

IAM Full Committee Meeting Notes

Tuesday, October 09, 2007
141 Computer Building

Discussion on Education and Communication

Renee led a discussion on how best to start educating the University community about the work of the IAM group. Kevin anticipates a three month period of spreading the word and communicating the roadmap to the University community. It was noted that we will need to communicate to executives as well as operational staff and faculty and that the messages for the various groups will need to be tailored. It was also noted that we will be presenting concepts—not detailed implementation plans. The message needs to be a balance of showing how the initiative will both mitigate risk and provide real productivity gains and other hard benefits.

The communications surrounding the conversion of the PSU ID were mentioned as an example of a broad based University wide communication effort.

The following ideas were discussed by the group

- Network of People presentation
- Joel & Renee visit executives in each of the areas that supported the IAM initiative by supplying representatives to serve on the committee
- Network of People
- AIS Steering
- AIS Advisory
- IT Directors
- FO Retreats
- F&B Meetings
- Academic Departments
- Council of Deans
- Academic Leadership Council
- Security Day Conference

Review of Framework Document - Joel

The group discusses the latest revisions and version of the framework documents that Joel had drafted. There was discussion on the exact purpose of the document and the right terminology to use. It was decided to use the term, Strategic Direction of the IAM Project. Joel will do some additional tweaking adding more context early on, explaining the work of the IAM committee and our charge. It was also noted to include the reciprocal use of external IDs by Penn State in the section on federations. Joel will also follow-up with Steve Kellogg and beefing up the section on registration authorities. We will do one more round of revisions with the document and at that point the committee will decide if it is ready to be used as an educational tool to help disseminate the progress of the committee and the IAM effort.

Policy Gap Analysis – Lisa German

Lisa presented the policy gap analysis and asked the committee to get updates to Deb by Friday. The sub-group will meet next Monday

There was discussion that current policies do not address many of the issues raised (assumptions are made in policy but there is not explicit policy) and that many gaps will be present.

Clarified the use of the document and asked group leaders to ensure that issues are properly documented and to list any existing policy that is applicable.

Discussed that the sub-group categories should not cloud or restrain our thinking. The goal is to ensure we have the right issues identified that will require policy.

Review of Document from Risk Assessment Group - Renee

Dave Lindstrom was unable to attend but the committee reviewed the initial report from the Risk group. The report is a good start in identifying the issue surrounding risk and members were encouraged to review and provide feedback

Life Cycles and Affiliations – Ken Forstmeier

Ken reported that the group is re-thinking concept and use of term relationship and has decided to focus on term affiliation

The group is working on draft of report

The list of affiliations is pretty complete > 80%

One question the group is pondering is, Do we have too many affiliations?

The group discussed the model for affiliations, statuses, attributes

Registration, Vetting, and Proofing – Steve Kellogg

Steve reviewed the work of the group which is making good progress.

- Vetting – collection and validation of data
- Proofing – matching of the electronic profile w/ the real person
- Credential Issuance – importance that this happen at the same time as proofing
- Re-credentialing issues – password reset and possibility of reduce LoA until in-person proofing re-occurs.
- ASR role – delegated registration authority – properly trained and certified, possibly via an online test.
- Concept of online self-serve center to provide as much functionality as possible.

LoA – Renee Shuey

The LoA group continues to work through the framework for the various levels of assurance.

There is still some question re: the need to distinguish between the two lowest levels (0 and 1).

The group has also yet to identify a use case, within the University, for a level 4. There was discussion on just how the various data classifications identified by the IPAS group (and mentioned in the Risk sub-group report) will play relate to LoAs.

Access Management – Renee Shuey

Renee reminded the group that we need to spend some time focusing on access management as well as identity. The group discussed some ways to bring this concept into the plan.

Need for Working Session to Integrate Sub-group Work

Ken Forstmeier proposed that we schedule a session to hammer out the integration between the sub-committees to come up with the initial draft of a roadmap. The group decided this was a good idea and we will try to schedule a 4-5 hour design session in November. Joel will coordinate dates and Tom Irvin will check to see if Louise Sandmeyer would act as a facilitator.