

2019-Aug-14

CTAB Wed., Aug 14, 2019

Attending

- Mary Catherine Martinez, InnoSoft (chair)
- David Bantz, University of Alaska (vice chair)
- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska
- Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Globus, University of Chicago
- Brad Christ, Eastern Washington University
- Eric Goodman, UCOP - TAC Representative to CTAB
- Adam Lewenberg, Stanford
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- John Pfeifer, University of Maryland
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2

Regrets

- Chris Whalen, Research Data and Communication Technologies
- Chris Hable, University of Michigan
- John Hover, Brookhaven National Lab
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2
- Ann West, Internet2
- Albert Wu, Internet2

Action Items

- [AI] (MC and David) produce first draft of blog about BE V2 survey results by next CTAB call Aug 28
- [AI] Emily reach out to Dean about upcoming blog on BE V2 Survey results and deadline for inclusion in an InCommon newsletter (done, deadline is Aug. 23, 2019)

Discussion

- **Baseline Expectations v2 survey response**
 - Received 86 responses
 - How to we publish results to the community?
 - Decision: publish a blog summarizing the results
 - [AI] (MC and David) produce first draft of blog about BE V2 survey results by next CTAB call Aug 28
- **Drafting Baseline v2 document and submit for community consensus**
 - Do we have a request for other BE elements?
 - When do we produce the draft for community consensus? - goal is end of Sept
 - More about community consensus here: <https://www.incommon.org/federation/community-consensus/>
 - **Proposed Schedule:**
 - Blog - end of Aug
 - Draft of actual BE v2 doc- end of Sept
 - Community consensus - starts by Oct.
 - **BE v2 community consensus process:**
 - Idea: smaller group(s) to write clear positions on what each of the elements mean - what it is, what it means to implementers, what it means to users, impact of
 - implementation technology evolution has on how we phrase Baseline statements, etc.
 - Will need volunteers/conscripts to convene discussion; set deadline
 - likely for subgroup and/or 8/30 discussion
- There is a need to clarify what CTAB really recommending in Baseline relative to "REFEDs MFA"
- What does support REFEDs MFA Profile mean for each party in Federation? <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/PRO/MFA+Profile+FAQ>
- Could follow up on the results from the survey.
- <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/InCFederation/Research+and+Scholarship+Category>
- In order to be in compliance with R&S, the institution does not need to **release** R&S for everyone on campus, just for some subset.
- There are FERPA and GDPR concerns about R&S at some campuses, on the part of registrars and some others
- There are many dept of education documents on FERPA and what is really required.
- If R&S is included in BE 2.0, how do we handle institutions that cannot comply due to policy?
 - There are a few campuses where a registrar or privacy officer, refuses to release R&S across the board.
- Within BE v1, there is a line for Service Providers about not misusing the attributes.
- <https://www.incommon.org/federation/baseline-expectations-for-trust-in-federation/>
- **REFEDs MFA**
 - Requiring MFA as part of baseline does not mean you must implement MFA. But if you do, here is the type of response required, and define that exactly.
 - We should also explain "failure case": If you don't have MFA, what should the response be.
 - The idea is NOT to fail with an opaque or unexplained error
 - IDP must be configured a certain way to handle the REFEDs MFA error case gracefully
 - EricG has been working on this issue at UCOP, for Shib IDPs, no cookbook for that yet
 - Discuss this more on next CTAB call

- Should we include foreshadowing of BE v3, perhaps in the blog?

- **R&S attributes** being released by default as part of BE - likely for subgroup and/or 8/30 discussion
 - Helpful to get to the bottom of the concerns about R&S, loss of control is one concern.
 - The question gets asked "what is legal recourse?" In fact there is no legal recourse, but the risk is small.
 - Find out what could be added to SIRTFI to make the next step successful
 - An argument for including R&S in baseline v2 could be to motivate a more meaningful discussion
 - SPs are in favor of R&S, and this was heard in the work of the Attributes for Collaboration and Federation WG. <http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.101.1>
 - R&S, or other attribute release, includes the value of the InCommon Federation.
 - Currently there is a need for a lot of one-off attribute release to individual Service Providers
 - With rise of Web AUTHN and FIDO, credentials will become less of a big deal
 - In that environment, Value of IDPs could decrease
 - Without R&S, there will be workarounds, not involving InCommon, including social media and other less secure approaches
 - The role of consent is important in the discussion also

- **Update on SIRTFI/CTAB taskforce** on issues of metadata freshness/accuracy: a meeting has been scheduled
 - Proposal was: SIRTFI and CTAB work together on exploring these issues of accurate, fresh metadata, for SIRTFI and then take the learnings to other federations to make this a global issue.
 - Volunteers are David Bantz, ChrisW, Albert, ScottK and TomB
 - Albert will convene the group

Next CTAB call: Aug. 28, 2019