

Version 4.0 (High Risk Delivery Confidence) June 2008

© Crown Copyright 2007

This is a Value Added product, which is outside the scope of the HMSO core Licence

OGC Gateway™ Process

Review 4: Readiness for service

**Version number:** Final v 1.0

**Date of issue to SRO:** 09 Mar 09

**SRO:** <name redacted>

**Department:** Dept of Health

**Agency or NDPB:** Connecting for Health

**OGC Gateway™ Review dates:** 17/02/2009 to 20/02/2009

---

**OGC Gateway™ Review Team Leader:**

<name redacted>

**OGC Gateway™ Review Team Members:**

<name redacted>

<name redacted>

## OGC Gateway Delivery Confidence Assessment

<b>Delivery Confidence Assessment</b>	<text redacted>
<text redacted>	

The Delivery Confidence assessment RAG status should use the definitions below.

<u>RAG</u>	<u>Criteria Description</u>
Green	Successful delivery of the project/programme to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly
Amber/Green	Successful delivery appears probable however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery
Amber	Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed, and whether resolution is feasible
Red	Successful delivery of the project/programme appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on project/programme definition, schedule, budget required quality or benefits delivery, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The project/programme may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed

### Summary of Report Recommendations

The Review Team makes the following recommendations which are prioritized using the definitions below.

<b>Ref. No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Critical/ Essential/ Recommended</b>
1.	<text redacted>	<text redacted>

2.	<text redacted>	<text redacted>
3.	<text redacted>	<text redacted>
4.	<text redacted>	<text redacted>
5.	<text redacted>	<text redacted>

**Critical (Do Now)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately

**Essential (Do By)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future.

**Recommended** – The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.

## **Background**

### **The aims of the project:**

Following implementation of a set of framework agreements in 2007 governing the supply of IT systems to GP practices within the NHS, the objectives of the project are to ensure that Suppliers deliver key NHS CFH functionality to the NHS. The framework sets out pricing structures; guidance on the contractual call-off arrangements between PCTs and suppliers; and technical standards required to demonstrate compliance with requirements of the wider CFH set of infrastructure and applications.

An important subsidiary objective is to improve the overall effectiveness of managing delivery and commercial relationships with the existing system providers (ESPs) who currently have direct relationships with several thousand GP practices as well as the PCTs.

### **The driving force for the project:**

The philosophy behind GPSoC is a response to a number of pressures and constraints, including:

- published political and contractual commitments to ensure that GPs have a choice of support system
- the commercial reality of a situation in which a small number of suppliers currently serve a very large part of the GP population
- delays in delivering the original strategic solution through the main CFH Local Service Providers.

To ensure that the benefits from new applications such as Electronic Transfer of Prescriptions (ETP), GP2GP, and Choose and Book (CAB) can be realised in the absence of the LSP solutions; and to increase levels of support for CFH from an important stakeholder group, the project will make it possible for GPs to retain their existing systems while putting in place a series of incentives and structures which to see those systems enhanced in a progressive and controlled manner. A formal accreditation process is used to assure these enhancements, with incentives built in at key points to encourage developments which lead towards the long term strategic direction of an integrated care record.

### **The procurement/delivery status:**

The project signed framework agreements in 2007 obliging suppliers to deliver NHS CFH functionality. This contract, for existing system suppliers, replaced existing contracts and is supplemented by a call-off arrangement whereby PCTs will be able to draw down services to meet the requirements of practices in their area. Suppliers have already achieved compliance since contract signature for EPS1 (all key suppliers), SCR (iSOFT) and Hosting to NHS CFH Standards (INPS), with a number of suppliers planning to achieve compliance in 2009 on SCR (EMIS and INPS), Hosting to NHS CFH Standards (EMIS), EPS2 (EMIS, INPS, iSOFT and Microtest) and GP2GP (iSOFT and EMIS).

### **Current position regarding OGC Gateway™ Reviews:**

GPSoC has undergone Gateway Reviews 2 and 3; the latter in 2007.

A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous OGC Gateway Review, can be found in Appendix C.

### **Purposes and conduct of the OGC Gateway™ Review**

#### Purposes of the OGC Gateway™ Review

The primary purposes of an OGC Gateway Review 4: Readiness for service, are to confirm that contractual arrangements are up to date, that necessary testing has been done to the client's satisfaction and that the client is ready to approve implementation.

Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for an OGC Gateway Review 4.

#### Conduct of the OGC Gateway™ Review

This OGC Gateway Review 4 was carried out from 17 Feb 09 to 20 Feb 09 at Leeds and London. The team members are listed on the front cover.

The people interviewed are listed in Appendix B.

The Review Team would like to thank the GPSoC Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Project and the outcome of this review. Especial thanks are due to <name redacted> whose unstinting efforts and support went way beyond that normally encountered during a Gateway Review

### **Findings and recommendations**

<text redacted>

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Purposes of OGC Gateway™ Review 4: Readiness for service**

- Check that the current phase of the contract is properly completed and documentation completed.
- Ensure that the contractual arrangements are up-to-date.
- Check that the Business Case is still valid and unaffected by internal and external events or changes.
- Check that the original projected business benefit is likely to be achieved.
- Ensure that there are processes and procedures to ensure long-term success of the project.
- Confirm that all necessary testing is done (e.g. commissioning of buildings, business integration and user acceptance testing) to the client's satisfaction and that the client is ready to approve implementation.
- Check that there are feasible and tested business contingency, continuity and/or reversion arrangements.
- Ensure that all ongoing risks and issues are being managed effectively and do not threaten implementation.
- Evaluate the risk of proceeding with the implementation where there are any unresolved issues.
- Confirm the business has the necessary resources and that it is ready to implement the services and the business change.
- Confirm that the client and supplier implementation plans are still achievable.
- Confirm that there are management and organisational controls to manage the project through implementation and operation.
- Confirm that contract management arrangements are in place to manage the operational phase of the contract.
- Confirm arrangements for handover of the project from the SRO to the operational business owner
- Confirm that all parties have agreed plans for training, communication, roll-out, production release and support as required.
- Confirm that all parties have agreed plans for managing risk.

- Confirm that there are client-side plans for managing the working relationship, with reporting arrangements at appropriate levels in the organisation, reciprocated on the supplier side.
- Confirm information assurance accreditation/certification.
- Confirm that defects or incomplete works are identified and recorded.
- Check that lessons for future projects are identified and recorded.

## **APPENDIX B**

### ***Interviewees***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Chief Operating Officer
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Director of Programme and Systems Delivery
<name redacted>	NHS CFH -Programme Director: GP IT
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Director of Primary Care and Care Record Service
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Director of SCR and Demographics
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Head of IT Service Support
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Director of the National Integration Centre [NIC]
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Head of Supplier and Release Management (GP IT)
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - GPSoC Commercial and Financial Manager
<name redacted>	NHS CFH Lead Architect Existing Systems Programme & GP Systems of Choice (GPSoC)
<name redacted>	NPfIT Primary Care Lead for North West SHA
<name redacted>	Deputy Technical Director / IT Service Delivery Manager Sussex Health Informatics Service
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - GP National Clinical Lead & Clinical Director for Electronic Prescription Service
<name redacted>	NHS CFH - Clinician
<name redacted>	Associate Director Informatics, North Lincolnshire PCT and NE Lincolnshire Care Trust Plus
<name redacted>	EMIS Group Development Director
<name redacted>	InPS - IT Director
<name redacted>	CSC - Primary Care Programme Manager
<name redacted>	GP
<name redacted>	GP
<name redacted>	OGC Gateway Reviewer for Gate 3

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Recommendations from previous OGC Gateway™ Review**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Progress/Status</b>
A handling and contingency plan should be developed in the event that Treasury approval continues to be delayed	<text redacted>
The project should establish an outline statement of direction for GP systems.	<text redacted>
The need to increase the visibility of formal controls such as minutes of meetings and action logs – remains valid and should be kept open as an ongoing requirement.	<text redacted>
The project team should set out clear expectations of the way the detailed implementation procedures are to be interpreted.	<text redacted>
The opportunity should be taken over the next few months to revisit the role and constitution of the Project Board to ensure that it is matched to the changing nature of the task once the procurement and set-up activity is complete.	<text redacted>