Information and systems strategy - policy integration and benefits

Metropolitan Police Authority

Audit 2005-2006
External audit is an essential element in the process of accountability for public money and makes an important contribution to the stewardship of public resources and the corporate governance of public services.

Audit in the public sector is underpinned by three fundamental principles:

- auditors are appointed independently from the bodies being audited;
- the scope of auditors' work is extended to cover not only the audit of financial statements but also value for money and the conduct of public business; and
- auditors may report aspects of their work widely to the public and other key stakeholders.

The duties and powers of auditors appointed by the Audit Commission are set out in the Audit Commission Act 1998 and the Local Government Act 1999 and the Commission's statutory Code of Audit Practice. Under the Code of Audit Practice, appointed auditors are also required to comply with the current professional standards issued by the independent Auditing Practices Board.

Appointed auditors act quite separately from the Commission and in meeting their statutory responsibilities are required to exercise their professional judgement independently of both the Commission and the audited body.

Status of our reports to the Trust/Council

The Statement of Responsibilities of Auditors and Audited Bodies issued by the Audit Commission explains the respective responsibilities of auditors and of the audited body. Reports prepared by appointed auditors are addressed to non-executive directors/members or officers. They are prepared for the sole use of the audited body. Auditors accept no responsibility to:

- any director/member or officer in their individual capacity; or
- any third party.

Copies of this report

If you require further copies of this report, or a copy in large print, in Braille, on tape, or in a language other than English, please call 0845 056 0566.
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Summary Report

Introduction

1 A strategy can be described as defining: ‘a general path for achieving the objective. It limits the options, making this achievement a manageable task for those who have to get the job done’¹. In developing any strategy, an organisation needs to take account of factors such as its current activities, its future aims and objectives and how it intends to achieve them.

2 In modern organisations the information and ICT strategies are crucial to success. Although different organisations may define their actual documents differently (information strategy, systems strategy technology strategy, etc), it is clear that the strategic approach to managing the information 'resource' of the organisation, including the systems and technologies to make use of information, should support and enable the organisation to achieve its overarching corporate objectives.

3 In the public sector, the strategic approach to information and ICT will usually also need to address external drivers such as national information/ICT strategies for the sector (eg National Strategy for Police Information Systems) and e-government initiatives.

4 In practice, experience shows that many organisations either have not agreed a strategic approach to ICT and information or else have a 'stand-alone' strategy that is not fully integrated with corporate priorities.

Background

5 The policing priorities for the Metropolitan Police Service are set out in the Policing and Performance Plan. This sets out a range of priorities derived from sources such as the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA), the Mayor of London, the National Policing Plan and public consultation. These have been grouped under three themes:

- protecting the capital against terrorism;
- reducing serious and organised crime; and
- promoting safety and reassurance.

6 Within the three themes are seven more specific policing objectives. In addition to these is a set of business group priorities relating to the work of specialist units and support functions.

¹ Gartner
The work of the MPS is highly information dependent and the responsibility to ensure that information needs are met rests primarily with the Directorate of Information (DoI). The DoI's goal is to 'deliver services and solutions to the MPS, guided by the priorities and demands of policing London'. To this end it provides the technology and communications infrastructure as well as information systems including call handling, crime recording, criminal intelligence and mobile data and communications.

The DoI was responsible for developing the MPS' information strategy and delivery of this is led through the activity of the Information Programme Group (IPG). The IPG's work breaks into three main streams:

- operational policing systems;
- professional and specialist systems; and
- infrastructure programme.

**Audit approach**

The objectives of this audit review were to:

- assess to what extent the information strategy is driven by and supports the MPS' policing priorities; and
- review how the MPS can demonstrate and manage the benefits derived from the strategy.

In developing this approach we have worked with MPA internal audit to agree complementary strands of work. In addition to the work undertaken by the Audit Commission and reported here, which concentrated mainly on the corporate information and systems strategies, internal audit carried out work looking at how information needs and strategies developed within operational units align with the corporate strategy. Internal audit covered communication and awareness of the strategy and the MPA's specific interests in oversight and scrutiny of MPS activities and is reporting separately.

Our audit approach included a high level review of the origin, development, maintenance and delivery of the strategy, in particular the involvement of end users. It also considered the process for identifying and managing the overall benefits of the strategy. We interviewed staff involved in preparing and delivering the strategies at Group Director level and below. We also reviewed the strategies themselves and related documentation. We assessed this using our Information Strategy audit tool which draws on good practice from a variety of published sources as well as experience from other audited bodies in the criminal justice, local government and health sectors.
12 The audit also used example probes to follow the pathway from corporate objectives through to identifying and meeting the consequent information needs. The corporate objectives selected were:

- reduce gun-enabled crime;
- improve citizen experience; and
- safeguard children and young persons.

13 The probes were undertaken primarily through interviewing appropriate persons identified by MPS/MPA and reviewing documentation.

Main conclusions

14 The MPS has a growing awareness at senior levels of the need to treat information as a crucial corporate resource and is committed to taking a strategic approach. In late 2004 DoI developed a family of information strategies but the current documents do not link clearly to the MPS' policing priorities. There is recognition that the strategies require revision following the appointment of the new Commissioner and new MPS business objectives. These revised strategies will need to show more clearly how information and information systems will support corporate objectives.

15 Diverse aims and objectives for some MPS activities make it difficult to develop a strategic approach to information which responds to policing needs. Complex matrix responsibilities within MPS and overlapping programmes of work and objectives also present obstacles to setting out a strategic approach to information. There is therefore a need for business areas to articulate their information needs more clearly, to examine the relationship between information and intelligence and to establish more clearly the relationships and dependencies between areas of work such as information management, information quality and the Impact programme (the response to the Bichard report).

16 The current strategies are not action oriented and in some cases read as proposals rather than statements of intent. The revised documents need to lead into delivery plans which identify the benefits and outcomes to be achieved. The Information Management Strategy Group will then be better able to oversee delivery of the strategies and realise the beneficial outcomes.

17 More detailed findings are contained in the detailed report which follows with recommendations in the action plan at Appendix 1.
Detailed Report

Development

Awareness

18 The MPS is very aware of the importance of information as an essential corporate resource and at the highest levels it understands the need to improve its use of information. However, there is not yet a clear shared vision of what the organisation would look like with optimum use of information and the family of information strategies is not owned by the organisation as a whole.

Figure 1 Good practice

Information is seen as a crucial corporate resource and the strategy is owned by senior management.
Senior management and members/non-execs have a clear vision of how they hope to develop the organisation and the information and ICT that will be required to enable this.

Audit Commission

19 The MPS sees information as a strategic resource, described by one interviewee as 'the lifeblood' of the organisation. This has especially been the case since the appointment in February 2005 of the new Commissioner who has raised awareness of the importance of information and information quality in particular. The appointment of the Director of Information to the MPS board exemplifies this increase in corporate awareness.

20 The existing family of strategies were written prior to February 2005. There was a consistent view amongst interviewees that the MPS does not currently see the strategies as key corporate documents. Up until now the organisation has seen the Directorate of Information’s (DoI's) remit as primarily technological and has not fully appreciated the central role that DoI must have in supporting and helping to direct the use of information.

21 The balance between the DoI responding to the service’s need and the DoI setting the agenda by virtue of its information expertise will be difficult to achieve. One essential is for the organisation to develop a clear vision of how the service would look to officers and citizens with optimised use of information to which DoI can respond. At present this vision does not exist or, at least, is not articulated.

Recommendations

R1 The MPS need to agree and own corporately a vision of the service with optimised use of information to which DoI can respond.
Commitment

22 The MPS is committed to the need to take a strategic approach to managing and exploiting information and has begun to put in place structures and actions to achieve this.

Figure 2 Good practice

Commitment to delivering the strategy is demonstrated through consequent actions and processes.

Audit Commission

23 The MPS has an Information Management Strategy Group (IMSG) chaired at board level by the Director of Information. This group signed off the current strategy documents in late 2004. Although these strategies were written with a planned life of four years until review, they are now seen as interim strategies as a result of the changed business priorities set by the new Commissioner. The DoI intends to prepare revised strategies early in 2006.

24 The current strategies did not include action plans and, because it became apparent soon after they were written that overall business objectives for the MPS would change, there has been no imperative to develop these. However, there are, of course, a number of ongoing activities which relate to a strategic approach to information. In this sense there is a distinction between the strategy as set out in an approved document and the de facto strategy of what is actually happening. These are not necessarily in conflict but the risk that they could be exists so long as the activities do not clearly flow from the documented and agreed strategy.

25 There are other activities underway in relation to information quality and these are discussed further below under the heading Delivery Plan.

Recommendations

R2 The revised strategies should be more action oriented and set out the actions needed for delivery.

Management involvement and user consultation

26 The family of strategies was largely developed within the DoI and without significant input from management in the rest of organisation. At the time they were written there was not a clearly defined business strategy for the service.
All senior management have and take the opportunity to contribute to development of the strategy. The strategy addresses managers’ information needs.

The views of front-line staff are sought and the strategy addresses their information needs.

**Audit Commission**

27 The DoI’s workstreams each include a senior manager from within the wider MPS as Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), although some have a considerable churn of SROs. The Information Programme Group (IPG) has a ‘supra workstream manager’ assigned to each workstream. IPG held workshops to identify systems requirements for each workstream but there has been no information needs analysis across the organisation. The outputs from these workshops inform the workstream activities but are not incorporated within the Information Systems Strategy, which exists at a higher level. This process was seen as sufficient at the time given the prospective new business strategy. The draft was circulated amongst the SROs and was discussed by the Information Management Steering Group.

28 The Information and Information Management strategies were developed under the coordination of the ICT Strategy group without any significant input from outside DoI. In their present form they are sufficiently high level that this does not present a problem, as the business could change considerably without requiring major changes to the strategies. However, as the intention is to revise the strategies in the light of the new corporate business objectives this implies that a closer linkage to business activities and wider management involvement will become more important.

29 In future DoI account managers will work with users to help identify new information requirements and also help business groups develop local strategies consistent with the corporate strategies, (internal audit is further examining the fit between local and corporate strategies in a review running parallel to this one).

**Recommendations**

| R3 | The next family of strategies should be developed with more input from MPS senior managers and seek to address the identified information needs of front line staff. |

**Corporate linkage**

30 There is some correlation between the information strategies and corporate business priorities but this is not explicit.
The Information Systems Strategy sets out seven core capabilities required by the MPS. In the absence of an up to date corporate business strategy at that time, these were identified within the DoI for the purpose of developing the IS Strategy. These capabilities were discussed with stakeholders and the MPS’ achievement levels for each were agreed in a workshop forum. The capabilities include ‘Delivering World Class Operational Policing’ and ‘Citizen Relationship Management’ so there is correlation with operational objectives even though there is not a direct linkage from the corporate business strategy or policing plan.

Similarly there is some correlation between policing objectives and the development programme. For example, nationally set criminal justice targets lead to development of the Case and Custody system. The IPG has 74 current projects and has been able to map these to corporate objectives. However this was a retrospective exercise rather than a case of the objectives clearly driving the programme.

There was a commonly held view expressed during interviews that the strategies need to be more clearly driven by and linked to the corporate business objectives.

**Recommendations**

*R4* The next family of strategies should be more clearly rooted in, and demonstrate the linkages to, the corporate priorities.

**Technical developments**

The technology strategy sets out a process through which MPS can evaluate emerging technologies.

One potential risk of any strategy is that it can fix an approach rigidly at a point in time and inhibit flexibility. For technology applications, in particular, the MPS needs to have the ability to take advantage of technological advances that may not have been available at the point of documenting the strategic approach.
36 The Technology Strategy specifically addresses this. It sets out a ‘Technology Emerging Applications’ methodology which uses a forward looking timeline across three timescales to assess the potential of new and emerging technologies. This is wider than, but includes, computer system technologies. These can then be discussed with the relevant operational units and piloted or adopted as appropriate.

37 From an information perspective, there is a tendency to be cautious of what might appear to be quick wins as these can lead to information silos. The DoI has addressed this risk through the roles of the Technical Design Authority and the Information Authority.

Implementation

Approval

38 The Information Management Strategy Group signed off the current strategy documents in late 2004. The MPS did not approve or sign off the strategies at board level.

Figure 6  Good practice

The strategy sets out both principles and actions. In approving the strategy the board has (subject to approving individual business cases) agreed a clear way forward.

Audit Commission

39 The Information Management Strategy Group, which includes both DoI senior management and workstream SROs from outside DoI, signed off the Information, Information Management and Information Systems Strategies.

40 However, the strategies are very high level, dealing mainly in principles, and do not contain even high level action plans. Approval does not, therefore, constitute endorsement of either an existing or a future plan of action.

41 There are procedures in place for approving specific projects and ensuring that these are consistent with the strategies but these processes operate at the next level down from overall strategy approval. These include:

- inclusion within Medium Term Financial Plan (when appropriate);
- approval by IMSG;
- approval by Investment Board;
- approval by the Technical Design Authority;
- approval by the Information Authority; and
- review by the IPG programme office using gateway reviews.
Recommendations

R5 In order to ensure corporate ownership, the revised strategies should be signed off at MPS board level.

Communication

42 There is no communication plan for the strategies.

Figure 7 Good practice

Staff below senior management understand the strategy (not necessarily in detail) and believe that it will lead to improved information provision.

Audit Commission

43 There has been limited effort so far to communicate and achieve buy in for the strategies beyond those staff directly involved within DoI and the IMSG. Although this is not a significant issue for the strategies in their current high level form it will become more important in order to secure ‘middle management’ commitment to the revised strategies. Staff interviewed recognised the need to engage with users in particular around the programme of work emerging from the strategies. The IPG has developed a draft communications plan for account managers to use.

44 The DoI and the wider MPS may be able to impose the control aspects of the strategies, for example around information governance issues, but there is a general need to increase awareness of the concept of information as a resource requiring a managed framework.

Recommendations

R6 Develop a communications plan to raise awareness of information as a corporate resource and to disseminate appropriate messages from the strategies to staff in various roles and levels.

Delivery plan

45 The strategies do not have specific associated delivery plans, although much work in progress does relate to strategic aims.

Figure 8 Good practice

Any actions required to deliver the strategy are set out in a delivery plan.

Audit Commission

Metropolitan Police Authority
There is an IPG delivery programme. Many projects on this predate the current strategy documents and will continue on under the revised strategy. The main activities now fall into either the Information or Infrastructure workstreams (although the activities in other workstreams also relate to using and managing information for particular purposes). However, the Information workstream is not synonymous with a programme to deliver the Information Strategy.

The Information Management Strategy discusses the need for an Information Authority to act as an 'approval gateway' for activities that impact upon information architecture. This Information Authority is now established. There are also some clear activities in relation to the emerging technologies strand of the Technology Strategy.

**Recommendations**

R7 Critically review the DoI's current activities in the light of the revised strategies when these are complete (see also R2 above).

### Oversight

There is user representation on the board responsible to deliver the strategies.

**Figure 9 Good practice**

Senior level user representation on the strategy board helps to ensure that users’ needs are kept at the forefront during delivery of the strategy.

*Audit Commission*

The IMSG is responsible for overseeing delivery of the strategies and will hold the relevant group directors to account. The IMSG includes user representation. The internal DoI ICT Strategy Group will also monitor delivery. Each workstream has a user as SRO.

### New information requirements

There are processes in place to capture new information requirements and ensure compliance with the strategies.

**Figure 10 Good practice**

New issues arising do not bypass processes or automatically take precedence but are considered in a managed way in the light of the whole strategy.

*Audit Commission*
The Information Programme has a Requirements Capture Group operating through account managers aligned to business groups. The account managers provide a linkage between DoI and business groups and the role includes capture of information requirements that arise. The strategy itself necessarily exists at too high a level to identify every requirement. The account managers capture requests on a standard pro-forma and these then enter the project approval process. This includes consideration by the Technical and Information Authorities to ensure strategic alignment.

There is also a business liaison team supporting the workstreams. Their role includes capturing requirements and developing outline briefs. As the workstreams cut across business group boundaries there is some potential for conflict between the business liaison and account manager roles and this needs to be managed carefully.

Benefits management

There is a benefits management process but this needs to be further developed.

**Figure 11  Good practice**

There is a standard approach to managing benefits realisation including identifying benefits, allocating responsibility, measuring and monitoring.

*Audit Commission*

DoI have taken a lead in benefits management and there is a benefits management team within the Information Programme Group. Every project has a business case and the benefits team use a methodology including high level definition of benefits, setting ‘smart’ metrics, baselining, defining how to measure benefits, measuring and monitoring and post implementation review. However, there is not a standard approach to costs benefit analysis or return on investment (RoI) analysis.

There are no overall benefits plans associated with the workstreams, and the benefits managers work mainly within the IPG. Benefits management for technology infrastructure and for ‘softer’ information initiatives is less well developed and the strategies do not clearly set out their desired outcomes.

**Recommendations**

*R8*  Further develop the benefits management process to operate consistently.

*R9*  Establish and document the benefits to be achieved by the workstreams.

See also R4.
Review of the strategies content

56 The logical flow between the strategies is not explicit at present. The strategies identify a number of areas where the MPS needs to take action to move its use of information forward but they are not constructed so that adoption of each strategy commits the organisation to a particular course. In revising the family of information strategies the linkages between them need to be made clearer and they need to be more action oriented.

Information Strategy

57 The document entitled Information Strategy (IS) is not itself an information strategy but rather a proposal for a strategic approach to information which would encompass various strategies and activities. It identifies three strands of work arising from 3 themes and notes the lack of a coherent programme to draw elements together. The revision of the strategy needs to set out what that programme should be.

58 The strategy does not cover the issue of identifying information needs across the MPS as a precursor to meeting them. It identifies an overall goal of Delivering Information Enabled Business Change but leaves unresolved the question of whether the IS is part of delivering change or the change is required as part of delivering the IS.

Information Management Strategy

59 The Information Management Strategy (IMS) picks up the ‘From Control to Exploitation of Information’ goal from the IS with the three information principles. The IMS sets out general principles and background relating to information management. It notes many areas where action is needed but does not set out specific proposals for what should be done to meet the needs. For example it refers to the need for ownership of information but makes no proposal about achieving this (likewise the need for a data quality initiative, see R2 above).

60 There is no linkage in the IMS to the business and policing priorities that it is intended to support. The metamodel of the IMS (figure 14) omits any reference to corporate strategy and business needs (see R4 above).

Information Systems Strategy

61 The Information Systems Strategy (ISS) is based around seven ‘core capabilities’ to be supported by seven to ten core systems. Information Programme Group identified these core capabilities as part of the process of developing the ISS. Although the capabilities were discussed with stakeholders they do not represent an agreed set of corporate capabilities.

62 The ISS sets out the current and desired levels for the seven capabilities and then gives an example of how systems will seek to move one (operational management capability) forward. Actions for the other capabilities are described only in high level terms.
The relationship between the ISS, the IMS and the IS is not clear. The IMS notes enablers for the ISS including some that might be expected to be in the other strategies (for example the approach to data management at paragraph 6.3). The ISS also sets out eight principles guiding IS development. These make no direct or indirect references to the IS (eg there is no reference to information principles). There is no reference to the role of the Information Authority.

Recommendations

R10 Draw clearer linkages between the strategies with cross references as appropriate.

Technology Strategy

The Technology Strategy is a more substantial document than the others, covering more than just ICT. It sets out linkages to external strategies (eg HOPSATS) but not to the other DoI strategies. It sets out guiding principles and a process for identifying upcoming technologies through to deployment and operationalising use.

The strategy sits above a set of more detailed strategies (mobility, security, etc), but these are not cross referenced. For each of these, however, it sets out specific key activities through to 2007/8. It is the only strategy to do this and also the only strategy to show the governance structures applicable.

Lessons from MPS priorities

Findings from the probes indicate a need for the service to define the information needs arising from corporate business and policing priorities more explicitly in order that DoI may respond to these in its strategic approach. There is also a need to clarify the relationships between areas of work and programmes such as information, intelligence, Impact programme, information quality and data quality.

The aim of using the probes was to explore the linkages between business objectives and information strategies. The 2005/6 Policing and Performance Plan sets out the priority areas and describes a framework for delivering these. The priority areas selected as probes were: Reduce gun enabled crime; Improve citizen experience; and Safeguard children and young persons.

We found it difficult to identify the key elements of the delivery frameworks for these objectives. In particular, we did not identify any analysis of the information needs in relation to these objectives that could feed into the information, systems and technology strategies.

There is a citizen focus programme working across five workstreams. This is directed by a programme board from January 2006. Presently this programme largely involves identifying existing activities within MPS and drawing these together (programmes such as service to victims of crime and safer neighbourhoods), increasing focus on citizens as users and filling in gaps.
Although some issues have arisen and been addressed on an ad-hoc basis, such as redesign of borough web pages and scanning correspondence, there has not been an analysis of information needs regarding citizen focus as a whole. Information issues arising often relate in some way to other existing initiatives within the MPS (eg single emergency number).

It would be valuable to undertake an analysis to distinguish between things being delivered through existing initiatives which simply need a citizen focus angle or awareness and things which are not being addressed elsewhere and need to be owned by the programme. The citizen focus programme could then monitor progress on all of these; some indirectly and some directly. This would then enable a more detailed information analysis to be done in relation to those things to be owned by the programme.

**Recommendations**

| R11 | Clarify what is owned by the customer focus programme and identify the information needs arising. |

Gun crime is the responsibility of the Serious and Organised Crime Unit and of Trident Operational Command Unit, both within the Specialist Crime Directorate (SCD). We did not find an overall analysis of information needs in relation to this policing priority and were referred to the Specialist Criminal Intelligence Unit (SCD10). This unit deals with the intelligence aspect of information including assessing patterns of gun crime and developing intelligence packages on criminal targets.

SCD10 has close links with the DoI mainly through the Intelligence workstream. The Intelligence Steering Group (ISG), which includes DoI representation, considers issues and then refers these on to the DoI as appropriate. However, despite this mechanism we understand that there is no process to resolve problems such as the inability to access archived data on the Holmes system.

The ISG prioritises and signs off work for the workstream. However, the workstream focuses on system solutions rather than being built from analysis of the intelligence process. Intelligence and information are clearly closely related but the connections and dependencies need to be more fully explored at a strategic level, recognising the DoI's responsibility for information assets and Intelligence's interest as core use of information.

**Recommendations**

| R12 | Ensure that the relationships and dependencies between information and intelligence activities at both the strategic and operational levels are well understood. |
Impact programme

75 It proved similarly difficult to identify an owner for information requirements in relation to safeguarding children and young persons. One major programme of work in this area is Impact. Impact (Intelligence Management and Prioritisation Analysis Co-ordination and Tasking) is the PITO led response to the Bichard report. It includes both systems development and information management elements. Impact is the subject of a separate Audit Commission review and was therefore not considered in depth within this audit. However, some relevant issues were identified.

76 Government response to recommendations 8-11 of the Bichard report has led to the Codes of Practice for the Management of Police Information (MoPI) which was enacted by Parliament on 14th November 2005. This involves an infrastructure for information management, including an information strategy and processes for information sharing. It also involves enabling policies for record creation, retention and review. These are clearly matters that relate to the information strategy and information management strategy.

77 MPS has established an Impact programme comprising Enhanced Interim Police Local Exchange, IMPACT Nominal Index, Cross Regional Information Sharing Platform (building on the pilot of the Integrated Information Platform (IIP) data warehouse) and Guidance on the Management of Police Information.

78 Implementing the code on management of police information is anticipated to be a major programme of work, with costs initially estimated at £9 million. The Information Management Strategy makes several references to Bichard (although not to Impact) mainly in the context of Bichard being a driver for work on developing information management with in MPS. Within the current strategy documents it is not clear whether the MPS response to Impact should be seen as part of a broader approach to information management or whether the information management strategy is part of how the MPS will address Impact. The relationship needs to be clarified in the revised strategies.

Recommendations

R13 The revised strategies should set out clearly the relationships between and the boundaries of the information management and Impact programmes.

Information quality

79 Following the appointment of as the new Commissioner, information quality is now one of the MPS corporate priorities and the DoI has begun assessing how to respond to this priority. The Information Strategy, which pre-dates this, also identifies data quality as a key area. Appendix C of the Information Systems Strategy develops the theme of Information Quality. Although the Information Management Strategy does refer back to three core information principles (trusted, accessible, usable) set out in the Information Strategy the theme is not well joined up between the documents and data quality appears to sit separately from the broader scope of information quality.
Data quality is also a key part of the response to Impact and the reports to MPA from the programme lead refer to the existing role of the DoI data quality team. The relative status of the information principles, information quality, data quality and new corporate information quality objective along with data quality aspects of Impact is not clear. There is a need for an Information Quality plan showing how the issue will be addressed by elements within the Information Management strategy and information systems design, but also adding specific actions such as data cleansing and meeting Impact requirements.

**Recommendations**

R14 Set out an information quality plan (not a separate strategy) showing the activities to be carried out in relation to the corporate information quality objective and how these relate to the information management strategy and to Impact.
## Appendix 1 – Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1  The MPS need to agree and own corporately a vision of the service with optimised use of information to which DoI can respond.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ailsa Beaton Director of Information</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2  The revised strategies should be more action oriented and set out the actions needed for delivery.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IM/IS - Steve Farquharson Group Director IMG. ISS – Richard Earland Group Director IPG. Technology Strategy – Phil Scutchings Group Director Technology.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This is on track as part of the re-write of the existing family of strategies.</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3  The next family of strategies should be developed with more input from MPS senior managers and seek to address the identified information needs of front line staff.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IM/IS - Steve Farquharson Group Director IMG. ISS – Richard Earland Group Director IPG. Technology Strategy – Phil Scutchings Group Director Technology.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This is on track as part of the re-write of the existing family of strategies.</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4  The next family of strategies should be more clearly rooted in and demonstrate the linkages to the corporate priorities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IM/IS - Steve Farquharson Group Director IMG. ISS – Richard Earland Group Director IPG. Technology Strategy – Phil Scutchings Group Director Technology.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5 In order to help ensure corporate ownership, the revised strategies should be signed off at MPS board level.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ailsa Beaton Director of Information</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R6 Develop a communications plan to raise awareness of information as a corporate resource and to disseminate appropriate messages from the strategies to staff in various roles and levels.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steve Farquharson Group Director Information Management Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R7 Critically review DoI's current activities in the light of the revised strategies when these are complete. See also R2 above.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Richard Earland Group Director Information Programme Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The introduction of cross DoI Portfolio Management will allow for this review.</td>
<td>Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R8 Further develop the benefits management process to operate consistently.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Richard Earland Group Director Information Programme Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The introduction of cross Dol Portfolio Management will allow for this review.</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R9 Establish and document the benefits to be achieved by the workstreams.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workstream SRO’s (coordinated by Richard Earland Group Director Information Programme Group.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The introduction of cross Dol Portfolio Management will allow for this review.</td>
<td>Nov 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R10 Draw clearer linkages between the strategies with cross references as appropriate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steve Farquharson Group Director Information Management Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The introduction of cross Dol Portfolio Management will allow for this review.</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>Clarify what is owned by the customer focus programme and identify the information needs arising.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steve Farquharson Group Director Information Management Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This is dependant on the business being able to define the customer focus programme with sufficient clarity for the analysis on information needs to be meaningful.</td>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>Ensure that the relationships and dependencies between information and intelligence activities at both the strategic and operational levels are well understood.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Richard Earland Group Director Information Programme Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page no.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority 1 = Low 2 = Med 3 = High</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>The revised strategies should set out clearly the relationships between and the boundaries of the information management and Impact programmes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steve Farquharson Group Director Information Management Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Set out an information quality plan (not a separate strategy) showing the activities to be carried out in relation to the corporate information quality objective and how these relate to the information management strategy and to Impact.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steve Farquharson Group Director Information Management Group.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>