planning call - 2011 07 29

Action Items

- EricW to make first stab at f2f agenda
- Continue work on pre-conf activities #1 & #2

New page, pertaining to activity #2: https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OSIdM4HE/Pre-Conference+Item+2+-+Chunking+and+Logical+Units

Roll

RobC, EricW, MattS, AaronNeal, SteveC, BennO, ScottGibson, TomB, KeithH, TomZ

Agenda with minutes intermixed

roll/notes

AIs and notes from last time https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OSIdM4HE/planning+call+-+2011+07+22 https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OSIdM4HE/Kuali+Rice+IdM+Notes

f2f agenda, principles, process. some bullets for thought below.

more planning needed for an Aug 5 call?

other?

_

f2f agenda bullets covering more than we'll have time for:

review use case derived requirements (pre-conf activity #1)

slot them according to however JacobF et al. frame the gap (pre-conf activity #2)

use them or a subset to define a gap relative to baseline. what should gap baseline be? KIM? KIM + shib + CAS + Grouper? Is this a useful question?

create a first pass plan for addressing some part of the gap with some combo of KIM enhancement and integration with other OS IAM wares.

which principles or processes should be in operation here? <== preworkshop group #2

1) identify first steps, definition of initial deliverables/milestones

- trying to identify who will do what to get to phase 1 deliverables; address funding and support
- how far will we get in day & a half?

EricW: Institutions that are interested in contributing to "it". From this info, he hopes to decide putting a proposal to Kuali vis-a-vis alternative approaches.

TomB: many resource owners who share the goals; What do we need to get done, how many owners would be willing to help DO IT: That is the next step we hope to get to at the end of the workshop.

EricW: requirements, gaps, BUT also what work should get done 1st to fill identified gaps. (TomB +1) plus a coordination framework. But that shouldn't be difficult to solve. see goal 3.

Has FIFER done any of this already? yes. We won't be starting from scratch.

2) first pass assessment of work needed on KIM and any other OS IAM wares we decide to incorporate into the first few milestones, ie, roadmap material for the set of IAM wares we focus on

- Of all that is left to be done, which bits COULD be taken up by or pitched to which existing efforts. (TomB) Benn +1 yep, there by lunch on day 2.
  - What's RICE interested in? what tasks would they be comfortable taking on, etc.
  - Self-identify reps of resource owners and round robin which of us would LIKE to take on
  - principles we can ID right now to guide the process? TomB. Bidding?
  - compare the Apache ServiceMix stack (Bamboo and Dedra @ UC Berkeley) to Kuali stack (& IAM integration)
  - SteveC: Draw boxes NOT labeled with products; Chad from Aegis: They are looking at a set of open source pieces, too.
  - Hybrid approaches will win, not a complete single stack (commercial or OS or...)
  - Benn: We're not gonna evaluate all products in this space; but TomB: How impactful would it be for us to offer a solution than accept a vendor solution; So campuses have a solution option that actually works.
  - SteveC: Let's differentiate our participation here for our short term needs; but in parallel, construct a set of OS packages that campuses COULD use in toto in a few years.
  - KeithH: Loosely coupled architecture with OS reference implementations is a fine goal. I won't push hard on vendor box inclusion.

- One more meeting? yes, a week from today; one agenda item: review a proposed rough agenda put out by EricW.
- Use case wise: kick the tires, ask "Does it work for you"

3) make communication and coordination plans to keep various stakeholders aligned, in the loop and to facilitate coordination post f2f

Some key points

Two key concurrences emerged in the discussion.

1. There will need to be on-going coordination of implementation efforts across all participating parties. Our community is accustomed to this, people among the f2f participants can do it. There isn't as yet any need to formalize it beyond principals electing to coordinate.

2. Some feel that our overall objective should be to have a complete IdM stack composed entirely of OS components while others think it's enough to have OS components that, together with other wares, comprise a complete solution for higher eds. But all agree that the latter is a good step towards the former, and so the latter is our more immediate objective. We will return to discussion of a more ultimate objective later on, as we approach completion of the latter.