Hello everyone,

We have quite a busy agenda today. To keep the meeting on time, I am sending the badging group updates in email so that we can save the call time for Q&A/discussion:

Background

As the InCommon community grows and the technological landscape evolves, "seamless and trustworthy integration" has become more complex. Cybersecurity threats and data protection requirements have led to a stronger demand for proof of security and data protection practices among integration partners. Scaling federated single sign-on for over 10 million users and thousands of organizations around the world requires more consistent information sharing standards and more robust and intuitive user experience. An post from Jack Seuss in late 2018 and the subsequent email discussions indicate that to continue to scale and support seamless collaboration, we need a lightweight, agile, and easy-to-understand mechanism to communicate with each other that we are doing the right things. At the same time, we want to provide tools to help InCommon newcomers to quickly understand and measure against the standards and practices they should support to be a good InCommon community member.

The badging group, made up of volunteers from TAC, CTAB, and I2 staff (Janemarie Duh, David Bantz, Brett Bieber, Matt Brookover, Jessica Coltrin, John Miner, Dean Woodbeck, and Albert Wu) convened to explore requirements and implementation options. These are our thinking to date:

Incentivize the best behavior among Federation participants

We believe that our overall goal is to help incentivize participants (IDPs and SPs) to do the right thing and to collectively raise the trust and ease integration among participants. One step to doing that is to enhance our online display of participant and entity information. It is not meant to punish or shame, rather to celebrate those to go above and beyond. It is also to help participants find like-peers to seek guidance and exchange ideas.

Note related to Baseline Expectations: whereas BE is a part of the basic requirements for participating in InCommon, we think this work opens up a new area for us to introduce non-mandatory, but highly desirable elements into the federation practice, possibly as a ramp to future BE elements.

Common user stories

To help clarify the needs, we have distilled the various community discussions into 6 common user stories. They are not exhaustive. Though they do serve as a direction pointer:

- Easy to use InCommon participant database
- Human-readable entity profile
- Gauging a vendor's conformance with SAML IOP specification
- Determine an IDP's (R&S) research readiness
- Research participant's (voluntary) adopted practices

- Find similar peer organizations

In addition, the group has developed various UI mock ups to facilitate discussion and to clarify ideas. NOTE: these are not final implementation requirements. They are storyboard drafts meant to help clarify discussions.

- A list of all organizations with metadata in the federation:
  https://docs.google.com/drawings/d/1F8RNlNhe7gugCBipBS7AodGmauJGKEy2x3QrJny7_Bo/edit
- Organization profile: https://docs.google.com/drawings/d/1I7cbHV-al3sI5N_NlIPlnmOEXIUsaASSdiXxlhGRmkY/edit
- Entity Profiles:
  - https://docs.google.com/drawings/d/1lqzfxgSPIKEY6sTt_pfeYlwMGMTHy2qnd7O6IFc_rM4/edit
  - https://docs.google.com/drawings/d/12f_4Ks_orq6qaC2rlTXAZpbBB6QiUj5LgCSObanXNeY/edit
- More elaborate alternatives
  - Participant List: https://drive.google.com/open?id=12OuNSyhc7rRaKajed6xXbSvl5i1eTgZQ
  - Participant Profile: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1A-qiIlLmKfNzp1R6aMxxLePBNb36FKv2
  - Entity Profile: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1aAcTkubL1oK7SVXajKec6bv0UwXQNdn8

Implementation challenges, priorities, and next steps

There are numerous possible things we could introduce/include in this conversation. At the same time, it is clear that the community needs *something* quickly. We are also constrained by available data and implementation resources. Therefore we are recommending the following phased approach:

- Phase 1: Refresh Federation participant and federation entity list/site
  - Scope confined to available data in Federation Manager / metadata
  - Improve search and overall UI
  - Develop more human readable (without having to parse XML) entity profile, similar to eduGAIN and REFEDS tools
  - Consolidate R&S and other entity category listing into the new UI
  - Build a foundational platform for future enhancements
  - Do this as quickly as possible
- Phase 2: Develop additional stories, needs, and requirements
  - While I2 staff implements phase 1 work, it may be useful for TAC to convene a follow-on working group in 2020 to further develop the longer term needs.

These are the running brainstorm and notes from the sub group: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-9aIpyOpk9kw7jcvFnFRrLV_qxupwV3FIfKVkownS-4/edit#

albert

Albert Wu
Federation Service Manager
InCommon / Internet2 Trust & Identity
awu@internet2.edu