Notes Sirtfi Call December 4th 16:00

Apologies: Scott K, Niels VD, Doug P, Nicole H

Agenda:
- Follow up comments on doc
- Define next steps, where this should live and in what format

Doc:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wh2SQU62zDRwlJLPFgwxmRnlq7iiVgPf76Xl97Hzt80/edit#heading=h.fhnh7fhk2vnj

Notes:

- On Niels' suggestion of running an “eduGAIN Decorator” service where entities can assert tags about others (e.g. LIGO asserts that University X supports Sirtfi)
  - Can only do a few times before the architecture gets complicated
  - Policy side needs thought, which tags take priority
    - Depends on architectural relation to eduGAIN
    - If after eduGAIN will be up to party defining tool, may not have much input from federation operators
  - Need to better understand tagging other parties for self-asserted frameworks
  - Perhaps need to scope this down, focus on allowing participants to assert a self-asserted framework such as Sirtfi
- Need to understand unwillingness for dependency on eduGAIN feed - is this a limitation in downloads? Will there be missing information that is normally added by the federations?
  - Problem 1: long tail adoption of self-asserted Sirtfi tags
    - Isn’t it better to include this information in the existing authoritative source?
    - Will it be an issue for people to consume multiple feeds? Through the federation + a new one?
    - Will this discourage federation participation? Costs (i.e. if they charge for Sirtfi)? If we have the tool, will federations put in the effort to support new frameworks?
- Will we need to synchronise data?
- Will it be a problem that information does not flow back to the home organisation?
- Model 1 = feed ingested by eduGAIN
- Model 2 = decorated eduGAIN feed
- If we are only enabling self-assertion, we can ensure information is authoritative by the entity itself
• How do we do this most simply with minimum tooling?
  ○ Each national federation could choose to trust the source - however many federations might not be able to do this (same problem)
  ○ eduGAIN trusts the source and injects - however, doesn’t benefit the home federation because they don’t consume eduGAIN attributes about their own entities
• If we have a federation doing this themselves, should users be redirected to their home federation? Probably yes. EduGAIN should also prioritise home federation attributes

Actions:
• Hannah schedule next call (and find more reliable vidyo conferencing…)
• All to add pros and cons

Model 1 = feed ingested by eduGAIN (i.e. additional source of authoritative information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns the trust model of federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tags for an entity wouldn’t be propagated to their home federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Common con) Might discourage federations from supporting frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2 = decorated eduGAIN feed (i.e. add tags post eduGAIN processing and relying parties consume the new feed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can be hosted independently</td>
<td>Synchronisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we remove something if we don’t know the source, i.e. it’s from a peer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relying parties would have to consume a new/additional metadata feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Common con) Might discourage federations from supporting frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>