

## PFCC Decision Report

Please ensure all sections below are completed

<b>Report reference number:</b> PFCC/073/18
<b>Classification</b> (e.g. Not protectively marked/restricted): <b>Official</b>
<b>Title of report:</b> TranSearch Project Budget Increase
<b>Area of County/Stakeholders affected:</b> Countywide / Records Management
<b>Report by :</b> 46059050 Matt Hyner (Project Manager) <b>Date of report:</b> 30/04/2018 <b>Enquiries to:</b> Matt Hyner

### 1. Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to request additional funding for the TranSearch project. The purpose of the project is to introduce an improved records management system for all physical evidential items held in deep store and traveling between sites. This does not include property stores. Following the approval of the stage two business case, the project moved to Procurement of the TranSearch product for Essex Police and Kent Police. After detailed requirements gathering and a mini tender, the supplier has provided quotes to configure the product to meet the requirements, this is higher than anticipated.

### 2. Recommendations

The project cannot progress to purchase until a budget increase is agreed against the quote. Without the additional configurations, the project will not be able to complete back record conversion of existing records. Given the purpose of the project this is fundamentally paramount. This exception prevents the project moving into the development stage.

The supplier has been consulted and has explained that on examination of the Essex Police and Kent Police requirements, they have found that their base product will require additional configuration and time with the business to ensure this is done correctly. This is to allow the full back record conversion of existing data. Given the

improved efficiency that the product will provide and the mitigation it will bring against fines from the office of the Information Commissioner, in comparison it would be prudent to secure the additional funding to allow the project to continue.

### **3. Benefits of Proposal**

The following benefits are extracted from the Project Initiation Document, which is referenced below at point 11. The consequences of not proceeding with the project are that the benefits listed will not be realised and the force would be susceptible to fines from the Information Commissioner.

\*Benefits pertinent only to Kent Police have been removed.

Ref.	Description	Baseline measure or current performance	Expected measure or performance
B02	Aligns Essex and Kent with the other forces in the 7 forces programme, enabling access to anticipated savings through further collaboration.	5 of the 7 forces are using RMS, Essex and Kent are not.	All 7 forces are using RMS, and can now develop further projects to collaboratively improve the sharing, review, retention and disposal of knowledge.
B03	Cost savings from replacement of current software	There is an annual support contract in place for DB/Textworks costing £1,161 per annum.	Save £1,161 per annum by decommissioning DB/Textworks.
B04	Avoid punitive fines from the Information Commissioners Office by taking recommended corrective action to remediate issues identified in recent inspections. (Risk 418 Essex)	Failed previous inspections.	Pass the next inspections.
B05	Avoid punitive fines from the Information Commissioners Office, by preventing future breaches.	Currently susceptible to breaches due to inaccurate and inefficient record management.	Accurate record and efficient record management reduces risk of a breach and enables existing breaches to be remediated.
B06	Speed up the review of existing records.	On average, 5 spreadsheets will need to be reviewed per record.  The sheets can only be reviewed by one person at a time, and there are two reviewers.	Reviews can be completed from one place.  All users can review records at the same time.  Reviews can take place twice as fast.
B07	Speed up the processing of new boxes.	There are currently 26 spreadsheets that require manual inputs.  Data input takes 10 minutes per box to double key from business records to RM records.	New box records can be completed in one place.  Estimate reduction to 3 minutes per box  X approximately 60 boxes per week saves 1 working day per week.

[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

B08	Speed up the tracking of existing boxes.	<p>Approximately 100 boxes move per week.</p> <p>Approximately 40 of these are delivered from storage.</p> <p>It takes approximately 15 minutes per box for barcodes and locations, and to track across 8 spreadsheets. 3.5 work days.</p>	<p>Box moves can be processed in 3 minutes.</p> <p>Total 0.75 of a work day.</p> <p>2.75 work days saved.</p>
B09	Reduce the risk of a civil case being brought against the forces due to breach of the Data Protection Act 1998, causing reputational and financial damage to the forces.	£500,000 per breach – rising to 2% of annual turnover from May 2018.	Satisfy all recommendations and outstanding risks. Reduce the risk of future recommendations.
B10	Contribute to the rationalisation of IT applications	The two forces use different systems to manage physical assets in storage – Excel and DB/Textworks.	Both forces using one instance of the RMS system.
B11	Mitigates Essex risk 1066 'Inadequate Records Management'.	Current working practices are too resource heavy, resulting in 'Inadequate Records Management'.	Introduction of automation improves the efficiency and accuracy of Records Management, achieving a rating of 'adequate' or better.
B12	(Essex) Comply with recommendations made by the HMIC 'Building the Picture' inspection in 2015, avoiding punitive fines.	Non-Compliant	Compliant
B13	Enable compliance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 'locate and provide recorded information...'	Non-Compliant	Compliant
B14	Enhanced ability to comply with BS ISO 15489-1 (industry standard)	Non-Compliant	Compliant
B15	Enhanced ability of the forces to respond to historic inquiries.	Neither force can currently guarantee it can quickly respond to an inquiry and either locate the information requested or confirm it does not exist.	Both forces can quickly search a single database to confirm the existence of information requested.
B16	(Essex) Assist the force in moving to a nominal-centric approach to the retention and disposal of information.	Currently there is no way to make automatic, bulk changes to the system.	RMS allows bulk changes to be made with the use of automation, enabling a move to nominal centric records management.

[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

B17	By introducing audit capability, reduce the opportunity for corrupt practices and potential loss or use of information by criminals or those wishing to discredit the forces.	Currently there is no audit capability in Essex or Kent. It would be very easy for someone to gain access to records without that access being recorded.	RMS logs all access, moves and amendments to all records. This provides an audit trail, which will inform regular internal audits by each Record Management team.
B18	Improved accuracy by reducing opportunities for human error	Every human input risks human error.  Barcodes are 15 characters, if 1 character is incorrect then the tracking, a potentially the record, is lost.  Spreadsheets can require up to 26 human inputs per box.	Automation introduced by RMS removes these potentials for human error.
B19	Improved accountability, identification and correction of deficiencies through improved audit capability.	In Kent the spreadsheets cannot be audited while they are being edited. This contributes to bottlenecks in the workflow and making auditing difficult.  In Essex there is no audit capability.	RMS allows auditing to be introduced which can be carried out simultaneously.
B20	Reduce inputting times.	Everything is manually typed onto spreadsheets.	RMS scanning allows all tracking to be logged automatically, rather than manually.
B21	Remove duplication	There is currently no way of automatically identifying duplicate records.	RMS provides the ability to identify, merge or remove duplicate records.
B22	Reduce cost of producing management information by providing a powerful reporting tool which can be configured to run automatic reports.	Currently all reporting is completed manually.	Reports can be set up in RMS to run automatically.
B23	Enable automatic accurate and timely flagging of records for review	DB/Text shows when reports should be reviewed, but marking is manual.  Kent records can have review dates set, but do not automatically flag.	RMS enables review periods to be set by MoPI group and will automatically flag and report on records due for review.
B24	Automated flagging of disposals, increasing rate of rationalisation and saving costs through reducing the required shelf space.	DB/Text shows when reports should be disposed, but marking is manual.  Kent records can have review dates set, but do not automatically flag.	RMS enables disposal periods to be set by MoPI group and will automatically mark, flag and report on records due for disposal.

B25	Improved process for viewing records, providing costs savings and preventing duplication or loss of master records.	Requests to view records are currently by email or by internal post. Duplicate records are often copied and sent to reviewers.	Requests to view records will be via RMS.
B26	Mitigate against accidental loss of police information.	Current risk level of human error means risk of accidental loss is high.	Automation introduced with RMS mitigates risk of accidental loss with more accurate tracking.
B27	Reduce printing and stationary costs.	Spreadsheets are currently printed regularly so records can be tracked as they are physically moved.	Requirement to print is removed as tracking is now done automatically via barcode scanners.
B28	Reduce email traffic.	Requests to view records and copies of records are currently sent via email.	Requests to view records and copies of records are sent within RMS.

#### 4. Background and proposal

Essex Police have two warehouse-type facilities set up as records centres. That activity is supported by the use of a physical records management tracking system 'DB Textworks' which has been in operation since 1996. This system is outdated and in need of upgrade, while the lease for one of the records centres is due to expire, requiring a relocation of all the physical records. The move will achieve significant savings and contribute towards an external mandate from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), which identified failings in Essex Police's records management processes (for which a grading of 'limited assurance' was given).

TranSearch is a multi-user, enterprise software product which provides a comprehensive Windows and web-based records management system for the storage and retrieval of original documents, files, archive boxes, magnetic tape or any other trackable item. Utilising the latest Bar-Code technology and RFID, TranSearch has been designed to identify and track any item within the workplace. Each item is given a unique Bar-Code to identify it to the system and from that moment forward the item can be tracked from location to location via the simple use of Bar-Code scanners.

The quote for TranSearch has come in higher than what is available in the project budget. The suppliers have advised this is due to the required Meta data (fields on the records) being more complex than anticipated. This will require the supplier to modify their base product to allow for full back record conversion. Given the nature of the project, development cannot proceed without back record converting the existing records management data. It is proposed that the additional funding be made available to enable the TranSearch project to progress.

#### 5. Police and Crime Plan

*(Demonstrate how the issue is relevant to the Police and Crime Plan and any other relevant strategic plans.)*

TranSearch supports the Police and Crime Plan by enabling Essex Police to keep a precise record of physical evidential assets which are stored in deep store and in transit around the force. This will help to ensure that evidential items can be identified and retrieved from storage in a timely manner should there be a need for further investigation or a possible connection to another investigation. The solution will enable

officers and staff to work more efficiently where records and associated items in deep store need to be reviewed. It will also help to track the movement of evidence that has been sent for storage. This will enable Essex Police to better comply with MoPI regulations with regard to review, retention and disposal. It will also mitigate the risk of losing data through inadequate management, which will attract fines from the Information Commissioner and reputational damage.

## **6. Police Operational Implications**

*(Outline any operational policing implications and how Essex Police has been engaged or consulted.)*

An external mandate was received from the Information Commissioner's Office, which identified failings in Essex Police's records management processes (for which a grading of 'limited assurance' was given). This supports the view that there is a risk of Essex Police not being able to locate physical evidence that it holds, and could potentially impact operations where that information is relevant to an investigation.

## **7. Financial Implications**

*(This section should be written by the PFCC/CFO and/or the CC CFO. It should set out the key revenue and capital finance issues arising from the report. Report authors, working with the CFO, will need to demonstrate that the decision is within existing financial and other resources and if not identify the source of any additional resources.)*

An additional £18,375.56 is required in order for the TranSearch project to move to deployment. Without full back record conversion the project will be unable to mitigate the risk of losing track of records. The financial implications of fines from the Information Commissioner's office are far greater than those to progress the TranSearch project.

If approved this will result in an increase of £18,375.56 to the IT capital programme budget.

## **8. Legal Implications**

*(This section should set out the key legal issues arising from the report and include any legal advice if received)*

None.

## **9. Staffing and other resource implications**

*(This section should set out any staffing or other resource implications. It needs to demonstrate that the decision complies with relevant employment legislation and / or policies).*

None.

## **10. Equality and Diversity implications**

*(This section should describe the equality and diversity implications of the proposal and should attach and address any findings from the equality impact assessment if one has been carried out.*

None.

**11. Background papers**

Please list sources of information e.g. documents that are not readily available to the public and that were used in the writing of the report. Please provide an electronic link embedded into the report).

Approved Stage 2 Business Case:



Essex Physical  
Records Manageme

**TranSearch Project Initiation Document:**

\*The timescales contained within this document are subject to refresh and change pending engagement with the supplier at the end of the procurement process, when the quote has been agreed. If a funding decision is not reached imminently, the project will likely be delayed further over the summer leave period.



KE0799 Transearch  
PID v0.5.docx

**Report Approval**

The report will be signed off by the OPFCC Chief Executive and Treasurer, prior to review and sign off by the PFCC / DPFCC .

Chief Executive/M.O

Sign:

Print: David Lawson

Date: 11 May 2018

Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer

Sign:

Print:

..... ABC7 ..... G.P.C.U. ....

Date:

..... 14/5/18 .....

**Publication**

Is the report for publication?

YES

NO

If 'NO', please give reasons for non-publication (state 'None' if applicable)

.....  
.....

If the report is not for publication, the Chief Executive will decide if and how the public can be informed of the decision.



**Redaction**

If the report is for publication, is redaction required:

1. Of Decision Sheet	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Of Appendix	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>		NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 'YES', please provide details of required redaction:

.....

Date redaction carried out: .....

**Treasurer / Chief Executive Sign Off – for Redactions only**

If redaction is required, Treasurer or Chief Executive are to sign off that redaction has been completed.

Sign: .....

Print: .....

Chief Executive/Treasurer

Date signed: .....

**Decision and Final Sign Off**

I agree the recommendations to this report:

Sign:  .....

Print: R. C. Hest .....

PFCC/Deputy PFCC

Date signed: 17/5/18 .....

I do not agree the recommendations to this report because;

.....

Sign: .....

Print: .....

PFCC/Deputy PFCC

Date signed: .....

