1. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] Normatively references numerous private specifications that are not standards and not in the standards process (or are only submissions): WS-Transfer, WS-ResourceTransfer, WS-MetadataExchange, WS-Eventing.

2. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] Normatively references IBM/Microsoft roadmaps as "the web architecture"

3. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] Specifies that the WS-Fed TC will define how canonicalization is to be performed with XML Signature, despite the existence of the W3C XML Security Specifications Maintenance WG [2] for this purpose

4. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] Incorrectly references WS-Trust and WS-SecureConversation committee drafts rather than OASIS standards

5. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] References the WS-Policy submissions rather than W3C WS-Policy CR, and without mentioning that the WS-Policy Recommendations are to be referenced when completed

6. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] References committee specifications, instead of standards: WS-ReliableMessaging, WS-Coordination, WS-AtomicTransation, WS-BusinessActivity

7. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

   [The proposed WS-Federation charter] May need to better address the risk of all the chartered work being completed within the 18 months allocated

8. Frederick Hirsch, Nokia, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

[The proposed WS-Federation charter] Includes some strange characters in the charter text: "t [4+AF0AOw- that".

9. Gaël Gourmelen , France Telecom / Orange, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00000.html

   In the section regarding similar works, it is not very clear what is meant by "The proposers of this TC seek involvement from authors of other such activities and the contribution of their expertise and experience, and intend to work in harmony with them in the creation of the product of this technical committee ".

   It would be better to use the specifications that have already been produced on the federation (e.g. SAML TC Specifications) in the WSFED TC, instead of only requiring the involvment of the actors that have worked on SAML. The work on this WSFED TC could be done within the SAML TC. Most of the targeted functionalities that are spoken about in this charter are quite the same with SAML (Federation, SSO, Sign-Out, ...) with the same defined entities/roles : Identity Provider, Service/Resource Provider,

10. Gaël Gourmelen , France Telecom / Orange, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00000.html

   In the Applicable work section: This is quite surprising that SAML is not mentioned in the Applicable work since SAML is really dealing with the same functions and therefore is applicable. This is very surprising also, given the fact that SAML is produced by the same standard organization! This is not very acceptable from a standard organization perspective

11. Gaël Gourmelen , France Telecom / Orange, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00000.html

   Globally, the charter of the TC is quite "long" and describes technical details in depth, and seems to be quite too detailed at this early TC proposal stage. The work seems to make already references to some WS-* specifications which quite constraints the charter for the future work."

12. Tom Rutt, Fujitsu, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00004.html

   The text regarding normative references needs to be strengthened in light of recent experience within ws-rx, sx and tx TCs on their references to WS-Policy:

   The term "far enough along" is ambiguous and should be replaced with a definitive Requirement that normative references only be to fully approved standards or Recommendations.

Proposed Changes:

In the section "General Notes on Scope": change the following paragraph:

"If any of the above specifications is outside of standardization process at the time this TC moves to ratify its deliverables, or is not far enough along in the standardization process, any normative references to it in the TC output will be expressed in an abstract manner, and the incarnation will be left at that time as an exercise in interoperability."

To the following:

"If any of the above specifications is outside of standardization process at the time this TC moves to ratify any CS version of its deliverables, or has not yet progressed to the status of full standard or recommendation, any normative references to it in the TC output will be expressed in an abstract manner, and the incarnation will be left at that time as an exercise in interoperability."

Along the same lines, the paragraph before d) deliverables should be changed from:

"The TC will not attempt to define functionality duplicating that of any normatively referenced specification in the input WS-Federation Version 1.1 [1]. If the referenced specification is outside of a standardization process at the time this TC moves to ratify its deliverables, or is not far along enough in the standardization process, any normative references to it in the TC output will be expressed in an abstract manner, and the incarnation will be left at that time as an exercise in interoperability."

13. Tom Rutt, Fujitsu, http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00004.html

    There is no good reason why WS-Federation should not be composable with Web services specs approved before WS-Addressing (e.g., WS-Reliability). This may be especially in cases of migration toward use of WS-Addressing.

    Add Reference (N) to OASIS Standard WS-Reliability.

    Change first sentence to General Notes on Scope, from:
    "The output specifications will uphold the basic principles of other Web services specifications of independence and composition and be composable with the other specifications in the Web services architecture, such as the specifications listed in the References section, numbers 1-18, 24-26."

    To:
    "The output specifications will uphold the basic principles of other Web services specifications of independence and composition and be composable with the other specifications in the Web services architecture, such as the specifications listed in the References section, numbers 1-18, N, 24-26."

14. NISHIMURA Toshihiro (FAMILY Given), STRATEGY AND TECHNOLOGY DIV.,
    SOFTWARE UNIT, FUJITSU LIMITED, http://www.oasis-
    open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-
    discuss/email/archives/200704/msg00006.html

    Propose to add following sentense in the section "General Notes on
    Scope" and in the paragraph before d) deliverables for clarification:

    Just being a submission to some standardization body does not mean
    it is inside of a standardization process.

15. Eve Maler, Sun Microsystems, Inc., http://lists.oasis-
    open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00007.html

    Related work:

    The non-normative Similar Work subsection says: "The proposers of this TC
    recognize there are other possible approaches to federation and believe
    that the defined Scope of Work of this TC addresses many functional use
    cases of these parallel efforts. The proposers of this TC seek involvement
    from authors of other such activities and the contribution of their
    expertise and experience, and intend to work in harmony with them in the
    creation of the product of this technical committee."

    The only provision in the normative charter language for how this harmony
    is to be achieved is the statement in the Scope of Work introduction that
    "OASIS members with extensive experience and knowledge in these areas are
    particularly invited to participate."

    It is left unsaid what would motivate those experts to come to this table
    (for example, greater interop between the technologies, a plan for
    convergence, or a demonstration of business use cases that the parallel
    efforts do not address).

    The field of cross-domain federated identity has been active for six years
    or more, with SAML, the predominant standardized application protocol, now
    widely deployed. SAML is a product of the OASIS Security Services TC,
    which is curiously not mentioned in the Applicable Work subsection. This
    is despite the fact that SAML often appears in reference architectures in
    both the public and private sectors, has been extensively profiled for
    interoperability, is the subject of an interop certification program at
    the Liberty Alliance, and has a vibrant specification and development
    community of many years' standing. The ID-WSF standard produced by Liberty
    shares many of the same strengths. They define a variety of solutions for
    both active (Web services-based) and passive (plain browser-based)
    interactions for single sign-on and other federated identity tasks.

    Therefore, the TC proposers must add normative charter provisions to
    coordinate with existing solutions that address the same or similar use
    cases, to enable better interoperability and harmonization in the spirit
    of the OASIS mission (http://www.oasis-open.org/who/). A Joint Committee
    or formal liaisons would be appropriate, in which a number of profiling

deliverables could be proposed for addressing functionality or interoperability deltas.

16. Eve Maler, Sun Microsystems, Inc., http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00007.html

   Specification dependencies:

   The WS-Federation V1.1 specification makes reference to a number of documents (and the charter makes reference to additional ones) that are not standardized; some are privately published and not on any standards track at the moment, and some appear never to be intended for contribution to a standards venue (such as charter references [21], "Secure, Reliable, Transacted Web Services", and [22], "Security in a Web Services World", mentioned in "The TC may also take into consideration the following specifications/works listed in the References section, numbers 19-22, 24-27.").

   The charter's General Notes on Scope say "If any of the above specifications is outside of a standardization process at the time this TC moves to ratify its deliverables, or is not far enough along in the standardization process, any normative references to it in the TC output will be expressed in an abstract manner, and the incarnation will be left at that time as an exercise in interoperability."

   As has already been pointed out by others, this statement is problematic because a subjective judgment must be made about the meaning of "far enough along". It is also problematic because it is unclear exactly how any "exercise in interoperability" is served by the under-specification of standards or the dependency of standards on unstable non-standards. If the foundation of referenced specifications on which WS-Federation needs to rest is this shaky, the risk of delay while this foundation reaches stability should be accounted for in the schedule (on which see more below).

17. Eve Maler, Sun Microsystems, Inc., http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00007.html

   Specification development and scheduling:

   The charter appears designed to ensure that the TC's output remains identical to the named input specification. See, for example, these statements:

   - Section b: Statement of Purpose: "This work will be carried out through continued refinement of the Web Services Federation Language Version 1.1 specification [1] submitted to the TC as referenced in this charter"

   - Section c: Scope of Work: This section contains more than a dozen pages' worth of paraphrasing of the input specification, paying particular attention to "web (passive) requestors". The statements under the "This

work will focus on:" headings frequently provide detailed instructions for using certain underlying technologies, rather than true use cases or problem statements.

- Out of Scope subsection in Section c: The "non-exhaustive" items that are out of scope include "Mechanisms and protocols for establishing federations beyond those described in the input document" (#2).

Thus, the note in the introduction to the Scope of Work section that says "Other contributions and changes to the input documents will be accepted for consideration without any prejudice or restrictions and evaluated based on technical merit..." is belied by the rest of the sentence, "...in so far as they conform to this charter."

Given the design constraints placed on the TC as the charter is written today, the plan to complete a Committee Specification within 18 months seems incredibly generous. (However, also see our comments on schedule risk because of dependencies, above.) If appearances are deceiving and it is not the intent to duplicate the input specification in the TC's output deliverable, 18 months seems highly optimistic, and this risk should be accounted for in the charter. The purpose and scope statements noted above should also be corrected in this case.

18. Eve Maler, Sun Microsystems, Inc., http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00007.html

Audience targeting:
section e, Anticipated Audience, focuses solely on vendors and users of "Web services", which seems to mean SOAP-based services exclusively given the context of the charter as a whole. But the greatest portion of the extensive Scope of Work description is spent on passive requestors, which are defined in WS-Federation V1.1 as web browsers that are "not able to construct a SOAP message". Indeed, this is current the most common case in federated identity deployments.

Thus, the audience description needs revision. In so doing, however, note that it would overlap in large part with the audience for SAML, which again suggests that coordination, interoperability, and harmonization activities with the SSTC are required.

19. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

The charter should indicate that the final deliverables will include a conformance program. In our view, this is a major omission as it is difficult to achieve product-level interoperability without a formal conformance program.

If interoperability between independently implemented products is a goal of this effort, then we propose that the section titled "Deliverables" include a document or section titled conformance requirements for WS-Federation.

20. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   The charter includes material that essentially duplicates the functionality found in the OASIS SAML 2.0 specification. The charter should clarify why the authors felt this to be necessary and whether the final specification would have any relationship to SAML 2.0.

   If the charter proponents view this work as a successor or improvement over SAML 2.0, then the conformance program should provide recommendations on interoperation with existing SAML 2.0 implementations.

21. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   The charter includes a section titled "Authorization" and one titled "Privacy". The section on "Authorization" should reference OASIS XACML 2.0. The section on "Privacy" should reference W3C P3P 1.0.

   We strongly recommend that the specification be informed by these works and avoid ad-hoc reinvention of existing work. These references should also be included in the section titled "General Notes on Scope".

22. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   In addition to the central topic of federation, this specification also addresses additional topics such as attribute services, pseudonym services, authorization, and privacy.

   The value of the specification would be enhanced if the specification were structured in a layered way with core material restricted to federation and the subsidiary topics incorporated via profiles or bindings.

   This would also support the widest possible use of the core specification when communities or vendors prefer alternative approaches to the subsidiary topics.

   We recommend that discussion of the use of a layered specification Structure be added to "General Notes on Scope".

23. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   Federation Metadata

   Will the specification describe how federation metadata could be published to a UDDI repository? UDDI is a well known and standard registry mechanism.

24. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   Attribute Services

   - In this section it is unclear what component is proposed to be standardized. Is it an API or some sort of documentation technique or a metadata specification?

   - It is suprising that the general problem of attribute access is being discussed here in item 2. Is there an explicit intention here to go beyond identity attributes or is this an error? It seems to lie outside the Scope of Work" statement.

   - There are many existing standards that speak to privacy and access control such as P3P 1.0 and XACML 2.0. It is surprising that these standards aren't referenced under item 3. [See comment 21]

25. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

   Authorization

   - XACML 2.0 is a well regarded OASIS standard for Authorization. It is surprising that this section makes no reference to XACML but rather chooses to invent an ad-hoc authorization service architecture. We would recommend that XACML 2.0 be referenced here and that the authorization service appropriately profile XACML 2.0.

26. Prateek Mishra, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00010.html

    Authentication Types

   - The SAML 2.0 specification includes a systematic and extensible mechanism for describing authentication types - the SAML 2.0 Authentication Context specification. We would recommend that this section reference the SAML 2.0 authentication context specification. Further, this specification be referenced in the section titled "General Notes on Scope".

27. Paul Madsen, NTT, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00005.html

   NTT shares the concerns raised by France Telecom/Orange with respect to the proposed charter for the WS-Federation TC.

   With the proposed scope, it would appear that the inevitable result can only be unfortunate duplication of existing SAML 2.0 functionality, with the consequent complexity and cost eventually assumed by technology customers.

28. Jeff Hodges, NeuStar, Inc., http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00011.html

    NeuStar strongly shares the observations, concerns, and suggestions about the proposed WSFED charter, as noted by France Telecom/Orange, Nokia, NTT, and Sun, in their messages to this list:

    France Telecom/Orange
    http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00000.html

    Nokia
    http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/oasis-charter-discuss/200703/msg00007.html

    NTT
    http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00005.html

    Sun
    http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00007.html

    We feel that the reasons for putting WS-Federation on the OASIS standards track are not clearly thought-through, both by the proposers and by OASIS, and are concerned with the further fragmentation of the web identity space, resulting in higher costs for vendors, customers, and service providers.

29. Anish Karmarkar, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00009.html

    In the "General Notes on Scope" section it says:

    "If any of the above specifications is outside of standardization process at the time this TC moves to ratify its deliverables, or is not far enough along in the standardization process, any normative references to it in the TC output will be expressed in an abstract manner, and the incarnation will be left at that time as an exercise in interoperability."

    It is not clear what 'far enough along in the standardization process' means. Does that mean a CD, CS or OASIS Standard, if the specification is being standardized in OASIS? Does that mean LC, CR, PR or Rec if the specification is being standardized in W3C? This should be explicitly stated in the charter.

30. Anish Karmarkar, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00009.html

We believe that OASIS Standards should have a high bar for normative references. Increasingly, OASIS Standards are being referenced and used by de jure standards organizations, which have strict rules with regard to normative references, as well as governments, profiling organizations such as WS-I and other standards bodies. Regardless of the disposition of comment #1 above for CS-level specifications, we believe that OASIS Standards should have only normative references to final, adopted specifications.

31. Anish Karmarkar, Oracle, http://www.oasis-open.org/archives/oasis-charter-discuss/200704/msg00009.html

We also agree with the comments at [2].

References:

[1] WS-Federation Version 1.1
"Web Services Federation Language" Version 1.1, December 2006