

OFFICIAL

# JESIP Doctrine Review: Call for Evidence

## ANNEX B – Technical Annex

**Chris Dingle**  
**National Delivery Manager**  
**4<sup>th</sup> June 2026**





## Technical Annex

### Evidence Submission Guidance for Academic and Assurance Bodies

#### JESIP Joint Doctrine Review (Version 4)

##### A1. Purpose of this Annex

This Technical Annex provides additional guidance for **academic institutions, inspectorates, regulators, and assurance bodies** responding to the JESIP Call for Evidence.

It is intended to:

- support the submission of **methodologically robust evidence**,
- enable consistent appraisal of assurance and inspection findings, and
- ensure the doctrine review is informed by **credible, transparent, and reproducible sources of evidence**.

This annex should be read alongside the main Call for Evidence and Consultation Questions.

##### A2. Intended Respondents

This annex is primarily aimed at:

- academic researchers and research institutions,
- professional bodies and standards organisations,
- inspectorates and regulators (e.g. HMICFRS, CQC, internal assurance functions),
- policy analysis and evaluation units,
- research working groups and evidence partnerships.

Respondents may submit evidence in an organisational, independent, or academic capacity.





### **A3. Types of Evidence Sought**

The doctrine review welcomes a broad range of evidence types, including but not limited to:

#### **A3.1 Academic and Research Evidence**

- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Research reports and systematic reviews
- PhD, MSc, or equivalent theses (where relevant)
- Funded research outputs or evaluation studies

#### **A3.2 Assurance and Inspection Evidence**

- Thematic inspection findings
- Assurance frameworks and assessments
- Audit reports and maturity models
- Synthesised learning from multiple inspections

#### **A3.3 Evaluation and Analysis**

- Programme or policy evaluations
- Comparative or longitudinal studies
- Cross-sector or international comparisons
- Evidence syntheses or meta-analyses

Respondents should clearly indicate the **evidence type**, **date**, and **context** in which it was produced.





#### **A4. Methodological Transparency**

To support proportional and consistent consideration, respondents are encouraged to address the following where applicable:

**A4.** What methodology was used to generate the evidence (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, mixed-methods)?

**A5.** What was the scale and scope of the evidence base (e.g. sample size, geographic coverage, case selection)?

**A6.** What limitations, caveats, or constraints should be considered when interpreting the findings?

Where full methodological detail is lengthy, an executive summary or link to published material is sufficient.

#### **A5. Relevance to JESIP Doctrine**

Respondents are asked to explicitly link evidence to its relevance for **multi-agency interoperability doctrine**, including:

**A7.** Which elements of the current JESIP doctrine (v3.1) are supported, challenged, or contradicted by the evidence?

**A8.** Does the evidence relate to:

- doctrine clarity or usability?
- consistency of interpretation or application?
- decision-making or information-sharing?
- organisational or cultural enablers and barriers?

**A9.** Are findings context-specific, or likely to be generalisable across sectors or regions?





## **A6. Inspection, Regulation and Assurance Context**

Inspection and assurance bodies are encouraged to address:

**A10.** Are there recurring interoperability issues identified through inspection or assurance activity?

**A11.** To what extent are these issues attributable to:

- doctrine content or structure,
- interpretation or understanding,
- training and implementation, or
- wider system or organisational factors?

**A12.** Are there areas where JESIP doctrine appears to exceed, align with, or fall short of assurance expectations?

## **A7. Evidence-Led Improvement and Future Development**

In line with the Consultation Principles 2018, respondents are asked to focus on **evidence of effects**, rather than preferred solutions alone.

**A13.** Does the evidence indicate areas where doctrine amendment could reasonably be expected to improve outcomes?

**A14.** Are there unintended consequences or risks associated with existing doctrine requirements?

**A15.** Are there emerging academic, professional, or international developments that may be relevant to future interoperability doctrine?

## **A8. Use of Submitted Evidence**

Submitted evidence will be:

- reviewed and appraised by the JESIP team,
- synthesised into an **Evidence and Gap Analysis Report**, and
- considered by the Doctrine Review Steering Group when identifying drafting priorities.

Evidence will be weighed alongside operational input, practitioner testing, and consultation feedback. No single source will be determinative.





## **A9. Attribution, Publication and Ethics**

- Evidence will not be attributed without consent.
- Respondents should clearly state any **publication or attribution preferences**.
- Ethical approvals or governance arrangements relevant to the evidence should be noted where appropriate.

## **A10. Submission Format**

Evidence may be submitted as:

- attached documents (PDF, Word),
- links to published or publicly available material, or
- structured summaries with references.

Where multiple items are submitted, respondents are encouraged to provide a brief **cover note summarising relevance**.

## **A11. Contact and Further Engagement**

JESIP may seek further clarification or dialogue with respondents where this would support accurate interpretation of evidence.

Queries relating to this Technical Annex should be directed to:  
[contact@jesip.org.uk](mailto:contact@jesip.org.uk)

## **Closing Note**

This annex reflects JESIP's commitment to **proportionate, targeted and meaningful engagement**, consistent with the **Consultation Principles 2018**. Contributions from academic and assurance bodies are critical to ensuring that revised doctrine is robust, defensible and aligned with inspection and evidence expectations.

