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UMA telecon 2015-03-04

Date and Time

- Wed Mar 4 2pm PT | Thu Mar 5 APAC-friendly (check your local listings)
  - Voice: Skype: +99051000000481 or US +1-805-309-2350 (international dial-in lines), room code 178-2540#
  - Screen sharing: http://join.me/findthomas
  - UMA calendar: http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/uma/Calendar

Agenda

- Roll call
- Minutes approval
  - Sample motion: Approve the minutes of UMA telecon 2015-02-26.
- Report on All-Member Ballot plans
- Report on ACE discussions
- Review upcoming F2F opportunities
- Binding Obligations: time to reinvigorate?
- Next steps and other outstanding AIs
- AOB

Minutes

Roll call
Quorum was not reached.

Minutes approval
Deferred.

Report on All-Member Ballot plans
The Ballot has begun! Colin also offers help in addition to our other list.

Report on ACE discussions
Eve has been discussing a door lock use case with Hannes T and Erik W of the ACE group, and they’re all working on an I-D to be considered at IETF 92. Maybe we can publish the case study on the UMA site as well; Mike has another blog post on such a subject too, and he may be able to attend the IETF meeting. Eve will see if Marcelo can attend IIW, since she and Hannes will also be there and hope to discuss this in a group setting there as well.

Sal described how attacking a pairing code is a way to hack low-power.

Mike poses the question: What’s the user interface for the person approaching the door? Gil proposes: Facial recognition. Sal proposes: You break out your “key”. Mike proposes: The door has a URL! Thomas proposes: Scratch on the door.

Eve: Ask to get Sal access to Hannes/Erik document as well.

AI: Review upcoming F2F opportunities
We updated the list on the Meetings and Minutes page.

Next steps and other outstanding AIs

AI: Gil: Edit the UIG to add Ishan’s content and excerpt it for Eve to add to the FAQ, pointing everyone to the UIG.

Outstanding AIs:

- AI: Sal: Fill out IDESG form.
- AI: Eve: Edit UIG (Mike’s input, Zhanna/Andi’s input)
- AI: Maciej: Write as many sections for the UIG as he can. (smile)
- This is under way.
- AI: Eve: Send suggested updates to Will at Gluu for English page updating, and to Domenico for Italian page updating, and to Rainer for hoped-for German page updating, and to Riccardo Abeti for the Spanish page, and to Mark for a Dutch translation.
  - Pending.
AI: Ishan: Review the FAQ for needed updates (http://tinyurl.com/umafaq).
  - Suggestions sent – review together?
    - We reviewed it and love it! We want to publish it immediately.
AI: Robert: Noodle on the kitten metaphor.
  - He's working on a Justice project with lots of access control use cases. He's still thinking about the "simple story" slides.

We discussed Mike's V1 text on:

Organizations as Resource Owners and Requesting Parties

It is common for one domain to call an API in another domain. Sometimes a person is behind this call. But other times, the API may represent an organizational business process. For example, consider a business analytics engine calling an API to gather data, machine-to-machine communication or autonomous web service clients.

In these cases, an UMA Authorization Server can may use a number of different pieces of data to make a decision to grant access. In higher education multi-party SAML federation, attributes are used to group certain websites, for example as "research." A similar idea can be applied to UMA clients, where a domain might use the client id, or previously registered information about the client to make an access decision. Of course, network address, cryptographic keys, geolocation of the originating request, time of day, the results of fraud detection services, and other mechanisms may be used.

We're thinking there's room for revision. Eve suggests defining an example where there's a non-human resource owner, and then explaining implementer implications (client credentials for PAT, no "consent", etc.), and then an example where there's a non-human requesting party, and then explaining implementer implications (client credentials for AAT, no "redirect_user" opportunities, etc.). Are the two just additive, or is it something more?

What about "client claims"? Where might these come from? Software statement? It's up to the AS to get these from somewhere.

Attendees

As of 13 Feb 2015, quorum is 7 of 13. (Dom, Sal, Mark, Thomas, Andrew, Robert, Maciej, Eve, Mike, Jin, Ishan, Ravi, John)

1. Eve
2. Mike
3. Maciej

Non-voting participants:

- Gil
- Colin
- Zhanna