National Records of Scotland

The Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011

Quality Meat Scotland

Progress Update Review (PUR) Final Report by the PRSA Assessment Team

11 December 2017

Contents

1. Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011

The Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011 (the Act) received Royal Assent on 20 April 2011. It is the first new public records legislation in Scotland since 1937 and came into force on 1 January 2013. Its primary aim is to promote efficient and accountable record keeping by named Scottish public authorities.

The Act has its origins in *The Historical Abuse Systemic Review: Residential Schools and Children's Homes in Scotland 1950-1995* (The Shaw Report) published in 2007. The Shaw Report recorded how its investigations were hampered by poor recordkeeping and found that thousands of records had been created, but were then lost due to an inadequate legislative framework and poor records management. Crucially, it demonstrated how former residents of children's homes were denied access to information about their formative years. The Shaw Report demonstrated that management of records in all formats (paper and electronic) is not just a bureaucratic process, but central to good governance and should not be ignored. A follow-up review of public records legislation by the Keeper of the Records of Scotland (the Keeper) found further evidence of poor records management across the public sector. This resulted in the passage of the Act by the Scottish Parliament in March 2011.

The Act requires a named authority to prepare and implement a records management plan (RMP) which must set out proper arrangements for the management of its records. A plan must clearly describe the way the authority cares for the records that it creates, in any format, whilst carrying out its business activities. The RMP must be agreed with the Keeper and regularly reviewed.

2. Progress Update Review (PUR) Mechanism

Under section 5(1) & (2) of the Act the Keeper may only require a review of an authority's agreed RMP to be undertaken not earlier than five years after the date on which the authority's RMP was last agreed. Regardless of whether an authority has successfully achieved its goals identified in its RMP or continues to work towards them, the minimum period of five years before the Keeper can require a review of a RMP does not allow for continuous progress to be captured and recognised.

The success of the Act to date is attributable to a large degree to meaningful communication between the Keeper, the Assessment Team, and named public authorities. Consultation with Key Contacts has highlighted the desirability of a mechanism to facilitate regular, constructive dialogue between stakeholders and the Assessment Team. Many authorities have themselves recognised that such regular communication is necessary to keep their agreed plans up to date following inevitable organisational change. Following meetings between authorities and the Assessment Team, a reporting mechanism through which progress and local initiatives can be acknowledged and reviewed by the Assessment Team was proposed. Key Contacts have expressed the hope that through submission of regular updates, the momentum generated by the Act can continue to be sustained at all levels within authorities.

The PUR self-assessment review mechanism was developed in collaboration with stakeholders and was formally announced in the Keeper's Annual Report published on 12 August 2016. The completion of the PUR process enables authorities to be credited for the progress they are effecting and to receive constructive advice concerning on-going developments. Engaging with this mechanism will not only maintain the spirit of the Act by encouraging senior management to recognise the need for good records management practices, but will also help authorities comply with their statutory obligation under section 5(1)(a) of the Act to keep their RMP under review.

3. Executive Summary

This Final Report sets out the findings of the Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011 (the Act) Assessment Team's consideration of the Progress Update template submitted for **Quality Meat Scotland**. The outcome of the assessment and relevant feedback can be found under sections 6 – 8.

4. Authority Background

Quality Meat Scotland (QMS) is the public body responsible for helping the Scottish red meat sector improve its efficiency and profitability, and maximise its contribution to Scotland's economy.

QMS market the PGI labelled Scotch Beef and Scotch Lamb brands in the UK and abroad and promote Scottish pork products under the Specially Selected Pork Banner. Their assurance schemes cover more than 90% of livestock farmed for meat in Scotland and offer consumers the legal guarantee that the meat they buy has come from animals that have spent their whole lives being raised to some of the world's strictest standards.

Scotland's beef, lamb and pork producers make an important contribution to the country's rural economy, contributing over £1,500m to the annual GDP of Scotland and supporting in excess of 30,000 jobs in the farming, agricultural supply, and processing sectors.

5. Assessment Process

A PUR submission is evaluated by the Act's Assessment Team. The self-assessment process invites authorities to complete a template and send it to the Assessment Team one year after the date of agreement of its RMP and every year thereafter. The self-assessment template highlights where an authority's plan achieved agreement on an improvement basis and invites updates under those 'Amber' elements. However, it also provides an opportunity for authorities not simply to report on progress against

improvements, but to comment on any new initiatives, highlight innovations, or record changes to existing arrangements under those elements that had attracted an initial 'Green' score in their original RMP submission.

The assessment report considers statements made by an authority under the elements of its agreed Plan that included improvement models. It reflects any changes and/or progress made towards achieving full compliance in those areas where agreement under improvement was made in the Keeper's Assessment Report of their RMP. The PUR assessment report also considers statements of further progress made in elements already compliant under the Act.

Engagement with the PUR mechanism for assessment cannot alter the Keeper's Assessment Report of an authority's agreed RMP or any RAG assessment within it. Instead the PUR Final Report records the Assessment Team's evaluation of the submission and its opinion on the progress being made by the authority since agreeing its RMP. The team's assessment provides an informal indication of what marking an authority could expect should it submit a revised RMP to the Keeper under the Act, although such assessment is made without prejudice to the Keeper's right to adopt a different marking at that stage.

Key:

| G | The Assessment Team agrees this element of an authority's plan. | | A | The Assessment Team agrees this element of an authority's progress update submission as an 'improvement model'. This means that they are convinced of the authority's commitment to closing a gap in | | R | There is a serious gap in provision for this element with no clear explanation of how this will be addressed. The Assessment Team may choose to notify the Keeper on |

   			 	provision. They will request that they are updated as work on this element progresses.	 	this basis.

6. Records Management Plan Elements: Checklist

Quality Meat Scotland
(Hereafter 'QMS')

Element	Status of elements under agreed Plan, October 2014	Status of evidence under agreed Plan, October 2014	Progress assessment status, 2017	Keeper's Report Comments on Authority's Plan, October 2014	Self-assessment Update as submitted by the Authority since October 2014	Progress Review Comment, 2017
1. Senior Officer	G	G	G	Update required on any change	No change.	No immediate action required. Update required on any change
2. Records Manager	G	G	G	Update required on any change	Lisa Wilson taken on role on 19/9/2016 on retirement of previous manager	The Assessment Team thanks the authority for notification of the change of

						personnel under this element and for the forwarding of Ms Wilson's contact details. The Team have been informed that the day to day management of records forms part of Ms Wilson's job description. In the event of any future statutory assessment the Keeper will require sight of evidence such as a covering letter signed by the senior officer identifying Ms Wilson as the individual responsible for operational responsibility for implementing the RMP.
3. Policy	**G**	**G**	**G**	Update required on any change	No change.	No immediate action required. Update required on any change.
4. Business Classification	**G**	**G**	**G**	Update required on any change	No change.	No immediate action required. Update required on any change.
5. Retention	**G**	**G**	**G**	Update required on any change. The Keeper	Retention schedule reviewed by senior	Regular reviews of key policies such as retention

| Schedule | | | | commends the authority's commitment to review its Retention Schedule in March 2015 and annually thereafter. The Keeper would welcome updates concerning these reviews | managers annually. Latest review 11 July 2017 and schedule of actions retained | schedules are vital to ensure that such policies remain accurate and relevant and helps guarantee that disposal/archival decisions for each series of records continue to be appropriate.

The Assessment Team therefore applaud the annual reviews undertaken by QMS and particularly commend the involvement of senior management. Should significant changes to the retention schedule occur as a result of these reviews, the Team would welcome sight of any revised documentation.

The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element. |
| 6. Destruction Arrangements | **G** | **G** | **G** | Update required on any change | No change | No immediate action required. Update required on any change |

| | G | G | G | Update required on any change. The Keeper requests that once the MoU has been agreed he is sent a copy of the MoU for inclusion in QMS' evidence package. | No change.

Agreed to work with NRS over web continuity service | The Assessment Team thanks QMS for the submission in April 2015 of a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding signed by Stuart Ashworth of QMS and Laura Mitchell, Deputy Keeper of NRS. The Team agrees that NRS is a suitable place of deposit for records identified by QMS as worthy of permanent preservation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Archiving and Transfer | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | QMS also continue to demonstrate a strong level of compliance under this element through their engagement with NRS over web archiving and continuity. This is a reasonably new field of digital archiving but it is clear from this submission that QMS are adopting a proactive approach to the archiving of content on their website. The Client Management Team has confirmed the current status of this project. However the Assessment Team would be |

	G	G	G			pleased to receive further updates in future PUR assessments as work continues in this area. The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element.
8. Information Security	G	G	G	Update required on any change	No Change. Staff attended Cyber security briefing Sept 2017. Plans in place to review situation alongside implications of GDPR	With the increased risk posed to public authorities by cyber-attacks, as reflected by the ransomware attacks earlier this year, the Team applauds the attendance of QMS staff at a cyber-security briefing in September. This reflects the authority's compliance with the expectations of the Keeper's Model Plan that all staff should be aware of information security threats and policies. The Team similarly commend the proactive approach being taken in respect to the implementation of the

						General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in May 2018. Although the exact requirements of GDPR have not yet been finalised, it is recommended that authorities develop plans at an early stage to review the business areas and practices likely to be affected. Should these reviews lead to significant changes in information security arrangements the Team would like sight of any relevant new documentation. The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element.
9. Data Protection	G	G	G	Update required on any change	No change, Staff reviewing requirements ahead of GDPR	As with Element 8, the Assessment Team recognise the initiative of QMS to review staff requirements under the upcoming GDPR legislation in regards to data protection. As

						the new Regulation will likely have a notable impact on how authorities handle sensitive personal data, the Team would be pleased to learn of any new policies or guidelines created by QMS in future PUR submissions. The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element.
10. Business Continuity and Vital Records	**G**	**G**	**G**	Update required on any change	No change.	No immediate action required. Update required on any change.
11. Audit Trail	**G**	**G**	**G**	Audit notes are applied to files which track the movement of records/documents from and to that file. The Keeper would like to know if there is a similar way of tracking the file as a whole. The Keeper agrees that QMS has properly considered the provision of audit trail	No change. Paper records continue to be accompanied by a 'Document Tracker' form (attached as evidence), whilst file naming guidance is in place for electronic records. Restrictions on access to high-level corporate electronic records are in place to prevent	The Assessment Team thank QMS for supplying their 'Document Tracker' form which accompanies paper documents. This document enables the authority to identify where such records are, with whom, and when returned. The Team have received clarification that this

				functionality in its record keeping systems provided he sees the guidance document and receives clarification regarding the tracking of files	unauthorised access and movement.	form can be used to track and record the movement of both files and individual documents removed from those files (although access is largely granted at the file level). The Team commends this approach as helping ensure that an audit trail can be applied to all paper records. There is also guidance to ensure that staff engage in the consistent naming of electronic files and that version control is applied to all relevant documents. This is commended by the Assessment Team. The use of administrator rights to restrict access to high-level corporate records to authorised individuals is similarly regarded as good practice. The Assessment Team received sight of the guidance issued to staff to ensure a

						consistent approach to file naming in September 2014. The Team thanks QMC for supplying this information. The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element.
12. Competency Framework	G	G	G	Update required on any change. The Keeper commends QMS' commitment to staff training and would be pleased to receive news of the planned day of records management training conducted by the individual named under Element 2.	QMS is a single office site with a staff of 20 FTE. Records management training is provided on an ad hoc basis rather than formal basis. Records management is covered in staff induction and staff handbook – particularly computer security, electronic files structure and document labelling. Induction process is to be reviewed in next six months, including records management support	QMS demonstrates an on-going commitment under this element to provide staff with targeted, specific training in records management. This is reflected in the inclusion of records management topics such as IT security and document naming within staff induction and the staff handbook. This will help ensure the on-going recognition amongst staff that records management exists as a separate and crucial function within the authority. As the induction process is to be reviewed in the

						forthcoming months the Team would be pleased to receive updates on any changes that occur, particularly where these have an impact upon records management support.

Although the Team would recommend a structured approach of regular, formal training sessions, they recognise that due to the size of this authority this may not be suitable.

The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element. |
| 13. Assessment and Review | **G** | **G** | **G** | The RMP states that it will be reviewed annually by senior management. The Keeper would welcome further details as to how the RMP will be reviewed and which tools will be used to measure compliance with the | RMP reviewed annually by senior managers last reviewed 11th July 2017. See also comment for element 5. | Regular internal reviews of an authority's RMP and key supporting policies is vital to ensure that records management arrangements remain appropriate and that they continue to be complied with throughout the authority. |

				requirements of the RMP.		
						The Assessment Team are therefore pleased to hear that the RMP is reviewed on an annual basis. It is especially laudable that such reviews are conducted by senior managers. This helps highlight the importance of records management and ensures that staff observe the requirements of the authority's agreed Plan. Should such reviews prompt significant changes to the Plan or accompanying policies the Team would like to be updated on these changes. The Assessment Team recognises the on-going initiative being undertaken by the authority under this element.
14. Shared Information	G	G	G	Update required on any change	No change.	No immediate action required. Update required on any change

Version

The progress update submission which has been assessed is the one received by the Assessment Team on 05 October 2017. The author of the progress update submission is Stuart Ashworth, Head of Economics Services.

The progress update submission makes it clear that it is a submission for **Quality Meat Scotland**.

7. PRSA Assessment Team's Summary

The Assessment Team has reviewed **Quality Meat Scotland** Progress Update submission and agrees that the proper record management arrangements outlined by the fourteen elements in the authority's plan continue to be properly considered. The Assessment Team commends this authority's efforts to keep its Records Management Plan under review.

General Comments

Quality Meat Scotland continues to recognise the importance of ensuring that their records management arrangements remain relevant and fit for purpose. This is reflected in the reviews undertaken of both the RMP and supporting policies and documents such as the retention schedule in July 2017. It is important to recognise that such reviews have prompted actions to be taken to update provisions in these areas.

Similarly commendable is the recognition by this authority of the need to consider the implications of the upcoming General Data Protection Regulation, particularly on arrangements in elements 8 and 9 (Information Security and Data Protection). Should the reviews being undertaken by the authority lead to significant changes in practice the Assessment Team would welcome updates in future PUR assessments.

Where 'no change' has been recorded under the update on provision by the authority, the Assessment Team is happy to agree that these elements require no further action for the time being.

8. PRSA Assessment Team's Evaluation

Based on the progress update assessment the Assessment Team considers that **Quality Meat Scotland** continue to take their statutory obligations seriously and are working hard to maintain all elements of their records management arrangements in full compliance with the Act and fulfil the Keeper's expectations.

- The Assessment Team recommends authorities consider publishing PUR assessment reports on their websites as an example of continued good practice both within individual authorities and across the sector.

This report follows the Public Records (Scotland) Act Assessment Team's review carried out by,

…………………………

Neil Adams
Public Records Officer