What we did

• Analysed existing SAML based catalogues and selected a platform for our white-label prototype or solution
• Analysed and compared various types of service catalogues, identified matching features and attributes and identified the most relevant and suitable ones
• Matched attributes to the available data
• Developed a simple white-label catalogue starting from the IDEM solution
• Consolidated the analysis based on data reality and experience with our solution in an RFC document
• Asked stakeholders to provide feedback
eduGAIN Catalogue Service RFC

https://docs.google.com/document/d/175DePh0JKmO6VPYO4TqVXoDNLEpf-3IUTwfpQuK425Q/edit#

• Yet to be commented by stakeholders
• The RFC is highlighting
  ○ The simplicity of the solution
  ○ Its white-label nature
• It is a moderate plea to gradually introduce curated data
• It proposes to more strongly engage federation and service operators
Currently proposed attributes (already available)

- **Service name** - Short localised service name; sourced from mdui:DisplayName; in the user's language if available, otherwise, default to English if available, but also offer other available languages
- **Description** - Localised one-paragraph description; from mdui:Description
- **Registrar** - The available registrar; sourced from mdrpi:RegistrationInfo
- **Logo** - Sourced from mdui:Logo; can also be multilingual (if there are some cultural adjustments text in the graphics)
- **Contacts** - Available values of md:ContactPerson
- **More service info** - Sourced from (localised) mdui:InformationURL
- **Privacy policy** - Sourced from mdui:PrivacyStatementURL
- **SAML attributes** - Requested and required attributes from sourced from md:RequestedAttribute and md:RequiredAttribute
- **Since** (first seen) - From the available metadata history
- **Last updated** - From the available metadata history
- **CatalogID** - A unique, URL usable, reference to the entity created as a sha1 hash over the SAML entityID
Proposed additional attributes*

* Not readily available from SAML metadata or their semantics needs to be agreed upon by the community

- **Access URL** - Direct link where the end-user may use the service. *Source: curated and obtained from the service*
- **Service provider (name)** - Sourced from md:OrganizationDisplayName, expandable to (typically longer) md:OrganizationName
- **Service category** - One or more values from a limited vocabulary list of categories as established by the eduGAIN community. In case entity categories are provided, these will be provided additionally on a national level
- **License info** - One or more values from a limited list of (high-level) classification as established by the eduGAIN community. Probably it is best to implement it as a binary selector, e.g.
  - Commercial/Non-commercial
  - Restricted/Public
  - Subscription-based/Free
Attributes that were left out of the RFC

Previously also selected (in the existing solutions)
- Status* - SPs would need to report it, many would not bother to
- Used SAML attributes (requested and required) - Perceived as too technical

Previously proposed for discussion
- GDPR-safe - Too contestable what it should mean and who should assert it
- Target users - SPs would report it, but the beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so it is more important how the readers would interpret it
- Hotness - eduGAIN F-ticks, feedback (score and count)? What is the most appropriate measure and how to collect it?
- (Catalogue data) sourced from - Could be perceived as an endorsement, not as a technical detail

These removals are reducing the usability of the catalogue as a promotional tool for services or a catalogue for end users.

Strategic choice: You cannot have a cake (propose a catalogue for the available data) and eat it too (request new data to be collected)!
Curating (meta)data

- Is potentially very labour intensive
- Is mostly in the interest of the service (to improve uptake)
- Is best done by the service

How can we get SPs to provide curated data?

Proposed model

- Any federation that exports SPs to eduGAIN will ask these SPs to provide the agreed-upon data.
- This activity provides a flow and additional data and will record the curated data in the catalogue.
- Federations may run a catalogue to present this data alongside SAML metadata-based information.
Concepts - “Catalogue Exchange”

Next to presenting the catalogue for eduGAIN, allow national federations to run their own local catalogue

• Assume minimal operational capabilities
• Consume curated data for eduGAIN services
• Support federations who already have a catalogue

Therefore:

• White label, lightweight, ‘Plain HTML’ catalogue (inspired by IDEM)
• A GUI for SPs to add curated data
• An API for federations that already have a catalogue
Proposed curated metadata engagement model

**Federation operated catalogues**

- Any federation that exports SPs to eduGAIN will direct the SP to the GUI to test existing SAML metadata for completeness and ask them to provide the agreed-upon curated data.
- To collect curated data a GUI is provided centrally, where federation operators may direct their SPs. The Catalogue GUI will:
  - Suggest SAML metadata improvements based on evaluating current SAML metadata of the SP and comparing that to the current best practices.
  - Allow services to create and maintain additional curated data fields.
- Federations that currently already operate catalogues with curated data, may provide that data on behalf of the services via the Catalogue r/w API.

**Proposed engagement**

- Any federation that exports SPs to eduGAIN will direct the SP to the GUI to test existing SAML metadata for completeness and ask them to provide the agreed-upon curated data.
- This activity provides a scalable flow, data structure and quality and will record the curated data in the Catalogue.
- Federations collect curated data via the API for their catalogue. If so required, a federation can make use of the white-label Catalogue to present this data.
Open Questions

• Do you consider the model where SPs provide curated data via a form as viable?
• Would you as a fed ops be willing to “chase” the SPs?
• Should we allow the inclusion of information typically found in SAML metadata if that is missing from metadata?
• Is a generic catalogue you can roll nationally and customize yourself appealing? Would you deploy that?

• What critical information did we miss so far which *must* be in the catalogue?
eduGAIN Service Catalogue

✅ Prepared the RFC

😀 How the approach was narrowed down to conform with the reality

😒 Perhaps too many internal assumptions, need to better document internal decisions?

⛔ No feedback so far
Demo video

https://wiki.geant.org/download/attachments/247431187/SC_demo.mp4
Thank you

Any questions?

www.geant.org