

# SAML Interoperability and Deployment Profiles

[eGov20 STORK difference October 2011.xls](#)

This is the home of the Kantara SAML 2.0 eGov Interoperability Profile. (It was moved from the eGov-WG to the FI-WG).

## SAML 2.0 eGov Interoperability Profile

This profile reflects the current best practice for SAML profiles with regard to scalability in federations and product support. It is used as a base for deployment profiles in large federations.

While there is nothing specific in the profile pertaining to governments, its initial sponsors were government agencies.

The current version is [attached](#) to this page.

## SAML 2.0 eGov Deployment Profiles

Following deployment profiles are known to be based on the SAML 2.0 eGov Interoperability Profile:

- Austria: [PVP-SAML2](#)
- Canada: [CA - CATS IAS V2.0 Deployment Profile](#)
- Denmark: [OIO SAML WebSSO](#)
- Finland: [Finnish SAML2 Deployment Profile](#), [Finnish SAML2 Attribute Profile](#)
- New Zealand: [NZ SAMS RealMe overview](#)
- U.S.A.: [ICAM SAML WebSSO profile](#) and the [functional test criteria](#) for the SAML Profile
- Higher Education: [SAML2Int](#) profile (was actually co-developed, not derived)

## Relationships between SAML standards and profiles (Overview)

The following "family tree" provides an overview the different classes of standards and profiles.

What purpose service profiles?

- An interoperability profile shall achieve conformance with the specification, is not too restrictive leaving many choices. It targets developers.
- A deployment profile leaves no or only few options. Its audience are deployers.
- SAML conformance profiles have the same intent as a interoperability profile, but are too loose in V2.0 to ensure interoperability.

