InCommon TAC Meeting 2017-02-02

Minutes

TAC Members Attending: Mark Scheible, Jim Jokl, Albert Wu, Janemarie Duh, Kim Milford, Mike Grady, Tom Barton, Chris Misra, Keith Wessel, Eric Goodma

Others Attending: Dean Woodbeck, David Walker, Ian Young, Nick Roy, Tom Scavo, Paul Caskey, Mike LaHaye

TAC approved the minutes from the last meeting (January 19, 2017)

Ops Update

https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/x/6QN-Bg

1. Shib IdPv3 Upgrades - 57% of InCommon Shib IdPs are at v3, 36% v2, and 7% unknown
2. R&S - No new InCommon IdPs added in January; 60 IdPs from Denmark declared support (all IdPs in Denmark declared at the same time - they have a hub/spoke setup).
3. Domains in IdP metadata - A sponsored partner (with a .org domain) submitted IdP metadata with a .com domain in the endpoint location. This is not usual. Tom has drafted a policy and procedure document "Domains in IdP Metadata" and asks that TAC read it and give feedback. Ops Advisory Group has discussed briefly.

OIDC Survey Results

The survey was open Dec. 22, 2016, and closed January 20, 2017, and received 143 responses. The survey listed a number of use cases, but there was an open-ended question, too, where a number of other uses cases were included. Albert shared a summary and highlights (see this document for additional information):

- 65% are very interested in OIDC/OAuth in API development
- Nearly 90% want OIDC/OAuth built into Shib and TIER offerings
- Two-thirds say OIDC/OAUth should support current federation model
- There is not a clear leader in terms of product (Google is largest at 13%)

NIST 800-63-3

There is an open comment period underway.

Global Summit Schedule

TAC F2F is scheduled Tuesday, April 25, 2017, 3-5 pm.

FOPP Change and Incident Handling Process

Internet2 legal has approved this and Nick will post a blog on Tuesday, Feb. 7.

Addressing Openness and Transparency in TAC

Mark has summarized the topics.

Two threads

- OpennessTransparency
  - TAC information currently hard to find and scattered
  - Plan to better organize the public information on the wiki
  - REFEDS site provides a nice example
  - The need for openness probably extends beyond TAC (InC overall, Steering, etc)
- 2017 Work Plan
  - Hold webinars on work plan
  - Provide method for input on work plan
  - What's the decision-making process?
  - Publish work underway - WGs, web/wiki

A number of things need to be kept in front of the community

- R&S, IdPv3, consent, attribute release, entity categories
- Identified obstacles to effective federation
- Identified attribute bundle, SP needs/use

Have we identified the gaps (in terms of openness)?

- Making the online content more accessible (at least have a one-stop-shop for information and links to other information)
- Need to determine the next step for the topics on the 2017 work plan (WG? Joint effort with REFEDS? What is appropriate?).

It seems that there is a need to respond to the question of transparency even before the work plan is open for discussion. Would it be appropriate to use this document as a starting point for communication?

- One idea for a next step - draft a note to participants once a process is worked out, with a way to provide feedback
- Is opening up the TAC calls a solution?
- The concern is likely broader than TAC -- TAC's work plan, how does that work plan fit with the larger Internet2 Trust and Identity efforts, other groups that may also require visibility.
- People may not know the mechanisms in place for feedback and participation. Reminding people periodically about the structure and opportunity for participation may help.
- It would also be useful to get feedback about what people want in terms of openness and participation.
- There are consequences for being open and transparent. Could lead to more questions about perceived inactivity and/or follow-up or follow-through on things like WG proposals.
- Perhaps need to be clearer about the role of TAC and related groups.
- What we do for TAC and CACTI and other groups should be done in a similar way. CACTI is having a similar discussion. Also should make sure to publish the process for developing and accepting the TAC work plan.

Work Plan

(AI) Mark - will put the four items listed in his summary as a start of a work plan. Put this in a collaboration tool and TAC have at it. Also, what are the scopes of these projects.

Next Meeting - Thursday, February 16 - 1 pm ET