Common Systems Group (CSG)

December 5, 2003
Meeting Summary

Attendees: Mitra Ashtari (for Kathleen O’Kane), Paul Craft, Jim Davis, Jason Frand, Bill Jepson, Carol King, Greg Kitch, Robert Konishi, Max Kopelevich, Sean Pine (for Tom Phelan), Nick Reddingius, Ruth Sabean, Mike Schilling, Steven Schwartz (for Terry Ryan), Marsha Smith, Eric Splaver, Kent Wada, Esther Woo-Benjamin, Don Worth

Guests: Donna Capraro (AIS), Peter Kovaric (CCC), S. Kumar (Anderson), Gwen McCurry (CTS), Jackie Reynolds (AIS)

Actions:

0) Jim Davis to work through the ITPB to form a Wireless Standards Board
0) Proceed with the conduct of a distributed unit impact assessment of Data Warehouse technical proposal (see Agenda #2 below for details)

Agenda:

0) Endorsement of Wireless Implementation Team recommendations

The Group unanimously endorsed the following Wireless Team recommendations:

- Uniform Public Network (UPN) / Distributed Operations Model
- Formation of a Wireless Standards Body through the ITPB
- Networking standards and guidelines for rollout of Phase 1 wireless, future phases, and department networks
- A one year trial to build experience with the UPN model and end user service. At the end of 1 year, review service and fiscal models.

The Group agreed that the Wireless Standards Board would be responsible for development and distribution of the standards and would be accountable for quality of user services, registry usage and open issues such as restrictions, logging, etc. Jim Davis will work through the ITPB on formation of this Board.

0) Initiate Technical Endorsement of Data Warehouse Technical Architecture

The Data Warehouse Project is now entering the endorsement phase - the Functional Specifications are in the signoff phase and the process of reviewing the Technical Specifications is beginning. A Data Warehouse Technical Review Panel has been appointed and the review is scheduled for mid January.
The CSG is responsible for organizing for collection of input on how technical proposals will impact the distributed units. The Group agreed on assessment of impact in two areas: 1) operational impact, including changes in distributed unit staffing and/or staff training and service level requirements; and 2) technical impact, including changes in code or applications, licenses and/or facilities that are in operation in the distributed units.

Conclusions and Actions from the discussion:

. The endorsement process is now proceeding with the conduct of a distributed unit impact assessment as described above.

. This will be accomplished through a case study approach in which 3-5 typical service scenarios covering a range of service requests will be established.

  • All expected service providers will be involved in the case study (AIS, Student Affairs, and a set of distributed departments representing a range of department needs).

  • The case study will be conducted as a mental prototype in which the workflow, responsibilities, expectations and service levels for each service request would be worked through in detail and in the context of the new Data Warehouse capabilities.

  • Each of the departments participating in this exercise would investigate any facilities, software, or license impacts.

. The CSG agreed to accept the results of the case study assessment based on the representative departments participating.

0) Update on Enterprise Directory

The Functional Requirements document is completed. More information is needed to complete the technical specifications. The Functional Oversight Committee has recommended some proof-of-concept pilots to gather information to feed the technical requirements. The Committee on IT Infrastructure (CITI) has approved releasing a portion of UTIPP funds to conduct pilots to implement a Shibboleth system and engage a consulting firm to help produce the technical architecture document.