



**CROWN OFFICE
& PROCURATOR
FISCAL SERVICE**

SCOTLAND'S PROSECUTION SERVICE

Meeting: BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE [06-17]

Date: 16 August 2017

Chair: John Dunn (Deputy Crown Agent – Local Court (DCA))

Attendees: Susan Cameron (Head of Business Transformation Delivery (BTD))
 Keith Dargie (Director of Information Systems Division (ISD))
 Nancy Darroch (Head of Business Management – Local Court (HoBM))
 Elaine Hales (Secretariat)
 Graham Kerr (Director of Strategic Development (SD))
 Helen Nisbet (Serious Casework Group (SCG))

In Attendance: Ben Butchart (for Item 7 only)

Apologies: Anthony McGeehan (Head of Policy)
 Ian Walford (Deputy Chief Executive (DCE))
 Stephen Woodhouse (Director of Finance)

- Agenda:**
1. Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB
 2. Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log
 3. Portfolio Dashboard
 4. Case Management in Court (CMiC) – Update on Business Case
 5. Draft Communication to staff of improvements and method of prioritisation
 6. Risks
 7. Management Information (MI) Progress Report
 8. AOB

| Item | |
|------|--|
| 1. | Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB |
| | Apologies were tendered on behalf of Anthony McGeehan, Ian Walford and Stephen Woodhouse. |
| 2. | Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log |
| | The proposed amendments to the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2017 were agreed. |
| | Concerns were raised around the minutes being published on COPFS external website as doing so clearly identifies Committee members as working for COPFS. |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Following general discussion a decision was made to seek guidance from COPFS Security Officer and to refrain from posting minutes to the website meantime. Suggestion was to refrain from using names and just put designations or initials.</p> <p>ACTION: BIC Secretariat to contact Departmental Security Officer to clarify position.</p> <p>Actions from July meeting not covered in separate agenda items:</p> <p>Action 1: SMS – in depth analysis to inform decision making on expansion of the use of text messages - Details outlining work undertaken and figures for the period January to March 2017. The outcome concluded that it was a useful mechanism to prompt action and worthy of consideration for expansion. It was agreed this was an initiative that could be governed by Local Court Improvement Committee and if wider benefits identified referred to other Functions. Witness countermands will fall within a wider piece of work being taken forward by Strategic Development in relation to witness attendance under the governance of Local Court Improvement Committee.</p> |
| 3. | Portfolio Dashboard |
| | <p>The revised Dashboard and prioritisation matrix was discussed.</p> <p>It was proposed that any initiative scoring 20 or less could be removed from the dashboard and returned to the author to revisit and re-submit with further evidence. However, it was agreed all initiatives should remain on the dashboard and visible. It was possible that some of the current initiatives scoring 20 or under could be considered functional improvements. There was at present many initiatives being taken forward by Local Court’s Improvement Committee, e.g. Productions and Witness Attendance. Strategic Development were in discussion with Serious Casework Group about setting up an equivalent Improvement Group which would take care of most of the current SCG initiatives.</p> <p>An enhanced ISD Planning Grid, underpinned by improved governance and analysis/planning processes will be implemented in early September, which includes confirmation of ISD resources to deliver current workload and agreed priorities. Due to the limited resources available within the Enterprise Solutions Team no commitment could be made to delivery of the Stage 2 analysis being completed by the next meeting, but updated schedules will be presented ahead of the next meeting.</p> <p>Concerns were raised in relation to BIC not being sighted on any potential legislative projects that may have an impact on BIC priority work and resources.</p> <p>ACTION: Strategic Development to work with Head of Policy to provide BIC with a clear picture of potential legislative projects that may impact ISD or BTD resources.</p> <p>In order to ensure that progress continues to be made on key projects, it was proposed that a triage system was considered over and above the portfolio management and enterprise solutions arrangements which ISD are putting in place.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>This would provide a mechanism for decisions to be made on, for example, any urgent pieces of work to be given priority over the agreed priority projects in between BIC meetings should the need arise. The triage system would ensure that demands are not placed on ISD or BTD resources which may derail deliver of agreed project outputs. Following discussion it was agreed that no formal triage system was necessary as there was already a mechanism in place if there was an urgent crucial piece of legislation through the DCA, Head of Policy and DCE channels.</p> <p>It was noted that a progress report on BIC improvements was to be provided to the Executive Board on 30 August.</p> <p>ACTION: Strategic Development to prepare a paper outlining the background to BIC, legacy cases, prioritisation methodology and how progress will be made.</p> |
| 4. | CMiC – Update on Business Case |
| | <p>An update on progress of the latest version of the Business Case was provided and BIC members thanked for their comments. It was the intention to submit the Business Case to the Executive Board on 30 August.</p> <p>A brief update was provided on the project itself highlighting that although an additional development sprint had been added, the project was still within tolerance to commence UAT at the end of September.</p> <p>ACTION: A copy of the roll out plan to be provided to the Estates Project Board.</p> |
| 5. | Draft Communication to staff of improvements and method of prioritisation |
| | <p>A draft communication to staff in relation to BIC improvements and method of prioritisation was discussed and accepted. Subject to any comments being received it will be posted to the intranet following the Executive Board at the end of August.</p> |
| 6. | Risks |
| | <p>Red risks had been highlighted in relation to Sheriff and Jury 21 and MI Projects. An update highlighted that following resolution of issues/timescales the Sheriff and Jury 21 project’s risk status had been returned to amber.</p> <p>MI project was discussed at Agenda Item 7.</p> |
| 7. | MI Progress Report |
| | <p>The background and overview of the MI project was provided. The ISD representative in attendance provided an update from an ISD perspective. The project had been challenging due to user requirements moving away from the</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>original concept and although some technical progress had been made, ISD had been unable to allocate resources to undertake detailed business and technical analysis due to the limited resources being required for other projects and priorities.</p> <p>It was confirmed the project was sitting at red RAG status due to no delivery timescales being available, which cannot be defined until the completion of the required solution and requirements analysis. The growing gap between the Inspectorate recommendations and delivery of the solution were noted.</p> <p>It was agreed that the prioritisation scoring should be amended to include reputational risk which increases the overall priority score to 22.</p> <p>Following detailed discussions, it was agreed that the appropriate course of action was for ISD and BTM to meet with the Project Executive to agree a delivery timeframe (factoring the above analysis and continued development planning) and confirmation that the project can carry the risk in relation to the Inspectorate. If, however, the project feels the level of risk is unacceptable, this should be referred back to BIC for further consideration.</p> |
| 8. | AOB |
| | No other business. |