Present: Brian Watson (for Chris Adcock), Matt Blankenship, Sharon Burch, Joellen Childers, Bill Clayton, Martha Dennis, Paul Keck, Will Laney, David Matthews-Morgan, Christine Miller, Dan Murphy, Jerry NeSmith, Barry Robinson, Robert Rysiew (for Teresa Payne), Cletus Stripling, Jeff Teasley, Carol Watson and Chris Workman.

Absent: Sue Achtemeier, Chris Adcock, John Anderson, Greg Ashley, Mike Campbell, Mark Cherry, Lee Cornell, Mike Dennis, Bert DeSimone, Corey Doster, Mark Ellenberg, Debbie Ellerson, Alan Ferrenberg, Sarah Fraker, Stan Gatewood, Sandi Glass, Brad Hunt, Stuart Ivy, Judy James, David Knox, Tammy McGarity, Eric McRae, Teresa Payne, Jeff Pentz, Cheryl Prichard, Sharon Thelen, Greg Topp, Dale Wetzelberger, Barbara White and Chris Wilkins.

Approval of minutes – The group approved the minutes for the March 3, 2005, ITMF meeting.

Telecommunications Policy — Brian Watson from the College of Agriculture, on behalf of Chris Adcock, presented concerns Chris had with the draft version of the Telecommunications policy. While Chris fully backs the effort, his intent is that ITMF take a look at the policy and air any concerns they may have. (Matt Blankenship, noting that several members of the group had not yet seen the draft, linked this particular issue with a concern about dissemination of draft policy information.)

Chris’ concerns, as articulated by Brian, follow:

1. Potential for increased workload and the study for guidelines for acquisition and use – apparently Chris has been told that web-based applications will facilitate
detailed information gathering as a way to track inventory of wireless device purchases. Chris Workman confirmed that the ASG group (within EITS’ CITP/Client Services division) is working on a web based form that tracks these purchases.

2. The policy clearly states that cellular service will not be provided by the university and then later the policy lists how to procure cellular services and hardware.

3. The policy contains a discrepancy on reimbursement for state and university reimbursement plans for personal usage.

The group responded to these concerns by noting the following:

- Those involved in the policy making process might benefit from recognizing ITMF in the vetting process of policies.
- There is a lack of clarity about the approval process and ITMF could be useful in providing some clarity to that process.
- Part of the struggle is that there is no official policy concerning the drafting of policies.
- It was noted that the policy addresses those employees on-call but not faculty or other employees.
- It was mentioned that whether or not the university sanctions the use of wireless devices, the usage on campus is inevitable
- ITMF may need to discuss the possibility of letting the administration and others know of their concerns surrounding wireless support.
- Matt agreed to send a note to Barbara White and Holley Schramski asking when the policy is set for approval and then providing the group with input.

Password Policies – Jeff Teasley noted the following about the UGA password policy (Attachment I):

- There is no current password policy in place.
- Systems Admin groups are interested in discussing what the different systems require
- the SECCOMM is interested in making the policy consistent
- Stan Gatewood has a draft policy prepared
• the ID Management group, at the urging of the Provost, is interested in seeing something come out of this discussion soon.

The two main questions concerning the issue are:

1. How to make a password policy work with different systems?
2. What level of “password pain” will a constituency accept?

Jeff noted that EITS has begun this process by requiring a password change from those who work with the main server. Paul Keck noted that the systems group is really mainly interested in making the policy MYID compatible and that its language deal with how the passwords are used. David Matthews-Morgan wants to make sure the policy deals with the security of the passwords. Jeff noted that it was possible that something could be in place policy-wise by this fall; Jerry stated that SECCOMM is due to report to the Regents by July 1st, 2005.

CENTBAC update and next steps – Jerry NeSmith noted that several groups on campus are interested in acquiring the Central Backup capabilities that were installed by the Research Computing Center as a model. He recognizes that, if more departments and colleges request the service, the RCC infrastructure may not support the demand. He is concerned, however, that if EITS (who is capable of supporting CENTBAC) uses it as a Compact Planning initiative, it may stall until acquiring funding in FY07.

Jeff Teasley mentioned that what is required is a Memorandum of Understanding between the Office of the Vice President for Research (which EITS has already developed) because the original model came out of the RCC. He also noted that a Storage Area Network would be required to support a campus CENTBAC initiative. He noted that that idea has been expressed to the administrative powers on campus.

Jerry asked ITMF to form a stakeholders group to possible play a role in bringing the people who have a grasp on the need and the situation together to offer solutions to the campus desire for CENTBAC.
Jeff Teasley, conversely, does not feel the responsibility or ultimate final design of a campus Centralized Backup Solution belongs solely in the hands of RCC despite the availability of equipment and current resources; a lot of people want it how do we provide services; perfect example of compact planning initiative; He noted that EITS is just cranking up compact planning process and that admittedly it will not give us funding until fy07; that does not mean that all progress must halt however.

Matt noted that it would prudent to remember that CENTBAC progress should not be completely stalled but that moving too fast could prove ill advised. He also requested that Jerry and Terry College make the CENTBAC model available to any who are interested in evaluating that model to improve their understanding and evaluate for themselves how suitable it is to meeting their needs. Matt was not suggesting that departments rush to specifically adopt the RCC model or jump into the RCC process with funding at this point but rather to use the information to grow understanding of the issues and approaches within each college IT Services staff. Matt felt it was important to allow RCC to share their positive and negative experiences with EITS so that collectively and collaboratively a framework can be established for capturing the financial resources and know-how required to support a few key Central Backup solution approaches / themes. Multiple sources of funding are available including campus administration funding AND internal college funding. Grants are yet another source.

Bylaws Discussion – Christine Miller passed out a revised Bylaw handout (Attachment II) and JoEllen Childers had several concerns about the wording in several areas of the document. Christine invited JoEllen to join the committee. Paul Keck motioned to electronically vote on the Bylaws as they are currently written. That motion was approved. Christine agreed to prepare an online ballot.

New Business – Matt presented two pieces of information for consideration:

1. All non-exempt groups or individuals must have a web site disclaimer in place by May 1st, 2005. The policy as written does not impact College, Departmental, Faculty, or Support Units (ie Parking / Food Services) web pages. It is targeted at those pages and sites that are not representing the mission of the University, that may be more opinion or advocacy related. A link to the official policy will be available through the ITMF website.
2. All department heads/Deans must “know” the contents of their servers. This comment was made in one of the College of Veterinary Medicine Administrative Council meetings. Matt was curious to what degree deans are expected to be intimate with the data/information hosted on servers in their colleges. He wanted also to find out if other directors or leads have heard the same comment in their unit leadership meetings.

With no other business to discuss, the group adjourned at 3:10 p.m.