

# Oct 23 2015 Ad Hoc Advisory Group Call

## Notes from Oct 23 2015 Ad Hoc Advisory Group Call

**Attending:** Nate, Keith, Ken, Ann, Emily, Jacob, JimJ, Paul, TomB, SteveZ

### Action Items from TIER Ad Hoc Advisory Call of Oct. 23, 2015

[AI] (Keith) tweak TIER-API WG charter over the weekend (adding new deliverable of a report back on the ongoing status of this group and a new deliverable of looking at Grouper APIs including SCIM) and email this group to review the revised charter.

[AI] (Jim) clarify the TIER aspect in the Packaging WG charter

[AI] (Tom) put feelers out to identify a TIER Security WG Chair: CIC-SWG, past Net+ security Net+ efforts, Steve's TIER conscripts list (Helen Patton expressed interest to Ann at TechX).

[AI] (Tom) tweak [TIER Security Group charter](#) to include some vetting of key recommendations by community Security groups

[AI] (SteveZ) draft charter for TIER Instrumentation/Measurement working group; Jacob will also work on it

[AI] (Emily/Tom) put the campus success WG question on agenda for next call when Ann is available

#### 1. Review TIER WG charters in-hand. Ready to go? Are next steps understood?

##### a. [APIs WG](#) (Keith)

Keith has done a doodle poll of the many volunteers, including a few each from U Florida, Clemson, and U. Wisconsin. Give the size of the mailing list (over 70) It will be challenging to make decisions and move through the issue list, but we will find a way.

Planning on a call on Thurs Oct 29 at 1pm CT, another Wed Nov 4 at 2pm CT each on a bi-weekly schedule. It was the only way to accommodate the Doodle results

Keith plans to sent out an agenda for the 1st call and that will include a link to the charter

Q: did the call for volunteers include a pointer to the charter? No. See above.

Q: should we use the TIER Contributions list as basis for getting new WG volunteers? A: yes

For charter: add dated deliverable items attuned to April + n\*8 month cadence.

Q: are there component architects on this API WG?

A: yes, have Grouper, CManage reps, no Shib person yet

Q: should this be a single WG over time? A: probably yes, may make sense to spin off component-specific subgroups. WG will keep the question in the parking lot and ask itself later

New deliverable is a report back on the ongoing status of this group.

Add Grouper API item to deliverables: Compare the Voot2 APIs, the simple group and membership APIs in Grouper, and the SCIM group API methods

Ken: Consent work also depends heavily on API work.

[AI] Keith tweak TIER-API WG charter over the weekend (adding new deliverable of a report back on the ongoing status of this group and a new deliverable of looking at Grouper APIs including SCIM) and email this group to review the revised charter.

Mike Zawacki will flywheel the API WG

a. [Packaging](#) WG (Jim)

Recruiting is going well. About 32 people have signed up on the sympa list

Will do a Doodle poll

Hope to have a 1st call during 1st week in Nov.

Plan to split into small work groups.

Q: do you expect difficult decisions? A: Jim: should be OK

Jim: much interest in Docker, but some schools don't use Docker and there may be demand for a VM also.

Tom: this Ad Hoc group can help resolve difficult issues if needed

JimJ: some of this group had origins in InCommon. We will need to keep TAC up to date.

Q: Keep Shib and Grouper in the WG name in the text of the charter?

A: [AI] Jim clarify the TIER aspect in the Packaging WG charter (what is in 6b currently)

a. [Security](#) WG (Tom)

There is a need to seek a chair for this WG. Tom wrote the charter but does not have cycles to chair the group.

Keith: this charter does not cover security requirements for the APIs. Issues related to OAUTH vs SAML vs TLS.

Maybe it's a matter of liaisons between groups. Need best practices for the working groups to ensure alignment?  
Agreed that it seems to be covered well enough in current charter.

Who to get to lead this group?

[AI] (Tom) put feelers out: CIC-SWG, past Net+ security Net+ efforts, Steve's TIER conscripts list (Helen Patton expressed interest to Ann at TechX).

[AI] (Tom) tweak Security Group charter to include some vetting of key recommendations by community Security groups

Nick Lewis will flywheel the Security WG

a. Settle chartering process for the APIs and Packaging working groups

- i. Is Packaging to be approved by TAC?
  - ii. APIs by ... us? Component Architects?
- 1. Do we need an instrumentation/measurement WG? What is its objective?
  - Things to measure include: performance, API invocations, method calls, config info of deployed environments. Help inform developers and inform community about how they're using TIER's great creations.
  - Technical or cross-functional membership? More the former, but maybe need a privacy person to supply "creepiness" input.
  - SteveZ would like this group to convene and develop ideas for TIER Release 1
  - Can this AD Hoc Advisory group come up with items around this?
  - Tom: no, this Ad Hoc group should stay out

[AI] SteveZ draft charter for Instrumentation/Measurement WG; Jacob will also work on it

- 1. When and how should we spin up Campus Success WG?
  - a. Is this best done as the product of a technical advisory group like us, or is it best done by some other means?

[AI] (Emily/Tom) Park this campus success WG question for next call when Ann is available

- 2. This group is sort of resetting itself under name "TIER Ad Hoc Advisory Group." What is our initial agreement of our objective and process?

Ken: when does this group become more than Ad Hoc (or rather, gets replaced by a standing group)? What would be the trigger? Should the decision be given to TCIC? Should decision belong to SteveZ and Ann? Probably the latter (says TomB!).

- a. How to find our docs: wiki home, Box docs linked from there.

Box folder for working documents is [here](#).

Q: What about using a CManage instance? A: TomB: we will discuss this when spaces is domesticated.

[AI] Tom will move the security WG charter to the TIER Box folder (DONE)

- a. <https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/ASWG/TIER+Ad+Hoc+Advisory+Group+Home>
- b. Role of this group in being advisory to management of Internet2's TIER activities and not decision-making
- c. Where we should end up and how we operate in the interim, esp. vis-a-vis TAC and Component Architects Group.

SteveZ: some of the overlap of working group members is intentional to facilitate communication. Keith and Jim and others: in the short term they can wear many hats on various TIER working groups.

Regarding TAC, a new TAC charter is in the works.

Suggestion: if TAC's role evolves dramatically, one way to ease the transition is to use some of the current TAC participants in the new TIER Working Groups spinning up

- a. Clarify process for producing TIER Development Roadmap, etc.
  - i. Cf. Deliverables section of [iCAPE draft - This is an AI for the future](#)
- b. Very interim and not publishing a charter, but should we have an internal charter?
- c. The brand under which our lasting products should be published or known
  - i. TIER, ie, Internet2's TIER activities ... right?

## Parking Lot of Future Agenda Topics

- 1. Review of David Walker's TIER Doc Stewardship Draft proposal? [See link](#)
- 2. campus success WG question