ITGC Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
02.23.17

Members in Attendance:
John Charles, Vice President, Information Systems & Technology
Professor Dennis Freeman, Dean for Undergraduate Education
Professor Karen Gleason, Associate Provost (Co-Chair)
Professor M. Frans Kaashoek, Charles Piper Professor, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Anthony Sharon, Deputy Executive Vice President (Chair)
Professor Maria T. Zuber, Vice President for Research

Guests:
Christopher Bunn, Director, Business Operations, Information Systems & Technology
Alice Kimball, HR Specialist, Information Systems & Technology
Michael Moody, Institute Auditor
Mark Silis, Associate Vice President for Information Systems & Technology

I. Meeting Minutes 12.08.16 approved (Approval)

II. Review of Action Items from 12.08.16
John Charles presented the following status update on action items generated from the December 2016 ITGC meeting:
- ITPC Recommendations presented at the 12.08.2016 meeting were unanimously approved via email by the ITGC members not present for the meeting
- The approved ITPC Recommendations will be presented at the March 23, 2017 IT Leaders meeting.
- Cloud migration: 1,577 out of 2,893 VMs have now been migrated to vCloudAir.

III. IPv4 Update (Discussion):
John Charles provided an update: Final stages of negotiations with a purchaser for the entire back-half of our existing /8 allocation, i.e., a contiguous /9 (~8m addresses)
- Initial set of equipment orders have been submitted
- Waiting for Provost to approve communications memo for the community
- We’re taking advantage of this renumbering opportunity to update MITnet’s architecture (replacing end-of-life equipment; adding support for IPv6; and improving security)
- Targeting completion within 16 months (42 of our /16s upon signing the agreement; 19 more by 6/30/17; and the final 67 no later than 6/30/18)
- Provost Martin Schmidt plans to form a small committee to advise him on the use of net proceeds.
- Action Item: Tony Sharon will be following up with Provost Schmidt to determine status of communications memo.

IV. Data Classification Security Controls (Status)
John Charles provided an update on proposed Data Classification Levels & Security Control Guidelines:
• Data Classification Level & Description:
  • Level 1: Public – directory information, published papers, etc.
  • Level 2: Sensitive – building plans, legal investigations, etc.
  • Level 3: Confidential – personnel records, identifiable human genome data, etc.
  • Level 4: Regulated – PIRN, PCI, FERPA, export related, etc.

• Security control guidelines for user accounts, devices & servers, and for admin unit & DLC data owners – mapped to each of data classification levels and labeled as:
  • N/A – not applicable
  • O – optional
  • R – recommended
  • B – best practice

• The draft has not been reviewed by the IT Policy Committee, Research Data Group, or IT Leaders group.

• Discussion: John Charles shared the rationale for using a guidelines-based approach vis-à-vis a stronger policy-based/compliance approach. Whereas, Michael Moody lobbied for stronger policy-based/compliance language that could be enforced. Franz Kaashoek and others lobbied for language that faculty would consider helpful and educational – guidelines that would help them learn how to apply the appropriate security controls for their data.

• Decision: The ITGC agreed to give Michael Moody additional time for his office to work with Mark Silis, Debby Fischer, and the Office of General Council to put together an example data classification case using stronger policy/compliance language that could be shared with just Robert Redwine – seeking his advice before deciding next steps.

• Action Item: Michael Moody agreed to provide an update for the ITGC meeting in May.

V. Cybersecurity Update (Discussion)
John Charles presented the Cybersecurity Update as a preview of a presentation for the MIT Risk and Audit Committee.

• Discussion: There was some basic discussion around the content on the slides. Franz Kaashoek made a suggestion that the presentation begin with where MIT is really at risk in terms of security. Franz also suggested putting the BitSight benchmarking slide in perspective – emphasizing that the biggest risks are not in the open portions of the network, and adding that there is no real danger segments in the open portion of the network do down for a day. Michael Moody cautioned that while there might not be infrastructure risks, there could be data risks that have legal, reputational, or compliance consequences. John Charles thanked the committee for their feedback and suggestions.

VI. Student/Community IDEAS Subcommittee Proposal (Discussion)
John Charles and Franz Kaashoek proposed a Student/Community IDEAS subcommittee with representatives from the faculty, DUE, ODL, DSL, and IS&T. The purpose of the committee would be to develop a structured start-to-finish plan for encouraging and supporting student and MIT community innovation across all stages of development – culminating in implementation of “ideas” that provide the greatest value to the MIT community.
• **Discussion**: There was strong support from the committee. Denny Freeman suggested getting Student Support Services involved, and Franz Kaashoek mentioned it would be good to get the City of Cambridge involved as well. Denny Freeman mentioned that the Registrar’s office is also supportive of the idea.

• **Action Item**: Denny Freeman and Franz Kaashoek agreed to co-coordinate getting a small group together to draft the proposed charge and membership for the new subcommittee.

VII. **Software Portfolio Planning Committee Report** (Status)

Chris Bunn reported that the initial analysis of the existing portfolio was completed with no “quick wins” identified for reducing ongoing expenses, however further areas of analysis have been identified that should help manage demand and expenditures going forward.

- The subcommittee plans to submit a recommendation for creating software asset management a role within IS&T.
- A draft software portfolio management process has been defined, but needs to be shared with other stakeholders within the MIT community and then be refined.
- The subcommittee has asked Christina Lo (Director of Strategic Sourcing and Contracts) to take the lead in facilitating future negotiations with software vendors.

• **Discussion**: Karen Gleason asked about multiple competing products, and Chris explained that their initial review did not identify any significant duplication within the IS&T managed portfolio.

• **Action Item**: The SPP Committee is scheduled to review the proposed Software Portfolio Planning Model with the IT Leaders Group in March/April.

VIII. **Project Planning for FY18** (Discussion)

Tony Sharon reported that one-time Institute-level funding for IT projects for FY18 is expected to decrease to $7.5M and then to $4M in FY19 and beyond. Tony also noted that in order to sustain our IT modernization efforts we must leverage SaaS product offerings with ongoing upgrades. In order to do this, we must also explore new resourcing models.

- Tony explained that while IS&T has done a great job continuing to innovate without additional ongoing funding, one of the lessons learned is that we need to make sure that project budgets consider ongoing costs, such as software subscription, licensing, and usage costs.

• **Discussion**: Franz Kaashoek pointed out that one goal of the transformation was to free-up resources for new projects and asked how the transformation and the resources tie into the $7.5M that we have available. John Charles explained that IS&T is now able to deliver completed project work at a much faster pace – which on the flipside is exacerbating our challenge with covering the rapidly rising post-implementation/ongoing software operating expenses.

• John also explained that by moving to the cloud we are changing the nature of the workforce. Some roles are no longer needed, and we’re trying to address that through normal attrition vs targeted reshaping of the workforce. When asked by Franz if we have succeeded. Mark Silis responded that we have made some progress, but some of the legacy roles are landlocked, making it challenging to address through attrition alone.
- **Action Item**: The ITGC will need to determine which projects qualify for Institute-level onetime and ongoing funding, and which projects need to be alternatively funded, cost-shared, or retired.
- **Action Item**: The timeline for completing the FY18 project planning is as follows: March – advisory committee prioritization of project requests; April - submit proposed funding plans; and May – ITGC approval of FY18 project portfolio and funding.

**IX. Revitalizing SSSC** (Discussion)
Denny Freeman summarized a plan for revitalizing SSSC. A core group of people reporting to the Chancellor will review and prioritize student services projects and then present this information for ITGC funding and resourcing consideration. Additionally, Denny suggested involving the Office of Digital Leaning (ODL) with this initiative, as there is some project overlap, which would give one voice that speaks for the strategic importance of education system projects and would also help with the financial process. Denny said that his group is in agreement on this approach.
- **Discussion**: Tony agreed that it would be helpful to have a coordinated approach when requesting money from the Provost. Tony also pointed out that it is important to consider what will require Institute dollars, what will require DLC cost-share, and what will require internal IS&T support.
- Denny noted that many DLCs are not revenue producing entities, so they would need help addressing any new cost-sharing requirements.
- **Action Items**: Denny will move forward with the core group, and will communicate the FY18 planning timeframe with the SSSC.