

InCommon TAC Meeting 2017-07-20

Action Items from Past Meetings

(AI) TAC should review the IdP strategy document (<https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/FgrkAg>)

(AI) TAC should review the information for IdPs on the wiki and consider useful additions and revisions.

(AI) Ann or Kevin talk with Klaas Weirenga from GÉANT about a presentation to TAC meeting concerning their T&I roadmap for, say, the next 3 years? <= Deferred to August

Minutes

Members Attending: Tom Mitchell, Mark Scheible, Tom Barton, Kim Milford, Keith Wessel, Eric Goodman, Mike Grady, Jim Jokl, Albert Wu, Steve Carmody, Janemarie Duh, Chris Misra

With: Kevin Morooney, Steve Zoppi, Dean Woodbeck, IJ Kim, Ann West, Ian Young

Past Minutes

Minutes from July 6 approved via the wiki

Trust/Identity Updates

- Tom Scavo has left Internet2. Inquiries that previously went to Tom should go to Nick Roy.
- Ann and Dennis Cromwell made a presentation to AACRAO Tech last week. An AACRAO group is forming with representation from registrars to help registrars understand federation in general and R&S specifically. Will also explore the concept of providing R&S attributes to all of InCommon
- Next week is Howard Pfeffer's first Internet2 board meeting. Kevin will be doing a 30 minute presentation to the board
- Steering meeting - Steering members agreed to help fill out the membership for the different roles in the Attributes WG

Spinning up Working Groups

- The Deployment Profile WG and Attribute WG are forming. The OIDC WG has 15 on the email list, and there hasn't been any feedback to the SP Onboarding group.
- There will be a blog post as part of the Trust/Identity newsletter to be distributed next week
- Timing for spinning these up seems a little off. It may be better to have this effort correspond with TechEx and do the recruiting for WGs there. Summer, in particular, is not a great time to kick off this effort.

REFEDS and Discovery

Scott Cantor has drafted a charter for a REFEDS working group on Discovery 2.0. <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/GROUPS/Software+Requirements+for+Discovery>

Identity Provider as a Service

The potential solutions run from running a services (which some federations do) to just posting an FAQ. One thought is to have a trustmark or something that vendors could self-assert. Just having an FAQ is likely unhelpful for the person looking for help.

Suggested goal: "Small schools would have access to an outsourced IdP service that they trust and would provide easy interop to popular SPs (regardless of whether they are in InCommon).

Perhaps convene a group that includes potential vendors of this service and agree on functions that we agree are critical. Any interested vendor could self-assess and submit something to InCommon as to which requirements they meet.

We need to agree on what the problem is and then determining if there is a low impact, low resource way to get from "here" to "there"?

It is difficult to install and run an IdP - if a school knew where to outsource and that it would be reliable and well-run, it would be a good solution. A set of community standards would help a school vet such providers. Are we confident that this is the main problem? There isn't any data - just anecdotes. The Alternative IdP WG report may help in this area. Assessment grid could be useful. A cookbook would help in this area, as well. Impetus for this was for schools that lacked technical skills and/or resources to run a traditional IdP. (See the final report - [Recommendations for Future Work](#))

Is there a next step to this discussion? Need to determine how to collect the right information from the right types of organizations. Similar question - how to make it easier for SPs and for VOs. Maybe go at it from that angle. We know there is a market for cloud services selling to community colleges and others. Consider including the SP angle as a future topic on TAC call, along with a potential decision (or direction) on IdPaaS.

GUI for Shibboleth IdP Configuration

Has been some progress on this as part of the TIER effort. Architects have talked about it. Scott Cantor weighed in on the core issues. Highlighted some perception/disconnect about what is needed and have synced on that and have a more consistent understanding. Proposal being developed right now and planned to finish by end of day July 21. Need to socialize the requirements before beginning.

Next Meeting - August 03 - 1 pm ET