Agenda
Item 4

**SCOTTISH
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE**

Working together for a safer Scotland

PUBLIC MEETING - TRANSFORMATION AND MAJOR PROJECTS COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 8 AUGUST 2019 @ 1000HRS

BRAIDWOOD SUITE, SCOTTISH FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE HEADQUARTERS, WESTBURN DRIVE, CAMBUSLANG, G72 7NA

PRESENT:

Marieke Dwarshuis (Chair) (MD)	Mhairi Wyllie (MW)
Fiona Thorburn (FT)	Brian Baverstock (BB) – Joined via VC 1315hrs
Nick Barr (NB)	

IN ATTENDANCE:

Kirsty Darwent (KD)	Chair of the Board
David McGown (DMcG)	Deputy Chief Officer & Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) for Portfolio
Mark McAteer (MMcA)	Director of Strategic Planning, Performance & Communications
T/DACO Stuart Stevens (SS)	Strategic Planning & Performance
DACO Jim McNeil (JMcN)	Head of Service Delivery, East SDA
DACO Paul Stewart (PS)	Head of Training & Employee Development (TED)
DACO John MacDonald (JMacD)	Executive Lead for Service Delivery Model Programme & Business Support Manager
AM Andrew Girrity (AG)	Programme Manager, Service Delivery Model Programme
AM Darren Riddell (DR)	Programme Manager, Service Transformation Programme
Gillian Buchanan (GB)	Deputy Programme Manager
Siobhan Hynes (SH)	Programme Officer
Vlad Valiente (VV)	Legal Services
Richard Whetton (RW)	Head of Corporate Governance
Linda Mackenzie (LMacK)	Human Resource & Organisational Development (HROD)Manager – Business Partner
Sandra Fox (SF)	Head of Information and Communications Technology (ICT)
Hazel Black (HB)	ICT Business Analyst
Heather Greig (HG)	Board Support Executive Officer
Margaret Kyle (MK)	Minutes

OBSERVERS

Chris McGlone (CMcG)	Fire Brigades Union (FBU)
Karen Horrocks (KH)	Internal Audit
Ian Wallace (IW)	Internal Audit
Derek Smith (DS)	Fire and Rescue Division, Scottish Government

| Jordan Murray (JM) | Fire & Rescue Division, Scottish Government |
| Asha Narsapur (AN) | Legal Services |

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

1.1 MD welcomed everyone to the Transformation and Major Projects Committee (TMPC) and requested attendees provide introductions for the benefit of Darren Riddell, Project Manager who has recently joined the Programme Office Team. MD welcomed those observing from FBU, Legal Services, Scottish Government and Internal Audit. BB would join for the latter half of this meeting due to a prior appointment.

1.2 Apologies were received from:
Sarah O'Donnell, Director of Finance & Contractual Services
GM Alasdair Cameron, Board Support Manager
Iain Morris, Head of Asset Management

2 CONSIDERATION OF AND DECISION ON ANY ITEMS TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE

2.1 Agreed draft Minute from previous Private Meeting of 9 May 2019 to be taken in private. No other business to be taken in private.

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

3.1 N/A

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PUBLIC MEETING: 9 May 2019

4.1 SS role not accurately reflected and should read *Strategic Planning & Performance.*

4.2 This Minute was approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting subject to the above amendment being accurately reflected.

5 ACTION LOG

5.1 The TMPC Rolling Action Log was discussed and actions agreed and updated.

6 PROGRAMME OFFICE BOARD ROLLING ACTION LOG

6.1 DMcG advised that the Programme Office Board now meets monthly. This is due to SMT business being taken care of through other executive arrangements in the Service. DMcG held the view POB required increased scrutiny and management, particularly throughout the next few months, with a view to providing project executive leads and managers additional opportunities to schedule papers coming forward to this Committee.

7 SERVICE TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS

7.1 DR introduced the Service Transformation Projects and Dashboard and provided the Committee with an overview on OHCA, Safe & Well, RRU, Service Delivery Model Programme, SFRS Youth Volunteer Scheme, Climate Change project and RVDS Strategy.

7.1.1 Discussion took place around the following projects.

7.1.2 **OHCA** – Committee sought reassurance in relation to OHCA, particularly around the longstanding relationship with Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS), especially given there were three ambers within the Dashboard. DMcG explained the main challenge was around tying in with SAS's own Human Resource processes to get the seconded paramedic officer to work with our Programme Manager and then subsequently three paramedics to deliver training. DMcG provided re-assurance that this was on track.

7.1.3   The Committee sought further re-assurance from DMcG in relation to costs. DMcG reported that SFRS pay for SAS seconded officers' time however this would slip depending on when the paramedics commence their secondment. There will be an additional cost for 2020 due to slippage in post for this year. DMcG was reasonably confident and agreed to obtain further re-assurance at the next POB meeting before reporting back to TMPC.

7.1.4   MMcA reported agreement through the Reform Collaboration Group (RCG) where this project is reported to the Chief and Chair of SAS. Any issues arising can be dealt with through that forum.

7.1.5   **Safe & Well (S&W) Project** – MD requested an update around the finance of this project. DMcG explained that as the S&W project had not defined exactly how much funding was required ahead of the Business Case Process to identify which projects would receive resource and capital funding for this financial year, it was not deemed the highest priority. The Project Manager had reverted back and reported that should funding not be identified for this project either this year or next year, the implementation of the project would slip by 6-9 months. Discussion was held at the last POB to identify what funding would be needed for 2019-20 and what could appropriately be spent within the procurement rules for this financial year and what was also needed for next year. DMcG reported this was actively being undertaken and would tie in with the Service's Business Case Process for the next financial year. Programme Office Board (POB) and Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) would determine what is needed by way of capital resources during the next few months. DMcG reported Martin Tait and Hilary Sangster would come forward to the next POB with an update on how much funding was required.

7.1.6   **RRU** – DMcG reported that whilst showing amber for quality there were no concerns relative to overall vehicles and equipment. DMcG wanted to ensure correct sequencing of reports. It was anticipated a Closing Report would come forward to POB followed by an Evaluation Report looking at quality of appliances, equipment and any other potential issues moving forward. DMcG explained that further work was required to complete the Closing Report which had resulted in the delay in coming forward to TMPC.

7.1.7   The Committee queried the timeline for the completion of the Closing Report and suggested more efficient timescales around Closing Reports should be considered.

7.1.8   The RRU Closing Report would be submitted to the next Committee meeting in November.

7.2   **Service Delivery Model**

7.2.1   JMacD provided the Committee with an overview of the Framework document for the Service Delivery Model Programme and identified delivery phases for five projects, including resources allocated to each programme, governance processes and timelines for each phase of each project.

7.2.2   MD sought clarification around timelines, highlighting that the indicative timescales did not reflect the timescales within the High-Level Plan. It was also noted that the Futures Vision had been identified as an urgent starting point, however, the Committee had not yet seen the project dossier.

7.2.3   JMacD reported that the timelines take cognisance of the combined projects which form the programme and are based on the knowledge and understanding of the project managers. The project dossiers would be submitted to POB then brought forward to the next TMPC meeting in November. Once the project dossiers had been through POB the High-Level Plan would be updated.

7.2.4   Assurance was given that each project would be subject to a research and scoping phase, options appraisals and implementation phase and submitted through the appropriate governance routes.

7.2.5   The Committee raised concerns around consistency of information brought forward and requested this be resolved prior to the next meeting.

7.2.6   The Committee supported the overview provided within the report subject to the indicative timescales given within the Framework Document and the High-Level Plan were updated accordingly and the project dossiers would be submitted to the November TMPC. It was recognised that this document would come back to TMPC regularly and thanked JMacD.

7.3   **RVDS Change Request/Dossier Phase 1**
7.3.1   JMacD reported this project is within the scope of the Service Delivery Model programme and will align the RVDS project and extend the reporting period for Phase 1 to align with the family of projects. JMacD requested extending first phase of this report to Q3 December 2019 whilst looking to add "improved attraction" as one of the specific objectives to this dossier.

7.3.2   Clarification was given that the Report on Phase 1 would be submitted to POB in December followed by a report to the February TMPC. Committee agreed the Change Request.

7.4   **SFRS Youth Volunteer Scheme Change Request**
7.4.1   DMcG informed the Committee of a change with the Executive Lead due to DACO Peter Heath having moved post to the R&R Directorate and DACO John Miller now Head of Service Deliver for the West SDA. This project has now gone through the developmental phase and is now in the implementation phase.

7.4.2   The Committee agreed the Change Request.

7.4.3   The Committee sought clarification on £200k which was invested in this project. DMcG advised his intention was to write to Scottish Government to provide assurance around funding made available to us this financial year and what the project will do within the next financial year. DMcG awaiting assurances from Project Manager who is currently working with Finance & Contractual Services colleagues prior to responding to Scottish Government.

7.5   **Climate Change Termination Report**
7.5.1   DMcG provided background information and provided reasons behind discontinuing with this project. This project was previously listed on the dashboard as part of the original programme. The overall vision of the service was to change and address the needs of climate change in Scotland. DMcG provided assurance work is being undertaken within executive structures relative to electric fleet, response, prevention and flood risk mapping etc. It was therefore considered that there was no requirement to formally commence with the Climate Change Project.

7.5.2   Committee requested the report reflect the examples of work continuing in the background and that consideration of climate change would be ongoing. DMcG reported an Executive Board had already been set up chaired by Sarah O'Donnell which supports Climate Change. DMcG would update the paper to reflect this.
                                                                                      ACTION: DMcG

7.5.3 Committee held the view if project was to be removed from the High-Level Plan this cannot be authorised at this Committee therefore any amendments to High Level plan will require Board approval.

ACTION: DMcG

8 MAJOR PROJECTS
8.1 Dashboard
8.1.1 DR introduced Major Projects Cover Paper together with Dashboard and provided Committee with overview upon each project.

8.1.2 Committee raised concerns why McDonald Road was showing green for time and cost within Dashboard.

8.1.3 DMcG acknowledged Committee's concerns and proceeded to provide update associated with time and cost and advised that a report would be submitted to the November meeting.

8.1.4 DMcG reported that the Asset Management team are in close contact with Pick Everard, the main Contractor for McDonald Road. To date the Head of Asset Management has no knowledge of the design specification, solution nor the associated costs or materials from the Architect but this is being worked on and once determined the cost in terms of additional capital and what this will mean in terms of time and delay for this project will be known. Once this information was available a report would be submitted to the next POB.

8.1.5 Committee sought clarification where the figure of £2million at May's TMPC was derived. DMcG reported this figure may have been indicative.

8.1.6 MD raised concerns in respect of verbal reports requesting available information be incorporated within the dashboard to assist in producing meaningful reports and further explained the dangers of undermining the governance process.

8.1.7 MD requested additional clarity in respect of current activity at the McDonald Road site. DMcG reported whilst the main issue relates to the McDonald Road roof, alternative work is currently being undertaken at the wider McDonald Road re-development site.

8.1.8 Revised Delivery Plan to November meeting to include financial implications together with wider implications upon the capital budget across the board, re-allocation of funds may be required.

ACTION: IM/DR

8.2 Business Process Review Phase 1 Closing Report
8.2.1 SF reported Closing Report had been through the Business Process Project Board and POB and handed over to Hazel Black, Senior Business Analyst to provide further information.

8.2.2 HB reported project did not deliver on time and was subject to extensions due mainly to resources taken to complete this project. In terms of cost this was delivered to considerable underspend. This project achieved many of the original quality milestones. An extension to scope incorporated a Cultural Diagnostic exercise which assessed the organisation's readiness for change. Further recommendations are being followed up by Sarah O'Donnell as Executive Lead. Item 3.1 Success criteria within report were all met.

8.2.3   Committee was content with the Business Processes and believed this will provide further opportunities beneficial to the organisation, however, wanted to know what were the next steps.

8.2.4   MMcA reported this will be used as a landing pad which will pick up learning from projects, tools utilised and adaptation of tools with a view to becoming part of the Service Improvement Programme. It is anticipated a suite of service improvement projects will be commissioned and become part of the Business Improvement process for the whole service.

8.2.5   Committee thanked SF and HB for report and agreed to accept Business Process Review as a closing report.

8.3   **PVG Project Dossier**
8.3.1   LMacK provided background information on PVG Project Lead. This was previously brought to TMPC in May 2019 with subsequent project dossier completed and brought forward to August TMPC for approval. LMacK summarised key points within dossier.

8.3.2   Committee raised concerns around what the service is doing at operational level to mitigate PVG risks prior to 2021 and sought re-assurance around organisational and reputational risk.

8.3.3   LMacK provided explanation around reasonable timescales, prioritisation and tracking areas of risk using interdependencies and further explained there were planned approaches for each area. MMcA provided further assurances that the service is taking every possible step to mitigate any potential risk. DMcG explained mitigation of risks will be covered within the project along with the provision of operational guidance documents and discussed at the next POB. Project Managers have been asked to provide their top risks and will be included within the portfolio of the Risk Register and escalated if necessary.

8.3.4   MD requested the Corporate Risk Register in relation to the impact of PVG checks is reviewed.

ACTION: LMacK

8.3.5   Committee requested further clarification upon Communications and Engagement and what was being delivered to personnel. LMack looking in more detail around concerns and mitigating fears and is in discussions with rep bodies.

8.3.6   Committee sought clarification why the cost of PVG has decreased from circa £900K to circa £411K. LMacK reported latter figure was spread over the whole range of the project and based on the initial estimate of all uniformed members of staff. This figure may decrease over time. DMcG advised some of the underspend will be allocated towards PVG project for this financial year and then a business case put forward for next financial year.

8.3.7   Committee agreed PVG Project Dossier.

9   **LEGACY REFORM PROJECTS**
9.1   **Dashboard**
9.1.1   DR introduced Legacy Reform Projects and associated Dashboard and provided Committee with an overview of each project.

9.1.2   **Operational Intelligence Ph3 Closure** - delayed until next quarter due to gathering of information.

9.2   New Watch Duty System Closing Report

9.2.1   Due to DACO Jim McNeil having been called away on business, RW provided Committee with update upon the New Watch Duty System, particularly further information identified under Lessons learned/identified. As of June 2019, SFRS has up-to-date staffing models. R&R have established Staffing Project to undertake a full review of processes.   The Project Team have reviewed internal and external business processes.   Cross Directorate Working Group will continue to look at reviewing retirement and recruitment.

9.2.2   Committee were content with the additional information provided under Lessons Learned, however, sought clarification around costs and overtime.

9.2.3   DMcG advised due to many factors it was difficult to pin point and almost impossible to extract this information, however, if required, would provide graph to provide some indication. DMcG advised overtime was back on track and budgeted daily.

9.2.4   The Committee recognised the magnitude of overspend on overtime.   JMcN joined meeting and proceeded to provide update on the monitoring of overtime and the benefits of the flexi duty system being able to capture annualised hours.

9.2.5   Committee requested updated Benefits Implementation Policy comes back to TMPC in 12 months indicating overview of original benefit, greater flexibility and overall savings having been realised. Committee requested highlighting within report the significant difficulties around the implementation period due to key issues not being adequately anticipated.

ACTION: RW

9.2.6   Committee agreed to close project on the proviso Benefits Implementation Review comes back to TMPC.

9.2.7   *JMcN departed TMPC 12:15hrs.*

10   **GENERAL REPORTS**
10.1   **Gateway Review Action Plan**
10.1.1   RW provided Committee with verbal report on the Gateway Review Action Plan particularly in relation to 1) assurance on how actions are validated and 2) clarification regarding contingencies for the Committee's information with a view to closure.

10.1.2   RW reported having agreed with the SRO that further scrutiny and detailing is required and this will go forward to the next POB Meeting on 28 August with a view to being brought forward to November TMPC.

10.1.3   Committee sought clarification on contingency planning and the validation of actions. RW advised the contingency arrangements are informed by the assessment of risks relevant to each project and reported that additional assurance on validation of actions would be provided through routine management follow-up and internal audit which will commence in October.

10.1.4   RW referred to the two points within the Gateway Review Action Log. Committee were content considering these are completed and requested full update with the associated action plan for the next TMPC in November.

ACTION: RW

10.2   **Delivery Plan**

10.2.1 Committee were mindful that the Delivery Plan requires to go back to the Board with the proposal that the Climate Change issue as a Project is taken out and the reason provided for this. Indicative timelines for projects require further updating.

10.2.2 RW reported version control has now been introduced with the intention to bring to TMPC for comment then to the Board for approval. High Level plan will require to be maintained in terms of an updated document giving accurate reflection of change activity. RW considered the High Level Plan would require to be a regular feature at TMPC.

10.2.3 Committee sought clarification on the anticipated approach to baselining. RW agreed with Committee's understanding whereupon it is anticipated to get to a stage where we are content to baseline.

10.2.4 Committee content with updated Delivery Plan with this being submitted to Board with the request for change and reviewed timelines.

ACTION: RW

10.3   **Benefits Management Strategy**

10.3.1 RW provided TMPC with update upon the Benefits Management Strategy and commended GB for her efforts in preparation of this paper. RW reported this was an explanatory document demonstrating trackable benefits. Baselining is also a key part of this document and working towards a more defined approach to benefits.

10.3.2 Committee sought clarification on the approach relative to double counting in relation to multiple projects and benefits. RW reported his main concern was baselining and ensuring we have trackable data. Discussions arose around Lessons learned and whether Benefits Realisation was a place to capture lessons learned/lessons identified.

10.3.3 Committee welcome approach to Benefits Management Strategy, however, sought clarification on benefits profiling and retrospective tracking for each project, how this would be undertaken and any benefits tracking beyond project closure.

10.3.4 DMcG assured Committee retrospective tracking will be undertaken where possible. MMcA highlighted as part of the long-term strategy some of these benefits will feature as part of the Performance Framework.

10.3.5 MD raised the issue of the TMPC role and whilst content with strategy wished to ensure there is an individual benefits portfolio for each project incorporating baseline, tracking method and benefits. Committee requested either population of table or individual Benefits Profile for all current projects come back to February 2020 TMPC.

10.3.6 DMcG agreed to work with Project Managers to develop Benefits Management Strategy. It was suggested that Benefits Management Strategy be a standing TMPC Agenda item moving forward with a view to providing TMPC assurance systems are in place and benefits progressed and tracked moving forward.

ACTION: RW

10.3.7 RW agreed to provide further reiteration of Benefits Management strategy for November TMPC Meeting.

ACTION: RW

11   **COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT UPDATE**

11.1   **Communications and Engagement Principles**

11.1.1   MMcA provided update/introduction of Comms & Engagement Principles for noting by the Committee. MMcA advised that the Head of Comms & Engagement was working to strengthen the approach around Comms & Engagement across the whole programme as well as individual projects. MMcA reported taking the National Standards of Engagement and build this into Comms & Engagement moving forward.

11.1.2   MMcA reported the Legal Team have had discussions and will determine how we comply with National Engagement standards to ensure we comply with best practice which currently exists in Scotland. It is also intended to support this to ensure each plan for the programme and each project complies with the strategy. Looking to build up performance aspects from Comms & Engagement and endeavouring to track what we promise to deliver in terms of Comms & Engagement processes with a view to meeting National Standards and report back to the Committee in due course.

11.1.3   MMcA reported strengthening the approach to Stakeholder Management driven by both analysis of Transformation consultation and work undertaken with focus groups (*not yet reported to the Board*) along with work having come through from the Communications and Strategic Plan. Recurring themes have been noted i.e. lack of understanding of certain terminology. MMcA reported further work required upon Framework with the intention of working with the Project Managers/Programme Office Team and produce Programme Plan for Comms & Engagement for November TMPC along with as many of the Project Plans as possible.

11.1.4   MW raised concerns around the following:
- "Genuine" engagement language used and requested reinforcement on the value around "genuine engagement".
- Engagement Plans being regional or national.
- Confusing the difference between "*inform, communicate and engage*" and suggested looking at the NHS Delivery Matrix.
- Item 3.5.3 Working Together - Description under the standards and what this means.
- Item 3.7.1 Engagement - Evidence could be clearer upon understanding the needs of Service and our Stakeholders.
- Third Sector is not recognised as a Stakeholder.
- Language around managing stakeholders, suggested "*managing relationships with Stakeholders.*"
- Insufficient evidence within training section.

11.1.5   MMcA gave assurances around MW's observations and would incorporate the amendments into the plan.

11.1.6   In relation to dedicated Communications Officers for individual projects, MMcA gave assurance that Comms & Engagement would act as a business partner to assist staff and maintain key relationships between the Programme Office and Comms team.

11.1.7   MMcA reported that the Head of Communications and Engagement or her deputy would attend regular Programme Office meetings to ensure individual projects come forward within the Service Transformation Comms Plan.

11.1.8   The initial Comms & Engagement plan would be submitted to the November TMPC meeting.

ACTION: MMcA

12   **RISK**

12.1   **Risk Tracker/Dashboard**

12.1.1   RW reported during the previous Programme Office Board the Risk Tracker was reviewed which resulted in no changes. In relation to the TMPC action, the SRO led discussions to determine if the Risk Tracker was fit for purpose in terms of management of risk. The outcome was the continuation of the re-formatting of work which will go forward to the SRO on 28 August. The Programme Office is currently working with all Project Managers to identify all key risks within each individual risk action log and provide focus on middle ground in terms of risk. Those attending the next POB will be asked to discuss their high-level risks. RW reported this would assist in pulling out actions from individual Risk Registers.

12.2   **Strategic Risk Register**

12.2.1   RW reported SFRS Risk & Audit Manager would contact all Directorates to request all risks are reviewed and mitigated as required. The revised Strategic Risk Register format will be reported to ARAC on 10 October and submitted to SLT on 23 December.

12.2.2   The Chair requested BB's view from an Audit and Risk perspective. BB advised he had discussions with David Johnston on how to simplify the presentation of the Risk Register and this was work in progress. BB reported within the Audit Plan for this current year having a review of Risk Management and was keen to use this review process to inform any changes. BB was mindful of the timing of this work in terms of developing a new presentation and highlighted two options, with option 2 his preferred route. Option 1 – make changes which are reviewed by Audit Process *or* Option 2 – use the Audit process to inform changes. RW agreed it made sense to take the recommendations from the audit process and held the view, given the acceleration of the Programme Office Board, to focus more on risk.

12.2.3   MD content Risk Tracker/Dashboard is taken forward through the Programme Office Board with a report back to the next TMPC.

12.2.4   MD also referred to the Strategic Risk Register, particularly the governance process for specific strategic risks having been allocated to specific Committees and raised concerns around the corporate risk flowing from strategic risk having failed to deliver service transformation and highlighted this is no longer relevant as it relates to the previous status. As we are now ahead of this process MD requested this is remedied as a matter of urgency.

ACTION: DMcG

12.2.5   DMcG provided MD assurance that each individual project is now reviewing their risks and our strategic risks will predominately be informed by those. SLT require to inform series of risks. DMcG reported the next POB will identify and collate the highest priority risks.

12.3   **Update on TED's Capacity To Deliver Training Associated With The Transformation Programme**

12.3.1   PS reported TED review is now complete. In terms of governance, a spotlight on the TED review is being applied by the Staff Governance Committee on 5 September. The full TED Review, Report and recommendations will be presented to the SLT Business Briefing on 12 August thereafter to the formal SLT on 26 August prior to going to Staff Governance Committee on 5 September.

12.3.2   PS provided TMPC with update on TED's capacity to deliver associated training to quality and time.

12.3.3   PS reported all service transformation projects are included within TED's organisational training needs analysis which is conducted annually and is scheduled into the wider training programme. In respect of governance arrangements, TED will report through POB. There are some issues around transformation projects and some of the wider challenges flowing from the TED review which start to look at resource and capacity implications which are acknowledged and referenced within the report and will be discussed at SLT as part of recommendations. The TED review has made phasing recommendations which will aid discussions around organisational prioritisation, type of training and delivery.

12.3.4   Recommendations have also been split into four key groupings allowing round discussions as opposed to an individual capacity.   PS content governance arrangements are wrapped around the discussions to be had at SLT.

12.3.5   Committee raised concerns how TED will ensure appropriate capacity to deliver transformation training at the appropriate time. PS advised he is looking at the desired end state of the Training department and function and aims to mould flexibility into the training capacity enabling flexibility based on the organisational training requirement. This will involve decisions around prioritisation to allow some of the Transformation projects prioritisation over other parts of training.

12.3.6   PS provided assurance around TED flexibility through recommendations within the TED Review, namely increasing the number of Instructors by re-engaging staff who have previously worked in TED and who are no longer employed by SFRS; enhancing the number of instructional staff who work on fire stations in an operational capacity.   PS reported looking at qualified individuals and staff members who undertake different roles who can be pulled into the TED environment, however, this may result in challenges maintaining appliance availability. PS advised he is also looking at individuals who are designated as national instructors within the national instructor pool and local instructors. PS also proposed to bring these instructors into cluster environments to allow crossover of training.

12.3.7   DMcG provided additional assurance that as much work as possible has been undertaken to identify demand, have knowledge of immediate priorities up to the end of this financial year i.e. OHCA and MTA and the skills to shift resources as necessary and that training was in place to support the programme. Any additional costs would be considered through Business Cases currently being developed. It was anticipated delivery timescales would be reported on in November.

12.3.8   It was noted that the impact on the operational service delivery aspect of the TED review would be observed through the Service Delivery Committee.

12.3.9   MD sought clarification upon two points as follows:
(1)   Governance, particularly delivery of recommendations and the implementation stage of recommendations. Should we reconsider the delivery stage of recommendations considered through TMPC as opposed to Staff Governance?

RW reported this will be part of the SLT discussions upon forming a Project or Programme Board and will report back in due course where this will sit.

(2)   Depending on the progress of conversations with rep bodies and based on some form of agreement being reached, MD requested update comes forward with indication of delivery and training. DMcG agreed to put TED's capacity to deliver Training placed on Forward Plan for November TMPC.

ACTION: BST

12.3.10 Committee sought further clarification at which point will TMPC know the overall assessment of training needs across various projects and at what point will this be completed and compared to capacity along with clear plans how capacity can be adapted to meet needs. DMcG advised it was hoped this information would be covered at the next TMPC in November.

12.3.11 PS reiterated the training content and the delivery models required to deliver training are now available. Training courses for MTA and OHCA have been developed. Volume and scheduling will go hand in hand.

12.3.12 Committee advised it may be appropriate for other support functions i.e. ICT/HR to indicate their capacity to support the Service Transformation Programme. MD's preference would be to wait for the revised Strategic Risk Register to be presented to the Committee before determining what areas to spotlight.

12.4 **TMPC Action Log – Risks Reconsidered**
7 February 2019
Item 12.14 – Committee agreed Spotlighting complete therefore can be closed.
Item 12.14 – Corporate Risk – remains open.

9 May 2019
Item 14.1.3 – Remain Open. Committee have not had sight of reporting format. Risk Register to be updated to read "Ongoing. Verbal update received at TMPC on 8 August 2019".

13 **COMMITTEE ROLLING FORWARD PLANNING**
13.1 Items added to Committee Rolling Forward Plan as follows:

Updated High Level Plan
Service Delivery Model Programme - Project Dossiers
RDS Options Report (February)
Final Version of Benefits Strategy for decision.
Outcome of Training Reviews
Communications Plan – Standing Item
Benefits Realisation Plan – Standing Item
Closing Report for RRU's
Closing Report for Operational Intelligence
Risks

13.2 **Items for consideration at Future IGC, Board and Strategy Day Meetings**
Board - Climate Change and change to High Level Plan
IGC – Conversation around the TED capacity and support capacity.

13.3 MD concluded meeting by advising she will stand down as Chair of TMPC, however, will remain on TMPC until her time on the Board has concluded as this will provide continuity. Fiona Thorburn will Chair the TMPC moving forward. On behalf of the Executive, DMcG formally thanked MD for her contribution to the programme and development of the service throughout her seven years as Chair of the Committee.

13.4 On behalf of the Board, FT also thanked MD and acknowledged her role as Chair and her exemplary method of challenge throughout her tenure.

14   **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
14.1   7 November 2019 @ 1000hrs, Training Centre Conference Room, Perth Fire Station, 401 High Street, Perth, PH1 1PL

 PRIVATE SESSION

15   **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS TMPC PRIVATE MEETING: 9 MAY 2019**
15.1   Committee agreed the Private Minute as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting.

16   **ACTION LOG**
16.1   The Committee considered the action log and noted the updates.

17   **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
17.1   As above.

17.2   There being no further matters to discuss, the meeting closed at 14:30hrs.