



**Minutes for the Assurance Panel Meeting Held on 23<sup>rd</sup> November  
in room P 2. 25 in Peel Building from 12.00 until 4.30**

**Attendees:**

Alan Hughes	Chair	Simon Rice	Programme
John Clarke	IAP	Brian Cherrie	Programme
Sue Garrard	IAP	Lisa Lyne	Programme
Malcolm Mitchell	IAP		
Fergie Williams	IAP		
Xxxx Xxxxxx	(Secretary)		

The objectives of this meeting were to Introduce Fergie Williams to the Programme review the panels operation and to meet the new Programme Directors.

**Introductions and Apologies**

Nigel Seed, one of the new Directors of the Programme had sent apologies. There were no apologies from the Panel who were fully represented.

Alan introduced Fergie Williams explaining he would replace Richard Dunlop who had left the Panel. Fergie is to be inducted and given access to both the Gateway review pack and the recent Gateway report: Reason for Fergie to get to grips with OGC good practice and the current state of play. (Post meeting note - the next Gateway review is Jan/Feb 2006).

*Xxxx to arrange this, timing – as part of Fergie Williams's induction process*

The Programme and the Panel want to acknowledge Richard Dunlop's extremely valuable contribution to the Panel and to the work of the Identity Cards Programme.

**Feedback from the Chair**

Alan explained the structure of the Programme as currently understood and advised that the Immigration and Nationality Directorate were now fully engaged.

Alan also reported significant activity on the Procurement Strategy and said he had been asked to float some procurement priorities past the panel. A discussion followed leading to a questioning of the assumptions behind the pricing. It was agreed that Panel members would benefit from an Assumptions Walkthrough: Reason to better understand current thinking on the assumptions.

*Xxxx to contact Xxxxx Xxxxxx to find out if there are any Assumptions walkthrough's planned.*

Alan advised he would raise the issues generated by the panel at the Programme Board and this would include the revised Terms of Reference. It was decided that the minutes of this meeting would be copied to the new Directors and Katherine

Courtesy: Reason to inform them of the outcome of the IAP's internal review and make plain that the panel's role will be more focussed.

*Xxxx to arrange for the Programme to have the Programme Board Documentation  
Xxxx to provide other Programme documentation risk log/issue log/Programme  
dashboard/ Key decision chart/Plan  
Xxxx to revisit the IT strategy for John Clarke  
Xxxx to provide the revised Procurement Strategy when available  
Xxxx is to arrange for the Panel to have a Glossary of Prince2 terminology.  
Xxxx is to arrange for the panel to have a Glossary of Home Office terminology.  
Xxxx is to refresh the contact list to include FW and all Directors emails and direct lines.*

### **Feedback from the Panel**

The Panel advised that there appeared to be no Communications or Marketing Plan at a strategic level and no clear Board level ownership of this area. It was suggested that if this was the case then it could be indicative that Marketing and Communication were not being used as strategic tools. The Panel considered this an omission with the potential for significant impacts when undertaking what could be regarded one of the biggest behaviour change requirements of the adult UK population in recent history.

(post meeting note Sue Garrard has been asked to comment on the Marketing strategy as part of its review)

*It was agreed that Sue should meet with Alan Barnish reasonably soon – Xxxx to arrange*

### **Risk**

The Panel acknowledged the work going on during this transition period however; they expressed some concern over resourcing and structure around risk. They agreed that once the transition was over the Panel should review the way risks were handled: Reason to ensure that the structure and integrity of the Programme, as well as the low level risks, are taken into account.

### **Review of the IAP**

Alan summarised issues raised at the previous meeting (the Panel was a very limited resource & Panel members may find themselves drawn into working outside of their remit with the potential impact that they would become less effective). He explained that he had spoken to Alan Barnish the SRO to obtain his views and then facilitated a general discussion where the following points were covered.

- The Panels remit could not include any expectation that it would deliver *absolute assurance*. The panel would, however, be able to deliver a degree of independent and flexible oversight that the Programme was fit to deliver the ID cards scheme.
- The Panel could organise its priorities in rolling 3 month periods. These would be agreed with the SRO and be sourced from the SRO, the IAP and the Senior Management Team (SMT).
- Within the priorities, panel members should be tasked at Panel meetings (either face to face or virtual).
- The Panel would not simply record and walk away. They could engage with the Programme in those areas they were currently working on. This should take the form of advice and some limited assistance.

- The SRO's priorities were not reflected in the risk register.
- Very few people understood the whole Programme and the panel should endeavour to join them. They needed to work towards developing an understanding of the complete picture (post meeting note – this will not work without a planned schedule of activities)
- The panel did not need to meet every month.

The Panel agreed its future process would include

- Holding face to face meetings less frequently than once a month (exact timing to be dictated by work requirements) and using months without meetings to engage with the Programme
- To hold a virtual meeting on months without a face to face meeting and at other times as required.
- To use secure email for online discussion.
- To develop a new TOR reflecting the above process and discussion points.

The Panel reviewed its priorities and the focus points for the next three month period are:-

Procurement

Strategy;  
Integration of and;  
The degree of outsourcing.

Marketing and Communications

There appears to be no clear, single minded strategy linking into delivery (either at launch or steady state).

Consumer behaviour

(and how this squares with the Programme).

### **Meeting the New Directors**

The Panel met with Lisa Lyne, Brian Cherie, Simon Rice.

Alan explained the IAP to the Directors and the Directors explained their roles with the caveat that (with the exception of Brian Cherie) they were new to their current roles and were still getting to grips with the Programme.

There was some discussion on the current state of play and Alan advised the Directors that they would find a Programme that was in fairly good shape although it was incomplete.

It was agreed that these notes would be circulated to all at the meeting plus Andrew Dent, Nigel Seed and Katherine Courtney.

Xxxx Xxxxxx  
Assurance  
9 December 2005