



Project Name	IAM Program – IAM Lifecycle Committee		
Meeting Date	November 10, 2014	Meeting Time	10:30 – 12:00
Location/ Conference #	561 Smith Center	Meeting Host	Jane Hill

Invitees

Mike Burke	
Teresa Butler	X
Julie Broad	
Peggy Callinan	X
Ann-Marie Costa	X
Courtney Harwood	X
Michael Humphreys	X
Tom Mayhew	X

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

Agenda and Notes

October meeting opened at 10:30 and concluded as 12:00.

Agenda Items:

1. IAM Status Update
 - a. Sailpoint stabilization release completed at end of October
 - b. HMS provisioning of 0365 using the so-called “FIM Bridge Solution” is ready to go live
 - c. Currently engaged with delivering the Program Increment 1 which includes preparation for Alumni and schools (HMS, FAS) being incorporated into Sailpoint and the new account management system. We are also closing work on the PeopleSoft Import, New LDAP environment, Program Increment 2 planning and planning with the Collaboration Services team for 0365 and mail migrations.
2. Discussion of the UserName Challenge
 - a. Merging the schools into the registry involves compromising on data model and process design to enable a consistent approach for user experience and a secure, compliant system
 - b. When we collapse into a single name “domain” we will have cases where individuals have the same name that we have to resolve
 - c. Jennifer Ryan pointed out that if two people have the same name, maybe it is necessary to give both parties a new name when resolving the conflict to minimize the risk of confusion in which two people could be seen as the same, and receive each other’s content
 - d. Follow-up: More discussion to understand the proposed model when it is in final draft
3. Discussion: Use of POI roles
 - a. When should a POI role be authorized?
 - b. There is a difference between a POI and Guest in people’s minds. One of the main differentiators is the length of time of the affiliation. If a person is going to be affiliated for 10 days or more, it should be a POI role.
 - c. Sponsored account holders (in the FAS) are sometimes also POIs. There are inconsistent uses of POI because there is no real policy. In the FAS, if the Sponsored Account gets the job done, there would be no incentive to get a POI role.
 - d. Sponsored Guests today are not card eligible, and we don’t want to give iClass cards to individuals who are relatively fleeting “guests.” When there is need for physical access, the POI route can be an upgrade of the Guest role.
 - e. Since we propose issuing HUIDS to Sponsored Accounts (as we do for POIs today) there is a general consensus to merge the process.
 - f. For most of us, the term Guest appears to be closer in concept to what we do with XID than Sponsored Account or POI.
 - g. Tom Mayhew indicated that for Campus Solutions (CS) it will be necessary to have an HUID to be a user, so they are working with IAM to ensure all of their users have identities that qualify for

an HUID. He said it had more to do with the mechanics of access than the business need to “know these users” (e.g. identify and proof them.) Many schools are accustomed to allowing individuals to participate in the academic program without feeling the need to manage their identities. However, the tools (like Canvas and now CS) do require that users are known to the IAM system so they can authenticate and be authorized. Since schools are not used to asking these individuals for their dates of birth, or requiring them to give their legal name, and perhaps a residence address, our plans around IAM are spawning new requirements and process changes around intake of some of these miscellaneous populations.

4. Discussion: Provisioning “Early Access”

- a. The group agrees this is a vexing issue at present.
- b. The group acknowledges there can be concerns from OGC and others about what it means to give access before a person’s formal appointment or pay starts. But it is clearly a fact of life at Harvard and in higher education in general that individuals are expected to engage with resources to do things like set-up course web sites before their appointment actually begins. It is the nature of the structure of academic appointments and compensation.
- c. The group agrees it is not a good idea to “game” the HR system to facilitate the access. It is preferable to enable the account set-up, and provisioning of limited access to enable the individual who is under contract or under offer to have sufficient access to meet the requirements of their position. Other benefits include being able to schedule meetings, login and view materials (instead of having to do paper mailings) and as discussed, “get ready to teach.” Email is sometimes also provisioned. Lab and other compliance training may be required.
- d. The group acknowledges that we are not expert on whether there are any legal concerns.
- e. As for what to call these individuals, they are “Incoming Faculty” and “Incoming Employees”

5. Discussion: Provisioning challenges with people on paid leave

- a. There are gaps today when individuals go on paid leave, and their HR department changes to be a central admin department (for HR/financial reasons) thus causing them to be seen as leaving their local department, which results in deprovisioning of local resources.
- b. The group agrees there needs to be a mechanism that enables HR or Academic Affairs to sponsor some role/affiliation in the former department that enables the access associated with the job prior to the paid leave status to continue without interruption.

Action Items

1. Tom Mayhew to schedule meeting with IAM and schools regarding new POI populations - Completed 12/9/14

Pending from October 2014:

2. Alumni, SIS and DCE review the Alumni data flow including name change after student has left the University (Owner: Tom Mayhew, Amy Fairhall)

Next Meeting

1. Scheduled for December 8; cancelled by Jane Hill on December 4th.
2. January meeting scheduled for January 12th.

Archived Document