

# Quality Assurance Board Report on Work Package 1

---

## 1. Deliverable 1.1: Existing EU practices for cyber security

In general the members of the Quality assurance board were satisfied with Deliverable 1.1. However, some comments / remarks were made and specific corrections were proposed:

1. Section 2 (page 10-12) and 4.3 (page 34-36) have overlapping content.
2. References to tables not correct (page 28, 34).
3. A very good WP. It is exhaustive. A final table summarizing the national cyber security strategy and practices could help the reader to compare the several national practices
4. For what is concerning the dimensions of activity, it was quite difficult to understand the difference between principles and dimensions themselves. The dimensions seem to be related to the governance, while the principle, in my opinion, should be related to key pillars that each activity has to respect (see comment in the WP 1.1 – appendix 1)
5. Probably we have to define better some meaning such as intergovernmental, international, and so on. In this way, also the tables with the several entities pay. 12 could be more defined.
6. In the national example of US, it is missing the most important agency: National Security Agency: The National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS) leads the U.S. Government in cryptology that encompasses both Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) and Information Assurance (IA) products and services, and enables Computer Network Operations (CNO) in order to gain a decision advantage for the Nation and our allies under all circumstances.
7. There are some minor comments in the attached WWP 1.1 (such as redundancy of sentences and so on)
8. Figure 1 should be re-drawn and adequately captioned.

In addition, **Appendix 1** includes further comments directly inserted as comments in the report. Please refer to Appendix 1 for further comments / remarks and corrections.

## 2. Deliverable 1.2: EU practice for cyber security education

In general the members of the Quality assurance board were satisfied with Deliverable 1.2. However, some comments / remarks were made and specific corrections were proposed:

- Nothing to add, there are only some duplicate in the description of the campaigns. See WP 1.2 attached.
- There are a lot of programme that could be useful to understand how to build a solid cyber security programme starting from the University.

In addition, **Appendix 2** includes further comments directly inserted as comments in the report. Please refer to Appendix 2 for further comments / remarks and corrections.

### **3. Deliverable 1.3: Cross-matching of practice in ME with EU standards**

In general the members of the Quality assurance board were satisfied with Deliverable 1.3. However, some comments / remarks were made and specific corrections were proposed:

- One comment is that I didn't find relevant links for improving the cyber education system in the description of the cyber security strategy of Montenegro. We could report that state level attitude and propose steps for changing this. A state level support is quite important for developing a sustainable cyber education system.
- There are two identical copies of the description of Atlas bank AD Podgorica

In addition, **Appendix 3** includes further comments directly inserted as comments in the report. Please refer to Appendix 3 for further comments / remarks and corrections.

### **4. Deliverable 1.4: Roadmap for new Cyber security Education in ME**

In general the members of the Quality assurance board were satisfied with Deliverable 1.4. However, some comments / remarks were made and specific corrections were proposed which can be found in Appendix 4 as they are related to specific parts of the report.

## **5. Conclusions and Findings**

The members of the quality assurance board are satisfied with the deliverables of Work Package 1 – “Review and analysis of existing European practice for Cyber security education”. However, modification which have to be made and that would rise the overall quality of the reports are proposed.

**The members of the Quality assurance board (QAB) conclude that Work Package 1 – “Review and analysis of existing European practice for Cyber security education” is completed successfully, but a revisions of the specific parts of the reports have to be made in order to include the issues raised by the QAB.**

## **6. Actions**

According to the report the transfer of the next money instalment is confirmed for the following institutions:

1. University Mediterranean (UNIM), Podgorica, Montenegro
2. University of Donja Gorica (UDG), Podgorica, Montenegro
3. Tallinn University of Technology (TUT), Tallinn, Estonia

4. Buckinghamshire New University (BUCKS), High Wycombe, United Kingdom
5. Università degli studi Roma Tre (UR3), Roma, Italy
6. Global Cyber Security Center (GCSEC), Rome, Italy
7. Institute of Modern Technology Montenegro (IMTM), Podgorica, Montenegro
8. Chamber of Economy of Montenegro (CEM), Podgorica, Montenegro
9. Ministry of Information Society and Telecommunications (MID), Podgorica, Montenegro
10. Ministry of Education and Sports (MED), Podgorica, Montenegro

Marko Hölbl,  
Chair of the Quality Assurance Board

## **7. Appendixes**

- Appendix 1 – Deliverable 1.1 (filename: Appendix 1 - Dev 1.1.docx).
- Appendix 2 – Deliverable 1.2 (filename: Appendix 2 - Dev 1.2.docx).
- Appendix 3 – Deliverable 1.3 (filename: Appendix 3 - Dev 1.3.docx).
- Appendix 4 – Deliverable 1.4 (filename: Appendix 4 - Dev 1.4.docx).