Update on implementation of the Board review of JISC

**Issue**
1. An update on progress with implementing the HEFCE Board commissioned Review of JISC.

**Recommendation(s)**
2. The Board is invited to discuss and note the information contained in this update.

**Timing for decisions**
3. There are no decisions to be made at this meeting; the Board requested an update.

**Further information**
4. Further information is available from Heather Fry (0117 931 7280, h.fry@hefce.ac.uk); Ian Gross (0117 931 7169, i.gross@hefce.ac.uk); Kate Page (0117 931 7455, k.page@hefce.ac.uk)

**Members’ Interests**
5. Two Board members were members of the review group (Rene Olivieri and Shirley Pearce). All institutional members come from institutions that use JISC and its related companies.
Background

1. Currently the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) is established as a joint committee of the HE and FE funding bodies. It is not a separate, legal entity but has relative autonomy from a strategic and operational perspective. JISC is located within HEFCE for accountability reasons, with HEFCE’s Chief Executive as Accounting Officer.

2. The JISC companies (JANET (UK), JISC Advance, JISC Collections and British Universities Film & Video Council, BUFVC) are all companies limited by guarantee. The companies are HEFCE-related bodies and HEFCE, on behalf of JISC’s funders, delegates authority to JISC to oversee the relationship with these companies; it acts as the intelligent customer on behalf of the funding bodies with regard to these companies. HEFCE and some of the other funding bodies are guarantors for the first three companies, while BUFVC has no funding body guarantor and is a registered charity.

3. The funding bodies ask JISC to provide world-class leadership in the innovative use of ICT to support education and research. It is the UK’s expert on information and digital technologies for education and research and the driving force behind many initiatives and shared services. It thus provides directly, or facilitates access to, or acts as a voice for a world class network, quality and cost-effective digital resources and a range of specialist advisory services, while JISC’s innovation programmes and projects seed the core services of the future.

4. HEFCE’s contribution to the JISC budget for 2011/12 is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JISC activity</th>
<th>Income £</th>
<th>HEFCE contribution £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure services</td>
<td>£63m</td>
<td>£30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data / content services</td>
<td>£44m</td>
<td>£18m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions services</td>
<td>£29m</td>
<td>£17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>£8m</td>
<td>£4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£144m</strong></td>
<td><strong>£69m</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. JISC offers leadership and support to UK educational organisations at a local, national and international level. It provides resources, knowledge and expertise that colleges and universities would struggle to source individually due to cost and resource. It can also take controlled risks with new developments that an individual institution could not support. By staying abreast of developments across information and digital technology it helps the UK education community make investment decisions which deliver appropriate solutions.
6. JISC’s mission is to provide world-class leadership in the innovative use of Information and Communications Technology to support education, research and institutional effectiveness.

7. JISC’s strategic objectives are to:
   • Provide cost-effective and sustainable shared national services and resources
   • Help institutions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their corporate and business systems
   • Help institutions to improve the quality of learning and teaching and the student experience
   • Help institutions to improve the quality, impact and productivity of academic research
   • Be a responsive, reflective and learning organisation that demonstrates value for money

8. JISC currently manages and funds 123 projects within 20 programmes\(^1\), including: assessment and feedback, developing digital literacy, e-learning, repositories: take-up and embedding, strategic management of institutions, UMF shared services and the cloud. Outputs and lessons are made available to the HE and FE community.

9. JISC also supports 40 services that provide expertise, advice, guidance and resources to address the needs of all users in HE and FE. As well as the related bodies these include things such as JISCMail, and JISC Regional Support Centres.

10. The Review of JISC, led by Sir Alan Wilson, stated that there was no comparable body to JISC within the UK, and internationally its reputation is outstanding as a strategic leader and partner. The review concluded that “JISC is an invaluable national resource which has evolved in response to increasing demands over 20 years”.

11. Notwithstanding the strengths the review identified, it also made several recommendations in its final report, published in February 2011. The seven key recommendations were:
   a. JISC activity focussed on achieving a large impact;
   b. JISC funding through a combination of grants and subscriptions/user charges;
   c. JISC should become a separate legal entity and implications of this for the four companies be reviewed;
   d. Clarification of governance arrangements ensuring Board takes clear overall strategic control;
   e. Clarification and simplification of internal structure, to improve efficiency and control;

\(^1\) Figures accurate at 8 November 2011 and extracted from http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo.aspx
f. Estimation of savings to be achieved from the proposed internal structure and operations;

g. Overall funding strategy for ICT in HE, FE & Skills sectors between JISC, its funders, sector representatives and other bodies.

12. These recommendations were endorsed by the Boards of the UK funding councils and JISC.

13. The aim of these recommendations was to provide a new, more focussed organisation with a sustainable future, reflective of the needs and priorities of the relevant sectors and with the aim of achieving a large impact. Funding for the organisation would need to reflect changes in funding for higher education (HE) in England and across the sectors and devolved administrations, as well as recognising the current constraints of the economic environment and developing new business models.

14. JISC has subsequently undertaken a range of actions towards implementing the Review, including:

a. Establishing a Transition Group to oversee progress with the implementation of the review’s recommendations;

b. Establishing a JISC Shadow Board;

c. Appointing external consultants to undertake three ‘strands’ of work:
   - Strand A - An analysis of the most appropriate new business and governance model for JISC as a separate legal entity;
   - Strand B - Systematic Review of all Existing JISC-Funded Services;
   - Strand C - Systematic review of JANET (UK).

d. The JISC Executive is undertaking considerable other work, including market research, to determine what the attitude might be to contributing more to the costs of JISC and its related companies.

There is also much other work and consultation taking place. Further details of these activities follow in the discussion section.

15. The JISC Assessors (i.e. the funding body representatives) have also initiated additional activity to ensure they are kept up to speed with progress. These include regular meetings with the chair of the Transition Group and regular meetings as a group without JISC officers being present. They wish to ensure they are kept informed, that key decisions will receive their input in a timely manner and that they have an opportunity to discuss the position of their organisations and assess where any differences might be emerging.
Discussion

The Transition Group

16. The Transition Group has been set up to oversee strategy and work streams around transition as well as acting as the steering group for the consultancies. It is chaired by the JISC Board Deputy Chair, David Baker and comprises a variety of members from the JISC Board and officers. Its decisions are carried out by a parallel group made up of JISC staff, lead by the Executive Secretary. It has been very active in initiating and leading activity. It is a time limited group that will hand over its functions to the new JISC and Board once the future is decided. Its meeting on 25 November is key, considering among other things: the three interim/final draft reports from external consultants (evaluating them against a set of criteria agreed by the Board, including the opportunity for assessors’ input); views from JISC Executive’s Staff Information and Consultation Group representatives; progress with monetising the JISC offer to enable more detailed discussions with institutions and funders about future funding streams and packages.

17. In January 2012 the Transition Group will produce a report and formulate the recommendations about the future of JISC that will be put to the Steering Committee, its own Boards and ultimately those of the funders for approval.

The Shadow Board

18. The Shadow Board met for the first time on 28 October 2011. The current Board will approve and oversee the programme of work for 2011-12, while the Shadow Board will define the programme of work and budgets from 2012-13 and consider JISC’s future strategic direction. Both Boards will receive information and reports from the JISC Executive, Transition Group and the Audit Committee.

19. Decisions made by the Shadow Board will have to be agreed / endorsed by the JISC Board until a new JISC is formed. Once the future JISC is established, the current Board and Shadow Board will stand down and a new JISC Board will be established for the company, reflective of its shape/scope and mission. It is envisaged a number of members of both Boards may wish to put themselves forward for membership of the new JISC Board of the new entity. The Shadow Board is composed as the Wilson review recommended for the future JISC Board (i.e. smaller and with a higher proportion of members being senior leaders directly representing the sectors.) An independent/private sector member is still to be appointed. Two assessors from the JISC Steering Committee attend in rotation; meetings are also attended by members of the JISC Executive’s Senior Management Team. A smaller, more stream-lined and executive board has thus been achieved.
20. Shadow Board membership is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Shadow Board role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Tim O’Shea (JISC Chair)</td>
<td>Principal, University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Boulderstone</td>
<td>e-Strategy and Information Systems Director, British Library</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Paul Jeffreys</td>
<td>IT Director, University of Oxford</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Noel Lloyd</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor (retired), Aberystwyth University</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Celia Duffy</td>
<td>Director of Academic Development. Royal Conservatoire of Scotland</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Martin Hall</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor, University of Salford</td>
<td>Deputy Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Paul Layzell</td>
<td>Principal, Royal Holloway</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Heather MacDonald</td>
<td>Chief Executive and Principal, Sheffield College</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor David Baker</td>
<td>JISC Deputy Chair; Chair of Transition Group</td>
<td>ex officio member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugald Mackie</td>
<td>Audit Committee Chair, JISC</td>
<td>ex officio member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Both Boards meet in January 2012 and will consider a report and recommendations from the Transition Group on the future JISC; this will be based on all work to date, including the reports from the three consultancies. All assessors will attend the meetings of both boards. The recommendations will subsequently come to the Boards (or equivalent) of the funders for approval of the new JISC (March HEFCE Board). A key decision for the central funding bodies at that time will be the level of control they wish to have over the new organisation, given that they will remain large funders and are in a position to take a view of the larger public interest in the body, as discussed further below.

The consultancies

22. Despite it taking some months to obtain permission from BIS to employ consultants, their work should prove invaluable and provide external and expert input into the formation of the new JISC. The consultants started work in September 2011. All three strands are on schedule. All the main data collection activities have been completed. There has been good cooperation between all Strands, and key stakeholders have appreciated the combined interviewing that has occurred. They will submit reports to the Transition Group meeting on 25 November. Strand A will submit its Phase One report on that date, providing a list of possible governance and business models and discussing the implications of each. Strands B and C will submit their final reports at that time.
23. Phase 2 of Strand A will begin on 26 November, to report on 9 January 2012. This will provide an options appraisal of all the shortlisted business and governance options. Each of which will need to be capable of being structured so as to maximise potential advantages in relation to charitable status (where beneficial), trading requirements, and taxation (including both VAT and corporation tax), and other arrangements.

24. Phase 3 of Strand A will be to produce an implementation plan by 5 April, based on whichever option is agreed by the assessors’ organisations.

Market Research

25. JISC’s communications team has undertaken a programme of market research to understand better what information and technology-related services universities and colleges delivering higher education currently use and value. It is also looking at those services institutions anticipate a need for in the future and their attitude towards how they should be paid for. This has involved talking individually or in small groups with many senior representatives from universities and colleges. Further work will be needed to determine similar attitudes among the much more diverse broader skills sector.

Institutional views have been collected and analysis is in progress. A later stage will be testing options with the sectors, which will have to merge with/into an iterative process with funders as to what they will and can afford to pay for.

26. A report will be presented to the Transition Group for consideration on 25 November.

27. JISC is also undertaking a number of stakeholder engagement activities, including a Sector Representatives Summit which was held in September. It has also had consultation meetings with the funded services as well as discussions with the JISC companies.

Other JISC developments

28. JISC has also been reviewing the implications and possibilities offered by another Wilson recommendation, namely reorganisation so as to better focus on some public facing activities:

- **Horizon scanning**: JISC is considering how to run a new Observatory Function which would be clustered around its two existing innovation centres

- **Demonstrator and Futures Labs**: a plan is currently being drafted about how these two new areas of activity could be put into place and the form they should take. The Transition Group will consider proposals around the two Labs in November.

- **Take up and embedding of JISC activity and larger impact**: JISC has reorganised its activities and services into nine portfolios to group like activities together and make it easier to negotiate a way through the complex JISC offering. This is starting to be reflected in how JISC manages and reports on its activities and is capable of being adapted to either a larger or smaller future
JISC. JISC is also currently piloting a new approach to supporting institutions in the use of outputs from JISC projects, by means of what are known as Transformation Projects. These are designed to have a large impact; a key part of how JISC is running these is a sectors’ engagement strategy.

29. The JISC Executive Secretary, Dr Malcolm Read OBE, is proceeding with his planned retirement at the end of January 2012. Permission was obtained from BIS to recruit beyond HEFCE staff and those of the Civil Service for a fixed term (9-18 months) appointment. The plan being that this period will see the creation of the new JISC, after which that organisation will need to determine what type of leadership role it needs. Mr Martyn Harrow, currently Director of Information Services at Cardiff University, will assume the fixed term position on 1 February 2012.

**Important issues to consider about the future JISC**

30. While needing to await the outcome of the Strand A consultancy before reaching a final position, the assessors agreed some months ago that a single entity large JISC (or at least as large as possible) should be the option against which other alternatives are measured. Implementing this option would bring a higher proportion of JISC’s staff and activities into one legal entity; at present there are close to 500 staff working on JISC activities in around 20 entities, with JANET having the most staff. This option was based on the thrust of the Wilson review recommendations, and was thought to have many advantages including:

- the opportunity of cost savings and efficiencies (at least in the longer term) through having shared back office solutions
- the greater likelihood of strategic decisions being taken across and for the benefit of the whole organisation
- the opportunity for all parts to be working towards common goals and avoiding duplication
- the opportunity for due control to be exercised over all parts of the business (especially those currently residing in institutions and companies);
- greater opportunity for rationalisation
- matters relating to pensions.

31. The consultants are likely to report with a number of possible options. There are likely to be additional up-front costs with the ‘large JISC’ option, but the payback period is anticipated to be fairly short because of the synergies and cost savings likely to be achievable. A downside is that if the other organisations were part of a single entity that included JISC, then that organisation would be a provider of services directly for the funders (presumably including by then institutions) with no managing agent to act as the ‘intelligent customer’, unless the assessors themselves put more professional oversight in place (JISC currently acts as the intelligent customer on behalf of the funders). Institutions might consider Board members from the sectors provided such a function.
32. We would also expect a new organisation to require a trading subsidiary, mainly to ring-fence the risks of trading outside the HE/FE sectors, although there are other advantages to doing this.

33. There are many possible alternatives to the single entity/large JISC model described above, including a central JISC company with each of the four companies existing relatively autonomously as they do now. Or with some of the companies and services joining a central JISC company but not others. (The strand A consultants are exploring the advantages and disadvantages inherent in the various options.)

34. No decision on the matter of the future shape of JISC is required from the Board at this stage.

35. Another key decision area for the future is that of the future ownership model. The crux of the matter here is how to ensure that the benefit of significant public investment in this area is retained and that central funders have a suitable level of ‘reserve’ control over future JISC activities. The HEFCE Head of Governance has been advising all assessors on possibilities as well as liaising with the Strand A consultancy. No decision is required from the Board at this time.

36. The letter to HEFCE from the Secretary of State in June 2011 indicated that funding for some central agencies including JISC remained among our priorities going forward. However, like all of our funding we have to re-examine the basis on which we make it available and ensure we are achieving value for money. To this end we are looking to JISC to make efficiencies and to approach its activity more strategically so that it focuses on essentials and activity with the possibility of a large impact, while also building alternative sources of funding to replace a decline in central funding. All nations subscribe to this view, in line with the Wilson review.

37. There are a number of things to note at this stage. We would expect in future that JISC (including all its current parts) would be funded from at least four funding streams:

- Central funding, including capital funding, based on public and/or student interest criteria
- Subscriptions from all HE providers proportionate to their size and or usage (this would include HE in FECs and private providers within the single gateway and thus able to benefit from public funding). JISC would need to apply the concept of a ‘level playing field’ to all providers that are part of the single gateway. (Non-HEIs and FECs do have JANET connections and can access other resources and services at market rates, but JISC and its companies will also need to further adapt to working with providers outside the single gateway who may wish to use its services and activities.)
- User charges to access and use a service or activity over and above anything paid for centrally or via a subscription
- Other sources, such as potential to create income from trading or use of IPR.
38. Currently HEFCE, on behalf of all of JISC’s core funders, has given direction to JISC on the use of its funding through an annual advice letter. Funding is allocated to JISC by each funder according to a historically-based formula that recognised the (approximate) relative size of each funder’s provision. In recent years, this arrangement has been subject to some stress, particularly where the LSC (now BIS, representing FE in England) chose to be an associate member buying specific services rather than a contributor based on an agreed formula. BIS is now involved as a full funding partner with effect from AY2011/12. In 2011/12, this arrangement for recurrent grant has again broken down, as the SFC (both HE and FE) and DEL (HE) were unable to contribute their proportionate share (by around £900k in Scotland’s case). JISC has ‘worked around’ this drop in funding by reducing JISC activity in Scotland by approximately this amount.

39. The stresses described above are early signs that the formula-based funding arrangements for JISC are probably not going to be appropriate as we move forward, for at least the following reasons:

- Each funder may have different levels of funding available to it, meaning it can no longer commit to the formula;
- Some countries have already or are considering using JANET in new ways (including with wider public sector networks), which may result in a different approach to funding SuperJANET6;
- The priorities of each funder are increasingly divergent and the general tone is that they will wish to fund specific activities and services, rather than support all that currently comprises JISC and its companies;
- For English HE some proportion of funding is expected to have to shift to institutions as more public money flows direct to them via the Student Loans Company, rather than flowing through HEFCE. Such change would have to be introduced gradually.

40. HEFCE has started to articulate what we consider the public interest in central funding of JISC to be. A public interest justification has to deliver public benefits (outcomes) that are not readily or as efficiently funded from other sources. In funding terms the public interest may be taken to include the following:

- Infrastructure, activities and services which it will be desirable to maintain UK-wide to support UK HE, e.g. JANET, cloud brokering and the Access Management Federation. In this respect, we should note that HEIs already pay a network charge based on turnover and they already make a contribution for some other JISC services e.g. HEIs subscribe to their own choice of content offered by JISC Collections (some of which is provided free);
- Services and activities of value but which institutions may not prioritise as being things they wish to see their subscriptions used for. For example they may see little direct benefit in funding innovation work that may or may not be successful and may or may not benefit them directly or in the short term.
In this case, HEFCE would be supporting the higher risk development work that has contributed so much to JISC’s long-term success;

- ‘Public service’ activities which offer a valuable service in the public interest (e.g. TechDis) and which institutions may, again, not prioritise;
- Other JISC services that HEFCE views as being in the student interest or that contribute to sustaining a competitive environment.

41. The principal public benefits anticipated to arise from these type of public funding investments include:

- Benefits accruing from economies of scale, providing overall better value for money than could reasonably be achieved by institutions acting alone or in small groups (whether by mission or location)
- Developing and providing a shared services operation, with access to specialist knowledge (of HE)
- Minimising the risk of individual institutions falling behind in their investment in IT and loosing out on the gains such investment makes possible; or, perhaps due to location, having much higher costs than other institutions
- The possibility of greater risk taking in development and innovation in the use of technology than an institution acting alone could take
- Helping to keep UK HE at the forefront in the use of technology in teaching and research, and to help HE in FE keep in touch with these developments
- Helping preserve the benefits of having a common academic network
- Supporting a level playing field to existing and new providers of HE, by opening up access to JISC to HEFCE-registered organisations
- Encouraging JISC to seek benefits from its past and future investment e.g. through exploiting its knowledge, skills and IPR in new ways as described in the Wilson review.

42. However, JISC will not be in a position to start substantially changing its sources of funding before 2013-14 as the sectors involved will need to be brought on board and each central funder has yet to determine how it expects to proceed. JISC (or its funders on its behalf, or the representative bodies) needs greater clarity about the shape of future governance and funding before any concrete propositions can be put forward - this will start to emerge when the various consultancy work-strands report. At the same time JISC is now prioritising the monetisation of its offer to assist in these decisions. Alongside this, JISC will need to have a clear idea of the proposed pace and timing of any reductions in funding as HEFCE T-grant reduces. It is apparent from stakeholder consultations carried out by JISC that, if the central funding of JISC falls below certain levels, then the existence of JISC itself will be put at risk. This is particularly clear in the case of the network, where HEIs can directly procure internet access for themselves. In this case, metropolitan HEIs would be at an advantage, with knock-on costs for all other users of JANET. This would most likely be detrimental to the sector as a whole, as it is
considered likely that central procurement of the network will deliver overall better (sector-wide) value for money.

43. It is likely that the January 2012 JISC funding proposition to the Board will therefore need to be for a very modest reduction in JISC recurrent funding for 2012/13. This will reflect the fact that increased efficiency and some rationalisation should already be happening, but recognise that rationalisation will be at a very early stage, alternative sources of funding will not have started and transition will itself cost money. There will be considerable costs in the short-term associated with JISC becoming a separate legal entity (assuming this is what happens). Where JISC currently uses offices, equipment, personnel and corporate systems of their host organisations (such as HR, IT, governance, payroll, etc), the new company would require initial investment in these assets and systems, which JISC will need to budget for. This latter point is important. There are however no decisions to be made at this stage.

44. Taking JISC together with its related bodies, services hosted in institutions and JISC Executive based at HEFCE, King’s College, and the University of Bristol, there are inevitably some complex staffing issues to resolve as JISC changes its shape and legal status. Apart from retaining the knowledge, skills and experience of the staff needed in the new organisation, the two main staffing–related issues are pension arrangements and TUPE, if some staff movement between organisations becomes necessary.

45. Whatever solution to the future JISC is agreed, it is likely to involve some change, with various groups of staff currently on varying terms and conditions. Under the TUPE regulations, such staff have certain rights and protections that would need to be honoured, including consultation. Once the future JISC arrangements are agreed, HEFCE and the other funders will need to ensure the proper procedures are followed. Such processes are lengthy and resource intensive, particularly if the scale proves to be large. (JISC has some 500 staff across 20 employers, if all related bodies, regional support centres and other services are taken into account). Legal advice is likely to be required as part of this work. There are also likely to be one-off costs associated with staff transfers.

46. The Wilson recommendation was that JISC become a separate legal entity on 1 August 2012. This remains the goal, but even if it is achievable what is likely is that a ‘shell’ will be created first into which activities and staff gradually transfer in an orderly manner.

47. The key dates for the Board are likely to be:
   - Grant for JISC in 2012/13 decided in principle in January 2012
   - Grant for JISC in 2012/13 decided in more detail in March 2012
   - Decisions about the future JISC taken in March 2012

**Recommendation**
The Board is invited to discuss and note the information contained in this update.
Resource implications for HEFCE

48. Transition is absorbing considerable time in JISC and the companies. It is also creating more work within HEFCE. But this is necessary and inevitable. Creation of a new entity will cost money in terms of one-off costs and recurring costs thereafter. Amounts for establishing separate administration systems, for example, cannot be quantified until more is understood about the shape and scale of the new organisation; opportunities for any shared services will also need to be explored. Even with efficiencies, savings are therefore not likely to be immediate from any change, but the opportunities for savings are anticipated to be significant, resulting in a reasonably fast pay-back period. HEFCE will also have a need to consider how it handles future relationships with JISC/its companies with the current arrangements not really being viable. One possibility might be a jointly supported post from all funders who could have dedicated time to devote to this activity.

49. With regard to HEFCE grant to JISC, it has already been suggested above that the scope for savings in 2012/13 is small. Alternative sources of funding ought to start coming on stream in 2013/14 under a new business model; they would need to increase gradually as HEFCE funding declined. The slope and end point of the gradient will need to be determined, but HEFCE will need to remain a considerable funder. Efficiencies from stream-lining and rationalisation will similarly not be strongly felt immediately.

Risk implications

50. The single most significant high-level risk (for both HEFCE and JISC) is that the new arrangements do not result in JISC retaining its status as a leader in its field, supporting the HE and FE sectors in the effective use of technology. The three consultancies and all the other work carried out to support the implementation of the JISC Review are designed to manage this risk.

51. The majority of the strategic and operational risks lie with JISC and its companies, to manage transition while maintaining business as usual. A considerable risk is that there is insufficient funding to enable transition to happen effectively. Another risk is that institutions cannot see the benefits they get and are reluctant to subscribe, even at fairly low levels. Different future models and timescales for change carry different risks. JISC has well developed risk registers covering such matters and more. For HEFCE there are some other risks, including that funders cannot agree on the approach to take or that if transition were badly handled there could be a knock on impact on the reputation of HEFCE and the other funders. The Strand A consultancy and Transition Group Report on future recommendations will need to take risk into account. Once a decision about the future model has been made HEFCE will be in a position to understand more clearly the risks it faces.

Communications and engagement

52. JISC has a communications plan in place. The market research activities have been an effective vehicle for drawing attention to the changes ahead, as was the stakeholder’s summit. Other opportunities for reminding the sectors about what is
happening and the consideration institutions need to start giving to a possible model and funding have also been taken, including at the UUK Conference. Where necessary JISC and HEFCE have issued joint press releases. But in future there will be still more to do as it is vital that the JISC community is engaged and supportive, and that what JISC does and supports is much better understood. JISC is aware of the need to step up activity in this area and make its work more visible.

**Regulation and sector impact assessment**

53. Some regulatory aspects regarding future ownership and control and a new Board have been mentioned earlier. Until options about the future are available for consideration their impact cannot be fully assessed. Consideration of impact will be a vital part of the process, including in determining a fair and effective method of paying for what JISC does so that core activities are not jeopardised and are available to the education sectors on a similar basis.