Agenda: ITC Committee Meeting		
Date: January 27, 2022	**Time:** 1:00pm-2:00pm	**Location:** Zoom
Type of Meeting: Virtual	**Duration:** 60 minutes	**Please Read:** Minutes from 11/10 Meeting Minutes from 11/10 Meeting (S)
Group email:	**it-council@umd.edu**	

List of Invitees: Derek Richardson (Chair), Jeffrey Hollingsworth, Marcio Oliveira, Axel Persaud, Gerry Sneeringer, Joseph Gridley, Philip Piety, Yifei Mo, Mary Shelley, Julie Wright, Jim Zahniser, Jack Blanchard, David Dahl, Peter Keleher, Lisa Petersen, Jonathan Resop, Hallie Oines; Eunha Yim; Melissa Dressler

Topic / Agenda Item	Description / Notes	Lead, if relevant
Welcome Approval of Minutes	Welcome Approval of minutes from 11/10	Derek Richardson
Updates from Working Group Chairs		Derek Richardson
Privacy Policy	Update Interim Standard on Search	Joseph Gridley
3rd Party Review Update		Jim Zahniser
Other Topics		
Adjourn		

Action Items (rolling list, update each meeting)				
Action Item	**Status**	**Notes**	**Due Date / Revised Date**	**Lead/ Assigned To**
Add investigation of appropriate technology to provide secure high speed transmission of HPC related files.	Updated on 10/18	Added 09/20		Jeff Hollingsworth

Meeting Notes:

1. Welcome
2. Approval of minutes
    a. Use Zoom reactions: use green check mark if voting ‘yes’ and red x if voting ‘no’
    b. No reaction=not eligible to vote
    c. Results: minutes have been accepted, majority voted ‘yes’
3. Updates from Working Group Chairs
    a. Updates on what you’ve been working on or upcoming, if you need guidance, etc
    b. Julie: Admin systems
        i. Last met in December, January meeting this afternoon
        ii. December meeting: Axel presented issues of Shady Grove becoming its own separate campus starting July 1st
        iii. Lots of issues in our system because of different systems
        iv. axel presented struggles DIT has on how they respond to the requests
        v. Any update on this? Working with ERP team and met with Betsy Beise earlier this week
        vi. CFO/CIO meeting next week to discuss consequences, unintentional or intentional
            1. What is appropriate vs feasible is still being discussed
        vii. One of the issues is how to get a response with the switch

viii. Budget controls will not be put in place: would be problematic during the change
ix. This afternoon agenda will involve more discussion on Elevate
x. Mary: would be helpful to have some communication with units that have a presence there
1. Timeline is still being discussed by CFO/CIO and system office on what is feasible and least disruptive
2. Stay tuned for more information

c. Jim: Infrastructure group
i. met in december
ii. discussed requirements around campus network refresh
iii. migrating away from public addresses
iv. discussed advanced needs such as IOT, needs to constantly evolve with the users

d. Mary: IT Security
i. Last 6-9 months off and on, grappling with how to provide guidance to campus for IT units
ii. how to implement IT4 and IT5 on sensitive data and IT resources
1. a lot of moving parts on this
2. there is a subgroup that is narrowing down on a solution that is interactive and working on a solution on how to meet the various requirements
iii. Privacy standards
iv. Security updates: discussion on security training
v. Derek question regarding protocols: does it play into the evolution of our storage capabilities? There are upper limits to Box and Google drive = where do we store our sensitive data?
1. not something they have discussed; haven't approached it with the thought there will be limits
2. Gerry: focused more on different ways they can approach it so folk can easily understand what they need to do with Box/Google

e. Phil: Learning Technology
i. Presentation from Megan Masters on data that has been collected and how we can use data from different platforms
ii. Plan not quite set up for January/February meeting yet
iii. Working with Marcio to set up agenda

f. Yifei: Research Technology
i. Last meeting was November
ii. No new information since last meeting

iii. Main thing that is missing is power distribution units
iv. Things will arrive last Feb, with hopeful distribution in March and decommissioning in April (Zaratan)
v. Quite overdue for new computer - been delayed more than a year and a half due to COVID
vi. Discussed survey results and assessment
    1. Doing quite well
    2. Some problems are reflected and some HPC needs
    3. Hard issue because each group has individualized needs
vii. Also discussed handling of research data, such as privacy issues - how do we protect the security of the people?
viii. Started but didn't finish: centralized solution for using python (?)
    1. Seems there are some needs for that
ix. Ultimately haven't finished all the items they want to discuss
x. If lacking expertise, can work with IT to reach out and see if someone can be a guest
xi. Mary: curious if other Big 10 schools have implemented something similar to Jupiter hubs
    1. Great to know if it's being used or needed
    2. For the non specialists, it would be useful for them to know how it could benefit them and their teaching
    3. Need to make sure we launch it in a successful way if we move forward with it
    4. This could be a good time for an overlap meeting of Learning and Research - Jeff approves for Marcio to move forward with it
xii. Marcio: two separate opportunities for an overlap in meetings of groups
    1. Updated data and information as well as Jupiter

4. Privacy Policy - Joe Gridley
    a. Signed by the President
    b. New enterprise privacy policy - live document
    c. very high level
    d. next steps are to develop the standards for it
    e. another round of collaborative drafting and what its going to look like over the next year or so
    f. worth noting: put in place 3 interim standards to address critical and immediate needs
    g. generally speaking, the way the process will work is a quarterly rolling shared drafting process
    h. end of march: looking at current slate of standards we have

   i. cybersecurity internet response
   ii. Accessibility
i. 2 new standard
   i. vendor engagement
   ii. access and use of certain type of data
j. ultimately are IT standards, not just privacy standards
k. when looking through vendor standards, including all considerations that go through IT standards
l. same for risk standards and others down the line
m. broad coalition being put together
   i. will be a quarterly process
n. Policy will go live tomorrow; put on website for review
   i. will remain open on website for 60 days
   ii. at the end, task force will meet and review feedback
   iii. finally will come to this group for final review and endorsement to Jeff to have it go live
o. some standards will go live right away
p. some will be given grace periods for implementation
   i. risk assessment, how we treat vendors
q. recruiting for volunteers to be directly involved in graphing
r. not just a leadership initiative - anyone that may be interested, contact Joe
s. This stuff affects the work we do on a daily basis
   i. need to make sure people are heard
t. Derek: asking for short blurb to give to potential volunteers
   i. Joe will pass something around
u. Jim: also looking at resources required to do the work?
   i. view it as fairly unfunded mandate - will not provide resources
v. Joe: will be re-evaluating and reviewing them at least once a year
w. Interim Standard on Search
   i. documentation of existing processes
   ii. only changes the standard changes:
      1. expansion of scope - will be for entire campus
         a. Remove burden of local IT directors - no longer need to do analysis of their own; now moves up through privacy office
      2. Three groups named ordinary force of investigators
         a. work directly with security office
   iii. Maintain a log of all searches done on campus and DIT searches
      1. What is suitable for review to make sure security measures are being followed?

5. 3rd Party Review update - Jim
    a. Have a good process diagram on how it should work for major activities
    b. Bit of a back slide about things that would fall outside of this process
        i. From procurement side saying everything needs to full under the process
    c. Threshold of criteria that were established
    d. Example: 3rd party extension that isn't sharing information with the outside world, does it need to go through the process?
    e. Criteria for things that may not need to go through process
        i. Got hiccup from procurement office
        ii. Indemnification and venue issues (where we can/cannot be sued)
        iii. because we are a state agency, a lot of discomfort around giving that away
    f. We have a good process for things we have outlined, but still have 1 decision point we need to come to an agreement on
    g. Good listing of other things that have come out of this process - good thing that has come out of this so far
        i. As we build it up over the years, it will hopefully make it easier
    h. Phil: would be a good capstone class for students
6. Other Topics
    a. Hallie: backtrack to previous topic when Joe asked for volunteers
        i. Question: Joe looking for volunteers that had some type of authority or empowered to make a decision, does that mean it rules out students because they bring a lot of perspective that could be useful?
            1. Need people with authority/decision making on certain teams
            2. Can use students on drafting team
    b. Joe: Privacy day - announcement in Maryland Today explaining what is happening and what to expect