

Nottingham City Council

evolution
linking people, processes, systems & services

Project Evolution Full Business Case

Delivering an integrated Children, Adults services and financial solution.

Lead Department: Children & Adults



Safer, cleaner, ambitious
Nottingham
A city we're all proud of



Nottingham
City Council

DOCUMENT CONTROL

BC Author	Lisa Ward
Project Sponsor (contact details)	Alison Michalska
Project Manager (contact details)	Lisa Ward
Date	24 th April 2015
Document ID	

Version	Status	Revision Date	Summary of Changes	Sign-Off
0.1	Draft	12.02.15	Draft created	
0.2	Draft	24.04.15	Amended following financial analysis and tender evaluation	

CONTENTS

	Page
1.0	Purpose of Document
2.0	Executive Summary
3.0	Strategic Fit
3.1	Background and Business Needs
3.2	Strategic Objectives and Outcomes
3.3	Scope
3.4	Constraints
3.5	Dependencies
3.6	Key Risks
3.7	Benefits
4.0	Option Appraisal
5.0	Commercial Aspects
6.0	Affordability
7.0	Achievability

1.0 PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This document provides the Full Business Case (FBC) for the above work to provide Nottingham City Council with a fully functional and fit for purpose Social Care and Financial system for the Children and Adults directorate which will enable them to provide good and appropriate services to the citizens of Nottingham City.

The FBC provides the detailed costs associated with this project. Costs are based on pricing estimates provided by suppliers, existing contractual costs and internal colleague estimates for the work that is to be completed.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of **Project Evolution** is to procure and implement an integrated social care case management and financial solution in place of CareFirst and the financial systems, databases that are currently in use. The purpose of **Project Evolution** is to consolidate systems, processes and ways of working in order to achieve compliance and efficiencies in order to cope with the rising demands on social care services.

The current system/s are not fit for purpose and do not provide the required support for practitioners and social workers. The Children's department was subject to an Ofsted inspection in early 2014, the result of which was that the council 'requires improvement'. The Ofsted report highlights a number of issues with the IT systems in use across the department and in particular the integration between the Care First and the document management system, Castle.

The Adults department are also preparing for a significant change in adults social care practices as a result of the Care Act, which will place an increased demand on the department in terms of the number of service users that will require assessments and financial tracking of personal budgets.

This project aims to implement a new case management solution in order to address the issues identified with current solutions and is expected to cost £4.1m over 5 years.

The benefits that the project aims to deliver as a result are:

- Avoidance of reputational damage and penalties
- Improved Ofsted assessment
- Improving business efficiency in Children's & Adults services
- De-commission systems and centralise system management
- Improve quality, communication and sharing of financial and customer data
- Increase staff satisfaction and improve retention

3.0 STRATEGIC FIT

3.1 Background of Business Need

There is an increasing concern about how fit for purpose the existing computer systems are for providing proper support to practitioners and other key and administration staff throughout the Children and Adults directorate. Workers have reported a number of problems with the CareFirst system including:

- the amount of time required to input information into the system, and then subsequently trying to get information out of the system instead of doing face to face work with clients;
- the inability to provide new business and regulatory requirements such as chronology and legal documentation required for courts
- the system is not user friendly and 'clunky' to use
- there are limitations in the way that forms can be designed within the system resulting in the department needing to produce separate paper work
- the lack of linkage between the Social Care Case Management system and other systems results in a considerable amount of discrepancies and duplicate data entry.

Additionally there are problems with some of the systems that are used alongside CareFirst:

- there are many issues with the quality of the key information across the various systems;
- there are a number of processes and activities that occur outside of the system for example on spreadsheets and word templates
- information needs to be re-keyed between systems
- some systems have become increasingly unstable, subject to failure and data loss and lack the ability to be able to collate information about a single view of a child or adult.

There is a business need to ensure that the processes and systems required to support the Children and Adults directorate satisfy regulatory requirements, fit for purpose and capable of managing the critical information held about the children and vulnerable adults within Nottingham City. This includes the need to ensure that we capture all of the key information not only within the disparate areas of the directorate but also within the different agencies providing services to our citizens.

3.2 Strategic Objectives and Outcomes

1. Departmental Objectives

Nottingham City Council aims to provide good services throughout its Children and Adults directorate and is increasingly focused on providing value for money to its citizens. The department is currently operating using a number of independent software systems and access databases. The key objective of this project is to consolidate a number of the systems, spreadsheets and access databases used within the Children and Adults directorate into one core case management solution that is fit for purpose as defined as providing a good service to the citizens of Nottingham City Council.

2. Inter-Agency Objective

One of the consistent themes to emerge from serious case reviews in recent years has been the need for a holistic view of a citizen to identify the need for early interventions and also to plot a chronology of events. Whilst this is important within social services increasingly it is recognised that effective information sharing across organisational boundaries will provide useful information from different relevant sources in order to provide practitioners and insight specialists with the opportunity to address early interventions and early notification to key events such as A&E Admissions.

Practitioners require clear, unambiguous and timely information in order to make good judgements with clients and as such the need for a single view of a citizen is important to good decision making. The third objective is aimed at considering three relevant solutions for addressing a cost effective way forward to provide a single view of a citizen.

This requirement also fits with the Agreed Vision which introduces the need to have multi-agency at the access point, multi-agency assessments, an integrated computer system for sharing information

between partners with a view to better integration of interventions across the partnership.

3. Support the achievement of Nottingham Plan

The Nottingham Plan for 2020 has 6 Strategic Priorities, two of which focus on the specific role in supporting Families and Older People. **Priority 3:** Family Nottingham and **Priority 6:** Healthy Nottingham both require increasing integration of information around citizens in order that practitioners are able to access the right information, a complete set of information and accurate information in an efficient and expedient manner.

These are also reflected in the Council Plan (2012-2015) and additionally through our goal of supporting effective early intervention activities. The Council Plan places a strong emphasis on putting Citizens First with a programme of work to ensure high levels of satisfaction, efficiency savings and innovative and modern service offering.

In the last three years a range of work towards these objectives has increasingly highlighted the deficiencies in the IT systems themselves, insufficient information quality and completeness, difficulty in integrating information between sources to fully understand a citizens situation and a range of vulnerabilities and risks in information management and key person dependency around systems and data maintained in isolation within service areas.

4. Changes in Government legislation

There is a very strong national policy imperative towards information integration to enable integrated services for the benefit of both citizens and in efficiency terms. Specifically the Care Act, the Children and Families Bill, the Priority Families programme, the Better Care Fund, the Public Health integration into the local authority and several others are all unequivocally demanding improvements in information management, integration and accessibility for practitioners.

5. Information sharing

In terms of Children and Adults safeguarding, without exception sharing of information is always highlighted in all Serious case Reviews. The recent Caldicott 2 review also emphasised this and has added a 7th principle stating "The duty to share information can be as important as the duty to protect patient confidentiality".

The Council plan, National Policy drivers and our statutory responsibilities for safeguarding children and adults all have expected outcomes that rely on information to be more integrated, more complete, more accessible to practitioners quicker and managed in a way to reduce risks.

6. Citizen Needs

The Children and Adults directorate works with Children and Adults to help children and young people stay healthy, safe, enjoy and achieve and make a positive contribution to society. Similarly with adults the focus is on investing in services that reduce needs, lower future costs and develop innovative ways to make use of these valuable resources in the community.

To achieve these outcomes, Children and Adults directorate require trustworthy systems which allow practitioners and the directorate partners to deliver consistent levels of quality and care. Broken processes and systems result in broken services and this is likely to affect the most vulnerable members of society.

In addition to ensuring that the city council is providing important day to day services the more disadvantaged members of society look to the city council for the help and assistance that only the Children and Adults directorate can provide. It is important that the busy professionals within the

department can look to their computer systems for help and assistance in undertaking their work rather than being a barrier, as they are viewed currently.

7. Address Strategic Risk

The Council Strategic Risk register has the following high priority risks which this work is also specifically focused on, as follows:

SR6 – safeguarding children: Vulnerable datasets and key person dependency, slow information sharing, inaccurate or out of date information all carry a risk to the safety of children. Evidence that these factors cause risks can be found from examples of the issues highlighted in the baseline report, and external work on safeguarding such as Serious Case Reviews, Safeguarding Board requirements and inspection issues previously noted by Ofsted specifically in Nottingham City.

SR2a – reputation: there are very high risks associated to information systems for our reputation in Children and Families. Ofsted is a limiting judgement for an authority, and failure to respond to issues previously raised by them is a serious concern. Educational attainment in the city is poor and an inability to evidence an effective Family Support Strategy that works is a risk. Information quality, availability and improvement of practitioners client facing time will improve this.

SR30 – Organisational capability: The IT capability is not able to deliver the application development and support we require and the fragmented manner in which we organise our responsibilities across systems is a cause of weakness. The issues highlighted in this work note limited strategic clarity, some systems supported but others not, unreliable funding for IT, relationship with suppliers could be better, under-investment in IT, inability to connect systems around a citizen are all factors. Skills and training in practitioners needs to be improved. Processes not always clear enough in the business to allow for systems to be more supportive of higher quality recording. Lack of mobile working capability.

SR8b – Information management: inconsistency, incompleteness, inaccuracy and conflicting information across different systems are all problems. Repetitive entry of information across multiple systems

3.3 Scope

In scope	Out of scope
<p><u>Case Management and finance solution</u> Social Care Case Management System, that incorporates the requirements of the following systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evince • Open objects/ Choose my support • Abacus / ContrOCC/ SPOCC and other payment related databases in order to consolidate financial systems into one single solution that is fully integrated with the social care system • Domestic Abuse Referrals system (DART – internal web app) • Priority Family Assessment System (PFAS – internal web app) • E Market Place solutions (Open Objects) • Softsmart (Children’s Centre Software) <p>See Appendix for full list of systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared Social Care Case Management systems with other local authorities • Education Management Systems • YOT case management functionality • Scanning solution • Providing all social workers with tablet devices

<p><u>Integration</u> Integrating with a number of existing systems, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YOT system (Raise by Careworks) • Education system (Capita One) • Health systems (Rio, System One, CP-IS) • Electronic Document Records Management System (EDRMS – Castle) • Integration with Corporate Citizen Portal • Corporate financial system (Oracle) <p><u>Data Migration and cleansing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data migration from systems in scope • Data cleansing / re-formatting and validation • Data migration scripts <p><u>Data and Reporting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop business reports in new system • Self-service reporting • Interim reporting • Statutory reporting <p><u>Contract management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract management functionality and processes • Loading of all contracts into the new system <p><u>Financial processing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster care placements processing • Panel Authorisation Processes • Consolidation and standardisation of financial processes across Children and Adults • Specification and development of Oracle EBS interfaces <p><u>Online services</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online social care, provider and partner portal • Integration with the Corporate Citizen Access Portal • E Market place solution <p><u>Case Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case management and workforce management requirements for adult provision <p><u>Change Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business process mapping (As is and to be) • Cultural change plan • Training plan, material and trained users • Communication plan • Performance measures • Post implementation support plan • Laptops for social workers. Remote working arrangements <p><u>Testing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration testing • Data migration testing • System testing • User acceptance testing • Acceptance criteria <p><u>Implementation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll out plan 	
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Handover to BAU plan <p><u>Benefits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits review plan Post implementation checks 	
--	--

3.4 Constraints

- Securing the resources with the required skills to deliver the project within the desired timeline.
- There is an imposed timeline for the implementation of the system, in order to meet the pre-determined implementation deadline compromises will need to be made in terms of scope items that can be delivered in the initial roll out.
- Poor records management has been highlighted via internal audits, poor IT skills leading to poor data management and the concerns regarding the proliferation of systems which causes challenges for DPA enquiries to be satisfied
- The Information Governance review as highlighted within the Caldicott Review as of March 2013 purports that citizens using health and social care services are entitled to expect that their personal information will remain confidential and only shared appropriately when that is in their interest. This creates a fine dilemma between sharing information between agencies to help safeguard and individuals rights to privacy and protection and on the other to provide that citizen with the help that they need especially in a vulnerable situation

3.5 Dependencies

- Citizen Access Portal (CAP) – the CAP is delivering an online portal for Citizens to use to access council services, the assumption is that this will deliver the required functionality for social care. The portal will need to be in place prior to implementation of a new social care system.
- Connected Nottinghamshire - There is an initiative involving Health and Social Care in Nottinghamshire called Connected Nottinghamshire. This is a Health led initiative primarily to help clinical staff understand the history of patients by deciding the most appropriate care required. The projects spans all of the health care areas within Nottinghamshire, including Nottingham City covering general practice, hospitals and special care areas such as mental health. There is a strong desire to link our social care system and the health care systems in a view of being able to provide a single view of a citizen. There are similar initiatives occurring within each county throughout England. Whilst again the Single View of a Citizen project is not dependent on Connected Nottinghamshire it does have a bearing on the direction of some of the work in this project.
- Document Retention schedule / rules are being defined, may impact system configuration and data migration.
- EMSS programme of work – the programme will need to prioritise this work in order to deliver within the required timeline.

3.6 Key Risks

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
Lack of buy in / commitment from key stakeholders	Milestone dates missed	Stakeholder engagement plan. Key business meetings used to provide regular updates. Heads of service and departmental directors part of the project steering and

		governing board.
Scope of solution is extended beyond control	Unable to deliver within required timeline	Scope approval required and scope to be reviewed at regular items. Change control and impact assessment processes to be in place to prevent unauthorised items coming into scope.
Unable to deliver all essential requirements within the pre-determined implementation deadline.	Poor quality product implemented	
Cost of consolidating financial systems greater than estimated in the initial OBC	The scope of consolidation may have to be limited, expected benefits/deliverables not as great.	Dedicated finance work stream to be created to focus specifically on this piece of work and manage risks in this area.
Delay in funding release or contact agreements following tender award will impact project delivery dates	Deadline for going out to tender missed	Identify and engage finance department early. Obtain commitment at senior level
A number of manual processes need to be in place in readiness for the Care Act, this could make the data and user migration processes more complex and time / resource demanding	Delay to implementation timelines. Increase in overall project delivery costs.	Include migration of data in scope of tender and in resource planning requirements.
Migration from existing systems is likely to be highly complex, NCC may not have the skills within the organisation to complete the work required	Delay to implementation timelines. Increase in overall project delivery costs.	Include migration of data in scope of tender and in resource planning requirements.

3.7 Benefits

Financial Benefits

- **Prevent need for increased workforce**

By consolidating systems and simplifying system processes the department will be able to manage the expected increase in demand with the existing workforce.

- **IT support and maintenance costs**

The department is currently spending approximately £185,000 per annum on system annual licensing fees, the on-going licensing of the replacement solution will be £xxx resulting in a saving of £xxx

Non-Financial Benefits

Compliance

- Care Act
- Munroe

-
- Statutory reporting
 - Children & families act
 - Best practice recording

Processing Efficiencies

- Work flow provides the opportunities to streamline processes, therefore enabling quicker and robust decisions
- Improved staff productivity through a reduction in data input
- Greater automation of processes
- Reduced number of systems and removal of inaccurate bespoke access and excel spreadsheets
- Improved processes between services Improved financial management and processing improving the monitoring and management of income
- The opportunity for on line self-assessment functionality that would deliver data entered through the web directly and securely.

Data quality improvements

- Better data quality through more stringent checks and balances inherent in the system
- System linkages to payment processes, enabling real time changes to be reflected in payments resulting in less overpayments, reduction in reclaiming process time and improving service to service users, particularly foster carers.
- The new system will provide the practitioners with the ability to provide more focused and professional reports for court case documentation.
- External bodies such as Internal Audit, Safeguarding and Ofsted will find reviewing and auditing the information substantially better and there is less risk of poor Ofsted reviews

Workforce & partnership working

- An opportunity for an improved interface with other systems including public health systems, customer access portal
- Better functionality and ease of use resulting in increased confidence in the system by practitioners, leading to improved case management, more manageable caseloads which in turn should help retain social workers

4.0 OPTION APPRAISAL (Economic Case)

A full options appraisal was completed by an independent consultant, following which the Leadership team made the decision to initiate Project Evolution to tender for a replacement Social care and finance system. Therefore this section details this option only.

Approved option: Replace current systems with a market leading social care product

Outputs

Integrated children and adults case management and financial solution

Benefits

As outlined in section 3.7, in summary:

- The current system is a 20th century technology solution and as a result there are no practitioners within the council who believe the system is fit for purpose. Similarly the supplier has lost considerable market share as other local authorities choose to move to another solution.
- The new system should be much more user friendly to practitioners and easier for new staff members in terms of being able to understand the system quickly.

- Modern working practices such as mobile working will be relatively simple to introduce as a result of introducing the new social care system.
- New technology will make practitioners and other system users considerably more productive.

Outline Costs

- The value of the contract is £1.399m over a 5 year period including annual support maintenance.
- There will be a further £1.850m for infrastructure and implementation costs; a total of £3.249m one off costs.
- In addition there are further costs of £0.648m for ongoing support and possible development of the system.
- Contingencies totalling £0.300m are included

Making a total cost over five years of **£4.197m**.

The current licensing costs for CareFirst, ContrOCC, Abacus and other key systems in scope is in the region of **£0.170m** per annum. This can be used to offset the costs incurred.

Timescales

12 – 18 months to implement the solution

Innovation and Collaborations.

- Opportunity to introduce best in class system
- Vulnerability and risk likely to be reduced

Option 2 – Replace the Primary Social Care system with OLM’s next generation solution

There is an option to upgrade to OLM’s new product ‘Eclipse’, however the product has not been tried and tested with other authorities and is still in test phase.

Option 3 – Do Nothing

There is the option of retaining the current system and accepting the risks that this presents. These can be summarised as:

- Systems will be disparate, data will continue to be poor, systems will remain uncompliant and Ofsted feedback will not be addressed.
- It will prove difficult to meet new statutory and business requirements. This will have an impact on social care practice and the ability to manage cases. Additional bolt on solutions may need to be developed at additional cost to the current contract.
- The current systems are not easy to use and lack the functionality of newer products on the market. This has resulted in less take up and enthusiasm from users. As a result the Council has not maximised the full potential or benefits from an electronic social care case management and recording system as it perhaps should and could have and data quality is compromised
- Commissioning of services, forward projection and planning is compromised by the lack of flexibility of the current systems.
- Financial management will remain limited with little potential for improvement.

5.0 COMMERCIAL ASPECTS (Financial Case)

Procurement approach:

The project is following a ‘further competition through a framework’. This is similar to an invitation to tender, often called a mini-competition or further competition via a small pool of ‘pre-approved’ suppliers on an umbrella or framework contract.

A relevant framework for a social care case management system exists. The Central Government ‘Crown Commercial Service’ or ‘CCS’ framework ref: RM1059 for Local Authority Software Applications, lot 6 covers the social care requirements. There are 16 suppliers awarded onto this Lot, however only 7 suppliers are pre-approved under lot 6 for the 3 strands we require (Case Management System and Financial System).

Tender scoring will be 100% based on quality, with a ceiling budget of £1.4m provided within the tender document.

Procurement timetable:

- Tender issued – 22nd December 2014
- Tender responses – 20th February 2015
- Evaluation of responses – 7th March 2015
- System demos – End March 2015
- Portfolio Holder approval & tender awarded – 7th April 2015

Evaluation approach:

1. Checking and Acceptance of Tenders – 20th February

All tender submissions need to be submitted by 12noon on Friday 20th February. An initial examination will be made by the Procurement Lead to establish the completeness of submitted tenders. Once completed, all acceptable bids will be saved M:\Project Evolution\Supplier Bids. An email will be sent to the Steering Board and Evaluators to confirm which suppliers have submitted a bid.

2. Evaluation of responses – 20th Feb to 4th March

Quality will account for 100% of the overall score. The ‘quality’ element of the tender will be assessed by three separate processes;

- Tenderers evaluate their proposed solution against each requirement listed (Standard / Achievable / Bespoke/ Not achievable)
- Tenderers responses to method statements detailing ‘how’ some of the requirements are met
- Highest scoring Tenderers will be required to provide a demonstration of their solution in which written responses will be verified and moderated

2.1 Tenderers requirements scores – 20th to 23rd February

The initial evaluation will be completed using the bidders responses to the Business Requirements within the excel spreadsheet. Bidders are required to score themselves using the scoring ratings below, and must provide a descriptive justification of their score.

Scores

‘S’ Standard feature within the product in its current live version	4
‘A’ Achievable by configuring the software (i.e. without the need to write/ amend code)	2

'B' Requires some bespoke development (or on the roadmap for development within the next 12 months)	1
'N' Not achievable (or on the roadmap for development after February 2016)	0

2.2 Method statement evaluation – 24th February to 4th March

The objective of the method statement evaluation is to assess the information provided by the tenderer. Each method statement will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5 points (see table below). Scoring '0', '1', or '2' for 10% of the method statements may give grounds for excluding the tender from further consideration.

In addition, if any method statement question within both the Finance section (8.0) or Integration section (13.0) scores below a '3', then this may also give grounds for excluding the tender from further consideration.

Score	Definition
5	Fully compliant with significant extra business benefits. No reservations about proposal in this area. Features/facilities offered meet all requirements with significant benefits compared with competitive proposals.
4	Fully compliant with some extra benefits. Workable solution with a small number of features offering benefits beyond the stated requirement.
3	Fully compliant, but no outstanding features. Meets the requirement around the average of offers for this requirement. No competitive advantage.
2	Partially compliant. Minimally falls slightly below acceptable level. Lacking in some important areas. Would require additional effort or cost to make it work. Some aspects of the requirement not fully understood or ignored.
1	Partially compliant. Serious deficiencies in the solution offered. Unlikely to provide the facilities required. Features not offered as requested. Would require major expenditure to make it work.
0	Not compliant or no answer or solution offered.

Clarifications

If any elements of the bids are unclear, there may be a need to liaise with the bidder to clarify. This will be managed by the Procurement Lead.

Scoring discrepancies

As there are multiple Evaluators, any discrepancies in scores will need to be reviewed and agreement reached via a 'Moderation Meeting' held with the work-stream leads from each area on 5th March.

3. Selection for demonstration – 5th to 6th March

The top two highest scoring tenderers will be invited to demonstrate their solution, unless the gap between 1st and third place is less than 5%, in which case the third place bidder will also be invited to demonstrations. Selection will be based on both the Tenderer Requirements Scores and the Evaluation team's scores of the Method statements. The Project Steering Group will approve the shortlist of suppliers.

4. Reference Sites – w/c 9th March

A sub-set of the Evaluation Team will hold a tele-conference with the reference sites, these will not be scored or form part of the evaluation exercise.

5. Scenario Demonstrations – 16th to 24th March

The scenarios will be prepared for the demonstrations. The Evaluators will use the demonstration as a basis on which to:

- a) Meet the project manager, the Data Migration Consultant / Specialist and the Business Intelligence Specialist assigned to deliver the implementation (if successful)
- b) 'verify' the scores tenderers were awarded in response to the confirmation questions on functionality and,
- c) 'moderate' the scores for both method statement and confirmation questions (if the written responses differ from the functionality evidenced within the demonstrations). This means that scores could be increased or decreased, depending upon the content of each tenderers demonstration.

Evaluators must record any changes to scores during or immediately after the demos and where the Evaluator wishes to modify a score they must also suggest a revised score and provide a reason for this suggested change.

6. Final Moderation – 25th March

As there are multiple Evaluators, any discrepancies in scores will need to be reviewed and agreement reached via a 'Moderation Meeting'. Following completion of all of the Evaluation Activities, the Project Manager will facilitate a 'Moderation Meeting' on 25th March.

The scores will be moderated by exception, so if everyone agrees with the original score for a method statement, the score will stand, without discussion. Evaluators should be prepared to justify, discuss and debate their reasons for disputing bidders own scores. The moderation meeting will be aimed at reaching a consensus score. In the unlikely event that agreement cannot be achieved, the majority vote will be used.

The outcome from the 'Moderation Meeting' will be a Revised Overall Score for each bidder, which is based on moderated/agreed scores for individual requirements. The Project Manager will capture this in a spreadsheet.

7. Selection of Preferred Supplier

Once the Quality scores have been agreed a summary paper will be produced for the Steering Group to provide the final approval for the award to the top scoring supplier. The Project Executive and Senior Users will then seek approval to award from the relevant Portfolio Holders. The top scoring supplier will be awarded and the order form finalised.

6.0 AFFORDABILITY (Financial case)

Proposed Expenditure

	2015/16 Year 1 £m	2016/17 Year 2 £m	2017/18 Year 3 £m	2018/19 Year 4 £m	2019/20 Year 5 £m	TOTAL £m
ONE OFF COSTS						
External Costs						
Consultancy Support						
Licence Fees	0.526					0.526
Implementation Support Costs		0.527				0.527

Internal Costs						
IT Infrastructure	0.050	0.050				0.100
Staffing - service backfilling	0.772	0.772				1.544
Training		0.020				0.020
Communications/Support Materials	0.010	0.010				0.020
Equipment (Laptops for social workers)	0.156					0.156
Equipment (Hub)	0.010					0.010
Integration with CAP etc		0.300				0.300
Contingency	0.150	0.150				0.300
ONE OFF COSTS¹	1.674	1.829	0	0	0	3.503
ON GOING COSTS						
Revenue						
Annual Support Maintenance			0.116	0.115	0.115	0.346
Application Management Support		0.072	0.072	0.072	0.072	0.288
Software Development/Oracle/EMSS	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015		0.060
ON GOING COSTS²	0.015	0.087	0.202	0.202	0.187	0.694
TOTAL COSTS	1.689	1.916	0.202	0.202	0.187	4.197

Funding

Indicative summary position of project costs and associated funding for a 5 year period

	2015/16 £m	2016/17 £m	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m	Total £m
EXPENDITURE						
Capital	1.464	1.299				2.763
Revenue	0.225	0.617	0.203	0.202	0.187	1.434
Total	1.689	1.916	0.203	0.202	0.187	4.197
FUNDING						
Corporate	1.464	1.036				2.500
Departmental		0.775	0.203	0.202	0.187	1.367
ITEF	0.225	0.105				0.330
Total	1.689	1.916	0.203	0.202	0.187	4.197
Analysis of Departmental Funding						
Reserve		0.200				0.200

Revenue			0.170	0.170	0.170	0.510
Savings		0.575	0.033	0.032	0.017	0.657

The proposed system is being designed to address the requirements of the Care Act and the Children and Families Act and to support the integration of social and health care. It is not therefore an initiative that will deliver a return on the investment.

There will be significant benefits arising from this initiative. These can be split into a number of themes:

Releasing Resources

These benefits free up time within various aspects of the service, e.g. reducing the time managers spend on the completion of file audits and the time spent by administrative colleagues in keying information into the various systems. It is estimated that the value of these benefits total about **£0.150m** on an annual basis. There will be no reduced spend however and the time freed up will be used to improve the service.

Service User Benefits

In some areas the system will improve the users' experience of the service. For instance, due to reductions in delays within the adult assessment and reablement processes, there will be reductions in the delays before receiving services. Indeed there could be savings as a result of these improvements if an escalation of needs can be avoided. Again such savings cannot be cashed and will be absorbed as the demands for services increase.

Qualitative / Performance Improvements

There are a number of benefits in this theme including improved data quality, improved management of caseloads and more effective financial management. In addition it is felt there will be improvements in workforce morale and satisfaction as a result of the improved management of information.

Compliance

The improved system will allow the Directorate to comply with the requirements imposed by Care Act and the Children and Families Acts. It will also mean that the criticisms levelled by the recent Ofsted inspection can be addressed effectively.

7.0 ACHIEVABILITY (Project Management case)

High level plan for achieving desired outcome:

#	Activities	Deliverables	Due
1)	Gather requirements and produce tender specification	Tender specification document	End October 2014
2)	Sign off tender specification	Baselined set of requirements	07/11/20 14
3)	Agree tender approach / scoring criteria	Agreed scoring criteria	07/11/2014
4)	Legal review and approval of tender specification	Legal approval and sign off to release tender document	02/01/2015

5)	Release tender to market	Tender document available to market	05/01/2015
6)	Tender responses	Completed tender responses	19/02/2015
7)	Tender demos / scenario days	Demonstration of solutions	Mar 2015
8)	Tender scoring	Assessment of all suppliers against agreed criteria	Mar 2015
9)	Full Business case	Full business case document based on costs provided by selected supplier	Mar 2015
10)	Internal decision / approval of business case	Project initiated. Start-up phase end approval	27/03/2015
11)	Award Tender	Supplier selected	07/04/2015
12)	AS IS Process mapping	Identifying current processes and mapping inefficiencies	Jan 15 – May 2015
13)	TO BE Process mapping	Map future state processes and identify benefits. Map processes to the system and take standardised approach where possible	May 15 – June 2015
14)	Implementation planning and scoping	Implementation and planning workshops and agree	May – June 2015
15)	Project Initiation document	Joint PID completed and approved with supplier	May – June 2015
16)	Set up infrastructure	Identify requirements, order kit and install	May – July 2015
17)	Install vanilla system	Supplier installs vanilla system	June – July 2015
18)	Configuration – children’s	Configuration workshops and specifications completed	June – September 2015
19)	Build – children’s	Forms and workflows, user permissions etc built into the system based on approved configuration specifications	September – October 2015
20)	Test – children’s	4-5 test cycles	October 2015– March 2016
21)	Final migration of children’s data	Final insertion of data	June 2016
22)	User training – children’s	Training users	March – June 2016
23)	Change management activities – children’s	All communications and change management work – workshops, web pages, comms messages, drop in sessions etc	September 2015 - May 2016
24)	Implementation / go live – Children’s	System goes live and all data manually captured to be inserted	June 2016
25)	Post implementation fixes – children’s	Identify and log issues, raising any with supplier and agreeing fix process	June / July 2016
26)	Post implementation checks – children’s	Review core processes and measure benefits	September 2016
27)	Configuration – Adults	Configuration workshops and specifications completed	June – September 2015
28)	Build – Adults	Forms and workflows, user permissions etc built into the system based on approved configuration specifications	October – December 2015
29)	Test – Adults	4-5 test cycles	February – August 2016
30)	Final migration of Adults data	Final insertion of data	September 2016
31)	User training – Adults	Training users	July – September 2016
32)	Change management activities – Adults	All communications and change management work – workshops, web pages, comms messages, drop in sessions etc	January – October 2016
33)	Implementation / go live –	System goes live and all data manually captured	October 2016

	Adults	to be inserted	
34)	Post implementation fixes - Adults	Identify and log issues, raising any with supplier and agreeing fix process	November 2016
35)	Post implementation checks - Adults	Review core processes and measure benefits	December 2016
36)	Configuration – Integrations with other systems	Identify data requirements and access	June 2016
37)	Build – Integrations	Develop integrations	July – August 2016
38)	Test – Integrations	Test integrations and pass through of data	August – October 2016
39)	User training – Integrations	Train any users impacted (YOT, Education etc)	October 2016
40)	Implementation / go live – Integrations	Implement integrations	November / December 2016
41)	Post implementation fixes - Integrations	Identify and log issues, raising any with supplier and agreeing fix process	December 2016
42)	Post implementation checks - Integrations	Review core processes and measure benefits	February 2017
43)	Project close down	Project closure and handover to the business	March 2017

Key roles required:

Resource Type	Grade	Estimate d Annual Cost inc NI etc	Estimate d Monthly Cost inc NI etc	Qty	Duration required (mths)	Total	Source
Project Manager	I	£46,825	£3,902.08	1	24	£93,650	Internal Staff
Project Support	D	£23,109	£1,925.75	1	24	£46,218	Internal Staff
Business Analyst	N/a	N/a	N/a	2	4	£36,000	Transformation Team
Change Consultant	N/a	N/a	N/a	1	14	£43,000	
Business Change Manager	N/a	N/a	N/a	1	16	£54,000	
Technical Lead	I	£46,825	£3,902.08	1	18	£70,238	Internal IT
Application Management Officer	G	£35,784	£2,982.00	2	18	£107,352	Internal & External
Server Infrastructure Analyst	H	£41,332	£3,444.33	1	12	£41,332	Internal & External
Server Database Analyst	H	£41,332	£3,444.33	1	12	£41,332	Internal & External
Data Migration Manager	N/A	£108,000	450 p/d	1	12	£108,000	Consultancy
Data Migration Analyst	G	£35,784	£2,982.00	2	18	£107,352	Consultancy
Principal Analyst	H	£41,332	£3,444.33	3.5	18	£216,993	Consultancy
Data Cleansing Administrators	D	£23,109	£1,925.75	6	12	£138,654	Internal Staff
Training support / trainers	F	£31,065	£2,588.75	5	8	£103,550	Internal Staff
Adult Social Worker / Practitioner	H	£41,332	£3,444.33	1	18	£61,998	Internal Staff
Children's Lead - Child	J	£52,532	£4,377.6	1	24	£105,064	Internal Staff

protection & safeguarding			7				
Vulnerable Children & Families Lead	H	£41,332	£3,444.33	1	24	£82,664	Internal Staff
Finance Business Partner (Finance Lead)	K	£58,345	£4,862.08	1	18	£87,518	External
TOTAL				33		£1,544,914	