

Title of Report:	Review into the project to transfer the Council's CCTV	Item
Report to be considered by:	Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission	
Date of Meeting:	28 June 2011	

Purpose of Report: To outline to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission the draft recommendations arising from the Commission's review of the project to transfer the CCTV service to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

Recommended Action: To agree the recommendations for the consideration of the Executive.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Brian Bedwell – Tel (0118) 9420196
E-mail Address:	bbedwell@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Ian Priestley
Job Title:	Chief Internal Auditor
Tel. No.:	01635 519253
E-mail Address:	ipriestley@westberks.gov.uk

Executive Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Following an request from Councillor Roger Hunneman, the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission (OSMC) agreed to conduct a review into the project to transfer the CCTV Control Room function to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
- 1.2 This report provides the terms of reference for the review, sets how it was conducted and the background against which the project took place. It then outlines the review's findings and the resultant recommendations.

2. Terms of Reference

- 2.1 The terms of reference for the OSMC were to conduct a review into the reasons for the delay in the transfer of the CCTV operation, and specifically to examine:
- (1) the project plan
 - (2) the way procurement was handled
 - (3) the public communications plan
 - (4) what level of uptime was expected/planned for during transition
 - (5) whether the Council's standard project methodology was used for the project
 - (6) evidence from Newbury Town Centre retailers.

3. Review methodology

- 3.1 The Commission met in full on 9th June 2011.
- 3.2 The meeting of 9th June invited witness evidence from the parts of the Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, external contractors, retailers and from the Thames Valley Police outlined below.
- | | | |
|------|------------------------------|--|
| (1) | Superintendent Robin Rickard | Local Police Area Commander West Berkshire |
| (2) | Stuart Messum | ICT Manager, RBWM |
| (3) | David Mead | Business Improvement Manager, RBWM |
| (4) | Chris Rice | Facilities Manager, Camp Hopson |
| (5) | John Colclough | Technical Sales Consultant CCTV BT Redcare |
| (6) | Tony Collis | Regional Manager, Chubb Systems Limited |
| (7) | Mark Barrows | Managing Director, Access Infrastructures |
| (8) | Lindsey Jones | Senior Account Manager Public Sector, Virgin Media Business |
| (9) | Councillor Anthony Stansfeld | Executive Member for Strategy, Performance, Community Safety |
| (10) | Andy Day | Head of Policy and Communication |
| (11) | Susan Powell | Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager |

- 3.3 However, only Robin Rickard was able to attend from external organisations. All others sent their apologies.
- 3.4 The OSMC received a presentation from Andy Day, Head of Policy and Communication, who had acted as Project Sponsor, outlining the aims of the project. This was followed by an overview from Anthony Stansfeld, Executive Member for Strategy and Performance, including Community Safety. Councillor Roger Hunneman then set out his reasons for requesting the Scrutiny.
- 3.5 The OSMC then explored the process of implementing the project with reference to the detailed report prepared by Susan Powell, Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager, who had acted as the Project Manager.
- 3.6 The minutes to this meeting are shown at Appendix A.

4. Background and context

- 4.1 The West Berkshire CCTV service was based on old and outdated analogue system that was both expensive, at £500,000 per annum, and difficult to maintain, with frequent faults and difficulties in obtaining spare parts for effectively redundant equipment. In addition the service was unable to provide evidence packages of CCTV footage that were of an adequate quality for the Police and Court Services to use.
- 4.2 Given the Council's difficult financial position any investment in a replacement system, for a non statutory service, was likely to be problematic. A number of other Council's have reduced or closed their CCTV services, for example Reading no longer has 24 hour live monitoring of their CCTV cameras and Wokingham have closed their CCTV service.
- 4.3 Through a contract with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, the Council has replaced the out dated analogue system with a state of the art digital solution. The new service meets the needs of the Police and Court Services and at the same time the running costs have been cut by 50%. In terms of outcomes, this innovative solution is a remarkable success.
- 4.4 The review by the OSMC however, has focussed on the process by which the project was implemented and in particular looked at the reasons for the delay, of five months, in completing the implementation of the system.

5. Findings of the review

- 5.1 The Commission's findings are outlined in the sections below.
- (1) The outcome of the project was a success with a new state of the art operation maintaining the 24/7 live monitoring of the CCTV cameras and at the same time reducing running costs by 50%. The officers involved in the project were to be congratulated for delivering this project.
 - (2) The provision of CCTV is a non statutory service and as such a full tendering exercise was conducted on the open market. The contract was awarded to the RBWM who were found to be the most competitive

in terms of price and quality. The contract provided 24/7 365 live monitoring, it achieved an annual revenue saving of £250k. The support provided by the CCTV service to the Shop Safe and Pub Watch schemes was retained.

- (3) The Prince 2 Project Management Methodology Principles were adopted for the project. A Project Board and Project Team were also put in place.
- (4) With regard to procurement, a range of providers were involved. On West Berkshire Council's (WBC's) side services were procured from British Telecom (BT) (Redcare) – which was responsible for BT commissioning; BT (Openreach) – which was responsible for operational activities such as cabling and equipment installation; Virgin Media – which was responsible for operational activities such as cabling and equipment installation and Co Channel – which was responsible for operational activities in respect of radio transmissions. The RBWM procured services from Chubb – which was responsible for operational activities in respect of the CCTV cameras and Access Infrastructure – which was responsible for operational activities in respect of computer equipment and software.
- (5) For compatibility with the digital Control Room and image storage systems new Dome CCTV cameras were installed to replace the 'old' analogue cameras. Dome CCTV cameras have the distinct advantage in that it is not easy to see where they are pointing, a significant improvement on the previous cameras. In addition they provide superior quality images.
- (6) As the CCTV service is non statutory, the Council's Procurement Team advised that the service had to be tendered. This added approximately one month to the start date of the works to effect the transfer. Even had the project started a month earlier this would not have overcome the main cause of the delay.
- (7) However, the four weeks delay did mean that the cut over took place just before the Christmas and New Year break. This increased the risk of exacerbating any difficulties with the cut over, for example holidays reducing the availability of staff and contractors to deal with unforeseen issues such as those caused by the very cold weather.
- (8) The intention was to commence the "shift" from the old system to the new system on 13th December 2010 with a planned period of 2 weeks disruption followed by a month of testing and refining of the new system. If all had gone according to plan then there would have been only a couple of hours 'downtime' for each camera and no complete break in service. The "shift" was planned in this way to minimise the cost of the project and to maintain some CCTV coverage during the transfer from the 'old' to the 'new' service.
- (9) The Project Board and Project Team did not make allowance to run a parallel system as this would have been costly and because some of the equipment from the 'old' system was required within the 'new'

system. On reflection Officers felt that this was appropriate given that the service was not considered “business critical”. Officers also considered that in retrospect they should have planned to close down the service completely during the critical phase of the “shift” and have advised other authorities considering similar projects to give this their full consideration.

- (10) The main reason for the delay to the project lay with the failure of one of the main contractors, BT, to deliver their CCTV camera data circuits within the system in the agreed 1:1 format. This was particularly disappointing given that all contractors involved were working to and delivered in line with a technical drawing generated by BT showing 1:1 presentation of data circuits.
- (11) BT’s failure was compounded by their apparent inability to remedy their failure in reasonable time. In the event, once BT accepted they had failed to deliver, they still insisted on a 90 day ‘lead in time’ to being able to install equipment and present CCTV camera data circuits in line with their own specification.
- (12) However, 8 of the 32 cameras were successfully transferred to the Windsor CCTV Control Room on the first day of the shift (13th December 2010) and were immediately fully operational. This was possible because BT had provided the CCTV camera data circuits for these 8 CCTV cameras in the agreed 1:1 format. The remainder of the CCTV camera data circuits were in ‘grouped’ and “daisy chained” formats that prevented them being connected to the data management systems and they could not therefore be linked to the Windsor CCTV Control Room.
- (13) The Council had signed a standard BT contract which did not provide the Council with any remedy for the failure to deliver. However, it was felt that it was very unlikely that BT would have varied their standard contract terms and conditions to accept the inclusion of penalty clauses.
- (14) Officers did apply considerable pressure on BT through a BT Redcare Partnerships Director. The Partnerships Director was able to apply pressure within BT Openreach to help deliver the contract.
- (15) Although the press had publicised that fact that the service was not fully operational, Officers and Superintendent Robin Rickard all confirmed that they had not received any complaints from the public.
- (16) Councillor Hunneman confirmed that he was briefed by officers during the delay in the “shift” and Councillor Beck confirmed that both he and Councillor Hunneman were regularly briefed prior to meetings with the Newbury Retailers Association.
- (17) Superintendent Robin Rickard confirmed that the reduced level of CCTV coverage during the delayed “shift” had not endangered public safety. He felt that suitable contingency arrangements were made, with regular updates from Susan Powell on CCTV coverage. Also, over the

Christmas and New Year period additional resources were available, both from retailers and the Police.

- (18) Superintendent Robin Rickard confirmed that the quality of the evidence provided by the new system is excellent and that the temporary requirement for the Police to collect evidence packs from the Windsor CCTV Control Room is not too onerous.
- (19) Andy Day confirmed that he had considered appointing an external Project Manager, but felt that the likely minimum cost of £25,000 outweighed any benefit. In addition Andy Day felt that the Project Team that managed the project had the necessary experience to deliver the project. Also, an external project manager would not have foreseen the specific issue that caused the delay.

6. Suggested actions for the Executive

6.1 The suggested actions (recommendations) for the Executive are outlined below.

- (1) The Procurement Team should produce an advice note for Heads of Service to outline the circumstances when services can or can not be “partnered” with other local authorities. This may have avoided the four week delay in starting the project.
- (2) Officers letting contracts should seek advice from the Council’s Head of Legal and Electoral Services in agreeing terms and conditions with a view to protecting the Council’s position in the event that the contractor fails to perform. In the unlikely event that BT were prepared to vary their standard terms and conditions and allowed the Council to add penalty clauses, then the Council may have been able to obtain compensation and or reduce the period of delay in BT completing their works.
- (3) Risk Registers used on projects should consider the implications of projects being delayed and / or failing, and outline the measures that would be taken to maintain existing services until solutions can be found.
- (4) Project Managers should set out a clear communications plan and agree this with key stakeholders and also maintain a log of communication with key stakeholders. This would provide a clear audit trail of communications.
- (5) Where a service / system is not classed as being business critical then consideration should be given to shutting down the service / system for a period before “shifting” to the new service / system in order to minimise cost and facilitate the shift. Alternatively where a service / system is considered to be business then a fully costed proposal to ensure business continuity should be included within the project plan.

7. Recommendation for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

7.1 It is recommended that the Members of the Commission agree the suggestions outlined in section 6 for the Executive’s consideration.

Appendices

Appendix A – Minutes of the OSMC meeting of 9th June 2011