

The latest draft 2022 CTAB Work Plan is here: [draft 2022 CTAB Work Plan](#)

## Deferred Work Plan Items

These items were considered for the 2022 Work Plan but were deferred to the future.

*Deferment isn't an indicator of importance (or lack thereof). Instead, factors such as clarity of problem definition and CTAB's ability to meaningfully move forward on an item in 2022 play significant roles in decision making.*

## The Future of Federation (Federation 2.0)

---

### Actions/Outcomes

- Embed that vision and goals in a vision of federation more broadly, to understand the context in which BE evolution has its impact. Alternatively, coordinate this work with the other community advisory groups.

Proxies and “Categories” of federation membership **Suggestion:**

Defer until new actors (other than IdP, SP, Federation Operator) in the federation trust model are fully defined. Absent new actors in the model, there is no reason to pre-emptively change policy.

TAC is spinning up discovery work to identify potential new actors. Interested CTAB members should consider participating the TAC work under way.

For now, strike this item from 2022 CTAB work plan

### How do we handle SPs (proxies or not) that have different needs for attribute bundles or entity categories for different parts of the SP?

---

Is this technically feasible in SAML? TAC is also talking about this.

**Suggestion:**

Defer. This doesn't feel like a CTAB item, more a SAML mechanics matter.

## Adapting Federation participation eligibility and model to new needs

---

<description>Communities need new ways to work with federation. Does our current participation model adequately represent these needs so that everyone can participate and meet BE?</>

InCommon currently defines three types of eligible organizations for participation: Higher Education, Research Organization, and Sponsored Partners. As the federation grows, new types of organizations, or parts of organizations, have expressed interest to join our community. Is it time to revisit our participation eligibility and model, and consequently adjust our procedures and support tooling to better meet today's needs?

|                                                                                             |                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CTAB Lead/Liaison</b>                                                                    |                                                             |
| <b>Interested Parties</b><br>add your name to the right if you are interested in this topic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•</li><li>•</li></ul> |
| <b>Format</b>                                                                               | <b>Suggestion:</b><br><b>Defer.</b>                         |

### Actions / Expected Outcome

- Survey institutions for appetite for membership categories entailing more or fewer requirements
- Devise/explore membership categories that do not reduce trust & assurance among participants

## Mini-federations or proxies to bring in additional light-resourced organizations into InC?

---

<description>community need new ways to work with federation. Does our current participation model adequately represent these needs so that everyone can participate and meet BE?</>

This is very similar as above, but opposite direction?

|                           |                                                                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CTAB Lead/Liaison</b>  |                                                                     |
| <b>Interested Parties</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• David B</li><li>•</li></ul> |

|                                                                |                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| add your name to the right if you are interested in this topic |                    |
| <b>Format</b>                                                  | Suggestion: Defer. |

## Actions / Expected Outcome

- Outcome 1
- Outcome 2
- Outcome 3

## “Trust Mark” for products/services meeting community requirements for participants to gauge interoperability?

<description>community needs new ways to work with federation. Does our current participation model adequately represent these needs so that everyone can participate and meet BE? This could be a great way to encourage adoption of aspirational features beyond baseline.</>

|                                                                                             |                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>CTAB Lead/Liaison</b>                                                                    |                                                                |
| <b>Interested Parties</b><br>add your name to the right if you are interested in this topic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |
| <b>Format</b>                                                                               | Suggestion: Defer. Possibly should be lead from TAC or CACTI   |

Entity Categories and attribute release with Proxies

Consultation on potential next phase of Baseline Expectations

Some aspects of MFA signaling?

Support of new entity categories (anon, pseudonymous, personalized)

---

- 

Subject Identifier and Pairwise Identifier to facilitate scaling and trust (?)

---

Enhancing trust and assurance beyond Baseline Expectations