



Minutes

Services Blueprint Steering Group

18 May, 12.30-1.30pm

Attendees: Wendy Horne, Ray Meldrum (Chair), Peter Wulff, Julie McGregor, Nika Solomon, Veronica White, Cat Kemp, Darren Horsman, Owen Werner, Travis Logan

Apologies: Meredith Morgan

1) Confirm Agenda

Confirmed

2) Actions from Previous Meeting

An update was provided from Darren regarding the items relating to the Maori Consultation process, as below:

Post clusters and Blueprint there is no iwi consultation plan. The view from Carol and Josie is we do not need to consult iwi in blueprint or clusters consultation but it would be sensible to tag key decisions with iwi after they are made so we can make sure we are developing the partnership on-going. Josie and Carol had other tactical recommendations around Maori stakeholders which will be picked up and included in the Comms/Engagement Plan e.g. Maori staff should be presented the proposal as a group and Carol/Josie are happy to be this link/conduit.

ACTIONS: DARREN/TRAVIS, KRISTINE

- **Darren and Travis** to capture comments from Josie/Carol and build into the stakeholder assessment and Communications and Engagement Plan.
- **Kristine** to send Nika and Change team financial targets from Transformation Business Case. Change Team to consider options within new proposed model to meet targets (action carried over).

3) Status Report

Nika provided an update on the project status report and highlighted a key risk around the potential for the time line to be delayed due to stakeholder feedback resulting in second round of consultation. A potential mitigation in the form of a revised implementation plan was discussed.

The Steering Group discussed our potential position on timeline extensions and the impact of the Blueprint and Clusters proposals being presented at the same time. It was agreed further exploration needed around this risk of concurrent release and potential mitigations and additional options to condense the timeline further.

Steering Group agreed a decision about the timeline would be made by the ELT on Friday 22 May and then could be communicated to staff.

Steering Group agreed having legal advice/review prior to the release of the proposals needed to be included in the project timeline.

ACTIONS: CHANGE TEAM, OWEN, TRAVIS, NIKA

- **Change Team** prepare Blueprint presentation slides for ELT on Friday including recommendation around amended sign off process and timeline for a decision.
- **Owen** lead the development of a risk assessment and recommendation around the concurrent release of clusters and blueprint proposals for change for submission to the ELT on Friday for a decision.
- **Travis** hold student services email update until after ELT sign off on 2 May
- **Nika** build in legal review/advice into Blueprint Project Plan

4) Project Whetu

The Steering Group discussed the Whetu Proposal and agreed there was not sufficient information to complete a full evaluation on the Blueprint straw man. The Steering Group requested the cost view of the model if implemented over 5 years.

ACTIONS: CHANGE TEAM

- **Change Team** prepare Blueprint presentation slides for ELT on Friday including cost information over 5 years.

5) Retention Strategy

Veronica provided an update on recent retention conversations and flagged:

- There is a key interdependency with property relocations which is surfacing through these conversations.
- Some team leaders spoken to feel they do not know who the Blueprint sponsor
- Some team leaders have requested more communication about what's happening and more contact with the Steering Group

ACTIONS: CAT, STEERING GROUP

- **Steering Group** to meet team leaders in services one-on-one to see how they are progressing.
- **Cat** to provide list of team leaders to Steering Group so they can allocate one-to-one conversations, including Library.

6) Kick Start

Steering Group discussed opportunity to 'front' Blueprint at the upcoming staff event. Decision made not to go ahead due to associated risks. The suggestion was to build additional activity into the consultation approach including Q&A sessions, information sessions etc.

ACTIONS: TRAVIS/DARREN

- **Travis and Darren** include in comms and engagement plan.

ACTIONS:

	Action	Who	Date	M/NM/WIP
1)	Darren and Travis to capture comments from Josie/Carol and build into the stakeholder assessment and Communications and Engagement Plan.	Darren and Travis	TBD	
2)	Kristine to send Nika and Change team financial targets from Transformation Business Case. Change Team to consider options within new proposed model to meet targets (action carried over).	Kristine	22 May	
3)	Kristine to send Nika and Change team financial targets from Transformation Business Case. Change Team to consider options within new proposed model to meet targets.	Kristine Change Team	TBD	
4)	Change Team prepare Blueprint presentation slides for ELT on Friday including recommendation around amended sign off process and timeline for a decision.	Change Team	22 May	
5)	Owen lead the development of a risk assessment and recommendation around the concurrent release of clusters and blueprint proposals for change for submission to the ELT on Friday for a decision.	Owen	22 May	
6)	Travis hold student services email update until after ELT sign off on 2 May	Travis	25 May	
7)	Nika build in legal review/advice into Blueprint Project Plan	Nika	22 May	
8)	Change Team prepare Blueprint presentation slides for ELT on Friday including cost information over 5 years.	Change Team	22 May	

9)	Steering Group to meet team leaders in services one-on-one to see how they are progressing.	Steering Group	End June	
10)	Cat to provide list of team leaders to Steering Group so they can allocate one-to-one conversations, including Library.	Cat	26 May	
11)	Travis and Darren include additional consultation activity in comms and engagement plan.	Travis and Darren	TBD	

Next Meeting: 2 June 2015



Minutes

Services Blueprint Steering Group

2 June at 3.00 pm

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Julie McGregor, Nika Solomon, Cat Kemp, Darren Horsman, Owen Werner, Holly Patterson

Apologies: Ray Meldrum

The meeting reviewed the Whetu and Blueprint options as presented by Nika/Owen and the following points were noted and risks identified.

It was agreed that there is a need to get clarification around the assumptions and that the LT members felt that there was no clear line of sight at this stage.

Concern was expressed regarding the implementation costs and whether these had been factored in accurately. Also, concern expressed around the flexibility of the Concentrix model in respect of the fixed fee - how would adjustments be incorporated without incurring extra costs?

Wendy asked where in the Concentrix model is the system to evaluate and respond to the service they provide. Owen advised that some work had been done around the flexibility of the model, but this was still in progress.

Concentrix have presented a 5 and 7 year option – a risk identified around this was the potential for costs to escalate at the end of the contract period.

Discussion was held around the risk for not being able to deliver the service at the same cost as Concentrix should it be brought in-house at the conclusion contract period. In addition some reflections were made in respect of the experiences gained from the establishment of Student Central. When this was launched the model continued to be developed and added to. This highlights the risk in implementation where many processes were not fully understood and to this extent this is unknown in the Concentrix model.

Nika advised that the increased emphasis on technology will help mitigate some of these risks. However, Meredith commented that a further risk is around potential delays in the readiness of the technology.

Concern was raised around Concentrix's accountability to deliver what they have agreed to and how that will be measured. In the Blueprint model success is measured around conversion as well as reduction. When considering the conversion rate, are there mechanisms to track student enrolments beyond the initial conversion.

The risks associated with the timing being late November through to late January 2016 were identified as:

1. Availability of staff over the period
2. Extra costs regarding transitioning arrangements. Will there be a duplication of staffing overheads?
3. The need to understand the impact of the transition stage – the benefits, costs, implications and risks.

Kristine commented that when originally considering the Whetu concept it was about achieving 20% savings but those savings don't appear to be there. Also concern expressed that if we go with the Concentrix model we are committed.

Kristine felt that between the options of providing the service in-house to outsourcing, there is not enough compelling evidence for change in the current financial modelling.

Wendy raised the relationship risk that the outsourcing model brings.

In the Whetu 1 model the maximum liability for redundancies was \$3m, however this had not been incorporated in the table – currently showing at \$1.5m.

A meeting to be established with Owen, Kristine, and Nikhil to provide more information around the financial model as both ELT and Council will want to see more detail.

Next Meeting: 15 June 2015



Minutes

Services Blueprint Steering Group

17 June at 8.00 am

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Julie McGregor, Nika Solomon, Ray Meldrum, Kristine Brothers, Owen Werner, Holly Patterson, Annette Pitovao, Lynnette Brown, Craig Eaton

Apologies: Steve Haddock

The meeting reviewed the options available for the work in scope under the Blueprint redesign. The aim was to reach a recommendation for SG and CE.

Annette Pitovao provided an overview of the student enquiry to application project explaining the five step programme that was in development.

Students would be given categorized into Gold, Silver and Bronze and this would then link into the response service.

Gold – Students who know what they want to study and meet all the criteria get immediate offer.

Silver – Students who may need further information and support i.e. cross credits/APL – an offer made within 24 hours

Bronze – Students who need to be followed up and intervention put in place. Target turn around would be 48 hours. Automatic entry into Bridgepoint or Language Studies and timetabling steps in to plan their progression through to degree completion. These students do not need to re-enrol at the end of the Semester/Year of study – this becomes automated.

The percentage spread of students in the above categories is 20% gold, 30% silver and 50% bronze which is why the Bronze level is so critical to programme. Availability of adequate self-help resources and a KMS would see a progressive increase to gold and silver from the bronze category.

It was noted that the assessor involved in the above processes needs to be allocated time to make the assessments and this is often where the blockages have been in the past.

Owen provided a summary overview of the models proposed for delivering student services under the Blueprint redesign with and without support from Concentrix via the Whetu proposal. This proposal has been revised by Concentrix now that final Blueprint financial and structural models are available.

Help desk function clarified as the 'one-stop shop' face to face contact for prospective and current students. ORMs would operate in the online space for enrolled students only. Under the Whetu model, all help desk staff would be Concentrix.

There was concern expressed around the Library administrator's positions being disestablished in Phase 2 as they would have gone through a restructure twice in a two year period. Nika commented that this is an area of risk as there is no guarantee that Concentrix will employ those staff. Concentrix have said they will take 15 of our staff. There is no detail in the proposal as to whether they would have the capacity to take on more staff.

Meredith believed that this should not impact on the decision to go with Whetu. Given there are only 6-7 roles that might be affected here, we work with the principal that we won't disestablish a second time. However we acknowledge to them that if we go with the Whetu model they will be affected and concern was raised about creating this exemption and what it might mean down the track.

Discussion around research on what types of queries the Student Central are answering at present. This has been undertaken with the example given that a large number of enquiries are things like forgotten passwords. The new model would seek to reduce transactional enquiries of this nature by proactively providing easy access self-help resources.

Owen said that the GM Operations role will be to look at continuous improvements which is a layer that was not in place in the Student Central model. They will manage the peaks and troughs throughout the year and managing the teams to flex where needed. In response to a question about how we manage staff attitudes to the redeployment model, Nika advised that training and recruitment will be key. Meredith compared the GM Ops role to the GM benefits realization role in the Clusters redesign.

The two options to be considered are Blueprint and Blueprint with Whetu 1. The timeframe would be to start the transition from November to Concentrix taking over full responsibility from 1 April 2016. Blueprint with Whetu 1 offers an approximate \$3 million saving over the Blueprint model. Owen advised further due diligence be carried out on the financial models, unit-pricing and length of contract.

In response to a question that the information presented to the SG is biased against Concentrix, Nika voiced her concern around Concentrix's understanding of the priority groups and the support that they will require. She sites this as a risk. Nika and Owen referred the SG to the evaluation matrix previously circulated.

ACTION:

- ***Owen to circulate the evaluation matrix to the SG***
- ***SG to make a recommendation to CE to move forward with or without Whetu by Thursday 18 June.***

Next Meeting: Thursday 2 July, 9am, Project Room B48



Minutes

Services Blueprint Steering Group

2 July at 8.00 am

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Julie McGregor, Nika Solomon, Ray Meldrum, Kristine Brothers, Owen Werner, Sina Solomona, Lynnette Brown, Craig Eaton, Darren Horseman

Apologies: Steve Haddock

The meeting reviewed the WHETU implementation approaches and wider for the work in scope under the Blueprint redesign. The aim was to finalise the approach for inclusion in the Proposal for Change.

Owen provided an update on the Council meeting, held on 29 June 2015. Council confirmed that work should continue to finalise the Proposal for Change including the WHETU proposal.

It was noted that Council wish to have greater clarity regarding the transition plan and arrangements; clarity regarding staff impacted and Retention plans in place to ensure that Student Services was not detrimentally affected during transition.

Owen presented three approaches to implementing the Services Blueprint.

It was noted that the Approach One may not provide for Phase 1 impacted staff to have an opportunity to consider new roles being created in Phase 2. This approach may also increase the retention risk of senior staff impacted during Phase 1.

It was noted that Approach Two included an overlap (Phase 1 transition and Phase 2 Proposal for Change) and this would present an opportunity for those potentially impacted in Phase 1 to consider possible roles in Phase 2.

There was a suggestion that International administration roles be considered for Phase 1. There was a request for the numbers and levels of those potentially impacted.

Concern was again expressed around the Library administrator's positions being disestablished in Phase 2 as they would have gone through a restructure twice in a two year period.

Decision – Approach Two was considered the most suitable option and that the implementation would take place over three phases.

Discussion then took place over the Future State organisational structure.

The current proposed structure needs to be modified, specifically with regards the number of General Managers reporting into the proposed Executive Director (ED) role.

The outcome of the discussion was that there needed to be a consolidation of the General Manager Achievement and General Manager Student Life into a General Manager Student Experience role. Reporting into to this GM role would be two managers. These would be Manager – Student Life and Manager – Achievement.

There was discussion about the nature of the ED role, i.e. was it wholly focussed on Student Services or a split role. A decision on this was due towards the end of July 2015.

ACTION:

- ***The Blueprint team to provide Meredith with data regarding the administrators for International.***
- ***ED decision to be communicated to the Steering Group at the end of July 2015.***

Next Meeting: Thursday 15 July, 12h30, Room 048-1070



Minutes

Blueprint & Sector Alignment Steering Group

26 August 2015 at 1.00 pm

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Julie McGregor, Nika Solomon, , Kristine Brothers, Owen Werner, Darren Horsman, Veronica White, Sina Solomona, Travis Logan, Lynnette Brown (Minutes)

Apologies: Ray Meldrum

1. Plan on a Page

2. Overview of Phase 2 Blueprint

There was some concern expressed around the belief by some people that the Sector Alignment proposal will be ready in February and this will be linking to Blueprint, but Owen advised that work will be continuing on this. At this stage does not see this happening in February.

Work to be done on how academic and quality go together/work together – Wendy to meet with Ray Meldrum to discuss. Need to do a scoping of this area as it may not be as big a project as anticipated.

Action: Wendy Horne/Ray Meldrum

In Phase 2: Discussion around Josie and the process for informing her of the potential changes which might including a change in reporting lines (staff reporting to her)/additional responsibilities.

Need to identify the additional resources required.

In respect of the budget, there is an increase of approximately \$100K against the original budget – offset against Concentrix – still within the original amount approved.

3. Overview of Phase 1 Implementation Plan Blueprint

Sina spoke to the implementation plan.

Discussion was held around the amount of engagement with stakeholders as it was recognised from the outset that this would need to be significant. Darren advised that a huge amount of engagement with stakeholders had been done.

The question was discussed on how are we are going to get SME's when the timing is at their busiest period and their workload will be increased through the potential loss of staff. This has been noted as an area of risk.

The list of SME's is being created to work with, but will be good to work alongside Hennie around the process mapping - how we approach and engage with them.

Next step is process mapping and requirements, then get into the design work. Key milestones are still being developed.

Major risks discussed:

- o Being able to get all of the resources required
- o Proposed availability – engagement with Concentrix. Engagement with the knowledge management system is commencing in the next couple of weeks.
- o Timing around the professional service agreement soon (... a full agreement ready to be signed in November)
- o Achieving Council sign off around the approval levels.

In respect of the approval levels Meredith advised that the Delegated Authorities paper was endorsed for Council approval by the Audit and Risk Committee. This will provide a maximum level for funding. The date when the Delegated Authorities paper is approved needs to be confirmed – this will ensure a more streamlined process for progress between Council meetings.

4. Update on the FAQ's

Travis provided an update:

Questions	Sector Alignment	Blueprint
Total: 398 Online: 349	Total: 111 Answered: 104 To be answered: 10	Total: 287 Answered: 245 To be answered: 39
Top Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How the structure will work - Issues around the workload and transition - When people will get notice - Grades of the new admin positions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed outsourcing – why are we and confirming what is being outsourced - Voluntary redundancy – when am I eligible and clarifying the incentive payment - The reason behind the lack of response to students (1000 students who didn't receive a response from us) - Why is IMS Help Desk included in the proposal?

Feedback:

Feedback	Sector Alignment	Blueprint
Total	12	3
Top Themes		

Concern was expressed around some of the information/answers to FAQ's, particularly in respect of Concentrix. Nika felt that there was a lack of clarity around how the services that Student Central and Student Administration and the Help Desk will be delivered in a new model. The services will remain but will be delivered by Concentrix rather than internally.

Nika has been added to be another pair of eyes to the FAQ's.

The next steps is to relook at the questions and trim them/group them into themes.

Travis advised that no more questions Q&A sessions are planned after the 3rd September.

5. Debrief from SG on Q&A sessions so far

Leon advised that from his meetings with teams within CIB, nothing further has been noted so far in respect of responses.

Darren advised that there is a student led Q&A session next week.

6. Union Update

Peter advised that the TEU are basically opposing the proposal and TIASA are taking a similar stance.

7. SG meetings going onward

It was agreed to split the meetings. The frequency of BP and SA was to be fortnightly and moving to weekly at critical times of the proposal. Workshop time will also need to be established. Nika to advise Lynnette on a proposed schedule and attendees.

Action: Nika to provide Lynnette with a proposed schedule including workshops

8. Any Other Business

Meredith advised that staff had asked if they came up with a different model with supporting financials whether it would be considered. The students have been advised that this would be OK. Meredith agreed that we will provide them with some resources to assist them with that if required and Rick has agreed that we can share our financial model with them.

Action: Owen to establish what is available for release that does not compromise the Confidentiality Agreement with Concentrix.

Owen status report on programme level. When we get a new Project Manager we will be having to report to Council to a T1 and SA as part of that.



Minutes

Blueprint Steering Group

Tuesday, 22 September 2015 1.15 – 2.00pm 48-1070

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Ray Meldrum, Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Nika Solomon, Kristine Brothers, Owen Werner, Veronica White, Sina Solomona, Lynnette Brown (Minutes)

1	Confirm agenda
2	OIA request and potential injunction from TIASA; implications and risks
3	Feedback; overview of high level themes
4	SME engagement approach; to develop OSA model for phase 2 P4C
5	Budget discussion

1 & 2. Brief discussion in respect of potential impact of injunction from TIASA. An injunction could potentially happen just before outcome doc is released. Impact is that all work has to stop.

3 & 4. Nika advised that the following work was underway:

- Work on summarising themes for BP. Significant feedback re the following areas:
 - Te Noho Kotahitanga and partnership with Māori
 - Outsourcing to CNX
 - Interface or convergence with Sector Alignment (Ray suggested 'convergence' is more applicable than 'interface')
 - The PG COE
- Discussion about SME engagement to develop phase 2 OSA components and particularly the PG COE aspect. Although it is suggested to shoulder-tap to get the process started, participation is open to a wide range of people, as there were many people putting their hands up to be involved. (This engagement with SMEs was factored in to the timeline, and the feedback received to date has reiterated that people feel the need to be more involved).
- There is also a risk that we are overtaxing SMEs and Nika indicated the team are preparing a one page overview of SME participation in order to see who is being over-utilised.
- Discussion undertaken on the process for Phase 2 around SME engagement. SG approved approach but require details on the following aspects:
 1. The purpose of engagement
 2. How we will do the engagement
 3. Who will facilitate

4. Timeline impacts

Action: Nika/Craig to provide this detail as soon as possible. (Target date Monday 28 Sept)

- SG noted that these sessions should not set up false expectations in SMEs that their designs were going to necessarily be the end result approved by SG/ELT. Also to make SMEs aware of constraints we are operating under. Also that no phase 1 feedback should be included in these sessions before the outcome document is released. It was agreed that this would need to have a very good facilitator to get the best outcome for all.
- It was also noted that Sector Alignment and Blueprint need to be looked at as a convergence model and need to ensure that they don't develop in isolation. This is important when developing accountabilities and needs to be factored in to the SME engagement. Meredith also requested an overview of the areas in which there is a need to illuminate the convergence between SA and BP with more detail.

Action: Nika to provide this view. (Target date Wednesday 30 Sept)

International admissions process (with reference to Feb 5 SG decision). *This is about international students benefiting from the improvements that we do in Phase One, not the restructure of roles.* Nika raised the risk that International have indicated they will do their admissions process at a later date. Meredith suggested to discuss it offline.

Action: Lynnette to set up meeting time with NS and MM

5. Budget – still tracking through the changes. The cashier role, financial administrators, and telephonists were omitted - \$660K. We still have an additional retained operational cost of \$300K. Effectively one third of the first year 2016 forecast return of \$980K will be lost.

\$200K additional implementation costs associated to additional resource required P1 and 2 due to Property requiring \$200K for fit-out.

Graeme Archer is expecting to see savings year on year reflected in the budget.

Cashiers are student facing so should be in scope for Phase 2.

A decision on Phase one needs to be made (with regards to responding to feedback as well as making any potential changes to what is proposed in phase 1) and therefore themes need to be summarised and circulated by the end of the week.

Action: Nika/Craig to advise SG of key themes by end of the week (25/9/2015)



Minutes

Blueprint Steering Group

Wednesday, 11 November 2015 1.00 – 1.50pm 48-1070

Attendees: Meredith Morgan (Chair), Wendy Horne, Peter Wulff, Nika Solomon, Kristine Brothers, Owen Werner, Veronica White, Sina Solomona, Darren Horsman, Sophie Webb and Craig Eaton (Minutes)

	Item	Who	Decision required
1	Confirm agenda	All	
2	Acknowledgement of work to Outcome Document	Meredith	
3	CNX Contract update	Owen	
4	Budget and resourcing update	Owen	
5	Phase 1 implementation update	Sina	
6	Phase 2 development timeline and proposed way forward	Sophie	Agree timeline Agree proposed approach
7	Next steps as per status report	Nika	

1. Meredith (MM) suggested keeping the fortnightly meetings proposed that these meetings would consider Risk Escalation or to make project decisions. The sessions would be split between Phase One and Phase Two.
MM also welcomed Sophie Webb as the new Phase Two Project Manager.
2. MM, on behalf of the Executive Leadership team thanked the Blueprint and Sector Alignment teams for the work to get the Outcome Documents released to staff on the 6 November 2015.
3. Owen (OW) confirmed that he had just received the final Concentrix (CNX) contract which he will review and progress for signature by 12 November 2015.
Darren (DH) has asked that a session is planned with the Student Council to discuss the CNX contract, the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and the implications for Students and the student experience.

Action: Darren and Owen to discuss and book meeting with the Student Council (Target date TBC once the contract is signed)

4. OW mentioned that from a Resourcing perspective we were waiting on approval for the Change Analyst and that the Technology workstream were reviewing their resource requirements to augment the current team. All large pieces of the Technology solution were underway with work on the Digital Strategy progressing in order to present to Council in December 2016. Kristine Brothers (KB) confirmed that if the Change Analyst role was part of the Business Case then there was budget. Owen confirmed that this was the case, MM approved the recruitment of the Change Analyst

Action: Craig to action (Target date Wednesday 11 November))

5. Sina (SS) stated that a regroup for Phase One particularly for Technology would have to be done with the delay in signing the CNX contract (implications and ways to progress to meet 1 April 2016 timeframes).

Action: Sina to provide the outcome of regroup to the Steering Group (Target date before the next Steering Group (SG) – 25 November 2016)

6. NS informed the SG that following the Project workshop on Monday 9 November, that there was an updated point view of the work and timelines for Phase Two. The rational for this shift were changes to the engagement approach, the postponed start of Phase Two activities, the delay in recruiting a Phase Two Project Manager and the one month lost due to the Christmas break. These changes and the impact on the timeline meant that getting a proposal for change in January 2016 was highly unlikely.

MM and WH requested that a full Options Analysis (including Risk, Cost, Resourcing and Benefits). This is to be sent to the SG before the next meeting.

OW also suggested that the Options should consider ways to repackage the planned deliverables across Phase Two and Three.

OW also stated that there may not be a Quorum of ELT members to review documentation during January 2016.

NS explained that the engagement with stakeholders (Phase One) was going well with all engaged stakeholders keen and willing. Work was also being to review Phase One and Two stakeholders. The provisional approach is to engage Service leaders to nominate staff as SME's.

Action: Owen, Nika, Sina and Sophie to provide the Options Analysis to Steering Group in advance of next planned Steering Group – for discussion at the next Steering Group meeting. (Target date Wednesday 18 November 2016)

7. MM asked if, as a result of release of the Outcome documents, that a project phase could be closed out. OW agreed and stated that Nigel Bernie (NB) would be in contact regarding a Post Implementation Review (PIR) including an update on the previous PIR.

MM also expressed concern that there may be gaps in visibility of dependencies across the UNITEC programme and project landscape. OW mentioned the Will Seymour was working to gather this information.