Steering Committee Notes, 7 February 2019

07 Feb 2019 at 21:00 CET

Call-in coordinates:

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: [https://geant.zoom.us/j/293267000](https://geant.zoom.us/j/293267000)

Or iPhone one-tap:

US: +16468769923,,293267000# or +16699006833,,293267000#

Or Telephone:

Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 646 876 9923 or +1 669 900 6833

Meeting ID: 293 267 000

International numbers available: [https://zoom.us/u/adix6Vr6Y6](https://zoom.us/u/adix6Vr6Y6)

Or an H.323/SIP room system:

H.323: 109.105.112.236 or 109.105.112.235

Meeting ID: 293 267 000

SIP: 293267000@109.105.112.236 or 293267000@109.105.112.23

Expected Attendees

- Nicole Harris
- Maarten Kremers
- Thomas Lenggenhager
- Heather Flanagan
- Miroslav Milinovi
- Tom Barton
- Scott Koranda

Apologies

Agenda

1. Open Actions
2. Administrivia
   a. SC nominations (seats held by Scott, Maarten, Miro, and Thomas)
   b. REFEDS Meetings 2019 (TNC19, TechEx, Global Summit)
3. eduPerson Update
   a. Vote on approving the governance model
4. Distinguished Engineer grant proposal
   a. See - [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CnyybVU24Q77xJrSO3Za9ObcoGsBApzaN0ynGOAcg/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CnyybVU24Q77xJrSO3Za9ObcoGsBApzaN0ynGOAcg/edit?usp=sharing)
   b. Discussion and vote
5. IDPro (new professional organization of IAM professionals) - if/how should REFEDS engage?
6. REFEDS Workplan 2019
   a. Getting better at coordinating comms
   b. Logos for entity categories / specifications
7. RA21
   a. Data Protection Code of Conduct
   b. Possible proposal for a new scholarly resource entity category
8. AOB

Notes

1. Open Actions
   a. Service Catalog - kick off meeting in GN4 happened today; this topic is on the agenda, but its still under discussion
   b. SIRTFI letter - not done yet
2. Administrivia
   a. SC nominations (seats held by Scott, Maarten, Miro, and Thomas) - to be determined, formal announcement out next
   b. REFEDS Meetings 2019 (TNC19, TechEx, Global Summit) - there will be two official meetings at TNC19 and TechEx, not at Global Summit; other community driven meetings may be happening, but we (REFEDS coordinators) may not know about them.
      1. Regarding TIIME - would it be worth talking about the REFEDS Work plan? Distinguished engineer?
      2. Note that there will be a lot of REFEDS topics in FIM4R as well
3. eduPerson Update
   a. Vote on approving the governance model - Passes
      ✅ Heather Flanagan to send to the nomination request for the schema board

4. Distinguished Engineer grant proposal
   a. See - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CnybbVU24Q77xJrSO3z2a9OsbcoGsaRsApzaN0ynG0Acg/edit?usp=sharing
   b. Discussion and vote - Passes with understanding that pre-mentoring will be required
      i. Thomas likes the mentoring component the best, but concerned that newcomers might find it confusing to start with a REFEDS meeting; would like to see more remote participation improved for REFEDS meeting so they could get familiar with the community first before coming to a meeting in person. Alternative proposal to encourage site visits to established federations. This would require more volunteer work by the established federations.
      ii. Miro supports Thomas' proposal.
      iii. Heath mentions the Backfire program in APAN, similar to what we're talking about with the Distinguished Engineer program. Participants seem quite comfortable and enthusiastic about presenting regarding what they're doing and actively engaging in the event.
      iv. Tom has an analogous concern re: ACAMP. They have had some success in on-ramping people by having a "here is what people will talk about" breakout session to get new people oriented. Perhaps that's what the mentorship part is going to do; if there is someone on tap to help them understand the work, that may be enough. The point of having them face to face is to help them build the relationships, and that should happen sooner rather than later.
      v. Heath agrees the idea is to build a buddy system.
      vi. Scott does indicate that we are asking for some cost sharing by hosting emerging federations. It might be easier to sell to home organizations if the engineers are coming to international, well known conferences rather than having the person go to a single federation in what may be (apparently) less structured event.
      vii. Thomas sees that part of the problem is having REFEDS as the first day, unlike ACAMP where there is time for prep work and sessions earlier on before the open conference starts. If we clearly identify the mentors in advance and start the relationship early, that would make this proposal more acceptable.
      viii. Nicole notes there is budget, so no administrative hold up

   ✅ Heather Flanagan to clarify the text, work with others to send out announcements and start building mentor lists

5. IDPro (new professional organization of IAM professionals) - How should REFEDS engage?
   a. IDPro definitely has a gap when it comes to R&E participation. The whole environment doesn't have much in the way of training or educational material to bring people up to speed in Fed IAM.
   b. SC members like the concept, but have questions. Open to further fact-finding discussions.

       ✅ Heather Flanagan to put Nicole in contact with Ian Glazer and Sarah Squire to discuss what is possible or practical here

   a. What will people get out of REFEDS involvement in IDPro?
   b. What would we need to invest to get make things happen?

6. REFEDS Workplan 2019 - very similar to previous work plans (usual working groups, usual maintenance, promotion and engagement). One item, though, is about the contracts. We have two contracts (MET, REEP) to consider. REEP is hopefully sunsetting, but MET is an active issue. GEANT has some internal accounting issues here, but RETI is anxious to work with us this. The big open question is whether we want to do anything with MET that incorporates Service Catalog requirements. Nicole suggests we make the current contract just for maintenance, and if we decide to do more on Service Catalog, we can put that in a separate contract. A second item, unrelated to contracts, is about building community. That seemed to be a very important item, but not a REFEDS item.
   a. Questions: should the Entity Category item include identifiers? This was around what is the "one" identifier we use? R&S has TargetedID, and the new SAML2INT profiles has other recommendations. If SAML2INT actually makes changes, that has fundamental implications to R&S. Action: update the text.
   b. Questions: Federation 2.0 - the first VC has happened, and it sounds like it's scoped to metadata. Is that correct, or is it broader? The objective of the working group is broader than the workplan page indicates. Action: Heather to update the description in the workplan with what's in the WG page.
   c. Re: SP engagement - Maarten to reach out to Heather and Laura re: SURFnet's action wrt engaging SPs
   d. Question: regarding sunsetting REEP, has a statement been made about sunsetting REEP? Licia suggests sending out a statement giving it 6 more months; no one has updated it in over 2 years. The use case that Hannah and Scott made on list is good, but there is no support to maintain the (very complex) system. Perhaps investigate the use case in the context of eduGAIN instead of REEP.
   i. Tom asks if we should get some kind of commitment re: the testing needs that REEP fills now before we formally scheduling the sunset the service? So, order the events with first talking to eduGAIN.
   ii. Thomas suggests we still announce a 1 year target for sunsetting
   iii. Miro suggests we send out a warning message asking people to speak now or forever hold their piece, then send out a reminder later. We're trying to avoid last minute "no!" from the community

   ✅ Licia Florio to go back to GN4 to discuss the use cases so we have a better plan for the service

   e. Getting better at coordinating comms - essentially discussed under 2019 meetings
   f. Logos for entity categories / specifications - does everything actually need a logo? What are we trying to achieve with logos? Do we want to keep assigning resources to creating these?
   i. Tom reports a very similar set of conversations within InCommon; suggests reaching out to Ann West regarding their thinking on the topic so far.
   ii. Nicole: somethings like SIRTFI have their own life and could use the logo, but it might be getting unnecessary for other things. Time to do this thoughtfully.
   iii. Tom suggests the idea is to make it easier for people to have a single place and unified presentation for what they can expect (rather than URLs to more info). So, having this as part of a catalog, as an example.
   iv. Scott suggests one of the criteria for a logo is when the information should be targeted at people beyond the fed ops. Canonical use case: a poor scientist who has to federate an application; the well known brand names help them. When it's a collection of organizations if the engineers are coming to international, well known conferences rather than having the person go to a single federation in what may be (apparently) less structured event.

   ✅ Heather Flanagan to add discussion of logos for entity categories/specifications to our next agenda

7. RA21
   a. Data Protection Code of Conduct - the RA21 leadership has decided to endorse the REFEDS Data Protection Code of Conduct v1
   b. Possible proposal for a new scholarly resource entity category
       ✅ Heather Flanagan to send an email update about RA21 to the SC and add to next agenda

8. AOB
   a. TIIIME? - covered under REFEDS meeting
b. Contracts for MET - covered under Workplan

c. Will need to get another meeting scheduled between now and the next official meeting to introduce new members.