

SO 12-09-11 Agenda and Meeting Notes

OSIdM4HE-Strategy&Org. call, 5pm - 6pm (ET) Friday, 12/9/2011

Participants

Who	With	Present
Tom Barton	U Chicago	
Dedra Chamberlin	Berkeley & UCSF	
Jacob Farmer	Indiana U	
Keith Hazelton	UW-Madison / Internet2	
RL "Bob" Morgan	U Dub / Internet2	
Benn Oshrin	Internet2 / Various	
Hampton Sublett	UC Davis	
Bill Yock	U Dub/Rice Board	

AGENDA

1) S&O Charter review



I hacked up the S&O Team Charge page that Hampton had started a few months ago:
<https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/QaKKAQ>

Basically, I described a lightweight process by which S&O can operate by (and pretty much has), and drafted a few deliverables that I think are aligned with the concept of "bootstrap then dissolve".
I think there's more effort that needs to go into getting our house in order, perhaps we can discuss potential action items on our next call.

-Benn

Benn: We need the gov structure to be part of the DIP

Billy: DIP wouldn't really need to go into details on governance

RL"Bob:" Typical CIOs would want everything they need to know before deciding to commit resources

Billy: Maybe we ask the consultant to help us chose the model of what we want the effort and the DIP to be.

RL: We do have drafts of the documents mentioned in the charter; DIP to be added as a task to the charter

Billy: It's great to want to start work prior to release of prospectus, a la UCB/UCSF.

RL: At this point the participants are individuals representing institutions and/or projects. They have no standing to be directing the resources of others.

Benn: It's not the central committee to decide which tech; ask the Subcommittees, what are the issues are

KH: The prospectus is of a piece with the model of a caretaker organization. The responsibility of caretakers includes addressing sustainability of initiatives.

Billy: What are we debating here?

Dedra: I have resources to invest. How do I decide where to put them? What has to happen for I2 or Kuali to step up to caretaker role and coordinate resources?

Billy: Part of DIP is to outline where we start, but of course devil will be in the details of the MOUs

Hampton: My resources have looked at provisioning and person registries for two years. They want to be in on debates of what is to be built.

Hampton: Trying to fight feeling some sense of discouragement. We are getting to a point where a fresh perspective could help us maneuver through the details. I want to make sure that working through the governance is a part of *doing* the work as opposed to *becoming* the work.

RL: Every big project has its dark night of the soul... We are on different pages on whether this is about compatibility guidelines vs development

Dedra: Two visions of the initiative 1) delivering a suite 2) defining the specs with which solutions should comply

RL: It has to be both, the question is one of emphasis. We also should start thinking about OSIdM4HE and organizational meeting schedules such as Kuali spring meetings.

2) Consulting arrangement update: No further development at present.

3 Significant new institutional commitments

- Dedra, UCB/UCSF email of 4 Dec. "More thoughts..."

Bob and Keith, I believe you are respectively the "chairs" for the registry and provisioning sub-groups. Would it be helpful to you to have additional dedicated resource for drafting documentation and diagrams for your groups and generally providing staffing support? -- Dedra

Sure ... but as noted on the Reg team call this morning, after a bunch of good technical discussion and reports of interesting progress on some fronts, we're still not sure, in the group, just what it is we're trying to do.

I think at this point we are acting like a "special interest group" on the topic area. Folks are present representing orgs with requirements and projects that are doing things. We talk about topics like match algorithms and the group is exposed to each others' thinking. If we're lucky some of this is recorded; a lot of it of course is documented at various external sites. Sharing this info and perspective is very useful I think since it will lead is in the direction of better common requirements. It does not at this point lead us to hard requirements, or prioritizing, or code-writing, since no one in the group is in a position to say "here's what the group is going to do".

So good analyst and architect resources are quite valuable at this point I'd say. Developers, less so. A commitment to sharing results of systems actively being developed (OpenReg, PSU, UCB, etc) and interest in convergence are also good. I think that's all we can expect at this point.

- RL "Bob"

- Hampton, UC Davis email of 8 Dec. forwarded to S&O today

I wanted to follow up on my team's involvement in the weekly OSIdM4HE Provisioning call. Brian Donnelly (Lead of our Middleware Infrastructure team) and Gary Sharpe (our lead developer on our Provisioning system) are planning to begin attending the calls on a regular basis beginning next Friday (16th). My hope is that they can help provide insights and where possible/useful existing documentation that we have collected as part of our IAM overhaul effort for the last 2 years and for them to gain a better understanding of the direction the team is heading. Both are among our best developers and both are always willing to take on additional assignments but I'd like to ask that they not be tasked with any assignments outside of an hour's work at least until we are clearer about our UC Davis investment intentions. -- Hampton

4) Goals and logistics of F2F meeting (who, what, when, where?)

- Thursday, Jan. 5, 9:00 am - 5:00 pm and Friday, Jan. 6, 9:00 to noon
- Location: Phoenix
- Hampton on logistics w Benn's help;
- Bill Y to invite Chris Mackie
- Agenda TBD

5) Communication to the community about our overall and per-team status, ideally to be sent by Dec 16.

- S&O cover report plus Registries and Provisioning Team reports. On the model of our September report.

6) The resource question ...held over for next meeting