IT Governance: Shared IT Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SIAC)

UF UNIVERSITY *of* FLORIDA

Notes

3:00 to 4:00	05/28/2013	CSE 507

Members Attending: Fitzpatrick (chair), Frey, Kirmse, Livoti, Robinson, Lander, Yeffet, Joe Carusone (proxy for Bailey), Wayne Hyde (proxy for Cromer)

Others Attending: C. Benjamin, Burdette, Easley, D. Miller, Moffat, Pokorney, Sallot

1. Chairman's Notes – from April 23, 2013   All

No changes

Membership Rotation

Tim reminded the group that the UFIT Governance Topical IT Committees annually review membership. Other than our Faculty Senate representative (now vacant), all current members will be asked to stay on. Tim thanked all the SIAC members for their service over this past year.

At the next meeting (June 25th), Tim will officially pass the SIAC chairmanship to Kris Kirmse (his designated successor).

Tim needed to leave the meeting at this point, due to a conflicting meeting scheduled by the CIO. Kirmse chaired the remainder of the meeting.

2. Remedy Stabilization -- Project Plan   Chris Easley

- Easley's CNS/Enterprise Systems Infrastructure team is working to "support the current Remedy and get it running the best we can."
- This project is proceeding in parallel with the overall UFIT ITSM tool evaluation project.
- Easley asked Column IT (Remedy reseller and support vendor) for a 'health check,' and got back some recommendations for improvements.
- Various options have been proposed, including going to a new version (8.1); but changes to the look-and-feel (among other things) may argue against doing this.
- Easley hopes to have a decision on project scope by end of next week. Rob Adams is closely involved to ensure that the Remedy Stabilization project supports the overall ITSM initiative.
- Over the past 3 months, Gartner consultants have helped ITSM teams document user needs.
- The next phase will evaluate ITSM vendors/products/tools. That could take up to 6 months.
- The final phase will implement the selected tool. Enterprise Systems will lead this phase.
- Tim previously expressed concerns about whether the stabilization effort would be funded. Easley believes that project funding has now been committed to cover consulting costs.

3. Office 365 -- Project Update   **Iain Moffat**

- The Project Steering Committee has met twice so far, and provided important guidance.
- Policy issues have been raised, and informally answered:
  - Will Forwarding be allowed? -- NO
  - Will users have IMAP access to their mailboxes in this system? -- NO
  - Questions related to account provisioning (e.g., students who are also employees) are being sorted out and resolved.
  - Still working on getting Office365 vetted for restricted data for students, faculty, and staff.
    - Although there is no (current) plan to migrate faculty & staff to Office365 email, the workgroup is looking into making SkyDrive storage available to them.
- Project is on-track for a pilot in mid-June.
- Opt-in migrations will begin in July.
- The Help Desk has test accounts in beta environment, and is now writing documentation.
- The Workgroup received 'use-case' input from Yeffet and others to help focus on actual needs.
- Looking at Exchange 2013 upgrades for our on-premise service ("UF Exchange"), to assure consistent features & functions, and integration between O365 and on-premise services.
- Also considering removing the 1-year retention and replacing it with a 25G limit for a UF Exchange inbox.

4. End-User-Storage -- Project Update   **Iain Moffat**

- Elias has asked us to consider using MS "SkyDrive Pro" for this service.
- OSG is working with Erik Deumens to evaluate SkyDrive Pro for faculty needs.
- Also working with Security regarding auditability issues.
- Kirmse: Need also to work with colleges to understand their needs. Deumens' faculty are not really representative of the majority of (non-High-Performance-Computing-Researchers) faculty

5. AT&T Hosting Services -- Cost Comparison   **Moffat, Lander**

- AT&T is offering "Storage as a Service" via Internet 2, which in turn is offering it through FLR.
- CNS internal hosting services compare well to the AT&T "Synaptic" service offering, except -- Lander & Kirmse suggest UF needs cheap archival storage, similar to Synaptic's "Policy 4".
- The Synaptic pricing given is MUCH higher than UF's internal service pricing. However, the published pricelist provided does not include the "Internet 2 Member Price" (still "TBD"). Madey suggests we need to find out the I2 member pricing, to make a real comparison.
- Moffat also mentioned another CNS/OSG 'storage pilot project'. What if we offered something below 'enterprise class' storage? High feature/function, but not really high performance. And with reliability that's just 'good enough'. Back-of-the-napkin guesses say 'pretty cheap". Moffat hopes to solicit beta testers in the future.

6. Password Policy Changes -- Readiness Check   **David Burdette**

- UFIT/Office of Information Security and Compliance is in the latter stages of drafting a new Policy [SEC-AC-002] (and related Standards [SEC-AC-002.01, SEC-AC-002.02]) that essentially mandate that all passwords at UF follow GatorLink standards (length, complexity, expiration, lock-out, role-levels, history-uniqueness, etc.)
- Systems, which use GatorLink/Shibboleth/Active-Directory, are going to be fine, because those central services will be compliant with the new Policy and Standards.
- However, some campus units will have password-authenticated services which, for various reasons, do not use GL, Shib, or AD.
- Are members aware this is coming? What challenges/obstacles do you see for compliance?
- Example: Mainframe uses its own internal authentication/authorization system ("RACF"). The mainframe group has been adding optional modules to allow RACF to be more compliant with the standard -- but full compliance could be a major challenge. Many obstacles to overcome.
- What possible problems do committee members see?
  - Environmental monitors, scanners, printers, Cisco, SaaS
  - Local applications, where the developer has left, and no one knows the code.
- Some of these things may need to be approved as 'exceptions'.
- Some of these things may need to result in revisions to the policy.
- Need to bring all these issues to the attention of the UFIT/OISC.

7. Next Meeting – the 4th Tuesday from 3:00pm to 4:00pm – June 25 at CSE 507

Additional Information:

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