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## Parallels between PKI and SAML

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The root CA is the trust root of a PKI</th>
<th>The metadata signing certificate/key is the trust root of a SAML federation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A CA typically has one CPS and multiple CPs</td>
<td>A metadata aggregator typically has one process (or practice) to gather a set of EntityDescriptors but may publish multiple signed metadata subsets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  * Targeted to different audiences and purposes |

However there is no SAML equivalent to CPS and CP

*Perhaps it is time to define them?*
CPS and CP in PKI

• CPS and CP(s) are all about:

• Certification Practice Statement
  “Statement of the practices which a certification authority employs in issuing certificates”.
  – How is a certificate created?
  – Who creates a certificate?

• Certificate Policy
  “Named set of rules that indicates the applicability of a certificate to a particular community and/or class of application”.
  – Why was the certificate created?
  – What should the certificate be used for?
RFC 3647

  - Defines a standard template to assist authors of CPS and CP.
  - Provides a comprehensive “set of provisions” that need to be covered.
    - Collaboratively determined by the PKI community through the IETF.
  - Over 200 topics defined over 9 primary components.
    - Introduction
    - Publication and Repository
    - Identification and Authentication
    - Certificate Life-Cycle Operational Requirements
    - Facilities, Management, and Operational Controls
    - Technical Security Controls
    - Certificate, CRL, and OCSP Profile
    - Compliance audit
    - Other Business and Legal Matters
Who are Consumers of CP and CPS?

- **Relying Party**
  - Gets better understanding how a CA operates.
  - Gets better understanding of the risks involved.
  - Gets better sense of trustworthiness of CA.

- **Auditors**
  - Third party verification that CPS and CP are true reflections of CA's practices and policies.
  - All RPs in auditor's scope benefit from manifested trustworthiness of the CA.

- **Interfederating Parties**
  - Can more easily gauge whether 2 PKIs are compatible for cross-certification and at what points.
SMAPS and SMSP in SAML (Proposed)

- SMAPS and SMSP(s) are all about:
  - **Who**, **What**, **Why** and **How**.

- SAML Metadata Aggregation Practice Statement
  “Statement of the practices which a metadata aggregator employs in publishing SAML Metadata”.
  - **How** is the metadata aggregation created?
  - **Who** creates the metadata aggregation?

- SAML Metadata Signing Policy
  “Named set of rules that indicates the applicability of a aggregation of SAML metadata to a particular community and/or class of application”.
  - **Why** was the metadata aggregation created?
  - **What** should the metadata aggregation be used for?
Who are Consumers of SMAPS and SMSP?

• Relying Party: IdP and SP
  – Gets better understanding how a core component of a federation operates.
  – Gets better understanding of the risks involved in using published metadata.
  – Gets better sense of trustworthiness of a federation.

• Auditors
  – Third party verification that SMAPS and SMSP are true reflections of federation's aggregation practices and policies.
  – All RPs in auditor's scope benefit from the manifested trustworthiness of the federation.

• Interfederating Parties
  – Can more easily gauge whether 2 federation are compatible for interfederation and at what points.
Scope of Audits

- “Trust, but verify”, Ronald Reagan (1911-2004)
  - 3rd party audit manifests trustworthiness but only over the scope of the auditor.

- In PKI an audit can be at a global scope:
  - Webtrust Audit. Covers most commodity trust lists requirements. Expensive!

- Or a lesser scope:
  - IGTF. Scoped only over Grid EE, hosts and services.
  - IGTF members audit each other. Cheaper?

- Same with SAML.
  - Governments, Corporations may require global scope.
  - Can R&E use a lesser scope in the spirit of the IGTF model?
  - Perhaps REFEDS is in an ideal position to help? (as suggested by Vic)
Example (sub) Set of Provisions

• Identification and Authentication.
  – of SAML End Points.
  – of person/organisation submitting EntityDescriptors and Extensions.

• Metadata Life-Cycle Operational Requirements.
  – Enrolment and processing of submitted EntityDescriptors.
  – Modifying EntityDescriptors, re-keying KeyInfos, Extensions.
  – Revoking EntityDescriptors and Extensions.

• Facilities, Management, and Operational Controls

• Technical Security Controls.
  – Signing certificate/key generation and protection.

Set of Provisions may need to encompass dynamic metadata!
Next Steps?

If there is sufficient interest:

• Create a SAML equivalent of RFC 3647?
  – “SAML Metadata Signing Policy and Aggregation Practice Statement Framework.”
  – What process should be used? Where should it be developed? IETF? OASIS?
  – Gather SAML communities list of topics that need addressing.

• Create a SAML Metadata Aggregation Best Practices Guide?
  – Not all SPs are the same!

• If R&E federations choose to audit each other
  – SAML Auditor's Framework