Committee on IT Infrastructure (CITI)

March 9, 2004
Meeting Summary

CITI Attendees: Sue Abeles, Jim Davis, Sam Morabito, Steve Olsen, John Sandbrook, Glen Winans

Guests: Joseph Chiu (PDP), Karen Melick (AIS), Jackie Reynolds (AIS), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT), Don Worth (AIS)

Agenda:

1) Data Warehouse

In early 2001, this Committee (called ECC at the time) committed funding and commissioned detailed design and planning for the Data Warehouse Project. Jim Davis reported on the process through which the Data Warehouse design and planning has been taken:

- The process has been highly consultative and has followed ITPB guidelines.
- The Office of Information Technology (OIT) is satisfied with answers to the major questions that have been raised.
- Functional specifications have been endorsed by a Functional Oversight Committee.
- The technical architecture has been reviewed by a team organized by the OIT.
- A Campus Impact Analysis is being conducted by the OIT through the Common Systems Group (CSG). The analysis has uncovered a number of intertwined services that are not all related to the Data Warehouse Project and is at the point of determining how best to disentangle these services and migrate them to the new Data Warehouse or to point to other more optimum resources. The completion of this analysis is expected in the next 30 to 45 days.

As a result of the various reviews, Jim Davis recommended moving forward with project implementation. Although the Campus Impact Analysis is not yet complete, it is far enough along and is converging sufficiently that the entire Data Warehouse project should not be held up while this analysis is fully completed.

Jackie Reynolds and Don Worth briefly discussed the Project Control Document in terms of major components of the implementation. They walked the Committee through how the data subject areas were prioritized for implementation and summarized staffing resource requirements.
The CITI members present had the opportunity to raise questions about the project and review process.

Steve Olsen approved moving forward with implementation and the release of funds that had been committed.

2) **AIS Mainframe Upgrade**

Karen Melick and Don Worth updated the AIS Mainframe Upgrade Projections given to the Committee in 2000. Originally it was projected that an upgrade would be needed in Fall 2003 but usage has been growing at a slower rate than anticipated. Based on current average monthly primetime CPU utilization data and barring unforeseen events, an upgrade will probably be needed before the beginning of Spring Quarter 2006. Assuming an accumulation of $1 million per year in the mainframe upgrade reserve account, $6 million would be accumulated through fiscal year 05-06. The estimated cost for the next upgrade is approximately $4 to $5 million. $1 million can be released from the mainframe upgrade reserve account.

The first day of Spring classes is the peak CPU utilization day. It was decided that the Committee should revisit the upgrade timeline after the first day of 2005’s Spring Quarter. AIS will provide the Committee an email update to the CPU Utilization for Peak Day graph after the start of Spring Quarter 2004.

3) **Effort Reporting Project**

Regulations concerning the use of federal funds require than universities certify effort on sponsored projects. In recent years, the federal government and its auditors have become more active in their review of effort reporting requirements and a number of universities have received large audit disallowances as a result. Since 1982, UC has been using a paper-based system to satisfy these requirements, but the system has become outdated and lacks functionality to handle some requirements. Given the recognized need to streamline the effort reporting process and address issues that exist within the current system to reduce compliance risks shared by all campuses; a system wide work group comprised of representatives from the five largest campuses was formed and has developed a Functional Requirements Definition document that describes the desired features of a new effort reporting system. An RFP for an outsourced solution was done but central development of the system in-house by UCOP ended up being the most cost effective option. It is proposed that each of the five participating campuses plus OP share in the development cost. Additionally there will be a one-time cost to each campus to implement the system and ongoing costs at OP and the campuses to maintain it.
Steve Olsen tentatively approved committing UTIPP funds for this project and noted plans to also review this recommendation with the Information Technology Coordinating Committee (ITCC) before making the recommendations to the EVC.