

UF Exchange Advisory Meeting

Date August 12, 2009
Time 2:00 PM to 3:30 PM
Location 507 CSE
Attending Erik Schmidt, Jan van der Aa, Elwood Aust, Barbara Sedesse, Tim Fitzpatrick, Margaret Fields, Bill Covey, Larry Oshina, Todd Kisida, Mike Conlon

Notes

1. Billing – Tim and Mike will meet to review the billing processes. We have allocations to the various units. The groups will pay by an E to E process. In some cases, will participate in split POs in order to use various kinds of money that are restricted from participating in E to E.
2. The group reviewed the Communicator go-live.
 - The service went live on July 29th with no issues.
 - The units require eCALs for each person using OCS. The eCALs cost \$9.00 per person, per year.
 - The homepage at www.mail.ufl.edu has been modified to add a button for the web version of Communicator which is also accessible directly by the url: cwa.mail.ufl.edu. Communicator webaccess is a web facsimile of the desktop client and means that you can use OCS features from any browser and this would also enable you to do a videoconference or voice or chat regardless of where you are or what machine you are using.
 - We are working on the interface between OCS and the videoconferencing infrastructure. We have been able to do test conferences and are working to refine the user experience in using a videoconference that has Polycom endpoints and OCS endpoints. To that end, we are establishing permanent multi-point conferences that can show up in buddy lists in OCS. These conferences can then be assigned to various Polycoms at various times. It looks like the procedure will be to call the Polycom maintainers, have them schedule a device to participate in the multi-point conference at a particular time, and then at that time, the OCS users can just click on multi-point conference and talk to people using Polycoms on the other end.
 - We are going to explore the relationship of the soft phone capability in OCS to our existing VoIP infrastructure. A meeting will be held later in August with CNS and UFAD people to look at the architectural issues related to connecting OCS to our existing VoIP infrastructure. Following the technical considerations, we will discuss the feasibility of owning and operating such a connection and the utility to various parts of the university community.
3. The MailMeter upgrade was completed without any event.

4. The BES upgrade was postponed. We will work with upper management to establish time when we can perform this upgrade in the future.
5. The group discussed Rights Management Server which is an additional feature that we could add to our infrastructure that would enable us to do fine grain control of email. Users would be able to indicate that an email could only remain in the system for 48 hours, that an email could not be forwarded, or that copy and paste could not be used on an email. We have not implemented these features. It appears that these features would generate significant complexity in policy development, in management, in Help Desk, and other areas of the university. Our current email system appears to meet user needs without the Rights Management Server. In the interest of disclosure, we wanted to make sure that people knew there was such a thing and that there had been a conscience decision to not implement it at the University of Florida.
6. We will be investigating unified messaging and the capabilities of CISCO and Microsoft with respect to unified messaging. We would like to offer this service but it appears that there are significant licensing barriers regardless of which way we turn. We will continue to explore that and report back.
7. A user at the O'Connell Center has requested a change in the BES security policy so that they can use handheld plug-ins to the BES and contact the Outlook Exchange Server. This is currently disallowed by policy. We will work with the user to determine what work functionality is not available to them currently because of our security settings.
8. The group discussed at some length room scheduling and the interface between the room, databases, and UF Exchange. Dr. Conlon distributed a tabulation of the rooms at the university by type for the purpose of discussing what kinds of rooms might be available in UF Exchange. The modest proposal is that we begin with conference rooms only and this represents 753 out of over 55,000 rooms at the university. Following discussion, this appeared to be a reasonable approach.
 - The room scheduling is facilitated by UF Exchange, but in no way are we changing the practice of scheduling. The same people who do scheduling currently will be able to do scheduling with or without Exchange and may choose to use Exchange if they find it attractive to do so. To that end, each room will have a corresponding UFAD group and the departments will put people in those groups as they see fit in order to replicate their current access control procedures.
 - As the room data is used, we will discover varied data quality issues and we will establish a process with Frank Phillips to feedback request changes in room designations.
 - Because many units may choose not to use the room scheduling features, the room busy feature in UF Exchange may not be particularly useful, that is, find an open room is not likely to produce meaningful results. Searching on a specific room that is known to be schedulable using UF Exchange, will produce the desirable results.
9. The next UF Exchange Advisory Committee meeting will be held September 9, 2009.