

eduGAIN policy comments

6nd Sep, 2010

www.edugain.org/policy

Initials	Commentator's name and contacts	In which role you have provided the comments
AS	Andreas Solberg	Comments from me personally. Not necessarily representing UNINETT as an edugain member.
DL	Diego Lopez diego.lopez@rediris.es	
EH	Eefje van der Harst, Surfnet	
GW	Glenn Wearen (glenn.wearen@heanet.ie)	As federation operator of Edugate
NH	Nicole Harris. nicole.harris@jiscadvance.ac.uk , +44 (0)20 3006 6040.	On behalf of JISC and the UK federation.
SC	Scott Cantor (cantor.2@osu.edu)	Non-European, Shibboleth developer, shepherd of relevant standards and profiles
TL	Thomas Lenggenhager	
TW	Torbjörn Wiberg torbjorn.wiberg@adm.umu.se	Involved in policy decisions for SWAMID

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Constitution (CONS)

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
1	TL	75	ge	<p>The currently used set of terms 'Policy', 'Declaration', 'Constitution' is in my view not well suited to quickly understand how that fits together. Which of these terms will in the future mostly be used? Probably the Policy, so it should also be explicitly be mentioned in the declaration and not just a reference to the constitution.</p> <p>For newcomers it should be made as simple as possible to understand about what we talk and not as complicated as possible. In the end, an easy to understand structure will be easier to sell.</p>	<p>Could we use the 'policy declaration'?</p> <p>For me constitution sound very much like government level. How about the term 'charter' instead?</p>	<p>policy vc 6.9: Policy Framework, Policy Declaration and Constitution</p> <p>Introduce and define these in the beginning of constitution and declaration</p> <p>VN: I think we as a group need to find a good name. “The eduGAIN service governance model”?</p>	<p>Updated terms to first paragraph of 1.1.</p>
2	TL	75	ge	<p>We could simplify a couple of sentences by introducing the term Entity for Home Organisations/Identity Providers and Service</p>	<p>Entity: Entity means a service described with a SAML 2 EntityDescription and registered in a Participant</p>	<p>OK. But Entity covers computers (IdP and SP), not organisations. add definition to 1.2 Terms</p>	<p>Introduced new term Entity to cover e.g. IdP, SP and AP.</p> <p>Introduced a new term Member to refer to an</p>

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				Providers.	Federation.	Should we leave the door open for Attribute Providers, too. At least in the declaration which is hard to change VN: OK	organization in Participant Federations.
3	DL	75	ed	I think that adding bullets or other marks to many of the lists (like those describing requirements or the responsibilities of NRENPC/TSG/OT) would improve their readability		No. I can't really see where we could have still more bullets... VN:OK	No changes
4	AS	75	ge	What about ProtectNetwork IdP. Allowed or not in eduGAIN?		If a Participant Federation has it registereg as an IdP and it fulfills the requirements the Policy framework sets out, including those in section 6 of the constitution, there is no formal reason to reject it. VN: The eduGAIN service is about interconnecting existing federations. If a federation chooses to export Protect Networks that's up to that participating federation and not	No changes

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						something that we should regulate in the policy.	
5	TL	78	ed		how the eduGAIN confederation ('the' missing)	Ok VN:OK	changed
6	TL	79	ge		<p>The term 'eduGAIN Policy' refers to these three parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the eduGAIN Policy Declaration - this eduGAIN constitution/charter - the profiles supplementing this eduGAIN constitution/charter. <p>The Participant Federations have committed to the Policy once they signed the Policy Declaration to join eduGAIN. [Align it also in the 1.2 Terms section.]</p>	Make consistent with CONS-1	see CONS-1
7	TW	79	ed	"This document, the profiles supplementing it and the eduGAIN declarations signed by Participant Federations form	"This document, the profiles supplementing it and the eduGAIN declaration which has to be signed by Participant	ok (CONS-1: Policy Framework, Policy Declaration)	see CONS-1

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				the Policy of eduGAIN."	Federations form the Policy of eduGAIN."	VN:OK	
8	EH	82	ge	'When they have joined eduGain' not clear	Signed the policy documents	"...signed the Policy Declaration to join eduGAIN" VN: OK, or when they have signed the unilateral declaration?	changed
9	TL	85	ge		eduGAIN is a confederation that interconnects Participant Federations, representing primarily education and research in a certain country. new: eduGAIN is a confederation that enables Participant Federations to inter-federate. Participant Federations primarily represent national education and research sectors.	vc 6.9: "eduGAIN is a service which enables Participant Federations to interfederate. Participant Federations primarily represent the interests of national education and research sectors." vc 14.9. remove "national" and "in a certain country" VN: We remove confederation and replace it with "the eduGAIN service"	"The eduGAIN service enables Participant Federations to inter-federate. Participant Federations primarily represent the interests of research and education sectors."
10	TW	85	ge	We wish to replace services with services and resources throughout the whole policy as we believe that this more accurately describes what the	change services to services and resources.	No. Let's not complicate the text unless we can't avoid it. VN: I can agree that resources might better reflect what is	Proposed change not done

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				NRNE are offering.		being offered in some federations.. IMO worth discussion but maybe not change all instances. Lets ask the technical author.	
11	GW	86	ge	Insert 'the interests' so as to broaden the scope.	...which primarily represent the interests organisations of education and research sector in a certain country	see CONS-9 VN: Following the discussions at removing the word confederation and replace it with "the eduGAIN Service" I think the sentence will sound more like: "The eduGAIN service offers interconnectivity between Participant Federations, primarily targeting federations serving education and research.." Might also be removed, in the end it is up to the NREN/TSG to decide upon which federation that will be connected..	See CONS-9
12	TW	86	ge		change "representing" to "serving"?	see CONS-9 VN: Se above	See CONS-9

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
13	EH	86	ge		Mention the position of the NREN's in edugain	It is mentioned in line 101. This is just introductory text to the constitution. VN: Se above. I don't think that NREN is always responsible for running a country's federation, so I'd be happy to leave it out.	Proposed change not done
14	TW	88	ge	Isn't it rather:	eduGAIN is an infrastructure that implements a standardised process for authorising access to network services and resources. Typically the End user belongs to one Participant Federation and the resource to another. During this process, the End user is authenticated by the Identity Provider that issued its identity and is authorised to operate on the resource by the Service Provider protecting the resource. Technically, eduGAIN uses the standard SAML 2.0 and it is managed by aggre...	No. This is just introduction text to the constitution. Let's not make it too complicated.	Proposed change not done
15	EH	92	ed	Registered ?	Members of	No. Computers are not members of Participant	"Members...take a step to have

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						<p>Federations. Organisations are.</p> <p>The Policy framework uses the verb “register” when Providers are registered to a Participant Federation and verb “expose” when the Participant Federation mediates its metadata to eduGAIN.</p>	their Entities exposed...”
16	EH	94	ed	To get exposed ?	Be part of	<p>See CONS-15</p> <p>VN: Yes, exposed should be replaced. “Be part of” or “make use of” (thinking of it as “the eduGAIN service”</p>	See CONS-15
17	TL	95	ge	Do we really want to speak from membership in eduGAIN? Is not the already used term participants more appropriate? What do we gain when we introduce also the term member in parallel to participant federation? Or we could use member, but also Member Federation instead of Participant Federation.	<p>now:</p> <p>Participant Federation</p> <p>A Federation which has been granted membership of eduGAIN as defined in this constitution</p> <p>new:</p> <p>Participant Federation</p>	<p>“grant membership” indicates that 1) applicant expresses interest to join and 2) eduGAIN expresses interest to accept the applicant. “Join” suggests 2) is not needed.</p> <p>“A Federation which has passed the joining process defined in section 3.3”</p> <p>VN: Should be harmonized. This is English, lets leave it for the</p>	“Participant Federation: A Federation which has passed the joining process defined in section 3.3.”

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					A Federation which joined eduGAIN as defined in chapter 3.	tech author..	
18	TL	95	ed		<p>now:</p> <p>NREN PC</p> <p>,</p> <p>which consists of appointed representatives from each partner in the project. It meets at least three times a year, and is responsible for setting and overseeing</p> <p>new:</p> <p>NREN PC</p> <p>,</p> <p>which consists of appointed representatives from each partner in the project. It is</p>	<p>ok</p> <p>VN: OK</p>	changed

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					network and project		
19	TL	95	ed		<p>now:</p> <p>TSG</p> <p>Technical Steering group, as introduced in this document</p> <p>OT</p> <p>Operational team, as introduced in this document</p> <p>new:</p> <p>TSG</p> <p>eduGAIN Technical Steering Group, as defined in section 2.2</p> <p>OT</p> <p>eduGAIN Operational Team, as defined in section 2.3</p>	<p>ok</p> <p>VN: OK</p>	changed
20	GW	95	ge	"Home Organisation" definition	...A Home Organization refers to a home organisation that has opted to participate within eduGAIN by requesting the home organisations Participant Federation to expose the home	No. It isn't enough that home organisation opts. The Home Federation may find that the home organisation does not qualify to eduGAIN (see section	"a Home Organisation refers to a home organisation who is a Member of a Participant Federation and whose Identity Provider the Participant Federation has exposed to

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					organisations metadata	6). VN: Make use of the eduGAIN service?	eduGAIN.”
21	TW	95	ge	<p>We dont think it will be OK with the restriction: “one IdP per Home Organisation”</p> <p>An organisation might operate many IdPs, for example one per LOA-level.</p> <p>Home Organisation</p> <p>The organisation to which an End user is affiliated and that is responsible for setting up and operating identity providers for its users.</p> <p>In this document Home Organisation refers to a home organisation who has an Identity Provider a Participant Federation has exposed to eduGAIN</p>	Clarify that many IdPs per organization is accepted.	ok VN: I think many IdPs per org should be allowed (or not regulated in the policy)	“Home Organisation is responsible for setting up and operating either one or more Identity Providers,...”
22	TW	95	ed	Identity Provider:	IdP shall be in plural	ok	See CONS-21

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				... refers to the IdPs ..		VN: OK	
23	TW	95	ge	As earlier mentioned	A SP controls the access to services _and resources_ , ...	no VN: As discussed before, should what shall we use, “services” or “services and resources”	See CONS-10
24	NH	95	ge	Whilst ‘home organisation’ does have an explicit use within the data protection profile, the 6 instances in which it is used within this document would make no material difference if ‘IdP’ was referred to instead. Adds complexity without reason.	Remove ‘home organisation’ as a definition and use IdP throughout.	No. IdP is a computer that the Home Organisation can outsource. Practice has shown that making the difference between IdP and Home Organisation reduces confusion. VN: Agree, there is a difference between Home Org and IdP.	Proposed changes not done
25	EH	95	ed	Participant federation has been granted	There is not really a granting procedure	See CONS-17 VN: OK, A Federation that makes part of eduGAIN.. Difficult to express in English...	See CONS-17
26	EH	95	ed	Identity provider	Is it a organisation or a server, unclear in the documeny	The document defines IdP clearly as “A server acting in an Identity Provider role as defined in SAML 2.0 specifications.” VN: Replace “A servcer“ with “An entity acting as an	No changes done

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						Identity...”?	
27	EH	95	ed	Home organisation last sentence	Whose IP s part of a participating Federation	<p>Let’s add that the Home Organization needs to be a member of the Participant Federation.</p> <p>“In this document, a Home Organisation refers to a home organisation who is a member of a Participant Federation and whose Identity Provider the Participant Federation has exposed to eduGAIN”</p> <p>VN: I think it’s clear..?</p>	See CONS-20
28	GW	96	ed	”Terms” section doesn’t expand ‘GEANT’		<p>ok. Expand GEANT.</p> <p>VN: OK</p>	Changed
29	TL	100	ge		<p>now:</p> <p>1.3. Goal</p> <p>The goal of eduGAIN is to support the constituency of National Research and Education Networks by operating a confederation interconnecting Participant</p>	<p>see CONS-9.</p> <p>“The goal of eduGAIN is to support the constituency of National Research and Education Networks by providing a service which enables federations to interfederate.”</p>	“The goal of eduGAIN is to support the constituency of National Research and Education Networks by operating providing a service confederation which enables federations to interconnecting inter-federate.”

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					<p>Federations.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>1.3. Goal</p> <p>The goal of eduGAIN is to support the constituency of National Research and Education Networks by operating a confederation which enables the Participant Federations to inter-federate.</p>	VN: agree, see above	
30	NH	101	ge	Not all federations are run and organised by NRENs.	Change the goal of eduGAIN to include federations NOT run by NRENs.	<p>Not OK. GEANT is linked to NRENs (“the pan-European data network dedicated to the research and education community”). eduGAIN is linked to GEANT. Thus, it is fair to say the goal of eduGAIN is to support the constituency of NRENs. Still the Constitution leaves the door open for federations not operated by NRENs, see section 3.1.</p> <p>VN: Hmm.. I’ll look into this</p>	No changes done.
31	EH	104	ed	Governing bodies	Not defined	The three bodies are defined in 2.1-2.3.	No changes done.

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						VN: OK, right, but I think it comes out of the context below..	
32	TL	113	ge	<p>what does this mean 'other tasks defined in the Policy.' specifically?</p> <p>If anything gets added to the constitution, this bullet list can be expanded, so only supplementing profiles could include further tasks since the declaration shall not be changed at all.</p>	<p>How about:</p> <p>Other tasks delegated to the NREN PC in supplementing profiles.</p>	<p>OK. Cross-check that the bullet list is exhaustive and anything isn't hidden in other parts of the Constitution</p> <p>VN: Could it be: Other tasks not mentioned otherwise in the policy? The NREN PC is after all the highest one of the all..</p>	Added exhaustive list of NREN PC's responsibilities and "other tasks delegated to the NREN PC in supplementing profiles"
33	TL	115	ge	<p>Why do we need a two year term for the TSG? That is ongoing and delegates get replaced once a Participant Federation wishes to. Should we also require a name of a deputy delegate per Participant Federation?</p>		<p>A good management practice is to force organizations to regularly make an active step to refresh the name.</p> <p>ok for deputy.</p> <p>VN: Two year is OK, but if a federation wishes to replace someone within the two years they should be free to do so..</p>	Added deputy delegates to TSG.
34	EH	116	ge	<p>Tasks of TSG should be better</p>		<p>Described in 2.2. Make sure that the list is exhaustive. At</p>	Exhaustive list added.

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				descripted		least branding instructions are missing in the list.	
35	AS	122	ge	Does "daily technical issues in eduGAIN," involve running, developing, and fixing bugs in the MDS service?		yes VN: Yes, they run a service. They might (will) outsource the actual programming, but they gather comments on the MDS.	No changes done
36	EH	125	ge	Task Leader ?		We don't know yet the eduGAIN service organization when the project ends in 4/2013. Referring to the Task Leader's successor is best we can have at the moment. VN: Something needs to nominate the OT..	No changes done
37	SC	134	ge	More a question: is it necessary to restrict participation to federations that represent education/research? If a commercial or govt federation agreed to the relevant terms and technical profile, why exclude them?		What GEANT says in general on who can use its services? There are no commercial companies in Geant network, are the? VN: When a federation run by a non NREN comes and wants to participate in eduGAIN, lets have a discussion with the NREN PC then.. And lets for	See CONS-9

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						now focus on what we have.	
38	AS	134	ge	From what I can tell, eduGAIN is open for both lower education and e-gov and commercial providers both in and outside Europe? Is that correct?		<p>“Must represent primarily research and education”</p> <p>Lower education yes. Civil servants and citizens no, unless they form just a minority in the Participant Federation</p> <p>Higher education and research outside GEANT network: if NREN PC decides so</p>	See CONS-9
39	GW	134	ge	Insert ‘the interests’ so as to broaden the scope.	... which primarily represent the interests organisations of education and research sector in a certain country	Follows from CONS-9	See CONS-9
40	EH	135	ed	Home organisations	Identity providers ?	No. Computers don’t sort out technical issues, organisations do.	No changes done.
41	TL	139	ge		now: have an appropriate mechanism to ensure that only Identity and Service Providers conforming to the Policy are exposed to eduGAIN. As a	ok. Do we need to clarify that, for policy enforcement purposes, the Home Federation may need to refuse to expose an Entity to eduGAIN	“have an appropriate mechanism to ensure that only Entities which have been opted in by a Member and which are in conformance with the Policy Framework are exposed to

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					clarification, Participant Federations do not have to expose all their Providers to eduGAIN. new: have an appropriate mechanism to ensure that only Entities which opted-in and are in conformance with the Policy are exposed to eduGAIN.	VN: OK.	eduGAIN”
42	GW	139	ge	Re-inforce to opt-in concept	...only Identity and Service Providers that opted to participate in eduGAIN and conforms to the Policy	see CONS-41	see CONS-41
43	NH	143	ge	Good practise for any contractual arrangement	Introduce some timelines around how long it will take an application to be processed.	No. This document merely defines eduGAIN’s governance and Participant Federations obligations and rights. There are other documents for operational issues.	No changes done.
44	TL	145	ed		now: 1. To apply for membership, the applicant Federation signs the inter-federation declaration and presents it to OT.	ok.	To apply for membership, the applicant Federation signs the eduGAIN Policy Declaration and presents it to the OT. OT confirms that the applicant Federation fulfils the

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					<p>2. OT confirms that the applicant Federation fulfils the requirements above.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>1. To apply for membership, the applicant Federation signs the eduGAIN Policy Declaration and presents it to OT.</p> <p>2. OT confirms that the applicant Federation fulfils the requirements in section 3.2.</p>		requirements in section 3.2.
45	EH	145	ed	Inter-federation declaration ?		see CONS-44	see CONS-44
46	EH	147	ge	What are the procedures to check that the requirement are met		see lines 43-45 of the Policy	no changes done
47	NH	149	ge	Creates an unnecessarily bureaucratic third level that is costly and unsustainable.	Allow the OT to submit proposal to NREN PC directly, not through TSG.	vc 14.9: both steps necessary VN: We want to avoid shuffling things to the NREN PC, if TSG fails to solve the question at hand... then they have to raise it.	no changes done
48	EH	152	ed		If a applicant is approved OT takes	ok	"if an applicant is approved the OT takes the necessary technical steps to register the Federation to eduGAIN. "

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
49	TL	155	ed		<p>now:</p> <p>Membership in a Federation that is a Participant Federation in eduGAIN confederation does not imply any right of communication between any particular Identity Provider and Service Provider. An individual Participant Federation or Home Organisation MAY decide not to communicate with a Service Provider registered to eduGAIN. An individual Participant Federation or Service Provider MAY decide not to communicate with an Identity Provider registered to eduGAIN.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>For an Entity registered in an eduGAIN Participant Federation it does not imply any right of communication with any other Entity exposed to eduGAIN. An individual Participant Federation or Home</p>	ok	<p>“For an Entity registered in an eduGAIN Participant Federation it does not imply any right of communication with any other Entity exposed to eduGAIN.”</p>

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					<p>Organisation MAY decide not to communicate with a Service Provider exposed to eduGAIN. An individual Participant Federation or Service Provider MAY decide not to communicate with an Identity Provider exposed to eduGAIN.</p>		
50	EH	155	ge		Membership of edugain does not imply	See CONS-49	see CON S-49
51	NH	157	ge	Adds no additional meaning or necessary context to the process.	Remove lines.	No. Necessary clarification.	No changes done
52	EH	159	ge	Not to communicate ?		eduGAIN is a service which enables Participant Federations to interfederate. To make a contrast with this general goal, the word “not” is used here.	No changes done
53	TL	162	ed		<p>now: it MUST notify its own members with sufficient notice to allow them to make alternative arrangements with any Identity and Service Providers in other Participant</p>	<p>First Entity: no. You notify organisations, not computers. Second Entity: ok.</p>	<p>“it MUST notify its own Members with sufficient notice to allow them to make alternative arrangements with Entities which other Participant Federations expose to eduGAIN, ”</p>

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					<p>Federations,</p> <p>new</p> <p>it MUST notify its own Entities with sufficient notice to allow them to make alternative arrangements with Entities which other Participant Federations exposed to eduGAIN,</p>		
54	EH	164	ge	Should the notice be in a written form		add "written notice"	"it MUST give a one months written notice to OT"
55	TL	166	ge		<p>Section 3.6 Policy violation.</p> <p>It must also be mentioned that the OT informs all other Participating Federations on their actions taken as described in lines 172-174. Based on such information, Participating Federations could already plan or take own measures if deemed necessary.</p>	ok. add "issues a notice to TSG" in all cases	added "issue a notice to the TSG"
56	EH	172	ge	There should always be a notice to the TSG		ok. see CONS-55	see CONS-55

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
57	GW	173	ed	The word 'suspend' is more appropriate in place of 'quarantine'	Propose to NREN PC a temporary period of suspension	ok	changed
58	EH	174	ge	Does the NREN PC takes the decision ?		yes. It is obvious from lines 175-176	Added "approving Participant Federation's disqualification or temporary suspension of eduGAIN membership in case of Policy Framework violation, as defined in section 3.6, to 2.1."
59	EH	175	ge	There is no decision yet		The decision to appeal is the one made by TSG (lines 172-174), not the one made by NREN PC.	no changes done
60	DL	181	ge	I find the statement under "Attribute Profile" too strict, as it can be read as a requirement to specify syntax and semantics for *all* attributes suitable to be exchanged between eduGAIN-registered IdPs and SPs.	I'd propose a more lightweight approach, in the spirit of the following text: "To promote interoperability, it is important that Home Organisations and Service Providers have a common definition of the basic attributes exchanged in eduGAIN. This covers both the syntax and semantics, including the vocabularies. A	ok. The last sentence from CONS-62.	"To promote interoperability, it is important that Members have a common definition of the basic attributes exchanged in eduGAIN. This covers both the syntax and semantics, including the vocabularies. A listing of these attributes and a common definition for them will be covered in a supplementary profile."


Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					listing of these attributes and a common definition for them will be covered in the Policy."		
61	TW	182	ge	<p>Common definitions of attributes seems to strong to us. Something with harmonized is more realistic. Perhaps something like "edugain defines attributes which each federation has to describe how they relate to".</p> <p>Is this mandatory? Would prefer that eduGAIN defines best practice</p>	Clarify if this is mandatory or best practice	<p>see CONS-60.</p> <p>The intention is that the attribute profile is RECOMMENDED.</p>	See CONS-60
62	TL	183	ed		<p>now:</p> <p>A common definition of attributes will be covered in the Policy.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>A common definition of attributes will be covered in a supplementing profile.</p>	ok	See CON S-60

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
63	TL	189	ed		<p>now:</p> <p>Guidelines and instructions assisting Home Organisations and Service Providers will be covered in the Policy.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>Guidelines and instructions assisting Entities will be covered in a supplementing profile.</p>	ok	“Guidelines and instructions assisting Members will be covered in a supplementary profile”
64	NH	190	ed	Clarity required.	‘the Policy’ does this mean to actually refer to the Data Protection Profile rather than a policy? Needs reference.	see CONS-63	See CONS-63
65	SC	193	ge	Seems premature given ongoing discussions in multiple venues to make any branding specific to eduGAIN a SHOULD, especially for SPs.	At least relax to MAY or probably just a non-normative “may”.	<p>No, current wording is already relaxed. TSG providing the instructions is OPTIONAL, if TSG can’t agree on the instructions, then they will never appear. If they appear, referencing them in the Constitution just gives them a stronger position.</p> <p>The intention was to make this a placeholder for “eduID”. The intention is not to make</p>	No changes done

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						 the brand this section refers to.	
66	NH	193	ge	There is absolutely nothing to be gained by suggesting there may be branding at the eduGain level and this will put off participants despite the suggestion that this is only 'SHOULD'	Remove section.	see CONS-65	See CONS-66
67	EH	193	ge	Instructions or requirements ?		Taking into account CONS-65 and CONS-66, the more relaxed "instructions" is better.	No changes done
68	GW	196	ed	DANTE abbreviation not explained, neither is the relationship between GEANT and DANTE		explain relationship of Dante and Geant VN: Something as pointing to respective websites should be OK.	Added to section 1.2. Terms
69	TW	200	ed	Change to and add clarification:	Participant Federations MUST ensure that each identity issued by an Identity Provider is issued to an individual. This means that an individual can be known under more than one identity, but each identity is always issued to ONE individual and an identity can never be shared	vc 6.9 adopted weaker formulation: "Home Organisations that expose Identity Providers to eduGAIN MUST have the technical and organisational means to match exposed identities to individual End Users."	"Home Organisations that expose Identity Providers to eduGAIN MUST have the technical and organisational means to match exposed identities to individual end users."

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					between many individuals.		
70	NH	200	ge	Clarity sought	How are federations expected to achieve this when identity policies are tied to Identity Providers, not the federation? This would require explicit changes to the UK federation policy.	OT checks that the federation can enforce it when it joins eduGAIN.	See CONS-69
71	EH	200	ge	ensure		see CONS-69	See CONS-69
72	SC	204	ge	Requiring that data be "up to date" is nice in theory but fairly vague in practice. How current does it have to be? What if something very useful isn't guaranteed to be current, but the consequences of it being wrong are minor?	Suggest that the requirement be relaxed to making information on the currency and quality of date being documented publically by the organization, or that a more specific requirement be created that would be testable.	we didn't want to make an explicit interpretation to "up-to-date", because it just opens loopholes. The interpretation of this is left to Participant Federations and OT. On the other hand, we didn't want to expect Service Providers to check any Home Organisations' documents, because there may be hundreds of Home Organisations.	No changes done
73	TL	204	ed		now: Further guidelines on authentication and user information quality will be	ok	changed

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
					<p>covered in the Policy.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>Further guidelines on authentication and user information quality will be covered in a supplementing profile.</p>		
74	TL	209	ed	<p>What does eduGAIN operations mean? It surely should not imply that services operated by Participating Federations are part of eduGAIN operations. Otherwise DANTE could not just agree with OT on audits :-)</p>	<p>now:</p> <p>DANTE agrees with OT on audits of the eduGAIN operations.</p> <p>new:</p> <p>DANTE agrees with OT on audits of eduGAIN operations like the centrally provided services and related processes.</p>	ok	<p>“The OT proposes a plan for audits of eduGAIN operations like the centrally provided services and related processes, which is accepted or amended by the TSG.”</p>
75	EH	209	ge	<p>The position of dante is not clear</p>		<p>Should this be moved to TSG?</p> <p>VN: I think not, Dante is a legal body with whom, at some future date, the eduGAIN OT might have a formal contract with.</p>	<p>See CONS-74</p>

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
76	EH	212	ge	What are the amendment procedures		See lines 219-223	No changes done
77	EH	230	ge	Why not to the TSG first		<p>VN: I think that we should reinforce the role of the TSG, so I agree to re-discuss this.</p> <p>vc 14.9: To be effective, any complaints on OT should be communicated to the one that nominates OT.</p>	“If the Participant Federation is not satisfied with OT and its resolution, a Participant Federation should bring the issue to the attention of the eduGAIN Task Leader or successor”
78	EH	232	ge	Constitution change		<p>Couldn't understand the comment</p> <p>VN: I think it should be “a change in the constitution...”</p>	No changes done

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial