

Deloitte.



Bedfordshire
county council



BEDFORD
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Bedfordshire, Mid Bedfordshire, South Bedfordshire and Bedford Councils

Review of SWIFT Disaggregating proposals

2 October 2008

Contents

1	Introduction&Background:	1
2	Workshop-29thSeptember.	2
3	Keypointsfromtheworkshop.....	3
4	NextSteps:.....	6

1 Introduction & Background:

SWIFT is the main software and system that supports both Adults and Children's social care services but Council. Its supplier is Anite Public Sector, an established provider of social care systems. SWIFT was selected in 2003-4 through a comprehensive procurement exercise undertaken by BC C, and phased implementation was started in June 2004. This was completed in December 2005 and overall acquisition costs of the project were about £1.3m. The contract with Anite runs until October 2009, with a six-month notice period. Annual running costs of the system are currently about £273k for software and hardware maintenance, and around £600k for internal staff resources.

The system is deployed extensively within the service with around 1200 authorised systems users, and is satisfactory, but somewhat old-fashioned in terms of fit 'look and feel' and in need of some software upgrades in the near future to keep it in line with legislation.

To assist the new authorities in planning for the future, Anite have proposed that an immediate system now be commissioned from them as a major priority, alongside additional short-term investment in new software and associated services. Their intention would be for the two new councils to each have new licences for a separate SWIFT system and Anite would migrate the data from the county system, so that by April 2009, each council could have independent system support for its social care operational services. The one-off costs for each council for this would be £326k for new software and services and £137k for data migration.

As part of its forward planning for ICT in the new authorities, officers have commissioned Deloitte to assist in evaluating the options and choices for Social Care systems and technology and a workshop was held to agree a clear way forward for rSWIFT. This brief report outlines the results of the workshop, its key decisions and the next steps.

2 Workshop-29th September.

The workshop was well attended by all stakeholders and reached clear conclusions on the way forward, identified key areas for further attention and proposed a strategic direction that would be led by service priorities and meeting their business requirements.

The workshop agenda covered:

- A short presentation from Anite on their migration strategy proposals and an opportunity for questions.
- Agreeing the starting point for Bedford and Central Bedfordshire.
- A short summary of the current position of SWIFT within the county.
- A brief summary of the state of the social care system marketplace, and Anite's current status in terms of market share etc.
- A discussion on available options.
- A summary of the Anite migration proposals.
- Agreement on the way forward.

3 Key points from the workshop

- It was agreed that officers needed to keep thinking strategically, but continue to focus on operational service priorities and meeting business requirements.
- It was agreed that the starting point was for the new council to aim for having distinctly separate social care systems at an early opportunity, and separation/disaggregation of the SWIFT database would need to be undertaken in a measured and risk controlled way.
- The current system is well regarded by staff and has settled down to provide a good robust database, with good data quality, although it's not seen as particularly future-proofed. However, although many council's have developed separate databases to support the separation of Children's from Adult Social Services, Bedford CC chosen not to do this, and systems development in Adult Services, for supporting Self Directed Care services have not yet been implemented.

The main areas of contention for deploying SWIFT in the new council was currently seen to be in three key areas.

- Performance monitoring and statutory reporting
- Transfer of financial data to respective SAP and Agresso systems
- Sound information governance arrangements, including compliance with the Data Protection Act etc.

However, after extensive debate, it was considered that the current work programme of the County Performance Management Team and the SWIFT team gives a sufficient level of confidence in achieving business requirements for the two new councils in the first two areas.

On the information governance aspects, there was a confidence that the existing systems security was adequate although additional information sharing protocols would need to be developed to meet future requirements.

The social care systems marketplace has changed significantly over the last six years. Prior to this, the 150 local authorities responsible for social care was almost equally divided between two leading suppliers – Anite and OLM and systems built in-house. This has now changed to:

- In house systems are now only in place for ten councils, with four of these currently out to tender for replacement systems
- Five new suppliers now have a presence in the market, and provide system solutions for forty two councils
- Anite currently have forty-nine customers, twelve of which are unitary councils. Five of their sites are currently out to tender. They have lost two sites this year, including the flagship Surrey site to SAP
- OLM currently have forty-eight customers, of which twenty are unitary councils. Two of their sites are currently out to tender and they have lost three sites this year.
- The newest supplier, Liquid Logic, has five main customers, two of which are unitary councils. They also have a presence with their Integrated Children's System in twenty-two other councils, including thirteen Anite sites.
- Three other suppliers of ICS have a presence in six Anite sites.

The proposal from Anite was considered difficult to accept in terms of:

- Its aggressive timetable and contract renewal conditions
- The limited choice offered from Anite on systems disaggregation
- Diverting attention and scarce resources away from operational service delivery, and at a time when organisational upheaval was anticipated
- Difficulty in justifying its costs and determining value
- A lack of confidence in the supplier being able to deliver to time and budget
- Their view, that systems migration from SWIFT was difficult and unproven, even though it had been successfully achieved by other suppliers on at least fourteen occasions

Following on from this discussion, a more detailed evaluation of options was undertaken and a clear preference to continue with the existing SWIFT system and share the database in the short term, was agreed, whilst evaluating alternatives system solutions that would best meet the future needs of the service, which would be developed in the near future, based on service plans and priorities and business requirements. This was considered the most realistic choice, for a number of key reasons:

- Operational services would not be significantly affected in the short term
- The current work on performance management and financial data transfers should provide a satisfactory result for each council
- Business rules and processes could be updated to improve on existing information access and sharing arrangements [reflecting the new organisational structure] to ensure that moving towards DP Act compliance was demonstrable.
- The existing system functionality was agreed in late 2003 and quite clearly further work on evaluating service priorities and business requirements need to be undertaken, but in a more measured way, to get the 'best fit' systems solutions for the future.
- There is now much more choice in the marketplace and the 'best-fit' systems solution for the business may well not be from Anite.

4 Next Steps:

Progress will now need to be made in a number of key areas:

- Further 'due-diligence' will need to be undertaken to ensure that the three key areas of contention identified above are successfully resolved in time to meet the April deadline.
- A limited amount of market testing needs to be undertaken to increase confidence in finding the 'best-fit' system solution for each council, and prior to any decisions on systems procurement.
- The service priorities and business requirements need to be defined in enough detail to enable effective systems procurement exercises to be undertaken.
- Discussion on how to put effective SWIFT governance in place needs to be undertaken, to ensure the continuity in system support for operational services and to manage the current contract and any extensions to it. This would include getting the right level of stakeholder representation, controlling any significant SWIFT upgrades and development work and aligning it with the emerging IT strategies within the two new councils, including agreeing any hosting arrangements etc.
- Business cases for any new significant investments in systems and technology will need to be developed in line with overall council priorities.