MICROSOFT 365 / TEAMS

At this 10.20.22 Roundtable 55, *NOREX Select Members from Fortune / Forbes 1000 organizations discussed Unified Communication strategy; operationalizing the rapid changes in M365; use cases for a Team vs a Channel; the Wiki app to provide a knowledge base of articles; integrating Records Retention Schedule (RRS) into MS Teams / SharePoint / OneDrive; workarounds used if MS Teams / SharePoint / OneDrive is unavailable; integrating Azure / Azure AD with M365; processes used to manage business requests to add Teams apps; managing access in the SharePoint site that comes automatically with a Team; and internal support structure implemented to support Teams / M365 within IT and / or the business.*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On the topic of devising a Unified Communication strategy, an Enterprise Architect was curious if other organizations were trying to do a best-of-breed or one solution to leverage an ecosystem. An Associate Director of IT with approximately 200 users had tried to economize as much as he could with their Microsoft investments. From a UC standpoint that meant Teams. They learned a great deal when migrating to Teams telephony, which proved to be the biggest pain point for any particular UC strategy. For a call center and the need for call center metrics, he suggested a strategy or solution that is outside of Microsoft. If he could do it all over again, he would definitely look at a third-party Cloud UC space. An insurance organization had gone to all soft phones pre-COVID and no longer has hard phones in the company. However, their customers want a number to call. They use Cisco Jabber to establish numbers for their large call centers for retirement program claims. They are a fully embedded Microsoft shop and have recently updated all licensing to E5 to be able to take advantage of the other capabilities offered with that license. For instance, through Teams, their conference rooms are fully aware. You walk into a conference room with your laptop, and it automatically logs you in and knows you are there. No need to fumble around with connectivity issues to be able to project items from your laptop to the screens and televisions in the rooms.

When discussing use cases for a Team vs a Channel across the organization, public and private Teams, standard, private, and the new shared Channels, a Member is trying to determine when to use the Channel vs when to use the Team for a group of people. His inclination is to roll out Teams to most of the people requesting a Teams application with an understanding that the Channel is focused on the discussion. One organization has established the Team size based on group membership. The group membership was done organizationally. If there was an architecture team within IT, it would be a group. They would have a Teams site with multiple Channels underneath it if necessary. They have followed their organizational structure in establishing the group membership because they did this with their internal file shares that were transitioned to SharePoint on-prem and then to SharePoint Online, and then further on to the Teams and the Channels underneath them. Another organization has open federation for chat and finds that useful to chat with anybody they need to. From a Channel perspective, they have that locked down because they are concerned with IP and losing control of documentation when files are shared out. They use Slack, but also disable file sharing. It is challenging to be able to do this in a way that allows them to control a data loss.

Additional headline topics:

- **Integrating records retention** schedules with MS Teams, SharePoint, or OneDrive.
- **Addressing rapid changes** in Microsoft 365.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Moderator: Thank you for joining us.

TOPIC: Unified communication strategy

Moderator: What is your unified communication strategy?

Johan N.: I'll just elaborate on this very broad question. Probably a few years back we looked at this to say, what are some of the guiding principles we're going to use to select solutions for unified communication, and we probably haven't really revisited for a while. But we have been marching to those principles, because I'm just curious as to what other companies are doing. Are you trying to do a best-of-breed or one solution to leverage an ecosystem? Are there any learnings along with that now that some of these solutions are maturing? We can talk about call center too if that's of interest. But mostly just the UC platform and approach to that was my question.

Dan O.: I can share with you, Johan. We're approximately 200 users so we're a little bit smaller than some of the organizations out there, but we 100% had tried to economize as much as we possibly could with our Microsoft investments. From a UC standpoint that meant Teams, and we learned a lot when we had migrated to Teams telephony. It really gets down to zeroing in on what is important for your organization as it pertains to telephony probably number one, because that's going to be the biggest pain point in any particular UC strategy. If you have a call center and you need call center metrics and / or just generalize metrics at all, you will most certainly need a strategy or a solution that is outside of Microsoft. We were really focusing on that Microsoft piece as well as having as few interfaces and tools as possible for users. If we could do it all over again, I would definitely look real hard in the third-party Cloud UC space, so your 8X8 and other providers that are out there. The Microsoft solution is okay, but there are a lot of quirks to it. Another important part of it - soft phone versus hardware phones was a big sticking point for us. It turned out to be originally a big sticking point, but actually not that big of a deal for us because we normalized it through just hey, y'all did this during COVID so we should be able to make that cutover. Really digging into a lot of those entrenched ideas as to what's normal from a user adoption standpoint, and trying to understand the why on those and where a lot of those pieces came from.

Johan N.: Awesome, awesome. I mean we're well down the path of completing this transition to PSTN to Teams with direct route through audio codes. I would say our experience has been very good so far. One of the things that we are realizing is that for the most part people don't really want the number anymore. They don't want the direct dial-in number, because we don't use it. We have a huge population of people that was sort of automatically you got it because that was something to do twenty-five years ago in order for you to do some correspondence that you were doing. But everything happens over a non PSTN voice or video platform, in our case Teams, where this lift and shift transition to saying ok, well now your PSTN number is coming into your Teams client. It's all well and good, works great. But during COVID we were kind of enjoying not getting these unsolicited calls, and now they're coming back in. And by the way, if you share your cell number, it'll come in there 2 ½ seconds later if you don't answer the first one. Those are the things that we're looking at right now. The other thing we're looking at is we used to have a physical phone in every conference room. And everybody's bringing their phone to the conference room now. I think that's part of what we may need to revisit. It's not much the technology side of it. It's more the fact that we are using it differently now, and we have a different population that may need those direct dial-in numbers. In some cases, maybe

even the folks that would never get them in the first place, being on the manufacturing floor. Then taking maybe some of those and shifting them away from us that used to have them and it was just you had your stapler, you had your tape dispenser, your phone. It was all things that you had had on your desk right next to your cat pictures and whatever else. But that seems to have changed, and I think we're a little bit maybe slow to shift to that. That's why I think we may need a little bit of a revisit and reevaluate our approach. Technology-wise, I think we've been pretty happy. We see vendors leapfrogging each other a little bit. We did have to bring in Zoom as part of our portfolio just because they had the ability to at one point time handle a lot more concurrent connections. It was a little more of a known platform for some of our IREs and board members and those things. But for the most part I think we've been pretty happy with Teams.

Moderator: Good Johan. Let's hear from Buzz.

Buzz W.: Good morning, everyone. We made some decisions pretty much pre-COVID to move to some different directions. We went to all soft phones. We don't have any hard phones anymore in the company. We use Cisco Jabber for that. And the reason went with Cisco Jabber is because we do have to have phone numbers. We have large call centers for claims for retirement programs, etc., and they want that number. They want a number to be able to dial in and call. I call us a fully embedded Microsoft shop. We have just recently updated all of our licensing to E5 to be able to take advantage of some of the other capabilities that that offers, fully loaded with Teams. We do Zoom - obviously we allow Zoom, but we don't use it anywhere within the organization. We only use it for things external to us. Our conference rooms are what I call fully aware. When we walk into one of our conference rooms with our laptops, it knows we're there. It logs us in. We can project on the screens onto televisions. We don't have to go through all the push the buttons and do all that type of work any longer, which has been really wonderful. It's like people now hunt for those types of conference rooms because we're not 100% there yet, but it's like when you have to go to the old style where it's like push this. Is it working yet? Try and unplug. All that went away. It's amazing how seamlessly that works. We also like the ability within Teams itself to set the Channels. We find a lot better document management from that standpoint, because it's just a SharePoint site is what you're creating out there with a Teams front end. We use SharePoint extensively. We've been very, very pleased with Teams. We have a team that their focus is when are we going to roll out all the new features? Because everything's out there. There's a lot of stuff available. We go through a lot of testing to make sure everything works before we roll it out. The same thing with Office 365. There are features that are available now to us at home. I'll say when are we going to do this? I really like this in Excel. What are you going to turn that on right? We have an organization whose sole purpose is to manage our O365 environment. But again, Teams just works. It didn't at first. I think I read an article the other day in Harvard Business Review or someplace. It's the largest used collaboration tool in the world right now with over - it was in the hundreds of millions of users. I see companies that weren't using it converting to it because of the features and functionalities you can do back and forth. That's where we are with it. We are very pleased.

Moderator: Great news Buzz. Thank you for that experience that you've had.

Our UC Strategy provides:
- **Consistent user experience**
- **Comprehensive security**
- **Advanced collaboration tools**
- **Flexibility to scale (Responds to future UC / workplace needs)**
- **Other**

I did add a few bullets here. It was maybe a little bit different angle to strategy when it comes to unified communications with Teams, etc. But consistent user experience, comprehensive security. Take a look at those. And then as Buzz was just mentioning to be able to respond to future workplace needs with unified communications. It just continually grows the technology. Maybe that will spark a little more conversation on this.

John M.: I do have a comment. I do agree with the comments I've heard so far. But we're experiencing a bit more of a challenge on our side. We're dealing with about 30,000 users globally, and we do have a mixed platform. We've grown through acquisition and through organic growth. When you are acquiring other large companies - we have a mixed environment between on our hardware endpoints we have Cisco and we have Polycom mixture. We have Cisco Jabra across the board, but we also use Teams. We have this mixed environment which causes a lot of challenges for end user experience, but also just technology enablement across the landscape. We have had struggles with Microsoft Teams. We do have a number of quality issues, and for conferencing we do hover between using Teams and using Zoom. That is a little bit of a challenge. On the larger side we see a lot of performance issues when we are overseas in China and India and other locations as well. I guess depending on your global footprint your mileage may vary on that particular experience. But something we do struggle with. We do like the flexibility of a Microsoft Office 365 strategy. We're trying to go down that path. But we are finding scaling challenges that we're dealing with.

Buzz W.: One add-on to that comment. We were originally seeing that type of issue. A lot of it was bandwidth and a lot of it was the tool hadn't really caught up to itself. We found some of the features that we hadn't really applied yet. But we had a conference last week where one of the speakers through Teams was in Australia, and it's just like she was here. I mean there was no lag, no anything. The other piece that came up is they were talking about from a call center. We do use some other third-party tools, especially when it comes to fraud detection and things of that nature. That's just not available yet within Microsoft products or Teams. There's some very best-of-breeds out there from that standpoint. We do look at some of those and utilize some of those, but they tie in really well with Cisco and Teams.

TOPIC: Use cases for a Team vs. a Channel

Moderator: This is Brad's topic. What are your organizations' use cases for a Team versus a Channel covering or organization-wide, public and private, standard private and the new shared Channels? Maybe you want to give us a little more information here on the use cases for Teams and Channels. I know a Channel is part of a certain specific Team, is that right? It's maybe a file folder in the group or something like that.

Brad R.: That's correct. And there are a limited number of Channels. I think a standard Channel is 200 per team. As for Teams, you can have 500,000 a Team. We're just rolling out Teams, and one of the things that's been discussed among our groups is when to use the Channel versus when to use the Team for a group of people. My inclination is to roll out Teams to most of the people requesting a Teams application. My understanding is the Channel is focused on the discussion. I'd like to see how others are using it and what various applications - when do they use an organization-wide Team, when do they use a public Team, and how have they implemented shared Channels. Because that's a newer feature.

Moderator: And that shared Channel, is it correct that would have both people within the Channel and then outside maybe, of the organization and the Channel can invite people in or out?

Brad R.: Yeah, the shared channel can be, depending on your external sharing settings. It can be either just people throughout the organization that are not necessarily members of the Team.

Moderator: Okay. Anyone have comments on this or even a portion of these use case examples? People use Channels, I'm sure, correct? Because that would be like a subject matter within a Team.

Johan N.: We basically established the Team size based on group membership. The group membership was done organizationally. If there's an architecture team within IT, it would be a group. They would have a Teams site with multiple Channels underneath it if necessary. I don't know to what extent we have really explored the Channel sharing. I'm sure some Teams have probably explored that more than we have. But I would say we've kind of followed some of our organizational structure in establishing the group membership, because that's what used to happen on our internal file shares that got transitioned to SharePoint on-prem and then to SharePoint Online, and then further on to the Teams and the Channels underneath them.

Brad R.: Yeah, to address what you conveyed, I just have one question. One of the things that we did and I think was an incorrect rollout was we created a Team for all of IT, and then the various sections of IT were Channels. In retrospect we feel like that it might have been better to create individual Channels for the various sections of IT or individual Teams for the sections of IT rather than Channels within a larger team. We did the same thing in HR, for instance. We had a talent and acquisition section of HR. It became a Channel under the HR team and now we're looking at rolling out a separate Team for them.

Johan N.: Yeah, I would agree with you. I think I would have gone more granular at the Teams level, which I believe - I'm not an expert in this space - but also equates to the group membership level. And if you want to maintain some of that security and separation, especially if you have MNA section, or if you have other finance sections that need to maintain some separation from other parts of IT. We have an all IT Teams site where some of our general announcements and that kind of thing happen. But I would say not much really happens underneath that except for some general communication, if I remember correctly. Again, we have our individual Groups / Teams sites for functional areas within IT, functional areas of HR, Finance, those kinds of things.

Dan O.: One question for you. We have not yet started using Teams for collaboration. We're still primarily using SharePoint Online. Have you guys had any Teams in which you built the Team around the idea of a specific area of work or projects, essentially non-departmental Teams to incorporate cross-functional working Teams?

Johan N.: Yeah, we have. I think to some degree they come and go. I'm talking about this as if we have it all formalized. We certainly don't. It's a little bit of a wild West, and we've sort of been intentional about not wrapping too much governance around in order to squash any innovation. At the same time, do we lose track of it? Records retention, those kinds of things that come into play. But we have had efforts where there's been research done by cross-functional teams where temporarily we have put a team together. I'll give you an example. We're exploring some ideas around using Teams as some of our assistive technology for hearing impaired or deaf people and looking at that as being a mechanism for communication with certain devices in a noisy environment and still having effective conversations. That is an example of instantiation of a team that is not following any organizational boundaries or something like that. I mean, obviously Teams allows for that kind of freedom. There are probably people in the organization that are in IT that are a little more savvy on what governance we've wrapped around this. I know that we did go through a little bit of a naming exercise early in the game in order to have some department / sort of functional area within that department, indication of some of these Teams. But that's kind of as far as I can think of it. We've used it in all the above ways.

Dan O.: Thank you.

Moderator: Sounds like governance kind of gets wrapped around this part of this question, too, with the best case for your organization and what would work best. Anyone else on this question for Brad?

Paul G.: We're a small company, only about 1000 users, and we rolled out Teams when everybody left the office. It was our main collaboration tool, and it's done nothing but grow within our organization and helped really the company change its mindset. We definitely used to be the old you got to be in the office kind of a place. Shirt and tie, the whole nine yards. Teams has proven that basically you can work anywhere anytime as long as you've got that internet connection and computer. As far as how we have Teams set up, we do have one organizational site that some use as far as posting information. We do have an information technology site, and we do tend to set up Teams sites based around the different divisions within the company. Then the work groups within, if they want to set up their own site, they can as well. We let users set up the sites. We really didn't want to restrict it and be in that business of managing it. Our plan next year is since we now have an E5 license we're going to start as expiring groups. That's the way to manage those Teams and keep them from going too crazy. I think we're going to start like at like 18 months or something like that, and just keep reminding people if you don't need it, let us know and we'll get rid of it. But if you need to keep it around I think we'll like follow up every 6 months after that. Our Project Management Office has also decided to use Teams for every project. Every project we have going on in the company there is a Teams site set up for that and all the documentation is stored there as well. That's really a thing we're going to try to focus on next year, leveraging the investment in Teams and then the E5 license because you get a lot with it. Also trying to move our document management up there as well. We really don't have any standard there. We've got the standard network share with five million folders buried, in some cases twenty or thirty folders deep. Trying to find something's next to impossible. We really want to focus on moving that. We do also have Teams that we share or we do allow external users. I found it's great to get a hold of the Microsoft people, because if you've got their email address you pop that in the chat, you can get a whole of your tech people at Microsoft. I found it great as an IT person, and I am a messaging engineer for the company, messaging and collaboration. And I find it very useful to get a hold of my Microsoft contacts when sometimes it's hard to get a hold of them via email.

Moderator: Sounds productive. Good tip, Paul.

John M.: Yeah. What Paul said is sort of like what we're doing. We have open federation for chat. We can chat with anybody that we need to, and we find that very useful. But from a Channel perspective, we have that locked down because we are concerned with IP and when we share files out and losing control of your documentation in that direction. We do have DLP and other technologies that are monitoring for IP that's leaving the company, but that gets a little bit challenging. And we also have global trade compliance challenges with some of our products. That gets kind of messy. We also have Slack, which we use as well due to those acquisitions. We do open federation and Slack as well, but we also disable file sharing. I guess that's one of the pieces where we are challenged the most. I think our business wants it, but it's really challenging to be able to do that in a way that allows us to control a data loss. Still looking for a good solution.

Moderator: Thank you. Johan?

TOPIC: Open federation

Johan N.: Yeah, just a question on the open federation. Is that through a request process, or is it indeed open to basically any tenant out there?

John M.: We have open federation so if you just chat to my mail address, we can establish a connection and chat that way.

Moderator: Thank you. Great question, Brad and the team from his organization. Thank you for submitting it.

TOPIC: Wiki app for providing a knowledge base of articles

Moderator: How effective is the Wiki app for providing a knowledge base of articles? Would anyone want to adopt that, or could share a little bit? Anyone using it?

Greg R.: I guess that would depend on I don't know if I recall the Wiki app, but we use it in SharePoint which I know Teams and all of that is based on. We found it very useful. If you've got something that would be beneficial to the rest of the company or your organization, you just you craft a Wiki. You put it in there and then anybody can see it, as long as they know where to go to find it. But yeah, we find it very useful.

Moderator: Good to hear. Thank you very much for sharing that. Anyone else using it? Maybe we can connect Joan with you if you don't mind Greg?

Greg R.: Yeah, that's fine.

TOPIC: Integrating records retention schedules with MS Teams or SharePoint

Moderator: Thank you. Would anyone like to talk about integrating records retention schedules with MS Teams or SharePoint, OneDrive, that sort of thing? I know document management was mentioned, but record retention I think falls in with that. How about that integration, folks? Anyone moving forward here?

Jasen H.: We contracted with a company that promised they could integrate but they didn't realize the effect of Microsoft updates. They backtracked on their integration and have since hired a third-party company to help them integrate. We still have our records retention schedule in in a SaaS solution. That SaaS solution they're telling us the first quarter of next year we can integrate it. In the meantime, we'll be able to download it from that system and then upload it into SharePoint. I won't say what company that is, unless that's allowed.

Moderator: It sure is allowed for us. We like to hear vendor experiences and hear which ones are working. It sounds like they're trying to make it happen for you.

Jasen H.: Yeah, they're trying to make it right for sure. Virgo is the system. I really like the record retention platform they have, but the integration part has been a bugger for us.

Moderator: With Microsoft updates.

Jasen H.: Yeah.

Moderator: Got it, Virgo. Thank you.

Brad R.: And I work with this brand. I work with Jasen as well on the record retention, and I will say that we are just getting started with it. But it's our intent to utilize the MS Teams and SharePoint, even if we have to manually transfer it over from the SaaS system we've employed. OneDrive we're still struggling with how we will implement it for OneDrive because even though we can label it number of metadata that's available on OneDrive is restricted to some extent. You have to do some workarounds and none of them are very good. Applying labels to OneDrive files is a little more problematic. We've got a consultant that is going to come on board that's going to help us with it. We have some ideas, but we're still working on that and would love any input that others have.

Moderator: Anyone else?

Johan N.: Does that plug into the Azure information protection? Or maybe it's called something else. Something on compliance, I can't remember exactly.

Brad R.: It is in compliance. It is a record management section of compliance now. Of course, with Microsoft, you never know from week to week what section it's going to be in.

John M.: Is that the AIP, the document classification is what you're talking about?

Brad R.: Well, yes, document classification. There are retention labels that are not the retention policies but are more individual document specific. They could be automated and most of the people we've talked to have recommended doing that automated and not relying on your users to classify the documents because they may not know it very well. There's a large potential for mistakes. It's better to roll that out on an automated basis. But the automated basis would use other criterion, other metadata associated with the document, and so you'd have to make sure you've got the right metadata in both your SharePoint and your Teams applications so that when you do the automated rollout of the labels they go to the right locations. That's what our vision application is. We haven't done it yet. We're on the precipice of doing it.

TOPIC: Workarounds if Teams, SharePoint, OneDrive go down

Moderator: Jennifer has our next topic regarding workarounds you have or plan to use if Teams, SharePoint, or OneDrive would go down, like a business continuity issue. If it goes down, do you have any workarounds? Anyone focused on that or have a plan in place? What have you used or what you plan to use if your Teams, SharePoint, or OneDrive should go down?

Dan O.: The only thing that we have in place particular to this is our primary 100% remote individuals. As we do our onboarding and adoption with them point out if it's an important directory on SharePoint Online or something that you always want to keep offline to use the always make available offline, because those folks are typically not highly connected wherever they are at. But outside of that, from a larger continuity plan, no. We've purely touched on that at the local level for individuals that need to manipulate files on their own laptop.

Moderator: Thank you, Dan.

Christopher Z.: I don't know if this answers or helps anybody. We use Teams in a way for our P1 major incident bridges. Like it's a collaboration space that we declare P1s. When Teams goes down, which it hasn't - I think once in the two years that we've had an issue with it - we have it on our backup plan for that use case for Teams is to defer revert back to our pure audio bridge only. We used to be on a pure audio bridge, which was painful because of the noise and slow connections. The Teams space that we use for P1 major incident management is much more comfortable and more

robust. But then we obviously have that as a back door. We did have to do it once though. So, if you guys are using Teams for that, you've got to have a backup.

Moderator: Good point, Chris. Thank you. This next topic was member-voted, and a few of the others will be. Are you utilizing or integrating Azure or Azure AD with Microsoft? Anyone interested in any comments here, or the integration with Azure?

Johan N.: I don't think you have a choice.

Moderator: Oh, you have to, okay. So, everyone's using Azure and Active Directory with Azure?

Johan N.: Certainly, Azure AD with M365, or at least the Office 365 side of it you would have to. I suppose on the identity management side of it you could use a third-party tool, but the ultimate conditional access and authentication authorization would happen with Azure AD.

TOPIC: Addressing the rapid changes in Microsoft 365

Moderator: Thank you. The rapid changes in Microsoft 365 and what can happen there. How do others operationalize those rapid changes? Anyone want to talk about that? I'll also get into some of those other member-voted topics. Jump into the chat or share a question you would like to discuss. Anything on rapid changes?

Johan N.: We have basically rolled out I don't remember exactly what it's called because I wasn't as close to it. But you can essentially sign up for a different frequency of receiving updates. And we have these experts in various functional areas within the company that will receive some of these releases on them. This is mostly on the Offices 365 side of it and kind of become the test bed for some of those changes and we get some visibility to it. That's to the best of my knowledge is how we're managing some of these changes, because I think to sit and actually proactively read through the release notes and that kind of thing sounds like a full-time team effort. But because some of the changes are a little bit subtle. I think in other areas we set the expectations that some of these things can change sort of underneath the covers. One example being if you have this robotic process automation that kind of thing, and your bot is sensitive to any minor changes in how you authenticate or something like that, we set the expectations to say that might not be the best place to perhaps roll out a bot. But you're going to have to stay on top of those changes as they're happening. That's not the super fantastic answer. But it seems to be working for us at least so far. I'm sure we get some support calls along the way. Something changed and we don't know why, but I think that's for the most part how we're handling some of this new world of constantly changing as opposed to through any kind of a formal change management.

TOPIC: Process used to manage business requests

Moderator: What processes are used to manage business requests to add Teams apps?

John M.: We do have a process. My team is the one that does the integration of Teams apps. We use ServiceNow, and we bring in applications. We have a customer submission form that says I'd like to use this Teams app. We have a process called Cloud Governance, which allows our information security team, our purchasing teams, and our legal teams to take a look at the application to make sure there's no concerns across that level. Then once we've passed that process of assessment my team will take over and do the actual integration into Teams. We're doing packaged apps that come from like the Microsoft store. But we're also doing custom app development inside Teams to be able

to do enablement of different applications. Happy to talk with anybody if they want to talk through that process or whatever.

Moderator: Thank you, John. The chat is very similar. We have a SharePoint form for that. I'll move this forward.

TOPIC: Managing access in SharePoint site that comes automatically with a Team

Moderator: How are companies managing access in the SharePoint site that comes automatically with a Team? Are you allowing team members to maintain full access in the site? Anything here?

Buzz W.: Yes and no. We scan all of our SharePoint sites looking for things that shouldn't be there and then take action appropriately. For the most part we allow the owners of the SharePoint sites to manage their own access. Then we have parameters set up pretty stringent. We scan on a consistent basis to see if there's any PII or PCI or anything else that shouldn't be out there and then manage that expectation.

Moderator: So, they're scanned numerous times a day Buzz, or how does that work?

Buzz W.: Yeah. We monitor them pretty rigorously. Because like anything, 99.99% of the people aren't trying to do anything wrong, or they say oh, I didn't think that mattered. Well, no, it really does. You can't do this. It's as much a protection for the company as it is for the associate.

TOPIC: Managing exited users and removing them from Teams as owners / members

Moderator: Thank you. How are people managing exited users and removing them from Teams as owners or members? A new way of having to take care of those, another place you need to take care of that sort of thing. Any tricks of the trade here or lessons learned? Does it automate along with the other processes?

Buzz W.: Yes. We consider that a birthright access. When an associate or a contractor leaves, their credentials are automatically disabled to other processes. We have a flow that takes care of it.

Moderator: Great. Integrates right in there.

TOPIC: Internal support structure to support Teams

What sort of internal support structure have companies implemented to support their Teams, their Microsoft 365 within IT and in the business? Certain support structures that you have that are effective for you or maybe you changed things a bit?

Buzz W.: I can tell you what we do. We have a council, like a steering committee type of council that talks about all of them. If it's a feature from the endpoint point of view that goes over into this organization to manage, so Office 365 we're going to turn features when they give whatever that is, Yammer, etc., and then Teams has its own entity that manages strictly Teams. Then we have another organization that manages the Outlook part of it. Any of the changes that are added or decisions made, we have it. I always tell people we've got 30,000+ IDs that we're managing in this place, so you need all that to keep it all straight and do the work. Larger companies are going to need a larger infrastructure or larger staff to be able to handle this, but it's just because of the volume.

TOPIC: Guiding principles to develop a governance

Moderator: Absolutely, an automation. Thank you Buzz. Our final question, I believe, is this one. What are the guiding principles that you are using to develop a governance? Do these principles extend out to your SharePoint Online, Yammer, Viva? Anything here on governance or guiding principles? We've touched on some of them, and more specifically with things like Access.

Johan N.: I would say at least one of the principles we have is leverage the platform and try to get the benefit from the ecosystem. Things like pushing Teams before Zoom, for example, because you get the presence information and other integration. Right click you as an owner of a document and then SharePoint would be able to start a chat on it or something like that. We're just trying to as much as possible leverage the investment we've made in our E5 subscriptions for users as well, whether they think it's for their own good or not. But sometimes we try to push the single platform because it ultimately delivers a better user experience.

Moderator: Standardized with that. Great point. Seeing some heads nodding, too. It's great to see those cameras on when you can, folks. Any final comments or questions you have? We're just at that point of the end of our discussion. Anything more here?

Johan N.: This is probably potentially a topic for a whole different discussion, but has anybody implemented the E911 capabilities within Teams Voice?

Moderator: Good question. Anyone implemented? How long has it been available?

Johan N.: I don't know actually. Some might argue that it's not quite there yet, because I think they've had some availability issues with it. Kind of looking at this is part of our PST into Teams rollout. And do we place common phones in various areas and does that really put it in compliance? We've heard different stories about whether the Teams phone has to be logged in to make a 911 call. And then just looking for what the experience might have been and rollout. But it doesn't sound like this has been widely adopted yet.

Moderator: Anyone do some homework on that yet? More to come it sounds like on that one. Good question, though.

Johan N.: Thank you.

Moderator: We look forward to you joining us again soon. Thank you very much for your participation.

End of discussion

Products/Vendors/Technologies shared in this Roundtable 55:

AIP
Cisco Jabber
Cloud UC
Metadata
OneDrive
Open federation
PSTN
SharePoint
Reams
Virgo
Zoom