

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/fixetime.html?msg=REFEDS+Federation+2.0+Conference+Call+%28every+two+weeks%29&iso=20190626T11&p1=179&ah=1>

Wednesday Jan 22, 2020

Attending: Alan Buxey, David Walker, Tom B, Lucy L, Arnout T, Craig Lee, Albert Wu, Dedra C, Laura P, Judith

Regrets:

Agenda:

1. Continue agenda item 1 from last time, starting with the Multiply or Divide scenario, slides 7 and 8 of the [TechEx](#) presentation. For each scenario, what of the [strategy classes](#) are important? More broadly, **“In each scenario, what do we gain, what do we lose, and how do we stay on mission”**
2. Less structured discussion on what the 10-year-out state of federations should look like in order to help shape the direction of the strategies and recommendations. As a place to start, consider Federations being far more responsible for ensuring that user attributes are available and the communication of policy negotiations between idps and sps.
3. AOB

NOTES

Multiply or Divide scenario

- Do we enable research to cross isolationist boundaries? Assist in the policy enforcement?
- Open standards vs proprietary protocol

Suggests standards building NOW entrenches the protocols and technology so that even isolated communities can reconnect without larger challenge. Harmonization strategy contials this -- consider recommendation (urgency).

James Webb telescope focusing all research energy on one goal/focus - consider that group dictates the formats for data and potential networking protocols.

Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

Role/Mission: consider federations as facilitating the underserved and excluded research communities → strategy (maybe engagement?)

Advocacy Strategy that federations should be aiming to have a seat at the table at national (and other research funders like NIH) discussions about how identity and access is standardized, funding the staff to be able to participate and advocate, [and then if there is a disconnection for federated identity, determine bridging solutions ?] Consider Open Geospatial Consortium as an example.

How to balance propagating the best practices (“easy to use”) VS interoperating with groups NOT using best practices? Or understand new role (Instead of live authentication, use the new authentication model and facilitate the attributes from academic affiliation?)

In ten years -- what will the need be? Linking identities? Given an enterprise identifier and a trust framework (like a federation) ... Interoperate with federation outside of the higher ed context. **There are (adjacent) industry verticals that WANT the solution of federation, need help from higher ed federations.** How does this need and opportunity affect governance, influence what federations engage in. Perhaps offers sustainability opportunity.

Some of the language used in discussion “governance” vs “Engaging the community” “inclusion” is more powerful than governance.”

If identity solved by a monolith, then what do we do? Pivot? To fix what?

- Advocacy strategy with large national/government regulating organizations (such as governmental organizations that manage education and research, eg NIH) to ensure implementation of regulations is in alignment with higher ed federation functionality (Best practice promulgation with fall back to determining bridging solutions) [Governance?]
- Adjacent vertical strategy: facilitate adjacent verticals in implementing multilateral federation and negotiate integration strategies in relevant cases. (Best practice promulgation) [Engagement?]
 - Commercial solutions B2B situations - law enforcement, insurance, airplane supply chain...
- Participation in technical protocol standards to ensure Higher Ed use case and multilateral access use cases are supported. [Harmonization?]
 - Particularly looking towards attribute release
 - (Best practice promulgation with fall back to determining bridging solutions)
- Some strategy around facilitating the underserved and excluded research communities [Engagement? | Governance?]
- Bring other solutions (like a monolithic (but still regional!) identity provider) in while protecting ourselves with policy & practice standards /auditing/oversight/compliance [Renewal?]

Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

- Cf: university allows authentication with google (or webauthN or ...) and then asserts the attributes from the organization
- Still need interop between GoogleApple + The GDPR solution + The China solution etc....
- What if policy/regulation prompts a consumer business solution to shut down? Accept vs Depend.

Several facets

- Credentials
- Identities
- Identifiers
- Personas

Trying to capture what Tom said...

- Renewal ->
- Engagement -> Broadening federation concept for who/what
- Governance -> Broadening who contributes to future direction
- Harmonization -> Simplifying use, increasing value
- Sustainability -> Diversify revenue models