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Passwords are bad and will get worse. We know!

- Use stronger credentials
- Improve password practices until you no longer need them
  - InCommon’s Identity Assurance Profiles
Stronger credentials

Factors

- Something you know
- Something you have
- Something you are

Stronger authentication & multi-factor authentication

- One-Time Password (1 factor)
- Biometric (1 factor)
- Pass phrase (1 factor)
- PIN + token (2 factors)
- Password + another password (2 factors)
- Password + cellphone confirmation (2 factors)
Poll: How long do I have to wait?
The MFA Cohortium

• Community jointly tackling questions of
  – Strong authentication strategy
  – Pros/cons of various multi-factor technologies
  – Implementation approaches, lessons learned
  – Making the business case
  – ...

• Eric Goodman (U California Office of the President)
• Mike Grady (Unicon)
• David Walker (consultant)
The Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) Cohortium

All In This Together

https://spaces.internet2.edu/display/mfacohortium
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David Walker, Scalable Privacy Project
Independent Consultant

Mike Grady, Scalable Privacy Project
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Eric Goodman, Identity and Access Management Architect, University of California Office of the President
Overview

- What is the MFA Cohortium?
- Why are Institutions Participating?
- Cohortium Goals and Deliverables
  - Help for campuses trying to understand their need for multi-factor authentication
  - Help for campuses deploying multi-factor authentication
  - Sponsorship for development of MFA software infrastructure
What is the MFA Cohortium?

- Objective: Advance the deployment of Multi-factor Authentication (MFA) in Higher Education
- Roughly 40 institutions participating
- Started end of May 2013, ending in August 2014
- Collaborative effort to help each other understand the business case, technologies, deployment models, issues, costs, requirements, ROI, etc. around deploying MFA.
What is it, continued ….

○ Ultimately, collect and create extensive set of resources/artifacts on “all things MFA planning and deployment” for Higher Ed, establishing a public web site to serve as lasting resource site.

○ One of a number of efforts that are all part of the Internet2 Scalable Privacy project.
Scalable Privacy

- 2+ year grant to Internet2/InCommon, funded as part of the National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace (NSTIC)
- Development partners are CMU, Brown, with expertise from Wisconsin, Ohio State and others
- Several focal points
  - Promotion of multi-factor authentication (MFA)
  - Citizen-centric attributes and schema
  - Development and deployment of privacy managers
  - Introduction of anonymous credentials
- [https://spaces.internet2.edu/display/scalepriv](https://spaces.internet2.edu/display/scalepriv)
Scalable Privacy - MFA activities

- MFA Cohortium (today’s talk)
- Three funded pilot deployments of MFA at MIT, University of Texas System, and University of Utah
- Sponsorship of software development activities related to ease of integration and support of MFA:
  - Shibboleth
    *Assurance and MFA Enhancements for the Shib Identity Provider*
  - InCert: Installation and lifecycle management of certificates on client device(s)
  - CAS: Provide similar assurance & MFA support as per Shibboleth effort above
Why Are Institutions Participating?
MFA at University of California

- As a system, UC falls into multiple MFA scenarios
  - Developing business cases
  - Pilots in progress
  - Deploying (and releasing) solutions
- Currently beginning development of system-wide MFA strategy
- This is typical of all universities
What Questions are Universities Asking About MFA

Campuses considering MFA solutions

- Strategies for gaining funding
- Convincing execs to support efforts
  - Developing Business Case
  - Risk Management Focus
- Developing project plans
- MFA technology options
- Resource expectations/funding models
What Questions are Universities Asking About MFA

Campuses deploying MFA solutions

- Deployment strategies
- MFA product selection
- Integration options
  - Many specific platform questions
- Operational requirements and concerns
- User support models
- User communications (supporting roll out)
What Questions are Universities Asking About MFA

Campuses that have deployed MFA solutions
- Share technology solutions
- Support experience
- Areas of user satisfaction/dissatisfaction
- Other “lessons learned”
Poll: Areas of Greatest Interest
Cohortium Goals

- Advance the use of Multi-factor Authentication in Higher Education.
- “Move the needle”
  - Help campuses without MFA understand the need for it, the risks it addresses, its costs, *etc.*
  - Help campuses that are implementing MFA with deployment, policy, technology, usability and accessibility.
  - Help sponsor development of core infrastructure software modules to facilitate technology integration.
Cohortium Deliverables

Subject to Concurrence of Cohortium
Cohortium Activities and Products

● A forum for discussion of common issues
  ○ Business Cases
  ○ Deployment
  ○ Technology
  ○ Product / Vendor Issues

● A source of white papers addressing best practices for business, technical, and operational issues

● Lots of example artifacts from institutions
Business Case Elements for Multi-Factor Authentication

- **Strategic Context**
  - Alignment with Research and Education Community

- **Benefits and Risk Mitigation**
  - End-user security
  - Service provider based risk assessment

- **Compliance**
  - Policy and law
  - Assurance Profiles

- **Costs**
  - Initial and Ongoing
  - Technology refresh
A Little More about Assurance

- Multi-factor authentication often required to address risk for services related to health care and public safety
- NIH is likely to release services that require MFA
- InCommon Silver does not require MFA, but multiple institutions are finding it more effective than cleaning up their passwords
  - Virginia Tech
Gaining Acceptance in the User Community

- Require MFA only when necessary
- Make business rationale clear
- Build community of enthusiasts by implementing opt-in first
- Select tokens that fit well with users’ work styles
- Extend session timeouts when MFA used
- Require based on location (e.g., only for remote access)
Initial Deployment Strategies

- Deploy for one or a small number of services
  - Minimize startup risks
  - May require re-implementation to add services
  - This is the most common scenario

- Deploy as part of SSO but use for one or a small number of services
  - Minimize startup risks
  - Addition of services is straightforward
  - Allows technology refresh without affecting services
Initial Deployment Strategies

- Deploy as part of SSO with focus on user “opt-in” for MFA
  - Gives users control, time for acceptance to build
  - Can then drive Service Provider adoption as a requirement

- Not aware of “whole hog” initial deployments, requiring, or just enabling, MFA for everything
We will produce documents/artifacts summarizing deployment strategy options. This is a sample (not yet vetted with the Cohortium) of a possible “Decision Tree” artifact.

This is from “institutional perspective”. Decision trees could also be produced from the end user perspective (opt-in), the Assurance use case perspective, etc.
Sample Partial Decision Tree

1. Do those services use your SSO?
   - Yes: Add MFA support to your SSO system.
   - No: Go to the next condition.

2. Are they web browser-based or easily integrated with SSO?
   - Yes: Integrate with SSO.
   - No: Go to the next condition.

3. Just a few services, with easy way to integrate "effective*** MFA?"
   - Yes: Consider a network/VPN/password portal approach: MFA required to VPN or portal, services only available thru that.
   - No: Use MFA solution that integrates with each of those services/apps.

*Note: The asterisks indicate potential errors or omissions in the decision tree.*
Architectural patterns of integration

- **Individual Services**
  - Mainframe
  - VPN
  - Unix login
  - Web application

- **Access Control Systems**
  - Portals
  - “VPN as a portal”

- **Enterprise Single Sign-On and Federation**
  - CAS
  - Shibboleth
  - User Option (“Opt-in”)
Technology-focused documents

- Comparative analysis/review of the various security properties of MFA technologies
  - Look at a class of solutions and highlight strengths and weaknesses
  - May start with review of security & privacy properties of telephony approach vs non-telephony approach

- Technologies Assessment Matrix
  - Assess on multiple factors, with broad categories such as Security, Usability, and Deployability
  - Accessibility as a specific criteria
Technology-focused documents

- Great example of analysis is the paper: “The Quest to Replace Passwords: A Framework for Comparative Evaluation of Web Authentication Schemes”
- [http://t.co/VUdl7VNb](http://t.co/VUdl7VNb)
- Evaluate based on “broad set of twenty-five usability, deployability and security benefits that an ideal scheme might provide.”
Alternative Strategies When Multi-Factor Tokens Are Not Available

● What about failure cases?
  ○ Token left at home, so can’t read mail
  ○ Battery failed in token, so can’t submit $10M grant proposal

● Must balance risk of impersonation against risk to business continuity
Alternative Strategies When Multi-Factor Tokens Are Not Available - Strategies

● Strategies for opt-in MFA
  ○ Pre-registered proxies
  ○ Single-use passwords

● Strategies for service provider required MFA
  ○ Restricted but not denied access
  ○ Emergency access for limited time
  ○ Authorized third parties for authentication

● Strategies for federation required MFA
  ○ Re-registration
  ○ Authorized third parties for re-registration

● https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/RABtAg
MFA Enhancements for Shibboleth and CAS

- Enhancements to facilitate integration of MFA technologies into the enterprise SSO
- Issue is really handling *multiple* authentication contexts (e.g., assurance profiles)
  - Integrating a single MFA approach as *only* method is straightforward
  - This work will provide a better framework for integrating a variety/multiple MFA technology options through a standard interface
MFA Enhancements for Shibboleth and CAS

- Need to offer options to the user that meet SP needs and that the user is certified to use
- The IdP may be aware of other options that satisfy the SP’s requirements
  - SP requests password; IdP satisfies with PKI token
- Initial Shibboleth testing next week; completion by end of year
- Still determining exactly what/how similar work will be done for CAS
Some Other Deliverables that are planned …

- Considerations around outsourced authentication
- Accessibility evaluation of MFA technologies
- FERPA and MFA contract language
- Funding Models
- Sample project & deployment plans
- Sample support documentation & processes, FAQs, etc.
- Sample user communication campaigns
Poll: What Deliverables are of most interest?
More Information about the Cohortium

- **Cohortium Wiki Space**
  - [https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/4AwwAg](https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/4AwwAg)

- **Join the Cohortium**
  - Share your questions
  - Share your expertise
  - Help set priorities for deliverables
  - Contribute example documents and artifacts from your institution
  - [https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/4wwwAg](https://spaces.internet2.edu/x/4wwwAg)

- **Contact us:** cohortium-reg@internet2.edu
Questions & discussion
Evaluation
Please complete the evaluation of today’s IAM Online:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/IAMOnline_Sepermber_2013
## InCommon Identity Week - November 11-15, 2013

[www.incommon.org/idweek](http://www.incommon.org/idweek)

San Francisco Airport Marriott Waterfront, Burlingame, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday Nov. 11</th>
<th>Tuesday Nov. 12</th>
<th>Wednesday Nov. 13</th>
<th>Thursday Nov. 14</th>
<th>Friday Nov. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFEDS – Global R&amp;E Federation Operators</td>
<td>Advance CAMP Identity Services Summit</td>
<td>Advance CAMP Identity Services Summit (through noon)</td>
<td>CAMP: Managing Identity and Access in an Era of Distributed Services</td>
<td>CAMP: Managing Identity and Access in an Era of Distributed Services (through noon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CAMP Pre-Conference: Getting Started with Federated Identity Management (afternoon)
InCommon Shibboleth Workshop Series

Installation Training for Shibboleth
*Single Sign-on and Federating Software*

October 21-22 – University of Nebraska Omaha – Omaha, NE
Details and registration at [www.incommon.org/shibtraining](http://www.incommon.org/shibtraining)
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