**Northern Ireland
Assembly**

# ENSURING DELIVERY OF THE CROSS-CUTTING THEMES IN THE PROGRAMME FOR GOVERNMENT

**Jane Campbell**
Research Officer

## INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing emphasis within government in recent years on cross-cutting policy and 'joined up' working. This is in recognition that many of the challenges for government today call for a joint response - requiring the involvement of many departments, agencies and local authority functions. Consequently, Government programmes now include goals and targets which cross traditional departmental boundaries. But observers have commented that joint working has not proved easy, and policy implementation has often suffered as a result.

This paper is a discussion of some of the key lessons for cross-cutting working provided by research within this area, largely by Central UK Government over the last decade. The paper also examines approaches in other jurisdictions such as Scotland, the Republic of Ireland, Sweden, Hong Kong and New Zealand. Section 4 covers approaches to performance management and how it relates to the evaluation of cross-cutting working. Section 7 examines the cross-cutting themes and key priorities contained within Northern Ireland's Programme for Government (PfG) and how delivery is envisaged.

## 1.0 TRADITIONAL WAYS OF WORKING & 'SINGLE-CUT' POLICY

The traditional structure in government for delivery of policy is a 'vertical' or a 'top-down' system or 'model'. Policies such as road maintenance, planning and social work provision belong within traditional yet narrow departmental and professional boundaries. It is obvious that there are justifications for such 'single-cut' policies. Traditional departmental (or some would say 'silo') based activity in government has obvious advantages – for instance, it provides a single clear line of accountability and audit trails in straight vertical lines (easier to follow), it allows for tight control over scarce resources, it has a concentration of professional expertise and a strong organisational focus.

The relationship between policy and implementation is complex and in practice there often exists an 'implementation gap' in which policy does not get translated into action in the way policy makers intended. Often the top-down flow from policy is imperfect, - due to poor communication, inadequate resource allocation, or poor policy specification. It is recognised that the traditional delivery structure has contributed in the past to the failure of policy in cross-cutting areas, areas such as social exclusion, regeneration, community safety and sustainable development.

The literature on cross–cutting working suggests that delivery of cross-cutting goals is greatly benefited by an understanding of the complexity of the processes involved.

Research studies[1] of cross-cutting working have highlighted useful lessons for the policy process; these will be covered later in this paper.

## 2.0 CROSS-CUTTING WORKING – WHAT IS IT & WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS ?

Central Government in UK values cross-cutting working but it is also aware of the problems in taking such an approach. The House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee stated recently that:

> *It is vital that thinking about the future and long-term policy is not constrained by departmental boundaries…. Cross-government thinking is, however, inherently difficult.[2]*

Cross-cutting issues are those which cross departmental boundaries. Cross-cutting policies have more stakeholders, are harder to monitor and evaluate; they run greater risks of failure and communication breakdown. Cabinet Office guidance states that:

> *Cross-cutting approaches are no panacea. They have costs as well as benefits….*
> *It is necessary to weigh up the costs and benefits of a cross-cutting approach with the costs and benefits of more traditional vertical structures. A cross-cutting approach should only be implemented if it is likely to offer significantly greater net benefits than the alternatives, i.e. add value[3]*

Starting around a decade ago, central UK Government tried to address the concern that it had worked least well in dealing with issues that cross departmental boundaries. It was concerned that the effectiveness of government and the value for money of its polices would be undermined. Some of the reasons why cross-cutting working is liable to fail are identified by the Cabinet Office[4]:

### 1. HOW GOVERNMENT IS STRUCTURED

The structure of government - and its associated ways of working is identified as one of the biggest barriers to successful cross-cutting activity. Traditionally most areas of government business – education, health, etc have been managed in 'vertical' management lines with Ministers at the top and service providers and their clients at the bottom. However, such rigid structures with their protected departmental and professional boundaries are liable to inhibit effective inter-organisational or inter-

---

1 See, *Cross-cutting issues affecting local government.* Department for Communities and Local Government 1999 http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/general-content/localgovernment/crosscuttingissuesaffecting/
and *Wiring it Up: Whitehall's Management of Cross-Cutting policies and Services.* Cabinet Office 2000
http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/generalcontent/localgovernment/crosscuttingissuesaffecting/
2 para 4.5 *Governing the Future.* House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee. Session 2006/07
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmpubadm/123/123i.pdf
3 *Wiring it Up: Whitehall's Management of Cross-Cutting policies and Services.* Cabinet Office 2000
http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/generalcontent/localgovernment/crosscuttingissuesaffecting/
4 ibid

departmental working. Mechanisms for dealing with conflicts of priorities between departments can be weak, eventually leading to a lack of coordination at the local level. Research by central UK government from around ten years ago found that some civil servants were finding it difficult to adjust to the new ways of cross-cutting working. It found a reluctance to take on work that was not seen as 'core' to the department – cross-cutting issues were often seen as marginal to mainstream policy areas[5].

Policy delivery is heavily influenced by organisational culture. This can be thought of as the values, meanings, language and attitudes that underpin behaviour or "*the way we do things round here.*"[6] Good Practice guidance urges that organisations seek to create a culture conducive to cross-cutting working – i.e. where there is *ownership* of the policy. Researchers examining cross-cutting working in UK found that *a range* of cultures are often present in an organisation[7] for example,

- a *compliance* culture treats new initiatives largely in terms of conforming with required procedures,

- a *survival* culture treats new initiatives as 'noise in the system', and by indulging inertia and avoidance of taking responsibility, induces failure to implement,

- a *can-do* culture rejects constraints and obstacles and reflects a determination to make things happen,

- a culture of *strategic implementation* is grounded in shared thinking and understanding about the long-term, the joint ownership of problems and sustained motivation

The researchers found compliant and survival cultures were prevalent in central departments. Some civil servants regretted the speed of the approach to cross-cutting issues and felt that since they had not originated the policies: "*it is not our fault if it goes wrong".*

The researchers acknowledged that culture does not exist in isolation from other elements. However, they concluded that if interaction between the various levels of government on cross-cutting issues is to become more productive then issues of culture must be addressed at both levels, and together.

**2. INCENTIVES AND REWARDS**

A second major obstacle to successful cross-cutting working occurs when organisations or individuals receive little incentive or reward for contributing to cross-cutting goals. High profile initiatives bring recognition to Ministers rather than lower key but significant contributions to cross-cutting objectives. There is little reward for helping someone else achieve their objectives – either in financial terms or in terms of enhanced status or career prospects.

---

[5] Para 3.1.2 *Cross-cutting issues affecting local government.* Department for Communities and Local Government 1999 http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/general-content/localgovernment/crosscuttingissuesaffecting/
[6] Ibid Para 3.6
[7] ibid

Inter-Departmental rivalry may also occur inhibiting the development of policy on cross-cutting issues. Ministers who are departmentally minded may be eager to keep policy initiatives clearly within their own departmental remit. Some themes may be regarded as 'top of the agenda' and attract more support than others. It has also been observed that there is a tendency to focus on the short term and on the need for quick wins – despite the fact that cross-cutting issues are by their nature not amenable to quick solutions.

### 3. A SKILLS AND CAPACITY DEFICIT

The skills and capacity to develop and deliver cross-cutting solutions are different from those required to defend and promote a departmental brief. New skills and capacities are essential for those working in government – particularly strategic capacities, and skills in listening, negotiation, leadership through influence, partnership working, performance management and evaluation.

### 4. VERTICAL STRUCTURES AND BUDGETS

Organisational structures and budgets tend to be arranged around *vertical* lines such as health, education etc rather than *horizontally* – i.e. focussed on cross-cutting issues such as social exclusion or sustainable development.

### 5. HOW THE CENTRE OPERATES

The Cabinet Office's research has noted that the centre (in GB this equates to Treasury, Cabinet Office and No. 10) has not always been proactive in promoting cross-cutting policy formation and service delivery, neither has it been effective at giving clear strategic direction, and mechanisms for resolving conflicts between departments can be weak.


## 3.0 GOOD PRACTICE FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Lessons can be learned about cross-cutting working from the example of other jurisdictions.

### SCOTLAND

Scotland has had some success in changing structures to achieve better cross-cutting working. For instance it has endeavoured to arrange Ministerial portfolios and departmental structures around cross-cutting objectives rather than simple sectoral functions, for example by creating a Minister for Enterprise and Lifelong Learning, a Minister for Rural Affairs and a Minister for Children and Education.

Scotland uses Outcome Agreements[8] (OAs) for delivery of policy. Outcome Agreements operate at national and local level. They were designed to better link national policy priorities and targets with local priorities and circumstances. Scotland has developed OA's in relation to two key policy themes - education attainment and children's services. Outcomes are dependent upon partnership working. Local outcome agreements were seen as a means of limiting the use of ring fenced funding

---

[8] Guidance on Single Outcome Agreements
http://www.improvementservice.org.uk/news/news-across-scotland/single-outcome-agreement---guidance-format-and-indicators-package-issued.html

and shifting the balance to mainstream funding. The benefits of Outcome Agreements are:

- Help to think about impact rather than just delivery.
- Clarity about priorities and aims.
- Improves transparency about who is accountable.
- Emphasis on outcomes.

## SWEDEN

The Swedish system of government recognises the need for cross-cutting working in a number of ways – by setting objectives which cut across Ministerial and budget boundaries. The budget system, at least initially, allocates money according to policy areas, rather than to organisations. It also requires Ministers to co-ordinate and to consult with each other. Finally, there is a tradition in Sweden of inclusive and collective decision making – and many people are brought into the decision making process.

## HONG KONG

The Hong Kong government employs a range of initiatives to enhance cross-departmental working and uses a system, called the Target Management Process (TMP). This has provided:
- Clearer ownership and sponsorship of cross-cutting objectives
- Greater clarity of cross-cutting responsibilities and relationships
- Closer alignment between funding and priorities.
- Greater visibility for cross-cutting working

## NEW ZEALAND

The New Zealand Government's broad objectives are articulated through Strategic Results Areas (SRAs).  Ministers and Chief Executives must identify the main contribution of their departments to SRAs through the articulation of Key Results Areas (KRAs) which are, in turn, included in performance agreements between the Chief Executives and departmental Ministers. SRAs have increased awareness of synergies and trade-offs between government policies and have also articulated the link between outcomes and outputs.

## REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

In the Republic of Ireland the Department of the Taoiseach has a policy co-ordination role especially in relation to cross-cutting issues; the Programme for Government[9] favours the fostering of a '*whole of government'* approach and emphasises:

- the ability to co-ordinate, lead and progress key cross-departmental issues
- supporting long-term planning and inter-agency co-operation in policy formulation and implementation

---

[9] Programme for Government 2007-2012.
http://www.taoiseach.gov.ie/eng/index.asp?docID=3493

- leading and participating in cross-Departmental initiatives, including the Cabinet committee system

## 4.0 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND CROSS-CUTTING WORKING

One of the potential difficulties with cross-cutting working lies in measuring its effectiveness and impact. Cross-cutting working therefore requires government to develop and maintain more sophisticated performance management systems. Performance management is the activity of tracking performance and identifying opportunities for improvement. Good performance management is an integrated process that aims to link strategy with corporate objectives in ways that make the best use of resources by co-ordinating the efforts of every member of the organisation.

Central government in UK has admitted to shortcomings in its approach to performance management in the past and that it is possible to set targets which can be insensitive to the needs, values and demands of the users of public services, and result in the charge that the government has '*hit the target but missed the point*'[10]

Allied to the new focus on cross-cutting and joined up working, it has developed a new approach to performance management, as part of its *Modernising Government*[11] agenda. A system was developed setting performance objectives that aimed to be new and challenging and capable of achieving more within the constraints of available resources. This new performance management system focuses on continuous improvement throughout government[12].

- The system focuses on Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs). The Government's key priorities are contained in the PSAs. PSAs are intended to express clearly to the public what the government intends to deliver with the resources that are available.

- Each large Government Department has a PSA; this specifies an aim and a number of objectives - which are outcome focussed.

- A value for money (VfM) target is also included – this establishes the cost-effectiveness of policy initiatives and the services that are delivered.

- The PSA usually states who is accountable for the delivery of the targets (in most cases, the Minister responsible for the department/policy area). Aware of the former shortcomings in performance management, government has issued Treasury guidance, for instance, on the setting of PSA targets which advises that they should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timed), and that they should "*not be open to distortion*"

- As well as departmental PSAs, a number of cross-cutting PSAs may be stated. For these, responsibility for delivery is shared between two or more Ministers.

---

[10]http://www.theworkfoundation.com/aboutus/media/pressreleases/publicvaluefinalreport.aspx
[11] http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm43/4310/4310.htm
[12] See *Policy Evaluation in the United Kingdom* Cabinet Office 2004
http://www.nationalschool.gov.uk/policyhub/docs/policy_evaluation_uk.pdf

This new approach to performance management links policy and delivery. It facilitates the development of *"end to end"* policy making, where implementation and delivery are considered from the start. Recent guidance from the Cabinet Office talks about *"embedding deliverability"*[13] because viewing policy and delivery as two separate activities "*is an artificial divide*".

## 5.0 WHAT MAKES A GOOD CROSS-CUTTING GOAL?

Section 2 earlier in this paper maintained that a cross-cutting approach is not appropriate in all situations and that this form of working was "*no panacea*". Guidance emphasises the need to weigh up the cost and benefits of using a cross-cutting approach against the more 'traditional' approach to policy.

It is now widely accepted however, that there are many areas where a cross-cutting approach has clear advantages in government. Before examining some of the guidance on ensuring delivery of cross-cutting goals and objectives, it is important to consider what makes a *good* or a *sound* cross-cutting goal. The research[14] on cross-cutting working recommends a number of critical factors to consider.

Crucially, there should be an unambiguously defined central government definition either of the 'problem' or the desired outcomes. A research paper stressed that:

> *…success in achieving outcomes requires clarification of the problems being addressed before the event…*and recommended that: *…..objectives are clear and unambiguous, and that desired outcomes, together with the mechanisms to achieve these outcomes, are certain and known to and accepted by all the parties to implementation.*[15]

Lack of a sufficient explanation of the cause and effect of the problem and the lack of a clear and unambiguous central definition of the problem means insufficient direction is brought to policy development and no clear framework for implementation. For example, researchers studying the implementation of the cross-cutting issue of social exclusion in GB found it to be interpreted in terms of specific problematic groups – rough sleepers and truants/excluded pupils[16]. The researchers found that other cross-cutting issues were given different meanings by different departments. They emphasised the need for the basic terms to be sufficiently thought through. The researchers pointed out that these variations in meaning are probably due to genuine and important differences in values and goals between departments. For example, sustainable development appeared to be interpreted by the Treasury in terms of environmental economics, and by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) as the environmental performance of business.

The research also found that definition can be *deliberately avoided* by departments, perhaps so that conflicts of interest in policy agendas may be disguised. The

---

[13] *"Identifying good practice in the use of programme and project management in policy making"* Cabinet Office
http://www.nationalschool.gov.uk/policyhub/docs/IPPD%20GP%20v.61.pdf
[14] *Cross-cutting issues affecting local government.* Department for Communities and Local Government 1999 http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/general-content/localgovernment/crosscuttingissuesaffecting/
[15] Ibid Para 2.2
[16] Ibid Para 3.1.1

researchers believed that it is unrealistic to expect differences to be resolved locally if they cannot be resolved nationally - and that ambiguity in the centre translates into confusion on the ground:

> *Government cannot expect local agencies to work collaboratively if in the centre they are fighting turf wars*[17]

The researchers found that the absence of definition allowed for different interpretations of policy and different ideas about the purpose and form of new initiatives. They also observed that tensions could arise where stated goals were not accompanied by the legislative, fiscal or other measures which the local level believed were necessary for progress towards the goals.

## 6.0 ENSURING DELIVERY OF CROSS-CUTTING GOALS

It has been maintained that the complex nature of cross-cutting issues demands a new approach to policy development and implementation. Central government in UK has been monitoring its performance in relation to cross-cutting working for a number of years; a report from the Cabinet Office specifies a number of key points for organisations to consider for ensuring effective delivery[18]:

❑ **Leadership** – is it strong and is it creating a culture which values cross-cutting policies?
Ministers and senior civil servants should make it clear that cross-cutting working is valued. This will mean that how the performance of Ministers and civil servants is judged needs to change. This should result in new incentives for Ministers and civil servants to look beyond departmental responsibilities and receive credit for leading successful cross-departmental initiatives.

❑ **Policy formulation** – has it taken account of cross-cutting problems and issues?
Greater importance needs to be placed on cross-cutting problems and issues at the policy formulation stage. This can be achieved by putting more effort into using external sources of advice, including feedback from users of services and service delivers and their views about the effectiveness of government's policies and funding mechanisms.

❑ **Staff** - do civil servants have the skills and capacity to address cross-cutting problems and issues?
The skills and capacity of civil servants should be enhanced so they are better able to promote and manage cross-cutting policies and services, work in partnerships with multiple reporting lines and have strong project management skills.

❑ **Budgets** – are they being used flexibly to promote cross-cutting working?

---

[17] Para 3.1.1 *"Identifying good practice in the use of programme and project management in policy making"* Cabinet Office
http://www.nationalschool.gov.uk/policyhub/docs/IPPD%20GP%20v.61.pdf
[18] *Wiring it Up: Whitehall's management of cross-cutting policies and services.* Cabinet Office. 2000
http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/work_areas/~/media/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/coiwire%20pdf.ashx

There is a need to reform the way that money for cross-departmental policies and initiatives is allocated and controlled. More cross-cutting budgets are needed and they need to combine flexibility in service delivery with clear, tight accountability.

❑ **Are audit** and external scrutiny being used to reinforce cross-cutting working and encourage sensible risk taking?
Parliament and public sector auditors and inspectors should be encouraged to respond positively to new approaches to cross-cutting working and innovative accountability arrangements.

❑ **The Centre** – is it being used to lead the drive to more effective cross-cutting approaches?
The centre should be looking at the way in which objectives and targets are set for departments and agencies. Direct intervention, should be however, only a last resort.

## 7.0 CROSS-CUTTING APPROACHES IN NORTHERN IRELAND

PfG *Making a Difference* 2002-2005

Before examining the current programme for government it may be useful to look at local approaches to cross-cutting policy and activity in the past. The previous devolved administration in Northern Ireland published *Making A Difference,* its Programme for Government for the Years 2002-2005. This was based on the premise that *"modern government"*… needs to be "…*accessible, accountable and responsive"* and that an exclusively 'top-down' approach *"is neither desirable nor effective"*[19]. The programme set a series of five priority areas which would require a whole of government approach:

➢ Growing as a community
➢ Working for a healthier people
➢ Investing in education and skills
➢ Securing a competitive economy
➢ Developing North/South, East/West, and International Relations

The administration used Executive Programme Funds (EPFs) to support the PfG and encourage cross-cutting policy development. These new funds aimed to contribute to delivery in each of the PfG's five priority areas. In 2001 the Minister for Finance and Personnel Mark Durkan stated that EPFs provided one of the most effective means available to promote cross-cutting working and support initiatives brought forward by a group of Ministers working together[20]. Reviewing the performance of the programme in 2001, there was some debate between the Minister Mr Durkan and the Chair of the Assembly's Finance and Personnel Committee around the scrutiny of allocations of the EPF funds. Mr Molloy expressed a view to the Minister that while the EPF funds were intended to be directed to cross-departmental projects, the "cross-department aim has been lost"

---

[19] http://www.pfgbudgetni.gov.uk/pfgreport0205main1.pdf
[20] http://archive.nics.gov.uk/dfp/011203j-dfp.htm

PFG *Building A Better Future* 2008-2011

The current Northern Ireland Executive's strategic thinking is expressed in the Programme for Government (PfG) *Building a Better Future*[21] published in 2008 which sets out its priorities and plans for the next three years.

The PfG appears to have a hierarchical structure. It begins with five key priorities:

- Grow a dynamic innovative economy
- Promote tolerance, inclusion and health and well being
- Protect and enhance our environment  and natural resources
- Invest to build our infrastructure
- Deliver modern, high quality and efficient public services

    (Associated with each key priority are a number of 'key goals'.)

The PfG states that the five key priorities *will be underpinned by two cross-cutting key themes:*

- ❖ a shared and better future
- ❖ sustainability

To support the five key priorities is a framework of 23 Public Service Agreements (PSAs). The PfG states that the PSA framework is specifically designed to focus on addressing key cross-cutting issues and challenges.

Since the publication of the draft PfG government Departments have been required to produce and publish Service Delivery Agreements. These are intended to support the PSAs. The Service Delivery Agreements should set out how the Department will contribute to the government's overall strategic commitments and its own PSA targets.


**8.0 DELIVERY OF THE CROSS-CUTTING THEMES IN THE PfG**

It has been stated that the complex nature of cross-cutting issues demands a new approach to policy development and implementation. It has also been stressed that cross-cutting work requires organisations to develop and maintain more sophisticated performance management systems.

In his introduction of the Draft PfG to the Assembly on 25 October 2007 the First Minister stated:

> *The draft Programme for Government represents a very different approach to that which was adopted by the last Executive. We have facilitated the creation of a more focussed set of priorities and a smaller number of goals. The Executive feel that it is important to be clear about our priorities and what we are trying to achieve[22].*

Whilst there were many positive responses to the draft PfG from Members and Assembly Committees some concerns were expressed about its clarity in relation to delivery and performance management. Some statutory committees envisaged difficulties in tracking priorities through to the Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and

---

[21] http://www.pfgbudgetni.gov.uk/finalpfg.pdf
[22] http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/centre/2007mandate/reports/Report_9.07.08R.htm

then to the draft Budget and Investment Strategy. This was felt to be due to the number of aims, objectives, priorities, themes, goals and milestones. Others expressed concerns that there was inadequate detailed information to enable proper scrutiny and to be satisfied about the delivery of targets. A further concern was in relation to a lack of clarity over who has responsibility for delivering on each goal or target in the PfG.[23].

The Committee for OFMDFM asked for clarification from the Department on these matters. Additionally the Committee sought clarification on how departments will be required to take account of the cross-cutting themes of *a better future* and *sustainability,* and in particular:

- How the contribution being made by individual departments towards *a better future* and *sustainability* is to be assessed
- Who will be monitoring the action being taken by departments to achieve *a better future* and *sustainability*
- When will progress against key milestones be reported

OFMDFM's reply was:

> *The cross-cutting themes highlight the Executive's determination to address these key areas. The themes have informed the identification of the Executives priorities and the targets and commitments set out in the PSA framework. The delivery of the priorities and PSAs will, therefore, be complementary to the delivery of key strategies and will be central to the delivery of the cross –cutting themes.*

> *The Delivery Framework for the Executive's priorities and the PSA Delivery Agreements will provide an effective and robust basis for monitoring and reporting progress on these areas.[24]*

> *The Programme for Government confirms that in the first instance OFMDFM Ministers and the Minister for Finance and Personnel, supported by a central delivery team, will take the lead in monitoring progress on the Programme for Government and reporting to the Executive. A six-monthly progress report will be provided to the Committee and an end-year report will be published on the website.*

## 9.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This first part of this paper is concerned with the practice of cross-cutting working in government. Lessons for cross-cutting policy design and implementation were examined from Best Practice examples from other parts of the UK and beyond. These highlighted some of the pitfalls of cross-cutting working and some of the critical factors for success. Best Practice stresses that an effective performance management system is tantamount for ensuring delivery of cross-cutting goals. It is noteworthy however, that research also highlighted the importance of "embedding deliverability" at the policy design stage and the need to consider factors such as defining the 'problem', what organisational structures and cultures exist in central and local government, the influence of incentives and rewards, the need for effective skills and leadership and the vital role that the Centre can play in ensuring objectives are delivered.

---

[23] ibid
[24] Response to Committee's Report on the Executive's Draft Programme for Government 2008-2011 and draft Investment Strategy 2008-2011. Memorandum to Committee for OFMDFM from the First Minister and deputy First Minister. 28 Feb 2008

The rest of this paper focused on approaches to cross-cutting working by government in Northern Ireland, and in particular, within the current administration's Programme for Government. The PfG appears to have a hierarchical or linked structure consisting of key priorities (and two cross-cutting themes) supported by PSAs (with Objectives, Actions and Targets), followed or supported by Delivery Agreements at Departmental level.

The PfG refers to the creation of a <u>Delivery Framework</u> to establish:

> *A robust and effective basis for monitoring and reporting of progress at a strategic level, to and by, the Executive[25]*

However the PfG contains only limited information on this Delivery Framework. The PSA framework in the PfG resembles the framework for PSAs set out in the Central UK Government's performance management system, outlined in section 4 of this paper. The PfG does not state if this model was followed in the setting up of the PSA framework, and therefore if the same or a similar approach to performance management is envisaged.

In conclusion, the finalised PfG provides limited information about how government will be managing and monitoring delivery of its priorities and goals (including the cross-cutting themes).

**June 2008**

---

[25] Page 21 PfG