

IAC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 21, 2019

9:00-10:30 AM, WCNR Foothills Room 243

Attendees: Jake Anderson (CAS), Lance Baatz (ACNS/Telecom), Katie Banghart (ACNS/Telecom), Brandon Bernier (ACNS/Telecom), Mike Brake (Student Achievement), Kelley Branson (Engineering), Dave Carpenter (CHHS), Josh Clark (IS), James Cizek (ACNS), Jim Cox (CNS), Bill Davis (HDS), John Engelking (COB), Lisa Gertig (Internal Auditing), Bryan Gillispie (CLA), Chris Glaze (BFS), Eric Hamrick (Procurement), Dave Hoffman (ACNS/Telecom), Ronie Jalving (Research Services), Steve Lovaas (ACNS), Kylan Marsh (UA), Jamie McCue (ACNS/Telecom), Colleen Polley (Internal Auditing), Greg Redder (ACNS/Telecom), Kacie Reed (CVMBS), Gary Senseman (WCNR), Eric Tisdale (CHHS), Dallace Unger (Facilities), Shane Vigil (HDS), Joe Volesky (ACNS), Suzi White (ACNS), Ruth Willson (Extension)

1. Introductions
 - a. Introduce Josh Clark, new Information Systems Director
2. Voicemail Migration (Hoffman/Redder)
 - a. Microsoft will no longer support voicemail connection to O365 effective Dec. 1 2019. ACNS will be moving this service to on campus as an interim solution until we fully adopt and deploy TEAMS for voice (see below).
 - b. Customer experience will be the same on many levels. During the transition, users will need to re-record their greetings, reset their pin, set up menus, etc. myphone.colostate.edu will be repurposed to support the on-campus service. There are currently many active voicemail-only mailboxes, and ACNS will be verifying which ones are actually in use.
 - c. Call-in service and email will not be unified: deleting in one place, will not automatically delete in the other. Voicemails will reside on servers on campus for 30 days before deletion.
 - d. Timeline: September through October: internal testing and pilot with ACNS/Telecom/Library, develop training materials and communication plan. Oct/Nov: rollout to campus. Folks will have a few weeks to record their greeting, set their pin, etc. before old service is disconnected.
 - e. Questions:
 - i. (Q) How will voicemails that send to shared mailboxes work? (A) *One of the test use cases. Voicemail will be pointed locally to shared mailboxes.*
3. MS Teams Voice & Security Pilot (Carpenter, Bernier, Volesky, McCue, Baatz, Lovaas)
 - a. Business Case: Campus Communication Committee recommendation. IT Security threats have increased, voicemail support ending, Microsoft license cost increases and changes.
 - b. Software Licensing:
 - i. Software license model is changing, Office365 (current) v. Microsoft365 (new). Current model based on "Knowledge Workers" formula, allows for unlimited licenses (what gives students the option to download O365, etc.). New model: pay for "Education Qualified Workers", every person, not FTE. Preserves licensing for office products to students. Not accounting for retirees, associates, etc.
 1. A1 Level: Free. Possible option for retirees, no O365 download offered.
 2. A3 Level: Closest equivalent to current. Could allow Duo in front of email.
 3. A5 Level: Required for Teams Voice and Security features.
 - ii. Mandatory cost increase of \$150k/year. New model forces licensing a broader audience. Transitional licensing model can offset some costs. If A5 pilot succeeds, plan to scale. If it doesn't, plan to revert to A3 and buy other aspects ala carte. Since

every person will need a license, we need to refine numbers to reduce overall costs. Need to be strategic about what is provided to Associates and Retirees.

- c. 6-month Pilot for MS Teams Voice & Security:
 - i. Project charter shared with IAC members. First pilot will include ACNS/Telecom & IS, beginning Oct. 1st. Second pilot with campus partners, beginning Nov. 1st. Year 1: no increased cost to campus for FY 20, ACNS/Telecom will bear the cost of pilot. 300-user pilot, with the ability to go up to 1,000 users. Currently defining use cases.
 - ii. MS Teams Voice: Pilot will have no impact on faxing, life & safety, emergency text messages, elevator phones, call centers, and analog services. Telephone use cases: off-campus, international, long distance authorization codes, conference rooms, E911, music on hold, message waiting, blind transfers, etc. Currently evaluating two SOW's from vendors to help with pilot and transition. Target is to move away from physical phones and use softphones and headsets (if needed) instead; however, physical phones can still be used. Calls can be transitioned into a video call, desktop sharing option, chat option, and additional people can be added to a call. If successful, plan to roll out to faculty and staff, conference rooms, remote users, etc.
 - iii. MS Teams Security: Enhanced email security covers entire scope (not limited to 1,000 users). Features included in A3 (for everyone): Anti-phishing, anti-spoofing, scanning, site evaluation. Features included in A5 (pilot): (1) Advanced Endpoint Protection: Microsoft Defender ATP ties into cloud intelligence, behavior tracking, etc. this feature already exists on client machines but has greater functionality in A5; (2) Proactive incident response: currently, when a phishing attack happens it is a manual process and interrupt driven workflow - this feature allows scripts for interactions, smoother experience, and less frequent interruption given other security tools in place; and (3) Data Loss Prevention (DLP) policies: scans for sensitive information in OneDrive; testing in pilot with credit cards, social security numbers, etc. If pilot is successful, plan to roll out enterprise-wide. If not successful, will drop down to lower licensing model, and evaluate purchasing tools a la cart.
- d. Q&A
 - 1. (Q) What client options are available for Teams? (A) *Users have the ability to use the Teams desktop client, web client, and mobile app. There is support for Mac, Linux (limited), and mobile clients.*
 - 2. (Q) What do we currently have for end-point threat protection and what would we be getting with the pilot? (A) *We currently have Exchange Online Protection, a very basic and largely ineffectual tool. A3 option would be new to us as well; but not as robust as what A5 provides. The biggest benefit in end-point protection would result in a move to A5 (Defender ATP).*
 - 3. (Q) What visibility will college/department IT staff have with security alerts? (A) *Similar cloud-platform visibility as we have now. We have not yet defined how to share or control this information with other units but will explore during pilot.*
 - 4. (Q) Has Microsoft committed to the Teams platform insofar as to assure we won't have to do this again in the near future? (A) *From what we understand, Microsoft is all-in for Teams. There have been many transitions to Teams already and Microsoft is using MS Teams Voice internally. If they change course, it will have major business impacts. One of the biggest resourced projects they have done in years.*

5. (Q) Can you clarify the A5 Windows Licensing changes related to operating systems? (A) *The license would not extend to personal/home use, relatively similar to what we have today. Current exemptions granted among colleges/division would go away, all would be treated the same. Everyone gets Windows upgrades and everyone pays the same amount based on the number of employees they have. Team recommends talking to business officers in their units to socialize this change; this has been communicated to CAAG. Budget numbers still need to be calculated and distributed.*
6. (Q) For the security pilot, is Duo integration being considered/tested? (A) *There are many tools available in A5, the newest and most useful were selected to test in the pilot. We will not be including MDM features or multi-factor authentication in this pilot.*
7. (Q) Would MS Teams replace BlueJeans? (A) *Videoconferencing in Teams is a built-in feature and offers the same functionality. Would most likely not pay for both services. Videoconferencing works for non-Teams users as well.*
8. (Q) Have any of CSU's peers gone to Teams? (A) *Many are using it in some capacity, some of our extended peers have moved to Teams for Voice.*
9. (Q) Will there be an option to lease physical MS Teams compatible phones from Telecom? (A) *Leasing phones is not a valuable business model to Telecom. To simplify administrative processes, the division that purchases the equipment would manage it. We think many will embrace the soft phone and cell phone options for their desk line. We also know that certain people and other functions (i.e. conference rooms) will need a physical device.*

4. CIO Updates (Burns)

- a. ITEC Actions: IT Policies Status
 - i. Significant policy changes will still go to ITEC for review and approval, small changes no longer will, they will go to the Provost and then posted to policy website.
- b. President McConnell Update
 - i. CSU System projects: President McConnell recognizes the collision with the CSU System and Main Campus projects. For example, IS was required to free up resources to dedicate to the joint Banner implementation, so they are currently doing less for campus. Capacity, resources, and prioritization are current issues.
- c. Capital IT Request – IT related projects for more than \$500k. We reapplied this year for Network Infrastructure device refresh/replacement. Costs were included to replace core network hardware (border routers, core switches, and firewalls) and edge switch replacement.
 - i. Questions:
 1. (Q): What happens if the request is not approved? (A) *Would need to reset the entire funding model. This equipment has to be replaced.*
 2. (Q): Would this increase or change what we currently pay to Network Chargeback per FTE? (A) *Yes, this most likely will become a shared responsibility to replace switches by increasing the Network Chargeback per FTE.*
 3. (Q): If the model is changing, will the base budget also change and move to an annualized cost? (A) *It would work better for central as one-time funds each year (i.e. maintain the per FTE network chargeback), to adjust costs as needed.*

4. (Q): Are there concerns for replacing copper infrastructure year after year?
(A) *This proposal is for a 5-year "fix" for network hardware. In the next 10 years, we will need to look at replacing/upgrading the cabling infrastructure. Will be very expensive to rewire, probably have to go back to state for funding. Will need to look at Wi-Fi capability as an alternative to cable replacement over the next decade, too.*

5. Adjourned – 10:37 AM.