# Computing Strategy Group Minutes

**2nd May 2019, 11:00 am, Room 5.42**

Present: Stuart Anderson (Chair), Alastair Scobie, Jane Hillston, Martin Wright, Tim Colles, Chris Williams

Apologies: None

## Summary

1. **PREVIOUS MEETING**

   Approval of previous minutes and matters arising
   Actions completed from previous meeting where discussed and agreed.

   Actions still pending from previous meeting:

   - **Strategy for supporting possible on-line 2 years MSc** - Stuart has produced proposal but yet to circulate.
   - **GDPR update** – MW will convene GDPR champs meeting to review data processing register. Will follow up in June to identify whether we need specific privacy notice for the School. SA notes the sharing requirements for Graduate Apprenticeships (being done with University lawyers)
   - **School access to self-managed compute resources** – this refers to accessing encrypted laptops where we don’t have key, although we are storing keys for Macs informally and IS keeps keys for managed Windows. Master copies of data should not be kept on laptops – discourage use but also key escrow for all self-managed machines, add agenda item to cover this.
   - **Updates from working groups** – AS in consultation with IS and SOA to confirm sponsors for working groups. [ACTION: Done.]
   - **Computing Strategy**
      - AS will incorporate these changes and circulate a draft update prior to submission to College IT Committee. [ACTION: done]
      - AS will form a working party in October 2019
      - IS and SOA to support AS to complete the Strategy plan by beginning of October. Comments received. [ACTION: done]
   - **Possible purchase of Qualtrics survey software licence.** Purchased. [ACTION: done]
2. **Updates from working groups**

**Teaching admin**
Two further meetings held with SA and Gillian Bell. Proposing to drop local “submit” system for 2019/20.

**Compute and Data Strategy**
Met with IS who have no plans to grow resources.

Need to compare against external provision.

EPCC are making national service bid and if we host get a certain amount of usage, however this is delayed on government spending review and we might now also be bidding against others (we were previously the only bidder).

Reviewed GPU utilisation:

- CDT cluster ok and hitting peaks often.
- MLP cluster is busy but idle once all course work done, we should increase PhD usage out of teaching period and also use for MSc projects to improve utilisation. Note though that this cluster has much cheaper GPUS, 6GB rather than 11GB.
- The old MSC cluster is only lightly load - partially due to ongoing maintenance.
- Research grant owned (DICE) individual machines wiki booked, 50% usage, includes very early machines, excluding these improves utilisation figures marginally
- Small old GPUs barely used so we should remove.

AS noted that these figures were for DICE managed machines only. The meeting was supportive in mandating that these figures are harvested for self-managed machines as well.

CW says research usage is bursty, e.g. peaking approaching conference deadlines. CW also stated that it was important for researchers to believe that they are getting the resources that they have paid for (particularly at peak periods).

Intend to keep running but we don't have space/power to compartmentalise resources so we should instead amalgamate into one School cluster.

TC says can use prioritised queues to guarantee specific researchers or groups can get resource when needed.

CW says more data on usage is needed.

Working group should meet now and can help establish what data we want from GPU utilisation figures. [ACTION: AS]

**VLE**
Met once. Tim to circulate paper to CSG members. [ACTION: TC]
3. **Computing Strategy**

IS says there are 29 high priority goals, how do we prioritise these?

JH says mix of short/long, need more stratification of recurring, some goals have admin staff dependencies and these need to be shown.

CSG also need to know about where we need new policy, maybe we should have two documents.

We have a high maintenance threshold. Need to know how much effort we actually have to allocate to high priority goals. Too much business as usual, focused on annual cycle of work.

Form a working group to discuss. [ACTION: AS/SA/IS]

4. **Replacing the School’s ageing course work submission system**

IS say that the main requirement for any new assessment tool is sufficient training and documentation to help staff transition.

5. **Future planning for online learning initiatives**

Distance learning group has met, includes Kobi Gal who understands the fractured landscape.

Going to pilot three things for 2019/20:

- online IAML with significant revision - CW requests we make this run in Sem2 as some materials are done JiT
  - uses compute infrastructure
- online INF1B
- online only data literacy course for Uni

Still has to go to strategy and be approved. These initiatives are all for physical students here. AS - we may have to beef up our Remote DICE Desktop (XRDP) provision.

6. **Scope requirements for managing School teaching content**

Form a working party. Maybe Patras, Goldwater. TBD. [ACTION: SA]

7. **Web strategy working party**

From a small working party for strategy and a larger group to discuss implementation. Hard to find committed members - NeilH maybe plus senior academics, e.g. Kami, Judy. Stuart to probe for possibilities. [ACTION: SA]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8. <strong>Procurement of the PGR GPU cluster – update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The winning bid price allows us to purchase more nodes which CW wishes to do. [ACTION: TC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. <strong>Office 365 migration – update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently on hold. Research staff not done yet. IS told Academic staff to be done by September or they will need to wait another year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. <strong>Any other business</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion that we schedule 90 minute meetings in the future and time budget agenda items so that the meeting can be constrained to time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. <strong>Date of next meeting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>