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March 19, 2004
Meeting Summary

Minutes (available on web and already distributed by listserv)

ITPB Attendees: Chair Chris Foote, Christine Borgman, Alfonso Cardenas, Jim Davis, Adam Harmetz, David Kaplan, Kathleen Komar, Sam Morabito, Tom Phelan, David Sears, Gary Strong, Chuck Taylor

Guests: Joseph Chiu (PDP participant), Mike Schilling (CTS), Marsha Smith (ATS), Kent Wada (OIT), Esther Woo-Benjamin (OIT)

Agenda:

1) Privacy Board

At the June 2003 meeting, the ITPB appointed a Task Force on Privacy and Data Protection to make specific action recommendations to the ITPB. The Task Force presented its recommendations to the ITPB at its Fall 2003 retreat. At the retreat, the ITPB approved the recommendations of the Task Force, with modifications. Rather than forming two boards, one Advisory and one Operational, the ITPB recommended forming one Advisory board with broader responsibilities. On February 25, 2004 a memo from Chris Foote, with recommendations to establish a UCLA Advisory Board on Privacy and Data Protection was written to EVC Dan Neuman and Senate Chair Clifford Brunk. On March 10, 2004, Chris Foote, Jim Davis, Alfonso Cardenas and Christine Borgman met with EVC Neuman to present and discuss the ITPB recommendations.

EVC Neuman endorsed the ITPB proposal and asked that the board be in place by mid- to late April. He requested the following recommendations from the ITPB:

- **Line of authority**: EVC Neuman prefers that the board does not report to his office. The ITPB discussed options such as IT, legal affairs, student affairs, administration, and EVC Neuman’s office. There was agreement to ask for recommendations from the Senate Executive Board.

- **Board membership and chairship**: In addition to the membership already recommended in the February 25, 2004 memo, the ITPB felt the medical enterprise should be represented; the Institutional Review Board (IRB) should be represented or at least have a dotted line to the Advisory Board; and the chair could be anyone.
• **Charge to the board**: The ITPB recommended the same charge outlined in the February 25, 2004 memo: 1) Establish high level principles for UCLA following Fair Information Practices (OECD) guidelines; 2) Articulate principles that reflect institutional values and cultural expectations of the University; 3) Vet new records management systems to ensure compliance with guidelines; and 4) Promote communication to the UCLA community regarding privacy and data protection.

A meeting with the Executive Board of the Academic Senate is being scheduled ASAP to present these proposals and get their input. More discussion on this topic will be scheduled for the April ITPB meeting.

2) **CSG Preliminary Assessment of Security Resolutions**

At its last meeting, the ITPB approved 5 security resolutions. These were taken to the Campus Computing Council (CCC) and they reworked the wording into 4 resolutions. The new wording changes the tone to emphasize the need for broad community awareness, acceptance and accountability for security. The Common Systems Group (CSG) approved the new wording with one additional change. The ITPB endorsed the new wording, including the CSG change. With this endorsement, the CSG’s next step is to start policy discussions. This is estimated to take 2-3 months. The revised resolutions/principles can be found at: [http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents/2004_Postings/March_2004/DRAFT_Security_Resolution_Document.pdf](http://www.csg.oit.ucla.edu/documents/2004_Postings/March_2004/DRAFT_Security_Resolution_Document.pdf).

3) **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.

Marsha Smith updated the Board on Action Plan recommendations #1 & 2: Increase usage of 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 already represents over 13.5K so increasing UC wide participation is essential in order to meet the goal. Alfonso Cardenas reported that he brought this topic up with the UC Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) committee.
In the context of cost savings through encouraging electronic business via email, a Board member inquired on the status of Bruin Post. The ‘Official Notices’ portion of Bruin Post is operational but there are no plans to implement the Weekly Digest System. The Digest was dropped because of executive concerns that the system does not have strong enough controls over who can post and what gets posted. The Board felt that faculty need the functionality this option provides and encouraged reviving the system.

There was agreement that Action Plan recommendation #22: Evaluate directions for instructional technology and alternative funding models should be discussed as a separate topic at a future ITPB meeting.


The ITPB recommended proceeding with a survey 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. The CSG is being asked to identify mission-critical data and applications and list server rooms within their purview that house this data.

5) File Sharing

UCLA is announcing that starting Spring Quarter, it will be implementing its “quarantine” approach toward dealing with illegal file sharing in the residential halls. Computers in the residential halls that are the target of a copyright infringement claim will be put into a “quarantine area” that is constrained within ucla.edu. This approach allows the student to continue his/her academic pursuits during the judicial process that is managed by Student Affairs.

6) Future Meetings:

- Tuesday April 20, 2-4 p.m., 23167 YRL (West Electronic Classroom)
- Friday, May 21, 2-4 p.m., 2325 Murphy
- Tuesday, June 15, 2-4 p.m., 2121 Murphy

7) Action Items

- Jim Davis and Sam Morabito to pursue reviving the Weekly Digest option of Bruin Post.