

**Subject:** Re: [TAC-InC] TAC Call Agenda - January 16, 2020  
**Date:** Thursday, January 16, 2020 at 9:50:42 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** tac-request@incommon.org on behalf of Mary McKee  
**To:** tac@incommon.org

Hi, TAC!

I unfortunately am not going to be able to make the call today, so thought I'd give more detail on the agenda item I was going to introduce in case you're all still able to talk about it...

It seems to me that SP integration is one of the biggest burdens for many IAM teams, which the IdPaaS WG survey has reinforced. Anecdotally, I also think it's one of the most demoralizing job functions for IAM staff - colleagues in other departments pay vendors with the hope and expectation that the investment will deliver them from any technological worry or hassle, and everything goes wonderfully until central IT barges in with their acronyms and somethingorother about validating assertion timestamps, and suddenly the project team's RACI chart is on orange (or whatever) and every person in the meeting is doing their best Robert Downey Jr. eyeroll gif impression while the IAM folks silently try to calculate how much they can compromise without implicating the team in a complete security or support nightmare.

At Duke, we created a "Shibboleth readiness" evaluation for vendors and rolled it into our security evaluation process. This has been *tremendously* successful at helping manage expectations about the level of involvement in an SSO integration before they enter into a contract, but I'd really like if we could drop this in favor of an inter-institutional questionnaire solution, perhaps like the HECVAT. To my mind, our current solution mostly helps us avoid problematic SPs, or at least manage expectations about how long an integration will take. A better (shared) solution would support IdPs via a mainstream mechanism for recording SPs' commitments to best practices BEFORE contracts are signed, and support SPs by demonstrating how many potential customers will be impressed with a very clearly scoped set of requirements.

The straightforward/objective ask here is whether this is reasonable and if so, where such a vendor questionnaire should live. Behind that ask is a belief that there are a lot of people like me out there - responsible for an IdP, bought into the idea of federation but by no means an expert on it, and willing to do the right things but more confident about what that looks like at a philosophical level than a practical one. I feel like if I still struggle with that, there are likely a lot of others in the federation who do as well.

I love eduPerson and the SAML2 deployment profile because they clearly signal when I (/the IdP) should change vs. when an SP should. These resources provide common terms of engagement, which for me is the primary value add of a federation. The problem (as I see it) is that these terms don't currently carry enough weight once a business contract is in place.

I'd love to explore how the TAC can make the business value of federation less abstract/at scale and more immediate, uniting the community with actionable steps we can take so that responsibilities and best practices are more clear - not to technologists, as we often seem to focus on, but to the more business-minded folks who are primarily concerned with how to shrewdly manage assets to scale a business. I believe that many of us would jump at the opportunity to make that bottom line ("commit

to these best practices, or risk losing our business") more clear to potential vendor partners, but like with all things, we are stronger if we can do that together.

Thanks for reading/considering! Catch you all on the next call 😊

Mary

---

**From:** tac-request@incommon.org <tac-request@incommon.org> on behalf of Janemarie Duh <duhj@lafayette.edu>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 15, 2020 3:48 PM

**To:** tac@incommon.org <tac@incommon.org>

**Subject:** [TAC-InC] TAC Call Agenda - January 16, 2020

Hi, Everyone!

A reminder that the first TAC meeting of 2020 is tomorrow, Thursday, January 16, 2020. The call information appears below as does the link to the agenda. Please note that one of the agenda items is in a bit of flux at the moment.

Looking forward to talking with you all!

Best,

Janemarie

#### **Date, Time, and Location**

Thursday, January 16, 2020

1:00pm ET | 12:00pm CT | 11:00am MT | 10:00am PT

Joining the Meeting:

Zoom Web Meeting: <https://internet2.zoom.us/j/808839193>

Telephone: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 646 558 8656

Meeting ID: 808 839 193

#### **Agenda**

<https://spaces.at.internet2.edu/display/inctac/TAC+Meeting+2020-01-16>

Janemarie Duh  
Identity and Access Management  
Information Technology Services  
Lafayette College  
610-330-5609