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Abstract

This document describes the conformance clause for the SAML specification.

Referenced Documents


3. XML Protocol specification conformance issues

Notational Conventions
The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in Key Words for Use in RFC’s to Indicate Requirement Levels (RFC 2119).

**Status of this Document**

This document represents work in progress upon which no reliance should be made.

**Document Version History**

- Version 0.001: Initial version
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1 Conformance Clause

1.1 Introduction

The SAML conformance would be expressed by three orthogonal dimensions.

- The first dimension is a profile, which is a subset of the overall specifications that includes all of the functionality necessary to satisfy the requirements of a particular community of users. The profiles for SAML are authentication authority, authorization authority, attribute authority, session authority, Policy decision authority and policy enforcement authority.

- The second dimension is the role of a system - consumer, producer or producer-consumer.

- The third dimension is the binding viz http, xmlp, soap, ebXML et al.

1.1.1 Conformance Nomenclature

The nomenclature for expressing SAML conformance would be two SAML conformance matrices as follows:

1. Profile-Role Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Consumer</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Producer/Consumer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentication authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy decision authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy enforcement authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Profile-Bindings Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>http</th>
<th>xmlp</th>
<th>SOAP</th>
<th>BEEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentication authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy decision authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy enforcement authority</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.2 Mandatory/Optional:

All conformances profiles/roles and bindings are mandatory and there are no optional characteristics. i.e. if a system describes itself as conforming to a SAML Authorization authority, producer-consumer over http and SOAP, it has to consume and produce *all* SAML authentication assertions and be able to support the http and SOAP bindings described in the SAML specifications.

1.1.3 Extensions:

There are no mechanisms for the extension of SAML features.

1.1.4 Implementation Defined Features

TBD.

1.1.5 Alternate approaches

The different transport mechanisms are covered under the bindings dimension.

1.2 Profiles

<Describe the profiles and relevant use case sections>

1.3 Roles

<Describe the roles and relevant use case sections>

1.4 Bindings

<Describe the bindings and relevant use cases sections>
2 Things To Do