



Minutes of the Core Directory Project Working Party - Meeting 2

There was a meeting at 3 pm on Friday 18 January 2008 in the Turing Room at OUCS.

Present: Tom Payne, Chris Cattermole, Maureen McNaboe, Beth Crutch, Adrian Parks, Lyn Waddington, Ray Miller, Ilana Veitch, Anne Bowtell, Peter Bushnell, Mike Fraser, Paul Jeffreys, Miranda Turner and Neil Jeffries for Dave Price.

Apologies: Mike Heaney, Dave Price, Alana Davies, Mirjam Siderius, Emma Potts and Jim Davies.

Agenda:

1. Welcome from the Chairperson - Mike Fraser

Mike Fraser welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the new members to the group: Peter Bushnell, Anne Bowtell, Mike Heaney (not present), Jim Davies (not present) and Alana Davies (not present). Ilana Veitch was also introduced to the group as it was her first meeting. Mike asked the group to go round the table and give a brief outline of who they are and what activities they represent.

2. Minutes and matters arising from the previous meeting – Mike Fraser

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed (corrections had been emailed to Miranda and were incorporated in the circulated minutes). Mike reminded the group of the Weblearn page which held working documents, agendas and minutes to be seen only by the group. Miranda confirmed that the URL for the Weblearn site had changed slightly as the name of the group had changed – the URL is now:

<https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/site/asuc/ict/cudpwp/>.

Mike announced that the project had a public web page (now live at:

<http://www.ict.ox.ac.uk/odit/projects/coreuser/CoreUser.xml>) which displayed the terms of reference, the membership and agreed minutes.

Mike then asked the group to summarise their use cases. Comments on the use cases were recorded as follows:

- Anne Bowtell's use case – no comments.
- Neil Jeffries' use case -- it was commented that the use case mainly related to authentication which was out of scope for the CUD. However, the Use Case assumed identity attributes (about non-Oxford users) would be provided by the CUD to the authenticator.
- Beth Crutch's use case (4 use cases) - Anne Bowtell commented that it would be helpful if data protection policies determined that personal data was held in one place with a central policy and an agreement on the publication of e.g. email addresses.
- Adrian Parks' use case - Ray Miller commented that webauth does not currently provide an authorisation service, though the Oak LDAP project is intended to fulfil that purpose.
- Maureen McNaboe's use case -- highlighted the two month time lag for congregation to wait until they can update their details from the central system. Ilana confirmed that there is a unique identifier on the record of every member of staff (since 2004). This clerical procedure ensures that the same staff identifier follows the person regardless of whether they have breaks in service.

Peter Bushnell asked for further feedback on use cases as he was not sure at what level to approach the issue. Mike confirmed that the use cases were to assist the requirements gathering process as a set of initial statement of practical problems or inefficiencies which the CUD was perceived to solve.

3. Project Profile – Paul Jeffreys

- **Agree break-down of activities**
- **Requirements gathering**
- **Architecture and implementation**
- **Project resources**

The Project Profile is on Weblearn at: <http://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/site/asuc/ict/cudpwp/meeting2/>

Mike asked for brief comments on the Project Profile. Ilana commented that she felt the scope was enormous and that the resources and times scale offered in support are not enough to fulfil the brief. Tom Payne asked if she thought the scope should be narrower, Ilana felt it should. Paul Jeffreys confirmed that the scope had been set by the University. He explained that he understood the concerns of the group, but the paper that went to the GPC describing the project said that a Core User Directory would be delivered. Paul described that the project covered 2 aspects: (1) requirements and (2) the deployment of a Core User Directory – but this does not have to be connected to every database within the University. He felt that they were heading towards a position where the Core User Directory had relationships with the other databases within the University – relationships to a sub set of directories. So he felt that the group should try to collect overall requirements in the first 6

months and then find the most important 2 or 3 directories with the University and work with them.

Ilana expressed concern that the ownership of data would be an issue. Beth felt that this issue would arise in phase 2. Lyn Waddington asked if the project produced a Core User Directory, having not decided which directory is authoritative, how would the University decide which data is the authentic data? The group discussed transporting data from directories. Neil Jeffries confirmed that he had built a large scale meta directory for a large multinational – so it is possible. Tom commented that no one is suggesting that the project builds a full-scale Core User Directory within 12 months – the project profile depicts what is achievable in 12 months.

Paul considered the Project Profile: he felt that they had agreed on the first phase – requirements gathering. He confirmed that the requirements gathering would be as wide as realistically possible: the focus would be on the analysis of existing business processes in so far as they relate to the management of identities.

Action: Mike to revise the Project Profile in consideration of the discussion in the meeting (consider a shorter version for public consumption).

Lyn suggested a forum for discussion, Paul felt that this was a step back and he asked the group to consider the Project Profile. Ray commented that the schedule looked reasonable. Mike confirmed that in months 7-9 the Project Group would also be planning the next phase. Ilana asked who would decide on the business processes. Paul imagined that they would go to the University and to the Student Information Services team and say – we imagine our attributes to be this...how many do you manage?...Does anyone else have a claim? Collect all the information, document it and iterate until a consensus is reached. Paul confirmed that in some cases it would be clear who owned the data but in others it would not – but it was an issue that requires resolution. Lyn asked where this came within the schedule – and how could it be planned for. Paul confirmed that this was in the first month of the schedule. Mike confirmed that the project had only agreed to agree the minimum attributes. Tom reminded the group that there would be 2 members of staff working on the project in the first 6 months and their remit would be agreed by the Core User Directory Project Working Party. Adrian expressed concern at the amount of resource the project will actually take. Paul confirmed that he did not know if the resource was enough to complete the project. The project had been funded with £100,000 from Michael Sibly. The project would have to be monitored and if more funds were needed they had a strong case to ask for them. Adrian felt that it would be better to have double the resource and complete in 6 months rather than being under resourced and not completing anything within 12 months.

Tom felt that the Project Working Party should decide how and when they would report back to Michael Sibly. Any report back should show complete mile stones.

Action: Paul to make amendments to the Project Profile and then circulate.

Anne Bowtell and Tom Payne agreed that communications about the project would need to be handled to ensure participation from across central admin and to keep the Divisions informed. It was suggested Tara Jewell be contacted for her knowledge and experience in communication within the University.

Action: Paul/Mike to meet with Tara Jewell

Mike confirmed that there would be two half post supporting the project. This would be filled with 0.5 FTE from OUCS and 0.5 FTE from BSP. The roles would start at the beginning of February 2008.

Action: Mike and Tom agreed to talk to the staff members they hoped would be able to take on the role.

4. Agree next steps over three months

- **Facilitated workshop?**

This item was carried forward to the next meeting.

5. A.o.b

There were no further issues and the meeting was called to a close.