APPENDIX 3

THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

WATFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

DRAFT

ICT SERVICE PLAN

2013-2016

Shared Services Joint Committee – 19 November 2012

Shared Services Programme

CONTENTS

Section	Item	Page
1	Key Purpose of the Service	
1.1	Scope of the Service	1
1.2	Contribution to Shared Services Objectives	3
1.3	Contribution to the Councils' Strategic Objectives	4
1.4	The Future of the Service	5
2	Inputs	
2.1	People	6
2.2	Workforce Planning	7
2.3	Partnerships & Contracts	9
2.4	Assets and Technology	10
2.5	Current Budgets	11
2.6	Revenue Growth, Service Reductions and Cashable Efficiency Gains	12
2.7	Capital Investment	13
3	Outputs and Outcomes	
3.1	Customer Insight and Consultation	15
3.2	Service Level Agreements	19
3.3	Performance Indicators	20
3.4	Benchmarking information	22
3.5	Outstanding Recommendations of External Inspections	24
3.6	Projects	25
3.7	Equalities	29
3.8	Risk Management	30
	Version Control	39

SECTION 1: KEY PURPOSE OF THE SERVICE

1.1	Scope of the Service

The ICT services defined as being core to the Shared Service are:

1. Service Desk
2. User Account Maintenance
3. Desktop Computing
4. Printers and peripherals
5. Corporate telephony system
6. Business Applications
7. Internet Services and Email
8. Business Analysis & Consultancy
9. Disaster Recovery
10. Resources
11. Infrastructure Support

This scope was maintained within the invitation to tender for the ICT service and the preferred supplier has assured the councils that they will support the councils on this basis. If the service is outsourced, in addition to the scope above they may also manage our 3rd party contracts on our behalf. This area will be investigated during due diligence and a recommendation will be made on this point to the Joint Shared Services Committee in January 2013.

Progress:

Over the last financial year, the ICT team has increased the stability and resilience of the infrastructure at both councils by

- Implementing new SANs at both councils with the ability to replicate data from the WBC server room to TRDC and vice versa.
- Extending the WBC VPN solution to TRDC and implementing 2 Factor Authentication (in the process of roll out)
- Upgrading the email and internet filtering systems of each council to a shared, cloud based solution
- Hardware upgrades on all servers over 2 years old (memory, processor and reinstallation to higher capacity hard drives)
- Virtualisation of a large number of physical servers
- Re-design, rebuild and expansion of backup system at both councils (further work still in progress)

In addition to this, the team has supported various departments to upgrade current business systems, implement web based systems or to enhance existing business intelligence such as

- EU cookie directive implementation for both council websites
- Transfer of BACS payments to R&B and Finance departments

- Creation and\or redesign of electronic forms for services at both councils including WBC Licensing, Watersmeet bookings, TRDC CSC and Revenues and Benefits
- Implementation of Revs & Bens e-services and internal reporting for caseload
- Document management system implemented within planning department
- Upgrades to Revs & Bens document management systems, planning and environment health systems, GIS systems and more.

1.2	Contribution to Shared Services Objectives
Savings	Savings are detailed in section 2.6 and are summarised below: Savings of £115,882 are expected over the life (5 years) of the contract, however these only reflect the base price and do not include further savings that may arise through service improvement and implementation of future projects. Additional savings planned by the Head of ICT can still be achieved if the service regardless of whether the service is outsourced, these include consolidation of the Disaster Recovery and further system and contract harmonisation. The projects to implement the new, shared income management system as well as the in-house replacement of performance plus for TRDC and the replacement of the e-committee system for WBC were completed and had expected to bring in savings and efficiencies for the services involved. These should be seen in service plans relating to those services.
Resilience	Work has progressed towards a improvements to infrastructure systems such as thin client, new SANs at both councils and the introduction of some cloud based systems. Work continues on cross training the Application Analysts to ensure that the council's application systems are supported by a robust and resilient team who are multi skilled across the full complement of systems we support. It is expected that if the service is outsourced, the councils will benefit from increased resilience across the service.
Improved Services	The availability (uptime) of ICT systems has seen a significant increase over the last year and the service has been above target for the last six months for Three Rivers systems and for 5 out of the last 6 months for Watford systems. The primary reason for this improvement was the completion of a programme of upgrades at both councils which enabled the team to focus on critical work required to stabilise the ICT infrastructure. The work planned within this programme was informed by recommendations from the independent ICT review backed by service desk statistics.

1.3	Contribution to the Councils' Strategic Objectives

Three Rivers District Council	
Safety and Well-being	We will support\enable the Council and its services to meet these objectives
Clean and Green	
Economic Opportunities	
Customer Service	

Watford Borough Council	
Making Watford a better place to live	We will support\enable the Council and its services to meet these objectives
To provide the strategic lead for Watford's sustainable economic growth	
Promoting an active, cohesive & well informed Town	
Operating the Council efficiently & effectively	

1.4 The Future of the Service

The ICT Service is in the process of conducting due diligence with Capita Secure Information Solutions Limited for the provision of a managed service to both councils.

If following due diligence, the councils do enter into a contract with Capita, the service provided will be based on the requirements specified by the councils centred around the current scope of the ICT Service.

This will include provision of a centralised helpdesk, local desk side support, server and network support and applications support. The aim of the new service will be to

a. To consistently provide a modern, reliable ICT service to all of our customers;
b. To make innovative use of technology to support our programme of service transformation in a challenging environment;
c. To make best use of ICT to increase the accessibility of services to customers and to increase productivity and efficiencies.

The current timescales if the decision is to outsource to the preferred supplier are as follows:

Event	Date
Tender submission	**9th July 2012 (12.00pm)**
Evaluation, Moderation and Interviews completed	**21 August 2012**
JMB	**29 August 2012**
JC Meeting	**24 September 2012**
Notification to Bidders	**25 September 2012**
Financial Health check on preferred bidder complete	**1 October 2012**
Standstill or "Alcatel" period ends	**9 October 2012**
Due Diligence period ends	**30 November 2012**
Formal contract discussions end and award made	**15 January 2013**
Transition Ends	**April 2013**
Effective Date (contract start)	**May 2013**

If, following due diligence, the councils opt not to outsource the service, we will have the option to either go into due diligence with Northgate Ltd or conduct a service redesign and implement an internal team that is able to deliver the councils current and future ICT requirements.

SECTION 2: INPUTS

2.1 People

Shared Services Organisation Chart

Job Title	Grade	FTEs
Head of ICT	CO3	1
Infrastructure Manager	9	1
Technical Support Engineer	7	4
Service Desk Manager	8	1
Support Analyst	6	3
ICT Business Manager	10	1
Application Analyst	7	7
Web Development Analyst	7	2
Project Manager\Business Analyst	8	2

2.2 Workforce Planning

Overview

The current establishment was designed to meet the day to day demands of departments and will continue to strive to maintain and improve upon existing service levels.
The councils are increasingly facing pressures to make efficiencies whilst maintaining levels of service for customers and residents. As a result of this, our public facing services are looking at streamlining back office processes and more innovative ways of working both internally and out in the field. The councils are also looking at service transformation at a high level combined with channel shift towards the web so that there is increased ability to self serve.

It is therefore clear, that an agile, resilient, efficient and knowledgeable ICT Service will be required to enable these changes across both councils.
In order to alleviate this problem, a Joint ICT Steering Group whose role is to agree and prioritise ICT projects for both councils has been set up. This is critical for the ICT team to be able to fully understand the requirements of the services and to be able to plan the required resources. Despite having added resilience from the larger team, resources are still stretched.

Workload – Trends & Changes	Staffing Implications – Impact on Service & Individuals	Options & Preferred Solutions	Outcome – Financial Implications, Resilience Implications & Implications for Improving the Service
Projects within the councils are likely to draw upon the staff resources within ICT. The requirements could be based upon technical application\infrastructure input, project management or business analysis expertise.	External assistance could potentially be required if resourcing if several projects are required at the same time.	1) Rely on external expertise being brought in on a project by project basis, although this would mean skills would be not be retained following the completion of the project. 2) Outsource the whole of the ICT service, have robust project approval process (via the Steering Group) and deliver the ICT project programme	It will prove difficult to meet service standards in the event of there being a particularly high demand on the skills of the ICT team during major implementations. In any of these options, extra resource will be need to meet increasing demand.

Interface development has being conducted in house by the Finance Service. Once the associated documentation is complete, they will be handed over to ICT to support along with a structured handover.	There is currently no resource available or sufficiently skilled within the ICT structure to conduct in-house development of software. This was in order to move away from bespoke systems and therefore increase the resilience of the teams.	1) Do nothing – keep documentation and acquire external resources on an ad-hoc basis to cater for any future requirements. 2) Restructure or add a growth to the establishment to include this resource, however there would still be a resilience issue due to there only being 1 resource to do this work. 3) An alternative could be to bundle these up and approach an external supplier to provide maintenance and updates of all in-house interfaces on a yearly basis. 4) Ask the outsourced provide to support this system as an additional requirement	1) There would be no cost implications but a major risk to the councils resilience for these key system interfaces, 2) This would result in a revenue growth, however resilience would be maintained and risk would be minimised. 3) There would be a growth to the budget but resilience would be increased. 4) This would be in addition to the core service to be provided by the supplier.
The reduction of 1 application analyst that is planned in FY 13/14 will result in a smaller team delivering the support of council applications.	This will reduce the number of applications analysts from 7 to 6.	Staff will continue to cross train and ensure that work progresses towards harmonisation of systems as well as looking at internal processes to ensure that these are as efficient as possible. In addition to this, external help will be sourced if required.	This will result in a saving to the councils of £39,210 per annum.
Outsourcing the entire ICT service.	All ICT staff would be eligible for TUPE transfer to the new supplier.	4 options were considered: 1. public sector partnership, 2. multi-sourcing model, 3. private sector outsourcing of the entire service (GPS tender) 4. private sector outsourcing (under HCC framework agreement with SERCO)	Option 3 was selected and the councils are undertaking due diligence with a preferred supplier. The ITT for this contract focussed on quality, agility, resilience and expertise that a potential outsourced provide could give to the councils rather than as a cost saving exercise.
Review and redesign of the internal ICT Shared Service.	This exercise may result in a reduction of staff in some areas and an increase in other areas. Some roles that are not currently within the ICT Scope (e.g. DBA) would need to be included.	Based on the requirement specification for the ITT for the Managed ICT service, detailed work to review the current structure, budget and staffing within the ICT Service and redesign to meet the councils current and future needs.	This would require external assistance as well as most likely result in an increase in overall levels of staff within the service area. The budget implications of this would need to be calculated if the Joint Shared Services Committee decide not to outsource the service.

2.3	Partnerships & Contracts
Partner / Partnership	Expected Outcomes
Various software supply and maintenance contracts	Both IT services at the two Councils have contracts with software suppliers to provide software applications to the service departments. Over time, it is expected that contracts of this type will be harmonised wherever possible.
Hardware maintenance contracts	Maintenance contracts exist within both ICT teams to cover the breakdown of essential computer hardware which is no longer under manufacturer warranty. It is expected that these contracts could also be harmonised to bring potential savings.

2.4 Assets & Technology

The ICT service will own all ICT assets used within the two Councils and the ICT service is responsible for managing the corporate ICT infrastructure comprising of application servers and networking hardware.

They include:

- Networking equipment and servers
- Corporate telephony systems
- Desktop PCs / terminals
- Laptop computers
- Desktop telephones
- Departmental printers
- Application and software licences
- ICT related Data

A list of systems used within the Councils can be obtained from the Head of ICT.

Corporate assets, including business systems and infrastructure will be is owned by each of the councils and is maintained by the ICT department using approved capital budgets.

The above will still apply f the service is outsourced; however, the supplier has been asked for a price to manage 3rd party contracts on behalf of the councils. If the councils choose to take up this option, they will retain the responsibility of retaining and procuring contracts as well as escalating issues with existing suppliers.

2.5 Current Budgets

ICT Revenue Budgets				
Draft Estimates	**2012/13**	**2013/14**	**2014/15**	**2015/16**
	Revised	**Original**	**Original**	**Original**
	£	£	£	£
Employees	1,121,940	1,014,870	997,980	1,017,620
Transport	900	4,020	4,190	4,190
Supplies and Services	399,840	392,110	392,110	392,110
External Income	-	-	-	-
Total	**1,522,680**	**1,411,000**	**1,394,280**	**1,413,920**
Budgets agreed by the Joint Committee November 2011				
Employees	1,005,270	958,460	994,840	
Transport	5,000	5,000	5,000	
Supplies and Services	392,110	392,110	392,110	
External Income	-	-	-	
Total	**1,402,380**	**1,355,570**	**1,391,950**	
Additional Savings (-) / Costs	**90,930**	**55,430**	**2,330**	
Notes:	Includes £80k agreed by Joint SS Committee 24/09/12			
	Assumes continued in-house service provision			
	Original based on revised staffing estimates 2012/13			
	Includes an additional £29,370 for in house client team from January to March 2013 (As per ICT Client Function report to Joint Shared Services Committee – November 2012)			

2.6	Revenue Growth, Service Reductions and Cashable Efficiency Gains

	Description	2013/14 £	20114/15 £	2015/16 £
1	**Potential Growth**			
	None	0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0
2	**Service Reductions**			
	No further reductions to those included in current budgets	0	0	0
		0	0	0
	Total	0	0	0
3	**Cashable Efficiency Gains**			
	If the service is outsourced, a total saving of £115,882 is expected over 5 years.	23,176	23,176	23,176
	Total	23,176	23,176	23,176

2.7 Capital Investment

Shared Services Scheme Name	Capital				Revenue Implications				Savings	Resilience	Improvement
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£			
Hardware and Software to conform to the requirements of the GCSX auditors for the latest code of connection to the Government Connect Secure Extranet (GCSX)	40,590	0	0	0	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000			✔
Hardware Replacement Programme	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0	0	0	0		✔	✔

TRDC Scheme Name	Capital				Revenue Implications				Savings	Resilience	Improvement
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£			
Replacement CRM system	239,100	0	0	0	(31,830)	(31,830)	(31,830)	0	✔	✔	✔
Scanning Tree Protection Orders	20,000	0	0	0	2,400	2,400	2,400	0		✔	✔
ICT Hardware replacement	56,000	56,000	56,000	0	0	0	0	0		✔	✔

WBC Scheme Name	Capital				Revenue Implications				Savings	Resilience	Improvement
	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Future Years			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£			
e-Democracy	6,000	6,000	0	0	0	0	0	0			✔
Environmental Health System	45,000	45,000	0	0	0	0	0	0			✔
ICT Hardware replacement	70,000	70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0		✔	✔

SECTION 3: OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

3.1 Customer insight and consultation

Who / types	Approximate numbers	Location	Consultation
All office based and remote workers	830	Office locations within the boundaries of the two authorities	User group meetings, staff satisfaction surveys, all staff e-mail, intranet, post call survey. Remote Workers include those from Charter Place, Depots and home workers.
Public	All residents and businesses within the two authority areas plus other members of the public living outside of the area	Customers living / working within the area covered by the two Authorities. Less commonly, residents elsewhere in the country who my be future users of the Authorities' services	No direct consultation unless specific input is required on public facing IT developments (i.e. redesign of website)
Councillors	84	Predominantly at home or work, within close proximity of the Councils' offices	Communication via democratic services and party secretaries, regular meetings with portfolio holders the quarterly meeting plus and update reports to joint committee and other committee where called in.
Suppliers / profit centre	100		Quarterly meetings with account managers, split into ICT meeting to discuss financials and ICT specific issues and a session involving representatives of the user community to inform about future product improvements. Monthly Account Managers meeting with Steria.
Trade Union / staff representation	5+	Council Offices	Ad hoc consultation re staffing issues and organisational change issues

3.1.1 Customer access channels

Service Area	Information Access	Service Access
Service Desk	Face to face or telephone, email and internet	Face to face or telephone, email and internet
Infrastructure Support		
Applications/ Systems admin		
Web Development		
Project Management/ Business analysis		

3.1.2 Customer identification and segmentation data

Service provided	Customer group	Segmentation data held
Helpdesk services	All Services, all staff, Members, suppliers, public	Name, Department, E-mail address, Access channel, Business address (if applicable), Technical information, Staff - place of work (TR/Watford), Home Address\ Telephone number (remote worker)
Infrastructure support		
Applications/systems admin		
Web development		
Project Management/ Business analysis		

3.1.3 Communication and consultation methods

Service provided	Inform	Consult	Engage
Helpdesk services	All-staff e-mails, intranet, 'phone, 1:1s, All Aboard, Wat's Up	Rolling feedback survey (at call close, with quarterly reports) Annual satisfaction survey	Managers and business team 1:1s, user group meetings, Ad-hoc 1:1s
Infrastructure support			
Applications/systems admin			
Web development			
Project Management/ Business analysis			

3.1.4 Customer satisfaction measures

Service provided	Measure	Collection method	Timescale for consultation - start date and regularity	Baseline result	Target
ICT Services (Service Desk, Infrastructure support, Applications/support, Web Development, Project Management & Business Analysis)	% satisfied with overall service % of SLAs met % of successful projects within parameters	Annual satisfaction survey	Annual satisfaction survey	4.38	5.75
Web development	Carried out by Communications – Performance and Scrutiny	N/A	N/A		

3.1.5 Learning from customer consultation

Questions	Answers
What key findings has customer consultation work identified in the last year for each service area? Have the needs of a specific customer group been identified?	During the year, the following issues were identified: • A lot of calls were dropped due to high call volume at certain times of the day • Resolution times for incidents increased due to less capacity on the service desk
What has been done as a result of customer consultation?	In order to alleviate these issues, the following actions were taken over the last year: • A new call waiting system with auto response implemented • A new auto routing and monitoring system installed to track bottle necks with a view to further improvements • Improvements have been communicated to the organisation
How have you feed back to customers that have been consulted?	Consultation with our customers happens in a number of ways. • A dedicated column for ICT has been put on All aboard and Wats Up magazines. • Intranet articles have also been published on both council • The dedicated ICT parts of the intranet are regularly updated. In addition to this, we will be conducting an annual ICT Survey before the end of this financial year.
How effective were the consultation methods used? What changes are proposed?	Although an annual survey has not been carried our for the last year yet, there has been data collected from the regular ICT survey sent out as part of the incident resolution process. There are no proposed plans to change this method due to possible outsourcing of the service.

3.2	Service Level Agreements

SLAs between shared services and the councils
As part of the development of the operating model for the ICT service, internal customers were consulted and formal Service Level Agreements (SLAs) have been agreed between the ICT service and its customers at both councils as well as the Joint Committee.
As part of the Service Level Agreements, performance standards have been identified as well as performance indicators that will be used internally by the shared service; these have been included in this service plan.

SLAs between shared service and other organisations
There are service level agreements between the ICT service and its third party suppliers. These will be monitored at relevant service review meetings and updated as necessary.

Looking forwards
Following the decision on the future of the ICT service, revised SLAs will be agreed by the councils with the new supplier.

3.3	Performance Indicators

Reference SSICT 1 & 2	Service Availability															
Indicator Definition	To measure the availability of the ICT service to users during core working hours															
Target	2011/12				2012/13				2013/14				2014/15			
	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50	99.50
Outcome	2011/12				2012/13				2013/14				2014/15			
TRDC	99.83	99.80	99.63	99.75	98.89	99.90										
Watford P1	94.54	97.50	98.01	97.67	99.75	99.64										
Watford P2	93.43	97.87	98.26	97.77	100.00	100.00										

Comments on Performance:
WBC LT has asked to have the availability stats reported in 2 priority levels. Hence the figures reported are split accordingly.

The availability of systems has been within the target for this financial year due to improvements made to the infrastructure at both councils which has provided increased resilience as well as knowledge within the team.

Reference SSICT 3	Resolution of reported incidents															
Indicator Definition	To ensure the service delivers its promises of responding to pre agreed timescales to incidents that are presented															
Target	2011/12				2012/13				2013/14				2014/15			
	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Outcome	2011/12				2012/13				2013/14				2014/15			
	95.06	94.44	94.70	97.10	93.12	95.55										

Comments on Performance:
The service continues to fall below resolution targets. An improvement would be made if ITIL service management was implemented as per the ICT Review in May 2011, however the councils have decided to freeze investment in this area until the future of the service has been decided.
If the service is outsourced, ITIL service management would be implemented as part of the transition to the new supplier.

Reference SSICT 4	Annual Customer Satisfaction			
Indicator Definition	What is the perception of the service from the end users view point?			
Target	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	5.65	5.65	5.65	5.65
Outcome	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	Not yet available			

Comments on Performance:
No annual satisfaction survey has been conducted this year as yet, figure for 2010/11 was 4.38 – as shown in SOCITM Benchmarking results in section 3.4.

3.4 Benchmarking Information

The first full year (2010/11) of the ICT Shared Service was benchmarked in May 2011. The benchmarking group consisted of 17 government organisations across the UK ranging from County Councils, Shires, Districts to other public sector organisations.
Results for this group were published nationally by SOCITM in December 2011.

Measure: Quality of Service					
Benchmark Description	**Comparator Group**	**Result**	**Upper quartile result from UK1 Group**	**Date Valid**	**Comments**
User Satisfaction	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 1)	4.38	5.29	Dec 2011	
Resolution of reported incidents	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 2)	n\a	93%	Dec 2011	Figures were not available due to constraints within our reporting system.
Project Management	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 3)	6.3	7.2	Dec 2011	This measured the number of projects completed using formal methodology with a budget of at least £25,000. ICT delivered many more projects but they were of lower value and did not qualify for the benchmarking criteria.
Service Availability	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 3)	49	93	Dec 2011	Values are not expressed as a percentage but a weighted index based on 3 levels of availability. Further clarification on this can be obtained from SOCITM
Measure: Use of service by employees					
ICT competence of employees	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 10)	3.97	5.22	Dec 2011	

Measure: Cost Efficiency of Service (Note: In all cases the lower the ranking score the better is the result)					
Benchmark Description	**Comparator Group**	**Result**	**Lower quartile result**	**Date Valid**	**Comments**
Acquisition cost of workstation	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 4)	PC = £495 Laptop = £619	PC = £402 Laptop = £576	Dec 2011	
Workstation Support (support costs per workstation)	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 7)	£161	£99	Dec 2011	
Cost per connection for voice and data communications.	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 17)	Voice = £103 Data = n\a	Voice = £99 Data = £74	Dec 2011	Figures for cost of data connection were not available due to lack of information.
Total cost of ownership for workstations	SOCITM Benchmarking Group (KPI 18)	n\a	£314	Dec 2011	TCO calculation was not possible due to the cost per data connection being unavailable.

3.5	Outstanding Recommendations of External Inspections

The Annual Audit Report to those Charged with Governance in September 2012 noted the following outstanding recommendation that is the responsibility of ICT.

This is due to be discussed with the preferred supplier for the outsourced ICT service and will be planned into the project timetable once service with them commences.

Action	Priority	Responsibility	Action to date	Resolved	(Original) Implementation Date
Network Intrusion The Council should consider implementing a network intrusion detection or prevention system. Management should agree reasonable times to follow up on the actions highlighted in the penetration tests, both internal and external, to ensure a secure network.	Medium	Head of ICT	An action plan to implement all penetration test recommendations is in progress and all patches have now been applied successfully. The Appgate VPN solution in use at WBC has logs for intrusion attempts and has replaced the Netilla system in use at TRDC. The potential of implementing a network IDS has been discussed as part of the Network Infrastructure Audit and it has been decided that we will focus on prevention rather than detection. Hence work has progressed to implement VLANs within the network in order to segregate desktops from servers and minimise potential risk of intrusion.	x ***(On-Going)***	September 2011

3.6	Projects

Corporate projects for 2013/14 have been discussed by the Joint ICT Steering Group. Many of the projects are yet to be scoped and therefore it has not been possible to estimate resource requirement.

A budget for projects in the next financial year has been estimated based upon the resource required to deliver 2011/12 projects against the list prices of ICT resource provided by the Capita.

This list is due to be discussed with them during due diligence and will discussed further at a future Joint ICT Steering Group meeting in order to set priority and review Project Initiation Documents.

If the service is outsourced, priority will be assigned by the Joint ICT Steering Group in conjunction with the preferred supplier during transition period.

Authority	Project Name	Category*	Financial Year	Lead	Comments	Estimated Resource Days				Resource Note	Budget (£)	Revenue or Capital? (£)
						Bus Analyst / Project Manager	Apps / Web Analyst	Infra - structure Engineer	Service Desk			
TRDC	Service Transformation: 1) Replacement CRM 2) Automate/transfer online elements of customer contact (Channel Shift) 3) Development of TRDC website (website review)	1	13/14	Gordon Glenn	Some work has been initiated to obtain a baseline of customer interaction across the council.	55	95	50	5	Resource estimated with information as at Nov 11 Full PM to be externally sourced.	Total of 284,100	239,100 Capital 15,000 Revenue
TRDC	Standardisation of profiles	1	13/14	ICT Service	Internal audit recommended implementation of standardised profiles	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	There would be savings a as result of a standardised desktop environment	TBC	
TRDC	Garages system replacement	5	13/14	Gordon Glenn	Capita software and support has been extended by one year until 31st March 2014	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC		TBC	
TRDC	M3 upgrade\replacement	5	13/14	Allan Caton	New project identified.	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	To Be reviewed. Update is not required for legislative reasons at the moment	TBC	
WBC	Print & Post Review - Managed printing services	1	13/14	Dani Negrello	May require review by ITSG to bring into the end of FY12/13.	20	5	20	5	Resource estimated with information as at Nov 11	TBC	

Authority	Project Name	Category*	Financial Year	Lead	Comments	Estimated Resource Days				Resource Note	Budget (£)	Revenue or Capital? (£)
						Bus Analyst / Project Manager	Apps / Web Analyst	Infra - structure Engineer	Service Desk			
WBC	WBC channel shift project	1	13/14	Alan Gough	PID will change as the project has evolved into "More Efficient Ways of Working" project.						TBC	Capital
WBC	Environmental Health & Licensing: Uniform Housing Module	5	13/14	Alan Gough	This project is dependent on whether or not the Waste Service is outsourced.	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC		AG to confirm	
WBC	Environmental Services Handhelds (Scheme not listed in section 2.7until confirmed to proceed)	1	13/14	Alan Gough	This project is dependent on whether or not the Waste Service is outsourced.						14K	Capital
WBC	Environmental Services Point & Click (Scheme not listed in section 2.7until confirmed to proceed)	1	13/14	Alan Gough	This project is dependent on whether or not the Waste Service is outsourced.						14K	Capital
BOTH	Voice Over IP Install and rollout	1	13/14 or beyond	ICT Service	To be discussed with incoming ICT supplier at due diligence						TBC	Capital

Authority	Project Name	Category*	Financial Year	Lead	Comments	Estimated Resource Days				Resource Note	Budget (£)	Revenue or Capital? (£)
						Bus Analyst / Project Manager	Apps / Web Analyst	Infra - structure Engineer	Service Desk			
BOTH	Uniform 8.3 upgrade and MS Office 2007	5	13/14	ICT Service	UNIFORM 8.3 upgrade will require MS Office 2007 as Office 2003 is not compatible	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC		TBC	
BOTH	Implement Blackberry Enterprise Server and smart phones	5	13/14	ICT Service	This is so that the councils conform to Gov Connect requirements in relation to secure email access via mobile phones.	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC		TBC	

***Category Key**

1 = Invest to save

2 = Completion of SS implementation

3 = ICT review recommendations

4 = Legislative requirements

5 = Service Requirement

3.7 Equalities

The Equalities Act 2010 includes a new public sector equality duty (both a general duty and specific duties), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The duty places a range of steps that are legally required by local authorities covering issues such as: assessing relevance, using and publishing equality information, engagement, equality analysis, equality objectives, commissioning and procurement and business planning and reporting.

ICT Shared Services will integrate the general equality duty into service planning and will ensure that Equality Impact Assessments are conducted wherever appropriate.

3.8 Risk Management

Risk Ref	Risk	Impact	Impact Classification	Likelihood Classification	Reason for Assessment		
ICT 1	Insufficient staff and skills or key staff leaving the organisation before the service is outsourced	Service Disruption	III	C	Staff working on technical services or capital projects would have most direct impact. Arrangements would be made to bring in temporary cover for the gap in resource. There is now more documentation available than when the shared service was implemented. Therefore, if staff are unavailable for support of due diligence or transition to outsourced provider, information can still be made available to the supplier. If the service is retained in-house, there will be the need to fill all vacancies and undertake recruitment actions are immediately.	Requires Treatment	**Yes**
		Financial Loss	II			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	III			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	III			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 2	System failure – main ICT systems suppliers	Service Disruption	II	E	All major suppliers used within the Shared Service are checked for financial standing and reputation prior to the contract being signed. In the event of contractor failure, other suppliers would be sought to provide similar services.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	II			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	II			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	II			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	II			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 3	Loss of Accommodation	Service Disruption	III	E	This would result in all IT services being unavailable for a period of 36 hours. Following this, the Disaster Recovery arrangements would be operational and IT services for critical systems would be available to key staff at separate accommodation.	Requires Treatment	**Yes**
		Financial Loss	III			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	III			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	III			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	III			Date Closed	N/A

Risk Ref	Risk	Impact	Impact Classification	Likelihood Classification	Reason for Assessment		
ICT 4	Fraudulent Activity	Service Disruption	III	F	If fraud is committed by staff or customers, the impact could be significant on either the councils finances or reputation depending on the nature fraud committed.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	III			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	III			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	II			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 5	Failure to deliver the ICT Capital Programme	Service Disruption	II	D	If the ICT Capital programme is not delivered, there may be an impact on the reputation of the service with the Councillors who would be less likely to approve capital funds in future years. There could also be a disruption to services if essential projects were not implemented on time or to quality standards.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	II			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	II			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	II			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	II			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 6	Loss of portable storage device containing sensitive data	Service Disruption	II	D	The loss of portable storage devices could potentially have legal implications through a breach of the Data Protection Act. It is also likely that the loss of data in this way would be reported in the press and therefore result in a damaged reputation for the Councils	Requires Treatment	**Yes**
		Financial Loss	II			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	III			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	III			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	II			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 7	Virus introduced to the network via storage device	Service Disruption	II	F	The shared ICT service will have comprehensive security processes in place to ensure that the best protection is given against the threat of software viruses. If a virus was introduced, it is expected that services would be interrupted while the virus was isolated and the network cleaned.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	I			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	II			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	I			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A

Risk Ref	Risk	Impact	Impact Classification	Likelihood Classification	Reason for Assessment		
ICT 8	Software being removed from the corporate network	Service Disruption	I	E	Software licensing could be compromised by staff illegally removing software owned by the Council. Both councils have processes in place to reduce this risk.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	I			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	I			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	II			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 9	Disaster in Computer Centre	Service Disruption	V	E	The impact of this risk affects all services and the people affected would be customers and staff. E given because of past experiences which have been infrequent.	Requires Treatment	**Yes**
		Financial Loss	III			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	III			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	I			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	IV			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 10	Power Outage longer than 1 hour	Service Disruption	III	E	For this risk, all services disrupted, but for less time. The likelihood rating is based upon past experience.	Requires Treatment	**Yes**
		Financial Loss	I			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	I			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	I			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A
ICT 11	Slow / unreliable network communication between TRDC and WBC	Service Disruption	III	F	Services could be affected because of slow links. Network resilience has been established to avoid disruption, hence the low likelihood.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	I			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	I			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	I			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A

Risk Ref	Risk	Impact	Impact Classification	Likelihood Classification	Reason for Assessment		
ICT 12	Insufficient handover between internal SSICT & any potential outsourcing provider	Service Disruption	I	F	There is the risk that handover is not sufficient. This has been mitigated by ensuring sufficient time for due diligence, regular checkpoint meetings and transition time before service commencement.	Requires Treatment	No
		Financial Loss	III			Last Review Date	Oct 12
		Reputation	II			Next Milestone Date	May 13
		Legal Implications	I			Next Review Date	Sept 13
		People	I			Date Closed	N/A

Likelihood	I	II	III	IV	V
A					
B					
C			1		
D		5	6		
E		2, 8	3, 10		9
F		7	4, 11, 12		

Impact →

Impact	Likelihood
V = Catastrophic	A = ≥98%
IV = Critical	B = 75% - 97%
III = Significant	C = 50% - 74%
II = Marginal	D = 25% - 49%
I = Negligible	E = 3% - 24%
	F = ≤2%

RISK TREATMENT PLAN

Risk Ref:	ICT 1	Risk Title:	Insufficient Staff and Skills		
Responsibility		*Who is managing the risk?*	Head of ICT		
Consequence		*What can go wrong?* *How can it go wrong?* *Has it gone wrong before?*	The IT service that will be provided will be limited and as a result there will longer waiting times for resolutions and fixes. It can go wrong whereby there is not enough capacity to deal with customer requests. This has happened in the past. Lack of key skills in areas will result in a drop in support and service. Impact on reputation as there will be a loss of confidence in BIS staff, frontline services may be affected which may therefore affect members of the public.		
Cause / Trigger		*What happens to bring the risk into being?*	Long term staff absence or temporary staff absence. Possible skills gap not analysed and managed as the implementation of shared services begins. No cross training or knowledge sharing implemented which reduces the resilience within the team.		
Existing Control		*What controls exist now to minimise the risk?*	Currently looking at the cross training for Applications Analysts to improve resilience within the teams. Work and information documented where possible. Ensure that effective handovers are completed.		
Adequacy of Control		*What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?*	Evidence is required – not just a statement that the controls are working.	Impact II	Likelihood D
Further Action / Controls Required		*What gaps have been identified?* *What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?*	At present some staff are still being cross trained, however some staff have skills across most areas and we continue to ensure that cross training is part of the day to day tasks that all teams undertake as there ICT landscape changes.		
Cost / Resources		*Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?*	Perhaps additional training costs?	Not identified for FY13/14 as yet	
Current Status		*What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating*	Enter here the 'status' of the risk, i.e. how it has changed over time, when the further controls are expected to take effect etc.	Impact III	Likelihood C
Critical Success Factor		*How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?*	By the means of cross training and building up resilience other team members will be able to help on a particular issue whether it is related to the applications team or the infrastructure team.	Impact III	Likelihood C

Risk Ref:	ICT 3	Risk Title:	Loss of Accommodation		
Responsibility		*Who is managing the risk?*	Head of ICT		
Consequence		*What can go wrong?* *How can it go wrong?* *Has it gone wrong before?*	Loss of access to building where ICT staff are located. The building may be affected by a disaster taking it out of action for long periods, or by power failure meaning health and safety requirements prevent access. Neither site has experienced long term disruption.		
Cause / Trigger		*What happens to bring the risk into being?*	Major incidents such as fire, flood, bomb (real or threat) or loss of power to the building making it unsafe to enter.		
Existing Control		*What controls exist now to minimise the risk?*	Disaster recovery arrangements are in place at TRDC to allow key staff to relocate to the DR test centre (Uxbridge) in the event of a building not being available. This provision allows for 60 staff to relocate. WBC currently have no relocation site, however other sites are available such as Wiggenhall Depot and Three Rivers House.		
Adequacy of Control		*What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?*	Key staff could relocate from TRDC to the recovery centre. WBC staff could relocate to TRDC or work from home via the VPN.	Impact III	Likelihood F
Further Action / Controls Required		*What gaps have been identified?* *What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?*	Further discussion could take place with HCC to identify alternative accommodation if the existing arrangements were deemed inadequate or unsuitable. There might also be cheaper options than the existing DR arrangements. Availability in other buildings such as Basing House, Watersmeet.		
Cost / Resources		*Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?*	Not at present.	£ ??	
Current Status		*What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating*	TRDC staff could relocate to alternative accommodation. WBC staff can relocated into spare office space at TRDC and also work from home.	Impact III	Likelihood F
Critical Success Factor		*How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?*	Risk action will have worked if disruption is minimised in the event of accommodation being unavailable i.e. staff are with within a pre-agreed time – 24 hours.	Impact III	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	ICT 6	Risk Title:	Loss of portable data storage device containing sensitive data		
Responsibility		*Who is managing the risk?*	Head of ICT		
Consequence		*What can go wrong?* *How can it go wrong?* *Has it gone wrong before?*	Devices such as laptops, memory sticks, PDA's and CD's all have the ability to store data/information. Damage to reputation, loss of public confidence and trust. Sensitive data being used for unknown purposes. Breach of data protection act. Financial implications. It has gone wrong for other public sector bodies.		
Cause / Trigger		*What happens to bring the risk into being?*	Staff being unaware of the following policies, information and security and Internet and email policy. Staff and external suppliers not adhering to rules regarding the use of memory sticks.		
Existing Control		*What controls exist now to minimise the risk?*	Within Internet & Email policy (WBC) there is an explicit rule of not using memory sticks. This same guidance has been issued within the Information Security policy (WBC)		
Adequacy of Control		*What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?*	No current known loss of data from WBC or Three Rivers.	Impact IV	Likelihood B
Further Action / Controls Required		*What gaps have been identified?* *What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?*	Data can still be copied to laptop hard drives and CD's. Education of staff of new Information Security (WBC) policy. Look at preventing staff from saving data locally.		
Cost / Resources		*Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?*	Staff time	£ Enter cost here	
Current Status		*What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating*	Implementation of WBC Information Security policy.	Impact III	Likelihood D
Critical Success Factor		*How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?*	Risk can be tolerated.	Impact III	Likelihood E

Risk Ref:	ICT 9	Risk Title:	Disaster in Computer Centre		
Responsibility		*Who is managing the risk?*	Head of ICT		
Consequence		*What can go wrong?* *How can it go wrong?* *Has it gone wrong before?*	Loss of Data Loss of Service until DR kicks in + possible interruptions during back to normal process i.e. during restore or replacing servers Air conditioning failure causing servers to “melt” If DR correctly applied short time to back to normal but long time to repair all damages and ensure cost recovery		
Cause / Trigger		*What happens to bring the risk into being?*	Could be water leakage, malfunction of air conditioning, fire, etc Wrong concept for air-flow		
Existing Control		*What controls exist now to minimise the risk?*	DR with ADAM for trailer and generator – WBC DR with Phoenix for relocation to DR site.		
Adequacy of Control		*What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?*	Previous flood at WBC – Service back up and running after 4 days (cheque payment) and service to public after one more day.	Impact V	Likelihood E
Further Action / Controls Required		*What gaps have been identified?* *What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?*	Implement remote control for hardware. Increase bandwidth between sites so that data replication between SANs can happen continuously (even during working hours). (I.e. WBC←→ TRDC) This would allow DR quickly and each data provide full resilience for the other.		
Cost / Resources		*Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?*	Yes – increasing the bandwidth between WBC and TRDC –	Tbc	
Current Status		*What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating*	Currently awaiting outcome of due diligence with Capita – once outcome is known, we will be able to decide whether the council should put this in place or whether it will be provided by Capita.	Impact IV	Likelihood E
Critical Success Factor		*How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?*	The measures recommended will enable the service to be restored from either data centre to the other with minimal disruption.	Impact V	Likelihood F

Risk Ref:	ICT 10	Risk Title:	Power outage longer than one hour		
Responsibility		*Who is managing the risk?*	Head of ICT		
Consequence		*What can go wrong?* *How can it go wrong?* *Has it gone wrong before?*	Localised or more widespread power failure preventing ICT equipment from operating. A variety of reasons can cause power failure, all would have the same affect on the service. Power failure has occurred at TRDC resulting in 1 day without access. WBC has UPS systems in place, which allow the safe shutdown of servers. Neither site has experienced long term disruption		
Cause / Trigger		*What happens to bring the risk into being?*	A failure of the electricity supply. This could result from a number of different causes		
Existing Control		*What controls exist now to minimise the risk?*	WBC has UPS systems in place to safely shut down hardware and a switchable power supply to manage some causes of power loss		
Adequacy of Control		*What evidence is there that the existing Controls are working? What would the Risk Rating be without the existing controls?*	There are no controls at TRDC to manage power loss. The controls at WBC would manage the safe shutdown of services and allow for power supply to continue in some instances of power loss.	Impact III	Likelihood C
Further Action / Controls Required		*What gaps have been identified?* *What can be done to reduce the likelihood of something going wrong and/or reduce the Impact if something does go wrong?*	TRDC to improve UPS facilities in the server room. To test the UPS at WBC regularly.		
Cost / Resources		*Are there cost / resource implications in achieving the further action above?*	No yet identified.		
Current Status		*What is the current position on introducing additional controls? What is the current Risk Rating*	The current position is that the TRDC server environment is more vulnerable to power loss. WBC controls are adequate. However this will change if the service is outsourced since the preferred bidder would plan to move all our servers to their data centre and only use the WBC data centre for resilience.	Impact III	Likelihood C
Critical Success Factor		*How will you know that the action taken has worked? What will be the Risk Rating outcome with the new controls?*	The action will have worked if a power failure in the future has a minimum impact and services will be able to continue as normal.	Impact II	Likelihood F

Version Control

Version No.	Date	Reason for Update / Significant Changes	Made By
1.10	05/11/12	Draft for discussion of contents	APa
1.12	07/11/12	Draft to be approved by Joint Shared Services Committee	APa