In Attendance: Stephen Balfour, Andy Bland, Lauri Brender, Becky Carr, Bill Cholette, Steve Conway, Jim Culver, Fred Fisher, Juan Garza, Mark Harris, Stephanie Leary, Tom Lyster, Adam Mikeal, David Sweeney, Ron Szabo, Rick Young, Willis Marti, Pete Marchbanks, Jeff McCabe, Allison Oslund, Michelle Osterholm

Announcements
A. Vision 2020 review is progressing. Any input should be sent to Stephen Balfour.
B. The email retention recommendations will be published on the ITAC website.

Item 1 IT Best Practice Metrics Subcommittee Draft Charter
A. Draft Charter:
   - The subcommittee will research information, provide opinions and disseminate status in support of discussions between Texas A&M IT and System Internal Audit concerning standards and practices to be used in IT audits. Research will focus on best practices within the higher education community, especially in Texas. Recommendations will reflect ITAC members’ preferences where choices and/or interpretation exists. Status reports should be frequent and interactive.
   - The final product is a “Best practices” reference for IT Professionals at Texas A&M. The subcommittee will also provide a recommendation on how to maintain the reference.
B. The subcommittee title changed from IT Audits to IT Best Practice Metrics because the scope of this subcommittee goes beyond working with the Internal Audit.
   - Purpose isn’t to satisfy audit, the purpose is to provide clear guidelines to IT groups on campus.
   - Developing a single standard that can be used across the campus
   - Developing more levels than merely pass/fail
C. Discussion:
   - Items to subcommittee should consider
     - Levels of passing below an A+ level.
     - Appropriate solutions dependent on the size of a department and/or budget limitations.
     - Clarification on what IT materials include.
   - What’s the relationship with Internal Audit and this subcommittee?
     - There is a good intent on their part to work with us.
   - Auditors use our rules and the ambiguity in those rules to ding us.
     - What we are doing is creating a metrics document that gives a standard by which each rule can be judged.
   - This committee isn’t looking to provide interpretation of the SAPs
     - Providing examples of the best way
     - If you can’t do this, acceptable alternatives.
D. DECISION: Charter Approved.
   - Subcommittee Members:
     - Willis Marti
     - Juan Garza, Chair
     - Jeff McCabe
     - Adam Mikeal
     - Lauri Brender
     - Andy Bland
Item 2: CIS Reallocation Request

A. Network Resiliency goal
   - A power outage in a single building will not affect any other building
   - Most frequent cause of network outages is loss of power
   - Currently, when a building loses power, network access for that building is not expected.
     - With growth in the popularity of mobile devices, this may change.

B. The Texas A&M Network is currently built on a hub and spoke system with several “hub” building on campus linking to the network backbone, and all other building connecting to one of the hubs.
   - All of the hub buildings have redundant fiber connections to the campus backbone.
   - Plus, we have pretty good control and knowledge regarding construction on campus.
   - However, if power goes down in one of the hubs, it affects all of the spokes.

C. The Network Resiliency Plan will create a dual home for each spoke building, so if power goes out in its hub, pass-through fiber will allow traffic to travel to another hub.
   - Anything off of a hub needs a second home.
     - This will require a lot of planning and time.
   - All electronics will need to be upgraded to handle 2 connection points for each building, requires equipment purchases and installation time.

D. Current Implementation Plan:
   - This resiliency is part of the university’s strategic plan for IT.
   - Without additional funding this project will take 5-6 years.
   - We’ll publish a prioritization list.
   - With a portion of the reallocation fund, implementation can be moved up to a 2-3 year time frame.

E. Discussion:
   - Network funding has historically been subsidized. We’ve gotten to a point where subsidies are hard to continue.
   - Three ways to handle funding:
     - Moving at our current pace, very slowly
     - Publish schedule and allow group’s to purchase building priority.
     - Speed things up to 2-3 year time frame by getting a big infusion of money now
   - Prioritization may not be the best method. If groups have some money to contribute it seems that we should be helping.
     - Texas A&M IT recommends that you support recommending the reallocation.
     - If we get some of the reallocation it is everyone contributing
   - Do you have an estimate for how much it will cost to do this?
     - No exact figure but under 5 million
   - What will you request from the reallocation fund?
     - Ask for half of it each year for 2 years.
   - Why not just buy a generator for each hub building?
     - Backing up power will not help if emergency workers ask for no power in a building.
     - Backup power will not be as reliable or cost affective as the dual home solution.
   - There is a long list of things that are needed from the reallocation fund, and the money won’t go far. Is it really the best source of funding for the network resiliency project?
     - From Willis Marti’s prospective this is the only source.
We all represent our units, but when we come into this room we are supposed to represent all of IT at Texas A&M.

- Is it something that we need?
  - Is it worth asking?
  - Can you quantify losses during network outages?
    - When the network goes down, it affects us significantly.
    - If network access goes down on important days it may drastically affect everyone on campus.
    - If we are going to one thing to increase the robustness of the network, this is it.

- Bottom line is $5 million and no one building going down will cause any other to go down

**ACTION:** Willis will provide a document with details and requests a letter of support from ITAC within the month.