

---

## 1 6 Security Composition

### 2 6.1 Composition Requirements

3 To discuss the composition of the facilities provided by WS-ReliableMessaging (WS-RM) with those  
4 provided by web service security infrastructures we must first define what we mean by “compose”. For  
5 our purposes composition will be defined by the following requirements:

- 6 1. The use (or non-use) of WS-RM facilities should not impact a service's ability to provide or  
7 require the necessary security qualities (authentication, integrity, confidentiality) in its  
8 communications.
- 9 2. The use (or non-use) of security services should not impact the service's ability to use WS-RM to  
10 provide message tracking and retry.
- 11 3. The use (or non-use) of WS-RM facilities should not impose additional security requirements **on**  
12 **individual services**. It may be that, in order to protect the security of the WS-RM protocol itself,  
13 additional security infrastructure (e.g. an WS-Trust runtime component) is required, but these  
14 additional infrastructure requirements should not impact the services that use WS-RM.

### 15 6.2 Profiles

16 The following sections detail individual security composition profiles. A unique URI is assigned to each  
17 profile for use as a reference to that profile.

#### 18 6.2.1 TLS/BasicAuth Profiles

19 The following two profiles use TLS/SSL to provide integrity and confidentiality and HTTP Basic  
20 Authentication [BasicAuth] to authenticate the RMS. The mechanisms used to protect the Sequence are  
21 the same in both profiles, but the scope of the BasicAuth credentials are different. The following applies  
22 to both of these profiles:

- 23 • These profiles pre-suppose that HTTP is being used to carry all WS-RM messages for the  
24 Sequences to which these profiles are being applied.
- 25 • The use of TLS limits the application of these profiles to situations in which the source process  
26 and the destination can directly connect over a single network hop.

27 The high-level mechanism of both profiles is as follows:

- 28 1. The source process (RMS or combined AS/RMS node) negotiates a server-authenticated TLS  
29 session with the destination.
- 30 2. The source process authenticates with the destination using HTTP Basic Authentication for all  
31 subsequent messages.
- 32 3. The RMS establishes a Sequence with the RMD.
- 33 4. Protocol and traffic messages for a Sequence may flow over any TLS session between the same  
34 source/destination pair.

35 The specific profiles are:

36 [http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/http\\_auth/samenode](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/http_auth/samenode)

37 The credentials presented by the source process are meant to serve as authentication information  
38 for both the AS and RMS. It is the responsibility of the RMD to forward the source process'  
39 authenticated identity to the AD. It may do this by replaying the HTTP Authorization header or by  
40 some other, unspecified mechanism.

#### 41 [http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/http\\_auth/sep\\_node](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/http_auth/sep_node)

42 The credentials presented by the RMS serve solely to authenticate the RMS and do not apply to the  
43 AS. The AS may independently authenticate with the AD via some other mechanism, but it cannot  
44 use HTTP Basic Authentication to do so as this will conflict with the headers used by the RMS.

45 Both of these profiles satisfy the security requirements (described in Detailed Security Requirements) as  
46 follows:

- 47 1-4. The integrity of message bodies and headers and the binding of headers to bodies are all  
48 provided by TLS/SSL.
- 49 5. At sequence creation time the RMD can perform an authorization check using the identity of the  
50 source process (as claimed by the HTTP `Authorization` header that accompanies the  
51 `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` request) to determine if the source process is allowed to create  
52 Sequences with this RMD.
- 53 6-8. The source entity that is permitted to operate on a Sequence is identified by the BasicAuth  
54 credentials that accompanied the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` message for that sequence. Note  
55 that it is the entity *referenced* by the credentials and not the actual credentials that is considered  
56 in Sequence ownership checks. The destination entity allowed to operate on the Sequence is  
57 identified by the X.509 certificate of the authenticated server for the TLS connection used to  
58 carry the `<wsrm:CreateSequenceResponse>` message. The use of the TLS session ID to  
59 identify the destination entity is discouraged as this binds the lifetime of the Sequence to the  
60 lifetime of the TLS session.

## 61 **6.2.2 TLS/Mutual Authentication Profiles**

62 The following two profiles use TLS/SSL to provide integrity and confidentiality and use client-side  
63 certificates to authenticate the RMS. The mechanisms used to protect the Sequence are the same in  
64 both profiles, but the scope of the client-side credentials are different. The following applies to both of  
65 these profiles:

- 66 • These profiles pre-suppose that HTTP is being used to carry all WS-RM messages for the  
67 Sequences to which these profiles are being applied.
- 68 • The use of TLS/SSL limits the application of these profiles to situations in which the source  
69 process and the destination can directly connect over a single network hop.
- 70 • The RMD must be configured to trust (either explicitly or through a trust chain) the signer of the  
71 source's X.509 certificate.

72 The high-level mechanism of both profiles is as follows:

- 73 1. The source process (AS or combined AS/RMS nodes) negotiates a mutually-authenticated TLS  
74 session with the destination.
- 75 2. The RMS establishes a Sequence with the RMD over this TLS session.
- 76 3. Protocol and traffic messages for a Sequence may flow over any TLS session between the same  
77 source/destination pair.
- 78 4. Authorization is based on the authenticated identity of the TLS client (as represented by the  
79 client-side X.509 certificate). WS-RM protocol and traffic messages for a single Sequence may

80 flow over any TLS session between the same source/destination pair provided all such sessions  
81 share a common client identity. This allows a single Sequence to span multiple TLS sessions.

82 The specific profiles are:

83 **[http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200602/profile/tls\\_auth/samenode](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200602/profile/tls_auth/samenode)**

84 The identity of the TLS/SSL client represents both the AS and RMS. The RMD is responsible for  
85 forwarding the source process' authenticated identity to the AD. The mechanisms by which the RMD  
86 accomplishes this are not covered in this document.

87 **[http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200602/profile/http\\_auth/sep\\_node](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200602/profile/http_auth/sep_node)**

88 The client-side X.509 certificate used to authenticate the RMS applies only to the RMS and should  
89 not be construed as representing the identity of the AS. If the AS wishes to authenticate with the AD  
90 it must do so using some other mechanism than TLS/SSL mutual authentication.

91 These profile satisfies the security requirements (described in Detailed Security Requirements) as  
92 follows:

93 1-4. The integrity of message bodies and headers and the binding of headers to bodies are provided  
94 by TLS/SSL.

95 5. At sequence creation time the RMD can perform an authorization check using the identity of the  
96 source process (as represented by the client-side X.509 certificate of the TLS/SSL connection  
97 over which the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` request was sent) to determine if the source process  
98 is allowed to create Sequences with this RMD.

99 6-8. The source entity that is permitted to operate on a Sequence is identified by the client-side  
100 X.509 certificate of the TLS/SSL connection over which the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` message  
101 for that Sequence was sent. Note that it is the entity *referenced* by the certificate and not the  
102 actual certificate that should be considered in Sequence ownership checks. The destination  
103 entity allowed to operate on the Sequence is identified by the X.509 certificate of the  
104 authenticated server for the TLS/SSL connection used to carry the  
105 `<wsrm:CreateSequenceResponse>` message. The use of the TLS/SSL session ID to identify  
106 the either the source or destination entities is discouraged as this binds the lifetime of the  
107 Sequence to the lifetime of the TLS/SSL session.

### 108 **6.2.3 WS-SecureConversation Profile**

109 The following profile uses WS-Security [WS-Security] to provide integrity and confidentiality to WS-RM  
110 Sequence Lifetime and Traffic Messages. WS-SecureConversation [SecureConversation] is used to  
111 mutually authenticate the RMS and RMD. This profile is identified as:

112 **[http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/wsc\\_auth](http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-rx/wsrmsp/200604/profile/wsc_auth)**

113 The mechanism for this profile is as follows:

- 114 1. The source process uses WS-SecureConversation to create a Security Context between itself  
115 and the destination.
- 116 2. The source process creates a Sequence with the RMD. The Security Context established in (1) is  
117 bound to this via a `<wsse:SecurityTokenReference>` (STR) that refers to the  
118 `<wsc:SecurityContextToken>` for that Security Context. This binding is accomplished by  
119 including this STR in a `<wsrm:SecurityComposition>` extension element (see [Profile](#)  
120 [Agreement and Negotiation](#) below) to the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` message.
- 121 3. All Sequence Lifecycle and Traffic Messages and RM Protocol Header Blocks for the Sequence  
122 created in (2) must be signed with the key corresponding to the Security Context created in (1).

123 All `<wsrm:Sequence>` headers must be bound to the body of their Traffic Messages by a  
124 signature that covers at least the `<wsrm:Sequence>` header and the message body.

125 4. Authorization is based on the Security Context communicated in (2). Proof of knowledge of the  
126 key(s) underlying the Security Context constitutes permission to operate on any Sequence  
127 related to that Security Context. Such proof is provided via WS-Security signatures that are  
128 computed using the key(s) in question. For example, if a Sequence Traffic Message has its  
129 sequence header bound to its message body by a signature that uses the key associated with the  
130 Security Context that is bound to that Sequence, then that message can be considered to have  
131 originated from an RMS that is authorized to operate on that Sequence.

132 Observant readers will note that this profile is not divided into sub-instances to cover the two cases in  
133 which the AS and RMS are the same entity and in which the AS and RMS are separate entities. This is  
134 due to the fact that WS-Security allows a single mechanism to handle both cases. For example, suppose  
135 a source process is composed of a combined AS/RMS entity. The Sequence Traffic Messages issued by  
136 this source process contain a single `<ds:Signature>` element that serves to authenticate both the RMS  
137 and the AS. The RMD node can perform all necessary authorization checks against the RMS based on  
138 this signature and, if the message is successfully processed, pass the unaltered message to the AD node  
139 where it can perform any authorization checks based on the same signature.

140 Conversely, suppose the AS and RMS are separate, independent entities and that the Sequence Traffic  
141 Messages issued by the RMS contain two `<ds:Signature>` elements, one that was created by the AS  
142 and one that was created by the RMS. The RMD node can perform all necessary authorization checks  
143 based on the RMS-level signature (it may optionally remove the RMS-level signature from the  
144 message). The AD node can perform any authorization checks based on the AS-level signature.

145 Note that this profile imposes no constraints on and makes no assumptions about the processing of WS-  
146 Security defined message properties such as signature or encryption elements. In situations where  
147 multiple signatures appear in the same message the determination of which signature corresponds to  
148 which source node (RMS or AS) is outside the scope of this profile.

149 This profile satisfies the security requirements (described in Detailed Security Requirements) as follows:

150 1-4. The integrity of message bodies and headers are assured and the binding of headers to bodies  
151 achieved by including the bodies and headers in WS-Security-defined signatures. These  
152 signature are formed using the key(s) corresponding to the Security Context associated with the  
153 Sequence under which the Sequence Traffic Message is being carried or to which the Sequence  
154 Lifecycle Message (including faults) applies.

155 5. At sequence creation time the RMD performs an authorization check using the identity of the  
156 source process (as conveyed during the establishment of the Security Context used to protect  
157 the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>` message and to which the STR in the `<wsrm:CreateSequence>`  
158 message refers) to determine if the source process is allowed to create Sequences with this  
159 RMD.

160 6-8. The source entity that is permitted to operate on a Sequence is identified by the  
161 `<wsc:Identifier>` of the Security Context that was associated with the Sequence at creation  
162 time. The destination entity allowed to operate on the Sequence is identified by the same  
163 `<wsc:Identifier>`. Neither party should refer to specific key instances within a Security  
164 Context as this ties the lifetime of the Sequence to the lifetime a specific key.

165 **Ed Note: It's not clear that this profile does enough to address possible interoperability problems**  
166 **associated with using WS-SecureConversation and WS-Security. In particular the number of signatures**  
167 **and the order of their processing seems to be a likely area for conflicts. Perhaps we should constrain the**  
168 **options and simply mandate that the AS and RMS represent themselves as separate entities (i.e. require**  
169 **two signatures) even if they share the same process/address-space? We could also require adherence to**  
170 **Basic Security Profile.**