

Change of direction for Signet project

From: RL 'Bob' Morgan <rlmorgan@washington.edu>
To: Signet Users <signet-users@internet2.edu>, Signet Dev <signet-dev@internet2.edu>
Subject: [signet-dev] change of direction for Signet project
Date: Tue, 21 Oct 2008 16:23:59 -0700

This note is to let everyone know about the status and direction of the Signet project and product. This topic was discussed at the Grouper/Signet BoF at the Internet2 Member Meeting last week.

The Signet project has been public since April 2004. During that time lots of great work has been done in system design, development, project management, collaboration, and outreach. Unfortunately, what has been missing is adoption. Lots of sites have shown interest in Signet, and tried it out in various ways, but we're not aware of any significant production deployments. (If someone out there is using it in production, please let us know!)

There are many possible reasons for this. Maybe privilege management as an infrastructure service is not yet in scope for most university IT organizations, so Signet is ahead of its time. Maybe those campuses that are doing privilege management are more likely to add on to an existing homegrown service than try a new product. Maybe potential adopters looked at earlier versions of Signet that weren't ready for production and never came back to it. Maybe the product is too complicated, or requires too much work to try it out. Maybe it was a mistake to make Signet a separate product from Grouper, which has had a number of large deployments in the last year or two. Maybe Signet has just been missing the killer app whose privilege problems it could solve.

In any case MACE and the Internet2 Middleware Initiative continue to believe that privilege management is a core institutional service (and an organizational service in the context of collaborative organizations and COmanage) and that we need to find ways to support our community's requirements for it. But we have to face the fact that Signet in its current form seems not to be an effective vehicle for this at this time. As folks have seen, our colleagues at Duke have led an effort to assess current campus requirements for privilege management. While this is still going on (and let me encourage folks to respond to the survey if they haven't yet, you only get to complain if you vote! 8^*) indications are that sites are interested in approaches that can integrate easily and be deployed incrementally along with all the existing stuff in campus environments.

The specific change at this time is that the current funded Signet work will continue through the end of this calendar year but not be renewed after that. There is still discussion to be had about work to be done on the product during that time to tie up loose ends. This work has been supported by an NSF grant that is ending next year, hence there is some urgency in making a change.

We'll be taking this opportunity to look at other approaches to meeting people's needs, such as, for example, simple management of named privileges as an extension to Grouper. We also know many sites are interested in the new work such as Kuali Identity Management, and how that will relate to enterprise services. There are other privilege management systems out there that might have some advantages. For now we'll be having these discussions under the Signet project banner, using the existing signet mailing lists (primarily signet-dev) and conference calls. I encourage those interested in this topic to participate, especially those we've heard from already who said "I always assumed Signet would be there when I got around to needing it some time." We agree that privilege management needs to be in the toolkit, but we need to work on creating the thriving community to make it so.

In the interest of accountability, let me note that the decision makers on this (the "we" I mention above) are me, as chair of MACE, Ken Klingenstein, as director of the Internet2 Middleware Initiative and budget maven, and Tom Barton, project manager of the Grouper project. Many others were involved in lots of discussions to get here, and I hope they'll continue to participate.

- RL "Bob" Morgan