

# **Infrastructure Technology Advisory Group October 16, 2017 Meeting Notes**

**Members Present** – Steve Hahn, Chair, Steve Barnet, Kevin Cherek, Katy Duren, Richard Kunert, Dawn McCauley, Kristen McRoberts, Jeanne Skul, Alan Silver, Dave Towers, and Melissa Tran

**Others Present** – Kevin Kettner, Mike Layde, Rafi Lazimy, and Mike Lehman

**Members Absent** – Elizabeth Harris, John Krogman, Steve Krogull, Dundee McNair, Scott Nolin, Jason Pursian, and Bob Turner

**September Minutes** – Motion by Alan Silver to approve the September minutes, second by Melissa Tran. Minutes unanimously approved.

**Search of Campus IT Process Catalogue** – Dawn has done some investigation of the enhancements that could be used for navigation and searching of the catalogue. Due to cost and ease of use, she is exploring the use of Tableau software. She stated that the information provided lists the top 20 generic services and 80% of the total services, so the group has the bulk of the options to begin exploring.

**Project in the Process for IT Governance Members** – Dawn reported that approximately 80 people attended the IT intake process orientation sessions. A couple of additional sessions will be held in early November. There are four official projects in the queue, going through the process at this time. Two of the projects have been rated as low impact and are proceeding. The remaining two project may have medium impact and are being reviewed in detail. A cross Tag subcommittee is being formed to review campus-wide policies.

**Back-ups/File Sharing** – Steve Barnet noted that the campus does not have uniform backups of information. The decision to use the Bucky Backup service is a decision that is left up to the unit, leaving the campus

vulnerable. Cost is the main factor on why departments do not use Bucky Backup.

Mike Layde distributed a chart of the current Bucky Backup service options. In many cases, the department's budget will determine which level of backup service will be used and will leave departments less protected than they would prefer. The cost is determined by the amount of storage needed after compression. Generally, once the data has been backed up two or three times, it is protected.

Mike Lehman asked how many campus customers use Bucky Backup, and if they do not use the service, are they purchasing another service? Kevin Kettner stated that of the 1,600 nodes in use on campus, DoIT is using 1,000 of them. The question is how can we ensure that the others have sufficient back up to protect the data?

DoIT can expand their capacity if the whole campus were to use Bucky Backup. In addition, IBM Spectrum, has the ability to back to the Cloud if we decide to go that route. At this point, it is a user-by-user decision on how backups are handled.

It was noted that students are another concern with no current backup options by campus. Most departments feel that Bucky Backup is too expensive, and only the units with reasonable professional IT support tend to have backups. Kevin noted that other software (such as CrashPlan) is available that would be more oriented towards the novice user.

On other university campuses, a backup service for one computer is provided for staff and students using their net ID. This is something that the UW should consider in the future.

Mike Lehman stated that this is a policy decision, and right now, the campus is at risk. Steve Barnet will do some research to see if there is a campus policy for backups. Kevin Cherek noted that AIMS will backup information on laptops and desktops issued thru AIMS.

Mike asked how do we quantify the risk of non-universal backups on campus? Is it a high or low risk for campus, and how do we make it important enough? He would also like to discuss including the students as well. It was noted that there is currently no research policy for backups on campus. Several research foundations require a data management plan, but do not mandate that it be done in a particular way.

Steve Hahn noted there are three main threads to pursue:

1. Work through MIST and determine whether we have a policy or not (Steve Barnett will take the lead).
2. Determine if ITAG is the best positioned to look at these. What is the opportunity cost of not doing anything? Include the cost of providing it multiple different ways (duplication). (Melissa, Kevin, Kevin Kettner and Mike Layde)
3. Assuming there are costs to duplication or not doing anything, create a process to look at the service in detail.

Bucky Backup will be sending a survey to their customers in the near future and another survey to non-users. It was determined that the second survey would be the most beneficial for providing information to ITAG.

ITAG is planning to focus on infrastructure items from the generic service list. Working through the first service will provide an example on how to approach other services.

**Catalogue Discussion** – Rafi talked about new data that has been added to the final Categorization report including the breakdown of IT FTEs by mission across all services and number of services by mission.

Rafi noted that the support and commitment of campus leadership is very important as the decisions concerning the services are primarily business decisions and need to be governed by the core mission of the school or college. We would like to have the IT advisory groups and stakeholders participate in this process.

Rafi stated that we need to identify general drivers, objectives and principles for each service addressing whether services could be done in a more common way with greater institutional consistency and looking at key success factors for each process.

Steve Hahn suggested the following strawman:

1. Assume that services were originally set up based on rational business decisions.
2. By directive of the ITSC or interest of the particular group, advisory groups pick services they would like to consider.
3. Establish what policies are in place as well as the business drivers for changing any existing policies, opportunity cost of no action, etc. Is there a business case for change?

4. What does rationalization look like? Can solutions scale to campus?  
Establish a group to look at successes and apply the different or same solution for other services.
5. Figure out how to close the loop at rationalization and optimization.  
Circle back and see if we met the business needs of the customers.

It was noted that other universities are facing the same issues concerning their IT services, however we are unique in that we are a bigger, and more complex operation trying to support 1500 IT services.

The group asked that the data collection be refreshed and refined with examples provided.

Alan Silver reported that he has only received four responses from the ITAG survey on which services the group would like to prioritize for review.

Dawn will send the group more information on the services including a summarized spreadsheet listing all 90 services with definitions.