



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	District Executive Report 7 <sup>th</sup> November 2013
<b>Project Name</b>	Sharing Brympton Way Office Space with SCC
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> November 2013
<b>Project Officer</b>	Donna Parham, Laurence Willis

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	Lease Negotiations Dec 2013 Building Works August 2014 for office moves and September 2014 for car park	Dec 2013 August 2014 and September 2014
<b>Project Completed</b>	Lease September 2014  Office Building works September 2014 Car park works December 2014	Concluded August 2014, signed October 2014  September 2014 December 2014

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget Capital Allocation £</b>	<b>Revised budget (if applicable)</b>
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	242,000	
<b>External Funding, SCC</b>	12,000	
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>254,000</b>	
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>208,000</b>	
<b>Project underspend</b>	34,000	
<b>% underspend to SSDC</b>	14%	

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference/comments</b>
Approval by DX	Nov 2013	Nov 2013	
Negotiations with SCC and completion of 'Agreement to lease'	December 2013	December 2013	Concluded August 2014 and meet both parties committed to the project
Building works to offices	August 2014	August 2014	

## APPENDIX B

commenced Building works to car park	September 2014	September 2014	
Signing of Lease	October 2014	October 2014	Enabled signing of the lease
SCC occupation of red floor	December 2014	January 2015	SCC Completion of their works and delay moving staff

### Revenue Implications (if applicable)

Key Categories	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate now project is completed	Reasons for Difference
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	100,000	104,688	
<b>External Funding, SCC</b>	0	0	
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>104,688</b>	Works to enlarge fire doors
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>104,688</b>	
<b>Project overspend</b>		4,688	
<b>% overspend to SSDC</b>		4.7%	

### Officer Time

Officer/Teams	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
Property Services	(not known)		
Engineering Services			
IT			

### Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)

To move forward with a shared office proposal for Brympton Way which has the potential to lower operating costs and deliver a significant saving towards the medium term financial plan
To bring key public services together under one roof and be delivered from the same location in Yeovil
To utilise and maximise SSDC office space at Brympton Way with partners in a similar way to that which has been operating at the lace Mill in Chard and Churchfields in Wincanton
To meet Government recommendations to look at opportunities to share office space as a means of saving money in the tough economic climate

## APPENDIX B

### How have the objectives been met?

Negotiations with SCC and completion of 'Agreement to lease' to provide the red floor for use by SCC along with meeting rooms and 120 dedicated car parking spaces
SCC relocating various services under one roof from various individual offices around Yeovil
Rationalising office space, change in working patterns, 'hot desking' and working from home and better use of technology
Achieving the shared office proposal

### Benefits resulting from the Project

SSDC's commitment to shared working arrangements
Significant revenue savings
Potential for more savings by rolling out a more comprehensive agile working programme for SSDC staff and free up further space to rent
Bringing key public services under one location

### In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently?

No
----

### Summary

Only underspend was on the revenue but overall project came under budget
Delay in commencing the building works due to SCC delay in signing 'agreement to lease' but outside SSDC control
Good communications and consultations between services and project team



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	Original 2010-07 - Based on revised capital appraisal 13.3.13
<b>Project Name</b>	Castle Cary Market House Regeneration Project
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	April 2013 (updated from approval December 2009)
<b>Project Officer</b>	Pam Williams

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	November 2011 – phase 1a	December 2011- phase 1a
	February 2012 – phase 1b	February 2012 – phase1b
	May 2013 – phase 2	May 2013 – phase 2
<b>Project Completed</b>	February 2012 – phase 1	February 2012 – phase 1
	March 2012 – phase 1b	March 2012 – phase 1b
	November 2013 - phase 2	February 2014 – phase 2 (practical completion) February 2016 – phase 2 (final invoices - retention etc)

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget £</b>	<b>Revised Budget (if applicable) £</b>
<b>SSDC Corporate Capital Funding</b>	164,000	164,000
<b>External Funding</b>	288,000*	259,428
<b>SSDC – Area East</b>	20,000*	5000
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b><u>472,000*</u></b>	<b><u>428,428</u></b>
<i>*including contingency (£20k AEC + £20k CCTC)</i>		
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>428,428</b>
<b>Project under /overspend</b>		<b>43,572</b>
<b>% under / overspend</b>		<b>9%</b>

This was an updated project budget following the receipt of tenders on the approval originally granted in December 2009 against an anticipated project budget of £360k

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>

## APPENDIX B

Finalising specifications	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Revisions made
LBC/Planning consents	Dec 2012	Jan 2013	Various applications for different elements approved between July 2012-May 2014
Tendering	Feb 2013	Feb 2013	Return date
Community office works	March 2013	March 2013	Design and commission by P+E team
Bill of Reduction	March 2013	March 2013	Subject to budget revision to be approved
Contingency funds secured	March- April 2013	March- April 2013	AEC + CCTC – March DX – April
Site works commence	May 2013	May 2013	Enabling works undertaken – main contractor on-site in June
Completion of site works	Nov 2013	Feb 2014	Very ambitious programming given complexity of works and size of site. Requirement to do additional works to deal with issues on site once stone floors lifted + damp revealed

### Revenue Implications (if applicable)

Key Categories	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate now project is completed	Reasons for Difference
Loss of interest @ 3.9%	6,397	5,000	Lower interest rate (now calculated at 3%)
(If building retained) additional maintenance implications of roof			

### Officer Time

Officer	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
Area Development Manager	15	10	
Regeneration Officer	110	200	Significantly underestimated project management implications of complex project which overran
Senior Land & Property Officer	20	20	
Senior Building Surveyor	80	95	Multiple phasing/complexity of project

**APPENDIX B**

**Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)**

To make the best use of a magnificent, town centre building as a real focus for community activity, whilst increasing its revenue potential thereby helping to address a potential liability and secure its long term future.
Increase availability of accessible, flexible public meeting and event space in the centre of town.
To have a building which is accessible throughout, for both ambulant people/wheelchair users. This bid addresses ground floor public access (4 levels) and provides an easy access toilet Access to 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor access could be addressed in the future
To optimise usable space at the ground floor level thus helping to sustain the building into the future.

**How have the objectives been met?**

Usage of the building has increased significantly and things like the town’s weekly market couldn’t have been established without access to the facilities at the Market House
Well used community meeting space now available and regularly hired by community organisations/local businesses
Three level changes within the ground floor have been addressed through the provision of ramps/lift/flex step. Revised operational arrangements by CCTC mean that disabled visitors can always access assistance (during opening hours). Scheme design doesn’t compromise lift provision to upper floors in the future.
Proactive marketing of meeting/outside space by CCTC for income generation with Asset Transfer to CCTC approved by DX in April subject to finalisation of HofT

**Benefits resulting from the Project**

Reduced deterioration of previously exposed areas within this Grade II* Listed building
Enthusiastic community support for what is well regarded meeting space, with good level of regular/repeat bookings
Works have meant that the building is a more appealing prospect for CCTC to consider accepting responsibility for the building

**In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently?**

Pushed anchor funder for more realistic programming with breaks so that there were ‘recovery’ periods built into the different elements of work which could soak up programme slippage and the requirement to do additional works
Better estimate of the time implications of build overrun, partner/funder relations, financial and overall scheme management
Allow for more

**Summary**

Brought in close to budget so contingency funding agreed following receipt of tenders was only partially required
---



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Project Name</b>	Yeovil Country Park Ranger Base
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	9 January 2014
<b>Project Officer</b>	Katy Menday

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	2009	January 2014
<b>Project Completed</b>	Un confirmed	October 2014

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget £</b>	<b>Revised Budget (if applicable) £</b>
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	128,000	
<b>External Funding</b>	172,597	
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b><u>300,597</u></b>	
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>299,000</b>	
<b>Project under /overspend</b>	<b>1,597</b>	
<b>% under / overspend</b>	<b>-0.5%</b>	

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
<b>Project Initiation</b>	2009	2009	
<b>Feasibility</b>	Jan – Dec 2009	As planned	
<b>Yeovil Vision Capital Bid</b>	Feb 2010	As planned	
<b>Planning Permission</b>	Summer 2010	As planned	
<b>Capital Fund raising</b>	Early 2011	Completed Jan 2014	Changes in the capital grants available for visitor centres meant funding had to be found elsewhere and as a package of grants rather than one single large funder. A community support group (The Friends of Yeovil Country Park) was established to help this

## APPENDIX B

			fundraising effort. As the fundraising took so long planning permission had to be re-submitted in July 2013.
<b>Value Engineering / Design refinement</b>	Jan – April 2014	Jan – April 2014	
<b>Contractor Procurement</b>	January 2014	January 2014	
<b>Contract and Construction</b>	May – October 2014	May – Oct 2014	
<b>Operation Preparation</b>	Sept – October 2014	Sept - October 2014	
<b>Handover and Opening</b>	October 2014	28 October 2014	

### Officer Time

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Original Estimate per capital appraisal</b>	<b>Estimate of actual time spent on project</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
Staff hours were not recorded for this project. It included staff from Countryside and Engineering and Property Services.			

### Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)

1. The development of new facilities (Ranger Base and Visitor Centre) at Yeovil Country Park.
2. Appointing a Grant-funded Community Officer for a fixed term period of 4 years.
3. Creating additional visitors (schools, students, informal education and events) to the park.
4. Increasing the number of volunteering opportunities at the park.
5. Increasing formal training opportunities.
6. Generating a small but dependable income stream.

### How have the objectives been met?

1. Yes, on time and on budget, to a high standard that have been very well received by the visiting and using public.
2. Yes through an associated bid to the Heritage lottery Fund for a 3 year funded Community Ranger Post (2015 – 2018).
3. Yes, through new capacity and skills brought by the full time community ranger post.
4. Yes, though new volunteering programmes developed by the community ranger.
5. No, informal training has increased but constraints on the revenue budget have meant that formal training like apprenticeships have needed to be removed for the financial year 2016/17. Apprenticeships funding was proposed as part of the heritage lottery



**APPENDIX B**

project but it was not approved at round 1 submission and was removed from the bid.
6. Yes, the Ninesprings Café is performing in line with its business plan and on track to meet income targets for 2016/17.

**Benefits resulting from the Project**

The award winning Yeovil country park now has an accessible gateway to the 127 acres of greenspace. The Centre can be promoted as a start and finish point for visits and provides key free facilities like toilets. Leaflets and advice can be picked up from the centre and face to face interactions with the visiting public and groups has increased. The country park has subsequently won a 5 star Best Parks award from Britain in Bloom.
A wider range of groups are now visiting the country park, this includes young families, childminding groups of pre-school children, groups supporting individuals with physical disabilities. They are able to safely access and enjoy the country park from the centre. New activities have been developed and can run from the centre and in the country park, including walking groups and sessions like buggy fit.
Volunteering has expanded and the staff and volunteer team have access to facilities for tool storage and rest breaks during the working day. Volunteering sessions have now been expanded and offered to individuals with physical and additional learning needs.
The Friends of Yeovil Country Park can now meet on site, and the group has attracted new members because of this.
The Ninesprings Café is performing well. Financially it is exceeding the business plan targets and it has created a welcoming space that is well used by groups meeting socially, before and after making use of the country park.
Confirmation of funding for the centre and its construction enabled the submission of the Heritage Lottery Fund bid to cover the project elements of a 3 year community ranger and a huge range of other natural and built heritage elements. The construction of the centre was a condition of the lottery grant.

**Summary**

Finalising the funding package was the only delay in project delivery. This element of the project was problematic as the funding landscape changed, meaning a single large grant submission could not be made to cover the construction project. Building the grants package took time and coordination to bring all elements online at the correct timescales. We created a Friends group for the country park to increase fundraising capabilities, and access funds not available to local government; this was successful in securing a greater degree of small business contributions. The Group is still going and goes from strength to strength, having secured £30K for park projects in 2015.
In order to optimize the café potential for the centre, the project team benefited substantially through an existing contact from the Family Focus Programme who had previously been the Business Development Director for Costa Coffee. This input enabled the project to adopt a national chain commercial approach and 'piggy back' upon a range of national supplier arrangements to both deliver better value for money and fast track implementation. It ensured we attracted a high calibre manager at recruitment in Summer 2014, who has since developed an excellent team with exemplary customer service.
The countryside ranger team and volunteers are very happily sharing the building with the new café team and are actively searching out ways to increase footfall to support its success. The most recent successes include free dog micro chipping events, running events, ranger trail events and fairs.



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	2015-04
<b>Project Name</b>	Replacement Sweepers – Chris Cooper
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	April 15
<b>Project Officer</b>	Chris Cooper

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	Sept 14	Nov 14
<b>Project Completed</b>	Oct 15	Nov 15

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget £</b>	<b>Revised Budget (if applicable) £</b>
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	70,000	
<b>External Funding</b>	15,000	(Sale of old machinery)
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b><u>85,000</u></b>	
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>86,000</b>	
<b>Project under /overspend</b>	<b>1,000</b>	Sale of Machinery achieved £1K less than anticipated
<b>% under / overspend</b>	<b>1%</b>	

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
Review the Market	Sep 14	Nov 14	
Shortlist Machinery and arrange demonstrations	Jan 15	Jan 15	
Place order	April 15	Aug 15	It took longer than expected to get the machinery demos here
Take delivery of machinery	July 15	Sept 15	Knock on from the demonstration & consequent selection process
Sign & Register Vehicles	Aug 15	Sept 15	As above
Dispose of existing vehicles	Oct 15	Nov 15	That's when the auction was

## APPENDIX B

### Officer Time

Officer	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
Streetscene Manager	20 hours	48 hours	Visited factory which makes the machines
Streetscene & Car Parks Supervisor	20 hours	10 hours	There was less range of machinery to select from thus making the process easier
Fleet Services Supervisor	35 hours	14 hours	There was less range of machinery to select from thus making the process easier
Operational staff	20 hours	26 hours	There was less range of machinery to select from thus making the process easier

### Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)

To replace old machinery used to clean the district with more effective and efficient models.

### How have the objectives been met?

The new machines have been acquired and deployed with excellent results & some efficiency savings as vehicles with trailers that were previously used to transport the machinery around the district are no longer required.

### Benefits resulting from the Project

New machinery of a higher specification has been acquired

Less travelling costs than using old system

Improved health and safety as the new models are more stable than previous machinery

Higher quality of street cleaning has resulted from the use of this equipment

Less wear and tear on other equipment – land rover & trailer

### In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently?

Not that we can think of – we considered the electric powered models but these were unsuitable for our application due to limited range of travel.

### Summary

Visiting the factory to see how the supplier can substantiate their claims of fantastic back up support.

The machinery wasn't the most expensive or the cheapest, but it is the hidden costs that need to be interrogated in order to find the best value machine for us.

Actual costs are difficult to clarify when the project is in its conceptual stages so the capital bid was 'conservative' and possibly a slight variable should have been built in.

We could get better sale value of older machinery if we could sell directly via e-bay or other such media rather than through traditional auction methods



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	
<b>Project Name</b>	Upgrade CedAr Financial System
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	Nov 2014
<b>Project Officer</b>	Karen Gubbins

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	November 2014	November 2014
<b>Project Completed</b>	March 2015	December 2015

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget £</b>	<b>Revised Budget (if applicable) £</b>
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	106,000	
<b>External Funding</b>	0	
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b><u>106,000</u></b>	
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>107,065</b>	
<b>Project under /overspend</b>	<b>1,065</b>	
<b>% under / overspend</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
<b>Completion Date</b>	March 2015	Dec 2015	During the initial planning the live date was moved from March to June 2015 to allow internal SSDC teams to complete other IT delivery commitments. This was put back further to November due to the Finance team being involved with the closure of accounts and also to allow further testing.

## Revenue Implications (if applicable)

<b>Key Categories</b>	<b>Original Estimate per capital appraisal</b>	<b>Estimate now project is completed</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
Loss of interest @ 3%	2,900	2,900	
Annual Maintenance	2,300	2,300	

## APPENDIX B

### Officer Time

Officer	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
Financial systems officer	480	1,040	Due to the completion date being put back further time was spent on it. This was necessary as some of the problems that occurred very early in the project highlighted we were the first E5 customers to implement E5 on a windows platform using the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party software (microfocus server) which in itself caused delays.
Finance Manager	125	125	
Land and property Assistant	125	10	The Land and property assistant didn't get involved as envisaged due to her lack of knowledge about the system
ICT	350	1,040	Due to the completion date being put back further time was spent on it. This was necessary as some of the problems that occurred very early in the project highlighted we were the first E5 customers to implement E5 on a windows platform using the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party software (microfocus server) which in itself caused delays and required IT to do some further work to ensure compatibility.
Creditors/Debtors input/advice	74	100	Due to errors found in testing further testing was required once the errors had been fixed
Accountancy input/advice	74	74	

### Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)

To seamlessly upgrade E5
To utilise efficiently the new functionality that version 5.4 offers
To ensure that existing financial data is accessible
To ensure that the system provides quality management information when and as required

**APPENDIX B**

To ensure that all income and expenditure is correctly accounted for
This project will also enhance the current asset that is owned by SSDC. Ownership will continue for as long as we continue to pay on-going maintenance

**How have the objectives been met?**

The upgrade has been successful and the financial data is accessible and correctly accounted for with the ability to extract quality management information when required.
We haven't yet explored the new functionality due to the lack of resources available within the financial systems team

**Benefits resulting from the Project**

We now have a financial system that is supported and when time allows we will implement some of the new functionality available from the system
---

**In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently?**

The majority of the issues incurred were as a result of corporately deciding to move to a windows environment – this involved IT having to re-write the way the files communicated with each other which took a lot longer than initially planned into the upgrade. The move to a new platform established ABS weren't as familiar with it as we were initially led to believe. The individual module testing was left to the last minute as well due to the issues of prioritisation referred to in the initial brief.
---



# Post Investment Appraisal Form

<b>Project Number</b>	2014-17
<b>Project Name</b>	UPGRADING THE HELPDESK AND PROPERTY SERVICES SYSTEM (HEAT)
<b>Date Funding Approved</b>	
<b>Project Officer</b>	Roger Brown

## Project Duration Summary

	<b>Original Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>
<b>Project Commenced</b>	October 2014	January 2015
<b>Project Completed</b>	November 2014	May 2016

## Project Budget & Actuals

	<b>Original Budget £</b>	<b>Revised Budget (if applicable) £</b>
<b>SSDC Funding</b>	37,000	
<b>External Funding</b>	0	
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b><u>37,000</u></b>	
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>36,330</b>	
<b>Project under /overspend</b>	<b>670</b>	
<b>% under / overspend</b>	<b>2%</b>	

## Project Milestones

<b>Key Milestones</b>	<b>Estimated Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>
Training	Oct/Nov 2014	May /August 2015	The consultant who was project managing for HEAT changed jobs and was not quickly replaced. The training work had to be outsourced to a third party.

## Revenue Implications (if applicable)

<b>Key Categories</b>	<b>Original Estimate per capital appraisal</b>	<b>Estimate now project is completed</b>	<b>Reasons for Difference</b>

## APPENDIX B

Running Expenses (Yr 1 to 5)	22,500	22,500	
---------------------------------	--------	--------	--

### Officer Time

Officer	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
<b>ICT</b>			
ICT Manager	35	35	The original project brief was written on the basis that we were getting an out of the box system that would require minor configuration to meet SSDC requirements.
Helpdesk Team Leader	65	100	
Infrastructure Support & Operations Team Leader	40	40	
Systems Support Officer	50	10	
Systems Support Officer	75	10	
Systems Support Officer	0	150	
Desktop Support Officer	60	150	
Performance & Compliance Officer	30	150	
Helpdesk Technician	0	150	
<b>Property Services</b>			
Property & Engineering Manager	30	30	
Principal Property Management Officer	60	60	
Property Management Officer	45	45	
Total	490	920	

### Objectives of the project\_(per the capital appraisal)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate the upgrade of the server that hosts the ICT Helpdesk / Service Management System removing compliance issues around running an unsupported server operating system.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upgrade the Service Management software to the currently supported system removing risks around running old unsupported software with vulnerabilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilise enhanced features to improve call management and reporting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resolve Property Services problem's with their PSR system.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-establish mainstream support with the vendor so we don't have the same problem again and keep our software up to date.</li> </ul>

### How have the objectives been met?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The unsupported server operating system that hosted the old version of the ICT Helpdesk / Service Management System deactivated/removed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The software has been upgraded to a newer supported version.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have set up the new system to improve call management and reporting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have worked with the Property Services team to set up their system requirements.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are now back in a support agreement with the software vendor so we can</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX B

contact their helpdesk for advice and also receive ongoing version updates.

### Benefits resulting from the Project

As per objectives.

### In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently?

We would have asked for a more detailed breakdown of the work involved to set this up as the staff hours were much greater than expected.

### Summary

The delay was caused by our main Project Manager at HEAT leaving the employment and then not being quickly replaced. The project started picking up pace in mid-2015.

Creating a small project group within the ICT service really helped to focus the attention on the project. Also blocking out one day per week for each of the key administrators has helped.