

A. Cabinet Assurance, Transparency & Decision Quality

1. Why was Cabinet not told the system would be delivered only as MVP?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper (20 Dec 2023): Describes Arcus as a fully functional replacement system; no mention of MVP.
- b. Officer Decision Record (3 Apr 2024): Also describes Arcus as a complete replacement; no mention of MVP.
- c. ITT Requirements: Require full configuration, acceptance testing, and readiness for service.
- d. Outcome: System delivered as MVP with missing functionality.

Why it matters: Cabinet approved a system they believed would be complete.

2. Why was Cabinet not informed that no local configuration would be completed before go-live?

Evidence:

- a. ITT (Planning & CM): Requires configuration, workflow tailoring, acceptance testing.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Implies full implementation and testing by April 2025.
- c. Officer Decision Record: No mention of configuration gaps.
- d. Outcome: No configuration delivered pre-go-live.

3. Why did the Cabinet paper omit statutory compliance risks?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper Risk Section: Lists migration time, capacity, supplier delays — but not statutory register risk.
- b. ITT: Requires statutory Planning Register, Enforcement history, Land Charges continuity.
- c. Outcome: Planning Register incomplete; documents missing.

4. Why did the Cabinet paper claim financial savings contradicted by the FBC?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper: Claims £80k saving.
- b. FBC Financial Modelling: Shows negative NPV, speculative benefits, excluded costs.

- c. Officer Decision Record: Repeats “within budgetary framework” without detail.

B. Procurement Integrity & Evaluation Process

5. Why do the evaluation sheets contain #DIV/0! errors?

Evidence:

- a. Evaluation Sheets (Planning & CM): Price score formulas show #DIV/0! even though bid values are present.
- b. Cabinet Paper: States procurement followed MEAT and regulations.
- c. SRQ Guidance: Requires complete, accurate evaluation.

Why it matters: Price weighting (40%) may not have been applied.

6. Why were suppliers given identical or near-identical quality scores?

Evidence:

- a. Evaluation Sheets: Arcus, Supplier 1, Supplier 2 all receive clustered scores (3s and 4s).
- b. ITT: Requires differentiation based on ability to meet specification.
- c. Appendix 2 Assessment Forms: Require detailed responses, but scoring does not reflect variation.

7. Why was Arcus selected despite incomplete bid coverage?

Evidence:

- a. Arcus Bid (from evaluation sheets): Excludes migration, excludes configuration.
- b. ITT: Requires full migration, configuration, testing.
- c. FBC: Assumes supplier will deliver full functionality.

8. Why were safer procurement options not presented to Cabinet?

Evidence:

- a. FBC Options: Only 3 options (do nothing, self-build, procure).
- b. Cabinet Paper: Repeats same 3 options.
- c. Missing: Phased rollout, dual running, partial extension of Acolaid, configure-before-migrate.

C. Business Case Accuracy & Financial Integrity

9. Why did the FBC underestimate migration complexity?

Evidence:

- a. FBC Data Volumes: 112,017 planning records; 332,925 documents.
- b. FBC Migration Cost: £35k (implausibly low).
- c. Cabinet Paper: Repeats optimistic assumptions.
- d. Outcome: Eight fix-runs required.

10. Why were Digital Services and officer time costs excluded from supplier bids?

Evidence:

- a. FBC: Lists £50k Digital Services, £10k officer time separately.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Does not disclose these costs.
- c. Officer Decision Record: States costs “within budgetary framework” without detail.

11. Why did the Cabinet paper claim cost neutrality contradicted by the FBC?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper: Claims savings and efficiency.
- b. FBC: Shows negative NPV; benefits speculative.
- c. Financial Modelling: Option 3 total cost £578,877 vs claimed £469,071.

D. Governance, Risk Management & Internal Controls

12. Why were the most material risks omitted from the Cabinet paper?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper Risk Section: Omits MVP, configuration gaps, statutory risk, fallback absence.
- b. FBC Risk Section: Also omits MVP and statutory risk.
- c. Outcome: These risks materialised.

13. Why were risk logs withheld under FOI?

Evidence:

- a. FOI Response: Risk logs withheld under Section 36 (prejudice to effective conduct of public affairs).
- b. Cabinet Paper: Claims strong governance.
- c. Outcome: Members could not see true risk profile.

14. How was “strong governance” assured when key risks were not disclosed?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper: Monitoring Officer and S151 sign-off.
- b. Officer Decision Record: No mention of MVP or configuration gaps.
- c. Outcome: Governance claims contradicted by omissions.

E. Implementation Readiness & MVP Deployment

15. Who authorised MVP deployment and when?

Evidence:

- a. No document mentions MVP.
- b. Outcome: System delivered as MVP.

16. Why was no local configuration completed before go-live?

Evidence:

- a. ITT: Requires configuration.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Implies full implementation.
- c. Officer Decision Record: Silent on configuration.
- d. Outcome: No configuration delivered.

17. Why was acceptance testing compressed or incomplete?

Evidence:

- a. ITT: Requires structured acceptance testing.
- b. Project Plan (Cabinet Paper): Only 4 weeks for testing.
- c. Outcome: Testing insufficient for MVP.

F. Data Migration, Statutory Compliance & Service Continuity

18. Why was migration risk understated?

Evidence:

- a. FBC: Acknowledges migration complexity but budgets only £35k.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Repeats optimistic assumptions.
- c. Outcome: Multiple fix-runs.

19. How was statutory compliance assured?

Evidence:

- a. ITT: Requires statutory Planning Register, Enforcement history, Land Charges continuity.
- b. Cabinet Paper: No mention of statutory risk.
- c. Outcome: Planning Register incomplete.

20. Why were eight fix-runs required?

Evidence:

- a. Scrutiny Q&A: Confirms multiple fix-runs.
- b. FBC: Underestimates migration complexity.
- c. Outcome: Data issues persisted.

G. Internal Capacity, Resourcing & Project Management

21. Why did the FBC assume internal capacity existed for configuration and migration?

Evidence:

- a. FBC: Notes capacity issues but still assumes internal delivery.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Repeats optimistic assumptions.
- c. Outcome: Internal capacity insufficient.

22. Why was officer time not tracked or costed?

Evidence:

- a. FBC: Lists officer time but does not track it.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Does not disclose officer time costs.

- c. Outcome: True cost unknown.

H. Contract Management, Supplier Performance & Accountability

23. Did the contract require full functionality, and if so, why was MVP accepted?

Evidence:

- a. Software Agreement (Schedule 7): Requires delivery of specified functionality.
- b. ITT: Requires full configuration and testing.
- c. Outcome: MVP accepted.

24. Why were supplier capacity concerns ignored?

Evidence:

- a. FBC: Notes other councils experiencing delays with same supplier.
- b. Cabinet Paper: Does not disclose this.
- c. Outcome: Supplier delays occurred.

25. Why is the Council now dependent on future Arcus releases for essential functionality?

Evidence:

- a. Outcome: MVP delivered; missing features require future releases.
- b. ITT: Required full functionality at go-live.

I. Public Accountability, Transparency & Lessons Learned

26. Why were key facts not disclosed to Cabinet, Scrutiny, or the public?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper: Omits MVP, configuration gaps, statutory risk.
- b. Officer Decision Record: Omits same.
- c. FBC: Overly optimistic.
- d. Outcome: Public misled.

27. Why do procurement and decision documents omit material information?

Evidence:

- a. Cabinet Paper: Omits MVP, configuration, fallback.
- b. Officer Decision Record: Omits same.
- c. Evaluation Sheets: Incomplete/erroneous.
- d. Outcome: Audit trail incomplete.

28. What governance changes will prevent recurrence?

Evidence:

- a. All documents: Show systemic governance gaps.
- b. Outcome: Need for reform.