

**CTO Meeting Notes**  
**October 27, 2004, 9:00 am – 12:45 pm**  
**SCS Reno**

Present: Jeff Cox, GBC; Don Moxley, WNCC; Brian Chongtai, NSC; Becky Seibert, SCS; Lori Temple, UNLV; Steven Zideck, TMCC; Steve Zink, UNR; Brooke Nielsen and Tom Ray, System Administration.

1. Acacia Summary

There are three issues with respect to the Acacia threat regarding video streaming patents:

- Do they have a valid patent?
- Do we engage in the kinds of activities that involve these patents? Activities include any transfer of a file or streaming video. Do not include a live broadcast.
- Is the Acacia agreement reasonable? It is one sided. It opens the door to further claims. The license is for Distance Ed courses only. It gives Acacia unlimited rights to audit us. Acacia recently issued the third version of a license agreement.

Tom Ray advises not signing the agreement and taking a wait and see approach. He suggests joining the Educause sponsored defense consortium. The CTO's agreed. Tom will be the point person for all correspondence.

2. NevadaNet Update

The H323 conversion is complete with the exception of a few sites that chose not to convert or where we are awaiting end user equipment purchase. H322 will provide more efficient use of bandwidth with the dynamic allocation of video and data traffic. New scheduling tools are being investigated, and if adopted will require some retraining.

Northern status:

- AT&T has assumed assets of Sierra Touch America for both Reno/Sacramento and Reno/Salt Lake paths. New AT&T agreements are being created with the same terms as the original agreements.
- The Northern loop will be upgraded to 10 GB but will probably run at 1 GB initially.
- The DRI and TMCC path is at 1 GB and has a 100 MB radio back up.
- A new highway 50 drop off point is being investigated that will be closer to WNCC.
- The Redfield project is on schedule for delivery to the site in December. Fiber will be lit in Feb/Mar.

Southern status:

- SCS is looking to upgrade its existing alternate path connection to Southern California from 155 MB (OC3) to 1 GB which will provide adequate backup for the 1 GB northern CENIC/BRIN connection. SCS might acquire fiber rights on its own or work with CENIC to hook up with Utah for south and north routes. This would provide a physical loop on eastern side of the state to compliment the loop on the western side of state. SCS will enter into a partnership if it is most cost effective.

- The connection to CENIC is OC3; it will go to 1 GB and then 10 GB.
- Cox has finished testing most of the southern metro loop; SCS will begin its testing as soon as Cox officially turns over the fiber paths for operation. The goal is for 10 GB loops in both the north and south.

So far this year Network Services has completed 110 small projects such as adding sites or modifications and currently has 60 projects in the queue.

### 3. Status of ERP Planning

Becky and Roberta completed visits with each president. Becky informed the Regents about the process at their last meeting. She used a \$100 million cost figure that includes hardware, software, training, and personnel backfill. It is a rough estimate at this time. The Regents received the information positively. Regent Seastrand agreed to head up task force to oversee the process. He hopes to include several presidents, some CTO's, and representatives from each functional area. Hopefully each institution will be represented. Regent Seastrand sees the primary goals of the ERP project as creating a better experience for the students and making UCCSN more accountable to the citizens of Nevada.

Becky provided the following URLs as resources:

<http://www.scs.nevada.edu/admin/> -- SCS Administrative Projects – use IIS link  
<http://www.educause.edu/LibraryDetailPage/666?ID=ERS0204> – ECAR Research Study, *The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Systems*.  
<http://www.usu.edu/banner/> -- Utah State's Banner Project Charter  
<http://www.sytecpa.org/strategicplan.asp?thisPageID=1&thisSubMenuID=1> – Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, *Strategic Plan for System-Wide ERP and Shared Information Technology Services*.

Becky also provided some of her thoughts in a document entitled, “Thoughts, Questions and Status Information for ERP Project Definition Phase, Oct 27, 2004.” She described a meeting with Chancellor Rogers in which he indicated that he understands the importance of the project and he is committed to a system-wide ERP.

The CTO's prefer to refer to the project as an *Integrated Information System (IIS)* rather than an ERP. The Enterprise Resource Planning term carries the connotation of manufacturing, which is where the term originated. They believe Integrated Information System is a better description of what we are trying to acquire for the UCCSN.

### 4. Status of Vice Chancellor for Technology Search

The Chancellor has given permission for the search to begin. It will be conducted out of the Chancellor's Office. There had been some talk of moving technology under one of the other Vice Chancellors; however Chancellor Rogers agreed it will stay a separate unit.

### 5. Open Discussion about ERP Process

Some questions to consider:

Will each campus kick in funding for the initiative?

Who owns the data? How do you share the data? The decision is not an IT decision.

What are some possible things to do in the interim while developing the ERP? Becky mentioned an HR data warehouse and longer access to SIS (though the later may not be an option under current system).

What is each campus working on now or what are seen as important issues and problems to solve?

UNLV – Lori Temple

The team set up by the President to oversee the ERP project is chaired by Lori and has just met. It consists mostly of vice presidential level members. Lori believes there is very strong support among campus management. UNLV has an internal project to clean up the data within the campus, ensuring common data definitions, resolving who has stewardship of which data, and eliminating duplicated data. UNLV also plans to boost the data warehousing efforts. Another major concern for the campus is to adopt a better identity management system and eliminate some of the duplicative log in processes. Lori is also trying to find out how many shadow systems exist at UNLV.

TMCC – Steve Zideck

They are putting a big emphasis on data integrity. Two big projects are in progress, ERMA (Employee Resources Management Application) and DEMOS (Dynamic Enrollment Modeling and Scheduling). There are still lots of independent systems. They have data entry issues. They are working to break down silos. They have a new approach-writing applications from an events standpoint, e.g., management of department codes. They use crystal report with most reports coming from programmers. IT is primarily a Microsoft shop.

Great Basin – Jeff Cox

There is some conversation about the ERP project on the whole campus. Everyone appears to want the change, although there will be some reluctance to change. The biggest benefit will be the ability to get the data out of the system. No meetings are set up at this point. They do not run a data warehouse and have no resource to set one up.

WNCC – Don Moxley

He is not aware of any ERP action or discussion on the campus. There is not much communication, and IT efforts are carried out in different areas. When people need a systems analyst they bring in their own. He would like to see the coordination and communication strengthened.

NSC – Brian Chongtai

The campus is committed to the ERP changes. They need a lot of training, and a lot of staff is new. They are currently hiring someone for institutional analysis. They have only one person to do focus reports.

There was some general agreement that institutional analysis is sometimes in a different loop.

#### 6. Planning Period Between Now and End of Fiscal Year

SCS has some funds for one-time expenditures, and Becky asked for suggestions about what might be done in lieu of or in addition to the needs assessment.

The CTO's would like to facilitate conversations with their campuses and folks that have recently implemented new systems. We could bring them in or visit them. We'd like to know: how and why they did what they did; lessons learned; and what surprises they encountered. This should involve campus personnel responsible for business functions as well as IT people.

They would also like to bring in a vendor neutral group to talk about the vendor space and to bring in the vendors to talk about their products. There was some discussion about scripting the vendors' presentations to deal with the topics of highest interest for UCCSN. The Business Officers, Student Affairs Officers and Human Resources Officers could help with identifying the most important issues for their areas.

Steve Zink reported that he had heard that the first HR assessment meeting was raising unrealistic expectations among the staff.

#### 7. Next CTO Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 17 and will be held at UNLV.

Note: Many thanks to Lori Temple for her assistance in preparing these notes.