IT Governance Program – Research & Innovative Technologies Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 15, 2018
10:00a.m. – 11:30am
JK Williams Building, Conference Room 212

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RITC Members</th>
<th>RITC Members</th>
<th>ITG Program Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Narasimha Annapareddy</td>
<td>X Dr. Hye-Chung Kum</td>
<td>Juan Garza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Michael Bishop</td>
<td>Sean Michaelson</td>
<td>X Joshua Kissee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Susan Bloomfield</td>
<td>Dr. Honggao Liu</td>
<td>X Missy Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Brender</td>
<td>Dr. Ramalingam Saravanan</td>
<td>Lea Ann Westmoreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Pierce Cantrell</td>
<td>Dr. Venky Shankar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Cheryl Cato</td>
<td>Paula Sullenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Dee Childs</td>
<td>X Chris Seabury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dr. Michael Hall</td>
<td>X Mark Barteau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes: Scheduled Business

Item 1: Welcome and Introductions
Description: General welcome and an opportunity for announcements or items on interest relevant to the RITC

Item 2: College Specific Survey Results
Description: Review the results of the RITC survey using the college-specific data requested from September meeting.

A zipfile of the reports were distributed to the group via email and also in the Google Drive before the meeting for later reference.

Discussion Points:

- The graphical results were affirmation of what faculty researchers need. Not many surprises.
- The RITC felt that how we satisfy those needs will be based in part on M. Dee Child’s vision.
There was discussion that the question wording in the survey was too open-ended, encouraging faculty researchers to ask for “anything” without consideration of costs.
  - Counter-discussion that felt the survey was valid and still represents PI priorities.

Centralized storage was the main issue with discussion surrounding how to pay for centralized and compliant storage solutions.
  - The group looked at a list of resources and could see that some are easily centralized and some not.
  - Comments on centralized vs. distributed resources: some activities/resources easily “centralized”, others not so much. E.g., if long-term (="archival") storage were consolidated, this would be very helpful to guard against loss of storage capabilities if PI has a gap in funding. Many funding agencies now requiring data be stored for 5 years, but will not fund capital equipment to support that requirement.
  - Many PI’s need access to data for many years beyond 5 years. Noted that one currently funded Research Development Fund (RDF) is devoted to archival storage ($5m award).

Google Drive fine for most PI’s, unless data is protected by HIPAA or covered by export control regulations or is commercializable (then should be encrypted).
  - Noted that Google Drive not great for terabytes worth of data.
  - Maybe we need a tiered response: 1/3 faculty might have no special needs, another 1/3 have intensive needs for storage.

Another issue: how can PI’s keep up with all the rules & regs about data security and export control?
  - Kum reports that a one-on-one meeting she held with Privacy Officer John Pryde (who reports to Kevin McGinnis at System Office) was especially helpful on this point.

Another issue on export control: PI’s cannot always accurately anticipate which projects will produce commercializable products/processes; can easily run afoul of export control rules if employing any international students as GA’s, who are not generally allowed to work on export control research.

Should we increase income devoted to RDF to support needs such as this?
  - (VPR Barteau;) historically, the RDF review committee has frowned on using RDF $ for computing resources; however, this year’s version commits 20% of RDF funding for operational costs.
  - Another option: pull some monies off top of IDC returns for essential compliance activities; some computing needs fall in this category..

Dr. Narasimha Annapareddy felt that the survey did not take into account faculty paying for the things they asked for, and that this should be kept in mind when analyzing the data.
  - It may be a good idea to go back with questions as to whether those faculty are willing to pay for this.
  - Second level of discussion to prioritize issues as well as where the money would come from for PI needs.
  - Others believe survey is useful as indicator of PI’s priorities.

Next steps: Recommendation that individual college survey results are compared to all-university results. Dr. Bloomfield will create some side-by-side comparison graphics before next meeting.
Item 3: **Current IT Organizational Model**

**Description:** *Continued discussion surrounding the advantages and disadvantages of the current IT organizational model toward research activities across the University.*

- RITC members recognized that even within some colleges, IT may still be distributed or only partially “consolidated.”
  - There is much variability in IT organization across colleges/units and sometimes for good reasons, to suit unique needs (e.g., Vet Medicine must support two animal hospitals with critical needs related to clinical care).
  - Recommendation proposed that “centralization” should be a word used to describe University level IT only, not at the college level.
- Centralized storage was the main issue and there was discussion surrounding how to pay for centralized and compliant storage solutions.
  - NOTE: Hye-Chung Kum’s RDF project on compliant computing is working to address some of these issues.
- The discussion switched to the Task Force on TAMUS 29.01.03.
  - Concern raised about if IT security would be happy with this at a centralized level
  - The next process is for the university to make an SAP based on this policy
  - IRPSC will begin development and discuss this in their next meeting

**Next steps:** Dr. Bloomfield hopes Dee Childs can be at next meeting to share her vision for centralizing IT services. The RITC agreed to examine what it is easily centralized and what is not in terms of IT services.

Meeting adjourned 11:32p.m.