

MINUTES

Independent Scheme Assurance Panel (ISAP)

Tuesday 7th October, 2008

Chairperson:	Alan Hughes	ISAP Member		AH
Members:	John Clarke	ISAP Member		JC
	Malcolm Mitchell	ISAP Member		MM
	Peter Simpson	ISAP Member		PS
	Fergie Williams	ISAP Member		FW
Attendees:	Bob Assirati	Mission Critical Director	OGC	BA
	Xxxxx XXXXXXX	Scheme Architecture Group	IPS	XX
	Bill Crothers	Executive Director	IPS	BC
	Xxxxx XXXXXXX	Head of Resourcing and Skills	IPS	XX
	Xxxx XXXXXXX	NBIS	IPS	XX
	Xxxxx XXXXXXX	Director of Projects and Programmes	IPS	XXW
	Andrew White	Scheme Architecture Group	Deloitte	AW
Secretariat:	Xxxxxx XXXXXX	Programme Secretariat Manager	IPS	XX
Circulation of Minutes:	Members and Attendees Biometrics Assurance Group Scheme Management Board			
Apologies	John Clarke Fergie Williams			

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
1.	<p><u>August minutes</u></p> <p>The minutes from the August ISAP meeting were approved. There were no new conflicts of interest. MM continues to be employed by BAA.</p> <p>Action Point 02 : A&E : JC to carry out follow up review with project lead in November – Carried over</p> <p>Action Point 07 : FW to draft section on NBIS and send to XX – Carried over.</p> <p>Action Point 08 : JC to draft section on A & E and send to XX – Carried over.</p> <p>AH made the following observations ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISAP can help the Scheme procurement process by identifying potential gaps. • Given what is occurring in the financial markets it is inconcievable that the NIS will not be affected in some way. 	AH
2.	<p><u>SMB Report</u></p> <p>MM updated the ISAP meeting with regard to the SMB meeting of 16th September. The minutes of the meeting have already been circulated to ISAP.</p> <p>MM recieved an action at the SMB which was to collate ISAP'S response to Katie Davis on the document 'Government Identity Management Strategy'. MM provided written feedback to Katie Davis on the 5th October, regarding clarity in the document.</p> <p>At the SMB MM suggested that the Lifecycle Architecture diagram should contain explicit benefits realisation, where it had been implicit before, urging a restating of the benefits to the individual.</p>	MM
3.	<p><u>Planning ISAP Work 2008</u></p> <p><u>3.1 Review of Scheme Architecture Work</u></p> <p>BC introduced AW who then gave a presentation and circulated a paper giving an overview of Scheme Architecture. ISAP noted the encouraging progress that has been made to define Scheme Architecture and to expose gaps or inconsistencies.</p>	AH

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	<p>ISAP asked what AW considered were the intractable big issues. AW replied that the main gaps were :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of ID Services proposition ; • Lack of information on how EEA nationals would be dealt with ; • The development of the card ; • How will Enrolment Centres link with other parts of the Scheme. <p>ISAP noted that wide communication and understanding of the Architecture amongst all those involved in the delivery of the NIS was essential to overcome the most common cause of failure of large programmes : that of size, complexity, duration and people-turnover. ISAP commended the work accordingly but encouraged its thorough 'socialisation' amongst NIS people.</p> <p>Whilst descriptions in the Architecture documents would now be 'frozen' to ensure consistency in the procurement dialogue, a process of review should be undertaken in the light of suppliers' proposals to see if improvements were possible. This process should be subject to formal change control.</p> <p>ISAP noted the gaps and inconsistencies the work had revealed, including those listed by AW above. ISAP members felt that benefit and proposition definition would benefit from greater detail in two respects :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of <u>how</u> scheme benefits to Government are to be realised in practice ; ('What data standards apply ?') • Definition of <u>what</u> are the benefits and uses for the individual citizen or organisation when verifying identity; ('Why do I want one ?' ; 'What do I use it for ?') <p>These may introduce the need for functionality that is yet to be envisaged in the Scheme Architecture, such as redress and exception handling.</p> <p>BC replied that he felt that the Proposition Issues were being dealt with, and that in relation to Data Standards, ISAP have raised that issue on a number of occasions and that there was a need to sit down with ISAP to discuss in more detail what is being done and what more might be needed.</p> <p>Action Point : 01 XX to include Data Standards as an agenda item for the next ISAP meeting (see actions 06 and 08 below).</p> <p><u>3.2 IPS Capability</u></p> <p>XX gave a presentation that outlined progress regarding recruitment, retention and development of staff, which was being carried out in concert with the Home Office where possible.</p> <p>XX stated that the skills base was now adequate for the current position with the combination of the retained Clientside consultants and Civil Servants.</p> <p>ISAP were encouraged by this, but noted that as the combination was just adequate, then there was little capacity for knowledge transfer from consultants</p>	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	<p>to permanent staff. ISAP also observed that in terms of Capability, looking forward to 2010 there is not a map of how we get there and what the requirement will then be. A transition plan should be developed.</p> <p><u>3.3 Reporting and Assurance</u></p> <p>ISAP was informed of the progress that has been made regarding Scheme reporting.</p> <p>ISAP observed that the development and build phase the Scheme is now entering should warrant development of its system of assurance. For example, supplier activity would soon need to be included in the assurance and audit process. The requirement to appoint a Scheme Commissioner before the first card is issued is another example as the Commissioner will have an assurance role. The process of internal audit of Scheme activity may be another.</p> <p>ISAP felt that the various components of reporting and assurance would benefit from being codified into a comprehensive whole that should expose gaps or overlaps and can offer Ministers Scheme-wide assurance and audit.</p> <p>MM spoke of the Fractal Governance model, which works downwards and upwards, and how it could be applied at various levels across the Scheme. If the model is utilised, it could show who is delivering what, and to whom.</p> <p>Action Point 02 : MM to draft a summary of the ISAP work regarding Reporting and Assurance and provide toXX for the ISAP annual report.</p> <p><u>3.4 Benefits and Communications</u></p> <p>ISAP noted strategic marketing companies had been appointed and are working on the Youth proposition. ISAP had questions regarding the value of the card to the Youth Market.</p> <p>ISAP were encouraged by this but questioned if the work to date fully reflected the behaviours and habits of 16 – 18 year olds. Their heavy usage of on-line networking may be an example – would registering on the NIR or having a card have any relevance for this ? Were the card to serve as a visual proof of age for a retailer it could be very over-engineered for such a simple purpose.</p> <p>On the value of the Scheme to Government and in particular Government efficiency and 'Service Transformation', ISAP felt that the priorities may be different. Here, for the Government to "know what it knows" had obvious benefits for both reducing duplication and for citizens to find it easier and more reliable to interact with all parts of the Public Sector.</p> <p>Accordingly, ISAP suggested that there may be merit in more development of the definition of the benefits proposition (what) in the case of citizens and the card, but for the Scheme in the Public Sector, the priority should be development of the means of realisation of benefits (how).</p> <p>Action Point 03 : PS to write up progress in Benefits and Communications with recommendations including the differential on benefits of the Scheme</p>	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	<p>and benefits of the card. Provide to XX.</p> <p><u>3.5 Data Governance</u></p> <p>FW has done some work in relation to Data Governance and JC has provided some advice.</p> <p>DH gave an update on the IMSPG. The Identity Management Standards Policy Group (IMSPG) is part of the cross government strategy on identity management. The IMSPG works to the IMSG, chaired by Sir David Normington. The IMSPG will help to establish trusted and efficient management services in the UK through the agreement of a comprehensive set of standards.</p> <p>ISAP considered this and discussed how Government is to apply Data Standards. For example, as a 'minimum' standard for every record, or more likely as a system of categorisation of the reliability or source of a record. Concerns at 'non-overlapping' data between passport and DWP CIS data records is an illustration of this need.</p> <p>Action Point 04 : FW to write up the ISAP position on Data Governance and Standards with recommendations and provide to XX.</p> <p>Action Point 05 : XX to invite Katie Davis to the next ISAP meeting under Agenda item regarding Identity Management Standards in Government.</p> <p>Action Point 06 : DH to ensure that ISAP is copied in on the minutes from IMSPG.</p> <p>Action Point 07 : DH to provide a paper to ISAP outlining the bigger picture regarding Identity Management Standards.</p> <p><u>3.6 Scheme Integrity</u></p> <p>ISAP felt the public should be reassured of overall integrity of the Scheme. This reassurance should come from several sources:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen protection, rights, validation and redress processes, complaints handling transparency; • Security controls of all parts of the system itself; that data blocks never leave the secure data centre, the quality of the data recorded and access to it, etc.; • The audit and assurance regime (see above). <p>ISAP considered that there may be value in setting out the approach of each of these and defining the standards and principles thereof.</p> <p>Although the Act gives few powers to the proposed Scheme Commissioner, that role through the publication of annual and other reports could have a valuable</p>	

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	role in building public trust in the integrity of the Scheme. This would require those reports to contain comprehensive detail.	
4.	<p><u>Trade-off decisions process : NBIS and A & E</u></p> <p>XX provided a paper titled NBIS Trade Off Update, and said that his focus was on NBIS, but that A & E were taking a similar approach. XX stated that a lot of thinking had gone into what could be traded off and how. On being asked how scaleable the trade offs were, XX replied that Biometrics are very difficult to trade off, and there is a level below which IPS would not consider going in terms of trade offs.</p> <p>XX voiced the following concerns :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to ensure that business users will maintain an open mind – there has been an element of ‘gold plating’ in requirement setting by users. • Ensuring that something that might be a really good idea for NBIS does not cause disruption elsewhere. • The speed of decision making towards the end of the process when time is short – which is why we are looking in detail at costs now. <p>XX stated that NBIS is looking for cross Scheme benefits / conflicts, which will be escalated to the SMB for decisions when necessary.</p> <p>ISAP was encouraged by the disciplined approach being taken to this potentially dangerous subject. No doubt scope gaps identified by the Scheme Architecture work would increase cost as would suppliers’ initial bids. Placed against the worsening public finances mentioned at the start of the meeting, there is clearly going to be pressure to reduce cost.</p> <p>ISAP noted the advice from BAG that trade-off decisions need several data points to show a ‘curve’ if optimal value is to be selected. Assumptions of data standards expected of enrollers should be explicit.</p> <p>ISAP felt that trade-off decisions that might have a security or integrity impact should be subject to additional review.</p>	XX
5.	<p><u>ISAP 2008 Report</u></p> <p>AH advised XX on the suggested format for the ISAP 2008 Report. The areas to cover and the ISAP leads are as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates on 2007 report • Specific reviews, A&E, NBIS 	<p>XX</p> <p>FW & JC</p>

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAG recommendations XX Scheme Architecture (including a linkage with Strategy) JC Reporting and Assurance (including integrity of systems) MM Benefits and Communications PS Data Governance and Standards FW IPS Capability XX (from work to date) Integrity TBC <p>Action Point 08 : The lead person on each topic should collate a draft and pass this to XX. XX will circulate a well-developed and comprehensive draft of the whole to ISAP members 10 days before the next meeting. This will be the main topic at that meeting.</p>	
6.	<p><u>AOB</u> None.</p>	AH

Details of Next meeting :

Date:	Location:	Room:	Time:
09/12/2008	Allington Towers	TBC	10.00 – 14.00

Version control

Version No.	Date	Reason for Change	Author	Approved for Distribution by
0.01	08/10/08	Initial draft	XX	-----
0.02	14/10/08	Second draft	XX	-----
0.03	15/10/08	Third draft	XX	-----
1.0	15/10/08	Final version	XX	XX