

15 July 2009



Mr Tony Collins
Computer Weekly

By e-mail to:
tony.collins@rbi.co.uk

Dear Mr Collins

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 – REQUEST REF 207193

I am writing to let you know that OGC is complying with the Information Commissioner's Decision Notice (dated 10 June 2009) regarding OGC's non-disclosure of information to you in response to your clarified request of 22 May 2006. Your clarified request was for the RAG status and recommendations of high-risk IT-related projects within the Home Office, the Department of Health and the Department for Work and Pensions.

I attach at Annexes A-1 to A-3 a copy of the information that we are required to disclose in order to comply with the Decision Notice.

Notes

At the time of your request Project Visor was the responsibility of the Home Office, although it now rests with the Ministry of Justice. Annex A-3 reflects this.

One project listed in our original response to you was incorrectly categorised as IT-enabled. This is the Department of Health IS DTC Procurement Wave 2 project. Although it is outside the scope of your request we are supplying the information in order to comply with the Decision Notice.

The information supplied to you continues to be protected by the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. You are free to use it for your own purposes, including any non-commercial research you are doing and for the purposes of news reporting. Any other re-use, for example commercial publication, would require the permission of the copyright holder. Most documents supplied by OGC will have been produced by government officials and will be Crown Copyright. You can find details on the arrangements for re-using Crown copyright on the Office of Public Sector Information website at:

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/index.htm>

Your attention is drawn to the Statement on OGC's Intellectual Property at <http://www.ogc.gov.uk/sdtoolkit/copyright/index.html>

If you have any further enquiries regarding this matter please contact the OGC Service Desk (details at the foot of page 1) quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth Carrod". The signature is written in a cursive style with a loop at the end of the last name.

Ruth Carrod
Head of Information Management

ruth.carrod@ogc.gsi.gov.uk

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0097 Electronic Booking Systems (P)
Gate: 4a
RAG status: Red

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	The Taskforce urgently considers the concerns that exist in the Service and decide whether the October incentive milestone remains appropriate.	Red
2.	The deployment plans are reviewed taking account of experience to date, current constraints and local capability.	Red
3.	The project urgently undertakes an assessment of NHS IT capability in each PCT and Trust to determine those which do not have a capability to diagnose and resolve local system issues and takes appropriate steps to support or strengthen them.	Red
4.	Current efforts to improve issue management must focus entirely on application fault reporting and resolution and provide visibility of process and feedback to users.	Red
5.	Rationalisation of issues logs, bringing them all into a controlled system with proper escalation and cascade between local and national levels, with regular and frequent review.	Red
6.	The project should gain assurance that there are no high risks in the applications' scalability and produce a risk assessment with mitigating action defined.	Red
7.	Integration of the Department of Health risks associated with Choose and Book with those for Choose and Book itself.	Amber
8.	Development of processes for measuring local performance of the service which will facilitate end-to-end assessment and management.	Amber
9.	Comprehensive benefits realisation plans should be created, implemented and performance managed.	Amber
10.	The project should confirm that it is delivering value for money.	Amber

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0496 Electronic Staff Records
Gate: 4a
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	We find that the project has reached a satisfactory state to go forward and we endorse the decision to go live with the Main Pilots and to commence preparation activities for Roll Out.	Amber
2.	<p>We recommend that the SRO and the Central Team work together with the Strategic Health Authorities to ensure that the implementing Trusts carry out the programme of preparation activities prescribed by the ESR project before they go live. In particular that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All implementing Trusts should use the education and training package provided by the project to prepare their staff in a timely manner. • All implementing Trusts should use effective communication channels to prepare the immediately affected staff for the level of change and disruption that will occur and to inform those that will be paid by the new system of any changes that will affect them. • All implementing Trusts should use a proven change management methodology to fully define any new processes and procedures that they will introduce during go live. <p>All implementing Trusts should produce a comprehensive plan before go live to show how and when the benefits from implementing ESR will be realised.</p>	Amber
3.	We recommend that an improved process of risk management of the activities within the Trusts is adopted with the clear understanding that risks must be escalated through to project management in a timely and effective manner.	Amber
4.	<p>We recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Roll Out plan is conducted after the Main Pilot phase 4 has gone live to ensure there is optimum staff, finance and facilities available to sustain the plan's 'Wave' approach. 	Amber

Annex A-1
Department of Health

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk profiles are developed for each Trust to be based on their nature, size, commitment and status in order to inform the planning. This should take into consideration where a Trust provides payroll services to other parts of the NHS. • A risk assessment is conducted of the new plan to ensure that appropriate and adequate contingencies and mitigation actions are included. This assessment must take account of the knowledge and lessons learnt to date in order to attempt to predict where problems might be encountered in the future. A higher level of contingency may be required during the early waves to allow for time to address emerging new problems without derailing the later waves of Roll Out. <p>The plans for the ramp-up of the operational environments are reviewed, particularly Help Desk facilities to ensure they will support an increasing population of live Trusts in parallel to providing the necessary help to the implementation teams and the Trusts.</p>	
5.	We recommend that the partnering relationship between the NHS Central Team and McKesson should be actively managed and its effectiveness measured on a regular basis by a specialist third party organisation with remedial actions to re-build trust and closer co-operative working.	Green

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0635 ICRS - Local Service Provider (LSP) 2nd Wave EEM Cluster
Gate: 4
RAG status Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	A framework detailing the function and protocols for the use of ASRs should be developed and the necessary resource for its management established in the Cluster.	G
2.	As the plans for the revised Cluster structure are implemented, the opportunity is taken to adjust the governance arrangements at national and Cluster level to clarify roles, relationships and authorities as the programme moves forward.	A
3.	The EEM Cluster team examine, with their NE colleagues, opportunities where there would be mutual benefit in sharing experiences and working even more closely together in order that every benefit is drawn from their joint role as customers of the common LSP.	G
4.	The Cluster and the SHAs should agree a plan which transfers responsibility, in a timely manner, consistent with the build in deployment activities, for the management of the go-live process from the Cluster to the SHAs. The Cluster will continue to have responsibility for management of "first of type" go-lives, all ATP signoffs and retain an assurance role.	A
5.	With the expected considerable expansion of roll-out volume across the sector, the ATP process is reviewed to examine any opportunities for streamlining, subject to ensuring that standards of operational capability and commercial prudence are not compromised.	G
6.	A plan needs to be agreed between the Cluster, the SHAs and the local health community as to how to achieve a service led programme for 2006/7.	A
7.	The deployment plan capability in terms of volume, timing and product range should be assessed and agreed with key stakeholders in the light of known potential risks and constraints.	A

Annex A-1
 Department of Health

Department of Health
 0503 ICRS - Local Service Provider 1st Wave London
 Gate: 4
 RAG status: Red

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

- Red Take action immediately.
 Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
 Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1	We recommend the Cluster team appoints a suitably experienced Benefits Manager and actively pursues the establishment of a Benefits Management network, setting a clear lead across the Cluster, identifying pockets of expertise, and enabling best practice to be shared.	A
2	We recommend that in determining the core CRS plan for the short term, every effort is made to ensure that the plan is realistic (challenging but genuinely achievable), has clear ownership, and has the explicit and informed support of all stakeholders.	R
3	The Cluster needs to examine the manner in which its existing Risk Management system is being used in order to assure the Programme Board that it is addressing the highest risks and issues at each meeting.	A
4	We recommend that the Cluster makes a careful assessment of the readiness and capacity for Trusts to implement the CRS solution and ensures that, through SHAs, clear and effective guidance is made available, tailored to the needs of each organisation.	R
5	We recommend that the Cluster team, with key stakeholders, identifies the potential opportunities for sharing expertise and passing on lessons learned from early adopters (particularly in the case of UCLH) and puts in place processes to turn good ideas into action.	A

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-1
Department of Health**

6	The Cluster Board needs to be satisfied the new governance arrangements stress the importance of CfH, the Cluster team and the care community presenting a single face to the suppliers and that these arrangements are widely promulgated and understood.	A
7	We recommend that the Cluster gives thought to the way in which a more partnering-based relationship with the LSP might be developed, when conditions make this possible, in order to lay a stronger and more effective foundation for the longer term programme.	G
8	The Cluster Board, in conjunction with its key care community stakeholders, needs to ensure that the forward a programme for the Cluster gives more emphasis to customer engagement and service led priorities.	A

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0451 ICRS - Local Service Provider 1st Wave North East Cluster
Gate: 4
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

- Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Status R/A/G
1.	We recommend that, as the plans for the revised Cluster structure are taken forward, the opportunity is taken to adjust the governance arrangements at national and Cluster level to reflect the current stage of the programme and the nature of the challenges ahead.	A
2.	We recommend that the NE Cluster team examine, with their EEM colleagues, opportunities where there would be mutual benefit in sharing experiences and working together in order that full advantage is drawn from their joint role as customers of the common LSP.	G
3.	We recommend that, given the expected considerable expansion of roll-out volume across the sector, the ATP process is reviewed to examine any opportunities for streamlining, subject to ensuring that standards of operational capability, safety or commercial prudence are not compromised.	G
4.	In order to ensure appropriate ownership and control, we recommend that the Programme Board reviews the top risks and issues as a standing agenda item.	A
5.	We recommend the Cluster team actively pursues the establishment of a Benefits Management network, setting a clear lead across the Cluster, identifying pockets of expertise, and enabling best practice to be shared.	A
6.	We recommend that every encouragement be given to the establishment of a pool of expert users in order that their expertise is deployed to best effect and some of the risks of implementation are mitigated.	G
7.	We recommend that, in setting the future programme, every effort is made to ensure that it is as realistic as possible in order to achieve a greater degree of stability and so sustain the commitment of stakeholders.	A

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0502 ICRS - Local Service Provider 2nd Wave NW&WM Cluster
Gate: 4
RAG status: Red

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Status R/A/G
1.	We recommend that the Cluster Board gives high priority to agreeing the full scope of the necessary governance protocols and puts in place a plan to ensure they are delivered by the end of December 2005, as targeted.	Red
2.	We recommend that the Cluster team, in performance managing the LSP, continues to give the Remediation Plan a high priority and puts in place a process to monitor early signals that the various strands of this critical initiative are on track to succeed.	Amber
3.	We recommend that the Cluster Board ensures that, in setting the future programme, every effort is made to develop as realistic a plan as possible in order to achieve a greater degree of stability and so sustain the commitment of stakeholders.	Amber
4.	We recommend that the Cluster Board decide the new Cluster management structure as a matter of urgency. Filling the many new posts should then be tackled as a specific project and given high priority.	Red
5.	We recommend that the initiative to reinforce Cluster resources includes a review of the expertise and capability of the management team, so that the Cluster is able to play its full part in managing the LSP and driving the programme forward across the Region.	Red
6.	We recommend that the Cluster team broadens its approach to risk management, which is currently predominantly focused on project risks, to include business and LSP operational risks. The Cluster Board should take active ownership of the highest risks and provide appropriate direction for their mitigation.	Amber
7.	We recommend that the Cluster team examines, with their colleagues from the E and NE Clusters, what opportunities there are for mutual benefits in sharing experiences and working together so that full advantage is drawn from their position as common customers for iSoft products.	Green
8.	We recommend that the Cluster team sets a clear lead for benefits management, promotes the establishment of a benefits management network, identifies pockets of expertise and enables best practice to be shared.	Amber
9.	We recommend that the Cluster team leads in the establishment of an effective process to capture lessons learned from the early deployments and ensure these are disseminated and applied to those implementing later.	Amber

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
1074 IS DTC Procurement Wave 2
Gate: 2
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1	In order to minimise any delays to the short term procurement process and ensure planned delivery dates are held, we recommend that the project team rapidly develops a process map and check list to inform the activities leading to issue of ITN. Critically this should include demonstration of satisfactory PCT engagement.	A
2	We recommend that more is done to communicate directly with PCTs and GPs by improving the two-way flow of information and creating an environment for open dialogue and the sharing of best practice and models for service delivery.	G
3	Recognising that there will, in reality, be a mix of commissioning of the new IS diagnostic services by both specialist consultants and GPs, we recommend that bidders be asked to provide flexible bids to suit both situations and to allow for progressive change towards more GP direct commissioning later in the contract.	G
4	In developing the commercial strategy we recommend that every opportunity should be taken to fully test the market interest (which may vary between Clusters) and minimise DH exposure. This might include, for example, tapering the level of volumes guaranteed to the IS bidders over the contract duration and inviting alternative bids at lower levels of guarantee.	A
5	We recommend that before ITNs are issued a specific check is made of all key linkages with other programmes and initiatives in order that before commercial commitment is made dependencies are identified (and their risk assessed) and any incompatibilities addressed.	A
6	We recommend that NHS tariffs/benchmark prices are established now for each service type requested from IS providers, so that these are available to compare with prices quoted by bidders, plus an appropriate allocation of NIT project management costs, to demonstrate VFM.	A

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-1
Department of Health**

7	We recommend that NIT secures secondments from SHAs (and possibly other NHS organisations such as PCTs) in order to prepare for the transition with the delivery community.	A
8	We recommend that the review of the top risks be concluded swiftly and that it should be regular practice to review the current top five risks at every meeting of the Programme Board for mitigating actions to be decided or endorsed. This is key in systematising the risk management approach across the project.	G
9	We recommend that NIT works with Access to determine and communicate with SHAs and PCTs the detailed requirements for their input into the Cluster procurement process through to financial close and implementation. This should include SHA and PCT governance arrangements for the Cluster Full Business Case approvals and any legal obligations under the contracts.	A
10	We recommend that after the ITN is issued NIT, with Access, works with the clusters to develop a NHS mobilisation plan. Each cluster project should engage referring clinicians early to mobilise the delivery changes required to generate new referral pathways for the new diagnostic services.	G

Annex A-1
Department of Health

Department of Health
0709 IS DTC Procurement Wave 2
Gate: 2a
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

No.	Recommendation	Status R/A/G
1	We recommend that the project team should continue to work energetically with their Access & Choice colleagues in taking forward the engagement with the SHA, PCT and GP communities. Achieving the widest possible buy-in from local stakeholders should be seen as a key objective.	A
2	We recommend that, building on the good start already made, the approach to benefits realisation is extended to ensure that there is a fully agreed baseline, that non-material benefits are quantified, and that the full breadth of benefits is carefully articulated so that all stakeholders appreciate the project's full potential.	G
3	We recommend that the work to define and embed the processes and behaviours for information and knowledge management within the programme be completed and documented.	G
4	We recommend that the CCPP Executive assess the risks associated with the exercise to outsource the Project Management function and the establishment of the Intelligent Customer function and ensures these are addressed as a matter of priority.	A
5	We recommend that the project's approach to lessons learned be applied from the first scheme onwards, for the benefit of those that follow, and also that lessons learned are shared between regions.	G
6	We recommend that work is commissioned to review the impact of the project on the existing provider network in each local health economy in order to provide a clear departmental perspective and to inform the procurement activity.	A
7	We recommend that the planned way forward for the Extended Choice Network be clarified and communicated to all stakeholders in order that there is a common understanding and a sound basis for early procurement.	A

Annex A-1
 Department of Health

Department of Health
 0339 N3 New National Network for the NHS
 Gate: 4
 RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
 Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
 Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	The review team recommend that a permanent appointment of an SRO should be made as soon as possible.	A
2.	The review team recommend that a document showing the project stakeholders be prepared, together with a plan for managing relations with them.	G
3.	The review team recommend that the necessary effort to identify, clarify and resolve the outstanding commercial issues be dedicated to that purpose once the N3SP position becomes clear.	A
4.	The review team recommends that work be put in hand to enable payment of the uncontested portions of existing and future invoices.	A
5.	Additional services such as building blocks to support locally funded COINS where they are agreed as offering vfm for the public purse should be brought clearly within the N3 scope of work.	A
6.	The review team recommend that clear plans be developed by N3SP for upgrading COINS network provision as an adjunct to the N3 programme, with additional locally provided funding as needed being sought from the relevant Trusts and COINS partners.	A
7.	The Review Team recommend that the authority to ban classes of traffic that are seen to inhibit the ability of the network to meet the business needs of the Health Service be established within CfH.	A
8.	The Review Team recommends that the current plan to define the terms of the transfer of operational responsibility for management of the installed base to Service Management be extended to cover planning for the further targets, tasks and resources of the N3 team.	A

Annex A-2
Department for Work and Pensions

Department for Work and Pensions
0677 Centralisation of Benefit Processing Project
Gate: 0a
RAG status: Green

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
Para 2.8	Consider making more direct use of expertise already developed in Contact Centres (or elsewhere) for remaining deployments.	G
Para 3.4	Consider managing project closure as a higher level version of the existing site readiness assessment process, with a full articulation of the responsibilities to be completed or handed over; formal reviews at the 10- and 4-week milestones and explicit sign-off by both the sender and the receiver.	G
Para 3.5	The end of project 'lessons learned' exercise should pay attention to the less procedural aspects of the lessons to be learned, including management styles and interpersonal relationships	G

Annex A-2
 Department for Work and Pensions

Department for Work and Pensions
 0677 Centralisation of Benefit Processing Project
 Gate: 1
 RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
 Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
 Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	Update and complete the business case to reflect the recent Board's support, strengthen the justification for the chosen option and finalise the financial case.	A
2.	The project team should ensure that a statement of strategic intent for the longer term vision is in place to provide context of how this initiative aligns with other existing Jobcentre Plus initiatives and DWPs strategic vision.	G
3.	Provide a dedicated resource to defining and implementing a communications strategy for the project.	A
4.	Undertake an exercise to ensure that people now understand roles responsibilities and objectives on this project.	A
5.	Review the areas of risk highlighted in Section 3 and consider their inclusion on the Risk Register.	A
6.	That a programme approach be developed for this project.	A
7.	At this stage of the project we would recommend – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The COO becomes the SRO. • Use the opportunity to implement any changes to project governance, management, ownership and clarification of roles. 	A
8.	That the Processing Director chairs for example a workshop with all key parties to resolve any decisions on short term telephony direction.	G

Annex A-2
Department for Work and Pensions

Department for Work and Pensions
0297 Pension Transformation Programme
Gate: 0a
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	Review of Steering Committee Working Practices	Green
2.	'Non Efficiency' Objectives Benefits Granularity	Green
3.	Decision on The Pension Service Funding Position	Amber
4.	Assurance on Operational Readiness for Wave 1	Green
5.	Review of Resources for PMO & Delivery Management	Green

Annex A-2
 Department for Work and Pensions

Department for Work and Pensions
 0663 WATCH
 Gate: 0a
 RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
 Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
 Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	Establish clear programme boundaries and align all aspects of the programme with these.	A
2.	Provide the programme with a period of stability in its scope, structure and plans.	A
3.	Re-examine document review mechanisms to ensure that the Business Case and other key programme documents are kept up to date.	A
4.	Clarify responsibilities around programme management and ensure responsibilities are discharged.	A
5.	Increase the involvement of DWP and partners in contributing to, assuring and accepting joint ownership of plans.	A
6.	Ensure escalation of key issues occurs direct to programme management to ensure early resolution.	A
7.	Improve configuration management and document controls across the programme.	A
8.	Revise the programme management approach to focus around outcomes, with commensurate measures, key performance indicators and critical success factors.	A
9.	Recommendation 9: Review risk management activities against agreed processes, and ensure that the top programme risks and issues are addressed at each IPB and IDB meeting.	A
10.	Commission an independent review of the latest plans to address both concerns.	A
11.	Review stakeholder communications and engagement on Task Force outcomes to provide assurance.	A
12.	Base Management Reviews on the Programme Plan.	A
13.	Establish management reporting lines from projects to programme and hence to IPB and above.	G
14.	Establish an appropriate level of resourcing at the WATCh2 Programme Management level.	A
15.	Communicate senior management expectations that agreed programme processes must be followed.	A

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0193 Adelphi (Formerly ERP)
Gate: 5
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	The programme should develop and implement a training plan which also addresses the role of the user in the end to end business process.	G
2.	A data quality remediation plan should be produced with responsibilities defined and clear targets identified.	A
3.	The Adelphi Programme should produce a closure plan, by 31 March 2006, for action by the CSMPB.	A
4.	Measurable CSFs on compliance with baseline Adelphi processes should be set for business managers.	G

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0893 **Bichard Implementation Programme**
Gate: 0
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	The Home Office should consider splitting in due course the present portfolio programme, based on implementing historical recommendations, into two more normal programmes, based on delivery of future benefits: one for developing a fully effective police information and intelligence system and the other for co-ordinating work on protection of children and vulnerable adults on a continuing basis across Departments and the CRB.	Green
2.	If the IMPACT programme is to be a success, the Government will need to be persuaded at the highest levels to see the programme, not as competing with the many other current policing initiatives, but as a prerequisite for success in all these other initiatives, and an enabler for them.	Green
3.	The IMPACT Programme needs to sell itself much more effectively to Ministers, opinion formers and the public generally.	Green
4.	The Home Office should consider re-branding the Bichard Implementation Programme Board as a Programme Team, with representation at working level.	Green
5.	Further HO staff should be brought into the IMPACT programme as soon as possible.	Amber
6.	On benefits management, the key task should be to ensure that the individual sub-programmes develop (a) well-considered measures of success and (b) serious plans for ensuring that they are delivered in practice. A benefits-driven, delivery-oriented, approach should be a hallmark of the programme.	Amber
7.	The Home Office should consider emphasising in their high-level statements of policing and harm reduction objectives the central importance of world-class police information, intelligence and communication systems.	Green

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-3
Home Office**

8.	Home Office Ministers should be invited to reach an early strategic decision, in the context of Home Office resource allocation generally, on how much resource can be planned for the IMPACT programme, in broad terms at least, within the Department's forward plans. This decision cannot be left over until the CSR07 spending round.	Amber
9.	A decision should be made as soon as possible on what should be done (or not done) in relation to recommendation 7 and on the governance and funding consequentials. CJIT seems best placed to lead on this.	Amber
10.	The programme should urge DfES to consider including direct assessment of recruitment skills by Ofsted inspectors themselves as part of the Schools Inspection programme.	Green
11.	The next updating of the risk register should explicitly address the points in section 5.	Amber

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0360 EDRM
Gate: 4
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	We recommend that the project manager, in conjunction with senior IND stakeholders, develops a specific implementation strategy and plan for engagement with IND and secures appropriate high level IND commitment for the project going forward.	A
2.	We recommend that HO review the supplier relationship management arrangements in an attempt to improve delivery and reduce costs. An Intelligent Customer role may help in this area.	A
3.	We recommend that some form of verification report be developed upon completion of the data migration phase for each unit to confirm which folders/files have not been migrated	G
4.	We recommend that the SRO and project manager review team staffing against the project plans and strengthen as necessary.	A
5.	We recommend that the HO review the contingency and Disaster Recovery plans to ensure that robust arrangements are put in place before EDRM is rolled out to a substantial number of users.	A
6.	We recommend that the project manager should review all risks and quantify them in terms of cost and timescale; adjusting budgets and plans accordingly.	G
7.	We recommend that an effective benefits sign up and tracking mechanism be set up with all Directorates with regular reporting on benefits achieved back to the project board and on a regular basis to the HO at Board level.	A

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0412 Identity Cards Programme
Gate: 0b
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	The Department should make clear that the New Agency will be responsible for making a success of the wider identity management scheme, covering both UK and foreign citizens residing in the UK, in partnership with IND, UKvisas and others.	Amber
2.	Consideration should be given to developing the present ESMT meetings into a Partnership Forum with a clearly defined remit to exercise leadership of the wider scheme. Alternatively the Forward Programme Board, suitably constituted, could have this role.	Amber
3.	The Department should develop financial arrangements which will facilitate rational decisions on development and resourcing of the wider scheme (rather than let these decisions be driven by unrelated circumstances such as the wider financial positions of scheme partners in a particular year). For example, a single pot of money could be allocated to the wider scheme, for the Forward Programme Board or Partnership Forum to spend in the most efficient and effective way.	Amber
4.	The title "Board" should be reserved for the Programme's main decision-making groups, viz the Programme Board and the subsidiary Boards for the major projects. Other groups, including the important stakeholder and professional groups, would better be called Groups, Forums or Sub-committees, as appropriate.	Green
5.	In accordance with normal recommended practice, Executive Directors of the New Agency should be designated as SROs for the main projects.	Amber
6.	There is an urgent need to establish an effective resourcing and budgeting system for the Forward Programme. This needs to extend to employment of consultants and interims.	Amber
7.	The Department should consider adopting a more "normal" governance model for the New Agency along the lines sketched in section 1 (d), in which the CEO runs the Agency on more collegiate lines with his or her senior colleagues with Non-Executives playing a significant but not preponderant role.	Amber

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

Annex A-3
Home Office

8.	Consideration should be given to developing a section of the Framework Document or a separate MOU to set out clearly the financial regime under which the Agency will operate vis a vis central Home Office and HM Treasury.	Amber
9.	The Business Case needs to include a specific focus on short-term benefits to cardholders as well as assessing the total picture on benefits over the longer-term. The new Ministerial Committee will have an important role to play in ensuring that public service departments make this happen.	Green
10.	One early benefit which the Business Case needs to mention is the objective to provide up to date information on individuals' addresses as well as themselves and to serve as a single central point for notification of changes of address.	Green
11.	The opportunities for collaborative procurement across the wider identity management scheme should be fully explored and formulated as part of the procurement strategy.	Amber
12.	The Forward Programme should take the lead in firmly establishing the procurement approach for the wider identity management scheme and communicating this within the Team, to the stakeholders and to the marketplace.	Amber
13.	The procurement strategy should be updated to include an intention to develop partnering style relationships with suppliers in the major contracts.	Green
14.	A rigorous and professional risk management process should be introduced and established using recognised risk management tools and procedures, and this should be integrated with the supply chain during procurement.	Amber
15.	The Team should redouble its efforts to confirm the resource requirements and to recruit the necessary skills in order to reach the required staffing levels as quickly as possible.	Amber

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0412 Identity Cards Programme
Gate: 1
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1	Future versions of the Business Case should briefly but cogently assess the recommended option against other plausible options for design and delivery, such as those suggested in this report, in terms of costs, benefits and risks.	G
2	Later versions of the Business Case could be strengthened by setting out the case in a much more strategic way, as outlined in the report, with less reliance on necessarily precarious figures.	G
3	New arrangements could usefully be made as soon as possible to enable a committee of senior Ministers to make early and continuing contributions to plans for benefits realisation.	G
4	A Cross-Department communications and public relations plan should be developed, which would make clear how benefits will occur in the private sector as well as across a range of Departments. The proposed Ministerial Committee might choose to oversee this work.	G
5	The work to mitigate and manage risks should be developed further with technical support if required from outside.	G
6	The Transition Executive, IND and UK Visas should keep interrelated project work under joint review, with the specific aim of seeking de-risking opportunities. Much of this work is very challenging. IND and UK Visas will therefore need to be fully engaged and prepared.	A
7	Linkages are established between the benefits identified in the Business Case and the ID Cards system design features (including costs) and they are used to inform trade off studies.	A
8	A single and effective source of authority is set up to define and control the system design across the operating packages within the delivery structure.	A

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-3
Home Office**

9	The role of system integration in the programme is clarified and that the System Integrator is selected and appointed early in the next stage.	A
10	Proving trials involving the public should form part of a staged assessment and release process involving gate 4 reviews with clear decision points so as to build confidence in proceeding with the roll out of a full service.	A
11	Irrespective of whether ID Cards is considered to be a single project or a programme future Gate reviews should be undertaken at the normal key stages appropriate for a project. The Gateway process may also be appropriate for individual ID Cards elements with the features of a project but this should be a case-by-case decision.	G

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0875 Single Non-emergency number
Gate: 0
RAG status: Green

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	It is recommended that a senior representative from ODPM is appointed to the role of deputy SRO. This should ensure the correct balance of focus between ODPM and Home Office objectives.	G
2.	It is recommended that, as the Strategic Outline Case is developed, the benefits (financial and non-financial) are quantified with targets and means of measurement. This should improve the ability of the Programme Team to baseline, prioritise and track the delivery of benefits.	G
3.	It is recommended that the Programme Team investigates the possibility of obtaining additional resources seconded from local government via the ODPM to be deployed in specific roles within the team (e.g. Central Programme Team Business Change Management). This should further ensure appropriate ODPM representation, provide local government expertise and strengthen joint Departmental sponsorship.	G
4.	It is recommended that the Programme Team exercise care in the use of governance terminology and that clear distinction is drawn between the decision-making bodies (boards) and the Subject Matter Expert groups within the Programme structure. This should bring greater clarity to the executive authority and advisory capacity within the Programme.	G
5.	It is recommended that the Programme formalises its Regional Support Team as a Business Change Management function with the specific remit of co-ordinating change within the seven wave 1 partnerships. This should be complementary to the joined-up senior support within ODPM and Home Office and improve the delivery of change in a structured manner.	G
6.	It is recommended that the incoming SRO prepares a short assessment of the SNEN Programme against each of the eight common causes of failure, together with an action plan to address any deficiencies identified.	G

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-3
Home Office**

7.	It is recommended that a more formal resource plan is developed for the medium to long term. This should provide a baseline staffing requirement against which to test and adjust anticipated resource requirements as lessons are learnt as the Programme progresses.	G
8.	It is recommended that each of the seven wave 1 partnership projects undertakes a healthcheck prior to “go live”. This should prevent problematic service launch and ensure that the planning for Wave 2 is appropriately informed.	G

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0875 Single Non-emergency number
Gate: 0a
RAG status: Amber

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1	It is recommended that a common shared vision for SNEN is formally agreed between, and strongly communicated by, police, local government, the Home Office and ODPM.	A
3	It is recommended that the SRO role should be performed at Director General level, given the importance of this Programme in underpinning a number of government priorities. It is essential that it is not perceived as having been downgraded by the absence of direct Director General involvement in managing the variety of senior stakeholders.	A
6	It is recommended that as part of the evaluation of Wave 1, the Business Case for SNEN is re-visited in order to fully quantify the benefits and costs with hard data in order to shape the delivery plans for Wave 2 and beyond.	A
7	It is recommended that Wave 2 should be timed to enable new partnerships to take proper account of the full evaluation of Wave 1 (including Leicester) whilst, where appropriate, allowing Wave 1 partnerships to progress in the interim.	A
8	It is recommended that the criteria for selection of Wave 2 partnerships reinforce the overriding need to establish a single delivery model within any strategic police force area.	A
9	It is recommended that the Programme issues wave 2 partnerships with a consistent Project Brief that prioritises the delivery of benefits to the citizen thus reinforcing the credibility of the 101 service.	A
2	It is recommended that the SRO establishes strengthened governance between the 101 and 999 services to better manage the interdependencies, particularly in relation to new technologies.	G
4	It is recommended that ODPM should more visibly demonstrate commitment to the Programme, perhaps through alternating chairmanship of the Steering Group. Ongoing opportunities should also be found for local government Ministers to demonstrate their clear commitment to the Programme.	G

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-3
Home Office**

5	It is recommended that arrangements are made to monitor the telecomms market to ensure that the Cable and Wireless contract maintains value for money.	G
---	--	---

Annex A-3
Home Office

0803 **Single Transactional Shared services programme (STSS)**
Gate **0**
RAG status: **Amber**

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.6	that the governance arrangements be reviewed to ensure they are appropriate for phase two.	A**
1.8	that communications are improved	A**
1.11	that the Programme Board satisfies itself that Adelphi can deliver the required functionality within STSS' timescale.	A*
1.11	that if Adelphi cannot deliver within the required timescale that costed contingency plans be drawn up.	A*
1.12	that the relationship with Adelphi be reviewed, and a clear strategy for convergence agreed.	A**
2.4	that the Strategic Business Case be enhanced	A*
2.6	that, either as a separate document, or as an annex to the Business Case, the resource implications for the business areas in supporting STSS be quantified.	A*
5.1	that the risk and issues register be reviewed to capture all current risks and issues.	A**
5.2	that risk be a standing item on the Programme Board agenda	A**
6.4	that Programme Board members be asked to ensure that the information requested from other programmes/projects is provided.	A**

* By Strategic Business Case approval

** As soon as possible

Annex A-3
Home Office

Home Office
0814 SRG framework contracts
Gate 2
RAG status: Red

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action by the next OGC Gateway Review.
Green Take action as required.

		Status
Ref. No.	Recommendation	R/A/G
1.	Recommendation 1: The project should consider treating the NOMS requirement separately and drawing up a business case covering that requirement, with appraisals of the options which would meet that requirement and a cost-benefit analysis of those options. The project should also consider separate Business Cases for out-sourcing existing work undertaken by DCG and also any future, new requirements.	Red
2.	Recommendation 2: The project should re-visit the project board's terms to confirm the members' understanding of their roles and responsibilities.	Amber
3.	Recommendation 3: The project should review their procurement strategy, including the use of OJEU, and consider separate procurement approaches for the three different areas of work, namely NOMS, existing DCG work (to address the headcount reduction) and future, new work. (This should include, for example, assessing different pricing methods and charging mechanisms.)	Red
4.	Recommendation 4: The project should formally identify its scope, objectives, stages and funding.	Red
5.	Recommendation 5: The project should identify the staff resources and skills which will be required to enable successful delivery of the project's objectives.	Red
6.	Recommendation 6: The project team should consider risk-ownership, producing risk management and contingency plans and financial evaluation of any of the risks.	Amber
7.	Recommendation 7: The project should consider continuing with the project but concentrating on meeting the NOMS requirement, in line with Recommendation 1. The project should re-visit the NOMS specification to ensure there is sufficient detail to enable bidders to understand the requirement fully and to be able to make an appropriate offer.	Red

Annex A to OGC letter ref 207193 dated 15 July 2009

**Annex A-3
Home Office**

8.	Recommendation 8: The project team should determine their supplier selection criteria and bid evaluation criteria.	Amber
9.	Recommendation 9: Further consideration needs to be given to how best to achieve headcount reduction and meet new business requirements.	Red
10.	Recommendation 10: The project needs to develop a strategy on how to manage contracts post-award. They should consider involving expertise from DCG, "customers", data-suppliers and procurement.	Amber

Annex A-3
Home Office

Responsibility rested with the Home Office (at the time of the FOI request), now with the Ministry of Justice

0900 ViSOR - National Implementation in NOMS

Gate: 0

RAG Status: Red

APPENDIX C

Summary of recommendations

Red Take action immediately.
Amber Take action before further key decisions are taken
Green Take action as required.

Ref. No.	Recommendation	Status R/A/G
1.	NOMS Project Board and the Offender Manager Programme Board should review and support ViSOR in conjunction with other major programmes taking special account of the Police dimension.	Amber
2.	Work should be initiated to develop a medium term strategy to resolve the functional overlap of multiple systems and double keying if all the systems are to be used efficiently and effectively.	Amber
3.	The business case needs to be revised using current figures and based on the deployment to all three agencies in accordance with the HMT Green Book, and CSF's agreed with all user agencies.	Amber
4.	The policy on the deployment of ViSOR to private prisons needs to be resolved and funding identified if the full benefits of the ViSOR system are to be realised.	Amber
5.	The project team should develop, with PITO, an improved SLA based on the general principles set out the existing document and an MOU setting out the responsibilities of both parties.	Red
6.	An MOU should be developed describing how ViSOR is to be used and the responsibilities of the 3 partner organisations.	Red
7.	The project team needs to establish the scope of ViSOR including detailed user requirements, business needs and processes, number of users, Training Needs Analysis (TNA), number of terminals etc.	Red
8.	The project team should develop and/or enhance the products required for successful national implementation.	Red
9.	The project should be delayed – the exact time to be decided after due consideration of our findings but probably in the region of 4 to 6 months.	Red