

## **JOINT ICT COMMITTEE**

(Bolsover District Council, Derbyshire Dales District Council and North East Derbyshire District Council)

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint ICT Committee held in the Council Chamber, District Council Offices, 2013 Mill Lane, Wingerworth, Chesterfield S42 6NG on 10 February 2020 at 10.00 am**

Present:

### **Bolsover District Council (BDC)**

Councillor R Heffer

### **Derbyshire Dales District Council (DDDC)**

Councillor C Furness

Councillor D Hughes

Councillor G Purdy

### **North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC)**

Councillor J Lilley

Councillor K Tait

Councillor N Whitehead

Officers:

Karen Henriksen – Head of Resources (DDDC)

Nick Blaney – Joint ICT Manager (NEDDC & BDC)

Matt Broughton – Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation (NEDDC & BDC)

Nicola Astle – Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager (NEDDC & BDC)

Alan Maher – Senior Governance Officer (NEDDC)

Martin Derbyshire – Members ICT and Training Officer (NEDDC & BDC)

Tom Scott – Temporary Governance Officer (NEDDC & BDC)

### **30/19-20 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Fritchley (BDC).

### **31/19-20 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest submitted for this meeting.

### **32/19-20 Minutes of Last Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the Minutes of the meeting of the Joint ICT Committee held on 4 November 2019 were approved as a true and accurate record.

### **33/19-20 ICT Service Restructure**

Members received a presentation from the Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation on the ICT Service Restructure.

The Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation explained that the Joint ICT Manager would be leaving his post at the end of February 2020. Members thanked him for all of his help and hard work.

### **34/19-20 Quarterly Service Report**

Joint ICT Committee considered the latest performance report of the Joint ICT Service. This covered the third quarter of the financial year from October 2019 to December 2019. The Joint ICT Manager delivered the report and explained updates for performance, budget, resource utilisation, key projects, security and ongoing development of the service.

Members asked if the 'Project Related Activities' graph showing usage above target on a number of occasions meant that there were more Project Related Activities than planned. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that this meant a higher percentage of time being spent on projects.

Members referred to the performance of Rykneld Homes (table 2.1.3 titled 'Incidents resolved within SLA target time') appearing to have the best figures for incidents resolved, and asked why this was. The Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation explained that Rykneld Homes had simpler ICT systems, due to having one single major ICT business system and e-mails being handled by a third party.

The Committee agreed to note the report.

### **35/19-20 Cyber Security Presentation**

Members received a presentation from the Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager on Cyber Security.

The presentation informed Members on the following areas:

Threat actors – who and why? (cyber criminals, foreign intelligence services, hackers and employees)

Current threats – malware, spyware, viruses, ransomware, phishing, false websites and e-mail spoofs

More threats – password brute force, zero-day attacks and DDoS attacks

How we protect ourselves – gateway security, anti-virus, encryption, patching, system monitoring, penetration testing, secure system, password policies, awareness and training

Achievements – achieved ‘amber/green’ in the LGA self-assessment tool in August 2019 after getting ‘amber/amber’ in August 2018. Received ‘substantial assurance’ in January 2020 from a network and internal security audit

Statistics – 139,000 e-mails blocked a month, block 2,700 attempts to access the network a month

The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager advised Members that she would circulate the presentation to them after the meeting.

The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that phishing and ransomware attacks were the ones recorded most.

Members asked what kind of safeguards there were built into the system to detect problems with the system. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that web/e-mail proxies, anti-virus and firewalls were in place for this along with regular patching, although organisations had no way of knowing when zero-day attacks would occur.

Members asked if the system picks up code being changed. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that Windows picks up filename changes via its Microsoft resource manager as may the anti-virus products being used.

Members asked for zero-day attacks to be explained in more detail. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager informed them that zero-day attacks were attacks on software with known vulnerabilities which had no patch in place to fix, and code could be written to trick users into letting them on the network. There was a case study from 2017 at Copeland Borough Council where they were hit with a zero-day attack and given three days to respond.

Members asked if the incident at Copeland Borough Council had resulted in that authority publishing a report about the reasoning. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that Copeland were putting together business continuity processes which could then be drawn upon by the Joint ICT authorities for experience.

Members asked if there was an offline backup of the system. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that backup software had recently been acquired and space was being cleared to store the data.

Members asked which anti-virus software was used and if there was a tender process. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that the anti-virus software was one of the leading security products, and reviews were regularly completed to ensure cost and effectiveness.

Members enquired if there was something in place for routers/servers to detect phishing sites. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that an internal and external cloud pre-filter was in place. She added that educating officers on phishing was an important part of the protection, and this would be detailed in the next agenda item.

Members asked if penetration testing was done externally and how much it cost. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that testing was done internally on a monthly basis, and an external company were paid to come in and test it once a year. This cost approximately £3,000 per authority.

Members requested that the presentation be circulated to Members of all three authorities.

Members noted the presentation.

(Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager)

### **36/19-20 'Phishing' Proposal**

The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager presented a report to update Members on phishing attacks and gain approval to complete a cyber security phishing awareness exercise for all employees and Members. The report also recommended that all Councils consider a Business Continuity exercise based upon a ransomware attack.

As a training and awareness exercise, the ICT department wanted to complete a simulated phishing exercise. Similar exercises had been recently completed by nearby councils and the results had demonstrated the following:

- a) The need for awareness, as a large percentage of users clicked on the phishing e-mail and provided sensitive information.
- b) The exercise was a valuable training tool as subsequent phishing exercises showed a significant reduction in the number of users who clicked the links and provided sensitive information.

Members agreed that the proposed simulated phishing exercise seemed very beneficial.

Members asked if anything was in place to prevent phishing when Members were given Council iPads. The Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager explained that an Information Security Policy was in place, but part of it still relied on people not clicking phishing links, which is where this training would come in.

The recommendations in the report were moved by Councillor Nick Whitehead and seconded by Councillor Garry Purdy. Members unanimously agreed to approve the recommendations.

Members requested that the most senior officers in attendance from each authority should follow these recommendations through to ensure they get carried out.

(Head of Resources/Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation/Joint ICT Infrastructure Manager)

### **37/19-20 Budget Report**

The Joint ICT Manager presented a Budget report to Members. The report updated Members on the projected outturn for the 2019-20 Joint ICT budget and sought approval for use of anticipated underspend.

The report showed the quarter 3 outturn for the Joint ICT Budget which had a current underspend of £44,000. This was because:

#### **Employee costs**

- Underspend due to delays recruiting to vacant posts
- Staff purchase of additional annual leave
- Underspend on training budget due to external grant funded training opportunity

#### **Transport**

- No fuel charges as yet so anticipated will be on budget

#### **Services**

- Outstanding commitments for Q4. Anticipated will come in on budget

The Joint ICT Manager explained that table 1.2 in the report showed an income of £21,860 for 2019/20. This came from services provided to others outside the partnership.

The recommendations in the report were moved by Councillor Garry Purdy and seconded by Councillor David Hughes. Members unanimously agreed to approve the recommendations.

(Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation)

### **38/19-20 Critical Project Outcomes Report**

The Joint ICT Manager presented a report to update Members on the outcomes of key infrastructure projects undertaken in 2018 and 2019.

The report explained that in 2018, work commenced on a series of time critical projects on the infrastructure that underpinned the technologies in place to deliver ICT services to partners. The key projects were:

- Migration to Windows 10 across all PCs and laptops
- Migration of all 2008 Server instances to 2012/2016 across all Windows Server instances used to deploy business systems

- Migration of all SQL 2008 databases to supported versions for all Business systems that use this database management system (DBMS)
- Deployment for a new backup solution for all partners' data

The Joint ICT service initiated projects managed and controlled by the partners' Project and Programme Methodology (PPM) to deliver these areas. The outcomes were:

### **Windows 10**

- 487 Ageing PCs and laptops were replaced
- 285 Existing PCs and laptops were upgraded
- Total cost of new devices was £94,847 against a budget of £156,750
- 472 days of effort spend on design, build and deployment against an initial estimate of 798 days

### **Server 2008 Migration**

- 99 server instances upgraded
- Total cost was £31,914 against a budget of £39,125, including SQL Server costs
- 92 days of effort against a an initial estimate of 136 days

### **SQL 2008 Migration**

- 234 SQL Database instances upgraded
- 101 days of effort against an initial estimate of 90 days

### **Backup solution replacement**

- 23 days for implementation against 60 day estimate
- Total cost of £63,900 against original budget of £125,000

The report included a recommendation that Committee acknowledge the contribution of staff to the successful delivery of these time critical, complex and high risk projects.

Members felt this was a positive report where savings had been found and the partnership between the three authorities had allowed for single upgrades across all of the Councils. Members wished to place on record their thanks to all of the officers who had worked hard (sometimes out of hours) on these projects.

Members asked if staff providing external services was something that had been considered. The Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation explained that the service was in the process of an infrastructure programme, so all resources were committed to that at the moment. Members agreed that providing external services at this moment in time would mean spreading resources too thinly.

Members referred to the budgets for this report being underspends and budgets in other agenda reports being overspends, and asked why there were such variations. The Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation explained that

budget estimation was sometimes difficult due to staff changes and business application vendors.

Members wished to add two further statements to the recommendation in the report:

a) That the Committee acknowledges and appreciates the hard work and contributions of all staff involved.

b) That the systems put in place are done over a number of years.

The recommendation in the report and the additional two statements were moved by Councillor Ray Heffer and seconded by Councillor Chris Furness. Members unanimously agreed to approve the recommendation and statements.

(Joint Head of Partnerships and Transformation)

### **39/19-20 Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business for the Joint ICT Committee to consider at this meeting.

### **40/19-20 Future Meetings**

The Senior Governance Officer informed Members that because the draft programme of meetings was not completed, he proposed meeting dates for the Committee on 11 May 2020 at Bolsover District Council and then another on 13 July 2020 at Derbyshire Dales District Council. He added that these dates would be confirmed with Members in the next month subject to availability.

(Senior Governance Officer)

---