Chancellor’s May 16, 2003 message:

“The implementation of many technological advances over the past decade has enabled the campus to reduce administrative costs, overhead, and complexity; to cope with growing workloads; to enhance communication across departments; and to provide easy access to information and data in support of decision-making. While technology has enabled the campus to increase overall productivity, the funding of continuously improving technologies and expanding services, and the growth and maintenance of the campus information technology infrastructure, represent major challenges for the campus.

In order to meet these challenges, particularly in the context of the current budgetary environment, it is necessary to explore modifications in the ways in which information technology services and systems are provisioned and managed across the campus. A variety of possibilities are already under consideration. These include: opportunities for merging functions like network services for smaller departments, consolidating e-mail and calendaring systems, sharing desktop support services, co-locating departmental servers, and addressing IT security through campus wide IT strategies. It is necessary to accelerate the exploration and implementation of these modifications.

The introduction of these concepts and others not only positions the campus for new service demands, but could potentially reduce costs and improve existing services across the campus. To that end, I am asking Jim Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, in working with the Information Technology Planning Board, and in consultation with the appropriate campus groups, to review existing structures. In addition, I am asking for recommendations on how best to organize these functions to meet both the funding and technological demands of the future.”

Scope of Opportunities

- Campus wide infrastructure opportunities to use resources more effectively by:
  1. providing greater functionality/availability/reliability without increased costs,
  2. freeing up resources for realignment, (3) reducing costs and (4) improving campus services
• Current and future infrastructure cost avoidance and cost reduction seen from campus wide view

• Functional review of need for continuing or scaling back on existing or planned applications is proceeding by system owners; savings/budget reductions are occurring through local negotiations with Office of Budget and Planning

• Impact is local savings/realignment flexibility

• Focus on areas where minimum $500K per year savings possible

**Implemented In FY 03/04 with impact no later than FY 04/05:**

1. Review KST contract with the expectation that ITPB will encourage continued use of KST contract for computer products:
   a. Since inception (two years) $19 million in purchases
   b. 89% sweet spot computers
   c. Based on expenditures prior to contract, estimated savings 15%
   d. Estimated annual savings $1 million per year

2. Encourage awareness and use of the Microsoft agreement:
   a. UC contract into effect with 32,000 FTE; now up to 35,400 breaking into next tier of savings; add-on products reduction at 14.5% at 35,000 FTE
   b. Estimated UCLA savings at 35,000 FTE, $500K per year
   c. Next tier of savings; 19.5% at 50,000 FTE estimated savings grows to $675K per year
   d. Raise awareness and encourage use within UCLA
   e. Work with UC to raise awareness and encourage use UC wide – try to reach 50,000 tier

3. Aggregate IT staff training and certification as on-campus activities, encourage in-sourcing projects to internal IT staff and encourage awareness and use of campus contract for out-sourcing programmers:
   a. Save training, travel and lost productivity costs associated with off-campus training by aggregating and organizing training on-campus – estimated savings $250K per year
   b. Campus spends $11 million per year for contract IT staff - estimated $800K savings per year through a contract
   c. Study the potential for establishing a program to use internal IT staff

4. Accelerate the implementation of an aggressive and coherent IT security strategy that leverages consolidation of management and procurement services
   a. Coordinate fragmented license purchases for patch management - estimated savings $400K per year
   b. Estimated savings on coordinated patch management services and procedures - $775K per year
c. Estimated savings on new expenditures for improved security - $1 million per year
d. Requires campus investment - proceed with Request for Information (RFI) to establish requirements and cost-benefit

5. Consolidate campus email and calendaring systems
   a. Campus wide there are 50 distinct systems serving a community of 68,000 faculty, staff and student (expected to currently use email)
      i. For 30,000 faculty and staff annual costs per mailbox range between $29 to $600 with high costs associated with units providing email services for a very small number of constituents
      ii. 19 exchanges systems supporting fewer than 1000 mailboxes
   b. Requires campus investment
   c. Proceeding with study of Administrative/OIT systems (7 systems to 1) – estimated savings at $200K - $300K per year – extend to campus

6. Position campus for more electronic business with the individual
   a. Email model initiative to define email namespace through which campus business can be conducted with reasonable confidence
      i. Bruin Post – estimated savings on notifications and announcements - $160K per year
      ii. Applications shifted toward email transactions – estimated $100K per application per year
   b. Enterprise Directory to provide authentication/authorization and directory services
      i. Reduction of individual directory and security implementations for each application – estimated $50K per application per year
   c. Proceed immediately with policy to require faculty staff campus email address in directory
   d. Requires campus investment:
      i. Upgrade functionality in BOL as email system
      ii. Proceed with commitment to enterprise directory

7. Grand total potential impact
   a. $4.8 million per year in distributed savings
   b. $0.5 million per year in new expenditures for increased network security
   c. total campus investment to be determined

**Analysis in FY 03/04 of Potential and Possible Implementation**

1. Review potential for consolidating campus dial in services and for reduction in BOL dial-in services.

2. Review home broadband connectivity
   a. Examine potential for provider contract
b. Examine campus expenditure on home connectivity currently at $500K per year
c. Justification for university funding

3. Review network funding model and expenditures estimated at $29 million per year
   a. Proceed with cost and funding analysis of telephone and surcharge services
   b. Disaggregate network funding from surcharge services
c. Develop new network funding model

4. Review campus data center operations structure and expenditures for campus databases, servers and applications

5. Review campus helpdesk and desk top support structure.