

## Scrutiny Review – Planning & Scoping

<p><b>Definitions:</b></p>	<p>ICT = Information Communications Technology          NNC = North Northamptonshire Council          WNC = West Northamptonshire Council          IAA = Inter Authority Agreement          VFM = Value for Money</p>
<p><b>What is the purpose of the review?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Specify exactly which outcome(s) the review is examining?</i></li> <li>• <i>Also being clear what the review is not looking at.</i></li> <li>• <i>What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve?</i></li> <li>• <i>Where possible refer to value for money issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction</i></li> </ul>	<p>The review aims to do two things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Understand the overall value for money of ICT services at North Northamptonshire Council.</li> <li>(2) Determine the value for money of the ICT services provided by WNC to NNC given the significant role this plays in provision of the Council’s overall ICT arrangements.</li> </ol>
<p><b>What are the Criteria for Selection?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Why has this topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny?</i></li> <li>• <i>Which of the principal criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy?</i></li> </ul>	<p>This scrutiny is considered a priority for a scrutiny review for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NNC is carefully considering its future ICT Strategy and options for the future. Our services, including those commissioned from partners, should therefore represent best value to the Council and local residents and businesses.</li> <li>2. In total, the Council’s 2022/23 ICT budget is £7.696m of which the supply of ICT services from WNC to NNC represents a significant proportion at a cost of £3.682m.</li> <li>3. The procurement and method of ICT service provision is of strategic significance to the Council and its services and has the potential to impact on the options for future service delivery and transformation of the Council.</li> <li>4. Both NNC and WNC are looking at the options, timing, value and sequencing of the disaggregation of the remaining</li> </ol>

	<p>aggregated services. The results of this scrutiny review will provide timely information to help inform the Council's decision-making in this regard and help shape discussions with WNC.</p>
<p><b>What are the indicators of success?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</i></li> </ul>	<p>The following factors are considered indicators of success for the scrutiny review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) A clear view of the value for money of the ICT services at NNC based on financial comparisons and other comparative data.</li> <li>(2) A clear view of whether the ICT services provided by WNC to NNC represent value for money for the Council through the presence of both quantitative and qualitative information relating to the cost and performance of the service provided and the experience of service users.</li> <li>(3) A clear view as to whether the ICT services provided by WNC to NNC are in accordance with the IAA and any other relevant agreements in place when designing the service architecture.</li> <li>(4) Identification of any additional factors that may need to be taken into account that add context to the current services provided, such as legacy interdependencies and risks associated with accelerated disaggregation.</li> </ol>
<p><b>What methodology / Approach is to be followed?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What types of enquiry will be used to gather evidence?</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Following a structured and proportionate review process, which is likely to involve the active consideration of evidence, direct representation(s), a review of financial, performance and risk data to arrive at an objective opinion against some Key Lines of Enquiry</i></p>	<p>The following key lines of enquiry may wish to be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overall cost of ICT services for NNC compared to other similar unitary councils.</li> <li>2. The cost, scope, scale, service delivery model and performance of ICT services provided by WNC to NNC.</li> <li>3. Establish compliance with responsibilities as set out in the IAA for both Councils as relevant and as agreed during the setting up of the new unitary authorities.</li> <li>4. The plans the Council has in place for disaggregating ICT services from WNC, including an update on progress against</li> </ol>

	<p>those plans and future discussions that are scheduled to take place.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Learning points and experiences from other councils who have embarked on similar service delivery journeys to that of NNC, if available.</li> <li>6. Members may also wish to understand the interdependencies that exist between the WNC and NNC ICT arrangements and the respective risks associated with different models and speeds of disaggregation.</li> <li>7. Feedback from senior ICT colleagues at both NNC and WNC in answering members questions in relation to these key lines of enquiry.</li> <li>8. Any other factors considered relevant provided that they do not involve the disclosure of confidential information relating to the ICT security arrangements in place.</li> </ol>
<p><b>What specific resources and budget requirements are there?</b></p> <p><i>What support is required for the review exercise?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>specialist staff</i></li> <li>• <i>any external support</i></li> <li>• <i>site visits</i></li> <li>• <i>Consultation</i></li> <li>• <i>research</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead officers identified to support in providing information required to feed into the review.</li> <li>• Specialist resources already engaged to help understand and explain the complexities of the current ICT arrangements, their interdependencies and perceived value for money.</li> <li>• Literature review – there may be some desktop research that is available to support the review and provide context.</li> <li>• It may be appropriate to procure additional targeted resources to answer specific questions in relation to value for money. This may be necessary where data is not currently at hand.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there any corporate risks associated with this review?</b></p> <p><i>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of available detailed information may potentially be a barrier that may need to be overcome. There is a reliance on information from an external organisation.</li> <li>• It will be important not to identify any information about the ICT security arrangements of the Council and any perceived vulnerabilities. This information could be considered high value to cyber criminals.</li> <li>• It will be important to consider the context of the review in terms of the complexities</li> </ul>

	<p>and interdependencies of the ICT arrangements, solutions and contracts in place. Failure to consider these could lead to decisions being made in terms of perceived value for money, isolated from the operational and legal impacts of any resultant decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A delay to operational decisions relating to the resources required to support the disaggregation of ICT services, for example digital services, could impact on projects scheduled to start in the immediate future. These risks will need to be understood, flagged and balanced against the risks associated with moving too fast.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is still to be confirmed but it is likely that the outcome will be reported to the Executive and will also be of interest to WNC as the service provider.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the review timescale?</b></p> <p><i>Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports or decisions.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be confirmed although it is understood that pace is important given the significance of the issue and dependencies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who will lead the review?</b></p> <p><i>Identify a nominated:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Elected Member - Lead Officer</i></li> </ul>	<p>Nominated Leads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lead elected member that is not an executive member – TBC</li> <li>• Guy Holloway, Assistant Chief Executive</li> <li>• Nana Barfi-Sarpong, Chief Information Officer</li> <li>• ICT Finance business Partner</li> <li>• Legal Officer input (re IAA)</li> </ul> <p>Other officers likely to be required to contribute:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICT Disaggregation Discovery Team colleagues</li> <li>• ICT Management Team Colleagues</li> <li>• WNC IT colleagues</li> <li>• WNC finance Colleagues</li> </ul>

<p><b>Media Interest / Publicity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Communications Plan</i></li> <li>• <i>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement?</i></li> <li>• <i>What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g. Fliers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</i></li> </ul>	<p>There is likely to be media interest in both the work and outcome of this scrutiny review. To assist, it is suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proportionate communications plan (internal and external) is developed to support the review process should it be required.</li> <li>• Will the review be subject to a press embargo? Yes, it is suggested that the outcome of the review is not disclosed publicly until official papers are published for the respective scrutiny meetings.</li> <li>• The designated spokesperson for the Council will be Cllr Bunday, Executive Members for Finance and Transformation.</li> <li>• The lead officer for communications will be Guy Holloway, Assistant Chief Executive.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Completed by:</b></p>	<p>Guy Holloway, Assistant Chief Executive 5<sup>th</sup> January 2023</p>
<p><b>Approved by Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <p><b>Date:</b></p>	