

## Information Technology Council Minutes

March 25, 1998: 9:00 am - 1:00 PM  
System Administration Conference Room, Reno

**Present:** Chair Davan Weddle, SCS; Stan Aiazzi, GBC; John Case, Chair ATSC; Michelle Dondero, WNCC; Juanita Fain, UNLV; David Keebler, TMCC; Katrina Meyer, Dir. Distance Learning; Becky Seibert, SCS; David Westfall, UNR, Robert Wharton, DRI; Steve Zink, UNR, Tom Anderes, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, and Karl Armstrong, Assistant General Counsel

1. Review of Minutes from March 3 Meeting  
Minutes of the March 3, 1998, meeting were approved without corrections.
2. Internet 2, vBNS, NGI and Nevada  
Steve Zink gave a briefing on the current national status of high-speed networking. The vBNS (Very High Speed Backbone Network Service), begun in 1995, is operated as a commercial network carrying voice, data and video by MCI, provides a high quality service, and connects supercomputer sites. It runs at OC-12 (622Mb) and is projected to go to OC-48 (2.4Gb). The federal government established the NGI (Next Generation Internet) in 1996 but has not funded it. In 1997 the University Consortium for Advanced Internet Development (UCAID) established Internet2 for academia. Original members had to pay \$500,000 to join. Members must now pay an annual fee of \$25,000. These three, vBNS, NGI and Internet2, are connected in a complicated manner. Steve distributed a vBNS Backbone Network Map and a vBNS Logical Network Map.

NSF encourages academic participation in high speed networking through connectivity grants and through EPSCoR. \$375,000 was allocated for matching grants; however, the funds are currently held up in litigation. UCCSN has applied for NSF and EPSCoR connectivity grants. SCS is seeking legislative funding for some of the matching resources required by the grants. One factor driving UNR, UNLV and DRI participation in seeking high speed networking is that NSF has indicated that future grant requests of all kinds will be affected by whether high speed networking is available to the institutions seeking the grants.

3. NevadaNet High Speed Link and Budget Request  
Because Van had been called into a meeting with the Chancellor, Becky gave a brief overview of NevadaNet issues that are driving a UCCSN budget request to upgrade the NevadaNet backbone. She distributed a draft document, "Background for the SCS 1999-2001 biennial budget request to upgrade and expand the UCCSN statewide network, NevadaNet." A key element of the request is funding for intrastate bandwidth, equipment, maintenance and personnel to meet the matching research support requirements for the NSF/EPSCoR grants. The growth of video traffic, many new network sites and the demand for graphical data are driving the request for increased non-research capacity as well.
4. SIS Upgrade Update  
Van brought up the recently raised questions about the SIS upgrade and the response provided in a March 24 memorandum to the ITC and SIS User Group. The student services officers are pleased with SIS functionality, and the other available products are much more expensive. Our \$180,500 investment is not due until July 1999. By that time we will have an even better idea of the upgrade's potential for success. We have no obligation to assume any of Informs' development costs. As to Java's immaturity, IBM is staking \$100 million per year on Java development, which is reassuring.

Van emphasized that the campuses must make the SIS upgrade decision, not by SCS alone. Stan Aiazzi said GBC and its president support the plan. Steve Zink said that although \$4 million is a lot of money, he sees no better alternatives and has briefed the UNR president to that effect. Juanita Fain met with the UNLV president to brief her. She believes that UNLV will support the request, but believes an Informs presentation would be useful. Van will arrange for an Informs

demo as soon as possible. Michelle Dondero said that WNCC and its president support the plan. Bob Wharton asked how the SIS upgrade would be incorporated into the budget request. David Keebler asked about a test period, whether TMCC's data warehouse efforts would be affected, why we will be a test site, whether we currently have the hardware Informs will use for testing, and how this fits into strategic technology plans for the future. David said that he and Rita Huneycutt had briefed the TMCC president, and Rita had recommended approval. Van indicated that campus personnel would have testing opportunities, that the project would not affect current SIS production or data warehouse efforts, and that the database will change with the new system, requiring changes in how campuses extract data for data warehouses. Informs is interested in testing the product on hardware we currently own; however capacity will need to increase as the upgrade becomes a production system. Van agreed that we do need a technology strategic plan. The Chancellor is discussing bringing in a consultant to assist with system-wide technology assessment and planning. Steve Zink asked whether Informs has a relationship with IBM or Sun in Java development.

#### 5. Planning for the 1999-2001 Technology Budget Request

Tom Anderes thanked the Council for their work on the data warehousing and technology budget request. He said it would be very useful to have the summary, detailed and anecdotal information about each campus' data warehousing efforts and requirements. It will be useful information in explaining how the \$4.5 million allocated in the last legislative session has been used.

Tom raised the question about how to formulate and size the technology request. There are numerous kinds of requests, for example, campus staff positions, equipment, data warehousing, the SIS upgrade, distance education, and network expansion. The total of all requests will be a very large number; so some limit needs to be set and some understanding is needed about how funds will be allocated. There is discussion about bringing in a consultant to help integrate long term campus and System technology planning, to provide comparisons between Nevada and other states and to lend credibility and coordination to technology budget requests. That probably can't take place in time to help with the upcoming biennial request. Lacking coordinated long term planning, the current request will have to be based on what is needed to get through the coming biennium. In the last session, UCCSN requested about \$15 million in technology funding. Much of that was funded.

Tom expects the presidents and Chancellor's cabinet will set a single technology budget placeholder to take to the April 30 Regents' meeting. Technology is included among the eight budget priorities and institutional allotments in the current budget request. By August the Board will need to make a decision on a detailed request.

Tom was asked about how a consultant would be chosen. He replied that he would be looking to Cause and Coopers and Lybrand for suggestions, and he welcomed input from ITC members. Tom was asked whether we are requesting an increase in the support formula. He responded that we are and that it is not clear yet whether technology support staff may be requested separately. It is also unclear whether technology equipment will be included under the technology or the equipment request. Tom was asked about the Estate Tax request and replied that we would be requesting a continuation of the data warehousing funding through the Estate Tax. It has not been decided how to handle that part of the data warehousing funding which was one-time.

Katrina Meyer said that providing a technology plan that accounts for growth, equipment replacement, etc. makes our requests more credible to the Legislature. Steve Zink mentioned his fear that the K-12 demand for network services will overwhelm UCCSN resources.

#### 6. UCCSN Computing Resources Policy

Karl Armstrong, Assistant General Counsel, briefed the Council on the status of the UCCSN Computing Resources Policy. Karl described the System policy as an overarching policy.

Campus policies could be written to deal with individual campus issues and could dovetail with the System policy. The General Counsel's Office is particularly concerned with the liability of exposing school children to pornographic materials through UCCSN computing resources. Another very strong concern is liability for the illegal use of copyrighted electronic resources. Council members raised a number of questions about appropriate software, the use of email for administrative communication, and other issues. Karl indicated that the General Counsel's Office is still working on a draft. When questioned about the process, Karl said that a policy would be taken to the presidents and ultimately to the Board of Regents.

7. ITC Role in UCCSN System Technology Budget Request

Van questioned the Council about their willingness to take a role in recommending a System Technology Budget Request. He said he believes one of the primary charges the Chancellor made to the Council was to provide advice on and support for System technology issues. Little time remained in the meeting; so the discussion was brief. Primary issues were the SIS upgrade, the data warehousing projects, the network expansion and distance education. Van and Becky agreed to draft a proposal and send it to Council members for their review.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.