2019-Jan-30

CTAB Call Wed. Jan 30, 2019

Attending

- Mary Catherine Martinez, InnoSoft (chair)
- David Bantz, University of Alaska
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- Chris Whalen, Research Data and Communication Technologies
- Albert Wu, Internet2
- Ann West, Internet2
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2
- John Pfeifer, University of Maryland - guest
- Adam Lewenberg, Stanford - guest

Regrets

- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska
- Chris Hable, University of Michigan
- Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Globus, University of Chicago
- John Hover, Brookhaven National Lab

Action Items

- [AI] (Albert) will do a doodle poll to see how many CTAB members will be attending 2019 Global Summit (DONE)
- [AI] Albert will randomly assign CTAB members to work on the gaps, orgs where we don't have a contact (DONE)

Agenda

2019 CTAB Members / Vice-Chair update

- David B - Vice Chair nominee
- Mary Catherine - Chair nominee
- Roster submitted to Steering for approval
    - Should hear back from Steering next week
- Wiki content access update: worked out mechanical issues
    - The wiki access is coming along for new CTAB members
- CTAB Meeting during Global Summit?
    - March 5-8, 2019 in Washington DC
    - [AI] (Albert) will do a doodle poll to see how many CTAB members will be attending 2019 Global Summit (DONE)
    - People on this call Attending Global Summit: Ann, TomB, Albert, John P

Do we continue with the off week CTAB call?

- Focus on BE docket handling
- The off week CTAB calls have been happening in Dec 2018 and Jan 2019
- Could depend on the docket of orgs not meeting BE, there are about 40 orgs now
- CTAB needs to do roadmap planning and also handle the "docket"

- Decision: CTAB should keep meeting weekly during February at least

2019 CTAB Roadmap Planning

- Recently there was a CTAB Roadmap planning call
- The group reviewed priority / risk / timeline matrix from sub group
- Early emphasis on next stage of Baseline Expectations and establishing cadence for community consensus and implementation
- Group on CTAB planning call tried to assess further baseline related work that should be done, TomB started slotting work into a timeline

    - Proposed Work projects include:
        - Finish BE for metadata (dispute process for phase 1, below
        - Consensus proposal: Add error URL to BE
        - Consensus proposal: Academic IdPs support REFEDS MFA

- Need to share the arc of CTAB and community work with other bodies who have a stake in the work.
- Comment: this attempt to establish a cadence for the work is very helpful
- Shib v2 versus Shib v3 issues are of great interest to the community

- We need to be clear on how the Shib issues will be enforced
- CTAB can't enforce all issues on software version issues
- Shib may be a special case where we DO get involved
- Question: Does InCommon CTAB effort include verification ?
- Answer: there are many issues InCommon won't be able to verify, for example a recommendation to run up to date software
- CTAB should look for ways to make expectations demonstrate-able
- The baseline expectation for "generally accepted security practices" is not concrete, but CTAB will make refinements around requiring SIRTFI , etc.
- What are the positive feedback loops we can establish?
- Should we require participants to report back software version of federating software
- Question of how proactive CTAB should get in discovering failures to meet BE…
- It's possible to guestimate what version of Shib is being used by an InCommon participant, but do we want to get into that?
- That will be part of the consensus process
- Q: is the proposed arc of work a good start and should we start to socialize it with CACTI and InCommon TAC?
- CTAB will try to make sure the consensus process is extensive, but only a fraction of InCommon participants will likely participate. But let's say 10% participate in initial conversations. Then we need to educate the other 90% and engage them and respect their cycle times.
- Suggestion to publish the proposed work package at earliest possible moment, even if it covers things 12-18 months down the road. To help education and inform the community.
- More frequent smaller steps will be helpful versus bigger steps
- Could have a schedule laying out the timeline for new requirements….
- So organizations can potentially get ahead and handle all of the expectations in advance
- Will need to provide guidance on issues like add Error URL to Baseline Expactations
- Need to explain how Error URL will be used
- Similarly Baseline Expectations for MFA and R&S will include work between the consensus and the work package
- Issues around validation and verification will need to be planned and handled and communicated
- Collaboration ready is key, InCommon will need cloud services in good shape
- Revisit the planning on the next CTAB call.

Baseline Expectations Docket

- Added lower priority orgs and updated to show RA activities
- Albert is moving the data to the wiki
- There is updated info as of this morning
- Doing pretty well for priority 2-5
- In most cases there is someone working to get contact info where it is missing
- There are some gaps
- [AI] Albert will randomly assign CTAB members to work on the gaps, orgs where we don't have a contact
- For priorities 7-8 there are more gaps
- Question of how long RA (John Krienke's group) work on an org before we move it along
- Suggestion to turn on required validation of the fields
- First priority is having the right contacts
- Should work towards a date by which this work package is concluded
- FROM JAN 23, 2019 CTAB call: Suggestion to cut off the outreach effort in mid March 2019 timeframe

InCommon's draft response to the 2018 Working Group reports (as time permits)

- There is a draft response to reports from Attribute for Collaboration WG (Steering, CTAB, TAC co-sponsor) and Streamlining SP Onboarding WG (TAC sponsor)
- Seeking CTAB member comment

NEXT CTAB CALL: Wed. Feb. 6, 2019