

Ref. No.	Gateway Recommendation	Timing	Trust Response	√ / X	Update November 2009	September 2014
			A further paper to address this recommendation including a fuller assessment of the risks inherent in the decant project, with a clear project plan, will be considered not later than the November Programme Board.		review the Trust has continued with the decant policy and has also pursued the option of leasing a local vacant school. This would provide a better decant solution for the administrative and clinical support services.	
Ref. No.	Gateway Recommendation	Timing	Trust Response	√ / X	Update November 2009	September 2014
3.	The Programme Team should review the risk management process to widen involvement and embed the ownership and use of risk management at all levels within the Trust and the Programme Team.	Do by Nov 09	<p>Agreed. We will examine how the review of the 3Ts risk register can be more firmly embedded in Trust-wide processes such as the Trust Board sub-committee on risk.</p> <p>As well as being part of the Programme Board agenda on a regular basis (as now) the risk register will be reviewed by the Core Team on a weekly basis to ensure that risks are being managed and that a wider mechanism exists for adding new risks as they emerge.</p>	√ √	The OBC risk register was formally closed down after the OBC was submitted for approval in August 2009. A new register created by a sub group of Core Team with facilitation by Cyril Sweetts. This was then	This process has continued since OBC and has recently been devolved to the new sub Programme Structure to create greater ownership.

Ref. No.	Gateway Recommendation	Timing	Trust Response	√ / X	Update November 2009	September 2014
			We will take a paper on this to the September Programme Board to dovetail into the proposed action at 5 below.	√	rescored and new risks added, as befits the OBC-FBC phase, at a core team meeting in October. The risks which require Trust attention were then uploaded to the Trust's corporate risk register. The Trust's risk manger has been involved at every stage and will continue to attend Programme Boards meetings when the risk register is reviewed.	

Ref. No.	Gateway Recommendation	Timing	Trust Response	√ / X	Update November 2009	September 2014
4.	The Programme Team should seek advice on the skills and capabilities required to manage the ProCure21 project through FBC and onto construction. The Team should be supplemented by independent cost and technical advisers to support and protect the interests of the Trust.	Do by Dec 09	<p>Agreed. We will review this and discuss the action to be taken with the national ProCure 21 team and our existing independent cost advisers. We fully understand the issues here and will act accordingly.</p> <p>We are also examining the internal team costs which were set out in the OBC with a view to strengthening the team in equipping and IT, as well as the significant addition to the team of a dedicated HR resource to lead on workforce planning.</p> <p>We will agree a clear way forward not later than the November Programme Board.</p>	X	A meeting was held with the Procure 21 advisor to discuss this. LO'R is also considering whether to appoint a different QS. However the Trust considers that the good historic working relationships and the in-depth knowledge built up would be at risk if another cost advisor was appointed. Moreover the potential conflict of interest is being managed by the separation of the London & Southampton offices.	The use of internal/external advisors is covered in the FBC Management Case and PID.

Ref. No.	Gateway Recommendation	Timing	Trust Response	√ / X	Update November 2009	September 2014
5.	The SRO should consider a refresh of the governance arrangements to encompass an empowered decision-making Programme Board to serve the Trust and to continue the excellent harnessing of stakeholder support and participation.	Do by Oct 09	Agreed. The SRO will take revised terms of reference and membership to the September Programme Board for discussion and agreement. This will form part of a wider governance review to be undertaken to the same timescale to ensure that our formal and informal structures are fit for purpose for the next stage of development.		In process	The Selim review of July 2013 recommended further changes in governance which have been implemented. A new sub structure has also been implemented to ensure that the decant and main scheme programme have sufficient capacity to steer the programmes towards the phase 4 contract.
6.	Consider further how the Trust will respond to potentially adverse influences on the achievement of the programme.	Do Now	Agreed. We will continue to identify key risks and issues relating to the programme within the revised governance structures to ensure that decision making can be assessed and acted upon in a timely and effective way. In order that the programme as a whole and the team (in its widest sense) remains agile and can react quickly, it is proposed that this forms a key part of the agreed ways of working under the P21 framework when the next stage is formally		In process	BSUH has sought legal advice that the P21 contract can continue to be used. The OGC Common Causes of Project Failure is regularly used in order to ensure that the Programme processes as well as structure are fit for purpose.

			launched as the timing of the OBC approval becomes clearer. We will formally agree regular key points in the programme of the next stage where the team (and the Trust) can step back and identify any changes which might be required.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--