

For the attention of Kevin Carson and Arun Devasia
Cc: Anthony Busselier, Gavin Cooke, Holly Christopher, Yameen Rasul

8 January 2026

Dear BECTU representatives

Response to fourth collective consultation meeting

Thank you for attending the collective consultation meeting on Friday 19 December 2025.

In attendance at the meeting were the following colleagues:

- BECTU Representatives – Kevin Carson, Arun Devasia, Anthony Busselier, Lisa Singh, Gavin Cooke, Yameen Rasul
- BBC Business Representatives – Kelly Kowal, Jaime Toca, Jack Whyte, Nic Bailey, Alison Ransome

At the meeting we talked through the points raised in Gavin's email of 15th December. Please find a summary of these points below.

1. Evidence for new rationales introduced during the call on 11 Dec

New justifications for the restructure were introduced during the meeting, including inefficiency and examples of thriving teams. When asked for supporting data and specifics, none were provided - we would welcome sight of any data underpinning these new rationales.

Kelly re-shared the organisational context, in particular BBC market share, industry disruption around technology and the fast pace of change in audience behaviour. The brand approach Product Group used to operate within required coordination from Delivery. The move to the Product Operating Model aligned to devices and capabilities reduces the need for coordination at a team level. The proposal is a fundamental shift in ways of working and puts accountabilities into appropriate teams and functions. We are confident this proposal will be successful because the approach is common across large technology organisations and we have adapted this to suit the needs of our organisation. None of the information shared on 11 December was new rationale.

Gavin explained that he has data that shows the level of coordination needed has increased. We shared our view that this will not continue to be needed in the future when the organisation fully transitions to new ways of working.



We have received your further list of questions on 19 December 2025 which sets out the metrics you would like to see. We'll review these, establish whether we agree the metrics are relevant to the success of this restructuring and respond accordingly.

2. Job description overlap analysis

When we walked through the shaded overlap between SETL responsibilities and Delivery responsibilities, it was clear that some items listed as 'overlap' are not carried out by Delivery today in practice. This suggests that part of the overlap mapping may need to be revisited, as it forms a key element of the rationale provided – it was suggested that this was not the analysis done ('what I saw was the JDs side-by-side').

During the call Nic Bailey shared a 'side-by-side' view comparing the CPFs of SETLs and Delivery Managers. It is acknowledged that the wording isn't identical but the comparison illustrates where there is overlap in accountabilities. This slide has been attached with this letter.

3. Redistribution of work into Engineering

The task analysis shows a large set of Delivery responsibilities moving to Engineering, predominantly to SETLs. In practice, many of these tasks are not part of Engineering's remit today and it would be helpful to see any task-level analysis and capacity modelling that demonstrates how this volume of work could realistically be absorbed alongside SETLs' existing responsibilities.

We shared our view that the workload of SETLs shouldn't be increased as a result of this proposal. Although SETLs are accountable, this doesn't mean they have to undertake all duties themselves. When considering work that stops, work that is automated, the ability to delegate, improved tooling and the efficiency that is gained by removing duplication, it is considered that SETLs will be able to work in this new way without their workload increasing. We've received your email dated 7th January highlighting workload as a continued concern for your members and we'd welcome another conversation on this at the fifth collective consultation meeting.

We acknowledged that some SETLs may no longer wish to work in this role in the future organisation. We are open to conversations with colleagues on a case by case basis to discuss options, for example an Individual Contributor role. We believe this is something that we could offer on a headcount neutral basis (for example a job swap between an individual contributor and a team leader, providing they both have the skills for the alternative job). We would need to explore whether there is additional headcount if there is more interest one way or the other.

4. Initiative-level delivery responsibilities

We also discussed initiative-level coordination work (cross-team alignment, sequencing,



overlapping work, risk and dependency management). It was stated during the call that Product already does this work today, but no examples were provided when we asked who does this in practice. As these duties do not appear in existing Product or Engineering CPFs, and are currently carried out by Delivery, it would be helpful to understand in more detail how this conclusion was reached.

In particular, we would invite you to review the Lead Delivery Manager job description, Executive Product manager job description, and the Initiative Lead document side-by-side.

We heard your view that the Product Initiative Lead document suggests Delivery work is moving elsewhere. We disagreed with this and talked through our view that Product Management already work in this way. The Initiative Lead isn't an independent role, rather the document reinforces expectations around operating across multiple teams. Since the call, an email has been shared which summarises the discussions held around the Product Initiative Lead. Our view is that the existing CPF in Product Management covers this expectation.

5. Outstanding questions raised earlier this week

We have not yet received written responses to several of the questions raised over email, including those relating to the Equality Impact Assessment, stress risk assessment, role mapping, JD inconsistencies, and the introduction of the Initiative Lead role mid-consultation.

In advance of the call, we re-shared the proposed job descriptions deck and asked for clarification on any questions outstanding in relation to this. No questions were raised. Job evaluation for the three newly created roles is ongoing and we expect this to be concluded imminently. We will share the outcome with you at the earliest opportunity.

During the call we gave an overview of the discussions held with the Data Operations team on 18th December, attended by Kevin. Following a careful review of the information provided and senior stakeholder engagement, the proposed approach will be maintained and colleagues in Data Operations will not be mapped directly into the proposed model. This is because the team do not operate at a programme level, rather they are embedded in teams similar to Delivery colleagues. Should colleagues wish to raise further points for consideration we remain open to reconsidering the approach to mapping as part of collective consultation.

The Product Initiative Lead role was discussed in the third collective consultation meeting and an email has now been shared which summarises the discussions held.

We ran out of time on the call to talk through the Equality Impact Assessment and Stress Risk Assessment questions raised on email by Gavin on 8th December. We agreed to share the response by email and this has now been done. We'd be happy to talk through any questions at the fifth collective consultation meeting if that is helpful.

We trust this answers questions from the fourth meeting. There will be a fifth meeting on Friday 9th January 2026.

With regards

Kelly Kowal
Director of Product Operations