Implementing Electronic Government (IEG) Statement 2006

Report by the Head of Information Management

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to submit the final IEG 6 statement. Due to the late issue of guidance by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the need to progress the IEG through the usual HDC approval process the Council has submitted a statement which has only received Cabinet approval. Should any amendments be required, we will re-submit the IEG, via the ESD Toolkit[1], once it has received Council approval.

2. SUPPORTING / BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The Council is required to submit a statement of progress against e-government targets to the ODPM each year. Statements were submitted in 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004. In return the Council received capital grants of, respectively, £200k, £200k, £350k and £150k. A further statement – IEG5 – was submitted in December 2005.

2.2 The IEG6 has been enclosed separately with the agenda for Members' only. The section which is still subject to change is:

Section 6 – Local e-Government Programme Efficiency Gains

This section will be updated in line with our responses under the Gershon agenda.

2.3 In addition, Section 3 – BVPI 157[2], contains the same data as in the previous submission, due to insufficient timescales needed to collect updated figures.

2.4 The status of the priority outcomes for HDC at the end of the ODPM IEG Programme (31st March 2006) are as follows:

---

[1] The ESD Toolkit is a practical, hosted, online resource that enables local authorities to monitor and report their progress towards e-government, efficiency and other modernisation targets. It is also the mechanism used for building the IEG statement and reporting to the ODPM.

[2] Best Value Performance Indicator 157 (BVPI 157) is the nationally set target for delivering or supporting services by electronic means. It measures 'the number of types of interactions that are enabled for electronic delivery as a percentage of the types of interactions that are legally permissible for electronic delivery'.

Status	Priority Outcome
Green	R1, R2, R3, R5, R6, R8, R12, R14, R15, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26, R27, R29
	G1, G2, G3, G4, G5, G6, G7, G9, G14, G16, G18, G19, G20, G22, G23, G24, G25
Amber	R4 (page 6 of IEG6), R7, R9, R10, R13, R16, R28
	G8, G10, G11, G12, G13, G15, G17, G21
Red	R11 (p8)

Green means that we have met the outcome.

Amber means that we intend to meet the outcome and have made progress towards doing so. However, Amber outcomes were not met by 31st March 2006 due, for example, to other priorities set by HDC, or restrictions imposed by supplier's software.

Red means we do not currently plan to meet the outcome. In the case of R11 this is due to the excessive cost of the software interface. The Council may chose to re-visit this outcome at a later date if other benefits "balance" the cost.

2.5   The document was compiled by the Customer First Team and input has been sought from a number of services within the Council.

2.6   As with previous IEG statements, successful implementation of Amber outcomes will depend on timely and sufficient input from all parts of the Council.

2.7   **RECOMMENDATION**

        that Council confirms the submission of the Implementing Electronic Government (IEG) Statement.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The National Strategy for e-Government:
http://www.localegov.gov.uk/Nimoi/sites/ODMP/resources/20021127%20Final%20NS%20with%20cover.pdf

Defining e-Government Outcomes for 2005 to support the delivery of priority services & National Strategy Transformation Agenda for Local Authorities in England: http://www.localegov.gov.uk/en/1/priorityoutcomes.html

Contact Officer: Chris Hall, Customer First Programme Manager
                         ☎ 01480 388116