2023 eduGAIN Constitution Consultation

⚠ This consultation is now closed. The final version of the Constitution is available at: https://wiki.geant.org/download/attachments/633275632/eduGAIN-Constitution-v4-final.pdf

Background

Following the recommendations from the eduGAIN Futures Working Group whitepaper the working group continued to work on Recommendation 3.1 of the whitepaper. As a result the working group has revised the eduGAIN Constitution and drafted the Terms of Reference for a to be formed Steering Committee. This consultation is for the proposed changes to the eduGAIN Constitution. The eduGAIN Community is invited to review and post comments on the documents below.

Consultation Documents

ⓘ The document for the consultation is available as a pdf attachment (with changes redlined) and a pdf attachment (clean). All comments should be added to the changelog below or sent directly to: edugain-discuss@lists.geant.org. Comments posted to other lists will not be included in the consultation review. All comments must be received by 2nd June 2023.

Change log

Please add your comments to the change log below

	Line /Reference #	Proposed Change or Query	Proposer / Affiliation	Recommendation to Working Group	Status
1	82-83	"...described in section 3.6" appears to be an error. Section 3.5 describes Dispute Resolution	Albert Wu / InCommon	Change to 3.5	Amended
2	86	The eSC ToR has an additional item under eSC responsibilities that is missing from the eduGAIN Constitution: "Approving, supporting and chairing eduGAIN Working Groups". Is that omission intentional?	Albert Wu / InCommon	Add this to the constiution	Amended
3	118 - 132	It is unclear from this text who the eduGAIN Service Team reports to, i.e., who oversees the work and performance of this function?	Albert Wu / InCommon	This is purposely left vague as this can change every project cycle and we want the constitution to be long term in its vision	No action
4	218 - 219	Both mentions of "... as per section 2.2." seem questionable. Section 2.2 describes the eduGAIN Steering Committee.	Albert Wu / InCommon	Remove the wording "as per section 2.2" - it doesn't add anything	Amended
5	283 and 285	The 2 URLs at these lines begin with "http://". Both redirect to their secure equivalent. It'd be best to point directly to their "https://" equivalents.	Albert Wu / InCommon	Update to https	Amended
6	general	The amended constitution still reads like eduGAIN is only a point of metadata exchange among federations. Is that the intent? Is there any work underway to address other matters essential to trusted and scalable interoperation among entities registered in eduGAIN: broad adoption of interoperability profiles; mappable operating (security, privacy, support, etc) policies? Does eduGAIN intend to take an active role in helping newer/smaller federations grow/mature in their capabilities so that there is parity across federations?	Albert Wu / InCommon	The eduGAIN Constitution is intended to specifically govern metadata exchange. The broader issues are important but need to be managed with more flexibility - hence the recomnmendation to create an eduGAIN Strategy to address this.	No action
7	75, 123, 217	'Technical Profiles': is there a difference compared to the 'Technology Profiles'?	Wolfgang Pempe / DFN	Change all to be Technology Profiles	Amended
8	249	'voting list': Does this refer to eduGAIN Membership Votes? If yes, there should be 1-2 explanatory sentences in section 2.3, e.g. "A Member Federation which is absent from two consecutive votes will be removed from the active list for the purpose of subsequent votes. Participating in a vote returns the federation to the active list." (copy+paste)	Wolfgang Pempe / DFN	The idea of dropping people from the voting list has been discontinued. The eduGAIN membership votes are now equal to all non-suspended members.	No action
9	90-92	Did we ever *need* the distinction between delegate and deputy? (I can't think of desirable processes that would act solely on the difference of someone being deputy vs. delegate.) Can we simplify this and just make it (up to) two delegates?	Peter, ACOnet	The only place this is relevant is when voting. If both representatives vote, we drop the deputy vote and maintain the delegate. There are benefits of having one person who has ultimate decision making authority, although in practice this is not used much	No feedback from community - leave as is

| 10 | 96, 101ff | We're still all voting on new memberships? I find that a bit tedious because I cannot imagine there being a different outcome other than a simple majority for "yes" for some fed joining. If the outcome is always the same the process itself seems superfluous.
Maybe rethink this approach and simply accept candidate federations if – within a given period, say a week or two – no *strong objections* have been raised and properly argued for. If strong objects indeed were raised, discuss those until the objector *can live with the decision*. If consent cannot be reached (within another given period, say, a week or two) we could still let the eSC decide or call for a vote *then* (but *only* then, which would/should likely never happen).
N.B.: Non-primary functions of voting such as "liveness detection" should be implemented using different methods (better CRM processes, essentially). I.e., we shouldn't ask people to vote only to find out whether they still care or still work for the federation. | Peter, ACOnet | For broader discussion - invite Peter to push this to the list?

Due to the lack of input from members, we do feel that we have to push for an active vote at the moment to ensure that there is consensus and not just apathy.

Need to roll out reporting tool asap. | No feedback from community - leave as is |
| 11 | 107 | should we add a MUST for having completed the membership/joining process to make this more explicit/clear? | Peter, ACOnet | Change from The voting period may be extended if a simple majority cannot be reached to The voting period MUST be extended if a simple majority cannot be reached. | Amended |