IT Advisory VM Subcommittee Report
Virtual Machines (and Storage Area Networks)

Committee members: Jim Rosser (chair), Xavier Chapa, Bill Chollett, Michael Leary, Anthony Schneider, Willis Marti

Committee charge:
Create a plan to implement Virtual Machines as a shared service for the TAMU 02 System Part. The goal is to have the service substantially implemented in >=85% of use cases (i.e., for VM/SANs, 85% servers and disk space).

Executive Summary:
The committee, which includes IT infrastructure experts and experienced managers representing academic, research and administrative units, approached its charge as a potential project, seeking to meet the deliverables by developing a project charter (enclosure 1).

VM subcommittee members initiated work on the deliverables beginning 11 Jan 2013 and wrapped up most committee work by its last meeting on 19 Jul 2013, dedicating over 127 total person-hours to this effort. Most work centered on answering deliverables by focusing on the most critical aspects of project charter development, including business case analysis, scope and stakeholder analysis. Requirements gathering and analysis helped to define the scope, which consumed most of the committee’s time.

Based on its findings and analysis, the VM subcommittee recommends the following courses of action:

1. Review the project charter and approve the VM shared services project for immediate detailed planning and implementation;
2. Using the project charter as a starting point, assign a project manager to form a
TAMU cross-unit project management team to complete development of a project management plan, and form a project team to execute and close the project.

**Deliverables:**

Deliverable 1 - Recommend a service platform, vendor or vendors (if applicable), infrastructure requirements and software including projected costs for initial implementation and maintenance for 5 years based upon current student staff and faculty growth levels.

A. Recommend a service platform, vendor or vendors (if applicable):

See enclosure 1. The subcommittee conducted a survey to determine stakeholder requirements, among other things. The two most heavily used VM products on campus are VMware vSphere and Microsoft Hyper-V. Furthermore, requirements analysis determined that vSphere followed by Hyper-V meet stakeholder requirements better than any other product available today. More detailed project management plan development will determine if one or both products should be used and which organization should host the service and infrastructure. CIS currently offers vSphere to TAMUS customers, but a 3rd party vendor such as Rackspace could also provide this service. The VM subcommittee recommends CIS manage VM service provisioning regardless of who maintains the infrastructure.

B. Infrastructure requirements and software including projected costs for initial implementation and maintenance for 5 years based upon current student staff and faculty growth levels:

This information is not available without extensive research and will be accomplished during project planning. Project management plan development will determine overall demand, which drives infrastructure capacity requirements and cost. The RFP process will help determine which services provider to use.

Deliverable 2 - If needed, a recommendation of a governing mechanism or body to
resolve issues with the shared service as needed.

A. Recommend a governing mechanism or body:

Deloitte’s Comprehensive IT Assessment released in Jul 2013 recommends a robust IT governance framework that will satisfy this need if adopted.

Deliverable 3 - Recommend local group responsibilities to administer the shared service to their customers.
A. Shared services administrator

See Deliverable 1 response.

Deliverable 4 - An evaluation of the overall gains and losses as a result of implementing the shared service. Metrics may include costs, personnel, efficiency, effectiveness, quality of service, or new services. The evaluation should be considered from both the local and university level. Gains and losses that cannot be objectively measured should be listed separately from those that can.
A. Evaluation of the overall gains and losses as a result of implementing VM shared services.

See section 1 of enclosure 1.

Deliverable 5 - A recommendation for a timeline to implement the plan.

See section 3 of enclosure 1.