

Sirtfi WG google folder:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/13EhgPxzLy4U6FMP\\_cVDalbqju40hOhUR](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/13EhgPxzLy4U6FMP_cVDalbqju40hOhUR)

## Current/Recent Tasks

Who	What	When	Status
Alan B	Read IETF Security Events docs and discuss impressions at next WG meeting (Aug 13, 2020)	July 30, 2020	Done
Tom	Create initial draft survey about Sirtfi v1	July 20, 2020	Done
Tom	Send email to REFEDS list on ~Aug 11, about 1 month before Consultation period closes, asking Fed Ops especially to look at the IR Handbook under Consultation.	July 30, 2020	Sent Aug 14, 2020
Tom	Ask Pål about the use of MISP across a national federation.	Aug 13 2020	Email sent Aug 26, 2020

Older tasks are at the bottom of running [Sirtfi call notes document](#).

## August 27, 2020

Attending: Tom B, Pål A, Laura P, Alan B, David C, Uros S, Sven G, David G, Romain W

Regrets: Dave K, Hannah S

Agenda:

1. Review tasks
2. Sirtfi v1 adoption survey
  - a. Objectives
    - i. Learn obstacles overcome from those who've asserted Sirtfi?
    - ii. Learn why some haven't asserted Sirtfi?
    - iii. Other?
  - b. Who do we want to invite to take the survey?
  - c. Do we want to engage via each Federation or directly from the WG?
  - d. Bake the [initial draft survey](#)

### 3. AOB

Pål explained that MISP is gaining traction in SWAMID, prospectively, and in other areas. Romain mentioned increasing adoption work in several countries. US has an additional hurdle of needing to get rid of CES before moving to MISP. But this is slowly being deployed more broadly, so perhaps the WG should try to amplify these efforts rather than work towards broad implementation of SETs for R&E federations in pursuit of its Phase 3 work plan.

#### 2.a:

- Benefits they've seen upon adoption
- What additional communication material we might provide to help them socialize it within their orgs
- What was their motivation to assert Sirtfi?
- Why did they decide to not adopt Sirtfi?

#### 2.b:

- Whoever is the next cohort we'd like to see adopt Sirtfi. Perhaps entities with "high quality" metadata as an indicator. Or have security contact but not Sirtfi, eg, all of InCommon.
- Be sure to include those who have adopted.
- Should we focus on members in some specific federations, at least for now? Eg, Feds that actually support Sirtfi?

2.c: WG is driving, but is unknown to many fed member orgs. Asking Fed Ops to send will likely produce a better response. Why not do both? Avoid issues if some Fed Ops aren't interested? For WG direct message, can use metadata contact info. Don't worry about over communicating. WG might ask Feds to encourage participation, but WG sends invitations directly.

2.d: Some comments and text added to the draft survey itself. Overall reaction seemed to be that it was too detailed or constrained too much how a respondent might tell us what we want to know. After the WG meeting, Uros agreed to take a pass at editing the draft survey.