


**METROPOLITAN  
POLICE**
**TOTAL POLICING**
**METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE**  
 ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC INQUIRY TEAM

**Public Inquiry Team**  
**Options Paper: FileSafe**

PROTECTIVE MARKING	<b>Restricted</b>	FOIA EXEMPTION	<b>No</b>
SUITABLE FOR PUBLICATION SCHEME	<b>No</b>	DATE CREATED	<b>16.10.2014</b>
TITLE AND VERSION	<b>Op FileSafe: Options Paper (version 4)</b>		
SUMMARY	<b>This paper sets out the options for the implementation of Operation FileSafe with reference to 1) Search &amp; Register, 2) Remedy, 3) Training, Communication and Compliance and 4) Digital Solution.</b>		
<b>HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS This document must be handled in accordance with the protective security marking shown at the bottom of the document and should not be disseminated to outside agencies/partners without the consent of the authorising officer &amp; or Director DPS. This FOIA table must not be detached from this Document</b>			

**Introduction**

This document proposes tactical options for the delivery of the strategic aims of Operation FileSafe. Each option is considered with reference to 1) Search & Register, 2) Remedy, 3) Training, Communication and Compliance and 4) Digital Solution. Options are presented in descending order of resource intensiveness. Each element can be considered independently allowing for a 'mix and match' approach to be adopted. The Options paper should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Scoping paper.

**Option 1**
**Search & Register**

**Scope:** All [redacted] operational sites, outbuildings, service areas, vehicles, mobile police stations, co-located premises, international sites, [redacted] and non-registered storage at TNT.

**Delivery and Resource:**

- Centrally controlled Search operations managed through the deployment of officers on central aid requirements. Strategy, tactical options and Operation Orders to be delivered by PIT. Staged delivery according to geographical hub (as defined by SSS) with dates agreed by PIT in consultation with Senior Designated Officers (SDO), Local Service Delivery Managers (LSDM) and B/OCU Commanders for each area.
- 25% of officers to be specialist search trained to guide regular search officers. Centrally briefed local staff will be responsible for registering material found on an agreed digital solution. This process will be overseen by LSDMs.
- 87,000 crates of non-registered material in deep storage at TNT to be returned to owning BOCU for review on their respective days of action.
- Overtime and TNT transport costs met centrally - Overtime estimated at £150,000. Transport cost of recovering and returning material to TNT estimated at £800,000.

**Support:** PIT to establish a Central Coordination & Communications Team (CCCT) responsible for maintaining progress logs and checking compliance on days of action. Records Management and PIT

staff to form Specialist Support Teams (SST) to be deployed to hubs if material of an especially sensitive nature, or relevant to the terms of reference of Operation Beacon is found.

**Quality Assurance:** Premises deemed to be at high risk of holding material relevant to the terms of reference of Operation Beacon to be searched for a second time by CT search teams. The Information Asset Register (IAR) for these premises will be reviewed by Records Management staff. Dip sampling of a further 10% of premises to be scrutinised in this way.

**Advantages:** Broad scope ensures that strategic objective of Operation FileSafe is met in full; all known premises will be searched and all known material will be registered. Central strategic and operational control will maximise quality, rigour and compliance and deliver objectives to time. Use of specialist search officers will ensure a systematic approach and enhance process credibility.

**Disadvantages:** Initial search and registration of material is conservatively estimated to require 41,946 officer days to complete, allowing for quality assurance processes. This drain on MPS assets will have associated financial costs (in excess of £6 million), prevent deployment to other AID requirements, significantly impact upon business as usual and see far reaching opportunity costs. Such impacts could draw negative media and political comment and damage confidence. Central control may lead to a lack of local ownership and hamper long term compliance and cultural change. Contextual understanding and access to sensitive material may lack through the use of centrally deployed officers. Additional staff would need to be seconded to staff CCGT and SST.

### Remedy

All material stored locally, including documents within local archives, to be reviewed, recorded and managed in line with records management policy.

**Advantages:** MPS placed in an optimum position to demonstrate a proactive, robust and comprehensive response to criticisms. Strategic aims will be achieved in the full spirit of the operation as the organisation will be wholly compliant with legislation and policy.

**Disadvantage:** Further resource requirement. Remedy of 124D and missing person files alone are estimated to require 4,325 working days. Estimate of working days required to remedy local archives will not be provided until completion of FileSafe pilots.

### Training, Communication and Compliance

Background and purpose of FileSafe to be communicated via Live Road Shows, Intranet and hard copy MPS publications and Commissioner's Conference Call. Training to be delivered via NCALT, face-to-face input by Records Management (RM) staff or LSDM at local training days. RM policy input to be included at recruit, MSC, detective and leadership training. Ongoing IAR and RM policy compliance monitored at CrimeFighters meetings and through dip sampling by RM staff. Relevant PDR objectives to be used to raise awareness and secure compliance from all levels of the organisation.

**Advantages:** Face to face and widespread publication of Operation FileSafe's context and aims will secure buy-in and generate enthusiasm for onerous local requirements. Enhanced training will maximise knowledge and capability of officers to complete tasks. Ongoing training and corporate and local compliance checks will, together, raise the status of RM policy and assist in embedding cultural change.

**Disadvantages:** Face-to-face training and communication would place pressure on PIT and RM / LSDM staff. Resource levels within these units is currently insufficient to deliver this option.

### Digital Solution

**IAR:** Delivery of a bespoke Information Asset Register (IAR) meeting all requirements as set out in the Initial Viability Assessment. Functions to include: corporate accessibility, document custodian, location and movement notes, review / destruction flags and rationale, performance management capability, layered access according to sensitivity and technologically future proof.

**Knowledge Map:** development of a system to chart live, historical, archived, decommissioned and stand-alone systems and act as a signpost for searching all material held by the MPS.

**Advantages:** Bespoke digital solution would allow performance management of RM policy compliance and place the MPS in a premier position to meet policy and legislation requirements in full. A Knowledge Map would facilitate the servicing of future requests to search and supply MPS records. It would assist in mitigating risks of failing to appropriately register all current documents on the IAR.

**Disadvantages:** The cost of delivering a bespoke digital solution would be £50K and would not be available until Q2 2015.

**Total cost to deliver Option 1: £7 million of which £6 million is opportunity cost of officer and staff time. £500,000 p.a. savings in storage costs are anticipated.**

## Option 2

### **Search & Register**

**Scope:** As outlined in Option 1, with the removal of sports premises, vehicles, mobile police stations and international posts.

#### **Delivery and Resource:**

- Big Wing style 'days of action' to be locally delivered with reference to a centrally developed strategy. Local SDOs to be responsible for tactical plan and delivery of Search strand.
- LSDMs to be responsible for managing and delivering population of IAR.
- Dedicated planning phase to allow local partners time to clarify requirements, agree resource, investigate tactical options and draw up operational orders.
- Staged delivery based on SSS geographical hubs with operation dates decided locally in line with centrally determined timescales.

**Support:** Local partners (SDOs and LSDMs) to be briefed by PIT and RM staff on requirements and strategy. Mailbox and 'hotline' to be live during planning phase. PIT and RM staff to conduct site visits to monitor planning, identify and share best practice. Op Orders reviewed by PIT and feedback issued. CCTs and SSTs to be in place and deployable during live phase as outlined in Option 1.

**Quality Assurance:** As set out in Option 1 with the addition of the circulation of proforma compliance reports at the conclusion of FileSafe search operations, in which local champions will be required to evidence and describe achievement of strategic aims.

**Advantages:** Significant degree of central control retained in relation to strategy and timescales. Through proactively advising local partners during planning phase, compliance and efficient delivery is centrally managed. Through devolution of responsibility to local leaders, buy-in and accountability are secured, establishing behavioural change. Reduction in scope saves approximately 7,000 working days whilst largely meeting strategic objectives. Access and contextual understanding of material is enhanced through the use of local officers.

**Disadvantages:** Use of local officers may increase inappropriate destruction of material to avoid registering it on the IAR and result in bulk submissions to General Registry. Credibility of process is diminished. Significant pressure on PIT and RM during planning and live phase to deliver support functions, requiring additional staff or redirection of existing staff away from core functions.

### **Remedy**

As set out in Option 1 with associated advantages and disadvantages.

### **Training, Communication and Compliance**

As outlined in Option 1 but with the removal of face-to-face communication and training. A scaled down approach is limited to NCALT packages for IAR operation and RM policy with no input at local

training days. Communication limited to on-line and hard copy publications and Commissioner's Conference Call. Compliance checks as outlined in Option 1 with associated advantages.

**Advantages:** No abstractions from PIT and RM core business during delivery period.

**Disadvantages:** The purpose and message of Operation FileSafe may be diluted, reducing enthusiasm, buy-in and obstructing long-term behavioural change. Compromised training strategy will reduce officer knowledge and risks degrading quality of outcomes.

### **Digital Solution**

As set out in Option 1 with associated advantages and disadvantages.

**Total cost to deliver Option 2: £5 million of which £4 million is opportunity cost of officer and staff time. Staff costs are reduced from Option 1 as delivery will be more 'business as usual.' £500,000 p.a. savings in storage costs are anticipated.**

### **Option 3**

#### **Search & Register**

**Scope:** As set out in Option 2, with the exclusion of review and registering of relevant MPS material currently in held in deep storage (██████ / TNT).

**Delivery and Resource:** As set out in Option 2.

**Support:** As set out in Option 2.

**Quality Assurance:** As set out in Option 2.

**Advantages:** The reduced scope of Option 3, excluding material currently located in deep storage facilities will significantly reduce asset drain to 23,258 working days. Enhanced 'Achievability'.

**Disadvantages:** Failure to deliver strategic aims or properly respond to criticisms. By ignoring deep storage material, the MPS would only maintain an accurate log of, and be able to retrieve some, rather than all of the material it holds. Confidence would be negatively impacted.

#### **Remedy**

No remedy of locally archived and stored material. Compliance with RM policy to be viewed as a future imperative only.

**Advantages:** Further reduction in resource requirement and increase in task Achievability.

**Disadvantages:** Non compliance with RM policy could lead to a breach of legislation, placing the organisation in a position of legal and reputational vulnerability.

#### **Training, Communication and Compliance**

As set out in Option 2 with associated advantages and disadvantages.

#### **Digital Solution**

Replacement of bespoke IAR with an Information Directory, developed for the MPS in 2000. MPS Knowledge Map as described above, with associated advantages and disadvantages.

**Advantages:** Limited cost. Technological nudges required but with a saving of approximately £50K. Estimated systems could be functional by end of 2014 Q4 enabling full implementation between 3 and 6 months earlier than Options 1 and 2.

**Disadvantage:** Significantly reduced technological capability, providing record and search functions with no option to facilitate adherence with RM policy / legislation or performance manage compliance. Information Directory will require updating and support contract by Cap Gemini with associated cost implications. Information Directory was created using outdated systems and is not future-proofed or likely to be compatible with Total Technology vision.

**Total cost to deliver Option 3: £3.5 million of opportunity cost of officer and staff time.**

#### **Option 4**

##### **Search & Register**

**Scope:** As set out in Option 3 with associated advantages and disadvantages.

##### **Delivery & Resource:**

- Operation FileSafe strategy will be set centrally and communicated to local key-stakeholders (SDOs, LSDMs, B/OCU Commanders). Centrally set broad parameters to include scope, search level and IAR compliance.
- Local delivery champions (stakeholders) will be grouped according to geographical hub and required to independently develop and deliver tactical options to meet strategic objectives within set parameters. No timescales will be communicated or monitored.

**Support:** PIT and RM staff to deliver central briefing to all key stakeholders and conduct single follow up visits to each geographical hub to respond to queries and offer guidance. Ad hoc advice will be provided by PIT and RM SPOCs during planning phase. No CCCT or SST to be established during live phase. RM and PIT staff will conduct site visits during live phase in exceptional circumstances only.

**Quality Assurance:** Proforma compliance reports to be circulated by PIT in which local champions will be required to evidence and describe achievement of strategic aims. Remedial activity will be directed centrally and undertaken locally. Dip sampling of IAR / Information Directory by RM staff with feedback provided to LSDM.

**Advantages:** Enhanced local control and accountability. Locally managed timescales will ensure regular commitments are considered, reducing impact on business as usual and easing risk of reputational damage through perceived disproportionate effort.

**Disadvantages:** Risk of slippage from strategic purpose and broad timescales through a significant loss of central control. Reduced support may reduce enthusiasm and quality of outcomes. Similarly, compromised approach to checks and balances could diminish local accountability and reduce credibility of processes. Removal of CCCT / SST may result in excessive material being recorded on the IAR as local officers are reticent to destroy material without expert advice / authority.

##### **Remedy**

As set out in Option 3 with associated advantages and disadvantages.

##### **Training, Communication and Compliance**

Corporate level removed. Communication via on-line and hard copy publications only and compliance checks through IAR dip sampling and use of PDR. Training to be delivered as described in Option 2 and 3; NCALT and greater RM input at recruit, MSC, detective and leadership training only.

**Advantages:** Reduced pressure on CrimeFighters and administrative functions associated with providing relevant data.

**Disadvantages:** Reduced status of Operation FileSafe, diminishing enthusiasm and buy-in. Lack of corporate compliance checks risks performance slippage and undermines cultural change.

##### **Digital Solution**

Use of Information Directory as described in Option 3. No development of MPS Knowledge Map.

**Advantages:** Removing requirement to develop a MPS Knowledge Map reduces drain on PIT resources, freeing asset to focus on core activities. Delivering just one new digital solution (IAR / Information Directory) will reduce risk of novelty fatigue and dilution of training.

**Disadvantages:** Removal of Knowledge Map reduces capability to service requests for MPS held information and prevent mitigation of risks of failing to fully and properly register ALL MPS material on a corporately searchable system.

**Total cost to deliver Option 4: Opportunity cost will be dependent on BOCU commitment to improve, approx £500,000 can be anticipated. Digital solution will cost approx £10,000 to upgrade with anticipated support cost of £10,000 per year it remains in operation.**

**Recommendation** - Option 2 provides the most appropriate balance of resource commitment to scale of risk presented by failures in current MPS Records Management processes and systems. Public Inquiry team scoping has identified widespread organisational failures in compliance with and understanding of policy. These have been exacerbated by recent re-organisations resulting in uncertainty regarding responsibilities and reduction in staff employed on Information Management. This option will embed understanding, change culture and provide long term improvement. It is anticipated that up to 60% of locally archived documents will be removed to General registry storage or destroyed resulting in more cost-efficient use of estate and delivery of Strategic objective.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

DI Coombe & DI Pyemont

MPS - UCPT  
PROVISIONAL  
REDACTED