



Identity Management Conference Call – 4/14/09

Mike Maloney - Middlesex  
John Mullens – Rowan Libraries  
Bruce Klein – Rowan  
Bob Mondelli – Passaic CC  
John Cohen – CCM  
Michael Skafidas – Ramapo College  
Brian Domenick – FDU  
Tom Depietro – WPUNJ  
Jane Hutchison – WPUNJ  
Ben Oshin - Rutgers  
Sujay Daniel – NJEDge.Net  
Tom Nemeth - WPUNJ  
George Laskaris – NJEDge.Net  
Tom Gillon – CCM  
Brian Richards - Middlesex  
Sandie Miller - WPUNJ  
Brad Trotte - WPUNJ  
Ron Jantz – Rutgers  
Chuck Hedrick – Rutgers  
Grace Agnew - Rutgers

1. Overview: How commercial video will work - Agnew
2. FMG test collection - Hutchinson / Nemeth
3. Identity management survey results - Daniel
4. Overview of Shibboleth status. Oshin, Hedrick
5. Federated IdM--NJ Commons Hedrick and Daniel.
6. Next steps. Options for participants are:
  - Peer to peer Shib installation
  - Participation in centralized LDAP directory

One XACML statement with each institution's name determines who has access. Can have further access restrictions based on roles (i.e. standard vocabulary from LDAP, faculty student, etc.). XACML statements accompany each object. If no XACML policy statement, then there is no authentication and the video is played. If there is a policy, the attributes get transferred from the institution and are

compared with what's in the XACML statement. If the comparison says you're permitted to access, then video plays. If not, you get a message telling you that you don't have access.

How exactly will the XACML creator understand who gets the rights and how to create these?

Question - Are we going to be required to differentiate between faculty and staff? (Faculty student staff affiliate employee) We'll still have to put something there – but could be highest e.g. member). Most videos will be open to faculty and staff, hence a [member@institution.edu](mailto:member@institution.edu) attribute will suffice in most cases.

Mike Skafidas – Will we be joining InCommon? On our radar, but not just yet. If everyone was going to be peer-to-peer, but we'll be using another method that InCommon doesn't handle. We're working w/Internet2.

Each Library will create its own portal. Create partner portals with those items that each Library has a collection for. Also, the record can go into the institution's library OPAC. Library user will access from institution website or OPAC. We need data that can be fed into centralized LDAP (e.g. patron records) or create peer-to-peer. Everyone in this test needs standardized LDAP. Will user be able to access from NJVid website as well?

Is NJVid going to provide attributes – Chuck – yes.

When will metadata be provided? Chuck recommends that you use the same attributes as InCommons. You can now subscribe to NJEDge by submitting your metadata. Go to <http://federation.njedge.net> that has a pointer for the metadata.

Question - Will we support both post and artifact method or one or the other? We don't care. We've been running with default setup. Brian (?) prefers artifacts. Our server will do either.

Jane – FMG test includes 20 titles that most of us have acquired. Wendy Collins from FMG sent these to Isaiah who is in the process of ingesting them now. Wendy will provide metadata to be mapped and thumbnails. Tom gave his list of test institutions (Ramapo, Rutgers, WPUNJ, Rowan, FDU, Middlesex CC, Passaic CC, County College of Morris. There will be a joint meeting of Commercial Video Workgroup in May for licensing with other companies. Now, we don't want to expand until we have a successful launch of FMG, AMBROSE, BIOMEDIA. These are not necessarily permanent digital licenses. We're not including XACML time periods so it's manual to take these down. FMG can do one year now, their new license will be either 3 year or perpetual. Each collection Manager will need to alert NJEDge to remove their access.

Mike from Middlesex – All we have is username and password. Affiliation will need to be added. Common name and principal name are both mandatory. Usernames have to map to a person. Ron Jantz said he thought they would only need institution. Sujay Daniel indicated that the eduPersonScopedAffiliation attribute is mandatory. This attribute can be mapped to eduPerson attributes, and the role 'member' can be made default. EduPersonScoped affiliation is of the form affiliation@institution.edu. We will need personalized attributes such as eduPersonTargetedID if we need to track usage and maintain account profiles, and this may be optional for the institution to release it at this time.

Some institutions allow guests - should they have access to their videos? NJVID may require a lower assurance profile than other services that may be offered in the future through the New Jersey

Federaton. Institutions may want to use eduPerson attributes to keep their Shibboleth standardized to work with other applications offered by the NJ Federation and InCommon. The NJ Federation can operate on both assurance profiles (high and low).

Next steps? That we only require the commonalities in order to go forward. However, affiliations would be valuable for future phases where it would be important.

Early stages of NJVid didn't need Shibboleth because of the Commons, but Chuck and NJEDge.Net are interested in getting other institutions to participate. There is downloadable VM information (on NJEDge's website) to your laptop and a free player so you can use a flat file to test Shibboleth with. Chuck can send sample config files and Sujay's file will help to show how to merge institution metadata. Once listed in NJEDge metadata, the service provider will know about you so you will have access. Beyond that, some set-up, but you're not creating XACML scripting. The collection manager will create that.

We must standardize on the organization name and affiliations.

Grace's list: p2p shibboleth or centralized LDAP?

Mike Skafidas – Ramapo – shib  
Brian Domenick – FDU – Shib  
Bruce Klein Rowan – Shib  
Mike Maloney – Middlesex – centralized LDAP  
Brad Trotte – Shib  
Bob Mondelli – centralized LDAP  
Tom Gillon – CCM – ?  
Rutgers – Shib

Need to know elements in individual's databases. Need a good strategy for our organization. We'll revise our eduperson based on that data. Also need standardized approach to naming for each organization. No later than next Friday, send to Grace the elements and an example of one of your records. What you have – send to Grace Agnew ([gagnew@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:gagnew@rci.rutgers.edu)) and cc shib@njedge.net. Grace will map the attributes. Constrain them to the attributes here – don't need the ones that are specific to the institution.

When do you think you can get Shibboleth up and running? Answer - By FIRST of JULY.

Mike Skafidas – What is the testing process for NJEDge? Chuck's machine will test it and there's a link on the webpage now (chuck just put it up).

We could use a calendar of when institutions expect to go live between now and July. Define test criteria: Shibboleth is up and running and NJEDge can test against it. Send email to [shib@njedge.net](mailto:shib@njedge.net). Then, we'll set up the XACML scripts for the control videos. Please visit [federation.njedge.net](http://federation.njedge.net) and [njedge.net/shibboleth](http://njedge.net/shibboleth) for test instructions and other information on the Shibboleth and the New Jersey Federation.