

Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB)

www.itpb.ucla.edu

April 6, 2006
Meeting Summary

ITPB Attendees: Kathryn Atchison, Jackson Beatty, Christine Borgman, Russ Caflisch, Alfonso Cardenas, Brian Copenhaver, Jim Davis, Bill Jepson, David Kaplan, Kathleen Komar, Bill Mason (for Scott Waugh), Alan Robinson, Vivek Shetty, Gary Strong, Chuck Taylor

Guests: Joel Bellon (Jim Davis' PDP mentee), Larry Loehner (OID), Nick Reddingius (OIT), Ruth Sabean (OIT), Mike Schilling (CTS), Marsha Smith (OIT), Kent Wada (OIT), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT), Don Worth (AIS)

Agenda:

1) Repositioning IT (RIT) Status

The long term objective of the Repositioning IT initiative is to build the next generation of infrastructure services within an integrated campus architecture that preserves and enhances high quality IT services and extends the same to the entire campus. Through appropriate campus design and shared management and where rationale exists to reduce replication, the initiative will consolidate email, network, and data centers and improve overall security. Efficiencies gained through consolidation can be re-deployed or emphasized within units to support the direct IT needs of researchers, educators, students and administrative staff who support them. The strategy to achieve this is to engage, enable and build upon campus expertise, using cross-functional teams, to be helpful and solve existing problems; look for opportunities (e.g. natural transitions, new buildings, technology refresh cycles) that marry practical, needed and meaningful work with initiative objectives. The Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF) is the funding mechanism for this initiative (16% of the TIF).

Projects currently in progress include:

- Network: Next Generation Network (NGN) teams have formed around two applied projects: Murphy Hall and California Nano-systems Institute (CNSI).
- Security: The Applied Security Task Force comprising 7 campus experts, was formed in Fall 2005 to develop practices for minimum connectivity and restricted information policies and consult with campus IT operations. They are currently conducting the eEye (a vulnerability management software) Pilot.

- Email: Twelve Exchange installations primarily within Business and Administrative Services (B&AS) have converted to the UCLA eMail, Messaging and Calendaring System; six units (both academic and administrative) are in exploratory phases.

2) Repositioning IT Strategic Issues

“Common Good” Services and Process and Role of the IT Governance Structure in Making “Common Good” Determinations

In meeting with various groups involved with Repositioning IT (including Deans and Executive leadership) and in the roll-out of the Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF), a number of questions/issues/concerns have emerged that have strategic impact or governance process implications. ITPB discussion was focused around two questions related to the definition of “common good” services and the process and role of the IT Governance structure in making “common good” determinations.

Question 1 for discussion: Services defined as "common good" create equally mixed opinions. The "common good" definition has a great deal of relevance as we think about the Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF) and changes and additions to the services that make up the TIF. “Common good” implies investment to equilibrate campus service capability or investment in services that are difficult to distinguish by user. When is a service common good and when is it fee-for-service? At what point does a service become common good and what are the limits? At what point does an aspect of common good become a "fee-for-service"?

Question 2 for discussion: We have agreed to use the IT governance structure and to create a process to make “common good” determinations. The governance committees are in place to have the discussion, but what is the process for determining a common good? How do we construct a process that is not overly burdensome that new services cannot be implemented but at the same time appropriately rigorous with respect to common good benefits?

ITPB suggestions and comments:

- Seek guidance on economic principles from UCLA economists (perhaps available in School of Law, Political Science, or Philosophy).
- Request from CTS, a list of services covered in the TIF.
- Medical Enterprises was concerned about how the TIF is being expended. They contribute 46% of the TIF, yet it appears they have no involvement in any Repositioning IT Projects. They would like to be included in the projects.
- There was concern that equilibrating penalizes those who are ahead of the game (i.e. charging the TIF to a campus unit although the services

TIF may provide would not be used by the unit satisfied with its own services).

- There was an opinion that the governance process is not working. Based on the statement in 2b below, "...there will need to be a campus process by which 'common good' services in the TIF can be reviewed, added, or changed"; the belief is that the Campus Exchange email service is an added service that was not reviewed by the ITPB.
- There was one concern expressed that the current suite of TIF services had not been decided through a governance process.

Technology Infrastructure Fee

The discussion of common good services and governance process evolved into a discussion of the fiscal model for the TIF. Key background documents referenced were:

- a. EVC Neuman's March 2, 2006 memo to Deans, Vice Chancellors and University Librarian regarding the Technology Infrastructure Fee (TIF) and Repositioning IT Initiative, in which he stated "In February 2005, the Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB) approved the principles of a TIF to fund the current suite of IT infrastructure services."
- b. Minutes from the February 28, 2005 ITPB meeting which stated "The ITPB supported the principles that the TIF would be the funding mechanism for the 'common good' services that emerge from the Repositioning IT Initiative and that there will need to be a campus process by which 'common good' services in the TIF can be reviewed, added or changed. They added a caveat that there must be ITPB participation in the review process."

A concern was raised that the ITPB had not sufficiently discussed and consulted the use of the TIF to fund the repositioning initiative. As stated in 2b above, "the ITPB supported the principles that the TIF would be the funding mechanism for the 'common good' services that emerge from the Repositioning IT Initiative..." There was also a clarification that pointing the "connect" funding (formerly phone line surcharge and now within TIF) to repositioning did not change the purpose of the funding. It is still to be invested in infrastructure that will heavily involve networking. It was further noted that the ITPB developed and supported the Repositioning IT Initiative and asked the campus to support it as an infrastructure initiative for the campus. The Chancellor agreed with the ITPB, viewed Repositioning IT as the next generation infrastructure initiative and assigned the connected funding to the Repositioning initiative to determine how best to use it. By doing this, the Chancellor was supporting the ITPB initiative. 'Assigning' the funds to the Repositioning Initiative means that the funds would still be controlled by the Chancellors office but are committed to the Repositioning initiative. How the funds would be used would be guided by direct recommendations and process

recommendations from the ITPB. It is understood that these funds are far from adequate for the infrastructure needs of the campus. As campus projects are determined, there would be a need for a broader funding approach.

ITPB suggestions, comments, and additional questions:

- Connect funds were terminated before the Health Sciences and School of Arts and Architecture upgrades were completed. Both need funding.
- How is TIF going to be deployed moving forward?
- Need transparency on TIF charges: request from CTS, monthly budget reports with breakout of expenditures.
- What should be done with monies left over when a service is eliminated? What is the process for making recommendations?
- What are the implications of a governance committee's recommendation? (This is covered by "Question 2 for discussion" above.

Action: Form a work group to address the governance-oriented questions and concerns to improve ITPB effectiveness and IT governance effectiveness.

3) ITPB Strategic Planning

In November 2005, the ITPB identified Scholarly Interaction and Next Generation Wireless as two of the most urgent institutional strategic areas to address in the 2005-06 academic year and beyond. At its February 13, 2006 meeting, the Board recommended formation of workgroups to develop recommendations to take back to the larger ITPB.

The Scholarly Interaction workgroup: Chair Gary Strong, Kathryn Atchison, Christine Borgman, Russ Caflisch, Jim Davis, Kathy Komar (absent), and Vivek Shetty met on March 23, 2006. They reviewed the inventory of campus discussions and activities related to Scholarly Interaction; discussed some priority areas; and identified some drivers. The priority areas identified by the workgroup include: content, tools and services to use the content, integrating research and teaching, incentives and disincentives, and promotion/privilege and tenure. The Board was in agreement with using these priority areas as a framework for developing recommendations to bring back to the larger ITPB. Other considerations expressed by the ITPB include: adding patient care to teaching and research; how to capture born digital content; large scale data collection; what the future looks like in 10-15 years, and preservation.

The Wireless workgroup: Alfonso Cardenas, Dana Cuff (absent), Jim Davis, Bill Jepson, Alan Robinson, and Mike Schilling met on April 5, 2006. They reviewed the inventory of current campus projects related to wireless and discussed some emerging trends and drivers. Their next meeting will focus on selecting priority areas to recommend to the ITPB. The Board suggested also addressing issues of policy and security.

Summaries of both workgroup meetings are posted at:
<http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/documents/default.htm#April2006>

Both workgroups would welcome participation by additional ITPB members. Future meeting dates will be announced to the Board and posted on the ITPB website: http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/task_forces/default.htm.

4) Reports

a. Academy of Arts and Sciences Task Force – Future Internet Issues

Responding to initiatives to rethink internet architecture, the Task Force is addressing questions of identity, location, determining if public policy engagement is needed and how to trust content (origin, authorship).

b. UC IT Guidance Committee (ITGC)

In January 2006, the UC IT Guidance Committee was appointed by UCOP Acting Provost Wyatt R. Hume with a charge to promote deployment of IT services to support innovation and enhancement of academic quality and institutional competitiveness using a (system-wide) shared approach to planning and delivery of selected services. The Committee has representation from all UC campuses.

UC Chief Information Officer Kristine Hafner and UC University Librarian Daniel Greenstein, who are leading this effort, will be guests at the May 25th ITPB meeting.

Future Meetings

Next ITPB meeting is May 25, 2006, 3-5 p.m. in 2121 Murphy Hall.