

MANAGEMENT BOARD

SPIRE Business Case - Supporting Paper

Paper by SPIRE's Senior Responsible Owner and Programme Director

Purpose

1. This paper sets out key points from the SPIRE business case and provides new information on potential savings.

Action for the Board

2. The Board is invited to give "outline planning permission" to the SPIRE programme, subject to financial approvals later in the year.

How much money will SPIRE cost?

3. Net funding required for the SPIRE Programme Board's preferred option (Option 4) is £7.55m over 10 years. (**Total programme cost is £8.98m.** In 2009/10 SPIRE already has a budget of £1.42m which has been included in the whole lifecycle costs).
4. Costs for the first three years of the core programme (April 2010 – October 2012) are less than current forecasts submitted for 2010 – 2012 at £4.45m versus £5.4m.

How much money could SPIRE save?

5. The SPIRE Programme is an investment to save in the longer term. The option to 'Do Nothing' would still incur costs. The preferred Option 4 will reduce the growth of these costs and in some cases provide the opportunity for cashable savings.
6. **Over the 10 year life of the programme SPIRE has the potential to save, avoid spending or spend more efficiently up to £14,254,000.**
7. The realisation of these potential savings depends on management action as well as the SPIRE Programme.
8. Currently the programme will break even at the end of year 7 (4 years after the core programme has ended).
9. Possible savings are based on post project implementation reports from other government departments, combined with details provided from

different areas of both Houses (PED, HoC Central Procurement, HoL Finance Department, HoC Department of Resources, PICT).

How do these savings breakdown?

10. Staff time wasted searching for electronic information
£934,875 per year = the value of an 8% saving in staff time (2500 staff) in Parliament currently spent searching for electronic information.
11. More efficient spending on accommodation which is released from use as paper storage
£1,000,000 per year = the cost of maintaining 2,800 sqm of Parliamentary estate which SPIRE could free up as a result of reduced storage for paper on the estate. This could mean a reduced reliance on space outside of the estate and the costs that incurs.
12. Off-site paper storage
£5,555 per year = the value of a 25% saving in costs for the Iron Mountain contract for off-site paper storage as a result of a not having a print to paper policy.
13. On-site paper usage
£14,867 per year = the value of a 10% saving in costs for stationery and supplies (purchased for use of departmental staff under the Banner contract) as a result of not having a print to paper policy.
14. Future electronic storage costs
£81,250 per year = the value of a 25% reduction in projected growth of electronic storage costs, reduced as a result of staff being more aware of what should and shouldn't be stored.

What are the risks of not doing SPIRE?

15. The organisation cannot be confident that its information is reliable, accurate, legally admissible or can be found in the first place. This is a huge reputational risk as well as a day-to-day practical one.
16. The concerns expressed that change needs to happen (for example from the Records Management Audits; corporate risks identified on information management; data security initiatives) will go unheard.
17. Information is an asset just like staff, IT and buildings. If it is not managed properly then costly mistakes will happen, both in terms of reputation and finances; it can not be exploited for the benefit of the organisation and improve the quality of service we offer.

How will the organisation be improved as a result of SPIRE?

18. SPIRE will provide better ways of managing Parliament's electronic information. These will:
- **help us do our job better** – we can collaborate more easily with others, facilitating the principle of the unified House service.
 - **protect staff and the organisation** – Parliament can provide reliable evidence, stored securely, to explain and justify decisions and meet legal requirements.
 - **save us time** – we can search more easily and find the information we need more quickly, ensuring we are all more productive and efficient in providing core services to Members.
 - **reduce costs** – we don't keep and therefore store any more documents than we need (paper and electronic); we buy less paper; and use accommodation more efficiently.
 - **give Parliament information we can rely on** – we know we have the right version of a document, who created it and when.
 - **protect and maintain Parliament's corporate history.**

What will Parliament get for the money it spends?

19. In practical terms:
- up to 2500 administration staff of both Houses who have improved their office practices and the way they manage their electronic information
 - staff who understand the need and importance of doing this with corporate policies in place to guide them
 - staff who are confident in using a newly implemented electronic document and records management system integrated with, and accessible via, SharePoint
 - a programme that has been managed by a qualified and experienced team according to programme management best practice, with dedicated resources to help staff improve their working practices.

How does SPIRE fit in with other initiatives?

20. SPIRE will provide a major contribution towards realising Parliament's Information Management Strategy. It is part of the jigsaw.
21. It provides a solution to the need identified by the Records Management Audits.

22. It will take advantage of the new robust platforms put in place by the Infrastructure Programme; it is working with the Vista Desktop project to maximize opportunities to clean up desk tops; and it is working with PICT to explore the potential of SharePoint.
23. It has a very close relationship with the Parliamentary Archives to ensure there is professional records management input into the programme and that SPIRE will contribute to the actions coming out of the recent audits.
24. It will be the catalyst for progress in other areas of corporate governance, such as policy development.

Conclusion

25. It has taken a long time for Parliament to get to the point of presenting a business case. Examples of implementing a system to manage electronic documents and records from other public sector bodies have not always been positive but there are now good examples of recent successful implementations (Scottish Government, Audit Commission etc.).
26. SPIRE has used the learning from these examples to inform the thorough work which has gone into preparing this business case – not just learning from others and assessing different software available, but also conducting pilots and studies within Parliament to fully understand the requirement, identify realistic benefits and measure likely costs. This should give the Board confidence that the proposed solution is soundly-based and will achieve the results it promises.
27. SPIRE and the Records Management Audits have identified a real corporate and individual need, and desire, for a solution to better manage electronic information which has not yet been met. SPIRE will not solve all of Parliament's problems connected with information management, nor will it be an easy change to make, but it is now a necessary one which will have a significant impact and can produce savings for the organisation.

**[s.40]
July 2009**