## **COUNCIL QUESTIONS – 18 JULY 2005**

## <u>Written Question 16 - To the Executive Member for Organisational Development</u> from Cllr Williams

Will he list the IT Projects which have been undertaken by the Council in the last six years; what were the timetables and actual implementation dates in each case and what was the original budget and final cost in each case?

## Answer:

The Council carries out a large number of time and budget limited activities in the IT arena. In 2003/04, the Council set aside an allocation of approximately £3 million for egovernment projects. From this point onwards, key e-government projects have been managed separately rather than as part of base resource.

The major IT projects since 2000/01 have been in two phases, building on the installation of a robust corporate network in the run up to December 1999. The two phases have been: (1) the procurement and implementation of managed service contracts for key applications, which was completed in 2002/03 and (2) the development of e-government functionality starting in 2003/04. In interpreting the following data members will wish to note that:

- in the first phase, the managed service contracts were constructed with an appropriate balance between upfront payments to suppliers and recovery of set up costs by suppliers over the life of the contract. In developing these procurements and contract structures, the Council was supported by the Office for Government Commerce (OGC) and members were independently advised by Gartner Group; and
- in the second phase, the Council's plans have had to change over the period as the
  government's thinking on e-government has developed. In particular, and as has
  been previously reported to members, the introduction of prescriptive Priority Service
  Outcomes (PSOs) in 2004 has moved us in part from developing strategic solutions
  to tactical fixes. The deadlines for the PSOs are December 2005 and March 2006,
  which explain why many of our planned completion dates are in this financial year.

The following table sets out the major projects. It is supported by notes to support the interpretation of the raw data.

Project	Origi nal budg et £'000	Revise d budget £'000	Outturn or spend to date £'000	Origin al date	Revise d date	Actua I completion date (wher e compl -eted)
Phase 1: Managed service procurements						
Infrastructure supplier replacement (1)	-	-	-	Jul 02	Jul 02	Jul 02

Project	Origi nal budg et £'000	Revise d budget £'000	Outturn or spend to date £'000	Origin al date	Revise d date	Actua I comp- letion date (wher e compl -eted)
SAP – finance, HR and procurement system	3,800	3,800	3,912	Apr 02	Nov 02	Nov 02
Siebel – Customer Relationship management system	1,100	1,100	1,148	Nov 01	Nov 01	Nov 01
Civica – parking system	200	200	196	Jan 02	Jun 02	Jun 02
SX3: Revenues and benefits system replacement (2)	70	70	69	Nov 02	Nov 02	Nov 02
Phase 2 – e-government						
implementation						
Web activities	0.000	0.000	4 4 4 5	lan 04	lan 04	lan 04
Website redesign and relaunch	2,030	2,030	1,115	Jan 04	Jan 04	Jan 04
Web content management system				Jan 04	Jan 04	Jan 04
Portal build and harinet relaunch				Oct 04	Oct 04	Oct 04
e-forms design and implementation				Jan 06	Jan 06	-
Library catalogue on-line	35	35	35	Sept 03	Sept 03	Sept 03
e-planning	190	190	205	Apr 05	Apr 05	Mar 05
e-payments – intranet implementation	605	605	465	Oct 04	Oct 04	Oct 04
e-payments – internet implementation				Jan 05	Dec 04	Dec 04
e-payments – extension of payment types				Mar 06	Mar 06	-
Public consultation	50	50	2	Dec 05	Dec 05	-
Business process redesign						
(3)						
Highways	460	460	429	Oct 04	Oct 04	Sep 04
Benefits and local taxation				Dec 04	Dec 04	Mar 05
Housing repairs				Sep 04	Oct 04	Oct 04
Human Resources				Jan 05	Jan 05	Mar

Project	Origi nal budg et £'000	Revise d budget £'000	Outturn or spend to date £'000	Origin al date	Revise d date	Actua I completion date (wher e compl -eted)
						05
Benefit realisation and						
SAP – finance, HR and	1,200	1,200	758	Nov 05	Nov 05	_
procurement system	1,200	1,200	730	1100 03	1100 03	_
Siebel – Customer Relationship management system	1,240	1,240	458	Mar 06	Mar 06	-
Business support systems						
Leisure services system replacement (5)	525	525	52	Dec 05	Dec 05	-
Local Land and Property Gazetteer – implementation	200	200	140	Jul 04	Jul 04	Jul 04
Local Land and Property Gazetteer – linking with other systems				Mar 06	Mar 06	-
Property management system	410	410	192	Mar 05	Mar 06	-
GIS strategy development and PSO delivery	100	100	16	Mar 06	Mar 06	-
e-care – phase 1	700	700	794	Apr 05	July 05	July 05
e- care – phase 2 (6)				-	TBC	-
Infrastructure						
Refresh of Council's desktop infrastructure (7)	9,000	19,100	14,382	Dec 04	Dec 05	-
Mobile working						
Street wardens solution (8)	-	-	-	Mar 04	Mar 04	Mar 04
Housing repairs Rollout to other areas	145	145	17	Mar 06 Mar 06	Mar 06 Mar 06	-
Notes	<u> </u>			IVIAI UO	IVIAI UO	-

## Notes

- (1) The transfer of the infrastructure facilities management contract from Fijitsu to Northgate was an important project. There were no upfront payments to Northgate for the implementation, hence the budget is shown as nil.
- (2) The managed service procurement was aborted after Best and Final Offer (BAFO) because the selected supplier attempted to inappropriately amend the

- agreed commercial terms prior to contract signature. The remedial plan had a small budget allocated.
- (3) The business process redesign project was about both delivering reviews in a number of areas and developing a Haringey methodology for wider application in service improvement and development activities.
- (4) Following the implementation of these two major applications, significant work has and is carrying on to ensure that the benefits arising from the investment are delivered and on-going enhancements of the applications are exploited within the Council. In relation to SAP, these includes a major system upgrade and implementing the SAP contract management application. In relation to Siebel, this includes optimising the configuration, moving to the public sector vertical and fully embedding the system within the Council's overall application infrastructure.
- (5) The leisure systems had been scheduled for replacement under the aborted outsourcing of the service. This project reflects the Council's decision to retain the service in-house and invest from internal resources.
- (6) This budget represents the Council mainstream resources. Grant funding has also been applied to this project. The full scope of phase 2 of the e-care project has not yet been agreed by members.
- (7) The refresh project, which was agreed in June 2003, is for the replacement and enhancement of the Council's infrastructure. The current PC environment is being replaced with thin client machines, all of the network components have been replaced and connectivity and resilience has been enhanced across the whole estate. Of the increase in the budget, £4.1 million has been identified from within existing and relevant base budgets and the remaining £6 million was funded as set out in the report to the Executive in June 2005.

The original budget for this project was deliberately tight. The complexity of the project has increased but there are substantial benefits that residents will get from refresh, such as prompter and more accurate reporting of potholes and dumped rubbish, better support to social workers and improved sharing of information on child protection issues. Internally, the new arrangements will be more resilient and we have taken the opportunity to systematise the storage of files and data across the Council; ultimately these will result in better services to customers. The costs of this project include the full capital cost of the new infrastructure. The budgets to fund much of this are in our base budgets. The projected shortfall of £6 million, as set out in the June report, has been met from Council resources without any impact on frontline services or tax levels.

(8) The mobile solution for street wardens was a joint project, lead by Enfield Council, under the auspices of the North London Strategic Alliance. The budget was held by Enfield.