Federation Implementations

Mwotil Alex

RENU Identity Federation (RIF)

Federation Architectures

- Identity Federations can be categorized into the following:
 - Full Mesh
 - Hub & Spoke
 - Centralized login
 - Distributed login
 - Hybrid (Full Mesh and Hub & Spoke)

Full Mesh

- Most federations employ this architecture
- No central components, all are distributed including failover
- Entities typically have more connections to other entities in the federation
- IdPs and SPs do more work
 - Configure attribute release
 - Maintain a discovery service
 - Protocol support
 - Manage entity connection

Full Mesh

Example: *eduGain*

- SWAMID
- SWITCHaai
- InCommon
- RIF



Full Mesh

Pros	Cons
 Better User Experience Distributed Points of Failure Providers have full control of the data No single points of attribute intercept Simpler for the operator 	 Harder for new providers All providers have to agree to a standard protocol, and implement it Results into large metadata Harder to debug problems

Hub & Spoke

- A central hub exists between all IdPs and SPs
- Entities need a single connection to the central hub, and maintain it
- The hub manages connections between the entities
- Features can easily be rolled out given the central hub
- Login may be centralized or distributed

Hub & Spoke

Example: *eduroam*

- Distributed
 - SAFIRE
 - WAYF.dk
- Centralized
 - FEIDE
 - AAI@eduHr



Hub & Spoke

Pros	Cons
 Onboarding simpler for providers Hubs can hide/solve interoperability problems Hub can extend or transform attributes 	 Complicates discovery Hub can be a single point of failure Privacy issues Individual providers lose control More complex to operate

Hybrid

- Organizations represented as individual entities in the metadata
 - May run own Identity Providers
- A central hub
 - Does most of the heavy lifting just as hub and spoke
- May have a central login with customization options for organizations
- Provides best aspects of full mesh and hub & spoke worlds
 - Flexibility and agility

