Common Systems Group (CSG)

March 23, 2004
Meeting Summary

CSG Attendees: Jason Frand, Bill Jepson, Carol King, Greg Kitch, Michelle Lew, John Lennon (for Paul Craft), Kathleen O’Kane, Tom Phelan, Nick Reddingius, Terry Ryan, Ruth Saean, Mike Schilling, Marsha Smith, Eric Splaver, Kent Wada, Steve Wesson, Esther Woo-Benjamin, Don Worth

Guests: John DeGolyer (OIT), Peter Kovaric (CCC)

Agenda:

1) CSG Processes

Following were member suggestions to improve or clarify processes related to CSG meeting logistics:

- If an action is required (e.g. vote), describe the action in the subject line or in the first sentence of the email
- After an email vote has concluded, send results (number of yes, no, yes with caveats and caveat details) to the list
- Meeting documentation that is posted on the web site or sent as attachments prior to the meeting will not be printed and brought to the meeting as handouts - each member is responsible for his/her own handouts. Handouts will be provided if the documentation was not available prior to the meeting. Agendas will always be provided at the meeting.

All suggestions were adopted.

2) Review of Campus-wide Applications

The specific application that is causing concern is Travel Express. It appears that this is a mandated application that requires an obsolete, Microsoft only version of Java that has been ruled to be illegal (non-compliance with SUN standards) and is no longer supported. Concerns include security vulnerabilities (no patches), impact on current implementations of Java, compatibility with Apple OS, conflicts with other system-wide applications (e.g. Bruin Buy), and support implications.

The larger issues are: whether central applications can be mandated without a technical review, who should be monitoring this, and what other applications are being planned that the CSG doesn’t know about? It was agreed that in the long
term, the ITPB Project Development Flow Process (http://www.oit.ucla.edu/CommonDocuments/Process/Project_Development_Flow_Diagram.pdf) can ensure technical and functional reviews to prevent this from happening. In the short term, applications developed prior to this Process that have not been rolled-out should still be subject to a shortened version of the Process.

**Actions:**

- Mike Schilling to ask Steve Duim, Information Systems Director for Corporate Financial Services to describe the Travel Express application to the Group at the April meeting.
- Bill Jepson and Peter Kovaric to make a “fact specific” list of issues/concerns.
- Marsha Smith to work with CCC to gather facts about Travel Express and draft a summary of concerns for Jim Davis and Sam Morabito.
- Identify other planned campus-wide systems.

3) **Wireless Standards Body**

The Wireless Standards Body (renamed Board by consensus) consisting of 20+ people, has met twice and has endorsed the Draft Proposed Networking Standards and Policies document. They have formed 5 subgroups to focus on: 1) Technical Standards, 2) Support, 3) Communication and Outreach, 4) Conflict Resolution, and 5) Emerging Technologies Evaluation. The full group plans to meet monthly as long as necessary.

4) **Chancellor’s Response Action Plan**

The response to the Chancellor’s May 16, 2003 message on cost reduction measures has been operationalized into activities. The Chancellor Cost Reduction Strategy Matrix (Action Plan) is a WORKING DRAFT document designed to track the progress of those activities. There are 22 recommendations grouped under 8 categories: Microsoft Software, IT Staffing, Remote Access Services, Email Strategy, Security, Network Infrastructure, Data Centers, and Instructional Technology and Funding. For each recommendation, OIT is tracking the actions; coordinator, lead or committee involved; the OIT person responsible for facilitation; timeframe; policy implications; and issues.

5) **Chancellor’s Response Action Plan Recommendation #1 & 2: Microsoft Consolidated Campus Agreement (MCCA)**
The deadline to enroll in the MCCA for FY 2004-2005 is May 14. Current system wide enrollment is approximately 37K FTE. The goal is 50K FTE. UCLA’s goal is to increase usage of the contract by 2K FTE. Software Central has launched a comprehensive campaign to make the campus aware of the agreement and enrollment deadline. The CSG is asked to renew current licenses and help with outreach efforts by spreading the word to colleagues.

6) Chancellor’s Response Action Plan Recommendation #3: Internal Job Posting Process to Bid Temporary IT Assignments

This project responds directly to past CSG requests for a system that gives UCLA departments the opportunity to bid for temporary IT assignments using internal staff before making the assignment available to outside contractors. Benefits of this system could include: direct cost savings, ability to bridge some staff through budget cuts, and opportunity for collaboration.

Steve Wesson distributed a FY 01-02 Technical Personnel Temporary and Career Recruitment Services RFP which listed the estimated annual usage (number of hours) of contract services. Mike Schilling noted that the hours attributed to CTS have been eliminated and that as of FY 2004-2005, CTS’ utilization of contracted services will be minimal. The Group agreed that this data is old and should no longer be used.

Steve also handed out screen shots of a prototype web based project posting bulletin board. Building this web site is one of the first projects available for bid. The CSG is asked to specify the functionality required of this system (e.g. level of authentication, who can post).

**Actions:**

- Steve Wesson to send email to CSG with key questions regarding functionality of project bulletin board web site.


**Security resolutions/principles**

The original resolutions framed by OIT, endorsed by ITPB, reworked by CCC, and revised again by OIT were approved by CSG via an email vote (11 yes, 4 non-voting, and 1 yes with caveat). The caveat was a rewording of resolution #4 (http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents/2004_Postings/March_2004/DRAFT_Security_Resolution_Document.pdf). The resolutions with rewording of #4
were taken back to ITPB and were approved. The CSG also approved the rewording.

**Actions:**

- Kent Wada and John DeGolyer to put together a “final” draft for ITPB and CSG approval.

**Minimum standards**

As suggested at the February CSG meeting, a Sandbox Security working group reviewed the UC Berkeley Minimum Security Standards for Networked Devices document ([http://socrates.berkeley.edu:2002/MinStds/](http://socrates.berkeley.edu:2002/MinStds/)) to see if it could be used as a basis for developing UCLA minimum security standards. The group did a “gap analysis” to see what would work at UCLA, what wouldn’t, and what could be modified to work. It appears that Berkeley’s minimum standards for antivirus software, passwords, no unencrypted authentication, no unauthenticated email relays, no unauthenticated proxy services, and unnecessary services could be adopted by UCLA with minimal modification. Berkeley’s minimum standards for software patch updates, host-based firewalls, physical security, departmental network devices, segmentation of network subnets, standards for departmental VLANs using host based security, and exceptions and compliance require more discussion.

**Actions:**

- John DeGolyer to continue discussions with the Sandbox Security working group. There is a standing meeting on the 2nd Wednesday of each month from 1:30-3:00 in the Technology Sandbox (4328A Math Sciences). Anyone on CSG that has a special interest in this topic is invited to attend. Alternate meeting times could be scheduled if necessary.

**Security incident handling**

The Sandbox Security working group is also reviewing a draft network security incident handling document that describes UCLA’s reactive shutdown procedures. The document, first introduced last year, is based on UCLA Procedure 350.6: Data Services ([http://www.adminvc.ucla.edu/appm/public/app_0350_6.html](http://www.adminvc.ucla.edu/appm/public/app_0350_6.html)) and has had several revisions. UCLA has been using this process for the past year. Issues that still need work are:

- How the Network Operations Center (NOC) and the Network Coordinator (NC) come to closure on an incident
- How to handle Network Address Translation (NAT) devices
What is a reasonable time to respond
Clarify what is time dependent or critical
Specify who has authority to act

Actions:

- John DeGolyer to survey those who connect to the backbone to determine which security services or techniques are in use. CSG will preview the survey questions.
- John DeGolyer to continue discussions with the Sandbox Security working group to produce the next draft document.

Blocking at the border

Kent Wada described considerations for permanent blocks at UCLA’s border. This has implications for use of VPNs. AIS is interested in who would be affected.

Actions:

- John DeGolyer to start discussions with the Sandbox Security working group about what should be blocked at the border.


The ITPB has approved moving forward with a process to identify data centers that house mission-critical data and applications in order to determine the risks to the University associated with those centers. UC Business and Finance Bulletin IS-3: [http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/bfb/bfbis.html](http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/bfb/bfbis.html) specifies the parameters used to define mission-critical applications. However, it does not clearly address research and instructional data. The Group felt that more clarification is needed in order to understand the grayer areas. UCLA’s Controller’s office has developed a questionnaire to help identify computing environments across campus. The CSG was given 4 sample questions but would like to see the entire questionnaire (27 questions). Everyone felt this topic needs more discussion and the goals of this project need clarification. It will be revisited at the next meeting.

Actions:

- Esther Woo-Benjamin to send UCLA Computer Environment Questionnaire to CSG; CSG to determine if the questions are the right ones.
- Mike Schilling to provide list of network wiring closets.
- CSG to provide list of server rooms (not network equipment rooms) under their purview (by next meeting).
- CSG to review the complete set of IS-3 standards: [http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/bfb/bfbis.html](http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/bfb/bfbis.html)

### Meeting Schedule for Remainder of 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 28</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>