InC-Quilt Tech WG Call 1-March-2013

Attending

Mark Scheible, MCNC (chair)

Chris Giordano, MOREnet

Bernie A'cs, NCSA

David Bantz, U. Alaska

Paul Caskey, U. TX System

Ann West, InCommon

Shel Waggener, Internet2

Steve Olshansky, Internet2

=> Next call: Friday 8-March 2PM ET

New Action Items

[AI] (All) Review the docs in our folder, started by Mark, and edit as you are inclined to.

https://internet2.box.com/s/91ypi5hcquq879cj806s

[AI] (Mark/Steve/Shel) work with the PilotDef group to start communications with potential proposers about what they are doing and how our pilots could mesh with and support that.

[AI] (All) tech wg members of a potential proposing organization, start talking with your group and determine what you might want to do in this context, i.e. identify technical and admin questions they need answered.

Discussion

1. Goals for this group (Charter - comments?)

Shorter term - define models

Longer term - white papers, diagrams, or other artifacts more fully describing aspects of the models defined.

Q: IdP Proxy = AuthN gateway?

A: Essentially the same thing.

2. Review Spreadsheet for Completeness - will this work?

This is a matrix of options.

"InC-Quilt Technical Options draft" seems to be a good companion for documenting the models, to help the regionals better understand what they are able to tackle (skillsets) and what they may need to gear up for.

We need to be mindful of our timeframes, in terms of what is viable to have ready by the time we want these pilots kicking off in the fall, and in advance of that to inform negotiations with prospective pilot proposers (or essentially a lightweight CFP).

Can an org not included in the InC metadata access InC SPs in the pilots?

3. Review "Descriptions" Document - is this the right approach?

4. Update from Pilot Development Meeting (Mark, SteveO)

Our goal is a workable timeline, and from that backing into the scope.

In lieu of a full CFP, it was determined that it would make more sense to do an invited "CFP" in negotiation with who would be likely to want to participate. There are some regionals actively working on this area, what could we do with them?

We would like to have these negotiations happen by mid-April, i.e. have the models baked enough to discuss coherently with potential pilot regionals or state systems (e.g. U. Alaska).

E.g. the IdP proxy model would seem to work for Illinois and Alaska.

MOREnet, MCNC, NJEdge, MERIT, U. Alaska, U. Illinois/NCSA, GPN, and OARnet are likely proposers. CENIC is possible, but unlikely for a variety of reasons.

What needs to happen on the admin/policy side to support the models? E.g. business and contract-wise...

The affiliates will be a key part of this effort, since there will be technical resources lacking in many of the proposers.

Potential pilots will want to leverage what they are already doing or planning, and thus we ought to be talking with them early in our process to ensure alignment.

Initial pilots may be more focused on who is ready, but there will likely be later pilots that could encompass others.

If we could run one of the pilots as if the org was a "newbie" i.e. to test the collaboration with an affiliate or consultant, that would be very useful.

InCommon could provide some federation expertise to support these pilots, and we would want to draw on other resources for e.g. IAM consulting. REFEDS and the InCommon TAC Interfed working group *may* be potential sources of support.

It was suggested that we setup a mailing list for pilot cohort discussion and support, including expert resources from the community. Consensus on the call was that this will be useful.