Common Systems Group (CSG)

September 23, 2003
Meeting Summary

**Attendees:** Paul Craft, Mats Granlund (for Carol King), Bill Jepson, Greg Kitch, Robert Konishi, Max Kopelevich, Kathleen O’Kane, Sean Pine (for Jason Frand), Tom Phelan, Ruth Sabean, Mike Schilling, Steven Schwartz (for Terry Ryan), Eric Splaver, Kent Wada, Esther Woo-Benjamin

**Guests:** John DeGolyer (OIT)

**Actions:**
1) John DeGolyer to fast track patch management recommendations by forming a workgroup to investigate products
2) Max Kopelevich and Greg Kitch to write a recommendation based on Court of Sciences Wireless Project experiences
3) Mike Schilling to provide wireless registry

**Agenda:**

1) **Email Model Recommendations**

   Greg Kitch on behalf of the School of Engineering expressed the opinion that undergraduate students should be allowed to replace their default published email address with an @seas.ucla.edu address. Since the School offers a lifetime email address to undergraduates, it is important to continue to enable an @seas.ucla.edu published address following graduation. They argue that allowing this would not affect the model since the Chancellor intends to use the actual email address for correspondence. Since each student is by default issued a @ucla.edu address, the registrar, admissions office, etc. would still be able to communicate with them even if that is not their primary published address.

   Paul Craft on behalf of External Affairs announced that they have decided to drop the objection to allowing undergraduate students to forward to an alternate email address. Their main interest is in having access to a reliable email address.

   The CSG voted to endorse the Email Model Recommendations but with a unanimous dissenting opinion regarding the recommendation to restrict the ‘published email address’ for undergraduates. The recommendation for more flexibility in choosing the ‘published email address’ will be taken back to the Task Force.
2) IT Security

As an action item from the last CSG meeting, John DeGolyer compiled a summary of lessons learned from recent attacked and reviewed their effectiveness with the Group. These included attack vectors, perimeter blocks, IDS/IPS, segmentation of networks, back scanning, time set backs, and patching. He also reviewed some increased IT security directions recently endorsed by the ITPB. These include specific recommendations for incident response, campus investment in desktop antivirus software, scanning and general campus-wide security recommendations. There has not been consensus on patch management so the Group proposed that John convene a group to fast track the issue and produce a product recommendation.

3) Distributed Court of Sciences Wireless Pilot Project

Max Kopelevich and Greg Kitch described a wireless pilot project developed jointly by the Campus Computing Council (CCC) and the UCLA Technology Sandbox. The demonstration was designed to illustrate wireless network connectivity which is consistent with the wireless standards document and which is transparent across the units participating in the demonstration, including Life Science, Chemistry, Engineering and the Sandbox. Users can walk into any of the participating units’ wireless coverage areas, connect to the wireless network, authenticate with the campus VPN server, and obtain essentially identical network services. It is significant in that four different groups can interpret the standards document in a manner sufficiently common to allow complete interoperability and can achieve this using different wireless hardware and software. It appears that this model is scalable to the campus.

Subsequent to this demonstration, the units involved also agreed on some additional recommendations:

- Public broadcasting through a common wireless identifier (SSID) - UCLAWLAN
- Private broadcasting through an SSID other than UCLAWLAN
- Use of a common access list or firewall

This pilot did not address roaming or funding for ubiquitous wireless access.

There was a suggestion that Max and Greg write recommendations for the CSG to consider.

Meeting Schedule for Remainder of 2003:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>October 28</th>
<th>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</th>
<th>2121 Murphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>December 16</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>