



**Data Standards Authority Steering Board
MINUTES**

Members	Observers and speakers
Sue Bateman (SB) - Chair - CDDO Tara Wilson (TW) - DWP Christophe Prince (CP) - HO Nicholas Oughtibridge (NO) - NHS Fiona James (FJ) - ONS Fiona Clowes (FC) - DLUHC Joy Lincoln (JL) - HMRC Hiran Basnayake (HB) - HMRC	Firoze Salim (FS) - CDDO Didac Fabregas-Badosa (DF-B) - CDDO Simon Worthington (SW) - DBT

Actions and Decisions

Action/Decision	Owner	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simon Wor to set a follow-up meeting with Fiona James to discuss the different points raised during the meeting. 	Simon Worthington, DBT	By next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simon Worthington to provide further information about the Standards Development Organisation that would maintain the proposed standard. 	Simon Worthington, DBT	By next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simon Worthington to engage with DWP's LogLaw Teams and HMRC Borders and Trade. 	Simon Worthington, DBT	By next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDDO set a meeting with DWP's CDO office. 	Data Frameworks and Standards Team, CDDO	Before end of October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDDO set a meeting with Nicholas Oughtibridge to discuss the Standards Hub. 	Data Frameworks and Standards Team, CDDO	By next meeting

Record of discussions

1	Chair welcome and introductions SB Bateman, CDDO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SB introduced the agenda and welcomed attendees.
2	Update: Vulnerabilities Working Group and Standards Relating to Common Attributes DF-B Fabregas-Badosa - CDDO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DF-B provided an update on the work related to the Vulnerabilities Working Group. DF-B shared that CDDO and iStandUK have been working together in preparation of the second working group meeting. Work includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engagement with a wide range of stakeholders and the expansion of the membership of the group, desk research to understand previous work and best practice both nationally and internationally and update of the terms of reference. ○ Development of three product specifications based on the opportunities identified by the group. The product specifications, still to be discussed and agreed with the group, are split in three main categories: Modelling (e.g. common definition of vulnerability), Terminology (e.g. taxonomies for vulnerability) and Enabling (e.g. IG frameworks or specific guidance). ● DF-B provided an update on the work about standards relating to common attributes. DF-B provided an overview of the first workshop, which included presentations from ONS on the IDS case and HMT on the Functional Convergence Programme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The group also agreed on a problem statement and discussed the issues around governance and ownership of the work. The group agreed to expand the stakeholders involved in this work. ○ CDDO is currently arranging the follow-up workshop and crafting a work proposal for this workstream.
	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (VULNWDG) CP supported the approach taken with the product specifications. CP flagged that the delivery of the “modelling” products may be difficult given that in some departments such as the HO this is a political and policy question. ● (VULNWDG) CP asked who is the client/user for the outcomes of the working group (product specifications). CP pointed out that the HO cannot be a user of the models proposed in the product specification as the HO has its own definition of “vulnerability” set by policy. However, CP recognised that there is value in this work, particularly to understand how a range of ‘definitions’ feed into models and then into data requirements that then can be applied as necessary to HO’s services.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (VULNWG) FJ asked how the use cases are developed and flagged the challenges when it comes to working with personal data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The use cases are being selected and developed with the input of the group and its members. The modelling work will provide a framework that enables a scalable approach to different vulnerability use cases. The ‘enabling’ product stream will consider some of the ethical, legal and other information governance factors around data sharing to support different vulnerability use cases.
	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● nil
<p>3</p>	<p>UK Tariff Data Standard SWWorthington, DBT</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SW presented a proposal for an official UK Tariff Data Standard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SW shared that DBT’s plan is to go through the Open Standards Process and create a new standard via the Open Standards Board. ● SW highlighted the importance of developing this standard by pointing out that it is crucial to have clear rules and import duties for trade with the UK, especially after leaving the EU. ● SW informed PRG that there is an existing standard (TARIC3) used at EU-level which is being used because it is the widely adopted language in international trade, but that there are recognised limitations and reasons for change. ● DBT’s proposal for a new official UK Tariff Data Standard would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recognise shared data language as an official government standard derived from TARIC3 and following the Open Standards Principles, ○ agree to manage it together as “one trade community” through an open governance group including government data architects and tariff data consumers (including industry), ○ document it at all levels, and store this as a repository of open content, and ○ Not changing current trade operations or policy. ● SW shared that the stakeholders involved to date in this work have been HMRC, DEFRA, GOV.UK services, DBT and the government of Jersey and Guernsey. ● DBT’s ongoing work includes documenting the standard, establishing an open stakeholder group, agreeing open governance arrangements, working with the DSA and writing weekly notes.
	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CP asked if DBT has engaged with LogLaw Teams.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● FJ asked about the negative impacts of the proposed standard in terms of burdens. FJ is keen to understand more the practical impacts of this work. FJ also flagged that the outcomes of this work are two different things. First, the standard and second a database that has the law and conforms to the standard. FJ raised that the governance of the database is one of the most important things to consider and that this has not been covered. ● NO echoed FJ's concerns about the governance of the database underpinned by the Tariff Standard. NO also stressed the importance for the new standard to serve UK needs rather than prioritising mimicking the TARIC3 standard. Nicholas asked SW who is DBT proposing as "Standards Development Organisation" to maintain the standard. ● HB asked if DBT has engaged with HMRC Borders and Trade.
	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SW to arrange a follow-up meeting with FJ to discuss the different points raised during the meeting. ● SW to consider the maintenance of the proposed standard relating to the question of the involvement of a Standards Development Organisation. ● SW to engage with DWP's LogLaw Teams and HMRC Borders and Trade.
<p>4</p>	<p>Data Ownership and Criticality FS Salim - CDDO</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Context: the alpha testing with departments (HO, DEFRA, EA and DFE came to an end in late September. Since then CDDO has met with the involved departments as well as other departments to capture their views, raise awareness and ensure the understanding of the work and the artefacts. The ownership and criticality working group also convened a week after the conclusion of the alpha testing to discuss the results and agree on the actions to take for CDDO, including the update of the artefacts ahead of this steering board meeting ● FS provided an overview of the findings from the Alpha testing as well as the actions taken and to take by CDDO to address the issues identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FS shared the positive feedback received after the alpha testing: departments found it a very valuable exercise that revealed more information on their data assets underpinning services, revealed the importance of some of the departmental assets from a x-gov perspective and highlighted the potential of the artefacts to help data teams to engage and drive data strategy plans within their organisation (see meeting slides for more details). ○ FS shared the issues and challenges identified after the alpha testing). These can be split between capability/capacity issues (e.g. varying levels of

	<p>maturity between government departments which impacts their ability to meet the requirements), issues related to the guidance specifications (e.g. the definition of ESDA being confusing and needing simplification), issues related to the returns (e.g. the metadata exchange model being difficult to understand and use) and other issues (e.g. difficulties to secure buy-in from senior leadership).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FS explained the actions that CDDO has taken and will take to address all the issues and challenges identified by government departments (see meeting slides for further detail). These include an update of the artefacts to improve its understanding, the establishment of a community of best practice to enable departments to share experiences and get support as this work progresses into Beta and changes to the metadata exchange model to make it easier to understand and implement.
	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP supported the ownership and criticality work and showed willingness to endorse the artefacts. CP suggested deleting specific references to government teams, units or initiatives. CP warned that HO approval was subject to ensuring that the artefacts are living documents and that these should be reviewed (obligatory review) within a year. On the issue of departmental capacity to deliver this work CP suggested having further conversation at CDO Council level to ensure that CDDO reaches to Permanent Secretaries for them to factor in resource requirements as budget holders. CP echoed (see below) FJ's point on reducing the timelines for departments to provide returns from 6 to 2 months. • FJ supported the ownership and criticality work and showed willingness to endorse the artefacts. FJ suggested CDDO to be more proactive in making sure that departments provide their ESDA returns as soon as possible and suggested that instead of a 6 months period the Beta is limited to 2 months. FJ raised that in the next stage of this work, CDDO should consider providing guidance on how CDDO is planning on opening the ESDAs in GDX and IDS. Fiona also echoed CP's point on the review of the guidance and added that CDDO needs to make sure that the peer review process is fair and independent. Specifically on the Data Ownership model FJ suggested to include further information on how it links with enterprise level ownership and governance of data. • NO asked if this work has been informed by conversation with Health Data Research UK. NO also asked about how this work ties to the Standards Hub and what is the current situation of the hub. NO supported the work and showed willingness to endorse the artefacts. • TW supported the work and showed willingness to endorse the artefacts. TW suggested CDDO meet with DWP's CDO office to understand the requirements linked to the ESDA returns within the 6 month timeframe. • The Steering Board agreed to endorse the artefacts in order for this work to progress into Beta phase. The Steering Board endorsed the artefacts with

OFFICIAL

	<p>the condition that these will be reviewed yearly in an independent and fair way.</p>
	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CDDO set a meeting with DWP's CDO office.• CDDO set a meeting with NO to discuss the Standards Hub.
5	<p>Any Other Business and Close</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The chair summarised the meeting and decisions taken by the board• There was no AOB• The chair closed the meeting <p>Next meeting: December 2023</p>