



# SPIT Review Project

## Summary Business Case

This summary business case focuses on the two agreed alternative options for reimplementation of an SPIT system for the Isle of Wight Council SP Team. The full business case is in the project file.

1	Overview .....	9
2	Objectives of the Summary Business Case .....	9
3	Options Available .....	9
4	Costs and Sources of Funding .....	10
5	Project Timescale .....	13
6	Key Decision Factors .....	13
	Appendix A – Functional Comparison .....	15

## 1 Overview

1.1 IWC's Supporting People Team are reviewing the requirement for a Supporting People Local System, possibly to replace the existing system, CareSupport. This business case focuses on the preferred alternative options for provision of an SPIT system to IWC's SP team. *This is a summary business case. The full business case is in the project file.*

## 2 Objectives of the Summary Business Case

3.1 Summary Business Case Objectives are to identify:

- the two preferred options for provision of an SPIT system for IWC's Supporting People team.
- the costs associated with the alternative options
- the fitness for purpose of the alternative options
- the key facts needed to make a decision in favour of one of the alternatives

## 3 Options Available

### 3.1 Option Summary

The preferred options available to the SPIT Review project board are:

- Abandon CareSupport and purchase the SP module of the SWIFT package from Anite Ltd.
- Abandon CareSupport and purchase the SPOCC system from OCC Ltd

The options are scored for functionality (Appendix A) and costs.

### 3.2 Purchase the SP module of the SWIFT package from Anite Ltd (Option A)

3.2.1 Anite's SWIFT social care package is being rolled out in IW Social Services. The implementation project is due to run to 2005 and by completion will have approx 900 users, mainly in IWC Social Services. SWIFT is an ORACLE forms based product (similar to CareSupport) and is in use with a wide number of LA's. A number of Supporting People AA's have purchased the SWIFT SP package which like CareSupport can be implemented either standalone or as an integral part of SWIFT.

3.2.2 SP team have informally reviewed SWIFT SP at Brooklyn House and at Portsmouth CC. A formal review of the product with assistance from Anite Ltd took place on 20<sup>th</sup> July. The functional comparison scores are at Appendix A. The SP Team's current impression SWIFT SP is that it appears in all respects to fall midway between CareSupport and SPOCC. It is better laid out than CareSupport and easier to navigate. Functions appear to be reasonably intuitive and will be familiar in concept to SP team users. Reservations re SWIFT SP as of 20/7/04 (i.e. after formal review) primarily relate to provider payments and MIS reports.

3.2.3 Rollout of SWIFT to IWC SP team would not happen until late 2004 (30<sup>th</sup> September is go live for Phases 1- 5 of the current implementation) which is too late for Phase II returns due August 2004. It is believed however that the service review in spring 2005 is a more important target to hit.

3.2.4 Selection of SWIFT SP as the preferred IT solution for the SP team will place responsibility for implementation with the Social Services SWIFT team. The SP team will not have the same level of control over the implementation of the SWIFT SP system as they would have over an implementation of the OCC system.

3.2.5 For these reasons SWIFT is not preferred by the IWC SP Team.

### 3.3 Purchase the SPOCC system from OCC Ltd (Option B)

3.3.1 The SP system from Oxford Computer Consultants – 'SPOCC' has been seen onsite at West Sussex C.C. and Lambeth B.C. and has been demonstrated onsite to the SP team. It is a fully functioning SP system with a variety of advanced features not available on either the Anite or OLM systems. Navigation is easier and more intuitive and closer to the windows paradigm. The application is based on SQL\*Server and .net and is e-gif compliant

3.3.2 OCC are a comparatively small company specialising in technical systems implementation across a range of services (as opposed to being a specialist product provider). They formed a consortium with twelve AA's to produce an SP system in 2002, and have to date sold the product – SPOCC – to 20 AA's.

3.3.3 Three key features of the SPOCC system not available on either Anite Swift or CareSupport are:

- Ability to determine full cost breakdown of provider remittances in advance of print runs
- Implementation *now* of Phase II and strategy returns to ODPM
- Internet based download/upload of workbooks to providers with data checking, to speed up QAF, Phase II etc return functions. OCC have been selected as a partner in an EEC e-government project specifically because of this additional functionality.

This option is preferred by the SP Team.

## 4 Costs and Sources of Funding

### 4.1 Sources of Funding

The project can be part funded from £107,979 currently accumulated into 478V (2004-05). The remainder will need to be funded from the Supporting People team's administration budget and other to-be-identified sources.

SPIT Relaunch	2004/5	recurrent	Total 2004/5	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	Total
<b>SOURCES</b> In 478V now	52,079		52,079					<b>52,079</b>
<b>OF</b> additional unspent from 2003/04	5,900		5,900					<b>5,900</b>
<b>FUNDING</b> Contribution to 478V from SP team	10,000		10,000	-	10,000	10,000	10,000	<b>40,000</b>
Contribution from ODPM	40,000		40,000					<b>40,000</b>
Administrative support	-	19,100	19,100	19,482	19,872	20,269	20,674	<b>99,397</b>
DSL Savings				450	450	450	450	<b>1,800</b>
<b>Total known income</b>	<b>107,979</b>	<b>19,100</b>	<b>127,079</b>	<b>19,932</b>	<b>30,322</b>	<b>30,719</b>	<b>31,124</b>	<b>239,176</b>

**4.2 Contract Costs**

The SWIFT project board wants to compare contract costs, as opposed to Gross, Net costs (see below)

**CONTRACT and PROMISED COSTS**

Anite Ltd have promised to match or near match OCC's costs. Graham Taylor, Anite Ltd, is to confirm the Promised costs.

The interface costs comprise the upper limit cost proposed by OCC Ltd plus the various items identified by Anite Ltd. These interface costs are not identified in the SWIFT Implementation project costs and are new costs to the project.

Items	SPOCC Capital	Contract		Annual Maint.	Promised	
		Annual Maint.	SWIFT Capital		SWIFT Capital	Annual Maint.
Application	35,844		40,000		35,844	
Annual Warranty		5,480	3,000	2,360	inc	5,480
Implementation	inc		32,500		inc	
Training	inc		1,500		inc	
Business Objects	-----		3,000		inc	inc
Universe	-----		1,000		inc	inc
Annual Warranty	-----			1,500	inc	inc
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,844</b>	<b>5,480</b>	<b>81,000</b>	<b>3,860</b>	<b>35,844</b>	<b>5,480</b>

<b>Interface</b>	4,000					
SWIFT Fiorano Integration Hub					25,000	
2 x Channel adaptors					6,000	
SP XML API to include core API's					10,000	
Annual Mtce.						8,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,000</b>				<b>41,000</b>	<b>8,200</b>

The above items (Fiorano and 1 channel adapter) would be re-used in other integration projects

**4.3 Gross, Net Costs, required extra income**

The costs associated with the four options identified above are summarised below with Sources of Funding to give net costs – i.e. required extra income, over five years.

<b>GROSS COSTS</b>		<b>2004/55 recurrent</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total 2004/5</b>	<b>2005/6</b>	<b>2006/7</b>	<b>2007/8</b>	<b>2008/9</b>	<b>Total</b>		
CareSupport	Totals	0		116,748	97,880	90,454	73,040	73,638	451,760		
Do_Nothing	Totals	0		101,907	19,482	19,872	20,269	20,674	182,204		
SPOCC	Totals	0		158,689	44,468	69,858	52,255	52,660	377,930		
SWIFT	Totals	0		218,886	82,298	74,688	57,085	57,490	490,447		
<b>Total known income</b>		<b>107,979</b>	<b>19,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127,079</b>	<b>19,932</b>	<b>30,322</b>	<b>30,719</b>	<b>31,124</b>	<b>239,176</b>	
<b>NET COSTS (income - gross cost = shortfall in budget 478V = what needs to be found including OLM exit costs)</b>									<b>avg p.a reqd</b>		
CareSupport	Totals			10,331	(77,948)	(60,133)	(42,321)	(42,514)	(212,584)	42,517	
Do_Nothing	Totals			25,172	450	10,450	10,450	10,450	56,972	(11,394)	
SPOCC	Preferred Option			(31,610)	(24,536)	(39,536)	(21,536)	(21,536)	(138,754)	27,751	
SWIFT	Totals			(91,807)	(62,366)	(44,366)	(26,366)	(26,366)	(251,271)	50,254	
<b>TOTAL WANTED</b>											
SPOCC	Preferred Option	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(31,610)</b>	<b>(24,536)</b>	<b>(39,536)</b>	<b>(21,536)</b>	<b>(21,536)</b>	<b>(138,754)</b>	<b>27,751</b>

4.4 Full costs and associated assumptions are in [SPIT - example of costs.xls](#) and [supporting\\_people\\_relaunch.doc](#)

## 5 Project Timescale

### 5.1 Option A: Purchase the SP module of the SWIFT package from Anite Ltd.

- Closedown OLM contract - Summer 2004
- Implement SWIFT/SP system - October 2004
- Phase II data technician in place- August 2004
- Train staff - October 2004
- Reload database - October 2004
- Go live provider payments - November 2004
- Phase II - October 2004

### 5.2 Option 3: Abandon CareSupport and purchase the SPOCC system from OCC Ltd

- Closedown OLM contract - Summer 2004
- Implement SPOCC system - Aug/Sept 2004
- Reload database - Aug/Sept 2004
- Train staff - Aug/Sept 2004
- Go live provider payments - Oct 2004
- Phase II - Nov 2004
- E-gov rollout to providers - spring 2005

## 6 Key Facts

### 6.1 Time, Cost, Quality

6.1.1 *The key deadline is May 2005, when IWC Social Services is due to be audited. Both alternatives can be up and running by then. Time is therefore not a critical factor.*

6.1.2 *Anite Ltd state that they will match OCC costs. This needs to be confirmed by contract. Capital project costs including exit costs from the OLM Ltd contract can be met by existing budget provision. aCost is therefore not a critical factor. Note revenue costs are yet to be budgeted.*

6.1.3 *Both alternatives have quality advantages: SWIFT SP can be expected to interoperate seamlessly with other SWIFT modules, whereas SPOCC has better general functionality and specifically better MIS, payment and service review functions.*

### 6.2 Decision Factors

6.2.1 *The Director of Social Services, Glen Garrod, states that seamless integration of social care services must be worked towards by all parties.*

6.2.2 *If there are agreed, budgeted plans in place for integration of Supporting People with Social Services and other social care organisations then the opportunity to provide an integrated back office system to the SP team must be taken and the SP team should purchase the SWIFT SP system.*

6.2.3 *If these plans are not in place then a decision cannot be based on them. The SP team should purchase the system which best suits their specific requirements, which is SPOCC.*

### 6.3 Exit from OLM Ltd Contract

6.3.1 *Both identified options depend on successful withdrawal from the OLM Ltd contract for CareSupport.*





**Appendix A – Functional Comparison**

<b>Function Comparison</b>		<b>Averaged Scores</b>	
<i>Marks out of 5</i>		<i>SPOCC</i>	<i>SWIFT</i>
<b>Major Functions</b>			
Provider Payments	setup subsidy payments/user	3	2
	calculate payments	5	3
	view payments to date	4	3
	authorise payments	3	3
	revise payments	4	3
	print remittances	3	2
	interface with Finance systems	3	1
Client Register	comprehensive details	4	3
	client payment history	4	3
Contracts	schedule generation	4	3
	warnings, contact details	4	3
Services/Reviews	KPI	5	2
	workbooks	4	1
	QAF	5	1
Communications		3	3
Contacts/Organisations		3	3
MIS	general (reports etc)	4	1
	Strategy	5	1
Phase II	Ph II reports	5	2
	Provider interface	5	1
<b>General Quality Comparisons</b>			
DB	Oracle v SQL*Server	2	2
	DBA Support	2	2
Ease of Use	Navigation	4	3
	Number of screens	4	3
	Windows Compatible	4	3
	Delete/tab/wildcards etc	4	4
	Print	3	3
	Attachments	4	2
	error messages	4	2
Reporting tools	Business Objects	1	2
	MS-Access	2	1
	Data Model	1	1
Security	User Management	2	2
	Audit Trail	3	1
Company	Helpdesk	4	3
	Consultancy	4	1
Architecture	XML	1	0
	BS7666	1	1
	e-gif	2	1
Performance	general screen refresh	3	3
	reporting	3	1
<b>Totals</b>		<b>137</b>	<b>79</b>
0 <i>doesn't have</i>			
1 <i>poor</i>			
2 <i>ok</i>			
3 <i>good</i>			
4 <i>very good</i>			
5 <i>world class</i>			
205 <i>possible maximum score</i>			