APPROVALS BOARD PAPER 3 - EXPANDED CSIIF OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

* To note, this is an extract from a larger document that reproduces all Hacker House Material and omits any information relating only to other bids.

PURPOSE OF APPROVALS BOARD MEETING

19 bids were received during the expanded CSIIF. These have now been independently assessed and shortlisted by DCMS policy leads. The function of the Approvals Board is to determine which bids should receive government funding. Recommendations must be agreed with at least a majority of the five Approvals Board members (as Chair does not participate in the voting process).

HEADLINE FIGURES

- Bidding for the fund was opened on 8 October until 5 November 2018
- **19** bids received during four week bidding phase
- Total of **£3.2m** of funding was requested across all bids
- Cumulative number of potential additional cyber security roles across all bids: **2,239**
- Average amount of funding requested per bid: **£168k**

QUESTIONS FOR THE APPROVALS BOARD

The purpose of the Approvals Board is to determine and confirm which bids (subject to final due diligence) submitted to the Fund should receive funding. The Board can also determine how much, when and on what conditions the bid should receive funding. As noted above, the DCMS policy team has already shortlisted initiatives with a recommendation for funding. In coming to a decision on which bids should receive funding, the Approvals Board may want to consider the following questions:

- **Of the two bids fully recommended for funding (ANNEX 1), are you content that this represents a complementary set of initiatives that are likely meet our policy outcomes and our internal metrics for success for you? You may want to consider factors such as compatibility of bids with other bids, location of bids, potential presentational risks of funding initiatives**
- **Of the bids that were near misses, do you agree with the proposal to reassess applications based on lower sum allocation (ANNEX 2)? If these two proposals are not seen to fit with CSIIF policy intent, are you content for funding to be approved for a refocused [CSIIF Applicant] application?**
- **If you agree with funding in principle, are there any conditions/amendments you would like to make to the funding offer?**
- **Are you content on the rationale for not seeking to fund the remaining bids set out in Annex 3?**

[ANNEX 1 - RECOMMENDED BIDS FOR FUNDING]

ANNEX 2 - RECOMMENDED SCENARIOS FOR REMAINING FUNDING

A. Given the £75,000 that has been allocated to the West Midlands Combined Authority as part of the West Midlands Skills Agreement 2018, we recommend that **[CSIIF Applicant]** if offered this additional amount to add a fifth retraining cohort to the four cohorts (of 60 total candidates) originally proposed as part of their original bid we have recommended for funding. We would ask that this cohort deliver 30 additional candidates. **AND EITHER;**

B. Ask for **[CSIIF Applicant]** and Hacker House applications to resubmit proposals based on an allocation of £100,000 for this to be reassessed for funding. **OR;**

C. If option B does not provide any satisfactory applications on a reduced sum, we recommend to fund the **[CSIIF Applicant]** for £**[redacted figure]** on the condition they work to solely develop a Level 5 cyber security course offering.

B/

Project Name	Applicant Name	Organisation Type	Assessment Score	Requested funding
	[CSIIF Applicant]			
• [Redacted: commercially sensitive information in regards to other applicant(s)]				
Hands on Hacking Training and Employer Portal	Hacker House Ltd	Training Provider	81%	£[redacted figure](Pot 1)

Project overview:
- Hacker House are looking to scale up and bring their currently classroom-based learning online that can be accessed by UK-based students on demand.
- In identifying talent, Hacker House already has a database of interested candidates that have come across the organisation through word of mouth. Training will be carried out through the online platform and placement will be done on the conclusion of this with employers who have already approached the organisation for talent.
- Sustainability will be achieved through CSIIF funding allowing for expansion of small team doing a lot of manual functions to a more streamlined approach that will allow sustainability on completion of the CSIIF funding.
- The Hacker House application is built on 2.5 years of training students in classrooms across the UK in an entry level penetration testing course that approximately ▮▮▮▮▮▮ have participated in.

Why near miss?
- The initiative has received no match funding for the project and therefore does not align with the CSIIF condition that funding represents up to a maximum of 50% of total project funding.
- In addition, there is to clear strategy for identifying and placing cyber security talent other than the reliance that candidates and interested employers will approach Hacker House.

[ANNEX 3 - PROPOSED UNSUCCESSFUL BIDS]