

**For the attention of Kevin Carson and Gavin Cooke**

**Cc: Anthony Busselier**

12 February 2026

Dear BECTU representatives

### **Response to counter proposal**

Thank you for your time on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> February talking through the organisation's response to the BECTU counter proposal. The richness and depth of the discussions held during collective consultation have allowed us to develop a revised model which we believe responds to the ideas and risks raised through the counter proposals. Thank you for supporting us to have these meaningful discussions.

As part of collective consultation and the insights received, the Product Group Operations model has been amended to include **an additional 14 roles** (subject to final job banding and CPF review) **plus 1 additional Agile Coaching role in Engineering Enablement**. This results in a Product Group Operations function of **49 EFT**, as opposed to the original proposal of 35. Of the additional 14 roles:

**6** additional roles are for teams/areas that were missed during the initial proposal development:

**Third Party management execution / administration activities** - Product Group Operations (3 EFT)

**Third Party programme management (e.g. gaming)** - Programme Management (3 EFT)

**9** additional roles to strengthen teams:

**Programme Management pan-BBC and cross-functional Product Group initiatives** (4 EFT)

**Portfolio Alignment** (4 EFT)

## Agile Coaching – Engineering Enablement (1 EFT)

Please find below the summary of the adjustments being made to the model as a result of the feedback received.

	Proposal	Counter proposal	EFT impact (Proposal v Counter)	Response to counter proposal	EFT impact (Proposal v Response)
Product Group Operations	10	15	+5	13 *tbc	+3
Portfolio Alignment	4	23	+19	8 **	+4
Programme Management – pan BBC	7	16	+9	11	+4
Programme Management – Third Party	0	5	+5	3	+3
Programme Management – Data	8	10	+2	8	0
Product Group Operations HQ	6	6		6	0
Agile coach (Eng Enablement)				1	+1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>+40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>+15</b>

- The proposal in Portfolio Operations results in Band E to Band E reporting. The impact of this is being explored.

\*\* The job description and grading of the Band D role counter proposed in this area is being explored.

A full response will be shared when the above reviews have been concluded.

### Product Operations

The counter proposal for the Product Operations area is aligned with the expected needs of Product Group in the Product Operating Model.

Portfolio Operations: We agree with the proposal to maintain a headcount of 5 and clarify the end-to-end vertical ownership around strategy & planning, delivery & insight, knowledge & reporting, and funding & governance. This part of the structure will be facing into more Senior members of the Product Group organisation and therefore requires a higher level of seniority to support them.

We are reviewing the implications of the Band E to Band E reporting in the counter proposal and will respond fully once this has been considered.

	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Counter</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>EFT impact</b>
Portfolio Operations	2 x E 3 x D	1 x E 4 x E	5 x E (subject to final review)	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

Third party operations:

We agree with the split of the team in two areas focused on advisory & governance and business operations.

For Advisory & Governance, we believe that given the number of suppliers we manage now, our direction of travel, and our level of maturity, the work requires 2 Band D roles, rather than the 3 suggested in the counter proposal.

For business operations, given the increased seniority of the team members and the expected level of process automation and optimisation, we believe this work can be conducted by a team of 4 (1 Band E, 2 Band D, 1 Band C), rather than the 5 suggested in the counter proposal.

Overall, we have added 3 roles to the model:

	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Counter</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>EFT impact</b>
Third Party Operations	1 x E 3 x D	2 x E 5 x D 2 x C	2 x E 4 x D 1 x C	+3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>+3</b>

## 2. Programme & Project Management

Overall, we agree that the size of the Programme Management team should increase to support all the large pan-BBC programmes, as well as some of the most critical cross functional initiatives across product group.

Data Programme Management

We do not support the counter proposal to increase the size of the team by 2 roles. The new structure of the data strategy programme and the potential temporary support provided by the pan-BBC programme management team should be sufficient to cover the scope of this programme.

Following a detailed assessment, the original proposal not to map colleagues into the Band D roles in this area remains unchanged. This is because the majority of their work has been as embedded Delivery Managers not Programme Managers.

	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Counter</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>EFT impact</b>
Data	1 x F	1 x F	1 x F	0
Operations	3 x E	3 x E	3 x E	
	4 x D	6 x D	4 x D	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>

Pan-BBC Programme Management

From a leadership standpoint, we do not support the counter proposal to introduce two additional Band F roles. With the increased support included in the revised model, we feel the Programme Manager will be able to provide leadership to the entire team.

In addition, we do not support the introduction of a Portfolio Manager dedicated to managing the project intake process. This is an activity that should be managed by the Band F & E roles in Programme Management.

3<sup>rd</sup> party

This area was not included in our initial proposal and will therefore require additional headcount. Given the primary focus on Project Management rather than Delivery Management, and the flexible deployment of these resources, we believe the work can be effectively supported by 3 roles rather than the 5 proposed.

Incremental support.

We agree that additional roles are needed to manage all key pan-BBC programmes as well as the highest priority cross-functional initiatives. To address this, the revised model adds in 4 Band D roles, as opposed to 6 suggested in the counter proposal. We will carefully manage and limit the volume of work assigned to ensure it remains within the team's overall capacity.

	Proposal	Counter	Response	EFT impact
Leadership	N/A	1 x F	0	0
Portfolio Management	N/A	1 x E	0	0
Programme Management (pan-BBC)	1 x F 4 x E 2 x D	2 x F 4 x E 8 x D	1 x F 4 x E 6 x D	+4
Programme Management (Third Party)	N/A	1 x E 4 x D	1 x E 2 x D	+3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>+7</b>

**Portfolio Alignment**

Overall, the need for Portfolio Alignment is clear and, in broad terms, the intent set out in the counter proposal aligns with our thinking. However, the scale of the organisation in the counter proposal significantly exceeds what we anticipate the future model will need. Many of the additional roles in the counter proposal are justified by activity that exists because the current operating system is still compensating for gaps the new model is intended to address. Portfolio Alignment is deliberately designed as a small, senior capability focused on a limited number of system-level interventions. We feel that the counter proposal replaces coordination activity that the model is designed to remove as we progress further towards the Product Operating Model. We feel this increases the risk of overlapping responsibilities, additional hand-

offs and unnecessary touchpoints with Product & Engineering teams, recreating patterns the model is intended to move away from.

That said, having considered the counter-proposal and a re-assessment of Product Group needs, we have added 4 roles (1 Band E and 3 Band D) to strengthen this function. We are reviewing the Band D level role that would be deployed in this area to confirm which job description would apply and will provide a full response when that has been concluded. This increase is intended to support portfolio-level processes such as Quarterly Business Reviews and improve overall portfolio visibility, without changing the purpose, scope or operating approach of the function.

Proposal	Counter	Response	EFT variance
1 x F 3 x E	2 x F 7 x E 14 x D	1 x F 4 x E 3 x D (subject to job description review)	+4

### Team Level Support

We have heard the concerns raised and risks identified through the counter proposal, and we talked through the following points to address these:

- Product Group Operations model now includes more roles in Programme Management and Portfolio Alignment to enable surge capacity on short- and long-term requirements
- Engineering Enablement will increase Agile Coaching resource by 1 EFT to further support the implementation of the Product Operating Model and Product Development Lifecycle
- Product Engineering will explore the movement of colleagues between SETL and Individual Contributor roles on a headcount neutral / job swap basis

- Redeployment priority will be given to colleagues formally at risk of redundancy to all roles advertised, both in Product Group and pan-BBC wide

Thank you again for your time in talking this through and agreeing to share this with your members. We have held time together on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> February to talk through any questions or comments from your meeting with members and we look forward to speaking then.

With regards

Kelly Kowal  
Director of Product Operations