Comparison of Alternative Federated Wireless Authentication Strategies

Comparison of Alternative Federated Wireless Authentication Strategies

This page provides pros and cons for the three federated wireless authentication strategies discussed in UCTrust Wireless Notes - 2010-07-26.

| | eduroam | ucroam | Captive Portal |
|---|---|--|--|
| Contact informati on | Eduroam provides only minimal contact information to the hosting campus. This may cause problems in the event of infringement notices, legal investigations, and or vulnerabilities detected in guests' computers. | ucroam could be built to support sending contact information. This could cause problems for future interoperability with Europe, because of their privacy laws. Depending on the authenticating campus to send supporting details may not be viable. | UCTrust Wireless could be built to support sending contact information. This would not cause interoperability problems with Europe, as Shibboleth can obtain end-user permission to release contact information. NOTE: This is dependent on the structure of the authenticating site's Shibboleth service - it may not be a generally true statement |
| Campus readines s | UCD will likely join eduroam, as will UCLA. UCB and UCR do not currently support 802.1x, a prerequisite for eduroam. | UCD and UCLA should be able to join without much effort. UCB and UCR do not currently support 802.1x, a prerequisite for ucroam. | UCLA has integrated Shibboleth into a test/demonstration captive portal but would need to add attributes for contact information. Other campuses would need to integrate Shibboleth and the contact attributes. |
| Automat ic present ation of host campus policy, e tc. | The 802.1x technology used by eduroam does not include include an automatic presentation of policy and other information about the host campus. Presenting such information could be done by associating a captive portal with the 802.1x guest network. (This may be precluded by eduroam policy.) | The 802.1x technology that would be used by ucroam precludes automatic presentation of policy and other information about the host campus. | The "captive portal" technology that would be used by UCTrust Wireless would allow host campuses to present arbitrary information at login time. |
| Consist ency of user experien ce | Access would be the same regardless of location | Access within UC would be the same regardless of location | Experience would vary in every location; access method in some locales may be less than obvious |
| Breadth of solution | Global | uc | uc |
| Particip ation in larger commun ity | UC would be part of a global effort | UC would be copying a global effort, but limiting extent to UC | UC would be going it alone |
| Ease of impleme ntation | Trivial (or next to it) for environments already running 802.1 x and RADIUS | Trivial (or next to it) for environments already running 802.1x and RADIUS; more configuration work than with eduroam | Potentially significant portal code development; likely significant coordination work for SAML attribute sharing |
| Global benefits to users | Users gain access to eduroam hot spots world-wide | none | none |