

Summary Minutes

Title: Digital Continuity Shared Service Governance Board
Date of Meeting: 7 November 2008, 10:00
Location: Conference Room A, Home Office, 2 Marsham Street
Subject or Purpose: Second Governance Board Meeting
Attendees: Natalie Ceeney (NC, TNA) [Chair]
Penny Ciniewicz (PC, HMRC)
Barry Glassberg (BG)
Simon Jones (SJ, DFID)
Helen Kilpatrick (HK, HO)
Simon Lovett (SL, TNA)
Tony Mather, (TM, FCO)
Jessie Owen (JO, TNA)
David Thomas (DT, TNA)
John Tuckett (JT)
Apologies: Katherine De Bourcier (KDB, MOD)
Jerry Page (JP, CO)

1 Minutes of the previous meeting

1.1 All covered by agenda items

2 Project Update/service delivery options

2.1 The board agreed the flexible framework option appeared prima facie to be the right way forward. They made the following points:

- The 'do nothing' option needed to be properly tested to ensure that the flexible framework was demonstrably the best option;
- This implied further work to identify more accurately what risk needed mitigating; it was noted that departmental resources would be needed to support this risk assessment work.
- The change of direction would need to be very clearly communicated to stakeholders;
- TNA needed to ensure they had the right skills and competence both to change direction and to deliver the service;
- TNA should work closely with departments to agree the prioritisation of how the framework should be delivered,

Action

JO

- e.g. addressing critical risks first;
- The flexible framework should preserve as far as possible the benefit of collective action which was a compelling driver for the single supplier shared service delivery model
- TNA should fully explore the feasibility and practicality of the flexible framework option before finally committing to it

2.2 The project team agreed to:

- Reassess what risk needs mitigating
- Further test the 'do nothing' option to validate the flexible framework approach
- Focus on short term communications, resetting stakeholder expectations;
- Revert to the Board at the next meeting with a worked up assessment of the two options and a blueprint for the flexible framework model;

JO

3 Departmental commitment process

3.1 The Board recognised that departmental commitment to take action was dependent on a proper evaluation of the risk and a compelling case for departmental action over 'do nothing'. In respect of levers to mandate action, the Board discussed the possibility of using the CSIA IA maturity model as an established reporting framework, into which digital continuity action could be logically fitted. The following points were made:

- Overall responsibility for digital continuity would then sit explicitly under SIROs; they would need to engage their IM teams as well as their IA people;
- It would help focus the IA community on the wider issues of information assurance;
- But it would not guarantee action was taken; digital continuity would be competing for attention with other pressing issues e.g. data security;

3.2. The project team agreed to work up the commitment options further, focusing on the IA maturity model and assessments but also, in recognition that this could be insufficient on its own, identifying other levers to encourage action

SL

4 Any other business

4.1 Date of next meeting: Q1 February 2009 (exact date and venue to be confirmed)