IT Governance: Shared IT Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SIAC)

Chairman's Notes

3:00 to 4:00	06/28/2011	CSE 507

Members Attending: Benjamin, Brasch, Cromer, Fitzpatrick (chair), Kirmse, Frey, Lander, Matusz, Mishra, Olson
Others Attending: D. Burdette, W. Curry, I. Moffat

1. **Chairman's Notes** – from May 24, 2011 – No changes

2. **Governance** – 6-month checkpoint review –
   - Tim reviewed progress of the UF IT Governance structure and the SIAC –
     - Purpose – are we doing the right things – policies, priorities, standards?
     - Products – are we doing things right – strategic plan, project priority list?
     - Process – what's working, what's not, what else?
     - Payoff – are we making a difference?
   - Governance focus should be on the big issues, not just service requests. Service requests should go directly to the service provider. Escalate through IT Governance if/when needed.
   - Kirmse: Where is the list of IT services, and how do we submit a service request?
     - Tim: Good question. We need an IT Service Catalog (a menu and order process).
     - Tim's "bigger than a breadbox" metaphor: Some things, due to their size and scope, clearly belong within the SOP of the provider organization(s). Therefore, they do not need to be reviewed by the Governance process/structure.
   - Cromer suggested setting up a well-defined process for "users/groups" to put in requests, which "providers" can review and decide to "Just Do It", or to bring to Governance.
   - Lander noted that some SIAC items don't seem to be moving as fast as they could (e.g. the Fax Server). Also, he expected to see a lot more requests from the other IT Governance committees. He was surprised that SIAC hasn't received much-if-anything from them.
     - Tim: this part of the IT Governance process is still evolving. Cross-functional impacts are now being acknowledged, but they still are not always formally addressed via project charters or project plans.
     - For example: this committee has considered Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI). But VDI is an area where Academic Technology has an existing service, and a strong interest to develop and expand their service. They should come to SIAC to discuss platform needs, options, and the "environmental impact" on shared infrastructure.
     - **This led to discussion of where to draw the line between Applications, which are the domain of other Governance Committees, and Shared Infrastructure.**
       - Olson: "Shared Infrastructure" may be construed to include VDI; who says we need to wait for Academic Technology? Why shouldn't this committee (SIAC) assert ownership and take the initiative?
       - Kirmse: Agrees. Doesn't see why VDI should be an "applications" service.

- Cromer: Various local groups set something up because they need it. But that may result in lost synergy, and missed opportunities for economies of scale. He questioned the line between central shared infrastructure and centrally supported applications. Some needs cross the line between these use-cases. Maybe SIAC should be reviewing and commenting on which ones are which. That is, do local units need central applications, infrastructure, both, none?
- Frey: This goes on in all the units. Everybody has pressing priorities. So they do their own thing, to meet their own needs. Local sense of urgency prevails.
- Tim: Sometimes the customer is a distributed IT department, and the needed service is shared infrastructure, because the department IT staff can run the app and provide end-user support. Sometimes the customer is the end-user, and the service need is not only shared infrastructure, but also applications development and maintenance, plus end-user training and support. In the latter case, then ES, AT, and CNS need to get their act together.
- C. Benjamin: We're isolated from the other governance groups. Maybe we need a joint meeting of all the committees, ASAP, before things get too busy in the Fall. This idea has been suggested previously. TIM WILL FOLLOW UP.

3. **Project Status –** Done – In-Progress – On-Hold
   - **Done –**
     - Financial Systems Upgrade
     - Sakai System Implementation
     - Enterprise Systems Databases moved to Oracle
     - Enterprise Systems Backups move to Data Domain
     - 8,000 more Wall-Plate Data Network ports installed
     - 2,000 more VoIP phone lines converted from Centrex/Key-Systems
     - 20,000 VoIP phones now broadcast Emergency Notification System (ENS) alerts
     - 5 major services shifted from user-chargeback to RCM central funding/subsidy
     - Secunia patch servers now operating on centrally hosted servers
     - Dell device scanners now operating on centrally hosted servers
     - SSL certificates now available through In-Common
   - **In-Progress –**
     - Enterprise Systems servers and storage expand/upgrade/replace – continuous
     - VM, Web, File, DB servers and storage expand/upgrade/replace – continuous
     - Distributed Antenna System (DAS) to be started this year – phased
     - 500 more Wireless Access Points to be installed this year – phased
     - Drop-Box service – targeted for Fall 2011
     - Virtual Fax Servers – targeted for Fall 2011
     - HR System Upgrade – targeted for Spring 2012

- o Student E-mail Outsourcing -- targeted for Spring 2012
- o East Campus Data Center (ECDC) – targeted for Fall 2012
- **On-Hold –**
  - o Hyperion Budgeting System rollout – TBD
  - o Unified Communications Systems evaluation – TBD
  - o Virtual Desktop Infrastructure central platform hosting – TBD

4. **Project Status –** Questions and Comments

Matusz: Noted that only 6 committee members responded to the request for priority-list info.

Frey: Emphasizes that her prioritization was based on her role as a voice for her college, not really as a UF-wide advocate. But SIAC needs to develop that UF-wide view.

- **Upgrade and Replace Servers**: CNS Just spent $500K on Cisco UCS Blade Centers to gain efficiencies through standardization. The plan is to merge/consolidate where possible, all of the CNS servers onto common hardware. This should result in better leverage with vendors, simpler maintenance and troubleshooting, focused skill-sets, and increased utilization of shared hardware and software.
- **SSL Certificates** are free via UF's InCommon membership. Now reaching out to all UF units, and assisting them with awareness and access. About 1/3 of the way through the colleges.
- **Central Funding now covers some shared services previously charged back to users:**
  - o Services now fully funded centrally:
    - Exchange
    - SharePoint
    - Red Hat Linux
  - o Services now partially funded centrally (i.e. the price has been reduced by 50%)
    - Departmental Server and Storage Hosting
    - Departmental Desktop and Server Data Backups (NSAM)
      - Matusz: NSAM charging model is a problem for departments, because it is (or seems) variable and therefore unpredictable.   It needs to be a flat rate, in order for customers to feel comfortable signing on.
- **Student e-mail outsourcing**: Checking what others are doing. It's not just student? And it's definitely not just e-mail. Tim has assigned Moffat to ask Microsoft about schools that have recently converted to Live@EDU. Then develop a project charter and implementation plan. If we do it here, what would it look like, how much would it cost, how long would it take? Then talk to others who have done it. Moffat reported that he has already had preliminary discussions with MS and some schools like FSU. More detailed follow-up discussions are now scheduled with MS to review implementation options.

- o Tim: Next Steps. Rather than bring in vendor reps to pitch their products, he has asked Moffat to complete the process outlined above, and then present findings to this group for their review and comment. And then invite MS to come in and do a presentation about how they could assist with our preferred implementation plan.

5. **Service Portfolio and Service Catalog for CNS** – preview –
   - service portfolio – 4 lines of business
     - o Network Services
     - o Telecom Services
     - o Computing Services
     - o Data Center Services
   - service families – 3 to 5 sub-categories in each line of business
   - service catalog – a menu of the services offered in each service family
   - service measures – capacity, utilization, performance, cost, quality, customer satisfaction, comparative benchmarks, value for the price
     - o Various members agree that they think having this information would be important and useful to the committee, to help them recommend strategies and priorities.

6. **Next Meeting** – the 4th Tuesday from 3:00 to 4:00 pm – July 26th 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/at/SIAC/