

[Link to 2021 ACAMP Wiki](#)

Title:

Advance CAMP Thurs. Oct 7, 2021

InCommon adopting the Deployment Profiles

Room - Arts + Crafts

CONVENER: Keith Wessel, JudithB, & Albert Wu

MAIN SCRIBE: Judith

ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTORS:

of ATTENDEES: 26

DISCUSSION:

[Adopt SAML 2.0 Deployment Profile](#) wiki

Keith asks for feedback:

Andrew Morgan: are the requirements going to be a problem for the integrations with Azure?

- Plan is in phases
- Some parts of the deployment profile may be too far out, affected by browser decisions
- Near term interop is just fine for shib

SLO? Did we keep the recommendation to have a URL? (We can't remember.)

Scott Cantor - the deployment profile is so ambitious, how can we adopt it.

Albert:

- Not baseline

Judith - not all requirements all at once

Scott -- if a vendor can say they are compatible with the (whole?) profile, vs vendors who are not... Yes this has been discussed.

Using the deployment profile as a guide for best practices and to adjudicate conflicts

Albert - when vendors ask how to join, we say "SAML" this profile is a place to point vendors at, with the current expectations and product roadmap items. Compatible is a good term

Any IdP in the IdP as a service will need to comply -- criteria to test and judge candidates

Judith notes the deployment profile does not mandate multilateral federation and that needs to be added by the R&E community.

Can we consider grades of compliance? In approving vendors and products, badging etc.

We're getting started with the deployment profile - there's definite possibilities for extending beyond simply the assessing agreeing with the selected parts of the profiles or not.

We are in the raising awareness phase. Do people know the profile exists?

"What does adopt mean?" and "How is it related to baseline?" need continued discussion.

Scott thinks grading is easy... Albert suggests other next steps There are gaps still for higher ed. Not just the SAML but also other elements. Other angle what are the prioritized elements? Probably complicated heuristics. People get emotionally attached to grades that overwhelms the rational assessment.

So we move on to grouping the requirements into the categories.

Many of the current or soon to adopt are things that can be enforced by metadata manager and tested.

What about the deployment profile versioning? We tried to make it future proof -- but we might have to fix things, such as browser driven changes (sad post instead of redirect aside)

The InCommon page will then adjust as the externally referenced documents change.

Current set of working documents:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1M8lvzl-yQfoiFEazKcctyssq-ziWHegqp-gbf6xtijA/edit?usp=sharing>

Some discussion about the logout part.

It remains useful for campuses to point vendors/products/platforms at the document to help discuss integration.

Folks could announce their compliance with the profile periodically

Segue to testing federation -- new working group starting up to write software spec for the testing platform.

Start with self assessment, then test.

Can you bake in an SP interop test as part of the integration? Albert thinks there are testable, non-controversial parts of the profile to support.

Framed as a helping suite vs a testing bar -- might just be motivating to SP.

What kind of tool are the TAC thinking of creating?

- Download library?
- Web interface i can run?
- Something done by the federation?

(Make Kantara host a tool)

[See Niels session on testing next time block]