

# InCommon TAC Meeting 2016-05-12

## Minutes

Attending: Keith Hazelton, Michael Gettes, Walter Hoehn, Steve Carmody, Janemarie Duh, Tom Mitchell, Scott Cantor, Tom Barton, Mark Scheible, Albert Wu

With: Dean Woodbeck, David Walker, Ann West, Nick Roy, Ian Young, IJ Kim, Mike LaHaye, Tom Scavo, Paul Caskey

## Minutes from April 28 meeting

Approved

## Face-to-Face Planning

There was a discussion about the goals and topics for the TAC face-to-face at the Internet2 Global Summit.

As a prelude, Ann provided a summary of the “deep dive” held in Denver last week, involving four community members (John O’Keefe, Ron Kraemer, Klara Jelinkova, and Bruce Vincent) and five Internet2 staff (Ann West, Kevin Morooney, Steve Zoppi, Dave Gift, and Ana Hunsinger). The group reviewed a number of recent reports, including the ops review, the changing demographics of InCommon, and a summary of phase 1 of the marketing plan (which was essentially a lot of data munging). The group discussed current work plans, resource availability, and community expectations. This will be presented to InCommon Steering and the TIER Community Investor Council on Monday of the Global Summit. The overall goal is alignment of work plans, resource availability, and community expectations.

Some overarching thoughts on the goals and topics for the TAC F2F:

- How does the TAC process fit with the other planning process in InCommon and Internet2 trust/identity?
- Consider the InCommon chart of priorities
- The TAC work plan includes a number of new work items. What is our ability to start, follow-through, and complete those items, given the available resources?
- What items are on the TAC work plan that could be completed mainly by the community?
- There is some evidence that some projects were started too early and then repeated. When some of these items were first explored, for instance, InCommon did not have the capacity to complete them, so things stalled with a beta-like service.
- It might help to identify efforts that would take time now, but would reduce the overall effort later on.
- Identify “low-hanging” fruit. Be pragmatic, in terms of what can be done short-term, but don’t ignore the long-term priorities and need for resources.
- Do we have the right things on the InCommon chart of priorities?

Ann encouraged a broader view of “ops” than just the technical work. When thinking about eduGAIN, for example, our transition was hugely successful and, once started, took just four months. However, it consumed a lot of time and work not only for the technical implementation, but for communication and education and legal. We received high marks from the community on the transition and the communication stream, but that took a lot of time. We are now looking at the Steward program, per-entity metadata, POP replacement, and SIRTIFY; all of which would require a communications plan and effort.

## Next meeting

Tuesday, May 17, F2F at Internet2 Global Summit, 9-11 am CT