

## TAG Questionnaire Responses Analysis

### I. General Results: Numbers correspond to questionnaire.

1. The Hardware planned for usage supports Java standards: Java support for J2SE 1.4.2 is stable for Intel, Power (IBM) and Sun Sparc.
2. The Operating Systems planned for usage support java standards: J2SE 1.4.2 and J2EE 1.3 are stable for Windows (2K forward), AIX, and Sun Solaris.
3. The Appserver are all supportive of Java Standards: Tomcat, JBoss-Tomcat bundle, Websphere (5.x) are all within the J2EE 1.3 compatibility matrix (Tomcat is the reference implementation for Servlet and JSP).
4. The DBMS implementations provide compliant Java support: Although MS SQL Server 7 is not supported by Microsoft's free jdbc driver, DataDirect offers a full support (including jdbc 3.0) for sale. Each of the other RDBMS (Oracle, DB2) includes a fully compliant JDBC 3.0 type 4 driver.
5. None of the campuses report current Web Services exposure for all external systems. One campus is willing to try (UCLA), one campus is ready to go (UCSD mostly). The rest are not ready in any significant way. The contrast between these responses and the Question 22 responses indicates a need for clarification.
6. The Java API support is the same as the Web Services support. Of course, remote access to any of the systems would imply RMI extensions to any java API's.
7. The best overall support is in the JDBC accessible data. Since all of the DBMS offerings have good, well-supported JDBC implementations, direct access to the DBMS of choice for the campus is appealing. A snapshot approach would be best for this choice for 3 reasons. 1- Low impact on operational system performance. 2- Predictable, manageable point-in-time cutoff for operational data. 3- Responses to question 23 indicate a preference for extract versus real-time.
8. No commonality to take advantage of.
9. One campus will have JNDI/LDAP access in the project timeframe. The other campuses do not have plans for this capability in this timeframe.
10. No common authentication approach will be in place within the project timeframe. We will need clarification and guidance in this area.
11. No general purpose Role system in place now.
12. All campuses are attempting to extend their Role capabilities. We need clarification and guidance about capabilities to be in place in the project timeframe.
13. Access Restriction based on data values is not in place in any campus in a general purpose way. Two campuses are looking at ways to extend their capabilities in this area (SIGNET initiative in Internet 2 Middleware was sited as a possible standardized approach).

**TAG Questionnaire Responses****Analysis**

14. It is not clear whether any of the respondents expect to have a general-purpose solution in place in the project timeframe. We need clarification and guidance.
15. LDAP is not currently directly available for Authentication at any campus.
16. Only one campus expects to open LDAP for Authentication in the ERS project timeframe.
17. LDAP is not available for Roles.
18. LDAP will not be generally available for Roles in the project timeframe.
19. LDAP is not generally available for Value-based authorization.
20. LDAP will not be generally available for Value-based authorization..
21. Although two campuses have comprehensive plans, it is not clear whether either of them will be in place in time to participate in the development and testing of ERS (January, 2005 – December, 2005). We need clarification and guidance.
22. All campuses anticipate using Web Services for access to external systems. This is in contrast to the response to question 5. We need clarification and guidance.
23. The campuses indicate a preference for batch mode extract to external systems versus real-time.
24. It seems safe to generate email that will not be automatically shunted by campus mail servers.
25. One campus has concerns about relying on email as the only means of notification. Others suggest mechanisms to make this a viable filtering-safe notification tool. We need clarification and guidance on any non-mail approaches to notification.
26. There is a good possibility that most campuses will step up the war on spam in the project timeframe. Notification may need some regular maintenance.
27. Two standards based portal implementations (UPortal, Vignette) are currently available at the campuses. The myucdavis implementation may be standards based, but more information is needed. Offering a mechanism to encapsulate ERS functionality inside a Portlet (at least not doing something that would preclude such encapsulation) would be valuable to these campuses.
28. The campuses expect safe page construction for use in portals as long as the resultant html is clean and standard (consult JSR 168). We will need guidance in this area.
29. All campuses responded quarter, except Berkeley(semester).
30. One campus has a preference for xml/xslt server-side transforms. The others are open, but in one case there is a preference for similarity to existing systems. This will require more in depth discussion and guidance in the near future