

1-13-12 Meeting Agenda and Notes

Conference Call Info: Video Bridge 22104

1. Dial the Auto Attendant at 812-856-7060
2. Enter the conference number (22104) followed by the # key (e.g., 22104#)

Attendees

Who	With	
Benn Oshrin	Internet2 / Various	✓
Jimmy Vuccolo	PSU	✓
Lucas Rockwell	UCSF	✓
Renee Shuey	PSU	✓
Steven Carmody	Brown	✓
Matt Sargent	Indiana U / Kual	✓
Dedra Chamberlin	UCB	✓
Omer Almatary	Rutgers	✓
Muhammad Siddique	Rutgers	✓

Agenda

1. Introductions/Roll Call
2. Updates from F2F Meeting

Action Items

- Everyone ok with Dedra functioning as a PM for these efforts? Check with your respective groups
- Dedra will also talk to Renee and others to formulate some timelines and suggestions for evaluation
- Benn will grab the JASIG incubation process and link to that as well as pull out some of the highlights in a bulleted list

Notes

dedra - lot of discussion on the work stream for the registry. some milestones and timelines were set for the next few months with governance questions. identity match and core registry were the main ones for this group and decided to keep on the same work stream. UC has come to the conclusion that ID Match is best done as a stand alone component. Benn's been working with that and has a straw man out there. For identity match we need to really look at the existing items that have been looked at prior, goal is to complete that by the end of Feb. with a recommendation on which to go with (KIM, PSU, OpenRegistry)

benn - the over arching strategy group talked about funding and such...

renee - was there any discussion about how this in-depth eval will be done and by who

dedra - not really, after the meeting though I asked the kual group to put forward some folks to participate in the eval. I know that the UC group has folks, would like PSU and some UW folks involved. Do we want a diff group of people or should we use this existing group? Should have a PM assigned to keep track of and by when, to keep things going forward. ideally this group will weigh in...

renee - early on we talked about having some Kual folks review the PSU code, not sure if we were thinking about having one team...

dedra - that would be more effective I think. if we try to tackle it individually, it would probably take too long. eric and bill are looking at when Kual could buy into it. using the subgroup as we can for now. seems to me that this group could be the one to do the formal evaluation. just need to find the steps and what from there...need a PM approach at this stage. making some decisions about this is a top priority for me, i'd be willing to offer my time.

renee - i think that's a great offer

dedra - see if we can't get some sign off of the PM and the members and see if the team is complete. That we're getting the input we need.

renee - i think we could utilize the IDM list to find out if we can find some more partners to look at this as well.

benn - we've talked through the funding model, nothing new on that. some talk on how the different forms of engagement might be. high end to low end. Spent some time talking over the various models and there's documentation on the wiki. There will be a report coming out of the meeting soon.

dedra - one of the main goals is to finalize these overall plans with some marketing materials, statement of work for consultants to organize us, and the hope to have things moving along and ready to start at the end of March. We do have a pile of resource from UCB that we'd like to spend on this effort, don't want to wait till April because it might disappear...want to lock in. group said it's ok to move forward on these eval efforts, that's why there's focus on concrete next steps...that's why I have a strong interest in getting this moving even with the governance structure and such still being finalized.

matt - action items - talk to group about dedra being ok as the PM.

dedra - i'll also work on a timeline with Renee, Jimmy, Omar, etc. on a timeline for the evaluation and such

steve - so far our requirements have focused on functionality. As we look at code there are other items that come into play. Do we have a process to identify those requirements.

dedra - that's one thing I think this group needs to come up with..

benn - as far as sustainability, my assertion has always been that things like that are part of the strategy group. Long term, we need this to be set. However I don't know that this group needs to do that.

steve - i agree, but with the folks we have here, it seems our technical minds could probably come up with 90% of that within our team. But we need to have some "other things" that we can use as red flags as we look at the systems.

renee - i think this group could do that..

benn - let me offer that we take some other groups criteria...JASIG has something like this already....things like how many people participate, whats the license on it, etc. not all will apply, but it's reasonably well documented and we could use that as a starting point. all 3 we're looking at all probably have red flags and we need to decide how many we're willing to accept.

steve - that sounds great

benn - i'll pull the highlights out that as well, the JASIG incubation process

renee - we did put our code out for review, really interested in who's looking at it and what they are thinking. email works great for this (to Jimmy and Renee)

dedra - could we do it via a wiki page so everyone is in the loop on what's being asked.

renee - we did hire a person to work on UI elements for our team.

dedra - i'd love to see that..

benn - i think the summary of that was that we like the idea of a common

renee - sure! I'll send a link out, our next wave of code should be out in March. We have some prototype of wireframes and UI elements out there

dedra - there was a separate stream of conversation on UI at the F2F on how these screens might look