Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

Fed2 WG Google folder:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vr728JXAFVH3agjnbueV9NLjB_OKHdET?usp=sharing

Meeting https://internet2.zoom.us/j/8853848902

time:
https://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/fixedtime.html?msg=REFEDS+Federation+2.0+Confer
ence+Call+%28every+two+weeks%29&iso=20190626T11&p1=179&ah=1

Wednesday Sept 18 2019

Attending:Judith, Karen O, Janemarie D, Richard F, Warren A, Thiliina P, Arnout T, Lucy L,
Sander E, Alan Buxey

What are the implications for federations from these stories:

Autonomous stories
   ● Thilina P - Tinder for Collaboration (Sander, Janemarie, Karen O)
   ● Richard F - I Will Survive (Arnout)
   ● (Stakeholders)

Tinder: The current state of affairs reflects folks not able to find data sets and collaboration
partners. If federations had a good catalog of services and resources

I Will Survive: More competition in the same field, less collaboration, more secrecy; more
smaller projects with the people they trust. Least expensive collaboration platforms used by
institutions did not facilitate sharing across institutions; shared using "freemium" services that
exposes data to commercial exploitation.

Large companies have leverage because of the scale of advertising

Both stories address collaboration:
High value for both academy and federation: collaboration and sharing

If a researcher knows what they are looking for they can "survive" but if they don't know … if
there was a baseline for starting collaboration …. Concerns about theft and hacking and
commercial exploitation may keep people from volunteering inclusion,

Attribution in collaboration - federations mark attribution, a creative-commons like sharing but
with identity
Blinding identify to support collaboration (contacts mediated through federation, not exposing
email, etc)

Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

Physicists/LIGO Warren: dataset release less attribution, more the embargo until the researcher is done.
People who are your collaborator are also competitors (grant proposals can compete)
Collaborations with people who are not known: unlikely to collaborate with people not known and trusted
Research brokerage "cold calls" not of interest.

Lucy & emerging /NRC : buried scholars at remote research institutions -- example climate science in Africa, resourced researchers willing to take isolated researcher's data but not able to attribute that researcher.

Asked regarding Federation: asking after services for "free" -- we don't have a taxonomy of service providers in the federation.

Federations optimize and share -- helping with saving resources -- value of federations in well resourced environment?

Collaboration and agenda setting needed even when there isn't financial motivation?

MIT lab as Tinder problem: money available to set agenda without questioning source of funds

People being able to do the work -- not enough skilled persons to do the work even if unlimited resources

Data silos: a problem in both stories -- Arnout explains European mandate for FAIR data , NSF also has requirements to make data available. Top down push to collaborate

Political drivers exist even with many resources (although money may be used to push the political agenda). LIGO & Japanese gravitational wave work separately for national competition.

The academy does see value in making a large collaboration to succeed…. Need broad expertise in "big science"

Personal response system -- different faculty license different "clicker" solutions -- raises cost for students.

Standards setting a value regardless of the financial incentives, facilitates ease of work

VALUES AND IMPLICATIONS as a whole from all four stories and relative importance.

Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

Corporate/Cloud & Agenda setting issues well illustrated by the stories we are collecting: please collect more