

## **NBA Technology Development Team – Project Report**

### **Project 1: Report to NBA Implementation Workgroup on prioritization of infrastructure projects**

**Purpose:**

The NBA Implementation Workgroup asked that the Technology Development Team identify the three technology infrastructure projects that should be given highest priority, considering project scope, impact and dependencies.

**Issues:**

The Technology Development Team reviewed the project list and came up with the following priorities for investigation:

**Top 3 Infrastructure Projects:**

1. Person Registry / Enterprise Directory Services  
These projects are extensively interdependent, and should be approached as the single most important initiative. Virtually all future systems integration initiatives rely upon them. The Technology Infrastructure Forum has been looking into this issue as well. Either a dedicated committee should be assigned to this project, or TIF should be asked to expedite their project.
2. Common Authentication  
A common authentication infrastructure will provide the foundation for the eventual goal of "single sign-on." The project to establish this authentication infrastructure should not itself be termed "single sign-on," however, as the latter will be achieved only after all systems are modified to take advantage of the common infrastructure. Such changes will likely take many years, while the authentication infrastructure itself needs to be established as soon as possible. Obviously, given the broad range of services to which a common authorization mechanism will provide access, the security implications of this approach need to be carefully analyzed and addressed.
3. MyUCDavis Architecture / Interface Standards for Porting Applications  
Since MyUCDavis has been identified as the foundation for the campus enterprise portal, a thorough analysis of the portal's architecture, coupled with the creation of interface standards for porting applications to it (and developing new applications for it) are critical early steps.

In addition to prioritizing these projects, the TDT also identified two key areas to which all three project teams will need to pay especially close attention: Security and Data Representation Standards. All of these projects have broad implications in both areas, neither of which can really be considered an independent project.

Finally, one major architectural component that cannot yet be effectively pursued is the Common Workflow Infrastructure, which relies upon the Enterprise Directory and Common Authentication. Once these initial components have been more thoroughly developed, work can begin on the Workflow piece.

**Status:**

The NBA Technology Development Team has reviewed the request and recommends that the projects be given the listed priorities.

**Next Steps:**

The NBA Implementation Workgroup should decide what further action should be taken to initiate/continue these projects and assign them to an appropriate workgroup.

## **Project 2: Report to NBA Implementation Workgroup on approach to campus wide Citrix pool investigation.**

### **Purpose:**

At the November 26<sup>th</sup> NBA Implementation Workgroup Executive Committee meeting the group discussed the possibility of combining the current distributed Citrix servers (Banner, AIS, Office of RMP) together into one environment. This also included adding the DaFIS client/server application in this environment. The interest in this approach is to combine the current distributed hardware resources together into one pool in order to leverage the fail over and load-balancing possibilities of a larger server pool as well to provide centralized data center support to all the applications. Another desire of this approach is the "web-enabling" of these client/server applications using the Citrix web client solution. This would allow for a first integration step into the portal.

Since there are many technical issues that surround this approach, the NBA Implementation Workgroup Executive Committee asked that Brian Alexander, Jeff Barrett, Joseph Calger, and Bill Grabert define both an approach to this investigation and who should be included.

### **Participants:**

Patrick Kelly – Information Resources  
Tom Arons – Information Resources  
Martha Cornejo – Information Resources  
Paul Hirose – Engineering  
Dale Hurt - University Relations  
Katie Stevens - DaFIS  
Chip Mrizek – Facilities  
Michael Timineri – CR

### **Issues:**

Some of the issues that this group should investigate are the following:

- What solutions exist for web-enabling these applications natively?
- What are the technical issues of the Citrix web solution?
- To what extent would the application owners be receptive to this approach?
- Can the different applications (e.g., Banner and DaFIS) co-exist on the same server? How will upgrades to one application impact the others?
- How does the Citrix web solution work with other goals like single sign-on and portal integration?
- What are the costs of moving in this direction? What are the costs of not moving in this direction?
- How would a move like this be implemented?
- Who will be able to participate in the Citrix Server pool if implemented? Can any department participate, or only certain systems?

### **Status:**

The NBA Technology Development Team has reviewed the request and recommends that the listed participants investigate this issue further.

### **Next Steps:**

The NBA Implementation Workgroup should decide if further action should be taken in this investigation and arrange for tasks to be assigned to the recommended workgroup.

### **Project 3: Report to NBA Implementation Workgroup on approach to additional E-mail and calendaring integration into the portal.**

#### **Purpose:**

MyUCDavis e-mail integration is currently limited to users of the central campus mail servers, and the portal is not presently integrated with any personal or departmental calendaring software. The NBA Implementation Workgroup Executive Committee expressed interest in providing a greater range of users the ability to access their e-mail and schedule via the portal. To this end, the NBA Implementation Workgroup Executive Committee requested that the Technology Development Team define both an approach to this investigation and who should be included.

#### **Participants:**

Debbie Edwards and/or Mike Wade – Information Resources (Postmaster)  
Bill Broadley – Mathematics (Unix-based departmental e-mail administrator)  
Perla Dinger – Information Resources (Meeting Maker administrator)  
Richard Sutherland – Information Resources (MyUCDavis Team)  
Dave Zavatson – Information Resources  
Mary Jo Landers – Information Resources  
Minh Nguyen – L&S Deans Office  
At least one person from a large Exchange organization (Sharie Sprague, Scott Hanley or Adam Getchell)  
One person from Student Affairs

#### **Issues:**

Issues that this group should investigate include the following:

- What is the range of options for portal integration (e.g., integration of existing central and departmental services, change in centralized service, etc.)
- How interested is the campus in having a common email/calendaring infrastructure?
- What are the associated costs (and/or potential savings)?
- Is it feasible to also have calendaring available for “resources” (e.g. LCD projectors, conference rooms, etc), or will only personal calendaring be provided?

Existing departmental e-mail and calendaring servers include Exchange, Unix, Meeting Maker, Netscape, Corporate Time, and others.

As one possible alternative to integrating the variety of existing departmental servers, the TDT discussed the idea of a central campus Exchange Server. Exchange 2000 includes a well-developed and customizable web-based interface for e-mail and calendaring, potentially easing the integration of those functions into the portal. Because Exchange also supports POP, such a solution would not necessarily require folks to change their existing e-mail clients (e.g., Eudora). Since many departments currently maintain Exchange servers, there might also be an opportunity to simultaneously consolidate those as well. (Alternatively, there could also be central campus Exchange server that the existing departmental servers could simply tie into.)

#### **Status:**

The NBA Technology Development Team has reviewed the request and recommends that the listed participants investigate this issue further.

#### **Next Steps:**

The NBA Implementation Workgroup should decide if further action should be taken in this investigation and arrange for tasks to be assigned to the recommended workgroup.