Facilitator: Brian Pietrewicz

Attendees: Kevin Stevenson, Andrew Yoder, Ryan Johnson, Walter Valdez, Cyndi Johnson, Kathleen Garcia, Elisha Allen, Grace Faustino, John Reindorp, David Sanchez, Irmin Wehmeier, Brian Pietrewicz, Duane Arruti, Emily Morelli, Darrell Banward, John Tiesi, Alex Roessner, Chad Covey, Garth Colasurdo, Jessein Al-Azzari, Carlos Herrera, Paige Briggs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td><a href="http://cio.unm.edu/agents/notes.html">http://cio.unm.edu/agents/notes.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td>• Introductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Hussein Al-Azzari from CARC introduced himself. Introductions around table.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standards in Development

1) UNM IT Discuss for SLA/Standards – Kevin Stevenson
   • Kevin thanked Agents for participating in this process. There has been insightful feedback and dialogue on the Discuss site that has helped to draft documents. SLAs and standards are still in process. The KSA recommendations are a reasonable framework to build new models, but we are still determining the best way to accomplish it successfully.

Questions & Answers
   • Q: Cynthia asked Kevin to shed more light on the history of the KSA engagement – the why, etc.

   A: It’s been 18 months or so since we began the engagement with KSA as the result of budget pressures. Based loosely on fact and anecdotal information, administration knew there was a level of duplication of services, touch points, etc., and wanted to see if there was a more efficient and effective way of providing services, as well as looking at cost reductions. The President committed to a specific dollar-amount savings as a result of KSA findings (roughly $500k per year for three years). KSA met with the administration and stakeholders and conducted a user survey across campus, among other things. They provided recommendations to develop strong governance, fiscal and business models to better serve infrastructure. These models are being developed independently without influence on each other. This has caused some tension – for example, the SLAs contain language about fees but the fiscal model is not yet developed. Kevin clarified that “enterprise” does not have to mean centrally funded. Enterprise services offered by one entity should have guaranteed service levels with accountability if service levels are not met. But we are still in the process of understanding our current baseline and articulating the scope and service levels so that we can look at financing. As a starting point, documentation is important in order to proceed. There is an unknown end game with the goal of saving money, allocating resources for value, and defining and improving necessary levels of service to units and end users.

   • Q: An agent expressed concerns about the speed at which the process is moving forward given the fact that there is not a firm understanding of the current situation. He used the End User Support standard as an example. He expressed that having the funding model divorced from standard seems dangerous.

   A: SLAs and Standards have not been signed by senior leadership for reasons that include this type of concern. Also of concern is that there is no compliance component in place yet. Kevin reiterated that standards should serve as a baseline capture and set bar for performance and accountability no matter the entity handling a service.

   • Q: An agent used a recent security incident to highlight that current funding model is problematic in
terms of control and fiscal accountability being aligned, and developing standards without the funding model attached could be problematic.

A: Kevin stated the funding model could manifest itself in a variety of ways – central ING, fees, or a combination of both. He used the example of telephones – enterprise funding, but still with a monthly fee. He stated that the overall current funding levels for information technology might be appropriate, but not leveraged through collaboration for the best value.

• Q: Do we have peer institutes that have gone through this process or similar process to KSA?

• A: KSA did provide information from ASU and Utah about governance, standards, funding, compliance, etc. Kevin solicited Agents for feedback regarding universities they thought ITSAC should look at, noting that each institution has fundamentally different factors that affect how organizations operate.

• Q: Regarding the Datacenter Standard, was there feedback about why it’s not signed yet? It is foundational to SLAs for implementation.

There was then discussion among several attendees regarding how the datacenter standard process took place – collective drafting, rather than one entity, as with the current drafted SLAs. Concern was expressed that the university is repeating past mistakes, rather than making progress on working collaboratively, by having one entity write SLAs/standards and allowing only one week for community review.

A: Kevin commented that it was a fair assessment to point out that agents are being asked to hurry up to write and provide feedback while leadership takes longer to approve. It is part of the by-product of having senior officials necessary for the process in terms of time, technical understanding, etc. Kevin expressed that he would address the time concerns with senior leadership.

• Several attendees discussed the Datacenter Standard and implementation process, hypothetical compliance scenarios, PCI, and HIPPA in the context of SLAs and Standards.

• Duane Arruti suggested that Agents need clarification and perspective of how SLAs and Standards fit into the overall picture, as the process is not defined or clear from the original drafts through compliance. Knowing what is next concerning the drafted, unsigned documents would be helpful to group.