

# SAVINGS PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE OPTIONS – Annex A



| Title  | Structure | Savings Responsibilities   | Mgt Board Responsibilities  | Savings Programme Deliverables   | Pros  | Cons   |
|--|-----------|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Standard MSP</b><br/>                     * Full responsibility for delivery rests with Savings programme – including policy, principles, delivery and member engagement.</p>  |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Direction of all savings streams policy, delivery, resourcing, timing, benefits and programme control.</li> <li>•Business Change</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Policy setting for single programme.</li> <li>- Savings Programme Board includes all Mgt Board members excluding Clerk.</li> <li>-DG are <b>not</b> SROs of savings streams.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Savings</li> <li>•The Changed Business</li> <li>• Programme Vision</li> <li>•Business Case (single)</li> <li>•Programme Definition, resources (right place right time)</li> <li>•risk and issue management</li> <li>•OGC Gate 0</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Maximises chances of savings being realised.</li> <li>•Benefits from best practice.</li> <li>•HoL impact managed centrally</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does not align with organisational culture.</li> <li>• Too hierarchical</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Delivery (Active Assurance)</b><br/>                     *"Managed Service" – Policy and business solutions rests with Savings streams. Savings programme responsible for all savings delivered through central programme office capability.</p> |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Direction of all savings streams in relation to dependency management, risk and issue management, benefits and financial management as central programme office; facilitate resource planning.</li> <li>•Consistent application of programme/project standards and practices</li> <li>•<b>Not</b> responsible for policy, business solution/change.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Policy setting for all strands of savings.</li> <li>-Escalation forum for all dependency, risk, issue and exception planning resolutions.</li> <li>-DGs are SROs of savings streams</li> <li>-Business Change through savings streams.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Savings</li> <li>•Programme controls and support delivery functions across all savings streams.</li> <li>•Assurance of individual programme report – production of whole savings delivery assurance report.</li> <li>•Business Case(s), savings programme vision, programme definition plus ....</li> <li>•OGC Gate 0</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides resources and ability to have central programme management capability without negating SRO (DG) accountability for individual strands.</li> <li>•Benefits from many elements of best practice whilst having a better "fit" with HoC structure.</li> <li>•HoL impact managed centrally</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does not fit with current departmental (silo) culture.</li> <li>•Dependency conflicts resolved at management board?</li> <li>•7 Distinct business cases.</li> </ul>                                      |
| <p><b>Assurance (Finance)</b><br/>                     *Finance assurance only. All other aspects of delivery out of scope.</p>  |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial information only.</li> <li>- Delivery of enhance finance reporting/management function.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Policy setting for all strands of savings delivery independently.</li> <li>-Active management and escalation forum for all dependency, risk, issue and exception planning resolutions.</li> <li>-DGs are SROs of savings streams.</li> </ul>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Finance Report</li> <li>•Finance Report production processes embedded.</li> <li>•Enhanced finance capability.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Simplicity.</li> <li>•Allows management board (and DGs) to resolve wider savings governance and delivery discussions directly (no need for coordinating layer)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Standard programme delivery responsibilities not addressed for the savings programme.</li> <li>•Increased savings programme resource not required.</li> <li>•HoL impact not managed centrally</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>None</b><br/>                     * Function moves into finance and programme structures stopped.</p>  |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None – stop the savings programme. Board disbands and resources reallocated to other tasks.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Everything without additional dedicated support to central activities.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Avoids additional reporting</li> <li>-Avoids any governance overhead</li> <li>-No standing resource cost for central coordination.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•All work still need to be done somewhere</li> <li>•Lack of overview for comms, TUS, etc</li> <li>•Duplication</li> <li>•HoL impact not managed centrally.</li> </ul>                                     |