These are notes recorded by Joseph Giroux from the CDS Task Force session at the PESC Data Summit in Las Vegas on May 4, 2012. Items 1- 13 are from the first half of the session and were reviewed by the group at the beginning of the second half. Subsequent items were typed on screen as they occurred.

1. JPL – licensing. Which license model to use for open source. Start a Source Forge instance for code collaboration.
2. EdUnify for listing services – EU is not yet federated.
3. For PESC – October – a web-service proof of concept
4. JSON with versioning for everything except payload. XML payload. Multiple WSDLS to be defined.
5. Consider exposing both SOAP and REST APIs
6. Look at SIF version 3 to assure interoperability. Possibly establish a transformation service to handle flows to SIF clients.
7. Actual point is that our system should be compatible with SIF’s web services. Look at what they’ve done to see if we can leverage it.
8. Encryption not required given that we’re using a secure channel – However the design should allow for encryption at both the network level and at the client level.
9. Provisioning may include registration of encryption keys. Provisioning should include vetting to assure proper support. Perhaps PESC can offer the provisioning service.
10. Some providers need to be able to see the content in order to determine whether to deliver it.
11. PESC Seal of Approval for Service Providers?
12. Registration to include whether a recipient allows/requires encrypted payload
13. Registry should indicate which docs and which doc versions a recipient will accept
14. General use case: encryption not needed
15. If the network need to interoperate with the UT Server (and it does)\_ then encryption must be supported.
16. How to handle the fact that some clients are supported by multiple service providers?
17. PESC is a viable choice as a governance entity. May require a fee for service. Board has considered this. Client fees Handled by service providers.
18. If transaction history is published in the public domain then the service providers can use this for billing. However, need some redundancy and validation to verify accuracy. Also can give us adoption rates.
19. Who is the legal entity for SPEEDE UT server. UT-Austin. They do not warrant any service level. Its supported as a public good.
20. Because what we’re proposing is not centralized. PESC doesn’t hold the data merely provides the registry and perhaps some reporting. The service providers are liable to their clients.
21. PESC vets the participants. Vetting process will include a SLA.
22. Replicate the registry at the network level to protect against the registry server going down.
23. Does Internet2 have a role. Probably not PESC is a better fit.
24. Terms of use: are there privacy issues for PESC to deal with? These are typically handle by service provider’s legal relation to their client.
25. Do terms of use need to be listed in the registry? Should they be categorized? Who does the categorization?
26. Open source licensing: Berkeley, GNU. Creative commons. Start with what you want to constrain. Do you want enhancements to donated back? Must attribute the source?
27. Conflict resolution: is PESC involved? The terms of use hold PESC harmless. For payment processing? Liability limited by terms of use.
28. Conflicts over fee charges: probably not till the distant future. -
29. Costs/Fees could be included in a cost service.
30. How do you prevent someone from capturing all information about the customers of a particular company. One opinion- this should not be institutionalized at the PESC level. Could be included in terms of agreement for each vendor.
31. Servicer providers will differentiate on the basis of services other than simply delivery.
32. Even though we aren’t handling pricing for the first draft of the spec we should include it in the design.
33. Payment handling: no role for PESC. If the payload in the headers, if the payment is handled outside the system the header should include a payment reference. This would require modification of the header to handle payment ids.
34. Version 0.1 webservices standard out for public comment before the conference and then have it discussed at the Oct conference.
35. Ask the Change control board – what do we need to go out for public comment on an web service? WSDL, implementatkon guide/best practices. Compliance test set. (eg third party testing?) Should include versioning definitions.
36. What about long-term maintenance of the standard.?
37. Should start the project plan.
38. Next meeting is May 15th 11:00 Pacific.