



SAML Version 2.0 Scope and Work Items

Working Draft 16, 17 February 26 March 2004

Document identifier:

sstc-saml-scope-2.0-draft-165

Location:

http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/documents.php?wg_abbrev=security

Previous draft: @@

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/5523/sstc-saml-scope-2.0-draft-15-diff.pdf>~~<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/5490/sstc-saml-scope-2.0-draft-14-diff.pdf>~~

~~<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/5489/sstc-saml-scope-2.0-draft-14.pdf>~~~~<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/5522/sstc-saml-scope-2.0-draft-15.pdf>~~

Editors:

Scott Cantor, individual (cantor.2@osu.edu)
Prateek Mishra, Netegrity (pmishra@netegrity.com)
Eve Maler, Sun Microsystems (eve.maler@sun.com)

Abstract:

This non-normative document describes the scope of the V2.0 work of the OASIS Security Services Technical Committee (SSTC), including candidate work items and their status.

Status:

Revision 165 reflects the latest drafts of solution proposals and the new statuses of several work items. The assessment of newly "completed" work items is conservative; please notify the editor if you have updates, new progress on implementing work items in specification drafts, discussed in the TC telecon on 17 Feb 2004.

26 **1 Scope of the V2.0 Work**

27 The SAML 2.0 effort intends to deliver on the following goals:

- 28 • Address issues and enhancement requests that have arisen from experience with real-world SAML
29 implementations and with other security architectures that use SAML.
- 30 • Adding support for features that were deferred from previous versions of SAML.
- 31 • Develop an approach for unifying various identity federation models found in real-world SAML
32 implementations and SAML-based security architectures.

33 **Design Principles**

34 At its October 2003 face-to-face meeting, the TC ranked its design principles for the V2.0 roughly as
35 follows:

- 36 • Must meet the schedule
- 37 • (Equally) Must meet the accepted use cases
- 38 • Retain the existing domain model (i.e., restructuring not acceptable; additions are acceptable)
- 39 • Clean versioning path from 1.x to 2.0 and beyond
- 40 • Selective backwards compatibility where it doesn't conflict with other goals

41 The TC also listed design non-principles:

- 42 • Minimally invasive to the 1.x design
- 43 • Overall backwards compatibility
- 44 • Maximally elegant design

2 Work Items

45

46 We are taking a use-case-based approach for each new area of functionality. The owner for each work
 47 item makes a proposal containing at least one use case and definitions of any new terms, possibly along
 48 with formal requirements. (Use cases for a priori accepted items are welcome too.) On acceptance of a
 49 use case, the owner is expected to make a proposal for SAML technology that solves the use case.
 50 (Others may submit proposals as well.) The work item table uses the following status values and colors.

51 **Note:** Where it is noted in this section that solution proposals have been “accepted”,
 52 design features may still change in accordance with TC wishes. Accepted solution
 53 proposals are typically just starting points for further refinement.

Status: Color	Description	Work Items
Active: green on white background	Targeted for SAML V2.0	W-1 , W-2a, W-3, W-4, W-5, W-5b , W-6, W-7, W-8 , W-9 , W-14, W-15 , W-19, W-21 , W-25 , W-27, W-28b , W-28a1 , W-28a2 , W-30 (<i>italic items are considered at risk</i>)
Reassess: orange on light gray background	For non-core functionality that we may decide to include in V2.0 as we go	W-12, W-22, W-26
Liaison: purple on yellow background	For functionality farmed out to other efforts	W-18, W-20
Inactive: red on gray background	Not considered part of the V2.0 work, but may be picked up later	W-5b , W-10, W-11, W-13, W-16, W-17, W-24, W-28, W-28c
Completed: black on green background	Was previously active, but has now been fully implemented in the specifications; this does not preclude further discussion by the TC on technical particulars of the specs or further issues being reported by TC members or others	W-1 , W-2, W-5a, W-8 , W-21 , W-28a1 , W-28a2 , W-28b , W-28d, W-29

54 Documents in the SAML repository are referenced here by document ID root (for example, “draft-sstc-
 55 session-management”) and download ID number (for example, “3659”). To retrieve the document, add the
 56 download ID number to the end of the following base URI:

57 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/>

58 For example:

59 <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/3659>

60 Mail messages are referenced here by message month and ID. To retrieve a message, add the citation
 61 string to the following base URI (this link takes you to the whole mail archive):

62 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/security-services/>

63 For example:

64 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/security-services/200310/doc00001.doc>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-1 Completed Active</p>	<p>John Kemp</p>	<p>Session Support</p> <p>Keywords: profiles, SSO, sessions, logout</p> <p>Global signout and similar would be considered simple sessions. Complex sessions would include things like global timeout. Boeing has provided input on their requirements around this.</p>	<p>Base use case (accepted in principle): support for sessions as found in liberty-architecture-overview-v1.1.pdf (3895) Sections 3.2.4 and 5.6</p> <p>Advanced use case (needs to be voted on): support for time-out and session linking as discussed in draft-sstc-session-management and mail message 200310/doc00001.doc</p> <p>John K.'s further elucidation of use cases, resulting in a P1 through P5: message 200312/msg00038.html</p> <p>All of P1 through P5 were accepted on 9 December 2003 (see message 200312/msg00054.html), with the understanding that a logically separate session authority would be specified. If this imposes too much of a design burden, we may reconsider.</p> <p>Solution proposal: See liberty-architecture-protocols-schema-v1.1.pdf (3896) Sections 3.2 and 3.5; also message 200402/msg00013.html and draft-sstc-kemp-sessions-proposal-01.pdf (5256)</p> <p>Original issues: See sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) UC-3-01, UC-3-08, UC-3-09, DS-13-01</p> <p>Additional input: see Boeing input in message 200308/msg00008.html</p> <p>Motion to "Incorporate ID-FF v1.2 logout protocol, with extension into SAML v2.0" was accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html</p> <p>Discussion on timeout feature has not been resolved/decided yet</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-2 Completed	Scott Cantor John Linn	Identity Federation Keywords: account linking, pseudonyms, SSO, privacy NameIdentifier Exchange between sites. Persistent pseudonyms for principals. This should also include privacy and anonymity features à la Shibboleth and Liberty. This should include the notion of an anonymous name identifier. It was noted that Liberty V1.2 has anonymity features.	Base use case: support as described in liberty-architecture-overview-v1.1.pdf (3895) Sections 3.2.1 and 5.4 Extension use case: includes use of "one-time" identifier as discussed in mail message 200310/doc00002.doc Sum of these use cases accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Solution proposal: draft-sstc-nameid (4587); also see liberty-architecture-protocols-schema-v1.1.pdf (3896) Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4, along with the Shibboleth architecture at http://shibboleth.internet2.edu/docs/draft-internet2-shibboleth-arch-v05.pdf . SAML core spec (sstc-saml-core-2.0-draft-05, 5519) now contains a nearly complete solution proposal, which was accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html Original issues: see sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) DS-1-02
W-2a Active	Prateek Mishra	SSO with Attribute Exchange Keywords: attributes This can be used to achieve a kind of federation without using an account-linking model. This may have some impact on W-12.	Use case proposal: sstc-ssso-attribute-exchange (3966) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Additional input: see Boeing input in message 200308/msg00008.html Solution proposal: mail message 200401/msg00079.html Discussion at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html) resulted in an instruction to describe use cases more thoroughly for comparison with existing ID-FF solutions to see if there's already a match

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-3 Active	Jahan Moreh	<p>Metadata and Exchange Protocol</p> <p>Keywords: metadata, interoperability, discovery, trust</p> <p>This work has already begun. It should include SAML feature discovery through a WSDL file. SAML metadata might want to include a way to discover supported types of authentication protocols, as outlined in closed issue DS-7-06.</p>	<p>Use case proposals: sstc-cantor-w3-metadata (4122) and 200311/msg00018.html</p> <p>Use cases accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>Solution proposals: now in a spec draft: sstc-saml-metadata-2.0-draft (59604538) and sstc-saml-MetadataDiscoveryProtocols-2.0-draft (3695); also see liberty-architecture-protocols-schema-v1.1.pdf (3896) Section 4, along with the Shibboleth architecture at http://shibboleth.internet2.edu/docs/draft-internet2-shibboleth-arch-v05.pdf</p> <p>Original issues: see sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) DS-7-06, MS-5-08</p> <p>At F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html, items at sstc-cantorandmoreh-w3 (5260) were discussed; proposal to consider ID-FF V1.2 metadata as basic of SAML V2.0 (removing Liberty-specific references) was accepted</p>
W-4 Active	Jahan Moreh	<p>Profile Enhancements for Metadata</p> <p>Keywords: protocol, metadata</p> <p>Implications for the profiles (and profile creation guidelines) regarding metadata usage.</p>	<p>Use cases are covered by W-3.</p> <p>Solution proposal: sstc-saml-MetadataInBindings-2.0-draft (3697)</p> <p>As of the F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html), we are waiting until the metadata spec is stable to go back and enhance the profiles as necessary (including any new profiles done by then)</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-5 Active (see also W-5a, W-5b, W-17, W-25)</p>	<p>Prateek Mishra</p>	<p>SSO Profile Enhancements</p> <p>Keywords: profiles, SSO, metadata, discovery, authentication</p> <p>Richer SSO profiles, including (signed) requests from destination sites, control over authentication, passivity, extensibility, and source site discovery. Boeing has provided input on their requirements around “destination site first” scenarios.</p> <p>Candidate solution should reference both Liberty and SAML 1.1 draft. Need to conduct survey of “typical” data items transfer from SP to IdP.</p>	<p>Use case: Add flows from SP to IdP as discussed in mail message 200310/msg00162.html</p> <p>Use cases accepted on 9 December 2003 (see message 200312/msg00054.html).</p> <p>Need to choose profile extensions among W-5 and W-5a that we want to cover.</p> <p>Solution proposal: sstc-bindings-extensions (3893); see also liberty-architecture-protocols-schema-v1.1.pdf (3896) Section 3.2, liberty-architecture-bindings-profiles-v1.1.pdf (3898), the Boeing input in message 200308/msg00008.html, and the Shibboleth architecture at http://shibboleth.internet2.edu/docs/draft-internet2-shibboleth-arch-v05.pdf</p> <p>Use cases accepted.</p> <p>Proposal at message 200402/msg00013.html accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html</p> <p>Design work for this related set of items is largely taking place in the area of AuthnRequest/Response; see solution proposal at thread starting at message 200402/msg00047.html and other threads in month 200402/threads.html</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-5a Completed Active (see also W-5, W-5b, W-17, W-25)	Frederick Hirsch	Enhanced Client Profiles Keywords: profiles, clients Some profiles rely on enhanced clients and proxies ("Liberty-enabled client" or LECP). This might need enhancement to account for general considerations of clients that are web services, and also non-mobile clients.	Use case: 03-09-18-lecp-proposal (3802) See also additional input in Fidelity presentation (3585) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Solution proposals: hirsch-sstc-lecp-draft (4641), hirsch-paos-lecp-draft (4948) Proposal to adopt LECP and PAOS+LECP proposal and integrate into SAML 2.0 Bindings and Profiles spec accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html ; implemented in the newly separated Bindings spec (sstc-saml-bindings-2.0, 5489) and Profiles spec (sstc-saml-profiles-2.0, 5510)
W-5b InaActive (see also W-5, W-5a, W-17, W-25)	Tony Nadalin, Jeff Hodges	SOAP Client Profile	Use case: mail message 200310/doc00003.doc Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Additional use cases and beginnings of solution proposal: draft-sstc-solution-profile-soap (5330) See also additional input in Fidelity presentation (3585) See also details in W-17, which has been merged in with this Discussion at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html); some new use cases presented late in the cycle don't seem to have consensus yet During the telecon of 2 March 2004, IBM withdrew the work item for V2.0 consideration

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-6 Active</p>	<p>Scott Cantor</p>	<p>Proxied SSO</p> <p>Keywords: profiles, SSO, intermediaries</p> <p>Liberty 1.2 adds dynamic proxying into the SSO profiles, including non-Liberty services.</p>	<p>Use case: sstc-cantor-w6-proxy (4388)</p> <p>Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>See liberty-architecture-protocols-schema-v1.1.pdf (3896) and the Liberty V1.2 dynamic proxying capability described at http://www.projectliberty.org/specs/liberty-idff-protocols-schema-v1.2.pdf Section 3.2.2.7</p> <p>Discussion at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html); need to track progress in AuthnRequest/Response to close this</p>
<p>W-7 Active</p>	<p>Scott Cantor</p>	<p>Discovery Protocol</p> <p>Keywords: discovery, metadata</p> <p>For example, this includes common domain and cookie mechanisms.</p>	<p>Use case for finding an IdP when at an SP: liberty-architecture-overview-v1.1.pdf (3895) Section 5.5</p> <p>Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>Solution proposal: liberty-architecture-bindings-profiles-v1.1.pdf (3898); see also the Shibboleth architecture at http://shibboleth.internet2.edu/docs/draft-internet2-shibboleth-arch-v05.pdf</p> <p>Accepted proposal to incorporate introduction cookie mechanism at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-8 Completed Active</p>	<p>John Kemp</p>	<p>Authentication Context</p> <p>Keywords: SSO, authentication</p> <p>Liberty authentication context exchange and control.</p>	<p>Use case for indicating SP-requested authentication characteristics and reporting actual characteristics used: mail message 200310/msg00216.html</p> <p>Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>Solution proposals: liberty-architecture-authentication-context-v1.1.pdf (3899), draft-sstc-authn-context-v1.0 (5188); also draft-sstc-authn-context-v1.0-02 (5244)</p> <p>Proposal to adopt solution proposal accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html</p>
<p>W-9 Active</p>	<p>Scott Cantor Hal Lockhart</p>	<p>XML Encryption</p> <p>Keywords: security, encryption, privacy</p> <p>Incorporate XML-based encryption of assertions and/or other SAML constructs.</p>	<p>Use cases: messages 200311/msg00116.html and 200312/msg00039.html</p> <p>On 9 December 2003, agreed to allow for encrypting requests and responses and to provide schema validity selectively on a case-by-case basis; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>Additional input: see the usage of XML Encryption in Liberty V1.2, described at http://www.projectliberty.org/specs/liberty-idff-protocols-schema-v1.2.pdf Section 3.2.2.3 and http://www.projectliberty.org/specs/liberty-idff-bindings-profiles-v1.2.pdf Section 3.8</p> <p>Solution proposal: message 200402/msg00023.html (slide prese) Most recent use cases and solution proposal: message 200403/msg00127.html</p> <p>Discussion at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html), but solution proposal not yet accepted; need use cases described more thoroughly</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-10 Inactive	–	Back Office Profiles Keywords: profiles, web services B2B, A2A, and other similar profiles.	
W-11 Inactive	–	Mid-Tier Usage Keywords: profiles, web services, intermediaries, delegation Profile or other specification for SAML usage in the middle tier for XML firewalls and similar. This is related to W-15.	
W-12 Reassess		Attribute Retrieval Enhancement Keywords: attributes, XACML, protocol Finer-grained attribute retrieval, for example, “All attributes in namespace X.” It has also been suggested that just the attribute schema or just the attribute names could be requested, that it should be possible to boxcar multiple assertion types in a request, and that requests with assertion ID references should also be allowed to contain attributes. Any solutions here should take into account the differences between SAML and XACML attributes. This may be impacted by W-2a.	Original issues: see sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) DS-12-03, DS-12-04, DS-9-02, DS-9-03
W-13 Inactive	–	Hierarchical Privilege Delegation Keywords: attributes, authorization Hierarchical delegation of privileges among federated attribute authorities.	

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-14 Active</p>	<p>Jeff Hodges</p>	<p>SAML Server Trust</p> <p>Keywords: interoperability, trust</p> <p>Standardized trust between SAML-enabled servers, apart from what we're already doing in the metadata work. It may be that the only appropriate action at this stage is to flesh out the security considerations and/or discuss it briefly in the SAML Primer. Some feel that it's premature to address this, although Liberty has done some work in this area.</p> <p>Awaiting a proposal on how to put a framework around SAML and trust relationships.</p>	<p>Liberty Alliance has contributed a new document addressing this area; see message 200402/msg00007.html</p> <p>Document submitted is liberty-trust-models-guidelines-v1.0.pdf (5242)</p> <p>Discussion at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html) resulted in request to cast document in SAML-specific terms for TC consideration</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-15 Active	Scott Cantor Bob Morgan Jeff Hodges	<p>Delegation and Intermediaries</p> <p>Keywords: profiles, web services, intermediaries, delegation</p> <p>Use cases that support arbitrary multi-hop delegation. Liberty WSF supports one-hop impersonation. The relationship of this to WSS needs to be sorted out. This relates to the Fidelity need for a WSRP profile. This is related to W-11. The item "multi-participant transactional workflows" was folded into this one.</p>	<p>Delegation/intermediaries use case model: draft-morgan-sstc-delegation-model (4402) introduced in message 200312/msg00004.html</p> <p>Library meta-search use case from Scott Cantor: see messages 200312/msg00035.html and 200312/msg00040.html and 200312/msg00041.html</p> <p>Use case accepted on 9 December 2003, with additional exploration into existing proposed profiles, with view to the assertions being communicated further to a backend system – what are the security considerations and changes necessary? (see message 200312/msg00054.html)</p> <p>Additional input: see Ron Monzillo's slides in mail message 200309/msg00059.html</p> <p>At F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html), discussed this but concluded that more progress is needed on the AuthnRequest/Response design work in order to determine what is needed here; also see Ron's issue at thread starting at message 200402/msg00049.html and other threads in month 200402/threads.html (recorded in the issues list (5428) as TECH-3), plus proposal in 200401/msg00102.html</p>
W-16 Inactive	–	(Merged with W-15.)	–

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-17 Inactive (see W-5 , W-5a , W-5b , W-25)	Tim Moses Jeff Hodges	(Merged with W-5b.) Credentials Collector and Assertions Keywords: protocol This includes pass-through authentication. This is related to W-18.	Use case proposal: oasis-sstc-v2_0-credentials_collector-use_cases-moses (4119) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Additional input: see mail messages by Adams 200206/msg00007.html and Lockhart 200303/msg00033.html Original issues: see sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) UC-1-14
W-18 Liaison	Jeff Hodges Bob Morgan	SASL support Keywords: authentication Defining SAML as a SASL security mechanism.	Jeff and Bob will create an activity in IETF around this topic and function as our liaisons. Original issues: see sstc-saml-1.1-issues-draft-02 (3690) UC-1-05, UC-5-02
W-19 Active	Scott Cantor	HTTP-Based Assertion Referencing Keywords: bindings Additional protocol binding for direct HTTP use.	Use case and solution proposal: draft-sstc-assertion-uri (3651) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Accepted solution proposal at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html); TC will pursue SAML-specific media (MIME) type registration
W-20 Liaison	Dale Moberg Matt MacKenzie	ebMS Binding/Profile Keywords: bindings Additional protocol binding for ebXML Message Service use and/or additional profile for using SAML to allow for authentication and authorization of ebMS messages. The eGov TC has discussed this latter notion a little. The ebxml-msg TC will take on both questions.	Dale and Matt will examine this in the ebxml-msg TC

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-21 Completed Active	Scott Cantor Bob Morgan	Baseline Attribute Namespaces Keywords: attributes, XACML For example, a DSML or X.500 profile for a person's attributes expressed in SAML.	Use case and solution proposal for convention for using X.500/LDAP attribute types in SAML: draft-morgan-saml-attr-x500 (4124); see also message 200401/msg00060.html Use case that proposes going beyond X.500/LDAP to RDB and/or UDDI: 200311/msg00010.html Further elucidation of use cases, resulting in P1 and P2: message 200312/msg00052.html Use case P1 accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Additional input: see also the Shibboleth architecture at http://shibboleth.internet2.edu/docs/draft-internet2-shibboleth-arch-v05.pdf and the XML-Enabled Directory work described in message 200312/msg00052.html At F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html), John Hughes agreed to be editor of new "Baseline Identities and Attributes" specification
W-22 Reassess		Assertion Caching Keywords: assertions, web services, auditing Persistent caching or mirroring of assertions at multiple sites. We think the WSS SAML token may be related to this; SAML has a protocol to obtain assertions, and there's also STR. Ideally this would be coordinated with the designs for W-13 through W-15, so that it's possible to express "I trust this server to cache assertions."	
W-23 Reassess		Security Workflow Keywords: protocol Expressing security processing workflow definitions.	
W-24 Inactive		(Merged with W-2.)	

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-25 Active (see also W-5, W-5a, W-5b, W-17)	John Hughes	Kerberos Support Keywords: authentication, profiles	Use case proposals for both the bridge server situation and the basic browser/Kerberos situation: draft-sstc-use-kerberos (3760) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html Solution proposal: draft-sstc-solution-profile-kerberos (5935250); discussed at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html) but no conclusions reached quite yet because of potential tie-ins with merged work items
W-26 Reassess	Prateek Mishra	Dependency Audit Keywords: assertions, auditing A “validity-depends-on” feature.	
W-27 Active	Tony Nadalin	Security Analysis Enhancements Keywords: security, profiles Suggestions from researcher who has done a formal security analysis.	The security analysis has been published at http://www.acsac.org/2003/abstracts/73.html . Tony and Scott will propose new issues based on this.
W-28 Inactive	–	XACML-Proposed Changes See the individually broken out work items below.	Input: see the combined XACML/OGSA proposal at 200309/msg00058.html and the original OGSA proposal at 200306/msg00018.html
W-28a1 Active <u>Completed</u>	Rebekah Lepro	Existing Attribute Usage Codification Keywords: attributes, interoperability This is codification of existing namespace usage within the specs. XACML and SAML structure their attribute information differently.	Use case proposal: sstc-cantor-w28a-attrib (4035) Solution proposal: draft-sstc-attribute (5312) At F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html) did a detailed walkthrough of the solution proposal and tasked Eve with a comprehensive revision (now at sstc-maler-w28a-attribute, 594336) (This item should be considered re-merged with W28a2 for all intents and purposes)

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
<p>W-28a2 <u>Completed</u> Active (see also W-28a1)</p>	<p>Rebekah Lepro</p>	<p>Reconciling Attribute Usage with XACML</p> <p>Keywords: XACML, attributes</p> <p>This should also acknowledge existing usage (W-28a1).</p>	<p>Use cases and solution proposal: 28b-draft-solution (note that the document ID should properly be “28a” or “28a2”) (3666) Use case accepted on 9 December 2003; see message 200312/msg00054.html</p> <p>Additional input: see the combined XACML/OGSA proposal at 200309/msg00058.html</p>
<p>W-28b <u>Completed</u> Active</p>	<p>Hal Lockhart</p>	<p>XACML Proposal for Policy Transport and Authorization Decision Reconciliation</p> <p>Keywords: XACML, policy, authorization, grid</p> <p>XACML has asked for a SAML-based solution to transporting requests for policies and the policies themselves. This ties into how to coordinate the XACML and SAML versions of authorization decisions.</p>	<p>This was sent back to the XACML TC. It is up to them to profile this use case from SAML foundations.</p> <p>Additional input: see the combined XACML/OGSA proposal at 200309/msg00058.html</p> <p>Proposal to freeze Authz Decision functionality as is for V2.0, with no further enhancement planned and with referral to XACML for those need more finality accepted at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004; see message 200402/msg00123.html</p>
<p>W-28c Inactive</p>		<p>Merged with 28b above.</p>	
<p>W-28d Completed</p>	<p>Rebekah Lepro</p>	<p>IssuerName Enhancement</p> <p>Keywords: XACML</p> <p>XACML would like to have “datatyping” of issuers.</p>	<p>Use case and solution proposal: 28d-draft-solution (3667), draft-sstc-AssertIssuer (5158)</p> <p>Additional input: see the combined XACML/OGSA proposal at 200309/msg00058.html</p> <p>The acceptance of draft core-04 at F2F on 3-5 Feb 2004 (see message 200402/msg00123.html and W-2 above) included core spec features implementing enhancement of issuer names</p>

ID/Status	Owner(s)	Description	Documents and Dispositions
W-29 Completed	Eve Maler	Promised V2.0 Changes Plans to make backwards-incompatible changes in V2.0 that were promised in V1.0 or V1.1: Removing AuthorityBinding element (core) Removing RespondWith element (core) Removing deprecated NameIdentifier URIs (core) Requiring URI references to be absolute (core) Disallowing Status element as the only child of a SOAP Body element (bindings) Removing deprecated artifact URI (bindings)	Implemented.
W-30 Active	Scott Cantor Prateek Mishra	Migration Paths Document the migration paths from SAML V1.1 to SAML V2.0, and from Liberty V1.2 to SAML V2.0. This is likely to go in the <i>Implementation Guidelines</i> document, though this may change.	Waiting for implementation