

Replacement of core client information system for social care

Meeting held on 4 May 2004

Present: Paul Clark, Martyn Ellis, Nick Georgiou, Malcolm Jeeves, John Kane, Geoff Wingrove

Notes of the meeting

1. Strategic Issues

The decision on the development of a core ICT system for social care needs to be placed within a strategic context. Some of this context is set out below.

- Need to concentrate on ensuring that core service issues and needs are met.
- Need for a system, which offers the best fit for Harrow but is flexible enough to meet new needs and priorities.
- System should offer the facility to establish links with other services and agencies i.e. internal corporate/education and external PCT/Health.
- Recognition that the system will require substantial input from managers and staff in the development phase and that there will be major requirements for training, system refreshment, monitoring and evaluation.
- The new system will support business processes in which staff will be assigned clear responsibility for delivery of posts.
- Aspiration that all staff will be involved in data input but that there will not be significant administration savings, certainly in the short term, as Harrow needs to “catch up” on its processes.
- Need to build the development of a new system into an overall change management programme with clear responsibilities for induction, training, refreshment, monitoring and evaluation.
- The system will need to drive and underpin the performance management processes, which will involve meeting challenging targets.
- Application should be capable of growing with the business and to meet changing requirements and priorities.

2. Evaluation

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT FOR SOCIAL CARE IT SYSTEM – OPTIONS COMPARISON

CRITERION	e-WORK	CORELOGIC	POTENTIAL RISKS	NOTES
Initial purchase costs	<p>2 options: 1 with full external provision; 1 based on recruiting some dedicated in-house resource to take on some further development and DBA maintenance</p> <p>Full devt: £1.364m in years 1 / 2</p> <p>(Includes £87k license fees)</p> <p>Oracle license costs already covered, but costs include for refining current CARES database</p>	<p>£1000 per concurrent user (up to 250 users, which is the likely initial demand level) –</p> <p>Oracle license costs already covered except possible IAS server costs.</p>	<p>Both sets of projected costs are indicative only.</p> <p>Full development costs of either application will depend very much on specified functionality required, and especially on the development costs associated with building interfaces with other systems (corporate and other agencies)</p>	<p>e-Work option includes cost of full Enterprise License – allowing unlimited number of users (including any Borough resident and staff in other agencies, providing application is hosted on LA servers), and potentially unlimited range of future use / applications. Some of license cost might be defrayed if taken-up for corporate use</p>
Set-up costs	Included in above	£1600k per user		
Ongoing maintenance	<p>£800k over 4 years</p> <p>Includes £17.4k p.a. for license costs</p>	£500p.a. per concurrent user licensed,		
Other resource requirements	Opt 2) would require additional internal costs of about £80-100k p.a. *	<p>Some savings may be achievable for elements not required</p> <p>Specialist interfaces / re-configuration costs to be determined</p>	Option 2 requires maintaining / supporting some specialist internal skills base – may be seen as out of step with current corporate strategy	* e-Work solution - likely reduction in internal annual costs after year 2.
Projected costs over 5 years	<p>Opt 1) £2.288m</p> <p>Opt 2) £1.478m plus £400-500k over 5 years for in-house staffing resources = total of £1.9 – 2.0m</p>	£1.5m plus specialist interfaces / configuration, less any savings for elements that may not be required		e-Work option also offers possible devt. partnership deal
Availability	Would need to be developed from ground up, although PDSS pilot would provide a starting point and some development basis for some of the key modules	Most modules available now - some features and some core modules still in development	Some risks associated with e-Work option in relation to development and support of a system with this degree of complexity	e-Work solution offers possibility of dedicated SAP solution, possible Hospital Discharge solution, and potential for other developments as required
Presence in market place	Leading dedicated Business Process	Relatively new players in small	e-Work option largely means	

<u>CRITERION</u>	e-WORK	CORELOGIC	POTENTIAL RISKS	NOTES
	Management application – limited penetration in health & social care sector, but possible player within current NHS IT developments	specialist social care sector, but rapidly gaining a share of the market	breaking into new ground. Corelogic rapidly gaining a foothold – might be vulnerable to over-reaching themselves	
Likely time to solution	Phased implementation – some modules within 6 months, overall development over (up to) 2 years Implementation pace depends as much on internal capacity to sustain our contribution as on capacity of developer	Probably 12 months minimum with some modules not available before April 2005 at earliest	Development time for e-Work solution will depend both on developer capability and on capacity of operational staff to engage with development process. Time to solution for Corelogic will depend to some extent on their own development schedule	
Workflow (maintenance)	On-going – capable of being internally managed and controlled for all but major developments	Handled by developers, but limited to some degree by overall system design	Experience of PDSS pilot has alerted us to the possible danger of 'over-engineering' the business process design	e-Works provides full use of dedicated BPM design features – automatic alerts, integrated process tracking and e-mail. e-Work system automatically retains and uses ongoing data about progress through process Corelogic functionality is sometimes limited to relying (e.g.) on users running and then acting upon specialist ad hoc reports
Ability to model / dictate business process	Can be designed to fit and keep in step with local business processes, as these change over time Agility in relation to future requirements is a key bonus from use of a dedicated BPM foundation	Some flexibility to configure for local requirements, but will have development cost implications	Future development path for Corelogic will depend on market factors and requirements of other (sometimes bigger) LAs, as per any other 'package' application e-Work solution probably best used by retaining capacity in-house to develop future requirements,	In my view (ME) this is arguably the most critical strategic issue for consideration

<u>CRITERION</u>	e-WORK	CORELOGIC	POTENTIAL RISKS	NOTES
			as per Option 2	
Intuitive usability	Consistent look and feel – can be defined locally as can the extent of help and on-screen prompts Generally very well-received by PDSS pilot users	Consistent look and feel, familiar to Windows users Built-in help features with customisable links to other documentation	Arguably neither system has been very widely seen / commented on by front-line users	
Outputs / reports, including specials	Will need to be produced locally. e-Work system automatically records process data as audit trail, which is reportable	Comes with dedicated reports system, and major standard reports pre-defined. Ad hoc reports via Business Objects system	Both solutions require maintenance of relatively highly skilled in-house capacity for ad hoc report design.	e-Work solution may require investment in more sophisticated report-writing application
Integration with other systems	Potentially unlimited depending on basic e-GIF standards, and detailed interfacing	Potentially unlimited depending on basic e-GIF standards, and detailed interfacing	Cost / time-scales for interfacing requirements are largely an unknown factor - for both systems	Largely dependent on external development, probably in both cases
Integration with financial systems / processes	Part of expected development – can be specified to suit local requirements	Finance module in course of development – due April 2005.	Stability in relation to choice / design of corporate systems may be uncertain	
Implementation plan / process	Would require substantial injection of operational staff time to detail required functionality, but can be aligned with other efforts already required. Would also require strong project management to manage development and roll-out	Would require some injection of operational staff time to specify functionality. Would require major implementation team / project to manage roll-out, data migration and training		Implementation of either system will require dedicating some substantial resources (including those from current operational areas) to detailing required functionality; and to supporting data cleaning / data migration; set-up and roll-out. Very robust project-management framework will be required
Integration with Internet / Intranet	Should be unproblematic via Java capability	Should be unproblematic via Java capability		
E-mail	Can be used seamlessly as part of defined business process	Can be incorporated but unsure how flexibly		
Calendar functions	Incorporated to some degree, but no specialist scheduling	Incorporated to some degree, but no specialist scheduling		

CRITERION	e-WORK	CORELOGIC	POTENTIAL RISKS	NOTES
	functionality as such	functionality as such		
Document handling in database	Can be managed within underpinning Oracle database	Can be managed within underpinning Oracle database		
Training issues	Requires dedicated programme – some existing PDSS users who have some familiarity	Requires dedicated programme – possible we may recruit some staff from other LAs with existing knowledge / skills		
Assessment processes & scheduling	Already developed within PDSS pilot – would probably need some refinement / re-modelling Diary / scheduling is limited	Incorporated with some (limited) scope to specify detailed optional functionality as required Full diary / scheduling not included		
Handle processes related to carers	Can be incorporated as specified	Included		
Handling care packaging	Can be incorporated as specified	Included		
Service provision (support providers)	Can be incorporated as specified for internal providers. Interface with external providers possible but would depend in part on their systems, but fully electronic transactions feasible	Unsure, but likely to be some limitation for external providers depending on the systems that they use. This is likely to be achieved by the use of Web based packages.		
Caseload weighting & monitoring	Potentially possible - would need detailed specification	Unsure		

RISKS

In order to achieve the best outcome for the authority it is necessary that any system should meet the following four guidelines to support the Information Value Chain

- Minimise Business Risk
- Minimise implementation Time
- Be aligned with the Business Goals
- Provide a focus for value added activities

In addition to the areas highlighted in the previous papers the following should be considered

	E-works	Package Solution (Corelogic)
Development	<p>Requires development from base although the PDSS system could provide a solid framework which would require some reengineering</p> <p>The authority would require to recruit and train development staff. (Software development is not our core business</p>	<p>Exists and is installed in a number of authorities in a standard version. Web based version went live in L.B.Brent 5.4.04</p>
Maintenance	<p>Maintenance of the software would be the responsibility of Metastorm, the providers that of the application would fall to Harrow as would upgrading and meeting of ongoing legislative requirements.</p> <p>Availability if resources from HITS to support this approach</p>	<p>Would be covered by a maintenance agreement with the supplier there would have to be separate negotiation for bespoke modules and interfaces</p>
Peer User Authorities	<p>None</p> <p>If there are system problems resolution falls solely to LBH</p>	<p>At least 6 with others in the process of tendering</p> <p>A user group would have some leverage on the supplier or resolution. LBH would not be perceived by external authorities as being the sole owner of a problem</p>

3. Conclusion

Although there was clear recognition given to the considerable merits of developing a Harrow based system built on an E-works base, it was agreed to move forward with the procurement of a package solution. The following represented the main reasons for this decision.

- The risks of development and implementation would be supported by an experienced organisation and shared with a number of other organisations using the package.
- The current stage of organisational development in People First and HiTS and the capacity of the organisations would tend to argue against a Harrow developed system.
- The experiences and good practice of other Local Authorities would be transferable both in the initial phase and in further system developments.
- The speed with which a package system could be introduced. It was agreed that this was priority underpinned by the business imperative
- The need for a developed system that is up with the cutting edge of the business processes for social care.
- The need to guarantee success with staff and to demonstrate to staff that the system is being successfully used in other Local Authorities.

4. Further Action

- Development of a PID to go to CSPB **MJ/SC**
- Briefing/clearance by Members/EDG, (CMT, PHB and Cabinet?) **GW/MJ**
- Procurement issues to be identified and resolved **GW/MJ/PS/SC**
- Project team to be established **GW/NG/PC/SC**
- Management of short-term issues with current system to be identified and progressed
MJ/ME/SC
- Steering group to be established – must involve key operational staff **GW/NG/PC/SC**
- Implementation timetable and issues to be set out in an action plan **GW/MJ/ME/SC**