20220126 - Futures WG meeting (governance)

Attendees: Peter Gietz, Casper Dreef, Pål Axelsson, Stephen Lovell, Davide Vaghetti, Tomasz Wolniewicz, Steve Glover, Alber Wu, Maarten Kremers, Kevin Hickey, Mario Reale, Alan Buxey, Terry Smith, Klaas Wierenga, Alex Stuart, Chris Phillips, Dean Flanders, Anass Chabli, Meshna Koren, Licia Florio

Notes:

Goal 3: Make effective changes and improvements.

Size of SG. Turning into General Assembly.

- Current eduGAIN SG is more of an assembly and is not an effective decision making body.
- Current eduGAIN SG is limited to federation operators.
- Need for a smaller, elected focused SG?
- Need for technical support committee? Reference / advisory groups for other stakeholders?
- Need a better way to review and accept new federations.
- What does the new model need to achieve? Decision? Oversight? Review?

Are there points missing?

Pal: Low turn up at meetings. Maybe create a liaison group with other constituencies.
Maarten: It should be a Federation of Federations, but to me it is more an Interfederation. An SG with a clear mandate. The constitution is weak, the baseline could help with that. Federation guidelines are needed. A central committee would be of value.
Peter: Totally agree. Raise the trust level.
Chris: Within the brand eduGAIN or feature set (good quality MD)?
Alan: Equivalency
Peter: Policy.
Koren: Would that also mean that the membership policies would be more aligned than today? Easier for SPs to federate with other eG members?
Alan: Related to opt-in/out.
Koren: Also we cannot know if federations adhere to the same standards.
Chris: Opt-in/out could be a significant change. This could be a recommendation.
Licia: Not main critical impact. Fundamental: lack of expected behavior from IdP by SP. All possibilities are open. Minimal requirements would help.
Tomasz: What happens if federations are not up to that level? Are we (temporarily) kick members out?
Alan: Very much like the Web-model.
Alex: Baseline. The high level baseline was protocol agnostic. It can’t be too strict to keep us from experimentation.

Davide: Governance. Implementation process would benefit from a stronger governance model. A steering committee that can move quickly in case of incidents or urgent developments. Quick and effective decision making. Also needed if we want to implement the baselines.
Chris: Operations advisory group?
Peter: Different trust levels? Like DFN: Basic and Advanced.
Albert: Baseline expectation: implementing and enforcing. Advocacy and education. Wide gap between capability and maturity. Should be part of the core. Federation of federations - most participants are IdP centric. Setting up federation and joining eG at the same time. Learning as they go. 2) It takes a lot of time to pre-assess. 3) Assessment by SG takes a long time (2-3 weeks).
Licia: Process can be improved. Other part: resources. What do we do when technology is failing on new members.
Chris: Verification process.

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address the low attendance and low input at eduGAIN meetings by creating an eduGAIN Steering Committee (elected) and hold an annual assembly with all of the current SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve participation in leadership from non-federation members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a consistent approach to how federations are expected to publish metadata downstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve consistency of federation policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider levels (max 3) that apply to all IdPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve joining process for new entities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support implementation of baseline expectations (see goal 1)