



Information Services Governance Committee

Wednesday 24th February 2016

MINUTES

Present:

Professor Michael Arthur (Chair)
Ms. Wendy Appleby
Dr. Paul Ayris
Dame Nicola Brewer
Professor Nick Brook
Professor Andrew Brown
Mr. Simon Cane
Dr. Celia Caulcott
Dr. Michael Cope
Professor Mark Emberton
Professor Mary Fulbrook
Mr. Andrew Grainger
Mr Philip Harding
Professor Graham Hart
Mrs. Lori Houlihan
Mr Rex Knight
Professor Charles Mitchell
Professor Alan Penn
Professor Geraint Rees
Mr. Tom Rowson
Professor Anthony Smith
Mr. Mark Sudbury
Professor Alan Thompson
Mr. Nigel Waugh
Professor Jonathan Wolff
Dr. James McCafferty
Dr. Fiona Strawbridge (partial)
Dr. Clare Gryce (partial)
Ms. Bridget Kenyon (partial)

Apologies:

Professor Dame Hazel Genn
Professor Nigel Titchener-Hooker
Professor David Lomas
Professor David Price

1 16/02/01 Minutes of the previous meeting

Approved:

1.1 The minutes of the meeting held on the 3rd June 2015 (paper **15/06**) were approved

2 16/02/02 Digital Masterplan

Noted:

2.1 The Digital Masterplan was presented (paper **16/02/02**).

Discussion:

2.2 The Director of ISD summarised the Digital Masterplan highlighting that it supports UCL 2034 through enabler 4 and is based around 6 objectives. The estimated cost of the masterplan in FY 16/17 is estimated at £16m but only £13.5m of funding is expected and therefore delivery will need to be re-profiled to fit the available budget.

2.3 The Chair explained that ISGC needs to be content with the priorities set out in the masterplan. For instance, is the right priority given to the student experience.

2.4 Members of the committee expressed support for the masterplan, commenting on the strength of the objectives.

2.5 The Director of ISD explained that a more detailed plan will be tabled at the June meeting of the ISGC.

2.6 The Chair highlighted the importance of strong delivery to ensure we deliver on time and on budget.

2.7 The Director of ISD explained we have developed a strong project delivery capability and highlighted Grace, the new High Performance Computer, which will be delivered on time and budget, in a fraction of the time taken for previous HPC projects.

2.8 The Chair highlighted the need to ensure we celebrate success, such as Grace.

2.9 The committee asked what happens if sufficient funding is not forthcoming.

2.10 The Director of ISD explained that the delivery would be re-profiled to fit the available budget and focussing on the most important deliverables although, of course, this would push out the delivery timescales

Approved:

2.11 The Digital Masterplan was approved.

3. 16/02/03 IT Capital Funding for FY 15/16 and FY 16/17

Noted:

3.1 The paper proposing the allocation of capital funding in FY 16/17 and the allocation of the FY 15/16 supplementary funding (paper at **16/02/03**)

Discussions:

3.2 The Director of ISD explained that it had been possible to provision an additional £5m of IT capital funding due to slower than expected spend on the Estates Capital Programme. It was proposed that the focus of the additional funding is on the student experience and research computing with some spend on infrastructure and management information. Spend against the re-allocated funding must be capital spend and the spend must have completed by the end of the financial year in July 16.

3.3 The committee asked if allocating this additional funding to IT would impact delivery of the Estates programme. The Director of Finance responded that this re-allocation will not materially impact on the estates programme which is constrained by delivery issues rather than funding. Also the £5m is a relatively modest reallocation from the estates budget of £210m in FY 15/16.

3.4 Members of the committee wondered if the available funding could be used for other purposes such as new academic centres. The Director of Finance explained that any spend against this re-allocated funding would need to be capital spend and completed by July 16. Other initiatives could not meet these criteria.

3.5 The Chair highlighted that the £1.25bn allocated to the estates programme over 10 years was fixed and so prioritisation would be needed to ensure this was not exceeded.

3.6 The committee supported the proposed distribution of the £5m of additional IT capital funding and the proposed allocation of funding in FY 16/17.

Approved:

3.7 The proposed allocations were approved.

4. 16/02/04 Proposal for improved management information facilities

Noted:

4.1 The paper on the proposed project to transform management information at UCL (paper at **16/02/04**) was noted.

Discussion:

4.2 The Director of Planning summarised the paper explaining that improving management information in an organisation like UCL is not a trivial exercise. Many of our peers have spent 5-7 years reaching their current level of maturity and so we'll need to learn from their experience to move ahead faster. From research to date the most important needs relate to staff, students, space and research grants. The users need to be at the heart of developments and data management will be critical to success.

4.3 The Chair highlighted the value of good management information to the organisation explained the transformative effect it had at previous organisations.

4.4 Members of the committee expressed strong support for the initiative.

4.5 Members of the committee highlighted the cultural challenges that will be faced. Including embedding a culture where data quality matters and where staff need to own their own data.

4.6 The importance of good management information for REF2020 was highlighted.

4.7 The importance of having one truth so we debate the meaning of the data rather than its accuracy was highlighted by the chair.

Approved:

4.8 The proposed project was approved with funding from the extra £5m of IT capital funding in FY 15/16.

5. 16/02/05 Deferral of the go-live of the replacement HR system

Noted:

5.1 The paper on the proposed delay to the go-live of the new HR system (paper at **16/02/05**) was noted.

Discussion:

5.2 The Director of HR presented the paper explaining that the existing Northgate contract expires in August 2016 and previously the supplier was not willing to extend this. Recently however they had offered an extension and given the opportunity to potentially simplify processes as part of the work following the Cubane survey, the project is recommending delaying go-live by a year to August 17. This would also allow time for a more strategic approach to some of the technical changes and enable another system, called SiP, to be decommissioned.

5.3 Members of the committee were concerned that the Oracle product was not the user's choice and were concerned about making the implementation too complicated

5.4 The Director of ISD explained that the Oracle product was chosen because it offered the best combination of functionality, commonality with UCL's existing finance system and price. It is true the user interface is not as usable as other products and so is not as attractive to many users but the project believe this issue can be overcome.

5.5 The committee supported the plan to delay the go-live, include the decommissioning of SiP in the scope of the project and the simplification of processes ahead of the introduction of the new system.

Approved:

5.6 The committee endorsed the decision to delay the implementation of the new HR system by a year to August 17.

6. 16/02/06 Information Security Update (highly restricted)

Noted:

6.1 The paper providing the Information Security Update (paper at **15/06/04 highly restricted**) was noted.

Discussion:

6.2 Restricted information removed

Approved:

6.8 The committee noted the paper and approved i) the updating of the computer regulations to include reference to the Prevent initiative and the Terrorism Act, and ii) the encryption of desktop and laptop computers.

7. 16/02/07 AOB

Discussion:

7.1 There were no AOB items

MIKE COPE
Director of ISD
Information Services Division (ISD)
email: mike.cope@ucl.ac.uk
1st April 2016