UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

School of Clinical Medicine

School IT Committee Meeting

Wednesday, 20th November 2019

Present: Gordon Smith (Chair) (GS), Martin Keen (Secretary) (MK), Caroline Edmonds (CE), Matt Burgess (MB), Andrew Leedham (AL), Guy Williams (GW), Litsa Biggs (LB), and Randy Read (RR)

Apologies: Dennis Norris (DN), John Sinclair (JS), Soren Brage (SB), Nigel Berryman (NB), Bertie Gottgens (BG), Mary Dixon-Woods (MDW), Chris Wallace (CW) and Lydia Drumright (LD)

1. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**
   The minutes of the last School IT Committee Meeting held on 26th June were approved. There was a one minor error to correct – under AOB, 5th line, "much" should be changed to "such".

2. **Matters Arising**
   MK asked what communications, if any, had been sent regarding PID security to the Head of Departments (HoDs). CE reported that it had definitely been raised either at the HoDs' meeting or the Council of School, and the HoDs had been advised that CSCS would be conducting a system wide audit in the near future. It was not known whether Richard Bartlett had written to the HoDs to provide further information about the audit before he left, but CSCS could certainly now proceed with the audit. MK said that he would liaise with the Information Governance Office regarding timing of the scan as they would be involved with any required follow up.
   Action Point – MK to proceed with the audit

3. **Policy**
   CE reported that she was still in the process of rewriting the Interim Web Hosting Policy.

   LB provided an update on Digital Accessibility. She told the Committee that since the last meeting, the University had received legal advice to confirm that it was not a public body for the purposes of the new EU directive. This meant that it did not have a legal obligation to comply with the regulations and, in particular, the deadlines specified in the regulations. However the University was still keen to follow the regulations as best practice wherever practical.

4. **Information Security**
   - **The SDHS** - MK updated the Committee on the SDHS. He said 198 studies were now being hosted in the SDHS and this had doubled in the last two years. The SDHS had added a limited amount of compute capability to satisfy arising requirements of customers, as raised via the SDHS user group. A forthcoming development in Q1 2020 would enable patients or clinic staff to securely submit data to the SDHS via a web interface.

   The Secure Research Computing Platform - AL reported on the development of the Secure Research Computing Platform at the UIS. He said that the UIS was in ongoing discussions with Victoria Hollamby regarding how to introduce secure Windows OS services alongside the

existing Linux OS services in order to meet the requirements of the Clinical School. Unfortunately the existing SRCP infrastructure is not able to provide Windows OS. Steve Hoensch at the UIS was currently looking at re-using an upcoming Citrix Solution for this purpose. AL added that clients were currently being on-boarded one at a time to the Linux SRCP and the final tenancies identified as being in the first phase would be added by the summer. A discussion then ensued about the proposed charging model for the SRCP. GS mentioned that it had been hoped that the School IT Committee would have the opportunity to review this; this would need to be deferred to the next meeting. The Committee's request to review the proposed charging model would be reported to the next Project Board.

- ***Action Point – AL to follow up with the Project Board and ask them to provide a charging model for the Secure Research Platform.***

- **PID access** - GS noted that it was much easier to access PID within the NHS Trust than via the SDHS, which requires a key fob. MK reported that although both systems employ two-factor authentication (2FA), the NHS Trust uses digital certificates to verify the computer, while the SDHS uses a code generator to verify the user. MK noted that using digital certificates was less secure as once obtained the certificates could be copied between computers, and that this approach was due to be phased out (per Dr Afzal Chaudhry, Chief Information Officer of CUH). GS asked MK whether CSCS could provide an easier method of 2FA that did not rely on carrying a fob that still met security requirements. MK noted that the UIS was introducing a phone-based 2FA mechanism that might be reusable. GS agreed that a phone-based approach would be preferable.
  Action Point – MK to investigate 2FA options, with a view to making it more accessible.

- **Windows 10** - MK reported that the ISC Ops Committee had requested an overview of any issues encountered by institutions with the migration from Windows 7 to Windows 10. MK then reported on CSCS project progress, which had now been ongoing for a year. 1500 older PCs had been replaced, or reinstalled, with 700 PCs remaining that could be more easily updated. CSCS had developed a self-service update portal to allow users to update their own computers overnight with minimal intervention required, so far used successfully on 200 computers. He added that CSCS should be reasonably close to meeting the completion deadline of January 2020 for this project, and that mitigations would be in place for any not updated in time.

- **BYOD Access to CUH Systems** – MK reported that the CUH had made a significant change to its remote access requirements. As of the 19th November 2019, users of Apple devices were required to 'enrol' their device, enabling the CUH IT Team to trace or wipe the device in the event of it being reported lost. This requirement was expected to be extended to Windows devices in 2020. This change impacted University Staff holding CUH contracts, who often used University devices to access CUH systems, thereby placing the local data at risk of being wiped by CUH actions. The risk to University data was discussed, and it was agreed that under this new model it was not acceptable. The School would engage with CUH to develop mutually agreeable processes. In the interim, University staff should use devices provided by the CUH for access to their systems.
  Action Point – MK to liaise with Dr Afzal Chaudhry re: CUH remote access services.

5. **Strategic Planning**
   CE noted that since the Committee was not solely focussed on the services provided by CSCS to the School, it would be beneficial if the other groups who were represented on the Committee, could also provide an annual strategic report to the Committee. She suggested that this should be discussed prior to the next meeting and an invitation extended.

Action Point – CE to invite an IT provider at the School to the next Committee meeting.
Action Point – MK to present a strategic report on behalf of CSCS at the next meeting.

6. **Performance**
   MK reported on a number of matters raised in the CSCS Annual Report (circulated before the meeting).

   - CSCS had had another year of high staff turnover, particularly in the Infrastructure Team.

   - The CSCS Support Teams were mainly focussed on the Windows 10 upgrade at present.

   - CSCS had been able to reduce some costs this year – service charges had been reduced an average of 12%, and they had removed the 15% admin charge for purchasing standard items.

   - With regard to Service Performance the incidents (reported faults) per month were trending upwards. However the number of major incidents was slightly down from the previous year (9 to 8). CSCS was continuing to improve system design, operation and processes to further reduce this figure.

   - A number of major projects had been completed including the upgrade of the VMWare and Citrix virtualisation platforms which enabled the recertification of the SDHS. The CSCS network links to the UDN were upgraded to twin 10Gbit connections located on the Biomedical Campus and at the SLCU, and this had provided resilience and increased bandwidth to the WCDC services.
     Action Point – MK to check the location of the cables (mentioned above) in relation to Hills Road.

   - Next year CSCS would review its service model which might lead to an amalgamation of charges for user account, computer support and network connections. An increasing number of users within supported departments were using personal devices which were unmanaged and could not be said to comply with the School's minimum security requirements. Additionally, some were using the Eduroam guest network as a primary means of connection and while there was no network service charge for this, they were using approximately three quarters of the School's network infrastructure, which was reliant on cost recovery. This was leading to a disparity in financial contributions to shared resources between SCM Institutions.

7. **Finances**
   MK reported that the CSCS finances were currently stable. There was still a deficit for the purchasing of Capella related equipment for which the School would reimburse them. MB added that he and MK would meet up in the New Year to discuss the long term funding plans for CSCS.

8. **University IT**
   AL presented a brief report on University IT:
   - **Portfolios** – since the last Committee meeting the six UIS Portfolios have been reduced to four – Business Systems, Education, Research, and Infrastructure and Generic Services. Mark Rowland was now looking at how these Portfolios would work in practice. AL said there

would need to be a governance review in relation to these portfolios and they would also consider how the needs of the Schools could be reflected in each Portfolio.

- **Collaborative Tools Strategy** – Jon Holgate had developed a Collaborative Tools Strategy which had gone to the ISC and ISC Operations Committee and was likely to be endorsed. It covered a number of areas such as video conferencing, live streaming and document sharing. GS and CE expressed concern that the strategy considered external collaboration out of scope, and did not provide solutions for communication with external institutions or individuals not the our platforms, thereby overlooking an opportunity for staff to reduce their carbon footprint while still being able to participate in international conferences. [1]MK mentioned that collaborative tools recommended by the Strategy such as Cisco WebEx and Microsoft Teams could be used by external guests if configured to do so, though the UIS would need to include this in their design.
  Action Point –MK to investigate the availability of WebEx or equivalent and report to GS who would write to Ian Leslie in the event that there was no such access.

9. **NHS IT Matters**
   In LD's absence, GS noted that the Trust had been upgraded to a new server which was noticeably quicker and more efficient.

10. **Any Other Business**
    None

11. **Date of Next Meeting**
    1pm, 25th March, 2020.

---

[1] Following this meeting MK discovered that collaborative tools such as Cisco WebEx were available throughout the University.