1. Review of minutes
   a. Minutes were approved

2. Updates
   a. Active IT investments, new proposals, and recently completed projects – refer to slides.
   b. The Information Security Improvement Program (ISIP) Steering Committee will meet soon to discuss whether its role should be transitioned to the ITGC Council.
   c. An audit by the Internal Auditor on data centres across the university has recently begun and should conclude this fall. Council will receive more information as it becomes available.
   d. The Office of the CIO will embark on a strategic planning initiative over the coming months. More information to follow.
   e. Power outages over the summer caused issues in data centres across the university, especially to the data centre in the Library. This has led to a significant strain on IT resources and operations particularly in the Office of the CIO.

3. IT Investment Policy
   a. The feedback from the university-wide consultation process was reviewed.
   b. Recommended changes to be made to draft policy post-consultation include:
      i. Updates to the “IT Governance and Collaboration Council” and “Unit” definitions
      ii. Removal of the example criteria to determine which IT investments require assessment through the framework referenced in the policy body, section 3.
iii. Removal of “Capital Deferred Renewal Programs” from the list of avenues from which proposals may be identified in the procedure, step 1.

iv. Reword step 7 in the procedure to provide more clarity.

v. Increase the Total Investment Cost amount that determines the investments that require VPC approval from $500,000 to $1,000,000. (Procedure, step 9.)

vi. Increase the Total Investment Cost amount that determines the investments that require Board approval from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000. (Procedure, step 8.)

c. **Action:** Sarah will work with Carol on next steps re policy approval.

d. Council discussed whether it should update one of the criteria that determine which IT investments require a review through the framework. Specifically, the criterion that states an investment that requires more than 20 person days of effort by Office of the CIO resources. Should this include IT and IT-related (e.g. information management, security, privacy) resources from any unit? **This will be discussed at the next meeting.**

4. IT Investment Review Process

a. Sarah presented the process for Council’s approval – see slides.

b. The process was presented to the four governance committees for their input prior to being presented at Council. The process presented to Council included suggestions for improvement from the committees.

c. Comments/discussion:

   i. We will need to add a process to deal with proposals that are assessed and prioritized by the committees but never make it to the “in progress” phase (i.e. resources are never allocated for implementation).

   ii. Results of the review process can be appealed to the CIO. The CIO will inform and discuss any appeals received with Council.

   iii. It was questioned whether the “Scope of Impact” assessment criterion should be based on constituency groups served – e.g. “all students”, etc. This will be reviewed.

d. It was agreed that the process as presented would be put in place and regularly reviewed to ensure it meets our objectives.

5. Other business

a. Committee membership

   i. It is felt there is not enough faculty representation on the governance committees or Council. This is also something that MUNFA raised to Steve during a meeting he had with some of the MUNFA Executive members (and Faculty Relations) regarding the IT Investment Policy.

   ii. It was noted that the Dean’s Council representative has not attended a Council meeting to date.

   iii. Dr. Abrahams is no longer the AVP Research (Pro Tempore). Dr. Max Liboiron should receive a memo from VPC appointing her to the committee.

   iv. **Action:** Steve will discuss the above with Dr. Golfman and Dr. Bose.

b. Subscription-based Cloud services and risk to Memorial
i. There is a concern that these services may introduce significant risk to Memorial if not properly assessed using a risk-based approach. Is there a way to ensure subscription-based Cloud services are identified using the framework so they can then be properly assessed? This will be discussed at the meeting.

6. Next meeting: November 27, 2018 3-4:30pm
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Active IT Investments - Summary

Active IT Investments by Portfolio (45 Total)
September 10, 2018

- Academic and Student Life: 10
- Administrative Services: 13
- Core IT and Security: 19
- Research: 3

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER
New Proposals

- Uniform Workwear Management – Facilities Management
- Parking Management System Upgrade – OCRO
- Peer Review Software – CITL
- Graduate Admissions Improvements – SGS
- Visual Space Management – Facilities Management
- MyMUNLife (Orbis) Upgrade – Student Life
- MUN Login Upgrade – CITL, IT Services
- Server Requirements for EPC Project – Facilities Management
- Campus Identity Syncronization – MI ICT
Update from CIO

- Active Internal Audits
  - Information Security Improvement Program
  - Data Centre Audit
- IT strategic planning – upcoming
- Power outages and impact to operations
Recent or near completion

- Certificate Upgrades – IT Services
- Enterprise Survey Tool – CIAP, Office of the CIO
- HSIMS Videoconference Bridge Upgrade – Faculty of Medicine
- Memorial Active Directory (SJC Phase) – Office of the CIO
- Servers, Backup and Storage Upgrades – IT Services
- Research Network (CANARIE) Upgrade – IT Services
- Wifi Deployment at OSC – IT Services
- Venue Management System – Battery Facility
- Residence Management System – Student Residences
- Network Upgrade RFP – IT Services
IT Investment Policy

• Recommendation to VPC
IT Investment Review Process

- To understand **institutional priorities** so that IT resources can be allocated accordingly
- Evaluate priorities based on **business need**; purpose is not to determine technology solutions
- To facilitate coherent planning to enable better and **transparent decision-making**
- Identify opportunities for **collaboration** and **technology reuse**
Lessons learned so far

• Proposals should be reviewed by the Office of the CIO and key stakeholders prior to assessment by committee(s)

• Committee members need time to review proposals in advance of meetings

• Proposals received so far have been very detailed and included technology solutions; proposals should be more focused and assessed on business need

• Proposals need to be assessed by committees using common criteria and a standardized assessment tool

• Process will need to be reviewed and improved upon regularly
Proposal assessment and prioritization: a walk-through

Proponent submits proposal to itgc@mun.ca (requires sufficient lead time)

Office of the CIO works with proponent to ensure it is ready for assessment

Committee(s) receive proposal >7 days prior to meeting; assess and prioritize proposal (at bi-monthly meeting)

Council reviews recommendation from committee(s) (if required)

Core IT and Security informed for awareness and to identify potential opportunities

Implementation project is scheduled with stakeholders dependent upon resources
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Council review required?

Decision-making authority

- Committees assess and prioritize applicable proposals.
- Council will review a proposal and the assessment results if one or more of the following is true:
  - Proposal is assessed by more than one committee.
  - Funding is not yet secured.
  - Cost is more than $500,000 and/or requires a VPC briefing note.
- CIO will make appropriate decisions in accordance with the role's mandate and authority.
Proposal assessment and prioritization: a walk-through
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Investment implementation

- Start date to be determined with key stakeholders based on resource availability
- Priority assigned through governance will be used to allocate resources
- In the event of uncertainty around priorities and resource allocation, Council may be asked to confirm overall priorities
- Core IT and Security members review all proposals (outside meetings) for awareness and to identify potential opportunities and risks
Expedited Investments

• *E.g. Power outage in the Library and impact to data centre infrastructure*

• Involve the CIO directly

• An overview and update will occur at relevant committee(s) and Council

• May impact active investments