

**MINUTES**  
**Independent Scheme Assurance Panel (ISAP)**  
**Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2008**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	Alan Hughes	ISAP Member		AH
<b>Members:</b>	John Clarke	ISAP Member		JC
	Malcolm Mitchell	ISAP Member		MM
	Peter Simpson	ISAP Member		PS
	Fergie Williams	ISAP Member		FW
<b>Attendees:</b>	Xxxxx XXXXXXXX	Scheme Architecture Group	IPS	XX
	Bill Crothers	Executive Director	IPS	BC
<b>Secretariat:</b>	Xxxxx XXXXX	Secretariat Officer	IPS	XX
<b>Observer:</b>	Xxxxx XXXXX	Fast Streamer	IPS	XX
<b>Circulation Minutes:</b>	of Members of Biometrics Assurance Group Scheme Management Board			
<b>Apologies</b>	Bob Assirati			

**Meeting Minutes**

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
1.	<p><b><u>October Minutes</u></b></p> <p>The minutes from the October ISAP meeting were approved. There were no new conflicts of interest. MM continues to be employed by BAA.</p>	AH
2.	<p><b><u>SMB Report</u></b></p> <p>AH updated the ISAP meeting with regard to the October 2008 and November 2008 SMB meetings. The minutes of the meetings have already been circulated to ISAP.</p> <p>The SMB was informed that Scheme Architecture has progressed well but that there are still gaps. ISAP noted this awareness of what work still needed to be done was positive</p> <p>Demand creation was flagged up as an issue and IPS acknowledged that although this is a known problem, the Scheme has not progressed to the stage they need to be at for adequate specification of requirements.</p> <p>Thales had given an update on CWIC and informed SMB that they felt too many parties are involved and there are issues emerging around costs and timescales.</p> <p>SMB was also updated regarding the Biographic Identity Programme and their issues with utilising the DWP's CIS.</p> <p>AH informed ISAP that SMB was of the opinion that procurement across the Scheme is under control and going well.</p>	AH
3.	<p><b><u>MPRG ; 2009 Deliverables ; End 2008 Stock-take</u></b></p> <p><b><u>3.1 MPRG</u></b></p> <p>BC advised ISAP on the outcome from the MPRG panel. The panel was chaired by Nigel Smith in John Kingman's absence, and the panel members were Jonathan Simcock and John Suffolk.</p> <p>BC presented the highlights from the MPRG. It will cost £3.7 billion to run the business over 10 years. 17 % of these costs relate to identity cards which means £790 million will be spent on identity cards over 10 years. IPS has acknowledged that there is a lot of uncertainty on market demand and they are behind on dealing with this. As a consequence, IPS has made a decision to postpone entering into identity card contracts to September 2009 so that more marketing can be carried out beforehand. Additionally, contracts will be entered for 5 years rather than 10.</p>	BC

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	<p>MPRG had agreed with the above approach and advised that they will review the issue of identity cards and volume in summer 2009, with an interim review in March 2009 to ascertain how IPS has progressed with marketing.</p> <p>MPRG also advised that IPS needs to establish a succession plan in terms of its key staff.</p> <p>ISAP noted these concerns accorded with its own observations but it also noted that MPRG was silent on enabling benefits realisation within government by OGDs making use of the Scheme. ISAP had received a presentation on cross-Government implementation, notably the setting of standards and other pre-requisites of connectivity. ISAP was encouraged that this work has started. But ISAP was also concerned that progress would be made in time to inform requirements of systems procurements that are in train already.</p> <p><u>3.2 2009 Deliverables</u></p> <p>BC listed IPS' priorities for 2009 :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep the business running, including transition</li> <li>2. Deliver ID cards through CWIC, Young People</li> <li>3. Build capability to manage operational change</li> <li>4. Manage delivery of services procured</li> <li>5. Complete the procurement process</li> <li>6. Create front office services network</li> <li>7. Develop the market for biometric identification.</li> </ol> <p><u>3.3 End 2008 Stock-take</u></p> <p>BC summed up that arranging for the supply of biometric identification is on schedule but IPS still needs to advance plans to generate demand. IPS will put more effort and time into marketing in 2009.</p> <p>PS commented that potentially there is a natural demand for secure biometric identification and IPS needs to tap into this. He observed that if IPS runs a well thought out marketing campaign, demand might be higher than anticipated.</p> <p>JC added that there may be a possibility of matching another organisation's identification problem with an opportunity for IPS to offer a solution and this should be explored.</p> <p>MM stated that there are various commercial programmes that have biometric strands and felt that developing a strategy to tap into these may be helpful in moving the Scheme forward. HB agreed that at present moment there is no long-term biometric strategy.</p> <p>ISAP noted all of the above points and noted that BC and XX will look into these.</p> <p><b>Action Point 01 : BC and XX to look into the points raised by ISAP.</b></p>	

4.	<p><b><u>BAG Feedback and Response</u></b></p> <p>AH gave a brief update of BAG's December meeting. Minutes will be circulated.</p> <p>He informed ISAP that there may be an additional BAG meeting in February 2009 to review NBIS' procurement process. NBIS does not have a detailed evaluation strategy as yet but this will be produced by the end of January 2009. He advised that ISAP should review the NBIS procurement at ISAP's February 2009 meeting.</p> <p><b>Action Point 02 : XX to include NBIS procurement review in February 09 agenda.</b></p> <p>BAG too was concerned with the marketing and communications aspect of the Scheme and assumed this will be given attention by ISAP. BAG observed that user support is critical to the success of technology.</p> <p>BAG stated that they want more of an information push from IPS with regard to its various programmes which have biometric elements.</p> <p>BAG received presentations from Biometrics Residence Permit, Facial Recognition Trial, CWIC and Front Office Services. Details will be in BAG minutes.</p> <p>BAG questioned the interoperability of CWIC and BRP's enrolment suppliers. Different standards and quality criteria pose a risk to the integrity of data collected which may result in people having to re-enrol, or lower standards of assurance and matching.</p> <p>BAG's minutes of September incorporated their responses to ISAP's questions on the NBIS procurement. These will be covered in BAG's annual report and summarised in ISAP's report on its review of NBIS.</p>	AH
5.	<p><b><u>ISAP 2008 Report</u></b></p> <p>ISAP considered the draft 2008 Report collated by XX.</p> <p><u>Updates on 2007</u></p> <p>JC noted that the day-to-day management of the Scheme was improving, however, in the area of marketing IPS needs to look at all the opportunities available to them. One of these opportunities is working with other government departments to offer biometric identification.</p>	XX

	<p>MM voiced his concern on the clarity of detail of benefit realisation across government.</p> <p>ISAP agreed that there needs to be a better link between the concept of "securing my identity" and the benefit of the Scheme for the UK. Without this in place, there is a danger mistakes will be made during procurement specification and implementation stages.</p> <p><b>Action Point 03 : PS to draft section on ISAP's concern regarding marketing and communications and send to XX.</b></p> <p>Other points to add are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISAP acknowledge that IPS has done some very good work in producing scheme architecture documents and the management reference guide ;</li> <li>• The Home Secretary's delivery plan published on 6 March 2008 has brought more clarity of direction for the NIS although there still remains work that needs to be done ;</li> <li>• The procurement process is going well so far and this needs to be recognised ;</li> <li>• The problems of integration of systems and operations procured were noted by ISAP in its 2007 report. These problems are likely to be more, not less, difficult in 2009, as updates from Thales and the construction of the interdependent FOS and A&amp;E projects illustrate. BAG's observations on CWIC enrolment standards are a good example of just one. ISAP's 2008 report should re-iterate this issue, particularly as the detailed requirements specifications are still being developed in certain projects and procurements. Identity Services was mentioned as an example.</li> <li>• The matters covered in ISAP minutes of 17 October 08 item 3 should be incorporated in the appropriate sections of the ISAP Annual Report.</li> <li>• The recruitment problem has been solved but there is danger in succession becoming a issue.</li> </ul> <p>AH noted that ISAP's remit is the integrity of the Programme, not any decisions on the implementation of ID cards. However, ISAP, like BAG, noted that without user support and clarity of requirements specification, no programme could succeed. So ISAP should consider these matters and how the Programme could influence them.</p> <p><u>Work of the ISAP in 2008</u></p> <p>ISAP agreed on the following actions :-</p> <p><b>Action Point 04 : <u>3.1 Specific reviews, A&amp;E, NBIS</u> – FW is to draft a section on NBIS and and send this to XX.</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 05 : <u>3.3 Scheme Architecture</u> – JC is to draft additional paragraphs and send this to XX and ISAP.</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 06 : <u>3.4 Reporting and Assurance</u> – The reporting section</b></p>	
--	---	--

	<p>should be shortened and assurance section lengthened. The assurance section should be made a main topic. MM and XX are to collaborate and hone this section.</p> <p><b>Action Point 07 : <u>3.5 Benefits and Communications</u> – This section should be the first section in the report. PS is to redraft .</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 08 : <u>3.6 Data Governance and Standards</u> – This section should be moved to come after the Scheme Architecture section. JC is to add to FW's words and highlight the clarity needed.</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 09 : <u>3.7 IPS Capability</u> – XX is to dispense with this section as it will now be covered under "Updates on 2007".</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 10 : <u>3.8 Integrity</u> – As ISAP has no real concerns on this, XX is to incorporate this section into the Data Governance and Assurance sections.</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 11 : XX is to agree each section with the relevant ISAP member by early January 2009 and collate and circulate an updated draft of the 2008 report to all members by mid January 2009.</b></p> <p><b>Action Point 12 : XX to find out the CWIC success criteria.</b></p>	
6.	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b> None.</p>	AH

#### Details of Next meeting :

Date:	Location:	Room:	Time:
03/02/2009	Allington Towers	B04	12.00 – 16.00

#### Version control

Version No.	Date	Reason for Change	Author	Approved for Distribution by
0.01	11/12/08	Initial draft	XX	-----
0.02	17/12/08	Second draft	XX	-----
1.00	7/1/09	Final version	XX	AW