Minutes of HEFESTIS Board Meeting held at 11:00 am on Wednesday 14 August 2019 by Skype.

Present

Brian Henderson (Chair)	University of Aberdeen
Andrew McCreath (AM)	HEFESTIS Ltd.
Kathy McCabe (KM)	Heriot-Watt University
James Morris (JM)	University of Dundee
Angus Allan (AA)	South Lanarkshire College
Lisa Clark (LC)	Glasgow Kelvin College
Nick Murton (NM)	Edinburgh College
Anne Jamieson (AJ)	Independent

In attendance

Angus Warren (AW)	APUC Ltd.
Jordan Schroeder (JS)	HEFESTIS Ltd (from agenda item 4)
Michael Caithness (MC)	Corporate Services, APUC Ltd

Welcome and Apologies

1   The Chair thanked everyone for attending and welcomed Anne Jamieson to the Board.

Minutes of the previous meeting on 19 March 2019

2   LC noted that Section 55 should read 'Register of Interest' and not 'Conflict of Interest' register.

3   Subject to this change being made, the minutes were approved for posting on the website. (**ACTION: MC**)

4   Chair commented that, with reference to item 5, there should be a process for reviewing the composition of the board. (**ACTION: AM, Chair**)

Matters Arising from the previous meeting

5   Chair noted that all but one of the matters arising from the previous meeting were complete and that item 50 (creation of a strategy) was on the agenda for this meeting.

Finance update

6   AM provided a summary of the current financial status of HEFESTIS as follows:

- Late payments by some member institutions remains an issue.
- However, enough funds are available to cover costs to the end of August, and further income is expected soon.
- A suggestion has been made that HEFESTIS should make a charge for late payment of invoices and this could be built into the charge structure with a matching discount being offered strictly for payment on time.

7   KM enquired if the late payments were a blip due to end of financial year effects or a longer-term issue and AM explained that it was an ongoing issue. Of £240k invoices issued in July for the CISO Share, only £28k has been paid to date. A further £50k was still outstanding for services provided in 2018-19. He added that 3 invoices were issued in July for DPOs and 2 of these have been paid to date.

8   Chair suggested that a letter should be sent to member institutions explaining the importance to the Company, and continuity of service, of receiving payments on time. (**ACTION: AM**)

9   JM suggested that Board members should expedite any outstanding payments from their own institutions to ensure that they are up to date. (**ACTION: Board**)

10   AM recommended that members should raise POs earlier to confirm their commitment, as a significant part of the issue on late payments was the requirement by institutions to have PO's, but their reluctance to issue them earlier.

11   NM suggested that the proposal for a late payment charge should be communicated to member institutions.

APUC Service Charge

12   AM explained the figures for the APUC service charge and the board were happy to approve them. He added that he would issue a revised budget in due course to reflect this. (**ACTION: AM**)

13   AW noted that the APUC service charge was slightly less than previously stated.

14   Chair noted that the budget would be reviewed after 1 year.

Relocation costs

15   AM notified the board that relocation costs will be incurred for a new DPO recruited from down south to work at City of Glasgow College. He noted that the cost would only be for actually incurred one off costs for relocation and not for commuting and asked if this type of expense should be shared across all DPOs.

16   KM enquired where recruitment costs were charged, and AW explained that they are part of the APUC service and standard for the APUC HR process. He added that recruitment is in a central pot and the cost shared across all HR expenditure.

17   It was agreed that these relocation costs should be shared amongst all DPO members as a resource cost.

Service update

18   AM noted the report (attached to the agenda) on the review of the North Region CISO service and highlighted the following points:

- The service to members has been impacted by the departure of the area's multiple CISO's.

- The on-site use of CISO resource was not currently consistent across members.

- It was a priority to appoint a new CISO, and   interviews are scheduled with candidates shortlisted.

- A revised strategy for the CISO service will be developed and will take into account the priorities and expectations of member institutions, based on an agreed catalogue of services which can be revised annually.

- The service should be aimed at a higher-level activity and not get involved at hands-on server support level etc.

- Consultation is necessary with as many institutions as possible to agree the revised service definitions.

19   Chair suggested that the regional model should be reviewed as it caused problems to the service based on geographical constraints and resulting travel time requirements. In addition, different skill sets are required for different activities and CISO's should be deployed according to their skills and strengths.

20   He added that there were some good achievements reported by members for the service and stressed the importance of improving communication with all the membership.

21   AM noted that the DPO service was performing well, and LC agreed. Its role is well defined due to the statutory nature of the named DPO, and this illustrated how the CISO Share service could be strengthened by greater definition.

22   Chair stressed the need for institutions to agree documented plans for CISO related activities to help clarify the CISO service requirements and ensure efficient use of resource.

23   AW suggested that the CISO service needs to be flexible to match with the varying needs of members. He added that we need to compare how the service is working/perceived in the different areas and noted that the service provision in the North had been adversely affected by the amount of travel required for on-site activities.

24   Chair stated that there was now clear feedback from the North area on how the service should be redefined.

25   AJ suggested that a similar review should be conducted for other areas and AM confirmed that this is planned.

26   KM suggested that each institution has a different approach (to cyber security for example) and the service needs to be flexible enough to match each member's requirements.

Strategy discussion

27   Chair noted that a formal strategy does not exist yet for either the CISO or DPO shared services.

28   There followed a discussion based on the 4 bullet points as suggested in the agenda:

- Service Delivery Structure
- Membership Models
- Roles and Partnerships
- Geographical Areas

Service Delivery Structure

29   JS advised the board that he had prepared a draft service delivery structure for the CISO Service based on the following points:

- A CISO should be on-site at each institution at least once a month to be involved in leading a local support group to progress actions.
- A Risk Group or equivalent should meet quarterly.
- A Working Group or equivalent should meet monthly.
- Other support could be done remotely.
- This is a more flexible approach to providing the CISO service.

30   Chair stressed that care needs to be taken not to force members to change their organisation structures.

31   AM noted that one advantage of moving away from a regional model could be to facilitate possible future expansion of the service.

32   Chair cautioned that the priority should be to work through redefinition of existing services before considering expansion.

33   JM suggested that members' inputs are mandatory when developing a new strategy for the service and that we must be clear about what the service will not cover as much as what it will. AJ added that if it's not in the basket of service components offered, it should not be done.

34   Chair noted that we must be clear if we are supporting the Scottish Government service or if we have a wider scope and member consultation is important to ensure that we meet their requirements. AM and JS were keen to see the Scottish Government initiatives on Cyber Security supported by HEFESTIS but agreed that this must be done in a way that also meets the needs of members.

35   JM added that we need to be clear what we support. (Cyber Resilience etc.)

36   AM suggested that a strategy is required for each service and KM noted that they should be aligned to the direction that the Scottish Government is taking.

37   AW suggested that there should be sub-strategies for each service like the 5 key themes in the APUC strategy document. This makes it simpler to follow and easier to add new elements.

Membership Model(s)

38   JS advised that there is now a large amount of training and information material on SharePoint and that this should make it attractive to potential new members.

39   He added that this could facilitate expansion into new geographical areas without the need for much additional resource.

40   This on-line material can be continuously developed and improved and be easily available to all members.

41   Chair stressed the importance of having well documented material available.

42   JS asked the board if there was an appetite for expanding the service to other areas noting that the service would benefit from sharing experiences with a wider membership.

43   JM felt that the service was currently going through an important period in its development and that resources should be focussed on clarifying and bedding in current services first.

44   AM suggested that we must maintain the current shared service ethos and that a catalogue of service offerings would help to guide future decisions.

45   AW agreed that a future target should be set for expansion, so that it did not detract from progressing current priorities.

46   LC noted that some charities might be interested in an expanded service.

47   AA stressed that the feedback from the North review should form the basis of the first strategy.

48   JS noted that the Board had not yet seen his summary following the review of the North service but added that the potential appetite for future expansion was very helpful. (**ACTION: JS to copy board on review summary**)

Roles and Partnerships (CRU / SFC)

49   AM suggested that there was an opportunity for HEFESTIS to represent all the HE/FE sector (not just members) on certain cyber security matters but that this had received mixed feedback from institutions.

50   JM said that the feedback from members to date is that the benefits to members of such arrangements have not been well articulated.

51   JM felt nonetheless that more money from outside the sector would be beneficial and permit more CISO resource to be recruited, provided it was clear that there was a benefit to members.

52   AM proposed that this should be covered in the strategy and Chair stressed the need to consult with members but agreed that there is merit in securing other sources of funding.

Geographical Areas

53   JS felt that there is a clear benefit in relaxing the regional requirements and that this would reduce the amount of travel and pressure on the CISO resources resulting from the geographical demands of the current model.

54   AW suggested that a different approach could be adopted for different elements of the service and that DPO could be easily expanded as it is more established and roles well defined. DPO shared service could be expanded into other public sector areas.

55   Chair conclude by stressing the need to progress the CISO Share changes as top priority and to now develop detailed strategy documents.

56   JS committed to producing a draft strategy for the approval of the Board. (**ACTION: JS**)

Any Other Business

57   The Board agreed that the 2020 meetings should be scheduled for 19 March and 26 November.

58   Register of Interest to be circulated to Board members for completion and return to MC for filing. (**ACTION: MC/Board**)

Date of Next Meeting

- 22 October 2019 - Audit committee at Chiene + Tait, Edinburgh
- 26 November 2019 – Board Meeting, University of Dundee
- There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12:25.