

Wireless Committee Meeting
650 Kommas Drive
May 31, 2006
11:00 am

Attending: Andrew Goble, Michael Walker, Derrick Albright, Craig Bennion, Nelson Beebe, Pieter Bowman, ?, ?, Dave Packham, Mike Kwiatkowski, Rob Wineriter, Chris Hessing, Bryan Morris, Steve Adams, Wes Tolman, Jon Ross, Will Aoki, ?, Isaac Jeppson, Hang Wong, Bo Mendenhall

I. UConnect network

- A. Summer 2006 planned changes: SSID secure.utah.edu will go away. UConnect.utah.edu will replace. Dynamic WEP will be dead; WPA with TKIP and WPA2 with TKIP and CCMP encryption methods. Tentatively planning first part of August 2006. This will break everyone who is currently configured.
- B. Overlap period for Fall Semester – Chris suggests we turn UConnect on as soon as ITAC approves it; set a secure “dead” date; login page with big message to move over from old to new network. Deadline? December? Limited number of SSIDs on hardware so a department may need to turn it off sooner (insecure.utah.edu can be turned off now, if you like). Secure should be left on until UConnect is approved and in place; turned off no later than December 18, 2006 (Monday after finals) – this is for departments. For OIT: core service of UConnect could be in place (with ITAC approval) by July 1st for testing and use by IT Managers. It must be turned on and tested for enterprise use by August 23rd.
- C. **UConnect Timeline:**
 - 1. June ITAC approval (6-15-06)
 - 2. UConnect turned on asap (6-16-06)
 - 3. UConnect production: July 15, 2006 – bugs worked out, students/depts can use
 - 4. Secure pop-up page with UConnect transition message – on UConnect production day (Clean Access VLAN redirect – Dave Packham’s comment)
 - 5. Secure could be turned off around Fall Break (Oct 13th)
 - 6. Secure must be turned off by December 31, 2006
 - 7. Departments have their own discretion in between these dates
- D. Committee objections? Want to outline recommendations and take them to ITAC in June. Unanimous “vote” on the timeline.
- D. The SSID spelling will be all lower case: uconnect.utah.edu
- E. Putting UConnect on outdoor towers has positives and negatives – lots of people will see it but not be able to get back to it. Bryan sees this as a Phase II thing. It will change over time and should be revisited in the future. Initially – not on high building antennae. Fort Douglas Officers Club coverage? They make groups pay \$25 to use it; Rob W. will talk to Perry about changing this.

F. Tasks:

- Clean Access redirect pages – due 7-15-06
- Documentation on campus wireless page – due 7-15-06
- ITAC UConnect proposal: Andrew will work on this and will ask for assistance.

II. Wireless Standards document

- A. Foundry isn't in here – College of Science needs to use it. Dave P: task force funding will not buy anything but Aruba or Trapeze from here on out. If you already have a Cisco or Foundry AP, that's okay. Change language to allow for exceptions – variance. Why are those vendors excluded? They will both do WPA and WPA2; it comes down to support through the NOC. Jon Ross: moving from a model of a department bringing up a network and connecting to campus to a centralized model. Should it be encouraged that departments just do a full OIT-implemented/supported system? Reasonable SLA for a canned service to be provided, then departments should be okay with it. It's just the previous investment. Steve Hess is committed to keeping departments who have used Task Force funding to implement wireless up-to-date. Task Force funding – who is going to mandate what? Out of the scope of this committee but must be addressed before this document can be finalized. Original white paper was written that any vendor was okay if it met the specifications. Dave Huth and Steve Hess need to address this. Chris: campus task force money has been used only for campus solution. How are departments supposed to move over from Cisco or Foundry? Need clarification – this has likely been decided already at ITAC and ITC. Need this clearly documented where everyone can see it. This document should not have vendors mentioned in it. That can be defined somewhere else. This standards document must include roaming, however, and that is currently a proprietary solution. Today – must pick a single vendor or choose a 3rd party mechanism to make it happen. Roaming is going to be a hurdle for this committee. Jon Ross: if the financial burden was removed, CoB would have no problem replacing Cisco with Trapeze. Moving to a centrally-provided solution, but departments who jumped into wireless early shouldn't be penalized (into the future). Need to put this in the ITAC recommendation. College of Science is into it about \$100K.
- B. Two switching architectures on campus now (Trapeze and Aruba). Roaming is available within each of those systems. How to make roaming available between them . . . Bryan Morris is the lead on that sub-committee. May be topic for the next meeting. Roaming doesn't need to be in this standards document.
- C. Hardware piece should be pulled out – be more neutral and standards-based in this document. Dave Huth asked Dave Packham to put the hardware specs in this draft; may need to include a definition about “blessed” hardware and an “exception” for non-blessed vendor departments. Trapeze and Aruba were chosen because (at the time) they met the (then) standards and others didn't . . . this was the Friday wireless group. The fewer vendors to deal with, the easier to accomplish goals of roaming and support. OIT and ITS each chose a vendor that would meet the standards and their needs. It was passed through ITAC and SCAC.
- D. Dave Packham pulled out policy and info on how to do SSIDs (as per Dave Huth's request) in this document. This Standards doc should not include policy or authentication. Authentication is not unique to wireless. Need to clarify ubiquity which will affect authentication and roaming, but may not have to be in this document. Should be done by the

folks running the Radius mesh (Robert Roll). Need to ask ITAC for clarification on authentication. Dave Hoisve will email Andrew with a diagram of the Radius mesh configuration.

- E. Send Bryan an email when your task-force funding hardware is no longer viable with the central campus infrastructure and he'll make the case to have it replaced through OIT.

III. Action Items:

- A. Standards doc is going to ITAC
- B. Documented approval on vendors that are centrally or SCAC-funded
- C. Language on hardware variance or exception (grandfathered)
- D. Hotspot proposal/demo completely done for ITAC (webpage)

IV. Next meeting: June 7th

Focus will be on hotspots, funding