

# Identity and Passport Service

## DRAFT - MINUTES Independent Assurance Panel (IAP)

Tuesday 16 January

Phone Conference

|                    |                  |                   |             |    |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|----|
| <b>Chairperson</b> | Alan Hughes      | IAP Member        |             | AH |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Fergie Williams  | IAP Member        |             | FW |
|                    | Peter Simpson    | IAP Member        |             | PS |
|                    | John Clarke      | IAP Member        |             | JC |
|                    | Xxxxxx Xxxxx     | Programme Manager | Support IPS | XX |
|                    | Xxxxx Xxxxxx     | Programme Officer | Support IPS | XX |
| <b>Apologies</b>   | Malcolm Mitchell | IAP Member        |             | MM |

### Agenda Item Comments

| Agenda Item No. | Agenda Item comments  | Provided by : |
|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 1.              | <p><b><u>Update from the Chair</u></b></p> <p>IAP were advised of the Strategy Board taking place on the 17<sup>th</sup> Jan 07.</p> <p><b>ACTION: XX/XX to circulate papers to IAP.</b></p> <p>Reference was made to the changes that the new CEO has made in terms of the revised IPS management and governance structure, It was advised that the CEO is also giving consideration, with a view to reviewing the current IPS Assurance arrangements.</p>   | AH            |
| 2.              | <p><b><u>Remit and Responsibility of the IAP</u></b></p> <p>Following on from Item 1, the Chair invited discussion in relation to correspondence on the subject and the discussion document provided by MM. Panel members agreed with the points made, specifically:</p> <p>(a) <b>Assurance/Advisory</b> – IAP has not acted to fully ‘assure’ the programme due to the unstable nature of the programme. IAP agreed that their role has been to provide a solid contribution in an ‘advisory’ capacity. It was agreed that the origins of the term ‘assurance’ in relation to IAP should be tracked back.</p> <p><b>ACTION: XX to provide the IAP with the relevant passage from the government’s response to the Home Affairs Select Committee in 2004.</b></p> <p>(b) <b>Bandwith</b> – IAP suggested that IPS need to consider whether the panel take a broad and shallow view or narrow and deeper one. It was agreed that whilst various artefacts have been presented to IAP for comment, an overall, high level, end to end, project plan is yet to be presented. Going forwards, it was agreed that the programme has a choice of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Having a body that provides advice/assurance across the overall programme</li> <li>- Segmenting the advisory/assurance activity to concentrate on specific aspects, such as Design, Procurement, Technology (Biometrics) and Resourcing/Governance of the project.</li> </ul> |               |

# Identity and Passport Service

| Agenda Item No. | Agenda Item comments  | Provided by : |
|-----------------|---|---------------|
|                 | <p>IAP recognised that the programme is very large and transformational in nature which typically means that it has two dimensions, in common with similar programmes of its size: (1) technological and (2) Cultural/process change. IAP recognised that to date the focus has been on the former and that it is actually the latter which tends to be the more challenging aspect of transformational programmes.</p> <p>(c ) <b>Periodic overview</b> (such as the OGC) – IAP agreed that they should be careful not to duplicate the OGC Gateway process but that they could add value in between gateway reviews and assist the programme following the outcome of reviews which would provide greater assurance to the OGC.</p> <p>(d) <b>Information</b> – The panel agreed that to date they have viewed stand alone/silo documentation and not seen evidence of a ‘joined up’ nature, particularly around the business case.</p> <p><b>ACTION: XX to ascertain the latest position on the business case.</b></p> <p>IAP felt that generally they have acted in the manner of responding to presentational material. IAP agreed that it was timely and appropriate for them to now define what it is they need to see (i.e. the Business case, procurement plan) so as to best fulfil their advisory/assurance function in a more proactive manner.</p> <p>(e) <b>Audience</b> – IAP noted that they have not always seen the IPS response to recommendations made and that they should target the right audience.</p> <p><b>ACTION: XX to review minutes over the past 12/18 months and produce a list of recurring issues.</b></p> <p>IAP were advised that the IPS governance structure determines that they report directly into the National Identity Scheme Programme Board (NISPB). It was advised that other government departments are represented on this board. IAP recognised their focus has tended to be diverted towards IPS aspects of the scheme and that it was important to refocus and support the CEO in his capacity as Chair of the NISPB.</p> <p>IAP concluded that essentially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They are an independent ‘advisory’ panel.</li> <li>- Their operation is at NIS level, reporting to the NISPB.</li> <li>- They adopt a mentoring approach, supporting the programme as a whole, specifically in relation to the biometric database and all the process changes that go with that, as well as taking a view on PR and costs/benefits.</li> <li>- IAP should ensure that there is a ‘need’ and ‘want’ for a programme of this size and shape.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to the latter point the Chair advised that further to the Prime Minister’s review of the ID Card programme in the summer of 2006, a ministerial committee was formed to address implementation and usage.</p> <p><b>ACTION: XX to ascertain the latest position in relation to the ministerial committee.</b></p> <p>IAP considered their workplan for 2007 and concluded that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Panel members should compile issues/concerns for themselves.</li> <li>2. Determine the issues/concerns over which to probe/seek evidence.</li> </ol> |               |

# Identity and Passport Service

| Agenda Item No. | Agenda Item comments  | Provided by : |
|-----------------|---|---------------|
|                 | 3. Put together a reference model.<br>4. Check that all members have a common understanding.<br><b>ACTION: XX to send to the panel: (1) the components/capabilities document, (2) Organisational chart and headcount date for the programme, (3) A mindmap of the key documents that underpin the programme and how these relate to each other, (4) Latest version/position on the business case.</b> |               |
| 3               | <b><u>Strategic Action Plan</u></b><br>IAP were advised that this should be one of the key input documents for the February meeting.  |               |
| 4               | <b><u>DWP/CIS governance paper</u></b><br>IAP felt that a minimalist approach needs to be adopted, centred around the core individual customer data that will be common to all of the government departments involved. It was recommended that each relevant individual department should then be responsible for the other detailed data held.   |               |
| 5               | <b><u>Intellect Industry Workshops</u></b><br>IAP were advised to contact XX if they wish to attend on any of the dates circulated. IAP were also advised of a front line operations event.<br><b>ACTION: XX to circulate details about the front line operations event.</b>  |               |

## Details of Next meetings:

| Date:                           | Location:                       | Focus:  | Time:       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------|
| 13/02/07                        | TBC (face-to-face)              | IAP to construct reference model.<br>James Hall, CEO and David Foord, OGC to attend.                          | 9.30–13.00  |
| 14/03/07                        | Phone conference                | Individual progress reports (IAP to have probed/sought evidence individually following the February meeting). | 13.00-14.00 |
| 10/04/07                        | TBC (face-to face/ JC by phone) | Check understanding/ next steps   | 10.30-13.00 |
| Other dates as circulated by AW |                                 |   |             |

## Version control

| Version No. | Date     | Reason for Change | Author | Approved for Distribution by |
|-------------|----------|-------------------|--------|------------------------------|
| 0.1         | 23/01/07 | Initial draft     | XX     | -----                        |
| 0.2         | 29/01/07 | Chair Comments    | XX     | AH                           |