



From: Celine Murray  
Central Liaison Unit

Date: 16 April 2012

To: HoDs  
Gary Cushnahan  
Dermot Breen  
Donna Magee  
Tourism Policy – to coordinate NITB input

cc David Thomson  
Trevor Cooper  
David McCune  
Michael Blower  
Jacqui Rose

## REPORTING AGAINST DETI OPERATING PLAN 2011/12 TARGETS – YEAR-END 31 MARCH 2012

1. I am writing to formally request progress reports against the DETI 2011/12 Operating Plan targets to year-end 31 March 2012.
2. The templates attached provide the detail of the DETI Corporate Plan (2011-2015) 4-year targets (column 2), and, for ease of reference, we have highlighted those that are PfG commitments. Column 3 details the associated 2011/12 targets provided by business areas during the development of the Corporate Plan.
3. As this is the only monitoring exercise for the 2011/12 Operating Plan, it is important that you:
  - ensure correct alignment of the 2011/12 targets and activities against the relevant 4-year Corporate Plan targets; and
  - input, where appropriate, a target where none is currently shown.

### Monitoring Forms

4. You are now asked to populate the templates with the information requested in columns 4 – 8, as appropriate, against each of the 2011/12 targets.
5. Each spreadsheet will include several worksheets which can be accessed by clicking on the tabs across the bottom of the spreadsheet. Please ensure reporting against all relevant targets within your respective business area.
6. The reporting of “status” (column 6) is on the four traffic light classification (RAG – see **Annex A**). As this is the year-end reporting period, any targets that have been achieved after their original timescale should not be assigned “Green” status.
7. A brief narrative should be provided (column 8) and should include a specific update on the corresponding PfG commitment where appropriate.

DT1/12/0041724

**Reporting of slippage in PfG Commitments**

8. Where slippage in a PfG commitment or an associated Operating Plan target has been identified, (i.e. where a target is identified as having either Amber or Red status), Heads of Divisions / NDPB Chief Executives are required to submit a formal explanation indicating the reason for slippage and the remedial action being taken (**Annex B**). This should be returned with the progress reports.
9. Where slippage in a Corporate/ Operating Plan target which is not directly related to a PfG commitment is identified, DETI CLU will monitor and seek a formal explanatory report from the Division / NDPB as necessary.

**Date for Return**

10. All responses should be forwarded to [clumailbox@detini.gov.uk](mailto:clumailbox@detini.gov.uk) and copied to Michael Blower and Jacqui Rose by **noon Friday 11 May 2012**. Any queries about this exercise should, in the first instance, be directed to Jacqui (29265) or Michael (29428).

[Signed]

**CELINE MURRAY**

 29300

## ANNEX A

## EXPLANATION OF TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM

<b>GREEN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where targets have already been met (and, if relevant, should continue to be met);</li> <li>• Where progress is on track and interim milestones are being achieved or exceeded;</li> <li>• Where there is significant confidence, drawing on robust monitoring systems/data, around the prospects for delivering the targeted outcome on schedule;</li> <li>• For level of service indicators also; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The target level of service is currently being met;</li> <li>○ The target level of service is expected to continue to be met.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>AMBER/ GREEN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where progress is broadly on track and is broadly meeting interim milestones, perhaps with small but redeemable deviations from plan;</li> <li>• Progress has been good but there is diminished confidence around sustaining future progress towards the targets;</li> <li>• There is significant confidence around the prospects of getting close to the targeted outcome.</li> <li>• For level of service indicators also; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The target level of service is currently very close to being met (and no more than 5% away from the target);</li> <li>○ There is confidence around meeting the target level of service in the in future.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>AMBER</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where there is a lack of robust information on progress, or the rate of progress is less than planned, against the targeted outcome;</li> <li>• Where some measurable progress has been made but the rate of progress is less than anticipated or falling appreciably short of interim milestones;</li> <li>• Where there is significant doubt around the achievement of the target outcomes in the targeted timeframe.</li> <li>• For level of service indicators also; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is a lack of information on the current level of service;</li> <li>○ The target level of service is within 10% of being met;</li> </ul> <p>There is confidence around improving performance against the standard in the (near) future.</p> </li> </ul>

<b>RED</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where little or no progress has been observed;</li> <li>• Where the measured rate of progress is highly unlikely to lead to the achievement of the targeted outcome;</li> <li>• Where delivery of the targeted outcome is likely to be achieved, but with significant delay;</li> <li>• Where confirmed baselines and/or milestones have not been established;</li> <li>• For level of service indicators also; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The current level of service is some distance away from the level targeted - in excess of 10% (as opposed to 10 percentage points).</li> <li>○ The service standard is within 10% of being met but not expected to exhibit any real improvement in the future.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
------------	---

In indicating the status of targets using the four traffic light system, the following points should be considered:

- Quarterly assessments should be a snapshot of progress now towards delivery at year-end. The overall assessment is looking forward, i.e. given the current picture, likely future developments and risks, what is the current expectation for year-end?
- In general, traffic light assessments should be forward-looking. Therefore if a target/milestone has been missed and, as a result, the target has been revised, then future assessments should be based on the new target level. However in this case it is important to consider the level of ongoing risk to delivery i.e. if problems have arisen previously, does that make future problems more likely? This might be a particular concern if the final date for delivery is still some way off.
- Red traffic lights should not be considered automatically reflecting badly on those responsible for delivering an objective. Some Reds are probably inevitable and form a necessary part of the overall picture. However, Red traffic lights should always be a trigger for discussion on whether there is corrective action that can be taken to bring delivery back on track.

## ANNEX B

**HEAD OF DIVISION / NDPB CHIEF EXECUTIVE PRO FORMA FOR  
REPORTING SLIPPAGE IN TARGETS**

<b>PfG Commitment Corporate Plan 2011-15 target</b>	
<b>Corresponding Operating Plan 11/12 target</b>	
<b>Figure achieved to date</b>	
<b>Status of target (G / AG / A / R)</b>	
<b>Explanation of slippage</b>	
<b>Remedial action being taken</b>	
<b>Has the policy/ delivery mechanism been reviewed to ensure it is effective?</b>	

**Senior Responsible Owner:  
(DETI Head of Division/ NDPB Chief Executive)**

**Date:**

DT1/12/0041724