Agenda Item	16
Report No	RES/44/17

HIGHLAND COUNCIL

Committee:	e: Corporate Resources Committee						
Date:	30 th August 2017						
Report Title:	ICT Projects Update						
Report By:	Depute Chief Executive/Director of Corporate Development						

1. Purpose/Executive Summary

1.1 The Council's new Project Governance Policy came into effect on 1 April 2016. One element of that policy was to provide Members with a regular update of the status of projects. This report provides the update on the status of ICT projects currently underway.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to:
 - (i) Note the report.

ICT Project Governance

- 3.1 Each ICT project is governed by its own Project Board with a Project Sponsor at a senior level responsible for ensuring the governance adheres to the Council's policy. In addition, for a project to progress, it must pass a series of "Gateway Reviews" before being allowed to advance to the next stage. The Gateway Reviews are as follows:
 - **Gateway 0:** Strategic Assessment (requires a project mandate and a project sponsor);
 - **Gateway 1:** Initial Business Justification (requires outline of the project and an outline business case);
 - **Gateway 2:** Investment Decision (requires Project Definition and a detailed business case);
 - **Gateway 3:** Project Commencement (requires Project Initiation Document);
 - Gateway 4: Readiness for Service (the business solution goes "live");
 - Gateway 5: Operational Review and Benefits Realisation;

For ICT projects, Gateway Reviews are carried out at the ICT Development Board, chaired by the Depute Chief Executive/Director of Corporate Development.

- 3.2 The Project Governance Policy states that compliance with that policy will be monitored and enforced for projects that:
 - Requires significant capital or revenue investments significant investment means having a value of £4 million or more over the lifecycle of the project and any resulting contract/s as set out in the Procurement Reform (Scotland) Act.; or
 - Projects whose implementation exhibits a high level of complexity, ambiguity, tension, uncertainty or risk as identified by the scorecard in; or
 - Projects that are forecast to deliver substantial cost savings as identified by the Council's Senior Leadership Team.

However for ICT projects it is accepted that the standards and processes in the policy are best practice and they are therefore generally applied for all projects.

- 3.3 Projects are categorised into one of the following types, noting that in some cases more than one category may apply
 - Infrastructure generally crossing across Services and initiated by ICT Services enabling other changes to happen;
 - **Compliance** non-standard change required to comply with legislation etc;
 - **Business as Usual (BAU)** standard but large scale change, usually relating to planned system upgrades;
 - Innovation related to real changes in processes or systems something new.

3.

Current Projects

4.1 The table at **Appendix 1** provides the summary status for all current ICT projects. Of the 14 projects in the current portfolio, 2 are now closed and now being monitored for benefit delivery, 6 are classed as Green, meaning that they are on track to deliver to plan, budget and quality and 3 are on hold due to other priority work taking precedence. For the projects showing an Amber or Red status further commentary is given below.

4.2 SWAN Implementation – Red

The original completion date for the Transition to SWAN was 20 September 2016 but was re-baselined to March 2017. The Capita report to the PfN Board held August 2nd states that all circuits will be installed by September 2017.

The current status of the transition is as follows; 361 sites have successfully transitioned which is 96%. There are 12 sites remaining.

Discussions continue between the Pathfinder North partners and Capita to progress the partners' claim for additional costs as a result of the delay to rollout. Capita have put forward two offers for settlement which have been rejected on the basis that they did not sufficiently address the losses incurred. The negotiations continue to move forward positively and we are hopeful that a settlement will be reached without the need to take the matter to litigation.

4.3 Network Refresh – Amber

Full details of the status of the Network Refresh Programme are provided in a separate report to this Committee.

4.4 **SEEMIS – Amber**

Project has finished, but the decommissioning of the previous system had an outstanding legal clarification over data archive ownership which has now been resolved. A project closure report has now been requested.

5 Implications

5.1 **Resource** - Project Sponsors will have to ensure the required resources are in place to meet the requirements of their projects. This is the case for all projects detailed above in this report.

Legal, Community (Equality, Poverty and Rural), Climate Change/Carbon Clever or Gaelic – There are no implications arising from this report.

Designation:	Depute Chief Executive/Director of Corporate Development
Date:	11 August 2017
Authors:	Jon Shepherd, ICT Operations Manager
	Dan Scott, ICT Strategy and Engagement Manager

4.0

Appendix 1 – Current Projects List										Overall Project Status		
Before Gateway 0 – Strategic Assessment	Service	РМ	Project Sponsor	Cost Original	Cost Baseline	Cost Forecast	Go-Live Original	Go-Live Baseline	Go-Live Forecast/ Actual	Rebas elined	Current	Previous Report June `17
ICH IT Provision	C&L	Colin Jack	Brian Porter								Green	Red
Between Gateway 0 and Gateway 1 – Project												
Electronic Records Management System (ERMS)	CD	Philip Mallard	John Gladman								On Hold	N/A
Between Gateway 1 and Gateway 2	– Project D	efinition										
New School Project – Wick	C&L	Andy Robb	Brian Porter	£360,018	N/A	N/A	16/09/16	N/A	16/09/16	NO	Awaiting Closure Report	N/A
GIS Refresh Project	CD	Philip Mallard	Jon Shepherd	£71000	£71000	£71000	Aug 2017	Aug 2017	Aug 2017	NO	Temp. On Hold	Temp. On Hold
Inverness City Wi-Fi	D&I	Keith Grant	Stuart Black	£500,000	TBC	TBC	May 2017	May 2017	May 2017	NO	Green	Green
Between Gateway 2 and Gateway 3	– Project Ir	nitiation										
No items												

	Service	РМ	Project Sponsor	Cost Original	Cost Baseline	Cost Forecast	Go-Live Original	Go-Live Baseline	Go-Live Forecast/ Actual	Reba selin ed	Current Status	Previous Report June '17	
Between Gateway 3 and Gateway 4 – Project Delivery													
SWAN Implementation	CD	Derek Hart	Dan Scott	£1,400,000	£1,400,000	£1,150,000	Sep 2016	Mar 2017	Sept 2017	YES	Red	Red	
Unified Communications	CD	Brian Davidson	Steve Walsh	£1,514,590	£1,287,000	£1,287,000	Dec 2015	Mar 2018	Mar 2018	YES	Green	Green	
New School Project Caol	C&L	Andy Robb	Brian Porter	£115,729	TBC	TBC	29/09/16	TBC	29/09/16	NO	Awaiting Update	TBC	
CRM Phase 2 Project	CD	Darren Macleod	John Gladman	£166,849	£166,849	£166,849	April 2018	April 2018	April 2018	NO	Green	Green	
Network Programme – Refresh – Phase 1	CD	Graeme Mackay	Dan Scott	£3,300,000	£3,006,620	£3,006,620	August 2017	August 2017	August 2017	NO	Amber	Red	
Network Programme – Refresh – Survey	CD	Graeme Mackay	Dan Scott	£329,933	£329,933	£329,933	Apr 2017	Apr 2017	Apr 2017	NO	Green	Green	
Between Gateway 4 and Gateway 5 -	- Project C	losure											
Construction Information Management System	D&I	David McIntosh	Finlay MacDonald	£60,000	£60,000	£60,000	Feb 2017	Feb 2017	Jul 2017	NO	Green	Green	
SEEMIS	C&L	Colin Jack	Brian Porter	£400,000	£400,000	£408,000	Dec 2015	Dec 2015	Dec 2015	NO	Awaiting Closure Report	Amber	

Appendix 2 – Work Packages

Work Package	Service	РМ	Cost Baseline	Cost Forecast	Go-Live Baseline	Go-Live Forecast/Actual	Re-baselined	Current RAG	Previous RAG
Internet Explorer Upgrade	CD	Matt Smith	£55,000	TBC	August 2016	TBC	NO	Green	Red