Prepared: Paolo, David, Floor, Miro, David, Jian, Else, Ingrid, Sam, Scott, Hannah.


13:06 Intro with Michael.
13:30 Else / APGrid PPO update.
- Some auditing delayed because review sheets not available yet - fixed.
- Remote ID setting now approved by PM - HPCI about to roll-out.
- NAREGI - CP: supported aphoristic wrote up TLS 1.3.
FedID in AP region via APAN 1AM - joining to eduGAIN, with push @APAN 42 in Korea in Feb 2019.
Number of org from mainland China in eduGAIN? Scalability.

13:53 Cosmin / 1P status:
- Austria -> about to decide closed down. -> close S/H. ✓
- Russia -> no feedback yet, wait for Eugene. -> pend
- HD-Grid -> also needs a new root -> pend
- HPC Grid -> no reaction, wait for implementation. -> pend.
- CESNET -> needs DKG to do something.
- BG. -> Ian in slr, picking DKG
- Ukraine -> needs send to update CP/CPS.
- RSP -> OK! ✓ success.

Others:イスラエル/エジプト (3 utils) and serious for BYGRID.

14:05 TC5G4
- Lora and “constraint” needs EPC, and then has to be up to the root. “255.9”
  + Quantum.
  + FORNET.
  + TCS lesson learned presentation by Sam C -> as input.
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11:30 Jane/Jeanine: common vocabulary, based on requirements/ use cases?
- ensure we demonstrate that each profile has a unique niche
- no duplicates
- REFED influenced by flexibility (e.g. student/freelancer)
- common language? → beyond REFED

Session 3: 11:30 -
(define the conclusions/next)
IGTF and DP driven and capabilities openly discussed and engaged.

11:40 Security in TMI Harsh: -- relationships between entities impacts global threat
(- announce next update of info. in template.)
- organise list of trust groups by type: org or personal. Each with its own use case. Personal trust may result in org losing contact with peers.

14:10 APAC/MB/DL/B

- finish support: EOSCH + GN4 + DJ's
- SCI assessment → IGTF for peer review self-assessment.
- HUP → ISGC: Taipei + Von + BobC.
  → label "CC-BY:"
- DDR → close to the DJ's as distribution.
  → GN4's T5:3:0 device national compliant. Maybe NPS with DJ flow: may have a DDR task/activity.

ACT:
- need a discussion place + mailing list, specific for research infra.
  → EnCo / IRF-4.
- PDUC list → NISE SCI Nag.

Help for communities in designing their ARS is? → GN4 + EOSCH
needs: 1.1 consultancy, and more than a flowchart.
Otherwise people find lay cloaks.
instead of anchoring it in a particular project (with inherent bias),
should be 'neutral': NUSING or even better maybe PM4R WG?
 or: RDA-FM4R-TQ? → new communities!

16:10 [Here]: can open: see doc → SCI ++
→ 16:50
16:55 Send/Devbox on complexity
17:30 [Closing]

Wed
09:15
Assurance-
- 3 profiles from UO/NO: LIGTF, REPEPS, EIDP
  define/ask if this is the right approach? 
  That's better than creating another list
  so we made a because (N=1) did not do it.

REPEPS led the split with ACCC 15/15/50
the slide

BYGC9 = u.g. RP: will notify ops that BY grid is going out.
then terminate BYGC9

11:00 SCI comparison with ISO standards? → NISE wiki: SCI
just like federation was not part of L751, SCI works for
higher coupled federation whereas E7 is single-org.
Success of SCI in interoperation, as per E7/9.
NISE doc: also what is not in SCI
both content and methodology → Dave + Uros
[PH145 in Abingdon → NISE final meeting on Monday 18th 14:00-2.

Assessment also in ETC-4U8, with "services" being the "assets" for FIPS. (Small in size).

Put in: privacy considerations in the multi-proxy environment.

(D3.2) (Strict minimisation is not always true!)

Start with two documents, with the assessment bringing an MARE-Ix doc.

Then have the MARE/NISE Ix doc @ Mal.

Policy kit to extend to SCF? At NISE and discuss in Abingdon.

Can eduTEPPS itself claim Sirtfi, even if the upstream is not?

With traceability/contact in place.

But if upstream IdP is compromised, how would that even be communicated to all affected SPs and to eduTEPPS.

So what about a compromised authenticator? IT does not have that.

Could be acceptable if the SPs are directly linked, and it is not even in eTLD/N as a whole. But it is not white washing non-compl. IDP's.

It would be worrisome if the IdP upstream really is "bad" not in the spirit even if it literally does not require info on auth/N compr.

/Sirtfi+reg+IPI that would solve it.

Email of users must be checked for untrusted IdPs (challenge-resp.) on the edge, but preferably not. Further controls on IdP level needed.
chain has to be representative of the statement
but outsourced SAP under contract is fine because of the contract.

If there is technical reason to not have SRTfi, the SRTfi+ registry
will work.

or get explicit statement and white list.
and eduTEAMS to keep that record of agreements.