Common Systems Group (CSG)

September 28, 2004
Meeting Summary

CSG Attendees: Jim Davis, Steve Duim, Jason Frand, Bill Jepson, Carol King, Robert Konishi, Max Kopelevich, Kathleen O’Kane, Nick Reddingius, Terry Ryan, Ruth Sabean, Mike Schilling, Marsha Smith, Eric Splaver, Kent Wada, Esther Woo-Benjamin, Don Worth

Guests: John DeGolyer (OIT)

Agenda:

1) Security

   a) Patch Management Model

   With CSG and ITPB approval of “minimum standards for connecting to the UCLA network” and requirement for a patch management solution to be in place on University-owned desktops, an RFP process was begun earlier this year to select a patch management product for the campus along the same lines as an antivirus product. The RFP process revealed significant differences between the patch management and antivirus contexts. Simply purchasing a site license for a patch management product is neither economical nor useful to all departments. Instead, a two part model is proposed:

   i. Negotiate three, three-year Master License Agreements to allow departments to select, at low cost, what works best in their specific environment.
   ii. Offer a patch management service free of charge to departments.

The CSG recommended:

   i. Proceed with step i.- negotiate three, three-year Master License Agreements; simultaneously work policy side
   ii. Wait on step ii. - see how step i. works, identify holes, then come back to CSG to define what value added services should be offered to departments. A pre-testing service was suggested.
   iii. As a step iii. - develop a plan for wireless users and for personal machines brought on campus
   iv. Keep the current RFP technical committee constituted to work on above issues.
b) eEye Update

eEye and UCLA have entered into a 5 year agreement (through April 2009) for a UCLA site license of general availability eEye products.

c) Filesharing Update

Governor Schwarzenegger has issued an Executive Order (S-16-04) prohibiting the use of state resources to illegally download copyrighted material and UC has specifically been requested to comply. The State Chief Information Officer has been tasked with development of statewide policy regarding the use of peer-to-peer filesharing programs on state computers. The State CIO, UCLA and the studios are working together to solve this issue.

2) Repositioning IT Initiative

The ITPB has approved 1) the nominations to the Functional Oversight Committee (ITFOC), 2) the general approach of an external network review, and 3) a Professional Development Program (PDP) project for gathering information on data centers.

The members of the ITFOC are:

- Jack Beatty (ITPB)
- Alfonso Cardenas (ITPB)
- Jim Davis, chair
- Chris Foote (ITPB)
- Greg Kitch (Academic – Professional School IT Director)
- Kathleen Komar (Academic Senate)
- Mike McCoy
- Sam Morabito
- Kathleen O’Kane (non-Academic IT Director)
- Steve Olsen
- Mike Schill (Professional School Dean)
- Scott Waugh (College Dean)
- Joseph Vaughan (Academic – College IT Director)

The approach on the Repositioning projects is to move through successive phases of precision in analysis:

- Phase 1 is an approximation; these are the numbers stated in the Repositioning IT document; the precision is plus or minus 30-40%.
- Phase 2 is a categorical analysis to see where there is potential; these have a little more detail; some categories are: architecture relative to campus objectives, procurement practices, and fiscal model.
- Phase 3 is detailed planning and assessment in a pilot or demonstration.
• Phase 4 is a detailed analysis; leveraged into a campus wide or broader analysis.

The project that is farthest along is Administration’s email consolidation project - it is in Phase 3.

The network review is in the Phase 2 categorical analysis stage. The purpose is to see where there is potential. The proposed framework on the network review is to bring 4-5 external reviewers on campus in late January or February for 3 days. The first day’s focus will be on getting an overview of the campus by visiting with faculty, administrators and perhaps students to understand what the network is being used for. The second day’s focus will be on meeting with network coordinators and central and distributed CIOs, perhaps in a town hall type discussion and Q&A session. The third day will be devoted to pulling together a high level bulletized report to be delivered before leaving campus. The review team will be include people who have: experience with research institutions similar in quality and size to UCLA, networking expertise, gone through a similar process, done reviews before, a vision for trends with networking. In preparation for the review, the campus will be asked for updates and corrections to existing information collected 1.5 – 2 years ago. New information requested will include network maps, services, and management and operation structure. The objective at this stage is to get information as it exists rather than generate new information. It is important to understand what we don’t know as well as what we do know.

The Data Centers project has not entered the process yet. The proposal is to proceed on a Professional Development Program (PDP) project to gather and model data.

Meeting Schedule for Remainder of 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>October 26</th>
<th>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</th>
<th>2121 Murphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>December 28</td>
<td>2 p.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
<td>2121 Murphy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>