

Present: Sara, Maarten, David, Walter, David, Hannah, Uros, Mirsha  
 Jan C, Scott R.

Remote: Lidija, Miroslav, Mirvat A., Roberto C., Marcu H., Anders W., Nuno,

↳ Nicolas, Schillady  
 Reimer, Nicolas  
 Jens,  
 Maarten + Druht + Eric J.

13<sup>05</sup> Intro/David - Maarten U. - move SURF and intro.

Agenda: LIGO & RPS.

Time: time & RPS loose ends.

Next: - NLCC, ODC telco.

- Rlanth.

### Self audits

CESNET: reviewers to blame

Miguel: Nabil is implementing.

Moldova: as stated

13<sup>10</sup>

Scott / Digital Trust CP: [see slides]

- in July: retail portal (IGTF + public trust) combination!
- namespace to include "digital trust".
- digital trust has existed since 2016 already, just change the name expected!
- Adobe is now OK. test in progress since 2017.
- length of serial number is an issue on Let's Encrypt certs - need difference but default now set to 140 bits
- serial # was only issue found in production and in audit.
- few misissued due to config transition w/ truncated CN, but not shipped.
- independent auditors (internal). → A.
- updated CP/CPS v1.90 transition to Digital Trust.

14<sup>35</sup> // Rlanth: San 10 pro + CP/CPS

network descr. in 4.02 is fine.

- monitoring & change mgmt.

all accessible based, similar but identical. DB sync.

1x Etchen + 2x Luna.

ODC BB needs sync as well.



Geno: USB-based, Nicolas: PCIe.

GRNET: the mesh. (now in greek).

STFC: needs talk with Disc, for new VPN. AES256 + shared + PKIC.

15<sup>15</sup> // Tea

15<sup>50</sup> // CAM&RPS: does RFC 3647 help community, or ~~us~~ in assessments?

combine awareness with AAOPS 9040 anyway needed.

[see LIGO doc] → comments welcome.

non-expiring, but 1 year or 2032. Virgo was out of scope.

different account types. Request was for LBC members + LIGO staff.

does not discuss AAOPS.

read, comment, and interim go ahead OK.

new communities: suggest RPS model, need to include ops security &c.

16<sup>25</sup> // Derek TAG PMA [see slides]

16<sup>30</sup> // Eric: APG and PMA [see slides]

17<sup>00</sup> Dinner

Tue 09<sup>15</sup> SciV2. update from Konnas WISE meeting - see slides.

discussed "points" in the assessment sheet and their per-point representation in the spider diagram

\* We need a guidance document to aid the assessment, and ~~the~~ it can - with the guidance - help communities and infra do the assessment. Draft (for v1) on the Wiki.

there may be a 3rd dimension in the sheet to allow infra's to cross-correlate, and peer review



PM1746

SCI 2

③

Bob C to compare against Trusted CI and report at NSF

per review → publish results of assessment like in baseline InCommon model. Incremental raising the bar (like in study/AN).

For SCI many are already operating → percolate up from generic eInfra's to gain trust by the RI's (who can be the subsequent target)

And SCI is better suited than ISO 27k.

→ Baseline expectations. either:  
- subset of points  
- only show scores 0 and 1

process: either calls or 3-day F2F?

⇒ steps

\* guidelines

\* selection of points per phase./year.

\* assessments. → spider → maybe doc is lower than practice!

\* baseline for their benefit.

interactive way on a section at a time with assessment, e.g. start with AS.

\* re-mixen Sirtfi/Snotfi deferred - do mapping for now.

\* assessment trust mark → press release :-). TNC20?

\* work supportable by En Co: Uros, David B.

For target NSF in @t for assessments (incl. Saran S, @).

10<sup>05</sup> // ForN-assurance. - bars on the same level (hor.) are the same statement  
(see e.g. ASPEN and EDCROD on credential mgmt).

in the EDDPS diagram: the subboxes show dotted alternate paths.

Ukraine (and NISV) being the most complex (fewest breadcrumbs).

⇒ in Ukraine diagram hatched boxes indicates highly similar areas across all profiles.



Dim U  
Assessment // In the Kano diagram: empty boxes indicate that "you must not do" (4)  
the same or stated method.

→ Bread crumbs and baseline assumptions.

REFEDS focus on feasibility is clear from diagram.  
and the others are then linked to ID setting in REFEDS.

potential work: risk assessments commonality across frameworks (Leif, Collin)  
↳ NCI-Frust Open Call. work: feasibility study on common parameters.

For eIDAS: UAE/Gulf region <sup>(govt)</sup> also adopting eIDAS to cross-interact with services (fintech)  
don't in Erasmus eda QAN will be used, but when possible linked to eIDAS.  
(Scott → has mapping)

11<sup>30</sup> // PARC and beyond:

[in UK: IRIS adoption of PDK.]

The introduction of Snctfi by CERN did work to get adoption.  
even if it did not make them popular. How to try something  
(slightly more granular) for RAF?

PARC-community will continue to evolve.

Structure: AUP + AADPS → part of PDK?

operational guidance to support policy.

PDK = Snctfi.

12<sup>00</sup> Privacy Notices/IDN: driven by NLCG since CERN not bound by GDPR.

Based on a common NLCG policy and per-service notices, using  
maybe as a template - unless org has its own.

[evolve doc. ~1 FS-70...]

'what we do here is better than using Google'

taking into account also 4(5) conditions & non-interactive 4(3) req.



PTA46

(5)

13<sup>30</sup> EnCo planning, Mcarten K//

[see spreadsheet] -> Hannah has more effort now.

Activities: \* SCJ evolution & assessment. w/ per plan. contributed by 9N43 EnCo

PJT guidelines @, sent at NSP CSS?

\* SCCC-SNG.

- lot of challenges & types.

- calendar on Niki.

- sharing of results & trust establishment.

- communication around "Confluence Issue" as report test case

invite groups doing SCs like ESE as well.

\* Assurance profiles/RAF

- RAF FRQ

-> logo's for RAF profiles.

- outreach.

-> how to get SPs. , EOSC Stakeholder in lieu of DLR.

|| by EOSC secretariat, like the Brussels mtg.

↳ list of meetings.

Bobanks -> through the Infra Process first, then

pressure on home orgs. following?

\* IAEGIS to host Assam inter-infra.

\* Sirtfi - Registry

- IncRes process. } contribute.

\* AAOPS. -> IAEGIS targeted infra's

↳ input to PDL.

\* PDL evolution. and targeted advice.

\* FIMYR enablement.

[Mcarter's doc]

14<sup>56</sup> SCCC SNG // DLG:

Sirtfi challenges. extant data is direct, no fed info available actually

should fed's challenge natl. enterprises, even if that is not realistic?

"reply to this email" (w/ token)

phased approach.



what about sharing detailed results? show stats and distribution is probably fine, detailed within the community anyway.  
or "all are compliant or fixed" (or at federation level).

↳ sharing is contentious.

baseline. to get eduGAIN entities up to spec.

the "Orlando" issue in eduGAIN on the Registry and tagging.

Hannah to volunteer to IQTF RPTCC :)

[15<sup>10</sup>-16<sup>20</sup> Tea]

16<sup>21</sup> // Next 23-25 Sept 2019 (UIT south campus)

location thd (~~Paris~~, ~~London~~, ~~Amsterdam~~) (~~CEA~~) UIT

16<sup>30</sup> // TCS Ch. [showing TRs]

"99.5% of the browsers used in ~~Europe~~ Great member countries"  
number is dangerous → reward.

"combined in browsers covering 99.5% of EU market introduced and supported in 2019 Jan 1st"

17<sup>00</sup> // end.

Wed 09<sup>15</sup> // ~~Practical~~. RPS allows a community to move between IDP's

but with multiple at the same time is ok, as long as the compliance is fine you can list multiple CP/CPS' ~~so~~ open under

No delay for the LSC use case after review (simple) of process after it being distributed to SPG (and the "N3" list)

casting it in RPS format can be done at leisure later.

Revisions at TechEx19

Open Agenda: Bjeljana agenda.



11/17/16

(7)

IAAOPS guidelines. endorsed in Jan. PMA meeting  
this one to go into the Policy Development Unit  
and use LIGO as an example.

\*this has been given to eduTEAMS as a checklist.  
ctros has a checklist.

09<sup>49</sup> // Priv Notice discussion. → see doc. 1FS-70Mq2Ch-...

done ✓

(Sens@11<sup>30</sup>)

Ljubljana: - NLCG policy framework.  
- LIGO Assurance & CAM assessment.  
- containers vs VM policy. Useful? in view of containerisation  
- process to follow up on risks identified.

10<sup>55</sup> // Coffee.

11<sup>30</sup> // Sens scriptex.

Ljubljana meeting:

\* inputs: from FIM4R? rest of KAN43? EUDAT of AUP comment  
\* reclassify EOSC integration classification.  
\* general discussion on cloud risks.  
\* minimal requirements on IDS capabilities for VM providers.  
assoc w/ NLCG Sec WG + net isolation "Contrail" log pipe

11<sup>40</sup> Sens // Scriptex Q-series, see slides. → "auto issuance of host certs"

"technology platform (like CIAOPS-WG) lost": the arrows are all API's.

ET over complicated. ?

"ACMETT"? +OVIER = S does it need time at a meeting, or list, and/or workshop.

some can be done within current policy, can we do more:

representation to be broader. → who??!

[many one-off specials requested in the ULE (like SUR robots), SPN's).  
mainly software platform issues (depends on CP). ]

(ACT) | September Tech Wed

1217 // end