

MINUTES

Flare Replacement Project Board Meeting

24th April 2020, 09:30-10:00

Microsoft Teams

Attendees:	Andrew Errington (AE) Colin Monckton (CM) Lorraine Raynor (LR) Steven Brookes (SB) Peter Whitehouse (PW) Maria Balchin (MB) Paul Dales (PD) Rav Ghattoara (RG) Ryan Denton (RD)
Apologies:	David Walker (DW) Duncan Newbutt (DN) Claire Gavagan (CG) Louise Dobson (LD)
Item 1:	<u>Welcome and Introductions</u> All were welcomed to the meeting and apologies were noted. Shortened agenda to accommodate the limited 30mins available.
Item 2:	<u>Impact of the Project pause</u> LR highlights that there is a significant increase in project delivery timescale risks. The main challenge is the drop dead date of September 2021. The project pause/slowdown risk could be alleviated by an extension with Civica however they have expressed that they won't extend the current contract but the cost for a new 6 month extension contract could cost over £200,000. Legal & Procurement are negotiating with Civica about the issue. LR highlights with the project pause has led to the project phases time allotment to be constrained, and has led to some serious issues. If an extension cannot be achieved then Community Protection will be without the necessary software and has led to a high risk situation. SB confirms that Civica will not extend the contract due to the CX contract and legal and procurement are discussing a resolution. SB highlights that Winston Smillie has written to Civica requesting a 6 month extension under the same terms and conditions, a response to this email should be sent by next week. SB highlights some timescale impacts below; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased Risk of missing Civica's Flare End date• Reduction in time for the delivery phase; training.• Positive impacts of the project pause/slowdown are; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved software availability, Important Civica updates (Housing/GIS) in the pipeline at time of end date of September 2021.• Allows for more time on finalising and improving Exec Board/OBC/Planning documents.



	<p>CM believes it should be viewed more as a slowdown rather than as a pause, and that by May there should be no reason to pick up the project again, and ensure that key people work on the necessary tasks to allow the project to continue. AE agrees and that changes to work due to the pandemic such as remote working or with limited numbers in the office should allow the project to continue.</p> <p>CM states that due to council policy focusing on key tasks and policies during this unprecedented crisis, unless the leadership relaxes this then the project can't progress formally however certain tasks for the project can be continued.</p>
<p>Item 3:</p>	<p><u>Ongoing project activities</u></p> <p>LR highlights that there are two major gaps in the project due to the pause. Finance – where the money would come from for the project and IT Structure. MB clarifies that the focus has not been on the project due to the financial closedown and other pressures on the finance team, However they will be able to devote time to the project. MB asks that SB revisits key risks and put them forward in a brief to Keri. SB states that there are two sides to financial queries; how the project will be paid for and the cost to run.</p> <p>LR highlights that with Covid-19 legislation it may allow for wider options for the project. Procurement and legal are investigating as it may allow for a decision for a supplier to be made earlier.</p> <p>Furthermore LR states that Civica have stated that other councils have updated their systems, having council that have responded have denied that they awarded Civica with the project. SB and IT view it not an update as Civica says but rather a new system. CM asks that legal have a view on this and potential costs of that system. Furthermore what resources are required for further project work?</p> <p>SB states that the business specificity needs to be worked on further and further work on statutory functions. PW is leading on business mapping and the potential business benefits of the project which will feed into the wider business case.</p> <p>Suppliers, such as Northgate, Tascomi etc., have been written to and have expressed that they are ready to move on our requirements and are ready whenever we are. CX have now expressed that they have a housing product, which they have previously stated they didn't. Other local authorities have not been able to support our enquiries into their own past replacement projects due to councils focusing on their own pandemic response however as the situation is stabilising SB states they will contact them again for information.</p> <p>PW highlights that there should be a consideration of the potential business changes that will occur within the council, and that a scope and understanding should be gained. PW also asks what the procurement options are for the project as he understands there are 3 to 4 suppliers so far to choose from, and what is the projects approach on procurement.</p> <p>Action – MB asks SB to revisits key risks and put forward into a brief to Keri.</p>
<p>Item 4:</p>	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p>CM asks SB if there can be updates via email on the latest project changes especially towards any replies from Civica in response to Winston's email.</p> <p>Action – SB to notify attendees of project updates via email.</p>

