



UCL Research Data Services Executive

Paper 502

Title: Minutes for Executive 400

Date: 27th November 2013

Author: Max Wilkinson
Date: 29th November 2013
Version: 0.1

Document Location

The source of the document can be found in:

Revision History

Date of this revision:

Date of next revision:

Revision No.	Revision Date	Summary of Changes	Who	Changes marked
0.1	20131129	Drafted from notes at meeting	Max WILKINSON	no

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals

Name	Signature	Title	Date of Issue	Version
Max Wilkinson		Head of Research Data Services		
Jacky Pallas		Project Board Chair		
		Project Board	Acceptance at 500	

Distribution

This document has been distributed to:

Name	Date of Issue	Version

Contents

1. Meeting Summary 400	3
1.1. Attendance	3
1.2. Previous Actions	3
1.3. New Actions	4
2. Notes from Meeting	5
2.1. Item 1: Welcome	5
Agree agenda and accept minutes from previous meeting	5
2.2. Item 2 – Review Action from Previous meeting	5
2.3. Item 3 – Benefits	6
2.4. Item 4 – Programme update	6
2.5. Item 5 – Sustainability Planning	7
2.6. Item 6 – Executive Membership	7
2.7. Item 7 – AoB	7
2.8. Item 8 –Date of next meeting:	8

1. Meeting Summary 400

These are the minutes for the UCL Research Data Service Executive (400). Held at 10:00hrs on Wednesday the 27th November 2013. The minutes were taken by MW, supplemented with comments from GM and JP.

1.1. Attendance

<i>In Attendance</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Jacky PALLAS (Chair) (JP)	
Max WILKINSON (MW)	
Gavin MCLACHLAN (GM)	
	Anthony PEACOCK (AP, deputy for SM)
Peter COVENEY (PC)	
Samuel MASSIAH (SM)	
	Anthony FINKELSTEIN (AF)
Jens GROTH (JG, deputy for AF)	
	Martin Moyle (MM, deputy for PA)
Paul AYRIS (PA)	
Melissa TERRAS (MT)	
	Oliver DUKE-WILLIAMS (ODW, deputy for MT)
	Dipak KALRA (DK)
	Richard WORTLEY (RW)

1.2. Previous Actions

Action	Description	Owner	Status
A6.5 & A6.6	Liaise with Research Services to devise sustainable business model Devise business model options to include costing and charges for sustainability Update: >JP & MW to liaise offline and incorporate into business analysis	JP/MW	CLOSED
A1.4	SM/AP to provide regular updates as part of executive agenda (1 page summary) >Changing board agenda means IDSH/DSH will always provide an update	AP	CLOSED
A2.1	GM and MW to review all three policies, update required for next meeting Open Access Policy Data storage/security policy Data protection policy >Policy work re-established in ACTION A3.2	MW	CLOSED
A2.3	MW to develop communications plan for both Research Data and networks policy, as well as the Research Data Service launch	MW	ONGOING
A3.1	MW to re-write Research Data Benefits Register document	MW	ONGOING
A3.2	GM and MW to produce a detailed policies diagram, while cross-referencing and ensuring policies do not contradict each other.	MW	ONGOING
A3.3	MW to collate comments on the Research Data Policy. >MW reported that the policy was in effect 1 AUG 2013, review cycle was 12 months. PA noted that the policy would be owned by OVPR but advised by this executive		CLOSED
A3.4	JP to liaise with PA to discuss LERU global perspective	JP	CLOSED

Action	Description	Owner	Status
	>Comments received with thanks		
A3.5	DH to discuss LERU costing details with MW. A revised document to be forwarded to both MW and PA for further consideration. >Comments received with thanks and statement on indicative nature strengthened and approved by D Price VP-Research. LERU report formally published Sat 16 th November	MW/PA	CLOSED
A3.6/A3.7	MW to provide report detailing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who are the pilot groups? Why these particular Pilot groups were chosen? What has been learnt from these pilot groups? How success is measured for both project and KPIs (pilot and soft launch)? >Pilot completed and KPIs presented as part of project report. Primarily a base-lining activity to monitor allocation, usage and college wide representation	MW	CLOSED
A3.8	JP to provide guidance on how to report on costing and pricing for Research Data Services >JP and MW in discussion on the TRAC model for FeC and the impact on intuitional overheads. Will form part of business modelling work.	JP	CLOSED

1.3. New Actions

Action	Description	Owner	Status
ACTION 4.1	In partnership with RW and AP, MW to re-draft the Scope statements to include clearer service propositions and present at the next Executive.	MW	New
ACTION 4.2:	GM and SM to review benefits register and return comments and suggestions back to MW to compile for the next Executive meeting review.	GM/SM	New
ACTION 4.3:	MW to circulate the intranet URI to all executive members.	MW	New
ACTION 4.4:	SM/AP to present the MRC tender at the next meeting	SM/AP	New
ACTION 4.5:	MW to include impact of internal markets on the business planning and continue charging level discussions off line with JP and the Financial Research Office.	MW	New
ACTION 4.6	Members to email suggestions for executive membership to MW who will compile a list to present and decide at the next Executive meeting.	MW	New
ACTION 4.7	MW to take ownership of updating the ToR and Governance paper given recent changes from RIISG	MW	New

2. Notes from Meeting

2.1. Item 1: Welcome

Agree agenda and accept minutes from previous meeting.

The minutes from the previous project board (300/9th October 2013) meeting were tentatively accepted. There were minor formatting errors and some inaccuracy of content. JP and MW will attend to these offline and re-circulate the minutes for Executive approval.

SM noted that the scope of this group had possibly changed somewhat and that the scope statements at the presented should be re-considered.

MW agreed that the statements needed a complete review in light of the changing nature for the Research Data Executive. This should be considered as part for the wider ToR review (Item 6 on today's agenda).

PC noted that the Research Data Storage service was favouring the long tail of user needs and as a result was not supplying for the short tail. MW agreed that there had been issues in providing the type of service that CCS required and endeavoured to continue efforts to provide for these needs and that it was possible for the initial service offering was not going to be a perfect fit for all requirements.

It was also mentioned that the continued use of the term 'petascale' was suggesting only those with data collection on this scale would find this useful. Coupled to the lack in service provision for such large scale 'big data' users the confusion is confounded.

MW noted that a clearer service proposition should be included in the slides to remind all members that Research Data Services was a rich service wrap and that this group was becoming a focus for other 'data service' activity around College. It was important to separate the 'scope' as a remit of the Executive while the 'communication' of the services to the wider college was part of a wider communication plan. Scope creep and unrealistic expectations were a feature of a delayed and stagnant project and there continues to be confusion about college regarding exactly what Research Data Services provide e.g. storage, backup, mountable filesystems and for everyone.

ACTION 4.1: In partnership with RW and AP, MW to re-draft the Scope statements to include clearer service propositions and present at the next Executive.

2.2. Item 2 – Review Action from Previous meeting

Actions from Meeting 300 and any carried over actions were reviewed and commented on by members of the Executive. Comments and status updated in the actions register. Three actions noted as ongoing.

A2.3 MW to develop communications plan for both Research Data and networks policy, as well as the Research Data Service launch

A communications plan is being drafted by MW and PA and will build on the communication draft ion the Research Data Service Roadmap presented to the RIISG in 2011.

A3.1 MW to re-write Research Data Benefits Register document

MW noted that the Benefits register was a large gap in the Executive ToR and having a clear and living Benefits register was best practice in programme executive function. This was presented as a draft for comment. JP noted that this discussion was an agenda item and would be discussed further there.

A3.2 GM and MW to produce a detailed policies diagram, while cross-referencing and ensuring policies do not contradict each other

It was noted that this was a duplication of Action 2.1 and so Action 2.1 would be closed. It was noted that the new Research Data Policy should not conflict with existing and established policies. This would need investigation across UCL policy landscape. SM added that the IDHS was particularly rich in policy obligations, many of them statutory.

2.3. Item 3 – Benefits

MW introduced the benefits register (paper 403) and explained to the members that best practice in Executive function is to constantly review a benefits register in order to enable decisions in guiding project objectives and deliverables. This was a 0.01 draft that he hoped would be owned and agreed by the executive.

MT suggested a review of base-lining activity as measuring benefits was difficult and any such measurement would benefit from a clear and achievable metric. E.g. RDS_B002 is woolly in defining what 'efficient and productive' collaborations.

JP noted that RDS_B004 was part of wider activity in the Office for Vice Provost Research. She proposed it be removed from this register.

SM noted that benefits should now apply to the entire service wrap, IDHS/DSH and JDI, not just RDS.

There was some semantic confusion with the term 'cultural heritage' in RDS_B006 in that there is existing project activity using this term. It was suggested to change this to 'institutional heritage'

PC noted that there was no mention of possible economic benefit and this was an important factor in strategic investment from many sources, for example in the recent Research Council funding of Doctoral Training Centres

ACTION 4.2: GM and SM to review benefits register and return comments and suggestions back to MW to compile for the next Executive meeting review.

2.4. Item 4 – Programme update

MW presented the programme update, a changed in format from previous meetings. The new programme update would include RDS project updates as well as updates from the JDI and IDHS/DSH.

The RDS project update reported that a phase 2 procurement was nearing completion with tenders being evaluated on the 28th November 2013. This phase was a capacity expansion that built on existing capacity (independent to f technology or incumbent solution).

JP asked GM whether there was any further spend expected in this financial year for storage.

GM replied that there was a possibility that some more spend would become available as a component of a capital investment awarded to UCL, though this was currently not confirmed.

MW present the RDStorage KPIs and noted that there were still confusion in the KPI labels used.

JP enquired about the capacity management process that was being used.

GM updated the members of the 3-year investment proposal that currently indicated an investment level of 0.5 million GBP pa. This is draft and not confirmed. MW added that this was an investment profile that included RDArchive and RDSearch&Access which were the subsequent services in planning. The investment was required to support a 'change in behaviour' strategy that provided a free allocation followed by a charging model for further allocations.

Members asked about the guidance about obtaining allocations and usage policies. MW invited members to visit the registration pages on the RDS intranet where there is information about the service propositions, registration details and usage policies.

ACTION 4.3: MW to circulate the intranet URI to all executive members.

SM provided a verbal update on the Data Safe Haven. 5 projects have been taken through the IG toolkit process and a further 13 are onboarding. Further, 5 successful roadshows have been completed around college to both ISD staff and possible users.

Phase 3 of the project involves service enhancements with service wraps and ISO27001 audit.

SM noted that an MRC infrastructure tender was being compiled in It fir SLMS and JP suggested that SM or AP could present this at the next Executive meeting.

ACTION 4.4: SM/AP to present the MRC tender at the next meeting

2.5. Item 5 – Sustainability Planning

MW presented the drafted Business analysis (paper 405) and encouraged the members to separate the concerns of data storage (the RDStorage service) from long term data archiving (RDArchive and RDSearch&Access). This business analysis was concerned with identifying the market and attractiveness of RDStorage service in the current landscape.

MW explained that the approach taken was to 1. Identify the market, 2. Define the service proposition 3. Calculate the unit cost/s and define a strategy to facilitate uptake.

JG noted that policy compliance was a clear driver for uptake but agreed that competing interests of retail grade storage was often more attractive

JP noted that there were extensive and complex internal markets that were not represented in the analysis .e.g. the Computer Science provisioning to Biosciences. These internal market are essentially unregulated and as such are propagating unrealistic expectations.

PA noted that the business analysis could benefit from a clearer service message that linked to the communication plan. MT agreed and suggested use of info graphics as comms tools. Further, what should be the 'sell' for RDStorage as this would go a long way to helping users understand the benefits to them.

MT noted that it could be useful to make clear the costs of alternative services, e.g. Gdrive, Skydrive, Dropbox etc etc.

ACTION 4.5: MW to include impact of internal markets on the business planning and continue charging level discussions off line with JP and the Financial Research Office.

2.6. Item 6 – Executive Membership

JP asked the members to indicate academic staff who could be invited to the Executive to increase user representation. The current ToR need to be reviewed in light of the change in governance and transfer to a programme executive.

MT suggested that more junior members could be invited as they were most likely to see and receive benefit from the wider research data activities.

MW invited members to email suggestions to him and a list would be provided for the next executive meeting.

ACTION 4.6: Members to email suggestions for executive membership to MW who will compile a list to present and decide at the next Executive meeting.

ACTION 4.7: MW to take ownership of updating the ToR and Governance paper given recent changes from RIISG

2.7. Item 7 – AoB

JP asked for any other business. There were no further business items.

2.8. Item 8 –Date of next meeting:

~~Wednesday 30th April 2013 1000-1200, Room 103 The Podium.~~

Weds 18th February 2014 1000-1200, Room 103, The Podium

CLOSE: