



RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

2 SEPTEMBER 2004

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX</u>	<u>REPORT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
A	MINUTES OF 27 JULY MEETING	TO FOLLOW
B	ON-LINE PAYMENTS – COMPARATIVE INCOME VOLUMES	1
C	ON-LINE PAYMENTS – CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL FORM	2
D	INFORMATION STRATEGY MEMBER WORKING GROUP – MINUTES	6
E	PERSONNEL STRATEGY MEMBER WORKING GROUP - MINUTES	9

Income volumes in the 2003/04 financial year

Receipt Type	Council Tax	NNDR	Rents	Housing Advances	Sundry Debtors	Other Receipts	Totals
Postal receipts	16,666	2,997	1,597	65	2,316	94	23,735
Counter receipts	17,739	745	17,685	42	1,508	13,650	51,369
Direct Debit	186,435	10,832		298	5,433	13,115	216,113
Standing Orders	5,323	642	17,814	36	349		24,164
Post Office receipts	20,247	192	35,240		379		56,058
Bank tape/statement	12,891	1,013	1	22	662	40	14,629
Telephone payments	3,707	144	724	1	149	1,032	5,757
Interactive Voice Response (by telephone)	1,104	4	94		51		1,253
Internet Payments	1,825	1	48		12		1,886
Totals	265,937	16,570	73,203	464	10,859	27,931	394,964

Income volumes in the 1999/2000 financial year

Receipt Type	Council Tax	NNDR	Rents	Housing Advances	Sundry Debtors	Other Receipts	Totals
Postal receipts	21,285	3,968	2,159	88	3,708	110	31,318
Counter receipts	20,694	776	20,048	103	1,808	13,264	56,693
Direct Debit	173,477	9,967	0	554	4,291	21,429	209,718
Standing Orders	3,651	519	15,753	438	443		20,804
Post Office receipts	25,947	186	45,284	0	570	0	71,987
Bank tape/statement	16,177	1,613	7	30	817		18,644
Telephone payments							0
Interactive Voice Response (by telephone)							0
Internet Payments							0
Totals	261,231	17,029	83,251	1,213	11,637	34,803	409,164

Change in volumes between the 1999/2000 and the 2003/04 financial years

Receipt Type	Council Tax	NNDR	Rents	Housing Advances	Sundry Debtors	Other Receipts	Totals
Postal receipts	-4,619	-971	-562	-23	-1,392	-16	-7,583
Counter receipts	-2,955	-31	-2,363	-61	-300	386	-5,324
Direct Debit	12,958	865	0	-256	1,142	-8,314	6,395
Standing Orders	1,672	123	2,061	-402	-94	0	3,360
Post Office receipts	-5,700	6	-10,044	0	-191	0	-15,929
Bank tape/statement	-3,286	-600	-6	-8	-155	40	-4,015
Telephone payments	3,707	144	724	1	149	1,032	5,757
Interactive Voice Response (by telephone)	1,104	4	94	0	51	0	1,253
Internet Payments	1,825	1	48	0	12	0	1,886
Totals	4,706	-459	-10,048	-749	-778	-6,872	-14,200

CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL

Project Name ON-LINE PAYMENTS

Brief Description of Scheme
UPGRADING THE CASH RECEIVING SYSTEM (PARIS) TO
ACCEPT NEW-INOICED ONLINE PAYMENTS

Proposed start date SEP 2004

Length of Project ONE MONTH

Type of project

<input type="checkbox"/>	New
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Refurbishment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Replacement

Is scheme a result of legal/statutory requirements Yes No
 (If yes please specify)
NO - BUT DOES HELP IMPROVE IEG TARGETS

Is scheme a result of stakeholder consultation Yes No
 (If yes please specify)
NO

What are the Council policies/objectives affecting this scheme
YOUTH STRATEGY
IMPLEMENTING E-GOVERNANCE
COUNCIL'S POSITION STATEMENT (ONLINE BUSINESS ELECTRONICALLY)

What are the aims/objectives affecting this scheme
FACILITATE ON-LINE BANKING.

CAPITAL PROJECT APPRAISAL

What are the expected outcomes

What other options have been considered

USE OF THIRD PARTY SOFTWARE

Reasons for pursuing this option

COST AND ABILITY TO FULLY INTEGRATE FROM AND
WITH OUR EXISTING SYSTEMS.

What would be the consequences of not undertaking /delaying the scheme

INABILITY TO ACHIEVE GOVERNANCE POLICIES/OBJECTIVES.

What are the Risk Management Issues in pursuing this scheme

(Managerial, Financial, Operational etc. Please list)

STABILITY OF SOFTWARE SUPPLIER - VENDOR RISK IN USE BY COUNCIL AGENCIES
FUNCTIONALITY OF SOFTWARE - IN USE ON OTHER SITES
LARGE USE - NO SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL HONORARY COSTS BUT INSUFFICIENT
INVESTMENT
INABILITY TO INTEGRATE WITH EXISTING SYSTEMS - INTEGRATE CHANGE CONTROL USE

Signed [Signature] Project Officer Date 23 AUG 2004

Signed [Signature] Chief Officer Date 23.8.04

Signed [Signature] Director of Finance Date 23/08/04

These forms must be completed in full and returned to the Director of Finance for signature and evaluation prior to submission to any Committee.

CAPITAL PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Score	Range of scores
Complies with Councils Corporate Objectives as set out in the Leaders Position Statement	40	40 Fully complies 20 Partly complies 0 Does not comply
Complies with Property Strategy	-	20 Complies 0 Does not comply
Complies with Service Objectives contained within the Best Value Performance Plan/Service Plan	10	10 Fully complies 5 Partly complies 0 Does not comply
Is necessary to comply with legislative requirements	0	20 Essential 10 Recommended 0 No requirement
Supports meeting a Contractual Obligation	0	20 Fully supports 15 Partly supports 0 Does not support
Is necessary in interests of safety	0	20 Essential 0 No safety issues
Necessary to avoid service breakdown	0	20 Essential 0 Not Essential
Necessary to avoid consequential financial losses	0	10 Essential to avoid 0 No losses
Produces identifiable revenue savings	0	10 Covers capital charges 5 Partly covers charges 0 No saving
Involves Partnership working	0	5 Involves partners 0 No partners
Total	30	Out of a possible 175

**Runnymede Borough Council
Information Strategy Member Working Group**

Agreed Action Notes of meeting held on Tuesday 27th July 2004

	Action By:
<p>Present: Cllrs Niall Thewlis, Lynda Gillham, Robert Ray, John Dean, Tim Williams, Nigel Watson, Basia Dobrzalska.</p> <p>Apologies: Roger Habgood, Hugh Meares, Adrian Tollett</p>	
<p>1. Replacement Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement schedule for hardware was delivered by Nigel Watson. • TFTs vs CRT screens were discussed- where space saving wasn't an issue and there were no DMS implications, CRT's were to be used in order to save money. The replacement schedule is to be updated to reflect this. • Cllr RR suggested CDRW instead of CDROMs. NW stated that staff were encouraged to save files on the central server which was backed up on a regular basis. 	NW
<p>2. Decriminalised Parking Computer Upgrade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An upgrade proposal for the handling of Decriminalised Parking Charges Notices was presented by Nigel Watson. • The SCC Runnymede Local Committee have decided to drop the name "Decriminalised Parking", feeling that it is an ambiguous title and could be misleading. They have substituted the name "On Street Parking Enforcement", not 'off-street parking' as previously recorded. • The solution was recommended as proposed. 	NW
<p>3. ICT Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Williams presented the ICT strategy questions spreadsheet. Members had requested this in order to assist in focusing on the key issues that ,once resolved, could inform the new strategy document. • It was suggested that Cllrs take this away and consider the content for further discussion again in September's meeting. Should there be any requirement for a more detailed exposition, Cllrs should contact NW or TW for further explanations. • NT suggested that there should be a strong business case for savings in each of the categories and LG suggested that service enhancements should be delivered. • TW stated that the technology should be cost effective, but built on corporate standards. NW said that it was crucial that there was a balance of cost and functionality. • LG asked if any of the systems can be implemented as stand-alone products. The electoral registration software is an example where this is largely true but even this application is having to be integrated with the property gazetteer. • NT said there should be long term cost savings in using a common 	All

<p>standard, possibly using XML to translate to the web.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NT asked about development of in-house applications, though the in-house resource to enable this to be deliver was discussed. NW said any applications developed must be well documented for quality reasons. NT said that we should look at outsourcing this resource. TW suggested that resource could be shared within a consortium. It was agreed that this approach should be investigated with a specific application to ascertain relative costs. NT said that we should be looking at the benefits between each of the consortium, outsource and 'off-the-shelf' products. • NT requested a snapshot of the current skills set and a gap analysis. • Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPs) were discussed and it was decided that they should not be pursued for their own sake, only where they would be relevant and justified in a Runnymede Borough Council context. • Service resilience was discussed. There are key services that require 100% service resilience. A further paper on this key aspect would come to the next meeting. • Officers would take away these initial views and welcome others from Group representatives. 	<p>NW</p> <p>NW</p> <p>NW Cllrs.</p>
<p>4. Implementing eGovernment (IEG)- Content Management System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigel Watson presented the results of the investigation in to the Content Management system, following the presentation delivered to the IT Working Group by Vignette on 14th July. • NT questioned the cost of the solution. NW said that the cost of this would be around £200K. There would be benefits with integration as Vignette provide the Document Management solution but it was noted that this integration was not available in the product. • NT would like to see a presentation of the Microsoft solution. He also suggested that Macromedia have a low-cost solution that should be considered. • TW highlighted that it is imperative that the supplier/s should be aware that additional costs are not acceptable once a solution has been chosen. • NW said that a decision has to be reached as soon as possible as time is running out if the IEG deadline is to be reached. • In order to permit a recommendation to be put forward to the September Corporate Management meeting it was agreed that a date for the Microsoft CMS demonstration would be fixed in mid August at a time most suitable for Councillors. NW asked members to provide availability dates for a 6pm demonstration. 	<p>NW</p> <p>NT</p>
<p>5. Implementing eGovernment (IEG)- Internet Payments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigel Watson presented the requirement for on-line secure payments. • Everyone was in agreement with the recommendations. 	
<p>6. Grounds Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigel Watson delivered the initial specification for a Grounds Maintenance system. • NT said that this may be developed as a database. NW said that this has been looked at and would cost £25k. NT said that other quotes should be obtained from other sources and it was agreed that this would be done. 	<p>NW</p>
<p>7. Agenda and Minutes PDF Documents</p>	

This will be delayed until the next meeting	
8. Any Other Business NT said that he was aware that Egham Leisure Centre computer system failed and would like to see a report regarding this. NW said that the infrastructure at Egham Leisure Centre will be investigated with a view to enhancing resilience and a written report provided for the meeting.	NW
9. Date of Next Meeting The date of the next meeting will be at 6.00pm on Tuesday 4th September 2004	All to note

Circulated by e-mail to:

Cllrs Niall Thewlis, Roger Habgood, Hugh Meares, Robert Ray, Lynda Gilham, Adrian Tollett and John Dean
Tim Williams, Nigel Watson, Basia Dobrzalska

RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PERSONNEL SERVICES MEMBER WORKING GROUP

7.30 p.m. Thursday 29th July 2004, Members Room, Civic Offices

In attendance: Councillors Linda Gillham, Roger Habgood, Rod Pate, Cherith Simmons & Peter Waddell. Chief Executive Officer, Tim Williams & Personnel Officer, David Thomas

1. Apologies for Absence

None

2. Minutes of Meeting 25th May 2004

Agreed

3. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Cllr. Pate queried the arrangements for protection of staff terms and conditions if as a result of job evaluation their post was downgraded.

The Personnel Officer explained that the protection arrangements that had been agreed by the Council were in line with recommended best practice and that permanent protection could result in the Council being liable under equal pay legislation.

4. The Greater London Job Evaluation Scheme

The Personnel Officer provided an update on progress to date.

Following the last meeting of the Working Group, GLPC had provided briefings for Staff and Members on 16th June. Approximately 120 had attended and a great deal of concern had been expressed by staff about the introduction of JE and potential implications following downgradings. A section had now been set up on the Intranet with details of the scheme and a questions and answers facility was to be introduced shortly.

On 28th and 29th June 12 staff had received training on the scheme.

Pilot testing of the scheme had commenced on 27th July involving a 10% sample of jobs. It was hoped that this would provide a representative indication of implications for the Council should the scheme be introduced.

The evaluations were being carried out by panels of three consisting of Management, Unison and Personnel representatives. Two panels were simultaneously undertaking evaluations in tandem and so far correlation of results was encouraging.

The Personnel Officer would bring back a report on the pilots in September.

5. Competencies and Performance Pay

The Personnel Officer presented a report on a recommended way forward that was based on findings by Tribal and feedback from Members, staff and Unison. The proposals were not radical but attempted to address the issue of providing a sharper focus for the scheme and creating a more obvious link with Council objectives.

Cllr. Waddell felt that an approach that was more dynamic and forward looking would be better suited to the Council's needs. A core list of around 10

competencies should be introduced, some just for managers. Each competency would have a range of performance indicators. A system ultimately internet or intranet based should be used. Cllr. Waddell gave a brief demonstration of such a system.

The competencies should be linked to the JE scheme, Council objectives and the new MCI standard. Examples of performance/behaviours that would and would not be expected should be provided.

The scheme should be phased in over a 2 – 3 year period with a pilot for senior managers in 2005 running in parallel with the current scheme. Focus groups should be used to develop the scheme.

It was agreed that it would not be appropriate to make any interim changes to the current scheme.

The CEO suggested that a detailed proposal be worked up and brought back for Members' consideration. This would include anticipated resource implications.

Cllr. Waddell offered to supply a draft framework for a specification for the project.

6. Staff Survey

Members agreed minor changes to the staff survey to be conducted in 2004.

These would include:

Removal of questions 3, 18 and 32

Changing question 30 to read 'past 12 months'

An additional question on identifying the individual's perception of the link between their work and the Council's objectives

An additional question to identify what more the Council could do to keep staff informed.

To include a summary of changes introduced as a result of the previous survey – 'You asked for – We did'

7. Any Other Business

None

8. Date of Next Meeting

7.30 p.m. Thursday 16th September