

National Operational  
Guidance Programme



## **Phase 2: Service Integration Tool**

### **Specification clarification and FAQs**

**Contacts:**

Steve Beakhust  
[sbeakhust@ukfrs.com](mailto:sbeakhust@ukfrs.com)  
07585 306 690

Will Danckwerts  
[will.danckwerts@panlogic.co.uk](mailto:will.danckwerts@panlogic.co.uk)  
0208 948 5511

## Contents

1. Product specification and adoption survey .....	3
2. Adoption models.....	3
2.1. Automation .....	3
3. Costings.....	4
3.1. One-off onboarding cost.....	4
3.2. Hosting .....	4
3.3. Monthly support costs.....	5
4. Your questions .....	6

## 1. Product specification and adoption survey

The purpose of the specification is to provide more detailed information on the proposed solution for services to ascertain whether they would be interested in taking on the Service Integration Tool product, and, if so, which adoption model would be most of interest.

Your service's response to the survey will not be considered a commitment to a particular approach or costing arrangement, but will serve to help the Dev Ops team to best determine the optimal provision for the best value. Once this is known, more detailed and accurate options can be provided.

**Our goal is to support you at the price you need to be supported at.**

## 2. Adoption models

The standard model is to take on the platform as a service. Costs associated with this option cover a fully managed system where all system setup and support is undertaken by Panlogic and you would not require local resource to manage, maintain and support the system going forward (see Section 13.2 of the specification overview).

A key benefit of the standard model is the in-built automation. This significantly reduces the amount of time and cost associated with remote system management and therefore reduces ongoing local support costs significantly (see Section 2.1 below)

All other adoption models will require varying levels of local resource and responsibility for set up, deployment, testing, management and support of the system. Further details on these responsibilities and the resources that would be required are detailed in Section 13.3 of the Specification Overview.

### 2.1. Automation

To maximise the efficiency of the fully managed Standard adoption model and to provide compound/exponential long-term support cost savings for the fire and rescue services that adopt the platform as a service, the NOG Programme has invested in full automation of the system.

Full automation allows:

- An automated deployment requiring minimal manual input/input from local services
- Automated roll out of infrastructure and application maintenance (changes and patches)
- Automated deployment of development changes (i.e. new features)

The alternative to this is:

- Significant manual input needed to deploy each new instance (commission hosting, set up server software, install website, restore codebase and database – a more detailed list is present on Section 2.8 of the full specification)
- Monthly patching would need to be applied manually for each service
- Any changes in infrastructure or application architecture would need to be applied manually to each service. This would be infrequent but could involve significant time for each instance.

- Development changes need to be deployed manually for each service. In certain circumstances, this can involve a few hours of manual work.

The central investment in full automation has removed the need to manually apply development and support changes to each site and has reduced the cost per service by £850 in setup costs and £4,199 in ongoing monthly support costs:

Local service support	Automation type	Support days required per month	Cost per month
Onboarding cost per service - (including technical and account setup costs)	Light	6	£5,100
	Full	5	£4,250
Monthly support cost per service	Light	7	£5,950
	Full	2.06	£1,751

### 3. Costings

The costings provided for the standard service as a platform adoption model in Section 14 of the specification overview are headline figures only. The developers are keen to support you at the price you need to be supported at and are open to discuss your needs and internal resource available to manage the solution.

#### 3.1. One-off onboarding cost

The fixed one-off payment of £4,250 in the standard adoption model includes all technical and account management setup costs. It is anticipated that the following tasks will be required between each service and Panlogic:

- Initial engagement - meetings/calls
- Account setup (financials and identifying main contacts)
- Technical setup - this is much reduced within the fully managed solution due to investment in automation, but will still include time for:
  - Domain and server instance setup
  - Local branding and configuration (i.e. site email, logos, banners, Google Analytics configuration etc.)
  - Setting up initial CMS users
- Organising contract + service level agreement (SLA)

Services taking on an alternative model will still need to onboard the system, but the amount of account and technical set up/support time required from Panlogic would vary by circumstance and would need to be agreed on an ad-hoc basis.

#### 3.2. Hosting

The headline cost of £422.50 per month is an estimation for a single hosting instance on AWS. There will likely be opportunities for savings in this area, but this is dependent on a number of factors, including the economies of scale to be gained from the number of services who onboard, the volume

of traffic to local instances and the quantity of content changes coming from the central NOG platform.

It is foreseeable that multiple services could share the same infrastructure resource and split the cost, and further savings could be achieved by purchasing multiple years up front. Key considerations are that, depending on the technical approach taken, there is likely to be dependencies between services; for instance, decisions around details such as security arrangements may need to be made collectively, and planned/unplanned downtime may affect more than one site instance at the same time.

Completion of the consultation survey will give us a broader understanding of the appetite for the standard service as a platform and the Dev Ops team will then be able to best determine the optimal provision for the best value. Once this is known, more detailed and accurate options can be provided.

### 3.3. Monthly support costs

The ongoing central investment in automation greatly reduces the actual development, infrastructure and support costs required for each service (see Section 2.1 above). There are, however, still some very small local costs in this respect based on the need for the developers to have cover for making sure changes are rolled out smoothly to each service. This amounts to just 0.06 days per month.

In addition to application, infrastructure and development support costs, the fully managed package also covers any account management tasks that local services might need, including:

- Set up of new users/help changing user settings
- Dealing with users unable to log in, helping reset passwords etc.
- Help in changing configuration, for example:
  - Google Analytics needing a change in configuration or a new ID put in place
  - A 'contact us' form that requires changes to the fields used or the send-to email when submissions are made
  - Assistance in creating brochure/informational pages on the site
- First line support desk. This involves Panlogic having the resource available to answer admin or user support calls. Such calls could be for anything that occurs, including:
  - If an error appeared on screen
  - If a user had a query around how to use a feature/questions as to whether the site includes certain features
  - If a user wanted to know whether a certain feature was available on the site or a particular task possible
  - Any content editing queries

Panlogic's monthly support arrangements range from 2 to up to 10 days per month, depending on client internal resource and support demands. An SLA of 2 days per service per month was estimated to be a sensible lower boundary for required support. The specification recommends that this is reviewed quarterly so services on this model can feed back on whether the support available is sufficient and adjust accordingly.

If services do not wish to take on the standard service as a platform model they will need to ensure that they have resource available to be able to manage the support activities defined in Section 13.3 of the specification overview.

## 4. Your questions

### 4.1. Is each Service expected to conclude a separate agreement with Panlogic regarding the ongoing charges and if so is there room for negotiation on cost?

It is expected that each FRS that takes on the Standard platform as a service will have their own contractual arrangement with Panlogic for ongoing costs since support requirements may vary due to local resource, capacity and capability.

Savings with regard to hosting could be achieved through economies of scale and up-front purchasing, but there are dependencies (see Section 3.2 above). Completion of the consultation survey will give us a broader understanding of the appetite for the standard service as a platform and the Dev Ops team will then be able to best determine the optimal provision for the best value. Once this is known, more detailed and accurate options can be provided.

The daily rate for support and maintenance costs are competitive and are based on industry standards. The requirements of SLAs between services may vary depending on local resources and capacity. You may wish for Panlogic to handle all aspects of system and account management or you may wish to utilise your own resource for these tasks and only utilise SLA time for the bigger ticket items. It is proposed that each service will review its SLA requirement quarterly and adjust if appropriate.

It may be prudent to start with the estimated 2 day SLA when first adopting as this will allow sufficient time to work through any teething issues that may occur and then revisit the requirements after the first quarter.

### 4.2. Given that we are only being presented with one supplier option when we would normally obtain at least three tenders, can we have an outline of the selection of Panlogic and the due diligence carried out. Are NOG providing assurance to services to negate our normal tender obligations on purchases over £10,000?

#### **Selection process**

Panlogic were selected through a competitive process that completed in December 2016 and was managed by London Fire Brigade's Procurement team. The tender was advertised and processed through the Crown Commission Service (CCS) framework. The specification was to develop the new NOG website, design and develop the Service Integration Tool and to develop a mobile scenarios application.

52 expressions of interest were received, which were shortlisted to 5 suppliers. Each supplier then submitted a written proposal against the specification and were invited to present their offer to the procurement panel and to ask any further questions. The suppliers were then given the opportunity to refine their proposals and resubmit. After the final evaluation Panlogic received the highest score and was awarded the contract.

#### **Tender obligations**

The NOG Programme is not able to provide any assurances regarding local procurement rules and internal governance arrangements. Tender thresholds vary between services - some will be relatively low, others may be significantly higher.

Given the importance of maintaining the integrity of the product and considering the slight variations that may exist between services, the case to justify a single tender action for the designers, developers and central managers of the product could be made.

#### 4.3. Each service appears to be being charged the same amount for ongoing maintenance and hosting, this is regardless of varying size of services, is there a logic to this?

The ongoing support, maintenance and hosting costs are not dependent on the number of users accessing an individual system. However, hosting savings could potentially be achieved through economies of scale and up-front purchasing, but there are dependencies (see Section 3.2 above).

Services that have the resource, capacity and capability to manage elements of the system locally may choose to do so; as such it is likely that SLA requirements will differ between services. It is proposed that the SLA is reviewed on a quarterly basis and, if necessary, adjusted to meet local requirements. While SLA amounts may vary, the pro rata day rate will be the same for all.

Responses to the consultation survey will help us better understand the local positions within the national picture and be able to make further suggestions on the most cost-effective hosting and support arrangements.

#### 4.4. Were the charges put forward by Panlogic discussed with NOG and, if so, at what point in the process?

Following the user requirement workshops held throughout summer 2017, Panlogic drafted the technical specification for the product along with associated costs for development and ongoing support. This was presented to the project team in September for review.

At this stage two primary models were proposed – one with light automation and one with full automation. The light automation approach had a cheaper up-front development cost, but would have resulted in higher ongoing support and maintenance costs required at the local level. The NOG Programme decided to invest in the development of the fully automated system as the aggregated local service savings were substantial and scaled exponentially (see Section 2.1 above).

#### 4.5. What are the likely costs to each service of the app being developed as Phase 3 of the project? At least some indication would be helpful.

The costs for the phase 3 mobile application are still unknown since full discovery for this phase of the project is yet to commence.

As with phase 2, the cost of development will be funded centrally by the NOG Programme, but any service level costs would be dependent on the optimal way of delivering, maintaining and updating the product, which could vary by device and data distribution method.

Further information will be made available following the discovery process scheduled to commence in November 2017.

#### 4.6. The 'core product' is defined in Section 14 as being provided to local services without charge. Can you define the scope of 'provided' and what this actually means given the installation fee referred to in 14.1?

The development and build of the core product is being funded centrally by the NOG Programme. Once the build is finished, this core product will be available for services to adopt via the method of their choosing.

Adopting the Standard service as a platform model includes a fully managed onboarding and support package provided by Panlogic. The onboarding fee covers all technical and account management setup to get the system up and running. This process is managed by Panlogic and will require minimal effort and resource at the local level (see Section 3.1 above).

If you choose an alternative adoption model then you will need to manage this process yourself and ensure you have the resource, capacity and capability to perform the onboarding activities outlined in Section 13.3 of the Specification Overview.

#### 4.7. If we paid nothing, what would we receive?

If you wanted to pay nothing toward onboarding, hosting or ongoing support costs then you would likely receive a packaged on-premise version of the tool and a set of installation instructions to allow you to install it locally, restore up-to-date content and continue receiving updates published by the central NOG site.

In such a circumstance, a contract with Panlogic will still need to be in place to define the distinction of responsibilities. A standard contract can be provided for free, but any additions or amendments will need to be financially covered on a local basis.

To ensure your system could still receive content updates from the central NOG there will be a set of integration points that would need to be kept intact. Note that any unsupported changes made to the system may develop architectural conflicts with the fully-managed solution. Such a scenario may require substantial development time to restructure the altered solution and to bring it back in line.

#### 4.8. Have the NFCC been sighted on this consultation and if so what views have been expressed?

This project is managed as part of the National Operational Guidance Programme and does not come under NFCC jurisdiction. The choice of whether to and how to take on the product sits with each fire and rescue service, CFOs should be consulted on this locally, if appropriate.

#### 4.9. The services in my region would like to collaborate on a single set of local guidance. Does the standard adoption model allow for this?

Yes, multiple services could share a single site instance. All users would see the same content and the content would need to be managed collaboratively in the background. There is co-

dependency to consider that will impact levels of independence, control and management and would need to be explored on a case-by-case basis (see Section 3.2 above).

If this approach is of interest to your region, please be sure to specify this in your consultation response.

4.10. Why isn't a central solution provided that would remove the needs to keep the underlying system up to date and patched. I envisage a single hosted provision with possibly multiple instances of the software running if necessary that is maintained centrally. Not only would this save time for patching, updating, backing up and securing a single site, but the aggregation would allow overheads in hosting provision to be amalgamated, saving on over provisioned services that are paid for multiple times.

The central solution needs to be kept up to date at the infrastructure and application level, and then each instance of it does too. The NOG Programme has invested in full automation of the platform which means that all updates and changes are developed and tested centrally and then, once approved, rolled out to all local instances automatically. The investment in automation is designed to reduce the overall overhead with just 3% of the monthly support cost relating to technical patching and 97% to account management (see Section 2.1 above).

There are a range of options available for sharing infrastructure resource, but all are dependent on a number of factors and each degree of sharing involves co-dependency. The more closely dependent services are on shared infrastructure, or website instances, the less independent control they will have (see Section 3.2 above).

Completion of the consultation survey will give us a broader understanding of the appetite for the standard service as a platform and the Dev Ops team will then be able to conduct further research and best determine the optimal provision for the best value, that meets your local needs. Once this is known, more detailed and accurate options can be provided.