

Sirtfi Registry Call

29th January 16:00 CET

Attendees:

- Licia Florio ✓
- Doug Pearson
- Tom Barton ✓
- Nicole Harris ✓
- Thomas Bärecke ✓
- Wolfgang Pempe
- Alan Buxey ✓
- Hannah Short ✓
- Scott Koranda ✓
- Brett Bieber
- Pål Axelsson ✓
- Shannon Roddy ✓
- Uros Stevanovic ✓

Apologies: Scott Koranda (on for a short time)

Agenda:

- Analyse the three different approaches
 - A feed ingested into eduGAIN
 - A decorated eduGAIN feed
 - An independent reference tool with no integration in eduGAIN
- Understand the next steps, i.e. where this should live, who is well positioned to work on the tool
- TIIME

Registry working document:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wh2SQU62zDRwJLPLFgwxmRnlq7liVgPf76XI97Hzt80/edit?usp=sharing>

Notes:

Options	Pros	Cons	Pilot
Option 1 A feed ingested into eduGAIN	No need to change existing tools	eduGain policy would need to be enhanced to support it Downstream back to	

		home federation will be a problem	
Option 2 A decorated eduGAIN feed (automatically consumed by entities)	Tools already exist (Jagger)	Downstream back to home federation will be a problem Synchronisation between multiple sources	Plans are to have a small pilot in AARC, given that some of the interested parties are already in AARC.
Option 3 An independent reference tool with no integration in eduGAIN (manually consumed by entities)	This option does not imply an automated feed, so it may be potentially easier to deploy.	Federations need to update tooling or IdP/SP SAML software upgraded to ingest info (Scott asks why)?	This could use REEP - at the moment REEP runs best effort supported by REFEDS. There is a discussion ongoing in REFEDS as to whether kill it or improve it.
Option 4 Stronger liaison with federations to get Sirtfi in the metadata (include in their policies)	Long term solution	Slower	Federations that already support Sirtfi
Option 5 (Tom's excellent Idea) Encourage joining another federation			
Option 6 Research Federation or per-Community Federation		Duplicate entities	

LIGO's requirement = "there be a tool sooner rather than later". Sooner is defined as "within 2 years".

- Deployment scenarios should be considered, possibly community based
- Discussions in SWAMID about federation pulling in Option 2
- Sirtfi included in CoCov2
- Need to consider ingest by SPs and IdPs and others

- Consideration that source federations don't receive benefits in some of these models
 - Are we asking people to incorporate a second source of information?
- How often do we need this automated?
- Use cases
 - Permitting AuthN on Sirtfi assertion (more automatic)
 - Contact lookup, two places might be complicated (could be more manual)
- Any of these scenarios may result in federations being unwilling to improve their practices for framework adoption
- Too many frameworks = IdPs won't bother
- Too many frameworks = XML bloat
- Per-entity metadata will not provide new ways of sourcing information, should not be an impact
- Research Federation update at TIIME
- Perhaps this WG needs two threads
 - Temporary workaround
 - Long term solution (federation policy)
- LIGO, expected it to be small scale and governed by trusted entities within the community
- IGTF style managed community might be appropriate but not short term
- Eventually we want this in policy - eduGAIN policy adoption is some way off (not 2 years)
- Community policing of Sirtfi assertion will take a lot of work, heavy process
 - Suggest something lighter weight and scalable
- ****Require**** that entities must join their national federation? Not considered "helpful" by FOG
- PEER is a trusted 3rd party registry, was set up before eduGAIN. Drawback is that it's best effort (would need to find a new source of support)

Objective is to help the long tail of IdPs to assert Sirtfi, if they cannot through their home federation, in a timescale of < 2 years.

LIGO use case:

- LIGO wants to be able to say on time scale of 2 years (or so) that SIRTFI is required for an IdP to be used to authenticate and then assert to LIGO SPs
- Some Universities in India will be particularly important to LIGO as LIGO-India spins up
- LIGO would like to assist particular universities in India with deploying an IdP and LIGO would like those IdPs to assert SIRTFI
- LIGO is concerned that the Indian federation may not be mature enough to consume the SIRTFI assertions from the IdPs and have them pushed upstream into eduGAIN.
- Hence LIGO is interested in other ways for the Indian IdPs to assert SIRTFI and have that information available to LIGO SPs.
- LIGO does not feel that the process needs to be automated--LIGO is willing to have a manual process it goes through with each IdP that exercises the process.

- LIGO predicts that the collection of IdPs that would benefit from this process intersects with collections that other research communities would find useful (eg. CERN).

ACTIONS:

- Licia talk to Neils r.e. the pilot for Option 2
- Nicole to investigate tools used by Federation Operators (Jagger? What else?)
- Tom to propose an unconference session (if there is enough audience)
- Hannah look at PEER

Next Steps:

- AARC Pilot kickoff in February
- Try an Option 3 pilot (PEER? Would need some tech support)