ORIGINATOR: ACO RUPERT BIRTLES	PAPER NO: NS13/5

SUBMITTED TO: NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK COLLABORATION PANEL
                                     15 JULY 2013

SUBJECT: JOINT ICT PROGRAMME PLAN

SUMMARY:

The Norfolk/Suffolk Joint ICT Programme Plan has recently been updated.

A recent report by Assistant Chief Constable Hall on the functioning of the Norfolk/Suffolk Joint ICT Department has made a number of recommendations.

This report brings these issues together for the PCCs' information and agreement of the way forward. The report was considered and discussed by the Joint Chief Officer Team (JCOT) on 18 June 2013.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the PCCs:

1.1   Note the contents of this report generally.
1.2   Note the attached updated Joint ICT Programme Plan.
1.3   Note and agree the responses to the recommendations of ACC Hall's report.
1.4   Note and agree the proposed Terms of Reference for an external review of ICT, subject to any later additions/amendments.
1.5   Agree JCOT's preferred option for a consultancy to carry out the review.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1. **ACC Hall's report on the functioning of the Norfolk and Suffolk ICT Department**

1.1 *Recommendation1: The joint ICT strategy and associated programme plan needs to be formally reviewed and then reaffirmed by both Chief Officer Teams and PCCs to provide clarity on the future strategic direction of ICT. This document then needs to be communicated with senior managers and ICT staff to give them clarity on the overall strategic direction for ICT.*

   1.1.1 The Joint ICT Programme Plan has been updated and is attached hereto for the PCCs' information. The development of this into a Joint ICT Strategy is dependent on further decisions about the strategic direction for collaboration between the 2 PCCs and CCs, including decisions about the way forward for Contact Control Rooms, Shared Service Provision, and operational policing models. JCOT has set in place a time-line milestone target of November 2013 for these decisions to have been made.

1.2 *Recommendation 2: The governance and decision making arrangements for ICT should be reviewed and clarified to provide appropriate Chief Officer oversight, strategic alignment and transparency of decision making.*

   1.2.1 This will be addressed by the new Assistant Chief Officer (ACO) arrangements. Governance arrangements include the regular meetings of the ICT Programme Board, reporting to JCOT.

1.3 *Recommendation 3: That the newly appointed ICT programme manager undertakes a review of programme and project management practice across the collaborated ICT function.*

   1.3.1 This has been completed.

1.4 *Recommendation 4: That ICT conducts a light touch post implementation review of Microsoft to identify any lessons learned.*

   1.4.1 The Joint Director of ICT is putting this in hand – this will be reviewed by the ICT Programme Board.

1.5 *Recommendation 5: The Major Investigation Team should review and advise upon the on-going suitability of the HOLMES2 provision across both Norfolk and Suffolk.*

1.5.1   This has been completed – no issues.

1.6   *Recommendation 6: Human Resources (HR) should be asked to undertake team building work within ICT to develop a cohesive joint unit that enjoys good relationships at all levels.*

1.6.1   Two back-to-back Teambuilding Days for the staff of the Joint ICT Department have been scheduled in August.

1.7   *Recommendation 7: The Director of ICT should review communication and consultation processes with staff to improve constructive engagement on issues and understanding of decisions made.*

1.7.1   The Joint DICT is considering next steps. This will probably be addressed in the teambuilding days, to include the construction of and signing-up to a Team Charter.

1.8   *Recommendation 8: That the ICT Senior Management Team reviews and develops its management style and approach to best engage staff in a cohesive team to deliver the ICT strategy and programme.*

1.8.1   HR staff have been tasked with developing some training proposals for ICT managers.

2.   **External Review of ICT**

2.1   Consideration has been given to carrying out an external review of ICT. If required, it is proposed that this is carried out once the full Joint ICT Strategy has been agreed, ie in or after November 2013 (as referred to at paragraph 1.1.1 above).

2.2   Pending final decision, proposed TORs would be as follows:

2.2.1   "The purposed of this review is to provide a health-check of the Joint Norfolk-Suffolk ICT Strategy and Programme Plan in order to provide re-assurance to the respective PCCs and CCs that the proposed direction of travel for the provision of ICT support to both Constabularies over the next 5 years is appropriate and sound in the context of the direction of travel for ICT universally".

2.2.2   It is not intended to review the provision of ICT support prior to the current date, nor is it intended to fundamentally change the way in which ICT support is provided, unless the review identifies serious

questions about the current structure of staff, hardware, software, applications etc.

2.2.3   The review should:

- Examine the ICT Strategy and Technical Roadmap to ensure that best use is being or will be made of available technologies to support the current and future needs of the Constabularies.

- Focus on the provision, management and use of technologies to deliver the core infrastructure which underpins applications and service delivery.

- Review the desktop build and infrastructure to ensure the needs of the organisation are being met.

- Review the WAN/LAN topology, its resilience and bandwidth to ensure suitability/capacity to meet the organisational needs.

- Review the server infrastructure, to ensure suitability of technologies employed, resilience and disaster recovery facilities to ensure it is able to meet the organisational requirements.

- Review telephony infrastructure and the technologies employed ensuring their suitability to meet the needs of the two organisations.

- Review the data centre provision ensuring its fitness for purpose in terms of current and future needs.

2.3   Regarding who to carry-out the review, it is preferable for it to be a neutral entity which would have no stake or interest in the outcome of the review. That would rule out the obvious consultancies, who have a vested interest in recommending alternative approaches which they can then sell us. It had been hoped that the British Computer Society (BCS) would be able to do this work, but unfortunately it is not a service that the BCS offers. An alternative might be a government agency (Office of Government Commerce equivalent) or a respected ICT lead from another force, or to invite the College of Policing, but this may not meet the PCCs' requirement for objectivity. Andy Barker's thoughts have been tapped and he has suggested Robert Kirkwood from PwC, or Mentis, who specialise in ICT consultancy and have worked for most government departments and forces. We would also have a route to PwC via our internal audit functions.

Whatever, procurement would have to comply with the PCCs' Contract Standing Orders.

2.4   On balance, it may be preferable and most practical to obtain this work through Internal Audit. IA has an interest in remaining objective, can tap into appropriate professional resources, and it is possible that the service could be procured using existing contracts, depending on cost. This is the preferred option of JCOT.

3.   FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

As stated in the report.

4.   OTHER RISKS AND IMPLICATIONS:

None.

Officer Presenting Report at the Meeting:

Rupert Birtles, ACO – Joint Resources
Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies
01952 424212
birtlesr@norfolk.pnn.police.uk

ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)	PLEASE STATE 'YES' OR 'NO'
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	**No**
Has financial advice been sought on this submission?	**Yes**
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate?	**Yes**
Have human resource implications been considered?	**Yes**
Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plans?	**Yes**
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	**Yes**
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	**No**
In relation to the above, have all relevant issues been highlighted in the 'other implications and risks' section of the submission?	**Yes**