

IT Governance: Shared IT Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SIAC)



Chairman's Notes

3:00 to 4:00

05/24/2011

CSE 507

Members present: Cromer, Fitzpatrick (Chair), Kirmse, Lander, Matusz, Mishra, Olson

Others present: D. Burdette, W. Curry, I Moffat, D. Pokorney

1. **Chairman's Notes** – from April 26, 2011 – no changes.

2. **Strategic Plan for UF IT** –

- The plan is expected to be published “soon”; waiting for the president to write an intro letter; at this point, it is expected to be ready for release middle-to-end of June
- priority setting survey – see Rating & Ranking Results sheet (distributed with the Agenda, and available on the [SIAC SharePoint site: see “2011-05-20 SIAC-Results-v5”](#)) –
 - Received 6 responses to prioritization worksheet: Tim’s observations from the result:
 - 1) The sheet is sorted by over-all rank, but also included rating categories (High, Medium, Low); mostly the “High” category items were at the top, and the rankings made sense.
 - 2) Support for Enterprise Systems stands out (#s 1,2,3,6) – It seems clear that the committee wants to keep ES up to date. (Note: the recent Financial Systems upgrade was a huge project; we should expect similar effort needed for HR project.)
 - 3) Item 22 is Student E-mail Outsourcing (really Microsoft or Google apps “in the cloud”); may not be the big cost-saving one might intuitively expect, due to the requirements to maintain various infrastructure components even after migration of ‘the masses.’ Also, some won’t be allowed to migrate to cloud-based services (HIPAA/FERPA concerns), which means they’ll have to move to Exchange, which costs more per user than GatorLink, off-setting any savings realized from those who do migrate.
 - 4) Items 8 & 17 (8,000 wall-plate ports, 2000 more VoIP phones, 2000 more WAPs); this is a ‘just finish up what we started’ thing.
 - 5) It’s important that we foster a clear understanding of what the Categories really mean:
Category “C” = “Needs new \$”
 - a. Some “category A” items are really new initiatives, and perhaps should have gone into Cat. C
 - i. NAC
 - ii. IPv6
 - iii. IPAM
 - Cromer: All 22 of them are “sort-of medium” – just because an item is #22 doesn’t mean we shouldn’t do it.
 - TF: It’s more about where is the \$ going to come from; we’re most-likely going to do everything on the list.

- Lander: Agrees; we need to do all of them. He also looked for ‘quick-wins’ and prioritized those higher. Similarly with Secunia – since we’ve already paid for it, we need to implement to start realizing ROI.
- TF: This list/ranking isn’t so much about IF we’ll do these things, but WHEN, and also “Don’t give me anymore right now; see, our plate is full.”
 - Various committee members expressed concern that other groups are making their own lists which may result in more to-dos for Infrastructure.
- TF: Suggests changing the focus to tracking the 22; and understanding how will they be done on top of the ‘day-in/out’ work of maintaining regular operations?
- How does this fit into the service catalog and service portfolio initiative?
- Cromer observes that there is plenty of opportunity for parallelism for the projects on the list; just because the committee ranked them serially, doesn’t mean that various projects can’t be done in parallel, given availability of resources.
- What happens next? TF turns in ranking sheet to the IT Policy Council: explain categories in terms of allocation of existing resources; emphasize the importance that Governance not create a long list of projects that won’t get done because of \$.

3. Follow-up Actions – quick status –

- Fax Server – testing in progress – target date for early adopters – late Summer
- Student E-Mail Outsourcing – on hold for now – still a priority – target date TBD
 - TF discussed the current thinking regarding ‘Student E-mail Outsourcing’ for the benefit of committee members.
 - Lander: MS is ‘Exchange in the cloud’ – will we be able to get rid of UF Exchange?
 - TF: more study is needed before can think about going down that road. HIIPA, FERPA, et al make that difficult, but we’re trying to fully understand the issues. IPM investigating the technical issues; then we’ll revisit the policy issues.
 - Olson makes strong argument that all students and faculty need to be allowed to have access to the ‘cloud-apps’ – if only as a “second ID”. Lander says collaboration should be through Sakai, not Google (or whatever). Olson says Sakai doesn’t have all the needed collaboration tools.
 - MS Demo – when?
- Drop Box – brought up last time – no progress to report
 - Pokorney mentions that Internet2 is looking at an application like that
 - Cromer speaks strongly in favor of having this as a UF-wide service
 - Lander volunteers to admin/manage, if CNS will provide the server/storage
 - Moffat will look into what infrastructure CNS would need to provide for this
 - Kirmse says Dr. McCollough might sponsor this as a “reduction of redundancy” initiative

IT Governance: Shared IT Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SIAC)



- Proofpoint – proposal to change to user-selected protection options – done
- Curry: Certificate service is in early adopter phase, with Lander, Ben-Shoshan, Dan Crisman, FCLA, InfoSec as participants; seems to go smoothly.
 - Meeting next week to review how it's going & work out how to roll it out in larger-scale. Are we ready to let others play? [Lander likes it; good management interface; allows you to scan your subnets looking for expiring certs, so you can be proactive in replacing them.] Curry will probably use "Campus IT Directors" as local certificate authorities. Looking into maybe offering 'Personal certificates,' but we may be swamping InCommon & Comodo; Wildcard certs also allowed. GA announcement in a week or 2
- Moffat: Asks for the committee's input regarding e-mail attachment size: most outsource providers seem to be allowing 25MB (we're currently cutting off at 20MB). Maybe we should go to 25MB. Maybe we should also consider further-constraining the attachment size for multiple-recipient e-mails (block sending huge attachments to large numbers of recipients); Moffat offers to bring details to the committee for consideration & committee says 'yea'.

4. Service Portfolio and Service Catalog for CNS – Not addressed at this meeting: Coming Attraction

- service categories in the portfolio – 4 lines of business
- service offerings in the catalog – 3 to 5 sub-categories in each line of business
- value for the price – capacity, utilization, cost, quality, customer satisfaction, comparative benchmarks

5. Next Meeting – 6/28/2011; 3:00pm-4:00pm; CSE 507

Additional Information:

- UF IT Governance Home: <http://www.it.ufl.edu/governance/>
- Shared Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SIAC) website: <https://connect.ufl.edu/at/SIAC/>