

MSP Mandate for Change 2009

Introduction

This mandate for changes to OGC's practitioner guidance *Managing Successful Programmes* (MSP) is derived from issues discussed at the MSP Reference Group meeting on 9th July 2009 and the change request log.

In summary, the main areas identified as needing to change were as follows:

- to improve consistency between MSP and the other products in the portfolio, e.g. PRINCE2, M_o_R, P3O, etc.
- to address (selected) issues raised in the change request log.
- to address the issues discussed by the reference group.
- to remedy any inconsistencies within the content (see also change request log).
- to redesign the content according to OGC's updated style guidelines.

The reference group concerns and the issues on the change request log agreed four crucial areas for revision:

1. The benefits realisation management chapter
2. The risk management and issue resolution chapter
3. The quality management chapter.
4. Address inconsistencies and ambiguities in:
 - a) roles and responsibilities across the Themes, and the Flow,
 - b) information in Appendix A,
 - c) content of strategies and plans and how they differ.

Please note the change request log also includes additional specific requests for changes that the MSP Change Advisory Board has recommended for action in this revision.

Scope for change

- This is an interim revision NOT a major refresh.
 - Therefore it must not fundamentally change the structure process or approach of MSP
 - It is about re-wording not re-formulating the method
- It is not expected that entire sections will be rewritten rather the remit is to:
 - fix known errors
 - remove superfluous text
 - add new material where identified.
- No new internal inconsistencies are introduced when revisions are made

The following table expands to show these issues together with the actions recommended.

Annex A sets out the background to the proposed refresh of the guidance.

Issue	Recommendations
<p>1. Benefits The reference group views were that the benefits section was not clear enough. There was a call for separate additional and more detailed guidance on the subject that could be referenced rather than included in the MSP chapter. The current chapter was ranked 4 on a scale of 1 to 9 with 9 being good.</p>	<p>1.1 Need the definitions tightening up and applied consistently for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit • outcome • capability • outputs • tranche • transition • end goal. • clarify how capability relates to business change. <p>1.2 Process not clear as there are at least two phases, identification and delivery, at it's simplest but could also be described in more detail as define, plan, realise, and review. This could be dealt with as two separate chapters.</p> <p>1.3 Need to relate benefits more clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to justifying the programme in terms of cashable, the wider non-cashable/intangible and intended and unintended benefits. b) to benefits led planning <p>1.4 Improve the diagrams provided at Figure 7.5 and 7.8 as there are questions around their suitability as examples,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Figure 7.5 organisation changes should be enablers or products b) Figure 7.8 is inappropriate business change example <p>1.5 Stronger discussion of metrics</p> <p>1.6 Examples not so heavily focussed on policy programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) use of externally provided examples/case studies via a website was the favoured approach rather than just adding more examples to the manual as that makes reading and understanding it more difficult. <p>1.7 The benefits discussion should focus on programmes but should include the wider context of portfolios and projects</p> <p>1.8 Improved clarity around benefits owners (SRO) vs. BCMs.</p>
<p>2. Risk The reference group's views on this chapter took on board the revision to MoR which has provided an opportunity for a coherent approach to risk in MoR, MSP and eventually PRINCE2.</p>	<p>2.1 Need to strengthen and expand the discussion around risk escalation, aggregation, delegation and mediation.</p> <p>2.2 Make reference to MoR process, better integration of the two perspectives.</p> <p>2.3 Focus on programme level risk but set the context within portfolio, programme, project risk and operational risk.</p> <p>2.4 Clarify what a programme manager needs to know about projects, level of detail and expectation from project level.</p> <p>2.5 Clarity around dealing with assumptions and the risks they pose to the programme.</p> <p>2.6 Greater clarity around issue resolution</p> <p>2.7 Greater clarity around which Strategy defines what rules e.g. Risk Mgt/Issue Resolution vs. M&C</p>
<p>3. Quality The reference group's views were that this chapter was too abstract.</p>	<p>3.1 The current chapter was neither necessary nor sufficient for quality in programme environment, see Fig 12.1. It needs greater clarity on the scope of the chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) it's about assessing fitness for purpose at a programme level, acceptance criteria and outcomes b) it needs to talk about outcomes, benefits, outputs and capabilities c) it's about the right project done in the right way d) it's about a range of approaches to quality in the context of different programmes and roles of the stakeholders. e) clarity over what a programme should be checking vs. project responsibility f) more clarity that CSFs can also be outcome based not just relating to programme management e.g. risk <p>3.2 The roles and responsibilities needs to be tightened</p> <p>3.3 Need a discussion of tools and how to do it</p>

Issue	Recommendations
	3.4 MSP should set the scene not provide all the specifics but it should address the solutions not the problems.
4. Change Log	4.1 Align risk principles, types and opportunity responses with PRINCE2 and MoR 4.2 Provide guidance for how multiple BCMs should be managed 4.3 RACI Tables and ownership not clearly defined and inconsistent with the new PRINCE2, move to PRINCE2 approach. Table A.5 in particular needs to be reviewed and revised. Remove inconsistencies with what it says in the text about responsibilities. 4.4 need to improve the discussion around overlapping tranches and projects and ensure consistency with the diagram. Also clarity over when end of tranche occurs. 4.5 Blueprint needs to show current, intermediate states not just the end state 4.6 Need to cover the emerging role of the Programme Director, i.e. someone to whom the SRO delegates day to day responsibility for the programme while not relinquishing the ultimate responsibility

Quality criteria

Quality criteria for this update dictate that the content must:

- Be written in plain English and idiom-free
- Be consistent with other OGC PPRM guidance (in particular, M_o_R, PRINCE2 and P3O)
- Must be compatible with national or international standards, e.g. BSI or ISO
- Be free from inconsistencies
- Address the topics of benefits, risk and quality management appropriately
- Meet the aims of the project as set out earlier in this mandate.
- Change requests, identified by the Change Advisory Board and OGC as requiring action, have been addressed

Quality method

Quality assurance will be carried out by the Review Group. The Review Group will consist of members of the Reference Board, real users and members of the training community. This will be managed as a programme by OGC with work packages by TSO for the guidance and APMG for the qualification elements. OGC, in consultation with the reference group, will set the detailed scope for the product based on this mandate, agree the full product description/s, and may also provide input to the design of the relevant work package/s if required. The Review Group will monitor progress against these product descriptions.



1 **Background**

- 1.1 OGC first published its guide Managing Successful Programmes in 1999 in response to various drivers, which indicated that good management at programme level, was a key area in achieving successful delivery. In the Government context, Programme Management is what the best policy makers have always done, though they might not have called it that: thinking through the end-to-end process to translate policy into delivery plans and delivery plans into desired outcomes. In a commercial context, Programme Management is being used to deliver corporate strategies for increasing market position and shareholder value. Programme Management is a vital component in the delivery of change; whether change to public or customer services, or change within organisations. The general principles and techniques of Programme Management have been developed and applied in many different areas and for many years. They are equally applicable to the construction of buildings, or the exploitation of e-commerce, or electronic service delivery.
- 1.2 Since 1999, there have been several re-prints and one relatively in-depth revision to resolve some inconsistencies, but no major revision or review of the content of the guide since it was first published. The last one being in September 2007 which was welcomed on launch and for which several issues have been registered on the change control log at <http://www.best-management-practice.com/ChangeLog> that need to be addressed.

2 **Drivers for change**

- 2.1 Since publication, MSP has received a great deal of positive feedback. There is every indication that the concept of programme management and the use of MSP in particular to assist with the implementation of programme management is on the increase, indicating that there is an increasing level of maturity in organisations. The associated qualification has seen a steady rise in demand year on year since inception. However, although this might indicate the beginnings of a wider recognition of the need for a framework like MSP for assisting organisations, the world of programme management has not stood still. Developments in the areas of risk management need to be reflected in MSP's treatment of risk, there has been much research into the behavioural aspects of programme management, and not least there is a growing awareness that the programmes do not operate in a vacuum, but that organisations need to recognise the need for overall management of their portfolio, from strategy to delivery into their operational environment.
- 2.2 MSP needs to be refreshed to reflect this changed perspective both in government and in the wider market place.
- 2.3 MSP needs to be revised to bring it back into line with the recent revision to PRINCE2 especially around the treatment of risk.
- 2.4 The need to respond to issues raised in the change control log some of which have been there for nearly two years now.
- 2.5 Reference Group feedback - General and longer term
 - 2.5.1 Thought the guide was 90% right.
 - 2.5.2 Only talk about things in detail that are not discussed elsewhere
 - 2.5.3 Need to think about who the audience is and if we need supplementary guidance for certain roles, e.g. BCMs, sponsoring group, CoEs, project teams
 - 2.5.4 Longer term need more about tailoring the guidance
 - 2.5.5 MSP should not be prescriptive, the language should not be prescriptive nor should the examination take examples tables and apply them as if they are the only way
 - 2.5.6 The need to apply language consistently across the product set and in each product
 - 2.5.7 The need to ensure when making changes that they do not introduce new inconsistencies in the guide or new conflicts with other products.

3. **The purpose of MSP**

- To provide a referencable standard for programme management
- To provide a framework of best practice principles and concepts drawn from latest experiences and proven practice in setting up and managing programmes.
- Aimed at programme management practitioners to adapt the guidance to real life situations.

- To be accessible by programme teams and organisations as well as by individual practitioners.
- To help programme management practitioners improve their decision making at programme level and to become better at implementing beneficial change.
- To provide the basis of the examination of individuals to obtain certification to show their level of knowledge and understanding of the content and application of MSP.

MSP is *not* –

- a form of management for big projects
- a detailed guide on managing business change
- a guide to ongoing service management/management of business as usual

Though it should demonstrate the context of programme management in all three of these areas.