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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISMA</td>
<td>Financial Integrity and State Manager’s Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSUAM</td>
<td>Integrated California State University Administrative Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDR</td>
<td>Information Technology Disaster Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDRP</td>
<td>Information Technology Disaster Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>State Administrative Manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor during the last quarter of 2010, the Board of Trustees, at its January 2011 meeting, directed that Information Technology Disaster Recovery (ITDR) continue to be reviewed. The Office of the University Auditor had previously reviewed ITDR for financial systems in the biennial Financial Integrity and State Manager’s Accountability (FISMA) and Auxiliary Organization audits.

We visited the California State University, Channel Islands campus from March 7, 2011, through March 11, 2011, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

Our study and evaluation did not reveal any significant internal control problems or weaknesses that would be considered pervasive in their effects on ITDR controls. However, we did identify other reportable weaknesses that are described in the executive summary and body of this report. In our opinion, the operational and administrative controls for ITDR activities in effect as of March 11, 2011, taken as a whole, were sufficient to meet the objectives stated in the “Purpose” section of this report.

As a result of changing conditions and the degree of compliance with procedures, the effectiveness of controls changes over time. Specific limitations that may hinder the effectiveness of an otherwise adequate system of controls include, but are not limited to, resource constraints, faulty judgments, unintentional errors, circumvention by collusion, and management overrides. Establishing controls that would prevent all these limitations would not be cost-effective; moreover, an audit may not always detect these limitations.

The following summary provides management with an overview of conditions requiring attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [ ] refer to page numbers in the report.

ALTERNATIVE PROCESSING FACILITY [8]

The campus had not established an alternate processing facility that would be used in the event of a disaster affecting the data center.

END-USER MANAGEMENT [8]

The campus had not established policies requiring documented management review and approval of the campus information technology disaster recovery plan (IT DRP).

SECURITY MEASURES [9]

The data center was not using an intrusion alarm system.

DISASTER RECOVERY TESTS [10]

The campus had not designed a comprehensive plan to test the recovery plan strategies.
EMERGENCY RESPONSE TRAINING [11]

Emergency and disaster instructions were not posted prominently throughout the data center or on the employee bulletin board.

DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING [11]

The campus had not completed a business impact assessment to determine the data processing requirements needed to create a viable IT DRP. In addition, the current written plan for the overall recovery of IT services needed to be updated.
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Information Technology Disaster Recovery (ITDR) planning is a specific subset of an entity’s business continuity planning process that addresses how the IT resources required to operate critical business functions will be restored in a timely and effective manner following a disaster. ITDR planning requires the interaction of individuals at every level of an organization and a recognition by the organization that, in today’s computer-driven work environment, the loss of data processing capabilities can lead to significant financial loss and non-financial exposures if an organization has not planned properly for such an occurrence.

The ITDR planning process requires the evaluation and consideration of several factors, including:

- Who will coordinate the recovery activities, and which supporting groups will report to that coordinator.

- How business units will be impacted if data processing capabilities are lost.

- Which IT systems are critical to support those business units.

- How systems will be restored in the event of a disaster, whether alternate processing facilities will be necessary, whether backup hardware should be stockpiled, and whether insurance coverage will be needed to cover the costs of recovery activities.

- The kind of training individuals involved with the recovery activities will need to ensure they will be prepared to respond to a disaster in a concise and coordinated manner.

- What incidents have occurred in the past that tested the recovery capabilities of the IT systems, how plans have been modified as a result of the incidents, and what simulated testing is required to refine the effectiveness of the plan.

Because organizational and operational design variances exist between the 23 campuses and the Office of the Chancellor, each campus process must consider many unique factors. Campuses have been directed to prepare ITDR plans for disasters via multiple directives, including, but not limited to, State Administrative Manual (SAM) §5355-5355.2, Executive Order (EO) 1014, and the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) §8085.0.

SAM §5355-5355.2 directs state agencies to develop, implement, test, and modify disaster recovery plans, including plans specific to IT assets. SAM §5355 states that agencies must take appropriate steps to identify the impact of potential losses, maintain viable recovery strategies and plans, and ensure that essential business functions will continue in the event of a disaster. SAM §5355.1 states that, in developing an ITDR plan, agencies should provide for the continuity of computing operations in support of critical business functions, minimize the need for decision-making during a disaster and subsequent recovery, and plan for the migration of computing resources toward resumption of operational capacity in an expeditious and efficient manner. In preparing such a plan, SAM §5355.1 directs that ongoing testing, analysis, and modification of plan assumptions and activities must occur. SAM §5355.2 states that each
agency must maintain a list of computer applications that are critical to agency operations, information assets required by such applications, and a method by which such applications will be reestablished.

EO 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Program*, dated October 8, 2007, provides detailed guidance to campuses for creating, implementing, and maintaining a business continuity program that includes an ITDR plan. EO 1014 states that goals, which must be met by such a program, include, but are not limited to:

- Maintaining a program on each campus that ensures the continuity of essential functions or operations following a catastrophic event.
- Establishing recovery goals and objectives for the campus that reflect the needs of the campus and its business units.
- Identifying functions and assets that are essential to the operational continuity needed to support the campus’ mission.
- Recommending recovery strategies based on the circumstances of various events.
- Listing, prioritizing, and establishing recovery time objectives for essential functions, systems, and applications through business impact analyses and risk assessments.
- Establishing and testing alternate data processing capabilities, if deemed necessary.
- Protecting and safeguarding vital database systems and data assets.
- Reviewing, testing, modifying, and validating recovery plans in terms of campus and business unit expectations.

ICSUAM §8085.0, *Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery*, dated April 19, 2010, represents the most recent and specific guidance to campuses in regard to ITDR planning. Simply stated, the policy directs campuses to ensure that information assets can continue to operate or, in a reasonable time frame, be supplanted by backup systems so that minimal interruption of critical business services occurs in the event of a disaster or other emergency event. While the policy itself does not provide detailed operational requirements, it can be surmised that the campuses must consider a multitude of factors such as restart times, backup and recovery procedures, system security (environmental, physical, and logical), and system interdependence and redundancy to ensure a satisfactory level of continued operational capacity.
PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to ITDR planning and to determine the adequacy of controls that ensure compliance with relevant governmental regulations, Trustee policy, Office of the Chancellor directives, and campus procedures.

Within the audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- The administration of the ITDR program incorporates a defined mission, stated goals and objectives, and clear lines of organizational authority and responsibility, and is adequately funded.

- The ITDR plan is reviewed and modified on a regular basis, and modifications reflect the needs of the campus and the business units.

- Adequate system redundancy or alternate processes exist to ensure minimal interruption of critical business services.

- System backups and record retention are sufficient to meet the recovery objectives of the campus.

- Initiatives and investments are underway to improve ITDR planning and maximize ITDR resources; risks specific to the campus have been identified; and policies and procedures are current, comprehensive, and sufficient to support campus ITDR planning.

- An adequate emergency operations center (EOC) exists; sufficient equipment, supplies, and other critical resources are properly provisioned; and the campus is fully prepared for emergencies affecting data processing activities.

- The ITDR plan clearly identifies who has authority and responsibility for emergencies and incidents, and the emergency organization is sufficient to ensure that campus command/incident command techniques provide command and control when emergency incidents occur.

- ITDR resources are available; plans have been updated appropriately; and plans are integrated with the campus business continuity plan.

- Previous incidents were mitigated in a timely manner; lessons learned were evaluated; appropriate after-action reports were prepared; and sufficient plans for mitigation of any such incidents in the future are in place.

- Simulated tests of plan components are routinely scheduled, and after-action reports and modifications are generated.

- The potential outage times expected while executing the ITDR plan have been adequately communicated to and coordinated with the campus community, and emergency communications and operations are adequately coordinated and managed.
The campus business units have taken an active role in determining the prioritization of systems and their recovery time expectations.

Sufficient training has been provided to employees, disaster recovery staff, and building marshals who are expected to execute the ITDR plan; and the finance function has been integrated into the disaster recovery activities.

The ITDR plan is written so that a competent individual or group of individuals who are unfamiliar with the campus’ systems would be able to execute a portion or all of the recovery steps if needed.
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The proposed scope of this audit was presented in Attachment A of Audit Agenda Item 2 during the January 25 and 26, 2011, meeting of the Committee on Audit. The attachment stated that the ITDR audit would include a review of Trustee policy, systemwide directives, campus policies and procedures, the essential functions or operations following a catastrophic event, business impact analysis and risk assessment, business continuity and disaster recovery plans, testing and exercising of plans, plan maintenance, communications, training, and necessary retention of key records.

The scope of this audit is focused on the campus’ ITDR planning specific to a disaster only affecting data processing services.

Our study and evaluation was conducted in accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors and included the audit tests we considered necessary in determining that operational and administrative controls are in place and operative. This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with state and federal laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. The audit review focused on procedures in effect during fiscal year 2010/11. In instances wherein it was necessary to review annualized data, calendar years 2010 and 2011 were the periods reviewed.

Based upon this assessment of risks, we specifically included within the scope of our review the following:

- The ITDR planning management organization.
- The ITDR plan for all critical campus data processing activities.
- Disaster recovery plan guidelines, policies, procedures, and recordkeeping.
- The building marshal program, emergency action plans, and campus emergency hotline, as it relates to IT disasters.
- The EOC, emergency equipment, and related emergency supplies applicable to ITDR.
- Coordination with other agencies and vendors, including mutual aid and assistance.
- Funding and budgetary controls for disaster recovery planning activities.
- Communication of the disaster recovery plan.
- Training for emergency activities affecting data processing.
- Evacuation drills and emergency plan testing affecting campus data processing facilities.
- Backup and retention of system data.
OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

ALTERNATIVE PROCESSING FACILITY

The campus had not established an alternate processing facility that would be used in the event of a disaster affecting the data center.

Executive Order (EO) 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Program*, dated October 8, 2007, states that campuses must meet certain goals in their information technology (IT) disaster recovery programs, including establishing and testing alternate data processing capabilities, if deemed necessary.

State Administrative Manual (SAM) §5355 states that agencies must have a plan that maintains viable strategies to ensure that critical information assets are available for continued business operations.

SAM §5355.1 states that disaster recovery plans and other IT procedures should be developed to ensure that critical services and applications are restored as quickly as possible and with minimal loss of data.

The chief information officer (CIO) stated that the campus has been exploring alternatives and soon will identify and document an alternate location.

Failure to establish an alternate processing facility could increase the anticipated time frame for recovery.

**Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus establish an alternate processing facility to be used in the event of a disaster affecting the data center.

**Campus Response**

We agree. We are currently researching alternative processing facilities. We will have the alternate facility identified and in production by February 28, 2012.

END-USER MANAGEMENT

The campus had not established policies requiring documented management review and approval of the campus information technology disaster recovery plan (IT DRP).

EO 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Program*, dated October 8, 2007, states that campuses must meet certain goals in their IT disaster recovery programs, including reviewing, testing, modifying, and validating recovery plans in terms of campus and business unit expectations.
SAM §5355 states that agencies must have a plan that maintains viable strategies to ensure that critical information assets are available for continued business operations.

SAM §5355.1 states that disaster recovery plans and other IT procedures should be developed to ensure that critical services and applications are restored as quickly as possible and with minimal loss of data.

The CIO stated that he was unaware that the campus was required to document management review and approval of the campus ITDRP.

Lack of documented management review and approval of the campus ITDRP could lead to misunderstanding and confusion regarding management expectations for recovery of operations.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus develop and implement policies requiring documented management review and approval of the campus IT DRP.

Campus Response

We agree. The plan is in progress. We will complete the initial plan by November 30, 2011.

SECURITY MEASURES

The data center was not using an intrusion alarm system.

EO 1014, California State University Business Continuity Program, dated October 8, 2007, states that campuses must meet certain goals in their IT disaster recovery programs, including protecting and safeguarding vital database systems and data assets.

SAM §5355 states that agencies must have a plan that maintains viable strategies to ensure that critical information assets are available for continued business operations.

SAM §5355.1 states that disaster recovery plans and other IT procedures should be developed to ensure that critical services and applications are restored as quickly as possible and with minimal loss of data and that ongoing testing, analysis, and modification of plan assumptions and activities must occur.

The CIO stated that the campus had been evaluating systems and will soon have an active intrusion system in place.

Failure to use an intrusion alarm system for the data center could lead to theft or damaged equipment.
**Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus use an intrusion alarm system for the data center.

**Campus Response**

We agree. The intrusion alarm system has been redesigned and the equipment ordered. It will be installed and in operation by November 30, 2011.

**DISASTER RECOVERY TESTS**

The campus had not designed a comprehensive plan to test the recovery plan strategies.

SAM §5355.1 states that a disaster recovery plan should be designed such that the requirement for decision-making during and after an event is minimized and individuals are provided direction in as clear and concise a manner as possible. In addition, disaster recovery plans must be viable, fully documented, and tested.

EO 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Program*, dated October 8, 2007, states that the campus must keep all business continuity-related plans current, must test all plans for viability, and must reference all materials necessary to recover from a disaster.

Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) §8085.0, *Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery*, dated April 19, 2010, states, in part, that campuses must ensure that information assets can continue to operate or be supplanted by backup systems so that minimal interruption of critical business services occurs in the event of a disaster.

The CIO stated that the campus is in the process of developing a test plan.

The absence of a current, tested, and easily executable disaster recovery plan can result in unnecessary financial and non-financial losses in the event of a disaster and can create recovery delays that are outside of management expectations.

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus design a comprehensive plan to test the recovery plan strategies.

**Campus Response**

We agree. Our inventory of systems and services is complete, and the plan is being prepared. The plan will include a phased, multi-year test plan with annual test exercises. The first exercise will be completed and documented by February 29, 2012.
EMERGENCY RESPONSE TRAINING

Emergency and disaster instructions were not posted prominently throughout the data center or on the employee bulletin board.

SAM §5355 states that agencies must have a plan that maintains viable strategies to ensure that critical information assets are available for continued business operations.

SAM §5355.1 states that disaster recovery plans and other IT procedures should be developed to ensure that critical services and applications are restored as quickly as possible and with minimal loss of data.

The CIO stated that he was unaware of the requirement to post emergency and disaster instructions throughout the data center or on the employee bulletin board.

Failure to post emergency and disaster instructions on the employee bulletin board could lead to misunderstanding and confusion in the event of a disaster or emergency.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus post emergency and disaster instructions prominently throughout the data center and on the employee bulletin board.

Campus Response

We agree. A plan summary and contact information will be prepared and posted by November 20, 2011.

DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING

BUSINESS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The campus had not completed a business impact assessment to determine the data processing requirements needed to create a viable IT DRP.

Specifically, the business impact assessment should include the following:

- Specific recovery timelines to ensure the IT DRP satisfies business needs.
- Estimation of the financial/non-financial losses and hardships that would result from an interruption of computer services lasting a week, two weeks, four weeks, or eight weeks.
- Manual desk procedures end-users could use during an extended outage of computer services.
- An inventory of all equipment, printed forms, and supplies used in the normal course of business.
The recording of all predecessor-successor relationships, including whether critical applications require input from secondary applications.

SAM §5355 states that agencies must have a plan that maintains viable strategies to ensure that critical information assets are available for continued business operations.

SAM §5355.2 states that each agency must maintain a disaster recovery plan that identifies the systems that are critical to the agency’s operations, the information assets required to operate the systems, and a tested process by which the systems will be restored.

EO 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Plan*, dated October 8, 2007, states that the campus must develop plans to protect all critical data assets to ensure minimum data loss and continued business functionality in the event of a disaster.

ICSUAM §8085.0, *Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery*, dated April 19, 2010, states, in part, that campuses must ensure that information assets can continue to operate or be supplanted by backup systems so that minimal interruption of critical business services occurs in the event of a disaster.

The CIO stated that the IT DRP planning efforts are still a work in progress and that the IT DRP will address the recommended items.

Failure to properly determine the business impact of a loss of data processing services prevents the campus from determining how long business operations could continue before suffering severe degradation of business services or excessive monetary loss and prevents the campus from providing realistic expectations for the recovery planning of data processing services.

**Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the campus complete a business impact assessment to determine the data processing requirements needed to create a viable IT DRP.

**Campus Response**

We agree. Our systems and services inventory is complete, and we will have the business impact assessment completed by February 28, 2012.

**DISASTER RECOVERY PLAN**

The current written plan for the overall recovery of IT services needed to be updated.

We noted the following:

- The IT DRP did not address the following procedures:
  
  - The verification of triggered fire alarms before an evacuation of the premises is ordered.
  - The declaration of a disaster, which would cause processing to move to an alternate site.
  - Evacuation of the information processing facility in case of emergency.
• Powering down of computers in various emergency situations.
• Pursuing an alternative recovery solution based on the severity of the disaster.
• Annual update of the IT DRP and communication of relevant changes to the employees.

- Contact information for personnel and vendors was not easily accessible or provided within the IT DRP.
- Emergency procedures were not easily accessible to key operations personnel.

SAM §5355.1 states that a DRP should be designed such that the requirement for decision-making during and after an event is minimized and individuals are provided direction in as clear and concise a manner as possible. In addition, DRP must be viable, fully documented, and tested.

EO 1014, *California State University Business Continuity Program*, dated October 8, 2007, states that the campus must keep all business continuity-related plans current, must test all plans for viability, and must reference all materials necessary to recover from a disaster.

ICSUAM §8085.0, *Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery*, dated April 19, 2010, states, in part, that campuses must ensure that information assets can continue to operate or be supplanted by backup systems so that minimal interruption of critical business services occurs in the event of a disaster.

The CIO stated that the IT DRP is still a work in progress and that the final plan will include the recommended items.

The absence of a current, tested, and easily executable disaster recovery plan can result in unnecessary financial and non-financial losses in the event of a disaster and can create recovery delays that are outside of management expectations.

**Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the campus update its plan for the overall recovery of IT services.

**Campus Response**

We agree. The plan update is in process and will be completed by February 28, 2012.
## APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard R. Rush</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Aquino</td>
<td>Manager of Academic &amp; Information Technology Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Berman</td>
<td>Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration/Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Coville</td>
<td>Vice President for Finance and Administration (At time of review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc DuBransky</td>
<td>Senior Systems Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Frazier</td>
<td>Administrative Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Gutierrez</td>
<td>Senior Network Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Long</td>
<td>Senior Telecommunications Analyst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 22, 2011

Mr. Larry Mandel
University Auditor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

Subject: Campus Responses to Recommendations: Audit Report 11-30, IT Disaster Recovery at
California State University Channel Islands

Dear Mr. Mandel:

Enclosed is our response to the recommendations in Audit Report 11-30, IT Disaster Recovery at
California State University Channel Islands. Upon acceptance of our response, we will follow up with
your office providing supporting documentation for each recommendation by the anticipated
completion dates.

Please let us know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
A. Michael Berman
Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration

Enclosure

cc: President Richard Rush
IT DISASTER RECOVERY
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
CHANNEL ISLANDS
Audit Report 11-30

ALTERNATIVE PROCESSING FACILITY

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus establish an alternate processing facility to be used in the event of a disaster affecting the data center.

Campus Response

We agree. We are currently researching alternative processing facilities. We will have the alternate facility identified and in production by February 28, 2012.

END-USER MANAGEMENT

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus develop and implement policies requiring documented management review and approval of the campus IT DRP.

Campus Response

We agree. The plan is in progress. We will complete the initial plan by November 30, 2011.

SECURITY MEASURES

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus use an intrusion alarm system for the data center.

Campus Response

We agree. The intrusion alarm system has been redesigned and the equipment ordered. It will be installed and in operation by November 30, 2011.
DISASTER RECOVERY TESTS

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus design a comprehensive plan to test the recovery plan strategies.

Campus Response

We agree. Our inventory of systems and services is complete and the plan is being prepared. The plan will include a phased, multi-year test plan with annual test exercises. The first exercise will be completed and documented by February 29, 2012.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE TRAINING

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus post emergency and disaster instructions prominently throughout the data center and on the employee bulletin board.

Campus Response

We agree. A plan summary and contact information will be prepared and posted by November 20, 2011.

DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING

BUSINESS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus complete a business impact assessment to determine the data processing requirements needed to create a viable IT DRP.

Campus Response

We agree. Our systems and services inventory is complete and we will have the business impact assessment completed by February 28, 2012.

DISASTER RECOVERY PLAN

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the campus update its plan for the overall recovery of IT services.

Campus Response

We agree. The plan update is in process and will be completed by February 28, 2012.
October 11, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel
University Auditor

FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report 11-30 on IT Disaster Recovery,
California State University, Channel Islands

In response to your memorandum of October 11, 2011, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on IT Disaster Recovery, California State University, Channel Islands.

CBR/amd