

FINANCIAL SERVICES

E-Government Board

Minutes of the Meeting

Date	Monday 21 st June, 2010
Time	10.30 am
Venue	Board Room, Doncaster Gate
Chair	Councillor Ken Wyatt (KW)
Minute Taker	Andrea Pearson (AP)

Attendees	Initials	Directorate
Cllr Alan Buckley	AB	Cabinet Adviser
Richard Copley	RC	Financial Services
Sarah Corbett	SC	Chief Executive's
Jayne Dickson	JD	RBT
Richard Douthwaite	RD	Financial Services
Mark Gannon	MG	Financial Services
Shaun Johnson	SJ	RBT
Tracey Parkin	TP	Chief Executive's
Jon Ashton	JA	Financial Services
Susan Gray	SG	CYPS
Kirsty Faundez	KF	EDS
Ben Potts	BP	EDS
Nick Glarvey	NG	BT
Nick Milnes	NM	BT

Apologies	Initials	Directorate
Sue Wilson	SW	CYPS
Jane Evans	JE	EDS
Paul Harris	PH	EDS

No.	Item	Action
1.	<u>Apologies for Absence</u> Apologies were noted as above. Sue Wilson (Susan Gray attending to represent) Jane Evans (Kirsty Faundez attending to represent) Paul Harris	
2.	<u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 26th April 2010</u> KW welcomed Cllr Buckley (Cabinet Adviser) to the group and round the table introductions were made. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.	
3.	<u>Matters Arising</u> KW asked whether any further developments had been made on Digital	

No.	Item	Action
	Access to Culture, RC to check on status and give an update to the next meeting. It was noted that the University are still currently bidding for funding.	RC
4.	<p><u>Replacement of Tribal Enterprise System</u></p> <p>BP was in attendance to update the group on the decision to select a corporate asset management data system which is to replace the current Tribal system. The new system is to provide a corporate and fully integrated asset management tool.</p> <p>It was the intention to upgrade the current Tribal system but it has been agreed to integrate into the CIPFA asset management system which has recently been procured within Corporate Finance. The modules in place are for capital accounting and valuation. It was also felt that this system could be rolled out and shared with other partners within the public sector which would drive down costs.</p> <p>Officers from EDS are working closely with colleagues within Finance with a view to a full roll out the system. Discussions are taking place with S Booth, C Shaw and I Bratley.</p> <p>The system would be funded from existing sources.</p> <p>Reference was made to the value for money work currently being undertaken within NAS, BP reported that he had been working with Dave Richmond on this.</p> <p>RD stressed that with imminent work moving on to the budget this needs to be mapped closely.</p>	
5.	<p><u>VPN Sharing</u></p> <p>MG gave the context which included the need for the workforce to be much more agile, to be able to access systems securely and to utilise infrastructure that was affordable.</p> <p>VPN tokens are currently assigned individually to users. The Council has been working with RBT over the last 2 years to negotiate reduced monthly costs. The Transformation and Strategic Partnerships Team have successfully negotiated monthly price reductions in that time from £30 to £18; however, the cost of the monthly RBT charges for VPN still cost the Council in the region of £250,000 per annum. These costs are unaffordable going forward. Attempts to further reduce costs have been made by the Council but RBT have not been willing to reduce them further. The Council has therefore looked at other ways to achieve reduced costs and has decided to progress the option of shared VPN tokens.</p> <p>RBT has previously been asked if this was feasible on more than one occasion and had told the Council that it wasn't. The Council decided to revisit this again recently and on asking RBT again, they admitted that it was actually technically possible to share VPN tokens; however, they made it clear that they did not think it was a good idea on security grounds and because this has not been done elsewhere to their knowledge. The</p>	

No.	Item	Action
	<p>Council sought a second opinion and commissioned an internal audit report to assess the risk. The audit report found that the risk of shared VPN usage was more or less equivalent to the risks posed by individual VPN usage currently. The proposal and the audit report were discussed by CIG who felt that the risks are already in existence so the new proposal doesn't contribute any further issues and they are out weighed by the reduction in costs anyway.</p> <p>The group discussed at length the proposal of shared VPN usage, the pros and cons and the different options available of how the tokens would be controlled.</p> <p>The Board agreed to proceed with shared VPN adopting the preferred option for allocation which would be via a signing in and out system. The next phase of the process is the management arrangements which need to be written, tried and tested and then communicated to users.</p> <p>RBT outlined their concerns around the risks, the same arguments that had previously been discussed at CIGG and with Internal Audit, and it wasn't felt that anything further had been added which would require the issue to be revisited. RBT confirmed that they would accept the Council's decision despite their misgivings and would support the implementation of the solution.</p> <p>Discussions took place around where the responsibility lays, MG stressed with an approved system such as the signing in and out procedure whoever is the last officer to have the token assigned to them is responsible; same as any other equipment.</p> <p>It was noted that the pilot was being tested within a small team of in CYPS; feedback would be brought to the next meeting for information.</p> <p>The Board agreed to go with trial and roll out further subject to no issues.</p> <p>KW suggested the need to share this with the Corporate Governance Group officers to contact Rob Houghton to put on the next agenda.</p>	<p>MG</p> <p>MG</p>
6.	<p><u>BT Consultancy Days</u></p> <p>MG reported to the group that every year the Council has an allocation of 75 days from BT to be used by the Council. It was stressed that these are not just for ICT. Agreed representatives to go back to Directorates to discuss how and what these days could be used for. Noted the days are split 12 for each Directorate and 15 for Corporate.</p> <p>Directorates to report to MG by 2nd July, 2010.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
7.	<p><u>Update on Document & Records Management</u></p> <p>MG gave the group an update following the steering group;</p> <p>It was noted that there are 4 strands to the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear policies and guidance 	

No.	Item	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective paper storage • Effective solutions • Central scanning and mail room <p>It was reported that there is to be half day planning session to be held regarding the roll out and MG to report to SLT shortly with the plan to roll out before the move to Riverside House.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>No other business reported.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Date Of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>9.00am, 10th September 2010, Board Room, Doncaster Gate</p>	