

Sirtfi WG google folder:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1\\_4zo\\_qJdqz1ugZD9MfPUKt\\_OID6eIHVr](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1_4zo_qJdqz1ugZD9MfPUKt_OID6eIHVr)

## October 6, 2022

Attending: Tom B, Pal A, Alan B, Sven G, Shannon R

Regrets: Hannah, Dave K

Agenda:

1. Review published Sirtfi v2 materials
  - a. <https://refeds.org/sirtfi>
  - b. <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/SIRTFI/SIRTFI+Home>
  - c. punch list
    - i. Figure out how to remove unrelated and old comments from Guide for Federation Operators
2. Review/update remaining items in the work plan
  - a. <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/GROUPS/SIRTFI>
3. What next? Should the WG close down?
4. AOB

Notes on each of the two remaining incomplete work plan items are below, followed by discussion of closing the WG down.

### ***IETF Security Events***

The work plan item is to analyse suitability of implementing an automated security event notification system across R&E federations globally. There have been previous discussions about this with the interim conclusion that, although it's quite different, something like broader MISP deployment would reduce the benefit of also having a security events infrastructure. In discussion today, members also noted that IdPs increasingly rely on commercially available federated authentication systems, sometimes with add-on "connectors" to handle multi-lateral federation. These commercial systems would need to change to be able to integrate with a security events infrastructure. In addition, implementation and adoption of an automated security event notification system would require a huge amount of effort, and there are more important objectives that effort could be put towards, like achieving Baseline Expectations across R&E federations globally.

The conclusion was to consider this item in the work plan to be completed.

### ***Responsiveness testing***

WG members agree that responsiveness testing is a Good Thing, but the WG is not a good instrument through which to accomplish this. WG suggests that eduGAIN should take this on, perhaps as one of its obligations under Baseline Expectations. Cf. Recommendation 1.1 of the eduGAIN Futures report.

***Should the WG close down?***

Yes - all present agree. Something different might take its place, like a periodically convened Interest Group where people talk about security, or a sort of narrowly focused community chat.

Regarding the need to maintain Sirtfi v2 related docs (like the FAQ), Heather & Nicole can likely handle that as they have with v1 related questions, perhaps by reaching out to (former) WG members. If something arises that they can't handle, use that to start another WG or as the focus of some REFEDS task.

Tom will message the sirtfi list and slack channel to say "if you've got another perspective about closing the WG down, speak up or tell me to schedule one more meeting to discuss it". Absent a request to have that live discussion, the WG will cease meeting.