



HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

# **Full and Final Business Case 2013/14 Parliamentary Business Programme (2012- 2016)**

SRO

David Natzler – Clerk Assistant, House of Commons

Ed Ollard – Clerk Assistant, House of Lords

March 2013

v1.0

### Document History

Version	Date	By whom	Description of change
0.1	24/8/12	██████	First Draft
0.2	6/9/12	██████	Drafting amendments
0.3	14/9/12	██████	Drafting amendments
0.4	28/9/12	██████	Changes to financial figures, drafting amendments
0.5	20/01/13	██████	Submission to PICTAB for 13/14 funding

### **1. Introduction**

This is the Programme Business Case for the **Parliamentary Business** programme for the financial years 2012-16.

The Programme Business Case outlines prioritised areas of work to be completed in this timeframe. The programme is envisaged as a rolling programme of work that will seek to gather, prioritise and reprioritise during each financial year and report to PICTAB and to the two Management Boards.

This document requests agreement to the programme's funding current financial requirement and dossier of projects.

### **2. Background and Programme Outline**

The Parliamentary Business Programme (PBP) is the follow on to the Procedural Data Programme (PDP). The Procedural Data Programme created the foundation within the procedural area for reusable data in most offices. The PBP aims to complete the transformation of all data into a reusable format and to undertake new projects to improve upon PDP outputs as well as replace any remaining legacy systems. There is a dependency of this programme on the delivery of the PDP and on the efficient support of existing systems. The PDP is now currently planned to complete key elements, the Order Paper project is the only work that will be held over. The order in which they are listed in Annex A is not intended to be an order of priority if it proves necessary to delay some projects. The prioritisation for 13/14 has been completed.

On the basis of viability and readiness for change, discrete projects in both Houses have been identified that will improve the capture and reuse of core procedural information. These have been prioritised for 2013/14 and form the Project Dossier at the end of this paper.

Some applications are approaching obsolescence and will need to be replaced or upgraded. It is crucial to replace the applications that have not been replaced by the PDP with robust, resilient and fit-for-purpose technology that meets business needs.

### **3. Strategic Intent**

House of Commons

The programme is aligned to the House of Commons strategy 2011-16:

- 1. To make the House of Commons more effective*
- 2. To make the House Service more efficient*
- 3. To ensure that Members, staff and the public are well-informed*
- 4. To work at every level to earn respect for the House of Commons*

And specifically:

- *Reducing costs:*

- *Making papers more easily available and searchable on the web and reducing printing costs by discontinuing hard-copy production where acceptable alternatives can be provided.*

## House of Lords

The programme is aligned to objectives from the House of Lords Business Plan 2011-15:

- *To make the House and its work accessible to the public.*
- *To provide the House and its committees with the advice and services they need for the effective conduct of business.*

The programme is aligned to the following tasks:

*7. Ensure that information produced in support of objectives is well-managed, and that for all information requirements ICT is effectively exploited.*

Priorities in the period 2011-15:

*(1) We will work with PICT and the Web and Intranet Service to ensure that its strategy delivers robust core services and reflects an informed understanding of business needs.*

*(2) We will encourage greater reliance by Members and staff on electronic rather than paper documents and records; and we will implement an electronic document and records management system for the Administration.*

*(3) We will help PICT consider how new ICT developments (including internet-based computing) could produce secure, more efficient and effective ICT services.*

## PICT

The programme is aligned to PICT's Business Plan and ICT Strategy

- *Understanding the requirements and the business case for the further prioritised development of bespoke parliamentary information systems that will be necessary to deliver the vision of both Houses for 2015, including developments that are essential to deliver savings; and translating this into a costed plan of work for 2012/13.*
- *PICT will contribute fully to the Procedural Data Programme/CPIMF/Web publishing developments, and will support the House of Commons Print to Web savings initiative which is facilitated by these programmes.*

## **4. Programme Objectives and Outcomes**

### **4.1 Programme Objective**

This document requests agreement to the programme of work for financial year 2013/14 with Programme Business Cases to be prepared for subsequent years on a rolling cycle. The programme objective is to provide a structured governance and resource model under which projects can be requested, prioritized and delivered across both Houses. This programme will provide ICT to support the DCCS and Parliamentary Services to achieve their core objectives, mitigate their high priority risks and measure performance.

### **4.2 Programme Outcomes**

The outcomes of the programme are to:

- Improve the resilience of current applications through renewal and upgrade
- Develop fit-for-purpose applications in conjunction with business areas, taking into account their needs and tolerances

- Increase the opportunity for improvements in business efficiency by further enabling information and data sharing across parliamentary departments through improvements in capture and reuse
- Improve access by external and internal users to parliamentary information by using common information and data languages
- Deliver higher-quality products to parliamentary departments on budget and on time
- Reduce Risk to core procedural systems and reduce downtimes

## 5. **Benefits**

Benefits realization will be ongoing. It has been acknowledged that many of the benefits of the programme are non financial. Benefit owners will be allocated to each major project within the programme and will be responsible to the programme SROs for developing appropriate measures and cost effective reporting mechanisms. Benefits and performance indicators will be managed at an individual project level.

The following are high level benefits that have been identified.

### *Benefit 1: Improved service to users*

- Ability to make information available in different formats that make it easier to re-use and re-purpose as well as publishing through channels (including mobile devices)
- Services that can be tailored to users' needs and develop with changing expectations and future requirements
- Greater service availability and reliability
- Ability to reuse thesaurus/taxonomies as a corporate resource to support a range of other applications and services across Parliament

### *Benefit 2: Improved efficiency*

- Services that can be supported and maintained cost-effectively and avoidance of extra costs associated with maintaining obsolescent applications
- Reduced duplication of information, manual rekeying of information, or post-processing of content – greater sharing of information (and less time spent checking duplicated content)
- Faster retrieval of information
- Improved/faster processes for generating metadata/indexing and content management
- Improved ability for Members and the public to search information and achieve meaningful results first time

### *Benefit 3: Improved value for money through more effective use (and re-use) of resources*

- A wider group of users employing our services and more in-depth use by existing users of information through improved search tools and fit for purpose applications
- Greater use of information in electronic form that can pre-populate other applications, reduce the occurrence of double keying and increase accuracy and currency

### *Benefit 4: Improved reputation and user confidence*

- Accurate, reliable, and comprehensive search capability due to access to consistent, definitive data and content
- Users can find exactly what they need, with manageable result sets containing relevant and timely information
- Improved service availability and reliability, with appropriate business continuity and disaster recovery measures in place

- Applications are scalable and adaptable and meet the needs of changing House priorities for information access

## **6. Risks**

The programme will maintain a risk register and issue log that include all identified risks and issues for the programme. All projects within the programme will also maintain a risk register and issue log. Monthly monitoring of risks and issues will take place at both project and programme level. The following summary outlines the key risks identified for the programme. These risks are well known and form part of the status quo. A management strategy will be compiled to ensure that they do not have an adverse impact or to escalate issues.

### *PDP Delivery*

- PDP cutting back on its scope and leaving work uncompleted could mean that work identified for the PBP will need to be delayed or reprioritised. To date, this impact is one project, the Order Paper. If any further delays occur (Hansard) then the PDP project team will move and be managed/paid for by the PBP. This could impact on delivery of 13/14 prioritised PBP projects as they will not be able to start when scheduled.

### *Scope*

- Programme scope subject to creep
- Lack of clarity about requirements
- Deliverables do not meet user needs or are not fit for purpose
- Savings that could derive from potential projects are promised and accounted for before the relevant projects have been adequately scoped and given authorisation to proceed

### *Stakeholders*

- Lack of agreement on priorities/Competing priorities
- Lack of buy-in from stakeholders
- Disengagement among business users because of project timescales

### *Resources and budget*

- Lack of key personnel in departments and PICT
- Uncertainty over budget need
- Insufficient resources for projects because of competing demands

### *Interdependencies*

- Individual projects within the programme fail to dovetail with each other when necessary
- Delivery dates in concurrent programmes do not coincide
- Programme teams do not work together cohesively or communicate effectively

### *Timescales*

- New priorities set by each House or the Government disrupt programme
- Delays in individual projects or other programmes have an adverse impact

## **7. Interdependencies**

Where possible, projects concerning similar business areas and functions in both Houses will be run in parallel to ensure that there is minimal duplication of effort. Where business areas and functions differ between the two Houses, projects will be run in one House with a view to replicating good practice and

reusing any products that are developed. Early interdependencies have been identified and include: Procedural Data Programme delivery, the HoC Savings Programme, Select Committee Change Programme and the delivery of data.parliament.uk as a platform for applications. The Broadcasting/Audio Visual Programme also has the potential to be an interdependency with the possibility of Live Logging needing to deliver/be moved to that programme. Please see Appendix C for an outline of interdependencies.

## 8. Governance

It is proposed to form a small programme oversight board under the leadership of the two Clerks Assistant, comprising business owners as well as WIS/IS and PICT, but to leave to individual projects the greatest practicable freedom.

## 9. Financial Overview

An overview of the requested funding is shown below. Items in *italics* are unknown/estimated at this time.

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
<b>Programme staff</b>	597,000	597,000	597,000
Questions and Answers	500,000	164,000	
Bills	40,000/(39,000)*	<i>TBC (150,000est)</i>	
Select Committee Written Evidence	90,000		
Order Paper	100,000	100,000	
Select Committee Reports	25,000	<i>TBC(50,000est)</i>	
Divisions and Attendance (HoL)	150,000		
Divisions (HoC)		<i>TBC(100,000est)</i>	
Live Logging	25,000/(25,000)+		
E Tabling		<i>TBC(100,000est)</i>	
E Laying of SI			<i>TBC</i>
Print to Order		<i>TBC(150,000est)</i>	
EDMS		<i>TBC(125,000est)</i>	
Voice Recognition			<i>TBC</i>
PDP Spill Over	75,000		
Capital Costs-Estimate across projects	50,000	50,000	50,000
<b>Total</b>	1,716,000	<b>911,000 (known) 1,600,000 (est)</b>	

\* Additional Bills budget could be allocated if project shows need and monies are not needed elsewhere

+ Live Logging will be granted £25k now to do initial works that will help inform Broadcasting Programme. Additional £25k could be made available at a later date

Assumptions for financials:

- The priority of projects could change and will be re-evaluated each year.
- New requirements could be identified in year if, after evaluation, life cycle management work is deemed to be too large to carry out without project rigours. These projects will then be prioritised against others in the programme and some may be discontinued/paused
- The Project Manager, BA and PSO costs for Q&A have been subtracted from the project cost and included in the Programme Team cost as have the resources estimates for Bills.
- All estimates will be evaluated after further requirements are gathered and reassessed.

- Programme Staff comprises: 2 x A2 Project Managers, 1 A2 Business Analyst, 3 x B1 Business Analysts, 1 B2 Programme Support Officer, 1 Contract Architect, 1 Contract Development Manager.
- **Ongoing costs are unknown at this time; it is assumed that the current funding for the House Applications Team and BAU Development team will not need to increase. If at PID stage it is necessary then additional monies for these costs may need to be bid for.**

## 10. Assumptions

The following assumptions underpin the portfolio:

- The majority of systems will require bespoke development, but COTS (Commercial Off The Shelf) packages will be incorporated into development where possible. Projects will be managed overall by PICT, but it is assumed that development work will be a mixture of outsourced and in house development.
- Where both Houses have similar requirements, they will work together on a joint system. Where their requirements differ in comparable business areas, PICT will provide a solution that has a common foundation, but different specifics to provide for the requirements of each House.
- The programme/portfolio will be delivered in line with the ICT strategy.
- No funding for backfill of any business involvement has been proposed for the portfolio/programme. If necessary each project will request funding for business area backfill.
- The normal HoC:HoL cost distribution of 75:25 will be used.
- Risk and contingency have not been included but are estimated to be +/-20%.
- Estimated development costs are based on engaging third party contractors as opposed to day rate contractors, a departure from the current resourcing model. This may need to be reevaluated if unsuccessful. The benefits of using third parties to do pieces of development work mean that we do not have to have day rate contractors that are guaranteed to be here for x number of months at y costs. In this model we “send out” pieces of work that can be completed for a contracted price and incorporate this back into the total build.

## 11. Options

The crop of projects for 13/14 have no tolerance for non delivery at this time. They may be able to decrease delivery costs but this will be unknown until PID stage. This applies to Bills, Live Logging, and Divisions. At this time it is highly unlikely that it is possible to descope any projects due to the nature of their deliverables and especially not the Select Committee and Order Paper projects as they have already been moved from 12/13 to complete delivery. Questions and Answers has a robust and achievable business case and has reconfirmed its funding needs.

## 12. Recommendations

The recommendation is for PICTAB to approve the Parliamentary Business Programme portfolio to continue and to:

- Confirm funding for 2013/14 programme project delivery in the amount of: £1,716,000. This Business Case has indicative costings for future years but is only requesting at this time for funding for 2013/14



## 13. Annexes

### Annex A: Dossier of Projects 2013/14

#### 1. Questions and Answers- HoC and HoL

This is Year 2 of the project. It has received full business case funding but will be reviewed at regular intervals to ensure it is on track for delivery.

#### 2. Bills – HoC and HoL

**Overview:** The aim is to ensure that Parliament is in line with the Open Data agenda for one of its highest profile outputs. It takes a holistic approach to the lifecycle of legislation, covering Parliamentary Counsel, both Houses and The National Archive. The project will simplify the process of producing amendments and will create better electronic outputs. Enhancing the electronic production of bills and associated documents to enable the production of high-quality XML would meet the strategic objectives of the two Houses in a number of ways, in particular in terms of public access and print to web. The Scottish Office of Parliamentary Counsel and the Scottish Parliament, having the same requirements at the same time, have expressed an interest in working together on this project thus sharing costs and resources.

*Estimated cost: £40,000 13/14 to finish off Pilot 1 work. Further £39,000 could be made available.*

#### 3. Select Committee Reports –HoL and HoC

**Overview:** This project would enable the transformation from the current report template to allow for indexing and publication on the website. It does not re-write the template or provide an XML based platform as originally set out.

*Estimated cost: £25,000 to make minimal changes to the current template*

**Business Area:** Committee Offices (both Houses)

**Legacy Systems/Apps:** – [REDACTED] upgraded to 2003 then upgraded to 2007 & includes VBA

**Why change?** [REDACTED] authoring has been adequate for the print requirements of Committee Reports for many years. However, reliance on [REDACTED] templates leaves Parliament dependent on the upgrades and support lifecycles dictated by [REDACTED]. A production process that is mainly print-based does not adequately support the various electronic means of consuming parliamentary data, making it more difficult, time-consuming, expensive and unpredictable to display the information in non-paper formats. The HTML versions of the documents are split down into sections but this is inadequate and

could be more granular. Another potential requirement which is not currently catered for is the better use of multimedia and linking to webcasted evidence sessions, other submitted evidence that is not written and better linking to government sites

*What will the project do?* Create a transform module to the current template to allow for indexing and digital publication.

*What are the key interdependencies?* The new information will need to be compatible with CPIMF for indexing and search purposes. Possible interdependency with work that will be undertaken by the HoC Committee Change Programme

*Risk to not doing?* Current Word templates may become unusable with upgrades to basic Office suite. Electronic outputs are unsatisfactory or inadequate. They meet the brief for producing printable reports with a good, well understood workflow but require additional metadata to be added to the documents either in the word file or the PDF to enable better search results at the very minimum.

#### 4. **Select Committee Written Evidence – HoC (potential reuse in HoL)**

*Overview:* The PBP attempted to develop a web portal for use in the submission of written evidence to Committees. The pilot portal was successful and the intention is roll it out to all Committees. Unfortunately it has not been possible to engage the resources needed to complete in FY 12/13 so this will continue into 13/14 and complete roll out by October 2013.

*Estimate:* 90,000k to be spent on contract development resources

#### 5. **Divisions and Attendance – HoL (potential reuse in HoC)**

*Overview* Attendance data is captured by Doorkeepers and Clerks crossing names off lists with pen and paper. Division data is captured by Clerks crossing names off Division lists in the Lobby. This project would introduce a system of capturing this information electronically, using the Members' security passes.

*Estimated cost:* £150,000

*Business Area:* Journal Office (HoL)

*Legacy Systems/Apps:* The same technology is currently used to capture both divisions and attendances. Both systems are supported by specialist software supplied and supported by an external supplier, [REDACTED]

*Why change?* Problems with attendance-related payments to Members in recent years have highlighted the fragile nature of the current manual system of capture. An electronic system that put the onus on the Member to register their own attendance would be more robust and defensible as well as less labour-intensive. On Divisions, there is increasing demand within the House for a new means of capturing and publicising voting information accurately and in a more timely way. Use of pass access cards for other purposes will encourage more reliable use of passes.

*What will the project do?* The project will create a simple method for Members to register their own daily attendance at designated terminals, based on the handheld card readers currently in use by the police. It will also propose a system for using the same technology to register votes in Divisions, subject to formal approval of the change by the House.

*What are the key interdependencies?* This is a major change in the way the House votes and records attendance; it would be subject to a vote and could possibly be derailed at any point.

*Risk to not doing?* The current process and hardware works but is slow and not overly reliable. In the next three to four years a refresh will be necessary.

## **6. Live Logging – HoC and HoL**

*Overview* There is increasing interest, particularly from the Broadcasting Unit and the Committee Office, in using live, timestamped information about what is happening in the Chambers and Committees to provide a richer, better indexed audio visual experience for end users. HoL Hansard already use a laptop to create a log of most of their Select Committees, creating a skeleton around which the rest of the transcript can be filled in.

*Estimated cost:* £25k for the first phase, with a further £25k for a second phase later in the year.

*Business Area:* Official Report (HoC and HoL) and Committee Office (HoC). Broadcast Unit also interested.

*Legacy Systems/Apps:* Various pen and paper or laptop-based systems for recording names and events. Intention is to build on the functionality of new HRS.

*Why change?* A project was originally proposed, under the Commons Savings Programme, to unify the operation of microphones in Select Committees with the creation of an electronic log. After investigation and prioritisation, it was felt that the likely scope and cost of this was too great to justify the level of savings, much of which could be obtained by other means. However, the principle of creating an electronic log is now well established in House of Lords Select Committees, where it has been found to save time in the overall transcription effort. There is also significant interest from other potential users in the possibility of creating a live output that could facilitate better video indexing and richer services to join up text and video.

*What will the project do?* Building on the functionality of HRS2, the project will create a module in which the operator can record in real time the names of all speakers, notes about their contributions and any procedural events that happen. All these events will be timestamped so that the output can be reused not only by Hansard, as a skeleton around which the transcript can be created, but by other users who wish to create links to specific parts of the video output, or between the video and the transcript. The first phase would create the basic operating tool. The second phase would look at ways of providing the output for reuse.

*What are the key interdependencies?* Linking up with the microphone operating system is unlikely to be part of this year's work, but is still a viable proposition for future investigation. Other interdependencies with the webcasting system, the Official Report business processes, 3<sup>rd</sup> party contractors to Official Report, and Committee Office business processes.

*Risk to not doing?* There is no direct risk associated with not doing this. However, it is an enabler for potential better services in the future. The demand for better information and more accurate timestamping for video linking will only grow in the future. Failing to start down this path could leave Parliament with more catching up to do in the future.

## **7. Order Paper - HoC**

*Overview:* The Commons Order Paper project was originally part of the PDP, but a decision was taken in autumn 2012 to remove it from that programme and incorporate it into the new PBP.

Estimated cost: £100,000 in 13-14, with a further £100,000 in 14-15 to complete the project.

Business Area: Table Office - HoC

Legacy Systems/Apps: Existing Order Paper system; new PDP-created Commons Business Papers applications.

Why change? The other applications for creating Commons Business Papers have been replaced by the PDP with a joined-up, XML-based workflow in which data can be reused between one system and another. The Order Paper is the missing piece in this jigsaw.

What will the project do? Replace the current [REDACTED] based system for authoring the Commons Order Paper with an XML-based system built on the same principles as the other PDP applications. The PDP is shutting down the project but ensuring that it can be quickly resurrected in August. It is likely that this project will go over the 13/14 FY into 14/15.

What are the key interdependencies? Other systems that were developed in the Commons Business Papers strand of the PDP.

Risk to not doing? The Order Paper is central to the entire Business Papers output in the Commons. Although the PDP closes in spring 2013, its benefits will not be fully realised without the completion of this project.

#### **8. PDP Spillover/System Optimisation**

Overview: The PDP is currently on track to deliver the remaining projects left in the programme. At this time it is not anticipated to require more time/funds to deliver. Rather than keep the programme running if there were to be unfinished pieces of work they would be taken up by the PBP. Some re-prioritisation of planned PBP work would need to occur. It is also possible that products may need further bedding in periods to ensure systems recently developed are fully functional and deliver the processes and benefits required by the houses. This system optimisation will most likely be needed in Q2 of 13/14.

Estimate: 50,000-70,000 will be held aside, if not needed it will be reallocated to Bills/Live Logging

## Annex B

### Financial Spreadsheet

Cash Costs and Benefits	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total
Total Costs							
- Resource	(469,200)	(1,716,000)	(861,000)	(597,000)	0	0	(3,643,200)
- Capital	0	50,000	(50,000)	(50,000)	0	0	(50,000)
Total Benefits	0	0	330,000	467,000	467,000	467,000	1,731,000
Cashflow	(469,200)	(1,666,000)	(581,000)	(180,000)	467,000	467,000	(1,962,200)
Discount factor	1.00	0.97	0.93	0.90	0.87	0.84	
Present Value	(469,200)	(1,609,662)	(542,370)	(162,350)	406,964	393,201	(1,983,416)

- Costs for 14/15 have not yet been defined but areas of work have been identified
- Further analysis and prioritization to occur in 13/14 for all remaining years
- **On costs for 13/14 will be identified at project PID stage**

