16-Oct-2018 Attributes WG at TechEx in Orlando

Tech Ex Program: https://meetings.internet2.edu/2018-technology-exchange/detail/10005295/

Wiki page for Attributes Working Group https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/ipiTBg

Final Report is here http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.101.1

Attending

Matt Brookover, Paul Caskey, Jon Miner, IJ Kim, Mike Grady, David Bance, Mark Scheible, Tom Barton, Nathan Dors, Warren Curry, Bradley Christ, Brenden Belina, Ken Klingenstein, Janemarie Duh, Mike LaHaye,

Please add your name if you attended and you are not listed above.

Discussion

Brad Christ: Presentation

This meeting culminates the work of the group.

Review of WG Charter and Goals:

- Why Orgs / IdP Operators have not adopted R&S
- Look at policies and what is provided on how to join R&S and accelerate that

What we did:

- Surveyed InCommon and non-Incommon members (130 responses), interviewed 7 CIOs and senior staff, conducted sessions at Internet2 TechEx and Global Summit
- Many folks did not even understand the value of InCommon much less R&S
- 1/3 were going to do it, 1/3 were not sure, 1/3 were not planning on it (roughly)
- Result was drafting a set of Recommendations (see report link above)

Report was Issued and formally adopted by TAC and InCommon

Q & A

Report provides for using Consent for Attribute Release

- Note that there are provisions within GDPR that allow for not using consent
- R&S is directory information and not really any private information
- Also vendors must apply and get approved to be able to consume R&S

Brenden Belina: Had issues with getting folks into InCommon years ago and just needed to sell it over an over and it is getting there, does not seem to be happening with R&S and concerned about making it mandatory. What is an institution's alternative if they want to interoperate but don't want to do it.

This is a process. Most people with concerns about adopting thought others that would reject it without really knowing or did not see a broad base of support. Danger that we pushed SPs to do it and if they don't see adoption they may give up support in the long run as no value. Researchers and SPs may choose less secure alternatives, if R&S adoption does not increase.

Tom Barton: Baseline Expectations and CTAB are drivers and they are community driven and not just InCommon. There is a Dispute Process run by CTAB to work with disputes and work to find a way forward. If there is no response and/or cannot find a way forward then CTAB can recommend removal from InCommon. This is a mature process based on real needs for supporting Research. Questions and/or enhancement requests around Baseline Expectations are run through a Community Consensus Process run by CTAB so anyone in the community beyond those affected can voice their opinions and have a voice.

Ken Klingenstein: There are schools that just will not adopt period and we need to have a way to deal with these. We need to reinforce multi-lateralism and that is where the existential threat is. Also have heard criticisms of the transparency of the audit on the R&S. Tom: this is all published and have not heard complaints. The process is that there is a process for working with any open complaints.

Observation that it will be very difficult to add more researchers. Engaging with their sponsors (funding sources) will be critical to successful adoption in this area. Researchers have a great deal of influence at their home institutions and, by extension, so do grant agencies. Suggestion for InCommon to engage more than just NFS and NIH; there are many grand agencies out there with broad reach.

- possible AI We should make a short list of the key types of funding organizations or those that coordinate funding organizations.

We need to find a way to better promote Federation as it is not as easy to recognize the value like it is with Eduroam.

Value of federation isn't completely clear for the "holdout" schools, especially community colleges and small private institutions. More common services that leverage federation will benefit the entire community.