

[Link to 2018 ACAMP wiki](#)

Advance CAMP Thursday , Oct. 18, 2018

4:00pm-4:50pm

Oceana 9

SIRTFI Registry

CONVENER: Tom & Hannah

MAIN SCRIBE: Derek Simmel <dsimmel@psc.edu>

ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTORS:

of ATTENDEES:

20

DISCUSSION:

- What is Sirtfi? <https://refeds.org/sirtfi>
- REFEDS Sirtfi WG Wiki <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/GROUPS/SIRTFI>
- Sirtfi Registry Description
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wh2SQU62zDRwJLPPFgwxmRnIq7liVgPf76XI97Hzt80/edit?usp=sharing>

ACTIVITIES GOING FORWARD / NEXT STEPS:

How to insert SIRTFI information into metadata for research purposes

E.g., take EduGain metadata, dust (add attributes to it)

Rules for how a tool to self-assert SIRTFI compliance (to their federation?) should work.

How to support a feed to services?

If someone doesn't respond to an incident, how do we remove their SIRTFI tag?

Will 'dusting' metadata break the trust that people are trying to achieve? This needs to be handled very carefully.

Who is the consumer of the dusted metadata? Is the federation going to publish something?

What if a service relies on the SIRTFI metadata to make decisions?

What is the expectation regarding what federations do with the metadata?

Entities consume this directly from the tool.

How you do it affects the governance of the tool?

Where is the augmented metadata reinserted into the flow?

Where is the farthest-down point [where this happens]?

What is a sufficiently feasible solution for this?

How many end-users have the problem of being able to support SIRTFI but who are in a federation that does not support it?

There doesn't appear to be sufficient motivation/authority to compel federations to support SIRTFI (yet?)

Some SPs now require SIRTFI despite this.

Who is the source of authority?

Will communities of federation operators value this? Who has a stake in this?

If federation operator choose not to support SIRTFI, will it prevent research communities from functioning?

What can a federation operator gain by saying "NO"? Primarily, they don't have to make any changes.

Lower tech option is to publish a list [of SIRTFI compliant entities] rather than have a tool.

When we work together, it adds value.

Example: Nothing prevents LIGO from publishing a list that others also make use of.

If there were a neutral registry for trustworthy contact information, so that SPs and others could refer to a common trusted list, would that be helpful?

25/66 federations currently support SIRTFI

Jim B: issue has been IdPs missing SIRTFI rather than federations not supporting it

More difficulty communicating with federations in (e.g. Japan)

How to enable (rather than force) people to do things?

Entity should be assessing themselves rather than the federation requiring it.

Federations today request a statement of compliance from [IdPs?] to count them as compliant.

Opt-in versus opt-out question: should federations require compliance or [at least not inhibit/support] their members to assert SIRTFI?

Will you get a timely response from federations that can't comply as to whether they want to be included in the registry?

Reputation risk with inconsistent implementation or

Whose entity is it anyway? How does that relationship work? Being in a specific place doesn't make you "owned" by a local federation; one can be a member of a remote federation. How elective is membership in a federation?

Delivery model is important if you expect services to consume tags.

If embedded into EduGain, it could ensure that only the SIRTFI tag is delivered(?)

That was the model initially pursued, but concern was expressed previously about changing EduGain policies...

Discussion about governance:

There are many potentially qualified operators of the SIRTFI+ registry

Operation and governance should be treated separately

How it is implemented affects feasibility and security concerns

Needs to be:

Reliable

Secure

Sustainable - what happens when the operator needs to leave, on-going budget and personnel to operate

Someone to decide policies

Signing authority

Level of user experience needs to be high

Federation support

UX - Not only in English - translation

Contacts in metadata

Requirements:

Operator should not be able to divert operations to their specific interests

Governing board with balanced participation

Someone with signing authority

Who can bind an institution to this?

Administrative contact in metadata?

Technical contacts do not have authority to bind an organization

Signer needs authorization to make commitments on behalf of organization

Nothing in the SIRTFI spec requires an officer to issue an official declaration

Bugs in SIRTFI v1 that need to be addressed in v2

What happens when an update to SIRTFI causes it to no longer be supportable by some federation, SP other entity?

Members of the governance board should include

Federations that do support SIRTFI

Federations that don't support SIRTFI (yet)

SIRTFI expert

Stakeholders, relying parties

EduGAIN (if the implementation requires their participation, else just as another federation)

Parity representation, other rules of membership

Other bodies to elect members?

FIM4R

WISE community, e-infrastructures

Service providers

Define and follow a charter

Laura: It would be useful for there to be a service available during an incident to help automatically determine the needed contacts for response

EduGAIN Op Sec?

Tom: Working group does have preparedness as a topic of upcoming discussions (where AARC left off)

What is the funding avenue for this?

One suggestion is to host it at CERN, but others might find this objectionable.

For long term operation and sustainability, a plan for funding and operations needs to be

Will having the registry endanger interest in supporting SIRTFI

Should those that do not support SIRTFI pay for it?

LIGO - want federated identity and supporting SIRTFI within 3 years (?)

Federation customers are the only ones who can make demands of their federations.

Asymmetric need between IdPs and SPs makes incentivizing adoption difficult (?)

SPs and proxies for communities behind them.

SPs has the most to lose. IdPs are the ones most likely to have incidents...

=====

Note: please be sure to link to or attach any key resources from this breakout session