OSIdM4HE Meeting

2012

Attendees

- Hampton Sublett
- Chris Mackie
- Bill Thompson
- Bob Morgan
- Bill Yock
- Keith Hazelton
- Dedra Chamberlin
- Eric Westfall
- Tom Barton
- Misagh Moayyed
- Ben Oshrin

Resource Time & Methodology

	Registry & Identity Matching	Provisioning	Access Management	Authentication Management	Shared Services
< 6 months	**Registry/ID Match:** - Review high-level requirements - Hire PM & developer - Write implementation specs **Registry:** - Review PSU, OR, KIM - Draft evaluation - Hire PM/developer - Decide on investment needs - Solicit investment - Implementation specs **ID Match:** - Write code - Begin testing	- SOR to Registry toolkit - Oracle HCM, Registry solution - Registry consumer toolkit	- ID new use cases - Document new use cases - First iteration of API standards - Review workflow tools - Initial implementation of standards with/in Grouper/KIM	- Convene integrated parties - Confirm analysis/gaps	- Convene standards/API body - Convene cross stream project steering team - Publish initial standards - Publish baseline policy & lifecycle use cases
< 12 months	**ID Match:** - Testing complete - Packaging & dates - Deploy **Registry:** - Development - Testing plan - Define interfaces	- Registry to Acct Creation, SIS & LMS solution - General purpose app & data integration toolkit	- Complete POCs - Decide on investment needs - Use of APIs with/in community (uPortal, Kuali apps, mobile, etc)	- Assess password management requirements & existing code - Assess OAuth requirements	- Establish UI management console team and environment - Establish QA/Integration team and environment - Establish Audit/Report team requirements
< 18 months	**Registry:** - Testing complete - Packaging & date - Early adopter deployment - Marketing materials	- Configuration Identity & affiliation - Lifecycle management - Engine (shared services)	- Implementation of useful platform integration plugins (Spring, .NET, PHP, etc)	- Deliver beta password management services in registry, portal context	- Create baseline management console - Create baseline QA/Integration tests - Create baseline data warehouse and reporting - Establish training & support team
< 24 months	Full deployment	- Bundled app & data - Integration reference implementation as an installable package	- Access audit & monitoring (Access requirement fulfillment)	- Assess social to SAML gateways? (Ties to Reg Acct Management; Need identities)	- Create 2nd version of audit/reports - Create 2nd version of management console - Create baseline training & support program
Gimme	- Established code - SIDS	- Schema mappings to/from RDBMS/SCM/SAML/LDAP - Registry <=> LDAP integration	- KIM/Grouper - BPEL & workflows	EDUROAM/Radius CAS, Shibb, Kerberos	KEW Developer tools

Chris – PM and Developers could be contributed resources. "Hire" may not be the wrong term, may use "Identify". Authentication management needs to bring itself up to a level in alignment with the rest of the categories in terms of funding opportunities.

Eric – Some of the packaging items may have to happen early during the cycle. In terms of risks, the actual direction has not been decided and so we wouldn't want to get stuck in analysis-paralysis.

Bill – CAS/Shibb could also be considered Gimmes here.

Dedra – We are trying to use a modular approach so that the entire package does not have to be used, but only the bits that are required by the party. A lot of universities right now have reporting tools, so that may be a proof of consist for integrating with registry components.

Bill Y - What is the management console? Is it designed for sys-admins or is it targeted at users too?

Bob – **MYU might be interested in workflow/BPEL tool integration**.

Break

	Registry & Identity Matching	Provisioning	Access Management	Authentication Management	Shared Services
< 6 months	Level Res	Level Res			
< 12 months					
< 18 months					
< 24 months					

Bill Y – The development time will encapsulate the effort to review and analyze.

Chris – Rename the outline to be named "The Business Plan" as it resonates better with the CIOs. In terms of resources, projects are currently suffering. The reasonable approach seems to be to create a 2-3 short surgically and strategically focused engagement plan with these projects by doing a lot of integration and tailored investment. The process we have followed for our deliverables add substantial business value. In practice, people who bring the money make the decision and our governance model should really consider that aspect. Money could also be resources. The long term governance model proposes a chance for late binding, for the long time project practices. RICE was seriously suffering from investment for a period time because expectations weren't right and set from the beginning. So, a fraction of the investment should go to the benefits of the project itself.

There are various design patterns in the community and they converge rather nicely. So, solutions are possibly implemented and out there.

Dedra – The idea was originally to leverage orgs to donate money, but the overall priorities for the entire product suite should also be looked at for further investments. We currently don't have an agreed upon caretaker for the shared service.

Bill Y – RICE is funded from both institution investors and projects.

Hampton goes over the Strategy Organization Deliverables; Team decides to further the discussion on what can realistically be delivered in view of the business plan and the proposed timeline. The overall rough approach and timeline does seem fine at this point.

Bill – Thinking about all the diverse projects up on the board, we mostly mean "The Joint Venture" when the term "This Project" is used so alternate models could be used here. The Joint Venture model does not preclude a focused project based governance model. The key thing is the decoupling of the project itself with the venture.

Chris – It will be difficult to persuade people to invest money in the development of new codebases if they don't have governance over what they are paying for. When you divorce governance from funding, funding goes away ultimately. Nobody would want to invest in something if all the pieces are not there. The diversity of representation is an inherent value. The partners, not this group will make the decision, and this is all just a matter of late binding. If you try to restrain the money, folks with the investment will just work around you. Folks with the money are not necessarily evil and dictators, orgs follow mission statements and objectives and it will not be all about the money and brining resources to the project.

Bob – Shibb and Grouper are good examples of models from the opposite end. The academic model could have benefited from directly receiving money. Using the I2 model, we are trying to serve any legit and deserving body.

Chris – Funding sources could be NSF, NSH, etc, but what about our marketing model to CFO and CIOs? The I2 model could also be used. Once you get out of CIO/CISO triangle, most people want to buy a product in a usable form. That kind of contract allows the CFO to grant money. Outside this triangle, we need to be confident that investment and funding should be uniformly available for all streams. In the coordination council mechanism to provide the product assurance level, the #1 priority is to ensure minimally adequate funding to all streams to avoid passion-play. Kuali learned the importance of functional government and to not let just technologies run the body. The functional government in general is not the VPHR.

Hampton – At the end of the day, this is designed for the masses.

Bob – We have not yet resolved how money is directly contributed to the work streams, through the MOU as the caretaker.

Chris - The coordination council could own the IP during the project. A joint venture is an adequate legal venture for this type of task. This will be a useful limbo during the project since everyone's contributing. When you're thinking about the implementation details of the governance, the best possible strategy today may not be true a few years from now. Late binding is important in that aspect to figure out who owns the IP.

Dedra – Are we targeting the CIO/CEO goal from day 1, or should we gather initial investment first before we sell to them?

Ben – The evolving Jasig/Sakai model is also a 3rd option. We could possibly come up with a hybrid model. As a useful exercise, it might be to write up a couple of examples for each of the work streams and work out the details.

Bill – Difference types of contributions are coming in; Cash dollars are coming from the coordination council level and MOUs are agreements on resources, FET plus a bit of cash. The governance bodies are then allowed the decision making influence they have for their work streams.

Tom – Not form, not just monetary could also be embedded in the governance model? This should not have to be secondary.

Bill Y – The new Shared Service work stream is not entirely in the same flavor as the other? The coordination council could be the owner of that. Altruistic contributions within the current status of economy are rather unlikely for the S.S stream.

Chris – Next steps: will deliver a report to the team. The resource matrix has the highest priority. Group agrees on the hybrid model proposed by Bill and discussed on the whiteboard. (See image) We still need to make sure the MOUs still are on the same page as we are. Also, need to outline template IP agreements, all of which have to be approved by the council.

Defining measures for level of effort:

Low: 1 FTE / Period
Medium: 2-3 FTE / Period
High: 4 FTE / Period