MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY GROUP

September 23, 2004
MAG Office
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING
Greg Binder, Phoenix, Chair
*Kevin Hinderleider[1], Avondale
*Dee Hathaway[1], Buckeye
✓Jim Keen[1], Carefree
*Pat McDermott, Chandler
*Mike Ciccarone[1], Fountain Hills
*Shawn Woolley, Gilbert
Ajay Joshi, Glendale
*John Imig[1], Goodyear
Cary Parker[2], Maricopa County
**Dale Shaw, Mesa
**Duncan Miller[1], Paradise Valley
**Jim Labita for Ralph Spencer, Peoria
**Lyn Gillean, Queen Creek
**Kevin Sonoda, Scottsdale
Randy Jackson, Surprise
**Dave Heck, Tempe
*Bruce Johnson[1], Tolleson
*Karen Strickland, ADOT
Bryan Jungwirth for Randi Alcott[1], RPTA

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT
Ronald Page, ASU
Bill Hayden, ADOT
Keith Dolgaard, Computer Consulting Partners, Ltd.
Phil Weintraut, Cox Communications
**Pat Timlin, El Mirage
✓Mark Johnson, Guadalupe
✓Bob Thaxton, Guadalupe
Audrey Skidmore, MAG
Craig Chenery[1], MAG
Debbie Kohn, MAG Telecommunications Assoc.
Heidi Pahl[2], MAG
Peter Burnett, MAG
Elaine Trammell, MAG
Gordon Tyus, MAG
**Annette Weaver, Peoria
Dennis Naiberg, Phoenix
Greg Minton, Phoenix

**Participated via audioconference.
✓ Participated via videoconference.

[1] = RVS Site Coordinator
[2] = RVS Backup Site Coordinator

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 am by Chairman Greg Binder. Voting member Jim Keen attended via videoconference. Voting members Dale Shaw, Duncan Miller, Lyn Gillean, Kevin Sonoda, Dave Heck and proxy Jim Labita attended via audio conference. All members introduced themselves.

2. Call to the Audience

No comments were made by the audience.

3. Approval of May 20, 2004 Meeting Minutes

It was moved by Randy Jackson, seconded by Cary Parker and unanimously recommended to approve the May meeting minutes.

4. Spam

Greg Binder thanked the four guest speakers for attending the meeting to educate and inform the TAG and others on spam.

Dennis Naiberg gave a presentation on the threats, challenges and methods of minimizing spam.

Cary Parker asked if a category was setup in WebSense for filtering. Dennis Naiberg said that in a phishing attack, the suspect uniform resource locaters (URL)s are updated daily in WebSense so access to the fraudulent domain is blocked.

Ajay Joshi asked how the City of Phoenix handles open communication and yet filters spam. Mr. Joshi said that in Glendale the constituents need to be able to send e-mails to their elected officials and the Glendale IT department cannot even bracket the public e-mail as spam. Dennis Naiberg replied that Phoenix filters spam, but has someone(s) look through it all for false positives. Randy Jackson added that City of Surprise has a "stronger" filter on staff e-mail, but also struggles with staff time required to look it over.

Phil Weintraut gave a presentation on spam from Cox's perspective.

Ronald Page asked how many Cox subscribers use Cox e-mail. Phil Weintraut responded approximately 50-60%.

Cary Parker asked if the spam filtering is done at the Cox location or done at the local PC. Phil Weintraut replied that filtering spam for the customer is an optional service. If the customer selects to filter spam they have two options: with the first option, Cox tags the e-mail as spam and delivers it to the e-mail box with spam in the subject line and with the second option, Cox

deletes the e-mail. Mr. Weintraut added that spam filtering is done at a server level at Cox, no software is added to the customer's PC.

Debbie Kohn asked if there is Federal or State legislation to reduce spam. Phil Weintraut replied that the President signed anti-spam legislation in 2003 but it is not enforceable.

Greg Binder asked if it would be accurate to state that the cost of handling spam is built into a consumers Cox bill. Phil Weintraut responded that Cox provides spam blockers to their customers without raising rates because of the reduction in support calls. Cox also scans for viruses and provides popup blocking software for the same reason.

Jim Keen asked if Cox has a setup that allows a customer to specify an e-mail address they do not wish to receive an e-mail from. Phil Weintraut replied that for residential customers, if unwanted e-mail arrives at a customer's inbox they can e-mail Cox the unwanted e-mail address and Cox will put that e-mail address on a list. Similarly, if a false positive is detected, a customer can e-mail Cox that e-mail address and Cox will put it on a list. Jim Keen asked if this policy can be implemented for Cox business customers. Phil Weintraut replied not at this time but it is being discussed. Randy Jackson said that City of Surprise is a Cox business customer and 67% of their e-mail is spam, stating that if Cox could reduce the amount of spam Surprise would greatly appreciate it.

Keith Dolgaard discussed the lack of economical solutions for spam and e-mail content management. Mr. Dolgaard emphasized the usefulness of the tips and tricks mentioned by Mr. Naiberg in his presentation. Mr. Dolgaard discussed various software and hardware products for spam blocking, virus protection and e-mail content management, including Brightmail, Ironport, spam assassin. He informed the group that a product that blocks 70% spam is a good product and it is most economical to purchase a spam blocker with content management.

Greg Binder asked what the City of Phoenix uses for a spam blocker. Dennis Naiberg responded that they use a product called Sophos Pure Message on a subscription service for $28,000 per year for 12,000 e-mail boxes. Randy Jackson stated that Surprise is using a product called Surf Control and it is stopping 90% of spam. Mr. Jackson added that Surprise pays $10,000/year for that product. Bryan Jungwirth stated that RPTA does not use a spam blocker and is currently looking at a free Microsoft product to block e-mail spam. Keith Dolgaard said that performance was proportional to price and that while the free Microsoft product will block some spam, it will likely not be as effective as other products available. He added that there are only ten major internet service providers (ISP)s in the world and Microsoft is working with these major ISPs to develop authenticated e-mail. He mentioned that Microsoft expects this to be in place by end of 2005. Mr. Dolgaard explained that there is no economical way to handle spam. He mentioned an efficient and not very expensive way of handling spam by redirecting e-mail to a company like US Internet that cleans the e-mail for a fee. He said there could be security issues with this but mentioned that the Gilbert Unified School District uses this method to reduce spam.

Greg Binder mentioned that the City of Phoenix experienced a denial of service attack; where the attacker used proxies to hide the source of the attacks. Mr. Binder said that the proxies were located at the schools that unknowingly left an open SMTP relay. He noted that the schools were willing to close the open relays, once made aware of them.

Ronald Page gave a presentation on how Arizona State University (ASU) blocks spam.

Greg Binder asked if spam filtering at ASU was a project and if so how much time it took. Ron Page replied yes it was a project, where product selection took one month of research, and implementation three months including a couple months of software development. He added that their vendor was willing to adapt to the needs of ASU because they were such a large client.

Cary Parker asked why only a fourth of users "opted in" to the spam filters. Ronald Page said that 9,000 of 15,000 users that opted in were ASU employees and the student body has not realized the benefit of opting in.

Cary Parker asked how ESCOM ranks on Mr. Dolgaards scale of one to ten with one being poor ability to block spam and 10 being best ability to block spam. Keith Dolgaard responded that ESCOM is above five but below ten, adding that it is not widely used in the U.S. but it is a good system.

Pat Timlin explained that the City of El Mirage is looking to implement a reverse domain name system (DNS) lookup and asked if other cities have looked at this method and if so what are the impacts.

Keith Dolgaard responded that reverse DNS lookup is impractical for a large enterprise; adding that spammers defeat IP filters by changing Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. He added that a lot of manpower would be used to monitor spam with a reverse DNS lookup system.

Ronald Page added that ASU uses Active SMTP which does reverse DNS and it works fairly well. Mr. Page added that reverse DNS lookup can be done more efficiently than expected.

Greg Binder thanked the presenters for providing a wide ranging approach to spam.

5. MAGTAG Working Group Projects

Randy Jackson explained that the Information Sharing Working Group (ISWG) meets once a month to schedule and plan topics of interest to telecommunications and information technology professionals. Mr. Jackson stated that the group is planning on covering multilingual web sites and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance to web sites at the October meeting; light rail transit and telecommunications or public safety and telecommunications at the November meeting and government web identity at the December meeting. He invited any interested parties to attend the ISWG meetings.

Debbie Kohn reported that since the MAGTAG last met, the Definitions Resource Group (DRG) met a second time. Debbie Kohn reported that the DRG members include economic development,

information technology (IT), and telecommunications staff from member agencies and one citizen from Cave Creek. Debbie Kohn reported that the DRG finalized the draft definitions, criteria and screening criteria for Phase I of the Digital Oasis Initiative. Debbie Kohn reported that the DRG also reviewed the draft registration processes, forms, and timeline for the project as well as the overview and recommendation for certification of telecommunications information. Debbie Kohn reported that the DRG forwarded their recommendations to the Digital Oasis Advisory Group (DOAG).

Debbie Kohn reported that the DOAG met September 22, 2004 and the group includes not only IT, telecom, and economic development staff but also representatives from the Arizona Department of Commerce and the State Government Information Technology Agency also known as GITA. Ms. Kohn reported that the DOAG received an update from MAG staff on the status of the project. She reported that the DOAG is reviewing the draft definitions, registration, and certification recommendations and will provide comments to MAG staff.

Debbie Kohn reported that the City of Phoenix is developing a project called Phoenix Prospector that they plan to implement this fall. She added that Phoenix Prospector will be similar to the MAG Digital Oasis Initiative. Ms. Kohn reported that MAG staff is coordinating with Phoenix on the data collection efforts and the marketing efforts. She reported that Phoenix has agreed to include specific data fields regarding telecommunications information in their database and that MAG has agreed to share the telecommunications information with Phoenix. She said that Phoenix has agreed to include a flyer about the MAG project as part of their marketing efforts and that MAG and Phoenix are working on coordinating efforts to avoid confusion in the business community about the two projects. She reported that MAG would continue to monitor and support the implementation of the Phoenix project and do whatever it can to help make it a success as the Phoenix project may be a model that could be used for the entire region.

Debbie Kohn reported that MAG is also continuing to work with the telecommunications providers to obtain Phase I telecommunications data.

6. Announcements and Public Input

There were no announcements.

7. Date of Future Meetings

Greg Binder reminded the group that the next MAGTAG meeting will be Thursday, October 21, 2004 at 10:00 am.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.