# IS Applications 3-Year Planning 2015/16 to 2017/18

## Proposal Suggestion Template – 21/11/14 v 1 OVERVIEW

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Portfolio | *ISG* | Programme Name | *Infrastructure* |
| Proposal Name | *New SQL Server Database Tier Replacement* | Proposal Sponsor | *David Smyth* |
| Other Contributors | *Heather Larnach, Iain Fiddes* | | |
| Need, problem, or opportunity? | This is needed to provide a more up to date environment for SQL Server based services and bring the SQL Server service into a more resilient and “enterprise” scaled infrastructure. This will allow us to bring the load balancer technologies more into use with these systems to provide the same features (including load balancing) for Windows-based services that we currently provide for our Linux-based services.  In addition, existing systems or new one to come in the near future with a requirement to run SQL Server 2012. We need to ensure we are in a position where we have the experience and knowledge of installing and running this version of the software.  This will benefit us by ensuring minimised delay for projects with the need for this version of the software, continued supportable position for the Microsoft database product set within the University and exposure by the technical teams in the install/upgrade and running of the new version with an appreciation of its new feature set for use in other project and support areas | | |
| What would happen if the project did not take place? | Our services would be running on unsupported operating systems and other software. High risk that third party products would fail on older version of architecture software and databases. | | |
| Additional Information | *No specific information at this time* | | |
| When is it needed? | *Start Year: 2015/16*  *Duration (No. of Years): 1* | | |

## IMPACT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Who does it affect? | *Users and Owners of a number of services running on SQL Server, such as UniDesk.* |
| Why it is needed / what the benefits are | This project is to provide a new centralised infrastructure for SQL Server. This will provide a corollary infrastructure to the one provided for Oracle.  We currently offer SQL Server 2008 as the primary version of the product which will have a final end of live in June 2019. We will look in this project to install the latest Microsoft SQL Server version (2014) on the new infrastructure. |
| Procurement activity required? | *no* |
| BI/MI requirement? | *no* |
| External costs? | *£30K estimated for environment (bid to be submitted to ISC)* |

## CATEGORY

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of work | *Compliance* | Funding Source | *Core Grant / Sponsor Funded* |
| \*Compliance Justification | | | *Please select corresponding criteria below:* |
| *Meet external legislative requirement* | | |  |
| *Address obsolescence of technology component* | | | *x* |
| *Maintain critical University business system AND*  *no practical workarounds available* | | | *x* |
| *Provide further brief details re. why this should be considered Compliance* |  | | |

## FIT WITH UNIVERSITY STRATEGY

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Goals – Excellence in Education |  | **Infrastructure updates**  -          ensure infrastructure components are maintained and supported to ensure capacity, security and performance requirements  -          rationalisation of architecture where appropriate to enable easier maintenance and reduced costs  -          to standardise delivery of the various operating system, database and application layer technologies across the enterprise IT estate.  We will look to ensure we are providing a stable, secure and available infrastructure by ensuring adequate maintenance for the hardware and supporting software required to provide the University services.  This is seen as an on-going factor of our work where these elements are continually maintained year on year. |
| Goals – Excellence in Research |  |
| Goals – Excellence in Innovation |  |
| Enablers - People |  |
| Enablers - Infrastructure | *X* |
| Enablers - Finance |  |
| Themes – Outstanding student experience | *X* |
| Themes – Global Impact |  |
| Themes – Lifelong community |  |
| Themes – Social responsibility |  |
| Themes – Partnerships |  |
| Themes – Equality & widening participation |  |

## SCORE FOR PORTFOLIO COMPARISON (TO BE COMPLETED BY APPS & PARTNER TOGETHER)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme Priority (per [separate guidance](https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/insite/Guidance+for+Programme+and+Portfolio+Prioritisation+of+Proposals+in+3-Year+Planning)) | *5* | |
| Overall Priority  (per [separate guidance](https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/insite/Guidance+for+Programme+and+Portfolio+Prioritisation+of+Proposals+in+3-Year+Planning)) | *2* | |
| Programme Scoring (per [separate guidance](https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/insite/Guidance+for+Programme+and+Portfolio+Prioritisation+of+Proposals+in+3-Year+Planning)) | *1.Alignment with University Strategic Plan/Business Objectives* |  |
| *2.Risk of not doing the project* |  |
| *3.Benefits relative to cost* |  |
| *4.Time to deliver tangible benefit* |  |
| *TOTAL SCORE* |  |

## ESTIMATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY APPS & PARTNER TOGETHER)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Estimation Types: Select the relevant option(s) – each option must be estimated separately | | | | |
| *Business Case / Options Appraisal (BUS)* | |  | *Software Development (in-house) (SWD)* |  |
| *IT Solution Procurement (BUY)* | |  | *Agile Software Development (in-house) (AGL)* |  |
| *3rd Party IT Solution Implementation (IMP)* | |  | *Software Development and Configuration within Student Systems Partnership (SSP)* |  |
| *IT Infrastructure (TEC)* | | *x* |  |  |
| Estimated IS Apps Days  (see additional guidance\*) | | *M* | Estimated Business Partner Days | *n/a* |
| Estimated Service  Management Days | | *n/a* | Impact on other Service area | *n/a* |
| Estimation Confidence *(delete as required)* | *Reasonably Confident (Similar to previous work)* | | | |
| Estimation References | *Justification for the Estimated Days and Estimation Confidence. This section is also used to provide any other relevant information the proposal estimate. This may include:*   * *Assumptions about the project approach, scope or deliverables* * *Details of previous similar projects* * *Risks or other unknown elements*   *Record as many details as are relevant* | | | |

**\*Estimation – Additional Guidance:**

For our 1st stage / iteration of the Plan / Red Line, the following standard estimation categorisations will be used:

* Small – this is based on average expected outturn of around 50 days (+ or – 20%)
* Medium – this is based on average expected outturn of around 100 days (+ or – 20%)
* Large – this is based on average expected outturn of around 200 days (+ or – 20%)
* Extra Large – this is based on average expected outturn of around 400 days (+ or – 20%)

Individual proposal allocations will be made using the expected outturn figure and an allocation equivalent to 20% of each estimate will be added as Contingency to each Programme.