

Proposed Security Standards for Discussion with BRIDGE 05.21.13

Pros and cons for Keys, Standalone readers, and Networked readers:

	Pros	Cons
Keys	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Low cost to customer, inexpensive to implementSimple technology, high familiarityHigh level systems prevent duplication	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Lower level systems can be easily duplicatedLost keys require core replacement, add costNo audit trail of useNo automation or real time monitoringNo schedule control of key useNo campus lock down capability
Standalone readers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Costs less than networked systems to installOffers basic level of auditing at the doorOffers base level of automation at the doorMinimizes the number of keys issuedMeets departmental needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Significant ongoing costs to maintainHigher cost than keysNo global management, lower data accuracyNo real time monitoringShort lives, high replacement costsNo campus lock down capabilityEmergency responders must be programmed individually at each door, no defined process for service provider or emergency responder additionsSignificant administrative burden w/costTimeliness for removal of personnelLacking location data
Networked readers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Global system-wide management at no dept. cost including scheduling, support, clearance modification, cardholder records, and compliance with federal regulationsSupports enterprise culture/solutionsOffers campus lock down capabilityTime synchronization and data accuracyReduced risk, increased reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Higher installation costData access for formal Police, Audit, General Counsel, Human Resources investigations

Proposed Standards for Keys, Standalone readers, and Networked readers:

Keys	Refer to University Construction Standards Division 8 <u>Override:</u> Best or Medeco (based upon design criteria and customer need)
Standalone readers	Approach to involve stakeholders such as FM, DCS, DEM, AHCRBMS, CPPM, U Card Office, Purchasing, and Customer Reps for product demonstration, evaluation and selection Develop data storage and retrieval requirements for 90 days Ensure additional capacity for emergency responders and service providers Restrict use by staff (<50), doors (<5), and risk assessment (threat/liability) Refer to type of space within Division 28's Security Design Criteria Not to be used for cash handling, pharmacy, chemical, HIPPA, BSL, etc. facilities No fobs or proprietary cards, must use U Card <u>Override:</u> Best or Medeco (based upon design criteria and customer need)
Networked readers	Refer to University Construction Standards Division 28 <u>Interior Override:</u> Best or Medeco (based upon design criteria and customer need) <u>Exterior Override:</u> Medeco

Proposed Maintenance plan for Standalone readers:

Standalone readers will require database management and maintenance outside of the department. Our current costs are:

\$80/hour for service

\$90/hour for design/management

SLA for an estimated \$1000/year per reader (onsite testing, preventative maintenance, and one data update)

Suggest having DCS perform this role, but whoever does it will require a staffing presence for:

Data uploads and programming and data extraction for investigative purposes

Monthly testing, including audit verification and cardholder troubleshooting

Battery replacement, preventative maintenance program

Project management responsibilities for installations and equipment orders

Training

Need to engage the Department Access Coordinator (DAC) for role definition and decision making

Key control maintained with each new installation, with override keys to the Fire Lock Box, BSAC, DAC (or building manager), and Keytrak (where applicable)