

# CSIIF APPROVALS BOARD

## Minutes 19 December 2018

### Attendance:

Approvals Board

- [civil servant] (DCMS) - Chair
- [civil servant] (DCMS)
- [civil servant] (DCMS)
- [civil servant] (DfE)
- Industry representative (TechUK)
- [civil servant] (NCSC)
- [civil servant] (DCMS)

**Overview** The Chair provided an overview of the CSIIF and outlined the purpose of the Approvals Board to challenge and confirm which bids (subject to due diligence) are successful in their application for funding. The Chair confirmed any clarification questions the Board had would be put to the initiatives for a response within 48 hours.

**CSIIF pilot initiatives progress [DCMS]** provided an update on the seven sponsored CSIIF pilot initiatives up until this point and confirmed a full evaluation of the initiatives will be taking place in 2019. The Board noted progress of initiatives and the number of individuals (171) either participating or identified to participate in one of the seven initiatives. The policy team confirmed it was confident of still reaching internal target of at least 100 adults becoming ready for a career in cyber security on conclusion of these initiatives.

The Board also noted the interim lessons learnt from the pilot initiatives which have been taken into account when considering applications to the expanded CSIIF, including expectations of an 'immediate impact' and issues faced by initiatives on placing candidates into cyber security roles.

**Assessment and approvals process [DCMS]** provided a brief overview paper of the process up until this point. 19 applications had been received in total. Given the manageable number of applications received, all were progressed to full assessment. These were assessed by volunteers from the wider DCMS cyber security team. Results were then moderated.

**The board confirmed they are content the process followed to shortlist the bids was robust and transparent.**

The Chair recommended that for future assessment process, the policy team consider

two independent assessors to grade the same assessment and aggregate scores for Approvals Board consideration.

**Expanded CSIIF - application consideration** The policy team presented two bids recommended for approval, which were considered as strong applications in line with CSIIF objectives. These were [CSIIF Applicant] and [CSIIF Applicant]. **[Redacted: commercially sensitive information in regards to other applicant(s)]**

[DCMS] presented three near-miss bids that could be reconsidered if they agreed to submit an application based on a reduced allocation and/or altered scope. These were bids received from [CSIIF Applicant], Hacker House Ltd and [CSIIF Applicant]. The Board agreed these initiatives should be considered for funding, but requested additional information from each.

Finally, given the ring-fenced funding for the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA), [DCMS] presented an update on 'Pot 3' reserved for West Midlands-based initiatives and confirmed **[Redacted: commercially sensitive information]** had been received. **[Redacted: commercially sensitive information in regards to other applicant(s)]**

**Before reaching a final decision on funding allocation, the Board requested clarification questions to be asked of all organisations outlined in ANNEXES 1 and 2.**

There were a number of bids that were considered to have been unsuccessful by independent assessors and the policy lead. There was discussion on the [CSIIF Applicant] and the policy recommendation that their initiative should not receive additional funding while [REDACTED] is still ongoing.

**Given their high score and the interim progress of their pilot initiatives, the Board asked for proof of outcomes to this point to be provided, before a final decision on funding is reached.**

There was also a discussion on the [CSIIF Applicant] initiative missing out despite its strong assessment score, given its use of [REDACTED], which is currently being evaluated by DCMS and [DCMS] recommended funding should not be provided pending evaluation outcomes. There were good reasons for not recommending the other initiatives for funding. The Board noted a number of these were interesting initiatives, but not in line with CSIIF requirements. **The Board agreed that all bids outlined in ANNEX C, except for [CSIIF Applicant], would not receive funding as part of the expanded CSIIF.**

## **Conclusion**

The board will take into account the merit of the application, the availability of CSIIF funds

and clarification question responses when approving a final shortlist for funding. Approval would be completed by correspondence between all members of the Board with a view to candidates being informed of the outcome of their application before the end of 2018.

Once finalised, the Policy team would arrange to notify successful and unsuccessful applicants, ensuring that extended feedback was given especially to applications that were unsuccessful for a second time.

**Actions  
summary:**

1. **ACTION 1:** Policy team would send clarification questions to initiatives and submit these, alongside an updated financial model, to the Approvals Board (via correspondence) for review and approval.
2. **ACTION 2:** Policy team to consider whether the unsuccessful **[CSIIF Applicant]** bid should be reviewed as part of DCMS **[Redacted: commercially sensitive information]**.