

# REFEDS assurance vc 2017-11-20

REFEDS Assurance wg call  
20 Nov 2017 15:30-16:50 CET

Jule&Michael  
Alan  
David G  
Pål  
Tom  
Mikael

## Notes

### - SFA BCP for Active Directory

- Draft: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VRIHWTWvB1CU0yqzHNwDr\\_5FQ8oXEW1cENI90FI8PD0/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VRIHWTWvB1CU0yqzHNwDr_5FQ8oXEW1cENI90FI8PD0/edit)
- Is this really a Best Current Practice or rather a minimal requirements specification to meet the requirements of SFA? Many of the requirements are actually less than a best practice? Consider renaming (e.g. SFA baseline requirements)
- AD would be used as the verifier (i.e. the component that verifies passwords) so other applications relying on AD are out of scope
- Should the document cover also the authentication protocol to connect to the AD (the legacy protocols like NTLM that are these days deemed insecure)?
- "Passwords in transit must be protected by TLS" only when plaintext passwords are passed (normal Windows login works differently).
- strategy for managing the risk of compromised/blacklisted passwords? (e.g. password filtering)
- Remove the second table on guidelines (applications are out of scope for the document).
- generally the meeting was OK with the structure
- before the next call: update the document based on the feedback and create a similar document OpenLDAP.

### - RAF open issues

- are SFA and MFA incremental?
  - REFEDS MFA is mostly an interoperability profile with little qualitative requirements to the MFA but SFA has also qualitative requirements for the tokens (currently passwords)
  - therefore SFA and MFA are not comparable and cannot be defined to be incremental
  - this means also that Cappuccino and Espresso are not incremental
- floor value for ID vetting
  - Pål suggests to have a new ID proofing value to indicate self-asserted ID with e-mail handshake and Captcha. The value would be useful for homeless IdPs
  - the value would be weaker than verified and assumed in the hierarchy and table
  - Pål will write a draft of the text
- extend ePA-1m to cover eduPersonPrimaryAffiliation as well
  - ePPA added for consistency
- section 3 on conformance criteria: Federation metadata is accurate, complete and includes [...] MDUI information? What MDUI information exactly?
  - refined the criteria: at least one of the following contacts: admin, technical, support, security.
  - No MDUI information requires for RAF as it serves usability whereas RAF focuses on assurance

- goal is still to expose all 4 documents to a public consultation together: RAF, SFA, BCP for AD and BCP for OpenLDAP

- next call: 4 Dec 15:00 CET (to avoid clash with Sirtfi call)