Minutes and Action Items – WGIRMP Meeting #4

Meeting Date	Wednesday, June 24th, 2015 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Meeting Attendees:	Heidi Bohaker, Robert Cook, Glenn Cumming, Sven Dickinson, John Di Marco, Rafael Eskenazi, Rachael Ferenbok, Kelly Hannah-Moffat , Dan Hutt, John Kerr, Martin Loeffler (Co-chair) , Sue McGlashan,Gian Medves, Sian Meikle, Paul Morrison, Daniel Ottini, Zoran Piljevic, Philip Poulos, Susan Senese, , Alex Tichine, Vicki Vokas, Philip Wright
Regrets:	Kumar Murty, Sam Chan, Leslie Shade
Location:	Faculty of Engineering Galbraith Building, 35 St. George St., Boardroom 202
Notes taken by:	Andrea Eccleston

Agenda Item	Discussion
1. Meeting Updates	Bob provided an update on the policy and governance. The policy went forward at the 6th cycle of Governing Council as "for information" and will seek approval in the Fall 2016.
	Further consultation on the policy maybe arranged through Marden Paul. The FAS consultation meeting with the Provost will be on July 6th, 2015.
	A distinguished member of faculty has agreed to serve as academic Co-Chair for the WGIRM, and will be announced as soon as final arrangements are made to assume responsibility in September.
	A schedule of meetings will be negotiated immediately for next academic year. These will become ISC meetings dates when the ISC is established, with the expectation that some WGIRM members willcontinue on.
	ACTION:
	Expect probes on calendars for tentative arrangements for meetings
	Qs & As
	Kelly H. Moffat asked for a similar meeting with the UTM Academics Reference Group.
	ACTION:
	Susan S to coordinate a consultation session for the UTM's Academic Reference Group.
	Clarification was requested regarding the most current version of the draft policy. The latest version online is current and can be found at: http://main.its.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Policy-on-ISPDA-12-May-2015-POLICY.pdf

Agenda Item	Discussion
2. Presentation by Faculty of Arts & Science	Philip Wright presented FAS and APSE findings compiled by John DiMarco and Alex Tichine on current practices at peer institutions (*see attached presentation materials*).
	Discussion ensued regarding controls such as those at the University of Washington that are also recommended by US best practices.
	Sven recommended that the ISC have a very thorough review of our comparator institutions but due to urgency expressed by the Audit Committee, the current policy should be adopted as interim. The ISC

Minutes and Action Items – WGIRMP Meeting #4

	should have the mandate to make changes as best suited to the implementation plan. **ACTION** **Vicki to circulate presentation to committee members**
Agenda Item	**Discussion**
3. Review of standards	Martin referenced the Draft Cyber Risk Management Guidelines v. 1.6 (2015) which contained easily recognized standards – based on ISO/IEC 27002 . He alerted members that they should be aware pointing out that the use of specific terms may not align with definitions in the draft Policy. Discussion began around how many levels of data classification are required. John DiMarco noted that most universities use 3 levels and some had 5 levels of data classification. Heidi Bohaker commented the FIPPA link on page 9 is to Manitoba and needs to be corrected. No mention of tri-council or research data that are externally regulated. Perhaps administration or teaching (fiduciary responsibilities) should be in a separate classification hierarchy from research data. Rafael noted it is not sufficient to look at regulated and things that are not, for example under FIPPA. HR data are not regulated but are treated in the same way as protected information. Likewise, research data are also excluded from FIPPA. The existing approach we have is a two level system - everything that is not public should be treated as confidential including those data covered under FIPPA. It was recommended that accountability be added to paragraph one, page three in addition to confidentiality and integrity. In response to a question, Martin stated the purpose of this draft guideline is for adaptation by division with internal security skills and could become a basis for recommendation by the ISC. The CIO clarified that this Working Group has been tasked with providing the Terms of Reference for the ISC; to recommend Standards, Procedures and Guidelines; and recommend a framework for local risk management plans. It was recommended that the ISC would review these on a periodic basic and recommend how often they should be updated. The ISC does not exist until the Policy has been adopted. In the meantime, the CIO has established this working group to make recommendations to the ISC. The Working Group can operationalize its decision-making as it sees fit. The following recommendations were advanced: 1. ISC be charged with investigating standards extensively, across other institutions, and bring forward recommendations for adoption.

Minutes and Action Items – WGIRMP Meeting #4

2. If there is an urgent need for a policy now, it should be an interim policy, with a commitment to allow that policy to evolve as we better understand implementation standards and procedures – allowing us to achieve the best policy.

3. ISC should be charged with the ability to review policy, standards guidelines and procedures and recommend changes as required.

4. ISC needs to uphold the academic mission of the university. Faculty concerns in the domains of research and data preservation need to be discussed.

ACTION:

The objectives for the next two meetings:

1. Recommend Standards and Procedures
2. Address framework for local risk management plan
3. ToR for the ISC