



MINUTES

Technology Architecture Committee

Objective: Guide the direction of information technology across the enterprise, making recommendations as appropriate to the IT Governance Council

Date: July 29, 2020

Participants: Alex Birkovsky, Dave Borschel, Louis Brooks, Andy Bucior, Alexander Chisler, Tom Doughty, Matthew Earhart, Mary Eichen, Lori Gormin, Andy Hanlon, Jason Henderson, Matt Hohmeister, Cali Jones, Fred Jordan, Chuck Kemeny, Jason Lammert, Shawn Lewers, Ray Marky, Michael McDonald, Tom Morgan, Matt Mortimer, Bobby Sprinkle, Sasank Vemana, Johnny White

ACTION ITEMS

- There is the potential of an assessment of “Ring Central” (TAC).
- The TAC was asked to review the TSR replacement ITN when it is available (TAC).

DISCUSSION

Call to Order, Introductions, and Opening Remarks

1. Chuck called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He asked everyone to document their attendance via the TAC Teams Chat.
2. Chuck introduced Alex Birkovsky, Manager of High-Performance Computing, as a new member replacing Edson Manners. Also attending were Andy Hanlon, representing Gerardo, and Cali Jones of Procurement Services. Chuck explained that Cali was invited to provide input on a project that may require the assistance of Procurement Services.
3. Chuck was pleased to announce that the TAC website (<https://its.fsu.edu/about-its/technology-architecture-committee>) is live, and he thanked everyone who contributed to its creation.
4. Chuck reminded everyone that Tom will post the draft meeting minutes in Teams and the TAC will have one week to review it for potential edits prior to the minutes being posted on the website.

Draft TAC Assessment Form

5. Chuck displayed the TAC Assessment Form, reminding the group that it is based on the assessment questions that the members developed during the April and June meetings. He asked whether anyone had any questions about the process of creating the form.

Assessment Process Draft



6. Chuck displayed the draft TAC Assessment Process and thanked the members of the TAC Assessment Working Group.
7. Chuck asked the members to review the “About” section and to suggest changes. Matt H, and Matt E> both stated that this section looks good.
8. Matt E. suggested a word swap to make the second bullet read “strategic technology roadmap”. Andy expressed his agreement. Dave suggested removing the trailing period.
9. Chuck made the suggested changes immediately to the draft.
10. Chuck asked the members to review the “Assessment Process” section and to suggest changes. Jason L. and Matt E. stated that it looked good. There were no suggested changes.
11. Chuck asked the members to review the “Process Flow” diagram. Jason L. stated that it looked good. There were no suggested changes.
12. Chuck asked the members to review the “Request” section and to suggest changes.
13. Dave suggested changing the second bullet to read “related or existing”. Lori, Matt E., and Alex B. suggested additional wording changes wording changes. Chuck immediately updated the draft.
14. Chuck asked the members to review the “Review” section and to suggest changes. There were no suggested changes.
15. Chuck asked the members to review the “Result” section and to suggest changes. Matt E. suggested a wording change that Chuck applied immediately to the draft. Jason L. and Matt E. stated that the revised version looked good.

TAC Distribution List (TAC-Assessment@fsu.edu)

16. Chuck explained that Andy B., Matt E. and he are the only assigned contacts for now, and that more may be added later if/as necessary.

Preliminary Disaster Recovery Gap Analysis

17. Chuck explained that the DR gap analysis discussion is to determine if there is a potential need and business opportunity for ITS to offer disaster recovery services to campus departments. The first step will be discussion with TAC members to determine what gaps may exist in their respective DR plans and capabilities. Chuck further explained that TAC was asked by leadership to assess departmental DR needs and to determine based on TAC members’ feedback whether a broader assessment is warranted. He asked whether there are any questions regarding the scope of this discussion.
18. Matt H. asked whether an appropriate solution would be a warm standby solution utilizing AWS Cloud Endure. Chuck replied that the answer would depend on the nature and scope of DR needs.



19. Matt E. asked whether a Business Impact Analysis DR needs assessment survey was done a couple of years ago. Chuck replied that a BIA was done but that its focus was primarily on ITS-owned and supported systems and services and that departmental systems and applications were largely excluded. Chuck explained that this is why the current goal is to begin to identify and document department-level DR gaps.
20. Alex B. stated that affordability of DR solutions has been a significant obstacle. Chuck replied that cost is not the immediate consideration, and that the first step is to identify what units have or do not have DR plans, and what unmet DR needs currently exist among the TAC units.
21. Louis mentioned that the Libraries received an IT security audit and were instructed to create a DR plan.
22. Michael McD stated that DR capabilities for the research centers should be centrally funded by ITS because the centers do not have the requisite funding. Chuck replied that the immediate task is to define DR needs, not detailed requirements and associated costs.
23. Matt E. questioned the breadth of TAC's mandate. Chuck replied that ISPO's focus is on the needs for DR plans, whereas TAC's focus is one whether there is a need for a DR service offering ("DRaaS").
24. Matt H. stated that consideration should be given to centralized funding of a storage / backup system. Alex B. agreed with Matt.
25. Louis stated that there is not much information available of how to write a DR plan, and that guidance and assistance in writing DR plans would be extremely helpful. Matt E. agreed, noting that there is considerable confusion associated with this. Dave stated that the starting point should be a business continuity plan.
26. Matt E. noted that SharePoint is being underutilized as a storage / backup tool.
27. Tom D. stated that DR gaps clearly exist among the departments represented on the TAC.
28. Chuck asked which TAC departments already have departmental DR plans. Alex B. replied that CAPD as a plan but that it is local.
29. Matt E. stated that for this analysis the TAC needs a member survey with specific questions. Chuck asked whether there is a sufficiently broad need to warrant development of a survey.
30. Mary noted that CAS is vital.
31. Shawn L. suggested that there may need to be different standards across units, with the standards reflecting differences between desirability and affordability.



32. Chuck stated that anything that is mission-critical should have an offsite backup. Johnny explained that he has been researching the types of data that need to be protected, and he has been evaluating the possibility of offering Backup as a Service.
33. Chuck asked whether the members can agree that there is a need for further and broader evaluation of enterprise need for DR service offerings. The consensus among the members was “yes”.
34. Matt E. stated that TAC will be a great resource for solving specific problems, and that he believes a DR needs survey with more precise questions is needed.

Open Floor Discussion

35. The University is evaluating a campus-wide call center named “Ring Central”. Bobby stated that he wants the TAC to conduct an assessment.
36. Bobby reported that an ITN is being created for the replacement of the TSR system and that he wants the TAC to review the ITN. The University is seeking a solution that would be cheaper than Salesforce, although Salesforce could be utilized for this purpose if no acceptable alternative is found.
37. Chuck explained that a recommendation has been made by the ELT to include DR in the TAC Assessment Form.
38. Chuck noted that he is seeing a rapidly growing campus interest in the TAC. Matt E. agreed.
39. Regarding the TSR ITN, Matt H. asked whether internal custom development has been considered. Fred replied that there are problems greater than billing that need to be resolved. Lori suggested that depending on any upcoming budget shortfalls, the TAC could compile a list of billing needs to determine whether ITS supports an alternative system that could meet these needs.
40. Matt H. stated that he advocates more centralized services and billings. Matt E. replied that expansion of centralized services would have to be finite.
41. Chuck stated that offering DR services would be a great “ground floor” opportunity for learning how to make centralized services viable.
42. Matt H. explained that he would be a big proponent of utilizing Microsoft Azure as an enterprise solution for backups. Chuck reiterated the need to define DR requirements first before focusing on potential solutions, although he noted the conceptual appeal of a cloud-based solution.

NEXT MEETING

Chuck will email options.