

## SIR SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESSES IMPROVEMENT PLAN

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	The MPS's aim should be the creation of a single MPS Vetting Unit and that this unit sits within DPS, combining the functions of all current vetting units under one head, working to a common policy and set of standards, supported by a robust, integrated IT infrastructure.	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	To implement a new Vetting Unit to ensure a consistent, corporate and standardised approach to all vetting checks and to design and develop this to allow for the transition towards e vetting.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>1. Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scanning hardware &amp; software – estimated at £20,000 &amp; £15,000</li> <li>• Associated maintenance costs - £3,000 per annum</li> <li>• Warrantor costs - £2,200 per terminal based on an additional 10 terminals</li> <li>• Warrantor Server - £4,000</li> <li>• Estimated £30,000 cost of designing and implementing combined online forms (HR Recruitment estimate)</li> <li>• 5 extra staff members to cope with demand for key action (2) - £136,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated saving of up to £200,000 per annum on repeat recruitment (£3,000 recruitment cost per potential employee – based on preventing up to 10% of current Police Staff withdrawals)</li> <li>• Potential long term saving of a minimum of £70,000 per annum in postage and printing when moving to automated e-vetting environment – approx. £3 (per pack + postage) -assuming 75% move to e-vetting represents (based on estimate of application forms sent out per annum)</li> <li>• Reduced costs in maintenance and renewal of PARASOL licences approx. £4,000 per annum (based on removal of 4 terminals)</li> <li>• Faster vetting process leading to fewer good candidates lost through clearance delays and fewer unfilled vacancies reducing the reliance on overtime and temporary staff, leading to improved MPS service delivery.</li> </ul>	

Non-quantifiable costs	Non-financial benefits			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A potential deterioration in service whilst vetting functions are amalgamated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More accurate audit trails and better case progression removing duplication of process, delays and inefficiency</li> <li>Flexibility in roles of staff</li> <li>Improvements in policy and standards including closer compliance with ACPO, Cabinet Office and Home Office policies</li> <li>Quicker application process due to fewer errors</li> <li>Provision of a customer focused service, single point of contact for Sponsor &amp; other customers</li> <li>Increased robustness of MPS vetting checks, record keeping and sharing of traces with other Forces leading to a reduced likelihood of incidents in the MPS or other Forces as a result of failures to make use of police information</li> </ul>			
Key actions to implement	Lead	Deadline	PI/Milestone	Target
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combining the CTC administrative functions of PSG and SB Vetting Unit</li> </ol>	Head of MPS Vetting Unit/Head of SB Vetting Unit	By end June 2005	CTC functions of vetting under one governance, working to common policy and standards	Fully functional and operational MPS Vetting Unit.

<p>2. Ensuring that those checked by SO14 are done so to MPS standards</p>	<p>Implementation Team /Cdr SO14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SO14 representation on vetting board – by end June 2005</li> <li>• Transfer checks to new unit – by end March 2006</li> </ul>	<p>SO14 applicants vetted according to MPS policy</p>	
<p>3. Developing the current IT systems to prepare for the future</p>	<p>Head of MPS Vetting Unit/Directorate of Information (DoI)</p>	<p>After March 2006</p>	<p>Warrantor link to SS is secured and recruitment &amp; security application forms are combined on-line</p>	

<p>4. Identifying whether it is appropriate to incorporate the functions of SO4 vetting units into the MPS Vetting Unit</p>	<p>Head of MPS Vetting Unit/Head of SO4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure SO4 representation on Vetting Board – by end June 2005</li> <li>• Consider potential for transferring staff released from SO4 vetting unit into MPS Vetting Unit – by end March 2006</li> </ul>	<p>SO4 rep. on vetting board</p> <p>Business case for staff transfer completed</p>	
<p>5. Consider the potential for combining the SC vetting functions of PSG and SB Vetting Unit and whether this should be incorporated into the MPS Vetting Unit</p>	<p>Head of MPS Vetting Unit/Head of National Security Vetting MPS</p>	<p>After March 2006</p>	<p>MPS Vetting Unit is functioning effectively, with CTC functions combined</p>	



6. Consider the potential for incorporating the DV vetting function of SB Vetting Unit into the MPS Vetting Unit	Head of MPS Vetting Unit/Head of National Security Vetting MPS	After March 2006	MPS Vetting Unit is functioning effectively, with CTC functions combined	
--	--	------------------	--	--

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	The MPS Vetting Board should revise Policy and Standard Operating Procedures, by the end of June 2005, so that personnel will not require National Security vetting clearance if this cannot be justified taking into account Cabinet Office, Home Office and ACPO policy.	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	To produce a more efficient, effective and economical process. To ensure accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and not discriminate. To prevent candidates giving up and leaving the system due to the length of time the vetting process takes.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity cost, per annum, of identifying, and reviewing, the clearance levels appropriate for posts.</li> <li>• A more flexible approach to vetting will require amendments to terms and conditions of employment and ongoing risk management opportunity costs associated with lower levels of clearance (including education, supervision and escort requirements).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated saving of up to £200,000 per annum on repeat recruitment (£3,000 recruitment cost per potential employee – based on preventing up to 10% of current Police Staff withdrawals).</li> <li>• Faster vetting process leading to fewer unfilled vacancies, reducing the reliance on overtime and temporary staff.</li> <li>• Reduced opportunity costs per annum of managing candidates through lengthy vetting processes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in flexibility of the workforce.</li> <li>• Risk management costs if staff member fails a CTC clearance on promotion, location or job change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling a fairer, more transparent process to be developed, reducing the potential for appeals, tribunals or legal challenge to the MPS, widening the potential pool of applicants for MPS employment and reducing any potentially disproportionate impacts on VEM applicants.</li> <li>• Improvements in policy and standards including closer compliance</li> </ul>	

	with ACPO, Cabinet Office and Home Office policies.			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checks carried out will be appropriate to the requirements of posts, reducing the workload for the vetting units.</li> </ul>			
Key actions to implement	Lead	Deadline	PI/Milestone	Target
1. Risk Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment of new process and policy.	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Head of PSG	May 2005	Assessments complete	Allowing certain Police Staff to be employed with IVC clearance only.
2. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and policy re-written to incorporate change.	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Head of PSG	June 2005	Revised SOP and policy documents	
3. Publish and publicise SOP and new policy.	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Ch. Supt DPS	End of June 2005	Documents and Notice published	
4. Invite initial business cases for exemption of CTC clearance.	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Ch. Supt DPS	End of June 2005	Articles and Notice issued.	
5. Education of MPS employees with respect to new policy and associated risk management.	Chair MPS Vetting Board	Ongoing from July 2005	Awareness of new policy and process	
6. Sponsors submit business cases.	Sponsors	From August 2005	First case submitted	
7. Assess potential benefits and risk management costs for identified posts.	Chair MPS Vetting Board	October 2005	First posts assessed	



8. When case is proven for identified posts, advise the relevant units to implement the new policy (and set dates for review).	Chair MPS Vetting Board	Ongoing	Police Staff employed with only IVC clearance	
--	-------------------------	---------	---	--



<b>Recommendation 3</b>	A pilot process to test the viability of granting interim clearances should be developed by the end of March 2006.	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	To produce a more efficient, effective and economical process. To prevent candidates giving up and leaving the system due to the length of time the vetting process takes.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity costs of developing the pilot process.</li> </ul> <p>Given the implementation of interim clearances following a successful pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity costs per annum of identifying, and reviewing, the clearance levels appropriate for posts.</li> <li>Ongoing risk management costs associated with lower levels of clearance (including education, supervision and escort requirements).</li> </ul>	<p>Given the implementation of interim clearances following a successful pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated saving of up to 200,000 per annum (£3,000 recruitment cost per potential employee – based on preventing up to 10% of current Police Staff withdrawals).</li> <li>Faster vetting process leading to fewer unfilled vacancies, reducing the reliance on overtime and temporary staff.</li> <li>Reduced opportunity costs per annum of managing candidates through lengthy vetting processes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk management costs if staff member fails a CTC clearance in post.</li> <li>A more flexible approach to vetting will require amendments to terms and conditions of employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening the potential pool of applicants for MPS employment and reducing any potentially disproportionate impacts on VEM applicants.</li> </ul>	

Key actions to implement	Lead	Deadline	PI/Milestone	Target
1. Identification of 'example' Police Staff posts that require a CTC but would need only limited risk management prior to receiving CTC clearance.	Chair MPS Vetting Board	September 2005	Posts identified.	A pilot process is established to allow certain Police Staff to be employed with IVC clearance pending CTC.
2. The benefits and risk management costs of allowing interim clearances for these 'example' posts should be assessed to prove the business case.	Vetting Working Group	December 2005	Costs, benefits & risks assessed.	
3. If the business case is proved then the granting of interim clearances to 'example' posts should be trialled to test the robustness and the operation of the risk management approach (such as restricted passes, escort and supervision).	Chair MPS Vetting Board and CGSC	January 2006	Pilot implemented.	

<b>Recommendation 4</b>	Changes are made, by the end of March 2006, to the way the current Management Vetting process is carried out.	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	To produce a more efficient, effective and economical process. To ensure accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and not discriminate. To address barriers to effective communication and improve customer focus within the MV process while maintaining robustness of the process.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstraction costs of two vetting officers being present at each interview (per interview).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faster vetting process leading to fewer unfilled vacancies, reducing the reliance on overtime and temporary staff. Increased robustness of MPS MV checks.</li> </ul>	
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A more efficient, customer focused service.</li> <li>Closer compliance with ACPO policy.</li> <li>MV checks carried out will be appropriate to the requirements of the post.</li> <li>Opportunities for monitoring effectiveness of the system and identifying areas for improvement.</li> </ul>	

Key actions to implement	Lead	Deadline	PI/Milestone	Target
1. 4.1 - Mandatory interviewing of all MV applicants is discontinued. Senior Vetting Officers should exercise discretion whether an interview is necessary on an exception basis. As a general rule ACPO criteria should be used and interviews should only be conducted to clarify queries, ambiguities or concerns raised during the vetting process.	Head of PSG	November 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken</li> <li>SOP re-written</li> <li>Process Implemented</li> </ul>	Implementation of a new MV process.
2. 4.2 - The MV Unit should produce a clear, effective feedback process for MV, so that candidates can give feedback on their experience of the process.	Head of PSG	November 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of Proforma</li> <li>Process Implemented</li> </ul>	
3. 4.3 - The designation of a post as MV is done through close collaboration between PSG and the Head of the Unit responsible for the post. The recent pilot with SCD units to be used as good practice.	Head of PSG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good practice documented by July 2005</li> <li>Then process ongoing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to effectively designate all MV posts across MPS and provide reviews as required.</li> </ul>	

<p>4. 4.4 - Staffing levels within the MVU are increased to the original BWT of 12 (currently included in DPS growth bid). Grades of staff to be appointed are to be reviewed.</p>	<p>Head of PSG</p>	<p>August 2005</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To achieve a fully staffed MV Unit.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. 4.5 - Implement the MPS Inspectorate recommendation (March 2003) of having 2 staff present at each MV interview.</p>	<p>MVU PSM</p>	<p>November 2005</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SOP re-written</li> <li>2 officers present at interviews in all cases.</li> </ul>	
<p>6. 4.6 - Each MV applicant to be allocated a specific caseworker, who will provide a single point of contact (SPOC) for the applicant during the process. The MV Unit to provide a dedicated answer phone for out of hours response.</p>	<p>MVU PSM</p>	<p>September 2005</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All MV applicants know their SPOC within the MV Unit and have their contact details. Helpline goes live.</li> </ul>	
<p>7. 4.7 - Each member of the MV Unit to be provided with appropriate interviewing training before conducting MV interviews.</p>	<p>Head of PSG</p>	<p>March 2006</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All staff conducting MV interviews are trained to the appropriate level.</li> </ul>	

<b>Recommendation 5</b>	The MPS Vetting Board to determine, by the end of March 2006, the extent to which Special Branch database checks should be carried out.	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Ensuring the accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and ensuring that the policy does not discriminate.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity costs of approximately £4,000 per annum based on the assumptions in Section 10.2.3. If no efficiencies can be found in other aspects of vetting this could mean up to 0.15 additional Full Time Equivalent posts.</li> <li>• Accommodation costs of any additional staff required.</li> <li>• Costs in providing training and access to Special Branch databases.</li> <li>• Opportunity costs of up to approximately £66,000 per annum if checks are implemented for all vetting candidates and their close relations, based on the assumptions in Section 10.2.3. If no efficiencies can be found in other aspects of vetting this could mean up to 2.5 additional Full Time Equivalent posts.</li> <li>• Opportunity costs of at least £1,300 per annum if checks are carried out for other Police Forces,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil.</li> </ul>	

based on the assumptions in Section 10.2.3.				
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>		<b>Non-financial benefits</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to slow down vetting if the checks are under-resourced or demand is greater than anticipated.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closer compliance with ACPO and Home Office Policy.</li> <li>Increased robustness of MPS vetting, leading to a reduced likelihood of incidents in the MPS or other Forces from failure to make use of Police information.</li> <li>If the number of Police Staff posts that require CTC clearance is reduced then the introduction of Special Branch checks for these posts could provide extra reassurance.</li> </ul>		
<b>Key actions to implement</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>PI/Milestone</b>	<b>Target</b>
1. 5.1 - Checks against MPS Special Branch databases should be reintroduced for prospective MPS Police Officers (but not their partners, spouses or close relatives)	Chair MPS Vetting Board	September 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process &amp; responsibilities agreed.</li> <li>SOP &amp; Policy written</li> </ul>	MPS to produce and implement a policy on Special Branch vetting checks.
2. 5.2 - Special Branch should provide the MPS Vetting Board with an assessment of the extent to which Special Branch systems checks could benefit the robustness of vetting.	Head of SB Vetting	January 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report prepared &amp; submitted</li> </ul>	All new Police recruits are checked against MPS Special Branch databases.



3. 5.3 - The MPS Vetting Board should decide on the extent to which the MPS should check both MPS and other Police Forces' Special Branch databases for prospective Police Staff and Non Police Personnel, and for candidates' partners, spouses or close relatives	Chair MPS Vetting Board	March 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Decision made based on evidence</li></ul>	
---	-------------------------	------------	---	--



<b>Recommendation 6</b>	To prepare a MPS proposal, by the end of June 2005, about more flexible application of residency criteria, for discussion with key external stakeholders such as Cabinet Office, Home Office, ACPO and the Security Service			
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Ensuring the accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and ensuring that the policy does not discriminate.			
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of the MPS & individuals			
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity costs per annum of managing applicants' expectations for longer</li> <li>• Cost of searches in countries that may charge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>			
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of taking on someone with less rigorous checks than now</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling a fairer, more transparent process to be developed, reducing the potential for appeals, tribunals or legal challenge to the MPS, widening the potential pool of applicants for MPS employment and reducing any potentially disproportionate impacts on VEM applicants.</li> </ul>			
<b>Key actions to implement</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>PI/Milestone</b>	<b>Target</b>
1. Prepare a case for adopting a more flexible approach to the application of residency criteria	DCS PSG	June 2005	Proposal exists	Agreed approach to flexible application of policy
2. Consult key internal and external stakeholders	Chair MPS Vetting Board	June 2005	Views of key stakeholders	

<b>Recommendation 7</b>	That the MPS agrees a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the Security Service, by the end of June 2005, for its input to the vetting process.			
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Preventing external candidates from giving up and leaving the system because of the length of time the clearance process takes.			
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals			
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing cost of ensuring the MPS is meeting the requirements of the SLA with the Security Service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil.</li> </ul>			
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunities to identify areas for improvement in the process</li> <li>Opportunity to have more control over the process</li> </ul>			
<b>Key actions to implement</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>PI/Milestone</b>	<b>Target</b>
1. Identify areas to incorporate within the SLA	Head of PSG / SB Vetting Unit	June 2005	MPS document for SLA produced	To have a working SLA in place with the Security Service
2. Meet with Security Service representative and establish SLA	Head of PSG / SB Vetting Unit Head	June 2005	SLA parameters established	
3. Ensure relevant MPS staff members are aware of SLA requirements and implement policy	Head of PSG / SB Vetting Unit Head	End of June 2005	Policy in place	



4. Record and monitor effectiveness of SLA	Head of PSG / SB Vetting Unit Head	Ongoing	Features in Monthly Management Reports	
--	------------------------------------	---------	--	--

<b>Recommendation 8</b>	The MPS should, by the end of June 2005, request written confirmation from the Security Service of the precise difference in approach followed for checking against surnames of overseas origin and why this approach is taken.			
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Preventing external candidates from giving up and leaving the system because of the length of time the clearance process takes.			
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of MPS and individuals			
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil.</li> </ul>			
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better understanding of the Security Service approach will enable areas for improvement to be identified</li> <li>Enabling a fairer, more transparent process to be developed, reducing the potential for appeals, tribunals or legal challenge to the MPS, widening the potential pool of applicants for MPS employment and reducing any potentially disproportionate impacts on VEM applicants.</li> </ul>			
<b>Key actions to implement</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>PI/Milestone</b>	<b>Target</b>
1. Contact relevant personnel at the Security Service	Head of PSG	May 2005	Contact established	Clear policy is implemented in line with MPS Diversity Policy
2. Security Service advice cross-checked with MPS Diversity Policy	Head of PSG	June 2005	Policy acceptable to MPS	
3. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and new policy written and publicised amongst relevant vetting units.	Head of PSG	End of June 2005	SOP and policy implemented	

<b>Recommendations 9-13</b>	To ensure governance arrangements are in place, by the end of June 2005, for implementing the recommendations from this and previous reviews	
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Ensuring the accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and ensuring that the policy does not discriminate.	
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of the MPS & individuals	
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of Implementation Team estimated at £99,000 per annum (based on 3 full time members: 1 Band C and 2 Band Ds for 1 year)</li> <li>• Opportunity costs per annum of supporting governance arrangements e.g. carrying out consultation and assessment</li> <li>• Opportunity costs per annum of setting up and maintaining a process for feeding back traces to Home Forces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential savings per annum of time spent on appeals or tribunals</li> <li>• Potential to prevent an incident in another Force, using information on traces</li> </ul>	
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring the MPS vetting policy is fair</li> <li>• Identification of areas for improvement in problems associated with risk (through further ICG research)</li> </ul>	

Key actions to implement	Lead	Deadline	PI/Milestone	Target
1. Set up an action plan to implement the issues and recommendations remitted to the Vetting Board (including monitoring progress)	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Implementation Team	June 2005	Action plan drafted	Issues and Recommendations implemented
2. Set up an action plan to identify solutions to the issues remitted to the Vetting Working Group	Chair MPS Vetting Working Group	June 2005	Action plan drafted	Solutions agreed by Vetting Board
3. Set up a process for carrying out Equalities Impact Assessments on future policy decisions	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Implementation Team	June 2005	Proposed process exists	Equalities impact assessments are carried out for every policy decision
4. Set up a process for feeding back traces to Home Forces	Chair MPS Vetting Board remitted to Head of PSG	June 2005	Process exists	Information provided to other Forces

<b>Recommendation 14</b>	A comprehensive system is developed, by the end of August 2005, for monitoring the performance of the vetting process, using the existing process maps and taking into account the costs and benefits of collecting the data			
<b>Objective(s):</b>	Ensuring the accuracy and currency of MPS policy to comply with national standards and ensuring that the policy does not discriminate.			
<b>Link to strategic aim/priority</b>	Integrity of the MPS & individuals			
<b>Additional costs</b>	<b>Estimated savings/benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of changes to current IT systems to enable monitoring</li> <li>• Opportunity costs per annum of collecting and analysing data</li> <li>• Opportunity cost of ICG time to support the development of the system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to identify areas for improvement in the vetting process</li> </ul>			
<b>Non-quantifiable costs</b>	<b>Non-financial benefits</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling a fairer, more transparent process to be developed, reducing the potential for appeals, tribunals or legal challenge to the MPS, widening the potential pool of applicants for MPS employment and reducing any potentially disproportionate impacts on VEM applicants.</li> </ul>			
<b>Key actions to implement</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>PI/Milestone</b>	<b>Target</b>
1. Establish which areas of the process are to be monitored	Head of PSG	June 2005	Areas identified	New system in place

2. Assess the management information required, including consideration of the costs and benefits of collecting the data	Head of PSG	August 2005	Management information identified	
3. Amend existing IT systems to provide the required information	Head of PSG	By end of August 2005	Required changes identified	