



Project Name	IAM Program – IAM Lifecycle Committee		
Meeting Date	March 9, 2015	Meeting Time	10:30 – 12:00
Location/ Conference #	320 1414 Mass Ave.	Meeting Host	Jane Hill

**Invitees**

Mike Burke	
Teresa Butler	X
Julie Broad	
Peggy Callinan	X
Steven Beardsley	X
Courtney Harwood	
Michael Humphreys	X
Tom Mayhew	X

Isabelle Modiano	X
Susan Richelson	
Susan Vomacka	
Kwok Yu	X
Jennifer Ryan	X
Gretchen Grozier	X
Fairhall, Amy	X
Shoykhet, Masha	X

**Agenda and Notes**

Agenda Items:

1. IAM Status Update
2. Discussion of POIs
  - a. Review of the strategy and terminology surrounding POI’s presented by Terry Connolly
  - b. Existing and proposed POI role types were reviewed
  - c. Isabelle questioned why we need the POI role subtypes. The group agreed we did so that we could continue to limit the types of people that specific individuals create. Also there was agreement that the role types help schools and departments keep track of the types of individuals who are affiliated in their units.
  - d. Role types are also necessary for provisioning of access, and ID Cards.
  - e. There is a “non-Harvard Instructor” requirement, but everyone is leery of using the term “Instructor” since it directly overlaps with an HR category. Everyone is pondering what we should call the category
3. Deceased status
  - a. Amy Fairhall discussed how we have incorporated a deceased status at the person level
  - b. From a provisioning standpoint, it is like any other terminated status, and probably doesn’t require any special handling.
  - c. When we do matching against existing identities, we will determine how to alert to potential fraud if we discover people submitting identity data for deceased individuals.
  - d. Isabelle said we could create separate identities for spouses of deceased retirees.
  - e. HR does need to continue to communicate with benefit vendors using the HUIDS of deceased former benefit recipients, who have surviving beneficiaries. This accounts for why we see “continued usage” of deceased identities for retirees.
4. Discussion: SIS Related Topics
  - a. Tom asks if it is okay that SIS only sends updates for individuals for 90 days after they separate from Harvard. The discussion revolved around the flow of updates, and there was some concern that if SIS limits their updates, it will result in data being less up to date and out of synch. SIS concern is that after 90 days, they would often be submitting a change that came to them from HR (e.g. an address update for a former student who is now an employee) as if it was an SIS-sourced change.
  - b. Many of us have fielded complaints about how difficult it is to change address or name data at the University, and how the burden falls on individuals to update multiple systems.
  - c. Isabelle Modiano and Masha Shoykhet were advocates of not limiting the SIS updates but ultimately, SIS has implemented the 90 day limit.

### Action Items

1. Look at impact of new SIS Self-Service data flows on the downstream data recipients
2. Consider examining how Admissions and Registrars ask for name data – do they ask for legal name?

### Next Meeting

1. April 13, 2015