Capital Ambition: Project Closure Process and End Project

Project name	**London Library Change Programme**
CA reference number	CA 322 (CA89 P1 W 5-7 & P3 W1)
Release	Draft/Final Date: 25 March 2011
Project Manager:	Sue Thiedeman / Sophie Lancaster
Project Sponsor:	Andrew Holden (chair LLCP board & Director of Engagement London, MLA Council)
Lead Borough:	London Cultural Improvement Group (LCIG) on behalf of all London Authorities
Participating Boroughs & organisations	London Cultural Improvement Group (LCIG) on behalf of all London Authorities; London Councils; MLA – London Field Team; MLA Council; London Chief Culture and Leisure Officers Association; Local Government Improvement & Development (formerly IDeA); Association of London Chief Librarians

Revision Date	Author	Summary of Changes	New Version
25 March 2011	Tina Morton		
29 March 2011		Final check	

Executive Summary

(This closes phase 2 of the London Library Change Programme, phase 3 is ongoing)

The London Library Change Programme (LLCP) has supported London boroughs to find new models of public library service delivery that will help to deliver budget savings and improved efficiency. The aim of the programme was to collaborate to reduce the cost of London's library services and achieve better value-for-money. The first two phases of work explored individual service efficiencies and the sharing of back-office functions. Building on these foundations, Capital Ambition supported the final phase (phase three) of the programme to help boroughs implement new models of collaboration and shared services.

Previous phases were funded by Capital Ambition as follows:

- London Library Change Programme: Phase 1 – a feasibility study for change (part of URN: CA89 P1 W1; January 2007 – November 2008; submission of a feasibility study and identification of 5 major projects to take forward; £30,000 awarded by Capital Ambition (and £30,000 from London Centre of Excellence)

- London Library Change Programme: Phase 2 – Workforce Benchmarking and an Examination of Procurement and Classification Processes and Standardisation (URN: CA89 P1 W3-5; July – October 2009; submission of benchmarking data on staffing levels and deployment across London and on current procurement and inter library loans process – resulting in appraisal of options to take forward to implementation stage; £124,000 awarded by Capital Ambition

Phases 1 and 2 of the programme provided the data and evidence base, and at the same time increased awareness of need for transformational change with stakeholder groups, including officers and Elected Members. Investment in a set-up and development stage was needed to provide a strong offer to boroughs, and to involve those who wished to participate in the first wave of decisions and processes.

In the final phase of the programme, we are focusing on providing boroughs with tools and support that will help to accelerate the work of existing partnerships or to help establish new collaborative projects. The programme will continue into 2011/12 as it was not possible to allocate all the funding due to the avalanche of cuts and the time it has taken boroughs to get their heads both managerially and politically round what they can do.

The LLCP Community of Practice has been developed to facilitate cross borough communication and sharing of best practice.

All past and present information and reports are posted on the Communities of Practice website, where further debate and insights can be made.

http://www.communities.idea.gov.uk/c/8423813/home.do

PART 1: PROJECT CLOSURE

Achievement of Project Objectives

Objectives in PID	Achieved (Y or N)	Relevant Products	Commentary on how these objectives / products link to the major benefits & Lessons Learnt
Agreeing and adopting common standards for servicing and classification. Common standards should enable a higher level of discount from suppliers and importantly provide a platform for future partnership working and potential for opportunities though shared services	N	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	Report identified common standards and some authorities (SELPIG, LLC and Haringey) are currently working on various projects to take this forward.
Supporting Authorities to streamline processes to receive stock as efficiently and shelf ready as possible and in particular to: • Deliver a greater proportion of supplier selection for stock • Increase the use of electronic data interchange (EDI or XML) for invoicing and ordering • Receiving as high a proportion of shelf ready stock as possible to save on servicing and repacking costs • Prepare library services for the potential benefits of a shared services approach to management and operations in the future	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	Report identified common standards and some authorities (SELPIG, LLC and Haringey) are currently working on various projects to take this forward. The Future Library Programme pilots worked on some of these issues (SELPIG; Tri Borough - K&C, H&F, & Westminster).
Work with the National Acquisition Group and others to develop the minimum standard currently in existence further for the benefit of users, customers, and suppliers	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	Consultants liaised with NAG to identify minimum standards.
Establish a standards board for London to deliver efficiencies through market management, with the potential for rollout nationally.	Y	n/a	Developed a shadow standards board for the period of phase two. This work is now under the remit of LLCP Board and ALCL.
Identifying the costs of providing Inter-Library Loans (ILL) across London and make a transparent decision about the cost versus benefits of the service,	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	The report highlighted costs and outdated process associated with inter-library loans. Provided boroughs with information to make informed business decisions.
Identify whether the service can be delivered more efficiently and effectively.	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	The report highlighted costs and outdated process associated with inter-library loans. Provided boroughs with information to

			make informed business decisions.
Make recommendations for the future of the service.	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	The report highlighted costs and outdated process associated with inter-library loans. Provided boroughs with information to make informed business decisions.
Undertaking a workforce benchmarking project across London Local Authority Library Services	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	Report highlighted the inconsistency in management structure across London boroughs, the potential for savings at a management level and variances in effectiveness and productivity.
To build a platform to deliver substantial efficiencies, cashable savings and continuation of and improvements to service delivery	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	Phase 2 programme contributed to the development of phase 3 and enable the programme to lever in funding.
To build a platform to encourage collaboration and joint working across London's public library services	Y	Community of Practice: http://www.communities.idea.gov.uk/c/8423813/home.do	Aligning work of ALCL and established consortia and networks such as LLC, SELPIG and emerging collaborations such as tri-borough to delver efficiencies and improved effectiveness in London's public library services.
To establish an accountable body for structural change across London's public library services	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/policylobbying/culturetourismand2012/lcip/londonlibrarychangeprogramme.htm	The LLCP Board has worked closely with sector partners to oversee the programme.
To establish a design authority to steer new ways of working and sharing processes	N		A change in the delivery mechanism meant that this objective was no longer applicable.
To facilitate peer support across London Boroughs in order to bring all 33 services up to the levels of the best	Y	Case studies: http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyConsortiaSECURE%20(2).pdf http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyPlacecasedSECURE.pdf http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudySharedSECURE.pdf http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyTrustSECURE.pdf Strategic Operating Framework: http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/SOFframeworkSECURE.pdf	LLCP workshops, ALCL, consortia and collaborations of boroughs together with Future Libraries Programme and the LLCP SOF have established methods of collaborative working to drive improvement and share best practice. (Password to documents: LCIP123)
To support a number of early adopter systems trials to establish new and proven ways of sharing processes across London	Y	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPBulletin9.pdf http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPBulletin14v1.pdf	The programme is funding a number of propositions from groups of boroughs to develop products which will be scalable and transferable.
To support the development of a	Y	Strategic operating model:	Project changed emphasis from

| | business model for structural change that will include a funding formula for participating authorities, transition costs, staffing and governance arrangements and implementation plan | | http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/SOFframeworkSECURE.pdf

http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPBulletin14v1.pdf | developing a specific model to enabling boroughs to use the Strategic Options Framework to work through a number of options to determine the optimum scenario for their own situation. It is anticipated that the products developed as a result of phase 3 will support other boroughs in their decision making. |

Performance against planned End date & Investment

	Agreed	Actual	Variance	Comment
Total CA Investment	404,000	295,555.05	108,444.95	Phase 3 propositions funding allocation yet to be finalised.
End Date	31 Mar 2011	30 Sept 2011	6 months	

Approved Change Request (description)	Effect on original schedule	Effect on Business Case (Costs / Benefits)	Impacts on project scope / objectives
Carry-forward of funding to support the development of products.	Delay of six months.	Nil	Project changed emphasis from developing a specific model to enabling boroughs to use the Strategic Options Framework to work through a number of options to determine the optimum scenario for their own situation.

Project Acceptance Criteria

	Acceptance Criteria	Has been met (Y or N)
1	Develop an organising and accountable change agent (body) to drive this scale and complexity of change across London and involve several stakeholder groups	Y
2	Develop a steering body to advise on how best to extend existing joint working practices and develop new ones, at the same time as building a technical platform that makes structural and systems change possible	Partly
3	Trial, establish and develop joint working processes and standards with early adopter authorities	Y – in progress
4	Generate individual service improvement through facilitating peer support between authorities	Y
5	Develop a business model and implementation plan for change in the structure of London library services in collaboration with boroughs participating in the first wave.	N – see above
6	The next phases of the programme (Phases 4 and 5) would be structured according to the delivery model developed during Phase 3 (this project). Transition to implementation – ie. sharing back office services and processes and potentially front office management as well - may be in two or more waves, either on a linear opt-in or cluster based opt-in model.	N/A
7	Implement a communications plan to ensure careful and timely messaging and to engage a range of stakeholders as the programme progresses	Y

Project benefits & assets produced

	Benefits / assets	Link to product if applicable	Comment
1	London Library Change Programme phase 2 reports:	http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/policylobbying/culturetourismand2012/lcip/londonlibrarychangeprogramme.htm http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPFinalReportsNov09.pdf	1.Workforce Benchmarking: Understanding the London library workforce's utilisation 2. Common Standards and Inter-Library Loans: Efficient libraries through standards and sharing
2	Phase 3: Community of	Community of Practice:	The LLCP Community of Practice has been

	Practice	http://www.communities.idea.gov.uk/c/8423813/home.do	developed to facilitate cross borough communication and sharing of best practice. All past and present information and reports are posted on the Communities of Practice website, where further debate and insights can be made.
3	Phase 3: Strategic Operating Framework	Strategic Operating Framework: http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/SOFframeworkSECURE.pdf	Password: LCIP123 The Strategic Options Framework (SOF) is designed to help you to navigate through the alternative service delivery models available. Whatever stage you have reached in your planning, it can help you to test your ideas and to refine your plans. It provides a step-by-step guide through the strategic decision-making process and will help you to avoid reinventing the wheel. Although it is designed to be practical, it does address complex issues and so it's not a DIY tool, nor is it a 'one size fits all' approach into which you can put in your numbers, crank a handle and get an answer.
4	Case Studies	Case studies: http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyTrustSECURE.pdf	Password: LCIP123 **Trust:** explores the benefits that conversion to trust status could bring to a library service. This case study draws on the experience of the Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust which gained charitable status in 2004. The case study also explores the success of Luton Cultural Services Trust in securing charitable funding. Councils considering trust status have concluded that their library service, on its own, does not have sufficient scale to justify the costs and overheads of conversion.
		http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudySharedSECURE.pdf	**Shared:** across the country, more and more authorities are sharing services, sometimes as part of full mergers of management structures, often as a stand-alone arrangement for a single service. No authorities have yet shared their library services, although a number of authorities are in active discussions within London. In the absence of examples of shared library services, we have developed a scenario that explores what could be achieved if 2, 3 or 4 authorities took part.
		http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyPlacecasedSECURE.pdf	**Place based:** in this case study, we showcase two examples of library services that have created new models of service delivery: • Sutton's Phoenix Centre in

			Wallington combines a library with a youth zone, gym, sports centre, dance studio - and more!
			• Tower Hamlets' plans for a new Idea Store in Watney Market bring together library and lifelong learning with a multi-agency one-stop-shop. The case study examines the benefits of sharing premises costs and generating increased footfall. It also explores the potential - and limits - of generic working.

Consortium: working in a consortium of authorities can provide economies of scale and allows authorities to share capacity and reduce the cost of investing in new service developments. There are now a number of consortia in operation across London and beyond. Launched in 2000 by four partner authorities, the London Libraries Consortium provides a framework for stock purchasing and for the management of a shared Library Management System. At the time of writing the case study, the Consortium has expanded to include 12 partner authorities with more planning to join. The case study reviews the evidence of the benefits to an authority of joining the Consortium. |
| | | http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPCaseStudyConsortiaSECURE%20(2).pdf | |
| 5 | Propositions/products under development | http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPBulletin9.pdf

http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/LLCPBulletin14v1.pdf | The programme is funding a number of propositions from groups of boroughs to develop products which will be scalable and transferable. |

Please sign below:

Project Manager's Details:

Sue Thiedeman

Director London Cultural Improvement Programme

Name: _____   Signature: _____

Project Sponsor's Details:

Andrew Holden

Director of Engagement, MLA London
Name: Field Team and Chair LLCP   Signature: _____

OUTSTANDING RISKS AND ISSUES

RAG Scores 🟢 scores 1-4, 🟠 scores 5-8, 🔴 scores 9-16.				
Description of Risk / Issue & impact on project legacy	Likelihood (1-4)	Impact (1-4)	RAG Likelihood x Impact	Action to resolve
NDPB changes within lifecycle of project.	4	4	🔴	Ensure that LLCP has a profile in transition from MLA to ACE.
Capital Ambition ceases to exist after March 2011	4	4	🔴	Ensure sufficient project management to ensure effective monitoring of later stages of phase 3.

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS:

Part 2 Sharing Lessons Learned

What worked well—or didn't work well—either for this project or for the project team, and what are your real world recommended solutions?

Worked well

- Alignment of partners in supporting the programme.
- Refresh of LLCP Board to provide expertise and local government officer and member input.
- Communications – e.g. Annual Seminars for officers and Members, e bulletins

Didn't work well

- Over-ambitious aspirations in the context of rapid change and reduction in public finances.
- Project management was not consistent across the three phases; there were several handover periods and new project managers took time to get up to speed.
- It took stakeholders a long time to revise expectations and arrive at a consensus for new vision.

What surprises did the team have to deal with, and how did you resolve these?

- The programme needed to adapt to a rapidly changing environment, which meant changing or deleting obsolete deliverables and focusing on newly emerging priorities to support the needs of local authorities. Developing a contingency plan to combat reducing capacity within cultural agencies, affecting time and resources available for project.
- MLA London/MLA Council merger caused unexpectedly high disruption.
- Rapid deletion of government policies and programmes such as: CAAs, LAAs, NIs
- The extent of upheaval caused by the general /local? election to the programme, partner organisations and local authorities. Phase 3 of the programme was significantly delayed due to restrictions of purdah.
- Abolition of organisations with a longstanding relationship with the programme such as GoL, Audit Commission, MLA Council.
- Organisations who were having to rapidly transform became inward looking and key individual relationships were lost.

What overall lessons were learnt and do you have any further recommendations for future projects?

- Strong governance and programme management are essential in driving complex projects with multiple stakeholders forward particularly in the context of a changing environment.