



In support of

Fame

Workstream 1

1.1.2 FAME National reference group report (Second Meeting)

Purpose

To QA project plan, product descriptors and sign off FAME products as they become available

Author: Julie Brown, Programme Manager, Regional Centre for Excellence NE

Date: 20 June 2006



FAME : a practical framework for working in Multi-agency environments.

Introduction

This is the report of the second FAME User Reference Group held on 14th June 2006 at Russell Square House, Russell Square, London. The group was chaired by Julie Brown, Programme Manager of the Regional Centre for Excellence North East and was convened with the overall aim of the process being:

“To QA project plan, product descriptors and sign off FAME products as they become available”

The summary report is presented in five parts:

- introduction
- structure of the user reference group
- aims of the user reference group
- comments on the Work Stream Products 1 and 2
- summary of the discussion between participants and the project team
- way ahead and next steps

Structure of the User reference group

The agenda of the URG covered

- Introductions
- Aims of the URG meeting
- Brief history of FAME
- Introduction to FAME 3 Project
- WS 1 and 2 Product Presentations and Discussions
- Summary and next steps

The structure of the product presentation and discussions followed the outline below:

- Chair introduced the Product
- Presentation/Report from the Product lead
- Discussion
- Chair Summary and Sign off

Aims of the User Reference Group

The URG was convened to:

- Explain the context of FAME
- Engage potential stakeholders
- QA and Sign off products of the FAME project
- Agree a QA strategy for the remaining products
- Produce the elements of the report of the meeting and distribute for comments

Comments on the overall project

The group received a presentation from the FAME team about the history of the project and the current context. The group responded positively overall, asked for some clarifications on some points including the relationship between FAME and Government Connect; the progress of Government Connect and made the following comments:

“good to see that its really progressed from the first URG meeting”

“would like to link up with FAME and discuss the potential learning from the Northumberland 101 and Hampshire 101 partnership”

“prior to today only thought FAME was Social Services project – we need to promote its generic approach”

A summary of the evaluation forms completed by participants of the user reference group is attached as Appendix A, whilst specific comments on the products are documented in the following sections.

The project team would whole-heartedly like to thank all URG attendees for their insightful comments. The comments made by URG attendees are shown in italics against each FAME product in the tables below followed by the project team's response.

Comments on the Product reports: Workstreams 1 and 2

WS 1 – Engagement and Capacity Building

The group received a presentation from the FAME team of the following products

Product Name and number	Comments and responses	Product Signed Off?
1.1.1 FAME National engagement activity and Information sharing workshop	<p><i>How are you gauging the effect of the national stakeholder activity?</i></p> <p>The engagement activity is partially reliant on the policy development cycle which is operating at different speeds in different places (for instance MISC 31 did not exist when we started the third phase of the project). We feel we have made significant progress in the 8 months project period. Two ways of gauging effects – one people change the way they communicate about the issue (both in speech and writing) and second they come back and ask our advice</p> <p><i>Relationships with other project e.g SNEN 101 programme</i></p> <p>FAME has a good relationship with the 101 team based in DCLG and would welcome such a forum and open to helping set something up at an</p>	Yes, subject to comments made

Product Name and number	Comments and responses	Product Signed Off?
	<p>appropriate point</p> <p><i>Importance of linking to new and emerging stakeholders e.g CIO Council and Care Services Efficiency Delivery team</i></p> <p>Keen to continue to work with the Cabinet Office and others initiatives such as MISC 31 to support and further the Information sharing and Shared Services agenda. FAME is presenting to Society of IT Management's Information Age Group in July where a number of key stakeholders will be present</p>	
1.1.2 FAME User reference group activity	No specific comments made	Yes
1.2.1 Reviewed output from Regional Symposium	<p><i>Why was FAME info sharing on NE RCE agenda but not others?</i></p> <p>NECE and NEC are reporting into their respective national networks about the learning coming from the FAME project on information sharing</p>	Yes
1.2.1 Regional Data Survey	<p><i>Was any work done on metrics of transactions between local authorities to support the building of business cases?</i></p> <p>This was out of the scope of the project but should be taken forward under an appropriate context e.g. the National RCEs group</p>	Yes
1.2.2 Infrastructure Vehicles	<p><i>Are you getting a view as to whether regional, sub-regional or other grouping is more appropriate?</i></p> <p>FAME avoids being prescriptive in this way to support a broad a potential use of the tools as possible. It is an organic approach. The FAME tools need to work and be used to encourage and not to limit.</p>	Yes
1.2.3 Updated Readiness Assessment Tool	<p><i>This is a really good document. Need for sustainability and consultancy to support LA in completing. Very useful doc for partnership review</i></p> <p><i>The RAT could do with a summary para</i></p>	Yes, subject to comments

Product Name and number	Comments and responses	Product Signed Off?
	<p><i>and shorter sentences in places to support understanding - how are different agency strategies addressed in RAT (in Strategy/Policy leadership?)</i></p> <p>A specific change has been made to the RAT to address this point.</p> <p>The RAT is mounted on the FAME website interactively and linked through to the Framework guidance. However we will explore the potential for a paper-based version</p> <p><i>The potential role of RCEs and E-government partnerships in supporting dissemination and use is potentially huge?</i></p> <p>We are keen to work with RCEs and E-government partnerships in future developments and dissemination of the FAME tools</p>	
1.2.3 Updated FAME Generic Framework guidance	<p><i>I can see the relationship between the Framework material and the RAT very well. Is there a need for case studies (e.g. is Derbyshire doing things in a FAME-like way?) to emphasise the points and show how it has made a difference?</i></p> <p>The website does have a number of case studies of organisations using the FAME tools including the RAT and Framework, however further case studies were out of scope of this phase of FAME. From what we know the Derbyshire approach appears aligned with what FAME is describing in its technical vision.</p> <p><i>Can we have documents written in Plain English and shorter sentences?</i></p> <p>Document authors will seek to continually improve documentation in line with this feedback.</p>	Yes

WS 2 Regional Reference Implementation

The group received a presentation from the FAME team of the following products:

Product Name and number	Comments and responses	Product Signed Off?
2.1.1 Identity of Likely Regional Contexts	No specific comments made	Yes
2.1.1 Assessment of policy and practice SNEN, ECM and Infrastructure	No specific comments made	Draft product presented
2.1.2 FAME Supplier Engagement	<p><i>Useful supplier engagement activity could be made through the Government Connect suppliers groups and the LGIP</i></p> <p>We are working with the LA Integration Practice on supplier events and hope to work with Government Connect and LeGSB in the near future on these agendas</p>	Draft product presented
2.2.1 Learning Evaluation	No specific comments made	Yes
2.2.2 FAME Demonstrator	<p><i>This is brilliant – it explains the FAME concepts and technical infrastructures really well. We need this to understand the relationships between different aspects of the e-government and service development programme. It's going to be a slow process but this really could help</i></p> <p>We are keen to see the Demonstrator widely used beyond the SNEN, e-CAF, Revenues and Benefits and current Infrastructure contexts</p>	Yes
2.2.3 FAME Roadmap	<p><i>Is the Roadmap going to be given to other regions?</i></p> <p>The development of the Roadmap was to inform the understanding of the requirements to meet the bigger picture using the example of the NE. We would be keen for other regions to use the structure of the Roadmap rather than the specific content of the NE as it will be different in another region.</p>	Draft product presented
1.3, 2.1.2 and 2.3.1 Sustainable Capacity Building: including CPD and Accredited courses	<p><i>We also need CPD training for elected members as well as service and ICT people</i></p> <p>It's a good point we will pick up on that in our plans for a future phase.</p>	Draft products presented

Way Ahead and Next Steps

Amendments will be made to the draft products in light of the constructive feedback and circulated to user reference group attendees for any further comments and final user reference group sign off.

All of the products will then be presented to the Project Board on 19th July 2006 for final approval and sign off. This will conclude the end of this phase of the FAME project.

Appendix A - FAME USER REFERENCE GROUP - 14th June 2006

Feedback

		Not at All	Partly	Mostly	Totally
1	I found the event relevant and useful		1	4	4
2	I was given ample opportunity to make a contribution			1	7
3	The venue was comfortable and suitable for this event		1	2	6
4	I understand the role of FAME project		2	7	

TOTAL OF FEEDBACK FORMS RECEIVED

9

	Yes	No	"Already on" mail list
5	7		2

Additional Comments

Do you have any comments or suggestions that you were not able to put forward during the event?

C1 I am not entirely clear as yet about plans for roll out implementation post the end of the funded project, and what that means for our work at EMCE

C2 Contact Mike Martin re closer working with GC register in demonstrating it to different audiences.

Do you have any more general comments or queries to which you would like FAME to respond? (if yes please ensure we have your contact details)

C1 Not yet convinced about the sustainability of the work or the delivery mechanism to agencies and local authorities.

C2 If you consider your audiences in distributing the products it would be helpful e.g. collect documents together as appropriate for tech and business managers, specialists so that I can forward for comment to each. Be sure to have introductory emails to each set.

If you would like to share information with FAME, for the benefit of partner organisations, about any specific projects or strategies that your organisation is undertaking then please do so in the space below.

C1 Just to confirm that Derby City Council have developed a strategic framework to support their vision of multi-agency working which is supported by clear and robust standards which if this team haven't already reviewed it may be useful to do so

C2 We are developing an enterprise architecture that needs a context. FAME concepts are key to that context.

FAME Partnership

Partnership working in the North East under North East Connects includes:



North East Connects: Andrew De'Ath



North East Centre of Excellence: David Wright and Julie Brown



Newcastle City Council: Ray Ward and Carol Wade



Newcastle University: Rob Wilson, Mike Martin and Roger Vaughan

