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Renee Frost gave an general introduction to federations and then went on to talk about the Shibboleth based federations in particular InCommon.

There was a request from the audience for clarification of acronyms used in the presentation, in particular IPR (Intellectual Property Rights).

There was concern about attributes across different systems in particular eduPerson. There is work to develop an common set for an international eduPerson. The federal government is also looking into this. In particular the NIH is looking at a Health eduPerson, but no FedPerson is yet available.

It was pointed out that the Swiss federation was similar in scale to state university systems in their use of Shib.

An international member requested clarification of what is a 501-C3 organization. [AI] Renee said she'd include definition for international partners.

The issue of one organization belonging to several federations and each federation has differing levels of privacy. How will this be dealt with? This has been given consideration. It will be between the members to determine what is visible to the members of the federation. SAML assertions include more explicit levels of assurance and this may be used to expand this information. This is a multidimensional problem that will require experience over time to work out the best ways to deal with this. This is not just an Origin Site issue but also from Target side the question which WAYF to link to.

There was discussion about how changes at both the campus side and on the federation side would be addressed. It was noted that most likely this would be an annual process that would include reviews of fee structure, policies, and software releases. InCommon will work to avoid having frequent changes. This will be another set of procedures that will be improved as InCommon moves forward.

Question was raised about the pricing structure for origins and targets. One response was that there has been consideration about having targets within orgins to not be charged a fee. But, it is expected that service providers that are not part of an origin institution will be expected to pay a fee. At the same time there is a dynamic of how to provide incentives to the content / service providers or make pricing that doesn't discourage service providers.

The issue of campuses with more than one identity provider and how that would impact both fees and federation participation was discussed. An example of an organization having 300 web sites and would they all be registered in InCommon came up. They'll have to decide. This led to a question about who would be able to be included. The question came from a state network provider, Indiana, which has relationships or supports industry,K12, state and local government resources as well as higher education. The reply was that InCommon is not limited to Internet2 members, but it is US based due to fact that privacy policies vary from country to country.