

2018-Mar-14

Notes, CTAB Call of 14-Mar-2018

Notes and Action Items, CTAB Call of 14-March-2018

Attending:

- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska (chair)
- David Bantz, University of Alaska
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2
- Chris Hable, University of Michigan
- Ted Hanss, University of Michigan
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- Mary Catherine Martinez, InnoSoft
- Chris Whalen, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)
- Ann West, Internet2
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2

Regrets: Joanna Rojas, Duke

New Action Item

- [AI] (Jon, David, Brett) will revise the text in the Community Consensus Process & "Rules of the Road" doc around lists and where the community consensus deliberations will occur

Discussion

Webinars

- Third of 3 **baseline expectations webinars** is complete <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/BE/Baseline+Expectations+for+Trust+in+Federation>
- Attendance at the 3 webinars was good
- Presented diagram on community consensus process
- Guidance will be needed on privacy policies, on logos, on MDUI
- Request from David Bantz: take a look at privacy URLs and comments in Slack channel

Community Notification of finalized FOPP/PA changes

- Things are falling into place for official notification to community of the FOPP/PA changes

Discuss & Finalize Community Consensus Process & "Rules of the Road"

- Thanks to Tom Barton for drafting a community consensus process.
- Six stages are outlined
- There is value in the IETF doc; it includes guidance on how a chair can help get to consensus, without expectation for everyone in room to agree; we should add it as reference material <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7282>
 - Concern - the focus of the IETF doc is that those who show up "in a room" or on a call. We should try to include the entire community, not just those who show up. Inclusiveness is important.
- Suggestion to mock up this community consensus process
- Rules of Road part of the draft may be too rigid and challenging to enforce.
- Do we moderate or facilitate discussions?
- There is the concern that a discussion can get dominated by a few strong views
- Chair should have role to elicit opinions
- The draft suggests a consensus-discuss email list. Discussion will get kicked off on participants list and moved to the consensus-discuss list.
- How to populate the consensus-discuss list? Suggestion to copy in all of participants list.
- Suggestion to spin up a new sympla list for each community consensus discussion
- Issue : a new list will be disincentive to participation
- It is unknown how often the community consensus process will get used
- There will be a community consultation process for each issue
- The group discussion the issue on the consensus issue could reach out on regular basis to the broader InCommon participants list.
- [AI] (Jon, David, Brett) will revise the text around lists and where the community consensus deliberations will occur

Diagram (diagram used for the webinar, updates/corrections needed?)

Dispute Resolution Process, The group participated in a sample scenario.

Issues to consider:

- Do we need to set up a requirement for how quickly an IDP must respond to CTAB in case of a dispute?
- Someone needs to keep the notes for CTAB discussions of cases on the docket
- Perhaps identify a lead from CTAB for each case

CTAB Meeting at 2018 Global Summit, Wednesday, 05/09, 12:00PM-1:00PM

- Will have a zoom bridge

Next CTAB meeting, Wed. Mar 28, planned agenda item: Privacy Policy Discussion (David, Chris W)