Committees:	Dates:	
Policy and Resources Committee Projects Sub	12 April 2018 14 March 2018	
Subject: Design, build, support and hosting for new website	**Gateway 3/4 Options Appraisal(Regular)**	**Public**
Report of: Town Clerk **Report Author:** Melissa Richardson, Digital Publishing & Content Strategy Lead, Town Clerk's Department		**For Decision**

Summary

Dashboard

- Project status: Amber

- Timeline: This project is now at Gateway 3/4. The previous Gateway 1/2 agreed the project proposal to scope and procure services to deliver a new City of London Corporation website, to move to a cloud-based hosting and external support model and 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.

  A supplier open day was held to test the market and gain feedback on likely costs and timescales for the project. This has provided an estimated capital figure of £360,000 and ongoing revenue costs for support, hosting and capital cost and a licence for a better search engine (£313,000). There are plans for a contribution from IT towards revenue costs (representing their previous internal investment), but this will not be sufficient to cover our ambitions to provide a world-class search engine or to fully support cloud hosting.

  Resources expended have been staff time **(**estimated at £286) and £7K for a digital consultant to assist with researching the business requirements to inform the invitation to tender.

  Ordinarily, this would be considered by Resource Allocation sub committee, but given that it doesn't meet until May it is being submitted to the grand committee for consideration in order to progress the project in good time.

- Options overview:
    - 1. New website hosted in the cloud, plus support and maintenance
    - 2. Do nothing. No website as will be taken down as a security risk
    - 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.]

- Option 1 is the proposed way forward. With agreement we would go out to tender this summer and have suppliers in place by the end of this year.
- The project officer has liaised with City procurement and PT 3 (options) has been agreed. Procurement have recommended option 1, with the proposed route to market of competitive tender via the digital marketplace (G Cloud)
- Overall project risk is at Amber

Table with financial implications

Description	Option 1
Capital estimate	£360,000
Revenue estimate	£20,000 pa x 2 plus 2 years (as per procurement framework) = £80,000
Federated search engine estimate [additional option – will search across a number of sites as opposed to any out of the box option which would only search the main site]	£15,000 capital, plus £10,000 pa licensing (x 2 plus 2 years (as per procurement framework) = £40,000, £55,000 in total
Project manager fees (estimate)	£500 per day approx., probably 2 year fixed term = £65,000 pa (£130,000 total) based on day rate and assuming full time
SOCITM website assessment (estimate)	£8,000
Ongoing user testing (estimate)	£10,000 pa (x 2 plus 2 years (as per procurement framework) = £40,000
Staff costs	* £0. This is filled by someone in a substantive post and which will be met by the TC existing local risk budget. Estimate of hours will be covered at Gateway 5 risk report once approved option has been fully assessed.
Spend to date	£7K plus staff time at £286

Total	£680,286
Funding strategy	Funded from capital request to Policy and Resources, plus request to add revenue costs to TC local risk budget as a new amount

Recommendations

Members are asked to approve option 1

- New website hosted in the cloud, plus support and maintenance

Options Appraisal Matrix

See attached.

Appendices

Appendix 1	PT 3 Procurement form
Appendix 2	
Appendix 3	

Contact

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

Options Appraisal Matrix
NB 1: Delete options columns not required or add extra if needed
NB 2: Merge cells if information is the same for multiple options
NB 3: If information is the same as Gateway 1/2 Project Proposal report delete the row
NB 4: Use bullet points and keep descriptions short

	Option 1	*Option 2*	*Option 3*	
1. Brief description	New website hosted in the cloud, plus support and maintenance	Do nothing. No website as will be taken down as a security risk	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.	
2. Scope and exclusions	Website representing the City of London Corporation to be built, designed, tested, hosted and maintained. Exclusions are Member info, Jobs, Media (Press) online forms and transactions.	Remains as is until removed	Website representing the City of London Corporation to be built, designed, tested, hosted and maintained. Exclusions are Member info, Jobs, Media (Press) online forms and transactions.	
Project Planning				
3. Programme and	Oct 2020 – SharePoint cut-off date	Do nothing	Oct 2020 – SharePoint cut-off date	

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
key dates	June 2020 – launch (allowing 3 months contingency) Jan 2019 – design and build agreed and ready to implement Autumn 2018 - Category board (every two months - 14/08, 09/10 and 11/12) - award report (PT8) - Gateway 5 June 2018 – go out to tender May 3 2018 – Committee (RA Sub)		June 2020 – launch (allowing 3 months contingency) Jan 2019 – design and build agreed and ready to implement Autumn 2018 - Category board (every two months - 14/08, 09/10 and 11/12) - award report (PT8) - Gateway 5 June 2018 – go out to tender May 3 2018 – Committee (RA Sub)	
4. Risk implications	• Reliance on third party may introduce risk of non-performance.	• Site becomes a security risk and has to be taken down leaving us with no web	• Unable to find necessary skillset at an affordable price	

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
		presence	• Not part of IT strategy. • No funding agreed for hiring permanent staff.	
5. **Benefits and disbenefits**	**Benefits:** More flexible and resilient as a platform, i.e. cloud hosted. Appropriate expertise available and broader experience Able to access knowledge/expertise (agile supply) when required through support options. Meets IT Strategy to use SaaS solutions, where possible. **Disbenefits:** No retention of skills in house.	**Benefits:** No demands on finances or resources **Disbenefits:** Huge impact on reputation, provision of service etc	**Benefits:** Able to design and build at City's pace. **Disbenefits:** No in-house skills – would need to hire/upskill making this option more expensive than outsourcing.	

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
6. Stakeholders and consultees	Members, IT, Comms, Chief Officers, City Procurement, Comptrollers & City Solicitors, web editors across the City Corporation, the public	Members, IT, Comms, Chief Officers, City Procurement, Comptrollers & City Solicitors, web editors across the City Corporation, the public	Members, IT, Comms, Chief Officers, City Procurement, Comptrollers & City Solicitors, web editors across the City Corporation, the public	
Resource Implications				
7. Total Estimated cost	Capital Costs - £375,000 (including proposed £15,000 capital for federated search), Revenue Costs - ongoing revenue costs for support and hosting (£80k), plus cost and licence for a better search engine (£40k), project manager costs (£130k), pre-launch assessment (£8k) and ongoing user testing (£40k), spend to date	N/A	Either look to existing Agilisys Team to nominate replacement CMS or bring new team in-house. Support for the Corporation Website is just one of the functions provided by the Agilisys SharePoint Team, therefore it is not envisaged that there would be any savings in this area from moving to an external support model.	

		Option 1	*Option 2*	*Option 3*	
		(£7,286); total revenue= £305,286 Estimated Total - £680,286			
8.	**Funding strategy**	£375,000 bid to Policy and Resources Committee as a capital cost £298,000 bid to the Resource Allocation Sub and Policy and Resources Committees for additional resources for the 2018/19 City's Cash provision for new schemes	N/A	£375,000 bid to Policy and Resources Committee as a capital cost £298,000 bid to the Resource Allocation Sub and Policy and Resources Committees for additional resources for the 2018/19 City's Cash provision for new schemes	
9.	**Estimated capital value/return**	N/A	N/A	N/A	
10.	**Ongoing revenue implications**	Plus request to add revenue costs (as above, £298,000 having deducted £7,286 already spent) to TC local risk budget as a new amount	0	Plus request to add revenue costs (as above, £218,000 having deducted £80,000 - over 4 years - for hosting as rhis will be covered internally, plus £7,286 already spent) to	

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
			TC local risk budget as a new amount (Current internal hosting is approx. £45,000 pa.)	
11. Investment appraisal	N/A	N/A	N/A	
12. Affordability	This option allows us the most freedom to meet our aspirations whilst meeting the corporate strategy. A competitive procurement exercise for all elements of the new website would ensure value for money.	This option whilst cheap is high risk and cannot be recommended.	The costs will be similar over all to option 1, but will not meet the corporate strategy and will be more restrictive as will have to to be compatible with other platforms etc. and hosting is likely to be more expensive.	
13. Legal implications	Review of legal notices and DPA/GDPR compliance	N/A	Review of legal notices and DPA/GDPR compliance	
14. Corporate property implications	N/A	N/A	N/A	

	Option 1	*Option 2*	*Option 3*	
15. Traffic implications	N/A	N/A	N/A	
16. Sustainability and energy implications	N/A	N/A	N/A	
17. IS implications	An externally hosted and supported website would meet the IT Strategy to 'buy not build'.	Extended support for SharePoint 2010 will come to an end, therefore the website will need to be decommisioned.	An internally supported model would most likely see responsibility for website support remain with the IT Managed Service Partner (currently Agilisys).	
18. Equality Impact Assessment	To be done at a later date	N/A	To be done at a later date	
19. Recommendation	Recommended	Not recommended	Not recommended	
20. Next Gateway	Gateway 4a - Inclusion in Capital Programme	Gateway 4a - Inclusion in Capital Programme	Gateway 4a - Inclusion in Capital Programme	
21. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway				

Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funding Source

		Option 1	Option 2		Option 3		
		Staff time	Existing resources used to reach next Gateway	N/A	N/A		