendations should be linked to project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

Background**The aims of the programme:**

The primary strategic imperative is the need to renew current applications, which also creates an opportunity to pursue a second strategic imperative: to enhance data sharing, optimising how information is exploited within the procedural business areas of Parliament. Many of the applications used to support the core business of the two Houses are coming to the end of their lifecycles and will need to be upgraded.

The consequent objectives of the programme, as discussed in the programme Business Case (BC), dated January 2010, are as follows (see paragraph 5):

- Improve the resilience of current applications through renewal and upgrade;
- Develop fit-for-purpose applications in conjunction with business areas, taking into account their needs and tolerances;
- Increase the opportunity for information and data sharing across parliamentary departments by improving the capture and reuse of data;
- Improve access by external users to parliamentary information by using common information and data languages;
- Deliver higher-quality products to parliamentary departments on budget, on time;
- Set principles for data sharing and production to allow access to core data.

The driving force for the programme:

The Procedural Data Programme (PDP) supports the strategic aims of the House of Commons Service and the House of Lords Administration, relating to the objectives set out in the business plans for each House (at the time that the programme started in 2010) as follows:

- To provide the advice and services that enable the House and its committees to conduct their business effectively (HC Core Task 1); To meet the needs of the House and its Committees (HL Core Task 1);
- To provide the advice and services that enable individual Members (and their staff) to perform their parliamentary duties effectively (HC Core Task 2); To meet the parliamentary needs of individual Members regardless of party or office (HL Core Task 2);
- To promote public knowledge and understanding of the work and role of Parliament through the provision of information and access (HC Core Task 3); To make the House and its work accessible to the public (HL Core Task 3); Improve public access to, and understanding and knowledge of, the work of the House of Lords and its heritage (HL Delivery Objective 4);
- To ensure that information is well-managed in pursuit of the Core Tasks, in part by exploiting technology effectively (HC Supporting Task 4); Develop information and communication strategies to give parliamentary and public users ready access to parliamentary information, when they want it and without having to know where it is held (HL Delivery Objective 7).

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

The procurement/delivery status:

No significant procurement activity has been needed for this programme.

Current position regarding OGC Gateway™ Reviews:

This is the second Gateway review for this programme. The first Gate 0 review was held in November 2010. All the recommendations from that review were accepted and action was started almost immediately. As considerable time has elapsed since that review, the progress and status against those recommendations are not documented in this report. Overall, the programme team's ability to deliver was assessed to be Amber/Green.

This review is also a Gate 0. However, it is recognised that the various projects within the programme are coalescing towards completion in 2013, so elements of a project Gate 4 have also been incorporated into this review.

Purposes and conduct of the OGC Gateway™ Review**Purposes of the OGC Gateway™ Review**

The primary purposes of a Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment, are to review the outcomes and objectives for the programme (and the way they fit together) and confirm that they make the necessary contribution to departments' overall strategy.

Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Gateway Review 0.

Conduct of the OGC Gateway™ Review

This Gateway Review 0 was carried out from 26th to 28th February 2013 at 7 Millbank, London SW1. The team members are listed on the front cover.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The review team would like to thank the programme team, and those interviewed, for their openness and candour, which contributed significantly to the review team's understanding of the programme and the outcome of this review. The review team would like to commend the logistical arrangements, which ran perfectly.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

Findings and recommendations**1: Policy and business context**

Since the programme started, the policy and business context is unchanged. As such, the programme has been able to continue along its original path and is still planning to do what it set out to do. The programme, as defined in the original Business Case, supports the strategic aims of both Houses and reflects their core tasks related to information services.

The programme technical blueprint was clearly defined up front. It has become clear, however, that the technical approach was more complex than originally envisaged and a level of maturity needed before the solutions could be implemented. There has been an extended period of development and redevelopment when delivery was slower than anticipated, partly due to the adoption of a new development methodology ("Agile"). In order to deliver to the agreed schedule and budget, projects have been descope.

The Programme Board has agreed to close the programme at the end of March 2013, with remaining projects, still to be completed, incorporated into the new Procedural Business Programme (PBP), which is already underway.

The experience of development throughout the PDP has demonstrated the need for proper organisational planning to support the Agile technical approach. It has proved essential to gather business requirements, understand the technical architecture and specify the skills needed to develop that architecture and the applications running upon it. Once the resources with the specified skills have been recruited, plans for the delivery of the architecture and applications can be developed; then development can finally begin. This has been a difficult lesson for Parliament to learn, over an extended period of time, but the Review Team was told (and saw some evidence) that this process is now embedded in the corporate consciousness, which will be important for the success of the PBP and other similar programmes.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

2: Business Case and stakeholders

A key part of a Business Case is the identification of benefits to justify the investment required. While expected benefits were identified and plans documented (see Business Case, paragraph 21), work needed to define how the benefits would be realised, measured and gathered remains outstanding.

Senior business stakeholders recognise their role as “benefits delivery managers”. As well as identifying benefits accruing already, they have a responsibility to advocate the solution to their colleagues, identifying how to increase benefits. Further, changes in Parliament’s business or new technology may unlock additional benefits. The role of the programme team (and ultimately the succeeding support organisation) is to gather the total benefits information and disseminate it.

While no benefits have been reported, we believe they can be observed and communicated. The programme team can enable this by reminding business users of the environment of complex MSWord templates in place four years ago and compare that with the more intuitive and accessible solutions in place today.

There is a perception that the programme has been unsuccessful. It is clear to the Review Team that this is not the case and that programme successes can be easily articulated; we believe that it would be worthwhile to communicate these achievements, whilst also providing positive feedback to the highly committed and hard working programme team.

Recommendation 1: The SRO should initiate a business-led benefits realisation activity and communicate the results.

It would be helpful for the SRO to involve the PBP in this activity so that the programme gathers benefits information from the start.

The Senior Supplier for the programme is the Parliamentary ICT (PICT). However, there was confusion over the dual supplier/partner role that PICT undertakes leading to the business belief that it is a PICT-led programme. It would be worthwhile to produce a RACI matrix of responsibilities, which should clarify decision-making.

Comments were made about the effectiveness of programme governance in resolving issues in a timely manner. Some interviewees felt that the Programme Board acted like a committee, with limited accountability and ownership of issue resolution. The Review Team notes that PBP is planning a “lighter touch” governance and recognises that this may allow a more robust and accountable structure to deliver the remaining projects within PDP. The RACI matrix, described above, and extended for all stakeholders, would clarify accountability.

Recommendation 2: The SRO should ensure the governance roles and responsibilities for the delivery of unfinished PDP projects are clearly documented and understood by key stakeholders.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

3: Management of intended outcomes

There were a variety of views expressed about the effectiveness of the use of the Agile process with frustrations that estimates of delivery could not be relied upon. We also heard that the effort for testing the applications was not widely understood. An optimism bias is currently applied to development efforts but perhaps a higher bias should be applied. It appeared to the Review Team that there did not appear to be any independent assurance on either the development efforts or delivery timescales. This level of assurance would give the business greater confidence and trust in the planned delivery timescales. We note the efforts currently taken to validate development complexity including the developers' peer review process (known as 'estimation poker'). The Review Team heard a variety of comments about the assurance carried out on the development code delivered and, without a Development Manager, this remains an area of concern. The Review Team did conclude that greater assurance in terms of the quality of the code would be of benefit. The Review Team will subsequently make a recommendation on targeted lessons learned workshops, one of which should look at the area of estimating and another on how use of the Agile methodology could be improved. The experiences of the CPIMF programme could also be helpful in this workshop.

There was a lack of understanding amongst interviewees about how projects have been prioritised for development. The example most quoted was the decision to remove the Commons Order Paper from the scope and delay it to 2013-14, despite its significance.

It was questioned whether the underlying data architecture was in place to facilitate sharing both components and data. The Review Team did not have visibility of the technical standards but it may be useful to review and reissue those documents for the PBP programme to confirm the standards are in place and are being followed.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

4: Risk management

We were told progress has been made in release and change management. Robust change and release management functions will remain important as the rate of change increases. It would be advantageous to change current practice to reduce delivery to smaller, more manageable and achievable “chunks”. For example, using the outputs from estimation reviews would highlight the more complex tasks suitable for simplification. There are inherent risks in this approach that, without adequate planning, the business could be overwhelmed with too many releases to assure. There is confusion about ownership of the release management process within Parliament.

We note that additional independent peer review throughout the programme, which would include a review of plans and delivery timescales, would enhance the quality of the outputs. This would improve standards and delivery, giving greater assurance and confidence to the SRO and stakeholders that the programme is under control and on track to deliver. This additional level of scrutiny does not need to be onerous and should be an integral part of day-to-day activities, especially if planned in advance; a programme quality plan will enable this.

Recommendation 3: The Programme Manager should produce a programme quality plan for unfinished PDP projects.

It would be good practice to produce a programme quality plan for PBP at this time.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

5: Review of intended outcomes

Several attendees noted the high quality of programme resources in a fluid and changeable programme, development and organisational environment. The Review Team advocate continuity and preservation of current good practices within the new PBP thereby enhancing the strongly formed business relationships.

Concern about resource allocation and funding/availability was expressed and the perception from the business is there is no robust resource plan for delivering the residual activities once programme closure is achieved and business applications are received into live operations. These activities should be covered in a transition plan and will aid handover and ongoing business relationships.

The Review Team acknowledges the difficulties the programme has had in recruiting and retaining appropriately skilled resources to deliver the technical aspects of the programme. The Review Team heard evidence that the current linear approach to recruitment has been reviewed and a more flexible approach is now in place to support new delivery programmes. We also note that as development resources are scarce, a more active approach to their management may reduce attrition. The Review Team will subsequently make a recommendation on targeted lessons learned workshops, one of which will look at the area of resourcing.

As previously noted, the key post of Development Manager has remained unfilled for an extended period and there is a perception that this has adversely impacted programme delivery.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

6: Readiness for next phase

There is still a need for the programme, both in terms of the replacement of the current core applications, and the aspiration to make Parliamentary information available in more formats. Whilst the financial position has not been examined in detail, we are satisfied that the current funding provision is adequate until the end of the programme in March 2013. However, we are concerned that we did not have any visibility of the Transition Plan for the completion of the current projects, most notably Hansard, Parliamentary Questions and Sessional Return.

A Transition Plan could address concerns raised by interviewees, such as:

- Management roles for the remaining projects, e.g. Programme Manager, Development Manager;
- Resourcing of the remaining projects, especially development resources;
- The governance structure;
- Funding after March 2013 (we heard that current funding could be insufficient to deliver the remaining functionality);
- Allocation of experienced staff across PDP, business as usual (BAU) and PBP;
- User training;
- Knowledge transfer planning and implementation;
- Use of active maintenance of development code (e.g. implementing coding standards, looking for better use of shared components);
- How the analysis/design work will be handed over to the PBP (e.g. considerable work has already been completed on Order Paper).

It is unclear how BAU ongoing support will be resourced or funded (for both the Development and Knowledge Application Teams) once all PDP projects are completed. There was no funding for this in the original Business Case.

Recommendation 4: The SRO should ensure the delivery of a Transition Plan.

The Review Team was shown various lessons learned documents. To ensure active management, targeted short reviews of specific areas would increase corporate understanding of future programmes. Areas suggested include: estimating, resourcing, Agile, release management, assurance and “planning a new programme”. To improve dissemination, this information should be shared with the PICT Advisory Board.

Recommendation 5: The Programme Manager should ensure the completion of targeted Lessons Learned workshops and publish the results.

The next OGC Gateway™ Review is expected in around 9-12 months time, to review progress on PDP benefits realisation and transition activities. These activities may be part of the first review of the Procedural Business Programme.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED**

APPENDIX A**Purposes of OGC 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 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 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.

OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment**Programme Title: Procedural Data Programme****Privacy Marking: UNCLASSIFIED****APPENDIX B****Interviewees (in chronological order)**

Name	Role
[REDACTED]	Programme Manager
Edward Ollard	Clerk Assistant, House of Lords; Deputy SRO
[REDACTED]	BRM; Programme Manager PBP
David Natzler	SRO
Lorraine Sutherland	Editor of the Official Report, DCCS
[REDACTED]	Applications Developer, PICT
[REDACTED]	Head of Development, PICT
[REDACTED]	Business Analyst, PICT
[REDACTED]	Director of Information Management Services, HoC
[REDACTED]	Table Office Clerk, House of Commons
Joan Miller	Director General, PICT
[REDACTED]	Head of Knowledge Application Team, PICT
[REDACTED]	Business Relationship Mgr (Procedural Services), PICT
[REDACTED]	Clerk / Committee Office, House of Commons
Christopher Johnson	Clerk of the Journals, House of Lords