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Context

Fragile contexts:

There are 1.5 billion people living in fragile context in 2015; 50% are under age of 20.

UNESCO, 2015: there are 121 child who dropped out of school or never started in the first place.

Education provide marginalized people and minorities with access to opportunities and equality (UNESCO)

Lack of documentation challenge to access (IIE and University of California Davis)

Examples of government adopted digital identity: Aadhaar-India (Public service duplication), Estonia (Legal representation)

SDGs goals (2.4 billion without legal identification)
Global Portable Digital Identity (GPDI)

Problem: Access to Education

People’s Lack of Documentation in disaster Areas

Global Portable Digital Identity

K12 Students
- Registered in UNHCR data
- Not residing in camp nor have UNHCR registry

University Students
- With Academic Digital Existence
- No Academic registry: With Social Media Existence

Users

Global Portable Digital Identity for Access to Education

Two Services
- Global Identity Platform Services
- Vetting Services

Current Focus
Challenges:

- Recognizing and determining the person’s identity in the digital space and whether the person recognized digitally is the same in reality. (R&E Federated Identity Approach)

- Privacy, security and stewardship

- Value proposition and universities prioritization.
Questions

• Who, to your knowledge, in the community is currently working on addressing the issue we stated?

• What is achievable today considering the many restraints?

• How do you see collaboration in the aspect of managing GPDI?
Thank You

For further questions reach out to:

Asmaa AbuMezied
Research Fellow, Internet2
amezied@internet2.edu
InCommon:
Coming Out of the Garage
Post eduGAIN

- Retooling of the pipeline because of variability and our assumptions
- Most IdPs in eduGAIN. Few SPs
- Early returns are that IdP have 1) lack of knowledge or 2) hesitation
- Metadata delivery
- Free flow of tags. Moving from a constrained policy to open one and our role as a FO
- Education, education, education
Steward Program

- State-based RENs to manage trust relationship with K12 and Community Colleges

- Builds distributed model we can scale to provide support and trust

- Open for comment
Community Trust

- Sirtfi Proof of concept
- Baseline Expectations
- US Government-certified InCommon Assurance Program Review
Hardening Operations

- Federation Manager code and UI/UX review
- Instituting lightweight change management
- Jumping into the TIER Dev/Ops wagon
- Planning for Per-entity delivery
- Instituting service management concepts and approaches with scoped implementation of ServiceNow
- Scaling our processes and move toward automation
Normalizing the Institution

TIER Demos
And the story extends to the community…

- Last strategic planning was 2009
- Community survey will be going out shortly
- Working with community leaders on Paths Forward for sustainable funding
- Need to get funding up to enable us to retool and refresh the plan
InCommon Path Forward Conclusions

Federation IdP Participants need to be committed to adherence of common interoperability, security, and trust practices. This is more important than lowering baseline standards in order to encompass participants not motivated by this principle.

InCommon Federation is a strategic Internet2 asset. It needs to be seen as an integrated asset to the Internet2 mission, the LLC structure should be examined.

The fee structure must be changed to reflect 1) the mission criticality of the federation and corresponding benefit, 2) deep understanding of the costs to sustain the mission and 3) mitigating risks to InCommon's trustworthy operation (including Shibboleth).

Shibboleth Federating Software is inadequately funded yet is a core element of the InCommon Federation. Evolution and scaling the federation can only occur when they evolve together, such as support for OpenId Connect.
InCommon Path Forward Conclusions

The value proposition for InCommon IdPs is decreased when vendors fail to fully support InCommon standards. For example, what is or should there even be a process for NET+ contracts to opt out of InCommon compatibility? The reverse is also true: the value proposition for SPs is decreased when IdPs don't support InCommon standards.

The federation's ability to scale and sustain depends only partly on technology. Substantial and sustained effort is required to understand the interests, and then strategically align the practices, of communities of IdP and SP Participants with InCommon's mission.
Need to Effect Innovation and Change

Hardest problem we have is to effect change at the IdP and SP level

Biggest asset we have is our ability to innovate to solve an R&E problem and effect change over time

How can we enable the community to drive it directly and get FedOps out of the way?
It’s a different world...

- “Market” funded
- Focus on service providers
- Encourage community development on a federation substrate and sandbox
- Scale outreach, education and communication
- Scale community requests and decision making
- Move from community-driven federation decisions to community-informed federation decisions, from people to roles