Data protection good practice for Home Organisations

These are commonly approved good practices for Home Organisations based on the data protection directive. A proper attribute release module installed to the Identity Provider server may help a Home Organisation to implement this good practice. See Notes on Implementation of INFORM/CONSENT GUI Interfaces for details.
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Home Organisations may consider taking the following steps to reduce their risks

• Study the Code of Conduct for Service Providers and, based on the Home Organisation’s local risk management procedures, decide if a Service Provider’s unilateral commitment to the Code of Conduct provides the Home Organisation with sufficient guarantees for an Attribute release
  ◦ For instance, a Home Organisation may reduce its risks by releasing only non-sensitive attributes. See Introduction to Data protection directive for details on sensitive personal data.

• Ensure that the Service Provider has committed to the Data Protection Code of Conduct for Service Providers
  ◦ see Code of Conduct for Service Providers for details on the Code of Conduct
  ◦ see SAML 2 Profile for the Code of Conduct for details on SAML metadata indicating SP’s commitment
  ◦ Tools may be available to scan the Federation metadata and identify the Service Providers which have committed to the Code of Conduct.

• Ensure that the Service Provider’s Purpose of Processing is consistent with the Home Organisation’s Purpose of Processing (typically, “support Research and Instruction”).
  ◦ the Code of Conduct does not provide support to this directly
  ◦ the Entity Category SAML Entity Metadata Attribute work may assist a Home Organisation with filtering out Service Providers with a conflicting purpose of processing

• Release only Attributes that are adequate, relevant and not excessive for the Service Provider
  ◦ flagged as requested in SAML metadata (see SAML 2 Profile for the Code of Conduct for details on how this is done)
  ◦ see What attributes are relevant for a Service Provider for information and suggestions on Attribute use

• If the Service Provider requests only a particular Attribute value, release only that value and no other values
  ◦ for instance, if the Service Provider requests only eduPersonAffiliation=”member”, do not release eduPersonAffiliation=”faculty”
  ◦ for instance, if the Service Provider requests only http://xstor.com/contracts/HEd123”, do not release eduPersonEntitlement=”urn:mace:washington.edu:confocalMicroscope”
  ◦ see SAML 2 Profile for the Code of Conduct for details on SAML metadata for requesting only particular values

• Inform the end user on the Attribute release
  ◦ by providing the following information to the user when s/he is accessing a new Service Provider for the first time
    ▪ the identity of the Service Provider (mdui:DisplayName and mdui:Logo, if available, for better usability and look-and-feel)
    ▪ the purpose of processing (mdui:Description)
    ▪ a clickable link to the Service Provider’s Privacy Policy document (mdui:PrivacyStatementURL)
    ▪ for each Attribute, the Attribute name, description and value
    ▪ an easily understood label can be displayed instead of displaying several closely related Attributes (eg the various name Attributes)
  ◦ user can be provided a checkbox “don’t show this information again”. If s/he checks it, the information above is not provided next time s /he logs in to this Service Provider.
  ◦ see Notes on Implementation of INFORM/CONSENT GUI Interfaces for details and GUI recommendations on how to inform the end user

• use the data controller’s legitimate interests as the legal grounds for attribute release
  ◦ release only attributes that are flagged as NECESSARY (see SAML 2 Profile for the Code of Conduct for details on how this is done)
  ◦ see Introduction to Data protection directive for reasoning
  ◦ however, in certain jurisdiction (e.g. Switzerland) user consent may be needed for attribute release

Deferred until Phase 2 of the Code of Conduct

Note: Introduction to Code of Conduct proposes to defer support to optional extra Attributes to Phase 2.

• If the user consents to, release extra Attributes that are purely optional but provide a higher service level to the user
  ◦ flagged as REQUIRING CONSENT
  ◦ If several Attributes are released based on consent, the user MUST be able to give his/her consent individually to each Attribute or each group of similar Attributes (for instance, a user could be asked to consent to release “name”, and this single consent would allow the release of cn, sn, givenName and displayName).
  ◦ user can be provided a checkbox “remember my consent”. If s/he checks it, consent is not asked next time
  ◦ If Attribute release is based on consent, the user must be able to view and withdraw his/her previously given consents any time
- see What attributes are relevant for a Service Provider for details on the Attributes
- see SAML 2 Profile for the Code of Conduct for details on SAML metadata for flagging Attributes as necessary
- see Notes on Implementation of INFORM/CONSENT GUI Interfaces for details and GUI recommendations on how to ask user consent