Votes

1. Deprecate inclusion of StatusCode as top level element in SOAP response. Require StatusCode to be encapsulated in <samlp:response>. Eve moves to accept; Jeff seconds. No objections. Motion carries by unanimous consent. See PE 17 for details.

2. For <saml:confirmationmethod> deprecated use of urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:cm:artifact-01 and adopted generic form urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:cm:artifact. After line 528 in protocols and bindings add brief normative note similar to “SAML authorities SHOULD NOT include SAML artifact in Confirmation Data” (exact text to be provided by Rob). Eve moves; Jahan seconds. No objections. Motion carries by unanimous consent. See PE 6 for details

3. Produce draft of all documents by Friday May 2, 2003. These would include items agreed to so far. Bob Morgan moves; Jeff Hodges seconds; No objections. Motion carries by unanimous consent.

Existing Action Items

- [AI-0004]: still open
- [AI-0013]: still open
- [AI-0023]: closed

New Action Items

- Rob: propose text for non-use of artifact as subject confirmation data. See PE6 for details.
- Eve: check with Scott on use of xsi:ID and propose correction to document.
- Eve: include informational reference to Liberty and WS Security SAML profiles.
- Eve: add definition of SSO assertion to glossary. Change glossary definition to refer to attribute assertions.
- Scott: provide text on use of XML DSIG.
- Jahan: Continue to develop Metadata specs.

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda accepted as published by Rob.
2. Accept minutes from 22-April meeting:
   - Rob moves to accept. Seconded. Motion passes. Minutes accepted with no change.
3. [Jahan] Errata Review
- All items closed except PE6 and PE17
- PE6: Unanimously accepted deprecation of artifact-01 and adoption of generic from artifact. After line 528 of protocols and bindings. Add a brief normative note like this: SAML authorities SHOULD NOT include SAML artifact in a Confirmation Data. Rob will propose exact text.

- PE17: There is a problem in that the current spec. states that the StatusCode is returned as a top level element in the SOAP body. This is a deprecated way and will not be supported in 2.0. The new way is to include the status as a SAML Response.

4. [Jahan] Review Metadata spec for V1.1
   - Jahan used the following rules to create spec:
     1. Keep it simple
     2. Use as much Liberty metadata elements and attributes as possible
     3. Do not introduce any new attributes or elements
     4. Leverage interop experience of July 2002

Jahan: Much of Liberty-specific metadata is not carries over. The reason is that there is no SAML context for this metadata (e.g., SingleLogoutProfile).
Jeff: Agree that in SAML 1.1 there is no context but this may change in SAML 2.0
Jahan: Agreed. The metadata spec. targets SAML 1.1
Rob: need more time to discuss. Consider making this a recommendation and publish it outside of formal 1.1
Jeff: we can release it as an asynchronous spec.
Bob: would metadata get referenced in the profiles? If so we have to delay until 2.0.
Jahan: There should not be any reference in Binding and Profile.
Rob: Recommend that we publish it as asynchronous spec.
Bob: Agreed, subject to satisfying the requirements that there is no need to reference metadata in the bindings doc.
Action for Jahan: continue to update the spec and publish.

5. [Rob] Action Item Review.
   Two items remain open [AI-0004 and AI-0013]. Six new items added. See section on Action Items for details.

6. [Rob] Are V1.1 specs ready to announce SSTC Last Call?
Status by Eve: has sent email on issues on Binding, Core and Glossary. Eve asks for all to review and resolve and send email back to Eve for incorporation. Eve also volunteers to edit the Metadata document (later rendered unnecessary as Metadata document will not be included in 1.1 committee spec.)
Eve: will check with Scott on use of xsi:ID and will propose correction to document.

Eve: In core, when HTTP methods are specified in AuthorizationDecision (GET or POST), there is no reference to HTTP 1.0 or 1.1.

Jeff: Since both 1.0 and 1.1 have the same semantics about GET and POST, we need not have a reference to it.

Eve: We will leave it as is and revisit in 2.0.

Eve: does Liberty 1.1 count as a submission for registering as a profile
Jeff: certainly we should go ahead and on Liberty’s behalf register them
Rob: what does registration mean
Jeff: we need to assign a profile for the urn and list it in 1.1 spec. This process would be similar to SASL registration
Jeff: take this off-line.
Jahan: Liberty profiles make explicit references to SAML profiles.
Jason: yes they do, but the messages and protocols are liberty-specific.
Rob: I suggest we hold off until 2.0
Jeff: Agreed.
Jahan: Agreed.

Eve: moving chapters around.
Rob: as long as it does not mess up cross references.

Eve: Conformance and Security Considerations:
Conformance:
1. Mentions “test suite as a deliverable”. Eve will make change to relax the deliverable.
2. put it non-normative reference to WS security
3. In section 2.4 (impact of extension): take out “requested that” and keep “MUST”

- Voted to complete drafts by Friday May 2, 2003.
- Last call cut-off is tentatively set May 16.
- Tentatively on May 27 vote to turn candidate spec to actual spec.
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