



**CROWN OFFICE  
& PROCURATOR  
FISCAL SERVICE**

SCOTLAND'S PROSECUTION SERVICE

**Meeting:** BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE [BPIC04-18]

**Date:** 24 October 2018

**Chair:** Stephen McGowan, Deputy Crown Agent, Local Court - SM

**Attendees:** Keith Dargie, Chief Digital Officer - KD  
 Nancy Darroch, Head of Business Management Local Court - ND  
 Elaine Hales, Secretariat - EH  
 Graham Kerr, Director of Strategic Development - GK  
 Anthony McGeehan, Head of Policy - AM  
 Robert Tinlin, Non-Executive Director – RT  
 Ian Walford, Deputy Chief Executive - IW  
 Stephen Woodhouse, Director of Finance - SW

**Apologies:** Helen Nisbet, Serious Casework Group - HN

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB
2. Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log
3. Portfolio Dashboard and ISD Portfolio
4. ISD Transformation Fund
5. Overview of enhanced mechanisms for Case Management change requests
6. Risks
7. AOB

Item	
1.	Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB
	Apologies were noted on behalf of Helen Nisbet.
2.	Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2018 were approved.</p> <p>The Action Log was discussed and updates noted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ISD Delivery Plan</b> - RT raised concerns in relation to this action not having been completed, the late circulation of the update paper and in respect of general communication providing the context of any corporate decisions/changes/updates between meetings. KD provided a detailed explanation as to the reasons why it was not feasible to circulate the finalised Delivery Plan highlighting that significant detailed planning was required and the dependencies in relation to resources and budgets being in place to define delivery schedules for the next transformation priorities. KD also emphasised the necessary planning of the COPFS projects funded from the recently confirmed Justice Digital Transformation Funds. There was a detailed discussion on the necessity to ensure that the full context of plans and in particular decisions taken between meetings of the Committee were fully evident</li> </ul>

	<p>from the papers for the meetings and that these were submitted in good time. Although RESPOND had been discussed and agreed as a priority at the last meeting this was not clearly set out within the ISD work programme. KD provided detailed background on why the Justice funding projects had been prioritised and that RESPOND was listed in the ISD Portfolio submitted to this meeting for discussion as part of the agenda. He also explained the planned case management 'summit' will be held over Q4 2018/19 to align with the development of the corporate project priorities (including the Justice funded projects) and based on discussions on the most effective timing for this event. The 'summit' required staff from the business to be released for 1 - 2 days and February would be the most appropriate date, however, there were questions around what was to be achieved at the summit as some of the work would be covered earlier and within existing plans. He advised that RESPOND would proceed to the next stage of analysis but the priority still remains with the 3 SG funded projects.</p> <p>SM agreed that the information shared with the Committee assumed a level of detailed knowledge of what was happening between meetings and that this was unhelpful. He undertook to work with RT to discuss how communication with NXDs could be improved, and to look to sharpen the papers in relation to what was realistically achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee agreed that there needed to be a level of expectation set around what can realistically be delivered and that this would inevitably carry some risks. The Committee also took on board the issues raised regarding communication between meetings.</li> <li>• <b>BPIC Communications</b> – The initial concept was to publish a communication ahead of this year's staff survey in relation to the structure of governance around change. While there was a significant amount of communications being published in relation to individual projects, e.g. CMiC, Corp Apps, it was felt that there needed to be some form of communication to highlight the role of BPIC and to assure staff that the capacity for change across the organisation was being overseen and to describe the decision making process. It was agreed that it would be beneficial for SM and IW to meet with Head of Corp Communications to discuss BPIC communications in general.</li> <li>• <b>Reporting Target Dates</b> – Action closed.</li> <li>• <b>MI Delivery Timescales</b> – Action closed</li> <li>• <b>Electronic Signatures</b> – Further information is being sought in relation to savings across the whole of COPFS. Action closed.</li> </ul>
3.	Portfolio Dashboard and ISD Portfolio
	<p>The BPIC Portfolio dashboard had been developed using ISD Portfolio documentation. KD provided updates as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CMiC</b> – The rollout is underway and going very well. Resiliency work is ongoing and should be available by the New Year. Corporate Wi-Fi is a key enabler for CMiC and is ahead of schedule. Agreement has been reached with SCTS regarding access to their corporate Wi-Fi. Apple updates are being advised in advance through ISD's Apple account which provides an opportunity to test the upgrades ahead of implementation. Lessons have been learned from a recent supplier issue affecting COPFS' remote access systems and actions being taken to mitigate</li> </ul>

	<p>repetition in future. The risk to CMiC is minimised due to this being an offline application and case information being able to be downloaded from any location where Wi-Fi is accessible ahead of court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Corporate Apps</b> – Corporate Apps was launched to all staff on 22 October and feedback has been very positive. Data is flowing to HR systems seamlessly and they are ready to switch off the paper versions (along with fully digital T&amp;S Claims and Vehicle Pool Booking systems). There will be a 4 week transition period to 19 November to ensure staff get used to the new digital systems and line manager processes to be phased. The next phase will involve development of the quarterly conversation application and overtime application to remove all requirements for these paper based processes.</li> <li>• <b>MI</b> – Estimates given at the last meeting indicated that the application would be developed in 12- 14 weeks. However, full analysis of the business requirements has now revealed that this will be a more realistic 16-18 weeks. Due to the loss of a number of developers over the last few weeks, including the lead developer, work did not commence until 15 October. A structure is now in place with defined resources and the application is scheduled for delivery by the end of February/March 2019, with the plan incorporating the Project Board’s testing and phased release approaches.</li> <li>• <b>Defence agent website</b> – This forms part of the 3 Scottish Government funded projects and is referred to under Item 4 below.</li> <li>• <b>Legal Documents</b> – as above.</li> <li>• <b>Corporate Wi-Fi</b> – This project is ahead of schedule and currently in the final testing phase. Roll out will be from November to late January. SCTS have the same supplier, Virgin Media Business, and are ready to go to pilot. A Service Definition Document is being agreed to set out the service and collaboration arrangements. SCTS have concerns around COPFS using all their bandwidth which may seriously impact the performance of their corporate Wi-Fi. However, there are no anticipated issues and there will be significant testing ahead of sign off and pre-agreements on technical bandwidth configurations. Workarounds are in place for the offices that will have CMiC ahead of court Wi-Fi being switched on. Once the solution is in place it will be a simple process to switch it on in any court location as each CMiC office comes on line.</li> <li>• <b>Encryption</b> – A workshop is scheduled with a range of stakeholders for 25 October. This process will be looking at encryption across all devices not just for encryption of media. There are currently 2 solutions being tested. The primary solution will be to get an application that can provide a report to remove the requirement of having to do a physical check to confirm all relevant material has been copied and encrypted.</li> </ul>
4.	ISD Transformation Fund
	<p>KD provided detailed information in relation to work undertaken to secure the SG funding to enable development of the 3 key projects – Witness Portal Website, Police/COPFS Data Exchange and the Secure Disclosure Website upgrade. Funding of £1.125m has now been secured to complete the 3 projects between now and the end of March 2019.</p> <p>KD will provide a short paper ahead of the next meeting providing further detail in relation to the solutions, Project Management activities and planned stakeholder engagement. Although these projects are not seen to be full scale PRINCE projects due to much of the</p>

	<p>work being around analysis, prototyping and user activities, a governance framework will be put in place.</p> <p>Procurement of an ISD applications solutions partner is underway with 26 interested suppliers and plans are to have this in place by December 2018.</p> <p>The funding provides a great opportunity to progress COPFS' strategic priorities and to consider innovation around <i>Chatbots</i> and <i>artificial intelligence</i> solutions as well as enhancing COPFS's infrastructure.</p> <p>KD provided assurance to the Committee that there were no foreseeable issues in relation to the market capacity between now and March to recruit the resources required to meet the timescales for delivery. He also provided reassurance that the amount of focus that ISD and senior managers will have to give to delivering the SG funded projects will not have any impact to delivery of the day to day business.</p> <p>KD highlighted the demands around the timing of confirmed projects funding from the Justice Digital Transformation Fund and the steps being taken to deliver solutions by end-March 2019, including a prototype version of the Witness Portal. The Committee acknowledged that there will be significant work required in order to deliver these projects within the timescales, however they are committed to help wherever possible.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is an identified risk in relation to procurement timescales and availability of resources to complete the work to the driven timescales, however, ISD are managing these risks.</p> <p>The day-to-day risk around the security or failure of our IT system can never be eliminated, however, these risks as being mitigated as much as possible.</p> <p>The scheduling in respect of RESPOND are reflected in the fact that the organisation is required to focus on the 3 SG funded and other corporate projects, however, following lengthy discussion it would appear that there may be alternative options around the replacement of the out of support software.</p> <p>Although there remains a risk in relation to the current software being unsupported, this does not mean that it will no longer be accessible. It was agreed that a new Stage 1 Report should be re-submitted to the Committee for consideration.</p> <p><b>ACTION: New RESPOND Stage 1 Report to be re-submitted for consideration by the Committee.</b></p>
5.	<p>Overview of enhanced mechanisms for Case Management change requests</p>
	<p>GK provided an overview of the recommended proposals in relation to how small change requests relating to case management systems will in future be considered and managed. Following detailed discussion there were concerns raised around the grading level of stakeholder representation from Local Court and Serious Casework on the proposed group, and the proposed group's relationship to the Local Court and Serious Casework improvement committees.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be more appropriate to re-submit a more detailed proposal to the Committee in advance of the next meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION: GK/KD to re-submit proposal addressing the concerns raised.</b></p>

6.	Risks
	<p>A conscious decision had been reached that there should be no BPIC risk register as this would duplicate the roles of the Project Boards reporting to BPIC. Project Managers are advised to bring any relevant risks to the attention of the Committee for consideration.</p> <p>There will be risks associated with the 3 SG funded projects some of which were highlighted under Item 4, however, these can be reviewed as and when relevant. Appropriate governance will be applied to these projects.</p> <p>SW advised there is a risk on the Corporate Risk Register in relation to change being managed properly and this is reviewed on a regular basis.</p>
7.	AOB
	No other matters raised.