

Item 7

REPORT TO CABINET

8 DECEMBER 2005

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

Performance Management Portfolio

IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT STATEMENT (IEG5)

1 SUMMARY

This report seeks the approval of Cabinet for the Council's IEG5 statement which must be submitted to the ODPM (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) by Monday 19 December 05.

2 RECOMMENDED

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 2.1 Review and agree the contents of the IEG5 statement (**Appendix 1**).

3 BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

3.1 **BVPI 157**

3.1.1 The Government has set a 100% target for all customer facing services to be delivered through electronic means by 31 December 2005. In calculating progress against this, Sedgefield has used the IDeA Electronic Service Delivery (ESD) toolkit. The toolkit enables the Council to benchmark its performance against other UK local authorities based on the Local Government Service List (LGSL).

3.1.2 To date, the Council's performance against BVPI 157 has risen from 88.55% in July 05 to 90.74% as of March 05. The Council has now met the 100% target.

3.2 **Priority Service Outcomes (PSOs)**

3.2.1 On 29 April 2004, the ODPM announced the publication of a guidance document entitled 'Defining e-government outcomes for 2005 to support the delivery of priority services and a National Strategy transformation agenda for local authorities in England'

The PSOs are based on seven-shared priorities agreed between Central and Local Government and can be closely mapped to the local priorities outlined in our own Community Strategy:

- Raising standards across our schools;
- Improving the quality of life of children, young people, families at risk and older people;

- Promoting healthier communities by targeting key local services, such as health and housing;
- Creating safer and stronger communities;
- Transforming our local environment;
- Meeting local transport needs more effectively;
- Promoting the economic vitality of localities.

3.2.2 Relating to the above themes, there are 73 PSOs that authorities are responsible for implementing. Of these there are 29 'Required' outcomes that should be in place by December 2005, 25 'Good' outcomes to be in place by March 2006 and 19 'Excellent' Outcomes. The latter are only applicable to those authorities that have 'excellent' CPA ratings and no timeline has been set by ODPM.

3.2.3 The Government is taking the implementation of PSOs across all UK local authorities very seriously. The new KLOE (Key Line of Enquiry) for the Corporate Assessment for the CPA for single tier and county councils has had an additional question added, which requires achievement of all of the priority outcomes for a level 3 assessment. In short, it means that an authority that has not achieved them cannot progress beyond level 2. Levels 2 and 3 are set out below.

3.2.3.1 **Level 2:** The council has sufficient ICT resources to deliver its priorities. There is progress towards realising the benefits of e-government. Competencies for e-government-based change are embedded in the organisation. The council uses ICT to improve services. It has achieved the required priority outcomes for e-government, including the availability of online facilities at all times.

3.2.3.2 **Level 3:** The council uses ICT effectively throughout its activities and partnerships. It uses e-government to deliver objectives and service improvements, to gather information about community needs, and to join up services in collaboration with partners. ICT provides real-time management information about service use. The council understands the levels of Internet usage in the community and is working with partners to improve access. The council has achieved the 'required' and 'good' priority outcomes for e-government.

3.2.4 The CPA for districts is currently out to consultation. It is likely that the corporate assessment will strongly mirror that for counties and single tiers.

3.2.5 The following table outlines Sedgefield Borough Council's progress against the 'required' and 'good' PSOs:

Number of 'Required' & 'Good' Priority Service Outcomes currently on GREEN (complete)	PSO Status as of 20/12/2004	PSO Status as of 21/06/05	PSO Projected Status as of 28/12/2005
GREEN	11 (20%)	23 (43%)	30 (56%)
TOTAL	54 (100%)	54 (100%)	54 (100%)

3.2.6 Given the significance of the PSOs in realising our local community ambitions, the Council has locked e-Government into its corporate planning process. E-Government guidance has now been issued to all Heads of Service to inform service plans.

3.3 E-Government & ICT Capital Programme 2006/2007

3.3.1 The Council is continuing to take the e-Government agenda very seriously, viewing it as a key enabler in the modernisation of the Council's Customer Services function.

3.3.2 The Council is committed to a substantial annual ICT capital programme to fund the delivery of its modernisation programme.

3.3.3 Business transformation, project management and IT capacity continue to be issues for the Council. To address project management gaps, two projects managers have been appointed on a 12-month fixed-term basis to facilitate the delivery of the PSOs and to enable the mainstreaming of PRINCE2 project management methodology across the organisation.

3.4 Efficiency Gains

3.4.1 Following the Gershon Review, Local Authorities are required to make year-on-year efficiency savings of 2.5% until 2008.

3.4.2 Councils are asked to provide best estimates of efficiency gains arising from the implementation of local e-government in IEG5. The expectation is that all cashable savings can be recycled in local services, but should be achieved without cutting service quality.

3.4.3 Whilst Gershon places strong emphasis on e-Government as a vehicle to deliver efficiencies, it should be noted that this agenda requires upfront investment in core business transformation technologies. The efficiencies will not be realised immediately, but in the longer term.

3.4.4 The projected efficiency gains are outlined on page 33 and 34 of the IEG5 Statement.

4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1.1 No further IEG funding from ODPM is expected. However the council needs to fund a substantial ICT Capital programme if it is to achieve the PSOs and deliver related service efficiencies.

5 CONSULTATIONS

5.1.1 The IEG5 Statement was produced in consultation with the Council's Modernisation Taskforce, and with the Officer Board of the County Durham e-Government Partnership.

6 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Links to Corporate Objectives

6.1.1 The IEG statement is about improving access to services through electronic means and as such it is key to the council's stated ambition to make its services accessible.

6.2 Risk Management

6.2.1 The two identified risks of not meeting / achieving the PSOs and subsequently receiving a reduced CPA Corporate Assessment Score have been set out in the body of the report. The IEG statement explains how they will be mitigated.

6.3 Health & Safety

6.3.1 There are no additional Health & Safety Implications.

6.4 Legal and Constitutional

6.4.1 No additional Legal and Constitutional issues have been identified.

6.5 Equality and Diversity

6.5.1 Equality and Diversity considerations are an inherent part of Implementing Electronic Government. Electronic delivery of services is a key contributing factor to the Council's corporate priority to ensure fair access to services regardless of religion, sex, race, gender etc as set out in the Corporate Plan and Corporate Equality Plan.

7 LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – IEG5 Statement

8 BACKGROUND PAPERS

)

Sedgefield's IEG4 & IEG4.5 Statement (November 2004 & July 2005)
ODPM 'Defining e-government priority services & transformation outcomes in 2005 for local authorities in England' (April 2004)
CSC Review Report (February 2004)
CSC Action Plan (March 2004)
Delivering Efficiency in Local Services (ODPM – January 2005)

Contact Officer: S Walsh
Corporate e-Government Manager

Telephone No: (01388) 816166 ext 4411
Email Address: swalsh@sedgefield.gov.uk

Ward(s)

Proposals are not ward specific

Examination by Statutory Officers

	Yes	Not Applicable
The report has been examined by the Councils Head of the Paid Service or his representative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The content has been examined by the Councils S.151 Officer or his representative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The content has been examined by the Council's Monitoring Officer or his representative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The report has been approved by Management Team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This page is intentionally left blank