

Consultation on Attributes for Collaboration and Federation WG Recommendations

Community Review

- Thanks to all who participated in this community consultation, which was open from Monday, May 7, 2018 to Monday, June 4, 2018
- The report was updated based on the feedback received and it was accepted by the sponsoring groups in August 2018.
- Final report is here: <http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.101.1>

Background

The InCommon Federation has three standing committees that help guide federation operations and activities: The InCommon Steering Committee, The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Community Trust and Assurance Board (CTAB). Sponsored by all three of those committees, the [Attributes for Collaboration and Federation Working Group](#) was formed to research and examine the low adoption rate of the Research and Scholarship Entity Category (R&S) by InCommon members and develop recommendations to increase participation.

Through surveys and interviews, the Attributes for Collaboration and Federation Working Group reached over 130 organizations, examining participation and planned participation in R&S. As a result of this process, the Working Group has drafted a report of its findings and developed a set of recommendations. The Working Group is now soliciting additional feedback through the community consultation process.

Document for review/consultation (the PDF link below is outdated, see final report at <http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.101.1>)

- [Recommendations of the Attributes for Collaboration and Federation Working Group](#) (PDF)

For more information about the working group, please see the [Attributes for Collaboration and Federation wiki space](#).

Change Proposals and Feedback - We welcome your feedback/suggestions here

If you have comments that do not lend themselves well to the tabular format below, please create a new Google doc and link to it in the suggestion section below.

Number	Current Text	Proposed Text / Query / Suggestion	Proposer	+1 (add your name here if you agree with the proposal)	Action (please leave this column blank)
1	Rebrand R&S	"Rebrand InCommon's R&S efforts" to avoid giving the impression to the rest of the eduGAIN community that the recommendation is to change the name of the entity category.	Scott Koranda	+1 please don't open that rathole again!	Recommendation accepted.
2	"less secure alternatives to federation"	Page 5. "less secure and more privacy-invasive alternatives". It's ironic that SPs and IdPs that create incentives to use them "because privacy" are actually driving users to share more personal data!	Andrew Cormack		Recommendation accepted.
3	"practical examples"	Page 7. You may cover this later, and it may not apply to InCommon members but I suspect a lot of IdPs would be greatly helped by providing detailed instructions on how to configure their software to support R&S...	Andrew Cormack		This issue is addressed in our recommendation to "Improve R&S related documentation..."

4	"bigger tent"	Page 10-11. Can you use the existing R&S SPs as a channel, to explain to researchers how they could make their, and their institutions', lives easier? We've been trying to close the loop between researchers' needs and central IT provision for a long time 😞	Andrew Cormack		While we're happy to encourage SP operators to spread the word about the value of R&S, we don't want to create an obligation for them to do the work of the federation.
5	"4.3.3 Make R&S attribute release the default policy for InCommon"	I'm confused about "default" versus "requirement" in this section. If the proposal is to make R&S support a requirement to Baseline Expectations, so all InCommon IdPs are required to support R&S, I think it could be stated more directly, and in my opinion, it should be the #1 recommendation, not the last one, since it's a big ask and buried on page 14 it's easy to miss.	Jim Basney	+1 - Gettes.	Recommendation Accepted. We have revised the report's recommendation to make it clear that we think R&S should be included in baseline expectations.
6	4.3.3	I agree with Mr. Basney. As I said at the Global Summit meeting, we should be making this a requirement for InCommon IdPs. And, as Jim notes, it should be the #1 recommendation. While InCommon would be supporting R&S from the REFEDs perspective, the notion of R&S within InCommon should be rendered moot by requiring every IdP to support it. No need to rebrand R&S, it just becomes moot for InCommon. InCommon has been dancing around this issue for far too long and it is time to make this a simple requirement. Yes, I should have done a +1 to Jim's entry, but I want to strongly support this perspective. I am also adding a +1 to Jim's comment.	Michael Gettes		See answer above to #5.

See Also

- [Trust and Identity Consultations Home](#)
- [InCommon Working Groups Home](#)