



SCOTTISH  
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

Working together for a safer Scotland

**TRANSFORMATION AND MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC MEETING**

**Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2019 @ 1000hrs  
TRAINING CENTRE CONFERENCE ROOM  
PERTH FIRE STATION  
401 HIGH STREET, PERTH PH1 1PL**

**PRESENT:**

Marieke Dwarshuis, (MD), Chair  
Brian Baverstock, (BB)  
Nick Barr (NB)

Mhairi Wyllie (MW)  
Fiona Thorburn (FT)

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Dave McGown (DMcG)  
Mark McAteer (MMcA)

Deputy Chief Officer (DCO)  
Director of Strategic Planning, Performance &  
Communications (SPPC)  
(DACO) Strategic Planning & Performance  
Area Manager (AM), Programme Manager  
Legal Services Manager  
Group Manager, (GM), Board/Business Support

Ross Haggart (RH)  
Ian McMeekin (IMcM)  
Vlad Valiente (VV)  
Alasdair Cameron (AC)  
Manager

Group Manager (GM), Strategic Planning &

Mark Bryce (MB)  
Performance

Head of Corporate Governance

Richard Whetton (RW)

Head of Asset Management

Ian Morris (IM)

Area Manager, Response & Resilience (R&R)

Garry Mackay (GMcK)

Deputy Programme Manager

Gillian Buchanan (GB)

**OBSERVERS**

Martin Riach (MR)

Scottish HMFSI

Derek Smith (DS)

Scottish Govt,

Bridget Spence (BS)

SFRS, Project Office

Marion Lang (ML)

SFRS, Board Support

**1 WELCOME**

- 1.1 MD welcomed everyone to this Transformation Major Projects Committee (TMPC) Meeting, particularly Richard Whetton, New Head of Corporate Governance and requested around the table introductions.

**2 APOLOGIES**

- 2.1 Apologies were received from:-

- 2.2 Primrose Stark, *Board Member*; Kirsty Darwent, *Chair of the Board*.

**3. CONSIDERATION OF AND DECISION ON ANY ITEMS TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE**

- 3.1 MD proposed 1) New Projects (B) and the Risk Register are both taken in Private Session as these relate to business which is under negotiation with TU's in terms of new T&C's and may prejudice negotiations if taken in the public session and 2) The Gateway Review Action Plan Progress Report is taken into Public Session after Item 11. The Committee agreed with both proposals put forward by MD.

**4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

- 4.1 None.

**5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: (8<sup>th</sup> November 2018)**

- 5.1 The Committee Minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> November were approved as a true record of the meeting.

**6. MATTERS ARISING**

- 6.1 MD sought clarification upon any matters arising which are not captured within the Action Log.

**7 TMPC ROLLING ACTION LOG**

(\*Reference to previous action Log)

- 7.1 The Committee held the view that circulation and updates of the rolling action log was helpful.

7.2 **7.2.4. ST0009 OHCA Ph2 &**

7.3 **7.3.1 ST0011 Safe & Well Project Brief**

- 7.4 MD requested Action Log updated to reflect these projects have been brought forward into the Private Session of this meeting (07/02/19)

- 7.5 8.5\* – **MP001CCF** Exception Report. MD advised due to the importance and risks associated with this project requested the Project Manager provide an update on a six monthly basis.

- 7.6 **ACTION: MD requested CCF Project Manager provide an update on a six monthly basis.**

**ACTION: IMcM**

- 7.7 9.24\* – **ST0016 RVDS** – MD requested confirmation if a report on recruitment recommendations has been submitted to Primrose Stark as Chair of Staff Governance Committee. MB reported this project is being managed by AM Jason Sharp, RDS Steering Group who has already liaised with PS.

- 7.8 10.5\* – **SA2.1.8 New Watch Duty System, Closing Report.** Committee sought clarification upon the delay in creating a New Watch Duty System Lessons Learned Report. IMcM advised that Project Managers are currently gathering and analysing information in order that lessons learnt can be grouped together and reported on appropriately. A Staffing Interdependency Working Group has been convened to assist with the forward communication of lessons learned to various Transformation projects.

**8 PROGRAMME OFFICE BOARD ACTION LOG**

- 8.1 MD noted Committee that the Programme Office Board are discussing draft Dossiers for both the Demand Led Watch Duty System and Urban on Call projects and requested clarification upon whether these will come forward to the next TMPC Meeting. RH confirmed it was anticipated these will come forward to the next TMPC meeting in May.

**9 PROGRAMME DELIVERY REPORTS**

- 9.1 Service Transformation Exception Reports – Verbal  
9.2 ST0002 Rapid Response Units RSD/V Ph1.

- 9.3 IMcM requested TMPC reference the timeframe 16 September – 16 December 2018. IMcM requested IM provide update upon quality and time.
- 9.4 IM updated the Committee on the quality and hardware issues during the roll-out phase of the RRU. Contaminates were found within MPC (Multi Pressure Connector) branch. Investigation and further analysis with the Contractors concluded this fault could not be replicated. Further analysis discovered this was a manufacturing fault. All hoses have been replaced at the expense of the manufacturer together with re-assurances. IM reported looking at remedial action with contractor. Lesson learned is we take time and evaluate any large roll-out of technology before undertaking a mass roll-out.
- 9.5 Committee sought clarification upon whether or not this fault has affected the credibility of the RRU's and crews and were hoses unique to RRU's.
- 9.6 IM reported there was no operational disturbance or impact on credibility. Performance was not affected due to fault being identified at the first station going Live.
- 9.7 MD inquired whether or not we were in a position to undertake the initial implementation review and obtain initial views on mobilisation back for May's TMPC meeting. IMcM suggested extending invitation to Andrew Girrity, Project Manager.
- 9.8 **ACTION: MD requested invitation extended to Andrew Girrity to provide details upon the implementation experience to date at the next TMPC in May.**  
**ACTION: IMcM and AG**
- 9.9 The Committee referred to milestones relative to relocation of appliances and equipment. IM reported appliances were available for re-deployment within the Service to cover strategic reserve for the EU Exit process.
- 9.10 Major Projects Exception Reports
- 9.11 MP0002 Training Facilities, Newbridge – Verbal
- 9.12 IMcM reported project progressing on time, cost and quality. A verbal update was provided to answers and questions raised during the previous TMPC meeting.
- 9.13 IM circulated pictures around Committee to showcase up-to-date progress at the Newbridge Training Facility for Committee's information.
- 9.14 IM referred to 8.13 within Action log, confirming no relationship issues with either primary Contractor or sub-contracting team. IM provided an overview of the robust management in terms of contracts and provided a brief overview of the full project in two phases over two years and emphasised this has been condensed and delivered within a single year.
- 9.15 IM provided Committee with an overview and explanation around the dismantling and re-location of the training at height (TAH) building from Newcraighall to Newbridge and provided clarity to Committee why structural engineers were replaced with second independent structural engineers. Project is being condensed into one single year with an additional four week delay in delivering TAH building which IM advised will not affect the handover time or training. IM reported cost will remain within budget. This project is on time and quality is good.
- 9.16 IM reported artefacts currently stored within Maddiston will be moved into the museum at MacDonald Road which will allow Maddiston to be released as a capital receipt. This process will allow the Heritage Group to utilise Newcraighall.
- 9.17 Committee sought clarification in relation to no additional costs in respect of the four week extension to the TAH building. IM confirmed there was no additional budget required as this was within the tolerances built into the budget contingencies envelope.
- 9.18 IM wished to emphasise, despite this being a two year project and a four week delay in respect of the TAH building, ultimately, this has resulted in the project being condensed into one year with an overall eleven month improvement.
- 9.19 Committee requested clarification upon issues with services and utilities and were these resolved? IM confirmed this was 99% concluded – electricity still required to be switched on within the power plant – awaiting Wayleave to be signed off before

- next week.
- 9.20 IM extended invitation to Committee members to visit the Newbridge Training Facility at the next TMPC meeting in May as this would allow landscaping and tidying up of site. *IM departed meeting at 10:35hrs.*
- 9.21 **Major Projects – Exception Reports**
- 9.22 MP0004 Business Process Review
- 9.23 IM reported this is currently amber for time. Slight delay in completion of HR analysis work. The original date for closure was December 2018, however, this project will now close in March 2019. IM advised the next request will be Closing Report or a Change Request at the next TMPC Meeting in May.
- 9.24 Major Projects Exception Reports  
MP0001 – Command and Control Futures
- 9.25 IM introduced AM Garry Mackay who provided a verbal update on the CCF project and Systel.
- 9.26 GMck provided update on the handover and the continuity of management along with issues relating to the management of the relationship with Systel and explained how the process for the cutover will be managed.
- 9.27 GMck reported he has been involved with a two week handover period with AM John Joyce.
- 9.28 In terms of handover, GMck reported having held a Workshop with key internal/external stakeholders including Systel to look at the full review and understanding of all aspects to allow him to report on updated timelines to the Project Board. GMck acknowledged the depth of work undertaken by AM John Joyce.
- 9.29 GMck provided Committee with key points of importance namely:-
- > Positive relationship with external providers while maintaining a strong line in terms of delivering statement of requirements.
  - > Factory Acceptance Tests completed
  - > Technical Design specification – This is a key project document outlining our expectations of what Systel will deliver technically (hardware and ongoing support for software for CCF system.)
  - > Project Board have had input and Review of document. Four key areas requiring clarification prior to sign off. Meeting has been scheduled with Systel, ICT and CCF Team to produce a technical design specification for sign off with three to five lower level functional directorates.
  - > Systel have confirmed that the technical design specification, whilst a key document in terms of future audit, will not delay their work in terms of building software.
  - > Functional design specification is exactly what SFRS expects the system to do. The functional design specification has undergone a period of review progressed through end of reporting period Qtr 3 2018 and it should be noted this work is overdue. GMck reported having scheduled a Workshop in March which Systel have undertaken to support which will enable the sign off of this key functional design specification for the satisfaction of Service and Project Board.
  - > This matter was progressed as a matter of urgency by Systel following a written request from the Senior Reporting Officer (SRO) Lewis Ramsay to the Chief Exec of Systel to ensure adequate resources were made available during the development of the functional design specification in January 2019.
  - > GMck will travel to La Rochelle, France on 12<sup>th</sup> February to meet with Chief Executive, Systel and obtain draft outline of the functional design specification to take forward to the workshop.

- 9.30 Committee sought clarification upon how overdue was the functional design specification.
- 9.31 GMck acknowledged an expected delay but this has caused no material impact and mitigation processes have been put in place.
- 9.32 Committee requested GMck provide confirmation upon the original milestone for signing off the technical design specification. GMck confirmed original milestone was October 2018.
- 9.33 With regard to the technical design specification not having been signed off, the Committee wondered if this would run the risk of Systel developing specification we do not require or have agreed. GMck assured the Committee and further explained the next phase of work involves the software build and explained the reason this has not been signed off relates to ICT. There are four areas which relate specifically to technical aspects and these require further clarification before sign off. ICT are satisfied everything has been met in terms of the build and is consistent with our statement of requirements Consistency on what is written within the statement of requirements and how the technical design specification now reads as presented by Systel due to weaknesses in translation and the way in which the document is structured does not meet everything that ICT is comfortable with. ICT are meeting with Systel within ten days to agree and write this. The expectation is to allow progression and then write four lower sub level procedures to meet that expectation.
- 9.34 Committee sought clarification upon how this project is working with the Operational Intelligence (OI) Project and how information is being shared given there are interdependencies.
- 9.35 GMck having met with GM David Murdoch OI project manager, the key interfaces will allow this to happen over the period of the build and how mobilisation information moves from operations control to the fire appliance.
- 9.36 Given the short period of time GMck has been involved with this CCF project, MD commended his knowledge on the subject matter.
- 9.37 Committee sought clarification around other Fire Services who use this software and was GMck comfortable with amendments within the 12 week schedule prior to the "Go Live" date.
- 9.38 GMck comfortable amendments would be made prior to the 12 week schedule enabling staff to have six months of familiarisation. Committee inquired whether or not GMck has resources at his disposal to undertake and deliver this project.
- 9.39 GMck reported he does have resources to complete this project, however, identified a possible window for concern may lie with the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) as this requires in the region of 6000 discreet tests to be undertaken. Given the inexperience of our CCF Team in delivering switchovers and cutovers within controls, GMck has asked Systel to advise what will be required. Systel have advised 13 weeks and 3 to 4 persons to undertake UAT. GMck advised this has been increased to 6 persons delivering on average 16 factory acceptance tests within a 13 week window.
- 9.40 In respect of the UAT, the Committee inquired whether or not 13 weeks would allow time for re-work with fault finding through testing.
- 9.41 GMck confirmed fault finding will not be closed until fault remedied. GMck reported the UAT testing has been based on a 20% failure rate.
- 9.42 MD referred to a specific action within the action log whereupon we requested written assurance from Systel to determine the period of installation between various sites would be sufficient to address any difficulties.
- 9.43 GMck met with Systel Programme Management to review implementation dates and advised Systel have no discomfort. GMck explained at the point of implementation there will be 72 hours of hyper care whereupon an individual will be on site specifically to deal with any issues. Upon conclusion of the hyper care period, Systel will then be comfortable for the next site to come on line.

- 9.44 GMck recently met with the SRO who held the view it was not necessary to request a written assurance from Systel as the expertise and experience within the CCF Implementation Team indicated support on this approach and referred to Appendix 4 within the Highlight Report.
- 9.45 MD sought clarification relative to the cut over risk and inquired were centres being managed one centre at a time with 3½ weeks in between and if there were difficulties would the other two controls centres take over calls.
- 9.46 The Committee also referred to written confirmation from Systel and held the view it would be helpful to have written confirmation, particularly in the event if something does not go to plan.
- 9.47 GMck referred Committee to the auditable and reportable meeting schedule and explained that this allows agreeable changes to timelines, therefore there is an auditable record of Systel agreeing to accountability and governance times.
- 9.48 MD held the view as this is a high risk project in terms of its nature and reputational risk, delivering to cost, time or functionality, risk to the Service not delivering to the people of Scotland, she welcomed GMck's detailed and concise update and invited him to stay for discussion in relation to the Risk Register due to a number of risks relating to the CCF project.
- 9.49 Operational Intelligence System Project Change Request Ph3
- 9.50 IMcM reported original dossier covered front line appliances. This Change dossier covers specialist appliances therefore additional funding will be required. The original funding package for Ph3 was £350K. There has been an additional request for capital funding for the fitting of specialist appliances of £50K.
- 9.51 IMcM provided update/report from Project Manager as follows:-
- > 347 installations to date. By February 14<sup>th</sup> all frontline appliances on mainland LSO areas will have been successfully completed - 365 vehicles across the service, 340 front line appliances, 4 MTF vehicles, 13 Spare Pumping appliances, 2 Heavy Rescue Vehicles, 5 Heavy Rescue Pumps and 1 SRP vehicle.
  - > All RRU's will be fitted with the units by end of March together with 20 Water Rescue Vehicles.
  - > Island Appliances will be fitted with the units during their scheduled maintenance regime by March 30<sup>th</sup> 2019.
  - > The legacy contract will be terminated by March 2019.
- 9.52 MD highlighted the Committee require to make a decision for approval to extend the scope to include RRU's and other specialist appliances which have not been previously included and was Committee content to approve scope.
- 9.53 Discussion ensued upon why devices were not included within the original contract scope and why new devices were not fitted to RRU's as part of the original contract. The Committee assumed this was perhaps due to a timing issue and this was a good example of why we need to look at critical paths and dependencies and adjust the scope of the project. The Committee held the view due to the RRU's having to be brought back for fitment there has been a cost implication. RRU's should have been fitted prior to going Live.
- 9.54 In view of questions upon the complete implementation schedule, legacy contracts, the Committee agreed to the Project Change Request.
- 9.55 MD requested Committee review the new POB Dashboard and consider when dashboard is fully populated whether or not this is suitable.
- 9.56 IMcM provided overview of Dashboard and explained the purpose was to show all programmes of work i.e. Legacy, Reform, Major Projects or Transformation. Gateway processes have been included to show the journey of projects from business case approval through to the programme. A hyperlink will be provided

- allowing TMPC visual indicators to enable insight to various reports which POB report on relative to time, cost and quality.
- 9.57 MD agreed with the new format, however, would like to see correct dates included otherwise Dashboard is not informative.
- 9.58 MD agreed with Committee suggestion would it be possible to project ahead expected project milestones and populate these milestones in *italics* for ease of reference.

## 10 CLOSING REPORTS

### 10.1 Strategic Plan 2019-22 Development Termination Report – C/TMPC/02-09

- 10.2 Committee was requested to agree the termination of this Project. It was agreed at the previous TMPC the Strategic Plan project would be managed through reporting directly to the Board and there was little additional benefit reporting separately through TMPC given tight timescales.

## 11 NEW PROJECTS (A)

### 11.1 RVDS Strategy Project Dossier ST0016

- 11.2 IMcM reported upon 3 New projects. RVDS forms part of the Transformation. Executive Lead is DACO Ross Haggart. IMcM invited Project Manager GM Mark Bryce to provide overview as follows:-
- > RVDS strategy project is a 3 phase project. Phase 1 – Research is due to conclude end of March 2019.
  - > Research covers five areas noted within Section 2 - Improved Recruitment; Enhanced Retention; Appropriate Response Models; Framework for Station Duties and Enhanced Engagement.
  - > Exclusions within Section 4: these areas not part of the scope of this project but have dependences within RDVS dossier
  - > There is support from the National Fire Chiefs' Council (NFCC) On Call Groups. MB sits on the Steering Group for On Call Group and Practitioners Group which has proved useful. England and Wales Fire Services have been undertaking improvement on On-Call systems to improve their RVDS.
  - > RVDS colleagues have assisted to scope out this project from the outset. MB advised he has spoken to SDA's and has attended various RDS forums. He will speak to staff groups who will focus on already specific researched areas.  
Committee questioned whether we are communicating with RDS to assure them they are being listened to?  
RH reported considerable research has been undertaken with RDS who have already provided a rich source of data and input. RH also reported tying back into the RDS through the Staff Survey Action Plan.
  - > As a result of the RDS Staff Survey Action Plan information has been sent back.
  - > Working with Comms & Engagement Team to provide Communication strategy.
  - > MB provided explanation upon Section 7. Research Phase 1 will conclude March 2019; Phase 2 Developing work programme and prioritising issues March 2020; Phase 3 – Testing and implementing changes March 2022.
  - > Benefits/Disbenefits – This dossier covers Ph1 specifically, so cashable/non-cashable benefits have been illustrated to take cognisance of Phases 2 and 3. Disbenefits not identified for Research phase.
- 11.3 Committee suggested as we improve benefit tracking it would be better if fixed costs/resource costs are referred to by their name. The Committee expressed the view it was not sound project management to seek approval of Ph1 of a project and should we not consider the Project as a whole? Were associated costs and

- benefits properly and appropriately estimated? The Committee inquired whether a business case had been put forward.
- 11.4 RH reported although the dossier focusses upon Ph1, Research phase, where possible it provides indicative aspects of Phases 2 and 3 including milestones and cannot currently predict what the research will throw up in terms of tangible recommendations and options. Research will conclude in March, Options will be developed for April for presentation to SLT and the Board with a set of options and recommendations. Until benefits and options are defined and authorised by SLT/Board it is difficult to be definitive upon benefits and timings in later phases (2&3) of the project..
- 11.5 RH explained the business case process is used for cashable requests only within the service. Once specific recommendations and options are identified and if there are associated costs at that point a relevant business case(s) will be put forward and held the view this project will evolve into a full Programme of Work in its own right. RH confirmed the Project Brief for Ph1 had been presented to the last TMPC on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2018.
- 11.6 The Committee agreed it was content Ph1 research goes ahead in the manner which has been described. Committee commented upon best value and true costs and felt there had to be more transparency in respect of true costs whilst running projects.
- 11.7 Committee referred to the governance route of reports and agreed it may be worthwhile cross-referencing papers to make it easier to identify the flow of work streams.
- 11.8 RH advised MD within the Agenda there are revisions to templates. RH agreed there was a need to be transparent with project costs and explained why costs have been listed within disbenefits section. RH advised the audit trail is something which can be added to these templates.
- 11.9 MD sought clarification from MMcA upon the following points:-
1. Was it unreasonable to expect a Closing Report for Ph1 at the next TMPC in May and will we see an updated dossier coming forward to the August TMPC specifying project plan for Ph2.
  2. Which of the five benefits articulated within the High Level Plan for service transformation is being contributed towards by this project and how this will be undertaken.
- 11.11 MMcA agreed that in future these connections to High Level Benefits will be built within dossiers.
- 11.12 MB advised he did not think there would be any issues having the Closing Report being ready for the next TMPC meeting in May.
- 11.13 **ACTION: MB to provide closing report Phase 1 RVDS project at May Committee meeting**

**ACTION: MB**

## **12 RISKS**

### **12.1 Transformation Risk Register/Tracking Process CTMPC/09-19**

- 12.2 IMcM advised the Risk Tracking process used by the Programme Office (PO) is designed to monitor risks which could potentially impact the successful delivery of Transformation Projects and Major Projects. IMcM reported the provision of training to support Programme Managers (PM's) to ensure appropriate risk management of projects and escalate any concerns to the Project Board. Risks highlighted are for the period 16<sup>th</sup> Sept – 16<sup>th</sup> Dec 2018. IMcM referred to new risk CCF3.2, Ongoing Brexit process and its impact upon the implementation of the CCMS Project and invited GMck to provide update upon risks relating to CCF.
- 12.3 GMck reported the provision around risk mitigation associated with Brexit has three facets i.e. financial, professional and expert advice, and equipment. Hardware associated with Command & Control Mobilising System (CCMS) is in



- control of SFRS. Two data centres at Johnstone & Saughton - all equipment is *in situ*.
- 12.4 RH explained how the risk appetite links to the Risk Management Policy, general risk and risk assessment process. The Board have previously agreed their risk appetite across the five categories of risk and where the impact rating equals or is greater than the previously identified core appetite for that category this is when the risk appetite changes to red. RH further clarified the impact of risks listed within Risk Register/Tracker are operating above the risk appetite as previously identified by the Board.
- 12.5 RH advised the Committee they should not necessarily focus only on risks repeatedly showing RED as the impact could be outwith their control. RH held the view Board and Committee members should keep a closer eye on control measures and re-assure themselves they are satisfied all reasonable control measures are being taken.
- 12.6 MD requested GMck provide update in relation to CCF1.2, around Service's network and data centre infrastructure, particularly, is it adequate at this point in time to support the needs of the new system and what is being done ensure that it is?
- 12.7 GMck provided explanation to Committee upon work undertaken which affects our current mobilising systems, data systems and post implementation. Currently moving between the existing developments of the ICT network to support what we are doing. ICT are focussing on maintaining ICT we currently have. Feedback from the Project Board and Partners within ICT have advised they are satisfied that the new system going into the wide area network and through data centres are robust. No indication from ICT there are any issues around our existing systems to support development nor are there any issues with what we have developed in partnership with Systel and BT. *GMck departed Meeting @ 12:20hrs*
- 12.8 Risk Spotighting
- 12.9 MD provided verbal explanation to members upon 'Risk Spotighting' and reported there had been discussion at the Integrated Governance Committee around the concept of risk spotighting whereby a Committee choose one particular risk and invite the risk owner to provide clarification upon the nature of the risk and actions put in place to mitigate. MD sought thoughts from the Committee whether we could do something similar in respect of the corporate risks allocated to this Committee (CR3.1 – CR3.11) i.e. risks relating to the overall delivery of the Transformation Programme. After discussion it was agreed to consider spotighting Governance (CR3.8),
- 12.10 Interdependencies (CR3.6), Financial Planning /Projected Savings (CR3.5 and CR3.10) and Engagement (CR3.11). MD sought views on which topic should be spotighted at the next TMPC in May or a meeting thereafter.
- 12.11 DMcG held the view these were appropriate items for discussion, however, interdependencies should be a standing part of the Agenda and discussed on a regular basis.
- 12.12 After further discussion it was agreed Financial Planning and Interdependencies should be looked at as soon as possible. MD held the view Committee members should be prepared for an extension of time at the next TMPC meeting allow spotighting upon both issues.
- 12.13 MD sought agreement from Committee that she discusses spotighting Finance and Interdependencies separately with MMcA, RH and DMcG and particularly how this is taken forward to the next TMPC in May. Committee agreed with this suggestion.
- 12.14 **ACTION: MD to discuss how spotighting the Finance and Interdependencies risks are taken forward to the next TMPC in May**

**ACTION: MD**

### 13 COMMITTEE GOVERNANCE

#### 13.1 Governance Templates Report

IMcM advised the purpose of this report was to detail additional changes that have been made to a) Project Dossier b) Project Highlight Report and c) Project Closing Report and requested Committee note the proposed document changes. Committee noted changes and requested further two additions to templates, namely, costs and Audit Trail of papers within covering paper.

#### 13.2 Review of Committee Terms of Reference

AC reported the purpose of this report was to present proposals to assist ensuring the continued effectiveness of the governance arrangements enabling Committee members the opportunity to review the TMPC Terms of Reference (ToR) (Appendix A) and propose amendments prior to it being presented to the Board on 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2019.

13.3 Committee held the view it would be helpful if there was consistency around the use of the words “agreeing” and “authorising” within ToR.

13.4 Committee noted and agreed changes to ToR.

#### 13.5 Overview of Committee and Programme Board

13.6 IMcM referred to previously circulated list to the Committee which listed respective roles within Programme Office Board and TMPC in relation the governance routes for the projects and requested any comments.

13.7 **ACTION: MD requested IMcM re-circulate list for Committee’s perusal.**

**ACTION: IMcM**

### 14 GATEWAY REVIEW ACTION PLAN – C/TMPC/08-09

14.1 IMcM reported that engagement took place with Scottish Govt. Programme & Project Management Centre of Excellence to look at the Gateway Review whereupon it was decided looking at key areas around Benefits Management, Change Management, Governance, Operations Management and Risk Management. Gateway Review was put in place during August 2018. Eleven individuals from SFRS, SLT and Head of Functions were interviewed by an external Gateway Review Team who benchmarked interview responses. Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) was delivered which presented amber and resulted in an Action Plan to address issues.

14.2 RH held the view whilst SFRS are committed to having Gateway Reviews undertaken at the appropriate time, RH considered that for a further, future Gateway Review this would be when we have more clarity around T&C’s.

14.3 IMcM reported a number of actions are ongoing, particularly Project Management Maturity Model (P3M3) assessment to be completed by the end of April 2019.

14.4 **ACTION: MD requested IMcM provide further update on the action plan at the next TMPC Meeting in May 2019.**

**ACTION: IMcM**

14.5 Given the importance of this review the Committee requested more information is provided around internal processes for providing validation for what is seen within ten action plans.

14.6 MD acknowledged the overall recommendations have resulted in a long list of actions but how do we determine actions are completed to a satisfactory standard and how can this be validated.

14.7 **ACTION: MD requested that a proposal is brought back to the next TMPC meeting to provide insight upon what has been undertaken to provide assurance actions have been appropriately validated.**

**ACTION: IMcM**

- 14.8 FT referred Committee to the Gateway Review Recommendation No. R6/4. FT acknowledged the steep learning curve in relation to the Transformation Programme due to the complexities of Programme Management and Change Management, however, held the view the organisation might benefit from seeking external Change Management/Programme Management expertise and allow for the acceleration and transfer of skills.
- 14.9 MMcA advised there is somebody currently within the Service who has extensive Change Management experience. FT and Committee agreed to assist in any way possible.

## 15 FORWARD PLANNING

### 15.1 Committee Forward Plan

- 15.2 MD referred to the introduction of a TMPC Rolling Forward Plan 2019-20 and held the view this would be an extremely useful tool and stressed the need for this to be kept current as possible.

- 15.3 Looking forward to the next TMPC on 9<sup>th</sup> May MD the following to be added:-

- Under “Monitoring Reports” - Update on RRU Implementation.
- Under “New Projects”, Urban on Call – Private Session.
- Under “General Reports”, Update Report on Key Themes coming through projects.
- Under “General Reports” - Risk theme discussion on Finance/ Interdependencies.
- Under “Closing Reports” - RVDS Ph1.

- 15.4 Looking forward to TMPC on 8<sup>th</sup> August MD requested:-

- > Under “Closing Reports” - RRU Ph1 Closing Report.
- > Under “Monitoring Report” – Rural Full Time Post Update Highlight or Evaluation.
- > Verbal Update on Impact of Brexit on Transformation Programme

### 15.5 Items for consideration at Future IGC, Board and Strategy Day Meetings.

- 15.6 The Committee suggested MD take forward Interdependences to the IG Committee considering the financial Interdependences as well as the technical interdependences.

**ACTION: MD agreed to take forward Interdependences to the IG Committee. This should be within the context of the financial Interdependences as well as the technical interdependences**

**ACTION: MD**

## 16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 16.1 The next meeting is scheduled to take place on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2019 at 1000hrs hrs at Training Centre Conference Room, Perth Fire Station, 401 High Street, Perth PH1 1PL.
- 16.2 There being no further matters to discuss, the Public meeting closed at 13:08hrs.

## THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE IN PRIVATE SESSION

### 17 WELCOME

### 18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (PRIVATE SESSION) 7 FEBRUARY 2019

- 18.1 The Committee Private Minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> November were approved as a true record of the meeting.

- 19** **TMPC PRIVATE ROLLING ACTION LOG**
- 19.1 The Committee noted and discussed the action log.
- 20** **NEW PROJECTS (B)**
- 21** **RISK REGISTER**