

Report Title:	Adult Social Care Case Management Project Update
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Del Campo
Meeting and Date:	Full Council 16th April 2024
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel Executive Director Adults Services & Health
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

The Adult Social Care case management system implementation project is working to replace the existing case management software used for Adult Social Care, known as PARIS. Mosaic is replacing an out of date system which is no longer fit for purpose and which poses significant IT security risks, while creating the platform for increased efficiency and self-service in the medium term. Once fully implemented, the new system will ensure staff have the tools to work more effectively and in line with national best practice while enabling tighter financial control on adult social care expenditure.

Following April 2023 Cabinet approval of the award of contract for the Mosaic case management system, teams across the council have commenced the design of the implementation. The project has successfully tested the migration strategy for client data and identified how the financial information will be loaded into the new system. Several workshops have also confirmed the proposed workflow for new activity in the system. The project continues to be on schedule for a go live date in October 2024, however much of the time contingency has been used to get to this stage.

The next phase of the project was planned with the majority of the implementation being done in house with limited external cost. With the range of other demands, this is not a workable approach in terms of the amount of resource required to deliver a project of this scale to the current delivery timescale. The project has quantified an additional budgetary cost of £1,022,000 to use external resources to deliver they project in line with the plan to complete in 2024. This figure includes contingency to ensure the project is able to respond to the potential issues that such a complex project may encounter as it moves into implementation.

This update report to Council provides an overview of progress to date on the implementation and seeks approval for the additional capital cost to ensure the successful implementation of the new system.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Full Council notes the report and:

Approves £1,022,000 capital allocation to ensure the successful implementation of the Adult Social Care case management system

project.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 The Mosaic implementation project is a broad programme of work impacting on several areas of the Council's statutory delivery. This includes adult social care operations and commissioning, performance and statutory reporting, income collection, invoicing and debt management/avoidance. The new software provides a work flow system which will improve risk management both in human and financial terms. It supports strength based approaches in line with national best practice and will enable residents to have greater control over their care and support as well as easier access to information and advice.

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
Council approves £1,022,000 of capital expenditure to ensure the successful implementation of the project This is the recommended option	This option supports the project to remain on track with provision of the key resources required to maintain progress.
Use existing council staff resources for the remaining work on the project. This is not recommended	The project team is a combination of external expertise, staff on secondment and those taking part in addition to their main role. There is insufficient capacity or the required skillsets across the staff cohort to take on the work to complete implementation in the current timescales.
Do Nothing This is not recommended	Should the project be stopped, the Council would face unknown costs to continue the use of PARIS with all of the risks previously identified when the project was started. Initially, the Council would still be liable for the cost of the new system without the means or ability to implement it.

- 2.2 The procurement activity for the new system resulted in a five-year contract for the supply of the system, and support for the initial implementation (£1,073,905) with Quicksilva acting on behalf of Access Group. The council has recruited a small team of specialist consultants, experienced in the migration and configuration of Case Management Systems to run the day-to-day project. This group, supported by staff from a range of teams, have driven the project forward within existing resources and the project has made timely progress. The project is divided into five workstreams and a summary of progress and next steps follows.

Operational Case Management Workstream: a joined-up collaboration between supplier, project team and the operational services completed the workflow review in November 2023 and the system changes were signed off in January 2024. The review of system forms and other configuration is in progress with the workstream

output, quality assurance and functional testing planned in May 2024. This will be followed by initial user acceptance testing (UAT) in June/July 2024.

Commissioning and Income Collection Workstream: the collaborative design workshops have mainly concluded and the system build document has been signed off and returned to the supplier for initial configuration. Although good progress has been made, some significant work remains to be completed including the interface development with the corporate finance system, and other integration pieces such as the provider portal and financial assessment tool. These are critical for increasing efficiency and giving resident greater transparency and control over their care and support. Additional capacity will be deployed to keep this workstream on track.

Migration and Data Quality Workstream: significant progress has been made on data quality in relation to the client data migrating from PARIS to Mosaic, with three successful migration loads completed with high levels of successful progress. The fourth load is crucial to the project as it is the first time that client, commissioning and finance data comes together. There has been a short delay to the fourth load due to the need for specific extraction tools as well as an interface with the commissioning and income collection workstream which has experienced some supplier delays.

The migration workstream is resource intensive and important to get right. The migration loads highlight any data compatibility problems as well as data gaps and each load is followed by an analysis of successes and issues and corrective work where needed. Although the migration loads have been largely successfully the huge amount of data to be migrated means that there is inevitably considerable analysis and correction activity required and steps taken to maximise the chance of the overall load being successful.

Training Workstream: The training strategy has been signed off and planning is in progress. Staff involved in the implementation are looking forward to the new system which offers great benefits in accurate and timely recording and reporting. This workstream will need some additional resource as we near project go-live, much of this will be available in house with additional training and support and there are likely to be as yet unquantified opportunity costs as the use of the system beds down.

Performance and Reporting Workstream: this workstream has not yet started because of the specific skills needed for this work which are not available in house. This workstream will ensure that managers at all levels have the tools they need to provide statutory data returns and make day-to-day decisions about the care provided to our residents.

- 2.3 Although the Mosaic project has had its own governance board since delivery began, a refreshed and strengthened Corporate Governance structure for major projects - which includes reporting through to the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) - was agreed in late 2023 and will commence in April 2024. This will ensure that existing transformation projects of this scale across the organisation provide reporting not only on implementation progress but also on budget and resource performance, in line with the new, strengthened corporate governance requirements. This will provide the overarching Governance of the RBWM Future Shape programme.
- 2.4 The departure of key staff, along with delays in the project caused by supplier resource issues has meant that quantifying the additional cost position of the project took most of the first quarter of 2024. It was, therefore, not possible to include the revised cost position with confidence in the annual budget report to Council in February. The current capital allocation is fully committed at the end of March 2024, given the five year contract with the supplier.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The project has used most of its time contingency during the procurement and technical commissioning phase which means any further delay is a risk to the planned go live date in October 2024. Planning to continue to use internal resources as it becomes available is incompatible with remaining on track while delivering all other priorities.
- 3.2 The migration workstream is particularly dependant on the interaction with a range of third-party suppliers. This collaboration is essential to be keeping the project on track, and should there be a pause in funding, it is likely that the external project resources would need to find alternative work meaning the project would face an extended delay and significantly more costs.

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Council allocate the requested capital allocation	Project delivery will miss go live date in 2024 incurring further, unquantified costs	Implementation of current phase of Mosaic project is back on track	N/A	N/A	16 th April 2024

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The current phase of the project has committed £1,073,905 to the cost of the software and related computer systems. To the end of March 2024, a further £409,365 has been spent on the people and tools to develop the migration strategy, establish the workflow design and start planning the financial interfaces.
- 4.2 In March 2024, Cabinet approved an urgent item to approve £60,574 of capital expenditure for resources to be deployed in April 2024 to avoid delays to the project that would incur further costs later in the project. This item was taken with the agreement of the Chair of People Overview & Scrutiny, as it was not on the forward plan for 28 days and was seeking a decision outside of the approved budget without time for a Council meeting to be arranged over the Easter period.
- 4.3 Appendix 1 includes a summary of the five year project budget. This indicates a total capital budget estimate of £2,432,109 for the implementation of the project. As the existing budget, including the additional amount mentioned above, is £1,410,274 this is a capital budget increase of £1,022,000, capital which would be funded by borrowing. The revenue impact in the table below represents the annual Minimum Revenue Provision impact, on the assumption the IT asset is depreciated over 5 years.

Table 3: Financial impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Additional total	£0	£0	£204,400
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£204,400

CAPITAL COSTS	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Additional total	£0	£1,022,000	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£1,022,000	£0

4.4 It is expected that £782,000 will be required to complete the project should no further delays be encountered, and there is a further provision of £240,000 should the go live date be delayed by up to 12 weeks. The Programme Board will be monitoring budget and timescale on a monthly basis for the remainder of the project. Once the Mosaic system operationally replaces PARIS, there will be a review of the ongoing revenue budget to ensure that the medium term plan has the appropriate charges to capital and/or revenue, including the Minimum Revenue Provision.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 This paper is seeking Cabinet approval to make a capital allocation outside of the allocated capital programme. The Constitution requires this to be a decision of Full Council.

5.2 Cabinet used the urgency provision within the Constitution, with the approval of the Chair of People Overview & Scrutiny, to make the minimum necessary additional budget allocation for April as it was impractical to establish a Full Council meeting over the Easter period.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The risk table relates only to the decision of this report, not all of the risks related to the project. These are covered by the project governance.

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Threat or risk	Impact with no mitigations in place or if all mitigations fail	Likelihood of risk occurring with no mitigations in place.	Mitigations currently in place	Mitigations proposed	Impact of risk once all mitigations in place and working	Likelihood of risk occurring with all mitigations in place.
Budget/ Funding: There is a risk that without funding, the project will be delayed or cancelled which could result in losing all of the benefits and assurances offered by the new system.	Extreme 4	Very likely There is a very strong chance this risk will occur	None - cost options or resourcing have been exhausted	No other viable option	Moderate 2	Unlikely – With funding, external resource can be secured and the project will move forward towards completion.

<p>Project Resource: There is a risk that without adequate resource to support the implementation the project will be delayed further leading to additional cost. External resources will seek alternative job if funding cannot be secured</p>	<p>Extreme 4</p>	<p>Very likely – this risk is linked to the budget risk and there is a very strong chance this risk will occur</p>	<p>None - utilised all available resources as far as possible.</p>	<p>Funding for additional resources proposed to mitigate the risk.</p>	<p>Moderate 2</p>	<p>Unlikely – with funding the external resource can be secured in a timely manner.</p>
<p>Supplier delays or additional supplier cost: There is a risk that if the proposed go-live date is not achieved as a result of not securing the funding, the supplier may request additional payment for consultancy cost</p>	<p>Moderate 3</p>	<p>Likely</p>	<p>Supplier caused some delays to the Finance workshops and are aware they has an impact on the overall project delivery and as such should bear some of the burden caused.</p>	<p>To continue to engage with the supplier through the weekly PM to PM meetings and at monthly Transformation Board meetings</p>	<p>Moderate 2</p>	<p>Unlikely – The estimated resources should enable the project to maintain it's time projection within the estimates agreed with the supplier.</p>

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. EQIA previously completed in respect of the project as a whole. No unmitigated risks identified when completing the EQIA screening on this decision.
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. No impact from this decision.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. No impacts. A Privacy Impact Assessment was completed as part of the original contract approval.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Not applicable for this decision

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 The full implementation stages are set out in table 5.

Table 5: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
Immediately	If approved, existing contracts will be extended and staff with the required expertise will be recruited.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by 1 appendix:

- Appendix A-Project budget estimate
- Appendix B – EQIA screening

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 There are no background documents to this report

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>	
Elizabeth Griffiths	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	02/04/24	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	02/04/24	4.4.24
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Julian McGowan	Interim Deputy S151 Officer	04/04/24	05/04/24
Jane Cryer	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer		
Helena Stevenson	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer		
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>	
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager		
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>	
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer		
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>	

Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer		
Mandatory:	<i>Assistant Director HR – to advise if report has potential staffing or workforce implications</i>		
Nikki Craig	Assistant Director of HR, Corporate Projects and IT		
Other consultees:			
Directors (where relevant)			
Stephen Evans	Chief Executive	02/04/24	
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	02/04/24	
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Adult Social Care & Health		
Lin Ferguson	Executive Director of Children's Services & Education	02/04/24	

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cllr Del Campo Cabinet Member for Adult Services, Health and Housing	Yes
---	---	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Council decision	No	No

Report Author: Kevin McDaniel, Executive Director for Adult Services, Health and Communities, 07816 535723
--

Appendix A – Project budget estimate

Total project costs assuming on time delivery of Go Live and contingency if delayed

Costs	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	Totals
Mosaic Licence over 5 years	214,781	214,781	214,781	214,781	214,781	1,073,905
People costs (on time)	381,365	588,595				969,960
NHS Spine	4,000 2,500	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	26,500
Civica Extraction Tool (one off cost)	20,000					20,000
Version One Extraction Tool	1,500	6,000				7,500
Access Group (Mosaic Billing Management)		10,000				10,000
Project Contingency (10% of total cost)		85,587				85,587
Project Total if Go-Live in October	624,146	909,963	219,781	219,781	219,781	2,193,452
People costs (if delayed)		216,684				216,684
Additional Project Contingency (if delayed)		21,973				21,973
Project Total if Go-Live delayed	624,146	1,148,620	219,781	219,781	219,781	2,432,109

Appendix B - Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Resourcing Adult Social Care case management system
Service area:	Adult Services
Directorate:	Adult Services, Health and Communities

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

The decision is to provide additional resources to keep the project on track, rather than rely on limited and stretched internal resources. It will add to the council's capital budget.

The system project is designed to ensure that people receive good quality services, with timely and up to date information. Additionally, the council will have more transparent cost and volume information to allow more accurate and timely financial forecasting which will benefit wider decision making

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

NO, this decision is specifically about providing resources to complete a project which has been identified as a key priority for the continued, high quality delivery of Adult social care services

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal?

For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented?

For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?

What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?

- How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?
- Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?

What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?

Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age			
Disability			
Sex			
Race, ethnicity and religion			
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Armed forces community			
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty			
Children in care/Care leavers			

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?

For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group

Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?

- For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.

How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?

See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Kevin McDaniel	Date: 02/04/2024
Approved by: Kevin McDaniel	Date: 02/04/2024

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------