School IT Committee Meeting

Wednesday, 29th June, 2016

Present:
Gordon Smith (Chair) (GS)
Richard Bartlett (RB)
Caroline Edmonds (CE)
Robin Uttin (RU)
Lydia Drumright (LD)
Guy Williams (GW)
Chris Wallace (CW)
David Robinson (DW) (standing in for Litsa Biggs)
Richard Hey (RH)
John Sinclair (JS)
Chris Wallace (CW)
Peter Maccallum (PM)

Apologies:
Bertie Gottgens (BG)
Randy Read (RR)

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
The minutes of last School IT Committee meeting held on 23rd March 2016 were approved.

3. Matters Arising
None

4. Policy

- RB informed the Committee that minor changes had been made to the Information Security Policy and Data Backup policy documents following discussions at the last Committee meeting. The Committee agreed that these minor amendments would not need to go back to the Council of School for approval.

- RB gave the Committee an update on Microsoft OneDrive. He said that CSCS was struggling with the testing and deployment of OneDrive due to staff shortages, however he added that once their testing was complete CSCS would put out a statement about the suitability of OneDrive.

- RB proposed that an online School directory should be set up for all official IT related documentation (such as policy documents and approved Committee minutes) and the Committee agreed to this proposal.

- With regard to the new Information Security Oversight Committee, RB said that this new committee would meet for the first time on 5th July.
5. Strategic Planning

(i) Storage
RB informed the Committee that CSCS would review storage costs with the intention of producing a new model. He said that his original intention was to present the new costing model to the Council of School in January 2017, however he might struggle to meet this deadline. RU advised him that any new potentially lower costing model must take the infrastructure debt into consideration.

A discussion then ensued about the centralisation of services, and in particular the services which would be best provided by the UIS. RB said that the School should not fund services if the UIS could provide them on a more cost effective basis. RH advised that the UIS had no centralisation agenda and would not provide services, such as first line support, which could be better provided by local IT providers.

(ii) The JSCS
RB provided an update on the JSCS project. He said that the project was effectively on hold due to lack of staff resources in CSCS. He explained that the CSCS Core Infrastructure Team manager who had had a significant role in the project had recently resigned to go to the UIS, and the remaining team members were very stretched with a number of other strategic projects. CE said that the School intended to ask the School of Biological Sciences to provide some resources for the project as the SCM could not fund the project on its own. GS expressed concern that the resources being devoted to this project might affect the services provided to Clinical School users. However, RB assured him that this was not the case; he said that the decision to put on the project on hold had been made to ensure that School services were not jeopardised.

(iii) The NHS Data Sharing Project
RB confirmed that this project was on track. The project was recently audited by an external security company who identified a number of minor issues. ISO certification visits were scheduled for July and September and CSCS was hoping to finish the automation process very shortly. LD added that the project should be complete within the next three to four months with an announcement to go out in the Regius’ newsletter before the end of the year.

6. Performance
RB provided an update on CSCS Service Metrics. He confirmed that in the year to date 72% of tickets were resolved within 1 working day and 80% were fixed within 3 working days. He added that CSCS was close to meeting its target to close 95% of tickets within 3 working days for incidents but requests were taking longer and CSCS needed to identify the reason for this.

A discussion then ensued on publication of the CSCS Service Summary and Performance document. The Committee agreed that it should be published on the School’s website and also included in the HR induction packs together with a URL link to the CSCS pricing structure.

RB also said that CSCS was currently putting together a list of services they provided for publication in a University wide service catalogue.

7. CSCS Finances

- A brief discussion took place on the infrastructure debt. RB said that CSCS had intended to pay off another £100k, however this was being temporarily delayed as funds were needed to balance out other cost centres. RU said that while there was no immediate rush to clear the debt he would like it to be paid off in the near to mid future.

- RB said that CSCS was currently incurring expenses for various refurbishment projects through its Service Desk cost centre. He said that these costs would need to be recovered from the School and invoices would be issued before the end of this financial year.
• RB said that CSCS intended to explore other funding sources such as grant funding and RH advised him that the UIS Research Computing Team could assist with grant applications.

8. University IT (UIS and ISC)

RH gave an update on various UIS matters:
• Renovation of Titian rooms – RH was seeking formal confirmation around continuity of service, and in particular the temporary use of an equivalent service in central Cambridge while the rooms were out of action.
• Research Computing – The UIS have introduced a new email address for queries regarding research computing (researchcomputing@uis.cam.ac.uk).
• UIS storage costs – these costs should be published very shortly.
• HPHI/BioCloud HPC – the hardware is now almost completely set up and Paul Calleja was keen to set up a model for use.
• ISO27001 – the UIS was starting a project on ISO27001 (an accredited standard for information security management) with the Clinical School.
• Data Centres – the UIS was exploring how to provide further storage facilities as the West Cambridge Data Centre (WCDC) had almost reached full capacity. Current plans include looking at virtualised services, other storage facilities in the Cambridge area and off-site storage via JISC shared services.
• OpenStack ((VMs/VSS) – this service is now at the test stage and will use feedback from the Cambridge Biomedical Campus Project.
• Cyber security – the UIS/ISC was increasing its focus on cyber security as it was becoming apparent that this was the biggest risk for University IT.

Action Points – with regard to the decommissioning and removal of WBIC equipment, RH to raise this issue with the team at the WCDC as the School does not have its fair share of storage space. RH to also chase up the fibre link to the WCDC as RB expressed concern that despite commissioning the link in January it was still not operational.

9. NHS IT matters

LD gave a brief update on NHS matters:
• The electronic records system (eHospital, underpinned by Epic) received a number of positive comments and awards. On review from the Healthcare Information Management Systems Society (HIMSS), eHospital scored 6 out of 7 (range 0-7, 7 being the most electronically advanced). The main reason it did not score 7 was due to the fact that it was less than two years old. The Department of Health commissioned Watcher Review, which examines, all acute care trusts in the UK who have electronic systems, said that CUH was the most digitally mature acute care trust in the country.

• Cambridge Clinical Informatics (CCI) secured all IG and infrastructure to support data sharing between the University and CUH. A few last bits of programming and testing were occurring between CSCS, CUH and systems built by CCI prior to the launch of the automated data request, review and delivery. This would cover all clinical data within Epic. Once this had started, CCI would extend this to cover UIS HPC space. Imaging data was held outside of the Epic system and was also critical to research. CCI was working with Medical Imaging within CUH and the University to extend these processes to the new private network that Imaging was establishing, which would enable movement of image data to HPC in UIS.

• CUH continued with their HPE contract. Some services, such as storage had been recently procured from Novosco.

10. AOB

• RB noted that there were ongoing problems with phone calls to the Trust.
*Action Point* – RB to log this as an issue with HP and also raise the matter with Afzal Chaudhry.

- RB informed the Committee that the ISC was currently developing a strategy for University IT and was keen to obtain feedback from each School within the University.  
  *Action Point* – RB to draft feedback from the Clinical School and then circulate to this Committee and School PIs for comments and approval.

- CE told the Committee that she sat on the University’s Information Security Management Committee. She said that this Committee was developing an online security awareness training course; she added that once it was live, every member of staff within the University would be required to do the training.

11. Date of Next Meeting  
Thursday, 24\(^{th}\) November 2016, 1pm – 2.30pm