# NSHE
## Campus Technology Officer Meeting
### April 28, 2010
### 1:00– 2:30 p.m.

# MINUTES

**Attendance**- Bob Moulton, Robyn Render, Roberta Roth, Steve Zideck, Steve Zink, Brian Chongtai, Karen Brown, Susan Bunyan, Kenneth Sullivan, Jeff Cox, Mugunth Vaithylingam, Carlo Dacumis, Chris Gaub, Ed Anderson, Jimmy Humm, Grant Dintiman,

**Advisory Group Update**- Steve Zideck stated the last AG meeting had joint participation between the CTO's and the AG. The process went well. Everyone present at the CTO meeting was at the Advisory Group meeting.

**Desktop Audit Issues**- The discussion on desktop audit issues continued from the previous meeting. The discussion yielded the question "why the sudden focus?" The sudden focus stems from a series of network security audits that gave light to desktop issues. Roberta provided everyone a list of the three released audits- CSN, UNR and TMCC. The spreadsheet, put together by Grant Dintiman, outlines the commonalities between the institutions. Grant stopped by to discuss the audit areas and plans for future audits.

The areas that triggered the desktop discussion were computers with outdated virus signatures, software installed that should not have been installed and security patches that weren't on.

Grant stated the scope was the same for all the institutions as was the audit program; however, he has revised certain things as he's moved along. WNC's audit was just finished but the audit findings have not gone to the Board of Regents. GBC's audit just started. DRI and UNLV's audit will follow shortly after GBC. Roberta asked if System Administration and System Computing Services would be audited. Granted replied it was expected. He also stated that at the moment they are going after low hanging fruit since this is the first time the audit has been done from a network security standpoint. The next time around the audit will be more in depth.

Three things Grant is looking for in the audit regarding desktop computers:
* Academic Computers
    1) Are they properly patched? What is the patch management policy?
    2) Is antivirus current?
    3) Do they have some type of system integrity software? A way of managing system integrity on academic computers?
* Faculty Computers
    1) Patch management?
    2) Is antivirus current?

Steve Zideck stated that even though it was not a part of TMCC's audit findings they don't list contact information on their website. Grant stated contact information should be posted on an institutions intranet. Robyn stated something would have to be done to 'think differently' when it comes to communicating the IT contact information to the institutions.

Paul Mudgett stated he would like Grant to attend the next security officer meeting. This discussion blended with the Information Security Officers council update and continues below.

**Identity Management Update with Ciber**- Paul Mudgett stated a requirement of the iNtegrate project is the need for a universal ID, universal authorization and institutional level provisioning for the PeopleSoft application users. SCS has engaged with Ciber in an effort to assist students gain access to their student information in PeopleSoft in all instances and use that same NSHE ID to gain access to institution specific student resources. Jimmy Hum from Ciber provided a presentation on identity management and how to move forward. Jimmy's presentation provided an approach, the goals as interpreted by him, three options and how to implement the best option.

For the approach Jimmy looked at the high level requirements at each institution. The goals that came from the conference calls and working groups are to improve system access for students while maintaining autonomy for campuses to select technology and infrastructure and single user name and ID for students and faculty and a single

password.

The first option provides for a single identity provider that looks at a single domain if using Active Directory across all NSHE institutions.  It provides for a consistent user name and password for students and faculty allowing for sub-trees for each institution.  The pros for single identity is one user name and password, same password for students and faculty, global authentication across all institutions and campus administrators will maintain access to local resources.  The con is that all campuses would be required to have the same technology.

Option two provides for multiple providers with each institution maintaining their own directory services.  Each institution would be an external federation to one another.  The pros are that each institution would maintain autonomy for technology and infrastructure, there would not be any transition issues and campus administrators would maintain local control.   The cons are that students have different user names and passwords at each institution and may have different authorizations which will create issues.  An example of this is when a student graduates from TMCC and then transfers as a graduate student to UNR.  Jimmy said he was referring to the user name in this case.

The third option is a combination of the first two.  The approach is to maintain a central directory service (not an identifier) and maintain multiple identity providers (one for each institution), the user ID is centrally controlled, each campus will use a user ID created by the central directory service and to make things manageable a central portal would be required to change passwords.   The pros are that each campus maintains autonomy on technology and infrastructure, no transition issues, campus administrators maintain control to local resources and there is a single user ID and password.  The cons are making changes in the ID generation process, must use the ID from the central directory service and must create a new password replication process at all institutions.

Robyn stated there is no assumption any of the solutions would need to be locally funded.  She said her charge was to determine what would enable the vision.  She stated that if a solution is found (based on the work Jimmy is doing and the feedback provided to him) the assumption is that the solution would have to be funded independently. She doesn't want the CTO's decision on the options to be based on what it will take or cost to implement.

Paul Mudgett asked what the group was leaning toward.  Steve Zideck stated TMCC was leaning toward options 1 and 2.  The consensus was it was too early for the group to tell where they stand.

**Information Security Officers Council Update**-   Paul stated the security officers council had met for the first time earlier in the day.   Robyn Render stated the institutions presidents have sent the request for a representative but not everyone was present at the meeting.  She thinks there may have been a break in communicating the meeting information to those absent. The council members are: SCS- Paul Mudgett, UNR- Jeff Bruner, TMCC- Tommy Guy, DRI- Braden Piersen, UNLV- Don Diener, CSN- Paul Pelegrino, NSC- John Nicpon, GBC- D.J.  Smith and WNC- Kenneth Sullivan.  They discussed looking at what challenges campuses face and the top issues at each campus.  One of the responsibilities of this group is to share and pass on information to the CTO's and the security oversight group.

Robyn needed clarification about which desktop issues and policy/procedure/guideline concerns are security related and which are non-security related.  She feels the CTO's have discussed this and are more inclined to distinguish between the two.  Robyn stated non-security referred to the technical tools used to manage software licensing and authorize software installs.  Susan Bunyan agreed with Robyn since she was the point of contact with the CTO's and the System Software Committee.

Steve Zink stated this was an opportunity to find a solution and that a tool would be needed to solve this issue.  He also said they currently don't have the staff to accommodate requests pertaining to this issue.  At the moment managing the desktops is not a solution on an academic level due to a lack of resources.  He said the only way for this to get enough traction this discussion would need to come from a very high level.  Steve prefers to not get further involved.  Steve Zideck is for sharing ideas on the subject.  CSN currently uses LAN Desk and are happy with it and will be upgrading next week.  Carlo Dacumis (CSN) doesn't think there is a single solution from a security standpoint. WNC is in the same boat as everyone else.  They will be on the lookout for information from the other institutions as it comes along.  Jeff Cox follows the group's sentiment.

Grant stated he's audited four institutions and the commonality is that almost all are using Deep Freeze.  He said there wasn't a consistent policy on how things are going to be managed and that is where the issues come up.  He said consistency is needed across all institutions. He also said there were pockets of expertise (and lack of it) across the institutions that needed to be shared.  Susan Bunyan will take this discussion to the System Software Committee and will inventory the licenses for tools currently being used and pockets of expertise across NSHE.

Paul Mudgett stated awareness and education came up during the common audit findings. The security council, in conjunction with National Cyber Security Awareness month in October, is looking at developing a common framework in regards to awareness campaigns across all the institutions. He said they will also be developing a common document that will be sent to Robyn as one of the steps in the process of breach reporting. Robyn stated there would be no additional paperwork since it's a process already in place. The only document that goes to Robyn is the notification that is prepared for the institution impacted by the breach.

**Student E-mail and Unix Services**– Chris Gaub stated the student e-mail and Unix transition is on track for the first transition on June 30, 2010. UNLV's switch to Rebel mail has been a success. The next institution scheduled to make the transition is GBC (Big Horn mail). They will begin mass mailings on May 17, 2010 for a June 01, 2010 conversion. SCS will continue to forward employee e-mail to @nevada.edu domains from July 01, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

**Load Runner Update**- An RFP was sent out for vendors to perform load testing. Out of three vendors there was only one qualified to perform load testing. The one vendor's references were checked with a positive response. Genilogix commenced their testing in January and finished in mid April. Their work was tied in with UNLV and TMCC's go-live. The contract with Genilogix requested they do the work in two phases. The first phase was to make sure all the infrastructure and software was in place and to work with NSHE with all the scrips, to do base line testing for the UNLV and the Shared Instances and to do training and knowledge transfer for UNLV and UNR.

During phase one NSHE had Genilogix build four sets of scrips for both instances. The first scrip dealt with enrollment, second was tuition calculations, third was initial log-ins and the fourth was caps/class searches. These became the bedrock of the actual scrips that were developed and used to test the iNtegrate instances. The systems were able to be tested during phase one which demonstrated they were able to perform under nominal load. Also during phase one of testing they noted they needed to make adjustments to the test environments, the test servers and to make basic changes to the applications.

Phase two's agreement was for Genilogix to perform stress testing on the environments. Additional configuration changes were made to the infrastructure environment and changes that needed to be made were made to manage the applications.

By the end of load testing the systems were able to run with 700 concurrent users for extended periods of time. They also tested the systems at 1,000 (load runner license limit) concurrent users with no issues. Chris stated the way the load testing pacing and the scrips were put together during the test environment represented thousands of users operating on a more traditional environment.

**SCS Services/Customer Matrix**- Roberta stated they have been working over the last two years to develop a valid cost of services for the services SCS delivers. Working with the Advisory group has allowed SCS to make a lot of progress and for feedback to come back.

A couple months ago a core group at SCS took the services catalog that was approved by the Advisory Group and provided themselves with a map of their many broad and diverse users. SCS is using a spreadsheet that depicts the services/customer matrix to further look at where they want to learn or look at for additional information. This spreadsheet is used by Robyn and SCS wants to provide it to the Advisory Group. SCS wants to validate the spreadsheet before taking it forward. Robyn would like a quick turnaround on getting the spreadsheet back to Roberta. Roberta would like the CTO's to verify the dots in their corresponding column by next Wednesday, May 05, 2010.

**UNLV & TMCC Go Live**- Steve Zideck stated the go-live went pretty well. TMCC has lessons learned meetings with all the teams involved after all of the go-lives. They document some of the occurrences and hope they can provide this documentation to others during their go-lives. The two most heavily influenced go-lives were student records and student accounts. Jump-start groups, two groups of 70, were allowed to register early. SCS staff, TMCC's IT staff and people from the functional areas assisted with this over two Saturdays. Everything went very well during the jump-start events. He stated that for the most part the biggest chunk of students made it through without any problems.

**Third-party unaffiliated groups use of video-conferencing**-Steve Zink stated he had a request from a non-profit group to use UNR's video conference equipment to contact another non-profit organization. Steve denied the request. Upon further investigation he came upon the video conference policy on third-party unaffiliated group use which does not allow for this. Steve would like further clarification since DRI had provided the non-profit organization with a rate sheet.

The policy has gone through several edits. The discussion was cut off due to the video conference ending. It will be put

on May's agenda.

**Next Meeting:  May 26, 2010**