

NSHE
Campus Technology Officer Meeting
June 23, 2010
1:00– 2:30 p.m.

Minutes

Attendance- Bob Moulton, Karen Brown, Lori, Temple, Steve Zideck, Paul Mudgett, Chris Gaub, John Rice, Dwaine Hiles, Brian Chongtai, Carlo Dacumos, Jerry Derby, Susan Shoemaker, Kenneth Sullivan, Roberta Roth

Advisory Group Update- Steve Zideck provided a summary of the AG meeting. He commented they discussed the iNtegrate tasks that were completed and those still in progress. He said there were thousands of tasks involved in the iNtegrate project with many of them already completed. There are 222 tasks that are behind schedule; however, many of them are 80% to 90% complete.

They also discussed the Strategic Plan draft document. He said Robyn spent some time presenting the latest draft and had expanded on some of the objectives to include the governance structure. Lori Temple stated there was some reorganization of the document and continued discussion on metrics.

The Educause core data survey was also discussed. He stated there are a couple campuses that regularly fill out the survey while others do not. System Administration responded to the survey for the first time and encourages every campus to participate in the survey to obtain better data.

The last topic was a request from SCS for all NSHE institutions to provide SCS with campus pennants that reflects each institution so that they may be displayed in the lobby of each SCS location.

Student Email and Unix Services Transition - As of Thursday July 01, 2010 the transition will begin and will continue until completion. Webmail (Pioneer/Fallon/POP/IMAP/Pine) will be discontinued from those systems. E-mail delivery will no longer be available for all Pioneer and Fallon accounts including accounts that were to be kept active for unix access and websites. Forwarding to NSHE e-mail domains will be available for employees until June 30, 2011. An NSHE e-mail address ends in "NSHE institution name.edu". All forwards for employee accounts (NSHE domain accounts) must be set by 5:00 p.m. on June 30, 2010. All references to e-mail will be removed from SCS supplied web pages on July 01, 2010. SCS will not be able to reestablish e-mail service for individual users. SCS will be able to provide a zipped raw copy (until October 31, 2010) of an individual's e-mail file upon request from each institution's CTO. Each institution will have to provide their users with a tool to read their e-mail.

SWAMI functionality will be limited to account and ID services. Users will be able to perform the following functions to the SWAMI interface:

- 1) Activate their account or ID (GBC, WNC, UNLV and NSC)
- 2) Able to choose a password and set password hints
- 3) Help desks will be able to change passwords, change password hints and look up accounts

Request for other ID maintenance actions (including updates for modifications to SWAMI records) should be communicated to the SCS service desk. Unix access and web space will be maintained for employee accounts only if they have been identified on the institution's exclude list. All exclude lists have been received from all institutions. DRI was instructed to notify SCS' Project Manager directly. Excluded accounts will not have access to e-mail. Updates or changes to the exclude list need to be submitted to SCS by the end of the day tomorrow, June 24, 2010.

Institutions may request accounts for use of classes through the SCS service desk. The accounts will only be considered active for a single semester. Listproc services will be available on Pioneer until October 31, 2010. Chris reminded everyone that it was a transitional service and should not be utilized for new lists. SCS requests to be notified of lists that have been migrated to alternate list servers so that SCS can proactively remove them from the lists.

SMTP mail relay will continue as a transitional service through December 31, 2010. Starting in August, SCS will begin working with the institutions personnel to determine the use of SMTP mail relay at each institution. All service requests and questions regarding the transition should be addressed through SCS' service desk.

Chris anticipates the most common question help desks will get come July 01, 2010 will be "What happened to my mail?" or "Why can't I log in?" and the number two question will be "Where did my UNIX account go?" Brian Chongtai asked if it was possible to send a mass e-mail notifying everyone of the change. Chris stated it probably wouldn't be practical since

it would be an e-mail to 340,000 accounts. Steve Zideck asked if it was possible to see how many people are still logging in. Chris stated there were about 800-plus people at TMCC still checking their e-mail.

Following the meeting, Chris e-mailed his detailed presentation notes to the CTOs for future reference.

PCHelps- Roberta had a four page Power Point presentation on PCHelps. PCHelps has a service intended to augment an organization's technical service desk. They don't do break fixes but rather they do end-user support for the functional/how-to use of desktop software products. They currently support 160 desktop applications and also provide configuration and user support in using iPhones, Blackberries and the Drone. PCHelps is selling two things- 1) end user support and 2) the format in which support is offered. Roberta has provided everyone a sample of PCHelps monthly reporting to a client. She also asked PCHelps for references in higher education or complex government institutions. She stated she had not validated them but is confident they are good. The University of Michigan, The Smithsonian Institute, a school district in Illinois, a community college in Philadelphia and one in Salem, Oregon use PCHelps. Jerry mentioned there was no mention of price. Roberta stated units of service needed to be purchased. She stated PCHelps has informed her that the average call-in time has a 91-94% resolution rate with an average time of eight minutes at a cost of \$25.00. Bob stated he was familiar with PCHelps numbers. He stated they are considered to be in the top 10% and are achievable. Jerry stated the sample had a date of 2003-2004 and was noted by all.

The outcome of the discussion was that each institution already has something in place but is willing to reach out to PCHelps should they need to. Roberta stated PCHelps reached out to her and was only providing the CTO's their information. Other vendors can be considered.

Identity Management- Paul stated Jimmy had provided an updated document on identity management which was discussed at the previous CTO meeting; however, he noted not everything was quite updated. Page seven listed a list of requirements that were formed via interviews with different NSHE institution staff. Some of the requirements he highlighted were: 1) Consistent user names and passwords across NSHE institutions and maintaining autonomy of institutions of technology and current infrastructure. He stated the last three on the list were an aggregate of the things in all the campus' environments that would be a part of any type of single sign-on option.

The Centralized Statewide Identity Provider option provided that the user directory be in a central location with sub-trees for each institution. He said this was the most direct approach with implementation and development costs being low. It also maintains the autonomy of each institution to manage multiple resources and allows for a consistent username and password. The disadvantages are that it is a highly costly approach requiring all institutions to be on the same technology with heavy migrations costs.

The Federated Identity Provider option allows each institution to maintain their own infrastructure, allows for a lot of autonomy, hardly has any migration costs but it does not allow for a consistent username and password.

The third option provides for a centralized Identity by keeping the identity providers (authentication) local. Each of the campuses maintains their own technology and infrastructure. The username and NSHE ID are maintained at a central source and then passed on to local authentication providers. This allows the username to remain consistent and allows local infrastructure to remain the same. It also allows institutions to maintain access control to all resources; however, a portal will have to be created in order to replicate a password. A problem with this option is the high probability of username issues and the migration cost associated with it, i.e. - more than one John Smith. A second problem is to use a centralized identity only when it is required meaning that everyone maintains their local authentication but requires a new user to be setup from the central directory when that student transfers to another institution. This option meets the requirement of a consistent username and allows for control of resources. Password synchronization from a central location would require the use of a portal.

The original problem statement "Can NSHE develop a system-wide identity management solution that enables the vision of the student system module task force as well as preserving the investment in local authentication and provisioning solutions already available at the institution level?". The answer is yes but it comes with pros and cons.

Lori Temple stated it was difficult to have this issue on their radar due to their own authentication issues at UNLV. Lori also stated they've had a position open and approved for almost a year with applicants that don't meet the criteria. She said it was very difficult to find someone that can do the job. Steve Zideck stated the consensus at TMCC is to have a higher source make the decision and go from there. TMCC volunteered to be the master ID while UNLV volunteered to opt out of being the master ID.

Paul will take this information back to Robyn Render.

Data Center Tour- Roberta provided a quick overview of a tour she took of a data center in Las Vegas. She stated it was a highly secure 600,000 square ft walled fortress with 100 gigawatts serving many a lot of significant clients. Some of the services they provide are: data center services (environmental, floor space, power, cooling...), disaster recovery services, connectivity (26 network providers), cloud and partnering with strategic vendors to provide on-demand cycles as well as storage. They support health care solutions and are secured for HIPPA, they are certified for secure e-banking levels of cloud services, and their customers range from using one rack, to two racks to five racks and more. Tours are given once a month and they do entertain client tours with a more focused discussion. Roberta offered to facilitate a private tour if the CTOs, or others, are interested. Roberta also suggested that a tour could be part of a future face-to-face CTO meeting, if held in Las Vegas.