

To EURIM Members and Observers  
From Philip Virgo, EURIM Secretary General  
E-mail: [virgo.philip@eurim.org](mailto:virgo.philip@eurim.org)

The Information  
Society Alliance  
**EURIM**



## EURIM Newsletter April 2010

### 1) The Earl of Erroll (Cross-Bencher) has been Appointed Chairman

*A practising information security professional with over 30 years parliamentary experience*

MPs cease to be members of EURIM when Parliament is dissolved. Those who are re-elected will be reinstated immediately after the General Election with the addition of those Associate Parliamentary Members who are elected. The Directors remain in post but those who are no longer parliamentarians are not eligible for re-election at the next AGM (14<sup>th</sup> July). Margaret Moran has resigned as Chair but hopes to be able to attend the AGM and encourage some of the new MPs to also champion the use of the Internet to give a voice to the victims of domestic violence and child abuse.

The Board has appointed the Earl of Erroll<sup>1</sup> as Chairman of EURIM. He has been a cross-bench member of the House of Lords since 1978, earning a living as an information systems and security professional, while also serving on advisory boards concerned with Internet Governance, Information Security and Smart Card Standards. His intention is to stand aside when the Class of 2010 have found their feet and their voice.

### 2) Programme for the Class of 2010

*Turning a cacophony of interest groups into a contrapuntal chorus*

On the morning of 20<sup>th</sup> April there is a “cross-group” planning meeting for the EURIM working groups to which we have invited corporate and associate members and guests from those partners with whom we already co-ordinate our programmes. The objectives are:

- to review plans to produce briefing material for the new intake: one by A4 “crib sheets” (for MPs) and four by A4 summaries (for research assistants), plus back up reports and links to websites covering sources and provenance (for policy advisors, officials and others requiring more detail).
- to discuss plans for co-operation with others (all-party groups, trade associations, professional bodies, think tanks etc.) on joint recruitment and briefing programmes for the new intake of MPs.
- to discuss receptions, presentations, exhibitions and other events, including on the afternoon of 6<sup>th</sup> July and after the AGM on 14<sup>th</sup> July.

We have not yet invited our public sector observers but if you would like to participate on the 20<sup>th</sup> or to separately offer to help organise events, please e-mail me c/o [eurim@eurim.org](mailto:eurim@eurim.org). The briefing organised by CESG in 2004<sup>2</sup> on “Public Domain Biometric Applications” is one model. The recent round table organised with the Audit Commission on Information Quality<sup>3</sup> is another. In both cases the objective was to give well-balanced inputs to enable political and official audiences to better understand the realities behind the claims - not promote policies or technologies. Both audiences included observers from across the public sector, not just the Westminster village.

<sup>1</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/what\\_is\\_eurim/biographies.php#chair](http://www.eurim.org.uk/what_is_eurim/biographies.php#chair)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.cesg.gov.uk/policy\\_technologies/biometrics/workshop.shtml](http://www.cesg.gov.uk/policy_technologies/biometrics/workshop.shtml)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/ig/100222report.pdf>

### 3) Is the Evidence Fit for Purpose?

*Improving the quality, relevance and presentation of public sector information*

On 18<sup>th</sup> March the follow up meeting<sup>4</sup> to the round table on 22<sup>nd</sup> February with the Audit Commission<sup>5</sup> agreed to look at:

- collecting and publishing evidence on the impact of good/poor information quality on service delivery, resource allocation and policy formation;
- recommendations for Industry and Professional action to improve the quality of information management at all levels;
- recommendations for action to improve end-user (from the top down) understanding of the basic principles and importance of good management,
- recommendations for political action to improve the quality of public sector information management and its use for policy formation.

The Audit Commission is hosting a meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> April on the terms of reference for the group, beginning with the production of briefing material for the Class of 2010. This is particularly important given the commitment of all the political parties to share more information with the public. How do we ensure that “information” is usable and is based on data that is accurate, up-to-date and relevant – given recent revelations as to the scale and nature of the errors in widely used databases, let alone their insecurity and vulnerability to fraudulent amendment.

### 4) Ensuring Better Practice in the Planning and Procurement of Public Service Delivery

*How to deliver more for less as a matter of routine*

As part of the briefings for the Class of 2010 we plan to re-launch the one by A4 Briefing<sup>6</sup>, on good practice in the planning and procurement of major programmes that was welcomed by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Stephen Timms, last year. This led into a summary of good practice, with cross references to the relevant guidance from the National Audit Office, Audit Commission, Office of Government Commerce, Intellect, BCS, Royal Academy of Engineering and others. The format was suggested by one of the Select Committee Clerks and Stephen, a member of the EURIM Council before he became a Minister, welcomed “EURIM's brave attempt to summarise thousands of pages of reports and guidance into a simple crib sheet for politicians”.

We are now working on follow up exercises to produce similar material on the need to include security by design in mainstream procurement, because government and society increasingly depend on reliable access to online systems. Moreover this has to be compatible with efficiency and usability and achieved at affordable cost. A one by A4<sup>7</sup> is available for review but the production of a four by A4 summary, as opposed to the detailed back-up<sup>8</sup> paper, is proving harder.

Spreading an understanding of good practice is also complicated by the view that security procedures should be kept secret, even from those supposed to follow them. Better practice at all levels is, however, also central to the delivery of rapid and confidential online access to public services in “the age of impersonation”. The growing pressure to cut costs by transitioning to shared services, including communications networks adds to the need to brief politicians and decision takers on existing good practice in balancing usability and security. We are therefore seeking to assemble a consortium of

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/100318qoireport.pdf](http://www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/100318qoireport.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/activities/ig/100222report.pdf](http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/ig/100222report.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pubproc/0909ProcurementSummary.pdf](http://www.eurim.org.uk/activities/pubproc/0909ProcurementSummary.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/sbd/SbyD-DraftSummary.doc](http://www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/sbd/SbyD-DraftSummary.doc)

<sup>8</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/sbd/SbD-DraftPaper.doc](http://www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/sbd/SbD-DraftPaper.doc)

suppliers who are willing to work together to help educate their public sector customers in how to reduce duplication of effort in designing and accrediting processes, building on what already works.

## **5) Involving the Class of 2010 in the E-Crime Reduction Partnership**

*Moving practical, cross-boundary co-operation up the political agenda*

Among the issues raised at the workshop to discuss industry engagement with the E-Crime Reduction Partnership on 29<sup>th</sup> March was the need to rationalise the points of contact between industry and law enforcement for reporting and co-operation. That meeting was introduced by Lord West who linked the E-Crime and Cybersecurity agendas, highlighting the need to work together, and led through to agreement on the importance of organising a scoping exercise to pull together what is already known about the scale and nature of both the current problems and the response.

The strength of feeling on the part of large users with local operations throughout the UK (e.g. high street branches) also indicated that the duplication and fragmentation of unresponsive points of contact was not just an online problem. The idea that large organisations could look after themselves and did not need help from law enforcement was also sharply criticised. Now that the Government E-Crime Strategy<sup>9</sup> has been announced, we need also to ensure that the new MPs understand the importance of the scoping exercise, how the various current and planned initiatives might come together as the partnership gathers pace and where they can, as MPs, make a difference: e.g. by championing initiatives on awareness, crime prevention, child protection and incident reporting.

## **6) Identity and Information Governance: Who Should be Responsible to Whom?**

*Citizen or subject: from Voter Registration to the regulation of identity services*

On 25<sup>th</sup> March<sup>10</sup> the Identity Governance Subgroup agreed to split its work into two exercises: one on Electoral Registration, the other on the need for an overall UK regime for identity governance that recognises multiple regulatory jurisdictions let alone many national and international systems.

The aim of the first exercise is to brief MPs and senior officials on how best to implement electronic Individual Voter Registration (eVR) in Great Britain, as provided for by the Political Parties and Elections Act 2009, under which individuals will be able to update their own registration data, replacing the traditional method in which the head of the household tended to provide all the information. A political priority is to produce guidance on how to avoid pitfalls in implementation.

This exercise needs to establish links with the Electoral Commission, Ministry of Justice and the main political parties: eVR has broad cross-party support. Plans are underway to contact other stakeholders and organise inputs from other countries, especially Scandinavia, to understand how eVR works in their operational systems. A key challenge is to “assure” the registration process. The electorate must have confidence that the eVR method is free of fraud and suspicion before any further developments, such as electronic voting, can even be considered.

The objective of the second exercise is to identify the key features of an identity governance regime that will help ensure London retains its status as a global centre for regulatory arbitrage and makes the UK an attractive home for global identity management systems - which have to operate within and across multiple jurisdictions. That will entail basing the intra-UK regime on global best practice, particularly for cost-effective and efficient interoperability, disputes resolution and redress. There is a need to inform politicians about the *differences* between public and private sector approaches to identity, as well as what Government can learn from the private sector, particularly with regard to operating across organisational and regulatory boundaries. This is particularly relevant to plans for transitioning departmental systems to shared services and cloud computing.

The aim is to identify, collate and assess material (particularly examples of good practice and of pitfalls to avoid) from international users who already operate under multiple regimes around the

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm78/7842/7842.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> [www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/100325idgreport.pdf](http://www.eurim.org.uk/members/ig/100325idgreport.pdf)

world. The group also plans to look at the approaches of those competing with London and the UK to provide the base locations for identity management services that could be based anywhere in the world. There are a number of federated identity schemes operating across jurisdictional boundaries that might be built on, particularly in the banking/financial services sector and in the academic world, and the team aims to present a draft outline of its approach on 27<sup>th</sup> April.

Please e-mail [eurim@eurim.org](mailto:eurim@eurim.org) if you are able to contribute operational experience and expertise.

## **7) Communications and the Digital Economy Act**

*From enhanced access to Broadband for social inclusion to reduced access for IPR “pirates”?*

The meeting to plan the forward programme for the Communications Group was put back to 19<sup>th</sup> April. The original main items of business were to discuss current EU initiatives and an update to the Broadband brief. The US Green paper is the main item on the EU update but now that the new Commission is in place, and a new Commissioner for the Digital Agenda, Nellie Kroes, we expect a raft of new initiatives, including on intellectual property, plus plans to open up the single market for e-commerce. The broadband brief also needs to be revised and expanded to introduce the range of issues and funding options that the Class of 2010 may need to consider over the next year or so.

This may, however, be one of those meetings where “Any other business” will be the most interesting item.

Is there a need to start planning now for the scrutiny of what was “agreed” last week regarding the UK enforcement of copyright online?

One of the problems that may have to be addressed rapidly, lest uncertainty leads to the demise of existing services, let alone hampers the roll-out of new ones, is expected to be the supposed liabilities and responsibilities of public access services: including schools, colleges, libraries, community centres, Internet Cafes and other wifi access (stations, airport, hotels etc.).