

**SUMMARY FOR ARCHITECTURE & NEW TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

**DATE: July 8, 2016**

**TIME: 1-3 p.m.**

**LOCATION: Dumke Room, Eccles Broadcast Center**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mark Beekhuizen	Joe Breen	Pieter Bowman	Steve Dean
Jeff Folsom	Matt Irsik	Sylvia Jessen	Jim Livingston
Jim Logue	Chris Roberts	Steven Seal	Chris Stucker
Dan Trentman	Rob White	Thomas Wolfe	

**COMMITTEE SUPPORT:** Scott Sherman, Emily Rushton

**UNABLE TO ATTEND:**

Rebwar Baesmat	Derick Bingman	David Blackburn	Dean Church
Tim Ebner	Demian Hanks	Matt Harting	Josna Kotturappa
Jon Thomas	Wes Tolman		

**AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:**

- Network connection memorandum of understanding
- Open networks
- Certificate management ad hoc update
- Campus wireless strategy
- Next meeting
- Open floor

**Network connection memorandum of understanding**

Chief Technology Officer Jim Livingston reminded the committee that during the last meeting, the committee formed a working group to revise a network connection agreement. That working group has been meeting over the past two months and came back with a multitude of changes. Before going over those changes, Livingston reminded the committee that the reason the ANTC was formed was to address the findings and recommendations from the Deloitte assessment. He then briefly reviewed some of the U's business requirements identified through the Deloitte interview process, along with the current state themes and Deloitte recommendations. A considerable discussion followed as Livingston guided the committee through some of the network connection document changes submitted, showing comparisons of the original verbiage vs. the new verbiage. Edits were discussed and agreed on by the committee, including updating the title to say "agreement" instead of "memorandum of understanding" and adding back some of what had been removed, along with agreeing on most of the edits supplied by the working group. There was a brief discussion about Section 3.a, where Chief Information Security Officer Dan Bowden had some concerns on data breaches and the amount of time it takes for the Information Security Office to track down an infected machine and run tests on it. He said ISO is not trying to control things, just trying to react faster. The

committee considered this and agreed that the new version of section 3.a seemed to address Bowden's points.

The committee voted in favor of all changes and edits discussed in the meeting, and the network connection agreement will now move to the SITC for consideration.

### **Open networks**

Bowden said he largely covered his talking points on this during the network connection agreement discussion, and gave back the floor to move on to the next agenda item.

### **Certificate management ad hoc update**

Corey Roach of the Information Security Office is leading the certificate management ad hoc group and said this issue is still in the discussion phase. The ad hoc committee first agreed that there is a problem with certificates and it needs to be addressed. One of the underlying questions from this was, do we need to have a central certificate authority for the campus? The consensus was yes, for consistency and manageability. The ad hoc committee determined it would make the most sense to have Identity and Access Management (IAM) run that central authority. That brought the group to the next point, which is whether there is a need to buy a tool. Roach said they looked at the data they had, and decided based on the preliminary data that it is premature to make that decision. Questions need to be answered first, such as how many certificates are working correctly? How much of the certificate problems can be cleaned up manually, and what would the workload be to keep them maintained? The ad hoc committee proposed that ISO go back to the data and make an initial effort to do manual cleanup, contact external certificate owners, fix obvious problems, and reexamine the data to look at the scope of what would be required for a tool. The committee asked Roach what the timeframe would be for ISO to complete this effort, and Roach said they should be able to notify external parties about certificates that need to be fixed within a matter of weeks, but at that point it's up to the owners and ISO will have to wait for them to fix their certificates. Some of the cleanup effort may be tied to the efforts around having a solid Point of Contact list in place. Roach's proposal to the committee is for ISO to do the notifications, allow three months to get an idea of how much will get cleaned up, and then reassess. It was suggested that the ad hoc's and ISO's action items be written down in an official document and sent to the ANTC, and Roach agreed to do so.

### **Campus wireless strategy**

Trevor Long of UIT's Common Infrastructure Services provided a brief update on the efforts toward creating a campus wireless strategy. The first item to complete was a physical wireless survey of the entire campus. Long stated they need a baseline to see where they're at before they can start to make improvements. The survey was recently completed, and they are already starting to get data back from

the vendor about the signal strength for wireless, cellular and emergency service frequencies. The vendor has said that the U is doing better than some other higher education institutions for which they have done similar work. The survey is one of the key components to developing a strategy, said Long, because we need data to drive business and architecture decisions around wireless on campus. Other topics included in the strategy discussion would be high density, outdoor wireless, user experience at venues, security, and so on. Long then showed a heat map from the survey results for building 822, to give the committee an idea of the kind of data soon to be available. He briefly reviewed how the survey was completed. The vendor sent people with backpacks of specialized equipment to walk around campus and in each building to evaluate wireless, cell coverage, and emergency services.

The committee asked about timeframe, and Long said they should have the completed reporting by July 22. The next steps for strategy include engagement. Long stated they will need input from IT professionals, staff, students, faculty, and guests of the U. They are considering focus groups, town hall meetings, and surveys to try to capture as much data and feedback as possible.

Long briefly mentioned the start of school and the steps his team has taken to mitigate potential issues during that time period. The committee asked if certain items would be considered in the wireless strategy, such as IPv6, high-density areas, cellular distributed antenna system coverage, and classroom standards based on occupancy. Long confirmed these will all be considered in the strategy.

### **Next meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for July 25, which is a holiday. The following scheduled meeting, Aug. 22, is the first week of school, so the committee voted to move the next meeting to August 15.

### **Open floor**

A committee member made the point that while governance is a representation of the entire campus, some items discussed affect a lot of people (the network agreement, for example), and it may impact various areas above and beyond what the ANTC may capture. Do we have a way to make sure we get input we may have missed?

CIO Steve Hess addressed this question by saying those on the ANTC may have other areas with which they should review these items. If there are concerns, the ANTC members should bring those back to the committee for discussion. There is also the possibility of taking it to a larger IT forum, which has been discussed, but that also has a negative effect on how quickly things can be accomplished. One committee member mentioned canvassing campus, having a webpage with information, etc. Jim Livingston made the point that many items discussed in governance are going to be works in progress, but must start someplace and evolve over time. Hess agreed.

<b>Action summary</b>			
<b>Action</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Person/Group</b>	<b>Next step</b>
Approved	Network connection memorandum of understanding / agreement	Portfolio	The agreement will move to the SITC for consideration.
Action item	Certificate management ad hoc update	Corey Roach	Roach will write the plan for evaluating the current state of certificates and provide that to the ANTC.
Approved	Next meeting	Portfolio	The meeting on July 25 will be skipped due to the holiday; the meeting on August 22 will be moved up a week early to August 15.