

NNAT TRUSTEES MEETING

BROADBAND TENDER

5TH DECEMBER 2018, ROOM 52, SHERINGHAM VI FORM

PRESENT

Christine Candlish - Chair
Gill Pegg
Andrew Richardson – CEO
Constance Tyce
John Wollocombe

ATTENDING

Natasha Allen – Clerk
Sally Boardman – CFO
Ashley Taylor – IT Manager

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

CC welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received and accepted from Julia Drury.

2. BROADBAND TENDER – ASHLEY TAYLOR

Document: Tender Evaluation for the Provision of Broadband & Internet Filtering Services (taken as read)

3/5 responded to tender, although one did not follow tender instructions correctly. Novotech, (REDACTED – COMMERCIAL) (reply by email therefore not valid, but included for comparison purposes only).

3 options to consider: like for like, upgrade, and future proofing.

Currently with Talkscope and Gresham are with NCC until next year.

Ashley Taylor recommended Option 3 (Novotech) – future proofing, best value, filtering more school-friendly.

GP asked if it is possible to achieve the optimum internet speed or is it affected by the link into the school. AT explained that the high schools would be linked to a dedicated connection; the primary schools would be similar to a home link, however this would be uncontested.

JW asked about Novotech as they appear to represent a saving over three years.

CC asked about companies that Novotech work with; Ashley explained that they switch between providers to ensure the best services

JW asked what Dedicated Breakout means; AT explained how this works as opposed to sharing (like home broadband).

AT spoke about updating hardware (leasing or buying own servers in the future). GP asked if there was any charge for new equipment; AT said that only the routers will be changed and these are free.

GP asked if the other companies offer anything that Novotech don't; AT said it is the opposite. Money can also be saved on phone calls through Novotech, however some of the schools are contracted with other companies. SB said that Pat Duggan is reviewing the contracts to see if paying to end them prematurely would still equate to a long term saving.

SIGNED AS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD BY CHAIR..... DATE.....


JW asked what the implications be of bringing in a new school; AT said that once their contract ends they can be added in. JW asked if there would be a charge to do this; AT said that there would be flexibility with all the companies to have new schools.

SB said that Option 1 represents a considerable saving for the budget, but if the Trust wants to adopt Thin Client then this would incur an upgrade cost. Both SB and AT prefer Option 3. JW agreed that the Trust will get more services and this represents the best value for money.

CC asked Trustees if they would like to approve the recommendation to choose Option 3:

THE TRUSTEES AGREED TO PROCEEDS WITH NOVOTECH, OPTION 3

Ashley Taylor left the meeting at 17:30

3. (REDACTED – CONFIDENTIAL) 



Sally Boardman left the meeting at 17:37

4. GDPR POLICIES

GDPR Policies: AR based the policy on the model policy on The Key, adding in the Trust's grids as appendices.

JW commented: GDPR for students; clarification of data sharing with financial organisations. AR said that some of our students are old enough to hold accounts and pay for things in their own right. In the same policy, JW asked about the right to access their data in "an intelligible form". AR to add in this for consistency.

GP ran through the implications:

DPO annual report (PD), including regular review and audit. JW asked if this could be a year from now (policy review biennially); Trustees agreed that this was a good idea.

Request PD to check that contracts outside organisations that store student notifications such as Norse (FSM), are GDPR compliant.

Parental consent ending for students aged 18 and over; AR checking whether we are gaining student permission for holding data.

Personal data taken off site must be signed in and out – remove line in policy. CC said that working from the cloud would eradicate the need for this type of system.

THE TRUSTEES APPROVED THE POLICIES SUBJECT TO ABOVE AMENDMENTS

5. SCHEMES OF DELEGATION FOR TRUST SCHOOLS

These were previously circulated to the Trustees.

THE TRUSTEES APPROVED THE AMENDED SCHEMES OF DELEGATION