

Committees: Corporate Projects Board Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Community and Children's Services [for information]	Dates: 22 May 2018 13 June 2018 2 November 2018
Subject: Electronic Social Care Recording System: Gateway 7 Outcome Report	Public For Decision

Summary

[S1] Key conclusions

In order to meet its statutory responsibilities, the City of London uses an electronic case management and recording system which holds information on all services users of children's and adults social care, special educational needs and disabilities and early help services. The system allows the social workers and other practitioners to record their decision making, manage workflow and co-ordinate activity across teams. The information held by the system is also used to report on performance to the statutory boards, statutory performance returns to Government and regular trend analysis informs discussions on future priorities. The City needed to procure a new system when the previous contract expired (and when support for the old system would cease). An issues report was submitted in October due to delays in the contract signing and additionally identified reporting, training and technical support requirements. The new system was in place in November (instead of October) and additional report mapping required was completed in February 2018. All of the requirements of the system, including meeting statutory requirements, good data security, ability to link with other City IT and finance systems and recording have been met and stakeholders have been positive about the smooth transition of the service. The final cost of the project was £29,610 over the original budget but within the revised budget agreed at issues report stage.

[S2] Key Learning and Recommendations

- A consultant with lead responsibility and expertise on the system enabled a smooth transfer from the project into Business as Usual.
- Early involvement of service users meant good engagement and the delivery of a system to meet their needs
- City Procurement are working on an adjustment to the wording of the standard Instructions to Tenderers (ITT) document which accompanies all procurements to clarify that any Terms and Conditions queries must be made via the Clarifications process and stating that all other requests including those made at or after submitting the bid will not be valid or accepted.
- Additional time is built in to project plans to allow for contractual discussions.
- Closer working between departments and IT/ City Procurement and the use of the IT project process is essential to plan for procurements and building in of technical risks at an early stage

[S3] Decisions required

Members are asked to approve the content of this Outcome Report, and that the Project will be closed.

Main Report

Design & Delivery, Variation and Value:					
Design & Delivery Review-					
[1] Design into Delivery	The system requirements document covered all elements of the current and future requirements and was developed using good practice from other local authorities, and feedback from service users of the system. The scope and scale of the work required to migrate data from the old to the new system was underestimated – additional time was required to train staff, map the reports required for statutory returns and additional technical support. These were reported as part of an issues report in October 2017				
[2] Options appraisal	The chosen option was to market test the key outcomes and requirements for a new contract/system and procure a system. This did allow the project to meet the project's objectives.				
[3] Procurement Route	The system was procured using a mini competition under a Crown Commercial Services framework. The framework allowed sufficient flexibility to tailor the specification to the City of London Corporation's requirements. However, there were delays in signing the contract as a result of the supplier requesting additional changes to the contract post procurement. This was despite the terms and conditions of the supply being issued in advance of call-off.				
[4] Skills base	The steering group consisted of users of the system, commissioning, procurement, IT, finance the systems manager and the Comptroller. An additional resource was procured to support the migration from the old to the new system, provide training and map the reports required from the system.				
[5] Stakeholders	The steering group (latterly the Project Group) consisted of users of the system, commissioning, procurement, IT, finance, the systems manager and the Comptroller. The group gave good feedback on how the project was undertaken.				
[6] Closing RAG rating	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Project Risk Assessment</td><td>Med</td></tr> <tr> <td>Project RAG rating</td><td>Green</td></tr> </table>	Project Risk Assessment	Med	Project RAG rating	Green
Project Risk Assessment	Med				
Project RAG rating	Green				
[7] Positive reflections	<p>A lessons learned exercise was carried out. Positive reflections included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The method of evaluating the bids has now been adopted by City Procurement for other IT projects. • Clarity on the use of externally procured frameworks was sought from the framework operator (Crown Commercial Services) • The steering group (latterly the Project Board during mobilisation) meetings had good representation, were well attended, very well chaired and well documented. • Involving the supplier (Servelec HSC) on the project board meant that the Project Team could access the Suppliers Best Practice environment in order to build forms whilst contractual issues were resolved. • Service user feedback was that the migration and mobilisation to go live was the smoothest transfer they had experienced due to the expert knowledge of the consultant. 				
[8] Improvement reflections	<p>In line with the issues report, the reflections include:</p> <p><u>Contractual delays:</u> This was caused by the supplier requesting changes to the terms and conditions which had been shared as part of the procurement. City procurement and the Comptroller have</p>				

	<p>considered how to mitigate this risk which has been reported as an issue with other City IT contracts. Actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The larger tenders now prohibit changes to contract. This will work if there is sufficient competition in the market place to make a selection. b) Clarifications/changes requested should be clearly set out and notified during the tender process: eg. a tick box, or template clarification form should be added to the tender pack. c) City Procurement are working on an adjustment to the wording of the standard Instructions to Tenderers (ITT) document which accompanies all procurements to clarify that any Terms and Conditions queries must be made via the Clarifications process and stating that all other requests including those made at or after submitting the bid will not be valid or accepted. d) longer commissioning and procurement timescales should be built in to allow for these changes <p><u>technical support/expertise</u>: the ability of the in-house resource to support the data transfer was underestimated. A number of changes have been made to identify earlier and more detailed assessment of T support required including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) All DCCS IT projects are now within the portfolio of one commissioning manager to build links and skills within the team f) a regular meeting with City Procurement, IT and commissioning is now in place to review all IT procurements, including technical requirements g) all new IT projects now go to IT PMO and follow the IT project process (which was reviewed in March 2017) as standard to engage IT at an earlier stage and make better use of IT expertise h) The job description for the DCCS day to day technical support has been updated and options for best support are being reviewed to reflect the needs of the department to reduce the risk of a single point of failure. i) An inclusion of data migration risks within the risk assessment will now be standard
Variation Review-	
[9] Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The key milestones identified were:</p> <p>Specification of works: December - January 2017 - <i>achieved</i></p> <p>Undertake procurement: January – March 2017 - <i>achieved</i></p> <p>Contract let: May 2017 - <i>achieved (although contract not signed until September)</i></p> <p>Data migration: May – September 2017 (<i>this was extended into November</i>)</p> <p>System go-live : October 2017 <i>this was achieved in November 2017</i></p>
[10] Assessment of project against Scope	<p>Requirements of the new system included the ability to link to the City's Local/National Land Planning Gazetteer (L/NLPG) and GIS. The new system has the ability to do this. The supplier's bid included a maximum price of £16k for technical work to support the City's implementation of these functionalities. The Project Board determined that this work should form a separate future project and therefore was removed from scope.</p>

	The NLPG is currently in the process of implementation and discussions will take place with the GIS team to consider how GIS functionality can be taken forward.
[11] Change	An issues report in October 2017 identified the impact resulting from the delays in signing the contract, the additional resources required for additional technical resources, training and report mapping. Projects Sub requested additional information in order to make a decision outside of committee and agreed additional funding of £55,000 for the consultant support. An opportunity arose at issues report stage to upgrade to a newer version of the system to avoid subsequent upgrades and this was successful. A number of known issues associated with the earlier version have been rectified in the newer version (e.g. the ability to allocate carers to a service retrospectively) as well as a number of new features requested by users (e.g. due date management and group summary screens). The provider gave additional consultancy support to the CoLC in order to iron out any bugs in the newer version.
[12] Risks and Issues	Only one identified risk was experienced (system not implemented on time) which was a result of delays in signing the contract (see paragraph 8 above). Early discussions with users and with other local authorities enabled the specification to be developed to meet user needs and use good practice from other local authorities. The existing system reports required significant mapping and re-writing to ensure they were suitable for the City of London and could be run in time for the statutory reporting deadlines. The timescales and work required to undertake this task was an unidentified risk - the extent and scale of which could not be identified until the procurement process had taken place. Additional consultant time was approved by Members at Issue report stage in October 2017. An earlier more robust risk assessment will be carried out for future IT projects alongside officers from the IT department to identify issues earlier.
[13] Transition to BAU	The consultants who were engaged to mobilise the contract and migrate the old to the new system set in place a suite of controls and associated documents to inform BAU including a new governance structure, reporting mechanism, new contract/account monitoring meetings. Test scripts were created so that any patches, or system upgrades can be implemented in a systematic way and any issues identified at an early stage.

Value Review

[14] Budget		At Authority to Start work (G5)	At Completion
	Capital Costs		
	System Capital costs	£ 83,990*	£ 59,000
	Project management /migration	£ 30,000	£ 84,600
	Revenue Costs		
	System revenue costs (5 years)	£212,500	£212,500
	Total	£ 326,490	£356,100

	<p><i>*The bid included £16,000 consultancy work over 5 years for system upgrades. This figure was included within capital costs but should have been within revenue costs and will be met from local risk budgets. The bid also included work to the value of £16,000 for GIS/NLPG functionalities which have been removed from scope (see para 10)</i></p> <p>The final cost of the project was £29,610 over the original budget but within the revised budget agreed at issues report stage.</p> <p><i>The Final account has been verified</i></p>
[15] Investment	This project was not an invest to save or revenue generating opportunity.
[16] Assessment of project against key measures of success	<p>The success criteria identified at Gateway 5 were:</p> <p>1) the system is in place and usable by October 2017</p> <p>The completion date was revised at Issue Report stage from October 2017 to November 2017 because of delays in signing the contract. The revised implementation date was achieved. The additional report mapping project was completed on time in February 2018.</p> <p>2) the key requirements of the system, as agreed in the specification, are met by the chosen provider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) meets statutory requirements and identified good practice b) Easy processes for data entry and recording. c) Co-ordinates all records in relation to a service user or carer and their family d) Potential for easier information sharing with the NHS e) Good data security (in line with Comptrollers guidance, national good practice and consideration of GDPR implications) f) Accurate reporting of performance and budget trends g) Safe and professional experience for service users and carers h) Flexibility to respond to future national and local requirements i) Flexibility to link to or interface with future City of London IT systems (including GIS, mobile working and finance interfaces) <p>All of these requirements were achieved at implementation date in November 2017 with the exception of accurate reporting of performance (2f). This was identified as an issue and reported to Projects Sub in October 2017. An additional project was identified to provide reporting to reflect the City's workflows and this project completed in February 2018. Of the 126 reports, all have been mapped to the new system. A small number have issues that are being fixed by the supplier as part of a reports upgrade for all local authorities and a further few have issues which are being resolved by the performance team and in house technical support</p>
[17] Assessment of project against SMART Objectives	<p>The following SMART objectives were identified at Gateway 1/2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific: the purchasing of an electronic social care case management recording system from October 2017 2. Measurable: a system which meets the statutory and local requirements is in place and operating effectively by October 2017

	<p>3. Assignable: the commissioning process will be led by Community and Children's Services' Commissioning team and the Procurement will be led by City Procurement. A steering group, led by Community and Children's Services and with City procurement has been agreed</p> <p>4. Realistic: A procurement process to purchase a system can be achieved by October 2017</p> <p>5. Time-related: A project plan has been agreed by the steering group to allow the procurement to take place and have a five month mobilisation period before the end of the current contract</p> <p>The completion date of October 2017 for 1, 2 and 4 was revised to November 2017 because of delays in signing the contract and the system was implemented in November 2017. An additional project to map the reports was agreed by Projects Sub in October 2017 at issue report stage and this project completed in February 2018. The mobilisation period was extended as a result of delays in signing the contract but the steering group were engaged throughout the mobilisation and testing phases.</p>
[18] Key Benefits realised	At gateway1/2, the benefits were identified as being the same as the key success criteria (paragraph 16)

Lessons Learned and Recommendations	
Lessons Learned-	
[19] General Purpose Review	<p>A number of positive learning points include engagement of service users at an early stage to identify their requirements of the system, the use of consultants with experience of migrating from similar systems and a simplified bid evaluation which has been adopted by City Procurement.</p> <p>A number of actions have already been taken Corporately to respond to the contractual delays which will be implemented for other IT projects as set out in paragraph 8.</p> <p>Closer working between departments and IT/ City Procurement and the use of the IT project process is essential to plan for procurements and build in technical risks at an early stage</p>
[20] Learning	Learning from this project has been shared within DCCS and with the Comptroller and City Procurement and actions have been taken to implement changes departmentally and Corporately.
Recommendations-	
[21] Recommendations	It is recommended that the learning from paragraph 8 be taken into consideration for future IT contracts
[22] AOB	N/A

Decisions required
If any decisions are required in addition to the approval of this outcome report please describe them here:
No additional decisions are required

Appendices

Appendix 1: Excerpt from the Projects Sub committee 13 June 2018 minutes

Contact

Report Author	Sarah Greenwood
Email Address	sarah.greenwood@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3594

Appendix 1: Excerpt from the Projects Sub Committee 13 June 2018

Gateway 7 – Electronic Social Care Recording System

Similarly, the Chairman noted that after further review, the Town Clerk was content to put Item 21 (a) – Gateway 7 – Electronic Social Care Recording System in the public domain. The following comments were made.

- The Chairman noted that it was clear that early involvement of service users in the project was a positive, but that there had been issues with the procurement process.
- In response to a question, the Chamberlain confirmed that the City's procurement guidance had been updated in light of the lessons learned from the project.
- Members noted that many of the lessons learned were from issues identified by the Projects Sub-Committee at an earlier stage of the project.
- A Member, commenting in his capacity as Chairman of the Information Technology Sub-Committee, noted that that Sub-Committee would also note the lessons learned from this project.

RESOLVED, that the project be closed and the lessons learned.