MINUTES
IT Advisory Committee Meeting
October 14, 2010
8:30-10:00 AM

In Attendance: Stephen Balfour, Andy Bland, Aaron Brender, Lauri Brender, Becky Carr, Bill Chollett, Steve Conway, Jim Culver, Fred Fisher, Juan Garza, Mark Hayes, Kirk Hausman, David Jennings, Stephanie Leary, Jim Rosser, Henrik Schmiediche, David Sweeney, Ron Szabo, Khalid Sanwar Warraich, Debra Dandridge, Pete Marchbanks, Willis Marti, Jeff McCabe, Michelle Osterholm

Item 1 Membership Alignment Announcement
A. Ron Szabo discussed maintaining a membership model where all divisions and colleges have 1 representative.
   - As Texas A&M organization changes, updates need to be made.
   - The bylaws need to be updated to reflect the membership model.
   - After the bylaws are updated, units will be asked to adjust appointments as necessary.
B. ACTION ITEM: Communications Subcommittee will draft a change to the bylaws.

Item 2 Subcommittee SOP
A. The committee reviewed the Standard Operating Procedure drafted by the communications subcommittee.
   - Drafted based on last meeting.
   - Anticipate adding a reporting format for all subcommittees.
B. Discussion:
   a. Should chair approval and suggested ITAC member vote both be present in the document?
      - Updated text to read: "If the charter is approved by ITAC, a subcommittee will be formed.
C. DECISION: SOP approved as amended.

Item 3: Review Existing Subcommittees

Communications:
A. Charge: Standing Committee that provides feedback and suggestions on Texas A&M IT communications, provide recommendations for effective ITAC communications, prepare ITAC documents.
B. Deliverables: Agendas, communications tools, ITAC web presence, participation requirements (Completed), bylaw amendments drafts

Email Retention:
A. Charge: To clarify the practical and technical rules, processes, and associated risks related to email for email administrators and users.
B. Membership - Andy Bland, Jim Culver, Juan Garza, Dave Jennings, Willis Marti, Michelle Osterholm, Brooks Moore, David Sweeney (chair), Rick Young.
C. Deliverables -
   - Email Retention Recommendations - delivered 3/11/10
   - Email Retention "Why" Paper - in process, draft v.2 complete. ACTION ITEM: Need clarification about the target audience for the Why Paper from ITAC.
D. Discussion:
  - How long is too long for the document?
    o For users, limit to one page
    o For administrators: a few pages.
  - The new email rule provides charges deans and division heads with educating their organizations about email retention.
    o Stephen Balfour passed out a one page document that is being drafted for Liberal Arts about email retention
    o Challenging to write because requirements are different based on roles.
    o Email Subcommittee will review the Liberal Arts document and provide suggested changes.
    o **ACTION ITEM:** Stephen Balfour will send David Sweeney an electronic version of the document.
  - **Using Gmail**
    o Against the rules to use Gmail for faculty and staff mail
    o What if @tamu forwards?
      ▪ Rule doesn’t specifically state.
    o There is a growing difficulty with cloud services, to know if state data is being stored outside of Texas.

**FAMIS Subcommittee:**

A. Achieved initial charter of developing a list of suggested departmental functions in FAMIS.
B. These comments will be forwarded to Dr. Cantrell
C. Steve Conway recommended dissolving the subcommittee
D. **DECISION:** FAMIS Subcommittee dissolved.

**Identity Management:**

A. Charge: To assess and evaluate single-sign-on capabilities across the university community.
B. Members: Fred Fisher, Steve Conway, Kirk Hausman, Tom Lyster, Ron Szabo
C. Background:
   - A&M’s decentralized IT authentication environment challenges inter-disciplinary / intra-administrative data/resource access/exchange
   - Difficult, cumbersome and non conducive to collaboration => multiple accounts to access multiple university resources
   - Vision 2020 requirements/ramifications (inter-collegial, government, and private research collaboration initiatives)
D. Requirement:
   - Knowledge acquisition (complexity of Id management; in general and A&M specific)
     o General
       ▪ AuthZ/AuthN
       ▪ Identity management systems / LDAP-based directory services / stores
       ▪ Federated identity framework (assertion-based Identity providers vs. service/resource providers)
       ▪ Shibboleth 2.x / ADFS 2.0 (federated capable systems) => SAML 2.0 (protocol standard). ADFS 2.0 May 2010 release.
     o A&M
       ▪ Multiple authorities => enterprise directory
       ▪ Windows vs. Unix installed base
       ▪ A&M’s Active Directory consumer “store” provisioning
       ▪ InCommon Federation participation (targeted Silver/Bronze identity assurance delegation)
E. Two track metamorphosis:
   - Best practices white paper
     - NetID Kerberos / Active Directory single-sign-on => Open Access Labs
   - Proof-of-concept white paper
     - NetID A&M Inter-college single-sign-on => WS-* Web Apps/Services (SharePoint 2010 – June 2010 release)

F. Status:
   - Successfully deployed AD <-> AD federated framework (College of Engr. / Bush School); not the right solution

G. Deliverables:
   - Best practice white paper
   - CIS Shibboleth -> AD federated framework proof-of-concept / working-model white paper

H. Discussion:
   - Imperative for CIS to pull authoritative services together to provide a single centralized service.
   - Big target has to be a very secure.
     - Needs to be done.
     - Status Quo is not acceptable.
   - Perhaps ITAC should develop a position paper stating the value of a centralized solution.

I. **ACTION ITEM:** Identity Management Subcommittee will redevelop charge and deliverables.

IT Career Ladder:

A. Charge: Look at CIS ladder and other IT positions on campus. Decide if changes need to be made, or if a different career ladder is needed.

B. Deliverables: Recommendations for current ladder, or development of new career ladder.

C. Before end of semester: The subcommittee will be ready to report on the information they’ve gathered, and recommendations for a new ladder for generalist position.

D. Discussion:
   - What is a good name for the generalist track?
   - Generalist positions are not good for advancement outside of Texas A&M University.

E. **ACTION ITEM:** Send suggested titles for the Generalist track to Becky Carr.

Virtualization:

A. Charge: Assess offerings, gauge usage around campus.

B. Status: Completed tasks requested.

C. Recommend dissolving subcommittee.

D. **DECISION:** Subcommittee dissolved.

**Item 4: Review Objectives for the Year**

A. ITAC reviewed the spreadsheet displaying the top 5 choices for each ITAC member

B. Top three topics:
   - IT Audits
   - Campus Active Directory
   - Business Continuity

C. IT Auditing
   - ISO group is reviewing recent audits
     - Identify areas where best practices need to be more clearly defined
     - Define a set of best practices that the auditors will go by.
   - Email ciso@tamu.edu for a copy of the audits. While they are not confidential, please do not further distribute.
Exploratory Committee for IT Auditing:
- Draft Charge: Develop a draft best practices document for IT administrators and auditors.
- Committee members:
  - Willis Marti, Lead
  - Steve Conway
  - Stephan Balfour
  - Juan Garza

D. Consider keeping 5 project subcommittees, as one finishes its task, start a new subcommittee to address the next item on the future topics spreadsheet
- One modification: review topics when developing new subcommittees, in case topics have changed importance or new topics have arisen.

Item 5: IPC Update

A. IPC met on September 27th and discussed three topics
- Preservation of electronic information
  - Sent to Office of General Council for Review
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Members should review the policy and provide any feedback to Henrik.
- Incident Management
  - SAP up for review
    - Current SAP doesn’t address an action plan, and suggested changes provides a structure for responding to incidents
- Web Accessibility
  - Policy based on TAC 206
  - Some topics seem unfeasible
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Members should review the policy and provide any feedback to Henrik.