



**Haringey Council
Review of Programmes and Projects
Project Report – Summary**

19.06.2007, reference: 6099 Project report - Summary.1.3

Author name, martin.green@socitm.gov.uk, mobile no 07802 346548
Socitm *Consulting*, PO Box 66, Holyhead, LL65 2YB, www.socitm.gov.uk
Registered office F19 Moulton Business Centre, Redhouse Rd, Moulton Park, Northampton, NN3 6AQ

Revision history

Document ID/version	Status	Date	Reason for issue	Author
6099PROREPSUM.1.0	Draft	14.06.2007	Initial issue	Martin Green
6099PROREPSUM.1.1	Draft	18.06.2007	Includes client comments	Martin Green
6099PROREPSUM.1.2	Draft	18.06.2007	Further client comments	Martin Green
6099PROREPSUM.1.3	Final	19.06.2007	Including Appendices	Martin Green

- Document approvals and distribution.

Issuing email file reference and date ¹	Issued to which approvers	Approving email file references and dates	Approval status
	Tim Dauncey		Awaited
	Jay Paramarathan		Awaited
	David Airey		n/a
	Doug Maclean		Awaited

¹ This is the explanatory email file name and date (from Socitm) to which the deliverable version was attached, which email explains what the issue /variation is about and asks for approval where needed

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Background	5
1.2	Purpose of Report	5
1.3	Approach	6
2	FINDINGS	7
2.1	General	7
2.2	Project Governance	7
2.3	PIR	8
2.4	Budgetary Control	8
2.5	Third Party Procurement & Management	9
2.6	Miscellaneous	9
3	RECOMMENDATIONS	10
3.1	Project Governance	10
3.2	PIR	10
3.3	Budgetary Control	10
3.4	Third Party Procurement & Management	10
3.5	Miscellaneous	11
	APPENDICES	12
	APPENDIX 1 - CRM (SIEBEL)	13
1	BACKGROUND	13
1.1	Purpose of report	13
1.2	Project	13
1.3	Findings	13
1.4	Conclusions	13
1.5	Recommendations	14
2	PROJECT SCOPE & OBJECTIVES	15
3	PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES	16
3.1	Project Manager	16
3.2	Project Sponsor	16
4	DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE	18
4.1	Background	18
4.2	Comments	18
5	COMPARATORS	20
5.1	Outline	20
	APPENDIX 2 - ECARE	21
1	BACKGROUND	21
1.1	Purpose of report	21
1.2	Project	21
1.3	Findings	21
1.4	Conclusions	21
1.5	Recommendations	22
2	PROJECT SCOPE & OBJECTIVES	23

3	PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES	23
3.1	Project Manager	23
3.2	Project Sponsor	24
4	DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE	26
4.1	Background	26
4.2	Comments	26
5	COMPARATORS	28
5.1	Outline	28
	APPENDIX 3 - E-PLANNING	29
1	BACKGROUND	29
1.1	Purpose of report	29
1.2	Project	29
1.3	Findings	29
1.4	Conclusions	29
1.5	Recommendations	30
2	PROJECT SCOPE	31
3	PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES	32
3.1	Project Manager	32
3.2	Project Sponsor	32
4	DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE	34
4.1	Background	34
4.2	Comments	34
5	COMPARATORS	36
5.1	Outline	36
	APPENDIX 4 - INSOURCING	37
1	BACKGROUND	37
1.1	Purpose of report	37
1.2	Project	37
1.3	Findings	37
1.4	Conclusions	37
1.5	Recommendations	38
2	PROJECT SCOPE	39
3	PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES	40
3.1	Project Manager	40
3.2	Project Sponsor	40
4	DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE	42
4.1	Background	42
4.2	Comments	42
5	COMPARATORS	44
5.1	Outline	44

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

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

1.1.2 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.

1.2 Purpose of Report

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

1.2.2 This report brings together the findings and recommendations contained in the individual reports produced for each of the selected programmes and projects which were:

- In-sourcing;
- e-Planning;
- e-Care;
- Siebel (CRM).

1.2.3 The Panel requested us not to repeat the detailed analysis of the Tech Refresh programme carried out by the Audit Commission. Rather they were seeking a view as to whether the failings of that programme were symptomatic of other projects and whether the lessons had been learned.

1.2.4 Perceptions of the longer-term benefits of the Tech Refresh programme have been assessed as part of the review of the projects/ programmes as above, all of which were impacted to a greater or lesser degree by the outcome of the Tech Refresh programme.

1.3 Approach

1.3.1 Socitm *Consulting* was provided with a wide range of documents for each of the selected programmes and projects comprising:

- Business Case;
- Project Brief;
- Project Initiation Document (PID);
- Project Plan;
- A sample of Project Board documents including:
 - Agenda
 - Minutes
 - Highlight Reports which include:
 - ❖ Risk Logs
 - ❖ Issue Logs
 - ❖ Budget Reports
- Closure Reports
- Post Implementation Review (PIR)

1.3.2 Other cross-cutting documents reviewed included:

- The Council's Project Management Framework (PMF);
- Sample reports to Customer Focus Stream Board
- Audit Commission's Review of Project Management, based on the Tech Refresh programme.

1.3.3 The review of documents was followed by interviews with key stakeholders for each of the selected programmes and projects. These were the Project Manager and Project Sponsor where these were still available or appropriate deputies where not.

1.3.4 All areas of project management were examined with particular attention being paid to those areas where failings were identified by the Audit Commission, including:

- Project governance;
- Change control
- Corporate finance overview, including:
 - Scope creep;
 - Budget authorisation;
 - Costing of changes
- Benefits Realisation

2 FINDINGS

2.1 General

- 2.1.1 In general project management/ governance (based on the 4 projects we examined) is considered to be very good and certainly in the top 10% of local authorities of which we have experience.
- 2.1.2 As with any complex area of management improvements can always be made. We outline below areas of strength and also areas where we believe such improvements could be made.

2.2 Project Governance

- 2.2.1 One of the reasons why the Tech Refresh programme failed so significantly was a lack of a formal governance methodology and structure.
- 2.2.2 There are a number of project management methodologies but PRINCE2 (Projects IN a Controlled Environment), originally created to assist in the management of Government projects, is by far the most commonly adopted.
- 2.2.3 The Council has implemented a Project Management Framework (PMF) which has been through a number of iterations. We reviewed the Framework which is very much based on PRINCE2 and is comprehensively documented.
- 2.2.4 There is evidence that the PMF is updated from 'lessons learned' from each project and programme. There is also clear evidence in those projects/ programmes we assessed that it is fully utilised (though pragmatically adjusted to meet individual project requirements).
- 2.2.5 Although some Project Sponsors admitted that the PMF initially seemed an excessive bureaucracy, they also believed that its use made governance more professional and better informed management.
- 2.2.6 Those projects/ programmes we assessed appear to have been well managed via Project Teams/ Boards. They are believed to have had committed representation on the Project Boards which led to issues and risks being managed through to resolution.
- 2.2.7 The Council appear to have a group of skilled and experienced Project Managers together with committed senior user personnel. Without this no methodology will ensure good project governance.
- 2.2.8 The level of resource spent on project governance in the In-sourcing programme amounted to some 6 – 8% of total budget cost and a recommendation in that Programme Closure report stated that this should be adopted as a 'norm' for all major projects/ programmes. It seems to us that 8% is at the high end for project governance but can understand why it was considered necessary given the importance of this programme and previous experience of such a major programme. Nevertheless we believe that an assessment of the project governance budget should be assessed on a project by project basis. We also believe, however, that the Council needs to remember what was required to achieve a successful outcome and not seek to reduce this part of the investment unnecessarily.

2.3 PIR

- 2.3.1 The Council's PMF makes reference to a Project Implementation Review (PIR) being carried out within about 6 months of Project Closure but these have not been done.
- 2.3.2 The Project Closure reports are well put together and outline areas which were done well and those less well leading to a 'lessons learned' section feeding back into an update to the PMF. This describes very well the mechanics of the project. It is, however, too close to the go-live date to evaluate any ongoing issues, the support functions, the adequacy of the system, the longer term business improvement measures supposedly achieved etc. etc.
- 2.3.3 In addition a PIR should be carried out by personnel outside the project board/ team though members of the board/ team would inform the PIR process. We believe that a PIR should challenge assumptions that, successful delivery of the project/ programme, necessarily, results in maximisation of benefits.
- 2.3.4 In addition for many projects/ programmes benefits cannot be accurately measured until several months after closure.

2.4 Budgetary Control

- 2.4.1 In all the projects/ programmes that we assessed Budgets seemed to be:
- Well managed;
 - Accurately recorded; and
 - Reported in a timely manner.
- 2.4.2 The Council's response to the Audit Commission's Review of Project Management stated 'inter alia' that Corporate Finance would be represented at Project Board and Stream Board level to provide challenge to budget setting and budget monitoring.
- 2.4.3 Budgets were monitored on a day to day basis by Project Managers using their own spreadsheets reconciling periodically with SAP. These spreadsheets are monitored centrally within ITS by the Development Programme Manager and reported regularly to corporate finance. The process still relies on the competence of the Project Manager.
- 2.4.4 In later projects/ programmes that we assessed corporate finance was represented on project/ programme boards and, in the case of the Insourcing Programme made a significant contribution to a budget monitoring model. The intention seems to be for this model to be used as 'best practice' and adopted for all future major projects/ programmes. This is in line with the Council's documented response to the Audit Commission report on Tech Refresh project management failings.
- 2.4.5 Earlier project reviewed by us were completed or largely completed before the Council received the Audit Commission report and, therefore its proposals had not been adopted. However the projects we assessed were delivered on budget or were expected to be delivered on budget.

2.5 Third Party Procurement & Management

- 2.5.1 A recurring theme across the selected projects was problems and issues with third parties. These were nothing like as serious as with the Tech Refresh programme but nevertheless caused disruption of the projects at various levels.
- 2.5.2 Suppliers are notorious for becoming 'overstretched' and have difficulty delivering in accordance with their sales 'pitch' (this seems to apply to all suppliers). Local authorities have generally struggled to negotiate contracts with third party suppliers containing appropriate levels of penalties.
- 2.5.3 The procurement process and subsequent management of third party suppliers has improved significantly since the Tech Refresh programme. However, there are still lessons to be learned:
- Claims by suppliers have not always been verified;
 - Payment schedules have not always been linked to milestones;
 - Penalties have not always been included
- 2.5.4 Assessment of the procurement process in Closure Reports is restricted to whether the process was completed in time rather than the effectiveness of the process to get what the Council was expecting and the capabilities of the supplier to deliver.

2.6 Miscellaneous

- 2.6.1 Assessment of projects at closure tend to be based on whether projects were delivered on time and on budget. In some projects there is little real and measurable assessment of business benefits (i.e. did the project help the business achieve appropriate service improvements).
- 2.6.2 The concurrent implementation of the projects/ programmes we assessed with Tech Refresh clearly caused problems. Some issues with the projects were confused with the Tech Refresh. We are not going to repeat analysis of the Tech Refresh but it is interesting to note that project sponsors have consistently expressed the view that the stability and capacity of the 'thin client' infrastructure shows a significant improvement on the previous environment. This is also supported by the latest ITS Customer Satisfaction Survey where satisfaction levels show continuing improvement.
- 2.6.3 It is also clear that the Council would have had far greater problems in implementing the successful e-Government programme in the previous inconsistent desk-top environment.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Project Governance

- 3.1.1 The PMF is one of the most comprehensive we have seen in use in local government and needs to be maintained to ensure it remains so. The Council also needs to recognise that proper governance still relies heavily on the skills and experience of key staff.
- 3.1.2 The level of resource required to govern projects/ programmes needs to be set at the start of the project (i.e. in the PID) but needs to be at sufficient level to ensure projects are delivered in a professional manner.

3.2 PIR

- 3.2.1 Closure Reports addressed a number of ‘lessons learned’ and made recommendations. These are, however, much to do with the success or otherwise of the project delivery. A PIR carried out some months after project closure and by independent personnel should be challenging and assess whether objectives have been achieved and benefits maximised. A PIR carried out as described above has a number of benefits, including:
- Confirmation or otherwise of the ongoing efficacy of the project;
 - Identification of any ongoing issues;
 - Identification of savings (costed); and
 - Objective service improvement measurements.
- 3.2.2 A PIR also provides an opportunity to identify further options or phases which might enable the project to deliver greater benefits.
- 3.2.3 We recommend that PIRs be carried out for all major projects which should be scheduled and managed by an independent group within the Council (e.g. Corporate PMO).

3.3 Budgetary Control

- 3.3.1 If project budget monitoring is to continue to be mainly via Project Managers’ spreadsheets there should be a ‘standard’ to be used and a defined way of using it. They should be reconciled on a regular basis, with SAP reports, under supervision of Corporate Finance, prior to reporting to Project Boards.
- 3.3.2 We are always concerned where budget monitoring is carried out by ‘shadow’ accounts (i.e. spreadsheets) which are outside the corporate financial monitoring process. SAP has a ‘project’ module which is capable of monitoring project expenditure based not just on actuals but on budget commitments (e.g. pre-defined stage payments to suppliers). We understand that the Council is considering implementing such a module from which real benefits should accrue, and we commend this approach.

3.4 Third Party Procurement & Management

- 3.4.1 Claims by suppliers should always be verified, by site visit, references, or demonstration
- 3.4.2 Payment schedules should be negotiated that are linked to delivery milestones.
- 3.4.3 Penalties should be negotiated wherever possible. This is usually only possible where competitive tension still exists in the procurement process and needs, therefore, to be considered by the business unit at an early stage of the process. It is unlikely to be successful where a monopoly exists or where the Council has already made its decision in principle. It is also unlikely to be successful where the supplier is relatively small as any imposition of significant penalty would effectively put it out of business.
- 3.4.4 The procurement section of Closure Reports should assess the suitability of the supplier, the product and quality of delivery as well as the assessment of the procurement process itself.

3.5 Miscellaneous

- 3.5.1 The benefits realisation assessment should include a greater degree of statistical measurement of business service improvements. This should be part of the PIR.

Appendices

The summary findings and recommendations reported above are based on the findings and recommendations arising from review of four individual projects:

- CRM (Seibel)
- eCare
- e-Planning
- Insourcing

The following appendices contain the reports on these individual projects.

Appendix 1 - CRM (Siebel)

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of report

- 1.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* was contracted to carry out a review of a representative selection of programmes and projects completed by the Haringey IT Services department in the period August 2003 to January 2007.
- 1.1.2 This report summarises the review of one such project (i.e. CRM (Siebel)). The purpose of the report is to::
- Assess the success of the project measuring it against the specific criteria, including comparisons with similar projects at other organisations of similar size and complexity to the Council;
 - Make recommendations for specific actions that would improve ongoing benefits realisation for the assessed project.

1.2 Project

- 1.2.1 The purpose of the project was to implement a new Citizen Relationship Management (CRM) solution using Siebel 7.7 Public Sector product, that will form the platform for achieving the vision and objectives detailed in the Customer Services Business Plan 2005 – 2008. was an integral part of the Council's e-Government work programme complying with the ODPM requirements.
- 1.2.2 There were 4 versions of the software implemented over 2 years but this report concentrates on Release 1 which was started in May 2005, was completed in December 2005 and had a budget of some £1.4m.

1.3 Findings

- 1.3.1 The scope of the project is shown at Section 2 and the findings of our review are outlined in Sections 3 to 5. The conclusions, however, are summarised below to provide, effectively, a management summary within this section.

1.4 Conclusions

- 1.4.1 The initial selection of Capgemini and contract signing were carried out before either of the interviewees of this assignment was appointed to this project. It is difficult, therefore, to be certain as to whether the Council could have prevented the issue relating to lack of resource for data migration which occurred.
- 1.4.2 Release 1 was governed under the Council's PMF and has been very well documented providing the Project Board with all appropriate information to address issues, resolve problems and drive the project forward.
- 1.4.3 The allocation of a qualified and full time Project Manager together with Change Management personnel is considered an essential element to the success of both phases.

- 1.4.4 Though the budget was managed effectively and costs kept within budget it is not quite clear how this was monitored by corporate finance (in accordance with the Audit Commission review).
- 1.4.5 Although a detailed report on performance against objectives carried out 6 months after project closure outlines service improvements achieved, a full Project Initiation Review (PIR) has not been carried out and could be used to provide a more detailed and considered assessment of benefits realisation over a longer term. The Project Closure Report indicated areas still outstanding which were to be addressed. A PIR could evaluate the further improvements arising from that action.

1.5 Recommendations

- 1.5.1 There are no recommendations specific to this project. General recommendations appropriate across all projects are given in our overarching report.

2 PROJECT SCOPE & OBJECTIVES

2.1.1 The objectives of the project were:

- Implement Siebel 7.7 Public Sector as the new CRM technology platform (providing a stable CRM platform from which to build)
- Eliminate the performance problems previously experienced with the use of SmartScripts (and take advantage of performance improvements in the Siebel 7.7. product, reported by Siebel)
- Improve the quality of data in the CRM system by cleansing the data and reducing duplication
- Migrate all relevant data and ensure historical data is maintained
- Provide more accurate reporting
- Centralise access to information
- Provide the ability to handle inbound structured emails (i.e. those received via the web through eForms) and unstructured emails (from Customers) both inbound and outbound through Siebel
- Ensure that the implementation conforms to Siebel best practice by utilising 'vanilla' functionality where possible, storing data in the most appropriate places and the use of appropriate functionality to meet specific requirements(e.g. use of Correspondence for the Receipting report)

3 PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Project Manager

- 3.1.1 The CRM project started with the procurement of a systems integrator (Capgemini). This procurement exercise was prior to the project manager starting at the Council.
- 3.1.2 The existing Siebel system had been built for the Council by ITNet (now SERCO) which had been supported by them for some three years. A system review by Siebel had criticised that build stating that:
- The Smart Scripts were overly complex;
 - They do not follow Siebel's best practice;
 - Design of scripts results in repeat questions etc.
- 3.1.3 A "Siebel Justification" document was produced which sought to validate the business case and reasons for implementing a new version and also validate its use on a Citrix thin client platform.
- 3.1.4 Relationships with SERCO were somewhat strained and presented a challenge to manage the transfer;
- 3.1.5 The Release 1 project was managed using the Councils Project management Framework.
- 3.1.6 The Project Board was chaired by the Project Sponsor and met when necessary (normally monthly but anytime in emergency). Attendance was consistent and decision making considered to be supportive.
- 3.1.7 Relationships with Capgemini were generally very good. However Capgemini were unable to make appropriate resources available at the data migration stage which caused a delay of 2-3 weeks. Capgemini recognised this as an issue and made additional resources available at their cost.
- 3.1.8 Tech Refresh impacted on the project as the system had to be made to work in both thin client and thick client environments.
- 3.1.9 The budget was managed by the Project Manager using a spreadsheet which was 'aligned with' actuals as per SAP reports. Was not aware of any involvement of corporate finance.

3.2 Project Sponsor

- 3.2.1 This personal perspective was provided by the deputy project sponsor as the original project sponsor has left the Council.
- 3.2.2 The project was delivered on budget and with a delay of only 3 weeks.
- 3.2.3 IT was seen as very supportive but felt that Customer Services (CS) had to be the driver (perhaps more than expected).
- 3.2.4 The key resource was deemed to be the Capgemini Business Analyst whose knowledge/ skills etc were considered excellent.

- 3.2.5 Expectations were that the replacement system would be much faster and follow improved scripts to provide an improved service to the customers. This was delivered but some improvements have not been pursued such as full integration with iWorld.
- 3.2.6 The new system is very localised and customised to fit the Council's requirements but within the 'vanilla' implementation. This should enable further versions to be implemented without re-building the system.
- 3.2.7 Project governance was deemed to be successful being managed via a Project Board chaired by the Project Sponsor. Attendance was consistent and committed. Documentation standards were not considered to be oppressive but aided project governance.
- 3.2.8 Statistics show that there has been a significant improvement in the performance of Customer Services.

4 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

4.1 Background

4.1.1 Whilst taking into account key stake-holders' views of how the project was managed a significant part of the assignment was to assess the documentary evidence which might either support or counteract those views. A comprehensive set of documents were requested to be viewed and assessed, where available, including:

- Business Case;
- Project Brief;
- Project Initiation Document (PID);
- Project Plan;
- Project Board
 - Agenda
 - Minutes
 - Highlight Reports
 - Risk Logs
 - Issue Logs
 - Budget Reports
- Closure Reports
- Post Implementation Review (PIR)

4.2 Comments

4.2.1 We have not seen a Business Case but instead a “Siebel Justification Discussion Document”.

4.2.2 A PIR has not been carried out.

4.2.3 Other than as noted above all documents relating to Release 1 were produced in line with the Council's PMF.

4.2.4 The Project Brief clearly described the scope of the project and its major aims and objectives. This was subsequently followed by a PID which provided a clear plan of how the project was to be delivered, including roles of third parties.

4.2.5 The Project Board was provided with regular, concise but comprehensive reports including Highlight Reports using the Red/ Amber/ Green (RAG) methodology. Decisions made by the Project Board are well recorded in Minutes and a clear audit trail is available.

- 4.2.6 Budget reports are clear but were based on the Project Manager's spreadsheet reconciled with the Council's corporate finance system (SAP) but there is no evidence of corporate finance monitoring.
- 4.2.7 Issue Logs were comprehensive and ensured that issues remained on the agenda until addressed rather than being 'lost' in the plethora of Project Board minutes.
- 4.2.8 A Risk Log was maintained which identified major risks.
- 4.2.9 The Closure Report for Release 1 refers to a PIR Session and includes as an Appendix a summary of the 'Lessons Learned'. The main issues appear to be around problems within the testing regime.
- 4.2.10 A full PIR should be carried out at a later date (some 6 months later) than the closure report and has a number of benefits, including:
- Confirmation or otherwise of the ongoing efficacy of the project;
 - Identification of any ongoing issues;
 - Identification of savings (costed);
 - Identification of ongoing conformance with business performance targets;
 - Potential further developments.

5 COMPARATORS

5.1 Outline

- 5.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* has been supporting local government clients for many years including many assignments relating to implementation of CRM systems. We have been asked to compare Haringey's CRM implementation project with best practice derived from that experience.
- 5.1.2 Documentation and project governance conformed to the Council's PMF to provide a professional, robust and well documented project support function comparing very favourably with best practice.
- 5.1.3 The effectiveness of the Project Sponsor, Project Manager and key stakeholders equally appear to match best practice.
- 5.1.4 Delivery by third-party suppliers has been less effective. Many, if not all, other local authorities have difficulty with negotiating robust contracts with suppliers. It is not surprising that co-operation was not particularly forthcoming from SERCO but appears to have been reasonably well managed. However the ability of Capgemini to provide appropriate levels of programming and/ or data migration resource should have been tested more thoroughly before signing contracts. The issue, though, appears to have been managed to resolution.

Appendix 2 - eCare

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of report

- 1.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* was contracted to carry out a review of a representative selection of programmes and projects completed by the Haringey IT Services department in the period August 2003 to January 2007.
- 1.1.2 This report summarises the review of one such project (i.e. e-Care). The purpose of the report is to::
- Assess the success of the project measuring it against the specific criteria, including comparisons with similar projects at other organisations of similar size and complexity to the Council;
 - Make recommendations for specific actions that would improve ongoing benefits realisation for the assessed project.

1.2 Project

- 1.2.1 The original brief was to assess the second phase of the e-Care project which was chosen, in art, because it is ongoing. However, on interviewing the project manager it seemed to us that this would be more helpful if we reviewed Phase 2 in the context of Phase 1. Phase 2 of this project has a budget of some £1.1m, started in August 2006 and the first stage is due for completion in October 2007.
- 1.2.2 Initially the e-Care Phase 1 project was to include implementation of a finance module but this was never delivered by the supplier. This module has been postponed until its availability and incorporated into e-Care Phase 2. Additional pilot project elements were added, being:
- Investigation of mobile working; and
 - Consideration of full Electronic Social Care Records (ESCR) compliance.

1.3 Findings

- 1.3.1 The scope of the project is shown at Section 2 and the findings of our review are outlined in Sections 3 to 5. The conclusions, however, are summarised below to provide, effectively, a management summary within this section.

1.4 Conclusions

- 1.4.1 In Phase 1 the council 'outsourced' project management of the contract tendering and procurement process to an external consultancy.. This resulted in an applications software supplier being selected. Once the contract had been awarded, the actual 'project implementation' of phase 1 was undertaken by an internal project manager, and shortly after this time , a number of issues were subsequently identified:

- It transpired that a major module (Finance) had not been built though the supplier had stated that it existed;
 - The supplier submitted an implementation schedule which was impractical to be delivered;
 - The supplier submitted a workplan involving their Project Management resource which was not capable of being delivered.
- 1.4.2 Once the Council assigned an internal professional Project Management resource the above failings were identified and the project was re-scoped into 2 Phases.
- 1.4.3 Phase 1 was governed under PRINCE 2 guidelines as the Council's PMF had not been fully implemented at that time. Phase 2 is now being governed within the PMF guidelines. Both phases, though governed under different regimes have been or are being, very well documented providing the Project Board with all appropriate information to address issues, resolve problems and drive the project forward.
- 1.4.4 The allocation of a qualified and full time Project Manager together with Change Management personnel is considered an essential element to the success of both phases.
- 1.4.5 Though the budget was managed effectively and costs kept within budget it is not quite clear how this was monitored by corporate finance (in accordance with the Audit commission review). The project governance arrangements in both Phases 1 and 2 ensured that the project budget was monitored and reported to corporate finance on a monthly basis. In addition to this, the Project sponsor reported any budgetary issues within the corporate budget monitoring process.
- 1.4.6 Lessons appear to have been learned from the initial procurement and a much tighter contract has been negotiated for Phase 2 with payments being made on delivery and with contract credits due on late delivery. It is not clear whether these lessons are because of experience of this particular supplier or whether those lessons will be applied to other projects. The supplier was financially penalised in Phase 1 for non-delivery of the finance module. In addition to this, certain payments due in Phase 1 were withheld and subsequently paid in Phase 2 upon satisfactory completion of project milestones.
- 1.4.7 The Project Closure Report for Phase 1 of this project was not as comprehensive as others. Detailed assessment of benefits realisation is somewhat lacking. However a decision was taken at the time focus would be on lessons that could be learnt from Phase 1 specifically in readiness for the proposed initiation of Phase 2. These lessons along with a number of other key factors were considered as part of the feasibility study conducted for Phase 2. Tangible financial savings and performance efficiencies have been realised from the Phase 1 implementation.
- 1.4.8 A Post Implementation Review (PIR), as described in our summary report has not been carried out and could be used to provide a more long-term assessment of the benefits realisation.

1.5 Recommendations

- 1.5.1 There are no recommendations specific to this project. General recommendations appropriate across all projects are given in our overarching report.

2 PROJECT SCOPE & OBJECTIVES

- 2.1.1 The scope of the project is:

- Implementation of Corelogic's Framework (FWi) Finance 'Purchasing module as a first stage;
- As a second stage implementation of partial or full functionality available within the FWi Payments Module and potential integration with SAP;

- 2.1.2 The project scope, therefore, for the first stage of Phase 2 covers:

- Implementation of the FWi Purchasing Module to staff in Social and Children's services;
- Decommissioning of the existing finance system (FIFI);
- Implementation of one single interface to populate SAP with new Purchase Orders (Pos) created on FW1 – all amendments to existing Pos and payments will continue to be processed manually and paid from SAP;
- Potential implementation of the Business Objects 'FINANCE' universe.

3 PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Project Manager

- 3.1.1 The e-Care Phase 1 project comprised the appointment of a supplier (Corelogic) of a web-based social care client record system (Framework (FWi)) to replace a predominantly paper-based system. The assignment of the Project manager came after the contract signing and the first task was to review the schedules and predicted milestones.
- 3.1.2 The contractual schedule was considered to be unrealistic. In addition the Financial Module was not going to be implemented within the timescales it did not actually exist. The suppliers had not started its design and build. The only way to deliver the client record system within a reasonable timescale was to postpone the implementation of the Finance Module until a later Phase 2. Only then was Phase 1 able to 'go live' on time and on budget.
- 3.1.3 The Phase 1 project was managed using PRINCE2 principles based on the experience of the Project Manager as the Council's PMF had not then been fully finalised.
- 3.1.4 Phase 1 faced a number of issues which included:
- Supplier having difficulty in delivering all aspects of the applications software;
 - Financial module did not exist;
 - Constant changes to / late delivery of software made systems testing a significantly greater issue than normal;

- Tech Refresh impacted on implementation;
- 3.1.5 Procurement of Phase 2 was much improved having learnt the lessons of Tech refresh and of Phase 1. Contracts with suppliers include payment schedules based on delivery against realistic project milestones, with appropriate penalties for non or late delivery.
- 3.1.6 The Project Board is chaired by the Project Sponsor and meets monthly in line with current project governance arrangements.. Attendance is consistent and decision making considered to be supportive. Major issues were taken up by the board and senior management got involved in resolving issues, particularly with suppliers.
- 3.1.7 The budget is managed by the Project Manager using a spreadsheet and reports from SAP.

3.2 Project Sponsor

- 3.2.1 The procurement process in Phase 1 was completed before the Project Manager and Project Sponsor had been appointed. The project had to be re-scoped to defer implementation of the finance module to a Phase 2 and reschedule what then became Phase 1 in light of the failures of the supplier.
- 3.2.2 After the re-scoping and rescheduling of the project it was then delivered on-time and on budget.
- 3.2.3 The supplier was believed to have considered the Council to be PRINCE2 obsessed. Haringey is now seen by the same supplier as a centre for excellence and the project achieved a London Connects Award.
- 3.2.4 The Tech Refresh Programme affected the project through the change of infrastructure being implemented at the same time as the e-Care project was being implemented. The main problems were around the delays in timing and fragility of the new infrastructure. However the 'thin client' infrastructure is now seen to be more stable and easier to maintain.
- 3.2.5 The major problems, apart from poor delivery from the software supplier, were around the huge change management programme with many staff having limited experience of IT.
- 3.2.6 Project governance was deemed to be successful being managed via a Project Board chaired by the Project Sponsor. Attendance was consistent and committed. Documentation standards were not considered to be oppressive but aided project governance.
- 3.2.7 Experience of Phase 1 has resulted in an improved approach to Phase2 including:
- Knowledge of the supplier;
 - Tighter contract with supplier;
 - Appreciating the value and benefit of having a structured change management programme running in parallel with the project systems implementation.

- Understanding of effort required to describe existing processes;
- More confident user base;
- More challenging user base;

3.2.8 There is great confidence that Phase 2 will be delivered on time and to budget.

4 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

4.1 Background

4.1.1 Whilst taking into account key stake-holders' views of how the project was managed a significant part of the assignment was to assess the documentary evidence which might either support or counteract those views. A comprehensive set of documents were requested to be viewed and assessed, where available, including:

- Business Case;
- Project Brief;
- Project Initiation Document (PID);
- Project Plan;
- Project Board
 - Agenda
 - Minutes
 - Highlight Reports
 - Risk Logs
 - Issue Logs
 - Budget Reports
- Closure Reports
- Post Implementation Review (PIR)

4.2 Comments

4.2.1 The following documents were not available:

- Business Case (replaced by Feasibility Study for Phase 2);
- PIR (not carried out for Phase 1).

4.2.2 Other than as noted above all documents relating to Phase 1 were produced broadly in line with PRINCE 2 as the Council's PMF had not been finalised. Phase 2 is being governed within the PMF guidelines.

4.2.3 The Phase 2 Project Brief clearly described the scope of the project and its major aims and objectives. This was subsequently followed by a PID which provided a clear plan of how the project (comprising 2 stages) was to be delivered. The PID is considered capable of informing the whole process up to and including closure and PIR where benefit realisation can be assessed.

- 4.2.4 The Phase 2 Project Board is being provided with regular, concise but comprehensive reports including Highlight Reports using the Red/ Amber/ Green (RAG) methodology. Decisions made by the Project Board are well recorded in Minutes and a clear audit trail is available.
- 4.2.5 Budget reports are clear but were based on the Project manager's spreadsheet. There is no evidence of reconciliation with the Council's corporate finance system (SAP) but there is no reason to believe that there will be any problems arising from that.
- 4.2.6 Issue Logs ensure that issues remain on the agenda until addressed rather than being 'lost' in the plethora of Project Board minutes.
- 4.2.7 A Risk Log is maintained which identifies major risks.
- 4.2.8 The Closure Report for Phase 1 identifies 'lessons to be learnt' but does not show a comprehensive comparison between originally envisaged benefits and an assessment of benefits actually achieved. The Closure Report is not as comprehensive as with some other projects.
- 4.2.9 The Phase 1 Closure Report addressed a number of 'lessons learned' and made recommendations. These lessons along with a number of other key factors were considered as part of the feasibility study conducted for Phase 2.
- 4.2.10 A PIR carried out at a later date, however, has a number of benefits, including:
- Confirmation or otherwise of the ongoing efficacy of the project;
 - Identification of any ongoing issues;
 - Identification of savings (costed);
 - Identification of ongoing conformance with business performance targets.

5 COMPARATORS

5.1 Outline

- 5.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* has been supporting local government clients for many years including many assignments relating to implementation of social care systems. We have been asked to compare Haringey's e-Care implementation project with best practice derived from that experience.
- 5.1.2 Phase 1 was implemented outside of the Council's PMF as it had not been finalised at that time. Documentation and the project governance methodology did not therefore conform to the same extent as other projects. However the Project Manager **did** use his experience of PRINCE 2 to provide a professional, robust and well documented project support function so compared favourably with best practice.
- 5.1.3 Haringey's PMF is being applied to Phase 2 and its application to this project compares favourably with the best planned and managed projects.
- 5.1.4 The effectiveness of the Project Sponsor, Project Manager and key stakeholders equally appear to match best practice.
- 5.1.5 Delivery by third-party suppliers has been less effective. Many, if not all, other local authorities have difficulty with negotiating robust contracts with suppliers. In terms of Phase 1 of this project the procurement process was, however, particularly flawed. There appears not to have been any exploration of any evidence that the supplier's submissions could have been delivered or whether they had been delivered elsewhere. However lessons have been learned and Phase 2 procurement has improved significantly.

Appendix 3 - e-Planning

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of report

- 1.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* was contracted to carry out a review of a representative selection of programmes and projects completed by the Haringey IT Services department in the period August 2003 to January 2007.
- 1.1.2 This report summarises the review of one such project (i.e. e-Planning). The purpose of the report is to::
- Assess the success of the project measuring it against the specific criteria, including comparisons with similar projects at other organisations of similar size and complexity to the Council;
 - Make recommendations for specific actions that would improve ongoing benefits realisation for the assessed project.

1.2 Project

- 1.2.1 This project had a budget of some £250,000 and was delivered within 7 months.
- 1.2.2 Its overall objective was for the PEPP – (Planning Environment Policy and Performance) business unit, to deliver an electronic planning service to customers by April 2005.

1.3 Findings

- 1.3.1 The scope of the project is shown at Section 2 and the findings of our review are outlined in Sections 3 to 5. The conclusions, however, are summarised below to provide, effectively, a management summary within this section.

1.4 Conclusions

- 1.4.1 This project was generally very well managed and was brought in on time and on budget.
- 1.4.2 It was very well documented providing the Project Board with all appropriate information to address issues, resolve problems and drive the project forward.
- 1.4.3 The allocation of a qualified and full time Project Manager together with Change Management personnel was considered an essential element to that success.
- 1.4.4 Commitment on the part of the Project Sponsor and the Project Board are also considered to be essential. There appear to have been times when commitment of some key players needed to be re-established but this was done in a timely and effective manner.
- 1.4.5 Though the budget was managed effectively and costs kept within budget it is not quite clear how this was monitored by corporate finance (in accordance with the Audit commission review).

- 1.4.6 Though the performance of third party suppliers was deemed inadequate the Council was unable to impose either financial penalties or sufficient client pressure to gain improvement of that performance.
- 1.4.7 Though the achievement of originally envisaged benefits was assessed in the Project Closure Report there was no follow-up at a later stage (i.e.PIR) the timing of which should enable a longer term assessment and clearer measurement of costed savings.

1.5 Recommendations

- 1.5.1 There are no recommendations specific to this project. General recommendations appropriate across all projects are given in our overarching report.

2 PROJECT SCOPE

- 2.1.1 PEPP – (Planning Environment Policy and Performance) business unit, was to deliver an electronic planning service to customers by April 2005. This was in accordance with government policy with all local authorities being scored according to the level achieved against the '21 Pendleton Report Survey' criteria.
- 2.1.2 The objective was to be awarded 2 points out of the maximum 3, against the '21 Pendleton Report Survey' criteria by April 2005. This was to be achieved by delivering an electronic planning service for Haringey Council customers, and would enable Haringey to obtain the top quartile position with regard to planning.
- 2.1.3 The objective was to investigate and evaluate possible web based solutions, enabling the PEPP business unit to offer services via the internet. To implement the chosen solution ensuring that all change management aspects for this new service is encompassed.
- 2.1.4 There were a large number of related projects, including:
- ERMS – (Electronic Records Management System);
 - E-Payments Project;
 - Technical Refresh Project;
 - New IT Capital Programme;
 - Mobile Working Project;
 - Scanning Project;
 - (National Land and Property Gazetteer) - NLPG and (National Land Information Service) - NLIS Project;
 - (Geographical Information System) - GIS Project;

3 PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Project Manager

- 3.1.1 The project was originally intended to comply with level 2 of the Pendleton criteria by April 2005 which the government moved to March 2005. In conjunction with this the perception of ICT was considered to be very poor so it was not the best start.
- 3.1.2 The project sponsors and key stakeholders were taken through the project processes as laid down in the Council's Project Management Framework (PMF) and were convinced of its efficacy and benefits.
- 3.1.3 The project was delivered on time and on budget despite a number of issues outlined below:
- Initial contract negotiations with Northgate (the supplier of the Sx3 e-planning software) were difficult and protracted; Northgate refusing to use the SCAT terms and conditions but insisting that their own be used. Eventually resolved to the satisfaction of the Council with significant support from the project sponsor.
 - Northgate hosted the Web and Applications Servers at their Hemel Hempstead site. This was affected by the major fuel depot fire and resulted in some ten days without a service (regrettably this coincided with the Pendleton survey resulting in a 6 month delay in achieving the level 2 objective).
 - There were a number of late deliveries of software elements by Northgate. Having been unable, initially, to negotiate penalty clauses the Council were unable to exert as much pressure on the supplier as would be ideal.
- 3.1.4 The Project Board was chaired by the Project Sponsor and met when necessary (monthly on average). Attendance was consistent and decision making considered to be supportive. Major issues were taken up by the board and senior management got involved in resolving issues, particularly with suppliers.
- 3.1.5 The budget was managed by the Project Manager using a spreadsheet, backed up by SAP reports.
- 3.1.6 Although the Closure Report referred to a Post Implementation review to be carried out after a further three months the Project Manager was not aware of its being carried out.

3.2 Project Sponsor

- 3.2.1 This was the first IT project under a new regime. Previous perceptions of IT were not good so was not expecting great support but revised opinion considered to be because of:
- Virtually full time, professional Project Manage (PM);
 - PM located in user offices;

- Project managed with revised processes which were considered, initially, to be excessive but the efficacy of which were subsequently seen to be beneficial;
 - Change manager and Analyst allocated to the project team which enabled existing processes to be mapped and new processes to be devised;
- 3.2.2 The Tech Refresh Programme affected the project through the change of infrastructure being implemented at the same time as the e-Planning project was being implemented. However the main problems were around the delays in timing and fragility of the new infrastructure. However the 'thin client' infrastructure is now seen to be more stable and easier to maintain.
- 3.2.3 The major problems were around products/ services being delivered (or not) by third parties; namely Northgate (Sx3) and Planning Portal.
- 3.2.4 Project governance was deemed to be successful being managed via a Project Board chaired by the Project Sponsor. Attendance was generally consistent though reminders had to be given on occasions to some members to ensure ongoing commitment.
- 3.2.5 The full set of predicted project benefits are still to be achieved, including:
- full paperless working;
 - mobile working;
 - seamless e-payments via on-line submission;

However the main objectives have been achieved (i.e. compliance with Pendleton Criteria, electronic submission of Building Control applications, improved effectiveness and efficiency). The hard work has been done which is seen to have laid the foundation for relatively smaller investments in systems which will enable the achievement of, proportionately, greater level of benefits.

4 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

4.1 Background

4.1.1 Whilst taking into account key stake-holders' views of how the project was managed a significant part of the assignment was to assess the documentary evidence which might either support or counteract those views. A comprehensive set of documents were requested to be viewed and assessed, where available, including:

- Business Case;
- Project Brief;
- Project Initiation Document (PID);
- Project Plan;
- Project Board
 - Agenda
 - Minutes
 - Highlight Reports
 - Risk Logs
 - Issue Logs
 - Budget Reports
- Closure Reports
- Post Implementation Review (PIR)

4.2 Comments

4.2.1 All documents were produced broadly in line with the initial version of the relatively new Project Management Framework (PMF) but with changes where it was believed might deliver improvement. The PMF was then updated using the experience gained from this project.

4.2.2 The Project Brief clearly described the scope of the project and its major aims and objectives. This was subsequently followed by a PID which provided a clear plan of how the project was to be delivered, over what timescales. The project comprised 5 stages with budget figures only capable of being identified after completion of the second stage. The PID was capable of informing the whole process up to and including closure and PIR where benefit realisation could be assessed.

4.2.3 The Project Board was provided with regular, concise but comprehensive reports including Highlight Reports using the Red/ Amber/ Green (RAG) methodology. Decisions made by the Project Board were well recorded in Minutes and a clear audit trail is available.

- 4.2.4 Budget reports are clear but were based on the Project manager's spreadsheet. There is no evidence of reconciliation with the Council's corporate finance system (SAP) but there is no reason to believe that there were any problems arising from that.
- 4.2.5 Issue Logs ensured that issues remained on the agenda until addressed rather than being 'lost' in the plethora of Project Board minutes.
- 4.2.6 A Risk Log was maintained which identified major risks. It is difficult to see, however, how this information was used by the Project Board.
- 4.2.7 The Closure Report showed a comparison between originally envisaged benefits and an assessment of benefits actually achieved. Savings arising from implementation of this project were described but not, however, given a value. This might not have been possible at the time of Project Closure so should form an important part of a PIR as should a review of recommendations made at Project Closure.
- 4.2.8 The Project Closure report makes reference to a PIR being carried out after some six months but there is no evidence of that being done. Whilst the Closure Report addressed a number of 'lessons learned' and made recommendations a PIR carried at a later date has a number of benefits, including:
- Confirmation or otherwise of the ongoing efficacy of the project;
 - Identification of any ongoing issues;
 - Identification of savings (costed);

5 COMPARATORS

5.1 Outline

- 5.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* has been supporting local government clients for many years including many assignments relating to implementation of property-based systems, more particularly in e-Planning. We have been asked to compare Haringey's e-planning implementation project with best practice derived from that experience.
- 5.1.2 Haringey's Project Management methodology and its application to this project compares favourably with the best planned and managed projects.
- 5.1.3 The effectiveness of the Project Sponsor, Project Manager and key stakeholders equally appear to match best practice.
- 5.1.4 Delivery by third-party suppliers has been less effective. Many, if not all, other local authorities have had difficulty with interfacing with the Planning Portal, particularly around that time which was early in its formation.
- 5.1.5 The project, however, also relied heavily on appropriate interfaces being produced by the applications software supplier (initially Sx3, subsequently Northgate). Significant problems arose with this relationship, initially in contract negotiations and subsequently with late delivery of a number of modules. These types of problems with suppliers is not uncommon but some authorities managed to work in partnership with their suppliers to achieve their objectives whilst also enabling their suppliers to improve their product. There is no specific action that we could point to that the Council could have taken to guarantee a better supplier response but it was unable to impose a position of strength in its negotiation.

Appendix 4 - Insourcing

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of report

- 1.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* was contracted to carry out a review of a representative selection of programmes and projects completed by the Haringey IT Services department in the period August 2003 to January 2007.
- 1.1.2 This report summarises the review of one such programme (i.e. Insourcing). The purpose of the report is to::
- Assess the success of the programme measuring it against the specific criteria, including comparisons with similar programmes at other organisations of similar size and complexity to the Council;
 - Make recommendations for specific actions that would improve ongoing benefits realisation for the assessed programme.

1.2 Project

- 1.2.1 This programme had a budget of some £6m and was delivered within 10 months.
- 1.2.2 Its overall objective was for the Council to exit the then infrastructure support arrangements from an external provider and to deliver most of those services in-house.

1.3 Findings

- 1.3.1 The scope of the programme is shown at Section 2 and the findings of our review are outlined in Sections 3 to 5. The conclusions, however, are summarised below to provide, effectively, a management summary within this section.

1.4 Conclusions

- 1.4.1 This programme was generally very well managed and was brought in on time and on budget.
- 1.4.2 It was very well documented providing the Programme Board with all appropriate information to address issues, resolve problems, mitigate risks and drive the programme forward.
- 1.4.3 Specific Change Management personnel were not allocated as the whole programme was, effectively a 'change' process. The allocation of a senior Programme Management Office (PMO) officer was considered to be an essential element to ensuring that proper processes were followed.
- 1.4.4 Commitment on the part of the Programme Sponsor and the Programme Board are also considered to be essential. Where representatives could not attend their deputies attended and were well briefed.

- 1.4.5 Though setting an accurate budget for this programme was difficult all risks were well documented including the costing of the impact of those risks. The Board (with a senior representative from Corporate Finance) was able to produce regular and frequent updates to the budget based on 'best-case' and worst case' scenarios.
- 1.4.6 Relationships with the incumbent supplier proved difficult and caused problems but these were managed sufficiently to keep the programme on track. There might be lessons to be learnt for future negotiations and contract drafting with third party suppliers.
- 1.4.7 The achievement of originally envisaged benefits was assessed in the Programme Closure Report. These are mainly based on the relative success of changing processes with minimum disruption. There has been no measurement to date of the relative quality of the IT Service except for a recent Customer Satisfaction Survey which indicates a significantly improved service delivery.
- 1.4.8 Socitm's benchmarking service records Service Level Agreement (SLA) targets across a range of IT service deliverables achieved by a large number of local authorities. We believe that Haringey should be aiming for the upper quartile of these target levels which we also believe could have been set at an earlier stage with a six month performance 'honeymoon'.
- 1.4.9 A Post Implementation Review (PIR) is scheduled for September 2007 which should address the potential for more specific performance measures.

1.5 Recommendations

- 1.5.1 There are no recommendations specific to this project. General recommendations appropriate across all projects are given in our overarching report.

2 PROJECT SCOPE

The high level objectives of the programme were:

- 2.1.1 To grasp the opportunity of the expansion of in-house services and to use the lessons learnt from the previous outsource arrangements to improve the business focus, service delivery and culture within IT Services. This will include adoption of recognised best practice, honest and open inspection of current issues and behaviours and implementation of a revised and revitalised organisation.
- 2.1.2 To transition support of the infrastructure delivered by the Tech Refresh from the project team to permanent staff
- 2.1.3 To outsource the Networks and Security element to a new managed service provider and to purchase 3rd party software tools as required by the service management design via a competitive tender in accordance with public sector procurement rules and best practice.
- 2.1.4 To design an organisational structure and processes based where applicable on ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library – the leading IT service delivery standard) recommendations to deliver the service.
- 2.1.5 To recruit skilled resources to enabled the support and maintenance of the infrastructure.
- 2.1.6 To deliver this programme of work in accordance with Haringey's Project Management Framework(PMF) and with adherence to the recommendations of the 2005 Audit commission report and subsequent Haringey PMF enhancements agreed by the Council Exec on the 21st Feb 2006

3 PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Project Manager

- 3.1.1 The programme was managed by the then Head of IT who has since left the Council. The personal perspective, therefore, was provided by the Programme Management Office manager.
- 3.1.2 One sub-objective of the programme was to test the revised and updated PMF. This meant following the PMF guidelines in some detail which was one of the reasons for a significant PMO investment.
- 3.1.3 The programme was delivered on time and on budget despite a number of issues outlined below:
- Lack of co-operation on the part of the incumbent service provider Northgate Information Systems (NIS);
 - Historic poor performance by NIS;
 - Difficulty in recruiting in a very competitive market;
- 3.1.4 The Programme Board was chaired by then Programme Sponsor (Head of Legal Services) and met fortnightly. Attendance was consistent and decision making considered to be supportive. Major issues were taken up by the board and senior management got involved in resolving issues, particularly with suppliers.
- 3.1.5 The budget was managed by the Programme Manager using a spreadsheet, backed up by SAP reports.
- 3.1.6 Investment in Programme governance reached some 6 – 8% of the total Programme cost and a recommendation to match this in all major programmes/projects is being considered by the Organisational Performance Team.
- 3.1.7 The Audit Commission report recommended a greater degree of external challenge and the Programme Board set an estimate of £25k to contract with reputable agencies with a track record in the various areas (e.g. British Computer Society (BCS) for staff competencies and grading).
- 3.1.8 Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were set at NIS levels and are to be reviewed upwards at some time in the future.
- 3.1.9 The Risk Log was considered comprehensive and risks were well managed through to closure. Some items in the log might not be considered risks but more like issues.
- 3.1.10 Where roles and responsibilities are changing through the course of the programme they need to be clearly defined and communicated.
- 3.1.11 The Closure Report refers to a Post Implementation Review due. to be carried out in September.

3.2 Project Sponsor

- 3.2.1 These personal perspectives were provided by the Acting Director of Finance who was ipso facto 'deputy' Chair of the Programme Board; the chair (Head of Legal Services) no longer being an employee of the Council.
- 3.2.2 Commitment of senior managers to the Programme via the Programme Board was considered an essential aspect of its success. Chair of Programme Board was not an IT technician (Head of Legal Services). The then Head of Corporate Finance and Head of Personnel were essential members with Head of Personnel giving priority to the recruitment and TUPE aspects and Head of Corporate Finance monitoring a complex budget.
- 3.2.3 The senior members of the Programme Board were not especially IT literate and, naturally, much of the detailed reporting was fairly technical. Nevertheless it is believed that the Programme Board managed the programme effectively by concentrating on the risks, milestones, impacts and budgets.
- 3.2.4 The programme was based on some very detailed planning from the beginning. This may have been perceived at the start as being overly bureaucratic but increasingly was viewed as supportive and providing the sort of comfort levels necessary to give confidence in achieving the overall objective.
- 3.2.5 Project governance was deemed to be successful being managed via the Programme Board chaired by the Project Sponsor. Attendance (fortnightly) was very consistent with properly briefed and informed deputies attending whenever the prime members were unable to attend.
- 3.2.6 Budgetary control was an essential aspect to the programme governance. There was potential for costs to escalate. However the final costs were within budget and did not utilise any of the £400k contingency. It is believed that the budgetary control aspects should be used as a model for other large projects/ programmes.
- 3.2.7 There was potential for 'project creep' as users tried to get work carried out which was out of scope. The Programme Board effectively prevented this and supported the programme deliverers in resisting this impact.
- 3.2.8 The Leader of the Council took a particular interest in this programme which had required a certain 'act of faith' on the part of Members. The Programme Board Chair met with the Leader on a regular basis. The IT Scrutiny Panel did not exist at that time.

4 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

4.1 Background

4.1.1 Whilst taking into account key stake-holders' views of how the project was managed a significant part of the assignment was to assess the documentary evidence which might either support or counteract those views. A comprehensive set of documents were requested to be viewed and assessed, where available, including:

- Business Case;
- Project Brief;
- Project Initiation Document (PID);
- Project Plan;
- Project Board
 - Agenda
 - Minutes
 - Highlight Reports
 - Risk Logs
 - Issue Logs
 - Budget Reports
- Closure Reports

4.1.2 Access was also provided to the Council's e-room which contains electronic versions of most of the above documents.

4.1.3 A summary of the April 2007 customer satisfaction survey was also provided.

4.2 Comments

4.2.1 All documents were produced in line with the revised version of the PMF. The PMF was then updated using the experience gained from this project.

4.2.2 The Business case was based, initially, in a report to Members in December 2005, subsequently amended in January 2006 following a revised offer from NIS. A further report to members in June 2006 revised the budget costs arising, in the main, from completion of negotiations with NIS.

4.2.3 The PID provided a very detailed and clear plan of how the programme was to be delivered, over what timescales and at what budget. The programme comprised 4 work streams plus Quality Assurance and Programme Management. These streams were:

- Service Delivery;

- Procurement;
 - Service Design; and
 - Resource Management.
- 4.2.4 The Programme Board was provided with regular, concise but comprehensive reports including Highlight Reports using the Red/ Amber/ Green (RAG) methodology. Decisions made by the Programme Board were well recorded in Minutes and a clear audit trail is available.
- 4.2.5 Budget reports are clear and were based on the Programme Manager's spreadsheet (to include commitments) plus actual expenditure from SAP. In addition Risks as identified in the Risk Log are purported to have had their impact costed though we have seen no real documentary evidence of this.
- 4.2.6 Issue Logs ensured that issues remained on the agenda until addressed rather than being 'lost' in the plethora of Programme Board minutes.
- 4.2.7 A Risk Log was maintained which identified major risks. Some of these we consider not to be risks as much as issues. (An example of this is "Conflicting demands on staff time" which is a 'fact of life' in any project). Over stating risks could dilute the management focus on more real and important risks.
- 4.2.8 The Closure Report includes a section on Benefits Realisation which describes the extent to which objectives were achieved but not benefits realised. It is, perhaps, considered too early to measure the wider benefits (lower cost, improved performance, better response to changing needs etc.) so this should be an important aspect of the Post Implementation Review (PIR) scheduled for September.
- 4.2.9 The April 2007 Satisfaction Survey indicates a significant improvement in satisfaction ratings over the June 2006 survey. Initially Service Level Agreements (SLAs) have not been re-set; the original objective being to transfer functions at, at least, the levels previously delivered by the outsourcing provider. The intention is for these to be re-set at a significantly higher level once the new help Desk is able to provide statistics over a reasonable time period. We believe that the revised SLAs should be based on Socitm's benchmarking survey with targets in the upper quartile. We believe that this could have been set at an earlier stage even if there was a performance 'honeymoon.'
- 4.2.10 The Project Closure report makes reference to the procurement process being fully achieved. In terms of delivery within timescales this is a true reflection. However the initial use of Hays as a recruitment agency was considered to be a mistake and alternative agencies had to be procured. This was done quickly and within the timeframe but why was the original 'mistake' made? How was Hays' experience and suitability assessed?
- 4.2.11 Similarly a service desk system was procured in accordance with proper procurement processes. However the supplier was not always able to deliver in accordance with the Programme schedule. The efficacy of the procurement process should be measured by the ability of the supplier to deliver according to contract as well as the timeliness of the procurement itself.

5 COMPARATORS

5.1 Outline

- 5.1.1 Socitm *Consulting* has been supporting local government clients for many years including many assignments relating to outsourcing of ICT. There have been far fewer assignments relating to insourcing and the few relate to relatively small local authorities. The Haringey Insource programme is, as far as we know, unique because of its size and because Haringey had never managed its own ICT service. Direct comparisons are therefore not possible. We can, however, make general comments on how a programme of this size and complexity matches best practice derived from our experience.
- 5.1.2 Haringey's Programme Management methodology and its application to this programme compares favourably with the best planned and managed projects.
- 5.1.3 The effectiveness of the Programme Sponsor, Programme Manager and key stakeholders equally appear to match best practice.
- 5.1.4 Delivery by third-party suppliers has been less effective though many, if not all, local authorities have had difficulty managing third party suppliers.
- 5.1.5 The programme, would have been more easily managed if there had been co-operation on the part of the incumbent supplier, though to expect this would, probably, have been naïve. The subsequent management of the process including negotiations, legal activity etc seems to have been very well managed although the details of the negotiations are commercially confidential so we cannot comment in detail.