

<b>Committees:</b>		<b>Dates:</b>
Projects Sub-Committee - For Decision IT Sub-Committee – For Information		04 October 2017 24 November 2017
<b>Subject:</b> Design, build, support and hosting for new website	<b>Gateway 1&amp;2 Project Proposal</b> Regular	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Town Clerk <b>Report Author:</b> Melissa Richardson, Digital Publishing & Content Strategy Lead, Town Clerk's Department		<b>Project Sub Committee – Decision</b> <b>IT Sub-Committee – For Information</b>

### Recommendations

1. Approval track and next Gateway	Approval track: 2. Regular Next Gateway: Gateway 3/4 - Options Appraisal (Regular)											
2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	<table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Existing staffing resource</td><td>To undertake soft market testing and continue project scoping</td><td>Existing staffing budgets</td><td>Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx = <b>£286</b> [Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]</td></tr></table>				Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Existing staffing resource	To undertake soft market testing and continue project scoping	Existing staffing budgets	Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx = <b>£286</b> [Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)									
Existing staffing resource	To undertake soft market testing and continue project scoping	Existing staffing budgets	Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx = <b>£286</b> [Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]									
3. Next steps	Undertaking soft market testing with Procurement in order to get an accurate understanding of market opportunities , costs and potential timescales for developing new website											

## Project Summary

<p><b>4. Context</b></p>	<p>4.1 Extended support for SharePoint 2010 (website content management system) ends on 13/10/2020 so a replacement must be found in good time.</p> <p>4.2 There are known issues with existing website functionality, namely <b>internal search</b>, i.e. it cannot search across related sites such as jobs or Member information, <b>responsiveness</b>, i.e. the site is not designed 'mobile first' and mobile usage is consistently increasing, <b>Information Architecture (IA)</b>, i.e. how the site is built and structured does not reflect user journeys and tasks</p> <p>4.3 We have also commissioned a report on website purpose and function which will inform requirements</p> <p>4.4 Website content is regularly reviewed by departmental owners as part of business as usual (there is a devolved publishing model), but there will also be regular communications via the 'Cluster Composer' user group around specific project requirements.</p>
<p><b>5. Brief description of project</b></p>	<p>5.1 To scope and procure services to deliver a new City of London Corporation website,</p> <p>5.2 To move to a cloud-based hosting and external support model</p> <p>5.3 To address known issues, e.g. Information Architecture (IA - how the site is built and structured), responsiveness (how it displays on mobile devices) and search functionality through the new website design</p>
<p><b>6. Consequences if project not approved</b></p>	<p>6.1 Mainstream support for SharePoint 2010 ended on 13/10/2015. Extended support for SharePoint 2010 ends on 13/10/2020. At this point this would become a major security risk.</p> <p>6.2 Adverse impact on reputation due to inadequate search functionality, lack of responsive design and poor layout (IA)</p>
<p><b>7. SMART Objectives</b></p>	<p>To scope and procure services to implement a new City of London Corporation Website by 2020.</p> <p>To move to an externally supported and hosted website model</p> <p>To improve website look, feel, and functionality to improve user satisfaction, as measured through user feedback and industry benchmarking initiatives such as the annual SOCITM survey</p> <p>Specific – user focus/tasks</p>

	<p>Measurable – responsive design</p> <p>Assignable – Ambition to have independent project manager and will appoint reputable supplier</p> <p>Realistic – if keep to timescales and get budget then everything</p> <p>Time-related – must be by 2020</p>
<b>8. Success criteria</b>	Improved SOCITM rating. Fewer complaints from Members and the public. Implementing future proof system that will last for at least five years. Better match with corporate strategy.
<b>9. Key Benefits</b>	<p>Better user experience</p> <p>Improved engagement with key audiences</p> <p>Better vehicle for communications</p>
<b>10. Notable exclusions</b>	CRM, online forms, online shop, jobs, media (press), potentially member content and any customer portals, other Corporation websites
<b>11. Governance arrangements</b>	<p><b>Spending Committee:</b> Policy and Resources Committee</p> <p><b>Senior Responsible Officer: Bob Roberts</b></p> <p><b>Project Board:</b> Yes</p>

### Prioritisation

<b>12. Link to Strategic Aims</b>	3. To provide valued services, such as education, employment, culture and leisure, to London and the nation.
<b>13. Links to existing strategies, programmes and projects</b>	<p>In line with the Town Clerks' business plan in creating a suitable platform for the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create and deliver clear, consistent and confident media messages and ensure consistent messaging across the City Corporation</li> </ul> <p>In parallel with the CRM (and forms) project. The website specification will include requirements to embed/join up with a number of formats including the online forms.</p> <p>[The intranet forms part of the IT transformation programme, but NOT the website. This project will be aligned with the new corporate strategy rather than the existing one]</p>
<b>14. Project category</b>	7a. Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
<b>15. Project priority</b>	A. Essential

## Options Appraisal

<b>16. Overview of options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New website hosted in the cloud, plus support and maintenance</li> <li>2. Do nothing. No website as will be taken down as a security risk</li> <li>3. Retain an internally hosted website which would be reliant on the robustness of our servers and the need to buy in skills to build and subsequently support it. [This option is susceptible to single point of failure in terms of in-house skills and is unlikely to be cost effective.]</li> </ol>
--------------------------------	--

## Project Planning

<b>17. Programme and key dates</b>	<p><b>Overall programme:</b></p> <p><b>Oct 2020</b> – SharePoint cut-off date</p> <p><b>June 2020</b> – launch (allowing 3 months contingency)</p> <p><b>Jan 2019</b> – design and build agreed and ready to implement</p> <p><b>Autumn 2018</b> - Gateway 5 [authority to start work signed off by TC]</p> <p><b>June 2018</b> – go out to tender (need to include spec which should cover how managed etc)</p> <p><b>June 2018</b> – Committee (RA Sub)</p> <p><b>Spring 2018</b> - Procurement options (PT3 add as appendix to gateway) - Gateway 3/4 [Path is dependent on cost, but most likely regular and then to the spending committee, P&amp;R. Then to RA sub / Gateway 4a]</p> <p><b>Sept/Oct 2017</b> - Gateway 1/2 [to project sub for 4 October]</p>
<b>18. Risk implications</b>	<p><b>Overall project risk:</b> Amber</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>18.1 Overspend</li> <li>18.2 Suitable supplier</li> <li>18.3 User testing</li> <li>18.4 Timescales</li> <li>18.5 Lose parts of spec due to lack of support, investment</li> <li>18.6 Can requirements be fully met by a third party?</li> </ol>

<b>19. Stakeholders and consultees</b>	19.1	Communications (TC)
	19.2	IT Division (CHB)
	19.3	City Procurement (CHB)
	19.4	Programme Office (TC)
	19.5	UX group (internal users, cross departmental)
	19.6	Members
	19.7	The public

### **Resource Implications**

20. Total estimated cost	Likely cost range: 2. £250k to £5m									
21. Funding strategy	No funding confirmed	Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource								
	There is no existing financial provision for this scheme and therefore funding options will need to be developed once the range of costs becomes clearer at the next gateway.									
	Depending on the sums required, funding options may include a bid for resources from the City Fund and City's Cash provisions for new schemes or a request for an additional allocation from general reserves. Such bids will be subject to the approval of the Resource Allocation and Policy and Resources Committees and potentially the Court of Common Council.									
	[The assumption has also been made that there will be need for internal resources.]									
	All of these costs will be clarified once the soft market testing exercise with Procurement is complete.									
	<table><tr><th>Funds/Sources of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Funding strategy to be developed once costs become clearer.</td><td>Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx.</td></tr><tr><td>[Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£286</td></tr></table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Funding strategy to be developed once costs become clearer.	Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx.	[Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]		Total	£286
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)									
Funding strategy to be developed once costs become clearer.	Indicative cost of potentially 2 days at £143 approx.									
[Minimal officer time will be required to progress the scheme to the next gateway which will be met from existing resources]										
Total	£286									
22. On-going revenue implications	Hosting, maintenance and support, details tbc  As we are likely to be moving to a 'software as a service' model, there would not be one-off set up costs which could be paid over a period of time. Consequently, there is likely to be an impact on revenue budgets, although this cannot be confirmed until we have more information from potential									

	suppliers (via soft market testing exercise with Procurement).
<b>23. Investment appraisal</b>	n/a
<b>24. Procurement strategy/Route to Market</b>	Procurement have been approached and will work with the project team to determine an appropriate procurement route in consultation with the IT Category Board to be reported at the next Gateway.
<b>25. Legal implications</b>	n/a
<b>26. Corporate property implications</b>	n/a
<b>27. Traffic implications</b>	n/a
<b>28. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	n/a
<b>29. IS implications</b>	An initial Opportunity Outline has been reviewed and approved by the IT PMO Review Meeting. Representatives from the IT Division are engaged in the project, and this project is included on the IT Project Pipeline.
<b>30. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	An equality impact assessment will be undertaken

### **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Melissa Richardson
<b>Email Address</b>	Melissa.richardson@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	020 7332 3449