Entity Category Consultation: Academia

Overview

The REFEDS Steering Committee has approved the launch of a consultation on the adoption of the Academia Entity Category by REFEDS. The consultation opened on 12th August 2015 and closed on 23rd September 2015. Participants are invited to review the full text and make change proposals in the table below or by email to the REFEDS Coordinators and to express their support / dissension for the category. It is recommended that you also read the prepared notes on the proposal. This proposal was NOT ACCEPTED. A revised consultation has been launched.

Please note the full text of the original proposed category is available at: https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/blob/master/academia-entity-category.md.

The notes are available at: Academic-Academia.

Statements of Support / Dissension

As this category has been contentious in the community, we are asking for organisations to express their support or dissension below to allow us to gauge the appropriateness of REFEDS adopting this approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Basney</td>
<td>NCSA / XSEDE (InCommon)</td>
<td>Support: This is needed by CILogon to support SeedMe access for academic but not commercial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niels van Dijk</td>
<td>GEANT Project; InAcademia Service</td>
<td>Support: This is needed by the InAcademia Service to support access for academic users, but not others (K12, Homeless IdPs, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Wartel</td>
<td>CERN / WLCG</td>
<td>Support: This would help supporting the needs of the High Energy Physics community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozef Misulka</td>
<td>LINDAT/CLARIN</td>
<td>Support: This would simplify filtering out IdPs not meeting our AAI requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change Log

Change Log for the Consultation on the Academia Entity Category. The Consultation started on 12th August 2015 and closes on 23rd September 2015 (5pm CEST). Please fill in your proposed changes to Academia Category below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Current Text</th>
<th>Proposed Text / Query</th>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/6">https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/6</a></td>
<td>On GitHub</td>
<td>Raised on github, addressed in forked refeds version.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2      | "a relying party SHOULD NOT assume that an attribute assertion received from an identity provider with the academia entity category represents a Subject (as defined in 
|        | [TBD](https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/7) defines) with any particular affiliation to the organization or behalf of which the identity provider is operated."
|        |                                                                                   | [Is this meant to imply "an attribute assertion received that does not contain an ePA/ePSA" from an identity provider. "If "yes," is the expectation that the mechanism for membership attribution in a federation will sufficiently address the EDP or the (for) ensuring that asserted ePA/ePSA are adhering to "expected norms"? Or, if "no," is the intent of the category to allow interpretation of the values of ePA/ePSA based on membership, but still avoiding any absolute meanings to the affiliations?](https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/11) | Eric Goodman   | Raised on github, addressed in forked refeds version. |
| 3      | Annotate those member identity providers that represent academic institutions, in order to distinguish them from identity providers that are not able to claim any affiliation with the international research and education community. The definition section sets the bar for degree-granting institutions at ISCED level 6. There are a number of level 6 degree-granting institutions in the US community category that have faculty that participate in national and international research projects, and may be funded by agencies such as the NSF. I’m concerned that the cut-off at level 6 may cause IdPs with participants in international research to be hidden from discovery. | [https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/7](https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/7) | Nick Ray      | Raised on github, addressed in forked refeds version. |
| 4      | 2.5 any organization explicitly denoted as an academic institution by a government entity in the jurisdiction where the claim of being an academic institution is made. | [Is it envisable that where ever the bar is set there will be groups that fall outside this.](https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/pull/8) | Nick Ray      | Raised on github, addressed in forked refeds version. |

Please note the full text of the original proposed category is available at: https://github.com/leifj/academia-category/blob/master/academia-entity-category.md.

The notes are available at: Academic-Academia.
5

- unless it is being operated
  - by or
  - on behalf of and by contract with at least one organization represented by a legal entity in good standing in the community of other academic institutions that fulfills at least one of the criteria below.

- unless it is being operated
  - by or
  - on behalf of and by contract with at least one organization represented by a legal entity in good standing in the community of other academic institutions that fulfills at least one of the criteria below.

Andrew Cormack

This does allow the category to be applied to contract-out IDPs that provide service to a mix of educational and non-educational organizations (e.g., Microsoft or Google). I suggest it also allows it to be applied to any IDPs that might be sponsored by universities as a commercial service to other organizations, even if some of those are educational.

Leif Johansson

Andrew Cormack

This seems to be reviewed by the committee.

Leif Johansson

6

- on behalf of and by contract with at least one organization represented by a legal entity in good standing in the community of other academic institutions that fulfills at least one of the criteria below:

This does allow the category to be applied to contract-out IDPs that provide service to a mix of educational and non-educational organizations (e.g., Microsoft or Google). I suggest it also allows it to be applied to any IDPs that might be sponsored by universities as a commercial service to other organizations, even if some of those are educational. Need to work on the wording to ensure it is not only instances run for academic organizations.

Andrew Cormack

Making less Discussion

Leif Johansson

7

- in A

Concern about using to imply conditions of use rather than authorization (e.g., being academic does not mean I will be restricted to using materials for educational use only... Add some text to express this).

Leif Johansson

8

- in A

Scope the category not to be "are you academic?", but "should you be trusted to assert academically-oriented data about users?" This is the same as point 15 below or #14 on github.

Leif Johansson

9

- in A

MLPs are happy without "close enough" Why is self-assertion of eduPersonAffiliation not close enough as compared with creating a new process?

Leif Johansson

Add text on link between using this category and ePA/ePSA

Eric Cormack

10

- By operating an identity provider to be a member of the academia entity category a registrar claims that the identity provider fulfills the criteria described above in the definition of the category. This indirect use for the entity category is twofold:

Specifically a relying party SHOULD NOT assume that an attribute assertion received from an identity provider with the academia entity category represents a subject we can define as a DAA/CA with any particular affiliation to the organization on behalf of which the identity provider is operated. Conversely, the absence of the academia category does not mean that the identity provider does not in fact represent one or more academic institutions.

Leif Johansson

By operating an identity provider to be a member of the academia entity category a registrar claims that the identity provider fulfills the criteria described above in the definition of the category. To allow relying parties a way to decide how to interpret the values of the eduPersonScopedAffiliation and eduPersonAffiliation attributes within their applications.

Specifically a relying party SHOULD NOT assume that an attribute assertion received from an identity provider with the academia entity category represents a subject we can define as a DAA/CA with any particular affiliation to the organization on behalf of which the identity provider is operated. Conversely, the absence of the academia category does not mean that the identity provider does not in fact represent one or more academic institutions.

Leif Johansson

The category MUST NOT be used for the purposes of gross access control (either allowing or disallowing access to any subject-based entity on the presence of an attribute) by an identity provider that is or is not associated with the entity category. The category MUST NOT be used for the purposes of blocking Identity Provider entities from discovery or excluding them from interoperability with otherwise broadly available services.

Andrew Cormack

Add text on link between using this category and ePA/ePSA

Leif Johansson

12

- Change definition approach

An identity provider annotated with the academia category implies that the registrar has made the determination that the identity provider SHOULD be trusted to assert the following attributes [1] when making the decision to associate an identity provider with the academia category a registrar SHOULD consider the following criteria [1]:

Add text on link between using this category and ePA/ePSA

Leif Johansson

This is still

13

- Change to definition

"DAA is unnecessary and could bring in some users organizations that you don't want. "IfC" would include an IDP operated by a university on some contract for non-educational organizations. "On behalf of" covers contract IDPs anyway. For IDPs operated by someone else, I suggest "by contract or other written agreement", rather than specifying a particular form of that agreement. Instead it may be that "on behalf of" means that it is not well (in which case all you need is "on behalf of an organization represented by a legal entity in good standing")

Andrew Cormack

Added to
draft #12

14

- Specifically add Research Hospitals

Research Hospitals are organizations present at least in Italy and France. I propose to list them under the current academic organizations. Though I don't know if it is possible to have a "teaching or research hospital" both in part- add them as a new item.

They differ from teaching hospitals in that they do not offer courses on their own, nor can award academic degrees. Though they provide laboratory and research for students, and they can have courses with special agreements with universities due to that fact.

A broad definition that covers both the Italian and the French case is: Health and research centers where doctors and researchers conduct highly specialized health researches and patients can get special treatments.

Currently the term "Research Hospital" is employed for education/organizationType in both the Italian and the French Identity Federations.

Andrew Cormack

Davide Vaglini

Italian

Nick Roy

French
Other Comments / Observations