Information Technology Planning Board Meeting

Meeting Summary | Monday, October 27, 2014 | 10:30 AM - 12:30 PM | Math Sciences 5628

Attendees:
Apurv Awasthi, Kathleen Bawn, Jim Davis, Leobardo Estrada, Robin Garrell, Mario Gerla, John Mamer, John Riley, Joseph Rudnick, Renee Tajima-Pena, Chris Testa, Robert Trelease

Absent:
Jason Cong, Jonathan Furner, Warren Mori, Neil Netanel, Chon Noriega, Paul Philabaum, Jack Powazek, Gary Ren, Virginia Steel

Guests:
Mark Bower, Dennis Jong (for Public Affairs), Michelle Lew, Tom Trapper, Quyen Vaillant, Mits Yamahata (for Public Affairs)

Resources:
Bill Labate, Kent Wada, Andrew Wissmiller

Recorder:
Barbara Woltag

Chair, John Mamer, called the meeting to order at 10:34 AM.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Agenda and Objectives
Chair, John Mamer, and Vice Chair, Kathy Bawn, welcomed new ITPB members.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of June 10, 2014 Meeting Summary
The Summary from the June 10, 2014 meeting was approved.

Agenda Item #3: Review of previous ITPB endorsements, transition roadmaps and status with (1) Microsoft EM and transition to Office 365, (2) Google email for students and faculty and access to Google apps, (3) transition from BOL and (4) Box.net (Andrew Wissmiller)

Context for agenda items 4-6 was provided by bringing together and reviewing previous ITPB endorsements, current transition roadmaps, and status for the four service changes as a whole.

Several updates with respect to Box were reviewed:

1. IT Services has worked with several units over the past year to pilot the Box service and now has approximately 2,000 faculty and staff users. They have been working with individuals, departments, and schools this Fall to roll out the service beyond a soft launch. Adoption kits and deployment guides are being developed and focus on the user experience will continue.

2. Plans for 2015 include role-based access control of department accounts (e.g., update Policy 403) and full support for department, project, and group accounts.

3. Internet2 finalized an agreement with Box to double the storage allocation without raising the price, increasing the storage for Tier 4 campuses from 200TB to 400TB.

4. Box for Office 365 has been deployed.
5. A Business Associate Agreement (BAA) is expected to become available as part of the agreement with Box. However, UCLA Health is not expected to use Box even with the BAA in place because of concerns with their synchronization options.

**Agenda Item 4: Campus Data Classifications to guide appropriate cloud resource use (Kent Wada)**

*Action: Review and Comment*

Cloud-based services are widely used by University departments and employees. The risks of employing cloud-based services can vary significantly, including whether a service is offered by the campus, there is a negotiated agreement in place with the provider, local support is available, or a standard consumer account is created without a University agreement in place. There are also numerous compounding factors, including seamless connections between personal and institutional services and devices; and the ease of clicking "I agree" and bypassing traditional procurement controls to evaluate and mitigate risk, ensure appropriate contract terms, and assure compliance with pertinent UC policies and practices.

A data classification scheme underpins a risk-based approach by matching protections and effort commensurately with level of risk. Such a scheme represents a nontrivial undertaking, and UCLA is planning to leverage the considerable thinking UC Berkeley has already done in this space. The data classification scheme will ultimately provide a more formal, consistent, and transparent policy basis for determining effort allocation and balancing security with other obligations and values.

Individual awareness and responsibility remain a key component in data protection. To this end, data use guidelines have been developed for cloud services being offered by the campus, but more education and awareness will be necessary.

The ITPB discussion considered the risk balance between awareness of complex nuances and the point at which individuals will give up and ignore requirements entirely. A multipronged approach will likely be needed. These are considerations for further discussion.

**Agenda Item 5: UCLA’s Institutional Deployment of Public Offering Cloud Services (Google, Microsoft, Box.net) (Andrew Wissmiller, Mark Bower, Tom Trappler, Michelle Lew)**

*Action: Review and Comment*

Institutionally provided Google core apps include Google Classroom, a new application that allows instructors to post content for a class. While the campus still emphasizes use of CCLE, Google Classroom provides another course content management option for posting course content. Google Classroom is currently turned off, but if made available as an instructional tool, it will require some support and resources from OID, ITS, and departments.

Should Google Classroom be made available? If so, how? What should be the campus communications about the application? More generally, there are use and data risk differences between institutionally contracted Google email/Google core apps and personal Google email and non-core applications. Are the distinctions sufficiently distinguishable and can campus communication address these or not.

Similarly, Microsoft has added a new set of cloud services called Office Pro Plus Benefit that make Office products available to all students. The UC system has over 90% subscription to the Microsoft Consolidated Campus Agreement (MCCA) agreement established in 2003, so Microsoft has made this benefit available to...
all students. What are the value, approach, and campus communications for making these services available to students? Also, any individual with an email address that includes “ucla.edu” would be able to get this service in a self-provisioning service model. Currently, UCLA has disabled the self-provisioning model, so the service is not available to students at this time. What is the campus’ role in promoting or managing promotion since self-provisioning is tantamount to Microsoft building relations with individuals?

Box.net is a more managed and secured cloud storage offering with far better performance than Dropbox but without a Health Systems BAA. Box does a good job of encrypting data, and it can be used for some levels of protected campus data but not HIPAA data. There is significant cost savings if Health wants to be involved, but there may be too much risk, for both HIPAA and non-HIPAA data.

The key points of guidance from the ITPB were:

1. There is no doubt that cloud services have become mainstream services. The University can no longer assume that University policies and cloud services can be managed effectively through contract negotiations. While contract negotiations need to continue, there also needs to be recognition that it is not possible to manage all services and contracts, and that the campus community will use these services.
2. The campus will need to establish policies and practices that focus on the highest risk data situations and establish greater personal responsibility and management of some campus data.
3. Campus communications and education that support greater personal responsibility become very important activities. However, the general campus community cannot be expected to keep up with nuanced differences in offerings or operate with overly complex practices.
4. With respect to new services, the ITPB is not in favor of shutting services off unless they pose some form of major risk. The ITPB does, however, understand that new services may be made available (turned on) without promotion or support. The ITPB does see itself involved if major resources, costs, and communications are involved since these services effectively have campus endorsement.
5. The ITPB would like to review and discuss the general approach to campus education and communications.
6. The ITPB recommended that IT Services complete testing and assessment of self-provisioning for the Office Pro Plus Benefit. The self-provisioning will be activated if support resources and impacts are minimal.

Agenda Item 6: Summary of Endorsement Votes on Box.net and Lynda.com and Next Steps (John Mamer, Glyn Davies)
[Action: Information]
This agenda item was dependent on Glyn Davies who was not able to attend. The item was deferred to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 7: Review of UCLA’s IT Governance Structure and Process (Jim Davis)
[Action: Information]
This item was tabled until the next meeting as time ran out.

Agenda Item 8: Next Meeting and Adjournment (John Mamer)
The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM. Doodle polls for the Winter 2015 meetings will be sent out to the Board.