Tailored Review update

Emma Strahan

Aims of this session

1. to revisit 9 of the 11 key areas that the review will cover

2. to provide a RAG rating for each area

3. to remind the board of the timescale for the review

Overall status	
Review area contains significant risks which may be beyond the control or influence of the secretariat and cannot be mitigated without further information	R
Significant risks or issues have been identified but the secretariat can demonstrate evidence of future work to address these issues	A
Area is being achieved and the secretariat can demonstrate evidence of completion or effective processes	G

Overall Summary

Key area	RAG Rating
Area 1: Assess each of ICCAN's functions using a First Principles Approach followed by the Three Tests approach	
Area 2: Consider issues of efficiency, including the potential for savings as well as contribution to economic growth	
Area 3: Assess ICCAN's accountability for their resources and performance plus consider if ICCAN is compliant with central government requirements on transparency	
Area 4: Include a cost-benefit analysis and use benchmarking to assess the performance of ICCAN against its stated objectives	
Area 5: Look at the existing controls, processes and safeguards for ensuring strong and robust corporate governance arrangements	
Area 6: Ascertain if the framework documents between the sponsoring department and ICCAN are based upon the Partnerships Code of Good Practice	
Area 7: Consider the effectiveness of the relationship between ICCAN and its sponsoring department and should place proper focus and scrutiny on both sides	
Area 8: Consider the remit and reach of ICCAN, its publications, its dependencies and its stakeholders within each of the devolved nations	
Area 9: Ask key stakeholders for their input on the review through individual feedback and or a workshop	

Area 1: Assess each of ICCAN's functions using the First Principles Approach followed by the Three Tests approach

Overall status	A

Summary

Five main functions designed by DfT at our inception and included in our framework document are:
1. Best practice guidance for all aspects of the Airspace Change process
2. Noise controls and operating restrictions
3. Other best practice guidance around noise management, engagement etc
4. Research around enforcement and compliance with noise controls, health impacts, etc
5. Monitoring and quality assurance of airports noise measurements plus modelling for night flights

These functions will be assessed using the First Principles Approach at the Stage 1 and then move to Stage 2

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
The review finds that the functions are no longer required due to changes within industry/government policy/direction	To demonstrate how we have thought about how our role might change in the light of alternatives
The review might find that the functions are not being carried out effectively	To ensure that we both point to and make available all documents which show progress on work, thinking about objectives and work programme priorities and give detail on how the functions are being addressed

The First Principles Approach

Stage 1

The First Principles Approach
1. Is the function still needed; if yes then in its current form or with a revised model of delivery?
2. Is the function still being delivered?
3. Is the function being carried out effectively by the ALB?
4. Is the function contributing to the core business of the sponsor department and the government?

Stage 2

The 'Three Tests'
1. Is this a technical function, which needs external expertise to deliver?
2. Is this a function which needs to be, and be seen to be, delivered with absolute political impartiality?
3. Is this a function that needs to be delivered independently of ministers to establish facts and/or figures with integrity?

Revised Models of Delivery
1. Abolish
2. Move out of central government
3. Commercial model
4. Bring in-house
5. Merge with another body
6. Less formal structure
7. Delivery by a new executive agency
8. Continued delivery by an NDPB

Area 2: Consider issues of efficiency, including the potential for savings as well as contribution to economic growth

Overall status	G

Summary

- **Type A – Cash releasing or cash generative**
  N/A
- **Type B – Efficiencies or improvements in outcomes to increase capacity or productivity**
  Recruitment campaigns complete, staff capacity increased, low cost organisation, frameworks and agreements now in place to allow us access to data therefore increase productivity,
- **Type C – Improved governance, transparency, accountability or staff engagement**
  High levels of corporate governance, high levels of transparency on website, encourage staff engagement

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
How is ICCAN contributing to the core business of the sponsoring department?	Regular catch up meetings between Ian E and Sam Regular meetings between ICCAN and DfT analyst teams and comms teams to discuss our work Open and transparent publication of our work which is shared with DfT Supporting a stronger aviation strategy

Area 3: Assess ICCAN's accountability for their resources and performance plus consider if ICCAN is compliant with central government requirements on transparency

Overall status	G

Summary

- ICCAN demonstrates accountability for its resources and performance by using clearly defined Milestones of Success for its work outputs, regular budget reviews and allocation of funds to support key areas of the work programme, board oversight of financial decisions, an annual report, reviewing and refreshing the corporate strategy, having established staff values, regular staff surveys and staff appraisals.
- ICCAN demonstrates high levels of transparency through their website and social media channels and is compliant with all central government requirements.
- Regular engagement with sponsoring department finance team
- Management oversight for all stakeholder interaction and media publications, including social media
- Quality assurance framework for projects to be implemented

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
ICCAN still needs to develop internal KPI's and performance indicators for both project work and governance	Business team and chief analysts have already started the discussion around these, and planning will be undertaken soon.

Area 4: Include a cost-benefit analysis and use benchmarking to assess the performance of ICCAN against its stated objectives

Overall status	R

Summary
• Stated objectives: To be a credible and authoritative voice on aviation noise issues To ensure that communities have a greater stake in any process which proposes to make noise changes To ensure that processes which change aviation noise impact better and more transparently balance the needs of all parties To bring greater public confidence in noise data published by industry and the impartiality of the airspace change process To support the improvement where necessary of industry's approach to assessing and mitigating noise impacts and engaging communities To create an environment where improved relations and trust underpin local decisions on noise controls To support the Secretary of State's role with regards to noise within strategically significant decisions

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
We don't know what the benchmarks will be/will look like at present	We can approach the DfT Performance, Risk and Assurance team to ask them what form the review will take and if they have any previously used benchmarks for assessing performance

Area 5: Look at the existing controls, processes and safeguards for ensuring strong and robust corporate governance arrangements

Overall status	G

Summary

- ICCAN have ensured that all commissioners are aware of and adhere to the Code of Conduct for Board Members of Public Bodies. There is TOR for board, an up to date Register of Interests, a Board Code of Conduct, a forward look document and we have implemented Commissioner appraisals on a 12 mthly basis.
- The board regularly reviews the high level risk register, the budget, communications and engagement activity, and receives updates on the progress in meeting projects in the work programme.
- HR and Governance policies are reviewed annually or when a fundamental change to a policy occurs.
- Quality assurance framework for projects

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
ICCAN still needs to develop internal KPI's and performance indicators for both project work and governance	Business team and chief analysts have already started the discussion around these, and planning will be undertaken soon.

Area 6: Ascertain if the framework documents between the sponsoring department and ICCAN are based upon the Partnerships Code of Good Practice

Overall status	A

Summary

- The ICCAN Framework Agreement clearly shows the purpose of the ALB and is widely believed to be well understood by both ICCAN and the department. The document is robust in its approach to the Partnership Relationship with the department, referencing its independence as well as expectations laid out in the Partnerships between Departments and DBs: Code of Good Practice.
- The document details accountability, board arrangements, corporate governance, financial and audit requirements therefore covering all aspects of assurance. The document does not talk about sharing skills and experience, as to do so would impinge on the ALB's perceived independence, however the document does reference the sharing of services and support areas such as HR services and IT functions.
- The framework document is however still in draft form and is not yet in place.

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
The Framework Agreement has not been agreed	Work on this continues by the secretariat and the board has noted an issue

Area 7: Consider the effectiveness of the relationship between ICCAN and its sponsoring department and should place proper focus and scrutiny on both sides

Overall status	A

Summary

As part of ICCAN's initial set up there were regular project team meetings which had clear agendas and an outcomes grid which was circulated to all involved post meeting. The sponsor team were clear that they were available to help when required. The sponsor team appeared invested in the creation of the ALB. Some ministerial contact with our Head Commissioner despite multiple changes. Move from set-up to policy and strategy work has been suggested by the sponsor team which seems sensible given where we are in the work programme.

However, the setup process was frustrating at times. For example: ICCAN's creation had not been adequately communicated across DfT, and services such as IT and procurement were unavailable to us.

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
Residual issues from the complex set up process	All communications are directed through SMT
Key staff changes within the sponsor team mean reduced corporate memory around formation of ALB	ICCAN to maintain continued communication and engagement with the sponsor team

Area 8: Consider the remit and reach of ICCAN, its publications, its dependencies and its stakeholders within each of the devolved nations

Overall status	A

Summary
- ICCAN has and will continue to follow the existing principles that underpin relations between the UK Government and the devolved administrations.   - During programme delivery, ICCAN has considered the applicable laws and processes in each of the devolved nations.   - ICCAN's publications will have separate and specific guidance for each devolved nation where applicable.   - Devolved nations have been and will continue to be consulted and included in correspondence, throughout the course of ICCAN engagements and research for projects.   - ICCAN have visited airports across all of the devolved nations

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
Neither the board or the wider team have undertaken any training around devolved settlement or its implications for aviation work	Training has been requested but was unable to be delivered due to COVID-19. Online training on devolution is available and the team have been encouraged to undertake this. Direct work with stakeholders around topic area has led to increased awareness and understanding.

Area 9: Ask key stakeholders for their input on the review through individual feedback and or a workshop

Overall status	G

Summary
• ICCAN can provide and support the reviewing team with access to stakeholders, arranging meetings if required and providing stakeholder mapping documents which show how ICCAN have thought about their stakeholders from different perspectives, i.e. with regards to communications and investment in our work outputs etc. • ICCAN can demonstrate stakeholder involvement through the Development Study board, reviewing documents pre-publication and seeking feedback and views on your corporate strategy.

Key risks / issues / concerns	Mitigation
Stakeholders may feel that we aren't fulfilling our remit and are not meeting our objectives	Encourage feedback and maintain an active programme of engagement

Review timeline

The sponsor team have indicated the follow timescale:

	Sept 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	Feb 21
Review team, sponsor and ALB agree parameters	■					
Stage 1 of review will begin (with agreed TOR)		■				
Stage 2 of review will begin (if required)			■			
Report writing				■		
Comments from ICCAN on draft report					■	
Final report agreed					■	
Report submitted to Minister						■
Report published on gov.uk						■

What further briefing would the Board consider appropriate nearer to the review being conducted?