

**Table of Contents**

1. INTRO .....	1
2. BUDGET GAP.....	2
3. NEXT STEPS.....	2
4. Q&A.....	2
<b>1. Networking.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Karen Troutman - LBJ School of Public Affairs.....	3
Charles Soto - Moody College of Communication:.....	3
Eric Hepburn, IT Director for School of Architecture.....	4
James Lewis - Liberal Arts.....	5
Brad Johnson - Fine Arts / IT.....	5
Parker Boyes – Liberal Arts.....	6
<b>2. Negotiating Purchases.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Elizabeth Cobbe (Office of Financial Aid) - online question.....	6
<b>3. Transparency, Networking, ESB, Rubric.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Mike Harvey - School of Law.....	7
<b>4. Networking.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Charles Soto - Moody College of Communication:.....	8
<b>5. Governance, Training.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Didn't introduce himself.....	8
<b>6. TAI Training.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Tom Beard - Texas Extended Campus.....	8
<b>7. ESB, Stonebranch.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>8. Naming portfolios with buckets of funding.....</b>	<b>9</b>
James Lewis – Liberal Arts.....	9
<b>9. “Easy”.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Guy in longhorn shirt.....	10
<b>10. Timing and Wording.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Sarah Snow - Fine Arts.....	10
<b>11. ESB Mulesoft.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Elizabeth Cobbe - Office of Financial Aid.....	10
<b>12. Culture, Federation.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Eric Hepburn - IT Director for School of Architecture.....	10

**1. Intro**

Purpose of today is to get feedback from you. Once we have feedback final recommendations will go to CFO, Provost, President.

Linda Hicke - Working with best interest of university at heart. Trying to make some positions that allow us to move forward and get IT going in a better direction. We don't know everything so we welcome your feedback and input given constructively. Not all recommendations will be to everyone's liking. We are working towards the best good for the university.

## 2. Budget Gap

Changes and recommendations for fast track closing \$8.58M a year of the budget gap - still a long way to go, in what we need to do. Everything we are talking about today (non-Fast Track) is in addition to that \$8.58M. CITEC is advisory, send to CFO/President ultimately decide and pass back to ITS to decide how to implement the recommendations. Difficult to immediately tabulate cost for complicated implementation.

**Q: Mike Harvey, Law School - are you going to share the details of how we got to this number.** This # is fantastic. Fast track report, published on the website, summarizes recommendations and changes. Including the cost so we can see the rationalization of how it applies? **Dan:** The summary spreadsheet is not up, if you go service by service there is the cost change for each one. Some of the recommendations might be straightforward to implement the suggestion to retire a service, some are more complicated in how you might implement them so it will be more difficult to immediately tabulate the costs. For the ones we are making changes we can talk about the costs that we're projecting for today.

## 3. Next Steps

1. Finish initial recommendations for Future Sustainability Model and Governance
2. Create a draft report and share with IT Community
3. Update report based on feedback and submit to CFO

We've made some cost changes, still not a place the revenue into ITS plus the fee revenue matches things we'd like to see ITS do, particularly when we roll in capital equipment costs which have to happen periodically and can't be put off forever, and how to do new things as innovations come online. Still working on model for sustainability of fee model and governance. How do we create a more responsive governance model, and how we recommend that we fund IT on campus to sustain all these services that we would still like to have.

## 4. Q&A

### 1. Networking

#### CITEC's Recommendation

<b>Service Description</b>	Networking and Telecommunications provides communications services for the university—including networking (wired and wireless); telephone systems; design, construction and installation of communication pathways, spaces and cabling; cellular coverage; cable television; communications to remote sites; multi-media support for events and various building systems.
<b>Recommendation</b>	CITEC recommends that all networking, voice and telecommunications be centrally managed. CITEC further recommends it is essential that adequate resourcing for ITS Networking occurs, including a salary/equity study of appropriate resource levels needed to meet service level objectives. In addition, CITEC recommends the creation of a new committee whose charge would include determining a timeline and transition plan to achieve a centralized network and meet related long-term strategies. Considerations for this “transition” committee to deliberate are expected to include efficiency managing transition costs, security, compliance, and risk.

<p><b>Rationale</b></p>	<p>A functional, reliable, secure and performant network with universal coverage in campus buildings is essential and expected by students, staff, and visitors at any modern research university. Consistent quality and security practices best achieved through central management – and security and compliance are growing risks to the university. A decentralized model not only leads to additional costs and risks in supporting a heterogeneous environment, but also imposes occasional, often unexpected capital expenses on dozens of units on campus, and often leads to untenable situations where ITS is left with no remedy other than to threaten to remove buildings from the campus network. A central network operation could accommodate suitable exceptions where needs for true differentiation exist (i.e., an experimental network in Computer Science). CITEC believes the recommended committee can set up a model that would smooth transition costs as current hardware is replaced for units with a significant investment, and provide sufficient service level agreements to accommodate the needs for responsive local changes.</p>
-------------------------	---

**Karen Troutman - LBJ School of Public Affairs.**

The points in the recommendation for the reason we should centralize include included: **the units don't maintain networks to policy standards, increased risk of poorly maintained networks, too many important network devices stay in service well beyond end of life, and current processes are highly inefficient and costly.** We would like to start with the fact that the **network operations manual** hasn't been updated in multiple years, it was supposed to have been updated every 2 years. I have colleagues that have requested this update that is the guiding doc that tells us what our network standards are. Technical support contacts have access to the building grade system, there are 189 buildings on it, of those 88% meet the minimum standards. I'm failing to see the risk. There are 23 that don't and 8 are at PRC. Karen: I think that PRC could look at what they need to do - Dan - nobody governs PRC. Karen -saying that people don't meet the standard, seems like this isn't a good a reason - Linda - **what we are trying to do here is to move forward and think about the future. You may have identified a problem that the standard manual isn't up to date, that is an issue we need to address, but it's not a reason in of itself to not move forward for a recommendation for the future. It's great to identify problems, and things that have occurred in the past, but let's not keep those things from making decisions about what's best for the future. Let's not hold the past in fear of holding us back from what's doing good in the future.** Karen: **A lot of us don't agree that the past is not working well for us.** That is why we question what the recommendation was. We suggest instead that the strategy instead be: define the network strategy, get networking house in order, then we would reconsider whether or not networking could be trusted without serious implications for all of us. Dan: **Trust is an issue that merits some discussion.** We hear that periodically, that there's not so much the technical reason that we wouldn't run the network centrally, but **there is skepticism that we can run the network centrally well. Is that a true statement? (Yes).** I would be interested in hearing the reasons for that.

For the 12% of buildings, we have a minimum standard, still 12% of the buildings can't hit the minimum.

**When you have to replace the switches its capital expense on whomever owns one of those 189 buildings, can we be in a situation today where we have to take campus buildings off the network. Can we be in that situation today? Someone in crowd says they are ok with this. Linda: you may be ok with this but the university isn't. Dan: You get a \$20K bill for a switch, they pass it to their dean, pay it or we get turned off - audience: That's fine. Linda: We have to think in the best interest of the university, broadly speaking.**

**Charles Soto - Moody College of Communication:**

Attack the reasons presented for the recommendation. I'm not proposing alternative reasons. The 12% of these building - the basketball support building, these are buildings that house basketballs for students to use. Meeting some minimum standard in Belo or Communications complex, someone has made a rational decision to save the university money to not meet a particular standard - is that going to continue with some kind of central thing or does everyone get

a minimum standard? Rawling hall -not a building yet, have one that's a portable building, garages, service building (the people who run the network are responsible for that - + laughs), a federal unit - the LBJ library (not UT) as you go through this, only 2 or 3 buildings need a talking to. Hey dean we are going to shut off your network, because you and your staff hasn't done their stuff. I am attacking that argument that it's in terrible shape and we need to do something. Dan: do you think in 2017 do you think it's a reasonable expectation that students etc., can walk to campus and network can't be accessible and be secure at some minimal standard? Every McDonald's is covered with a network, perhaps our minimum standards are not enough. Simply not being compliant with the minimum standard is not enough. We will need to advance switches. Linda: **Underlying issue is trust. What is the downside of having these building up to code and paid for?**

**Eric Hepburn, IT Director for School of Architecture**

We cannot divorce the challenges we face from the failure of overall university budget mechanisms that happen with tuition freezes. This increased pressure that we are all under is a part of that subsystem. The critical thing missing in this conversation is that value engineering happens between units and William. That is the place/tension in the organized system where we hold what we need, what we want to have and what resources we actually have, tension is held between building owners and William right now. Like all tensions, it can be uncomfortable at times. But my concern is that **this new system of centralization - I haven't seen a compelling argument for where that tension will be held, and what mechanisms will be in place.** Right now I'm going to update these three buildings and let this one linger, I'm using real on the ground information I have as a building owner to make that determination. I don't know if it's reasonable for William to know the details of the business or any other on campus Linda: he needs access to that information. Eric: assuming all relevant information would be in a spreadsheet, that's not how real organizations function. There's tacit on the ground knowledge of what's going on. I'm not talking speciously like it's not possible, but there is a **rubber meets the road aspect where the management really happens, and there are communication costs with centralization that we tend to ignore or sweep under the rug. When you centralize, need to add mechanisms to make sure the on the ground information is translated to good information.** I have been one of the bad actors, I had buildings that were way out of compliance. What wasn't known we were 14 months into waiting for the new routers we have ordered. There has been a history of understaffing. Do we have adequate info about salaries, exit interviews, how we evaluate the sources of historic conditions that they can be addressed in a way that allows us to move forward. Linda: I'm sure organizations larger than us have centralized networks. It can be done well. In all the recommendations we've made, **the assumption is that these will be implemented with oversight and high quality.** Eric: If you want buy-in from us, **we need Proof of concept of processes.** Here are the historical issues we know exist, here are the plan in place. We don't have luxury of saying trust and then verify. Go ahead and sweep more money out of my budget, so we can fund centrally. This is part of the underlying thing. **If you said the president's office is going to centrally fund this without touching your budgets, the feedback will be quite different.** Linda: we don't know who/how will fund. Dan: tension - **how we hold accountability for cost is a good point.** As we have seen on this campus, if you give monopoly power w/out accountability, costs can run up - **need to address in governance, how do units vote, where are the input points, this is an important issue where frankly a large part of our role is to figure out where this cost containment can take place.** To the proof of concept point - totally valid issue, the idea here is not that we are going to say, its central Jan 1 - **this is a multiyear phase out, potentially, with governance mechanisms in place, with a committee writing these policies and procedures, pilots as equipment age out (if port change, wireless problem) you will get service in a timely fashion, what is the SLA, what is the remedy if the SLA is not met?** We don't have a transition plan, it's beyond the scope now, could take 7 years, and this is a big change. **Let's look at the results of a pilot and look at the results and perhaps change course.** Linda: **How it's implemented is critical, and everyone is committed this can't happen unless this is implemented in a way that works for everyone.** Dan: **If you don't get a suitable response via a ticket in a suitable amount of time, if we can't do this in no more cost than we are doing now then we will have issues. We do have salary data, we've looked at, being able to pay people competitively to sustain the network organization is also a point, if we have too few people, not enough pay, and we can't sustain that.**

### James Lewis - Liberal Arts

We have a 2B deferred maintenance budget on our physical plant structure, if we are talking about network utility then we need to have the same approach. I'm one of the people who requested the manual several times. Let's maintain now. It's great to say centralize the network, **but there are issues in the current environment, where we aren't where we are supposed to be, and they should be. We need to start with that.**

I was part of the stakeholder group in August. We had the initial recommendation and evaluated. The three points were - centralize the network, give networking resources, come up with a strategy. Our feedback for these was reverse those - come up with the strategy first, then get ITS networking the support level they need to be at, then see if we can centralize. I'm disappointed to see that wasn't reflected [in the recommendation]. Our feedback was - **the devil's in the details. If we don't approach this with a clear strategy/plan, it's a mistake to say centralize, then figure it out later.** Figure out what you want in a network first. Is it okay that basketball doesn't have a network? I think it's ok. One of my buildings is mine - SW7 - thought it was going to be demolished - I mean secondary, not the core mission to have the finest network in that building. It's a mistake to approach without the strategy first, we don't have a network strategy. It tends to be the highest common denominator and needs to look at the lower common denominator. Linda: we aren't that far apart - **the only thing that is different is that the decision to centralize can be made before the strategy.** That's where we are different. Dan: the order of what you say is right, **but to design a strategy you need a goal.** James: what if you make the decision, and then start working and realize it's not a good strategy to centralize portions of the network? When we say "centralize the network" what does that mean? It has huge ramifications - every level - there are hundreds of hundreds of people/layers involved, people involved. Some are core and some are not, we need to evaluate those things. Dan: **Wall jack in, wireless access point in is the area we are talking about when we talk about centralization. This is a recommendation, form a committee, form a strategy, if the CFO goes forward, and there's \$10M that we can't pay for to hit that strategy, I suspect we would back out of that decision. Our statement was that we need to establish the goal, then build the strategy to reach the goal. We need ubiquitous high quality networking with minimum standards network availability across campus. Obviously there are edge cases.** Eric- that's a great goal. Centralization comes out of the evaluation process as the right mechanism to achieve that goal, everyone in here is good. But **let's not say that centralization is the goal before we've done the analysis.** There are successful examples of the universe for both federated v. non-federated models, there is not one model and one out. The question is what is the best way for us to achieve what we just said? Let's make that the goal, and then evaluate. Dan - I agree with many things you are saying, wholeheartedly. There are federated and non-federated systems that work in the world, **with regard to networks in particular when you move to the space in Universities and other large organizations to get that ubiquitous high quality minimum-high standard network will be to centralize.** We will not be the first nor the 100th university to make the change. It's not going to happen overnight. It will be a gradual thing that involves planning and pilots, if things go badly we have to re-evaluate. There are edge cases too, at both ends. The Computer science department they have advanced networking crazy stuff to do and have students run, there is certainly room to make exceptions. Any policy to support those kinds of specialized networks - - i.e. highly dense IoT, 15 robots on a floor that are tightly networked - all those would require some local specialization and management - **will try to explicitly say that in the recommendation that there would be a policy to make exceptions, i.e. building is being torn down next year, maybe we shouldn't pay attention to it.**

### Brad Johnson - Fine Arts / IT

Who are the other organizations like UT Austin which you could argue there is nothing like this in the world - Linda: **I hate to tell you we aren't that unique** - Most central efforts at this scale fail, I'd love to see something more central, I'd love to see a central resource that would advise those that have the academic responsibility to our deans, our students, our faculty. The networking we are looking at now will be a lot different in 7 years, we need to be nimble with it. I'm waiting for a router i ordered 6 months ago. Waiting weeks to hear back about a closet that potentially crippled with one wire coming out that could kill 5 switches - not my fault. **We really need to fix in house first.** It's going to be a long time, it's going to change right around you. Eric brought up a good point, **everything is dictated by business processes of this university. Until those are in order, the centralized state, all these imaginary things people want to do, you**

11/8/2017

**can't do it if it's so federated.** Dan: for peers, we are mostly looking at other research universities, large scale public or private are the closest analog. There is a huge disparity, almost everything central to almost everything distributed. We have a mostly federated model. There are a number of things that are central, a number that are not. The network is where we have recommended a change. In other places we have not made the recommendation to centralize, such as desktop support. We see the need for federation and local control. **Our budget core for things that need to be central to IT, is too weak.** Skipping ahead to a recommendation we haven't made yet, **all of us on the commission believe we have under-invested in this area. The ultimate answer is more money should be centrally spent. That said, we don't intent to move to a 100% central model for IT. We think we still want a federated environment.** Linda: **A lot of business practices will become more centralized, we have a provost and president who see huge advantages and efficiencies through more collaboration/coordination/standard practices across the university. That is the fundamental philosophy going forward.**

### Parker Boyes – Liberal Arts

I came from another university, we had a centralized telecomm model and it worked great, I was there 7 years, it did take collaboration and communications, but it did work. **It was also one of the most expensive IT units on campus.** It was great though. **The IT units that were embedded in the various departments got that completely removed from their plate and they could focus on the things specific to their departments.** Took a lot of collaboration and it started that way. Question 2 - the justification for the recommendation has a lot to do with people not buying the right equipment at the right times, therefore things fall behind and then it's hard to manage. How much consideration was given to **separating the purchasing portion of this recommendation from the management portion of this recommendation?** It seems like an alternative could have been purchasing centralized, and management retained within the units.

Dan: **There seem to be a lot of issues related to trust, level of service with central IT vs other things. Those are problems we need to tackle and fix, because it can be done well, and if not being done well, we need to address what parts and pieces aren't doing it well, ITS wants to fix and make things better, part of governance is to figure out how we target and identify in a way that people are satisfied with.** If procurement is the issue, or building wiring is the issue, we need to find ways to find solutions to that - but building a strategy around, this has traditionally been bad, lets fix that, let's figure out the right way to do it. Purchasing is a part of it. There are various capital expenses that come up for networking (189 buildings) - **-there are a lot of owners. Who owns it, who pays for it is in dispute in a number of them. Even ones that meet the standard, it doesn't mean that the last round of capital purchase went well. So part of the though is that we need to turn the cap expense into and op ex expense and smooth it.** We can't just go to a dean, and ask for more money as a surprise in August with a \$30K bill. It is possible to do that by changing the financial model, who owns, who procures? One of the things that drove our thinking, turn capex into op-ex, network just works it better be responsive.

### 2. Negotiating Purchases

#### Elizabeth Cobbe (Office of Financial Aid) - online question

If a team is interested in adopting a particular service, but it's not centrally funded, are they then responsible for negotiating their own purchase? And how do we as an IT group convince non-technical director-level management (who would approve budget) of that necessity of forward-thinking technologies that will help us modernize and advance the university's mission? Is there some way of getting enterprise-level approval of a system, to help us convince non-technical directors to approve of the expense?

Dan: category of advice, take or discard. Continuum of services, those offered centrally to subscribe, that's the "university way" - such as Box, don't go negotiate with Box. We have another tier of services that we think are a good idea for enterprise that we make fee for service, you have a lever to say hey they are offering it centrally, maybe we should do this. Managing your boss - where if you do want to pilot something new and innovative, we want to create space for that - for some new things you are on your own - how to get approval -start small, build success. JIRA - the

service was tagged at several hundred thousand dollars per year. Our cloud instances are 10 bucks a month, my on premise centrally managed instance is \$3000 a year. Started with Jira, my staff person asked to use it, \$500, got people using it, went to the \$3,000 instance. Pretty easy to measure usage and success when another unit jumps in. Need a mechanism and a case that you are using it, and then other units look at it, we need to look at making it a central offering. We can offer some things as central first. There are things that can be fee for service to see if there is an appetite for them, they grow and then become ubiquitous and centralized. There are some things where you start small and show that it works. Dennis Passavoy - regional model, if it succeeds in 1 CSU, the price could be re-negotiated for that smaller region beyond central. That's also an option.

### 3. Transparency, Networking, ESB, Rubric

#### Mike Harvey - School of Law

Transparency - appreciate the improved transparency such as having things to look at ahead of the town hall, so we could come in here informed and better prepared to give input. There hasn't been a town hall in three months, seems there are opportunities for engagement along the way, who are the stakeholders from whom you are getting information? I'm a stakeholder, I may have good information to share. But because I don't know what those things are, it's not the same as dropping into the CITEC feedback. There were opportunities for engagement that were missed.

Networking - what's the projected cost (are we talking about a 7 years, pulled out of a hat) it will take time, do you have any idea of the projected cost or where the money would come from. Dan: we have gotten some projections, today, in particular ways, they are not heavily vetted projections, just for guidance back of the envelope estimates, and we have estimates of what we spend distributed, back of the envelope estimates for 2-3 possible models to see if it's feasible but we need to look at final state (are we 40G buildings) before getting more costing. We asked for a lot of information from our staff, but we are not spending millions doing complex projections at this point, sharing what we trust/and spending levels we have - that information should be easy to share and of interest to share. Mike: It would be of interest to us as a foundation and to the people we report to. Dan: had a number of decisions by end of July to support fiscal year budgeting - we felt rushed. We had June and July town halls to get feedback on those topics. Linda: we didn't meet for a while the semester started, hiatus due to semester start. Dan: we wanted to wait until we really had something to say, we wrote it up, came to you this week to support the town hall. Nothing got recommended between these public requests for input. Mike: Agree with my colleagues, and where Eric got to, wherever we are we should be aspirational for who we want to be, we need a Customer Steering Committee, to determine those things, how much is this thing going to cost, I bring this up because centralizing IT came up and a ton of money was spent and we rolled back, ASMP is 40M plus over budget. Dan: not in scope: Mike: we have aspirational things we look at, but the cost and red dollar costs are not always taken into account.

**ESB** - has really important value to campus - the wording makes it seem negative. The concept when reading it through is wrong.

What is the **rubric** about what should be central? Linda: It's online Dan: if not we can put it there (this has been posted online)

Mike - Other universities do networking centrally? Dan - Virginia in the middle of doing it now, privates first, Chicago. Mike - We looked at Yale, Michigan and Berkeley and said "oh we should do that" we have looked at others and they aren't always right. Dan: One instance is not necessarily right, 100 is something to think about. Mike: **We are not planning on centralizing all IT, right?** Linda: **not our decision** Mike: **It would be good to say that we preserve a federated IT model. I think it would be good to say that.** Linda: **In some cases it might make sense, in others it might now.** Mike: **Blessing the fact that part of what makes us great is that we have a federated model that allows for certain kinds of focus, agility, funding, etc.** Dan: **We can consider making a statement that IT remains a federated thing on campus.** Linda: **I don't think we can make that statement.** Dennis "@ this point in time"

#### 4. Networking

##### Charles Soto - Moody College of Communication:

#1 What is the annual spend to take over purchasing part of network? #2 Non-networking comment: how do we go about developing services and maintaining those services? Box -**let's put together a group of customers to evaluate** -we should do this for all services from life to retirement/replacement. There are some customers who are dependent on the services and part of the charge is to **look at governance. It should not be what it had been in the past, load the deck with ITS needs that they needed to get done, have a bunch of people say yes okay let's do that - it should be customer focused groups, governing board, how are things going with all of these, give me your data on users/dollars, governance should say that is rational, let's continue to maintain. Let's make recommendations about services then.**

Dan: If you look fine grain, we have 150 services, so maintaining 150 committees, that's crazy, but we can aggregate.

Person: Governance support organic units. Dan: Box it's also stakeholders, not just customers, but you can't have an organization govern itself and stack the deck, true. Protected data, let's say health institution - what are the risks for health data for patients, and we let records slip out - papers, criminal penalties, there is significant value to making sure its centrally managed and run well - there are external stakeholders like security and legal that need to be a part of the governance frameworks. All of them should fall under some governance committee. Do we want to have desktop standards, even though there is distributed management? To have high quality governance, we can't have hundreds. What is the right set, what is their reporting? Linda: suggest we move off governance, we are running out of time.

#### 5. Governance, Training

Didn't introduce himself - I have a comment about governance - **we are just making recommendations. Who makes decisions?** - Dan: **There is a difference between governance and advisory. TAI training** Also, we are about higher education, but we are doing away with our training, we don't need it for our people? We need to plan for where we need to be. We want "this"; our people are "here", to get them "there", we need to make a plan, but oh, it will happen. Lydia [Lynda.com] is wonderful, but it's passive, but if you don't have time, you don't do it, or do it on your own. It's [Training] set aside to get people where they need to be, and you've recommended that we get rid of it. Dan: we didn't precisely say we were getting rid of training. However, all things have a cost. We have a couple of training programs we recommend we get rid of - the professional intern training where units would pay \$50k per person to train up interns for a skill set that we're probably not going to have in the long term future. We had \$700K a year dedicated to training their people, all the customers who had their money in that were going to pull their money out. So it's a no brainer. Trump University is also training, but just because they charge for it doesn't mean it's worth paying for, versus UT level training. In TAI, that was a fairly expensive form of training, dedicated personnel related to it. There are a number of things that require training, no doubt, do we really need a full time instructor on how to e-sign documents in DocuSign, I think that's something I can learn to do in about four minutes: Interrupted; **2nd guy** in blue shirt, middle of audience: "Not true, I spent 30 minutes yesterday trying to send it I'm still trying to figure it out to get it to networking - that's not true." Dan: Routing may be an issue. Not sure it requires full time level of instructors. We could have technical staff provide training, hire people to come in and deliver short course classes in it, it's a far cry to say the training that the ASMP project is no longer pay for belongs in the ITS budget at the level it was put in.

#### 6. TAI Training

##### Tom Beard - Texas Extended Campus

**TAI Training** - This is a statement that was drafted and signed last week by representatives/developers/analysts over 17 different units across campus. It was taken quite seriously, it's not just about one of these items, and it's about them as a group. Something you can't do with something online and a contractor, **how to connect these things to our older systems, how to make them work in a transition type role. We can't just grab that. We need to keep our TAI training.** We need a small group of folks to instruct us on this. It's not about using Mulesoft online resources, which is a supplement, doesn't get the main point, which TAI Training hits. Dan: **Maybe we need to change the recommendation?** When it comes to integrating in our environment, would it best be done by the technical staff who are working on this

who are working on this? A 2 day thing? Dedicated staff who are training are not embedded in our environment. The point you raise is how we use these in the context of the systems to which they tie, to which we currently do not have in production. This may be a bigger budget item down the line when these things exist. I find, and the way we do technical training in supercomputing, we have some people take a day off to do the seminar, would that be appropriate?

Tom: **There still needs to be a central point of contact that coordinates this, it doesn't need a huge staff, but some type of a central contact that says we built certain modules, documentation, that can guide you/lead you in this way to help you make that connection ever further. This stuff is not trivial, we need to learn how to use things.** Dan: We saw a lot of online feedback about this, will talk more about this in the next meeting.

## 7. ESB, Stonebranch

**Tom Beard point 2 - ESB and Workload Automation moving fee for service-** I asked detailed questions, operational questions have not been addressed, but the details do matter, the operational reality does matter, if you start to put those kinds of systems as fee for service, adoption becomes an issue when you put it fee for service, because people don't have the funds -**you create a self-fulfilling prophecy of "we put these out as Fee for Service, no one buys it, I guess it wasn't useful to begin with"** and in regards to [Linda] saying we are thinking about our future - these are ways to get us here. We need to be considering that on a regular basis. Dan: we need to understand our enterprise architecture and modernize with a core standards of doing things. **We may have put the cart before the horse on some of these.** We got feedback, there was unhappiness in how they were implemented and managed, got a lot of "no's" from folks whether they would consume them. In those things, we are to some extent measuring if there a demand now. Most of them will go over time. **When workday is implemented, I would expect that these need to get revisited,** if this is the ONLY way to talk to a service or a primary way to talk to the service as something like rabbit, should be done in a particular way, if that's what we need to make people to do to talk to the administrative systems then we need to remove the fee. But there are other ways to get to these systems too and there doesn't seem to be consensus that this is the set of ways at this point. Tom: **You mentioned security, being able to manage some of these APIs, Mulesoft offers a platform to let you do to that, and make sure you can vet who looks at is and who doesn't. We have these packages, we have got to take a hard look at them, we have a middleware committee, who is looking at this, saying here are rational ways to make these things happen. I ask you talk to these committee members -** Dan -send me your contact info, I'd like to follow up. Managing this sort of enterprise environment is a big question for governance going forward. There is enough broad disagreement that people looking at the ASMP project are not only looking at taking them out of the ASMP budget but shutting them down all together. The informal straw poll of a few units is "would you come in this way to talk to these units" the answer was No from a number of them. We do need from a governance steering level, we need to decide, Is this the API, is it the only API, is this the way we are going to talk to these services, or can we go around it and talk about these services in a different way, and what do the units want to do? Our sense is that a lot of those decisions have been made, in a way that people are happy with, not universally, and maybe not possible universally. The whole enterprise middleware and how we run enterprise, the functioning of the campus 100% depends on that, there is a **subset of campus that cares about it and needs to be engaged.**

## 8. Naming portfolios with buckets of funding

### James Lewis – Liberal Arts

"Remain as Is ITS Central Funds" - it would be helpful to add the buckets of funding, ie. Systems, networking. NOC, and datacenter operations center, the NOC should be in whatever centrally bucket that networking goes into, but I would question whether the data center network should go under the data center network item. Something to help clarify.

Dan: I asked the same questions, if I recall, it's whose budget (networking vs. data center's) it fell into now in the ITS budget determined where we considered it. So we considered the data center budget under one manager, and in their budget, and we considered the networking in the data center's budget that fell under a different manager in a different network. It's a management decision - for these services that these guys provide, do you want to continue funding, ask someone else to pay for it, or cut it off, if data center doesn't have network it's less useful. Jim: missing in the detail

## **9. “Easy”**

### **Guy in longhorn shirt**

You [Dan] keep saying everything is easy, everything is easy when you know how, often times we are trying to figure it out as we go

## **10. Timing and Wording**

### **Sarah Snow - Fine Arts**

What are the next stages you will be going through? Timeline for next steps would be great. Language of the report that's out now, if we have comments about language changes, you are still accepting comments and it could affect the report? Some wording things could be stated better.

Dan: We are going to finalize the report, for that report, once final draft goes to CFO, then discuss report that describes recommendations for sustainability and governance. Given the level and time span for this commission we hope to have that done by the end of the calendar year, next few weeks. We are outlining guiding principles instead of implementation. Will then hand off to CFO's office to implement.

## **11. ESB Mulesoft**

### **Elizabeth Cobbe - Office of Financial Aid**

**ESB-** If Mulesoft ESB moves to a fee-for-service model, will the university charge those who host an API or those who use it? If host, my own team will likely yank our API from the service rather than pay for it, because there's no direct benefit to us. If the fee goes to the consumers of the API, how will the funding model be determined?

Dan: It wasn't necessarily to host APIs, but to consume the API calls. Those who want to develop through the central mulesoft, there are those who want to talk to the central system through other methods, would be some fee to determine if there is real demand to consumers of the API, and it's to those who are standing up applications that consume them - if they want to pass the fees along to whomever is using the application it is up to them. Longhorn guy - this goes back so self-fulfilling prophecy about use + Some other guy in the middle of the audience “ yep”

## **12. Culture, Federation**

### **Eric Hepburn - IT Director for School of Architecture**

We have to think about staff culture and excellence at the UT - one of the babies that gets thrown out with the bath water in centralization and following models that come out of industry where there is a more concise mission - is what staff culture are we producing with organizations, job descriptions, how we parse things out? This deserves careful consideration from CITEC, and should be one of the major bullet points of where we need to go. Think carefully about who do we want to attract, how do we keep them here, and what work environment can we attract and produce excellent at the University? Unintentionally put at risk with centralization efforts. Dan: Agree, if we want to do these things at a high level, we need to be able to attract and support the people who can do them at a high level, I totally agree. Great thing to put in as one of the principles, thanks for that.