

# 2019-June-19

CTAB Wed., June 19, 2019

## Attending

- Mary Catherine Martinez, InnoSoft (chair)
- David Bantz, University of Alaska (vice chair)
- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska
- Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Globus, University of Chicago
- Brad Christ, Eastern Washington University
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- Chris Whalen, Research Data and Communication Technologies
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2

## Regrets

- John Pfeifer, University of Maryland
- Eric Goodman, UCOP - TAC Representative to CTAB
- Chris Hable, University of Michigan
- John Hover, Brookhaven National Lab
- Adam Lewenberg, Stanford
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2
- Ann West, Internet2
- Albert Wu, Internet2

## Action Items

- [A] MC will email CTAB to solicit a volunteer for the SIRTFI Task Force
- [A] Emily reserve CTAB Working Group meeting for TechEx (DONE)
- [A] David edit to Baseline Expectations phase 2 cover letter to go with the survey

## Discussion

### REFEDs

- ChrisW commented that the June 19, 2019 REFEDs meeting at TNC went well, including an interesting talk on Future of federations in a [WebAuthn](#) world
- <https://refeds.org/40th-meeting>

### Sirtfi WG participation from CTAB

- [A] MC will email CTAB to solicit a volunteer for the SIRTFI metadata accuracy Task Force

### Baseline Expectations Phase 2

- Straw timeline for next wave of BE - from now to TechEx time kick off - what are the milestones, when?
  - Hope to have work firmed up by 2019 TechEx - Dec 9 in New Orleans <https://meetings.internet2.edu/2019-technology-exchange/>
  - Working backward, this would mean Final draft of BE v2 - Nov. 10, 2019
  - Complete Community Consensus - 10/31
  - Set up formal community consensus structure (comm list, etc) 9/3
  - Produce first public draft of BE v2 - Aug 15
  - Gather community input for BE v2 - July 15
  - Send out request for input to BE survey around start of July?
- Letter to InCommon participants on next phase of BE
  - how do we structure the call for feedback/input to get the right kind of response?
  - elicit new insight or need CTAB had not considered
  - contain the scope enough so that it's not a wild goose chase
  - don't forget community consensus process
- Use survey (Google Forms) approach to determine what the hurdles might be to certain proposed new baseline elements
- Question of how well can a commercial product COTS implement MFA
- IDPs running Oracle Identity Manager or Site Minder are challenged to federate with LIGO
- Status as of last call - there was a letter drafted around BE Phase 2
- While it was noted that there is some advantage to having open ended format (not a survey), CTAB decided that on balance, it is easier to handle data from a survey than to collate open ended responses
- Could collect info using a survey but not be bound to the survey "results."
  - Some concern that we don't want to be locked into a path

- There was discussion on whether CTAB should share the survey results
- The survey might include an evaluation of baseline expectations phase 1 (At least summarize phase 1)
- Then after summarizing phase 1, present the question of "What should be our next goals for enhancing interoperability?"
- Then provide ideas for BE phase 2 and ask for a ranking (in what order should there be implemented)
- Survey should also include an ask for open ended thoughts on what should be added to BE phase 2 in addition to the items mentioned
- It will be helpful in the survey to gather concerns on certain suggestions for BE Phase 2
- Explain that the Community Consensus process will follow this input gathering exercise
- Include a draft timeline including the community consensus process
- Bundling of items in BE Phase 2 during Community Consensus?
  - Suggestion in Albert's doc for one community consensus process for all the items included in BE Phase 2, JonM also thought the consensus would be on a bundled package
  - Brett thought perhaps the items should be unbundled
  - DavidB: we probably don't want to run through the community consensus process multiple times
- Regarding [GEANT code of conduct](#), see item 2.2 in the draft
  - Information received from IdPs is not shared with third parties without permission and is stored only when necessary for SP's purpose
  - Will one of the survey questions cover that?
  - This is important to Adam's organization
  - Yes, can do
- Survey should ask if responder is SP or IDP
- Ask for email address optionally
- Would be helpful to have contact reference for a survey respondent who needs to know more about a proposal for phase 2
- Collect info on what software is being used, to help correlate with what items they say will be difficult
- Suggestion to include an option of "we already support this" for the items being proposed for BE Phase 2
- Ask how important is this for the InCommon community?
- Include opportunity for free text, on additional items that would improve trust in SPs and IDPs in the federation
- Should we send this survey to the REFEDs community?
- Action Items
  - AI MC will send the google form to CTAB for review (done)
  - AI Emily reserve CTAB Working Group meeting for TechEx (done)
  - AI David edit to BE phase 2 cover letter to be sent with the survey (done)

**Next CTAB Call: Wed July 3, 2019 at 4pm ET**