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 neccessarily representing UNINETT as an edugain member.
DL	Diego Lopez diego.lopez@rediris.es	
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

Declaration (DECL)

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	17	ed		Instead of 'Federation A' used several times in the declaration, better use the term 'FEDERATION' in capital letters which you define at the top of the document as short name for the Federation on which behalf an NREN signs this declaration. Not many federations will be able to sign on its own behalf since they have no separate legal standing.	I'll have a look at associating the name of the federation with the signature at the bottom of the document. Note that an NREN could potentially operate more than one federation (at one stage it was suggested that we run separate federations for schools and HE/FE), so both the signer and the federation need to be identified	See the attached new document version
2	TW	19	ed	In general OK. Q1: What does "in respect of other federations" mean? Q2: "it is aware" should it be "will comply with"?	Could line 19-21 be replaced with a simple sentence like: "Our federation wishes to join edugain. We are aware of that it involves complying with the edugain policy with adjoining documents."	Q1. The wording has to be clear that the statements in the declaration only apply to other eduGAIN members, not to the whole world. Q2. Not sure if either option is right: I'll need to check whether the Constitution is actually something you can "comply" with. But it probably needs to be	

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

Comment [ML1]: ok

Comment [ML2]: ok

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
						stronger than “aware”, I agree.	
3	TW	19	ed		lines 19-71: Harmonise the use of "It" and "Federation A"	Replacing “it” by “this Federation” throughout will make it awfully clunky to read ☹	
4	TW	22	ed		Merge line 22-28 into one bullet point.	We did try to write it as a single point, but it turned out to be almost unintelligible!	
5	TL	27	ed	The term 'member' is NOT defined in this context. Isn't 'institution' or 'organization' more appropriate? E.g. in the SWITCHaai federation we have federation partners, which are NOT members. They operate SPs which could be eligible for interfederation as well.		We discussed this earlier. I’d much prefer to stick to the term “member”, and add a note to say that this includes other types of membership. I think the critical thing is that the organization has signed an agreement under which the federation operator validates and publishes their metadata.	
6	TL	30	ed		instead of 'members' use here 'Entities'.	If you mean line 31, that *is* member, not entity. Entities don’t have discretion!	
7	TW	30	ed	What is the purpose and scope of line 30-41? Can they be	Can they be merged or removed?	Bullet 3 is there to set the expectation that federations will normally publish metadata they	

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

Comment [ML3]: Agreed, the current binding of the Policy Declaration to the rest of the Policy Framework is a bit weak. There were also comments that, to avoid misunderstandings, the structure of the policy framework should be defined here, too. For instance, “is aware/complies/… to the eduGAIN Policy Framework, which consists of this Policy Declaration, Constitution and supplementary profiles.

Comment [ML4]: I think DECL-1 solves this

Comment [ML5]: ok

Comment [ML6]: ok. as agreed in vc 6th Sep

Comment [ML7]: agreed!

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
				merged or removed?		receive. Bullet 4 requires federations not to leave out of date metadata in their export. Bullet 5 requires federations to let people know if they change their validation processes. Bullet 6 requires federations to help each other. All needed, I think.	
8	TW	31	ed	Line 31: member: We assume it means member organisation, should this be clarified? Member with capital M?		Member with capital M	
9	TL	34	ge	The reference to 'inform other Participating Federations promptly' implies that I have to actively inform all other federations promptly on changes. However, the changed information gets promptly published at awell known location. eduGAIN and others must fetch it from there. I cannot influence how promptly they do it.		The requirement would be to make sure that the central place is updated promptly. If others don't check it there then that's their problem.	

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

Comment [ML8]: ok

Comment [ML9]: ok. cross-check the other capitals, too. e.g. lines 24,52

Comment [ML10]: ok. Would following wording avoid this misunderstanding: "It will make the information on any subsequent changes to previously published Entity descriptions promptly available to other Participant Federations"

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
10	TL	37	ge	The same as above. No direct information of participating federations.		Answer same as above	
11	AS	42	ge	"It will provide such documentation and agreements as may be necessary to demonstrate compliance with eduGAIN's basic level of trust and, where appropriate, such documentation and agreements as may be required to support enhanced levels of trust." What is basic level of trust?		I thought there was going to be a minimum standard for, e.g. entity validation and LoA? Isn't there?	
12	GW	43	ge	Scope could be wide enough to be interpreted as an audit	Add "As a clarification, such requests will not require an audit of Federation A."	No. It says specifically "provide documents and information". There's no requirement to let auditors ask questions.	
13	TW	43	ge	To who shall a federation present documentation? Other federations or eduGAIN Operations Team?		It's part of the joining process, I thought?	

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

Comment [ML11]: as above

Comment [ML12]: The "basic level of trust" hides mostly in the section 6. of the constitution, which sets the LoA requirements for IdPs. However, depending how you define "trust" here, also section 3.2 sets requirements which Participant Federations need to address. 4.1. sets requirements on attributes, 5.1. on branding. Would it be appropriate to say "…basic level of trust as defined in the Constitution"?
vc 14.9: we don't want to put additional requirements to entity validation in the basic level of trust

Comment [ML13]: OK.

Comment [ML14]: yes, covered in 3.3. of Constitution. Does a Federation need to present them also to another federation on request?

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
14	TL	44	ge	A reference should point to where 'eduGAIN's basic level of trust' gets defined.		Indeed. Where is it?	
15	TL	47	ed		Replace 'member' with 'Entity'.	No. The Member (organization) and Entity (computer) are different.	
16	TL	51	ed		Replace twice 'member' with 'Entity'.	No. Member is correct here.	
17	TW	51	ed	"complaint about a member"	should be: "complaint about a member and/or entity"	You can't complain about a computer, only about a member.	
18	TL	57	ed		Replace 'members' with 'Entities'.	No. Member is correct	
19	TL	60	ed		Replace 'membership' with 'participation'.	No. Membership is correct, and "participation" could bring in lots of other people – individual users, for example!	
20	TL	61	ed		Replace 'members' with 'Entities'.	No. Member is correct	
21	TL	68	ed		Replace twice 'members' with 'Entities'.	No. Member is correct	

Comment [ML15]: see DECL-11

Comment [ML16]: ok

Comment [ML17]: ok

Comment [ML18]: ok

Comment [ML19]: ok

Comment [ML20]: ok

Comment [ML21]: ok

Comment [ML22]: ok

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
22	TL	70	ge	Here suddenly the term 'eduGAIN Operations Team' shows up which was not mentioned beforehand.	Shouldn't it also be mentioned in 5) regarding validity and the publishing process and in 6) regarding the assistance a federation has to provide?	Agreed for 5 (and 4, actually). But I'd have thought we wanted debugging of problems and policy breaches to go direct between federations, rather than via the Operational Team?	
23	TL	70	ed		Replace 'members' with 'Entities'.	No. Members is correct.	

Comment [ML23]: should it be "Operational Team as defined in the constitution"? Currently, the constitution uses Operational Team, by the way.

Comment [ML24]: OT is the one that can react to policy violation, as defined in 3.6 of the Constitution.
But do we need to define the exact debugging process in Declaration, the most high-level document that eduGAIN has?

Comment [ML25]: ok

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