



**Summary report of the EURIM Personal Identity Subgroup meeting, 2 March 2005,
1000 – 1200 Room ‘N’, Portcullis House Westminster**

Chairman: Paul McKeown (IBM)
Rapporteur: Dave Wright (EURIM)

Any details discussed in this meeting are ‘off the record’ and confidential.

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of the meeting was to collate subgroup member inputs for a draft EURIM paper on data sharing for presentation to eGU.

2. Draft EURIM data sharing paper for eGU

2.1 A draft document template for the Subgroup’s eGU paper was circulated and approved at the meeting. It was agreed that this provided an appropriate structure and discussion should be directed to populating the framework of headings to produce a compelling document. The main paper should be 3-4 sides of A4, and supporting documentation could be listed as appendices.

2.2 It was suggested that we use existing terminology, and acknowledge previous work, in particular recent developments involving Liberty Alliance (who also use the term ‘circle of trust’). ONS/CIP had commissioned a paper on the differences between the federated and integrated models for data sharing; copies had been circulated at a subsequent meeting, including to Andrew Stott and William Perrin, and the terminology used in any EURIM paper should therefore be consistent with this. The different approaches to data sharing, including integration and federation, were explained. A way forward might be to produce 2 documents: a detailed summary and a larger document that gives supporting detail and explanations of the terms used and proposed models.

2.3 Sections 4 and 5 of the template offered the opportunity to map out data sharing that is available today in the financial services context, and what might be available in the near future, an example of which might be the federated VH model. eGU were probably aware of previous work; the EURIM paper should be designed to add value and suggest practical projects that could deliver results.

2.4 Members asked if our message to eGU would be to emphasise that data sharing in the public sector should be progressed, with examples of how this could be done? Examples needed care – why should DWP as the owner of NINO take the risk of sharing data with the private sector in corroborating identity? Also, how do we persuade those people who we might identify as benefactors of data sharing to actually use it? How might Ian Watmore influence the target departments? Specific details would be required.

2.5 One supplier had tried to engage with the DWP, asking under what scheme they might see themselves as a major stakeholder/user of an identity system. Local authorities can corroborate NINO data, and can make enquiries regarding e.g. housing benefit.

2.6 Our purpose should be to explain to IW why data sharing is important, the context for implementation in the public sector, realistic examples of effective data sharing, and a route to long-term goals. This, together with successful pilots, would provide leverage in persuading and encouraging departments to buy into data sharing schemes.

2.7 The paper should highlight the significance of data sharing within the context of e-Government and citizens authenticating themselves for services. We can then provide practical examples of different ways to do this: data sharing is not an abstract idea, it is fundamental to the transformation of

services in a citizen-centric environment. Reliable figures that quantified savings due to data sharing would be useful in illustrating the scale of benefits to potential users. More work was being done to calculate savings by reducing ID fraud and duplicate driving licences.

2.8 It was agreed that there was no need for further conceptual discussion – what we need now is a punchy, readable paper that focused IW's attention on the benefits of data sharing, how it could be implemented, and the quick wins that should accrue on successful implementation. A detailed explanation of the different models may be necessary, but the eGU paper is not an appropriate vehicle for this. Supporting documentation in the form of the EURIM status report 'Citizen or Subject - How Far do We Control Our Own Identities?' and a paper assessing the relative advantages of the integrated and federated models are already available, and can be referred to as appendices.

2.9 It was further agreed that we should concentrate on the issues of sharing identity and integration without getting into specific industry issues; we should emphasise the principles that need to be established in order to make progress. How to implement these is a natural sequel: there are projects already running in some departments and local authorities. We should avoid repeating what eGU is already aware of, and instead add value by offering our ideas for pushing the plans forward.

2.10 Is there a document within eGU that summarises their current thinking on the benefits of data sharing? Agreement was being sought through the CIO Council on how the Gershon agenda for operational efficiency can be delivered including through data sharing. Departments are likely to take years before they can work out internally within their different systems how to recognise if they are referring to the same entity, and to then corroborate and integrate information across service boundaries. Cross-departmental collaboration is therefore likely to be some time away.

2.11 In that case, are decisions being taken now at the departmental level that will make data sharing more difficult in the future? If so, we should recommend to IW that in his visits to departments and local authorities, he ensures that data sharing is not treated as an afterthought, but rather is embedded in the forward planning. There is a significant risk that all are trying to solve the problem of how to join up their different silos by each inventing unique identifiers – so that far from achieving commonality, a proliferation of numbers results. We in this group should concentrate on what needs to be done, and why, and how it can add value.

2.12 We should inform eGU of where significant efficiencies and gains might be achieved, and state up front that the costs of not introducing data sharing could literally run to £millions. EURIM, as a cross-industry, cross-party group would be happy to seek an audience with IW and his team about the role EURIM can play in helping deliver the benefits and savings that accompany successful data sharing routines. The actual figures involved can be very significant – e.g. the National Fraud Initiative, with just a few collaborating departments and no electronic data sharing, has led to the recovery of some £80 million (and this is 3-year old data). £50 million p/a is lost through ID fraud alone. So the potential savings through data sharing are enormous. Even more significant numbers are involved with CSA failure to use tracing tools, but civil servants have a tendency to put their heads in the sand. Ministerial admission of such losses might compromise their department's reputations.

2.13 Savings of this magnitude would allow investment in data sharing systems to produce more savings and benefits, with better use of IT budgets. Shared service agendas would therefore offer a powerful argument for eGU to employ. A lack of an effective model for data sharing inhibits and frustrates such progress, and the issue should be raised at the CIO Council.

2.14 At some point, departments would have to consider the issue of access, and this might involve recognition that the data held by Government on individuals is a common resource. How to manage such a resource is a significant question. Routines around administering Housing Benefit involve a degree of data sharing across organisational boundaries, as a national benefit delivered by local authorities through private sector service providers (e.g. Vertex-Ealing Borough Council-DWP-Treasury). Data sharing has reduced problems with fraud and administration, and led to significant savings – JN will endeavour to quantify these. Rapid verification of identity also involves UKPS, and the confidence generated by such high level authentication can also be shared.

2.15 We should therefore propose 'quick wins' for IW, to be translated into proof of concept; a successful 'living' example would counter arguments for further delay by departments, while the role of a department, e.g. DWP, might in the first instance be limited to supplying data (or access to data), for corroboration, to allow the service to operate.

2.16 Another argument for adopting data sharing is that without it, Government policy is being frustrated. A pilot project might serve to quantify actual and potential savings, benefits and efficiencies, and report back to IW. Stated Government objectives for the use of ID cards are to reduce fraud and illegal working. Electronic access to NI records for employers, agencies etc. for validation or authentication purposes is vital in creating a 'gold standard' for secure authentication. Biometrics should be introduced to prevent multiple applications for benefits and services by the same individual.

2.17 A good example of data sharing is Project Semaphore, the first stage in the Government's e-Borders project. The project, which will process advance passenger information and passenger name records provided by the airlines, is part of a cross-cutting initiative co-ordinated by the Home Office in partnership with key border control, law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

3. Conclusions

3.1 The EURIM paper for eGU should highlight the importance of data sharing and include the following:

- Cost savings, with existing examples from housing benefit, DVLA, Semaphor etc.
- Achieving Government policy objectives for citizen-centric public service reform
- Improving efficiency and effectiveness, with examples (UKPS, DWP-IR etc)
- Improving service delivery to citizens
- Making services citizen-centric
- Reducing identity theft, fraud and money-laundering
- Reducing illegal working
- Reducing waste
- 'Quick wins', e.g. sharing NINO information to identify illegal workers

In addition, not using data sharing could frustrate Government policy – e.g. lack of data sharing in e-learning. Another efficiency would be processing online – e.g. if you could validate a passport online, what other identity information would be needed? This secure and simple check would avoid the need for paper documentation too. The PI subgroup should give examples of where data sharing has already produced benefits, and recommend 'quick wins'. This might provide an opportunity for IW to put eGU in a leadership role.

3.2 The draft paper would be written and distributed to the subgroup for further comment before presentation to the next meeting of the full PI Group if possible.

3.3 A list of items on the CIO agenda for consideration when writing the draft paper for eGU, together with a summary of contributions from subgroup members at previous meetings. This would help to ensure that the paper effectively pitched towards IW's priorities and targets.

4. Next steps

4.1 Proof-reading and circulation of the draft paper to the team for comment.

4.2 A date for the next meeting was not set because the work of the subgroup could probably be completed by emails between members.

4.3 Progress on the draft paper will be reported to the main PI Group meeting on 9 March. The main group would then decide how to proceed.