From: James Papps [James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk]
Sent: 21 July 2006 14:21
To: Spence M (Matthew); Sharp DP (Damian)
Cc: Reeve W (Bill)
Subject: Re: Tram Governance etc

Matthew
Many thanks for this - I think this is a sensible and helpful summary of basic principles
to be followed in constructing a governance document.
The trouble with the TIE approach is that it has always been founded on attempts to fit
arrangements within the complicated and overlapping corporate structure formed by TIE, TEL
and CEC, rather than starting with optimal structure and working out relationships to
other existing bodies as the second stage. As Damian knows, this latest paper is also only
the most recent in a whole series - all attempting to make sense of project board
functions within complex corporate structures (hence perhaps the particularly disjointed
contents when read in isolation).
The concept of a project board should not be complicated. The precise wording of the
Readines Review in this regard was simply:
'Good practice suggests this board [the project board] is a small group comprising the
decision makers in respect of scope and funding and delivery.'
It goes on to say that 'the project board is the only forum through which key decisions in
respect of the scope of the project are determined'.
Just thinking about how best to move things forward constructively on Monday, perhaps the
key basic message that Damian and I should try to get across is that TIE need to forget
about complex corporate structures in first instance. Step 1 is to sketch out membership
of small board in line with recommendations of Readiness Review. Step 2 can then be to
work out what additional reporting/stakeholder communication is required within structure
of existing company boards etc. From a TS point of view, getting Step 1 right is key and
provides the forum in which TS participates in all key decisions. Step 2 is in a sense up
to TIE/TEL/CEC and more about stakeholder communication/management.
James
(PS In terms of membership, if 'tram tsar' is to be the senior CEC champion of project,
then do feel they should be on the board, as should the SRO - assuming this is a different
individual)

-----Original Message-----
From: Matthew.Spence@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk
<Matthew.Spence@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk>
To: Damian.Sharp@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk <Damian.Sharp@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk>;
James Papps <James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk>
Sent: Fri Jul 21 12:45:30 2006
Subject: Tram Governance etc

Damian / James

Following the conversation this morning my comments/views would be as follows: -

-        Better emphasis is required on the 3 core tasks of 1) building the system 2) establishing the framework in which it is to operate and 3) ensuring the latter informs the former in a balanced, constructive and timely manner.

-        The document generally suffers from not been developed organically, it attempts to jump to a final solution and in the process misses a number of issues.

-        The document gets lost in words - I simpler approach would also help to illustrate the gaps.
-        In my opinion a good governance document starts at the beginning and making subsequent clear statements on the following: -

o   The parties involved
o   The role and output requirements of each of those organisations
o   A definition of the relationship between each of those organisations
o   The position/nature of the required project board in relation to the above
-        Then you can start to identify the positions in each of those organisation (and the particular individuals in those posts) who are charged with managing the defined relationships and the competencies they possess in order to do that.

-        This should help to define a balanced and representative group of people (i.e. the project board) who have the ability to interact efficiently i.e. the group needs to be in the region of 6-8 people.

-        There is a need to focus on other key individuals namely the SRO, project director and tsar and define precisely how they relate to each other and in particular the board itself (I'm not sure any of these people would actually sit on the board). This would involve what management procedures these individuals will use to fulfil their duties e.g. the tram director could have a representative project working group (with various work streams) that sits below the board and helps to determine what is put up to the board. Looking at this layer of governance will also help to avoid board 'sub-committees' that in my personal view add to the complication and allow people and issues to be hidden/siloed away from the central management processes.

-        At this stage the ability to delegate will be better understood and therefore easier to implement.
-        Applying the above principles will also make it easier to tweak the governance arrangements as the project move through its lifecycle (also helped by a more professionally presented document).

Matthew

Matthew Spence

Deputy Head of Major Projects

Major Projects Group, Rail Delivery Directorate

Transport Scotland, Buchanan House (7/09)

58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow G4 0HF

TEL: ▉▉▉▉▉▉▉▉▉   MOB: ▉▉▉▉▉▉▉▉▉

TRS00002657_0003