1-27-2012 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
Jimmy Vuccolo	PSU
Matt Sargent	Indiana U / Kuali
Dedra Chamberlin	UCB
Omer Almatary	Rutgers
RL "Bob" Morgan	UWash /Internet2

Agenda

1. Introductions/Roll Call
2. Updates from Rutgers from Omer
3. Action Items from Last time
    a. All : Outreach to other, potential parties for evaluation participation
    b. Dedra: Proposed Evaluation timeline/dates
        i. Timeline https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OSIdM4HEteam/Registry+Workstream+Tasks
        ii. Evaluation Criteria https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OSIdM4HEteam/Registry+Subcommittee+Deliverables

Action Items

1. Dedra - Have Carl work on the possibility of doing Use Cases and Questions
2. Dedra - Check with Colorado State about participating

Notes

Omer: Planning to roll out OR in prod at the end of April/first of May. Have had a couple of certification release in pre-production w/real data. Validated against legacy system, has been running w/out any real issues. Are planning on certification release to test out the UI (help desk, administration, netid management tool(s)), planning on going live with that the last week of April. Will need to migrate some data and may take a week or so to do. Shouldn't affect our commitment for the code review, but putting that out so we all know each others schedule

Dedra: I have a bunch of questions for Omer, related to this, but I think we can save those for the review period for OR that our group will do. We have PSU, Rutgers, and Kuali, Berkley and UCSF working together. Might be helpful to have one more school…

Bob: I've made the case to UW to the person that would be the best place, but waiting.

Dedra: I check with Oregon, but they have committed to a vended production. Colorado State would be a potential…

Bob: I would think one more school would be nice

Omer: Maybe still invite Oregon to participate to get what they've done?

Dedra: Sure. EDUCAUSE group has a forum for things like this were we can find why groups picked a vended product and such. I also have a contact in the California State School system. Will hit up Colorado for sure.

Dedra: For the identity match portion the main plan I think we should look at is check out 2 different options. First review the straw man, but there is also this health care option that we can look at? So we can look at the straw man proposal and the health care option to see how they match up with our requirements. On the Registry side, we could look at code review scoring process and start with the deliverables work that everyone has done already in this group. Maybe take what we have and develop a set of question that we would pose to the groups…seems the only thing we could add is a weighting factor for how important one is to the other. How formal should the process be for the evaluation?

Omer: Mapping the requirements is the right thing to do, maybe see if there are others/scope that should be added.

Dedra: So you would welcome mapping the requirements to questions for response on what you've already done?

Omer: yes?

Bob: the list we developed last year was pressed for time, partial sentences for features, doesn't seem to be fully adequate for what's really needed. I could see a use case or business functionality format…identifier assignment must have these properties for this function…not prepared to take on all that though.

Dedra: Sure, that would be a lot of work. If we had a resource that could do that, would that be valuable?

Bob: I believe so…the general entry with more info would be ideal

Dedra: Take the set of requirements that have been evaluated and see if that would be helpful for the campus, if it were part of Kuali KIM would it work or not. then in the end write up the strengths and room for improvement for each. But that's not as formal at this point, doesn't give quantitative measures at the end. That's why the weighting would be nice. Making sure the process is fair and gives a choice at the end.

Bob: So, you're in favor of more up from requirements spec-ing?

Dedra: I hadn't really thought about it that way. Seems worth the consideration. I do have a staff member that might be willing to do some of the work we've discussed, creating a narrative, use cases, along with questions to ask each group. This would take extra time since we'd need to give time for each area to respond and shorten the evaluation phase.

Bob: seems like if you're part of that group asking hard questions, you'd need a set case of requirements.

Jimmy: we're talking a bunch about code. i hope in these 2 weeks we're looking at code and supporting documentation, etc. It'd be great if use cases exist with the questions. I see the value in that for sure.

Dedra: Sure, I think I was coming in with the idea that documentation had been reviewed already. The code review would supplement the analysis that's happened. I will volunteer to have Carl see if he might be willing to spend some time to write up these use cases based on the requirements by next week-ish to share with everyone to see if that's the direction we should go and help drive the course of the code review in the next phase. So a set of questions and use cases to go with each group.

Matt - as we start looking at the ID match work, I'll probably pull in reps from the Kuali Student and KPME (Kuali HR) to help with that. They are the two groups that are clamoring for ID match and are impacted by it the most on the Kuali side.