

ProjectPlan < Projects/FAR < TWiki

Table of Contents

FAR Project Plan.....	1
Overview of Project.....	1
1. Background.....	1
2. Aims and Objectives.....	1
3. Overall Approach.....	2
4. Project Outputs.....	2
5. Project Outcomes.....	3
6. Stakeholder Analysis.....	3
7. Risk Analysis.....	3
8. Standards.....	4
9. Technical Development.....	5
10. Intellectual Property Rights.....	5
Project Resources.....	5
11. Project Partners.....	5
12. Project Management.....	5
13. Programme Support.....	6
14. Budget.....	6
Detailed Project Planning.....	6
15. Workpackages.....	6
16. Evaluation Plan.....	7
17. Quality Plan.....	8
18. Dissemination Plan.....	10
19. Exit and Sustainability Plans.....	10
Appendixes.....	11
Appendix A. Project Budget?.....	11
Appendix B. Workpackages?.....	12

FAR Project Plan

This is an attempt to emulate, as closely as possible, the JISC standard Project Plan template as a wiki page. The format is taken from the template version dated April 2007, at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/proj_manguide.aspx. Explanatory notes about completing the template are included as comments and will be visible only when you edit the page.

JISC Project Plan

Overview of Project

1. Background

Federated Access Management (FAM) is increasing in importance in the HE community, with the advent of the UK Access Management Federation. Briefly, FAM seeks to separate the management of identity from the management of resources, with tools for the former passing attributes describing user roles to the tools for the latter. However, applications of this philosophy to repositories are currently primitive, generally requiring attributes to be passed which uniquely identify the user and relying on the existing access control mechanisms in the repository software for the more complex authorisation tasks (such as who can edit metadata for an item in an existing collection).

The FAR project will develop attributes which describe authorisation at the micro-level for repositories, and enhance or redevelop the existing tools for FAM using the Shibboleth technology to provide the sophisticated access to DSpace and EPrints repositories which is required in an environment in which FAM is common.

2. Aims and Objectives

The aim of the project is to establish best practice for enabling Federated Access to repositories, in particular so that authorisation for access to sub-collections, specific parts of the workflow, etc. is enforceable based on the attribute values passed by FAM software such as Shibboleth. The project will work specifically with EPrints and DSpace, but will also make recommendations as to how the work done could be extended to Fedora.

- Create recommendations for attributes to describe authorisation to repositories; where appropriate, these recommendations will be passed to relevant standards groups
- Develop extensions to the repository software (EPrints and DSpace) so that it can be used with Shibboleth and meet these requirements (building on earlier work where this exists)
- Test existing work integrating Shibboleth and Fedora and recommend to developers what will be needed to meet these requirements
- Install demonstration repositories to show how this can work in practice
- Feed the modifications and full documentation into the appropriate repository software development process to ensure maintenance through future releases of Eprints and Shibboleth
- Develop procedures to consider ways of extending federated access management to new functionality introduced into the repository software products following the conclusion of the project

A demonstrator of the software will be produced as well as a final version.

3. Overall Approach

The project will start by devising the attributes required for low-level access control in repositories. The approach taken for this process will be two pronged: it will examine appropriate use cases (both existing ones from other projects) and devise new ones which will describe the activities of repository users; and it will carry out an analysis of the DSpace and EPrints software to determine the points at which some form of access control is applied. The outcomes of this process will be a collection of attributes relevant to real-world situations, and specifications for software development which will be able to rank the desirability of enabling FAM-based authorisation to each access control point in the two software products. Candidate sources for use cases to be analysed include: RepoMMAN Project's User Needs Analysis, OAI-ORE Thoughts on Compound Objects, and the DISK-UK DataShare Project.

Testing of the software developed from these specifications will be carried out on the FAR project server. This will host a Shibboleth Service Provider protecting the amended DSpace and EPrints installations, which will obtain user attributes from a Shibboleth Identity Provider which will use an LDAP server also hosted on the server. This will contain test accounts derived from the user cases, with associated test scripts to allow members of the community to try out and test the FAM access to the relevant repository functionality. The Identity Provider will also give access for these users to pages on the project WIKI, which the testers can use to report and comment on the testing.

An important issue to be addressed by the project will be to aim to ensure that the code enabling Shibboleth integration does not become obsolete with updates to either Shibboleth or the repository software, whether EPrints or DSpace; the project developers will liaise with the teams of repository developers and the Internet2 developers to ensure that this is the case as far as is possible. The project will also maintain contact with a range of national federations to keep the project in line with the latest thinking on cross-federation access to resources. The Shibboleth 2.0 software (currently in beta) will be used to ensure interoperability with Shibboleth releases for as long as possible.

The project will restrict its scope to the development required to implement Federated Access Management and the use of attributes for complex authorisation in repositories.

4. Project Outputs

- 1.1 Report describing attributes and their use in terms of repository access (due Feb 2008)
- 1.2 LDAP server containing sample users with these attributes (Feb 2008)
- 2.1 Demonstration system running demonstrator software for EPrints (April 2008)
- 2.2 Draft documentation for EPrints (April 2008)
- 3.1 Software release as part of EPrints or as standard extension (July 2008)
- 3.2 Final version of documentation easily accessible from EPrints web site (July 2008)
- 3.3 Report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term EPrints development programme (July 2008)
- 4.1 Demonstration system running demonstrator software for DSpace (April 2008)
- 4.2 Draft documentation for DSpace (April 2008)
- 5.1 Software release as part of DSpace or as standard extension (July 2008)
- 5.2 Final version of documentation easily accessible from DSpace web site (July 2008)
- 5.3 Report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term DSpace development programme (July 2008)
- 6.1 Report outlining software modifications to Fedora document management software that would enable similar functionality to that developed for DSpace and EPrints (July 2008)

The FAR project will develop understanding of the interaction between FAM and repository technology in both communities.

5. Project Outcomes

Greater use of repository software for non-public repositories or part-public repositories.

Contribution to understanding of FAM development community of how repositories fit into e-framework.

6. Stakeholder Analysis

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Stakeholder	Interest / stake	Importance
EPrints repository managers in academic institutions	Stake in continued manageability of repositories with Federated Access Management	Medium: Repository managers from partner institutions and from the wider community will be involved in the project to ensure that their needs are met
DSpace repository managers in academic institutions	Stake in continued manageability of repositories with Federated Access Management	Medium: Repository managers from partner institutions and from the wider community will be involved in the project to ensure that their needs are met
Fedora repository managers in academic institutions	Stake in continued manageability of repositories with Federated Access Management	Low: Repository managers from partner institutions and from the wider community will be involved in the project to ensure that their needs are met
EPrints software developer community	Wish to see Federated Access Management added to eprints software	High: Project software must fit into EPrints development plans
DSpace software developer community	Wish to see Federated Access Management capabilities of DSpace software enhanced	High: Project software must fit into DSpace development plans
Fedora software developer community	Wish to see Federated Access Management capabilities of Fedora software enhanced	Low: FAR will consider Fedora functionality but not develop software
Shibboleth software developer community	Wish to see additional software become compliant with Shibboleth	Medium: Project software must fit into Shibboleth development plans
JISC FLAME Project team	Seeking targets for FLAME project to work with.	Low: FLAME involvement is not crucial to any of the work planned for FAR, but may provide useful feedback
DISK-UK DataShare? Project team	Access control is one aspect of the Datashare project's interest in the use of repositories for sharing of data sets.	High: Data set use cases are likely to be of high interest to FAR, and project funding has been allocated to obtaining time from Datashare project staff.

7. Risk Analysis

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Risk	Probability (1-5)	Severity (1-5)	Score (P x S)	Action to Prevent/Manage Risk
------	----------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------------------

ProjectPlan < Projects/FAR < TWiki

Organisational: completed software is unmaintainable after project conclusion	2	5	10	Maintaining close links with repository development teams and paying attention to details of extension mechanisms within the software together with high quality documentation should make it maintainable by respective communities.
External suppliers: One of the repository software projects engaged with by FAR release timetable changes in a way that is incompatible with project timetable	2	5	10	Ensure close links with relevant development teams so that FAR project has ample warning and can amend timetable accordingly
Organisational: completed software proves incompatible with Shibboleth developments	1	5	5	Developing the software to interoperate with Shibboleth 2.0 (expected release date during 2007) should ensure long term compatibility; the LSE Projects Team has and will maintain close links with the Internet2 Shibboleth developers and with the UK Access Management Federation, which means that they will be aware of the trends in Shibboleth development and UK usage of the software
Staffing: Loss of non-development project staff	1	4	4	Be aware of the possibilities and ensure that alternative staff can be made available if needed
Staffing: Loss of development staff involved with project	1	4	4	The development process will be specified in detail, which will enable programmers to be replaced quickly if necessary
Technical: Failure of hardware or software	1	3	3	Be aware of dependencies; ensure appropriate backup routines are in place; be ready to switch to alternatives
Technical: Inability to agree on best approach among project staff and community consultees	3	1	3	Different approaches should be catered for in design of software deliverables
Legal	1	1	1	No legal difficulties are anticipated as the project is contributing to established open source development projects.

8. Standards

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Name of standard or specification	Version	Notes
LDAP	3	This standard will be used to store attribute data and present it to Shibboleth. Any attributes described or used by the project will be defined in terms of LDAP3 object classes. (See eduPerson below.)
SAML	2.0	Used by Shibboleth software to securely pass the attribute data to the software.
eduPerson	200604 (or later)	Will be considered as an object class used to structure attribute data in LDAP directory. (See LDAP above.)

9. Technical Development

The first step in development will be the production of the specifications for DSpace and EPrints, arising from the attribute work. These specifications will both describe the principal part of the software, the changes or plugin which will allow access to the repository via Shibboleth: this part effectively deals with authentication only; this will be the first functionality to be developed (and may be re-used from existing Shibboleth patches for DSpace). The specifications will then address the specific points in the DSpace/EPrints software at which access control is applied, and indicate (for each identified access control point) which part of the code needs to be altered, which attributes/values will be used to gain or deny access, and how this will be tested, at approximately the level of a unit test. The members of this listing of access control points will be given a priority ranking based on the use cases considered in the development of the attributes. Thus, the specifications will be identical in broad outline but differ considerably in the details.

There will formally be two releases of software for each of DSpace and EPrints. However, it is envisaged that the demonstrators will be updated incrementally, as each access control point is FAM-enabled. Documentation will also be updated incrementally, including the scripts devised to allow testing. This will permit flexible approaches (such as bug fixes when testers find errors with access control points already enabled).

10. Intellectual Property Rights

All published material produced by the project will follow current JISC (or JISC-endorsed) guidelines for accessibility or will adopt those used by the relevant software projects. Copyright of the appropriate partner institution will be asserted but all material will be covered by the appropriate Creative Commons licence allowing free non-commercial re-use. Software will be released with the appropriate open source licence, which is the GNU General Public Licence version 2.1 in the case of EPrints and the BSD Licence2 in the case of DSpace.

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

The project partners are:

The London School of Economics. The FAR project will be managed and supported administratively by a project team based at the London School of Economics. Close co-operation will be maintained throughout the project with the development teams for the selected repository software products. A Linux server will be purchased, installed and set up at the LSE library, which will be used by the developers of the software for the project, which may include members of the main repository software development team in addition to staff from project partners. The documentation will be developed on a subsection of the LSE Projects Team WIKI1, and will be transferred to the appropriate section of the various repository software WIKIs upon completion of the project. Project management software already in use by the LSE Projects Team will be used to organise and monitor the tasks within the project.

The software development will be shared between the London School of Economics and **Cambridge University**, the former taking responsibility for working on EPrints and the latter for DSpace.

A consortium agreement will be drafted and signed.

12. Project Management

The Project Manager will carry out the administrative management of the project and the Senior Programmer the technical management. The DSpace programmer will continue to be line managed by Dspace@Cambridge

staff, but the time s/he contributes to the project will be directed by the Senior Programmer. The Project Manager is funded for 0.2 FTE on the project, to be divided between project management (the majority) and dissemination. The Project Administration Officer will analyse mailing lists identified as important by the project team for discussion of FAM as applied to repositories, and will ensure that comments about how this should be done are tracked and filtered into the specification.

The project does not expect to have significant training requirements. Any that arise will be handled as part of the relevant institutional contribution.

13. Programme Support

No specific areas are envisaged.

14. Budget

See Appendix A. No changes have been made from the project proposal.

Detailed Project Planning

15. Workpackages

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

WP	Name and description	Timetable	Task breakdown
0	Project Management (LSE) Ensure efficient and timely delivery of project and production of deliverables detailed in Workpackages 1-4. Liaison with JISC; management of website and dissemination	Project months 1-9	Produce consortium agreement and obtain signatures; produce and maintain detailed project plan; install and manage software development and test environment; carry out dissemination tasks; produce final report
1	Attribute development (LSE, Cambridge) Create recommendations for attributes to describe authorisation to repositories. Where appropriate, these recommendations will be passed to relevant standards groups	Project months 1-4	Recruit repository community members to make suggestions and test outputs; gather, develop, and evaluate use cases for access control requirements; examine DSpace code and documentation for access control points; examine EPrints code and documentation for access control points; produce attribute requirements report based on these analyses; populate LDAP server with sample users embodying use cases with these attributes
2	EPrints demonstrator development (LSE) Develop demonstrator version of the software to extend EPrints so that it can be used with Shibboleth and meet these requirements; work with test users (EPrints installation managers) to ensure that the demonstrator is compatible with the requirements of a variety of EPrints installers	Project months 3-6	Produce and evaluate specification for EPrints development; Create Shibboleth authentication capable version of EPrints with documentation; Enable highest priority access control points for FAM with documentation
3	EPrints final version development (LSE) Enhance functionality of demonstrator to ensure ease of installation and	Project months 5-9	Enable lower priority access control points for FAM with documentation; Create downloadable software release as part of EPrints or as standard extension; Create final version of documentation

	configuration; integration with main EPrints development process; produce and test documentation for installers		and ensure accessibility from EPrints web site; develop report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term EPrints development programme
4	DSpace demonstrator development (Cambridge) Evaluate existing software enabling use of Shibboleth with DSpace; Carry out parallel tasks to those listed for EPrints in WP 2.	Project months 3-6	Produce and evaluate specification for DSpace development; Create Shibboleth authentication capable version of DSpace with documentation; Enable highest priority access control points for FAM with documentation
5	DSpace final version development (Cambridge) Carry out parallel tasks to those listed for EPrints in WP 2.	Project months 5-9	Enable lower priority access control points for FAM with documentation; Create downloadable software release as part of DSpace or as standard extension; Create final version of documentation and ensure accessibility from DSpace web site; develop report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term DSpace development programme
6	Fedora Federated Access Study (LSE) Evaluate existing software enabling use of Shibboleth with Fedora with respect to Federated Access requirements.	Project months 5-9	Develop report in conjunction with Fedora experts describing how to enable fine grained access control in Fedora with FAM

16. Evaluation Plan

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
Month 4	Attribute specification	Do the specified attributes address the requirements of the use cases considered?	Analysis of comments received during consultation process, as collected by Project Administration Officer	Every comment should be reflected in the final specification or a reason given for not following it in the specification
Month 5	DSpace development specification	Are the use cases considered by the project accurately represented in the specification? Do the identified access control points make sense in the context of the DSpace software? Are adequate tests specified?	Expert consultant asked to check through the specification in light of their knowledge of the DSpace codebase	Use cases should be referenced from the specification and these references should be matched up with every part of the use cases; Expert indicates that the access control points make sense; all tests should be objective
Month 5	EPrints development specification	Are the use cases considered by the project accurately represented in the specification? Do the identified access control points make sense in the context of the EPrints software? Are adequate tests specified?	Expert consultant asked to check through the specification in light of their knowledge of the EPrints codebase	Use cases should be referenced from the specification and these references should be matched up with every part of the use cases; Expert indicates that the access control points make sense; all tests should be objective
				Code analysis

Months 5-9	DSpace development (for each identified access control point)	Does the software pass the objective test(s) for the control point? Has a relevant test (or tests) been added to test scripts?	Checked by the EPrints developer	
Months 5-9	EPrints development (for each identified access control point)	Does the software pass the objective test(s) for the control point? Has a relevant test (or tests) been added to test scripts?	Checked by the DSpace developer	Code analysis

17. Quality Plan

Output: 1.1 Report describing attributes and their use in terms of repository access

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Feb 2008	LDAP attributes defined in accordance with standards	Creation of LDAP server containing instantiated attributes	Test data set can be imported without error into OpenLDAP server	Senior Technical Officer	

Output: 1.2 LDAP server containing sample users with these attributes %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
Feb 2008	Test users created and usable with all analysed use cases	Check list from LDAP search against list of use cases	Matching data	Project Administration Officer	

Output: 2.1 Demonstration system running demonstrator software for EPrints

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
April 2008	Basic authentication possible via Shibboleth	Attempted login as random test user	Successful access to EPrints	DSpace developer	
	Documentation for testing should match software development progress	Checking WIKI listing of access points enabled against documentation	Matching data	DSpace developer	

Output: 2.2 Draft documentation for EPrints %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
April 2008	Documentation should explain how to install and configure FAM-enabled EPrints	At this stage, the important issue is that these criteria are addressed	Documentation is available in rough form	Project Administration Officer	

Output: 3.1 Software release as part of EPrints or as standard extension

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

ProjectPlan < Projects/FAR < TWiki

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Software release should be easy to find via EPrints website	Attempt to find it from EPrints website	Download and documentation discovered in under 10 minutes	Project Administration Officer	

Output: 3.2 Final version of documentation easily accessible from EPrints web site

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Documentation should describe how to install and configurate EPrints with Shibboleth	Attempt a basic installation against existing Shibboleth Identity Provider	Possible to access software and duplicate at least one of the test scripts	DSpace developer	

Output: 3.3 Report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term

EPrints development programme %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Report should address sustainability of software against future EPrints development	Check by EPrints expert	It should be possible to install the software in 18 months time with current EPrints development plans.	External consultant.	

Output: 4.1 Demonstration system running demonstrator software for DSpace

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
April 2008	Basic authentication possible via Shibboleth	Attempted login as random test user	Successful access to DSpace	EPrints developer	
	Documentation for testing should match software development progress	Checking WIKI listing of access points enabled against documentation	Matching data	EPrints developer	

Output: 4.2 Draft documentation for DSpace %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
April 2008	Documentation should explain how to install and configure FAM-enabled DSpace	At this stage, the important issue is that these criteria are addressed	Documentation is available in rough form	Project Administration Officer	

Output: 5.1 Software release as part of DSpace or as standard extension

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Software release should be easy to	Attempt to find it from DSpace	Download and documentation	Project Administration	

find via DSpace website	website	discovered in under 10 minutes	Officer	
-------------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---------	--

Output: 5.2 Final version of documentation easily accessible from DSpace web site

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Documentation should describe how to install and configurate DSpace with Shibboleth	Attempt a basic installation against existing Shibboleth Identity Provider	Possible to access software and duplicate at least one of the test scripts	EPrints developer	

Output: 5.3 Report describing the future place of the software developed in the FAR project in the long term DSpace development programme %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Report should address sustainability of software against future DSpace development	Check by DSpace expert	It should be possible to install the software in 18 months time with current DSpace development plans.	External consultant.	

Output: %EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools (if applicable)
July 2008	Report should enable the production of a software specification in similar detail to those developed in WPs 2 and 4.	Check by Fedora expert.	With knowledge of the Fedora codebase, it should be possible to see how to do this.	External consultant.	

18. Dissemination Plan

The FAR project will create a public mailing list which will be intended for general discussion of access control for repositories (not just the activities of the FAR project itself). Key players will be invited to join this list. Additionally, other lists identified by project staff as those which are likely to be used by stakeholders (e.g. by repository managers in academic institutions) will be used to discuss FAR project activities and to elicit comments on them. Finally, the project team will use contacts they already have in the stakeholder groups.

The FAR project will be submitting a paper for the Open Repositories 2008 conference in April 2008, and will actively look out for other dissemination activities throughout the project timespan.

19. Exit and Sustainability Plans

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Project Outputs	Action for Take-up & Embedding	Action for Exit
Demonstration installation	This server will continue to be maintained at the LSE and accessible from the outside world for at least 18 months following the end of the project.	Ensure that all documentation and software is available from

		EPrints and DSpace web sites.
Fedora FAM report	This will be made available to the Fedora community, and hopefully will be taken up.	Ensure that Fedora community are involved in drafting the report.

%EDITTABLE{changerows="on"}%

Project Outputs	Why Sustainable	Scenarios for Taking Forward	Issues to Address
EPrints software package	A valuable update to the widely used EPrints repository software	Hosted on the EPrints website	Ensure that future changes to EPrints will not make it difficult to maintain
DSpace software package	A valuable update to the widely used DSpace repository software	Hosted on the DSpace website	Ensure that future changes to DSpace will not make it difficult to maintain

Appendixes

Appendix A. Project Budget?

Directly Incurred Staff	April 07– March 08	April 08– March 09	TOTAL £
Senior Programmer, Band 6 Step 34, 0.7fte	£14,023	£11,470	£25,493
Project Manager, Band 8 Step 44.5, 0.2 fte	£5,456	£4,463	£9,919
DSpace Programmer, Band 6 Step 30, 0.5 fte	£8,904	£7,284	£16,188
Project Administration Officer, Band 6 Point 30.5, 0.4 fte	£7,229	£5,913	£13,142
Librarian, Band 6 Point 31, 0.2 fte	£3,668	£3,001	£6,669
Total Directly Incurred Staff (A)	£39,280	£32,131	£71,411
Non-Staff	April 07– March 08	April 08– March 09	TOTAL £
Travel and expenses	£500	£1,750	£2,250
Hardware/software	£4,500	£0	£4,500
Dissemination	£300	£1,050	£1,350
Evaluation	£300	£1,050	£1,350
Other (to be used to pay for Fedora consultancy)	£300	£1,050	£1,350
Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff (B)	£5,900	£4,900	£10,800
Directly Incurred Total (A+B=C) (C)	£45,180	£37,031	£82,211
Directly Allocated	April 07– March 08	April 08– March 09	TOTAL £
Staff	£0	£0	£0
Estates	£7,262	£5,809	£13,071
Other	£0	£0	£0
Directly Allocated Total (D)	£7,262	£5,809	£13,071
Indirect Costs (E)	£40,503	£32,403	£72,906
Total Project Cost (C+D+E)	£92,945	£75,243	£168,188
Amount Requested from JISC	£45,180	£37,031	£82,211
Institutional Contributions	£47,765	£38,212	£85,977
Percentage Contributions over the life of the project	JISC 49%	Partners 51%	Total 100%

Appendix B. Workpackages?

FAR Project Workplan - GANTT chart:

-- SimonMcLeish - 09 Jan 2008

- Set ALLOWTOPICVIEW = LseLibraryOfficeGroup, FarProjectTeamGroup
- Set ALLOWTOPICCHANGE = FarProjectTeamGroup