



Governance Sub-Committee Meeting

Minutes

In Attendance

James Rigby (JR)
Rachel Taggart (RT)
Jane Goodes (JG)
Kirsty Dudley (KD)
Sally Hardman (SH)
Helen Chandler (HC)

Date: 27th April 2021

Time: 10:00

Facilitator: James Rigby

1. Introduction

James Rigby (JR) welcomed all to the meeting and confirmed the meeting agenda

2. Xoserve Change Fund

JR gave the background and that the change fund concept was discussed and approved in the budget last year, in September, through Change Managers and the newly raised Change Proposal was deferred in March

Kirsty Dudley (KD) stated that she is still not clear what is a CR and what a CP. Money aside, awareness is a priority as the change fund can cause more harm than good due to possible change impacts.

Sally Hardman (SH) advised that this had that with Gemini and that a change that was implemented and had customer impacts that were not highlighted.

JR understood the concerns and would take this on board.

KD doesn't trust that customer assessments take into consideration full customer impacts, however is willing to have a few tests to ensure no knock on effects before giving free rein to build trust.

Helen Chandler (HC) would want to ensure testing is wide enough to highlight defects in testing and not when live. This has previously had financial impacts on AQ's and doesn't want multiple task forces.

JR advised that Xoserve want to change direction and use the funds to improve the change process.

KD would like to see a few changes with transparency and understand what the benefits are show spending value on minor fixes. Will customers see speed and efficiency with fixes and does the benefit match the value of spend.

JR confirmed Xoserve need to articulate why/what we want to do and that it has no functional impacts on customer systems. Originally when we put this forward it was changes similar those in a minor release with more flexibility, which has been difficult to articulate and give an example.

JR introduced the idea of Project 1 stop – reimagining the funds. Instead of using for changes, we would use it for improving the customer experience on the website and change processes. Updating the website will come with a cost and Xoserve want to understand if this will add value, making the website easily accessible and getting info quicker.

KD said that attention to detail is a must as currently we have search in multiple places for documents and gave the change pack reference as an example.

SH emphasized the point and didn't want improvements to website still causing the same issues.

JR confirmed that we would need to utilise the resource we have to cost the user stories for improvements and customers to prioritise. There are some things that may only need tweaking and there are other things that will have a cost associated and that will take time and money to improve.

Essentially the Xoserve change fund will be a project to make improvements rather than spend the money on changes that can go into minor releases. JR went on to state that there could also be work /improvements in the UK Link space

KD stated that there could be others that are already improving the UK Link area e.g. REC space having a document repository.

Jane Goodes (JG) identified that the release pages need to be more interactive for customers that don't follow the process through ChMC.

KD/HC both affirmed this as they currently have to translate/interpret solution and design change packs. As they are written with the assumption whoever picks it up is already in the head space. Solutions don't have enough detail to understand which table, internal system it effects so will have to make assumptions. They are more governance speak and less techie.

JG assumed that the solution change packs have enough detail in to assess the impacts.

JR wants customers ideas to improve and build user stories to go into Capture get a wider view of the CP format and look at the current document formats. We will ask how to use the funds through the user stories with associated costs and get ChMC to approve priority on implementing.

JR confirmed that the next step is to get a list of pain points and how to improve the website and get costs.

KD suggested sending out a questionnaire to understand pain points.

SH concurred and could share with teams in the business to get a wider view on documents which may produce quick wins.

3. ChMC interactions with non-DSC-change-funded change programmes

JR gave an overview of non DSC changes and advised that there is another project to update on. Solution consultancy will be via the change function however they are not being funded by DSC. The financial side is discussed at CoMC.

KD infirmed that they use the same resource that need to spend time on all projects. They just need to know the physical impacts; is it behind the scenes updates that have no impact or is it functional and going out in change packs. KD confirmed that they don't need to see the funding just understand the impacts.

SH attends CoMC and advised that they see the financials but not the project updates and thinks they should see the progress. Change programmes are not governed the same and don't receive much of a refund. DSC change we get to see more and can challenge more with change programmes may get challenge on quality of what getting, however there needs to be more transparency in the business plan.

JR commented that there is £3.6m in DSC change and heavily governed and £36m associated with other investments so can see why customers would for more transparency. Need to find the right balance for Correla to move forward and customer interaction. JR thought that the CoMC update was a more granular level so will speak to Jayne McGlone.

SH thought that there should be an XRN associated and feel that the ChMC updates are still viable and needed.

KD would like to see a hub to include non DSC change projects so customers have one central place to see what is happening. Also need to have the documents located in one central place as currently customers working round what Xoserve doing not Xoserve following how best to work for customer.

JR stated that it is important to have this feedback to understand if we have the right level of transparency. To have a roadmap of change delivery in one place which needs to be less complicated. This makes project 1 stop even more prolific to bring forward. JR summarised that we need to take away what goes on in the contract space needs (to be revisited), ChMC need updates to be more relevant to the committee and continue to utilise the DSC meetings and Change pack process.

KD confirmed that the ChMC are the design decisions owners and need to be clear the financials are out of scope.

SH would like to see a link on the CP page that directs to the Project page

4. Financial Analysis and Management Information Discussion

JR advised that the HLSO on requirements with associated cost is on t-shirt size and complexity. Currently we don't publish the comparison of the HLSO against the other costs. Through each stage there is a refined view and we currently don't measure how accurate the HLSO change cost was. We have now started to track and show how costs develop for each change.

JR stated that the IGT constituency wants more transparency on how we get to the costs. JR asked what else customers want to see / if there is anything else needed

KD/SH both agreed that t-shirt sizing is an estimate and would like to understand the comparison to see how close Xoserve are.

KD suggested that we just to give details on why come to those estimates having the how/why a change is more expensive and need to think how we articulate the cost and effort.

JR confirmed from the analysis we have, shows that we are learning to estimate better.

5. AOB

KD raised the subject of her Change Pack response for the Map C change. The rep challenged the MI and stated that we need a better way to extract DDP information in relation to solutions.

JR said he will follow up and asked if there is a potential DDP delivery, how would you like it to work and noted that DDP and change are not communicating.

SH thinks that DDP should be considered with solutions.

JR agreed that there needs to be a better link between what is delivered in DDP and how this links with Change.

JR summarised and closed the meeting

Next Meeting

Thursday 27th July 2021 @ 10:00