

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

- Al Johnny - look into outreach to delegated admins around BEv2, and if we need a different list for that
- Al 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 Als
 - Incorporate feedback into the draft doc
 - Draft info on how bronze and silver 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/1lkkTKTB2vWo47cnnW1zaVyW3K-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
- Al 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 SSLabs' 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
- Al 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