



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Infrastructure Steering Committee

MEETING NOTES

July 11, 2007

1:00 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Conference Room 3304, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul

NEXT MEETING: Date: September 12, 2007

Time: TBD

Location: TBD

ATTENDEES: Jim Dierich, Ken Ries, Ken Brumbaugh, Mike Janke, Jan Doebbert,
Tim Furr, Deb Frost and Ross Berndt

ITV: Phil Thorson, John Roberson

Phone: Mohamed Elhindi

Approval of Meeting Notes from March 14th, 2007 Meeting - To be reviewed.

1. Wide Area Network: Mike Janke

The Office of Enterprise Technology's (OET) MPLS project update: the vast majority is complete. They have a couple of short outages left to do to switch the core routers over to the new technology MPLS. There are also a lot of odds and ends all over the state related to the old infrastructure that need to be cleaned up. This should be done before school starts. Also, this summer OET is going to give up on the old RSVP Quality Assurance System and pick up DSCP which is more widely supported.

Router Rollout: There is currently no schedule in place but we should have about 95% completed by mid-July. The ones that are left are small sites.

End-of-Year Money Left-Over: A decision was made to buy new replacement firewalls since the ones we had were five years old. We were able to do a one for one swap for the latest generation of Cisco firewalls. We purchased 40 new firewalls which is enough for two-thirds of the campuses. We want to roll them out at sites with a lot of traffic, hopefully 25-30 this summer. We did not buy all of them because we need to do an analysis on really big sites and really small sites to figure out exactly what we need. Also, the OET has agreed to put in a hub router and give us a better quality facility in exchange for a little bandwidth.

Redundancy Project: The OET is really dragging on the RFP. It is affecting Metnet Gigabit Circuit upgrades and the Redundancy project. We are doing a redundant hub design which will be a significant upgrade as well as something that we could apply to campuses. It is moving, but very slowly.

Internet: The University of Minnesota has a lot of connectivity to the outside world. They are running multiple connections to Chicago and Kansas City from Minneapolis. They are dispersed out among multiple carriers. For Fall start up we are going to try to: Upgrade two core routers, upgrade bandwidth by about another 50%. We will start at the core and then work our way outstate. In order to do that, we are going to have to update packet shapers. We are also going to review outstate bandwidths and

balance traffic among multiple internet access points. The goal for completion of all of this is the third week in August.

2. **Data Center Update (WBOB)**: Ross Berndt

Electrical and air conditioning improvements have been made. Heat issues are resolved. The D2L rack needs to be moved over the property line. We are working to get this resolved.

Staffing is 24 x 5. We are vacant from Friday at 11:30 pm until Sunday at 10:00 pm.

3. **ISRS and D2L Failover (Implies Secondary Data Center) Update**: Jim Dierich

As of the last status meeting, we had connectivity on the network between WBOB and COB but there was testing that needed to be done. We purchased a second E25K Sun server which is redundant to our Oracle Database Server. We are going to have it installed at COB. It has the same capacity as the server at WBOB. OET had to buy another power distribution unit (PDU) which put the build out of the secondary data center on hold. The PDU has now been installed and electricity is being brought in. Power for the network racks is going to get switched over to the new PDU. We have been placed on hold for about three weeks. Once we get power to our servers, we will start building out the physical hardware. For D2L we have to switch from a 32 to a 64 bit file system.

In general, we have spent a lot of time coming up with a data center design that would allow for flexibility and manageability. We have two relatively simple, straight-forward data centers with routing in between and nothing too fancy.

Downtime: We are not sure what kind of downtime to expect. It may be half a day or maybe a few shorter periods. There will be periods of time where we will have significantly less redundancy than what we have now.

Storage: We will have two EVAs at each site and we will be distributing applications across all four as we feel appropriate for redundancy. Then we will replicate data between the two data centers.

4. **Spam Filtering**: Phil Thorson – St. Cloud State U.

Phil and his staff have developed a set of requirements for what users and administrators need in terms of performance.

-How it interacts with other programs, etc...

Our goal is to delete all spam mail before it even gets to the inbox.

The software is purchased through SHI for way below the state contract price. SCSU ended up spending \$58,000 for the first year and \$17,000 ongoing after that at the 13,000 user level. Currently, there are 100 users in the pilot group. The pilot was in place for about a week, but the systems people wanted the entire campus involved in the pilot. They did not get a lot of complaints. At this point faculty and staff have the ability to turn filtering off. Digests of blocked messages are available. Phil and staff used the feedback to help make a product selection.

-From a system perspective, it is important to get this done before Fall.

It is not a requirement that we all have to use the same program. But from a pricing

perspective, the more standardized we are, the better.

Action Item: Let CIOs know what has been done as far as the SPAM filtering report at SCSU. Send a document out to the CIO list – Phil Thorson

5. Identity Management: Ken Brumbaugh and Deb Frost

Momentum is gaining in this area. We are working with a set of resources that will become part of a communications plan. Assuming that we get permission to officially hold a series of Identity and Access management presentations as a program, we will be prepared in terms of communication. We copied our roadmap model from the University of Texas system. We have a technology component and a governance component. Instead of “Policy”, we are using a category called “Standards and Practices”. We have also outlined the tasks that Leadership must perform. We need leadership all the way along, not just in the beginning.

People want Access Management, but the first step has to be Identity Management. The iAM materials that we have so far could be used to teach a course on Access and Identity management. We have a good starting effort, but until we get a formal go-ahead, there is no sense in putting more effort into finalizing our roadmap.

The Enterprise Investment Committee must approve or deny the establishment of budgets. Our requirements are going to be reviewed by the Portfolio Office within the next couple of weeks where different project managers will be reviewing them. They are going to send our materials out to the Enterprise Investment Committee in early August. We are unaware of what the cost of this project will be. The total budget will be rounded to the nearest \$50,000.

We are currently in phase one of this project. We need to do demonstrations and have a directory in place by the Fall so campuses can start doing activities on their own. We are planning to give around 50 people their Star ID to start. We are using Sun software and hardware for this phase one year as their prices were attractive to us. Towards the end of this year, we will make a formal decision on a vendor to use for FY09.

The Oracle report is exactly what was presented at their final session. Our discussions with them were excellent, but Oracle’s summary presentation, was sales oriented and did not say much to us. We met with Sun which led up to the Proof of Concept project. That meeting was not open to campus participation. Whatever solution we choose, it must work well with campus Microsoft activities. Some of the Microsoft suggested solutions for IdM will be taken into consideration, but they are not the universal solution for the entire system. That would probably be a combination of Sun, Oracle, IBM and Microsoft. But we will definitely be working with Microsoft Solutions at the workstation level. We need to make sure we communicate effectively about which vendors we are bringing in. We need to be communicating as we go, even if our presentations are not polished and packaged.

In the short term, we need to have a set of principles surrounding the governance groups. Last Fall, it was decided that the IT Management Council would officially oversee policies and procedures for Identity Management, the Systems Development Steering Committee would focus on business aspects and the Infrastructure Steering Committee would focus on the technology aspects. The SDSC is mainly tied to ISRS.

Where Identity and Access Management solutions tie in with ISRS influences is the issue that we've been dealing with. This is why we need everyone working together. Ken Brumbaugh suggested that perhaps the SDSC should not be a key player as their main interest is not Identity Management. We need to have a separate business standards advisory committee that only focuses on Identity Management (governance, standards and practices etc...). This group has not been chartered yet, but we need to be moving towards a new and enhanced governance structure.

Jan Doebbert expressed concern about not having the governance structure in place for this project. We do not have anyone in charge right now and we have no real direction. Our students are not able to do the things that we promised them three years ago. Someone needs to take the initiative so we can get this taken care of. We need to have candid discussions with presidents and executive leaders to establish exactly what we need to accomplish before we completely lose sight of what we are doing.

In terms of the time line, we have two restrictions: We need a hiring process that works and we need to be up front about the approval process we are going through as it has an affect on the time line. Staffing is the biggest issue we are dealing with here. We have 55 OOC ITS positions to fill. Maybe we should go to the campuses and spread the word about these positions. It may not be ideal, but it's a way to get things done.

Action Item: Ken Brumbaugh sent out user stories to the department as well as this committee and is asking for feedback on whether or not they are helpful. Would other accounts be useful?

Adjournment:

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Meeting notes submitted by Smitha Pennepalli, Smitha.Pennepalli@csu.mnscu.edu.