# 2021-June-1 CTAB Public Minutes

## CTAB call Tuesday, June 1, 2021

**Attending**

- David Bantz, University of Alaska (chair)
- Brett Bieber, University of Nebraska (vice chair)
- Pål Axelsson, SUNET
- Eric Goodman, UCOP - InCommon TAC Representative to CTAB
- Meshna Koren, Elsevier
- Jon Miner, University of Wisc - Madison
- Andy Morgan, Oregon State University
- John Pfeifer, University of Maryland
- Dave Robinson, Grinnell College in Iowa, InCommon Steering Rep, ex-officio
- Jule Ziegler,  Leibniz Supercomputing Centre
- Robert Zybeck, Portland Community College
- Ann West, Internet2
- Emily Eisbruch, Internet2
- Chris Whalen, Research Data and Communication Technologies
- Johnny Lasker, Internet2
- Kevin Morooney, Internet2
- Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Globus, University of Chicago
- Tom Barton, University Chicago and Internet2, ex-officio

**Regrets**

- Ercan Elibol, Florida Polytechnic University
- Richard Frovarp,  North Dakota State
- Albert Wu, Internet2

**New Actions Item from this call**

- AI Johnny - look into outreach to delegated admins around BEv2, and if we need a different list for that
- AI David - iterate on the wording in the proposed email outreach to site admins and execs, to be sure the message is welcoming and not scary

# Discussion

- Intellectual Property reminder
- Agenda Bash

**Working group updates**

- REFEDS Assurance WG   https://wiki.refeds.org/display/GROUPS/Assurance+Working+Group
    - On the way to provide an update, new RAF version 2
    - Addressing identity proofing
    - Good progress
- REFEDS MFA subgroup
    - Kicked off

- TNC, June 21 to June 25, online  https://tnc21.geant.org/
    - REFEDs meeting and more identity and trust meetings will occur the week before TNC, around June 15
    - FIM4R will meet that week, with focus on Identity Assurance
    - Side meetings at TNC21: https://tnc21.geant.org/side-meetings/
    -  FIM4R: https://indico.cern.ch/event/1038620/

- Assured Access  Working Group
    - Draft REFEDS Assurance Framework Implementation Guidance for the InCommon Federation is open for community consultation
- Proposed improvements to the draft:
    - add mention of bronze and silver profiles
    -  include the eduPersonAssurance attribute, conforming to REFEDs baseline
    - Getting towards cappuccino profile or espresso profile, etc.
    - Aspects beyond identity assurance
    - To assert those levels, must assert the base prefix for REFEDs assurance
    - Brett will incorporate that
- Will help to have CTAB think through how to solicit for more input as we get closer to consultation close date
- Ann: Had call w NIH around organization support of REFEDs Assurance Framework (RAF), identity proofing qualifiers, working to get NIH ready
- NIH will put up a website this week hopefully, with links to InCommon and REFEDS
- Suggestion to add to the Assured Access WG draft another assertion to add inside the multi valued attribute being released.
- It's mechanics for members of InCommon, they should be supporting that through Baseline Expectations
- TomB:  topics for the Assured Access WG:
    - as campuses start implementing, people will need a place to go for questions that arise, need to specify where to get questions answered

- - There are processes that undergird identity proofing profiles based on relationships
  - NIST dropped this approach from version 2 to version 3
  - But relevant in academia
- Brett AIs
  - Incorporate feedback into the draft doc
  - Draft info on how bronze and silver profiles align
  - Schedule meeting of Assured Access Working Group to review feedback from consultation

- **NIH update (compliance tool data)**
  - Meetings are biweekly with NIH
  - Info on the results of using a compliance check tool
  - NIH IDM people updated the compliance check tool to be useful for IDP operators
  - It was originally for researchers
  - Goes into the details around meeting the NIH requirements
  - Data will be sent to us on results of using the compliance tool
    - Will use this data for a progress chart
    - To show how the community is responding to the NIH requirements
  - New NIH webpage will be helpful
  - Privacy policy for NIH is being worked on, this was an issue for some of the UK institutions, some resistance to being sent to PubMed, and concern about how R&S would be handled
  - Pubmed moving to solely federated access
  - Requires R&S attributes, (not sure if R&S is truly needed, being looked at)
  - Timetable is still taking shape
  - Will update the wiki page when dates are available https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/federation/get-nih-ready

**Email message revision re BE v2 compliance**
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IkktKTB2vWo47cnnW1zaVyW3K-UZX6oGfoXui1DheAU/edit   **(do not include in public notes)**

  - Email to those orgs not in compliance w BEv2
  - Execs will get same message as Site Admins
  - Suggestion to add to the note that the link in the email will work for Site Admins, but not Execs in most cases (unless they are also a site admin)
  - Must go to Federation Manager to see the details
  - Did we resolve the concern that the Big Ten Academic Alliance IAM  group had about contacting the SPs directly?
    - Big Ten thought the IDP operators often don't have sufficient influence over the SPs, that InCommon may have more influence
    - From IDP side, trying to influence SPs is  fighting uphill
    - Currently pulls IDP and SP info
    - Some confusion around messaging
    - Is the suggestion to have a special SP outreach?
    - Technical contact for the SP and delegated admin are different
    - Delegated admin has some access to federated manager,
    - Can be delegated for certain SPs to make changes for publication
    - The Site Admin must approve the changes
    - We want delegated admins to move their part of the needle and we need to message this

  - AI Johnny - look into outreach to delegated admins around BEv2, and if we need a different list for that

  - Suggestion to communicate directly to each security contact, but clarify that they must  contact site admin if needed
  - Johnny has meeting today w EDUCAUSE, hopes to get more feedback from them
  - Suggestion for targeted message just for those missing SIFTFI
- add security contacts from metadata?

- **How do we communicate to participants the consequence of
  "not scoring 'A' on SSLLabs' test"?**
  - Current messaging may not be clear enough
  - Don't want to imply it is needed to get an A to be in InCommon
  - EricG: people want specifics, on questions like: can I claim SIRTFI? Do I need to have an A or B on SSL labs testing?
  - TomB: we want to know the schedule for an org to meet the BEv2 requirements
  - The issue around whether grade of A on SSL labs testing is required or not is confusing
  - Cycle times, CTAB  says: give yourself six months to fix this issue, if that's not enough, let's talk.

  - Should we have a formal "extension" request for organizations that cannot meet July 2021 target for BEv2?
  - Suggestion to add this info to the email message to InCommon site admins and execs, and/or add this to another message in about 2 weeks
  - We don't want organizations to start thinking they must "drop out" of InCommon federation based on SSL Labs score
  - Johnny: Plan is for "teeth" to be added for BEv2 on July 19.
  - We will pause changes to metadata for some issues, **but NOT** for the SSL grade.
  - Currently the email says,  " For assistance, please contact us at help@incommon.org."
  - This is too terse

- AI David - will iterate on the wording in the proposed email outreach to site admins and execs, to be sure the message is welcoming and not scary

- WebID: The End State

- https://github.com/WICG/WebID
- Concern this effort will break conversation between IDP and SP
- They intend to unpack/unbundle  the attributes the IDP is sending
- Challenge is,  browser vendor  can't be sure if someone is sending info to track authentication or to track the user
- Want to limit tracking, but still need to allow other things to happen
- Just disallowing the technologies will break more than authentication
- EricG has participated in some of the discussions
- InCommon TAC is involved in these conversations
- This is a multi year effort, related to SameSite effort
- No one knows what the end state will look like
- Comment: Microsoft has some info online, don't see enough people from R&E included in the conversation.
- We should be sure our R&E use case is represented
- Heather F is involved with Google on this and she is communicating w InCommon TAC about it
- Browsers as another important player in the trust fabric?
- Suggestion for a federation friendly browser

**Next CTAB Call** : Tuesday, June 15, 2021