

# UA Measurement WG Meeting

10 January 2022

## Attendees

Nabil Benamar  
Georgia Osborn  
Julien Bernard  
Jim DeLaHunt  
Vadim Mikhaylov  
Adarsh BU  
Seda Akbulut

## Agenda

- 1) Welcome and roll-call
- 2) Reviewing [Identity Platforms](#)
- 3) AOB

## Meeting Notes

### Identity Platform

Nabil shared the previous draft of Identity Platform discussion and asked for more input from everyone to make it a Statement of Work. He mentioned some points from the last meeting that a list of open-source software and commercial solutions have been compiled.

As an action item from the previous meeting, Seda shared a preliminary draft of the skeletal model to [SOW](#) based on the former notes taken down and previous SOW model. She suggested going through each step and discussing. In the description of work, there are a few steps. One of those is to test the identity platforms and to evaluate the oAuth standard. The vendor will be required to set up some websites and email addresses to see all the use cases.

Nabil mentioned important points from the draft that the first part of the project conducts a pilot study to determine UA Readiness of an initial set of identity platforms and then the second part, it requires evaluating particularly if oAuth follows UA or not. He reminded that in the last meeting Marc mentioned the

same points. He said he would discuss this with some IETF members if this is allowed by default.

Georgia mentioned that the security implications which will arise with single sign on is not mentioned in the SOW. Jim stated that the security implication is not part of the scope of SOW. Georgia said due to multiple authentication methods it will be a good idea to mention a little about security implications in SOW. Nabil said that the single sign on itself is related to security. Nabil sees no security matter to be included in the SOW as the security issue relates to the website developer's decision. The document should find answers to UA readiness of emails and domain names and to check if OAuth is UA ready or not.

Jim commented in the draft document that the word "authentication" should be replaced by "identification". He also said that instead of "authentication services", "identity platform" should be used. Nabil also agreed with Jim on this.

Jim shared that in the document, two phases of the project are mentioned. He stated that there should be a 3<sup>rd</sup> phase as well of testing and evaluating the testing results.

Nabil asked if the tests depend on the browser or not. Julian stated that there is very less chance that it will cause an issue as it will not cause an issue if the browser is already UA ready. Nabil suggested that it is a correct assumption. Yet, to be on the safe side, vendors can be asked to give multiple use cases of OAuth with browsers. Jim stated that increasing the scope of testing will increase the cost. Nabil and Jim decided to limit the number of browsers. Julian shared that platform can be a good parameter as well for testing. Jim stated that it's a good point, but it will again expand the scope. Jim shared that testing of multiple variations of browsers and platforms can be the second contract. In the first contract, it is better to evaluate how good OAuth works.

Seda mentioned that she will open the document for external comments and share with everyone.

Jim shared a big picture of the exercise and mentioned that OAuth is an obstacle to the UA readiness. Nabil mentioned that making OAuth UA ready will obsolete this obstacle. Jim mentioned that the initial phase of the project which is implantation will give an insight on this point.

**Next meeting:** Monday 24 January 2022 UTC 1500-1600

## Action items

<b>No.</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	Review draft document of Identity Platform	All
2	Open draft document for external comments and share	Seda