**System Division Face-to-face**

**SCD 2025 Strategy – Introduction:**

* ***Tree Diagram:***
	+ Provider of Choice - grab all the stuff going
	+ Why are we trying to do things
	+ Re-engineering to achieve what we need to
	+ Rather considering what do we need to do for STFC, consider what “I” want to achieve and what “you” want to achieve - and why
	+ Contribute to Science, Technical Challenge, Innovation, …
	+ Rewarding - professional operation, Int. Recognition
	+ Need to be able to grab opportunities - hard to pick up new things
* ***What holds us back? Why is it hard to be the Provider of Choice?***
	+ No time due to other responsibilities (patching, fixing, etc)
	+ Don’t know costs or prices, no capacity plan
	+ Cannot staff new projects (or finish old ones)
	+ Cannot exploit existing infrastructure - not joined up
	+ Not coherent service catalogue/portfolio
	+ Gaps in solution set
	+ No service guarantee (ISO, SLA, etc)
	+ Security (medical data, etc)
* ***Crossing the Chasm***
	+ Early Adopters, Early Majority, Late Majority
* ***SCD serving what UKRI needs and what we want to do***
* ***Why do people come to SCD?***
	+ We build bespoke solutions
	+ Track record
	+ We talk their language (PhD conversion)
	+ We understand their use cases
	+ We see synergies
	+ Communities
	+ Trust Relationship
	+ Track Record
	+ Affordable
	+ Storage USP
* ***What creates Trust - trust is critical***
	+ Partner working for greater good
	+ Can build solutions
	+ On Time
	+ Constructive
* ***New Roles & Positions****:*
	+ Architects and Leaders
	+ IT (FITSM) service Manager
	+ Existing Service Roles
	+ New FITSM Core Roles
	+ Resops capacity
	+ Operate Infrastructure to common standard
* ***Comments***
	+ Chart of majorities - Potentially want to be more up the curve in some areas to support the early adopters better.

**Group Discussions**

**Questions:**

***Additional Staff/Roles - Risks and Complications****Adding 10-15FTE of effort into our area is a huge opportunity and “should” benefit most/all, but:*

* ***What might individuals be concerned about***
	+ Training may impact delivery
	+ Management changes - could be opportunity or risk
	+ FOMO, who gets new roles
	+ Could change individual roles, but also an opportunity for career progression and development
	+ Increased specialisation
	+ Upskill individuals
* ***What negative impact might be experienced by existing groups and teams***
	+ Overhead with new members, focus on new people (long term benefit)
	+ Pressure on other groups
	+ Fragmented groups
	+ Siloed teams could lead to spare capacity
* ***What other risks might there be***
	+ Changes to how services run and how we are asked to work, and whether these are +/- depends on the individual again
	+ New activities draining existing activities
* ***How can we mitigate these risks***
	+ Showing what we’re doing
	+ Improve entry training
	+ Have new structures in place before adding people rather than adding people and then changing
	+ Ensure new roles consider existing staff
	+ Formalise training, send people to training as required

***IT Service Management: FITSM*** *Both ITIL and FITSM provide a framework for managing IT services in a coherent and professional manner. Whole we don’t formally follow these standards, many aspects of the standard are familiar to us and may be applied partially, not at all, or incoherently across our services.*

* ***What would be the benefit of adhering to a single service management operating model***
	+ FITSM is flexible and reasonable, and so is a laudable target for the division
	+ Most aspects of FITSM are likely already adhered to various degrees
	+ People can hold multiple roles within it
	+ Find gaps in existing services. If a service is running near capacity, this could provide a route to formalise requests for increased support
	+ Long term cost savings means that things can be repeated and managed easier
	+ Uniformity
	+ Consistency at entry level common factors
* ***What would be the downsides***
	+ Is it possible to make every service to fit into it
	+ Balancing the ups and downs, managing the service may be more streamlined/efficient but may be more involved on an individual level (especially to those already at capacity, and how to balance new effort alongside that)
	+ Not everything is service management - where does software management fit in, and what frameworks are there for that
	+ Cost, initial effort, etc
	+ Services are often evolving - from prototype through to things much more established - and so it can be hard to match agreements etc
	+ Repetitive tasks following standards/procedures, could make work boring
	+ Will this enable us to be agile, or will it make things less flexible
* ***On balance should we ignore this, fully adopt FITSM or do something in between***
	+ Benefits of moving forward outweigh the work to get there
	+ Groundwork should be tailored to the area, rather than “shoehorned” - tailor processes
	+ Cherry pick bits of the service as they go through evolution in order to understand what you can do and how they align
	+ More staff already FITSM trained, and aligns with how we already work

***Our Service Support Infrastructure***

*Behind each externally facing capability available to users are a bunch of underpinning tools and technologies which enable a service to function*

* ***What technical parts our service support infrastructure would it be better to do in common - what would be the benefit***
* ***What parts are best left to individual services - why***
* ***What roles (if any) does nobody fill (or does on a shoe string) that would be better created as a standalone post at >=40% FTE?***
* ***…***

***Our external facing Service Offering USP****In term of technical service offering, what category of services does SCD offer (if any) that makes us uniquely attractive to existing and potentially future customers:*

* ***What technical service offerings (our strengths) should we build on***
* ***What challenges do we need to address to ensure that this offering is available to anyone, anywhere, anytime (ASAP)***
* …

***FITSM Roles - All, Part, or Nothing***

*FitSM provides a structure of roles that may or may part map onto our “missing” capabilities. EG Capacity manager (CAPM), Information security manager (ISM). System Architects introduce further capabilities and additional finance and project management support take yet more burden from senior (GL like) activities*

* ***Do you think this may lead to a more “decentralised” structure***
	+ Architects looking at higher/lower levels means others can focus on the “interesting” USP areas
	+ Potentially already decentralised - project silos doing whole stack. Currently with more cooperation than previously, but not complete
* ***Is this beneficial***
* ***Where does this leave the groups***
* ***What should be the role of Group Leaders***