5 February 2015

Ian Apperley
FYI.org.nz

By email to: fyi-request-2444-ff91ba40@requests.fyi.org.nz

Dear Mr Apperley

Official Information Request Response

Thank you for your information request, submitted via the FYI.org.nz website on 29 January 2015, in which you ask for information on the Council's Odyssey project and related IT projects.

Your questions, and the Council responses to each are as follows:

1.   Can I please have all copies of all written communication (letters, emails, file notes) between WCC and other regional councils concerning Project Odyssey, as well as records of meetings being held and agendas for those meetings.

The approach as to how WCC and other councils would engage (if other councils would like to) was presented at meetings with them – Upper Hutt, Lower Hutt, Porirua and Greater Wellington Regional Councils were presented to.

GWRC were approached slightly differently, recognising that they have fairly significant differences in services and functions to WCC and the other City Councils.

Presentation documents are attached to this response.

2.   Please supply the original tender evaluation material for Project Odyssey that was released to the market including any additional documents released through the process.

Please see the attached documents concerning the RFP.

3.   Please supply the original scoring template, including weighting, and any other versions of that document during the life of the tender. I don't want the respondents identified or their scores, I want the empty template of requirements.

The Council is still within the procurement process. This part of your request is refused under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, sections 7(2)(b)(ii) and 7(2)(i).

4.   Any presentation, hard copy documentation, or any other material that was used to brief the Council on the 28th of January 2015 in relation to Project Odyssey or any other IT Project.

Please find attached the PowerPoint slides from the 28 January 2015 briefing.

5.   The Wellington City Council's Information Systems Strategic Plan, or any similar IT strategy documents, that show the plans for IT at the Council over the next two to three years.

Please find attached the Council's BIT ICT Strategy 2014-17 document.

6.   How many staff, or contractors, at the WCC are former employees of Technology One?

There are 1500+ employees at the Council. A review of all employees to determine who are former TechnologyOne employees has not been carried out. To ascertain how many Council employees have previously worked for TechnologyOne would require substantial research of the Council's Human Resources files, and follow up with each member of staff.

However, I can advise you that in the Council's IT team, which is likely to be of more relevance to you, there is one former employee of TechnologyOne – employed by the Council as the Odyssey Programme Manager. The Council was aware of this previous employment as it was declared up front by the Odyssey Programme Manager.

7.   Were any former employees of Technology One involved in the writing of, the evaluation of, or managing the process of the Project Odyssey tender?

The Odyssey Programme Manager was involved in the writing of the RFP, though the decisions as to the final make-up of the RFP were made by the Steering Group, not the Odyssey Programme Manager.

There were a number of people involved in the evaluation of the RFP.

This included the Odyssey Project Steering Group, the Council's Procurement Manager, and the Council's IT senior leadership team. The Odyssey Programme Manager was also involved.

The Odyssey Programme manages all activities in the Programme, though as pointed out above the Steering Group make the final decisions.

8.   How were conflicts of interest managed during the tender and what was the nature of those, if any?

Conflict of Interest statements have been signed by all who have direct involvement in the Programme.

Potential conflicts of interest have been raised, none of which were significant enough to require formal management.

9.   Were the Department of Internal Affairs Common Capability services analysed as part of the tender, if they were, why were they discounted, and if they were not, why not?

There is no overlap between the services offered under DIA's Common Capability and the functionality we seek to implement.

10.   Please supply a copy of the Gift Register for the IT Department, or, the gift register that the IT department is required to use, for the period of 2014 and January 2015.

Please see the attached pages from the Council's gift register, for the IT team, dating from September 2013 to December 2014 (the period in which the Odyssey programme has been active).

Some personal information has been withheld from the gift register under LGOIMA, section 7(2)(a), to protect personal information that identifies individuals where comments on the gift register were in relation to personal matters.

11.   A list of the functions of the systems that Project Odyssey seeks to replace.

The project is targeting the replacement of approximately 70 of our current 120+ different systems.

Please see the attached spreadsheet detailing the list of applications, and their uses.

12.   Without identifying tender responders, release the information as to why responders were NOT successful.

The Council is still within the procurement process. This part of your request is refused under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, sections 7(2)(b)(ii) and 7(2)(i).

13.   What is the expected cost of Project Odyssey over the next three years?

The project delivery is expected to complete in an 18-20 month time period, starting from contract signing.

The net financial return is a saving of $12M over 10 years. This includes a comprehensive set of costs of $15.3M. These include internal IT resource, internal business resource, consultancy, independent advice and review, legal, vendor implementation, vendor first year licensing and support. The gross savings are forecast at $27.5M.

14.   Was there any Quality Assurance, and or, independent Probity carried out on the tender process? If yes, please can I have copies of any formal reports that were given to the Wellington City Council.

Please find attached an Independent Quality Assurance report on the programme.

The Council's internal Risk Assurance team are monitoring the programme from the Probity perspective.

The independent advisor on the Programme Steering Committee also provides Quality Assurance for the project.

Additionally, Audit New Zealand will have oversight of the Odyssey work programme through the annual IT controls audit.
The Council has refused to provide information requested in questions 3&12. This has been done under the following sections of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA):

Section 7(2)(b)(ii) – to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information.

Section 7(2)(i) – to enable the Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).

If you disagree with the decisions to withhold information, you can apply in writing to the Ombudsman to have the decision investigated and reviewed under section 27 (3) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely

Chris Brown
Issues Resolution Office
Wellington City Council
Ph: (04) 801 3479
Email: chris.brown@wcc.govt.nz