PROPOSAL FOR APPROACH TO SCRUTINY OF KEY PROJECTS DELIVERED BY HARINGEY IT SERVICES DURING THE PERIOD 2003 – 2006

Terms of Reference for External Reviewer

Background

Haringey Council ('the Council') commissioned the development of an Information Systems Strategy that would enable the Council to meet the future demands on IT to support the Council's objectives of improving its services and the delivery of those services, and delivering its eGovernment Agenda. One key component of this strategy was the 'Technology Refresh', or 'ICT Infrastructure Refresh', which aimed to deliver the IT infrastructure and associated systems that would provide an appropriate platform for Haringey to fulfil its ambitions. Other key components were a number of individual IT projects that addressed specific service improvement goals and/or specific items on the eGovernment agenda.

The Council now wishes an independent review to be made of the success or otherwise of a representative sample of these programmes and projects leading to an objective assessment and recommendations for future improvements.

[Note that in the rest of this document the term "reviewer" refers to the external party engaged by the Council to undertake the independent review, and where an individual pronoun is used to refer to the reviewer, it may equally apply to a team or corporate entity.]

Purpose of this review

The purpose of this review is threefold:

- To assess the success of the programmes and projects that are within its scope, measuring them against the specific criteria given, including comparisons with similar programmes and projects at other organisations of similar size and complexity to the Council.

- To make recommendations for specific actions that would improve ongoing benefits realisation for the assessed programmes and projects.

- To generalise from the range of programmes and projects reviewed in order to suggest enhanced processes and methodologies that could be applied to future programmes and projects to improve their chances of success.

The outcome of the review will be presented to the Council's Scrutiny Panel in the form of a formal report document, to be supported by a presentation by the reviewer to the Panel and an opportunity for the Panel to cross-examine the reviewer.

Scope of review

This review is required to assess a representative selection of programmes and projects completed by the Haringey IT Services department in the period August 2003 – January 2007. The list of candidate programmes and projects is given below and the reviewer is expected to select a minimum of four and a maximum of six that are to be assessed in addition to the Tech Refresh programme. In selecting the additional programmes and projects for assessment, the reviewer is expected to select at least two for which comparative information from other organisations is available to the reviewer, with the comparison organisations to be used being subject to approval by the Scrutiny Panel.

)

- Tech Refresh – the Council-wide ICT infrastructure and systems refresh programme
- Insourcing – a programme to restructure the Haringey IT Services department in order to implement industry best practice at a level appropriate to and in support of the Council's requirements
- eGovernment – a programme of work which included:
    o BVPI 157
    o eForms – 129 online business process related forms for internal and external use
    o Major redesign of Haringey website
    o New Homes for Haringey website
    o 54 Priority Service Outcome projects including:
        - E-Payments – online payments
        - eDemocracy – webcasting; electoral management system; minutes & agenda system
        - E-Planning – planning and building control
        - Enforcement – online licensing applications and register
        - Web GIS – property-related and street works information
- Major projects:
    o eCare – Framework-i implemented in Social Services
    o Siebel – implementation of Public Sector version of this CRM solution; transition of maintenance and support supplier from Serco to CapGemini
    o SAP – SRM4 implemented; "quick wins" delivered
    o Leisure Management System – replacement system at all 3 Haringey Sports & Leisure centres
    o LLPG – creation of corporate Local Land & Property Gazetteer (LLPG) and daily contribution to maintenance of National Land & Property Gazetteer
    o Property Management System – Manhattan system implemented for Facilities Management Helpdesk and Commercial

Note that the quality of the Tech Refresh programme's governance and its adherence to the Council's Project Management Framework methodology (Haringey PMF) up to mid 2005 has already been assessed and reported upon by the Audit Commission – this report will be one of the reference documents for the current review.

Review approach and review criteria

Bearing in mind that the review is of the performance of specific individual programmes and projects leading to specific and general recommendations for the future, the approach covers the process for reviewing individual programmes/projects and the process for compiling the final report.

The general review approach will be similar for all programmes/projects reviewed, although the reviewer will be expected to adapt the specifics of the approach as appropriate for each

programme/project in agreement with the other participants in the review process.

At the highest level the review approach will consist of gathering relevant information about each project, digesting this information, assessing the success of the project based on this information, and then reporting the results of the assessment.

As performance in applying the Haringey Project Management Framework (PMF) will be part of the assessment criteria, the reviewer will be expected to familiarise himself/herself with the main requirements of the Haringey PMF prior to beginning the review.

Where comparison is to be made with external programmes/projects, the comparative assessment should be clearly documented in a separate section of the assessment report.

The reviewer will be expected to plan the review of each project so that key project personnel and other relevant parties can be made available to provide the necessary input to the review while ensuring the minimum distraction from their day-to-day duties.

The general approach and high level criteria for each project are expected to be as follows:

(Note that in the following steps 1 – 7 the reviewer will be able to gather verbal input from the relevant parties as well as reviewing the relevant documents.)

1. The reviewer will gain an understanding of the objectives of the project and the high-level specifications for the main project deliverables through a review of the relevant project documentation, e.g. PID, product descriptions/specifications.

2. The reviewer will examine sample products of the project management process, e.g. highlight reports, project plan, risk and issue logs, change control logs and lessons learned logs, in order to assess the effectiveness with which the Haringey PMF was applied to the project.

3. The reviewer will examine the main outputs (deliverables) of the project to assess the extent to which they met their specifications and the objectives of the project.

4. Where comparative information is available from other organisations, the reviewer will make the relevant comparisons and document the outcomes.

5. The reviewer will assess customers' satisfaction with the delivered outputs where customer feedback is readily available, e.g. in the form of customer surveys that have already been completed.

6. The reviewer will assess the extent to which the intended benefits of the project have been realised, and/or the plan for further realising them in the future.

7. The reviewer will prepare a short report on the findings of the review including any recommendations for improving the realisation of the project's intended benefits.

In the case of the Tech Refresh programme and only this programme, the following additional criteria are also to be used:

- Appropriateness
    - o Comparison of current objectives and requirements with originally envisaged objectives and requirements.

- Effectiveness
    - o Agreed objectives compared with programme outcomes (what was desired and what was achieved)
    - o Agreed requirements compared with programme outcomes (more specific than objectives)

- o Extent to which agreed objectives and requirements changed from the original to the final and on what basis this was justified

- o To provide additional programme quality assurance the Insourcing programme that has followed on from the Tech Refresh programme has instituted a series of 3rd party independent challenges to its programme approach. These cover the following areas and therefore may be relevant input to this review:

    - Microsoft challenge to the legacy environment decommissioning and migration approach – the approach is highly dependent on the fitness for purpose of the new environment implemented by Tech Refresh

    - itSMF and British Computer Society challenges to the approach to ITIL implementation and staffing within the restructured IT Services organisation – the approach is partly dependent on the new environment providing increased efficiency and effectiveness in system management.

    - Internal Audit challenge to the approach to programme governance and budget management (in part a comparison with the Haringey PMF) – the approach taken in the Insourcing programme is seen as a continuation, with some improvements based on lessons learned, of the approach taken in Tech Refresh.

- o To provide operational quality assurance Microsoft have been conducting audits of how various core infrastructure components have been implemented by Tech Refresh. So far the following components have been audited and the reports on these are available to this review:

    - Active Directory

    - Exchange Server

    - Efficiency

- o Extent of implementation compared with targets.

A comparison with suitable external programmes/projects is mandatory for the Tech Refresh programme.

Once the short assessment reports for the reviewed programmes and projects have been completed, they will provide the basis for creating the final report to the Scrutiny Panel containing an overall assessment of programme/project performance and making recommendations for future improvements. For reference the short assessment reports will be included as an appendix to the final report.

Key Assumptions

In order to produce these outputs it is assumed that:

- The review will be time boxed to 15 days over an elapsed timeframe of 5 weeks

- The required personnel will be made available to contribute to the interviews (limited to core project team and subject to availability and reasonable demand on time)

- Suitable comparative information will be obtained regarding relevant programmes/projects at comparable organisations.

EXHIBIT A (continued)

- Progress reports will be provided at key stages of the review (subject to further discussions)
- A presentation of key findings will be made to panel with opportunity for cross examination (subject to further discussions)
- The above outputs will be completed by dd/mm 2007, subject to further review and discussions