

REFEDS assurance vc 2018-06-25

REFEDS Assurance WG call to check the consultation comments
Monday 25th June at 15:30 CEST/8:30 CDT
CERN's Vidyo: <https://www.nikhef.nl/grid/video/?m=rawg>

Pål
Sami
Tom
Alan
Michael
Jule
Mikael

Notes

1. REFEDS Assurance Framework

- 10 comments received: <https://wiki.refeds.org/x/qwHoAQ>
- comments added to the Google doc: https://docs.google.com/document/d/15v65wJvRwTSQKViep_gGuEvxLI3UJbaOX5o9eLtsyBI/edit
- major comments
 - #4: clarify "pairwise IDs recommended by REFEDS"
 - decided to be forwards-leaning and adopt ePUID, subject-ID and pairwise ID for SAML and public/pairwise for OIDC
 - #1: clarify "ePPN reassign" w.r.t. other properties of ID/unique
 - to speed up adoption, keep the door open for eppn being the (only) unique id an IdP can provide
 - Tom to suggest a logic table that clarifies the CSP behaviour
 - #2, #8, #9: protests on references to external closed specs (like Kantara SAC)
 - let's find out if we can cite the relevant specs in the RAF appendix.
 - Tom to check if Kantara allows us to cite SAC directly
 - Kantara SAC now known as Kantara Classic
- minor comments
 - #10: the commentator appears to have misunderstood the ePA-1m and ePA-1d concepts.
 - Mikael to find out a wording that would be more clear on the difference on the business and IT decision
 - #10: should we replace 30 days by 31 days so "one month" will qualify also for months with 31 days?
 - Adopted
 - #3: Sirtfi proposed for conformance criteria (in the 2017 consultation the WG already rejected this)
 - Stick to the previous decision. Respect the orthogonality of RAF and Sirtfi
 - #5: espresso missing from the example in Appendix B
 - Adopted proposal
 - #6: Appendix C has become irrelevant after dropping authN from RAF
 - Adopted proposal
- thanks to Ian Young for style/grammar corrections

2. SFA profile

- received 4 comments: <https://wiki.refeds.org/display/CON/Consultation%3A+REFEDS+SFA+Profile>
- <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZjpzyYWZhqjbTelzxX9Vug9Whqb9YEK29e1FBjL5VM/edit#>
- #1: rephrase the introduction section to be more explicit on the intention w.r.t. NIST 800-63.
- #4: changed bullet lists to numbered lists
- #3: make the definitions more clear (including memorized secrets are supposed to be user selected)
- #2: provide exemplar

Next steps: Monday 2 July at 15:30 CEST/8:30 CDT