February 05, 2014

Date:

Feb 05, 2014

Time:

12 Noon Eastern, 9AM Pacific, 5PM UK

Dial-in Info:

+1-734-615-7474 (English I2, Please use if you do not pay for Long Distance),
+1-866-411-0013 (English I2, toll free US/Canada Only)
PIN: 0195401 #

Agenda:

1. Announcements
2. Outcomes from eduGAIN Policy Framework Review
3. Any other business

Attending:

Warren, Tom, IJ, Scott, Steve, Paul, Ian

Recording:

Minutes:

1. Announcements
    a. Steven notes that John has had meeting with I2 Counsel.
2. Is it worth writing a document on our review of eduGAIN Policy Framework
    a. Steven says that two days ago, there was a call between the I2 program committee and I2 steering with discussion of directions going forward. eduGAIN participation is prominent, and there are people who made need background. A paper we write might be useful for educating people on the importance.
3. AOB - Warren asks for future directions.
    a. Tom brings up Refeds call on Feb 17 regarding code of conduct. He sees technical issues on the horizon with it. Warren asks if how many people will be attending from this group? Steven notes that there seems to be little interest or awareness of CoC issues. Warren wonders if we need to make more awareness and interest since this means non-communication between InC SPs and EU IdPs. Ian thinks this is an overstatement - agreements can be made. Steven agrees but thinks CoC might be a step toward automating this. Steven asks how this relates to LIGO. Warren says that ultimately there are probably of the order of 20 institutions in Europe that LIGO would like to federate with, but currently there are only a couple. He notes that point-to-point agreements can and have been made but that it weakens federation and interfederation. Scott points out that there are security benefits regardless. He asks what other avenues there might be toward EU privacy. He has email regarding process of adoption for CoC. They are proceeding toward a public call for comment. Steven can raise this with Steering to see if they are interested. Scott wonders what is the best "bang for the buck" for getting attributes to flow in a pragmatic way, without getting tied down in policy concerns. Steven points out that counsel John Moribido is familiar with Safe Harbor from work with commerce and wanted to get input on what my work even if there are legal niceties. Scott wants to back away from legal concerns altogether. Ian agrees - he thinks the important fact will be how many IdPs will release attributes even if the CoC allows it. He points out that IdP operators might want to make decisions on a case-by-case basis anyway. Scott's concern is that at the end of the day the decisions are made based on what the needs are and not on what the official policies are, and that is what Steven is basically doing when these things are brought forward. Steven agrees that there is basically an unofficial statement that people will behave well. He suspects that for the LIGO example it will be based on P2P agreements. Scott wonders if an international R&S category is a lightweight framework that might form a basis for these agreements in the background as the legal and policy issues are sorted out. Steven asks Ian if he has a sense of whether IdP operators would be more comfortable with an R&S tag vs CoC. Ian thinks that there are, but that there is a spectrum of risk aversion in operators, and some operators will choose not to ignore that there is a legal grey area and will simply conclude that the risks for them are greater than the benefits. He points out that some operators might be more cooperative if they are unaware that there are legal issues. Warren asks if there is an international definition of R&S entity category? Scott and Tom point out that there is a REFEDs document that could probably be finished by the Dublin meeting in May. Steven wonders if there is ownership of this document? He will contact Nicole about how to push that forward.