IT Governance Program – Information Risk, Policy, & Security Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 18, 2018
1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Computing Services Center Conference Room 004

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIC Members</th>
<th>AIC Members</th>
<th>Ex-Officio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jane Bolin</td>
<td>X Ed Pierson</td>
<td>X Cheryl Cato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Paul Brandt</td>
<td>X Tony Quigg</td>
<td>X Juan Garza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Aaron Brender</td>
<td>X Katherine Rojo Del Busto</td>
<td>X Melia Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X M. Dee Childs</td>
<td>X Dr. Tracy Rutherford</td>
<td>X John Pryde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dale Cook</td>
<td>X Anthony Schneider</td>
<td>X Adam Mikeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Walter Daugherity</td>
<td>X Michael Sardaryzadeh</td>
<td>Kevin McGinnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Bruce Herbert</td>
<td>X Dr. Paul Wellman (Parliamentarian)</td>
<td>X Mike Russo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Karen Hrn (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Michael Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>X Peggy Zapalac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITG Program Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X Sharon Gibson-Mainka</th>
<th>X Joe Mancha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Joshua Kissee</td>
<td>X Lon Berquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Missy Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lea Ann Westmoreland

IRPSC Guests

Minutes: Scheduled Business

Item 1: Welcome & Announcements

Description: General welcome and opportunity for announcements & items of interest relevant to the IRPSC.

- Paul Wellman led the meeting today
- The meeting began with round the table introductions
- Dee Childs gave a word of thanks to the members for their service and time.
Item 2: Review of Proposed SAP Feedback

Description: An open discussion to explore the feedback offered by the TAMUS CIO for the proposed 29.01.03.M1. ## Approved by the IRPSC on Nov 22, 2018, and the edits made to the SAP.

- Adam Mikeal distributed handouts:
  - Standard Administrative Procedure – 29.01.M1.##
  - Rule/SAP Action Summary
  - Email from Mark Stone with comments on SAP 29.01.03.M1.##

- Adam reviewed the approval workflow of a new SAP

- Mark Stone’s feedback was provided to Karen Hrncir, IRPSC committee chair, and to Dr. Riggs who chaired the task force and developed this language.
  - Revisions were made to the SAP language based on the feedback.
  - Mark Stone approved these changes and agreed that the new language addressed the communicated concerns.
  - A new definition for “cloud computing” was added
  - New language also specifies that this SAP refers to information resources belonging to the TAMU, not to agencies.
    - The following Language was added: “does not apply to non-TAMU resources.”

Discussion:

- Reviewed the definition of Enterprise Data Center.
- Bullet 1: General Comments
  - This language does not portray how global the University has become. (Qatar)
  - The language feels very restrictive on contract requirements.
  - The word “federal” next to PCI may need to be removed.
  - This had already been voted on, but comments will be considered for future documents.
- Tony Quigg expressed concern about the Galveston Campus Data Centers being included as a “Texas A&M University Data Center” per the SAP definition and that TAMUG should not have to request an annual exception to have data centers in Galveston.
- Section 2: This section contains a double negative, so the grammar will be revised.
- SAP only applies to information resources owned by Texas A&M University.
- 3.3 Questions: Licensing – There is an approved list of providers and exceptions will cover everything else. It is up to the departments to monitor compliance.
- Dee commented that we should consider the expectations of the community. People wear numerous hats, they are very busy and have high expectations. The expectation that their resources are being protected. This is what we need to make that happen.
- Dee gave clarification after her discussion with Mark:
  - Data Classification- no time requirement and is ongoing responsibility for each information resource owner. This also applies to 3.1.3.
- The Chair called for a motion for a straw poll on approval of language and changes made.
  - Motion passed
  - Anthony Schneider voted against the enforcement poll and Ed Pierson abstained.
Item 3: Exception Process Review

Description: Presentation and discussion of the exception process developed for SAP’s.

- Adam Mikeal distributed a visual doc demonstrating the flow of how a request moves from one entity to another.
- Timetable for this review - subject to change depending on variables but the goal is for a 1-3 day response time to make our review and get back to the next part of the process.
- Website: U.tamu.edu/it-exception
- Doc in laserfische IT policy exemption request form. Reviewed completing the form
- There will be a comment box for the approver at each level before it goes on to the next stage in the process.

Discussion:

- This form is optional. How do we address those that choose not to do the form for exemption?
  - If they do not request an exemption, they are in violation of state law and the policy.
- The SAP and exemption process will be communicated to faculty, there is an expectation of good faith to follow the compliance requirements.
  - How do we find and manage those that do not?
  - Continuous engagement with the faculty and staff and communicating the requirements is suggested.
- Recommend adding a button for “short-term” or “long-term” and is it a renewal and is it a multi-year contract?
  - The exception should be reviewed and re-approved yearly.
- Are we changing SAP ending in .27?
- The only thing missing from the form is a statement saying that a Dean or VP needs to approve.
  - That will be reviewed at a later time
- Micahel Sardaryzadeh stated that passing our first SAP is a great success. He is very impressed with the success of the process whether it is approved or not.
  - Michael feels that others could learn from this group and thanked the group for their participation.

Meeting adjourned 3:04pm