Identity and Passport Service

DRAFT MINUTES
Independent Scheme Assurance Panel (ISAP)
Monday 8th October 2007, 10:00-12:30
Room 3.3, Allington Towers

Chairperson:	Alan Hughes	ISAP Member	AH
Members:	Fergie Williams	ISAP Member	FW
	Peter Simpson	ISAP Member	PS
	John Clarke	ISAP Member	JC
	Malcolm Mitchell	ISAP Member	MM
	Brian Collins	ISAP Member	BC
Attendees:	Katie Davis	Executive Director, IPS Strategy	KD
	Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx	Strategist IPS	XX
	David Foord	Mission Critical Director OGC	DF
Secretariat:	Xxxxxx Xxxxxx	Head of Programme IPS Secretariat	XX
	Xxxxx Xxxxxx	Programme Support IPS Officer	XX
Circulation of Minutes:		Members and Attendees	
		Biometrics Assurance Group	
		IPS Management Board	

Agenda Item Comments

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
1.	**Minutes from previous meeting** The draft minutes form the September meeting were approved. **Action (01) : XX/XX to update and issue as final.**	AH
2	**Portfolio Prioritisation & Capacity Plan** AH updated the panel on the re-prioritisation exercise being undertaken by the programme as a result of the approval and procurement delays. Members noted that the current Strategic Action Plan is highly challenging and as a result IPS are assessing 2009 delivery options. The 2009 delivery options are as follows: - First Biometric Card issued as part of the Adult FTA passport application. - First Biometric Card via online application for low risk existing adult pasport holders - Identity Checking Services on existing passport holders for private sector. - Second Biometric Card issued to standalone applicants using live prototype. The Panel noted that IPS intend to obtain ministerial steer (11th October) in order to re-baseline plan by end October.	AH

Identity and Passport Service

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	The panel were encouraged by the steps being taken to consider what can realistically be delivered in 2009. AH also advised the panel that the recent audit committee highlighted a serious training and development issue surrounding the organisation's handling of risk management. There was a concern that the programme may not be alerted to risks if this issue is not addressed and that some immediate action needs to be taken in this area. **Action (02) : XX to circulate audit committee report.** The panel noted that the next Gate 0 review is planned for end Jan'08. The panel agreed that there is a fundamental lack of clarity over the scheme approach. The panel considered that if an Identity Services approach is adopted then the cost of the scheme is difficult to justify on the service benefit. The Strategic Action Plan approach of a clean database, 10 year rollout and biometric enrolment carries considerable risk and the panel suggested that the 'commercial' approach would be to ramp up services as quickly as possible (e.g. passport, 1 biometric, data sharing, no card) and then strengthen the back office (for better identity assurance) and the biometric services. The panel agreed that they need to have a clear validated proposition before they can assure the delivery and await the outcome of the NIS options analysis.	
2.	**Management Reference Guide (v1.01)** KD advised the panel of the purpose of the Management Reference Guide which is to describe how the scheme will be defined, how the work will be managed and organised and what governance arrangements will sit over the scheme. The panel noted that each directorate is now in the process of forming a transition plan in order to enable adoption to the ways of working implied by the guide. KD advised that further work needs to be undertaken in order to address how the scheme fits with broader cross-government identity management strategy and the rest of the organisation. The panel noted that KD intended to have completed the cross-government identity management strategy by the end of the year. The panel welcomed the guide, concurred it was a good starting point with recognition that more work needs to be done. The panel fed back comments on the document including : - The need to cover where risk management, assurance, cost control and testing fit into considerations at section 1.3.4 of the guide. - The need to reference regression testing in the narrative. - The importance of ensuring that terminology is used consistently throughout the document e.g. use of 'integration'. In additon the panel advocated that the IPS representative responsible for systems (?) integration should be a standing member of the NIS Programme Board. - The guide needs to consider the Director General Identity Management role undertaken by the CEO of IPS and the components missing as a result of this group e.g. legal considerations. - Consideration needs to be given as to how the 'voice of the citizen' is considered and fits into the scheme. The Enterprise Privacy Group was referred to as a body that IPS ought to be engaging more closely with. KD advised that action was in hand to address this and advised that there was already some engagement with this group. **Action (02): Panel to send detailed comments to KD by e mail.** **Action (02/01) : BC to meet with KD to discuss management reference guide.**	KD ISAP

File Ref: draft Minutes oct07.for disc.doc

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	The panel reflected on the update given, querying why they are not referenced in the guide. Overall the panel felt that this was more like an infrastructure build reference guide, written periodically by the programme and there was a danger therefore that significant issues, highlighted above, will be missed.	
4.	**NIS Options Analysis** KD provided the panel with an update on the NIS options analysis. The panel noted that two workshops had been held with HMT/OGC/IPS with the second workshop being held on the 28th September which also included representatives from the cabinet office. The options will now be worked up into a number of delivery scenarios which will be the focus of discussion for a 3rd workshop being held on the 20th November. In addition specific 'concrete areas' will be discussed such as enrolment of people in the scheme and consideration of options around who, what, where and when. KD advised that the original NIS baseline plan had assumed that all enrolment would be on IPS premises but that consideration is now being given to alternative options e.g. creation of a market and encouraging competition around new services. In parallel the capacity plan will consider what is still possible in order to ensure plans are realistic and achievable. Caution was expressed around the use of delivery partners to carry out the enrolment process and consultation with experts to consider the social impact was advocated. KD agreed and advised that the options would be considered carefully with due consideration of the implications highlighted. The panel queried whether the card itself had been the subject of discussions. KD confirmed that there are 'no card' options but emphasised that there may be services that would necessitate the use of a card. KD emphasised key considerations were useage, best value and deliverability. There was general agreement that the use of a card determined a consumer/citizen issue. KD advised the workshop on the 20th November will produce options for the business case which will be finalised by the end of the year with the intention of seeking and gaining approval early next year. The panel queried how linked in IPS were to the considerations over creation of an ID Tsar. KD confirmed this is a Home Office initiative and acknowledged that further work is required to look at the governance around the scheme and specifically to clarify the relationship between the Scheme Commissioner and the Information Commissioner. The panel emphasised the need for robust inter-government agreements (SLA's) and sought confirmation that IPS has an understanding of constraints and capabilities of its' dependent other government departments. KD assured the panel that these concerns were being addressed. The panel sought confirmation that constraints around cross-government funding were being addressed. KD confirmed that recent discussions with HM Treasury were assisting in this area and that a new cabinet committee focusing on cross government delivery should also aid the process. The panel agreed that its focus must now be the planning and risk management around the options once they become clearer.	KD
5.	**Annual Report (v.0.1)** XX updated the panel on the current position of the report which incorporates all contributions from members to date. The main body of the report considers the	XX

File Ref: draft Minutes oct07.for disc.doc

Identity and Passport Service

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	panel's work around the three themes agreed with the SRO of the NIS/CEO of the IPS early in 2007. XX sought direction from the panel over their recommendations and resulting forward look for 2008. The panel advised that their outstanding concerns were as follows : - The risk of increased fraud if all ID related initiatives come together and specifically how IPS intends to address the end user perspective. The panel require assurance from the programme this is being addressed. - Lack of clarity over the NIS value proposition and benefits. Following review of draft 0.1 of their annual report the panel agreed that : - It is not their remit to 'comment on the scheme's objectives' (pg.4) but to assert where these are not clear. - The panel's remit is to offer advice, recommendations and challenge to the SRO and not 'assurance ' as per the terms of reference (pg.11). It was agreed that this should be made clear in the introduction to the report. - The report should be written as a tool for IPS management to use in order to address the areas highlighted by the panel and which the panel can subsequently seek to verify that the appropriate action has been taken during the course of 2008. - The panel's remit within the NIS should be made clear. It was suggested this could be usefully illustrated diagramatically. - The report should highlight the importance of cross government strategy, reinforcing the 'cross government sponsorship' point (pg.9) i.e. IPS cannot deliver the infrastructure build across the scheme without the relevant parts of the scheme being defined in a cross government strategy. - Within section 3.2 of the report the panel feel specific consideration needs to be given to their views around the proposed ID card, sepcifically that the panel has not yet seen the proposition which links service delivery and value to the use of a card. The panel agreed this section should consider the formal statements of purpose for the card (derived from the ID Card Act) and consideration over whether evidence exists to support feasibility and good value. The point should also be made that the link between this (the Act) and the options being considered lacks clarity. **Action (05): XX to send paper copy of the Act to PS/AH.** - The panel agreed that any comments made in their minutes should be reflected in the report and that these have been shared with the programme directly, either through the relevant Director's attendance at the meeting or through their Chair to the NIS Programme Board. - The panel agreed that section 3.2.1. of the report needs to address the specific cross-government standards that need to be in place around security, accuracy and cost if the requirements definition is to be properly informed. - Section 3.2. should reflect the importance of the voice of the citizen i.e. that 'trust is key' supported by Crosby's findings and the implications for the programme given the lack of clarity around benefit & useage for the citizen within key programme documentation. - The report should reflect that the panel are still seeking answers to	

File Ref: draft Minutes oct07.for disc.doc

Identity and Passport Service

Agenda Item No.	Agenda Item comments	Presenter
	fundamental questions surrounding the scheme e.g. what , why & who will benefit. It was agreed that the panel have concentrated efforts around this which has then prompted their questioning e.g. around data governance. The panel recognise some progress in this area e.g. the management reference guide.	
	The panel agreed that a short summary of what they considered by each meeting should be included in the report.	
	Action (05): Panel to send any contributions by e mail to XX by close Thursday.	
	Action (05.1): XX to redraft report and send to panel to receive by Monday 15th October.	
	Action (05.2): Panel to comment and return comments to XX by Monday 22nd October.	
	Action (05.3): XX to send final draft to panel by Mon 29th October.	

Details of Next meetings :

Date:	Location:	Focus:	Time:
05/11/07	Face-to-Face, London AbI Office	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	11/10/07	Initial draft	XX/XX	-------------------

File Ref: draft Minutes oct07.for disc.doc