

# 2019-May-8

## Attending

- Mary Catherine Martinez, InnoSoft (chair)
- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska
- David Bantz, University of Alaska
- Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Globus, University of Chicago
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2
- Brad Christ, Eastern Washington University
- Eric Goodman, UCOP - TAC Representative to CTAB
- John Hover, Brookhaven National Lab
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- John Pfeifer, University of Maryland
- Chris Whalen, Research Data and Communication Technologies
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2

## Regrets

- Chris Hable, University of Michigan
- Adam Lewenberg, Stanford
- Ann West, Internet2
- Albert Wu, Internet2

## Action Items

- [AI] (Jon) submit TechEx 2019 proposal around Baseline Expectations, with David and Brett and Rachana as presenters
- [AI] (MC) reply to Scott K that CTAB is interested in the SIRTFI collaboration and ask ScottK to join an upcoming CTAB call to discuss more details
- [AI] (David and Brett) draft a communication to the InCommon Participants list stating
  - We're coming to close of Baseline Expectations phase 1.
  - We will be entering a new phase.
  - Here are the topics we have been looking at.
  - Which are you passionate about? (Share some of the draft docs)

## Discussion

- Agenda Bash
- Partnering with Sirtfi WG - (MC/David)
  - There was a request from Scott Koranda for CTAB to partner with SIRTFI
  - [AI] (MC) will reply to Scott Koranda that CTAB is interested in the SIRTFI collaboration and ask ScottK to join an upcoming CTAB call to discuss more details
- Review Baseline Expectations (BE) Adherence Guide language - feedbacks, next steps (David) (30 min)
  - The draft BE Adherence guide is excellent, wish we had one for the current BE
  - Is there a way of validating each item in the adherence guide?
  - For example, encryption of endpoints, how would that be ensured?
  - For several suggested new BE items, it will be hard to automate validation
  - In such cases, adherence will need to be self asserted
  - Could have a task list (for InCommon Operations) to define the work needed to support validations
  - Push off requirement for REFEDS MFA to a later date?
  - In February 2019, CTAB decided to focus on SIRTFI first, before REFEDs MFA <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/InCCollaborate/2019-Feb-27>
  - We could present to the community a longer term plan/roadmap, that we will include REFEDs MFA as a longer term part of Baseline
  - We may want to find out from the community what's most important to them. (for example, focus on SIRTFI or on REFEDs MFA)
  - Could require, as part of baseline, that an organization have a long term plan to implement REFEDs MFA
  - It's up to CTAB to decide how we want to "program" our communications to the InCommon community
  - Will need to go through the community consensus process <http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.107.1>
  - Comment from the VO point of view, it's necessary for both SIRTFI and REFEDs MFA to get full value
  - It is important to encourage the community to provide feedback and input once CTAB presents its draft plan
  - Plan
    - reach out, sharing the proposed plan via message to InCommon Participants
    - Then have community consensus process <http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.107.1>
    - We need a separate doc with a **very clear call for action** and explaining how to provide feedback
    - Process will include tabletop exercise
  - We might share with newer CTAB members the table top exercise practice CTAB did in 2018
  - **AUTHN Context and Shib issues and REFEDs MFA** <https://refeds.org/profile/mfa>
    - Different campuses have different level of resources / ability to adhere to new baseline expectations.
    - Need to keep in mind the Issue of meeting proposed new BE for campuses that don't use Shib.
    - Eric G did survey of UC campuses on level of effort to support authn context. He got estimates of as little of one hour and up to 40 hours.

- This team should lead the way, even if REFEDs MFA is hard...
- Perhaps InCommon can help orgs who are running a Shib IDP to respond to an authn context request
- OKTA <https://www.okta.com/> and ADFS may provide better solutions in time
- Eric Goodman can serve as liaison between CTAB and the InCommon IDP as a Service Working Group [https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/XoGIC](https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/XoGIC)
- SIRTFI has no dependence on technology an org is running.
- R&S does have dependence on technology
- REFEDs MFA has even steeper dependence on technology
- Are we ready to consider the current documents a draft package for BE V2?
- Agreed CTAB should start to engage the community (participants list) with a draft proposal
- 
- [AI] (David and Brett) draft a communication to the community of
  - we're coming to close of Baseline Expectations phase 1.
  - We will be entering a new phase.
  - Here are the topics we have been looking at.
  - Which are you passionate about? (Share some of the draft docs)

**Possible submission CTAB event(s) at TechEx (December) (all)**

- <https://meetings.internet2.edu/2019-technology-exchange/>
- Tech Ex Call for Proposal closes on May 17
- [AI] (Jon) will submit TechEx proposal around Baseline, with David and Brett and Rachana as presenters

**Not Discussed on May 8 CTAB call. (Discuss on a future call)**

- Timing and logistics for community consensus review (10 min)
- Badging - introduction, recap, and how CTAB may participate / leverage it (David) (10 min)
- Future CTAB agenda items - CTAB roadmap: are there other items CTAB wish to engage in beyond Baseline requirements

**Next CTAB Call:** Wed May 22, 2019 at 4pm ET