InCommon Certificate Service

2017 Work Plan Review

January 10, 2018

Christopher Bongaarts, University of Minnesota

Nate Klingenstein, California State University Chancellor's Office

Paul Caskey, Internet2

Where did *this* come from?!?

with Christopher Bongaarts - University of Minnesota

Certificate Service Review Working Group

Convened in Fall 2015, anticipating vendor contract renewal

Chartered to "review and provide input on matters pertaining to the next generation InCommon Certificate Service"

Relevant deliverables:
- Community survey
- List of desired features for "next-gen" service
- Gap analysis between new features and existing service
- Recommendations for next steps

Working Group Input

Community survey issued November 2015

Current subscribers:
What works well? What needs improvement?
What new features would you like to see?

Potential future subscribers:
How can we make the service more attractive?
What obstacles prevent joining?

Survey invite distributed to InCommon Participants and cert-users mailing lists; later, Common Solutions Group invited

Survey Highlights

n=166
  20 non-subscribers
  81% RAO/DRAOs with current service

Satisfaction pretty high
  89% Satisfied or Very Satisfied (n=95)
  None dissatisfied overall

Federation/SSO for RAO/DRAOs was the only potential enhancement to garner a "high value" label from most respondents

Working Group Output

Draft report issued July 2016

Identified desired features and gaps
Priorities assigned by WG based on survey results, cert-users postings, and discussion

Recommended to keep an eye on the marketplace
Ensure we're getting good value
Vendors must continue to compete to keep our business

Working Group Output, Community Edition

Solicited community review of draft report to ensure we reasonably represented the community's needs

Used new InCommon community consultation process

No significant changes requested

Became basis for Certificate Service Work Plan

The Results

with Paul Caskey - Internet2

The Cal State Experience

with Nate Klingenstein - California State University Chancellor's Office

CSU Certificate Service Integration

23 Campuses and 1 Chancellor's Office
    RAO's are heavily outnumbered
    Multiple DRAO's at each campus

We have a proxy and we know how to use it
    But we try to avoid it
    Direct integration is always preferable

Chancellor's Office tries to get SP integrations done first
    Succeeded this time
    Although SMU apparently beat us

CSU Certificate Service Integration Process

Integrated the Chancellor's Office IdP first
    Biggest challenge is the SAML authentication context
        Triggers strongly specified behavior in some IdP's
            Shibboleth
        Completely ignored by other IdP's

Did our best to write documentation for the system
    Not homogenous in terms of implementation state
    Particularly heterogenous staffing

Remaining CSU Challenges (Certificate Service only -- we have our own, too)

"Add IdP User" doesn't scale and doesn't have an obvious purpose
   We think the button is a little extremely pointless

We think DRAO's should be MFA'ed too
   This would be a simpler implementation too

Finding our users (physically) and credentialing them
   We have a February 1 Chancellor's Office only deadline when MFA access to our main financial application will be strictly mandated

More Results

with Paul Caskey - Internet2