

# CACTI Meeting Public Minutes 28-Nov-2017

## Attending:

### Members

- Chris Phillips, CANARIE (chair)
- Warren Anderson, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee /LIGO
- Tom Barton, U Chicago
- Jill Gemmill, Clemson
- Ann Harding, SWITCH/GEANT
- Karen Herrington, Virginia Tech
- Todd Higgins, Franklin & Marshall College
- Tom Jordan, U Wisc - Madison
- Les LaCroix, Carleton College
- 

### Internet2

- Ann West
- Emily Eisbruch
- Steve Zoppi, Internet2

Regrets: Christos Kanellopoulos (GEANT), Nathan Dors (U. Washington), Rob Carter (Duke), Kevin Morooney (Internet2)

## Action Items list

<https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/GoPdBg>

## CACTI Work Items

- CACTI is currently focusing primarily on roadmaps and outputs from 2017 TechEx.
- We had started work on how to get input from the Trust and Identity Working Groups. That topic may re-emerge as a priority.

## Discussion

### Discussion of Trust and Identity Roadmap

Reference:

- Strawman model of the trust and identity space [Contextualizing-trust-and-identity-with-a-model-Strawman.pptx](#)
- OSI Model and TCP/IP Model slide: [Nov28-Jill-tcp-ip.pptx](#)
- [Some Historical views](#)

Comments and suggestions on the strawman model:

- .The model seems technical and explains what is in place already
  - Perhaps there should be another model for a less technical audience, including more about the campus factors.
  - Many campus factors are left out of this strawman model.
  - Could call the campus layer the "institutional" layer
- Perhaps the model should reflect a potential move to a self asserted identity model
- Make the place of VOs clearer in the model
- Jill noticed some of the FIM4R requirements also apply to VOs. Fedushare focused on non-web enabled SSH login using Shib <https://sites.google.com/site/fedushare/the-fedushare-framework>
- The VOs intersect with the campus. We have a multi dimensional space,
- This model captures one slice, but it could look at sources of identity and sources of authority.
- Could slice in other ways and get other useful views. No single dimension will show everything
- Perhaps blow up each of the boxes, such as the campus view, to see more detail.
- Once revised, the model can be a Rosetta Stone or a common language (Esperanto). Can be helpful to see where a certain conversation lives in the T&I model.

Additional discussion on roadmap

- For each project considered for the roadmap, we need to look at perspective of Campus, SPs, Federations, and VOs
- Perhaps consider end users also. This can include researchers.
- We can look at usability perspective, policy perspective, sustainability perspective
- It is important to find "win win"s such as SIRTFl. Most, but not all, projects cause some pain for one body to give benefit for another
- GEANT project side is focused on collaborative service delivery (edugain, eduteams). Enriching edugain metadata has been discussed to help researchers

- Business model canvas could be relevant, it is an innovation management perspective, fills in areas in addition to technology and operational aspects BMC introductory video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2FumwkBMhLo&feature=youtu.be>

Kevin, Ann and Steve are engaging the Program Advisory Group (PAG) on similar questions. The PAG is executive advisory group, looking at big questions including roadmaps and direction and roadmap. Helping the community understand what needs to be done, what is in play, and what is the Trust and Identity role. SteveZ has been engaging the TIER component architects on similar topics. Looking at closing the TIER 3-year funding period and communications around that. Need to reach out more broadly now beyond the initial TIER 49 funders. Goal is to make the "story" around TIER and T&I coherent to the broad community.

ChrisP: will follow up before next call with AnnW and SteveZ on how to add the VO perspective to the model.

Some of the T&I PAG members and CIOs may think primarily about the campus view. Would be good to help broaden the thinking through education. Data can potentially help change the mindset. TomB is compiling data on science gateways that are InCommon members. The number of users of the science gateways is impressive

## Community Reports

### -MACE-Dir Rechartering

- Keith Hazelton is working on charter for MACE-Directories working group

### -VO Person <https://voperson.org/>

- There is a new activity called VO Person, about schema issues from service provider aspect.
- VO Person is for the use case where there is a self defined group of people from various home institutions and info about them is needed to help run a resource
- Can re-use the approach. This is what VO person hopes to do
- The VO Person effort is primarily driven by Service Providers. But CI Logon is involved and CI Logon is also an IDP.
- Involves both the SP and the IDP and the glue inbetween. AARC architecture is useful for describing the glue <https://aarc-project.eu/architecture/>
- We need to allow the various kinds of sources of authority that go into Federated Access to express themselves. Using proxies is an impedance. We need mature and standard ways for the different sources of authority to manage their own pieces. Our model should not be constrained and overly technological. The model should take into account the groups of humans who must tell the technology how to behave.
- It was noted that there is VO infrastructure in place in Europe, with eduteam.
- <https://www.geant.org/Innovation/eduteams>
- Also there are various Grouper and COnmanage based installations more widely.
- There are questions around how to link/implement/roadmap VOperson. Also the relationship with previous work like VOOT
- A question is where VO Person should be defined and managed. Is it part of the new MACE-Dir charter?

## Other

Follow up on Input to FIM4R

GEANT workplan submissions ()

<https://wiki.geant.org/pages/viewpage.action?spaceKey=gn43tip&title=New+Idea+Submission>(Federated login required, )

Any items that CACTI want to call out that are head and shoulders above others?

CACTI members encouraged to add their +1's to the list

### Parking lot for this call:

- Next Steps on CACTI Working Group Processes - getting feedback from chairs (Objective: Discuss, Consensus sought ~10 min ChrisP+)
- see bold Q's on list of questions here(bottom page): [CACTI Working Group Processes - DRAFT](#)
- Q: CACTI would like to get a basic understanding of WG status with these minimum 3 questions. Is there a way to do this already or is this new ask of chairs?

**Next CACTI Call:** Tuesday, Dec. 12, at 11am ET