CIO Council Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2015
Madison, WI

Attending: Jim Barrett*, Bob Beck, Mark Clements*, Chip Eckardt, Mohamed Elhindi*, David Kieper, Joe Kmiech*, Tom Janicki*, John Krogman, Bruce Maas, Ed Murphy, Sasi Pillay, Elena Pokot, Steve Reed, David Stack (reporting), Sue Traxler, Doug Wahl, Ilya Yakovlev and guests Nick Davis, Lorie Docken, Jason Fishbain, Ruth Ginzberg, Jim Helwig, Kathy Luker, David Miller, Mike Schlicht, Annette Stratman-Durrer, Tom Tenley, Olga Turkina, Jenna Weidner. Additional guests joined the teleconference for the discussion regarding business intelligence.

*by teleconference

Approval of Minutes from August 20, 2015
Sue Traxler moved and David Kieper seconded the approval of the minutes, which were passed by acclamation. Diana Trendt will post the minutes on the Systemwide Information Technology web site.

Review of Prior Action Items
- Diana Trent will post the July 16, 2015 CIO Council meetings on the web. (DONE)
- Sasi Pillay will distribute the final Huron Consulting report to the all the CIOs as well as the disposition of the CIO Council's comments on the prior draft. (DONE)
- Sasi Pillay and Adam Fennel will clarify the language in the Huron Consulting report regarding coordination of security efforts without necessarily changing reporting structures. (DONE)
- Sasi Pillay will send an invitation to explore leveraging UW-Whitewater's VoIP service at other UWS institutions. (OPEN)
- Ruth Ginzberg will solicit volunteers for a Microsoft Strategic Licensing Team. (DONE)
- Sasi Pillay will solicit participation from Audit and Legal on the Security Steering Team. (DONE)
- Sasi Pillay will ask Purchasing and Legal to review the proposed data security terms along with the comments submitted by Ilya Yakovlev and Bruce Maas. (OPEN)
- Werner Gade volunteered to collect anecdotes that illustrate the case for a single UWS credential. (OPEN)

New Action Items

- Ruth Ginzberg will solicit volunteers to develop a process for internal bidding for training and services between the UWS institutions.
- Sasi Pillay will solicit suggestions from the CIOs as to when the next round of Innovation Fund proposals should be solicited.
- Sasi Pillay will notify the Innovation Fund applicants whether or not their projects were funded.
- Sasi Pillay will circulate the list of successful Innovation Fund proposals.
- The My UW System portal redesign team will solicit volunteers to help with the effort.
- John Krogman will distribute copies of the My UW System portal redesign materials.
- Chip Eckardt and Yakovlev will determine whether there is time for a My UW System presentation at the upcoming ITMC meeting.
- John Krogman will share UW-Madison's incident response process.

- Sasi Pillay will make the case to provosts, chancellors and CBOs regarding the need for resources for the IR replacement project. If possible, a CBO partner will be engaged.
- Sasi Pillay will share a revised IR/BI slide deck with the CIO Council before addressing any of the stakeholder groups.
- The Huron Project Management Group will survey the CIOs and classify the recommended business cases before the next Council meeting.
- Nick Davis will verify whether the Internet2 roadmap has any bearing on the advisability of switching to Comodo certificates.
- Sasi Pillay will notify the CSRG that the Council passed a motion to switch to Comodo certificates administered by each UWS institution.

Microsoft Contract Update

Ruth Ginzberg noted the communications she has distributed regarding the Microsoft contract. The UW System (UWS) has a contract for terms, conditions and the pricing that Microsoft will charge their distributers. The Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) has a contract for a single reseller that the UWS must use. Until the UWS completes new paperwork and Microsoft completes processing for the new reseller under their Insight Public Sector program, the UWS can continue to buy from the previous reseller, SHI. There may be an upcoming gap on the order of a few days when no Microsoft purchases will be possible. Ginzberg recommends that the UWS institutions make critical purchases now rather than risk getting caught in the gap. Future costs will be higher because Microsoft's prices keep increasing.

Mandatory Training

Ruth Ginzberg is assisting a working group that is acquiring online Title IX training for the entire UWS. The group would like to have online training for students, faculty and staff integrated with the Student Information Systems (SIS) and the Human Resources System. They are not fully aware of how difficult this might be. Ginzberg has put the group in touch with David Alarie. Associate Vice President Vickie Washington and Legal Counsel are responsible for ensuring the training takes place.

Joe Kmiech mentioned other forms of mandatory, common training, including Wisconsin Executive Order 54, FERPA, etc., that are offered separately in different forms at the various UWS institutions. Tracking who has taken the training is usually a challenge. Kmiech inquired whether the training could be included in the my.wisconsin employee portal.

UW-Platteville has contracted with a training vendor. UW-Whitewater had experience with a vendor who had inadequate security controls. In response, content was acquired from UW-Madison and made available via D2L on short order.

Bruce Maas reported that UW-Madison is already doing all of these forms of training and can share them with the other UWS institutions. Maas recommended that all products be compatible with InCommon and that the UWS sponsor the vendors for adoption by InCommon. Maas also noted McGraw Hill's direct marketing to faculty even though their products have insecure integration practices. Maas recommended that the CIO Council members be proactive regarding these kinds of initiatives with their Chief Budget Officers (CBOs), Provosts and student affairs leaders on a regular basis.

Ginzberg confirmed that there is not a UWS recommended vendor for training, although the working group members do have opinions regarding the different products on the market. John Krogman explained that D2L and campus portal are used to facilitate annual training for DoIT staff at UW-Madison. Meanwhile, departments buy additional training packages with procurement cards that no one knows about. UW-La Crosse is also using D2L for compliance training.

CIO Council members suggested sharing training activities between the UWS institutions. Ruth Ginzberg will solicit volunteers to develop a process for internal bidding for training and services between the UWS institutions.

Krogman reminded the CIOs to leverage the My UW System portal, which they are paying for already, for applications that require authentication.

Innovation Fund Status Update

Sasi Pillay thanked the members of the Innovation Fund proposal review team and reported that there were a total of 48 proposals that came from almost every UWS institution. Some 15 selections were made and the recommendations sent to Vice President David Miller. The 15 proposals will cost some 75% of the funds that were set aside for this program. The proposers are committed to submitting 60, 90 and 120 day reports that will be published on the UW System website so others can learn about what is underway. Pillay will circulate a list of the successful proposals.

Joe Kmiech inquired about a second round of solicitations now that faculty are within their nine month contract period. Some UW-Superior faculty did not submit proposals because they were not under contract when the solicitation was due. Sasi Pillay will gather suggestions from the CIOs as to when the next round of Innovation Fund proposals should be solicited.

My UW Portal Re-design

John Krogman noted that there is pressure at UW-Madison for portal accessibility and usability that is comparable to popular web applications. The campus has completed a needs assessment and redesign of their campus portal that has resulted in positive feedback.

Jim Helwig explained that the companion My UW System portal is already funded by the Common Systems Review Group (CSRG) and the 2015-16 fiscal year budget contains funds for a redesign. The my UW System portal is robust, secure, trusted and skinned for each UW institution. It receives high usage for earning statements and other Human Resources (HR) information at the rate of over 300K logins per month. It is available to all current employees as well as former employees, applicants and students at some of the UWS institutions. There are over a dozen portlets organized under two tabs: Employee Resources and Work Record. Each UWS institutions can add specific content or links for their community.

The My UW System redesign effort is focusing on ease of use and making it easier for partners to add content while also improving support. The portal redesign at UW-Madison had similar goals and was a open, collaborative process. Helwig shared an initial design with the Council. The personal homepage has a set of dashboards and widgets that a person can customize. More information is available in fuller views for each application. The search function has been greatly improved and the search hits can easily

be added to the landing page or launched immediately. The portal responds to the size of the device in use instead of requiring a separate mobile app.

The team will solicit volunteers from the UWS institutions to help with the design. No money is needed for the redesign, just ideas and the time to participate. Once prototypes are created, boarder participation will be solicited. An agile development process will be used for implementation and testing by a set of beta users. The goal is to make it easier for each institution to leverage the portal and make it more effective for the UWS.

Krogman reported that lot of work has been done at UW-Madison already that can hopefully be leveraged without an extensive amount of effort at each institution. Ilya Yakovlev inquired whether e-benefits, direct deposit of paychecks and routing of HR forms would be included in the redesign. Krogman explained that those efforts are still being piloted by the Service Center. Ed Murphy expressed concerns about putting banking data in the portal. Sue Traxler noted that campuses are starting to build their own e-forms processes using various tools because they are tired of waiting for a system-wide solution.

Sasi Pillay stressed the utility of the portal for applications that need authentication. UW-Madison uses their portal for student applications that need authenticated access. Meanwhile, UW-Eau Claire is building a web-based one-stop shop for students and UW-Stevens Point will be looking to replace their portal as they move to PeopleSoft SIS. Pillay also recommended engaging with the UWS libraries regarding integration with Alma. Chip Eckardt and Yakovlev will determine whether there is time for a presentation at the upcoming IT Management Council (ITMC) meeting. Krogman will distribute copies of today's presentation and notes.

Data Center Plans

John Krogman reminded the CIO Council that UW- Madison is in the midst of a data center aggregation project that includes virtual environments that other departments can choose to use. The chancellor and other leaders have recommended that departments look to the DoIT platform. Power and cooling will be the limiting factors if campus adoption becomes widespread. Various options have been considered that may lead to a hybrid environment in which the Dayton Avenue data center would be backed up by other facilities including, perhaps, a modular data center at Research Park.

Preliminary vendor discussions have begun for initial cost estimates. Other UWS institutions are welcome to participate in the discussions if they'd like. UW-Madison will move to the cloud in areas where it makes sense in a hybrid on-premise/cloud environment. For example, the Student Information System is not ready for the cloud. Meanwhile, UW-Madison is willing to host SIS instances for other UWS institutions.

Bruce Maas noted that the adoption of cloud services will increase and there will remain components that are housed on-premise. Sue Traxler emphasized how the tornado experience at UW-Platteville demonstrates how the cloud can reduce risk and security in the right circumstances.

Steve Reed noted that cloud strategies have changed a lot in the last several years. Some companies have moved away from the cloud and gone back to on-premise hosting for cost and other reasons. Maas explained that UW-Madison's prices are slightly below Amazon's. The ultimate goal should be to get to

the minimum number of quality data centers in the UWS. Today there are more than 100 data centers at UW-Madison, which is more than needed.

Sue Traxler explained that UW-Platteville is backing up data to a storage area network at UW-Eau Claire. Doing backups through UW-Madison would not result in a real time environment. Mike Schlicht recalled that UW-Milwaukee has available space in their secondary data center.

Ruth Ginzberg noted that Amazon Web Services and Google are selling very cheap CPU cycles on an "as available" basis which might be appropriate for some research processes. Sasi Pillay observed that the price comparison point for Amazon has dropped 15 times in the last few years.

Ilya Yakovlev inquired if the UW SystNet backbone would be housed in the new data center. Schlicht affirmed that it could be. At yesterday's UW SysNet meeting, the group discussed the tradeoffs between cloud and on premise services with regard to DDOS attacks.

David Kieper recommended that each UWS institutions have two data centers on campus as well as a cloud strategy for continuity of operations (COOP). Chip Eckardt predicted that institutional websites will move to the cloud for reasons of scalability.

Pillay noted the recommendation from the Huron Business Case exercise to convene a data center strategy team. Maas would like to consider how to engage the CBOs because this is a long-term facilities issue. Elena Pokot recalled that there was a system-wide data center group let by Mike Schlicht prior to the Huron recommendations. Schlicht explained how when that group was meeting the cloud was perceived as the answer for everything. Today, each institution needs to understand what resources they need to hold onto. David Kieper noted that the data center professionals face a conflict of interest in making such recommendations and suggested tabling this issue until the discussion of the Huron recommendations overall.

Projects for the IT Leadership Program

The question was raised whether investigations of the Huron recommendations could serve as projects for the participants in the IT Leadership Program. Elena Pokot questioned whether the cohort would have sufficient time to do anything beyond a simple needs analysis. If this strategy is pursued, there should be a CIO sponsor for each project.

Security/Hacking Breach Communication/Process

Chip Eckardt recommended the development of a checklist for addressing reports of exposed data in a quick fashion, especially when it involves a UW System resource such as D2L. Steve Reed recommended engaging with the Technology Infrastructure and Security Committee (TISC) and the new Data Council, which has not yet been formalized. David Kieper observed that everyone is willing to help other institutions, but it takes time to mobilize when an issue pertains to UW System resources. It also takes time and effort to extract information from D2L.

Ruth Ginzberg stressed that having ready access to data is something that could be put into the contract language with UWS vendors. John Krogman confirmed that the DoIT Help Desk (608-264-HELP) is the

single point of contact at UW-Madison for any kind of data breach or incident. After 11:00 pm the number is monitored by the network staff.

Chip Eckardt recommended the establishment of a process that does not need to be reinvented for each incident. Pillay agreed and stressed that there be a contact person at each campus who has the authority to make things happen, not just relay messages.

Krogman will share UW-Madison's incident response process with the CIO Council. Pillay recommended that each institution have an incident response process that is ready to go. Maas noted that the CIC group is discussing these issues as well. One of the CIC Chief Information Security Officers will put forth recommendations as to how the FBI can better interact with the higher education community. Sometimes Public Relations, Legal Affairs, the FBI and others discourage the sharing of information relating to security incidents. Ed Murphy recommended adopting the REN-ISAC model, which is appropriately vetted.

Business Intelligence Update

Kathy Luker reported that the RFP for a new Business Intelligence (BI) solution will replace the Interactive Reporting (IR) tool with a new tool that can connect to multiple data sources through a semantic layer. On October 1, the RFP team will look at the Total Cost of Ownership for the solutions proposed by the responding vendors. Afterwards, best and final offers will be solicited prior to contract negotiations.

A new BI solution will drive major organizational changes. The process could be disruptive, especially if there is not adequate training. The semantic layer is the tip of the iceberg. Underneath are data siloes, ungoverned data, inadequate data structures, minimal BI infrastructures and few data architects across the UW System. Bruce Maas stressed that the semantic layer construct will be a big change for the UWS institutions.

Ed Murphy expressed his CIO's concern that this effort has expanded beyond replacing IR and has become a BI project. Luker explained that there is no simple replacement for IR on the marketplace. Sasi Pillay recalled that over 180 people were involved in developing the specifications for the RFP.

Jason Fishbain noted that all of the tools on the market today allow for a semantic layer, which is probably where everyone wants to wind up. The question is how do we get there? Some tools allow for querying without a semantic layer by attaching reports directly to specific data sources. All vendors are pushing for the semantic layer approach, which allows people to simply specify data fields without worrying about the sources.

Luker reported that the workspace for the current system-wide shared queries will go away. The UW System's ERP vendors provide systems of record without expending too much effort in data availability or reporting capabilities. Because ERPs optimize transactions, they are not flexible with respect to reporting and analysis. To fill the gap, the UWS institutions have developed data warehouses, query libraries, analytics solutions, etc. UW-Platteville has an Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition (OBIEE) semantic layer that gives people a view of subject areas rather than raw data sources. Data elements can be renamed to make sense to the people using the tool, and computed items can be defined once and reused by everybody. This strategy empowers people and preserves a single version of the truth instead of having different people running their own reports and getting different results.

The current CSRG project is replacing the IR tool, converting the system-wide shared queries and providing limited training for the UWS institutions. The institutions will need to convert their own queries, which will involve creating a semantic layer, and training their own query writers and users. Executive sponsors and project coordinators have been named at each UWS institution in conjunction with their respective provosts.

The institutional executive sponsor is responsible for securing authority and resources for the project and is expected to be a vocal and visible champion. Mass emphasized the care that went into the letter that went to the provosts outlining the institutional responsibilities. Fishbain also sent an email to the CIOs that outlined the responsibilities. Depending upon the size of the institution there may be fewer or lesser individuals sharing the different roles.

It is the role of the executive sponsor to bring money to the table. Maas shared a first draft of a budget proposal and framework for undertaking the project at UW-Madison. This is a difficult time to be looking for investments, but projects must be funded or they fail. Maas recommends that the sponsors have conversations with their senior leadership as soon as possible so that risk does not fall back upon the rest of the UW System.

Mohamed Elhindi recommended sending a straightforward letter to campus leadership asking for financial commitments. Steve Reed noted that not every UWS institution has a mature data governance structure that involves key stakeholders. Additional leverage from UW System Administration to bring this about would be welcome. Pillay explained that he made a presentation to the President's Cabinet and the chancellors about the importance of data governance.

Ed Murphy questioned whether this is mainly a query conversion effort or a BI initiative. Pillay recalled that there were five different proposals that went to the CSRG which ultimately resulted in the funding of option zero, which is the most fundamental. David Kieper believes this project is mainly a change in tools and that the governance and structures are missing to recreate queries in a semantic layer. Bob Beck agreed that the semantic layer is all about politics. In contrast, the technology is comparatively easy.

Ruth Ginzberg stressed that the marketplace made the decision that this would become a BI project, not anyone involved in the procurement process, because there is no such thing as an IR replacement.

Elena Pokot expressed concern that the IR tool will be shut down only a year after training on the new tool begins. It could take more than a year to build a semantic layer. Fishbain explained that it is possible to build a semantic layer using the requirements within the existing reports instead of brainstorming what the semantic layer could be. Just because the IR workspace is shutting down, the Studio Client could still operate.

Maas expressed concern that if a CIO is the sole executive sponsor at their institution without the CBO or other business partner, they will face significant hurdles because this is not an IT problem, it is a business problem. Reed noted that at some UWS institutions, it will fall to the CIO by default to take the leadership role. Pillay asked for suggestions as to how UW System Administration (UWSA) can help in communicating the message to the institutional leaders. Reed recommended educating the chancellors about consequences, risks and steps for success. Sue Traxler recommended addressing the chancellors and provosts as groups, rather than expecting each CIO to convince their respective leaders. Pokot

recommended having a CBO present to other CBOs to help to explain the concepts, rather than the tools. PIllay will take this as an action item.

Traxler urged the importance of stressing that this is an IR replacement project and to refrain from talking about it as a full fledged BI solution, which it is not. Pillay countered with the risk of losing the message that the UWS is looking forward to BI. Ginzberg concurred that this will be a paradigm shift that is challenging to discuss. Pokot recommended making it clear that this is not a reorganization of people or departments. Beck observed that executives understand reporting more than they do BI. Kieper expressed concern that senior leadership realize that this purchase will not acquire everything that is needed for BI. Pillay agreed to adjust the messaging based upon this feedback and share a revised slide deck with the CIO Council before addressing any of the stakeholder groups.

Traxler recommended that some CIOs who are executive sponsors re-think whether they need co-sponsors from the business side. Fishbain suggested that the executive sponsor team start meeting sooner rather than later. The Council members thanked Kathy Luker for continuing to engage with them on this important project.

CSRG Update

Olga Turkina distributed an overview of the CSRG finances. There was positive cash balance after fiscal year 2014-15. Therefore, the CSRG decided to establish a contingency fund and carry over a few projects and supplement others with additional funding including the HRS affordable care act, budget system technical support, academic systems and BI tool migration.

There were special funding requests for data masking and cyber liability insurance. The cyber liability insurance proposal was vetted by the CBOs and funding was approved at the subsequent CSRG meeting. In the long run, self-insurance will be considered for at least low cost incidents. Sue Traxler would like additional clarity about the training, forensics and other services in the insurance proposal.

John Krogman stressed that there is a positive balance in the CSRG budget because all of the other projects came in under budget and some procurements and recruitments took longer to complete than anticipated. Turkina explained that the remaining cash balance will not buy down campus assessments but rather be used to address strategic initiatives in the year to come.

Jenna Weidner reported that there are three primary frustrations with the CSRG process:
- nebulous roles
- unclear accountability
- a focus on fiscal allocations rather than strategy

An initial proposal was made to replace the CSRG and the Enterprise Administrative Systems (EAS) Executive Committee with a new Shared Services Strategy group. After vetting the proposal, a different approach was developed.

At their last meeting, CIO Council members said they wanted the CSRG to focus on business not technology, define communication and authority, reduce the number of meetings and establish a communication plan. There was also concern that it would not be possible to have a strategic focus given the size of the current CSRG budget.

Therefore, the new approach will eliminate the EAS Executive Committee and retain a modified CSRG. Vice Presidents David Miller and David Ward will serve as co-chairs and the group will be expanded to include the sponsors of the HR, Shared Financials and Budget systems as ex-officio members. The Vice President of Finance will chair the CSRG budget committee.

Sasi Pillay encouraged the CIO Council to pick up the slack on the technical side of the CSRG process and weigh in on alternatives that deserve consideration. Later today, Nick Davis will talk with the Council about alternatives for digital certificates and take a recommendation to the CSRG. Wiedner noted that the largest number of voting members on the committee are CIO Council members. The CIO Council will be positioned front and center on the decisions, but will not have veto power over the CSRG.

The communication responsibilities of the CSRG members are also being redirected away from reporting back to their respective institutions to instead engaging their respective stakeholder groups, such as HR Directors.

David Kieper inquired if the CSRG will continue to operate on a model of one vote per institution. Wiedner concurred that this question has been discussed and will be considered further. There will be a meeting tomorrow morning to discuss streamlining the budget process and the engagement of the ex-officio members. The new structure should help the CIO Council be involved throughout a shorter budget process given that 95% of the budget is devoted to base infrastructure.

David Miller confirmed that David Ward has made a commitment for himself and his successor to be co-chairs of the CSRG. The CSRG spends too much time wrestling with operational matters and base funding rather than focusing on innovation. Once something becomes part of the base infrastructure the question is how to review it, which is a challenge across the entire UW System.

Bruce Maas inquired about right sizing the CSRG budget for a university system the size of the UWS. Miller explained that the Gartner study has tried to address this need in regards to the Shared Financial System (SFS) and HR. Progress has also been made with regard to individual academic programs, but not holistically.

Succession Planning for the Associate Vice President of Learning and Information Technology

David Miller reported that he doesn't have much to share with the Council yet regarding filling Sasi Pillay's Associate Vice President position on an interim basis. He explained that three CIOs have been engaged to work with him on the process. He selected John Krogman, Elena Pokot and Werner Gade based upon the differences in their respective institutions and their proximity to Madison. The process will continue and Miller will report back to the CIO Council as soon as possible. Appointing an interim will provide the necessary flexibility to thoughtfully develop a full recruitment.

Miller is open to suggestions from the CIO Council because he does not know the IT business. His role will be to work with the CIO Council, listen to needs and help the Council get where it needs to go, which could involve challenging the group and reflecting the reality of the world of the UWS overall.

From the Huron Business Case study, President Cross sees the need to collaborate efficiently by:
- increasing standardization
- decreasing customizations
- centralizing back office systems

Miller would like the CIO Council to discuss how it should receive and respond to this study. Sasi Pillay explained that the Huron Study Project Management Group (PMG) has discussed possible responses and the need to get underway. The four members of the PMG have recommend classifying the recommendations into three categories:
- ready for immediate action
- needing more consideration
- perhaps possible in the long term

The PMG will survey the CIOs and classify the recommended business cases before the next Council meeting. Joe Kmiech suggested adding a category for recommendations that are not actionable which are typically included in most consulting reports.

David Kieper recommended providing at least an initial triage of the 18 business cases since the Huron report is a public document. There could be subsequent follow-up on the most promising recommendations.

Bruce Maas observed that some of the recommended business cases are not really IT related, e.g., reducing customizations in Student Information Systems, which depends upon institutional culture and policy. In the year 2000, there was not a system-wide approach to student systems because the respective faculty senates would not agree to adjust their policies. Too often IT is blamed for the expense of implementing what the business units insist upon.

Maas noted the efforts of the Learning Environment Needs Analysis (LENA) project to help senior leaders understand that the manner in which work is done, and the subsequent costs, are driven by their areas. Although UW-Madison is necessarily complex and may have unique business needs, Indiana University is able to develop systems that address the needs of the Bloomington campus and which also meet the needs of the other campuses. Miller noted that this kind of approach is already underway in regards to the new budget system.

Jim Barrett reported that UW-Stevens Point recently surveyed all of their academic departments regarding business practices in an effort to surface issues that might arise during their SIS implementation. Follow-up meetings are scheduled with the academic departments to highlight the common needs and conduct a fit gap analysis. Academic policies will be re-examined in terms of their value, not in terms of which technologies they support. They are also putting staff through LEAN process training provided by their business school. The functional leaders have been meeting with their counterparts around the UWS and asking them how they would implement SIS differently if they were doing it today.

UW-Platteville is going through a customization and input/export review. About 70% of the customizations have been initially identified as necessary. The IT department is planning on challenging the functional users regarding a significant portion of them. It would help if there was a system-wide academic calendar and other standards.

Miller noted that the further you get from the essence of an issue, the more you rely on anecdotal information. This puts senior leaders in a vulnerable position. This provides an opportunity for the CIO Council to step in and provide value.

Barrett explained that his chancellor understands that you don't just pay for customizations once. Therefore criteria were established that customizations had to be essential to avoid negatively impacting learning at the institution. Sometimes PeopleSoft releases out so much functionality in one patch that the academic departments cannot absorb it all at one time. A lot of the new PeopleSoft functionality has therefore not been explored and institutions rely upon their legacy customizations instead.

Ilya Yaovlev reported that there will be a timeslot at the upcoming IT Management Council conference to whittle down the previous brainstorming exercise and generate a report back to the CIO Council. Kieper suggested the Huron recommendations feed into that process.

Digital Certificates

Nick Davis explained that the UWS digital certificate service is currently purchasing certificates from Entrust. Meanwhile, InCommon has a partner program with Comodo that provides similar certificates at a reduced cost. Extending the UWS centrally managed digital certificate service and upgrading it to work with certificates from Comodo would be expensive. Therefore, a reasonable strategy would be to have each of the UWS institutions administer their own certificates.

UW-Madison is currently using 89% of the existing certificates therefore, with the exception of UW-Madison**,** the migration to campus administered certificates through Comodo would not be an overwhelming task. Eleven of the 13 UWS institutions are members of InCommon. The annual costs for the remaining institutions to join InCommon and for the four remaining UWS institutions to purchase the Comodo service are small.

The current centrally managed service does enforce some commonality. However, the agreements that the institutions sign with Comodo bind them to the current level of security and controls. Maintaining a UWS central service also involves complexity. There is currently a duplication of services. We need to assess where we would get the best value. This would potentially free up significant funds for other security initiatives.

Ed Murphy explained that there are two decisions on the table, whether to go to Comodo and whether to give up a central certificate service. Davis explained that Comodo is already a de facto common platform that can be offered at a lower cost.

David Kieper reported that UW-Green Bay saves enough on server certificates alone to pay for their InCommon membership. Davis acknowledged that Comodo has caused some occasional headaches but it is a very good deal and it is important to support InCommon and Internet2, which makes minor inconveniences worthwhile.

Ilya Yakovlev expressed interest in receiving a recommendation from the TISC group. Olga Turkina noted that a contract for the more expensive alternative would have to be signed by November. Davis is willing to work with campus CISOs at the UWS institutions to help them migrate to new certificates. Any savings would go back to the CSRG balance. Pokot recommended that the CSRG keep the returned funds within the security realm, which has been historically underfunded. Michael Schlicht recommended that Davis check with Internet2 to determine if there are changes in their roadmap that would impact this decision.

A motion to recommend to the CSRG a switch to Comodo certificates administered by each UWS institution was moved, seconded and passed by acclamation. Pillay will notify the CSRG. After the first year, the two new InCommon institutions will need to fund their memberships from the savings they will realize using the cheaper certificates. UW-Green Bay and UW-Whitewater are willing to work with UW-Parkside and UW-La Crosse regarding the technical aspects of using Comodo certificates.

Staff Transitions Under UPS

Steve Reed noted apparent inconsistencies with staff transitioning to the new academic tracks which are outdated and difficult to align. Elena Pokot concurred that the Information Processing Consultant title is a catchall for academic staff because it has a broad salary range. Pokot is now being advised to use different titles. Joe Kmiech noted that most long time employees will not choose to switch to academic staff. It will eventually happen through promotion, attrition and replacement.

Future Meeting Dates

Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are scheduled for the third Thursday of each month at 780 Regent Street, Room 126A-B, Madison, WI 53715.

2015 Meeting Dates:

• October 20th	Noon – 3:00 pm after the ITMC conference in the Wisconsin Dells
• November 19th	TBD
• December 17th	1820 Van Hise Hall, Madison, WI 53706

2016 Meeting Dates:

• January 21st: TBD	• July 21st: TBD
• February 18th: TBD	• August 11th: TBD
• March 17th: TBD	• September 15: TBD
• April 21st: TBD	• October 20th: TBD
• May 19th: TBD	• November 17th: TBD
• June 16th: TBD	• December 14th *(Wednesday)*: TBD – Please Discuss: - *December 14 meeting location is 780 Regent Street* - *Change date to Thursday, December 15 and move location to 1820 Van Hise Hall*