



School IT Committee Meeting

Wednesday, 5th December 2018

Present: Gordon Smith (Chair) (GS), Richard Bartlett (Secretary) (RB), Caroline Edmonds (CE), Matt Burgess (MB), Nigel Berryman (NB), Bertie Gottgens (BG), Andrew Leedham (AL), Guy Williams (GW), Mary Dixon-Woods (MDW), Chris Wallace (CW), Lydia Drumright (LD), Soren Brage (SB), Litsa Biggs (LB) and Nigel Berryman (NB).

1. **Apologies:** Dennis Norris (DN), John Sinclair (JS) and Randy Read (RR)

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of last School IT Committee meeting held on 20th June were approved.

3. Matters Arising

RB gave a brief update on a couple of action points:

AP2 – RB to discuss information security with the Campus IT group with a view to agreeing advice and guidelines for School users. This had not been completed as RB was unable to attend the last Campus IT meeting. However there was now good content available from UIS, although this still needed to be disseminated throughout the School.

AP3 – LD to liaise with Afzal Chaudhry (AC) to measure uptake of consultant and clinical academics using BYOD and to provide that list to RB. This had not been completed although a parallel discussion with AC concluded that it would be unlikely that the pool of BYOD licenses would be increased, due to prohibitive cost per head. Once the migration of CUH IT to Novosco was complete the remote access option would probably be revisited.

4. Policy

RB drew the Committee's attention to the interim web policy as set out on the School's website (<https://www.medschl.cam.ac.uk/about/computing/interim-web-hosting-policy/>). RB proposed that, in the absence of any new policy from the centre, this policy should be made permanent, and that the policy should be re-advertised; firstly, because it was not being followed very thoroughly at present, and secondly, a recent security incident in CSCS had highlighted the importance of someone always being responsible and accountable for the servers they run. CW and LD both queried the requirement for "*all websites affiliated with the University should be hosted on a University server ..*" LD said this requirement was impractical for groups which were part of large multi-centre research teams and the University could not mandate that the websites which belonged to these teams were hosted on University servers. A discussion then ensued on the need to balance the University's concern for its security and reputation versus its researchers' ability to carry out their research, and RB agreed to amend the wording in sections 1.2 and 1.3 of the interim web hosting policy.

5. Information Security

RB updated the Committee on risk. He reported that three major threats were on the increase (ransomware, credential stuffing and phishing), and unfortunately the University currently had limited capability to deal with these threats. This was mainly due to a lack of resources both in the UIS and also at an institutional level. He said that the CSCS Server team was currently very short

staffed and this was impacting its ability to deal with the current threat level; he added that greater resources and expertise were needed to manage the situation more effectively.

6. Strategic planning

RB gave an update on the CSCS Strategy for 2018 – 2021 (circulated as a paper prior to the meeting). He said that most of the objectives in the strategy were being met or were on their way to being met. However a few objectives were not being met and this was mainly down to a lack of resources. MDW asked RB whether he had explored the potential for income generating streams besides user charges. CE advised the Committee that the Charging Group at the UIS was currently looking at what changes could be made, although any proposed changes would probably not take effect for at least three years. She added that the School needed to wait for the University to formulate a new charging policy which would in turn inform the School's policy on charging. GS reminded the Committee that the School received much better IT support than other schools within the University.

RB drew the Committee's attention to his paper on the School's strategic priorities (circulated prior to the meeting). He said it was very important for the School to communicate clearly to the UIS what its needs and priorities were, and he noted that only five users within the School had voted on the list of potential priorities which he had recently circulated. RB recommended that the strategic priorities should be kept under review as a standing item under Strategic Planning, in part to ensure this item did not solely focus on CSCS, but also to improve the Schools' ability to define and then track progress against its Strategic IT Priorities (whether satisfied by CSCS, other Institutional teams or UIS). CE reminded RB that the requirement for IT to be integrated into all new buildings could be removed as the UIS was now dealing with this.

7. Performance

RB drew the Committee's attention to the CSCS Annual Report (circulated prior to the meeting) and he highlighted a number of achievements over the past year. These included, amongst other things, changes to the SDHS funding model so that most groups now paid no changes, a new mail sever which enabled an increase to mailbox quotas from 5GB to 50GB, a new Service Management application (Ivanti) and the replacement of all storage infrastructure which had delivered a per terabyte unit cost reduction of 85%. GS asked RB about future storage upgrades and RB said that the next storage upgrade would probably be to a UIS managed storage facility.

A discussion then ensued on the University wide problems with recruitment and retention of staff. RB said that he would like to see staff able to progress within the University. He noted that currently staff can only move 2 points up the pay scale if they move to another post within the University. CE told him that this would be looked by the University as part of its examination into what was driving the gender pay gap.

RB also told the Committee about a recent Satisfaction Survey which CSCS had carried out. He informed the Committee that they had had 335 responses (10% response rate) and users were largely satisfied with their ability to understand their issue (88%), courtesy (95%), and technical ability (85%). There was significant support for instant messaging as a new contact method and CSCS would look into piloting this next year.

8. CSCS Finances

RB confirmed that the finances were generally healthy with all running costs met and income into sustainability funds continuing as required. He noted that one cost centre had a deficit (RYBW) but this was largely due to storage purchased for SCI and CITIID in the new Capella Building which had not yet been invoiced.

9. University IT (UIS and ISC)

AL gave a brief update on UIS matters:

- **Changes to staffing structure** – Steve Riley had recently been appointed as COO.

- **Project Governance** – this would be looked at very shortly and a new projects website would be launched in the New Year.
- **Video Conferencing** – the UIS had set up a number of rooms in the Roger Needham Building for video conferencing. These included the Hutchinson Room and the Wisbech room. Gordon Ross (GR) was currently looking at collaboration within systems alongside video conferencing. GS said that he would like to be able to do video conferencing from his laptop and LB said she would like them to consider how video conferencing could be used for teaching purposes (i.e. for students in regional hospitals). AL confirmed that GR would look into both of these matters.
- **Virtual Infrastructure service** – a new pilot for the Institutional File Store Service will be launched after various other pilots have finished at the end of January, unless any major issues arise before this time.
- **Amazon Web Services** - the UIS recently signed an agreement with AWS which should eventually bring down the cost of storage on Amazon Cloud
- **Research Computing Project** – this project was still ongoing and there were currently concerns within UIS as to whether it could be delivered on time. The deadlines were very tight and there was still considerable work to be done. Policy and procedures for control were currently being drafted.

10. NHS IT matters

LD reported on a number of NHS IT matters:

- The data sharing agreement will be updated, however, several issues would need to be resolved before the update could take place. In 2019 Clinical Informatics would look at different potential platforms for access to anonymised data.
- The Trust was currently transitioning its IT support and services from DXC (previously HP Enterprise) to Novosco, and it would take some time. Novosco had a schedule of things to do before the transition was complete. The next 12 months would also include an upgrade of EPIC to EPIC 2017. This would be the first upgrade to 2017 in the UK. BYOD would continue to be available.
- Unlike other NHS trusts, the Trust had not had any recent problems with NHS.net; and this was largely due to its very good infrastructure and security.
- The LIMS system – the Cancer Institute and Clinical Trials Unit had recently come on board. The system now contained a searchable tissue database.

11. Any other business

RB noted that Papworth Hospital would shortly be onsite and CSCS was currently assisting them with various IT related matters, including access to the School's room booking system.

LB raised the issue of digital accessibility. She said not enough people knew about it and it was very much seen as a solely IT related issue.

Action Point – LB to write a paper on digital accessibility to be circulated at the next Committee meeting.

12. Date of Next Meeting

1pm, 20th March, 2019