

THE EUROPEAN
INFORMATION
SOCIETY GROUP

EURIM



Information Sharing Protocols

Position Paper from the EURIM
Personal Identity and Data Sharing Group

February 2008

© Copyright EURIM 2008. All Rights Reserved. For written permission to reproduce any part of this publication please contact the EURIM Editor at: admin@eurim.org. This will normally be given provided EURIM is fully credited. Whilst EURIM has tried to ensure the accuracy of this publication, it cannot accept responsibility for any errors, omissions, mis-statements or mistakes.

Contents

Executive summary	1
Summary	1
Recommendations.....	2
Introduction	3
Statement of intent.....	3
The Information Sharing Sub Group	3
Types of protocol	5
Section Summary	5
Protocols reviewed	5
Guidance and advice	5
Protocol structure.....	5
Conclusion	7
Exemplar Protocols	9
Exemplars.....	9
Effective implementation.....	10
Overcoming barriers and recognising boundaries	11
Section Summary	11
Barriers	11
Boundaries	13
Overarching Issues.....	14
Conclusion	15
Appendix A Guidance on PSI Sharing Index	16
Appendix B Regional Centres of Excellence	17
Appendix C Acknowledgements	18
Appendix D References	19

Executive summary

SUMMARY

The report is an attempt to formulate an understanding of the experiences of local authorities in establishing information sharing arrangements. Documenting these experiences allows for an understanding of how these arrangements can be supported and developed and thus embedded in confident future service delivery practice.

This report does not cover well known issues with data sharing, for instance the problem that cost is often borne by a party that does not reap the benefit in data sharing, and that there is a need for common agreed technical standards to facilitate data sharing across government.

In addition it is worth noting that emergency situations will challenge any data sharing protocol and process – inherent in such a situation is the conflict between ensuring that data is accessible in a timely fashion against maintaining data protection and information assurance standards. This is an area that needs to be fully explored in any data sharing protocol and would be worthy of further investigation.

It is worth noting that the term Information Sharing has been used throughout this document in preference to Data Sharing. This is for consistency and ease of reading only.

Key points that are highlighted in compiling this report are as follows:

- Information assurance is vital to maintain citizen confidence
- The reasons for, management of and limitations of, information sharing must be clearly described to citizens.
- Where appropriate, protocols must permit citizens a single point of access to data that is shared about them – information sharing and information access go hand in hand.
- Over time a significant body of legislation regarding information sharing has developed, and case law is often required to demonstrate 'legality'. As well as the complexity of the legislation this also creates uncertainty within practitioners.
- There is a great deal of guidance on information sharing already in the public domain. Some of this guidance is complicated and not all of it is consistent.
- There are many examples of successful information sharing that can be used as examples to learn from by authorities embarking on new information sharing projects.
- There is more work to do to ensure authorities make consistent and good decisions around information sharing projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report makes the following recommendations:

National Government

1. Regional Centres of Excellence, through the Ministry of Justice, incorporate a feasibility study into their programme of work that considers the whole of England or regional approach to an overarching information sharing protocol model. One Regional Centre should be asked to take the lead in undertaking this work, working with the Ministry of Justice to ensure that the output will be appropriate to both local and central government. This work should include examining ways to reduce, simplify or in other ways improve the guidance pertaining to information sharing protocols, and build on the Information Commission's framework code of practice for sharing personal information.
2. The Ministry of Justice, in association with relevant departments, agencies and private sector organisations in each sector, should commission further work to map enabling legislation against citizen's needs so as to inform the above work in each sector.
3. EURIM works with SOCITM to produce an exemplar protocol to use as a standard against which information sharing protocols can be benchmarked and audited. This work needs to be presented in a form suitable for communication use at all levels including the service user.

Information Commissioner

4. ICO should endorse a common standard on information sharing that draws on those standards developed and in development by LeGSB group. This to be done in consultation with LGA and other stakeholders.
5. ICO should provide further guidance outlining in practical terms, using common language and terminology that enables organisations to make good quality decisions regarding information sharing. This would not be prescriptive but would stress the importance of using professional judgement in making these decisions.

General

6. EURIM to produce an impact study to evidence the effect existing exemplar protocols have on the efficiency agenda.
7. Citizen access to their own information, ability to change their information and knowledge of information sharing initiatives, is vital to the acceptance and smooth operation of information sharing schemes. An equally important aspect of security is ongoing training of all staff with permission to access databases containing personally identifiable information. Training should discriminate between legitimate and unacceptable use, and there should be electronic audit trail capability that enables all access to databases to be tracked back to the individual gaining access. Meaningful penalties should be enforced for misuse.

Introduction

STATEMENT OF INTENT

"The Transformational Government agenda is the most serious attempt to change the way public services are delivered in over twenty years. Success depends on citizen confidence that the information shared by those seeking to serve them better is accurate and will not be lost, leaked or abused, whether by accident or by design. There is a plethora of legislation, standards, procedures, protocols in this space but little sharing of practical experience. The objective of this exercise is to collate some of that practical experience to avoid duplication of effort in re-inventing square wheels, identify which obstacles to good practice are legislative and which are cultural (i.e. much harder to address) and shorten the timescale necessary for practical improvement at the operational level by helping to remove confusion as to what is already permissible as well as desirable.

It is intended as the first stage of a more ambitious exercise to establish and publicise good practice but we felt it important to collate what is already known in order to help those charged with implementing Public Service Agreements and, in parallel, those working on the National Identity and Information Assurance strategies."

Philip Virgo, Secretary General – EURIM

THE INFORMATION SHARING SUB GROUP

A Sub group of the EURIM Personal Identity and Data Sharing Group was established to undertake this work with the following aims, composition and approach.

Aim

Sharing of information across government will help enable citizen centric services to be delivered efficiently and economically and is a fundamental element of the government's "Transformational Government - Enabled by Technology" strategy. Many, perhaps most, of those who go to Citizens' Advice or their MPs for assistance complain that departments have not shared the information they expected and that would enable their problems to be addressed. Meanwhile there is also vociferous mistrust of the motives behind large scale information sharing initiatives.

Such mistrust needs to be overcome by the use of protocols for information sharing that are demonstrably in the interests of the citizen and are rigorous, fair and proportionate.

Much work has already been done to identify protocols and to provide guidance for sharing information. The Information Commissioner issued the *Framework Code of Practice for Sharing Personal Information* in October 2007. The aim of this EURIM sub group is to build on and publicise this work. It will also test the acceptability of these protocols by carrying appropriate consultation necessary for their wider adoption and support. This will ensure that the necessary checks and balances to ensure appropriate protection of privacy and the wider interests of society are maintained.

Group composition

- Industry experts responsible for delivery of information sharing projects
- Legal experts
- LA Authority representation

Approach

- Identify what has been produced;
- Identify best of breed;
- Identify characteristics;
- Test characteristics via consultation.

The work concentrated on information sharing implemented with or by local government. SOCTIM were able to obtain protocols and carry out questionnaires on behalf of the sub-group.

This report outlines the structure of the protocols received and discusses why there possibly is not greater commonality. It then discusses some exemplar protocols and, given the concerns raised regarding the use of case studies to define what is acceptable and what is not, following the Section on Exemplars we have included a discussion on the barriers and boundaries to Information Sharing with some possible recommendations.

Types of protocol

SECTION SUMMARY

We are very grateful to the local authorities and other public bodies who shared their information or information sharing protocols with us¹. So what applications were the protocols used for and what typically did they contain?

PROTOCOLS REVIEWED

The protocols were all designed for use across a number of public sector organisations or agencies acting on their behalf. Although only one or two extended across the whole range listed below, between them they included (in order of most frequency):

- Local authorities
- Police Force
- Primary Care Trusts
- Probation Service
- NHS Trusts
- Mental Health Trust
- Fire Service
- Youth Offending Team
- Ambulance Service
- Local Crown Prosecution Service
- Strategic Health Authority

Other stakeholders that protocols aspired to include in due course included:

- Voluntary sector
- NHS Direct
- Medical Schools in Universities
- PCT contractors such as pharmacists and optometrists
- Service users and their representatives and carers

GUIDANCE AND ADVICE

The group also collated guidance and advice regarding information sharing protocols² to identify the extent of advice available and to explore how it had been adopted in developing the protocols.

From this it was clear there was no shortage of guidance and exemplars but many different protocols had been developed.

PROTOCOL STRUCTURE

Protocols supplied tend to vary in their basic structure and it was difficult to identify and isolate common elements. This may be due to the varying nature of the protocols both in terms of the geographical and subject areas covered. But broadly the following common elements are required:

¹ See Appendix D

² See Appendices A and B

Legal basis

Relevant legislation was quoted in all the protocols and was also one of the drivers for developing a protocol. A variety of legislation was quoted:

- Children Act 2004
- Computer Misuse Act
- Crime & Disorder Act 1988
- Criminal Procedures and Investigations Act 1996
- Data Protection Act 1998
- Freedom of information Act 2000 and in Scotland 2002
- Health & Social Care Act 2001
- Human Rights Act 1998
- Local Government Act 2000
- Remaining provisions of the Access to Health Records 1990 in Scotland
- Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000
- Police Acts 2006 and 2007
- And general consideration of
 - The Common Law duty of confidentiality and
 - Ultra Vires

Guidance referred to included the

- Caldicott Guardian Principles
- Information Sharing: Practitioners Guide (Every Child Matters)
- DCA Protocol checklist
- ICO code of practice 'Fair Processing' and 'Best Practice Standards'
- Working together to Safeguard Children guidance
- BS7666 'fit for use' information - locations are usually relevant to public sector information
- DCA November 2003 Public Sector Data Sharing: Guidance on the Law supported this where there was no statutory prohibition
- ICO 'secondary use of personal data held for the collection and administration of Council Tax' supporting prohibition at that time

What and how information will be shared

The checklist below contains all the main sections that the protocols used:

- Policy context and purpose of the agreement
- Aims and Objectives
- Scope
- The Legal Framework
- Principles, Golden Rules etc
- Partners
- Designated Officers
- Organisational and individual roles and responsibilities
- Joint processes and procedures
- Conditions of use of the information
- Consent and Disclosure
- Information / data management
- Warranties and indemnity
- Complaints and Breaches
- Termination and variation of the agreement
- Security and audit
- Governance of the protocol
- Protocol monitoring and review procedures

- Definitions and glossary
- Notes, guidance, training and frequently asked questions
- Templates for agreements and forms

Additional elements

Two aspects we were looking for in the protocols were not particularly well covered

- Procedures for over-riding the protocol in national emergency
- Procedures for updating the protocol should legislation or another external factor change

CONCLUSION

It is apparent that development has been through a siloed approach driven by the requirements of legislation. Scrutiny of progress through siloed inspection regimes reinforces the separateness of development of the protocols.

This can also prevent the development of a wider 'best practice' in developing protocols. It also creates uncertainty and a lack of confidence for those wishing to share outside the immediate silo.

This is supported by the comments received by those who have submitted protocols. Hence it is worth investigating what it is suggested would help to promote confidence and provide clarity.

Changes to promote confidence

The availability of information and advice from the Information Commissioner is important at the early stages of information sharing protocols so consistency is achieved and working practices can confidently change.

The Scottish Executive has proved helpful in reinforcing intentions of information sharing in their documentation. The possibility of training across partnerships by the Scottish Executive is also mentioned.

There is a distinct need felt in the feedback for an overarching document giving clear context and guidance to enable consistent and good decision making in relation to information sharing.

Greater awareness of the benefits of information sharing is needed to encourage information sharers to act within the current frameworks and to ensure work on the quality of information as well.

One useful way to overcome these concerns is through promoting 'exemplar' protocols, however with some notable exceptions described in the following section this does not appear to have happened and sharing of knowledge in this area is often facilitated only by personal networks.

The sharing of information and the consequent aggregation places an extra onus on all parties to ensure that protocols are clear, published and easily understood, that responsibility for what information is stored, where and for how long is clearly understood and documented, and that accurate information is available in a timely and accurate matter.

Lack of case study precedents that would reassure the legal lobby and risk assessments of local authorities are put forward as a major reason for reluctance in profiling information sharing protocols.

Evidence of information sharing in preventive services was limited as most were after agency assessments and not around promoting general wellbeing.

Exemplar Protocols

EXEMPLARS

During the course of the report writing there appears to be good evidence of progress with overarching Information Sharing protocols. Their main characteristics are considered below in line with the discussions to date.

They are;

Open Scotland

- National approach supported by the Scottish Executive
- 14 partnership areas across Scotland working towards common aim
- Developing national frameworks

Leicestershire

- Information sharing protocol supported by specific exchange agreements
- Over 40 organisations are signed up including Health, Police, Probation and all the local authorities in the county.
- Originally a joint initiative between the City, Police, Health and Probation to meet the needs of the YOS initiative
- Uses now include ASBOs, CCTV, fly tipping, statutory transfer of responsibilities and single non emergency number SNEN/101
- Shared with Information Commissioner's office and Audit Commission
- Other counties considering adopting the protocol

Bolton MBC

- Used for the duty to prevent and detect crime and disorder, council tax data sharing and the duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children
- Extensive range of partners in the local area are part of the agreement

London Connects

- Started from a Caldicott Guardians Forum
- Strong governance arrangements
- Protocol supported by individual 'subject specific information sharing agreements'
- Aspires to extend to service users and carers
- Intention is to adopt London wide
- Thorough précis of pertinent legislation

Merseyside

- Originally developed by the GM Connections Partnership / North West ISAP Cluster Group
- Endorsed by the DFES (hotlink)
- St Helens Council have a programme to roll out protocol with all their partners
- Protocol agreed with Local Strategic Partnership Board

EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

No impact studies are available on the above exemplars. The following may give indications of possible issues. The statutory guidance on section 10 of the Children Act 2004 made it clear that effective information sharing supports the duty to co-operate to improve the well-being of children.

However, in response to concerns and to facilitate the desired development of multi agency working, the Department for Children Schools and Families (DCSF) produced non statutory guidance "Information sharing: Practitioners' guide - Integrated working to improve outcomes for children and young people" (2006). This attempted to define the language across agencies for sharing information and gave guidance as to how practitioners should be supported by their employers in relation to their responsibility to preparing front line staff for information sharing.

The Children Act demonstrated the need to bring out specific non statutory guidance to ensure employers support at a practical level any statutory duties of information sharing. This must be accommodated and prepared for within any protocol.

With the Development of the Greater Merseyside toolkit, the background to producing a standards framework has largely been done through the now defunct Local Government E-standards Board working group .There are three documented components to the LeGSB model:

- Establishing a Framework for Information Sharing (a structured approach)
- Information Sharing Standards: Audit Tool & Levels 1, 2, 3
- Information Sharing Framework Documents: Levels 1, 2, 3, 4

to date this has only been endorsed by DCSF.

The work of this group has not been continued and testing of the developed work has never taken place.

Overcoming barriers and recognising boundaries

SECTION SUMMARY

Obstacles to information sharing can be identified as either:

- Barriers: Things that can be overcome
- Boundaries: The point at which it either becomes infeasible or contrary to legal constraints

BARRIERS

The barriers that were evidenced can be grouped under the following headings

- Legislative
- Conflict of Interest
- Cultural
- Technical
- Fear, uncertainty and doubt

Legislative

Legislation was identified as being very clear as to the intention but once interpretation was applied this clarity was diminished. The duties imposed upon partners through legislation provided clarity and were reviewed as positive.

The majority of respondents identified the DPA as the main legislative barrier but recognised that such legislation was needed to prevent misuse.

Willingness between partners to tackle common issues was the driver that led to information sharing arrangements that worked and overcame any reluctance to share.

However, the potential use of information provided emerged as an issue. Information providers, it was felt, must be informed by information users as to how the information was to be used e.g. school information used by DWP.

While some responses from local authorities acknowledge that the DPA is perceived to be a barrier even though it is not, others clearly believe that the DPA is in reality a barrier, citing the Children's Act as one example where the law is contradictory. Clarity and advice from the ICO was perceived to be lacking by some,

Conflict of interest

The major barriers to information sharing are in normal working practices. It was identified that it is rarely in the interest of people who have accurate information to make that available to others, certainly not in the short term anyway. They do not usually get

rewarded on the information they provide. The benefits of information sharing are usually for the person receiving the information. No incentive. Put simply, the cost of information sharing is commonly borne by a department that does not directly benefit from the sharing.

Cultural

Further barriers are practitioners' ignorance as to why we share information. Others see themselves as having ownership of the information created and feel possessive of it. In addition some feel that sharing information would not be ethical.

Training is an important aspect in overcoming this issue and needs to be appropriately prioritised. Such training should not just focus on DPA legislation but should demonstrate the context of information sharing in day to day activities.

Staff are nervous of an open policy of sharing information. Concerns exist around the potential for significant reputational loss following an information leak.

Technical

Systems, technical and managerial, have to be in place to ensure that information is recorded in such a way as to be available to those who need it. Sharing sensitive information presents challenges in ensuring that the right protection, technical and operational, is in place, and an appropriate set of information security standards and guidelines should be in place and enforced. Awareness of the need for information risk management within Government, and adequate training and professionalism of operatives, are essential.

Government must ensure that Departments exercise their responsibility for sharing data within an appropriate legal and administrative framework, and have the capability to recognise and employ state of the art security solutions, including the use of electronic data transfer, and data minimisation techniques.

Technology and the use of it is always an excuse not to share information especially if they have to use IT systems to record information. There is inference that poorly maintained information sets drive the need for non-sharing rather than the uncertainty.

Issues of information quality also create barriers in terms of being able to match information.

Interpretation issues result in Solicitors always having a different opinion or viewpoint on information sharing.

Information standards can also be identified as a barrier to information sharing, however well they work.

BOUNDARIES

Varney's Review to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on "*Service Transformation: a Better Service For Citizens and Businesses, a Better Deal for Taxpayers*" (Dec 06), identifies that channels through which services are delivered can achieve greater personalisation and improved performance by addressing the 'needs of citizens and businesses'.

Instead of the needs of its citizens, information sharing is often organised around the traditional service delivery mechanisms of the local authority e.g.

- Security
- Social Care
- Health
- Education

Consequently, if information sharing arrangements continue to follow the traditional service delivery model then efficiency and accuracy in sharing information to deliver better and appropriate services will be difficult to achieve fully. This is one of the obvious boundaries that could be extended to deliver benefits and provide further clarity but it raises some interesting questions:

- Is it possible to identify a framework of types of protocol, based on common needs, issues and legislation?
- Would it be possible to create skeleton protocols around these types?
- How generic would they be?
- Would this be useful or too simplistic?

An approach to considering this is provided by Direct Gov. which uses the following categories of needs of citizens around which services could be organised:

- Education & Learning
- Motoring
- Home and Community
- Employment
- Money, tax and benefits
- Health and well-being
- Travel and Transport
- Environment and Greener living
- Crime, justice and the law
- Rights and Responsibilities

This demonstrates how legislation might be grouped, it is not meant to be a definitive analysis. The Regional Centres of Excellence may want to use such a device to carry out more detailed analysis of legislation by sector.

Organising information sharing on citizens' needs lines would provide an additional impetus to cultural change in planned service delivery and should deliver services that are more appropriate and effective and provide value for money.

The analysis below shows how legislation governing information sharing in one area (Council Tax Data) has developed and embedded the siloed service provision, resulting in confusion on the ground when a need to share covers a range of agencies used to dealing with their 'own' interpretation of their 'own' legislation and a citizen's needs do not fit that category.

Council Tax Information Sharing Legal basis		
Initial / Primary Legislation	Additional Legislation	Case law
Local Govt Finance Act 1992	Local Govt Act 1972 Local Govt Act 2000 Human Rights Act Data Protection Act E.U. Information Protection Directive	Hazell v Hammersmith and Fulham LBC (1991) Peck v United Kingdom (ECHR 2003) Innovations (Mail Order) v Data protection Registrar (1993) MS v Sweden (1997) J V Enfield Borough Council (2002)

What the diagram could represent is that citizen's needs are driving the groupings and in turn the legislation.

Evidence shows that front line professionals are often unclear about their responsibilities and lack confidence in making decisions about whether or not to share information in cases that require individual judgement. Time is spent referring back within an individual agency and that time and resources spent cannot be recouped even when clarity has been reached.

With the move to inter-agency working and neighbourhood management of services through the Local Government Act (2006) (emanating from White Paper on "Strong & Prosperous Communities") there is a need for clear understanding across legislation with a clear focus on outcomes for citizens. Effective preventative services of this type will usually require active processes for identifying citizens at risk of poor outcomes, and passing information to those delivering targeted support. Practitioners sometimes express concern about how this can be done lawfully.

OVERARCHING ISSUES

Trust is a major issue that needs to be addressed whatever the solution. The acceptability of the protocols will determine their success and their useful application. That acceptability should come about with appropriate communication with and benefits recognised by all concerned. See as an example non statutory guidance from children's services. This is intended to achieve within children's services what the Government Relations Group of the British Computer Society is calling for across all e-services programmes: a set of common guardianship principles.

CONCLUSION

Benefits relating to efficiencies gained through multi-agency working and improved outcomes could be achieved through identifying needs driven service areas where legislation could be rationalised, re-focussed or new enabling legislation passed.

Potential disadvantages or costs which could simply create different silos, could be addressed and designed out through adoption of a common framework that is regularly reviewed. Piloting of this could happen through the Regional Centres of Excellence³. The trust of citizens for information sharing must be maintained at all times. Information sharing must be demonstrably proportionate, transparent, secure and well managed.

³ see Appendix B

Appendix A Guidance on PSI Sharing Index

1	DCA – Privacy and Data Sharing: the way forward http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/index.htm
2	DCA – A public service guarantee for data handling http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/psguarantees/data.htm
3	DCA – How can the Public Sector provide people with information on, and build confidence in, the way it handles their personal details? – Consultation Paper http://www.dca.gov.uk/consult/datasharing/datashare.htm
4	DCA – How can the Public Sector provide people with information on, and build confidence in, the way it handles their personal details? - Responses http://www.dca.gov.uk/consult/datasharing/datashareresp.htm
5	DCA - Public Sector Data Sharing: guidance on the law and covering letter http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/lawguide.htm
6	DCA – Public Sector Data Sharing: a guide to data sharing protocols http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/infosharing.htm
7	DCA – Public Sector Data Sharing – complaints procedure http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/complaints.htm
8	DCA – Data sharing codes of practice http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/codepract.htm
9	DCA – Data sharing management guidance http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/manguide.htm
10	DCA – Public Sector Data Sharing: privacy statements http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/toolkit/privstat.htm
11	Performance and Innovation Unit – Privacy and Data Sharing: the way forward for public services http://www.strategy.gov.uk/work_areas/privacy/index.asp
12	DCA – Analysis of the responses to consultation on Performance and Innovation Unit report “Privacy and Data Sharing: the way forward for public services” http://www.dca.gov.uk/consult/piu/piuresp.htm
13	DCA – Data Sharing – FAQs http://www.dca.gov.uk/foi/sharing/faqs.htm
14	HM Government – Information sharing vision statement http://www.foi.gov.uk/sharing/information-sharing.pdf
15	Privacy and Data Sharing – Survey of Public Awareness and Perceptions http://www.dca.gov.uk/majrep/rights/mori-survey.pdf
16	Information Commissioner – Compliance advice – data sharing between local authority departments
17	Information Commissioner – Sharing personal information:; a new approach
18	Scottish Executive – Data Sharing – Legal guidance for the Scottish public sector
19	Department of Health – Making a Difference: Safe and secure data sharing between health and adult social care staff
20	National Statistics – Data Sharing for Statistical Purposes – a practitioners guide to the legal framework
21	Cabinet Office – The Data Protection Act 1998 – Standards and Best Practice Handbook for Government Departments
22	Association of Chief Police Officers – Code of Practice for Data Protection
23	Health & social care http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/REGULATION/documents/mad/data_sharing.pdf
24	Learning & skills council: http://www.lsc.gov.uk/Providers/Data/Help/Helpdetailpage/Data+Sharing+Protocols.htm

Appendix B Regional Centres of Excellence

The Regional Centres of Excellence (RCEs) were established by DCLG in partnership with the LGA in late 2003. Originally set up as Centres of Procurement Excellence to support local authorities to deliver the milestones laid out in the National Procurement Strategy. The publication of the Gershon Report and the introduction of efficiency targets of £6.45 billion by 2007/08 for local government quickly led to the RCEs having their remit widened to act as the lead change agents for local government efficiency.

Each Centre is autonomous with its own governance structure, business plan and deliverables best suited to the needs of its own region and are available on the RCE website. The Centres are hosted by local authorities and run by management boards. In addition to the delivery of their regional business plans each Chief Executive of the host authorities has taken national responsibility for the delivery of one or more of the workstreams identified by Gershon in his review of public sector spending. The Chief Executives along with representatives from DCLG, OGC, LGA, IDeA, 4Ps and the Cabinet Office meet quarterly at a Task Force to set the overall strategic direction of the programme. Inclusion of information sharing as part of their programme of work would seriously advance the transformational agenda.

Appendix C Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the local authorities and other public bodies who shared their information sharing protocols with us. The organisations that responded to our survey and/or shared their protocols were:

- Aberdeenshire Council
- Adur DC – West Sussex Accessible Services Partnership
- Ayreshire PCT
- Bolton MBC
- Bridgenorth DC
- Bromley LBC
- Camden LBC
- City of London Police
- Clackmannanshire Council
- Congleton BC
- Coventry City Council
- Croydon LBC
- Durham County Council
- Greater Manchester Police
- Herefordshire Council
- Horsham BC
- IDeA
- Kent Connects
- Leicester City
- Leicestershire CC
- London Connects
- Medway Council
- Orkney Islands Council
- Scottish Borders Council
- Scottish Executive
- Scottish Improvement Service
- St Helens Council
- West Devon BC
- West Midlands Regional Data and Intelligence Network
- Wolverhampton City Council

EURIM sub group members:

- Atkins PLC
- Bird and Bird
- LogicaCMG
- SOCITM

Appendix D References

L. Bennett, Government Computing July / August 07 The Trust Factor

'Information sharing: Practitioners' guide - Integrated working to improve outcomes for children and young people' DCSF(2006).

Varney's report to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Service Transformation: a Better Service For Citizens and Businesses, a Better Deal for Taxpayers (Dec 06)

Local Government Act (2006) Strong & Prosperous Communities

Establishing a Framework for Information Sharing (a structured approach) LeGSB March 06

Information Sharing Standards: Audit Tool & Levels 1, 2, 3 LeGSB March 06

Information Sharing Framework Documents: Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 LeGSB March 06

www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/resources and practices