# Information Systems Sub (Finance) Committee

**Date:** **MONDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 2012**

**Time:** **10.30am**

**Venue:** **COMMITTEE ROOM - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL**

**Members:** Roger Chadwick (Chairman)
Ray Catt (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Douglas Barrow
Nigel Challis
John Chapman
Deputy Pauline Halliday
Jeremy Mayhew
Hugh Morris
Sylvia Moys
Chris Punter
Matthew Richardson
John Tomlinson

**Enquiries:** Claire Sherer
tel. no.: 020 7332 1971
claire.sherer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

**John Barradell**
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

# AGENDA

## Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ANY ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**
   To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 02 October 2012.

   **For Decision**
   (Pages 1 - 6)

4. **IS REVIEW PHASE 3 (SOURCING OPTIONS) - PROCUREMENT PATH**
   Report of the Chamberlain.

   **For Information**
   (Pages 7 - 14)

5. **UPDATED PROGRESS REPORT ON KEY PROJECTS**
   Report of the Chamberlain.

   **For Information**
   (Pages 15 - 22)

6. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
   MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

## Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

9. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUB (FINANCE) COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 2 October 2012**

Minutes of the meeting of the Information Systems Sub (Finance) Committee held at Guildhall, EC2 on Tuesday, 2 October 2012 at 11.30am

**Present**

**Members:**
Roger Chadwick (Chairman)
Ray Catt (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Douglas Barrow
Nigel Challis
John Chapman
Deputy Pauline Halliday
Hugh Morris
Sylvia Moys
Chris Punter
Matthew Richardson
John Tomlinson

**Officers:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Susan Attard | - | Deputy Town Clerk |
| Claire Sherer | - | Town Clerk's Department |
| Daniel Hooper | - | Town Clerk's Department |
| Chris Bilsland | - | Chamberlain |
| Graham Bell | - | Chief Information Officer |
| Colin Ashcroft | - | Chamberlain's Department |
| Neil Hocking | - | Chamberlain's Department |
| Ellen Murphy | - | Chamberlain's Department |
| John Saberi | - | Chamberlain's Department |

**Part 1 - Public Agenda**

1. **APOLOGIES**
   Apologies were received from Jeremy Mayhew.

2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ANY PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**
   There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

   **RESOLVED:** That the minutes be approved as an accurate record, subject to those Members of the Sub Committee who were attending in advance of their formal appointment by the Finance Committee being marked as 'In attendance'.

**MATTERS ARISING:**
In response to a question, Members were advised that expressions of interest in serving on the Information Systems Sub Committee would be extended to all Members of the Court of Common Council in advance of the April 2013 Finance Committee meeting to ensure that the Sub Committee would have a full complement of Members should the Finance Committee not wish to fill all the vacancies.

4. **IS STRATEGY 2012 - 2015**
The Chief Information Officer set out the draft high-level IS Strategy and informed the Sub Committee that this would be developed in more detail over the coming weeks. Members were supportive of the general approach and governance arrangements but were keen for it to include a statement of direction on technologies and some operational detail about how the Strategy would be implemented.

**RESOLVED:** That the Chief Information Officer would submit the final IS Strategy to the Sub Committee meeting on 19 February 2013.

5. **IS REVIEW (SOURCING OPTIONS) PROGRESS REPORT**
The Sub Committee considered progress on the IS Review (Sourcing Options) and were advised that soft market testing had been completed.

It was noted by Members that this was an excellent initiative and all staff involved should be thanked.

To ensure that the OJEU process was approached in as simple as way as possible, Members requested that the Chief Information Officer maintain personal oversight of the process. In response to the Sub Committee's request to be kept involved in the tendering process, it was agreed that a meeting would be held at 10.30am on 5 November 2012.

**RECEIVED**

6. **PROGRESS REPORT ON KEY PROJECTS**
Members considered the update report and although the format was good, they noted a number of concerns relating to the content. In particular, they requested a revision of the report to include:

* an indication of corporate priorities
* a full definition for the 'white' RAG status
* update information on all points currently indicated by 'TBC'
* clarity on the timescales for completion (and reasons for any delay)

With regards to the City's website, the Deputy Town Clerk advised Members that Officers were working hard to resolve the workflow issue relating to updating website content. The website was deliberately not marketed, and although the number of visitors had decreased, an initial survey had indicated a high level of satisfaction - Members would be updated on this matter in due course. Members noted that Officers should ensure that the 'Visit the City'

android and iPhone app remains compatible with the most up-to-date operating systems.

By way of explaining the delay in the project to replace the City Corporation's property management system (Manhattan), the Chamberlain advised that this had been a deliberate decision whilst scoping work was done to see if there is any merit in assessing Manhattan and the financial management system (Oracle) in tandem to see if further efficiencies could be made. It was noted that this area should be marked as 'Amber' due to the inherent risks and a full update would be included in the revised report.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be revised and reissued to Members by 31 October 2012.

7. **COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE REPORT**
The Sub Committee considered an update report in respect of on-going implementation and use of the new committee management system (Modern.gov) including on-going implementation issues and future activities for enhanced use of the software.

Members noted that the system had supported more efficient working practices within the Committee & Member Services team when preparing and publishing Committee papers but were keen for the benefits to Members and the public to be fully realised. In particular, they were disappointed that the 'app' which would allow Members to access non-public papers via their iPads (rather than via the Intranet as currently available) was not likely to be available until early 2013 and that the calendar synchronisation had been slightly delayed due to some technical issues. Members were keen to be involved in the calendar synchronisation testing stage which would be progressed as a matter of priority.

Members also noted some difficulty in navigating separate PDF document packs on their iPads where papers were issued late. The Chairman noted that the new version of 'PDF expert' had introduced tabs at the bottom of the screen which aided navigation significantly and offered to assist Members in upgrading and using this software.

The Deputy Town Clerk noted Members concerns and advised that as a result of the iPad trial we were pressing Modern.gov to drive forward the development of the app allowing access to non-public papers as a matter of priority. In the meantime, PDF document packs would be circulated by email and Officers would continue to liaise with Modern.Gov to ensure that progress was made on these areas.

With regards to longer-term ambitions to reduce printing costs, one Member stated that there were options to reduce printing by not circulating a separate agenda and removing blank pages. The Deputy Town Clerk advised the Sub Committee that circulating separate agendas was in line with the agreed approach but that the distribution of hard copy papers could be tailored to each Member's needs on request. It was agreed that this issue would be looked into in more detail and Members would be updated in due course.

Members voted to receive the Sub Committee papers in soft copy only (currently to be provided as PDF document packs via email) for future meetings subject to providing iPad chargers in the Members' room and/or Committee rooms.

**RESOLVED:** That –

  i.     the report be received and its contents noted;
  ii.    subject to providing iPad chargers in the Members' room and/or Committee rooms, papers would be circulated in soft copy only for future meetings;
  iii.   the Sub Committee would be updated in all areas raised above as soon as possible; and
  iv.    the calendar synchronisation would be resolved as a matter of priority and Information Systems Sub Committee Members would be offered the opportunity to participate in the testing stage.

8.  **IPAD UPDATE**
    The Sub Committee considered a report detailing the iPad project progress to date.

    Members asked when they would get confirmation that they could upgrade to iOS6 and were advised that they could do this now but they may prefer to wait for a briefing note explaining any issues that would be issued shortly.

    One Member noted that the iPad guidance cards that had been circulated to Members had been very well received.

    **RECEIVED**

9.  **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
    One Member requested that the policy regarding access to websites such as twitter, facebook and other social media sites in the Member's room be reviewed, particularly as these are increasingly used as a way of communicating with constituents.

    The Chief Information Officer agreed to update Members on this by the end of the week.

10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
    There was no other business.

11. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

    **RESOLVED** - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

12. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
    There were no non-public questions.

13. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
    There was no other business.

**The meeting ended at 12.45pm**

-----------------------------
Chairman


**Contact Officer: Claire Sherer**
**tel. no.: 020 7332 1971**
**claire.sherer@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

| Committee(s): | Date(s): |
|---|---|
| Information Systems Sub Committee<br>Finance Committee | 5 November 2012<br>6 November 2012 |

| Subject:<br>IS Review Phase 3 (Sourcing Options) - Procurement Path | Public |
|---|---|
| Report of:<br>Chamberlain | For Information |

### Summary

This report describes the procurement options for Phase 3 of the IS Review, which seeks to deliver a more cost effective IS/IT service through outsourcing elements of the current, fully in-house IS Division.

Work to date, which includes Soft Market testing, concludes that the optimum procurement route is to use the OJEU restricted process. This process ensures CoL's statutory obligations to comply with EU procurement regulations and the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (as amended 2009) are met.

If approved, the next step is to complete final preparations, leading to the launch of the tender by the end of 2012.

The cost of the procurement exercise can be met from funds already identified for this purpose from this year's IS Division revenue budget.

Soft Market testing, supported by the Serco exercise (summer 2011) clearly indicate there is significant service, functional and financial benefit in the selected outsourcing of IS Services.

The main risk for this procurement phase would be that the bids received do not deliver the expected financial and service benefits. By using the OJEU restricted process, and having conducted a Soft Market test, this is not considered a significant risk.

The EU procurement rules will be met by following the OJEU Restricted process. A mix of internal and external professional procurement and legal advice will be utilised throughout the procurement process.

IS Division are working with the HR department to ensure all appropriate procedures are followed. Impacts on the structure and personnel in the IS Department will be defined by the procurement process. Union representatives will continue to be kept informed of progress.

The more immediate impact on staff and team morale will be planned and managed through communication and engagement in the process. Alongside this will be a programme of on-going development to support preparation for change.

Two issues to particularly highlight for members' attention are :

- The OJEU award criteria as set out in table 2b, paragraph 11. These have been weighted to be sure to give sufficient weight to quality, including corporate social responsibility ( a new legal requirement from 2013, but already a City Corporation expectation ) and Employment ( fundamentally important in any outsourcing proposal; and

- The proposals in paragraph 16 to form to a reference panel of Members as part of the overall governance and project management arrangements.

**Recommendations**

1. That the IS Review proceeds to the formal procurement stage using an OJEU tender process.
2. The evaluation of bids is based on 35% cost and 65% quality.
3. A Members' reference group comprising a sub set of the IS Sub Committee membership is created and meets regularly to consult and review progress.
4. The decision for the approval of the preferred bid is delegated to IS Sub Committee

**Main Report**

**Background**

1. The last report on the IS Review presented to this committee in October, provided details on IS/IT services in scope for outsourcing that will form part of a formal tender exercise. Table 1 below, lists all IS services, and identifies those in scope for this procurement (column a) services likely to be added to the scope during the term of the agreed deal (column b) and finally services that will remain in-house (column c).

Table 1: IS Service Scope

| (a) In Scope for Tender | (b) Optional/To add later | (c) Remaining In-house |
|---|---|---|
| Data Network | Application Development | Business Relationship Management |
| Voice Network | Application Management | Information Governance |
| Data Centre | Information Architecture & Application Rationalisation | Strategic Project & Programme Management |

| Server & Data Storage | Project Management | Information Management |
|---|---|---|
| Database Support | Business Analysis & Requirement Definition | |
| Desktop & Remote Access | Training | |
| Service Management | | |
| Service Desk | | |
| Disaster Recovery | | |

**Current Position**

2. The next stage for the Review is to launch the tender. The Review team has identified two options that could be used. These are described in the following paragraphs.

**Options**
**Option 1 - Government Procurement Services Framework**

3. This option is the pre-tendered Government Procurement Services (GPS) Framework for IT Managed Services. It is an established agreement, with the terms & conditions already negotiated with 11 suppliers via a fully EU-compliant competition.

4. We have reviewed the 11 suppliers and believe many would be capable of being a future partner for IS service delivery. Of these suppliers, 7 participated in the soft market test conducted during August and September

5. The scope of managed services available through RM717 is constrained. Although our 'core' service requirements (see Table 1, column (a)) are fully covered by the framework, adding further application services at a later stage would complicate the procurement process or cause further delays at a later stage.

6. The award criteria for a GPS procurement is also prescribed and cannot be altered beyond the set range of percentages used for each of the criterion (see Table 2a). We are proposing 35% cost and 65% quality in evaluating bids. These set criteria do not fully match our needs.

**TABLE 2a**: GPS Framework Award Criteria

| Evaluation criteria | Criteria Weighting % | Sub-criteria | Sub-criteria Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technical solution | 25-45% | Innovation<br><br>Benefits realisation<br><br>Quality of solution | 100% |
| Commercial | 25-30% | Pricing<br><br>Value for money<br><br>Payment profile | 100% |
| Service delivery | 25-45% | Service levels<br><br>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)<br><br>Transition | 100% |
| | **100%** | | |

7. The cost of using the GPS Framework would be the lower than the OJEU approach (see Table 3) and would take the least time. Framework agreements are time limited, RM717 runs until August 2013 which provides sufficient time to use this agreement. It is also likely that this framework will be extended past this date.

**Option 2 - OJEU Tender process**

8. The alternative path to GPS procurement is to use a fully EU-compliant process. The City's requirements (Table 1) can be met by using the Restricted Tender process. This would allow the City to state its requirements including an option to take up application service management during the term of the contract.

Page 10

9. The range of suppliers for an OJEU Tender is potentially unlimited. To manage the potential volume of interest, a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) would be used to select a limited range of suitable suppliers (i.e. 8-12) who we consider would be able to deliver our requirements, subject to minimum compliance standards. By restricting the number of suppliers invited to tender we make the process more manageable and focussed.

10. Service specific terms & conditions will be created, and although the process is likely to take longer than a GPS procurement (Table 3) a critical benefit would be the ability to determine our own award criteria (Table 2b).

11. An OJEU Tender procurement is likely to provide the optimum match of a supplier that could meet our full requirements.

**TABLE 2b**: Suggested OJEU Award Criteria

| Evaluation criteria | Criteria Weighting % | Sub-criteria | Sub-criteria Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technical solution | 15% | Innovation Quality of solution Transition Plan | 100% |
| Commercial | 35% | Pricing Gain Share | 100% |
| Projects | 10% | Delivery proposal Rate Card | 100% |
| Business Value | 20% | Demonstrates understanding of CoL Service Levels | 100% |

| | | Partnership approach | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Corporate Social Responsibility | 10% | Local area benefits Sustainability | 100% |
| Transfer of Undertaking ( Protraction of Employment ) – TUPE approach | 10% | Transfer Proposals TUPE track record Staff view | 100% |
| | **100%** | | |

**Proposals**

12. It is proposed that the IS Review follows an OJEU tender process to outsource a range of services currently delivered in-house.

13. The difference in time & cost to run an OJEU tender over a GPS Framework (see Table 3) is outweighed by the reduction in risk of matching our full requirements, and the ability to determine the award criteria.

**Table 3:** Procurement Path comparison data

| Requirements | GPS | OJEU |
|---|---|---|
| Scope - Infrastructure | Yes | Yes |
| Scope - Project Management | Yes | Yes |
| Scope - Applications | Yes* | Yes |
| Can include other parts of CoL | Yes | Yes |
| Choice of suppliers | Good (11) | Good |
| Commercial Deal potential | Very Good | Very Good |
| Length of Term for deal | 5 years + | 5 Years + |
| Estimated cost to run (£/Hours staff time) | £100k 1900hrs | £150k 2300hrs |
| Time to run | 6-7 months | 7-8 months |
| Selection Criteria | Restricted | Unrestricted |

*only when part of a wider managed service deal

14. The basis for the award will weigh the evaluation towards quality rather than simply accepting the lowest cost bid. Following the relative weightings shown in Table 2b, this would mean 35% of the evaluation based on cost and 65% based on quality.

15. It is proposed that a reference panel of Members is formed from the existing members of IS Sub Committee. This panel will meet regularly and would be consulted on key decisions and kept informed of progress throughout the formal tender process.

16. The decision to approve awarding the contract to the preferred bidder is delegated to IS Sub Committee.

17. An outline timetable for the next stages in the Review is shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4:** Activity timetable

| Activity | Timescale |
|---|---|
| Decision on procurement route | 5th November 2012 |
| Completion of tender documents | Mid- November 2012 |
| Initiation of procurement | By end of November 2012 |
| Receipt & evaluation of bids | Winter 2012 through Spring 2013 |
| Decision on winning bid | Spring 2013 |
| Transition to new operating model | Starts late Spring/early Summer 2013 |

**Corporate & Strategic Implications**

The aim of this latest phase of the IS Review is to provide the best possible technology in the most cost effective manner. By doing this IS Division will be better able to support the goals of the Corporate Plan, the Departmental Business Plan and the Transformation Board.

**Implications**

18. The engagement with Serco in summer 2011 highlighted the potential for significant revenue savings by outsourcing elements of IT/IS services currently delivered by IS Division.

19. In the event that IT/IS infrastructure services are outsourced, the decommissioning of the data centre, currently in the former Justice Rooms, would fit within the corporate property strategy

20. IS Division are working with the HR department to ensure all appropriate procedures are followed. Impacts on the structure and personnel in the IS Department will be defined by the procurement process. Union representatives will continue to be kept informed of progress.

21. The more immediate impact on staff and team morale will be planned and managed through communication and engagement in the process. Alongside this will be a programme of on-going development to support preparation for change.

22. The cost to run a procurement exercise can be met from the existing revenue budget for IS Division.

23. The main risk for this procurement phase would be that the bids received do not deliver the expected financial and service benefits. By using the OJEU restricted process, and having conducted a Soft Market test, this is not considered a significant risk.

24. EU procurement rules and Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (amended 2009) will be met by following the OJEU restricted process. A mix of internal and external procurement and legal advisors will be utilised to support the procurement process.

**Conclusion**

25. Soft Market testing, supported by the Serco exercise clearly indicate there is significant service, functional and financial benefit in the selected outsourcing of IS Services in line with the scope defined in Table 1 of this report

26. This paper recommends that this scope is taken into formal procurement through an OJEU process.

27. That Members are engaged in this process through a review panel comprised of a sub set of Members form the IS Sub Committee. This panel would meet at regular intervals and key decision stages during the procurement process.

**Background Papers:**

**IS Review Phase 3 (Sourcing Options) Progress Report** –

Finance Committee (September 2012) and

Information Systems Sub (Finance) Committee (October 2012).

**Contact:**
*Graeme Quarrington-Page | graeme.quarrington-page@cityoflondon.gov.uk |*
*020 7332 3991*

| Committee(s): | | Date(s): |
|---|---|---|
| Information Systems Sub (Finance) Committee | | 5 November 2012 (Updated report from 2 October 2012 meeting) |
| **Subject:** Updated Progress Report on Key Projects | | **Public** |
| **Report of:** Chamberlain | | **For Information** |

**Summary**

This report summarises the progress made with the delivery of key 'live' projects within IS and sets out progress with key projects currently in pre-project/proposal stage.

**Recommendation**

That the report be received.

**Main Report**

**Background**

1. Following the progress report presented to IS Sub Committee on 2$^{nd}$ October, Members requested that missing information was supplied through an updated report.

2. This report provides a short progress report on the most significant projects, including information that was unavailable for the previous report. This is for 'live' projects that are established within the current work programme.

3. The report reflects the move towards a Project and Programme Management gateway being implemented within IS; work that is underway in a 'pre-project' or 'proposal' phase is shown separately as work in the 'pipeline'. This was previously shown as 'white' in the status. As these activities work their way through the pipeline, any that are approved will become part of the main report.

4. Current information on staff hours is included in this report, we have also calculated the full time equivalent to put these numbers in context. The improvements to project and programme management in IS will result in more robust and complete information on budgets, timeframes and quality. This will provide the IS Sub committee and other governance bodies with information that measures progress as well as reporting on current position.

| PROJECTS 2012-13 | Current Period RAG Status | Previous Period RAG Status | Direction Of Travel | Project Sponsor | Original Target Date | Current Target Date | Original Budget for 3rd party payments | Staff DAYS In Project (Budget/ Used) | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Detail of progress on selected key projects: | | | | | | | | | |
| City's Web Site – Ph1 | AMBER | AMBER | → | Susan Attard | Jun 2012 | Jul 2012 | £818k | 815 (budget) 1500 (actual) | |
| City's Web Site – Ph2 | AMBER | New | → | Susan Attard | Dec 2012 | Dec 2012 | 0 | | Options paper on delivery being presented to Website Decision Board on 22 October following which hours required and project status will be determined |

Redevelopment of customer transactions is due to deliver in December 2012. Chief Officers are being consulted on changes in business needs and the impact of technical issues in phase 1. A project brief is currently being developed and key decisions being handled by the Web Delivery Board.

Since the website plan was created earlier in the year, the City has become involved in the joint development partnership with Newham, Havering and Waltham Forest, all of whom are building their websites and CRM using the same Microsoft technology that the City has adopted. The advantage of joint development is that resourcing can be shared across the Boroughs and speed up the delivery of new online facilities. We are working with the partnership to develop a detailed work plan that will enable the City to take advantage of components that are being developed by the partnership, identify differences which need to be managed and ensuring that the partnership can benefit from components that the City develops. The Sub Committee will be advised if this work changes the target dates for this project

| IS Review (Phase 3) – Sourcing Options – Market Testing | GREEN | New | ↑ | Chris Bilsland | Dec 2012 | Dec 2012 | £85k | 135 days (1FTE) | 1 FTE dedicated full time since July to assist CIO |

The IS Review continues with Phase 3 exploring options for the sourcing of certain IS/IT support services. Preparing the way for this part of the Review were two earlier phases:

Phase 1 unified the main IS/IT support functions in departments into the IS Division – completed April 2011.

Phase 2 restructured the IS Division to refocus services towards the improved delivery of business systems and technology – completed January 2012.

Preparations are now being made to move into the procurement phase of this work. See attached report.

Summary of progress on remaining key projects:

| PROJECTS 2012-13 | Current Period RAG Status | Previous Period RAG Status | Direction Of Travel | Project Sponsor | Original Target Date | Current Target Date | Original Budget for 3rd party payments | Staff DAYS In Project (Budget/ Used) | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Committee Management System Replacement | GREEN | GREEN | → | Susan Attard | May 2012 | May 2012 | £30k to £50k | 35 (0.2 FTE) | The project is now entering a closure stage. Additional staff days were included in the overall project budget of £5k |
| Windows 7 (Phase 2) – Remote/Mobile/ Offline | Closed | GREEN | → | Graham Bell | July 2012 | Aug 2012 | £0k | | Windows 7 image complete and passed to CTO group for delivery as part of BAU. Offline Pilot completed. |
| Payroll and Human Resources (iTrent) Phase 2a – Recruitment | Closed | GREEN | → | Chrissie Morgan | Jun 2012 | Aug 2012 | £10k | | New recruitment module now live aligned to launch of the new website and taking account of HR requirements. The project is now entering a closure stage. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Swift (Social Services system) Replacement | GREEN | GREEN | ➡ | Chris Pelham | Apr 2013 | Apr 2013 | £125k | 250 days (1.4 FTE) | Procurement process has commenced with supplier selection in October 2012, and Committee approval in November. |
| Disaster Recovery Review Phase 1 | GREEN | GREEN | ➡ | Graham Bell | Dec 2012 | Dec 2012 | £431k | 135 days (1.4 FTE) | Orders have been placed with Logicalis (data centre) and Virgin Media (WAN links). Work is progressing at all four sites. WAN links are currently estimated to be delivered on schedule – 22nd November. |
| Mobile Telephony Migration | GREEN | GREEN | ➡ | Graham Bell | Mar 2012 ongoing | ongoing | SAVING £608k over 5 years | <15 days plus 1 hour for each user to have their phone SIM changed | Migration of mobile phones from Vodafone to O2. Approximately 70% of individual users have been transferred – scheduling is based on the timing of existing contract end dates. |
| Managed Print Service | GREEN | GREEN | ➡ | Graham Bell | Jun 2012 | Mar 2013 | SAVING £326k over 5 year contract | 50 days (.25 FTE) plus user input during the audit of requirements | A PP2P initiative. Contract signed with Konica to provide a single umbrella contract for all multi function (print/scan/copy) devices. The original target date was for signing the contract and completing an audit to enable proposals to be created. GSMD to be completed by end November, followed by Guildhall complex and CLSG end December. Remaining sites to follow. |
| Business Intelligence (Phase 2) | GREEN | New | ⬆ | Peter Lisley | Mar 2013 | Mar 2013 | 0 | 22 days | Project brief approved on 4th October 2012 and work has started on target |

Key

RAG Status = Red/Amber/Green status:
Red = Major issues resulting in time, cost or quality constraints – with actions in place to minimise impact
Amber = Issues arising or being managed with minor impact on time cost or quality
Green = Progressing to plan within costs and quality standards

**IS Project Pipeline**
Projects in the Pipeline were previously reported as WHITE, these are ideas and proposals in a 'pre-project' phase of work. Once the projects have been approved through the gateway process they will be transferred to the projects list above.
RAG status' have been added to reflect the progress on the required work to deliver to the next relevant gateway. Not all projects will have a specific budget or allocated staff hours, unless stated.

| IS Project Pipeline 2012 - 13 | Current Period RAG status | Previous Period RAG status | Project Sponsor | Gateway | Decision date | Original Budget for 3rd Party payments | Staff Days | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Network Renewal | **GREEN** | New | Graham Bell | Gateway 3 | March 13 | £450k | 58 days | Budget is for £150k capital and on-going £300k service costs |

The existing wide area network contracts end from Mar 2013 and the following work is underway to replace these services.

Investigations are well advanced to confirm a procurement route for renewed connectivity; this will use one of several frameworks, which are available to the Corporation. The use of which will allow rapid access to competitively priced network services.

It is anticipated that a decision on the Framework will be taken in November, with a design complete during December, for orders to be placed in January 2013. A phased replacement will then be planned, in line with the expiration of existing contracts. The existing contracts also have a facility to be extended on a rolling monthly basis to ensure that there are no gaps in connectivity; this is normal practice in network replacement projects.

The renewal of these network connections will be based on a new technology and design principles which will bring greater resiliency and robustness to the network. This will also increase bandwidth to remote offices, greatly improving their access to the Corporation Systems. This work will also be integrated with the Phase 3 Sourcing Review, which will provide management services for this network going forward.

Reports to the IS Sub Committee, the Finance Committee and the Projects Sub Committee will be made to update on progress and to formally approve this project.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sharepoint Document Management (EDRMS Phase 2) | GREEN | New | Graham Bell | Gateway 0 | Dec 12 | 0 | 30 days | Work on engagement with services and develop project brief and plan for next phase |

Phase 1 of the EDRMS project has concluded. Three service areas were migrated to SharePoint for document storage. However, there have been some issues encountered following these migrations, and we are working with business users to resolve them.

The Sharepoint facility 'team sites' is being piloted in Economic Development and the IS Training Team. The results of these trials are being analysed but feedback suggests that business benefits are being achieved.

A report WAS submitted to the IS Strategy Board on 3rd October reviewing the progress with the pilots and proposing an approach to the next phase of the work.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oracle R12 | AMBER | AMBER | Chris Bilsland | Gateway 3 | Dec 2013 | Information included at gateway 3 | 35 days | |
| Property Management (Manhattan replacement) | AMBER | AMBER | Peter Bennett | Gateway 3 | Dec 2012 | | | |

The City of London currently runs its CBIS system using Oracle Financials. This is currently on 11i which will go out of support from Nov 2013, and the Corporation has been considering the best and most cost effective option to achieve this upgrade and realise business benefit from it. In Addition the City Surveyors department must also replace the Manhattan system, and with the advent of R12 there is the potential to use additional Oracle Modules to provide this replacement and integrate with the existing Oracle Financials.

An insight exercise with Oracle has concluded and the City Surveyors are now preparing a statement of requirements – a decision will be made in November 2012 on the direction. The options being evaluated are:
1. Upgrade Oracle to R12 using this to replace Manhattan
2. Upgrade Oracle and identify an alternative solution to interface with Oracle
A project will be set up following the decision in November to deliver this.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accommodation moves | GREEN | GREEN | Susan Attard | Gateway 2 | Dec 2012 | Information included at gateway 3 | Information to be determined once staff numbers per move are agreed | Working with City Surveyor and Accommodation Strategy Board in order to provide supporting IT services. Departmental move plan agreed. |