

November 8, 2018

Attending: Tom, Brook, Shannon, Romain, Uros, David G, Scott K, alan.

Proposed Agenda:

1. Action Item report out
 - a. Tom & Laura: draft a charter for a Sirtfi+ governing body

Rather than do as asked, they decided to present the two options below to the WG.

- b. All: next steps towards operating the Sirtfi+ Registry
2. Do we need a governance solution or do we need, ala [REEP's policy](#), a crisp declaration of how the Sirtfi+ Registry is operated, so everyone knows what they're getting should they choose to use Sirtfi+ metadata?

Two approaches to achieve suitable community oversight of the Registry operation were put forward.

Option 1: Sirtfi+ Registry governance group

As raised at the REFEDS meeting at TechEx18, this approach entails creating a charter for a governance group with appropriate representation and creating an SLA/MOU-ish agreement that the Registry operator would bind themselves to that, in particular, would acknowledge the governance group's authority over the operation. The charter and MOU-ish agreement would be created by the Sirtfi WG and put through Consultation to achieve Final versions of those docs. Someone would then need to constitute the governance group according to its charter. The WG did not explore how that would be done.

Option 2: Sirtfi+ Registry policy

Inspired by the approach taken for REEP, create a detailed description of how the Registry is operated, called the Sirtfi+ Registry Policy. The Registry operator commits to doing exactly what it says. The policy doc would be created in the usual REFEDS fashion: the Sirtfi WG would create a Final Draft form of the policy document, put it through through the Consensus process, and fold feedback from that into a Final policy document. By participating in the WG and/or the Consultation all parties participating in REFEDS have opportunity to shape the policy doc, so no governance group is needed. Should the Sirtfi WG wish to enhance the Registry's operation, they'd repeat the process: create Final Draft revision in the WG and put it through Consultation.

There was no decision taken about which way to proceed; instead, WG members asked lots of questions to clarify how each option would work.

3. Objections to releasing Sirtfi+ Registry Requirements as Final Draft
 - a. Needs a process to resolve a disputation of an entity's Sirtfi self-attestation.
 - i. Potential remediations: devise a process or commit in "Other Considerations" to doing so, or to doing something else that should address the circumstance

Either define a dispute process, or commit to providing some form of "social component" to the Registry, eg a scoring mechanism, so that parties downloading the Sirtfi+ metadata can also access and use this social data.

4. Backing all the way up, should we continue with our Sirtfi+ Registry work or stop and move on to completing Sirtfi proper, ie, finishing the description of how federated security incident response is to work?

Consensus that WG should do initial Registry, then social enhancement, then federated security incident response.

Brook invited Scott K (and Tom if he can make it) to an eduGAIN Steering meeting Tue Nov 13 to do a level set of the proposed Registry operating model (ala slide 5 in the [REFEDS Sirtfi WG deck](#)).

5. Else?