

## Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

Fed2 WG Google folder:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vr728JXAFVH3agjnbueV9NLjB\\_OKHdET?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vr728JXAFVH3agjnbueV9NLjB_OKHdET?usp=sharing)

Meeting <https://internet2.zoom.us/j/8853848902> sce

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>

## Tasks

Who	What	When	Status

Review

[A What are the implications for federations from these stories:](#)  
[“The important thing is organizational trust among participants”](#) [What are the implications for federations from these stories:](#)

## Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Attending: Judith Bush, Lucy Lynch, David Walker. Tom Barton, Craig Lee

Regrets:

Agenda:

1. WG process checkpoint
  - a. Do you think we are going in a valuable direction?
  - b. What adjustments should we make?
2. AOB

Are we being cautious? Or should we be more prescriptive? These things need to happen: shared standards, eg, and being more clear perhaps about authorization and not authentication -- this would be a specific thing, is this too general, more so? We need to become more specific in our recommendation -- or do we suggest the structure to support that body that makes the specific recommendations. If we are handing off, maybe just the strategies are sufficient. The charge came from REFEDS ... what is REFEDS expecting? Presumably REFEDS is looking for

## Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

a forward looking document that also connects to some prescriptive/actionable next steps.  
Doesn't seem like handing off is really best.

EG: Individual federations committing to maturation? Who are the organizations to follow up with? Who do we pass the charge on to?

Is the overall organization of the academic interfederation the best one? Do we need a stronger center?

Judith asks SO.... who is REFEDS? Organized program of Geant and funded independently by sponsors (because broader than Europe). What kind of governance does it have with respect to other federations?

It's hard to add new things (policy, etc) within individual federations, and hard to motivate without the larger Academic Federation structure.

There's the DOI Foundation, that then delegates registration to other registrars -- central flowing our instead of distributed. There's a plan in place for dealing with how if a registrar goes away that the namespace may be taken over for another.

Is there a linkage between the scale of what we are recommending and who we are?

The recommendation could be that REFEDs convene a group that could make decisions about how a strong center could be organized.

Does the process (data collection and scenario) & group representation allow us to have the standing for these ...

Exercise: going back to the scenarios, if there is value in academic federations and they continue for ten years, what is the value they are offering? How do we get there?

Federation operators' involvement missing?

We make a recommendation that isn't quite as high level that is more direct to what federation operators can do.

Tom: REFEDS Steering Committee & eduGAIN Steering Group

REFEDS steering needs to be more than a framework for bottom up work.  
eduGAIN has been reluctant to be more of a center of control.

What about eduROAM governance? Have reach into emerging areas. Have ability to deal with standards & commodification of service.

## Federation 2.0 Working Group Meeting Notes

David notes a center can be a shared agreement between the federation operators. Edugain very oriented in technology, is it the right place for policy? Might require changes to Edugain's make up to be more policy oriented

By building up an organization that can represent all academic interfederation it may have clout to negotiate with

If we had the ideal academic interfederation, the strategic goal would be to offer assurance in contracting (in ten years of maturity - goal).

Strategies cover academic interfederation AND federations themselves

Structure as academic interfeder or federation operators? Strategies stay, description focus on academic interfederation (the more local .. discovery of difference between the interests of national fed versus the global academic interfederaiton.

Linkage between scenarios & strategies (in part): Acad Interfed is a good way to mitigate the dystopian outcomes in the scenarios. The "center" is about connecting and aligning the independent (national ) pieces rather than issuing orders that must be followed.

If there are snags between federation operators, what is the way to resolve? (a within academic federation structure) "What is the weakest form of federation that is still useful" << and then this goes to Lucy's observation as a goal of assurance?

Within decision making is consensus then a commitment that members act on the consensus. Caution on consensus (be clear that newcomers don't renegotiate)

Membership?

Speaking on its behalf?