Minutes 3rd AARC Meeting 24th-26th May 2016, Utrecht

Table of Contents

1. Welcome and Project Updates

Licia welcomed the attendees and provided a quick overview on the projects as a whole. More information can be found on the slides online.

2. Report on the work done with the libraries

This session reported on the work done with the libraries so far.

- Finding summary - FIM not very high on the priority list; many libraries do not see a problem with IP-based authN, it seems to work well for them.
- Big publishers already provided fed access, and they are in edUGAIN. However, some of them refuse to grant access to new countries. Countries with libraries consortia that can negotiate licences are better off.
- There should be clear guidelines for publishers to implement working SP software; REFEDS produced the discovery guidelines which should be promoted more. A better way to promote the benefits of FIM is needed. Maybe use-stories would work better than focusing on the technical aspects?

The AARC pilot team has worked on different pilots aimed to integrate FIM in their existing work flows. The pilots with the libraries have to satisfy the following requirements:

- Solutions allowing **Hybrid Authentication** (IP-based AuthN and FIM)
- **Walk-In Users:** Library users might not be registered in any IdP
- **Library Consortia / Branding:** In many cases one or few organizations manage contracts with publishers at the national level

One of the pilots uses EZproxy, a widely used commercial software in the library world. A couple of scenarios scenarios were identified:

- in scenario 1: Ezproxy is installed and configured as switch that works as a normal IP proxies as well as for SAML credentials. Tests with the EZProxy to act as an SP in a federation. More information available on the AARC wiki.
- Scenario 2: this is a generalisation to support walking users via a portal that is able to do the switch between IP-based and SAML. Attributes are generated in both cases.

Q: What's the benefit of doing this? who should operate the solutions?
A: It could be either the federation operators or the libraries. However, the service model for this pilot needs to be specified.

The Fed 101 module was also reviewed.

- ACTION: Make the module 101 more generic and not too much library focused.
- ACTION: Finalise the fact sheets with AARC logo. The localisation should be something we can provide as best effort, done by the partners.

3. Policy and Best Practices

Mikael Linden reported on the progresses on the assurance profile. It was agreed to create a WG outside the AARC remit to develop the actual LoA profile. Mikael will propose the creation of such a WG at the next REFEDS meeting.

The developed of a self-assessment tool is still open for comments.

DAY 2

4. Architecture – From requirements to design and pilots: Guest and attributes

This session reported on the work carried out to progress the blueprint architecture.

ACTION: Positon AARC to define long term solutions that e-Infras can follow. Also AARC could help document pilots among e-Infras and RIs. Follow up internally how to achieve this.

ACTION: Try to arrange a Plug fest, to bring infra together and identify inter-operab issues.

ACTION: Submit a training (about the architecture) + session (about AARC in general) at DI4R in Krakow.

ACTION: Marcus to share the AARC blueprint architecture for comments; create a blog post to provide all the information in a central location

a) Non-Web authentication work

Q: How does the comparisons of the translation services help a r/e-infrastructure to make a decision on what to choose?

A: Difficult to answer.

ACTION: Provide a table that shows scenarios, solutions, pros and cons and implementations aspects. See table in the Michal's slides.

ACTION: Add a new section on the aarc site called for the communities (where we add different topics), non-web fed authN being one of them.

As part of this session there was also an update on the EU CILogon pilot: lots of interest in using the service, and different entities interested in running the various part of it. There are two pre-production instances: EGI and ELIXIR.

b) Sustainability work - The case of the EU CILogin Pilot

AARC should identify strategies for each 'good' AARC pilot and make recommendations for its operations in the future. The EU CILogon Pilot is a very useful pilot and should be operated beyond AARC lifetime.

Q: Who should run the master portal of CILogon-like for EU?

A: Best option - In theory this should be operated by the various ESFRI RIs as they are closer to the VO portals and the communities. It could also be managed as SaaS by the RIs.

Q: Who should operate the CA for the EU CILogon Pilot ?

A: This has to be better discussed, but clearly the operator of the CA needs to have the technical infrastructure. We should aim for one CA only!

ACTION: Explain why there are restrictions on the IdPs that can benefit from EU CILogon service (we need one non reassignable IDs).

A: How can we get IdPs to use the service? Not all of them to date support R&S and Sirtfi (specs are not even finalised).

Q: There are ways around this:

* The federations can make sure that requirements are fulfilled

* The eInfras could proxy the IdPs to match the requirements

Q: How about the cost recovery model

A: there are different options for that, but this should be decided by the party/parties that operate the service.

Q: Why only a few IdPs qualify for the CILogon Service?

A: the service requires one non reassignable IDs and not all the IdPs can guarantee that.

Q: Until when can Nikhef run the pilot?

A: NIKHEF can run the pilot until there are 2k users, after that their equipment won't be able to cope.

DAY 3

5. ID/SP Proxies Security Considerations

The AARC blueprint architecture proposes the usage of a proxy. Whilst this solves some problems, it raises some trust concerns: how does the federation trust the RI proxies? From the federation point of view the proxy is nothing more than an SP. David Kelsey propose to define a trust police framework to help RIs support the Proxy to establish the trust with the entity behind the proxy. The suggested name for this framework is Sanctfi. This framework will cover also Data Protection aspects.

6. ORCID - what's been done

Niels showed the work done with ORCID to make them an SP in the SURFnet federation and to use it as an attribute authority. All information are being gathered at:
https://wiki.geant.org/display/AARC/ORCIDpilotCockpitPanel

7. Integration challenges as seen by the r/e infrastructures

Mikael L on behalf of Elixir and Peter S on behalf of EGI presented the integration challenges both communities face.

8. VMs and Pilots

Demos were provided to show how to enroll somebody in a VO. One of the recurrent questions is how many different AAIs research infrastructures need. Can one AAI serve the same cluster of projects that are relevant for a specific community? Mikael noted that this aspect is being discussed in the Corbel community that caters 11 biomedical science project. A dedicated meeting with some of the AARC representatives and the Corbel representative will take place on 30th of May and 1st of June in Paris. The main hot topics identified were:

- Attribute release: if not fixed at institutions/federations level the research infrastructures will have to find an alternative
- Assurance: high assurance is expensive and not always needed; it makes no sense to solve this problem independently, so a global WG should be created.

Peter showed the progresses made by EGI in offering federated support. The AARC blueprint architecture model is being followed and the followed component are being tested:
- IdP/SP Proxy almost in production
- Connection available with EU CIlogon
- Integration with external components, include supports for social IdPs and ORCID
- Integration with EGI Operational Tools (SPs) is ongoing and covers different aspects

9. Summary of the meeting and actions

The main actions are reported below:

Action	Owner	Description	Status	Comments
242016-01	AS	to coordinate the work to make the module 101 more generic and not too much library focused.		
052016-02	Liber	to finalise the library fact sheets with AARC logo.	Done	
052016-03	ML	to propose to creation of assurance WG at the REFEDS WG in Prague	Done	
052016-04	LF	to work with the WP leaders to position AARC to define suport e-Infras settting up AAIs. Also AARC could help document pilots among e-Infras and RIs. Follow up internally how to achieve this.	Ongoing	
052016-05	LF/SG	to arrange a Plug fest, to bring infra together and identify inter-operab issues.	Open	
052016-06	LF	To submit a training (about the architecture) + session (about AARC in general) at DI4R in Krakow.	Done	
052016-07	MH	to share the AARC blueprint architecture for comments; create a blog post to provide all the information in a central location	Done	
052016-08	PSNC	to create a table that shows scenarios, solutions, pros and cons and implementations aspects for each of the non-web solution. See table in the Michal's slides	Open	
052016-09	LF	To add a new section on the AARC site/blog called for the communities (where we add different topics), non-web fed authN being one of them.	Open	This needs some thinking
052016-10	PG/MS	To finalise the sustainability plan for the EU CILogon service.	Done	