



**School IT Committee Meeting**

**Wednesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2016**

**Present:**

Gordon Smith (Chair) (GS)  
Richard Bartlett (RB)  
Caroline Edmonds (CE)  
Robert Williams (RW) (standing in for Robin Uttin)  
Lydia Drumright (LD)  
Guy Williams (GW)  
Chris Wallace (CW)  
Randy Read (RR)  
Bertie Gottgens (BG)  
David Robinson (DW) (standing in for Litsa Biggs)  
Richard Hey (RH) (standing in for Paul Calleja)

**Apologies:**

John Sinclair (JS), Chris Wallace (CW) and Peter MacCallum (PM)

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of last School IT Committee meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2015 were approved. However GS noted that the Committee was referred to as the School IT Steering Committee. The Committee agreed that the word "steering" should be removed from the title.

**3. Matters Arising**

RB provided an update on a number of matters which were discussed at the last Committee meeting (and were not otherwise covered in the agenda):

- A CSCS hosted small high performance cluster was now installed in the Medicine Server Room, however it was not yet fully operational and CSCS was currently waiting for the UIS HPC team to complete commissioning.
- CSCS now had geographically dispersed data centres (the Medicine Server Room at Addenbrooke's and the Sainsbury Laboratory on Bateman Street).
- The 10GB fibre to West Cambridge Data Centre (WCDC) was now in place and working (for data transfer to HPC only) but there was no confirmation yet from UIS HPCS on what was connected at the WCDC end.

**4. Policy**

**(i) Minimum Standards Policy**

RB drew the Committee's attention to the draft Minimum Standards Policy document. He explained that this document was drawn up as a result of the University Review of IT Infrastructure and Support and the standards were initially approved by the Council of School 18 months ago. He added that the intention was for the standards to be reviewed annually by this Committee and any

changes would be submitted for approval to the Council of School. The Committee did not wish to make any changes to the current document.

#### **(ii) Draft Information Security Policy**

RB circulated a draft Information Security Policy document and informed the Committee that this document was based on template 'light touch' policy approach originating in UIS Information Management. He emphasised that information security should be the responsibility of IT providers rather than academic departments as it was too technical for non IT trained staff to handle. GS noted that PID data was not mentioned in the document.

***Action Point - RB to amend the Information Security Policy document to include a section on how PID data should be handled.***

#### **(iii) Information Security Oversight Committee Proposed Terms of Reference.**

RB proposed that the School IT Committee did not have the time or the expertise to deal with information security and it would therefore be beneficial for it to be overseen by a specialist Committee. He raised a concern that there was currently no review of safe havens taking place, and he suggested that this proposed committee could review safe havens on an annual basis. A discussion on the composition of this Committee then followed. RB said that he envisaged technical and governance specialists and LD said that she would be happy to represent the Trust. RB also said that there should be a representative from each safe haven as well as representatives from other groups who store large amount of data such as CRUK-CI.

#### **(iv) Data Backup Policy**

RB circulated a draft data backup policy document which set out the processes each department should go through to establish an appropriate backup procedure for their data. A general discussion on storage then ensued. RB said that CSCS was currently testing Microsoft OneDrive storage to find out whether there are any issues with it. He added that use of OneDrive would lead to lower storage charges for most users. RH said that UIS is currently working with Dropbox with a view to obtaining a better solution for the University. RH also reported that the UIS was currently developing different storage strategies which recognised the possibility of different approaches. With regard to group drives and large scale storage, he advised the Committee that the UIS would distribute this storage to IT providers throughout the University who would then pass it on to their users.

GS queried whether the policy document dealt with sensitive and non-sensitive data and CE agreed with him that this should be included.

***Action Point – RB to amend the Data Backup Policy document to include a short section on sensitive and non-sensitive data***

### **5. Strategic Planning**

#### **(i) Joint Schools Computing Service project (JSCS)**

RB updated the Committee on the JSCS project. He said that a panel of three external experts recently reviewed the Project. They came up with a number of recommendations and were generally very positive about the project. They would meet again in August and November to carry out two further reviews. RB added that they were currently on track to meet their deadline to complete the finance and governance review and technical scope by the end of January 2017.

#### **(ii) NHS Data Sharing Project**

LD reported that sign off on the Information Governance Toolkit had been achieved, and she was also hoping to obtain ethics approval and sign off from the Trust by the end of the month. Once everything had been signed off, data can start moving from the Trust network to the CSCS secure data hosting system. She added that she does not intend to make an official announcement about new system until it has been checked for operational issues, and this may take several months.

### **6. Performance**

Following discussions at the last Committee meeting, RB circulated a second draft of the School's IT Service Metric policy. This policy document was amended to provide details of both a Core IT Service Delivery and also an Enhanced Service Delivery. A discussion ensued on the how service metrics could be applied throughout the School. RR noted that CIMR would not be able to report this level of metrics as they did not use a helpdesk ticket system. RB noted that whilst CSCS has the ability to report service metrics it may not be practical for some of the other IT providers to adopt the same level of formality. Several members expressed concern that there might be "pockets" in the School where users are not getting adequate IT support and how to discover and report on this.

**Action Point - RB to draft a paper to be circulated to this Committee and the Heads of Department meeting, detailing:**

- (i) The CSCS Service Metrics (including year to date service metrics)**
- (ii) Reference to the School Minimum Standard of IT Service which all IT services needed to meet**

## **7. CSCS Finances**

RB briefly reported on CSCS's finances. He reported to the Committee the capital expenditure reserves were healthy, CSCS was on target to pay back a further tranche (£100,000) of the server room debt and there were no planned big ticket expenditures in the near future. He also said that if the JSCS went ahead then CSCS may need to consider a different funding model.

## **8. University IT (UIS and ISC)**

RH gave a presentation on UIS matters (copies of his slides are attached to these minutes). He also spoke about the UIS's view on its relationship with local IT service providers. The UIS recognised that there were benefits in consolidating some services such as shared data centres; however, there was no centralisation agenda and Martin Bellamy was adamant that providers such as CSCS should continue to provide local user support as the UIS did not have the capacity to support everyone.

## **9. NHS IT matters**

LD told the Committee that the Trust was currently considering whether to change its IT service provider when the contract with Hewlett Packard expires at the end of the year.

RB raised the issue of Trust employees who had requested CSCS services as they were unhappy with the Trust services. He added that there were potential security issues with these requests as they could lead to NHS data being stored on the CSCS network. CSCS was not providing NHS staff with primary IT services.

## **10. AOB**

RW (on behalf of RU) drew the Committee's attention to the issue of expense claims. He said that some users were purchasing equipment such as laptops themselves and then submitting an expense claim to accounts. GS suggested that inappropriate claims for personal expenses should be brought to the attention of the relevant Head of Department. CE suggested that repeat offenders may not be able to have their expense claims refunded, particularly if their claim was significantly more expensive than could have been achieved through the proper channels.

## **11. Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday, 29<sup>th</sup> June, 1.00pm – 2.30pm