### Topics

- **Approval of Minutes (October 2018)**
  - Reviewed in committee; approved

- **Informational: Update on AAU/APLU Public Data Availability Meeting (Bridges/Benedict/Henning/Wheeler)**
  - Drs. Bridges, Benedict, Wheeler, Henning and Ms. Johansen (UNM IT) attended this conference organized by AAU – Association of American Universities and APLU – Associate of Public and Land Grant Universities. The conference attendees were a broad representation of senior administrators, faculty and specialists in IT, library services, legal counsel, and compliance. Institutions have identified options that address some of the issues but no one has identified a complete solution.
  - Federal agencies such as DOE, NSF, DOD, and NIH are interested in broader access to research data. Development, implementation, and management of a cohesive system for collecting and disseminating faculty research requires consideration of a broad range of issues including but not limited to:
    - Faculty interest in making their research public. Would incentive approaches be useful?
    - Infrastructure necessary to support such a system.
    - Compliance and confidentiality issues.
    - Federal agencies have not developed requirements or processes defining their needs.
    - Data management plans are not required for grant proposals or reporting.
    - Agreement about what data could and could not be shared publically.
    - The focus is to shift the current practice of sharing data in a limited way to sharing all data unless there are agreed-upon, valid reasons for not sharing it.
  - **Action Item**: Dr. Bridges will send committee members the meeting slides, presentations, and a summary of items relevant to UNM for further review.
  - Conference participants agreed there is not yet a defined and shared approach for addressing this issue. Some approaches currently in place include:
    - Utah State engaged library system for assistance; they do require a data management plan for proposals. Grant funds are transferred to faculty after they have fulfilled the requirements agreed to in the data management plan.
    - San Diego requires faculty who advise graduate students to have a data management plan in place.
    - USC includes sharing of faculty research data as part of their promotion and tenure requirements.
  - Dr. Celedon-Pattichis asked about the expense associated with sharing research data which can be significant. NYU has a tool for sharing multiple data formats (interview data, video, audio) that includes multiple privacy controls; this does not necessarily make it public and is not a cost-neutral or simple tool to use.
  - Providing a solution to make research data available to federal agencies will require an institutional solution. At a minimum, further evaluation is needed to determine how collected data would be used, preserved and re-used and what agreements should be in place for research artifacts.

- **IT Capital Planning Update (Duane Arruti)**
  - CIO Arruti reviewed the charge of the University Capital Planning Leadership Team. This is the first year for this group to meet and is modeled after BLT (Budget Leadership Team). Its purpose is to prioritize and select projects for potential bond funding and to have that process be more transparent. One of the
subcommittees is Information Technologies which CIO Arruti is chairing. Committee membership includes advisory board representatives and library representation will be included in subsequent meetings. The committee’s initial goal was to develop a 5-year IT capital project list for items that are needed by all units. CIO Arruti shared the project list which is based on an existing 5-year capital projects list IT developed in prior years. If funding is not allocated in this budget cycle, projects will roll over into FY20. The top requests for year 1 are as follows:

- $11 million to HED subcommittee in a severance bond package request for IT upgrades, renewals, and replacements for security cameras ($3 million), campus code fire and fire safety equipment ($3 million), learning environments and technologies ($3 million), and critical infrastructure repair ($2 million).
- Learning Environments and Technologies: The priorities here are upgrades for existing classrooms for the 150 centrally managed classrooms. The specific needs include WiFi upgrades or additions as needed, addition of wired data ports, and refreshing spaces with new paint, flooring, abatement or remodeling to make the space more usable. Needs are addressed based on heat maps and congregation points. Since 2016, wireless access points have increased from 2,200 to 4,500; the goal for optimal coverage is 8,200. The Educause e-track student technology survey results indicate more than 60% of students see coverage as less than good, 20% indicate it is poor. On average, students have 3-5 internet-capable devices. Additional resources are needed to meet the goal of 8,200 access points; the requested funding will support further progress towards this goal.
- Critical Infrastructure: The current campus fiber infrastructure in some areas is 30 years old, and average life is 10-20 years. Failures in this area will have significant impact on users. Electrical upgrades for the data center are included in this request. Maintenance completed Memorial Day weekend in 2018 was the first annual maintenance in 15 years. Going forward, having options for completing annual maintenance without taking the data center down for 3 days, ensuring stability in the current system and providing for additional capacity is essential. Options that have been explored include 1) replacing the electrical structure in the existing building, 2) build a new data center that would accommodate IT and CARC data ($3.8 million based on current quotes), and 3) move to the cloud. Options 1 and 2 require significant upfront costs that have not been funded and will require ongoing upgrades and maintenance of onsite infrastructure. Option 3 requires a commitment to recurring operational funding ($358,000/year) in addition to some capital funding for transition. At this time, IT is using salary savings of $557,000 to sustain the data center; this is not sustainable. There is a I&G recurring request submitted to BLT for $358,000 to support cloud based management of data. This does not include the $120,000 utility cost; this cost will need to be allocated outside of this funding request.

- The suggested wireless upgrades will cover interiors and exteriors.
- The committee discussed the cloud solution which does anticipate future growth and expansion. It is difficult to compare the data center build vs cloud as the features and options each provides are not identical. The resources needed to manage an on premises data center versus cloud management are significant; resources currently used to manage the data center could be repurposed. Evaluation of the impact of each option for IT and CARC shows that a cloud solution generates cost savings for IT but not for CARC. The life cycle of modular data center units is around 20 years. Bond funding is appropriate for this type of investment. Long-term funding is a challenge given how technologies continuously evolve. In a short period of time, more efficient and cost-effective solutions are developed to meet the existing need. Generally, these opportunities are not found in on-premises options. A hybrid solution of cloud and on-premises solutions might be optimal. Not all services already being provided are currently funded. Current funding requests do not include renewal and refresh costs. Both should be added to all capital and I&G recurring funds requests. Recurring funding is more difficult to secure than one-time capital funding requests.

- The IT Capital Planning Subcommittee will meet at least quarterly to have continuing input on IT needs and the prioritization of those needs relative to funding.
- Deputy CIO Pietrewicz clarified that $557,000 has to be added to $3.8 million quote to cover staffing and power costs for maintaining an IT/CARC data center. If the $750,000 is the option chosen, the $3.8 million does not apply, but the $750,000 does not help CARC.
Intake process - operational and scoring committee membership composition (Bridges)

- Currently at least 10 units supporting research requests. IT triages the requests. If a resource is not available to support the request, the request is escalated to one of the committees for review. This project will streamline the review process and support centralization of the research service catalog. IT expects to have a demo ready for testing in January or February. An operational committee of groups that support research computing should be constituted to complete initial evaluations of intake requests. The research service catalog will direct faculty to already available resources. They will submit an intake request if an additional service is needed. The operational group would review and either route to an available service where possible or submit to this committee for review. Intake requests that are approved for further consideration will be sent to a scoring committee to establish priorities. Groups to consider for inclusion in the operational committee would include CARC, IT or ITOs, Libraries, School of Engineering, Computer Science and possibly other departments. Their role is to triage requests for service which could be completed through online meetings. A charter will need to be developed outlining their role.

- A subgroup of this committee can complete the scoring. Director Allen suggested using an academic committee scoring rubric. The rubric may need revision. The commitment for the subcommittee will be relatively light.

- **Action item**: Patrick will email committee members to provide nominations for the operational and scoring committees for review at the January meeting.

Create working groups for major committee initiatives (Bridges)

- Dr. Bridges discussed the five areas where volunteers are needed for working groups to move these initiatives forward.

- Five identified needs:
  - Research data management — Dr. Benedict
  - Controlled unclassified information (CUI) — CIO Arruti advised the work of this group may intersect with CUI steering committee work. This will be revisited in January.
  - Research computing infrastructure/network infrastructure — Deputy CIO Pietrewicz and Dr. Busani suggested a representative from Libraries would be appropriate. **Action Item**: Dr. Bridges will request a volunteer from Libraries.
  - Intake process - Dr. Bridges/Grace Faustino
  - Electronic research administration — **Action Item**: Dr. Bridges will request a volunteer from Libraries.

- CUI conflicts with open data plan. Resolving this tension will require further discussion.

Next Meeting: *January 23, 2019 1:00-2:30pm Scholes Hall, Roberts Room*