ITAC Minutes  
March 8, 2012  
8:30-10:00

Meeting Leader: David Sweeney  
Recorder: Lori O’Bannon

Attendees: Tom Lyster, Chuck Braden, Fred Fisher, Willis Marti, Allison Oslund, Henrick Schmiedeche, Jim Bouse, Eric Beck, Adam Mikeal, Bill Chollet, Becky Carr, Rick Young, Andy Bland, Juan Garza, Jeff McCabe, Steve Conway

Guest Attendees: Pete Marchbanks, Don Gilman, Debra Dandridge, Allison Winslow

Item 1: Review of Minutes: Approved: Becky interjects with some “typo” corrections

Item 2: Announcements:
Nomination of new ITAC officers:
- David Sweeney states Ron Szabo and Becky Carr are retiring their positions on the ITAC Executive Steering Committee. (E.S.C.)
- David Sweeney states he would avail himself for continued service on E. S.C.
- David passes out paper with instructions for folks to note their nominations for chair, vice chair and secretary candidate positions (ITAC executive positions-Becky Carr collected nominations).
- David Sweeney currently serves as vice chair. It was asked and David clarified vice chair does not resume the role of chair; not how by-laws are constructed.

Action Item: David explained next step in election process is he will compile info and ask individuals that are nominated if they are interested in running. Outcome of the discussions and candidate selection will be announced at next meeting.

Power Steering Software & Demo Classes: Presentation by Don Gilman, NIS’ Lead IT Policy Analyst, and Power Steering Project Manager for TAMU and the System; Don is also part of the Isaac program.  
(See attached NIS handout and vendor flyer)
- NIS is looking at the Benefits of Implementation of Power Steering Project & Portfolio Management Software.
- The initiative began a year ago with pilot teams using the system.
- As a result of information and experience gained by the application usage, currently have a better understanding of the scope of the software’s limitations and advantages.
- Subsequently, PMO office can recommend what/ how organizations and depts. can effectively utilize the PPM software.
- Currently, licensing model is a corporate model, and NIS’ ITRM has requested Power Steering modify it to an academic model. (Added benefit to that request is that it lowers the cost).
Power Steering Software & Demo Classes  cont.

- Individuals can participate in demo classes presently being held at SCC.
  - Class is 3-4 hours long, and free of charge
  - There are 2 classes offered:
    - Beginner Project Manager Software class
    - 2nd class, more advanced for the Project Manager.
    - All classes receive electronic materials, offered during the class and exercises
      and the ability to access, play, and evaluate those resources for 30-60 day time
      period.
  - If you have several members in your dept. or unit interested, Don Gillman stated he or a
    member of his team would come to your office and hold a hold a demo class.
- The Power Steering Software pack Kit includes: 5 full seats, PMs leads, and 10 executive seats
  - Many technical interfaces; spectrum of reasonable interfaces, from taking a report and
    creating a Power Point presentation to updating time sheets.
  - Can be tailored for an array of tasks - from small projects to large complex management
    utilization
  - Ball Park cost license $480.00 per user, per year.
    - Working on bundles that would enable depts.to buy directly a full seat for
      $320.00
    - Partially functionality governance seats rough estimate: $165.00
- Present incentive: If sign up by 1 May, NIS offering TAMU organizations an additional block of 20
  hours of free consulting time.
- For more info or to sign up for classes: pmo.tamu.edu

Item 3: New IT Trends

- Adam Mikeal spoke about CITE Consumerization of IT Conference he and David Sweeney
  attended in San Francisco.
- Adam Mikael stated he attended with some reservation; he was really looking for solutions. In
  his department there is rampant use of mobile devices, drop box, etc.
- What he discovered at the conference is everyone in the same place.
  - Across the industry and enterprise no one knows how to control the invasion of
    consumerization devices.
  - What he learned was that speaker after speaker spoke of the need for “a shift” in the
    traditional IT model from controlling the devices connecting to the network, to a focus
    on controlling the data.
  - Solution is in improving the application to use data or resources.

(Video forthcoming on Consumerization conf)

- David Sweeney indicated he acknowledged there were Forces of Restraint –vs.- Forces of
  Proliferation-Question: How to restrain IT?
- David’s take away from the conference is the access has to be easy, or consumer will not use it.
If the secured access is not made simple, the leakage will continue into the enterprise.

**Item 3: New IT Trends: Consumerization cont. (David Sweeney comments)**

- Think about mobilization and consumerization as the New IT, change in shift of thinking has to be in creating systems that will flexible.
- One Speaker identified 3 Driving Principal Consumerization:
  1. **Self Service**: Make the process easy for users to get to without intervention.
  2. **IT Economical**: Consumers want the procedure to be inexpensive, and able to access relatively quickly.
  3. **Convenient**: If the secured method for system access that the University offers is cumbersome, the consumer will not use it.

**Mobile Devices**

- **(MDM) Mobile device Management Device**: technology is 15-20 years old, and is dead.
- **(MAM) Moving to Mobile Application Management**: Securing the mobile data at the application level, not the device level. Create a secured application. (A lot of limitations, customizing/wrapping applications)
- **(MIN) Mobile Information Management**: Securing Information Data- Enterprise Rights Management- Not possible right now.
- Adam Mikhail stated most information geared towards business, not higher education
  - Subsequently, emphasis on Human training/compliance
  - Employees’ signs paperwork: consequences for behavior.
  - Not as much emphasis on technical controls on devices, but behavioral controls.

**Misc. Information**

- Over the last 12 months, there has been a 3000 percent increase/threats to Android use. Industry suggests a policy for iPhones and iPads and a ban on Android use.
- Emails usage is in decline, people using social media or instant/group messenger for creative collaboration-Question: How to secure that?

**Item 4: Sub Committee Reports**

**Essential Elements Sub Committee: (Framework provided): Juan Garza (doc attached)**

- Willis and Jeff met with auditors. Auditors requested a requirements piece for each “Element. “
- Thus, auditors have a standard on which we will be “Judged/ based upon standards outlined.”
- Provided auditors with Password, Governance and EE framework- Asked for tweaks.
  - Henrick states and Juan agrees auditors seem to want a rule; that is documented.
  - Auditors do not have a real standard?
    - Response from Willis Marti is IT produces standards and documents them.
    - Then IT tells auditors, this is what you should be using.
- Juan will be sharing “User Management” criteria
  - Andy and Adam’s unique approach in developing “User management” user provision will be shared soon.
- Juan asked for ITAC reps to please read and provide feedback.
Item 4: Sub Committee Reports cont.

Password Sub Committee: Henrick Schimiedeche has completed and presented report; additionally, met with the auditors.

- The work of Password Committee is tied into Essential Element’s Document
- Willis Marti stated using Henrick’s report as a strong guide for a major update.
- Not ready to publish; it is a goal to incorporate and issue model soon.

ID Management Sub Committee: Jim Bouse presents

- Tom Golson has a CeRvs service that can authenticate against
  - Willis Marti interjected that the intent is to provide a campus wide authentication system that AD users can authenticate against.
- Fred Fisher states that we need a central AD.
- Jim stresses looking at costs for an environment, as an essential function.

Business Continuity Sub - Committee: Bill Chollet- Nothing new to report

Item 5: Rules and SAP Changes in Progress: Debra Dandridge: NIS’ Lead It Policy Analyst

- Presently, 2 SAPs and I Rule, docs attached, have been in the review process in IPC.
- See flow chart (How SAPS, Rules are formed from inception to being posted on web site)
  - SAPS Mandatory review cycle can be reviewed at any time during (3 yr.) time period
  - Rules mandatory review cycle can be reviewed at any time during (5 yr.) time period
  - Policy reviews occur whenever system decided to review a policy.
- Trying to get ITAC to be part of the process, early on in the review process.
- Willis Marti Marti’s desire is that Debra Dandridge provide/present to ITAC early in the process, once the rules, SAPS or policies come to committee in IPC. ITAC needs to make a decision on how/when to review the SAPS and communicate feedback to D.D.
- David Sweeney states ITAC adds value to the process is. If ITAC asks for input, ITAC has to have a commitment to the process.
- Dr. Marchbanks suggests that when receive info from IPC, begin conversation/respond within a 2 day time frame.
- Henrick as the ITAC IPC rep, states historically any comment made by ITAC is seriously taken into consideration at the IPC meetings.


Item 6: ISAAC End User: Spirited Conversation

- Willis Marti states he has reviewed the email conversation; understands that it is not fair to ask folks to incorporate a new process for this year’s Isaac.
- Willis expresses that ITAC reps acknowledge ISAAC will not be in this form next year. Process will reflect significant changes.
Item 6: ISAAC End User cont.

- ISAAC presently not offering an earnest value to him as CISO- cannot use it to assess risk to the campus community.
- ISAAC is not an accurate risk assessment. It will be revised/enhanced by next year.
- Willis Marti vows just because you do not have admin rights, does not remove you from responsibility of the device.
- Allison Winslow states that 2012 ISAAC develops and incorporate workstations
- Henrick Schmiedeche maintains the pass or fail grade is not an accurate reflection.
  - Like to see and identify the risk that addresses all issues. “Exclusion”: process should be documented by the end user, not ISAAC.
  - If the solution systematically makes for a more difficult process, individuals will use their own devices.
  - More barriers put in their way, the end result will be less security.
- Willis Marti states ISAAC is a snapshot of that device, does not report over the whole year. Even if you have admin control, do not know the state a month after the report.
  - The statement that you don’t have admin rights and you know nothing, and if you do have admin rights, you know everything are both false. Trying to get closer to providing enough info to view/provide an accurate risk assessment on campus.
- David Sweeney shared responsibility between IT and end user, unless something goes wrong, then no longer shared responsibility- it is solely IT problem
  - Willis Marti states actual final responsibility belongs to dept. heads.
- Prior to scanning, Bill Chollett uses this process as a chance to remind users not to have confidential info on their computers. If user does, asked to encrypt it. Trying to correct deficiencies as part of review.
- Willis wants to be able to access the risk to the community of users, and manipulate and deal with the data.
- Adam Mikeal makes an assessment that ISAAC end user is being used for 2 different purposes:
  - IT Admin: use it as a great educational tool; make end users aware of their responsibility of using the computer/device.
  - Willis Marti is using it to access risk

Action Item: David Sweeney states need to continue the conversation ISAAC End User over course of the year, and asks that it be added as a future agenda item.

Announcements: Allison Oslund
- Allison states all official TAMU student email will now be “Neo.”
- Neo is the formal email communication from faculty, staff to student and vice versa!