

ST ALBANS CITY AND DISTRICT COUNCIL

DECISION REGISTER

Portfolio(s) decision relates to:	Replacement telephone system	Name of Portfolio Holder:	Clr J Daly (ICT)		
Name of decision maker:	Clr Julian Daly	Signature of decision maker:			
Name of relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee:	Corporate Services	Date of decision:	27/11/01		
Type of decision (<i>please tick</i>)	Key	Significant	Virement	Other	✓
Scheme of delegation reference under which decision is taken:	6.1.1 (Strategic) matters in connection with Information Technology (although the budget for purchase of new telephone system is within Resources, as is the operation of the current analogue system, the procurement of a new digital system is more appropriately considered as part of the ICT portfolio, albeit in consultation with Resources).				
Has this decision drawn upon confidential information? (<i>If yes – please set out what confidential information has been taken into account on a separate sheet</i>)	Yes				
<p>DECISION:</p> <p>That the decision to proceed to tender on the purchase of new telephone system is deferred pending further clarification of the available budget.</p> <p>In arriving at my decision I have properly and thoroughly taken into account the legal, financial and workforce implications for the Council. My decision is within the Council’s policy and budget framework and complies with the regulations and procedures set out in the Constitution. I have explicitly considered the Council’s corporate objectives in arriving at my decision. In coming to my decision I have consulted with all relevant parties as appropriate and in accordance with the scheme of delegation.</p>					

REASON/S FOR THE DECISION

1.1. Summary

The basis for this decision is that the estimated cost of a replacement telephone system is significantly in excess of the budget available. In the light of the Council's current budget situation an in-year request for additional funds is not appropriate. A request for a new item to make up the estimated shortfall in the budget has been included for 2002/3. Whether this is successful will not be known until after the budget meeting (February). Similarly funding may be available from central government for implementing the Council's IEG statement. This funding has not yet been confirmed or priorities determined.

1.2. Specific budget provision available for the purchase of a new telephone is £50k. The consultants recommendation is to purchase a new system rather than a managed service. In addition to this there is £10k residue from the telecommunications consultancy budget, and £20k previously set aside to cover future revenue costs for the new system which are not expected to be required. The ICT portfolio holder has also identified £20k within the PC replacement budget to vire towards the cost of a replacement system. This gives a total of £100k.

1.3. In making the decision I had regard to estimates provided by the Council's consultants as to the likely cost of a replacement telephone system.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED:	REASONS FOR REJECTING THESE OPTIONS
1.Tendering in advance of budget	Budget is sufficiently uncertain that it would not be appropriate to engage suppliers at this stage
2.Managed service or leasing	Clear recommendation from consultant to purchase – decision can be reconsidered at later stage

CONSULTEES

In making this decision, I have consulted the following people:

Name and Signature	Position	Date of consultation	Outcome of consultation (may cross reference to supplementary/background sheets)
Cllr C Oxley	Resources PH	27/11/01 (Dir of Corp Services by phone)	Agreed with decision
J Samuels	Director of Corp Services	27/11/01	Agreed with decision
Ursula Jones	Snr Asst Solicitor	27/11/01 (Dir of Corp Services by phone)	Content with decision
Ian Duffield	Head of Finance	27/11/01 (Dir of Corp Services in person)	Content with decision

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT) 1985

Bibliography	Custodian	File location
Draft report to Cabinet – Dec 2001 (superceded by decision)	Committee Administration	Civic Centre

Confidential information under paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) was taken into account in reaching this decision, as included on a separate summary sheet supplied with this decision sheet but not available to the public.