eduGAIN policy comments

6nd Sep, 2010

www.edugain.org/policy

Initials	Commentator's name and contacts	In which role you have provided the comments
AS	Andreas Solberg	Comments from me personally. Not neccessarily representing UNINETT as an edugain member.
DL	Diego Lopez diego.lopez@rediris.es	
GW	Glenn Wearen (glenn.wearen@heanet.ie)	As federation operator of Edugate
NH	Nicole Harris. nicole.harris@jiscadvance.ac.uk, +44 (0)20 3006 6040.	On behalf of JISC and the UK federation.
SC	Scott Cantor (cantor.2@osu.edu)	Non-European, Shibboleth developer, shepherd of relevant standards and profiles
TL	Thomas Lenggenhager	
TW	Torbjörn Wiberg torbjorn.wiberg@adm.umu.se	Involved in policy decisions for SWAMID

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

General (GEN)

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
1	AS	1	ge	No references to saml2int, or any other saml profile.		intention was to make saml2int.org ver 0.2 an OPTIONAL profile. Problem was that saml2int isn't produced by SA3T3, so it wouldn't be appropriate to send it for comments.	We introduce a supplementary OPTIONAL "SAML 2.0 WebSSO protocol profile" document which refers to SAML2int.org.
2	AS	1	ge	Nothing that says that eduGAIN have to do with WebSSO. Nothing that says that providers should use SAML 2.0 over ID-FF1.2, is it?		The intention was to initially focus on WebSSO but leave the door open for other scenarios, too. That's the reason for making. WebSSO OPTIONAL (see GEN-1)	See GEN-1
3	AS	1	ge	Document mentions SAML 2.0 as if it was the only protocol supported, but I cannot find anywhere that SAML 2.0 is actually the required as a protocol, as a contrast to in example SAML 1.1, OpenID or InfoCard.		See GEN-1	See GEN-1
4	AS	1	ge	Document mentions Identity Providers and Service Providers, and add requirements to these roles, but it does not mention other roles; such as attribute authority.		Good comment. If we at least want to leave the door open for adding Attribute Providers and other kind of entities later, we should put that at least to the declaration which is hardest to change.	Changed Declaration to use the term Entity which refers to AAI endpoints, such as IdP, SP or AP. Constitution is more specific and requires that endpoints must have a SAML2 EntitiesDescription. If we want to extend this later, we need to update

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial

Id	Who	Line	Type	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change by the commentator	Discussion in the policy subtask	Resolution by the policy subtask
							the constitution (and, probably, the SAML2 metadata Procile which is REQUIRED).

Type: ge=general, te=technical, ed=editorial