

HPHI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

15th June 2017, Seminar Room 7, the Clinical School

Minutes

Present: Professor Ed Bullmore (EB), Dr Guy Williams (GW), Professor Bertie Gottgens (BG), Dr Lydia Drumright (LD), Dr Ferdia Gallagher (FG), Robert Williams (RW), Richard Bartlett (RB), Paul Calleja (PC) and Dr James Brenton (JB).

1. Apologies

Professor Kevin Brindle (KB) and Dr Ari Ercole (AE)

2. Minutes

The minutes of the first meeting were approved after PC pointed out a couple of factual corrections. Firstly, he had not requested that SCM develop a cost recovery model – they had actually asked him to develop one. Secondly, the UIS had saved 20% on Peta5 not as a result of SCM involvement but more because of involvement from the wider academic community.

3. Matters arising

The Committee ran through the action points from the last meeting. These were as follows:

- (a) **LD to meet with Paul Calleja reference UIS representation at this committee**
PC confirmed that he would represent the UIS on this committee and if he could not attend he would nominate someone else such as Paul Sumption (PS).
- (b) **LD to contact Paul Calleja reference presentation at the next meeting**
PC said he did not receive sufficient notice about this request. He confirmed he would do a presentation at the next meeting.
- (c) **EB to present Neuroinformatics cost model to next meeting**
EB will do a presentation on the proposed Neuroinformatics cost recovery model as a potential model for the Bioinformatics portion.
- (d) **LD contact Paul Calleja reference cost recovery model**
Discussed during this meeting (agenda item 6).
- (e) **RB to add committee structures to the agenda for the next meeting**
The Committee agreed that this should be added to the agenda for the next Committee meeting.
- (f) **LD to discuss extension of CSCS ISO 27001 ISMS to include HPHI with UIS**
Discussed during this meeting (agenda item 10).

4. Agree how the Committee should link in with UIS Research and Institution Services

The Committee discussed the purpose of this Committee - EB agreed with JB that its purpose should be to get value out of capital and address clinical need. In the medium term its needs should be fed into University wide strategic plans. PC suggested that the Chair of this Committee should sit on the HPCS –SG Committee.

Action Point 1 - EB to discuss the HPCS-SG Committee with Caroline Edmonds (CE) and Paul Alexander and ask them whether he should represent the School on this Committee.

5. Confirm the current state of readiness of the HPHI elements (the imaging and computational clusters)

BG, GW and JB summarised their current position regarding the readiness of the HPHI elements

BG confirmed they currently had no provision. JB said the hardware is commissioned, OpenStack is setup, 'fat' nodes have been created, JB and two of his PI colleagues have access. He stressed that the infrastructure is setup but the software/code is for the users to bring. GW reported that the imaging section of the HPHI is operational, with users able to access and process their data generated from the WBIC scanners. Approximately 100 users were registered on the system. Due to staffing issues, final user migration the WBIC and BCNI compute servers had been slow. PC advised that his team may be able to assist with this.

Action Point 2 – GW to contact PS and Stuart Rankin (SR) to discuss support for migration of users to the HPHI and decommissioning of legacy systems in WBIC and BCNI.

Action Point 3 – BG to advise his staff to contact PS and SR and they would be signed up in the usual way.

Action Point 4 - JB and BG to consult users and find early adopters who could act as exemplars; feedback from these users will feed into the roll out in September and should be publicised via the Regius' newsletter.

6. Discuss how the free allocation of computation and storage should be calculated

The Committee discussed the issues of cost recovery and how much free storage users should be entitled to.

Action Point 5 – PC to put together various costings models to be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

7. Discuss the options for cost recovery and sustainability

Action Point 6 – JB and BG to discuss storage costs and bring their ideas to the next Committee meeting. Any model they propose should start with free storage with additional costs to be added on at a later stage.

8. Review any requests for use which fall outside the original intended use

Deferred until the next meeting

9. Confirm any other strategic deliverables not yet agreed/confirmed which the HPHI should deliver

Deferred until the next meeting.

10. AOB

CE) and Carolyn Read (CR) joined the meeting to discuss the development of ISO 27001 safe havens. CE confirmed that there were two issues to clarify:

- What would be the role of formal project management within the ISO 27001 project which UIS had proposed?

- Movement of data between different safe havens with the University – it was essential that the different “geographical” safe havens should be subject to the same governance (IT Toolkit) and the user experience should be the same for everyone so that users would not inadvertently breach compliance.

PC confirmed that he had sign off and Technology Development Funding to produce a single ISMS accredited platform which will serve the whole University. He added that he expected Cassie Bradley (CB) to project manage it, although he could not yet confirm that she had the bandwidth to do this. CE confirmed and EB agreed (on behalf of the Committee) that if CB was project managing it and there was funding available then she would be happy to proceed, and when a suitable safe haven was developed, CSCS SDHS users could be migrated on to it.

Action Point 7 – CE and ED to clarify the position regarding SCM’s costs, and in particular the £53k which had been made available to UIS for CSCS to extend its ISMS safe haven.

The group agreed that operating under one Toolkit was highly desirable. However some thought would need to be given to the other users of a UIS safe haven. CE pointed out that since SCM was simply suggesting that UIS take the CSCS approved model and only adapt it if necessary, this would be the fastest way to achieve the overall aim and the other parts of the University would have comfort they were using a ‘tried and tested’ model.

11. Date of next meeting

TBC