

1

2



3

4

5 **Kantara Initiative Identity Assurance**
 6 **Framework – Validating Trustworthy Identity**
 7 **Ecosystem Components**

8

9

10 **Version:** 1.0

11 **Date:** 2012-07-25

12 **Contributors:**

13 The full list of contributors can be referenced here:
 14 <http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/x/UIDEAw>

15

16 **Status:** This document is a **Kantara Initiative Report**, approved by the Identity
 17 Assurance WG and the Kantara Initiative Leadership Council (see section 3.9 and 4 of
 18 the Kantara Initiative Operating Procedures)

19 **Abstract**

20 Identity ecosystems around the world continue to crystalize, and, as they do so, the
 21 number of applications that rely on their effectiveness and validity is increasing
 22 dramatically. Functions such as identity verification and credential authentication, which
 23 were traditionally fulfilled within a closed-enterprise identity lifecycle, are now being
 24 provided in modular service components that can support a wide range of applications,
 25 i.e. e-Government, health care, and financial. The Kantara Identity Assurance
 26 Framework (IAF) states the generic Identity Assurance and Privacy Safeguards
 27 requirements for Identity Ecosystem components. The Kantara Assessment program uses

Validating Trustworthy Identity Ecosystem Components

28 the IAF to accredit Assessors and to validate Service Providers. Thus, the Kantara
29 Identity Assurance Framework (IAF) and associated programs provide a mechanism for
30 the independent validation of the trustworthiness of identity system components, as
31 recognized by such parties as the US CIO FICAM sub-committee. This is a crucial step
32 in ensuring that the security and privacy considerations for a wide array of business
33 objectives are met, in an online environment.

34

35 **Filename:** IAWG-IAF-valueprop-Report.pdf

36

37 **IPR: This Work Group operates under the [Kantara IPR Policy - Option Patent &](#)**
38 **[Copyright: Reciprocal Royalty Free with Opt-Out to Reasonable And Non](#)**
39 **[discriminatory \(RAND\)](#)**

40

41

42

43	Contents	
44	1 BACKGROUND	4
45	2 KANTARA INITIATIVE IDENTITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK	5
46	3 IAF MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT	6
47	4 SUMMARY	7
48	5 REFERENCES	8
49		

50 1 Background

51 As identity ecosystems evolve to support a broad number of applications, the historically
52 sequential chain of functions, such as: user provisioning; identity verification; credential
53 authentication; and entitlement authorization; are being implemented as modular services.
54 The *modularization* of these functions into service components enables their sharing
55 across the multiple relying parties. In addition to the economic benefit of sharing such
56 services, the other two reasons for modularization are: to avoid unnecessary proliferation
57 of personal data (by limiting the number of points at which a user provides personal
58 data); and to support requirements for segregation of functions such as identity
59 verification and entitlement authorization. This permits more program flexibility and a
60 migration from traditional built-in identity proofing to a system based on services
61 provided by a number of trusted suppliers.

62 As this shift of the underlying architecture for identity systems moves from the sequential
63 enterprise framework, where trust was delegated down through each function, to a
64 federated identity system of interconnected components, the *trustworthiness* of each
65 constituent component becomes paramount. This requirement for trustworthy
66 components places a higher degree of scrutiny and accountability (business and
67 technology) on component technologies than was previously exposed in a sequential-
68 system flow of trust. In addition to component trustworthiness, a viable identity
69 ecosystem also requires consistency (i.e. commensurate processes and policies) across all
70 service components, for considerations such as privacy safeguards for data at rest and
71 transport protection for data in motion. The Kantara Identity Assurance Framework was
72 developed by a broad range of international identity and privacy experts and so reflects a
73 wide set of considerations that would determine such service provider consistency.

74 Trustworthiness can be demonstrated in a couple of key ways: the underlying framework
75 for an identity ecosystem can be demonstrated as trustworthy by an examination of the
76 operating procedures and policies; and each of the service components can be validated
77 to provide a specific level of service, via a component assessment scheme.

78

79 2 Kantara Initiative Identity Assurance Framework

80 The Kantara Initiative Identity Assurance Framework (IAF) was developed to satisfy
81 both of these key elements of identity system trustworthiness. The IAF traces back to e-
82 authentication initiatives described by OMB-04-01¹ and its supporting NIST Special
83 Publication 800-63². These documents define the requirements for identity assurance at
84 specified degrees of risk, and provide the basis for the operating conditions for service
85 components in the current version of the IAF³. As such, the IAF supports the four levels
86 of assurance that are generally recognized (albeit with different terminology) by the
87 governments of the U.S.⁴, Canada⁵, UK, New Zealand and other regions, such as the EU⁶.

88 The current version of the Identity Assurance Framework supports a modular approach
89 down to the level of separating out the functions of identity verification and credential
90 authentication. This de-coupling of identity from credential authentication allows a wide
91 range of identity ecosystem implementations to be accommodated. As an example, in
92 some jurisdictions, privacy legislation requires that identity verification to support a
93 claim of entitlement is only executed at the point of service delivery, and not be implied
94 in a transported credential.

95 In terms of service components, trustworthiness typically comprises demonstration of
96 two significant factors: that the operational processes and procedures of the component re
97 sufficient to support the degree of asserted identity assurance; and that the underlying
98 security safeguards for data protection are sufficient.

99 3 IAF Maintenance and Development

100 The Kantara IAF states the generic requirements for such Identity Assurance and Privacy
101 Safeguards. The Kantara Assessment program provides for the Accreditation of Assessors
102 and the validation of Service Providers. The detailed Assessment Criteria for such validation
103 of Service Providers is maintained by the Kantara Identity Assurance Work Group (IAWG)
104 and the Kantara Privacy and Public Policy Work Group (P3WG), for Identity Assurance and
105 Privacy Safeguards, respectively.

106 The Kantara IAF was designed to be as generic as possible and thereby intended to support a
107 range of identity initiatives “out of the box”. Sector-specific nuances or instantiations of the
108 Identity Assurance Framework, for example, to accommodate varying government,
109 healthcare, or telecommunications industry requirements are documented in profiles of the
110 IAF. These profiles are coordinated by the respective Kantara Work Group (eGov, Health
111 Care ID, Telco ID) to the IAWG and P3WG. This allows the overall Kantara IAF to support
112 a broad range of government, health care, financial, and telecommunication sector
113 embodiments.

114 As an example of a sector-specific embodiment of the IAF, there are numerous initiatives
115 evolving in the health care sector that require strong identity management to ensure adequate
116 trust. Some examples in the U.S. include the many Health Information Exchanges (HIEs)
117 being deployed around the country, the Drug Enforcement Agency’s electronic prescribing of
118 controlled substances (EPCS) rule, ONC’s Direct effort, the Nationwide Health Information
119 (NwHIN) development, Accountable Care Organization (ACO) pilots, and “meaningful use”
120 interoperability requirements. The Kantara Identity Assurance Framework and associated
121 Assessment and Accreditation Schemes provide all of the basic elements needed to support a
122 trusted identity ecosystem that enables a single identity to be broadly used in these and
123 numerous other health care scenarios

124 **4 Summary**

125 The Kantara Identity Assurance Framework provides an independent mechanism to
126 establish the trustworthiness of identity components to support a wide range of
127 applications, in an effective and validated manner. This will reinforce user acceptance of
128 such applications by establishing clear definitions of identity assurance processes and the
129 steps taken to protect personal data.

130

131

132 5 References

133

134 ¹ E-Authentication Guidance for Federal Agencies

135 www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy-4/m04-04.pdf

136 ² Electronic Authentication Guideline Recommendations

137 csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-63/SP800-63V1_0_2.pdf

138 ³ Kantara Identity Assurance Framework

139 <http://kantarainitiative.org/confluence/display/GI/Identity+Assurance+Framework>
140 [+v2.0](#)

141 ⁴ National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace

142 <http://www.nist.gov/nstic>

143 ⁵ Cyber Authentication Renewal Initiative

144 <http://www.tbs-sct-gc.ca/sim-gsi/si-is/docs/ident-eng.asp>

145 ⁶ European STORK project on a European eID Interoperability Platform

146 <https://www.eid-stork.eu/>

147

148

149

150

151 **Revision History**

152 Document approved by the Kantara Initiative Leadership Council

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163