1. **Decision Taken:**

1.1 Approval for an extension and variation to the Council's existing contract with Idox Limited to upgrade from its Acolaid Property Case Management product to its newer product, Uniform. The proposal is to vary and extend the contract by a further 3 years.

2. **Decision Taker:**

2.1 Executive Member for Finance & IT, Councillor T.W. Hone in consultation with the Strategic Director of Finance, Policy & Governance, Norma Atlay.

3. **Date Decision Taken:**

3.1 29 June 2016.

4. **Summary of Background:**

4.1 Most of the background to this proposal is contained in the Business Case.

4.2 The Council has been using Acolaid as its property case management system for almost twenty years. The system is supported on an Oracle platform, the version of which will be de-supported from the end of May 2017.

4.3 Idox has made it clear that it will not develop Acolaid to operate on the newer version of Oracle because of the considerable amount of development required for only five of its customers.

4.4 There is an option to run Acolaid on SQL and this would cost around £50,000 to implement for a system, which Officers believe will be short lived because of the declining number of Acolaid customers.

4.5 Idox does have an alternative property case management system, Uniform which has a large and growing customer base and which is more modern and up-to-date.

5. **Directorate:**

5.1 Finance, Policy & Governance

6. **Notification Date:**

6.1 1 July 2016
7. Reason for Decision:

7.1 This is the most cost effective means of ensuring that the Council retains a fully compliant and usable property case management system by the date that the current system is de-supported.

8. Other Options Considered:

8.1 Four options were considered:

8.1.1 Option 1. Do nothing – continue to use Acolaid on Oracle 11.2.0.4 beyond the supplier de-support date.

Advantages with option 1:
1. No changes to the current system and no additional work required.

Disadvantages with option 1:
1. The system would be un-supported and no support would be given if problems arose with the software.
2. Functionality would not be updated to meet the needs of legislative changes.
3. Supplier unwilling to provide software patches for Oracle v11.2.0.4 leaving security vulnerabilities and non-compliance with PSN.

Officer Group View:
The Officer Group considered this option and discounted it as not a viable option as the Council will fail the annual PSN audit which means it loses the ability to communicate with many other government bodies including the DWP. There is a significant risk of having a zero supported, zero patched system including the increased security risks to the IT Infrastructure.

8.1.2 Option 2 – Continue to use Acolaid and move to SQL Server before the de-support date.

Advantages with option 2:
1. Users continue to use Acolaid with minimal disruption.
2. Acolaid would continue to be supported.
3. PSN compliance would be retained if a supported version of SQL Server is used.

Disadvantages with option 2:
1. The additional cost for implementing SQL Server is approximately £50k. To implement this, it would take approximately six months and would require a large amount of resources. The Acolaid customer base continues to decrease and future decommissioning remains a risk, so this does not represent good value for money.
2. Potential reduction in the level of system development as customers continue to move to other systems.
3. Idox is only providing legislative changes to Acolaid and is not developing the product to enhance its capabilities; future development will only happen with the Uniform product.

Officer Group View:
The Officer Group considered this option and discounted it as it is not good value for money due to the continued risk of Acolaid being de-supported.

8.1.3 Option 3 – Initiate a procurement exercise for a replacement

Advantages with option 3:
1. Opportunity to test the market.
2. The Council able to consider other options instead of automatic upgrade to another Idox product.
3. Opportunity to review future software costs.
4. Ability to review current functionality options available from other suppliers.

Disadvantages with option 3:
1. A new potential supplier may have less experience migrating Acolaid data across to a new solution.
2. Procurement would add significant pressure to an already tight deadline.
3. Costs could increase significantly.
4. A large customer base is using Uniform for Planning, Building Control and Local Land Charges. A new product may not be able to accommodate the integration of all three service areas. This could lead to additional third party costs.
5. Building Control is currently in transition to a partnership arrangement and is procuring a new product, Tascomi for new applications. Uniform can be used as a historical data repository providing easy access for other service areas such as Land Charges. A procurement exercise could lead to a third system being required, incurring additional costs.
6. Local Land Charges is in discussion with the Land Registry regarding take over. Timescales are unknown at present. A procurement exercise at this stage would divert resources with the additional work required to move to a completely different product.

Officer Group View:
The Officer Group considered this option and discounted it as a procurement exercise is not feasible due to the tight deadlines.

8.1.4 Option 4 – Upgrade to Uniform on Oracle 12c before the de-support data.

Advantages with option 4:
1. Idox as a software supplier is experienced at migrating data from Acolaid to Uniform.
2. Uniform has a large customer base and commitment from the supplier to continue to develop the product.
3. Uniform can accommodate the integration of the required service areas enabling data to be shared easily.
4. Information required to make a decision is available. This includes costs and continuity of service.
5. The supplier has an existing knowledge of the Council’s IT infrastructure and integrations.
6. The supplier will not discontinue support for Acolaid using Oracle during the period of migration. This would allow for any unforeseen delays during the project.

Disadvantages with option 4:
1. No opportunity to test the market for comparison.

Officer Group View:
The Officer Group considered this option and recommends its adoption.

9. Consultations:

9.1 An Officer Group representing all relevant Service Areas was set up to consider the various options. After a number of meetings and discussions with suppliers, the unanimous view was to recommend option 4.
10. **Legal Implications:**

10.1 Contract extensions must comply with rule 29 of the Contract Procurement Rules. Rule 29 confirms that a single extension of more than 3 months may only be approved by the appropriate Executive Member in consultation with the Strategic Director of Finance, Policy and Governance.

10.2 Rule 29 also confirms that advice from Legal Services and Procurement should be sought. Such advice has been provided.

10.3 Rule 29 also requires a robust cost/benefit analysis which is set out in the Business Case.

10.4 Contract variations must comply with rule 28 of the Contract Procurement Rules and the Executive Member for Finance and IT is authorised to approve variations within 10% of the total contract value.

10.5 Section 72 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 confirms that a 10% increase in the value of a contract would not amount to a substantial modification which would require re-procurement of the Contract. As a result of extending and varying the contract, the net increase would be 24k per annum and because the contract has been in place for over 10 years, this net increase is materially below 10% of the cumulative value of the contract to date. Therefore the proposed extension and variation is permissible under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and Rule 28 and 29 of the Contract Procurement Rules with the approval of the Executive Member for Finance and IT in consultation with the Strategic Director of Finance, Policy and Governance.

10.6 The Council has a statutory duty to achieve best value and the Business Case sets out the reasons why the extension and variation achieves best value for the Council.

11. **Financial Implications:**

11.1 These are covered in the Business Case.

12. **Risk Implications:**

12.1 These are covered in the Business Case.

13. **Equalities Implications:**

13.1 The Equality Act 2010 came into force on the 1st October 2010, a major piece of legislation. The Act also created a new Public Sector Equality Duty, which came into force on the 6th April 2011. There is a General duty, described in 12.2, that public bodies must meet, underpinned by more specific duties which are designed to help meet them.

13.2 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of its functions, give due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

14. **Social Value Implications:**

14.1 As the recommendations made in this report do not constitute a public service contract, the measurement of ‘social value’ as required by the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 need not be applied, although equalities implications and opportunities are identified in the relevant section at paragraphs 13.
15. Human Resource Implications:

15.1 There are no specific Human Resources implications in this report other than some additional training that relevant staff may have to undertake on the new system. Because Uniform is similar in look and feel to Acolaid, this requirement should be minimal.

16. Background Papers:

16.1 Business Case
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