

Project 21

PROJECT CLOSURE REPORT

31/03/22

Project Name:	Project 21
Project Description:	<p>Project 21 (P21) was created to determine and deliver a new operating model for ESFRS Fire Control. The project was split into two main phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Evaluation of the options for future Fire Control for East Sussex and recommendation of a preferred solution for Fire Authority approval2. Implementation of that solution once approved by the Fire Authority <p>Phase 1 was completed in January 2020 when East Sussex Fire Authority approved the implementation of Option 1 on 9/1/20 – a new Joint Fire Control partnership with Surrey FRS (who already provide similar services for West Sussex FRS).</p> <p>The drivers for the project and all the associated background information, option evaluation, due diligence work and associated deliverables were set out in previous Fire Authority papers both in October 2019 and then again in January 2020.</p> <p>The aim of Phase 2 of Project 21 was to implement the approved Surrey Partnership solution for Joint Fire Control originally by the end of September 2021, with the associated change in operating model for ESFRS and new ways of working aligned as far as practicable with Surrey and West Sussex FRS’.</p> <p>Project 21 Phase 2 was tasked with delivering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>i) A new Section 16 partnership agreement with SFRS for Joint Fire Control and Mobilising Services;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Based @ SFRS Control Centre – a tri-service joint control room and a new more resilient Secondary Control and Training facility• Utilising SFRS suite of mobilising systems (the core being SSS Vision)• Supported by a SAN- H based Voice solution• Implementing a new set of operating policies / processes / procedures aligned with SFRS and WSFRS as far as practicable• Transferring ESFRS Control staff to SFRS and establishing new resource / service management team• Exit from the current Haywards Heath ESFC building• Removal of the need for ESFRS Secondary Control• Ensuring ongoing support for ESFRS existing mobilising systems through to P21 go-live, and decommissioning them post go-live <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>ii) Other system and equipment replacement / upgrades as follows:</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement and upgrade of 'front of cab' MDTs across ESFRS – including VMDS to SC response migration Phase 3 Station End Equipment upgrade – including Firecoder replacement 1-way Integration of Firewatch with the Surrey SSS Vision system Integration of ESFRS existing Paging and Alerting solution to Vision Upgrades to IRS and Bluelight Exchange BOSS desktop for c. 35 ESFRS users The ORH Dynamic Cover Tool (DCT) for ESFRS at JFC and Secondary Control.
Project Manager:	Chris Sharp
Project Sponsor:	Mark O'Brien – former DCFO

Milestone	Baseline	Actual	Delta
OBC Start date	10/9/18	10/9/2018	0
FA Phase 1 approval)	25/10/19	09/1/20	+ 12 weeks
OBC Approval	-	4/2/20	-
PID Approval	-	12/4/21	-
FBC Approval	-	17/6/21	-
Go-live @ JFC	29/9/21	17/11/21	+ 7 weeks
Finish Date	31/12/21	31/3/22	+ 12 weeks

	Baseline	Actual	Variance	% Variance
Total Duration	1,208 days	1,298	+90 days	+ 7.4%
Budget / Spend	£5,119k (reduced to £4,737k via May '21 CCN)	£4,737k	0	0

Transition costs	2018/19 (£k)	2019/20 (£k)	2020/21 (£k)	2021/22 (£k)	2022/23 (£k)	Total (£k)
Original FA approved budget	0	203	3,977	820	119	5,119
Dec.'20 reforecast budget profile	63	358	2,031	2,667	0	5,119
Revised budget profile after CCN	63	358	1,925	2,391	0	4,737
Items de-scoped (to IT Strat.)	0	0	106	276	0	382
Outturn cost	0	199	1,713	2,600	225	4,737
Variance	(63)	(159)	(212)	209	225	0

Spend is within budget / outside of budget. If outside explain:
The forecast outturn cost of P21 is currently £4,553k versus the approved budget of £4,737k, so P21 has delivered within budget by £184k. However, due to some residual cost uncertainties and on advice from Finance, the above reports a net variance of zero versus budget, with the residual £184k retained as contingency. See full financial analysis, including revenue cost impact, in Appendix A below.

Benefit Realisation			
	Benefits	Met / Partially Met / Not Met	Comments
1	Reduction in ESFRS headcount	Met	On go-live of P21 the ESFRS (former ESFC) headcount reduced to 3 FTE. This will reduce ESFRS payroll costs by £1.063m p/a (£1.244m 20/21 to £181k p/a 22/23).
2	Reduction in ESFRS IT support costs	Met	The direct ESFRS IT support cost associated with the previous ESFC control room of £287k p/a (20/21) will reduce to £145k p/a (22/23), a reduction of £142k p/a - primarily as a result of the removal of the costs of supporting the legacy Remsdaq 4i mobilising system and Frequentis ICCS. In addition, other mobilising related ITG costs (such as MDTs and Station End Equipment) will reduce from £393k p/a (20/21) to £312k (22/23), a further reduction of £81k p/a. The total reduction in 'mobilising' IT support costs as a result of P21 will therefore be £223k p/a. This is £22k more of a reduction than the £201k saving assessed within the approved Business Case and these savings are now incorporated into the approved ITG budget for 22/23.
3	Reduction in ESFRS Facilities costs	Met	On cessation of ESFRS current lease of parts of the Haywards Heath building on 31/3/22 (formal notice now served) the previous maintenance and utility charges of £64k p/a (20/21) will drop to zero (22/23), a reduction of £64k p/a.
4	Reduced tri-service investment needs	Met	By selecting a Voice solution for P21 that remains based on the ESFRS' existing SAN-H solution situated at Haywards Heath, two potential additional investment costs have been avoided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A potential cost of £308k to move the SAN-H from ESFC to JFC ii) A potential cost of £104k to upgrade the SAN-H to SAN-N
5	Removal of the need for ESFRS to procure a new mobilising system of its own	Met	By selecting the Surrey partnership option for P21 the potential additional cost of procuring a new suite of mobilising systems for ESFRS has been avoided. The potential additional cost of this over and above the costs of the selected Surrey partnership option were previously assessed at £6,096k over 5 years.
6	Reduced reactive costs associated with legacy mobilising systems failures	Met	ESFRS no longer has to respond to and resolve issues, reactive maintenance and disruption of incident reporting resulting from partial or complete failure of the legacy 4i mobilising

			system. The effort previously expended on such failures was estimated @ 20% of the ITG Managers' time, 5% of the P21 SRO and Ops Leads' and 24 days of the Data SME's time p/a. This equated to £38k p/a of reactive effort.
--	--	--	--

Other Operational Benefits of the project
See further commentary on the enablement of Operational benefits in Appendix B below.

Strategic Objectives (as identified in the business case)			
	Objectives	Met / Not Met	Comments
1	Highly Resilient	Met	The SSS Vision mobilising system that sits at the heart of Surrey JFC is an industry leading / standard product utilised by c.50% of all UK FRS. Surrey have also invested nearly £700k during the lifespan of P21 in brand new fallback control and training facilities and systems.
2	More Efficient	Not fully met	The 'more efficient' strategic objective has not been fully met because, whilst the JFC solution is significantly lower cost in revenue terms than our previous single service ESFC, the forecast revenue cost of the solution remains £247k p/a greater than the baseline revenue cost of the former East / West SCC (£1.346m p/a for 22/23 versus an 18/19 baseline of £1.099m). The choice of Surrey as a partner was fully documented in previous FA papers about the Phase 1 option evaluation phase – cost was only one of a number of considerations in the option evaluation, and Surrey's costs have evolved significantly in any case in the 3 years since then. The full explanation is as set out in the revenue element of the financial assessment in Appendix A below.
3	Borderless Mobilising	Not fully met	The adoption of the tri-service partnership model with Surrey and West Sussex under P21 has created an operating model whereby 3 geographically adjacent FRS are all

			served by a single JFC using a common suite of mobilising systems. This has created the optimum opportunity for borderless mobilising going forwards, and some aspects of borderless mobilising are now in place (e.g. no delay in requesting resources between ESFRS, WSFRS and SFRS, One pump calls receive the quickest most appropriate appliance across the borders, same radio procedure and language being spoken across all three services). Full borderless mobilising will take further time to mature and will depend on further future alignment of equipment, policies, procedures and training.
4	Proven and Stable	Met	The SSS Vision mobilising system that sits at the heart of JFC's mobilising systems is an industry leading / standard product utilised by c.50% of all UK FRS. As such it is a well proven and stable platform. This is evidenced by 4 months now of stable operation since go-live at JFC, plus there is a KPI on mobilising system stability built into the Section 16. This is monitored monthly along with all other KPIs.

Key Deliverables			
	Deliverables (items in blue are in addition to original scope)	Met / Not Met	Complete on date
1	New front of cab MDTs	Met	10/8/21
2	Single tri-service control room	Met	17/11/21
3	Common tri-service suite of mobilising systems	Met	17/11/21
4	Improved Business Intelligence reporting	Not met	Built. UAT not complete
5	Firewatch integration with mobilisation (1 way)	Met	17/11/21
6	Tri-service ops board	Met	17/11/21
7	More aligned WoW	Met	17/11/21
8	Improved turnout sheets	Met	17/11/21
9	SEE / paging and alerting interface	Met	17/11/21
10	SAN H support handed to SFRS	Met	17/11/21
11	ESN network security segregation is complete	Met	17/11/21
12	MDT Bearer Change	Met	17/11/21
13	Telephony Interface	Met	17/11/21
14	Aligned set of control room KPIs with WSFRS & SFRS	Met	17/11/21
15	Logistics Team / Resource Management Team / Hub	Met	01/10/21
16	New station end equipment (Firecoders)	Met	01/12/20
17	Transfer of JFC staff to SFRS	Met	17/11/21

18	Removal of HH primary & Maresfield secondary control	Met	17/11/21
19	Decommissioning of legacy ESFC mobilising systems (4i etc)	Met	04/03/22
20	Ability to pre-alert	Met	17/11/21
21	Improved use of SC Guide (officer navigation)	Met	17/11/21
22	Enhanced set of P21 programme management reports	Met	17/11/21
23	More effective P21 programme management	Met	17/11/21
24	Tri service risk information visible from our MDTs	Met	17/11/21
25	BOSS desktop	Met	17/11/21
26	Dynamic Cover Tool	Met	17/11/21
27	A tri-Service Collaboration Agreement with SCC & WSCC	Met	15/02/22
28	Renewed and improved station Wifi	Met	01/04/21
29	IRS legacy data migrated to SQL	Met	17/11/21

Note: Items 25 to 29 in blue above were additional scope varied into P21 in May 2021 by SLT as per the formal Change Control document approved on 27/5/21.

Project Outline
See Project Description above.

Success criteria	Met / Note Met
<p>The strategic objectives for P21 were guided by a set of Critical Success Factors (CSF's) defined by SLT at the start of the Phase 1 option evaluation and due diligence work for P21. These were:</p> <p><i>General:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We require a highly resilient & available control and mobilising service The new solution should cost no more than the current provision <p><i>Partner/ Providers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any relationship should be of such scale that if one party were to leave, ESFRS would not be the only party left It is not ESFRS preference to be a 'provider' (under Section 16) <p><i>Mobilising System:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any solution should be proven (no research projects) The mobilising system should be a stable, developed system The mobilising system supplier should be (financially) sustainable ESFRS do not want to procure a mobilising system in isolation <p>Whilst the above CSF's guided the P21 option evaluation work, these were distilled into the following four Strategic Objectives for the implementation phase of P21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly resilient More efficient Borderless mobilising Proven and stable 	<p>See above assessment of delivery versus Strategic Objectives.</p>

Project Closure Synopsis

Phase 1 of P21 (evaluation of the options for future Fire Control for East Sussex and recommendation of a preferred solution for Fire Authority approval) was completed in January 2020 when East Sussex Fire Authority approved the implementation of Option 1 on 9/1/20 – a new Joint Fire Control partnership with Surrey FRS (who already provide similar services for West Sussex FRS).

The drivers for the project and all the associated background information, option evaluation, due diligence work and associated deliverables were set out in previous Fire Authority papers both in October 2019 and then again in January 2020.

The governance structure, stakeholder landscape and the resources put in place to enable delivery of Phase 2 of P21 (implementation of the Surrey JFC solution) were as reported to Members in an updated presentation provided on 24/9/20.

In terms of the fundamental dimensions of delivery of objectives to time, cost and quality, it is the view of the Senior Leadership Team that P21 has been broadly successful on all fronts:

- All key deliverables met bar one, for which the solution is built but still undergoing UAT
- A smooth go-live achieved only 7 weeks later than planned
- Delivery achieved within the original FA approved budget

Set against the backdrop of a history of difficult fire control projects for ESFRS and working with a provider in the form of Surrey who are still maturing as a service provider of a multi-service control function in a complex tri-service political, stakeholder and supplier landscape, this is a very significant achievement. However, two strategic objectives have not been fully met:

The 'more efficient' strategic objective has not been fully met because, whilst the Surrey JFC solution is significantly lower cost in revenue terms than our previous single service ESFC, the forecast revenue cost of the solution remains £247k p/a greater than the baseline revenue cost of the former East / West SCC (£1.346m p/a for 22/23 versus the 18/19 baseline of £1.099m). The choice of Surrey as a partner was fully documented in the option evaluation material contained within the Fire Authority papers in October 2019 and January 2020 and, as Members will recall, cost was only one of multiple considerations in that evaluation. In addition, Surrey's costs have evolved significantly in the 3 years since then. A full explanation of these changes is as set out in the financial assessment in Appendix A.

The 'borderless mobilising' strategic objective has also yet to be fully met because full borderless operations will take time to mature and depend on further future tri-service alignment of equipment, policies, procedures, and training. However, the delivery of the tri-service partnership model with Surrey and West Sussex under P21 has created an operating model whereby 3 geographically adjacent FRS are all served by a single JFC using a common suite of mobilising systems. This has created the optimum opportunity for borderless mobilising going forwards, and some aspects of this are already in place – examples include no delay in requesting resources between ESFRS, WSFRS and SFRS, one-pump calls receive the quickest most appropriate appliance across borders, and the same radio procedure and language are now being spoken across all three services.

In addition, one deliverable (of 29) has not yet been met at the time of writing – 'Improved BI reporting': A BI mobilising database solution has been built and successfully tested by P21 but at the time of writing user acceptance testing of that database is still in progress. Whilst the approved P21 scope was to build a new reporting database providing access to the full suite of Vision mobilising data, there is further work required by the business to build the various mobilising performance reports themselves. Once UAT of

the P21 BI database is complete, the scoping of a new 'Mobilising Reporting Project' will then take place between April and June '22. This approach has been agreed by the DCFO, ACFO, P21 Strategic Board, AD Resources and AD Planning & Improvement. AD Matt Lloyd will be the SRO for this work and P21 has allocated funds within its forecast outturn for a Data SME to support this work.

Since go-live with JFC on 17/11/21, the P21 team have worked hard to create and maintain a list of detailed residual issues and drive action to resolve those issues. Of the 74 items identified at and since go-live less than 10 now remain open at the time of writing. An agreed business owner is identified for every item on this list, along with the proposed next steps to future resolution. There are a further 10 'monitor' items identified for monitoring going forwards, also with identified business owners. All of these items are captured and documented in the residual issues list included as Appendix C below.

There are also a small number of residual risks that ESFRS should remain aware of and actively manage to conclusion going forwards. Again, each risk has been allocated a business owner who will manage these through the relevant internal governance arrangements going forward. These 4 no. risks are set out in the residual RAID log included as Appendix D below.

The key reflections and lessons learned from P21 are captured within Appendix E below. These lessons have been shared with stakeholders and partners and will be used internally to drive improvements in how the Service manages large scale projects going forward.

Report Author (name & date):	Chris Sharp 15/03/22
Reviewed by PMO (name & date):	MP and SG 11/3/22 with comments
Authorised by PMO (name & date):	
Presented to the P21 ISB on date:	17/3/22
Presented to SLT on date:	24/3/22

FOR PMO ONLY: Presented to Change Board on:	15/3/22
--	---------

Appendix A – Financial Appraisal:

Transition costs

The combined phase 1 and 2 transition costs originally approved by the Fire Authority in January '20 to select and implement the Surrey partnership option were £4.619m plus a £500k contingency allowance, giving an approved total one-off transition budget of £5.119m.

A Change Control Notice reflecting several variations in scope and timescale was subsequently approved by SLT in May '21. This reduced the overall approved sum for P21 from £5.119m down to £4.737m, with the funding associated with de-scoped elements remaining in the IT Strategy Reserve. As set out earlier the forecast outturn position is now as follows:

Transition costs	2018/19 (£k)	2019/20 (£k)	2020/21 (£k)	2021/22 (£k)	2022/23 (£k)	Total (£k)
Original FA approved budget	0	203	3,977	820	119	5,119
Dec.'20 reforecast budget profile	63	358	2,031	2,667	0	5,119
Revised budget profile after CCN	63	358	1,925	2,391	0	4,737
Items de-scoped (to IT Strat.)	0	0	106	276	0	382
Outturn cost	0	199	1,713	2,600	225	4,737
Variance	(63)	(159)	(212)	209	225	0

Whilst the substantive scope of P21 has now been delivered within the original approved budget, at the time of writing there remain some areas of uncertainty in the final outturn cost. This is because some items proposed to be funded by P21 will now carry over into 22/23 before the sums involved can be finalised (e.g. TUPE pension costs).

The forecast outturn cost is currently £4,553k versus the approved budget of £4,737k but, due to the residual cost uncertainties set out below, the remaining £184k of approved funding is, on the advice of Finance, currently being held as residual contingency – hence the net variance of zero versus approved budget reported above.

The areas of residual cost uncertainty are as follows:

- Whilst both key legal documents associated with P21 are signed and in place (S16 and Collaboration Agreement) there will be a small amount of further Legal work required to vary the proposed additional Exit Plan into the S16 once that is agreed by Surrey. However, this should be catered for within the Legal cost forecast contained within the above.

- The vast majority of telent IT Integration costs are complete and billed, but two workstreams remain open at the time of writing - those being BI and Decommissioning. The costs for both should be catered for in full within the relevant lines of the above, but UAT of the BI solution is ongoing and decommissioning works, although complete, will not be billing until April '22 at the earliest. A suitable accrual for both should therefore be made in 21/22.
- The power supply element of the Haywards Heath ancillary engineering works (catered for on the SCC Decommissioning line of the attached) will now take place in May '22. This work is c.£20k of the forecast currently included in the P21 total above and hence will now be a 22/23 cost.
- None of Surrey's 'service provider' onboarding costs for 21/22 have yet been billed to ESFRS – these are highly significant at £741k for 21/22 and as such it is essential that a suitable accrual is made for these costs in our 21/22 accounts.
- Significant attempts have been made to get ESPF and their actuaries to make an assessment of both the likelihood and quantum of any balancing payment that may or may not be required between the East Sussex and Surrey pensions schemes as a result of the TUPE transfer. At the time of writing this question remains unanswered leaving an associated cost uncertainty. At present the attached P21 outturn forecast does not include an amount for any pensions balancing payment other than the £184k of retained contingency.
- P21 is required to fund the 'excess' revenue cost of running the former ESFC for the period from April '21 until the mid-November '21 go-live from its approved Contingency budget allocation. The best current assessment of this figure is £447k, as included within the above forecast, but at the time of writing this figure is pending confirmation of the 21/22 ESFC / JFC revenue outturn cost.

Revenue impact

The revenue cost impact of the new JFC Control operating model implemented by P21 has been continuously refined throughout the lifecycle of the project.

The latest and final assessment of the annual revenue cost of future control services is now £1.346m p/a for 22/23 (this being the first full year the new service is in place) versus the equivalent approved 22/23 revenue budget of £1.449m on a like for like basis. This provides headroom of £102k within the approved 22/23 budget, however there are likely to be calls upon this to fund unplanned JFC related costs such as the replacement of the SAN H. Forecast spend will be tracked through monthly budget monitoring regimes.

However, the likely revenue cost of the solution remains in excess of the 'baseline' revenue cost target originally set in the strategic objectives for P21, which was for costs to be no greater than the cost of the former East / West SCC in 18/19, or £1.099m. Although significantly cheaper than the former single service ESFC revenue costs endured by ESFRS through 20/21 and most of 21/22 (as set out in the Benefits section of this report above), the P21 solution will be £247k p/a more expensive than the baseline 18/19 target, excluding inflation. If that 18/19 target figure of £1.099m were to be inflated @ 2% p/a to an equivalent 22/23 target figure of £1.190m, the P21 solution remains £156k p/a more expensive than target. Surrey's proposed service charges have evolved significantly in the 3 years since the option evaluation phase for a series of reasons that include pay awards since 2019 and having to take account of the recommendations from the Grenfell Tower enquiry. This is the reason for the 'more efficient' strategic objective being marked as 'not fully met' above.

The breakdown of the actual and forecast revenue cost impact over time versus the latest approved revenue budgets is as follows:

	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025
ITG	392,190	392,190	392,990	392,190	311,758	311,758	339,881
IT (formerly recharged to ESFC)	322,592	306,869	287,084	293,515	145,106	145,106	145,106
Salaries	1,925,711	1,664,064	1,244,375	862,000	180,700	180,700	180,700
Facilities	25,252	34,328	64,413	29,000	0	0	0
JFC Recharge	0	0	0	361,124	1,020,685	1,020,685	1,020,685
Total (excluding ITG)	2,273,555	2,005,261	1,595,872	1,545,639	1,346,491	1,346,491	1,346,491
Total (including ITG)	2,665,745	2,397,451	1,988,862	1,937,829	1,658,249	1,658,249	1,686,372
Approved budget (excluding ITG)			1,595,700	1,616,700	1,448,606	1,448,606	1,448,606
Approved budget (including ITG)				2,008,890	1,760,364	1,760,364	1,760,364
Cost centres 2067 & 2021 (ITG)				686,506	456,864	456,864	456,864
Budget pot (LCS)					180,700	180,700	180,700
Budget pot (JFC Recharge)					1,122,800	1,122,800	1,122,800
Budget v forecast (excluding ITG)			172	-71,061	-102,115	-102,115	-102,115
Budget v forecast (including ITG)				-71,061	-102,115	-102,115	-73,992
ESFRS paid (excluding ITG)	1,098,978	1,150,241	1,595,872				
ESFRS tot. cost (including ITG)	1,491,168	1,542,431	1,988,862	1,937,829	1,658,249	1,658,249	1,686,372

Appendix B – Operational Benefits:

Twelve operational benefit (outcome) categories were identified for P21 as follows:

Optimum resources mobilised	Reduced ESFRS headcount	Reduced tri-service future investment
Enhanced situational awareness	Reduced Control overheads	Reduced IT support & maintenance costs
Increased visibility of assets	Improved decision making	Reduced risks due to EOL equipment
Enhanced Control resilience	Improved alignment with LRF's	Enhance programme management capability

The success or otherwise of P21 in enabling the above outcomes is summarised above using the following RAG rating:

- **Green** (enabled)
- **Amber** (partly enabled)
- **Red** (not enabled)

The 'reduced Control overheads' outcome has not been enabled for the same reasons as set out above in relation to the 'more efficient' strategic objective. This was explained further in the revenue cost assessment in Appendix A above.

Appendix C – Residual Issues:

As mentioned in the Closure Synopsis above, since go-live with JFC on 17/11/21 the P21 team have worked hard to create and maintain a list of detailed residual issues and drive action to resolve those issues. The reader should be reminded that none of these items were significant enough to prevent go-live with JFC in the first place or represent a significant risk to the BAU service now received from JFC on an ongoing basis. The list is currently as follows:

No.	Topic	Action	Who	Status
20	Reporting	Complete design, build and test of ESFRS P21 BI solution	PIT	Open
23	Defects (UAT)	Resolve Churchill Square & Hastings Old Town polygons issue (VSTS 370979 for Dev to advise)	LCS	Open
61	Haywards Heath	Decommissioning @ Haywards Heath	P21	Open
62	Maresfield	Decommissioning @ Maresfield	P21	Open
73	Data Quality	IRS: Addressable and Non-Addressable causing missing address data in IRS (P21-0020)	LCS	Open
74	Data Quality	IRS: Sections 1.6 and 1.8 not populated with OTB data (P21-0025-1)	LCS	Open
82	Reporting	Implement solution to reconcile all incidents transferred from Vision to IRS	LCS / PIT	Open
86	Firewatch	Enhance telent Firewatch support model	ITG / telent	Open
87	Defects (Cutover)	Paging: Vision fails to send Officer Inform messages to ESFRS Officers - not routed to ESFRS SEE	LCS	Open
93	Data Quality	IRS: Appliance call signs not showing in the log	LCS	Open
96a	Defects (Cutover)	Officer location not correct when status = code 11 (available from home) + Tom Tom power drain	LCS	Open
108	People	Quantify any balancing payment between East and Surrey pension schemes for TUPE staff	Finance	Open
113	Exit plan	Incorporate full Exit Plan into the S16	OSR	Open

Of the 74 items originally identified less than 10 now remain open. Of the 13 items listed above, the 4 highlighted in green were completed / resolved prior to the closure of the project on 31/3/22, and of the further 3 highlighted in yellow the testing of the BI solution is now 90% complete and the Exit plan is very close to agreement with Surrey. An agreed business owner is identified for every item on this list, along with the proposed next steps to future resolution. The remainder are residual technical and operational items familiar to the LCS team, and for which service requests / tickets are in place with the relevant suppliers to ensure future resolution.

There are 10 further items that have been identified for monitoring going forwards. These 'monitor' items are those that are either i) less urgent or important than the Open items above, ii) were issues that pre-existed or are not directly related to the P21 solution, or iii) are longer term 'service improvement' activities. These items also have identified and agreed ESFRS business owners:

No.	Topic	Action	Who	Status
71a	Defects (SAT)	Resolve incorrect mapping of peripherals from Vision (P21-201-03)	LCS / Surrey	Monitor
59	Defects (Cutover)	Resolve pager message received over Paknet (which isn't expected).	ITG / Surrey	Monitor
77	Data Quality	IRS: Officer & Appliance mob. location from Mobile Available - No NGR provided (P21-0026)	LCS	Monitor
89	WoW	Improve ESFRS use of Firewatch re effect on appliance availability	LCS	Monitor
91	DCT	Determine approach to and timing of DCT Phase 3	ITG / Surrey	Monitor
96b	Defects (Cutover)	Investigate a change to Tom Tom polling frequency (to assist with battery drain)	LCS	Monitor
97	Call recording	Access to call recordings (Symphony) dropping out periodically on one server	LCS / Surrey	Monitor
101	Firewatch	Occasional discrepancies between ESFRS view of appliance availability and what shows in Vision	LCS	Monitor
103	MDTs	3G IP addressing - if WiFi fails there is a 15 min delay in registering via 3G	LCS	Monitor
104	EWS data share	Field being truncated due to exceeding maximum character no.'s (EWS = Emergency Water Sour	ITG	Monitor

Appendix D – Residual Risks:

There are a small number of residual risks associated with P21 that remain open at the time of writing. These are as follows, with the business ownership defined in the ‘action owner’ column:

RISK IDENTIFICATION			RISK MANAGEMENT			RESIDUAL RISK ANALYSIS			
RISK REF	RISK DESCRIPTION & IMPACT IF RISK REALISED	DATE RAISED	ACTIONS	PROGRESS SUMMARY	ACTION OWNER	IMPACT LEVEL (L/M/H/VH)	LIKELIHOOD (Very unlikely, Unlikely, Likely, Probable)	RAG STATUS (Red, Amber, Green)	Open / Closed
6	There is a risk that the Project 21 delivery budget will prove insufficient which could result in a cost pressure for ESFRS.	10/04/19	ESFRS project manager to establish Project 21 project budget and financial control.	CCN to return monies to IT Strategy approved in May '21. Forecast still healthy v approved budget. Update on potential Pension balancing payment still being chased by Finance as of 31/3/22. Project closure report forecasts the project outturn costs as on budget - however £184k of that budget is being retained by Finance as residual contingency.	Finance	Medium	Unlikely	AMBER	Open
42	There is a risk that engagement with some parts of the ESFRS business proves more challenging than others due to other pressures of work. This could result in some stakeholders not being bought into P21 option recommendations and solutions.	11/05/20	Ensure a robust stakeholder management plan is in place and actively managed.	Stakeholder management plan in place. Particular effort being focused on teams impacted by P21 proposals. Residual relevant workstream / area is BI and the need for the PIT team to complete UAT, which is now @ 90%.	PIT	Medium	VeryUnlikely	GREEN	Open
64	There is a risk that previously agreed work to ensure a resilient environment for the SAN-H equipment that remains at Haywards Heath (environmental controls and power supply) will not be completed by 31/3/22, resulting in uncertainty as to if and when this work will subsequently take place.	06/04/21	West Sussex to lead and progress legal works on new lease arrangements for post P21 between themselves and Surrey. Engineering assessment to 'right-size' the environmental controls to be progressed to understand potential costs.	Engineering assessment of environmental controls complete. Paper proposing £85k of investment agreed with West Sussex and Surrey in Nov. '21 - all three parties agreed to fund 33% each. A/C work completed and power works now due to take place in May '22.	WSFRS	Medium	VeryUnlikely	GREEN	Open
62	There is a risk that the BI workstream will not be completed by 31/3/22 due to difficulties securing the business resources to complete UAT.	06/04/21	Progress the BI options paper to a conclusion and issue the RFS to telent to progress. Build and SAT of the BI solution completed by start of Feb. '22.	UAT is now 90% complete as @ 31/3/22 and will be completed shortly. A new follow on piece of work on Mobilising Reporting has also now been approved.	PIT	Low	Unlikely	GREEN	Open

Appendix E – Lessons Learnt:

Two lessons learnt exercises have been carried out for P21 on 3 and 4/3/22 respectively, the first of which included ‘internal’ ESFRS project team and telent stakeholders, and the second of which other ‘external’ stakeholders including representatives from Surrey FRS, SCC IT&D, Capita and West Sussex. In addition, other ESFRS stakeholders have been invited to provide their feedback virtually. The outputs from those workshops and broader consultation are as below:

3 key areas that were strengths:	
1	Governance: Robust governance put in place from the start, with strong Sponsor at a very senior level and a full time, experienced and respected SRO. Right Board structure, good quality comprehensive documentation and clear decision making.
2	Planning: Robust and comprehensive planning processes employed, with the level of detailed tailored to the topic and level of audience. Strong line of sight from detailed plans to summary progress tracker, comprehensive work breakdown structure and tight workstream scope definitions.
3	Transition and Cutover: Comprehensive transition plan and a very detailed Cutover plan that was well rehearsed ahead of go-live. Solid testing, Control staff training in advance of Cutover and the right distribution of resources between sites for the day of go-live all helped – we did not ‘crowd’ JFC. Cutover was well choreographed on the day by telent, and the whole process was calm and considered throughout.

3 key areas that were weaknesses:	
1	Communications: There was clearly a perception amongst Control staff that we could have done more to communicate and engage with them throughout the lifecycle of P21. Whilst a considerable effort was made in this space, the feedback demonstrates that you can always do more, therefore even more time and effort should be devoted to this during future change projects that impact directly on staff.
2	Resourcing: At time there was an imbalance in resource levels between the partners. This imbalance manifested in a number of ways, whether that be the volume / quality / quality of design documentation, over reliance at times on single individuals, difficulty getting adequate or appropriate representation at meetings and workshops or ensuring timely decision making.
3	IT support: Despite best efforts, we struggled to engage early and effectively enough with the right parties to ensure that a well-defined and documented set of IT support processes were put in place. The root cause here was not really the timing or frequency of our attempts at engagement, it was more who to engage with.