

Sent: 19 December 2005 16:46  
To: IT Strategy Project Team  
Subject: Shared Services Strategy

Not time to reply to it all, but

it is not justified for bodies awarding funding (section 40, 2) to presume that Public service organisations only get value for money when they standardise and share services with others. There are many examples of this not being the case e.g. individual excellence in specific areas in LAs e.g. the management of projects in Birmingham City, innovative website in Bracknell Forest, rapid website improvement in Richmondshire, and much excellence as a result of strong leadership at the East Riding, Newham, Newcastle City, etc etc The converse i.e. examples of sharing failing, is the failure of sharing due to many reasons in places like North Yorkshire, West Berkshire and their outsource contractor, and the many Districts who have tried to make County sharing work. Obviously sharing works too, and it has to be recognised that this can cost a lot, and can take extra time (e.g. Durham, Cumbria, West Sussex, etc). With experienced support a lot can be achieved.

I would like to endorse section 50 on suppliers. "Patchy" is a generous word to use with some suppliers. Recently I have been involved with crass supplier performance, the worst I have seen for a long time. Many Councils are getting together to publicise the abysmal performance of some suppliers. This needs coordination across Government, in particular the DWP needs to work with the 100+ councils trying to get new benefits software to work. The UK has at least one CRM supplier working on 311 projects in the States. The New York example is not necessarily the best approach for the UK as it is a broad and thin CRM implementation with no integration. In the UK we could adopt a better model for Citizens, giving them the right answer at the first contact much of the time.

Regards

Tony Glew Interim CIO. Bracknell Forest