

# Minutes of the REFEDS Fall Meeting, 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012, Utrecht

Licia Florio and Nicole Harris

## Abstract:

### Table of Contents

1. Welcome and REFEDS Updates.....	2
2. REF2 Barrier to Effective Federation Use.....	3
3. REF4 Federation Harmonisation.....	3
4. REF5 Interfederation.....	4
5. Working with New Communities .....	4
6. Updates and Future Planning .....	5



## 1. Welcome and REFEDS Updates

Licia Florio (LF) gave an update on expenditure to date against this year's budget and workplan. One of the recently commissioned pieces of work is for the Metadata Explorer Tool, which has been placed with Yaco. This will provide an automated way to explore and cross-compare metadata from all international federations.

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted and all the actions from the last meeting have been completed.

LF highlighted the reports that will be available by the end of the year. This includes:

- A response from REFEDS on the FIM Report;
- RFC Independent Stream;
- Discovery Project Report;
- Peer Policy and Service Model for the PEER pilot;
- Federation Policy Template.

The next official meeting of REFEDS will be in conjunction with TNC2013 in the Netherlands. There are two opportunities to co-locate a meeting in November: a planning ISOC meeting in the week beginning the 12<sup>th</sup> November, and the tf-emc2 meeting the week beginning the 19<sup>th</sup> November.

**ACTION20120905-01:** LF to send a Foodle for a meeting date for REFEDS in November with a focus on developing a workplan for 2013.

Leif Johansson (LJ) gave a background presentation on why REFEDS is interested in formalising its processes and adopting the RFC process as an Individual Stream. Nicole Harris (NH) gave an overview of the document development to date. This will be circulated to the list for consideration, with 3-4 decision points clearly identified for agreement.

**ACTION20120905-02:** NH to circulate the draft RFC documentation for consultation.

Andrew Cormack (AC) pointed out that there will always be documents that we wish to promote and 'publish' as part of REFEDS but whose existing IPR will prevent assignment to the [IAB trust] as required for the proposed RFC stream. REFEDS will also need to have a process for promoting non-stream documents as REFEDS Recommendations.

**ACTION20120905-03:** LF / NH to circulate a one page diagram to the REFEDS list explaining the process.

Chris Phillips (CP) pointed out that communications planning needs to be thought about to provide clarity around what is the REFEDS voice and what is individual voices of federations / people.

Attendees questioned whether this would be a research and education only stream? Can we separate the scope of the stream from the scope of the organisation? REFEDS has

never been closed or restricted to research and education attendees, it is merely the community this work has grown from.

Is there a risk that we will get competing streams? Heather Flanagan (HF) noted that this is the responsibility of the IAB to avoid having multiple competing streams.

Why do we not just submit these as Internet Drafts? This would be possible, but it would require us to have more people turning up to IETF meetings and appropriate levels of editorial input through this process. It would probably also pose a different set of problems for REFEDS to tackle, which would probably create a mini-REFEDS stream within the independent stream.

AC gave an overview of the process by which REFEDS can choose to RECOMMEND a piece of work. This could include documents not created by REFEDS participants but relevant to promote as part of our work. The proposal is on the REFEDS Wiki at: [https://refeds.terena.org/index.php/REFEDS\\_Recommends\\_Status](https://refeds.terena.org/index.php/REFEDS_Recommends_Status).

It is worth noting that the 2 new processes add a new workload on to the Steering Committee members and this should be taken in to consideration when considering membership and number of members.

**ACTION20120905-04:** LF to circulate the document on how REFEDS Recommendations can be made to the list.

## 2. REF2 Barrier to Effective Federation Use

NH gave a brief overview of the nearly complete Discovery Project output. NH will coordinate a communications plan with federations to ensure that the Discovery Guide is promoted to as many SPs as possible in a coordinated way.

## 3. REF4 Federation Harmonisation

Marina Vermezovic (MV) gave an overview of how GEANT and REFEDS are working together to create a template federation policy. GEANT will be focussing on a minimum policy stripped back to the bare minimum. REFEDS is analysing the the full set of information and content areas that federations currently use within their agreements. The work will be coordinated, with the GEANT work being complete by March 2013.

Federation harmonization is important in the context of interfederation. One of the biggest barriers within eduGain at the moment in this process whereby metadata flow is actively restricted by eduGain by requiring an opt-in.

Mikael Linden (ML) described the current status of the GEANT Code of Conduct. Queries were raised as to whether REFEDS would be able to reuse and extend the CoC work considering GEANT IPR issues. It was agreed to follow this up offline with GEANT.

**ACTION20120905-05:** ML to explore the options for reuse of GEANT CoC work and report back to the REFEDS group.

## 4. REF5 Interfederation

REEP is a service instance of PEER operated for the REFEDS community. Milan Sova (MS) and LJ presented the initial policy for use of the service. To complete the service, we need to establish:

- Who has change control? Should this be established as one of the RFC documents?
- One of the purposes of the pilot is to help us understand what the future funding / business model should be.
- Do we need to include information about an operational team / technical advisory group within the policy? Can this be added in after the pilot or should it be there now? Consensus seems to be to add this to the document.
- Is this an SP only registry or full entity?
- Is there a way to alert people that someone is trying to claim ownership of your domain?
- We need to add in the objectives of the service.
- Add to 4.3 that as a federation operator you will need to take responsibility for de-duplication.

**ACTION20120905-06:** REFEDS to create an FAQ for REEP as soon as possible.

**ACTION20120905-07:** LF / NH to add the current text for the REEP policy to the REFEDS wiki.

The service will be made available at [reep.refeds.org](http://reep.refeds.org). REFEDS members will get access early before the pilot is made available for federation entities.

**ACTION20120905-08:** NH to organise transferring and setting up peer-users and peer-dev lists for REFEDS working with Ian to transfer the current archives.

**ACTION20120905-09:** AC and CP to provide input to the policy and FAQ for REEP.

## 5. Working with New Communities

- REFEDS Response to the FIM Report (Licia Florio)

At the last TNC2012, TERENA recommended that REFEDS should formally respond to the FIM report from David Kelsey et al. One of the most complex problems is actually ensuring there is good and effective communication flow between researchers / campus IT / federations.

A small group of people have been brought together to start planning both a response and actions to help meet the requirements of the researchers. This will involve identifying appropriate actions to be taken with REFEDS, edugain and GEANT 3+.

One of the problems is ensuring that we are not meeting the of specific groups of researchers and ignoring the differing recommendations of other groups elsewhere.

**ACTION20120905-10:** LF to add Ken Klingenstein (KJK), Jim Basney (JB) and Niels Van Dijk (NVD) to the FIM response team and circulate a draft of the report within the next month.

- Virtual Campus Hub Project (Merete Badger)

Merete (MB) gave a presentation on the work of the Virtual Campus Hub project, it's work to start operating as a VO and it's uses cases for federated access.

KJK asked about the need for privacy of membership of groups. As VOs develop they need to make decisions about to handle these discussions.

## 6. Updates and Future Planning

- **LOA Registry (LJ)**

This has now been published as RFC6711 and IESG have assigned a review team. The registry is nominally open for business (you can send in a request) but it is not formally through all the IANA hoops. [www.levelofassurance.org](http://www.levelofassurance.org) may be used for further information as we move forward. Potential registrations: OIX, Kantara, InCommon Silver, etc.

- **Federation operator best practice/reference model (BS / LJ)**

At the last tf-emc2, the idea of having a federation operator best practice statement was put forward. Some work had been done to look at this, and others have been having conversations because of the need to understand federation operations between 2 operators to move forward with interfederation.

**ACTION20120905-11:** LF / NH to send a message to the refeds list to create a small working group to define a best practise statement for metadata aggregation and flow.

- **Shared interpretation of metadata signatures (LJ)**

LJ highlight a potential problem with the understanding regarding interpretations of metadata signatures that may need to be addressed and formalised by REFEDS.

- **Single LogOut (CP)**

CP proposed a work item on SLO to better define SLO to help define recommendations about what should be developed in common SAML implementations, and a guide to better explain logout and what it means to entities.

**ACTION20120905-12:** CP to write up his proposal for REFEDS work on SLO.

- **IdP of Last Resort (CP)**

Would there be any mileage in having a 'social' IdP that serves all federations rather than duplicating this effort across all federations.

It was suggested that REFEDS should evaluate whether a community IdP would be a better option than implementing an IdP per federation/VO. The findings could be summarised in a short REFEDS paper for future references.

**ACTION20120905-13:** LF / CP/ NvD look at a list of requirements to create either



an appliance / single IdP.

- Macedir / Entity Categories and relationship (KJK)

In parallel with the Terena SCHAC schema work, MACE-Dir from Internet2 has provided a home for schema and other good practice specifications over the last decade or so. Most recently MACE-Dir was the "official" home for the specification of a new SAML metadata attribute to carry entity category tagging. This work is intrinsically inter-federation in scope, so individuals from across the REFEDs space were involved in drafting and review. With the advent of a new REFEDS RFC stream, we may have an attractive option to migrate future official schema and specification development, adoption and approval processes to that framework. One benefit would be a clear channel through which to promote broader awareness and use of such schema and specifications.

- Levels of Assurance / InCommon Silver (KJK)

Ken noted that InCommon is starting to work to create a InCommon Gold. Are there other federations looking at LoAs? It was also noted that InCommon Silver is rather US-Centric to be adopted outside US. Would I2 benefit from comments while defining InCommon Gold?

#### Action Summary:

- **ACTION20120905-01:** LF / NH to send a Foodle for a meeting date for REFEDS in November with a focus on developing a workplan for 2013.
- **ACTION20120905-02:** NH to circulate the draft RFC documentation for consultation.
- **ACTION20120905-03:** LF / KJK / KW to circulate a one page diagram to the REFEDS list explaining the process.
- **ACTION20120905-04:** LF to circulate the document on how REFEDS Recommendations can be made to the list.
- **ACTION20120905-05:** ML to explore the options for reuse of GEANT CoC work and report back to the REFEDS group.
- **ACTION20120905-06:** REFEDS to create an FAQ for REEP as soon as possible.
- **ACTION20120905-07:** LF / NH to add the current text for the REEP policy to the REFEDS wiki.
- **ACTION20120905-08:** NH to organise transferring and setting up peer-users and peer-dev lists for REFEDS working with Ian to transfer the current archives.
- **ACTION20120905-09:** AC and CP to provide input to the policy and FAQ for REEP.
- **ACTION20120905-10:** LF to add Ken Klingenstein (KJK), Jim Basney (JB) and Niels Van Dijk (NvD) to the FIM response team and circulate a draft of the report within the next month.
- **ACTION20120905-11:** LF / NH to send a message to the refeds list to create a small working group to define a best practise statement for metadata aggregation and flow.

- **ACTION20120905-12:** CP to write up his proposal for REFEDS work on SLO.
- **ACTION20120905-13:** LF / CP/ NvD look at a list of requirements to create either an appliance / single IdP.

**Attendees:**

Guido Aben	AARNet
Merete Badger (MB)	Technical University of Denmark
Kristof Bajnok	NIIF / Hungarnet
Jim Basney (JB)	NCSA
Kurt Bauer	ACOnet
Sabita Behari	SURFnet
Andrew Cormack (AC)	Janet
Heather Flanagan (HF)	Internet2
Licia Florio (LF)	TERENA
David Groep	Nikhef and IGTF
Nicole Harris (NH)	JISC Advance
Keith Hazelton	U of Wisconsin-Madison
Roland Hedberg	Umeå University/SWAMID
Leif Johansson (LJ)	SUNET
Ken Klingenstein (KJK)	Internet2
Scott Koranda	LIGO
Thomas Lenggenhager	SWITCH
Mikael Linden (ML)	CSC - IT Center for Science
Lalla MANTOVANI	IDEM GARR (IT)
Heath Marks	Australian Access Federation
Miroslav Milinovic	Srce
Steve Moitozo	SIL
Lucio Monaco	KTH
Takeshi Nishimura	NII
Benjamin Oshrin	Internet2
Pascal Panneels	Belnet
Jaime Perez	UNINETT
Mads Freck Petersen	WAYF
Chris Phillips (CP)	CANARIE Inc.
Remco Poortinga - van Wijnen	SURFnet
Natalija Radosevic	AMRES
Peter Schober	ACOnet
Brook Schofield (BS)	TERENA
David Simonsen	WAYF - Where Are You From
Milan Sova	CESNET



Eefje van der Harst	SURFnet
Niels van Dijk (NvD)	SURFnet
Joost van Dijk	SURFnet
Marina Vermezovic (MV)	AMRES
Glenn Wearen	HEAnet
Klaas Wierenga	CISCO

