

1 Pseudonymous Access Entity Category

2 Overview

3 Research and Education Federations are invited to use the REFEDS Pseudonymous Access
4 Entity Category with their members to support the release of attributes to Service
5 Providers meeting the requirements described below.

6 The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD",
7 "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be
8 interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [BCP14].

9 This definition is written in compliance with the Entity Category SAML Entity Metadata
10 Attribute Types specification [RFC8409]; this specification may be extended to reference
11 other protocol-specific formulations as circumstances warrant.

12 An FAQ for the Entity Category has been made available to help deployments [FAQ].

13 1. Definition

14 Candidates for the Pseudonymous Access Entity Category are Service Providers that offer a
15 level of service based on proof of successful authentication and offer personalization based
16 on a pseudonymous user identifier. The Service Provider must be able to effectively
17 demonstrate this need to their federation registrar (normally the Service Provider's home
18 federation) and demonstrate their compliance with regulatory requirements concerning
19 personal data through a published Privacy Notice.

20 None of the attributes in this entity category are specifically intended to provide
21 authorization information. See section 6 for a discussion of this use case.

22 Identity Providers may indicate support for this Entity Category to facilitate discovery and
23 improve the user experience at Service Providers. Self-assertion is the typical approach
24 used, but this is not the only acceptable method.

25 2. Syntax

26 The following URI is used as the attribute value for the Entity Category and Entity Category
27 Support attributes:

28 <https://refeds.org/category/pseudonymous>

29 3. Semantics (Se)

30 By asserting a Service Provider to be a member of this Entity Category, a federation
31 registrar claims that:

- 32 • (Se1) The Service Provider has applied for membership in the Category and complies
33 with this entity category's registration criteria.
- 34 • (Se2) The Service Provider's application for using the Pseudonymous Access Entity
35 Category has been reviewed against the provided REFEDS [Guidelines] and
36 approved by the federation registrar.

37 By registering for this Entity Category, a Service Provider has agreed to the registration
38 criteria as defined in Section 4.

39 By asserting support for this Entity Category, Identity Providers are indicating that they will
40 release attributes to Service Providers that also assert this category.

41 4. Registration Criteria (RC)

42 When a Service Provider's federation registers the Service Provider in the Entity Category,
43 the federation registrar MUST perform at least the following checks:

- 44 • (RC1) The service has a proven and documented need for the pseudonymous
45 information that forms the attribute bundle for this entity category.
- 46 • (RC2) The Service Provider has committed to data minimisation and will not use the
47 attributes for purposes other than as described in their application.
- 48 • (RC3) Ensure that the service meets the following technical requirements:
 - 49 ○ (RC3.1) The Service Provider provides an `<mdui:DisplayName>`,
50 `<mdui:InformationURL>`, and `<mdui:PrivacyStatementURL>` in
51 metadata. Including an English language version (i.e., `xml:lang="en"`) is
52 RECOMMENDED.
 - 53 ○ (RC3.2) The Service Provider provides one or more contacts in metadata.

54 These are the requirements to assert this entity category; any change MUST be reported by
55 the Service Provider to the federation registrar. The federation registrar SHOULD remove
56 the Entity Category if the Service Provider can no longer demonstrate compliance with
57 these requirements.

58 5. Attribute Bundle

59 The mechanism by which this entity category provides for consistent attribute release is
60 through the definition of a set of commonly supported and consumed attributes. The
61 attributes chosen represent a privacy baseline such that further minimization achieves no
62 particular benefit for applicable services. Thus, the minimal disclosure principle is designed
63 into this category.

64 The use of the `<md:RequestedAttribute>` mechanism supported by SAML metadata is
65 outside the scope of this category, and may co-exist with it in deployments as desired,
66 subject to this specification's requirements being met.

67 5.1 Required Attributes

68 The *entity category attribute bundle* consists (abstractly) of the following data elements:

- 69 ■ *organization*
- 70 ■ *pseudonymous pairwise user identifier*
- 71 ■ *affiliation*
- 72 ■ *assurance*

73 These abstract elements are bound to protocol-specific definitions in the following
74 subsection(s) and additional bindings may be added in the future.

75 It is understood that not every subject can necessarily be associated with values for every
76 attribute. For example, some users may have no formal affiliation with the issuing
77 organization. In such cases, it is expected that those attribute(s) may not be provided. The
78 designation that all these attributes are required is a general obligation and not specific to
79 a given subject.

80 With regard to assurance, the REFEDS Assurance Framework [RAF] is REQUIRED as a source
81 of values, but other frameworks and their values are permitted. The requirement to
82 support the REFEDS Assurance Framework implies that at least one value,

83 ['https://refeds.org/assurance'](https://refeds.org/assurance) MUST be supplied, but no others are specifically required
84 unless the IdP deems them to be applicable.

85 Identity Providers are not expected or required to alter their business processes or to
86 provide any particular assurance level for their subjects, but rather are required to
87 communicate what they do provide or other applicable information as appropriate.

88 5.1.1 SAML 2.0

89 When the SAML 2.0 protocol is used, the following SAML attributes make up the required
90 attribute set defined abstractly above. In all cases, the defined `NameFormat` is
91 `urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:attrname-format:uri`

92 ■ *organization* is defined to be:

93 ○ `schacHomeOrganization` [SCHAC]

94 ■ Attribute Name: `urn:oid:1.3.6.1.4.1.25178.1.2.9`

95 ■ *pseudonymous pairwise user identifier* is defined to be:

96 ○ `pairwise-id` [SAMLSubId]

97 ■ Attribute Name:

98 `urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:attribute:pairwise-id`

99 ■ *affiliation* is defined to be:

100 ○ `eduPersonScopedAffiliation` [eduPerson]

101 ■ Attribute Name: `urn:oid:1.3.6.1.4.1.5923.1.1.1.9`

102 ■ *assurance* is defined to be:

103 ○ `eduPersonAssurance` [eduPerson]

104 ■ Attribute Name: `urn:oid:1.3.6.1.4.1.5923.1.1.1.11`

105 The specific naming and format of the attributes above is guided by the [SAMLAttr] and
106 [SAMLSubId] profiles.

107 6. Authorization

108 None of the attributes defined in Section 5 are suitable for accurately signaling access
109 authorization; signaling authorization is out of scope for this entity category. While they
110 are often used as approximations, this inevitably denies access to authorized users and
111 permits access to unauthorized users.

112 A companion document discussing the federated authorization problem and suggested
113 practices can be found at [FederatedAuthorization].

114 7. Deployment Guidance for Service Providers

115 Service Providers SHOULD rely on the bundle of attributes defined in Section 5, but MAY
116 ask for, or even require, other information as needed for additional purposes, via
117 mechanisms that are outside the scope of this specification.

118 A common example would be a requirement for indicating authorization to access a service
119 (see Section 6).

120 A Service Provider that conforms to this entity category would exhibit the following entity
121 attribute in SAML metadata:

```
<mdattr:EntityAttributes
xmlns:mdattr="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:metadata:attribute">
  <saml:Attribute
    xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion"
    NameFormat="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:attrname-format:uri"
    Name="http://macedir.org/entity-category">
    <saml:AttributeValue>https://refeds.org/category/pseudonymous</saml:AttributeValue>
  </saml:Attribute>
</mdattr:EntityAttributes>
```

122 8. Deployment Guidance for Identity Providers

123 An Identity Provider indicates support for this entity category by exhibiting the entity
124 attribute in its metadata. Such an Identity Provider MUST, for a significant subset of its user
125 population, release all required attributes in the bundle defined in Section 5 to all Service
126 Providers registered for this entity category, either automatically or subject to user consent
127 or notification, without administrative involvement by any party.

128 An Identity Provider that supports this entity category would exhibit the following entity
129 attribute in SAML metadata:

```
<mdattr:EntityAttributes
xmlns:mdattr="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:metadata:attribute">
  <saml:Attribute
    xmlns:saml="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:assertion"
    NameFormat="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:2.0:attrname-format:uri"
    Name="http://macedir.org/entity-category-support">

    <saml:AttributeValue>https://refeds.org/category/pseudonymous</saml:A
tttributeValue>
  </saml:Attribute>
</mdattr:EntityAttributes>
```

130 9. References

- 131 [BCP14] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14,
132 RFC 2119, March 1997. Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key
133 Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, May 2017. <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp14>>.
- 134 [eduPerson] REFEDS, "eduPerson," <https://refeds.org/specifications/eduperson>.
- 135 [FAQ] REFEDS, "Anonymous Authorization, Pseudonymous Authorization, and Personalized
136 Access FAQ," wiki page, <https://wiki.refeds.org/x/aQA2B>.
- 137 [FederatedAuthorization] REFEDS, "Federated Authorization Best Practices," wiki page,
138 <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/GROUPS/Federated+Authorization+Best+Practices>.
- 139 [Guidelines] REFEDS, "Requirements for Federations Operators Assessing Access-Related
140 Entity Categories," wiki page,
141 <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/ENT/Requirements+for+Federations+Operators+Assessing+>
142 [Access-Related+Entity+Categories](https://wiki.refeds.org/display/ENT/Requirements+for+Federations+Operators+Assessing+Access-Related+Entity+Categories).
- 143 [RFC8409] Young, I., Ed., Johansson, L., and S. Cantor, "The Entity Category Security
144 Assertion Markup Language (SAML) Attribute Types", RFC 8409, DOI 10.17487/RFC8409,
145 August 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8409>>.
- 146 [SAMLAttr] Internet2 MACE Directory Working Group, "MACE-Dir SAML Attribute Profiles",
147 April 2008, [https://refeds.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/internet2-mace-dir-saml-](https://refeds.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/internet2-mace-dir-saml-attributes-200804.pdf)
148 [attributes-200804.pdf](https://refeds.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/internet2-mace-dir-saml-attributes-200804.pdf).

149 [\[SAMLSubId\]](#) OASIS Committee Specification, SAMLV2.0 Subject Identifier Attributes Profile
150 Version 1.0, January 2019, [https://docs.oasis-open.org/security/saml-subject-id-
151 attr/v1.0/saml-subject-id-attr-v1.0.odt](https://docs.oasis-open.org/security/saml-subject-id-attr/v1.0/saml-subject-id-attr-v1.0.odt).

152 [\[SCHAC\]](#) REFEDS, "Schema for ACademia," <https://refeds.org/specifications/schac>.

153