

# JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

## Project Document Cover Sheet

### PROJECT PLAN

#### Project

<b>Project Acronym</b>	IDENTITYPROJECT	<b>Project ID</b>	
<b>Project Title</b>	The Identity Project		
<b>Start Date</b>	1 November 2006	<b>End Date</b>	30 October 2007
<b>Lead Institution</b>	Cardiff University		
<b>Project Director</b>	Jean Sykes, Chair of Steering Committee		
<b>Project Manager &amp; contact details</b>	<b>Name:</b> Joan Wright <b>Address:</b> Information Services, Cardiff University, 39-31 Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3BB. <b>tel:</b> 029 2087 4496 <b>fax:</b> 029 2087 4285 <b>email:</b> wright@cardiff.ac.uk		
<b>Partner Institutions</b>	Cardiff University (CU), London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE), Birkbeck College (BBK), Goldsmiths College (GOLD), Imperial College London (ICL), Queen Mary University of London (QMUL), Royal Holloway College (RHUL), School of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS), University College London (UCL)		
<b>Project Web URL</b>	<a href="http://www.identity-project.info/">http://www.identity-project.info/</a>		
<b>Programme Name (and number)</b>	<i>JISC E-Infrastructure Programme</i>		
<b>Programme Manager</b>	James Farnhill		

#### Document

<b>Document Title</b>	Project Plan		
<b>Author(s) &amp; project role</b>	Simon McLeish, Rhys Smith, John Paschoud, Joan Wright		
<b>Date</b>	17/01/2007	<b>Filename</b>	IdentityProjectProjectPlan
<b>URL</b>			
<b>Access</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

#### Document History

Version	Date	Comments
0a	06/01/07	Draft for comment by JISC at start of project
0b	24/02/07	Modified version of draft after Steering Committee meeting

## Overview of Project

### 1. Background

The JISC's recent "Core Middleware: Infrastructure" programme and "Core Middleware: Technology Development programme" have built the foundation blocks for the development of a new access management service within the UK. The UK Access Management Federation was formally launched in November 2006, and aims to support the four strategic requirements for access management within the UK that were identified as part of the JISC AAA Programme:

1. Access Management for internal (intra-institutional) applications;
2. Management of access to third-party digital library-type resources;
3. Access Management for inter-institutional use - stable, long-term resource sharing between defined groups (e.g. shared e-learning scenarios);
4. Inter-institutional use – ad-hoc collaborations, dynamic in nature (e.g. Virtual Organisations).

Meeting the fourth requirement is an essential part of achieving the vision of an "e-Infrastructure", as described in the Science and Innovation Investment Framework 2004 - 2014. Whilst the implementation of federated access management (FAM) is a positive step towards provisioning an e-Infrastructure that can meet the evolving requirements of researchers, further work is required to allow institutions the opportunity to engage with new opportunities.

Once such area of further work is the area of Identity Management (IDM). This is because a key part of an access management federation is the trust between members that their respective IDM arrangements are equivalent - or at least meet a minimum agreed level. The provision of access to resources by one member to another can then be based on that assurance. Hence there is a need to establish consensus and provide guidelines on the equivalence of various IDM arrangements, including technologies, practices, policies and processes.

As such, the JISC issued Circular 3/06, calling for projects to investigate e-Infrastructure Security, specifically (amongst other things) in the areas of Identity Management within Institutions and Identity Management across Institutional Boundaries. This led to this project - "The Identity Project" - proposal being submitted by Cardiff University and the London School of Economics & Political Science, in collaboration with seven other partner institutions. These full list of partner institutions involved are:

- Cardiff University (CU)
- London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE)
- Birkbeck College (BBK)
- Goldsmiths College (GOLD)
- Imperial College London (ICL)
- Queen Mary University of London (QMUL)
- Royal Holloway College (RHUL)
- School of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS)
- University College London (UCL)

This project will use its diverse consortium as the basis for research into the current practice and future needs of UK academic institutions in Identity Management. Identity management issues of interest to consortium members include Grid use, Shibboleth installations of varying degrees of maturity, collaborative courses and other long-term inter-institutional collaborations, internal and shared dynamic virtual organisations, classes of users other than the standard staff/student mix, library access schemes, and NHS involvement. All in all, this gives a wide range of IDM experience, problems and solutions that will allow us to assist the UK academic sector in allowing it to engage in the newly available opportunities of living in a federated world.

The project will carry out its research partly by surveying the current state of IDM across the country, partly by accomplishing certain key work packages with dedicated staff, and partly by involving staff at each partner, who will be familiar with local organisational structures and requirements. This research will be used to produce the major project deliverables, including a website designed to exploit the closely interlinked nature of identity management requirements. This website will include information about international efforts in the area (to which the project will contribute, building on

past links with the community), results from our research into the current state of IDM, and recommendations for future work, as well as the outcomes of the research at the project partners.

This project started on November 1<sup>st</sup> 2006, and will be completed by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2007.

## 2. Aims and Objectives

The broad aim of the project is to investigate and document the detailed IDM situation in UK higher education, and to produce outputs to assist academic institutions in the UK wishing to take part in the newly emerging federated world in understanding what they need from their own IDM to enable this.

More specifically, we aim to achieve:

- a comprehensive broad survey of the current state of IDM in UK academic institutions;
- a set of in-depth audits of IDM in a representative set of institutions.

Alongside these, we will also:

- investigate practise and policy around institutional membership;
- investigate how having NHS links affects an institution's requirements from IDM;
- investigate how having Grid Infrastructure affects an institution's requirements from IDM;
- identifying common problems (and their solutions if possible) apropos institutional IDM;
- examine current tools that assist with managing users, user groups and identities, and their applicability in an institutional context;
- attempt to establish community consensus on best practise in IDM;
- identify areas where further work is required.

## 3. Overall Approach

The overall approach to achieve these objectives, and the structure of the tasks, is described in detail in Section 15 (Workpackages) - particularly WP1 and WP2, which make up the bulk of the project.

A brief overview, however, is thus: The first main area of work - a broad survey of IDM across the UK academic sector – will be achieved through the use of an online survey. The second main area of work – in-depth institutional audits of IDM in a representative range of institutions – will be carried out by staff in each institution with help and guidance (and a template of how to go about the audit) coming from project staff.

Areas that will be covered include the following:

- Credential management (user registration and expiry procedures, safeguards against abuse of credentials, revocation of credentials) highlighting convergence with and differences from UCISA Information Security Policy toolkit Section H, User Management (<https://www.ucisa.ac.uk/acuk/infosecurity>) and ISO 17799 (Code of Practice for Information Security Management)
- Certificate management (where practised)
- Attribute stores and usage
- Handling of identity for individuals not classed as staff/student (academic and library visitors, contractors, etc)
- Handling of prior ID discovery for new users (e.g. postgraduate students who were prior undergraduate applicants) and of potentially competing ID generation by different parts of the institution (such as the Library and MIS)
- Identity security and privacy issues
- Requirements for use of credentials, including resource access, technological requirements (e.g. single sign on, stability and scalability), accounting and statistics, etc.
- Single institution and cross institution Virtual Organisations and tools
- Collaborative learning
- Integrating UK HE identity management with other communities (including NHS, overseas integration requirements), including problems requiring further work, standardisation issues (highlighting those which would benefit from an international approach)

- Personal Identity Management and managing identity across institutional boundaries (cross-affiliation): use cases in UK HE, including role management requirements; use cases between UK HE and other sectors.

## 4. Project Outputs

Early deliverables from the preparation phase of the project will be the Project Plan, and the plans for information gathering at each of the partner institutions. It is expected that these will form a useful resource for any institution seeking to carry out their own audit into their Identity Management situation and needs.

The principal deliverable will be the project website, which will gather together all outputs of the project to be made available to the community at large. This will include the results of the survey (described in WP1), the findings produced from the in-depth institutional audits (described in WP2), the specific influences on IDM (described in WP's 3-6), information on tools and their usefulness in an institutional context (described in WP7), and documentation on common IDM problems and solutions discovered during the duration of the project (described in WP8).

The findings produced by the in-depth institutional audits will have three main viewpoints, highlighting different dimensions of the research:

- **By partner.** This view will effectively sort the material into a series of case studies, together with separate strands of data from partners describing issues where they wish to remain anonymous.
- **By time.** This view will sort the material into current practice, current solutions and technology briefings, best practice recommendations, future plans, and recommendations for future work.
- **By subject.** This view will sort the material by topic (as described in Section 3).

Where work on standards and consensus building in the community is required, this will be taken on, producing appropriate documents through the project.

The final deliverable will be a summary report listing areas where further work is required, including specific recommendations for future JISC developments in relation to personal identity management.

## 5. Project Outcomes

The major outcome of the project will be the principal deliverable described in WP2, the website which describes in detail the research carried out throughout all work packages, and the results and conclusions obtained from that research. This should provide a clear basis for future work by JISC and others in the sphere of Identity Management.

Several parts of this deliverable will be designed for potential re-use by other members of the community (and will be clearly marked out as such):

- The plans for the institutional audits will be re-usable by other institutions planning to work through their identity management situation and future requirements
- The technology briefings will help those who wish to find clear and impartial information about the benefits and drawbacks of technical solutions for Identity Management
- The institutional case studies will provide information of use to similar institutions across the UK

A “side-effect” outcome of the project will be that the involvement of key staff at each of the project partners will increase the growth of the community of UK HE staff who are aware of the strategic and technical issues of next-generation identity and access management.

Finally, the increased readiness across the range of institutions in the UK for next-generation identity and access management developments will allow the UK academic sector to stay on the cutting edge of developments worldwide and will help increase international recognition of the the UK's technological prowess and abilities.

For further details, see Section 15 (Workpackages).

## 6. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Interest / stake	Importance
UCISA	Representing much of the UK HE community, UCISA is a major stakeholder in the outcomes of this project, as they will allow the community it represents to collaborate more effectively, as well as improving internal IDM processes and technologies	high
UKERNA	As the managers of the UK Access Management Federation, UKERNA are a major stakeholder in this project's outcomes, as they will influence take-up and effective adoption of the technology it manages	high
JISC	Since the mission of the JISC is to provide world-class leadership in the innovative use of Information and Communications Technology to support education and research, they are stakeholders: the project's outcomes will influence the readiness of UK institutions to innovate with their use of technology	high
RUGIT	Representing a specific group of HE in the UK, RUGIT are stakeholders in the outcomes of this project as it will allow the community it represents to innovate and collaboration more effectively	medium
IDM related staff in institutions	As people with jobs related to IDM (technologically, administratively or otherwise) within an institution, the outcomes of this project can help institutional staff to implement IDM in a way consistent with other UK institutions, and help them avoid common pitfalls	high
Developers in institutions	Developers in UK academic institutions will be interested in the outcomes of this project as the outcomes will influence their institution's readiness for using IDM technologies, policies and practise for internally developed systems.	medium
Researchers	Researchers across the UK are indirectly stakeholders in this project, as the outcomes will influence their institution's readiness and ability to participate with new federated technologies, thus giving them increased options with regards to collaboration and innovation.	low
Learners	Learners across the UK are also indirectly stakeholders in this project, as the outcomes will influence their institution's readiness and ability to participate with new federated technologies, thus giving them increased options with regards to collaboration and innovation, which can consequently affect their learning experience.	low
JISC Services	As the section of JISC responsible for many national infrastructure services, the outcomes of this project will influence the ability of many HE and FE institutions to actively participate in some new services.	medium

## 7. Risk Analysis

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Probability (1-5)</b>	<b>Severity (1-5)</b>	<b>Score (P x S)</b>	<b>Action to Prevent/Manage Risk</b>
Failure to produce deliverables due to lack of cooperation from other institutions	2	5	10	Early engagement with community, encouragement from the JISC, high level persuasion, sympathetic relationship management, getting backing of JISC, UCISA, and other similar organisations
Staffing: Loss of availability of Principal Investigators	2	3	6	Select carefully, and manage sympathetically. Be prepared to re-appoint at short notice or use other staff to do the job whenever needed.
Staffing: Unavailability of Key Researcher at any partner	2	3	6	Advance information about project timetable; prior commitment of senior staff; successful involvement of partners in past projects
Organisational: Key Researcher finding it difficult to access required information	2	3	6	Research criteria and methods agreed beforehand with Key Researcher; prior commitment of senior staff; successful involvement of partners in past projects; key researchers able to ask for advice from key researchers from other consortium members and core team
Failure to produce deliverables due to unexpected excessive complexity	1	5	5	Review scope of deliverables in consultation with the JISC.
Staffing: Failure to recruit Principal Investigators in CU and LSE	1	4	4	Candidates already identified, and in a position to start immediately, with no recruitment delay.
Staffing: Loss of availability of Project Manager or other personnel involved	1	3	3	Be aware of the possible need to re-assign another from the large pool of available staff in CU/LSE at short notice.
Technical: Failure of hardware or software	1	2	2	Be aware of dependencies; be ready to switch to alternatives.
Organisational: Breakdown of management structure	1	1	1	Establish clear structure at the start. Adhere to conditions of the grant and to institutional policies.
External suppliers	1	1	1	No part of the project depends on a single supplier. Be aware of alternatives.
Legal	1	1	1	No legal difficulties are anticipated. Be aware of the

				remote possibility of problems with copyright, privacy etc.
--	--	--	--	---

## 8. Standards

Name of standard or specification	Version	Notes
ISO 17799		An internationally recognized generic information security standard quite relevant to the area of identity management; also the basis for work by UCISA on recommendations for user security - "The Information Security Toolkit"

## 9. Technical Development

Since this project's aim is not to carry out technical development, but instead to inform future technical developments, no particular approaches to technical development are required.

## 10. Intellectual Property Rights

All publicly-available research outputs produced by the project will follow current JISC (or JISC-endorsed) guidelines for accessibility. Copyright of the appropriate author(s), and/or partner institutions will be asserted in all primary data and secondary research outputs. All secondary research outputs will be covered by the appropriate Creative Commons licence allowing free non-commercial re-use.

Any data which is personal and sensitive, as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998, will remain confidential and access will be withheld, in line with the provisions of this Act.

The project is required to comply with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, 2000. Any requests made by third parties for personal data, as defined by the Data Protection Act, 1998, will be exempt from the FOI Act, section 40 providing the relevant exemption.

## *Project Resources*

### 11. Project Partners

The main partners involved in this project, their role and main contact are:

- Cardiff University - Lead Institution – Joan Wright ([wright@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:wright@cardiff.ac.uk))
- London School of Economics – Lead Partner Institution – John Paschoud ([J.Paschoud@lse.ac.uk](mailto:J.Paschoud@lse.ac.uk))
- Birkbeck College (BBK) – Partner Institution – David Wilcox ([d.wilcox@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:d.wilcox@bbk.ac.uk))
- Goldsmiths College (GOLD) – Partner Institution - Basem El-Haddadeh (Basem El-Haddadeh)
- Imperial College London (ICL) – Partner Institution – Clare Jenkins ([c.jenkins@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:c.jenkins@imperial.ac.uk))
- Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) – Partner Institution – Brian Murphy ([b.murphy@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:b.murphy@qmul.ac.uk))
- Royal Holloway College (RHUL) – Partner Institution – Sarah Gerrard ([s.gerrard@rhul.ac.uk](mailto:s.gerrard@rhul.ac.uk))

- School of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS) – Partner Institution – Anne Poulson (ap45@soas.ac.uk)
- University College London (UCL) – Partner Institution – Paul Ayris ([p.ayris@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:p.ayris@ucl.ac.uk))

The project also currently has one Associate Partner (an institution which will not receive funding from JISC, but will receive support from the project team at LSE and Cardiff).

- University of London External Programme – Associate Institution – Peter Marsden (Peter.Marsden@lon.ac.uk)

## 12. Project Management

### Overall Governance

A national oversight committee for the project will be set up. This committee would exert overall control of the joint project, ensuring that the deliverables produced during the project are appropriate.

The committee would invite a senior representative from each of the 9 partner institutions, with LSE being invited to nominate a Chair of the group. Cardiff would nominate Dr Hugh Beedie (CTO and Assistant Director, INSRV) as Vice-Chair of the group. Representatives would also be invited from relevant outside bodies, including UCISA (David Harrison, current UCISA Vice-Chair) and the JISC. The steering group would aim to meet face to face 3 times during the 1 year project (at the start of the project, 6 months in, and at the end), and would meet virtually through video conferencing and email collaboration as often as deemed necessary.

### Project Management

Core project management and support functions will be divided between the staff at Cardiff and LSE, with Joan Wright at Cardiff (as the Lead Partner) taking named responsibility for financial and formal progress reporting to JISC, and John Paschoud at LSE taking responsibility for liaison between the partnership, with external agencies and relevant projects (such as the parallel JISC-funded investigation into Levels Of Assurance), and for reporting to the national steering committee.

The core project team at Cardiff and LSE will perform the bulk of the work on both the National IM Overview, and the 9 Institutional IM Studies, depending on local staff in each partner institution to gather basic information from their own institution, and lead on local dissemination activities about the work of the project. The core project team will also devote significant time to outward-facing dissemination, during the whole life of the project, contributing to and working with other channels of dissemination available to JISC.

It will be recommended that all partners (including LSE and Cardiff) should establish (or identify an existing institutional body that can act as) a local project advisory group, representing key departments or services of their institution concerned with Identity Management. These bodies will provide local advice to the project and help to raise local awareness of the issues with which it is dealing. The relevant groups of representatives at LSE and Cardiff have already been identified.

An important feature of the Consortium Agreement (already in draft) for the project will be trust between partners, so that potentially sensitive or security-compromising information about the internal infrastructures, policies and procedures of a partner can be disclosed to the project team in the knowledge that it will be handled appropriately and not published without proper approvals and safeguards.

### Core Project Management Team

Mr Jonathan Giddy	Grid Technologies Coordinator, WeSC, CU
Mr Simon McLeish	Principal Technical Officer, LSE Library, LSE
Mr John Paschoud	InfoSystems Engineer & Projects Manager, LSE Library, LSE
Mr Paul Rock	Principal Consultant Engineer (Directory Services), INSRV, CU
Mr Rhys Smith	Engineering Consultant: Identity & Access Management, INSRV, CU
Ms Joan Wright	Principal Consultant (Strategy, Projects & Liaison), INSRV, CU - Project Manager

## Consultation and Co-operation

The project team will also consult with other parties with an interest in UK higher education identity management, including particularly close collaboration with the project funded to carry out the levels of assurance work from the call. Level of Assurance requirements will need to feed into identity management work, and vice versa. The project team already has contacts with the team working on the 'ES-LoA' Level of Assurance bid. This work will go on right through the project, which will mean that the timetables of the this project and those funded to cover the Level of Assurance aspects of this call will need some co-ordination, as well as a willingness to amend earlier work in the light of deliverables produced by the Level of Assurance project(s).

MIMAS will provide a content provider's perspective on the identity management issues which the project will investigate. Links will be maintained with the National Grid Service, Eduserv (as proprietors of Athens) and UKERNA (as operators of the UK Access Management Federation), so that the project can inform them of our findings, and so that they can inform our work with their ideas for UK HE identity management. Other relevant organisations will also be kept informed and consulted, including overseas bodies such as Internet2, SURF (e.g. through the Infrawijs project) and TERENA (e.g. through the EARNEST project). The reports from the project will describe good practice, and make recommendations as to how institutions can achieve this from their existing positions which may fall short. The Core Study team will also coordinate the dissemination activities of the project, involving staff from the other partners where appropriate.

## 13. Programme Support

The main area of support the project would require from its programme manager and the JISC are:

- Helping disseminate how important it is that the community get involved with the project as much as possible, in order that its deliverables are both more “correct”, and have higher levels of community consensus;
- Managing a conference at the end of the project related to IDM and presenting the results of the project in order to engage the community and disseminate the conclusions as widely as possible.

## 14. Budget

The project budget is attached in Appendix A, and remains unchanged since the version presented in the original project proposal.

## *Detailed Project Planning*

## 15. Workpackages

See Appendix B.

## 16. Evaluation Plan

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
Post-project	How successfully we identified our audience	How well the project targeted its outputs to as wide a range of academic institutions as possible	Questionnaire at HE Identity Event	Number of academic institutions at event; Number of academic institutions now working on IDM as result of project
Post-	How successfully	How well the project	Questionnaire	Number of HE's now

project	we engaged with our audience	garnered community consensus and understanding of the key issues around IDM and its importance	re at HE Identity Event	working on IDM as result of project
Post-project	How useful the outcomes of our reports were the community	How useful the information produced by the project has been to the community in understanding IDM and taking steps to “improve” it	Questionnaire at HE Identity Event	Percentage of those who felt the information was useful

## 17. Quality Plan

Output	Publicly Available Material				
	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Before making publicly available	Professional presentation	Proof reading and Review by staff not directly involved with project	Good spelling and grammar, good graphic design	Staff to be identified but outside project	Word spell and grammar check
Before making publicly available	Accuracy and completeness of data and conclusions	Peer review of content	Agreement and community consensus	Peers to be identified	N.A.
Before making publicly available	Accuracy and completeness of data and conclusions	Review by appropriate experts, if appropriate	Agreement from experts	Experts to be identified	N.A.

## 18. Dissemination Plan

As dissemination is such an important area of this project, full details of the dissemination plan will be detailed in a separate document - “Communications Plan”. This will deal with the main areas of communications:

- Communication within The Identity Project;
- Communication with JISC;
- Communication with the UK academic community; and
- Communication with the public.

The Communications Plan will also deal with the methods of communication – via our website, via specialised events, and via the public media.

## 19. Exit and Sustainability Plans

Project Outputs	Action for Take-up & Embedding	Action for Exit
Survey & Survey Results	Publish survey on web site. Publish suitably anonymised survey results on web site. Make community aware of both being there. Publicise at HE identity Event.	Ensure website available for at least 2 years after project completion.
Institutional IDM audit guide	Publish guide on web site and work with community to make them aware of it being there. Publicise at HE Identity Event.	Ensure website available for at least 2 years after project completion.
Project Website	Ensure cross-linking to website from other sites. Publicise at events.	Ensure website available for at least 2 years after project completion.
Project Wiki	For public areas, publicise. For restricted areas, assess whether this could form part of next phase of work to address recommendations raised.	Ensure wiki available for at least 2 years after project completion.

Project Outputs	Why Sustainable	Scenarios for Taking Forward	Issues to Address
Key findings from Survey Results	Presents a view of the current status of IDM in UK academia and an understanding of where further work is needed	Areas of survey discovered to be key taken forward internationally by institutions such as Internet2, TERENA, etc.  Futher projects funded by the JISC and/or other organisations to address areas of further work identified;  Organisations such as UCISA and RUGIT emphasise importance of key findings for wider adoption by community	Survey results will become increasingly out of date; the more The Identity Project has an impact on uk academia, the faster this will happen
Institutional IDM audit guide	Gives a guide on how an institution can conduct an institutional IDM audit to better understand their current situation	Publish on JISC website and make sure it is mentioned in JISC publicity materials on IDM.	Guide will become out of date as institutions learn more about IDM audit.
Key findings from in-depth institutional audits	Presents in-depth information of current state of IDM in several	Futher projects funded by the JISC and/or other organisations to address areas of further work	As above with survey results, risk of findings becoming out of date.

	representative institutions	identified; Organisations such as UCISA and RUGIT emphasise importance of key findings for wider adoption by community	
--	-----------------------------	---	--

## Appendixes

### Appendix A. Project Budget

The following table represents in full the expected expenditure over the one year of the project.

	JISC Contribution Requested	Internal Contribution	Total
<b>Cardiff University</b>			
<b>Staffing costs (gross):</b>			
Total	£60,540		£60,540
<b>FeC Costs (for total of 1.3 FTE):</b>			
Recruitment costs		£910	£910
Staff training		£6,500	£6,500
Consumables		£650	£650
Small equipment		£1,300	£1,300
Accommodation		£7,150	£7,150
Lighting		£312	£312
Heating		£572	£572
HR and Financial Administration		£780	£780
Secretarial support		£1,950	£1,950
Car Parking		£260	£260
<b>Other:</b>			
Travel & Subsistence	£6,000		£6,000
Equipment (specify individual items over £10k)	£9,000		£9,000
Dissemination activities	£1,643		£1,643
Evaluation activities		£5,000	£5,000
<b>Sub-Total for Cardiff University</b>	<b>£77,183</b>	<b>£25,384</b>	<b>£102,567</b>
<b>LSE</b>			
<b>Staffing costs (gross):</b>			
Total	£97,853		£97,853
<b>FeC Costs (for total of 2.1 FTE):</b>			
Based upon London-averaged FeC costs		£107,369	£107,369

	JISC Contribution Requested	Internal Contribution	Total
<b>Other:</b>			
Travel & Subsistence	£2,000		£2,000
Equipment (specify individual items over £10k)			
Dissemination activities	£2,000		£2,000
Evaluation activities		£5,000	£5,000
<b>Sub-Total for LSE</b>	<b>£101,853</b>	<b>£112,369</b>	<b>£214,222</b>

### Partner Institutions

#### Staffing costs (gross):

Institutional Key Researcher, BBK (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, GOLD (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, ICL (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, QMUL (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, RHUL (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, SOAS (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821
Institutional Key Researcher, UCL (AR2, 0.2 FTE)	£8,821		£8,821

#### FeC Costs (Based upon London-averaged FeC costs, 0.2 FTE each):

BBK		£10,226	£10,226
GOLD		£10,226	£10,226
ICL		£10,226	£10,226
QMUL		£10,226	£10,226
RHUL		£10,226	£10,226
SOAS		£10,226	£10,226
UCL		£10,226	£10,226
<b>Sub-Total for Partner Institutions</b>	<b>£61,746</b>	<b>£71,579</b>	<b>£133,325</b>

<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>£240,782</b>	<b>£209,229</b>	<b>£450,112</b>
(Percentage of total funding)	53.5%	46.5%	
<b>Total requested from JISC</b>	<b>£240,782</b>		

**Appendix B. Workpackages**

Task Name (milestone)	Milestone	Start Date	Finish Date
<i>WP1: Broad Survey</i>		1 Dec 06	13 Oct 07
Research existing IDM surveys		1 Dec 06	28 Feb 07
Gather contact details of institutions		1 Dec 06	28 Feb 07
Prepare Survey		1 Jan 07	16 Mar 07
Distribute Survey	Y	19 Mar 07	19 Mar 07
Chase Survey Responses		1 Apr 07	18 May 07
Survey Results all in	Y	31 May 07	31 May 07
Collate Survey results		1 Jun 07	15 Jun 07
Identify interesting institutions		16 Jun 07	30 Jun 07
Process Survey data		16 Jun 07	5 Oct 07
Investigate interesting institutions		1 Jul 07	31 Aug 07
Process research data		1 Jul 07	31 Aug 07
Produce Survey Report	Y	8 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP2: Case Studies</i>		1 Nov 06	13 Oct 07
Set up dates for meetings		1 Nov 06	28 Feb 07
Project staff in place at partner institutions		1 Nov 06	28 Feb 07
Finalise topic list for research		1 Jan 07	31 Mar 07
Organise technology briefings for co-ordinators		1 Nov 06	31 Mar 07
Draft Research Guide		1 Jan 07	31 Mar 07
Research Guide Available	Y	31 Mar 07	31 Mar 07
Carry out research at each partner		1 Mar 07	30 Jun 07
Process research data		1 Jul 07	5 Oct 07
Produce research report	Y	8 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP3: Institutional Membership</i>		1 Dec 06	13 Oct 07
Research existing info re Institutional Membership		1 Dec 06	23 Feb 07
Identify additional input for WP1 and WP2		1 Jan 07	23 Feb 07
Feed in additional topics to WP1 and WP2	Y	26 Feb 07	26 Feb 07
Identify interesting institutions to add to WP1 Further Investigation		16 Jun 07	30 Jun 07

Process gathered data		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP4: IDM and NHS</i>		1 Dec 06	13 Oct 07
Research existing info re IDM and NHS		1 Dec 06	14 Mar 07
Identify additional input for WP1 and WP2		1 Jan 07	14 Mar 07
Feed in additional topics to WP1 and WP2	Y	14 Mar 07	16 Mar 07
Identify interesting institutions to add to WP1 Further Investigation		16 Jun 07	30 Jun 07
Process gathered data		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP5: IDM and Grid</i>		1 Dec 06	13 Oct 07
Research existing info re IDM and Grid		1 Dec 06	14 Mar 07
Identify additional input for WP1 and WP2		1 Jan 07	14 Mar 07
Feed in additional topics to WP1 and WP2	Y	14 Mar 07	16 Mar 07
Identify interesting institutions to add to WP1 Further Investigation		16 Jun 07	30 Jun 07
Process gathered data		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP6: Tools</i>		1 Nov 06	13 Oct 07
Identify available tools		1 Nov 06	28 Feb 07
Install and configure test equipment		1 Dec 06	28 Feb 07
Install and configure identified tools		1 Mar 07	31 Mar 07
Investigate tools		1 Apr 07	31 Aug 07
Process results of investigation		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07
<i>WP7: Identify Common Problems, Solutions</i>		1 Dec 06	13 Oct 07
Research existing info on common problems/solutions		1 Dec 06	14 Mar 07
Feed in additional topics to WP1 and WP2	Y	14 Mar 07	14 Mar 07
Process gathered data		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07

<i>WP8: Best Practice and Future Developments</i>		1 Nov 06	13 Oct 07
Agree any best practice with the community		1 Nov 06	31 Aug 07
Process all information gathered		1 Sep 07	30 Sep 07
Produce additions to Final Reports	Y	15 Sep 07	13 Oct 07