

# LAN Administrators 12/11/07 meeting notes

## **Attendees:**

Brian Shade, OIT	Ralph Yingling, College of Business
Randy James, Library	Don Weber, College of Education
Mark Liberacki, Arts and Sciences	Shawn Nelson, Health & Human Services
Mary Ramlow, Evaluation Center	Steve Winquist, SAMPI
Al Poole, OIT	Joel Fletcher, OIT
Erik Conover, OIT	Chad Stec, DOSA
Tom Meldrim, OIT	Dave "GD" Gaurav, College of Aviation
Mark Scafaria, Physical Plant	Ron Schubot, OIT
Demecka Richardson, NCASI	Andrew Phelps, ATIS
Paul Schneidenbach, OIT	Joe Mainwaring, Athletics
Tom Birkenbach, Aux Enterprise	Dave Longjohn, EUP

The minutes from the last meeting on 11/13/07 were reviewed:

- The minutes were approved with one correction
- The following names were requested to be added to the LAN Manager's distribution list:
  - Paul Schniedenbach
  - Joe Mainwaring (ATHL-Sysadmin)
  - Jim Gilchrist
  - Fawn Callen
- The procedure for future minutes processing will be to distribute them via the LAN-Administrators list for review with final approval at the next meeting after which they will be made available to the public.

LAN-Managers Group structure and relationship to other groups:

- Group Structure
  - Sub-groups of the LAN Managers group should include:
    - NetWare/GroupWise/Linux
    - Active Directory
    - Anti-Virus
  - College Reps should continue to be a separate group
- Relationship to other groups
  - What other groups should be notified of our actions and how?
    - Any actions that must be coordinated with other groups need to be directly distributed to individuals of those groups as delays in getting such items on agendas and into the meetings of other groups will greatly delay any actions taken by the LAN Managers Group
    - To whom should group decisions be communicated and why? Should there be a combined distribution across the various lists to disseminate information?
    - Can the Help Desk Blog be used for this purpose and if so should all LAN Managers be on the Help Desk Blog? No, not appropriate.

- Should there be a combined distribution across the various lists to disseminate information?
  - OIT should continue to communicate to the LAN Managers issues that specifically require their reaction when possible
    - Is there other OIT distributions list that should be distributed to LAN Managers?
    - Can Fawn include LAN Managers in her distributions in the future? Yes

#### LAN Managers Group mission

Do we need to define goals and purposes? Not at this time.

#### SLP Service designations

- LAN Managers are encouraged to reference DNS names instead of IP# because the IP# will change in the future and clients will have to be reconfigured.
- There will be a third SLP designator in the future: DA3
  - Do not use the DA3 designator until told to do so – continue using only “da1.edir.wmich.edu” and “da2.edir.wmich.edu”

#### SuSE/OES testing status

- Two machines have now been installed
  - Including test GroupWise domains and test user moves

#### E-Mail review by the Executive Advisory Board for Information Technology

- The board will be re-evaluating current e-mail systems
  - Delays may impact existing GW upgrade process
    - An evaluation of Mirapoint/Merit e-mail appliance product is planned – an in house presentation may take place.
    - CMU has implemented the Mirapoint system – could we get feedback from them?
    - Delays may cause GW and NetWare stability problems - stop gap measures will need to be implemented to keep GW/NetWare running – any change over could not be completed until 2009 at the earliest.
    - A move from GW to another e-mail system would cause massive disruptions
    - Other GW related functions impacted could be Blackberry and other mobile device integration.
    - Possible temporary measures
      - Splitting post offices between additional servers
        - Could delay main implementation if OK should be given in the middle of splitting post offices
      - Moratorium on new GroupWise accounts and on granting extra space to existing accounts
  - What is the purpose and scope of the evaluation? – any change will have to include more than just a technical evaluation – to will have to have buy in from all areas of faculty and staff.
  - How will the evaluation process be managed? What criteria will be used?
  - What will be the timeline for the evaluation? If an initial judgment that alternatives do not provide certain features the process can be shortened

- May delay moving forward on non e-mail projects
  - - including moving other NetWare dependencies to other platforms
- Many departments are already budgeting for upgrades in their GW/NetWare infrastructure.
  - Joel asked LAN Managers to provide scenarios of how the various departments use GroupWise.
    - i.e. folder sharing; resource accounts; calendar collaboration features; mail encryption features; account proxies etc
  - Can the information gathered in the Sun e-mail study be made available for this evaluation process?

Action Items:

- Action: check with Ed Kluk to find out if all LAN Managers can subscribe and/or submit to blog
  - Approved, any LAN Managers can be added to the distribution by contacting Ed Kluk. Messages contain brief technical information and acronyms and are not to be forwarded to others on campus.