

December 6, 2018

Attending: Hannah, Tom, Nicole, Brook, Shannon, Uros

Proposed Agenda:

1. Review the [Sirtfi+ Registry Requirements](#)
  - 1.1. Pros, cons, and associated needs if it is made a Federation in eduGAIN, per Nicole's comment.
    - 1.1.1. Seat in eduGAIN governance
    - 1.1.2. Metadata artifacts become part of the eduGAIN metadata -- no need for relying parties to integrate an additional metadata source
    - 1.1.3. Leverage eduGAIN's dispute process, section 4.2 of <https://technical.edugain.org/doc/eduGAIN-Constitution-v3ter-web.pdf>
    - 1.1.4. Given that Sirtfi should become a baseline expectation across all federations, strengthens that perception by locating associated management capability "within" the eduGAIN operation
    - 1.1.5. Probably implies that community cross-vetting of tags would need to happen in a separate environment
    - 1.1.6. Probably requires some change to existing eduGAIN policy
    - 1.1.7. The need for a governance solution specific to the Sirtfi+ Registry would probably be transformed into the need to create a Federation Operating Policy for Sirtfi+, rather like [Option 2](#) discussed last time
    - 1.1.8. Others?
  - 1.2. Address other comments in the requirements doc
2. Consensus?
  - 2.1. Work towards Sirtfi+ becoming a Federation in eduGAIN /or/
  - 2.2. Continue on previous course
3. Next steps
4. Other business?

Many WG regulars were unable to attend, but the few who did had a fruitful discussion that was not tethered to the proposed agenda, though largely addressed the agendized matters.

Feedback from latest eduGAIN Steering Group meeting:

- Concern that Sirtfi+ Registry disrupts the trust model. It has been axiomatic that the eduGAIN operation would not modify metadata submitted by member federations.
- Currently no software to merge metadata sources in the eduGAIN MDA pipeline. Rhys volunteered to do a technical deep dive into this.
- It's hard to think about the product side of this, if it becomes part of eduGAIN. Ideally it's a service that will disappear after a while, as we'd like federations to support Sirtfi natively. But what if some never do?

Agreed that Scott K's discussion with eduGAIN Steering Group should be rescheduled.

Might "metadata peering", a not well-defined aspect of eduGAIN policy, be the relationship between a Sirtfi+ Registry and eduGAIN? Or a subcontractor, an instance of an eduGAIN "washing service", inserted as a stage in the pipeline? In any case, change to existing eduGAIN policy is unlikely in any short time frame, so best to consider approaches that layer on top rather than requiring modification.

Disputes go to REFEDS? I.e. the Sirtfi WG and/or REFEDS Steering. May be more effective than leveraging the eduGAIN dispute process. That's how R&S disputes and clarifications are handled.

Having actual operational demonstration of the Sirtfi+ Registry capability in some context should help eduGAIN Steering Group members and others understand this approach more concretely. LIGO's urgent need suggests that the WG should encourage them to address their problem themselves, in parallel with the WG pursuing a comprehensive solution. A LIGO-focused instance would both let them proceed to solve their problems and provide that operational demonstration.