

# InCommon TAC Meeting 2016-10-27

**Attending:** Mark Scheible, Jim Jokl, Tom Barton, Michael Gettes, Janemarie Duh, Scott Cantor, Chris Misra, Tom Mitchell, Albert Wu

**With:** Dean Woodbeck, David Walker, Nick Roy, Ian Young, Tom Scavo, IJ Kim

## Action Items

(AI) Nick will send the results of election of new TAC members to the TAC list for review (a couple of days max for review).

(AI) Nick will send a note to the TAC list to confirm the decision (see minutes) on how to proceed with officer elections.

(AI) Dean will prepare a ballot for voting on chair and vice-chair.

(AI) Jim Jokl will share a brainstorming list concerning the future role of TAC and share it with the TAC email list for additions and refinement.

## Approval of Minutes

Minutes from Oct. 13 approved

## Ops Update

**eduGAIN** - There was a minor incident on October 25; eduGAIN dropped the the Spanish federation's metadata from the eduGAIN aggregate. eduGAIN fixed their feed within a couple of hours and InCommon signed the metadata a second time that day.

**Metadata Transformations** - Ops continues to work on automating the process that drives dynamic pages in the wiki (via the metadata). This process will also be applied to the federation info pages on the web.

## TAC Nominations Process

Voting is complete and TAC will invite three new members to join.

## 2017 Chair and Vice-Chair

A number of people received one or more nominations for these positions. Quite a few were nominated by one person; a smaller number were nominated by two or more TAC members. The suggestion is to consider those who were nominated by at least two people be considered for the positions. There were no objections. (AI) Nick will send a note to the TAC list to confirm this decision. (AI) Subsequent to Nick's note, Dean will prepare a ballot for voting on chair and vice-chair.

## Quick updates

**Vendor Configurations** - Janemarie mentioned that the effort at gathering configurations for large/popular SPs has begun to stagnate. Her suggestion is to incorporate this as a working group to move the process forward (as part of a general effort to make things easier for IdPs). The TIER program may help in this regard, but won't negate the need for this. WG could identify key vendors and recruit people to write the documentation. There was a discussion about how this fits with current TAC focus. (AI) Janemarie will draft a charter (or at least an outline of a charter) for the next call.

**Deployment Profile** - The WG is working through a categorized list of requirements for updates to SAML2int, and things that may or may not go in that bucket. The group also has a list of things that are not for SAML2int, but may be useful for entity categories or deployment profiles. The WG will experiment with Slack as a communications/collaboration vehicle.

**Per-Entity Metadata** - Hope to have a report out for community review very soon.

**OIDC/OAuth Survey** - The first WG call is tomorrow. There is a draft survey posted on the WG wiki, based on feedback during TechEx. The group hopes to have the survey ready for publishing by the end of November. Separate from the survey, there is a lot of developer interest in this area. Considering hosting a town hall to have a more technical discussion.

Draft survey: <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OIDCSurvey/Draft+Survey+Questions>

Discussion questions: <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/OIDCSurvey/Discussion++Survey+Ideas>

## TAC's role in the context of the InCommon PAG and Community Architecture Committee for Trust and Identity (CACTI)

There was a discussion about TAC's role as these other groups spin up. Key points from Ann's strawman email:

The TAC would engage all participants to gather requirements and constraints to address specific federation service-related gaps or questions, spin up wg, manage them tightly and efficiently and communicate their deliverables. It's not necessarily technical, but becomes more engagement focused, more open, more communicative, more diverse even than what we have today. It's process and advocacy oriented, not visionary. Vision is done elsewhere (CACTI) because it has to include the organizational infrastructure being addressed by TIER. And yes there is overlap, that we will have to work through.

Some points made during the discussion:

- The process seems a little backwards - that is, perhaps Steering should begin the discussion by addressing the types of groups it needs to charter to achieve its mission. If there is the need for a technical group, an engagement group, or other groups, then it would be clearer whether TAC would fill one or more of those roles.
- One thing TAC could do now is to develop an outline of needs that this group observes and provide Steering with a starting point (particularly related to federation-specific and architect-related issues and/or needs)
- Things are fluid, as TIER groups spin up. As the TIER Program matures, and its groups become more stable, TAC's role will likely continue to change.

(AI) Jim Jokl is developing a brainstorming list and will share that with the TAC for additions and refinement.

**Next Meeting - Thursday, November 10 - 2 pm ET**