

# Scrutiny Board

21 July 2015

<b>Report title</b>	Information Governance performance – quarter four 2014/15 and year end	
<b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b>	Councillor Paul Sweet Governance	
<b>Wards affected</b>	All	
<b>Accountable director</b>	Kevin O’Keefe, Governance	
<b>Originating service</b>	Democracy	
<b>Accountable employee(s)</b>	Adam Hadley	Group Manager - Democracy
	Tel	01902 555043
	Email	Adam.Hadley@wolverhampton.gov.uk
<b>Report to be/has been considered by</b>	Information Governance Board	28 May 2015
	SEB	2 June 2015
	Cabinet (Performance Management) Panel	15 June 2015

---

## Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Scrutiny Board is recommended to:

1. Review and comment on the quarter four and year end performance for Information Governance
2. Recommend any further action that may be necessary

## **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 To report on the performance of Information Governance for quarter four (January – March 2015) and year end.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) conducted consensual audits of the Council in October 2011 and July 2012.
- 2.2 The October 2011 audit covered requests for personal data and requests made under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI). The ICO's subsequent overall opinion was that there was a very limited assurance that processes and procedures were in place and being adhered to.
- 2.3 The ICO carried out a further audit on 19 July 2012 to measure the extent to which Wolverhampton City Council had implemented the agreed recommendations and identify any subsequent change to the level of assurance previously given. This was based on an update provided in March 2012 and subsequent management information. The ICO raised the Council's status from Red "Very Limited Assurance" to Amber "Limited Assurance" as an acknowledgement that progress had been made.
- 2.4 The Council provided a final management update to the ICO on 20 December 2012, after which the ICO confirmed that the audit process has been brought to a conclusion. Throughout 2013, work has continued to ensure that a strategic approach is adopted to how the Council manages information assets.
- 2.5 In February 2014 the ICO has asked for further updates on our progress, as a result of information incidents the Council is managing. The Council was then placed under an enforcement notice to achieve 100% of employees having undertaken the mandatory 'protecting information training'.
- 2.6 In June 2014 the Council complied with the enforcement notice and achieved 100% of employees completing the 'protecting information' training.
- 2.7 In order to ensure ongoing improvements with information governance this report outlines current performance for Information Governance. This report reflects the previous Council structure and future performance reports will reflect the new Council structure.

## **3.0 Progress**

- 3.1 This is contained in appendix A and B.

## **4.0 Financial implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications associated with the recommendation in this report as Councillors are requested to review the progress made on information governance.
- 4.2 It is worth noting, however, that a failure to effectively manage information governance carries a financial risk. Inaccurate and out of date information can lead to poor decision making and a potential waste of financial resources. In addition to this, poor information governance can actually result in a fine of up to £500,000 from the ICO.

[GE/07072015/S]

## **5.0 Legal implications**

- 5.1 The Council has a legal duty under the Data Protection Act 1998, Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 to appropriately manage and protect information assets.
- 5.2 The integration of Public Health into the Council in April 2012 required the Council to provide assurance to the NHS that it had in place suitable Information Governance policies, procedures and processes.
- 5.3 Failure to effectively manage information governance could increase risk of exposure to fraud and malicious acts, reputational damage, an inability to recover from major incidents and potential harm to individuals or groups due to inappropriate disclosure of information.
- 5.4 The Information Commissioner has the legal authority to:
- Fine organisations up to £500,000 per breach of the Data Protection Act or Privacy & Electronic Communication Regulations
  - Conduct assessments to check organisations are complying with the Act
  - Serve Enforcement Notices and 'stop now' orders where there has been a breach of the Act, requiring organisations to take (or refrain from taking) specified steps in order to ensure they comply with the law
  - Prosecute those who commit criminal offences under section 55 of the Act
  - Conduct audits to assess whether organisations processing of personal data follows good practice
  - Report issues of concern to Parliament.

[RB/08072015/P]

## **6.0 Equalities implications**

- 6.1 There are no equality implications arising from this report and its recommendations.
- 6.2 Existing information governance policies and procedures are due for review and will undergo an initial equality analysis screening and full analysis if appropriate.

## **7.0 Environmental implications**

7.1 There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

## **8.0 Human resources implications**

8.1 All employees are required to comply with Information Governance legislation and are required to complete the mandatory 'protecting information training'.

## **9.0 Corporate landlord implications**

9.1 There are no corporate landlord implications arising from this report.

## **10.0 Schedule of background papers**

10.1 Performance reporting report to Information Governance Board – 15 June 2015.

10.2 Update on Information Governance report to Cabinet – 26 March 2014