

Initial Publication of Decision: E-mail from Holly Adams 21 August 2009 15:30

Blind Carbon Copied to elected members, Senior and Executive Management Teams, Head of ICT, Democratic Services and ICT Helpdesk

The Policy and Performance Portfolio Holder has decided today (21 August 2009) that Council 'owned' SCDC email accounts be retained for all Members (no autoforwarding to personal addresses allowed). The reasons for the decision were:

- The Council fully meets the requirements of the Government Connect CoCo.
- Members will have access to a safe and secure email service with technical support from the ICT team.
- Emails relating to South Cambridgeshire business will be managed in line with existing standards and continuity issues will be minimised.
- A managed service including full Helpdesk assistance.
- Full archive, backup and recovery options.
- Increased mail box size (200Mb – some 2x larger than that offered by most personal Internet Service Providers).
- The Council's commitment under the Freedom of Information Act and the Data Protection Act will be fully met.

Full details are available on-line.

Members / home workers: Intranet Link

Council office staff: Intranet Link

In accordance with the [Access to Information Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution](#), any executive decision shall be published normally within five days of being made. That record will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 working days after the publication of the decision, unless called in for review by the Chairman of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee or by any five other councillors.

A list of decisions currently within the call-in period is available [on the Council's website](#).

Unless otherwise specified, the [Democratic Services Manager](#) must be notified of any call in by **Friday 28 August 2009 at 5 pm**. All decisions not called in by this date may be implemented on **Tuesday 1 September 2009** (taking into account the August bank holiday on Monday 31 August 2009).

Any member considering calling in a decision is requested to contact the [Democratic Services Section](#) to determine whether any relevant amendments have been incorporated.

The call in procedure is set out in full in [Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, 'Scrutiny and Overview Committee Procedure Rules'](#).

Holly Adams
Democratic Services Officer
South Cambridgeshire District Council
T: 01954 713030
F: 01954 713149
W: www.scambs.gov.uk/meetings

E-mail from Cllr Alex Riley, 21 August 2009 16:41

Richard

Since it is not my habit to read our weekly Bulletins, this is the first I've heard of this decision and I would like to hear a more convincing argument than "meeting the requirements of the Government Connect CoCo".

I wish to have this decision called in. Just think. If none of us called it in, this message would not be sent on to our private addresses – i.e. most of us would never receive it. I'm aware that this might be seen as a point in favour of the PFH's diktat.

I get more than enough complications with my existing ISP without additionally seeking "access to a safe and secure email service with technical support from the ICT team".

Holly: in order to ensure I continue to receive your missives, please could you add my private email address to your various lists which include my name!

Kind regards

Alex

E-mail from Cllr Dr Douglas de Lacey 21 August 2009 16:47

On Fri, 21 Aug 2009, Adams Holly wrote:

> Blind Carbon Copied to elected members, Senior and Executive
> Management Teams, Head of ICT, Democratic Services and ICT Helpdesk
>
> The Policy and Performance Portfolio Holder has decided today (21
> August
> 2009) that Council 'owned' SCDC email accounts be retained for all
> Members (no autoforwarding to personal addresses allowed).

I am both surprised by this decision, and infuriated by it. Surprised because, even in the short time we had been allowed for comment (9 whole days, and it took most of that to persuade IT to send me the base document, the CoCo) I had managed to produce a long list of comments explaining why I thought this was the wrong option. I had expected at least an acknowledgement from the PFH or Head of IT before a decision would be made. Infuriated because the PFH was presented with a false alternative; as I had pointed out other options were available to him; and on such an important issue I would have expected greater consultation. (We had 9 days yet the consultation document called Appendix 1 is dated July 2008.) It is clear from the fact that about 2/3 of us choose to have our mails forwarded that this will have a major negative impact on Members. Please can we Call it In for proper assessment?

> The reasons
> for the decision were:

>

> *

> The Council fully meets the requirements of the Government
Connect
> CoCo.

But can do so by other means

> *

> Members will have access to a safe and secure email service
with
> technical support from the ICT team.

Which 50 Members at least are quite happy to do without.

> *
> Emails relating to South Cambridgeshire business will be managed in
> line with existing standards and continuity issues will be minimised.

Auto-forwarding would also achieve whatever is of value in this

> *
> A managed service including full Helpdesk assistance.

Which 50 Members at least are quite happy to do without.

> *
> Full archive, backup and recovery options.

Auto-forwarding would also achieve whatever is of value in this

> *
> Increased mail box size (200Mb - some 2x larger than that offered by
> most personal Internet Service Providers).

I *think* my mailbox size is 500Mb so this doesn't cut much ice here.

> * The Council's commitment under the Freedom of Information Act
> and the Data Protection Act will be fully met.

Auto-forwarding would also achieve whatever is of value in this

The PFH and Head of IT have a loooong document of my comments which I am happy to forward to anyone else interested in the details.

Douglas

E-mail from Cllr Nigel Bolitho, 21 August 2009 17:18

[In this case I won't receive any emails. Is this joined up government?. I object and want to know what I can do to object. I asked you if I could have my personal email- you said no. I now want my personal email used on all correspondence or for all correspondence to be redirected to this computer. I don't have time switching from one computer to another.](#)

Nigel

E-mail from Cllr Mrs Deborah Roberts, 21 August 1009 19:06

I think that once again this shows up the Cabinet system as against the old committee one .

I don't begin to pretend that I really understand any of this but at least with the old ways we would have had proper warning that it was coming up with time to book into getting to the meeting and a chance then to debate or ask for a simplified explanation (and I don't believe I'm the only techno dumbo on the council) I want to understand in easy terms what this will mean in reality .

Another thing , why in August , a time when so many members would be away yet they get only 9 days warning .

Not good enough by half .
Yes let it be called in , add my name to the list please .
Regards ,
Deborah Roberts

E-mail from Cllr Mrs Hazel Smith, 22 August 2009 11:55

Dear Holly
I would also support a call-in on this item. I would like to hear a debate between members on this decision which affects all of us. I would like to hear Douglas's suggestions and any response to them in an open meeting. Insufficient time for consultation has been given for this, over the summer when many of us have other priorities.
Hazel

E-mail from Cllr John Williams, 22 August 2009 12:05

Dear Richard,

I would certainly prefer to continue the status quo in which I receive SCDC communications directly without having to go pro-actively into a "post-box", as it were, to see what is there. It works fine the way it is - why fix it?

I do not full understand what all this is about and would you please add my name to the list for calling-in th decision so this can be properly explained to members and debated.

Many thanks.

John Williams