

2009 Census Rehearsal Evaluation Governance

January 2010

Table of contents

1. Definition and scope for rehearsal.....	4
2. Evaluation findings	5

2009 Rehearsal - Governance

1. Definition and scope for rehearsal

In project management terms, the 2011 Census represents a large scale programme of work, comprising a number of individual but interdependent projects delivered by General Register Office for Scotland (GROS) and outsourced contractors.

The Programme Management Office (PMO) provides a central function that ensures the work across all projects is properly planned, resourced, co-ordinated and managed within a consistent framework and overall timetable.

That supporting infrastructure can be broken down into a number of key functions:

- project planning;
- management of budgets and resources;
- risk, issue, change and configuration management (including information management systems);
- quality assurance (QA) processes;
- operational quality management;
- management information; and
- business continuity.

What was tested:

- all above with exception of business continuity.

What could not be tested

The governance arrangements agreed with both the logistics and postal service providers for the rehearsal were scaled to match the low (relative to 2011 Census) volumes of supplies and questionnaires. The arrangements for 2011 will necessarily require to be more comprehensive and rigorous.

Formal business continuity processes were not tested in the rehearsal, but work is underway to develop and implement procedures focussed on the field enumeration phases into the programme, which will dovetail with existing contractual and other GROS domestic procedures.

2. Evaluation findings

- Pre – determined evaluation points

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
Milestone/workpackage plans	Milestone plan aligned with key rehearsal dates and service provider plans. Workpackage plans aligned with high level milestone plans and executed accordingly.	The planning process worked well and allowed the interdependencies between workpackages to be highlighted and managed. There were few changes to milestone delivery dates throughout the rehearsal period, pointing towards sound assumptions made during the initial planning process.	<p>Baseline the 2011 Census milestones before detailed work gets underway.</p> <p>Use the evaluation stage to re-confirm the various interfaces between workpackages so that these can be mapped and tracked.</p> <p>Continue to work closely with individual workpackage managers at the outset of planning for 2011 to ensure a consistent approach is taken.</p>	<p>Autumn 2009</p> <p>December 2009</p> <p>October 09 – January 2010</p>
Issues, risks and change management	a) Issues and change: procedures are recognised by staff and adhered to appropriately. Procedures are easy to follow and not overly time consuming, focussed to allow capture of key	a) Staff are not following the defined PMO procedures and therefore the effectiveness could not be measured (although	a) PMO to ensure we continue to manage issues well for the 2011 Census.	December 2009

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
	<p>information required and decisions for resolution.</p> <p>b) Risks: Mitigating actions are built into plans as required and actioned. Clear contingency actions identified (with associated financial impact) and where the risk is realised, contingency action is rolled out quickly.</p>	<p>this has been tested previously). However, through the rehearsal an appropriate process was adopted by the Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) that ensured that issues were identified, discussed and managed at the correct forums. There is clear evidence this approach worked well</p> <p>No internal change requests were required for the rehearsal, but one has been raised for 2011. The process worked smoothly and can be replicated for 2011.</p> <p>b) Delivery strategies for the rehearsal took account of risk register and associated mitigations were ‘built into’ workpackage plans. Risk associated with payroll solution was realised to an extent, contingency action</p>	<p>Continue with current procedures for change control for 2011 Census.</p> <p>b) Continue to assess risks to delivery and ensure these are apparent in 2011 Census plans. Need also to detail how key contingencies would be rolled out in practice and ensure that this is documented in annex to</p>	<p>December 2009</p> <p>-</p> <p>by Spring 2010</p>

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		taken is described in payroll evaluation report. Contingency action was required in respect of delay with Disclosure Scotland process (see recruitment evaluation report)	delivery plans.	
Configuration management including quality assurance	The processes ensured that there was no ambiguity/confusion around draft and final versions of documents throughout the process and sources of input were identified that covered associated interdependencies (e.g. that GROS Systems and Services Census in Scotland (SaSCinS) IPT reps had input to development of field staff instructions.	Some issues were realised with the print quality assurance process (see print evaluation report) but these were implementation issues as opposed to process issues. Need for a replacement for 'Team Room' was apparent, given access difficulties for off-site contractor staff.	PMO to re-enforce messages about benefits of good configuration management to all staff, using introduction of new 'Team Room' facility as the opportunity to drive this message home.	From December 2009
Financial management	Funds available to cover work required at the right time and rehearsal delivered within set budget.	Funding issues were minor and were able to be managed in-year and within budget.	Analyse rehearsal evaluation to determine budget requirements (including design changes) for 2011 Census, in time to inform next Spending Review.	by Feb 2010

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
Management Information (MI) systems	<p>Did the MI System provide relevant and timely information to Programme Delivery Team (PDT) to manage the rehearsal process?</p> <p>Was the Excel spreadsheet user-friendly?</p> <p>Were the checkpoint dates the correct ones?</p>	<p>A hybrid approach was taken whereby daily progress meetings were implemented to manage live or 'real-time' issues with the field operation. This was supplemented by a set of pre-determined check points against key operational deliverables. This approach worked well and gave management sight of the key issues as they occurred. However, it was also the case that reporting progress against a specific check point measure at a point in time did not necessarily provide valuable qualifying information behind the measure. The type of check points selected did provide useful snapshots of progress and generally the frequency of reporting was about right. The delivery format worked but further work is required to identify the best format for</p>	<p>Continue with this approach for the 2011 Census, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify key aspects of delivery for each part of the 2011 Census design; • agree associated check points and targets/ success criteria for each; • ensure that process is in place to provide background information in support of each check point measure; • review existing process against that adopted by Office for National Statistics (ONS) to identify where enhancements could be implemented; and • consider best format for delivering MI clearly, with limited administrative overheads. 	July 2010 and onwards

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		delivery for the 2011 Census.		
Managing operational delivery/project control (including cross area communication & decision making)	<p>That the governance structure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Project Teams (IPTs), ; • Technical Management Team (TMT), • Programme Delivery Team (PDT; and • Census Programme Board (CPB) <p>has helped to ensure timely and accurate delivery at each level of the programme, facilitating good communication and informed decision making to support the successful delivery of the rehearsal.</p>	<p>Feedback from staff is that the governance structure has brought significant/ tangible benefit to the programme.</p> <p>IPTs have been instrumental in managing the myriad of interdependencies across delivery areas and have brought the anticipated improvement from the communication issues that affected the 2006 test.</p> <p>The TMT forum has worked well also in facilitating an integrated approach to development/delivery of Information Communication Technology (ICT) support systems. It was able to take a holistic</p>	<p>Continue with existing governance structure for 2011, with the following recommendations:</p> <p>IPTs – On occasion, the communication ‘ethos’ was not followed consistently, so re-enforce the key messages.</p> <p>TMT – The TMT can at times be subsumed by detailed technical issues more appropriate and would be benefit from finding a better balance between problem solving and managing technical development holistically.</p>	

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		<p>management remit, leaving day to day management of each specific technical project to the assigned technical board. The TMT was therefore able to escalate exceptions that may have across cutting impact to the PDT. However, we have to be careful that TMT do not get subsumed with detailed technical issues, which happened on occasion during the rehearsal.</p> <p>The PDT has met its operational delivery remit and now interacts in a more streamlined manner with CPB. However, there may be benefit in increasing the forward thinking strategic role and in reducing the reliance of IPTs on the PDT to be the key decision forum.</p> <p>The above forums have</p>	<p>PDT – Increase forward thinking strategic role and allow more scope for other management issues to be reviewed. Delegate more authority to IPTs for decision making, with IPTs and PDT communicating more via exception reporting.</p> <p>CPB to continue with</p>	

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		allowed CPB to concentrate more on key strategic decisions and our interaction with the other UK Census Offices.	same remit for 2011.	
Evaluating the 2009 rehearsal	The evaluation strategy and associated processes guide operational leads to produce a set of consistent and detailed analyses for each operational area tested in the rehearsal, with evidence based lessons learned and recommendations identified for 2011. The evaluation reports are agreed by all stakeholders in each operational area, including associated service providers.	<p>The process of identifying in advance the key aspects of each operational area, with associated success criteria and measurement methods worked well. This focused the minds of the operational leads to determine exactly how they would use the rehearsal to test their solutions/processes and in turn capture recommendations for 2011.</p> <p>The system used to capture from recommendations the 'shopping list of change' for 2011 worked well. It allowed senior managers to assess holistically proposed changes across</p>	<p>Use the 2009 rehearsal evaluation strategy as the base for evaluation of the 2011 Census.</p> <p>Consider how the quality review process can be streamlined to be less labour intensive.</p>	July 2010

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		<p>the programme and determine whether the change should be accepted or rejected.</p> <p>The templates produced for evaluation reports helped to achieve a consistent look and feel to all reports, which will hopefully result in a more user friendly experience than the 2006 test evaluation.</p> <p>The quality assurance process (carried out by senior managers) did allow a holistic view to be taken, but was resource intensive.</p>		

Pre – determined evaluation points (Contractual governance - CACI)

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
Detailed implementation plans	Plans that provide detailed focus for IPTs to deliver service specification, operational readiness test & live phases of the rehearsal in an integrated and controlled manner.	The Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) delivered in October 2008 for Print/Internet and Paper Data Capture and Coding (PDCC) did not deliver as clear a holistic view of the rehearsal as anticipated. However, this was subsequently rectified within each part of the solution as development progressed and the interdependencies became clearer. A delay was experienced with the PDCC solution, partly because the initial planning process had not identified clearly enough the need for an operational trial ahead of go live. However, a remedial plan was able to	<p>A different focus is placed on the 2011 Census Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP). This should provide a high level view as to how the contracted solutions connect with other interdependent areas of the programme (e.g. the enumeration and logistics timetables). Detailed planning will then focus on what needs to be delivered in the next phase of development, as opposed to providing too much detail too far in advance.</p> <p>Once plans are agreed, and especially that relating to the PDCC solution, we must endeavour to stay on line with this and not have</p>	November 2009

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		<p>be produced that provided focus for the remaining delivery.</p> <p>There were also a number of 'agreements to agree' which, once the detail of each solution became clearer, had to be factored in during development which caused problems.</p>	<p>a repeat of the 'agreements to agree' scenario that caused issues in the rehearsal.</p>	
Integrated Project Teams (IPT)	<p>The rehearsal contracted deliverables are delivered on time, taking into account interdependencies at a detailed level within contracts, with other contracts and with GROS domestic programme (such as fieldwork, print products design).</p>	<p>Contractual IPTs (like domestic IPTs) played a key role in the controlled delivery of the rehearsal. Clear charter statements were produced at the outset which defined the deliverables, timetable, roles & responsibilities within each IPT and the interfaces/dependencies with other solutions. A key factor was the proper use of delegated authority, with IPTs able to manage</p>	<p>Ensure, through a review of interfaces and roles & responsibilities, that systems integration is managed closely at both IPT and Joint Operations Board level.</p> <p>Given the complexity of the PDCC solution, it will be broken down into a set of workstreams which will essentially operate under IPT status, but which will report to an overarching</p>	<p>From December 2009</p>

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		associated issues and risks whilst getting the balance right when escalating up within the governance structure. However, the main service provider delegated authority to their sub contractors which led to integration problems.	IPT. Continue with current approach but review at pre-determined points in the 2011 timetable. The main service provider's systems integration role must be maintained across all IPTs.	
Interaction with internal governance procedures	Synergy between the domestic and contractual governance arrangements that allows consistency of approach across both aspects of the rehearsal project.	Feedback from staff involved in both contractual and domestic solutions is that there is a tangible benefit from this synergy. This has also identified some aspects of 'best practice' that can be subsumed into domestic IPTs.	Continue with current approach but review at pre-determined points in the 2011 timetable.	
Issue/risk/change and configuration management	The procedures allow potential hitches to planned delivery to be assessed, reported and actioned in a streamlined and efficient manner with due regard to impact on the wider project and resource.	The overriding picture is that risks and issues were managed fairly well during the rehearsal and were escalated when required. However, the IPTs did initially record every	IPTs to assess each identified issue/risk for potential impact on deliverables/timetable, before deciding whether it should be raised formally.	

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		potential issue and risk (bringing with it a significant administration overhead) as opposed to identifying issues/risks that would have a real impact on delivery.		
Financial model and management	The financial model provides a method through which the contractor can be recompensed for successfully delivery on time, whilst also providing a clear and manageable procedure for dealing with deviances from planned outcomes.	The rehearsal provided a very useful test of the financial model as there was a mixture of both straight forward planned payments and cases where milestone payments were either delayed, re-calculated (or both). This also allowed testing of the contractual processes for remedial planning, which worked very successfully. On the whole the financial model worked well and showed useful flexibility but suffered, on occasion, because the tight development timetable meant that authority and contractors staff had	Continue with existing model for 2011, but ensure that each milestone not only has clearly identified deliverables and success criteria but also, where possible and appropriate, pre-determined contingency action to counter delays occur or success criteria that are not met.	From December 2009

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		limited time to prepare supporting information in advance (including setting clear success criteria and contingency for late delivery).		
<p>Managing operational delivery/project control (including cross area communication & decision making)</p>	<p>That the governance structure for the contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Project Teams (IPT); • Joint Contract Management Team (JCMT); • Joint Technical Management Team (JTMT); and • Joint Executive Board (JEB) <p>provides for delivery at each level whilst ensuring good communication, integration of outsourced services across lead/sub contractors, clear escalation routes and informed decision.</p>	<p>The evaluation of IPTs has been covered above.</p> <p>a) The JCMT worked well overall, but required a mid-term re-refresh of the original Terms of Reference to re-focus on resources, relationships, change and the financial model.</p> <p>b) A weekly Risks, Issues, Actions, Decisions (RAID) forum provided a useful look across the solution</p> <p>c) The JTMT was originally intended as a 'technical expertise' forum but found that as the rehearsal progressed it</p>	<p>a) Continue with this forum under the revised Terms of Reference.</p> <p>b) Continue with this forum, as a route to highlight and review operational level issues arising from the IPTs</p> <p>c) Remove the JTMT, with technical delivery at the operational level managed by IPTs/RAID under</p>	

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		<p>became more of a progress checking forum, leading to some duplication of the IPT meetings.</p> <p>d) The JEB, which comprised the key senior managers on both sides (plus GROS contract manager), provided direction for the partnership and managed key commercial issues escalated by the JCMT. This was done in a good, pragmatic manner and showed strong leadership throughout the rehearsal period.</p>	<p>delegated authority.</p> <p>The Joint Operations Board (JOB) will replace the JTMT and will take on a traditional project board role, with high level progress reviewed monthly via exception reporting from each operational area.</p> <p>d) Continue with this forum.</p>	