



---

## SCRUTINY BOARD (CENTRAL AND CORPORATE)

---

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR on  
Monday, 24th January, 2011 at 10.00 am

---

### MEMBERSHIP

#### Councillors

- P Grahame (Chair) - Cross Gates and Whinmoor;  
S Bentley - Weetwood;  
D Blackburn - Farnley and Wortley;  
B Chastney - Weetwood;  
M Hamilton - Headingley;  
A Lowe - Armley;  
N Taggart - Bramley and Stanningley;  
J Hardy - Farnley and Wortley;  
K Groves - Middleton Park;  
J L Carter - Adel and Wharfedale;  
R Wood - Calverley and Farsley;  
A Gabriel - Beeston and Holbeck;

---

*Please note: Certain or all items on this agenda may be recorded*

---

**Agenda compiled by:**  
**Andy Booth**  
**Governance Services**  
**Civic Hall**  
**LEEDS LS1 1UR**  
**Tel: 24 74325**

**Head of Scrutiny and Member**  
**Development:**  
**Peter Marrington**  
**Tel: 39 51151**

# A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p><b>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</b></p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25* of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded).</p> <p>(* In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, notice of an appeal must be received in writing by the Chief Democratic Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting.)</p>	
2			<p><b>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</b></p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p><b>LATE ITEMS</b></p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>To declare any personal / prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES</b></p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence and notification of substitutes.</p>	
6			<p><b>CALL-IN OF DECISION - BRIEFING PAPER</b></p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	1 - 4
7			<p><b>CALL-IN - DESIGN AND COST REPORT - THE WEB AND INTRANET REPLACEMENT PROJECT</b></p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	5 - 16
8			<p><b>OUTCOME OF CALL-IN</b></p> <p>In accordance with Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules, to consider the Board's formal conclusions and recommendation(s) arising from the consideration of the called-in decision</p>	
9			<p><b>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>To note that the next meeting of the Board will be held on Monday, 7 February 2011 at 10.00 am with a pre meeting for Board Members at 9.30 am.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



---

### Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

#### Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate)

Date: 24 January 2011

Subject: CALL-IN OF DECISION – BRIEFING PAPER

---

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a decision of the Executive Board has been Called In.<sup>1</sup> The background papers to this particular decision are set out as a separate agenda item and appropriate witnesses have been invited to give supporting evidence.
- 1.2 This report advises the Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate) on the procedural aspects of Calling In the decision.
- 1.3 The Board is advised that the Call In is specific to the report considered by the Executive Board and issues outside of this decision, including other related decisions, may not be considered as part of the Board's decision regarding the outcome of the Call-In.

### 2.0 REVIEWING THE DECISION

- 2.1 The process of reviewing the decision is as follows:
- Members who have requested the Call-In invited to explain their concern/reason for Call-In request.
  - Relevant Executive Member/Officer(s) asked to explain decision.
  - Further questioning from the Board as appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Paragraph 21

## OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD

- 3.1 Having reviewed the decision, the Scrutiny Board will need to agree what action it wishes to take. In doing so, it may pursue one of three courses of action as set out below:

### Option 1- Release the decision for implementation

- 3.2 Having reviewed this decision, the Scrutiny Board may decide to release it for implementation. If the Scrutiny Board chooses this option, the decision will be immediately released for implementation and the decision may not be Called In again.

### Option 2 - Recommend that the decision be reconsidered.

- 3.3 The Scrutiny Board may decide to recommend to the decision maker that the decision be reconsidered. If the Scrutiny Board chooses this option a report will be submitted to the Executive Board.
- 3.4 In the case of an Executive Board decision, the report of the Scrutiny Board will be presented to the next available meeting. The Executive Board will reconsider its decision and will publish the outcome of its deliberations within the minutes of the meeting. The decision may not be Called In again whether or not it is varied.

### Option 3 - Recommend that the decision be reconsidered and refer the matter to full Council if recommendation not accepted.

- 3.5 This course of action would only apply if the Scrutiny Board determined that a decision **fell outside the Council's Budget and Policy Framework** and this determination were confirmed by the Council's Section 151 Officer (in relation to the budget) or Monitoring Officer (in relation to other policies).
- 3.6 If, at the conclusion of this meeting, the Scrutiny Board forms an initial determination that the decision in question should be challenged on the basis of contravening the Budget and Policy Framework, then confirmation will subsequently be sought from the appropriate statutory officer.
- 3.7 Should the statutory officer support the Scrutiny Board's determination, then the report of the Scrutiny Board will be presented in the same manner as for Option 2. If the decision maker accepts the recommendation of the Scrutiny Board in these circumstances, then the revised decision will be published in the same manner as for Option 2 and the decision may not be Called In again. If, however, the decision maker does not accept the recommendation of the Scrutiny Board, then the matter will be referred to full Council for final decision. Decisions of full Council may not be Called In.
- 3.8 Should the appropriate statutory officer not confirm that the decision contravenes the Budget and Policy Framework, then the report of the Scrutiny Board would normally be progressed as for Option 2 (i.e. presented as a recommendation to the decision taker) but with no recourse to full Council in the event that the decision is not varied. As with Option 2, no further Call-In of the decision would be possible.

3.9 However, the Scrutiny Board may resolve that, if the statutory officer does not confirm contravention of the Budget and Policy Framework, then it should be released for implementation in accordance with Option 1.

#### **4.0 FAILURE TO AGREE ONE OF THE ABOVE OPTIONS**

4.1 If the Scrutiny Board, for any reason, does not agree one of the above courses of action at this meeting, then Option 1 will be adopted by default, i.e. the decision will be released for implementation with no further recourse to Call-In.

#### **5.0 FORMULATING THE BOARD'S REPORT**

5.1 If the Scrutiny Board decides to release the decision for implementation (i.e. Option 1), then the Scrutiny Support Unit will process the necessary notifications and no further action is required by the Board.

5.2 If the Scrutiny Board wishes to recommend that the decision be reconsidered (i.e. Options 2 or 3), then it will be necessary for the Scrutiny Board to agree a report setting out its recommendation together with any supporting commentary.

5.3 Because of the tight timescales within which a decision Call-In must operate, it is important that the Scrutiny Board's report be agreed at the meeting.

5.4 If the Scrutiny Board decides to pursue either of Options 2 or 3, it is proposed that there be a short adjournment during which the Chair, in conjunction with the Scrutiny Support Unit, should prepare a brief statement proposing the Scrutiny Board's draft recommendations and supporting commentary. Upon reconvening, the Scrutiny Board will be invited to amend/ agree this statement as appropriate (a separate item has been included in the agenda for this purpose).

5.5 This statement will then form the basis of the Scrutiny Board's report (together with factual information as to details of the Called In decision, lists of evidence/witnesses considered, Members involved in the Call-In process etc).

5.6 The Scrutiny Board is advised that there is no provision within the Call In procedure for the submission of a Minority Report.

#### **6.0 RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 The Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate) is asked to note the contents of this report and the procedure as detailed within it.

This page is intentionally left blank





---

## Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

### Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate)

Date: 24 January 2011

Subject: Call In – Design and Cost Report - The Web and Intranet Replacement Project - (scheme number -14201/BTE/WEB)

---

**Electoral Wards Affected: ALL**

**Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This paper presents the background papers to a decision which has been Called In in accordance with the Council's Constitution.<sup>1</sup>

1.2 Papers are attached as follows:

- Copy of completed Call-In request form
- Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement)
- Relevant extract of Executive Board Minutes of 5 January

1.3 Appropriate Members and/or officers have been invited to attend the meeting in order to explain the decision and respond to questions.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate) is asked to review this decision and to determine what further action it wishes to take.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules Paragraph 21

This page is intentionally left blank

**CALL IN REQUEST – Option (b)**

A Call In request may be made by:

Two non-executive Members of council if they are not from the same political group<sup>1</sup>

Date of decision publication: Wed 7/10/2011 .....

Delegated decision ref: ..... or

Executive Board Minute no: 158 ..... or

Area Committee Name and decision ref: .....

Decision description: DESIGN + COST REPORT: THE WEB +  
INTERNET REPLACEMENT PROJECT .....

.....

Discussion with Decision Maker:  
Prior to submitting a Call In, a nominated signatory must first contact the relevant officer or Executive Member to discuss their concerns and their reasons for wanting to call in the decision. Please identify contact and provide detail.

Director  
 Executive Member

Detail CLERK JAMES MCNAGHNON, MS. WITH JAMES  
ROGERS 13/11/11 .....

.....

Reasons for Call In:  
All requests for Call In must detail why, in the opinion of the signatories, the decision was not taken in accordance with the principles set out in Article 13 of the Council constitution (decision making) (principles of decision making) or where relevant issues do not appear to be taken into consideration. *Please tick the relevant box(es) and give an explanation.*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Proportionality (ie the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respect for human rights
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A presumption in favour of openness
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clarity of aims and desired outcomes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An explanation of the options considered and details of the reasons for the decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive promotion of equal opportunities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural justice

Explanation The Executive Board report does not provide  
satisfactory assurance that the significant investment  
required for this project would result in the  
desired outcomes

**Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support Unit**

A Member cannot count as one of the two/five signatures if they are a member of the Scrutiny Board to which the Call In will be referred. In the case of decisions made by Area Committees, a Member cannot count as one of the two/five signatures if they are a member of that Area Committee.

The following signatories request that the above decision be called in:

1) Signature..... *J.M.L.* ..... Political group..... *LIBERAL DEMOCRAT* .....  
Print name ..... *JAMES MONAGHAN* .....

2) Signature..... *Matthew Lobley* ..... Political group..... *CONSERVATIVE* .....  
Print name..... *MATTHEW LOBLEY* .....

This form should be submitted to the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development (Scrutiny Support Unit, 1st Floor West, Civic Hall) by **5.00pm on the fifth working day after the decision publication date**. The office is open from 9.00am to 5.00pm.

(For further information on the Call In procedure please refer to the Scrutiny Support Unit intranet site, or contact the Unit on 39 51151).

**For office use only: (box A)**

Received on behalf of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development by:  
..... *Richard A. Mills* ..... (signature)  
Date: *13<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011* Time: *3:15*..... SSU ref: *2010/11-158-48* .

**For office use only: (box B)**

Exemption status checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Call In authorised: <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes / <input type="radio"/> No
Date checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Signed: <i>Richard A. Mills</i>
Signatures checked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date: <i>13/01/11</i>
Receipts given:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Validity re article 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Receipt details: .....



---

## Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement)

### Executive Board

**Date:** 5 January 2011

**Subject:** Design and Cost Report - The Web and Intranet Replacement Project -  
(scheme number -14201/BTE/WEB)

<p><b>Electoral Wards Affected:</b></p>          <input type="checkbox"/> Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Equality and Diversity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Community Cohesion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input type="checkbox"/></p>
Eligible for Call In <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible for Call In (Details contained in the report) <input type="checkbox"/>

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The website is increasingly the channel of choice for the majority of citizens. Our current offering is deficient due to unreliable technology and an inefficient web content management system. This has led to a high number of separate websites (75 and growing) being developed outside of [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk). This disparate approach is costly to maintain, leads to confusing messages to residents and makes information hard to find.

A recent Socitm study ranked [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) 36<sup>th</sup> out of 36 Metropolitan web sites based on the number of visits and bottom for Yorkshire and the Humber with a -7.22% relative market share. It is also estimated that when people visit [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) they fail to find the information they are after over 35% of the time resulting in inconvenience and high cost to the Council with customers using alternative channels.

The council needs an improved web presence (internet and intranet) to allow residents, staff and elected members access to information and services on-line. The council will be reliant on an effective transactional website if it is to deliver the potential of significant savings from moving customers away from more expensive delivery channels.

We will use our existing partnership and investment in Microsoft technologies (SharePoint 2010) to replace the web content management system and deliver a new [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) and intranet. This will ensure costs are kept to a minimum. The new publishing system will provide the opportunity to consolidate the externally hosted websites moving them back to [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) and allow us to manage our information more efficiently. Funding for this project has already been provided for within the existing council capital programme resource.

## **1.0 Purpose Of This Report**

- 1.1 To receive the authority to spend existing capital provision for ICT developments, equating to £959.3K in 2010/11, £767.6K in 2011/12, and £80.7K in 2012/13 to fund the design and development of a new website and intranet presence as part of the Web and Intranet Replacement Project. The funding is to be provided from resources already set aside for ICT developments and will fund the allocation of existing ICT staff to deliver this important piece of work.

## **2.0 Background Information**

- 2.1 The content management system (CMS) that supports both the intranet and [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) forms an essential part of this infrastructure and is no longer fit for purpose. It was developed in house more than 10 years ago (with an expected lifespan of 3 years), is unstable, and costly to maintain. The council cannot publish information in real time which means we cannot react to emergencies or immediate changes to service information. There is a clear gap in functionality compared to standard commercially available tools and mass duplication and inconsistency of information through multiple versions of the system. Additionally the web site is completely unavailable for 20 minutes each day to enable site content to be updated. From an internal perspective, the Council's intranet is outdated. Staff find it difficult to access the information and services they require and the search facility is ineffective.
- 2.2 Failure to tackle the above issues may damage the council's reputation and means that the council will lack an effective web platform to underpin many of its efficiency programmes, e.g. Electronic Service Delivery, Changing the Workplace. The council needs to build a good website capable of realising efficiencies through the development of self service provision (internally and externally) wherever possible, reducing avoidable contact and providing timely information and services for our citizens, employees and elected members.
- 2.3 Many people do not use [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) now because it is cumbersome and difficult to find the information they are looking for fast. This results in people using more expensive channels such as the telephone. We receive an estimated 2.5 million calls per annum (at £3.21\* transaction cost per contact). If we consider that 85% of telephone contact to the Council is to find out information, moving only half of these, through effective marketing of the new site, to the web channel (estimated transaction cost of £0.39\* a contact) would result in significant savings to be made in the Contact Centre. We are also working closely with colleagues from First Direct who are renowned for excellent customer service delivery to maximise our investment in e-service delivery.

\*These figures have been provided by Socitm Insight Channel value benchmarking service, December 2009.

## **3.0 Main Issues**

### **3.1 Design Proposals / Scheme Description**

- 3.1.1 The project will deliver a new web content management system, consolidate the 75 web sites and replace [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk) and our existing intranet.

## 3.2 Consultations

- 3.2.1 The project business case has been considered, reviewed and approved by the relevant council officer boards including, Intelligent Organisation Programme Board, Resources and Performance Board, Corporate Leadership Team and the ICT Commissioning Board .

## 3.3 Programme

- 3.3.1 The project will be delivered in phases. Indicative time-scales are provided below:

Phase 1	Design Phase	January 2011 to March 2011
Phase 2	Build and Test Phase	March 2011 to July 2011
Phase 3	Launch Phase	July 2011 to October 2011
Phase 4	Consolidation Phase	Post October 2011

## 4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance

- 4.1 The project supports the council's developing ambition to be "The Best City Council in the UK" and particularly the new values currently being consulted on:

- Spending money wisely
- Engaging our citizens
- Working as a team for Leeds

## 5.0 Legal And Resource Implications

- 5.1 There are no specific legal implications – the design and build of the new internet and intranet will adhere to appropriate website standards, compliance requirements and accessibility issues.

### 5.2 Scheme Design Estimate

#### 5.2.1 Capital Funding and Cash Flow

- 5.2.2 The total project costs are show in the table below. These costs have already been provided for in the existing capital programme budget.

- 5.2.3 In terms of delivering efficiencies, the project will achieve circa £4.29m of savings, over five years, in its own right through the consolidation of the 78 plus externally hosted websites associated with the council and the reorganisation and consolidation of existing web publishers into a corporately led web management approach.

- 5.2.4 A conservative estimate of staff savings of £359K per annum for staff associated with externally hosted web sites has been included within the business case. These figures assume there is one person working on each externally hosted web site and that we are able to reduce this by at least 20%.

- 5.2.5 A conservative estimate of savings of £425K per annum through a reduction of existing web publishers across the council (400+) has also been included in the business case this assumes a 3% reduction of staff involved in web publishing made possible through the creation of a centralised web management team and a more efficient and effective CMS.

- 5.2.6 An estimated £292K per annum saving in equipment and ICT hosting costs has been calculated. This has been based on data obtained through an audit of externally hosted web sites which identified an average hosting cost per externally hosted site of £12,503 per annum. The £292K annual saving used in the business case uses a much reduced figure of £3,750 per annum per site.
- 5.2.7 The more significant, but yet unquantified saving, is in regard to e-service delivery and moving high volume transactions from face-to-face or telephone delivery to self-service over the internet and other channels. The current web infrastructure is restrictive in this regard and the proposals contained within this report will support a significant piece of work to encourage people to switch channels and thus make significant savings in services. Work is currently ongoing to ascertain the full potential of this and prioritise services for e-service delivery as part of the council's Customer Access improvement programme.

Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2010 £000's	FORECAST				
			2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014 /15 £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	4.4		4.4				
DESIGN FEES (6)	345.8		305.8	40.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>350.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>310.2</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Authority to Spend required for this Approval	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2010 £000's	FORECAST				
			2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014 /15 £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	213.5		213.5				
DESIGN FEES (6)	969.3		332.4	636.9			
OTHER COSTS (7)	274.6		103.2	90.7	80.7		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1457.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>649.1</b>	<b>727.6</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2010 £000's	FORECAST				
			2010/11 £000's	2011/12 £000's	2012/13 £000's	2013/14 £000's	2014 /15 £000's
LCC Funding	1515.8		667.5	767.6	80.7		
Corporate Unsupp. Borr.	291.8		291.8				
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>1807.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>959.3</b>	<b>767.6</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

- 5.2.8 The £350,200 capital funding covers pre-approved funding for elements of staff portal and enterprise search within the capital scheme. This funding represents existing capital programme resource so no injection is required.

### 5.3 Revenue Effects

- 5.3.1 The annual cost of software maintenance (£50k) will be offset by the savings achieved through consolidation of the web hosting (£80k in 10/11 rising to £266k by 2012/13).



## 5.4 Risk Assessment

5.4.1 The following is a summary of high level risks (P= probability, I=Impact):

1	The business case is not approved	P:Low I: High	Business case approved by key officer governance arrangements.
2	Failure of the existing www.leeds.gov.uk web site	P:High I: High	The current CMS is not fit for purpose and difficult to support and maintain with high risk of failure. The speed of implementation of the replacement content management system is imperative to mitigate this risk.
3	Damage to council reputation	P:High I:High	Current deficiencies in existing CMS pose significant risk to the reputation of the council – e.g. Inability to publish in real time means we can not respond effectively in an emergency situation. Duplication and inconsistencies in information means there may be no trusted or single version of the “truth” with the potential to misinform. This will be mitigated by replacing the multiple unstable systems presently in place with a single web content management system.
4	Lack of buy-in from the business and access to business resources	P:High I:High	The success of the project will depend upon the involvement of the business in the development of the Information Architecture and information governance. This will be at a time when services are already under significant pressure and could cause delay in implementation. A Strategic Working group will be formed with buy in to the Terms of Reference for this group. The business case additionally includes an element of time/cost to cover business engagement in the project.
5	Web Consolidation Workstream does not deliver cashable savings	P:Low I:High	This workstream will be governed as part of the Programme, managed from within Business Transformation. The release of cashable savings will be determined by the approach adopted to the surplus resource identified through the consolidation project and business process re-engineering.
6	Council does not utilise modern e-service delivery infrastructure to deliver efficiencies	P:Low I:High	The council is required to deliver significant efficiencies over the next four years. There is potential to deliver significant savings from e-service delivery. The new content management system and web infrastructure will be critical to delivering these savings.

## 6.0 Conclusions

6.1 The council needs a quality web presence (internet and intranet) to allow residents, staff and elected members access to information and services on-line and as the means through which further efficiencies are delivered in terms of electronic service delivery.

## 7.0 Recommendations

7.1 To provide the authority to spend of existing capital provision for ICT developments, equating to £959.3K in 2010/11, £767.6K in 2011/12, and £80.7K in 2012/13 to fund the design and development of a new website and intranet presence as part of the Web and Intranet Replacement Project.

## Background Papers

(1) Web & Intranet Replacement Project Business Case. Release 4, dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010.

This page is intentionally left blank

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

WEDNESDAY, 5TH JANUARY, 2011

**PRESENT:** Councillor K Wakefield in the Chair

Councillors A Blackburn, J Blake, A Carter,  
S Golton, P Gruen, R Lewis, T Murray,  
A Ogilvie and L Yeadon

Councillors J Dowson and R Finnigan – Non-Voting Advisory Members

### **RESOURCES AND CORPORATE FUNCTIONS**

#### **158 Design and Cost Report: The Web and Intranet Replacement Project**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) submitted a report outlining proposals and seeking the relevant approvals to fund the design and development of a new website and intranet presence for the Council as part of the Web and Intranet Replacement Project.

Members highlighted the need for the Board to monitor the development of this initiative, noted the interaction with the private sector and emphasised the integral nature of online service provision.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) That authority be given to spend existing capital provision for ICT developments, equating to £959,300 in 2010/11, £767,600 in 2011/12 and £80,700 in 2012/13 in order to fund the design and development of a new website and intranet presence as part of the Web and Intranet Replacement Project.
- (b) That progress reports be submitted to Executive Board at each phase of the project's development.
- (c) That following the conclusion of the Scrutiny Inquiry being undertaken in respect of this matter, an overarching report be submitted to Executive Board which draws together all of the Council's ICT priorities and needs.

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Golton required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter).

**DATE OF PUBLICATION:** 7<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011

**LAST DATE FOR CALL IN  
OF ELIGIBLE DECISIONS:** 14<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011 (5.00 P.M.)

(Scrutiny Support will notify Directors of any items called in by 12.00noon on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011)

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Friday, 11th February, 2011

This page is intentionally left blank