



**CROWN OFFICE  
& PROCURATOR  
FISCAL SERVICE**

SCOTLAND'S PROSECUTION SERVICE

**Meeting:** BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE (02/17)

**Date:** 28 February 2017

**Chair:** John Dunn

**Attendees:** Susan Cameron (by VC)  
Keith Dargie  
Elaine Hales (Secretariat)  
Graham Kerr  
Anthony McGeehan  
Helen Nisbet  
Ian Walford  
Stephen Woodhouse

**Apologies:** Nancy Darroch

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB
2. Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log
3. Portfolio Dashboard
4. Risks (Sheriff and Jury Reform Project and MI Project)
5. Fair Futures Progress Update
6. Stage 1 Report – Witness Website
7. Stage 1 Report – Defence Agent Website
8. Stage 1 Report – Complaints and Allegations Against the Police (CAAPD)  
Case Management
9. Stage 1 Report – PI Tapes
10. Stage 1 Report – Presentation of Specialist Casework Performance and  
Workload Information
11. Productions
12. AOB

Item	
1.	Welcome, Apologies and Agreement of AOB
	John Dunn welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were tendered on behalf of Nancy Darroch.  <u>AOB:</u> Process for revisiting BTD resources at end of financial year.

2.	Minutes of Last Meeting and Action Log
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2017 were agreed and approved for release under the Freedom of Information Act.</p> <p><u>Actions from January meeting:</u></p> <p>Action 1: SMS Review Report – Susan Cameron agreed to circulate the paper on text reminders by correspondence to Committee members.</p> <p>Action 2: Stage 2 for Fair Futures – See agenda item 5</p> <p>Action 3: Electronic Signature – Anthony McGeehan provided an update that a minute had been sent to John Dunn and Katie Stewart advising that an electronic signature was competent. Graham Kerr advised that he would be meeting with Katie Stewart, Head of NICP to discuss the new process.</p> <p>Action 4: Sheriff and Jury Reform risks – See agenda item 4</p> <p>Action 5: Automatic ordering of full statements on receipt of not guilty plea in summary cases – Confirmation was received that full statements are still being requested for all JP cases. Discussions are ongoing with ISD in relation to a go live date.</p> <p>Action 6: Dual screens – carried forward to next meeting.</p>
3.	Portfolio Dashboard
	<p>Elaine Hales presented paper BIC04/17 Portfolio Dashboard for discussion. The following key points were discussed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Case Management in Court</u> Ian Walford advised that the Executive Board had discussed the draft business case in detail and agreed that this provided sufficient information to continue. An iOS developer is being recruited to remove the reliance upon the previous external contractor. The project plan will be re-baselined going forward and a progress update will be provided to the next meeting.</li> </ul> <p>In order to keep all resourcing implications visible it was agreed that the ISD Planning Grid should form part of the suite of documents provided to each BIC meeting.</p> <p>Following discussion it was agreed that once the overall COPFS budget for the next year is available, BIC would take stock of and re-evaluate all the improvements commissioned taking into account the business's ability to absorb the change.</p>
4.	Risks
	<p>John Dunn presented paper BIC05/17 which outlined the key risks arising from the Sheriff and Jury Reform Project and MI Project.</p>

	<p>John highlighted risks 4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12 from the Sheriff and Jury Reform Project risk register and sought BIC's confirmation that the risk scoring applied to each of those risks were relevant. Following discussion BIC agreed</p> <p>Risk 4 – Agreed risk score of 12 was appropriate.  Risk 6 – Risk description to be amended to read "... brought forward 4 weeks".  Agreed risk score of 9 was appropriate.  Risk 8 – Agreed risk score of 25 was appropriate.  Risk 9 – Agreed risk score of 9 was appropriate.  Risk 10 – Agreed likelihood should be reduced to 2, reducing the overall risk score to 6 from 9.  Risk 12 – Agreed risk score of 12 was appropriate.</p> <p>Thereafter Susan Cameron highlighted the key risk for the MI Project which related to the prioritisation of resources to the MI project as a corporate project commissioned by BIC against other projects commissioned under other governance groups. Following detailed discussion it was agreed that a further meeting between BTD and ISD be held to progress the planning and resource scheduling for this task.</p> <p>In order to ensure visibility of all the improvements commissioned by BIC and those requiring ISD, BTD and SD resources and what stages these improvements were at an enhanced dashboard should be developed.</p> <p><b>Action: Elaine Hales</b></p>
5.	Fair Futures Progress Update
	<p>Susan Cameron produced paper BIC06/17 Fair Future Project Progress Update. She highlighted that although it had been agreed to submit a Stage 2 report to BIC, this had been superseded by agreement from the Executive Board to proceed. The PID is currently being developed and the underlying project structure, volunteers, workstreams etc are being established. It is likely that the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase will take approximately 2 years and may require additional resources. BIC will be provided with monthly progress updates.</p>
6.	Stage 1 Report – Witness Website
	<p>Graham Kerr presented paper BIC07/17 which outlined a proposal for the development of a witness website to enable electronic access and interaction with witnesses. John Dunn highlighted the risks around domestic abuse cases and access to statements and Graham confirmed this would be taken into account during Stage 2 development.</p> <p><b>Decision: BIC approved progression to Stage 2.</b></p>
7.	Stage 1 Report – Defence Agent Website
	<p>Graham Kerr presented paper BIC08/17 which outlined a proposal for development of a defence agents' website to enable full electronic dialogue through the website direct to our case directory – including live web chat. Graham advised that the website would be structured in a way that would enable system interrogation and</p>

	<p>channelling of requests and the saving of dialogue into our case management system. Development of this site would tie in with the Justice Digital Strategy and would provide a Proof of Concept for the witness website.</p> <p><b>Decision: BIC approved progression to Stage 2.</b></p>
8.	<p>Stage 1 Report – Complaints and Allegations Against the Police (CAAPD) Case Management</p>
	<p>Graham Kerr presented paper BIC09/17 which outlined a proposal for Strategic Development to work with Police Scotland Professional Standards Department and ISD to automate the processes to ensure that CAAP case reports and case documentation are submitted and saved in FOS and that updates/decisions are provided electronically direct from FOS to PSD. He advised that this will be using the same methodology and building on work already done with NHS/GPs.</p> <p><b>Decision: BIC approved progression to Stage 2.</b></p>
9.	<p>Stage 1 Report – PI Tapes</p>
	<p>Graham Kerr presented paper BIC10/17 which outlined a proposal to streamline the processes in relation to the transcription of police interview tapes together with developing management information to enable managers to manage and reallocate the business across the country, where required. This improvement originated from the Local Court Improvement Committee and once the processes are developed Local Court Management will take it forward.</p> <p><b>Decision: BIC approved progression to Stage 2.</b></p>
10.	<p>Stage 1 Report – Presentation of Specialist Casework Performance and Workload Information</p>
	<p>Helen Nisbet presented paper BIC11/17 which outlined a proposal to undertake the necessary work and secure the resource to commence a project to review the current KPIs, develop KIPs for units where there currently are none and develop and enhance the current Specialist Casework health check, which is the high level workload and performance check reported to the Operational Performance Committee. There was a general discussion around the future possibilities through Corporate Applications or inclusion within the current MI Project, however, Helen was keen this was progressed as swiftly as possible to bring Specialist Casework in line with other business units and to reduce the risks and labour intensive processes involved for answering enquiries such as PQs and FOIs as well as being in a position to provide the Operational Performance Committee with meaningful statistics.</p> <p><b>Decision: BIC approved progression to Stage 2.</b></p>
11.	<p>Productions</p>
	<p>Graham Kerr presented paper BIC12/17. This overarching document provided an outline of the review currently being undertaken by Strategic Development in</p>

	<p>collaboration with Local Court and Police Scotland in relation to the various aspects around the storage, transportation and disposal of evidential productions and was for BIC's information only. Graham was keen to highlight that this was very much in relation to the administrative processes and where any legal aspects arise, decisions would be referred to legal colleagues within Local Court/High Court leadership or to Anthony McGeehan in Policy.</p> <p>The pilot in relation to no cash productions in summary cases has commenced in 2 areas for a period of 3 months with a period of evaluation thereafter.</p> <p>Improvement of the processes will provide time savings therefore both Local Court and Serious Casework Heads of Business Management are keeping themselves updated on progress.</p> <p>The document produced is a living document and will be submitted to BIC every few months for information.</p>
12.	AOB
	<p>Susan Cameron had raised the additional item of resource planning for BTD going forward into the next financial year. It was agreed that once the overall budget had been clarified further work would be undertaken by BIC to review the current improvements and agree priorities going forward.</p>