

JA-SIG Clearinghouse Meeting Minutes August 26, 2003

August 26th JA-SIG Clearinghouse, edited to show results of the meeting and activities through August 31st.

What needs to be addressed:

- I. General Notes:
 - a. We have not yet received hardware. Sun has replied "Your Grant has been submitted." I'll get an update by August or September.
Jim Farmer is meeting with Sun next week and will ask for status.
 - b. We have arranged for it to live at Princeton. There is a \$5,000 annual fee for hosting. I have it covered for a year, but after that? I'll go to the JA-SIG Board with this concern. Suggestions for membership dues. Adding value to the JA-SIG membership by providing a robust clearinghouse might facilitate dues collection.
 - c. Because of security concerns, the system itself must be accessed through the web. This means utilities will have to be written to post, migrate, authenticate, authorize, as well as administer the authorization etc.
Whether we use content management for that remains to be seen. Where does SSH fit in? Listed as a category of work.
 - d. Once we determine the basis of what needs to be done, I will ask if different people could take ownership of different pieces. Done.
 - e. Once we determine what the pieces are and who owns them, we can jointly work out a timeline and deliverables. It would be good to understand what we can deliver by December.
 - f. Do we start with the latest uPortal that enables features like CAR bundling, and just let everyone else catch up? Our uPortal does not have to be the same as the one you run at your institution.
 - g. Collectively we are a very talented group, but we have to acknowledge that we all have other Primary jobs and avoid spreading ourselves too thin. Let's concentrate on getting something workable up, then enhance.
 - h. We are not truly open source. We can share among member institutions. I believe that makes us different from the types of efforts you see on SourceForge, which are public. Can someone enlighten me about that? Should I be begging for a SourceForge donation? We might consider a hybrid mix of sourceforge for collaborative JA-SIG efforts (like CAS) and our own debugging, email lists, etc. No consensus yet.
 - i. When we arrive at a list of the important questions/issues, we need to find a way to bounce that list off the current channel developers. I can form a list from the current clearinghouse and the CVS tree. Patty will make a listserv list for developers. We can consider other lists later.
 - j. Standards questions, especially naming standards, are important to developers and contributors. Listed as a category.

- II. Usage
- a. Who gets to post to the clearinghouse? This is also being discussed at the board level. JA-SIG members
 - i. If it's any JA-SIG member, do we leave how you register with the JA-SIG alone and tap into the file? Is there information we might want to add to that file? What exists in that file now? Listed as a category of work
 - ii. Should the registration be automated? Open question.
 - b. How do we authenticate? Can we load that file into a mini-LDAP? Listed as a category of work
 - i. Sun has asked us to consider Sun One Identity Server
 - ii. Are there open source LDAP solutions we can use?
 - c. Is everyone equally authorized – once you're in, you're in? 3 roles exist – superuser, institution owner, institution user
 - i. Is everyone authorized for read/write as well as read? Yes, right now
 - d. Do you post to a staging area or directly to production? Versioning should handle that
 - i. If staging area, how does it migrate?
 - e. How do we maintain CVS as well? Can we write a synchronization process? Open question – should we use CVS or something else?
 - f. What formats do we want to accept in the clearinghouse? Listed in categories
 - g. What documentation do we require? Listed in categories
 - h. What types of things get posted
 - i. What is the architecture – all on the one box? What DB? Listed in categories
 - j. Do we implement groups and roles – do different people see different tabs, for instance? Will use Columbia's groups and permissions
 - k. How do we encourage cleanup. Can there be an expiration date after which we shoot off an email asking for verification that it's still good? Listed in categories
 - l. How do we deal with different versions of uPortal? Just include whatever you know (such as I use it in 2.1.2) in the documentation? Data element required to post
 - m. What should be in a metadata layer of the documentation? What do people need to see first?
 - n. Should we require, if possible, an instantiation of the channel, if the object is a portlet, to demonstrate what you're contributing? Data element (demo, screen shots, etc) required to post
 - o. Search – do we need an underlying search engine? Preformed queries against a meta database? Listed in categories

- III. Development
 - a. Who gets to post to the Clearinghouse uPortal instantiation
 - i. Is there a separate developers' list? A few developers will have rights beyond the typical user rights. No root access required.
 - b. How do we authenticate? It should be sufficient that anyone has all rights.
 - c. Does a Princeton person have to be a super user because it lives here? No
 - d. Do we set up an instance in CVS, everyone copies it to his own environment and develops locally, and then tries to integrate it back in yes
 - OR
 - e. Do we try for collaborative development because we can't separate the pieces well enough. We will try to separate work because of the challenges of working remotely.
 - f. What version of uPortal do we develop in? the latest
 - g. What documentation do we require for ourselves that will help maintain the clearinghouse longterm? Are those pieces of documentation just objects we post to a special tab in the clearinghouse itself? Listed in categories
 - h. How do we stay in synch with CVS, especially with || efforts? Listed in categories
- IV. Ideas for after we establish the fundamental processes Not ready yet
 - a. A channel that provides a survey to determine what types of channels are needed.
 - b. A forum or newsgroup for each channel, to enable discussion that is not uportal framework development but portlet development.
 - c. Certification takes too long – is it enough for us to require in our metadata description for which versions you know it works?
 - d. A channel mgr channel. This suggestion from Pete Boysen: I think a really cool (but long-term) idea would be to have a channel manager channel that each institution would install in their portal. It would list all available channels from the clearinghouse and report updates for their version of the portal via Web Services to the Clearinghouse. When a channel is updated, the portal administrator could click on the update and the new version would be installed. Using the CAR format would simplify this although there are a lot of details that need to be worked out.
 - e. Announcements – do we use Columbia's, CalPoly's (needs an upgrade) or both? Who can post? Require expiration dates?
 - f. WebDav - can we use this for the research tab to organize our documents? How do we manage clean-up?