MINUTES

Independent Assurance Panel (IAP)

Tuesday 19th June 2007, 10:00-13:00 **Phone Conference**

Chairperson:	Alan Hughes	IAP Member			AH
Members:	Fergie Williams	IAP Member			FW
	Peter Simpson	IAP Member			PS
	John Clarke	IAP Member			JC
	Malcolm Mitchell	IAP Member			MM
Attendees:	Bill Crothers	Executive Commercial	Director,	IPS	ВС
	Dominic Hartley	Chief Architect	Business	IPS	DH
	Xxxxx Xxxxx	Programme Manager	Support	IPS	XX
Secretariat:	Xxxxx Xxxxxx	Programme Officer	Support	IPS	XX

Agenda Item Comments

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	IAP Theme 1: Building the NIS Infrastructure Framework Project Update The panel were advised that a set of papers has been produced for review by senior management in advance of issuing the OJEU for the IPS Strategic Supplier Framework (ISSF). ACTION: IAP to review the ISSF documents and provide comments to BC. HM Treasury approval is still awaited for the NIS Business Case. The OGC Gateway Review 2 outcome was Red with three immediate recommendations. BC advised that a detailed project plan has now been produced. IPS wants to select 5 strategic suppliers to the framework. BC advised the successful bidders would be individual companies, although it is recognised that it is likely that all of the prime bidders will need to appoint subcontractors to be	BC
	able to offer the full range of services required. The panel queried how IPS intended to manage this and BC advised that IPS would be introducing appropriate controls and will manage this by a risk based approach. It is intended that packages of work will be broken down into a number of projects and within these a number of phases. Whilst suppliers will be awarded a project there will be 'break-points' between phases which will be subject to a performance review before allowing the supplier to proceed to the next stage. Supplier performance will be monitored by technical and behavioural indicators. Sanctions for poor performance will include being terminated at the end of a phase or removed from the framework. BC acknowledged the difficulties in changing supplier during a project.	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	MM advised building a stage towards the end of each phase for suppliers to provide documentation in preparation for the next phase.	
	BC advised the IAP of the selection method to reduce the number of bidders down to a manageable number for final selection. MM suggested that one way to determine the final number of strategic suppliers might be to inspect the number of interfaces and determine relevant criteria which would then drive the test. BC advised that careful consideration was also being given to the packaging strategy so as to determine the number of packages of work in relation to the scheme architecture.	
	IAP had 4 main areas of concern regarding the procurement strategy: 1) Current IPS resources do not have the capabilites or experience to manage the procurement. BC shared these concerns and explained he was developing a model to enable IPS to act as an intelligent customer and also perform gap analysis to identify skills shortages. The model would then determine the sourcing approach. BC advised that IPS was looking for individuals from DWP, OGC, HMRC, MOD and others suitably experienced to manage an IT procurement of this size. ACTION: IAP to share information on any suitable resources for the	
	ACTION: IAP to share information on any suitable resources for the procurement if available. 2) Under the proposed structure the system integrator would be IPS. The IAP felt such integration would be particularly complex in the proposed structure. Given the lack of adequate expertise in IPS, the IAP questioned the approach, highlighting this as a major area of concern. Even if systems integration expertise was procured externally, ultimate responsibility for monitoring and ensuring its' success would rest with IPS. Long term and for steady state IPS would need to look at civil service pay and put together a case. FW advised that DWP had been successful in persuading the Cabinet Office of the need to pay market rates to recruit the necessary expertise The IAP noted they had not yet seen any plan detailing how IPS intended to manage systems integration. ACTION: AH to discuss how systems integration will be managed and the proposed approach with David Foord (OGC). 3) IAP discussed the idea of terminating under-performing suppliers at the end of phases. The IAP emphasised that change of supplier or termination needed to be a last resort and that there should be other remedies before sanctions are invoked. The IAP suggested procedures to give early visibility of issues and a clear escalation procedure need to be introduced. MM suggested that if terminations occurred, key individuals should move with the contract.	
	4) IAP felt the selection criteria for suppliers should be more heavily based on proven experience and capability rather than company revenue as presented.	PS/AH
2	IAP Theme 2 : Benefits Realisation	r s/an
	PS reported on the work of the Business Development Advisory Group (BDAG) and Customer Confidence Forum. PS stated the prime benefit of the NIS is building the identity infrastructure required for the future. This infrastructure must allow the management of identity for the nation as a whole. PS acknowledged it was difficult to quantify this in a cost benefit analysis. There may be supplementary benefits, such as those identified by Crosby, but if this main objective is not fufilled the scheme is meaningless. PS advised there is not sufficient articulation of the links between what IPS is trying to do, the articulation of benefits to the citizen and the planned procurement. FW	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	suggested it may be easier for IPS to consider the costs to the country which would result from not building the infrastructure. AH updated the panel on the work of the Public Private Forum on Identity	
	chaired by Sir James Crosby. Key concepts which Crosby has been testing include:	
	Uniqueness of Identity underpins the scheme;	
	2. The citizen must have trust in the scheme;,	
	3. The public sector is best placed to deliver a 'universal' scheme;	
	4. The private sector will deliver long term value to the consumer;	
	 The scheme must reach critical mass within the next 5 years. The consultation work has now finished and one-to-one meetings are being 	
	held to validate the material being put together for the final report, expected in July. PS stated the first 3 objectives would be a result of the basic infrastructure which is for the public good. It is difficult to analyse specific cost benefits around these.	
	MM raised concerns about the lack of discussion coming out of the forum around support requirements for such a sophisticated scheme. The IAP agreed that if Identity Management includes the requirement for an Identity enquiry intermediary to protect the citizen, it will need to be a regulated and transparent structure to build confidence.	
	The Panel agreed the scheme would encourage joined up government as a whole. However this did not rely on the ID card.	
3.	Assurance Arrangements	DH
	Following the proposed revised structure for assurance across the programme agreement is sought from both the Biometrics Assurance Group and the Independent Assurance Panel to the new arrangements. DH advised that BAG had been consulted over the proposal and that there was general agreement that the current assurance activities need to be better aligned. Brian Collins, deputy chair of the Biometrics Assurance Group, is likely to join the IAP in future to form a Scheme Assurance Panel. SAP could assign particular biometric focussed tasks to the BAG. BAG could also highlight particular areas for further investigation back to SAP. DH, AH and Brian Collins will be meeting on the 29th June to progress this further. The panel agreed they acted in an 'advisory' capacity. DH advised that culturally the BAG and IAP were similar and that Brain Collins had also advocated the DfT 'critical friend' model. DH advised that the new structure was not an attempt to inject greater formality into the assurance activitites. IAP questioned whether this would compromise the BAG's independence. DH	
	stated the reporting lines would still be the same. IAP queried how they could better track changes against areas they had highlighted for improvement and agreed that they should meet twice yearly with the CEO, early in the year to agree priorities for the coming year and then later in the year to discuss the concerns and recommendations raised over the course of a year and to discuss the IAP Annual Report. The panel agreed the new assurance arrangements in principle and also agreed this would be taken forward at the meeting on the 29th June for which DH would put together an agenda.	
	AH asked if members were satisfied they currently spent 12 days a year (their contracted amount) working for the IAP. Members concurred they were but that a budgeted amount for extra days might be helpful.	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	ACTION: XX to arrange a meeting for AH to discuss with Simon Rice.	
4.	Annual Report	
	The panel discussed the Annual Report and agreed to provide feedback to XX/XX.	
	ACTION: IAP to send comments on Annual Report to XX/XX.	

Details of Next meetings:

Date:	Location:	Focus:	Time:
23/07/07	Phone Conference	Introduction to Katie Davis Update on Crosby work & review first draft of report	10.00 – 13.00
18/09/07	Face-to-Face, London	Bill Crothers, update on framework agreement.	10.00 – 13.00
08/10/07	Phone Conference		10.00 – 13.00
05/11/07	Face-to-Face, London	Update to CEO Annual Report	10.00 – 13.00
03/12/07	Phone Conference		10.00 – 13.00

Version control

Version No.	Date	Reason for Change	Author	Approved for Distribution by
0.01	20/06/07	Initial draft	XX	
0.02	26/06/07	Review comments	XX	
0.03	28/06/07	AH review comments	AH	AH