



# loti

**Innovation in Technology Procurement Project**

Housing Management Procurement Workshop 2 - 02.12.20



LOTI\_LDN |



medium.com/loti

#LOTI

# What we discussed last week

There is a burning desire for a new approach to housing management technology.

## The favoured procurement approach combined:

- Option 1: tender for a full-suite HMS with an established provider (e.g. Northgate, Civica, Capita)

and,

- Option 3: where feasible, look to procure or develop additional capabilities that can be added to the core solution (e.g. Jadu, SiteCore, low-code applications)

**Main Procurement Options**

There are only a few realistic options for Boroughs to secure their HMS requirements.

1	2	3
<b>Tender for a full-suite HMS provider</b> e.g. Northgate, Civica, Capita	<b>Develop a new solution on Microsoft</b> MS Dynamics + Reseller	<b>Jointly develop a Digital Platform</b> Develop additional modules
<b>APPROACH:</b> Jointly engage large HMS providers to negotiate a better value service. <b>PROS:</b> (i) Full suite so little development or maintenance. (ii) Some embrace interoperability through APIs. Most have a cloud offering. <b>CONS:</b> (i) Digital customer experience is not high. (ii) Can still be costly to integrate custom modules or workflows, or access data. (iii) Migration costs from one system to another are high.	<b>APPROACH:</b> Approach MS with a 'single voice' to negotiate the best deal and reseller. Jointly develop core modules that replace functionality of legacy systems over time. <b>PROS:</b> (i) MS is cloud-native and highly interoperable, especially with MS suite. (ii) Number of resellers now well practiced at deployment. <b>CONS:</b> (i) Building modules takes time, leaving users with legacy processes until replaced. (ii) Ideally, some level of process alignment would take place.	<b>APPROACH:</b> Jointly procure a COTS platform, with individual module development to meet full requirements: - e.g. Housing Lite Platform - e.g. CXM Platform - e.g. Low-Code Platform - e.g. Digital Property Platform <b>PROS:</b> (i) Cheaper deployment (ii) Excellent out-of-the-box functionality for certain modules <b>CONS:</b> (i) Requires bespoke module development or integration to meet full needs

**PUBLIC**

And we discussed some of the inputs we needed to make a final decision, incl.

- User research on the pain points experienced
- Shared business outcomes

# What are we discussing in this session?

We'll be exploring common ground - business objectives, users, requirements, timelines, etc.

**Why focus on commonality?** What do we know about 'joint procurements' ([see guidance](#))?

- Joint procurements aggregate demand across a number of boroughs
- Large suppliers are very willing to work with collaborative purchasing groups, if they represent "a single voice"
- The key task of any joint procurement is to map out what you have in common, and seek to minimise the differences

**What does it take to speak to the market with 'a single voice'?**

- Common set of key objectives for the procurement
- Shared view of the key user needs
- Common specification, that minimises bespoke requirements
- Shared approach to contracting, that minimises alterations (for discussion next week)

**Key outcome: Planning how to take these work items forward together ahead.**

# Group Discussion

# Discuss: What are the common objectives?



We need to define a set of key objectives that guide the procurement exercise and inform the assessment of suppliers.

**Key objectives already discussed** (see [workshop](#), January 2020).

Do we agree? What is missing? Do these capture the business value we are seeking, and our understanding of the market today?

1. Interoperability to enable data openness and system integrations (without charges)
2. Improved core product -- e.g. better customer journey or front-end interoperability
3. Improved performance -- e.g. to avoid systems running slowly through KPIs and service credits
4. Improved flexibility -- e.g. ability for system to evolve, particularly to changes in statutory responsibility
5. Ability to deploy in the cloud, either as a SaaS or PaaS solution
6. Improved maintenance -- e.g. announce releases in advance and ensuring they are properly tested
7. Improved management -- e.g. more responsive account management
8. Pricing and roadmap transparency at the procurement stage

# Discuss: Who's user needs do we need to map?



Has there been any user research performed to date? Are there any users that we understand pretty well already? Who are the users that we don't understand well, and are likely served poorly by existing HMS? How can we better understand their needs?

User Group (As a...)	What are they trying to do and what barriers do they face?	What research can we do to assess needs?
Residents	Poor customer journey in: (i) applications process (ii) onboarding new tenants	Conduct ethnography to assess key process preferences, e.g. resident applications. Can we utilise any user insights from prior housing repairs user research?
Vulnerable people	Poor tracking of their interactions with council services: (i) adult social care (ii) homeless services.	Engage councillors to understand priorities.
Leaseholders	Poor information is provided to external leaseholders, and internal management team struggle with workflow.	Qualitative workshop to capture pain points.
Tenancy Management Officers	Need better processes for: (i) identifying residents with financial difficulties (e.g. voids)	Qualitative workshop to capture pain points.
Wider services related to housing	There are a range of internal (e.g. environmental officers) and external users (e.g. repairs and maintenance contractors, construction companies, housing associations) that are digital service users	Identify stakeholders and conduct qualitative workshops to capture pain points. Potentially could run a short survey to gather needs from a range of stakeholders.
Finance directorate	Need better processes for: (i) integrations and workflows vary across key payments and financial irregularity processes (e.g. tenants on benefits)	Conduct interviews across the business and directorates

# Discuss: How do we create a common specification?

To speak with 'one voice' the tender specification should emphasise common requirements. Each borough can still retain bespoke requirements, but these should be minimised.

Today, it's likely that each borough has a long and complex set of requirements. But, the goal is to reach a set of common requirements: e.g. functional requirements, technical requirements, etc. You should:

- Define best practice
- Simplify requirements
- State a solution-agnostic 'outcome' where there is disagreement over a specific requirement.\*
- ... ?

Specification input	What are the key sources of insight / information?	How can we agree best practice?
e.g. Functional requirements		e.g. Group workshop with 'X' users.
e.g. Technical requirements		e.g. Group workshop with 'X' users.
e.g. Performance requirements		e.g. Group workshop with 'X' users.
e.g. Future capabilities		Agree key principles (e.g. data sharing requirements).
E.g. Assessment criteria		E.g. social value

**Thanks for participating!  
Please leave comments  
with your views.**

 [LOTI\\_LDN](#)

 [medium.com/loti](https://medium.com/loti)

[#LOTI](#)

**loti**