

University Information Technology Committee Meeting
9:30 a.m. Wednesday, April 10th, 2002
Faculty Senate Chambers, D.H. Hill Library

Sam Averitt, co-chair

Voting members present:

Kristin Antelman, Perry Grady, Scott Lennon (substitute for Andy Raynor), Harriet Mermes, Tom Miller, Harry Nicholas, William S. Payne, Alan Schueler for Barbara Kirby; Bill Scott, Dan Steen, John Tector, Michael Vasu

Technical advisors present:

Donna Barrett, Shawn Dunning, Alan Galloway, Carl Malstrom, Ron Melbourne, Gwen Hazlehurst, Larry Robinson, Greg Sparks, Jennifer Van Horn

Welcome:

Sam Averitt called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes:

The Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the February 20th, 2002 meeting. The minutes can be reviewed online at <http://www.ncsu.edu/it/ucsc/04-10-02/minutes2-20-02.doc>.

Discussion:

- Sam reported that the following items would be topics for discussion at his and Steve Keto's annual information technology update meeting with Provost Cooper and Vice Chancellor Worsley. This meeting was rescheduled from March.
 - University Computing Standards Committee's name change
 - Network Billing Methodologies
 - IT Management Flexibility Plan
 - Sub Committee Reports
 - Disaster Recovery Project
- **University Computing Standards Committee – Name Change implies role change**

Sam said at the last meeting, there was a vote to change the Committee's name. Sam said as part of the name change, he thinks the Committee is also looking at a role change. He said the Committee is moving away from being just a Standards Committee to also being an advisory and, perhaps, even in some regards a Steering Committee. He asked the Committee to let him know if that message was not what the Committee meant when it voted on it. Otherwise, the message that he and Steve will carry forth is that the Committee is taking on a larger role in considering issues pertinent to the use and implementation of technology on this campus and that the Committee will take the responsibility to interface and interact with all of the Deans and with college computer committees or other bodies that are within divisions or colleges that discuss information technology issues.

- **Network Services Funding Methodology:**

Sam said he wanted the Committee's input and support in making a move away from, in terms of network billing, a billing methodology to a central funding methodology. Sam said currently, networking on campus is funded two-thirds centrally and one-third through fees or bills that are issued to campus units. He said the problem is that as we look at pending budget cuts, billing ourselves for essential services that everybody uses is a very inefficient process. Sam said as we look at how we use our resources, he would like to bring it to question why are we doing this. He said ITD has looked at its effort to come up with a creditable billing strategy and has spent about three FTEs over the last year without any good success. He said it is impossible to come up with a creditable strategy to account for usage of network infrastructure. Time Warner, BellSouth and other providers have been unable to come up with successful strategies to prevent people from going to Comp USA and buying equipment and doing whatever they want to do in a somewhat invisible fashion to those providers, he said. Sam said we're trying to do something the equipment has never been built to do. Billing is a very appreciable part of the cost of delivering the service and we're beginning to see that as well. He said if the University wants to bill on a usage basis, it will need to fully account for what people are doing and police behavior. That implies control. It implies complexity and ultimately appreciable cost, he said. Sam said the question that he would like to raise is why do we want to do that. Sam said he believes that the most cost-effective way is to centrally fund networking. He said the question that he has is do you centrally fund networking by sending a bill to the division units based on some formulated approach or do you simply say the University needs to come up with this money. He said the University already funds networking two-thirds. He said the last one-third is what's in question. Sam said a surcharge for differentiated services that are over some baseline would still be proposed. Sam said he would like to shift some of his key technical resources to doing more useful things like security and like developing services and functions that people need and move them away from trying to figure out how to equitably bill people and account for usage and re-bill when that capability is not built into the equipment.

Pete Evans said when PAMS receives its bills, its staff spends two to three man weeks trying to rationalize what ITD has given them verses what PAMS thinks it is. In addition to the effort that ITD has expended, Pete said he's sure that other units have done something similar. He said an inordinate amount of time is being spent on something that is an incredibly low return effort and that is always contentious.

Sam said he would like to recommend to the executive officers starting with Cooper and Worsley that we centrally fund networking. Sam said what he would like to do is be able to go forth with a recommendation from this Committee that this is a reasonable and appropriate thing to do and would also like to solicit any input or thoughts on how that might be done either purely off the top or in some formulated approach and what are the accountability metrics that the Committee should be held too.

Michael Vasu said obviously a baseline of usage is needed to determine how to account for differential additions to the system. He asked what would be the metrics for baseline usage.

Sam said the problem with baseline usage is that it is constantly changing. Sam said what we can judge is are we meeting the needs of campus.

Harry Nicholas asked Sam to identify cost elements. Sam said the most important cost elements are Internet access, the campus backbone, building connections, support cost

(people for engineering and field activities); and future development activities.

Perry Grady said the problem is that right now the bills are sent to the colleges and people are trying to figure out if they're really getting their money's worth. That's also what we do with electric power. There is no bill. People have no incentive to save or keep the cost down. He said if you say we're going to provide this centrally, the question the dean is going to ask of us is if the costs or services are going up or down. Grady said he's in favor of moving forth, but that he also sees a lot of problems.

Sam said he feels strongly that an accountability component is coupled with funding networking centrally. He said accountability works both ways. It's accountability from the user community in that they're not asking or expecting or demanding things that are unreasonable. It's accountability from our part, Sam said. Are we making good decisions, are we delivering good services and are we doing that in the most efficient manner possible? Once you go to a more socialistic model, accountability has to be a key element in that equation, he said.

Tom Miller said he liked the idea. He asked how much money is the one-third portion. Sam said the one-third portion is about \$700,000 or \$800,000.

Tom said he likes the idea of taking funding off the top and the accountability could be that this Committee negotiates a baseline service level agreement, which is the centrally funded piece and then have advance service options that are pay as you go. Tom said he worries about the accountability piece because you can never get enough of free services.

John Tector said it's not going to be free services. He said the bills go away but what will his dean see in his budget relative to this.

Pete Evans said it's not quite like electricity. You still have QIP. All of these devices have to be registered and they are still all tracked. The differentiation in the services is going to be what is the baseline.

Sam said the University knows how many physical connections there are. Because of security issues, it has to track the usage, the performance and the status of the network more closely.

Perry asked why couldn't we bill network services like telephone services.

Jennifer Van Horn said in the telephone world, the University can control dials services and the phones that are put in, etc., but it cannot do the same with data.

Perry asked if there is a medium to track usage. Jennifer said the University is trying to use databases but it doesn't have the resources to do that.

Tom asked if the \$700,000 amount has changed over the past several years. Jennifer said it had not changed.

Sam said the University has managed to hold the cost. Network was never a cheap activity once it was moved to a university wide service. Sam said the University has received a considerable amount of leverage out of the NC&I activities and some of the grants and other resources from there. We have moved to a university model with the dorms and they are

paying their freight and that has helped to balance off the cost, he said.

Dan Steen asked if the dorms are charged the same as the colleges.

Sam said no. He said everybody who lives in the dorm receives a bill for networking. Every student is charged \$80 a semester for network services. It's not optional. Sam said that statistics went up in terms of connectivity and they started going down even as usages and number of connections were still rising. Sam said the students actually voted to accept this. They recognized that this is very important and everybody wants it. It's too easy to circumvent any per connection charge. You can throw a cable to your roommate or to the next suite, he said.

Sam said what he proposes is a vote of support on the principle that this should be a centrally supported service. Exactly how this money is coming in we're not saying, he said, but, we think the process and the resources that it takes to try to do a for-charge for-fee based service is not what we want and is in fact contrary to the overall good. He said we also recognize that there are issues of accountability and processes and that this Committee will agree to take a primary role in helping to identify how this should be structured and worked and we are in fact getting what we paid for.

John said if he votes for the recommendation and the consequences of doing so is that his dean finds himself in a situation where he's financially in a worse situation than he is now, then he's fried alive for casting his vote. John said without a sense of what those changes are going to be, it's hard for him to give his support. John said he certainly understand conceptually what Sam is talking about. He said it sounds like a terrific idea and something that's going to go some place, but he can't take that kind of risk.

Michael said he thought Sam was giving the colleges the assurance that this would be a positive impact on the Dean's budget and that's why he would vote for this.

John said he could definitely support that this is a strategy that is worth looking at but that whether or not it is done would depend upon the guidelines.

Pete said what we have now is broke. It does not work well. At best, he said, it's a limping process. He suggested drafting a resolution that basically states that in principle, this is a good idea and will allow resources to be put in the right place; however, how funding is done is critical and has to go through the Dean's Council prior to final adoption. He said he does not have a problem with that because it takes it back to the people who are most affected by it.

Pete asked if the IT model were not really workable, would we go back to the desktop 368 to generate the bills.

Sam said his recommendation is that campus units are billed the same thing as last year if rates are not increased. Sam said the only issue that it raised is one of equity as somebody askewed the balance since the last detail assessment of network connections and infrastructure.

Sam asked for a vote to approve the following recommendation: In principle, the Information Technology Committee supports the concept of moving to a centrally funded model for

support of campus networking. The IT Committee proposes that it assumes primary responsibility for accountability on services delivered and resources expended (i.e. university return on investment). (With the attached note) How funding is managed and impact on units (budget neutral or positive) is key and critical to final acceptance.

John made a motion to approve the recommendation and Michael Vasu seconded the motion. It was unanimously approved.

Sam said that he would carry the recommendation forward, that this issue would be one of future discussion and that a subcommittee would probably be formed. He said there are a lot of additional details and issues that the Committee would need to work on.

- **Security and Security Responsibility**

Sam said security is becoming an ever more contentious and important topic and he wanted to make the Committee aware of several security issues.

Sam said the Office of Budget and Management is proposing an issue that the Committee would be addressing. The proposal is the Safe Computing Environment Requirements, which state that if you have a grant and you purchase any kind of electronic equipment with that grant, you will guarantee that the equipment is not compromised in any way or suffer a significant security incident. A significant security incident is any unauthorized access whether or not any significant loss occurred.

Greg Sparks reported that there was a note that came out prior to this meeting that the Office of Budget Management never sent the note and was not sure of its origination.

Sam said another hot issue was KazaA, a file-sharing program. Brilliant Digital Entertainment has imbedded a Trojan into KazaA that will give them access to processing and storage resources. When you click through the license to download the product, you agree or disagree to allow the use of your personal machine for this purpose. Brilliant has filed for permission to do so with the Security Exchange Commission. Sam said now you can have commercial use of the University bandwidths and resources just by clicking through this license.

Another issue proposed by five senators is the Consumer Broadband and Digital Television Promotion Act. Sam said the Act states that the only code programmers or software firms will be allowed to distribute must have embedded copyright and protection schemes approved by the federal government. This basically regulates almost all programming source code and object code that run on a PC or any other electronic device. Sam said programmers who write code couldn't give that code, transmit that code or exchange that code either directly or over a network with anyone else unless it passes or meets these standards.

Sam said there is also the U.S. Patriot Act, which allows the right to access information without anyone's knowledge. Sam said if you get a request from any federal agency, you should contact David Drooz.

Sam said other acts the Committee should be aware of include Utica and the Uniform Computer Access Act. He also mentioned that a Virginia Tech student's PC was confiscated in order to determine who committed the act of spraying anti-rape slogans on the campus. The student was involved in instruction and education on women's issues.

Sam encouraged members to participate on the security subcommittee and asked Greg Sparks, chair of the subcommittee, to give an update on the Security Subcommittee activities.

Greg reported that the security subcommittee met and has done a little bit of work on firewalls and then quickly realized that firewalls were only one small piece of what it needed to be looking at. The Committee met again and had a two-hour brainstorming session and tried to start scoping the problem. He said what the subcommittee came up with and where it's headed at its next meeting is to try to identify exactly what it needs to be looking at. Greg said the approach is to narrow it down to three different areas: Who is using certain resources? Where are they using them? And, what sort of service are they using? At the intersection of each, the subcommittee will determine what source of risks exists. The subcommittee will then try to identify those risks and then as a followup look at how to mitigate some of those risks and look at some common approaches. He said the subcommittee's goal is to prepare a work paper recommendation for the IT Committee to review.

Sam said that maybe David Drooz or Jeff Webster could provide an update on security issues at the next meeting in June.

Sam also mentioned that there are a couple of vehicles to revisit technology information on campus. He said the University is very likely to have a compact plan II process. There is also a SAC review coming up. As part of the review, there will be a Quality Enhancement Program Component.

- **Planning for the Future: IT budget cuts – What decisions are being made by colleges? What central IT services could be cut with least impact? Can strategies be coordinated? and etc.**

This item was not discussed.

- **Updates and Reminders**
 - Sam announced that there would be a major power outage during the weekend of May 24th-26th. A new generator will be installed and work on the A/C unit will be completed.
 - **New Campus Software Licensing Procedures Workgroup**
Sam reported that GA has formed a committee and the committee has met with EOM and received favorable response in the sense that it was charged with going forward and looking at the issue.

New Business:

- Open Discussion: None

Next Meeting:

- The next Committee meeting will be held at 9:30 a.m. on June 12th, 2002 in 2405 Williams Hall.

Campus Presentations:

- University Security Issues: Jeff Webster, Information Technology Division

David Drooz of the Office of Legal Affairs

Topical Reports

- **Security and Disaster Recovery:** Mardecia Bell
<http://www.ncsu.edu/it/ucsc/04-10-02/security-students.doc>
- **Communications and Networking:** Jennifer Van Horn
<http://www.ncsu.edu/it/ucsc/04-10-02/comtech.html>
- **Electronic Mail, Directory Services, Calendaring, Firewalls:** Greg Sparks
<http://www.ncsu.edu/it/ucsc/04-10-02/email.html>
- **Major Administrative Systems: Financials and Human Resources:** Ron Reed and Barbara Runyan <http://www.fis.ncsu.edu/EIS/finhrupdate.doc>
- **Student Administration:** Mardecia Bell
<http://www.ncsu.edu/it/ucsc/04-10-02/security-students.doc>