



SCOTTISH

CHILDREN'S REPORTER

ADMINISTRATION

Scottish Children's Reporter Administration Minute of Information Governance Leads held on Tuesday 22nd August 2023 via Microsoft Teams

Present:

Alistair Hogg (chair), Stephen Eodanable, Pamela Armstrong, Nicola Baird, Jo Donald, Julie Duncan, Jacqueline Johnston, Kerry-Ann Kean, Bruce Knight, Donald Lamb, Hannah McCulloch, Jennifer McIlree, Maryanne McIntyre, Gwen McNiven, Angela Mitchell, Neill Mitchell, Ed Morrison, Paul Mulvanny, Janet Robertson, Kelly Scarlett, Jacqui Stephen and Karen Garside.

		Timescale	Action
1.	<p>Apologies Helen Etchells, Sheena Banks, Victoria Ritchie. AH welcomed Kelly Scarlett who is covering for T&F whilst Kelly Campbell is on secondment.</p>		
2.	<p>Any other Business None</p>		
3.	<p>Minutes of last Meeting (23rd May 2023) Accepted as correct.</p> <p>Matters arising Updates on actions from previous minutes</p> <p>i)Use of CJSM for advocacy workers – any further examples of use of this method for info dissemination? BK - No further examples, but this is also used by Barnardo's.</p> <p>ii) Use of unsecured email accounts for low-risk admin matters - SE – At the previous meeting Paul Mulvanny had mentioned portal or potentially Test of Change (ToC). Stephen spoke with Alison Deighan in the Practice Team regarding use of Objective Connect for RP's viewing video recording files. There is no intention to jump ahead, and this is still to be finalised. The ToC for sending hearing papers via Objective Connect would involve checking that e-mail address and ID are correct and verified prior to contact. There would be a straightforward 'copy' of an e-mail address from CSAS. Establishing a secure method of e-mail, even if there was a relatively small uptake, would be positive in terms of accessibility and costs. There would be an initial reliance on Social Work for obtaining e-mail addresses. AH commented that it would be highly unlikely that one person would take on another person's e-mail address if they were to stop using it, unlike home addresses, emails rarely change, they often just lie dormant if people choose to change them. PM is very supportive and commented that there are other areas in the business that could benefit, and to factor in Digital First service standards. The original ask was regarding checking e-mail addresses/verifying who the person is. Posting information to the wrong house can occur, so this additional security link to a safe place, via Objective Connect scaling up, is a massive piece of work. This is a ToC for an accessible system which demonstrates flexibility. Angela Mitchell noted that North Strathclyde have piloted email reminders for Hearings which is working well. Jacqueline Johnson favoured anything to reduce the huge quantity of papers and appreciated the previous use of Objective Connect. She was unsure how we would gather e-mail addresses. AM offered to share posters used to promote this. Pamela Armstrong (added in Teams chat) that Lorna McNaughton was involved in using Objective Connect during early lockdown for sending papers to Panel Members. Bruce Knight confirmed it is ideal for large documents although to bear in mind that we are charged for the number of 'connections' we make, so the IT team monitors costs. Affordability would also need to be considered. PM suggested NS and LD&G would work well as two volunteer Localities. Digital First accreditation</p>		

		Timescale	Action
	<p>needs to be supported. Neill Mitchell asked if someone could download from Objective Connect as recipients of papers are entitled to receive and retain papers as an obligation on SCRA. SE responded that yes, they can be downloaded and retained if the permission is set to permit download. PA was involved in training Panel Members in the use of Objective Connect and they couldn't send to print or download, as Panel Members only have access up to the point of the Hearing. Alistair noted that different rights give rise to different permissions.</p> <p>iii) Recording dual professional roles in CSAS & resulting Virtual Hearing links (previous item 5) - any new examples? No new examples and not an issue for any attendees of this meeting.</p>	Ongoing	SE
4.	<p>Feedback regarding requests for MS Teams record functionality to be used by SCRA in specific circumstances – SE – In June this year the Record and Transcription function was turned on for MS Teams with no opt-out option. SE was looking for feedback, specifically on thoughts regarding the following uses: i) training and webinars, ii) corporate meetings, iii) the taking of precognitions. iTecs have confirmed that if we use it for any of these opportunities, the data for this would be processed in the US which wouldn't be viable. SE explained that if precognitions are processed in the US (not confirmed by Scots Govt yet) there are hurdles to get over, similar to a DPIA. We would need to look at local data security laws where it is processed. Previously, the EU-US Privacy Shield 2.0 would have applied. As Scotland is no longer part of the EU, this would now take considerable resources to reduce the risk to an acceptable level. The current Digital Recording policy is only used to capture content at 'official' level but not 'official sensitive'. Scottish Government is not using it for this level. The policy is not for personal information. Pre-recorded training/webinars would include a name, e-mail, job title on training/webinars slides, but the policy could be adapted for that, as that is no more information than would be made available following a FOISA request. Recordings of live sessions would include personal information so that would require consent from participants, which can make people uncomfortable. A pre-recorded extra session would not require consent to be obtained. Maryanne commented that it is a great step forward for webinars/training and good that iTecs have relented a little. At the moment, podcasts have to be done on a standalone Mac. It would be great for Neil's Team Brief and generally helpful for Comms functions. PA commented that in her and Neil's view it would save time and be extremely useful for anyone who attends and minutes meetings where no case information is discussed e.g. board reports. Stephen noted that for precognitions, the use of this technology would be high risk due to the sensitive nature of what would be recorded. Ed Morrison commented that they have used a risk management provider RiskMan, where some risk leads weren't able to attend the two training sessions. Decision Time software was used to record the live session and it was shared to just those unable to attend. External providers can pre-record or notify attendees that they're recording. PM was happy for there to be slow and steady progress, with more scope for editorial options in the future. It would make precognition-taking more efficient if you could record and he wouldn't want to close down options of using safe and secure tools for precognitions in the future. AH noted that a transcribing service would be a major gain. The Research team have used this service instead of typing up notes and it is relatively inexpensive. There are other things to explore around, especially regarding corporate meetings, and a policy could be constructed to manage any risk.</p> <p>It was agreed to proceed to consider enabling the use for training and webinars, but that using for precognitions was too risky at present. For corporate meetings, it was agreed that this needed to be carefully explored. It may be possible to create a policy and rules/expectations that would allow safe use.</p>	Ongoing	SE

		Timescale	Action
5.	<p>6 Monthly Report Summary - AH</p> <p>Everyone has a copy of the report, but the highlights were a reduction in the total breaches compared to the previous six months. The report looked closely at stats around breaches and reporter workload, with no correlation identified. There was one breach reported to the ICO at the end of May and an outcome is still awaited. Neill M noted that the summary of the ICO breach (appendix 2) included a line, 'There was a non-disclosure order in place prohibiting the disclosure of the child's current foster carers and prospective adopters' surname and address, to the child's mother.' This is inaccurately worded, as while the non-disclosure order requires that the address is not disclosed, it is for SCRA to decide whether further information (such as the names) requires to be withheld. JD noted for future use of ND terminology.</p>		
6.	<p>Deletion of duplicate contact records – test of change update - SE</p> <p>Thanks to T&F for facilitating the test of change. This has shown that once a referral is closed it is more difficult and time consuming, as the referral has to go back on for the contacts to be amended. Training would need to be delivered for duplicate removal as it is not easy to delete the link to the master record. Douglas has agreed to implement this process, 'read only'. Alison MacRae has taken this back to Neil McKinlay to discuss, and the process should be changed by March of next year at the latest. The ToC meant the process was improved ready for SOM input. Awareness was also increased. AH commented that this was a different, more proportionate approach taken, without taking everything out and putting it back in again.</p>		
7.	<p>MOU regulating appointment of safeguarders- potential revision - SE</p> <p>Stephen has a meeting with Children 1st tomorrow and can hopefully complete & sign-off the MOU. E-mail is used 95 - 98% of the time and this will continue. The aim is trying to reduce instances where we hold the safeguarder's address, and if we do hold an address then it is because the default option is not open to them, but this is higher risk. It should be ready for next IG leads meeting. AH has no concerns and commented on the good feedback.</p>		
8.	<p>Training update – JD</p> <p>The GDPR refresher training for 2023 has commenced with 300 staff attending the first nine sessions. Jo has asked all the IG Leads to encourage participation from their Localities. There are more sessions in early September available to book on iTrent. These include a H/O only session. These have received positive feedback.</p>		
9.	<p>Examples of good Locality practice or issues arising</p> <p>Address checks - Jennifer McIlree from Glasgow was invited to comment following a three-month run of no reported breaches from Glasgow locality. She said that they learned from their own mistakes. They rely on checking addresses with Social Work, and one staff member does their own printing and enveloping. Reporters and assistant Reporters phone and confirm prior to notifying of a Hearing as addresses are not always updated by SW in time. Jacqueline Johnston noted a similar approach, with Support contacting admin in Social Work but they find SW often haven't updated addresses where they are aware people have moved. Ideally, they contact the actual Worker direct. Janet Robertson noted that they have a contact form that SW complete with names and addresses of RP's which is submitted when requesting a SW report. They keep records of who they have spoken to. It is down to individual Social Workers as some are allegedly not so concerned with updating records. Kelly S noted that they double-check with SW too. AH commented on the different levels of engagement with local engagement being crucial here. The record should be changed immediately and updated as soon as possible. He will take away these comments and work out how to instil that sense of culture through partnership work at local and national level.</p> <p>Email suggested recipients/dropdowns/address book Kelly S asked if suggested e-mail outlook drop down can be stopped? There followed a discussion between several IG Leads trying to establish what exactly the issues are and how</p>		

		Timescale	Action
	<p>to resolve them. Bruce confirmed that the introduction of Office 365 has caused some changes that can't be overcome, but some steps can be taken to mitigate the issues. Gwen noted that one of the potential issues is the autocomplete and this can be stopped by going to File Options>Send Messages>Use Autocomplete list> uncheck the box. When looking up an address, it is better to have the default list set to the SCRA address book. Instructions on how to do this can be found in the latest (July) Monthly Breach Report. The most important step is to double-check the intended recipient prior to sending. Julie Duncan noted that she receives emails for another Julie Duncan in Scottish Govt and Jo confirmed that other people have reported this during the GDPR training. BK will check this too. SE pointed out that if you hover over the name of the addressee, it does offer further information about their department. DL mentioned a near-miss data breach where it was sheer luck that prevented child data being sent to the incorrect 'Julie' who had been included in a distribution list. The risk is not a new risk and therefore does not need to be added to a risk register.</p> <p>Government Security Classification Scheme BK noted that the handling descriptors have been updated in the Government Security Classification scheme.</p>	Next meeting	BK
10.	<p>New risks No new risks</p>		
11.	<p>Date of Next Meeting - Tuesday 21st November 2023 via Teams @ 13:30 Alistair thanked everyone for attending the meeting.</p>		