



## END PROGRAMME REPORT

**Project name** *Seamless Flow Programme*

---

**Release** Date: May 2008

---

**Author:** Programme Manager

**Owner:** Senior Responsible Owner (SRO)

**Client:** The National Archives (TNA)

## Document History

---

**Document Location** Hard copy versions of this document are only valid on the day that they are printed

This document can be accessed here: *[insert Objective link]*

The Objective file path for this document is: *[quote Objective file path]*

---

**Revision History** Date of next revision:

Revision date	Previous revision date	Summary of Changes	Changes marked
7 April 2008		Initial draft	No
2 May		Updated with feedback	No

---

Role	Form of Approval	Version	Location
SRO	e-mail	0.2	<i>Insert Objective link here</i>
Programme Manager	e-mail	0.2	<i>Insert Objective link here</i>
Programme Board	Minutes	0.2	

---

Title	Role	Date of Issue	Version
Project Support Office	e-mail		

---

## Purpose

---

To record how well the project has performed against its Project Initiation Document.

---

**Contents** This publication contains the following topics:

<b>Topic</b>	<b>See Page</b>
Project objectives	2
Changes	4
Quality work	4
Post-project review	5

---

## **Project objectives**

---

**Achievement of the project's objectives** Main Objective :

The seamless flow programme is intended to ensure a seamless flow of electronic records from creation in Government Departments through their eventual preservation at the National Archives and delivery to the public over the Internet.

---

**Performance against planned target time, cost and project tolerances**

Project deliverable	Task name	Who	Finish	Status @ April 2008 Completed / outstanding / ongoing
1	A critical path study for high level processes			Completed
2	An information flow model			Completed
3	Requirements analysis			Completed
4	A high-level system design			Completed
5	Confirmation of constituent projects for phase 2 and the products and processes relating to each			Completed
6	A detailed description of the work required in Phase two			Completed
7	A full cost estimate, resource need and timescale for each project build			Completed
8	The individual projects will implement automation in the following processes:			Completed
8a	Appraisal and selection/Departmental FOI activities			Completed
8b	Resource discovery			Completed
8c	Metadata and Cataloguing			Ongoing
8d	Management of survival of semi-current records in the Departments			Passed to Digital Continuity
8e	Transfer to TNA			Completed
8f	Preservation and maintenance (enhancements to Digital Archive to allow file migration)			Completed
8g	Technology watch, covering : 1. Technology changes in Departments 2. Readability of files within the Digital Archive to trigger file migration 3. Delivery technology			Ongoing
8h	Delivery & Presentation			Deferred

---

## Changes

---

**Statistics on  
change  
issues  
received** N/A

---

**Total impact  
of approved  
changes** N/A

---

## Quality

---

**Statistics for  
all quality  
work carried  
out** N/A

## Post-project review

**Date** October 2008 – PSO owner

---

## Current Position

### Outstanding Deliverables

- Lessons Learned Log - in progress
- Transition Strategy
  - Drafted Transition to Business as Usual Strategy for Board
- No 8c
  - Awaiting sign off for CR25 (cataloguing workflows)
  - Awaiting sign off for CR27 (metadata)
- No 8g
  - Final sign off after UAT
- No 8h
  - Revised scope and timescales

### Risk Register

- No 19 - Other business operations may conflict with the introduction of SF - may result in loss of focus, such as, 30 year review and possible paper mountain
  - Closed – escalated to Strategic Risk Register
- NO 20 - Lack of resources - manpower, skills - may result in TNA unable to deliver full SF system to schedule
  - Closed
- No 35 - Ongoing departmental reorganisation could threaten the ability of OGDs to be part of the initial transfer roll-out. The target of 6 departments by end March 2008 may be under threat
  - Closed – Business Change Project
- No 2 - TNA unable to control quality of record and metadata may result in poor quality of resource discovery
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 38 - At the close of the programme new processes may not automatically become 'business as usual'
  - Closed – transition to business as usual strategy compiled
- No 39 - Lack of key staff succession planning may result in Business Owner failing to realise benefits
  - Closed – risk transferred to RMCD – Business Continuity Working Group
- No 33 - Technical solution not available / identified for metadata transfer which would result in a less automated solution being adopted which would have adverse effects on staff levels
  - Closed – RMCD / DPD
- No 6 - Lack of adequate stakeholder management may lead to a poor reception of programme eg client side application, buy-in to process, unrealistic expectations and general lack of awareness
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 1 - TNA may receive records more quickly than planned. For example by decision to archive being based on technology change in departments or by impact of FOI - may result in inability to manage demand
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 29 - Copyright issues (moved from Issue log no.80) A way forward has been agreed but there is an element of risk associated with this. This needs to be managed.
  - Closed – web content manager
- No 8 - Seamless Flow becomes technology rather than business driven which may result in non business friendly outcomes
  - Closed – Transition strategy – business as usual
- No 37 - OGDs may be unwilling to transfer recent material to TNA [transferred from Business Change Project Board 14/9/07]
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 22 - Poor staging of project elements means work undertaken becomes invalid as another stage of the project progresses
  - Closed

## Risk Register cont'd

- No 27 - Costs may act as a disincentive to OGDs to adopt GSI
  - Closed – Business Change Project
- No 36 - Resource demands for FOI exemption / appraisal of electronic records may deter OGDs from undertaking this work at this time. They may prefer to defer this by utilising the Digital Continuity facility
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 34 - The delivery of spare off site DA tape by courier - could result in tapes being lost or stolen
  - Closed – government courier
- No 9 - The survival of digital records in departments: Scope can be misunderstood as not covering ultimate disposal of all records in a controlled way. (18/4/05) There are differences in standards within Departments.
  - Closed – Digital Continuity

## Issues Log

- No 37 - When / how do we get departmental buy-in to Seamless Flow?
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 78 - Seamless Flow needs to plan for a (costly) duplicate test environment
  - Closed – action underway
- No 35 - How do we get updates from OGDs of their semi-current records inventory, format usage, etc?
  - Closed – Digital Continuity
- No 81 - Data Protection - unsure how to deal with embedded data in documents on web
  - Closed – HD procedure business as usual
- No 79 - There is a need to identify the management reporting needs which would be allocated to individual projects e.g. how many records are in pipeline, upcoming size and nature of records, problems with preservation or migration of records, number of records successfully delivered in agreed period etc.
  - Closed – outstanding transfer to Technical Working Group
- No 87 - Possible mixed messages from Seamless Flow and Digital Continuity (Digital Preservation) could lead to OGDs confusion with SLF objectives
  - Closed
- No 39 - Organisational change due to a need for specialised staff – issues arising out of the change from lots of jobs to handle paper (e.g. in RMCD) to few jobs to handle digital records (e.g. IT skills)
  - Closed – Business Change Project
- No 69 - How do we handle certified copies in the electronic world?
  - Closed – RMCD
- No 30 - How far will new appraisal techniques affect the nature of "cataloguing" and "the orderable unit"? There is a need for the catalogues to be aware of the needs of appraisal.
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 32 - Potential for too much effort required in the final appraisal validation
  - Closed – RMCD business as usual
- No 21 - How do we resolve file size issue with respect to presentation to the user?
  - Closed – Delivery and Presentation Project
- No 24 - How should we handle the receipt of duplicates?
  - Closed - RMCD
- No 25 - How should we handle non-availability of external links, say for a website?
  - Closed – Technical Working group

## Outstanding Project Tasks

No	Tasks	Finish Date	Owner
	None		