GROUPS

👥 SHORT SUMMARY OF WHAT WE DID

Conf 2020 - Future Plans beyond repeaters

- Nested, creating a hierarchy.
- Related, creating a network.
- Protected by access restrictions.
- Governed by one or more policies.
- Process-driven by a workflow.

Requirement: Federated, hosted on multiple servers

Mentions: https://sociocracy30.org   https://www.valueflo.ws

Iain said "What I'm interested in building is that since we have these chat messages now that can only be addressed to one actor, since we can send a message to that group, to a closed group usually, can send these on to the members.

I want to emphasize a distinction between followers of a group and members.

We have join and leave and there should be different ways to address these collections of people. I think these are not the same thing, following and members"

ACTIVITYPUB GROUPS

"We have vocabulary in it for this reason, make it an explicit member collection, or make it a group with public announcements, or etc have a pleroma group with only those members chatting in it [...]

you can use it as a moderated thing [...]

The group maintains all the management and trust on 1 server. Of course if that goes down the whole group goes down"

Gregory mentioned admins and if they "have the authority to delete everything, to expel members from the group, etc."

Main Action types: **Add** and **Remove** // **Join** and **Leave** – for 'Invites', the usual **Accept** and **Reject**

then threads on socialhub mainly started by implementors

Gregory, Smithereen

https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/lets-discuss-groups/519

Nick, Tavern

https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/groups-implementation/591

Dan, Pixelfed

https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/standardizing-on-activitypub-groups/1984

Gregory

in essence raised the question how it would be "compatible with Mastodon and the rest of microblogging software"
macgirvin:
"In Zap, the initial posting to a group is either a DM or wall-to-wall post. We used to use mentions (I created the Friendica implementation many years ago) but this had a number of issues when it came to privacy and permissions differences between the posting actor and the group. We had also used bang-mentions for a time which had the same issues as well as a lack of general support outside a small number of projects. Wall-to-wall also has a lack of general support but we've kept it for those using compatible software as it matches the Facebook experience.
" and says "This can only be partially solved with OCAP and really needs a replyTo field or the equivalent to work properly and that's unlikely to find widespread support on the near term." and explains openwebauth briefly.

Main problem : Interoperability with a big player

Nick

describes Tavern Use Cases and was seeking feedback for the Tavern implementation described in

https://gitlab.com/ngerakines/tavern/-/blob/master/FEDERATION.md :

Public Group

A "public group" is a group that is configured to auto-accept new followers with the "member" role.

Broadcast Group

A "broadcast group" is a group that has one central creator of activities, and many followers that are only viewers. New followers may be auto-accepted with the "viewer" role.

This is useful for:

Providing "top down" updates for projects, teams, or organizations

Working Group

A "working group" (or committee) is a group has a mix of both viewers and contributors. New followers may be auto-accepted with the "viewer" role.

This is useful for:

Public project groups where discussions are visible, but contributions limited to a select number of individuals.

Private Group

A "private group" is a group that is limited to contributors who are invited to the group. New followers are kept as "pending" until accepted, or the group may be invitation only.

Gregory says about Tavern proposal: "Sending an `Update{Collection}` is never a good idea. Imagine there's a group with 50k members. Do you really expect all other instances to refetch the entire collection and diff it with their local copy every time someone joins or leaves? It's much better to avoid being vague ("something changed, go figure out") but instead forward the `Follow` and `Undo{Follow}` activities."

[nightpool

https://www.w3.org/TR/activitypub/#inbox-forwarding

How about partial updates, JSON patch ?

]

cjs says `Follow` and `Undo{Follow}` vs `Add and Remove`
needs concencus

Then above spec. updated.

Yuri, AndStatus understood it as: "**Following** an Actor means an intent to receive all activities by that Actor (Group being a type of Actor as per Activity vocabulary https://www.w3.org/TR/activitystreams-vocabulary/#actor-types 1)

Joining a Group means an intent to receive all activities sent to that Group (not by that group). Actors - members of the group may post a lot more than will be sent to the Group. So you will not receive all activities by the Group members."

aveltens
How Solid handles it
https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/groups-implementation/591/37

dessalines
Lemmy is doing it as Relay

macgirvin
Seems there are a lot of conflicting implementations
discussed in ff

Dan

Hello everyone!

We are adding federated Group support to Pixelfed! Going to be reaching out to a few projects to see if we can make our implementations compatible.

Advice and feedback is greatly appreciated!""

related FEP work

https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/fep-400e-publicly-appendable-activitypub-collections/1438

https://socialhub.activitypub.rocks/t/fep-8485-unbound-actor/2200/4

… … …

bhaugen: Am I understanding correctly that lots of different ideas about what a group is are floating around in this discussion?

Like

- An informal discussion group
- A group that you might have a defined relationship with (eg membership)

- A group that you might need permission to be a member of, or that you could be kicked out of, indicating that the group itself has some agency. So how is that agency executed?
- Another level of agency where a group take public actions as-a-group, like schedule a meeting or make an agreement to do something with another group.

etc.

Somebody mentioned Teams upthread. That's an example of a group that usually has some agency as-a-group.

How far do people want to go, in which direction? And especially how far to start with?

(P.S. I know this started out as Pixelfed groups, but I think the thread has already been hijacked by being posted in the fediverse, and here, as a standardization effort about groups-inp-general.)

hellekin: I guess the following actions should be taken to summarize this intense discussion:
- 1) Clarify what is meant by the term "group" and the scope of the discussion
- 2) Required readings, e.g., FEP 400e

—> partly ✔ now

- 3) State of implementations across participant software in this discussion