

1. [\[Source\]](#)

[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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The most any charter can do is to capture a snapshot of specification state prior to submission of a TC formation proposal to OASIS. Consistent with past OASIS WS charters, the WSFED charter provides for the handling of changes in state during the normal conduct of TC business as follows.

“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”

This provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references to WS-Transfer, WS-ResourceTransfer, WS-MetadataExchange and WS-Eventing when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables.

2. [\[Source\]](#)

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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The comment appears to refer to the following text in the General Notes on Scope section of the proposed WSFED TC charter.

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. The TC may also take into consideration the following specifications/works listed in the References section, numbers 19-22, 24-27.

This section cited above appears in existing WS TC working Group charters—the WS-SX and WS-RX charters, for example. The section separates the references into two groups. The first group is cited in the context of “the Web services architecture”. The second group, which includes the roadmap references, is not. In both instances the use of “such as” and “may” indicate that the references are cited as examples.

3. [\[Source\]](#)

[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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The intent is to specifically tie canonicalization in WS-Federation Metadata protocols to the mechanisms defined in [XML-Signature Syntax and Processing](#) and not to specify canonicalization mechanisms specific to WS-Federation.

4. [\[Source\]](#)

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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The proposed WSFED charter provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references to WS-Trust and WS-SecureConversation when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables. See number 1 above.

5. [\[Source\]](#)

[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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The proposed WSFED charter provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references to WS-Policy when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables. See number 1 above.

6. [\[Source\]](#)

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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The proposed WSFED charter provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references to WS-ReliableMessaging, WS-Coordination, WS-AtomicTransaction and WS-BusinessActivity when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables. See number 1 above.

7. [\[Source\]](#)

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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The proposed WSFED TC charter proposes that the TC meet on a weekly basis, that face-to-face meetings be held on a quarterly basis, and gives the TC latitude to vary the pace in order to accommodate workload. The work will be based on substantial concrete works submitted by TC members.

8. [\[Source\]](#)

[The proposed WS-Federation charter] Includes some strange characters in the charter text: "t [4+AF0A0w- that".

Response:

This will be corrected in the final submission.

9. [\[Source\]](#)

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 involvement 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, Principal, Attribute Service, Authorization Service, ...

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The scope of the proposed work is described in the charter as follows:

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.

The Proposers of the WSFED TC charter solicit the participation of others with domain area expertise to aid in the development of specifications consistent with the above. The applicability of similar work produced elsewhere will be determined by the WSFED TC members as part of the specification development process.

10. [\[Source\]](#)

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

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

SAML is mentioned in the Similar Work section of the WSFED TC Charter. The applicability of SAML work to the output of the WSFED TC will be determined by the WSFED TC membership as part of the specification development process.

11. [\[Source\]](#)

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."

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The WSFED TC charter reflects the practical scope of the work as evidenced by the anticipated contribution [1]. It is an explicit goal of the WSFED TC to produce output specifications that compose with the WS specifications referenced in the charter scope. The current level of detail supports the legal due diligence necessary for some potential TC members to commit to participation in the proposed WSFED TC.

12. [\[Source\]](#)

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 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."

To the following:

"If any of the above specifications is outside of a 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."

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The OASIS Process allows for the reference of specifications and other documentation which are not standards. There are numerous precedents in existing OASIS charters and specifications.

13. [\[Source\]](#)

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."

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The use of the phrase "such as" indicates that the references are cited as examples.

14. [\[Source\]](#)

Propose to add following sentence 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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The proposed WSFED charter provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables. See number 1 above.

15. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The scope of the proposed work is described in the charter as follows:

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.

The architecture and specifications referenced are supported by numerous vendors and the foundational security specifications are, or will soon be, OASIS standards (WS-Trust, WS-SecureConversation, WS-SecurityPolicy ...). The Federation work of the proposed TC is scoped to build on this widely adopted standard foundation and allow customers to leverage existing investments.

The applicability of SAML work to the output of the WSFED TC will be determined by the WSFED TC membership as part of the specification development process.

16. [\[Source\]](#)

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).

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

This is a duplicate of comment #1.

The proposed WSFED charter provides a mechanism for the TC members to determine how to handle normative references when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables.

17. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The scope of the proposed work is described in the charter as follows:

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.

The architecture and specifications referenced are supported by numerous vendors and the foundational security specifications are, or will soon be, OASIS standards (WS-Trust, WS-SecureConversation, WS-SecurityPolicy ...). The Federation work of the proposed TC is scoped to build on this widely adopted standard foundation and allow customers to leverage existing investments.

The proposed WSFED TC charter addresses schedule risks by proposing that the TC meet on a weekly basis, that face-to-face meetings be held on a quarterly basis, and giving the TC latitude to vary the pace in order to accommodate workload.

18. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

WS-Federation was always intended to extend and enhance WS-Trust. The original version of WS-Federation anticipated two distinct profiles, one for Active Requestors and one for Passive Requestors. Experience has indicated that the Active Profile is not required; SOAP requestors can use WS-Trust protocols directly. The bulk of the material covered by the revised version of the WS-Federation specification can be used directly by web services and SOAP requestors. Hence the anticipated audience for most of WS-Federation is assumed to be web service developers. Only one section of the actual specification is devoted to passive requestors. The extensive detail is provided to insure that the exact same capabilities developed for web services can be made available to existing passive requestors, precisely for the reason noted in the comment that passive

requestors are currently the most common clients in federated identity deployments.

19. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The charter is not required to state conformance requirements. The OASIS process in section 2.18 Specification Quality requires conformance clauses in any Committee Specification effective June 1st. The WSFED TC will develop conformance clauses per the OASIS process in effect when the TC moves to ratify its deliverables.

20. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The scope of the proposed work is described in the charter as follows:

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.

The architecture and specifications referenced are supported by numerous vendors and the foundational security specifications are, or will soon be, OASIS standards (WS-Trust, WS-SecureConversation, WS-SecurityPolicy ...). The Federation work of the proposed TC is scoped to build on this widely adopted standard foundation and allow customers to leverage existing investments.

The applicability of SAML work to the output of the WSFED TC will be determined by the WSFED TC membership as part of the specification development process.

21. [\[Source\]](#)

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".

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

With respect to XACML:

These are concepts anticipated in the WS-Fed charter which do not appear to be addressed by XACML:

- We want to enable the addition of an authorization context to WS-Trust RSTs to provide additional information for the STS to base its response upon.
- We want to enable the implementation of an Authorization service using the existing WS-Trust RST/RSTR protocol + the existing security token data structure to return authorization information. The goal is to allow either a client push, or back-end server-server communication path via existing wire protocols to for transmitting authorization data.
- We want to allow the possibility of expressing authorization decisions as a claims transformation process.

This is not focused on the transmission of authorization policy, which seems to be the major focus of XACML.

With respect to P3P:

There is no intention to create a new privacy protocol or service. The privacy goal here is scoped explicitly to protecting (a) the PII that may be presented to an STS in the RST and (b) the PII that may be returned in the RSTR or security token.

22. [\[Source\]](#)

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".

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The format (layered vs. non-layered) of the TC output will be determined by the WSFED TC membership as part of the specification development process. Different services are introduced to make the point that one can use the STS and security token model for a wide variety of services. Additionally STSs based on WS-Federation + WS-Trust could provide a consistent approach for deploying and accessing these services instead of treating them as separate concepts.

23. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

Describing how Federation metadata could be stored in a UDDI directory is not in scope of the Proposed TC.

24. [\[Source\]](#)

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 surprising 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]

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

There are numerous potential ways to implement an attribute service. Likewise there are multiple protocols that might be used to communicate attributes.

The primary intention here is to re-use the WS-Trust based STS model and the RST/RSTR protocol and commonly profiled security tokens from WSS to communicate attributes. Customers have responded positively to this proposal versus having to implement different kinds of services and protocols for obtaining attributes.

What is the intended interpretation of "identity attributes" in the question? All attributes that describe a security principal could be considered to be part of the subject's digital identity. Some parties might want to make a distinction between identity and authorization attributes. We make no such distinction. WS-Trust based STSs can already issue security tokens that contain a wide variety of attributes. We recognize that an IDP STS might not push all of the subject's attributes in the original security token used to authenticate to a Relying Party. After some processing in the application, the Relying Party may require additional attributes. We want to allow for the possibility of either the Relying Party (OnBehalfOf) or the subject to use the existing STS + security token model to obtain the additional attributes, instead of having to invoke a different mechanism and protocol.

25. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

See XACML response in comment #21.

26. [\[Source\]](#)

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".

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The applicability of SAML work to the output of the WSFED TC will be determined by the WSFED TC membership as part of the specification development process.

27. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

See responses to individual comments 9-11 above.

28. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

See responses to individual comments 1-8, 9-11, 15-18 and 28.

29. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The OASIS Process allows for the reference of specifications and other documentation which are not standards. There are numerous precedents in existing OASIS charters and specifications.

30. [\[Source\]](#)

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.

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

The OASIS Process allows for the reference of specifications and other documentation which are not standards. There are numerous precedents in existing OASIS charters and specifications.

31. [\[Source\]](#)

We also agree with the comments at [2].

Response:

No changes to the proposed WSFED TC charter are required.

See responses to individual comments 1-7.

References:

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