

SLOVENSKI STANDARD oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007

01-julij-2007

±bZcfa UVJ/g_U'h\\ bc`c[]'U'!'Cgbcjb]'dfcZj`zfUn`]]WU'%%

Information technology — Basic Profile Version 1.1

Technologies de l'information Version 1.1 de profil de base

Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: (standards.iteh.ai)

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007

https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

ICS:

35.100.05 X^ • |[b) ^Á] [¦æà} ãz\^ ¦^zãcç^

Multilayer applications

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007

en

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007



DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ISO/IEC 29361

Attributed to ISO/IEC JTC 1 by the Central Secretariat (see page iii)

Voting begins on 2006-12-18

Voting terminates on

2007-06-18

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION ORGANIZATION OF STANDARDIZATION ORGANIZATION ORGANIZATION ORGANIZATION ORGANIZATION ORGANIZATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION (MEЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОТЕХНИЧЕСКАЯ КОММИСИЯ ORGANIZATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION (COMMISSION ÉLECTROTECHNIQUE INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION ORGANIZATION ORGA

PUBLICLY AVAILABLE SPECIFICATION PROCEDURE

Information technology — Basic Profile Version 1.1

Technologies de l'information — Version 1.1 de profil de base

ICS 35.100.05

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

In accordance with the provisions of Council Resolution 21/1986 this DIS is circulated in the English language only.

Conformément aux dispositions de la Résolution du Conseil 21/1986, ce DIS est distribué en version anglaise seulement.

This Publicly Available Specification (PAS) is being submitted for Fast-track processing in accordance with the provisions of ISO/IEC JTC 1 Directives.

THIS DOCUMENT IS A DRAFT CIRCULATED FOR COMMENT AND APPROVAL. IT IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AND MAY NOT BE REFERRED TO AS AN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD UNTIL PUBLISHED AS SUCH.

IN ADDITION TO THEIR EVALUATION AS BEING ACCEPTABLE FOR INDUSTRIAL, TECHNOLOGICAL, COMMERCIAL AND USER PURPOSES, DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS MAY ON OCCASION HAVE TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF THEIR POTENTIAL TO BECOME STANDARDS TO WHICH REFERENCE MAY BE MADE IN NATIONAL REGULATIONS.

PDF disclaimer

This PDF file may contain embedded typefaces. In accordance with Adobe's licensing policy, this file may be printed or viewed but shall not be edited unless the typefaces which are embedded are licensed to and installed on the computer performing the editing. In downloading this file, parties accept therein the responsibility of not infringing Adobe's licensing policy. The ISO Central Secretariat accepts no liability in this area.

Adobe is a trademark of Adobe Systems Incorporated.

Details of the software products used to create this PDF file can be found in the General Info relative to the file; the PDF-creation parameters were optimized for printing. Every care has been taken to ensure that the file is suitable for use by ISO member bodies. In the unlikely event that a problem relating to it is found, please inform the Central Secretariat at the address given below.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

Copyright notice

This ISO document is a Draft International Standard and is copyright-protected by ISO. Except as permitted under the applicable laws of the user's country, neither this ISO draft nor any extract from it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission being secured.

Requests for permission to reproduce should be addressed to either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office
Case postale 56 • CH-1211 Geneva 20
Tel. + 41 22 749 01 11
Fax + 41 22 749 09 47
E-mail copyright@iso.org
Web www.iso.org

Reproduction may be subject to royalty payments or a licensing agreement.

Violators may be prosecuted.

NOTE FROM ITTF

This draft International Standard is submitted for JTC 1 national body vote under the Fast-Track Procedure.

In accordance with Resolution 30 of the JTC 1 Berlin Plenary 1993, the proposer of this document recommends assignment of ISO/IEC 29361 to JTC 1.

See also explanatory report.

"FAST-TRACK" PROCEDURE

- 1 Any P-member and any Category A liaison organization of ISO/IEC JTC 1 may propose that an existing standard from any source be submitted directly for vote as a DIS. The criteria for proposing an existing standard for the fast-track procedure are a matter for each proposer to decide.
- 2 The proposal shall be received by the ITTF which will take the following actions.
- **2.1** To settle the copyright and/or trade mark situation with the proposer, so that the proposed text can be freely copied and distributed within JTC 1 without restriction.
- **2.2** To assess in consultation with the JTC 1 secretariat which SC is competent for the subject covered by the proposed standard and to ascertain that there is no evident contradiction with other International Standards.
- **2.3** To distribute the text of the proposed standard as a DIS. In case of particularly bulky documents the ITTF may demand the necessary number of copies from the proposer.
- 3 The period for combined DIS voting shall be six months. In order to be accepted the DIS must be supported by 75 % of the votes cast (abstention is not counted as a vote) and by two-thirds of the P-members voting of JTC 1.

 OSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007

https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-

- 4 At the end of the voting period, athe comments received, whether editorial only or technical, will be dealt with by a working group appointed by the secretariat of the relevant SC.
- **5** If, after the deliberations of this WG, the requirements of 3 above are met, the amended text shall be sent to the ITTF by the secretariat of the relevant SC for publication as an International Standard.

If it is impossible to agree to a text meeting the above requirements, the proposal has failed and the procedure is terminated.

In either case the WG shall prepare a full report which will be circulated by the ITTF.

6 If the proposed standard is accepted and published, its maintenance will be handled by JTC 1.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW (standards.iteh.ai)

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007 https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007



Basic Profile Version 1.1

Final Material

2006-04-10

This version:

http://www.ws-i.org/Profiles/BasicProfile-1.1-2006-04-10.html

Latest version:

http://www.ws-i.org/Profiles/BasicProfile-1.1.html

Errata for this Version:

http://www.ws-i.org/Profiles/BasicProfile-1.1-errata-2006-04-10.html

Editors:

Keith Ballinger, Microsoft (1.0) TANDARD PREVIEW

David Ehnebuske, IBM (1.0)

Christopher Ferris, IBM (1.0) (standards.iteh.ai)

Martin Gudgin, Microsoft (1.0)

Canyang Kevin Liu, SAP <u>oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007</u>

Mark NottinghamhtBE/AaSystems ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-

Prasad Yendluri, webMethodsa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

Administrative contact:

secretary@ws-i.org

Copyright © 2002-2006 by <u>The Web Services-Interoperability Organization</u> (<u>WS-I</u>) and Certain of its Members. All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document defines the WS-I Basic Profile 1.1, consisting of a set of non-proprietary Web services specifications, along with clarifications, refinements, interpretations and amplifications of those specifications which promote interoperability

Status of this Document

This is a final specification. Please refer to the errata, which may include normative corrections to it.

Notice

The material contained herein is not a license, either expressly or impliedly, to any intellectual property owned or controlled by any of the authors or developers of this material or WS-I. The material contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and to the maximum extent permitted by

applicable law, this material is provided AS IS AND WITH ALL FAULTS, and the authors and developers of this material and WS-I hereby disclaim all other warranties and conditions, either express, implied or statutory, including, but not limited to, any (if any) implied warranties, duties or conditions of merchantability, of fitness for a particular purpose, of accuracy or completeness of responses, of results, of workmanlike effort, of lack of viruses, and of lack of negligence. ALSO, THERE IS NO WARRANTY OR CONDITION OF TITLE, QUIET ENJOYMENT, QUIET POSSESSION, CORRESPONDENCE TO DESCRIPTION OR NON-INFRINGEMENT WITH REGARD TO THIS MATERIAL.

IN NO EVENT WILL ANY AUTHOR OR DEVELOPER OF THIS MATERIAL OR WS-I BE LIABLE TO ANY OTHER PARTY FOR THE COST OF PROCURING SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES, LOST PROFITS, LOSS OF USE, LOSS OF DATA, OR ANY INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, DIRECT, INDIRECT, OR SPECIAL DAMAGES WHETHER UNDER CONTRACT, TORT, WARRANTY, OR OTHERWISE, ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THIS OR ANY OTHER AGREEMENT RELATING TO THIS MATERIAL, WHETHER OR NOT SUCH PARTY HAD ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

Feedback

If there are areas in this specification that could be clearer, or if errors or omissions are identified, WS-I would like to be notified in order to provide the best possible interoperability guidance.

By sending email, or otherwise communicating with WS-I, you (on behalf of yourself if you are an individual, and your company if you are providing Feedback on behalf of the company) will be deemed to have granted to WS-I, the members of WS-I, and other parties that have access to your Feedback, a non-exclusive, non-transferable, worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free license to use, disclose, copy, license, modify, sublicense or otherwise distribute and exploit in any manner whatsoever the Feedback you provide regarding the work. You acknowledge that you have no expectation of confidentiality with respect to any Feedback you provide. You represent and warrant that you have rights to provide this Feedback, and if you are providing Feedback on behalf of a company, you represent and warrant that you have the rights to provide Feedback on behalf of your company. You also acknowledge that WS-I is not required to review, discuss, use, consider or in any way incorporate your Feedback into future versions of its work. If WS-I does incorporate some or all of your Feedback in a future version of the work, it may, but is not obligated to include your name (or, if you are identified as acting on behalf of your company, the name of your company) on a list of contributors to the work. If the foregoing is not acceptable to you and any company on whose behalf you are acting, please do not provide any Feedback.

Feedback on this document should be directed to wsbasic comment@ws-i.org.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction
 - 1.1. Relationships to Other Profiles
 - 1.2. Changes from Basic Profile Version 1.0
 - 1.3. Guiding Principles
 - 1.4. Notational Conventions
 - 1.5. Profile Identification and Versioning
- 2. Profile Conformance
 - 2.1. Conformance Requirements
 - 2.2. Conformance Targets
 - 2.3. Conformance Scope
 - 2.4. Claiming Conformance
- 3. Messaging

```
3.1. SOAP Envelopes
         3.1.1. SOAP Envelope Structure
         3.1.2. SOAP Envelope Namespace
         3.1.3. SOAP Body Namespace Qualification
         3.1.4. Disallowed Constructs
         3.1.5. SOAP Trailers
         3.1.6. SOAP encodingStyle Attribute
         3.1.7. SOAP mustUnderstand Attribute
         3.1.8. xsi:type Attributes
         3.1.9. SOAP1.1 attributes on SOAP1.1 elements
       3.2. SOAP Processing Model
         3.2.1. Mandatory Headers
         3.2.2. Generating mustUnderstand Faults
         3.2.3. SOAP Fault Processing
       3.3. SOAP Faults
         3.3.1. Identifying SOAP Faults
         3.3.2. SOAP Fault Structure
         3.3.3. SOAP Fault Namespace Qualification
         3.3.4. SOAP Fault Extensibility
         3.3.5. SOAP Fault Language
         3.3.6. SOAP Custom Fault Codes
       3.4. Use of SOAP in HTTP
         3.4.1. HTTP Protocol Binding
         3.4.2. HTTP Methods and Extensions
         3.4.3. SOAPAction HTTP Header
         3.4.4. HTTP Success Status Codes RD PREVIEW
         3.4.5. HTTP Redirect Status Codes 3.4.6. HTTP Client Error Status Codes
3.4.7. HTTP Server Error Status Codes
3.4.8. HTTP Cookies OSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007
4. Service Description Standards. iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-
      4.1. Required Description 4.1. Required Description
       4.2. Document Structure
         4.2.1. WSDL Schema Definitions
         4.2.2. WSDL and Schema Import
         4.2.3. WSDL Import location Attribute Structure
         4.2.4. WSDL Import location Attribute Semantics
         4.2.5. Placement of WSDL import Elements
         4.2.6. XML Version Requirements
         4.2.7. XML Namespace declarations
         4.2.8. WSDL and the Unicode BOM
         4.2.9. Acceptable WSDL Character Encodings
         4.2.10. Namespace Coercion
         4.2.11. WSDL documentation Element
         4.2.12. WSDL Extensions
       4.3. Types
         4.3.1. QName References
         4.3.2. Schema targetNamespace Structure
         4.3.3. soapenc:Array
         4.3.4. WSDL and Schema Definition Target Namespaces
       4.4. Messages
         4.4.1. Bindings and Parts
         4.4.2. Bindings and Faults
         4.4.3. Declaration of part Elements
       4.5. Port Types
         4.5.1. Ordering of part Elements
```

- 4.5.2. Allowed Operations
- 4.5.3. Distinctive Operations
- 4.5.4. parameterOrder Attribute Construction
- 4.5.5. Exclusivity of type and element Attributes
- 4.6. Bindings
 - 4.6.1. Use of SOAP Binding
- 4.7. SOAP Binding
 - 4.7.1. Specifying the transport Attribute
 - 4.7.2. HTTP Transport
 - 4.7.3. Consistency of style Attribute
 - 4.7.4. Encodings and the use Attribute
 - 4.7.5. Multiple Bindings for portType Elements
 - 4.7.6. Operation Signatures
 - 4.7.7. Multiple Ports on an Endpoint
 - 4.7.8. Child Element for Document-Literal Bindings
 - 4.7.9. One-Way Operations
 - 4.7.10. Namespaces for soapbind Elements
 - 4.7.11. Consistency of portType and binding Elements
 - 4.7.12. Describing headerfault Elements
 - 4.7.13. Enumeration of Faults
 - 4.7.14. Type and Name of SOAP Binding Elements
 - 4.7.15. name Attribute on Faults
 - 4.7.16. Omission of the use Attribute
 - 4.7.17. Default for use Attribute
 - 4.7.18. Consistency of Envelopes with Descriptions
 - 4.7.19. Response Wrappers DAKD PKL
 - 4.7.20. Part Accessors
 4.7.21. Namespaces for Children of Part Accessors

 - 4.7.22. Required Headers
 - 4.7.23. Allowing Undescribed Fleaders 29361:2007
 - 4.7.24. Ordering Headers veatalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-
 - 4.7.25. Describing SOAPAction
 - 4.7.26. SOAP Binding Extensions
- 4.8. Use of XML Schema
- 5. Service Publication and Discovery
 - 5.1. bindingTemplates
 - 5.2. tModels
- 6. Security
 - 6.1. Use of HTTPS
- Appendix A: Referenced Specifications
- Appendix B: Extensibility Points Appendix C: Defined Terms
- Appendix D: Acknowledgements

1. Introduction

This document defines the WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 (hereafter, "Profile"), consisting of a set of non-proprietary Web services specifications, along with clarifications, refinements, interpretations and amplifications of those specifications which promote interoperability.

Section 1 introduces the Profile, and explains its relationships to other profiles.

Section 2, "Profile Conformance," explains what it means to be conformant to the Profile.

Each subsequent section addresses a component of the Profile, and consists of two parts; an overview detailing the component specifications and their extensibility points, followed by

subsections that address individual parts of the component specifications. Note that there is no relationship between the section numbers in this document and those in the referenced specifications.

1.1 Relationships to Other Profiles

This Profile is derived from the Basic Profile 1.0 by incorporating any errata to date and separating out those requirements related to the serialization of envelopes and their representation in messages. Such requirements are now part of the Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0, identified with a separate conformance claim. This separation is made to facilitate composability of Basic Profile 1.1 with any profile that specifies envelope serialization, including the Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0 and the Attachments Profile 1.0. A combined claim of conformance to both the Basic Profile 1.1 and the Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0 is roughly equivalent to a claim of conformance to the Basic Profile 1.0 plus published errata.

This Profile, composed with the Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0 supercedes the Basic Profile 1.0. The Attachments Profile 1.0 adds support for SOAP with Attachments, and is intended to be used in combination with this Profile.

1.2 Changes from Basic Profile Version 1.0

This specification is derived from the <u>Basic Profile Version 1.0</u>, and incorporates published errata against that specification. The most notable changes are:

- MESSAGE conformance target Some requirements that had a MESSAGE conformance target in BP1.0 now use a new target, ENVELOPE. This facilitates alternate serialisations of the message, such as that described in the Attachments Profile.
- SOAP Binding Requirements relating to the SOAP binding's serialization of the message have been moved to the Simple SOAP Binding Profile to facilitate other serializations.

https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-

1.3 Guiding Principles

a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

The Profile was developed according to a set of principles that, together, form the philosophy of the Profile, as it relates to bringing about interoperability. This section documents these guidelines.

No guarantee of interoperability

It is impossible to completely guarantee the interoperability of a particular service. However, the Profile does address the most common problems that implementation experience has revealed to date.

Application semantics

Although communication of application semantics can be facilitated by the technologies that comprise the Profile, assuring the common understanding of those semantics is not addressed by it.

Testability

When possible, the Profile makes statements that are testable. However, such testability is not required. Preferably, testing is achieved in a non-intrusive manner (e.g., examining artifacts "on the wire").

Strength of requirements

The Profile makes strong requirements (e.g., MUST, MUST NOT) wherever feasible; if there are legitimate cases where such a requirement cannot be met, conditional requirements (e.g., SHOULD, SHOULD NOT) are used. Optional and conditional requirements introduce ambiguity and mismatches between implementations.

Restriction vs. relaxation

When amplifying the requirements of referenced specifications, the Profile may restrict them,

but does not relax them (e.g., change a MUST to a MAY).

Multiple mechanisms

If a referenced specification allows multiple mechanisms to be used interchangeably, the Profile selects those that are well-understood, widely implemented and useful. Extraneous or underspecified mechanisms and extensions introduce complexity and therefore reduce interoperability.

Future compatibility

When possible, the Profile aligns its requirements with in-progress revisions to the specifications it references. This aids implementers by enabling a graceful transition, and assures that WS-I does not 'fork' from these efforts. When the Profile cannot address an issue in a specification it references, this information is communicated to the appropriate body to assure its consideration.

Compatibility with deployed services

Backwards compatibility with deployed Web services is not a goal for the Profile, but due consideration is given to it; the Profile does not introduce a change to the requirements of a referenced specification unless doing so addresses specific interoperability issues.

Focus on interoperability

Although there are potentially a number of inconsistencies and design flaws in the referenced specifications, the Profile only addresses those that affect interoperability.

Conformance targets

Where possible, the Profile places requirements on artifacts (e.g., WSDL descriptions, SOAP messages) rather than the producing or consuming software's behaviors or roles. Artifacts are concrete, making them easier to verify and therefore making conformance easier to understand and less error-prone.

Lower-layer interoperability (standards.iteh.ai)

The Profile speaks to interoperability at the application layer; it assumes that interoperability of lower-layer protocols (e.g., TCP, TEthernet) is adequate and well-understood. Similarly, statements about application-layer substrate protocols (e.g., SSL/TLS, HTTP) are only made when there is an issue affecting Web services specifically? WS-I does not attempt to assure the interoperability of these protocols as a whole. This assures that WS-I's expertise in and focus on Web services standards is used effectively.

1.4 Notational Conventions

The keywords "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC2119.

Normative statements of requirements in the Profile (i.e., those impacting conformance, as outlined in "Conformance Requirements") are presented in the following manner:

Rnnnn Statement text here.

where "nnnn" is replaced by a number that is unique among the requirements in the Profile, thereby forming a unique requirement identifier.

Requirement identifiers can be considered to be namespace qualified, in such a way as to be compatible with QNames from Namespaces in XML. If there is no explicit namespace prefix on a requirement's identifier (e.g., "R9999" as opposed to "bp10:R9999"), it should be interpreted as being in the namespace identified by the conformance URI of the document section it occurs in. If it is qualified, the prefix should be interpreted according to the namespace mappings in effect, as documented below.

Some requirements clarify the referenced specification(s), but do not place additional constraints

upon implementations. For convenience, clarifications are annotated in the following manner: C

Some requirements are derived from ongoing standardization work on the referenced specification(s). For convenience, such forward-derived statements are annotated in the following manner: xxxx, where "xxxx" is an identifier for the specification (e.g., "WSDL20" for WSDL Version 2.0). Note that because such work was not complete when this document was published, the specification that the requirement is derived from may change; this information is included only as a convenience to implementers.

Extensibility points in underlying specifications (see "Conformance Scope") are presented in a similar manner:

Ennnn Extensibility Point Name - Description

where "nnnn" is replaced by a number that is unique among the extensibility points in the Profile. As with requirement statements, extensibility statements can be considered namespace-qualified.

This specification uses a number of namespace prefixes throughout; their associated URIs are listed below. Note that the choice of any namespace prefix is arbitrary and not semantically significant.

- soap "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/"
- xsi "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
- xsd "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
- soapenc "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/encoding/"
- wsdl "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/"
- soapbind "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/" REVIEW
- uddi "urn:uddi-org:api_v2"

(standards.iteh.ai)

1.5 Profile Identification and Versioning

oSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007

This document is identified by a name (in this case, Basic Profile) and a version number (here, 1.1). Together, they identify a particular profile instance. icc-dis-29361-2007

Version numbers are composed of a major and minor portion, in the form "major.minor". They can be used to determine the precedence of a profile instance; a higher version number (considering both the major and minor components) indicates that an instance is more recent, and therefore supersedes earlier instances.

Instances of profiles with the same name (e.g., "Example Profile 1.1" and "Example Profile 5.0") address interoperability problems in the same general scope (although some developments may require the exact scope of a profile to change between instances).

One can also use this information to determine whether two instances of a profile are backwards-compatible; that is, whether one can assume that conformance to an earlier profile instance implies conformance to a later one. Profile instances with the same name and major version number (e.g., "Example Profile 1.0" and "Example Profile 1.1") MAY be considered compatible. Note that this does not imply anything about compatibility in the other direction; that is, one cannot assume that conformance with a later profile instance implies conformance to an earlier one.

2 Profile Conformance

Conformance to the Profile is defined by adherence to the set of *requirements* defined for a specific *target*, within the *scope* of the Profile. This section explains these terms and describes how conformance is defined and used.

2.1 Conformance Requirements

Requirements state the criteria for conformance to the Profile. They typically refer to an existing specification and embody refinements, amplifications, interpretations and clarifications to it in order to improve interoperability. All requirements in the Profile are considered normative, and those in the specifications it references that are in-scope (see "Conformance Scope") should likewise be considered normative. When requirements in the Profile and its referenced specifications contradict each other, the Profile 's requirements take precedence for purposes of Profile conformance.

Requirement levels, using <u>RFC2119</u> language (e.g., MUST, MAY, SHOULD) indicate the nature of the requirement and its impact on conformance. Each requirement is individually identified (e.g., R9999) for convenience.

For example;

R9999 WIDGETs SHOULD be round in shape.

This requirement is identified by "R9999", applies to the target WIDGET (see below), and places a conditional requirement upon widgets; i.e., although this requirement must be met to maintain conformance in most cases, there are some situations where there may be valid reasons for it not being met (which are explained in the requirement itself, or in its accompanying text).

Each requirement statement contains exactly one requirement level keyword (e.g., "MUST") and one conformance target keyword (e.g., "MESSAGE"). The conformance target keyword appears in bold text (e.g. "MESSAGE"). Other conformance targets appearing in non-bold text are being used strictly for their definition and NOT as a conformance target. Additional text may be included to illuminate a requirement or group of requirements (e.g., rationale and examples); however, prose surrounding requirement statements must not be considered in determining conformance.

Definitions of terms in the Profile are considered authoritative for the purposes of determining conformance.

https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

None of the requirements in the Profile, regardless of their conformance level, should be interpreted as limiting the ability of an otherwise conforming implementation to apply security countermeasures in response to a real or perceived threat (e.g., a denial of service attack).

2.2 Conformance Targets

Conformance targets identify what artifacts (e.g., SOAP message, WSDL description, UDDI registry data) or parties (e.g., SOAP processor, end user) requirements apply to.

This allows for the definition of conformance in different contexts, to assure unambiguous interpretation of the applicability of requirements, and to allow conformance testing of artifacts (e.g., SOAP messages and WSDL descriptions) and the behavior of various parties to a Web service (e.g., clients and service instances).

Requirements' conformance targets are physical artifacts wherever possible, to simplify testing and avoid ambiguity.

The following conformance targets are used in the Profile:

- MESSAGE protocol elements that transport the ENVELOPE (e.g., SOAP/HTTP messages)
- ENVELOPE the serialization of the soap:Envelope element and its content
- **DESCRIPTION** descriptions of types, messages, interfaces and their concrete protocol and data format bindings, and the network access points associated with Web services (e.g., WSDL descriptions) (from Basic Profile 1.0)
- **INSTANCE** software that implements a wsdl:port or a uddi:bindingTemplate (from Basic

Profile 1.0)

- CONSUMER software that invokes an INSTANCE (from <u>Basic Profile 1.0</u>)
- SENDER software that generates a message according to the protocol(s) associated with it (from <u>Basic Profile 1.0</u>)
- RECEIVER software that consumes a message according to the protocol(s) associated with it (e.g., SOAP processors) (from <u>Basic Profile 1.0</u>)
- REGDATA registry elements that are involved in the registration and discovery of Web services (e.g. UDDI tModels) (from <u>Basic Profile 1.0</u>)

2.3 Conformance Scope

The scope of the Profile delineates the technologies that it addresses; in other words, the Profile only attempts to improve interoperability within its own scope. Generally, the Profile's scope is bounded by the specifications referenced by it.

The Profile's scope is further refined by extensibility points. Referenced specifications often provide extension mechanisms and unspecified or open-ended configuration parameters; when identified in the Profile as an extensibility point, such a mechanism or parameter is outside the scope of the Profile, and its use or non-use is not relevant to conformance.

Note that the Profile may still place requirements on the use of an extensibility point. Also, specific uses of extensibility points may be further restricted by other profiles, to improve interoperability when used in conjunction with the Profile.

Because the use of extensibility points may impair interoperability, their use should be negotiated or documented in some fashion by the parties to a Web service; for example, this could take the form of an out-of-band agreement.

(standards.iteh.ai)

The Profile's scope is defined by the referenced specifications in Appendix A, as refined by the extensibility points in Appendix B.

| Appendix B. | OSIST ISO/IEC DIS 29361:2007 |
| https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/7900d2dd-6cce-41de-9cb1-

2.4 Claiming Conformance a6aa434ad34d/osist-iso-iec-dis-29361-2007

Claims of conformance to the Profile can be made using the following mechanisms, as described in Conformance Claim Attachment Mechanisms, when the applicable Profile requirements associated with the listed targets have been met:

- WSDL 1.1 Claim Attachment Mechanism for Web Services Instances MESSAGE DESCRIPTION INSTANCE RECEIVER
- WSDL 1.1 Claim Attachment Mechanism for Description Constructs DESCRIPTION
- UDDI Claim Attachment Mechanism for Web Services Instances MESSAGE DESCRIPTION INSTANCE RECEIVER
- UDDI Claim Attachment Mechanism for Web Services Registrations REGDATA

The conformance claim URI for this Profile is "http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic/1.1" .

3. Messaging

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference, and defines extensibility points within them:

- Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1 Extensibility points:
 - E0001 Header blocks Header blocks are the fundamental extensibility mechanism in SOAP.
 - E0002 Processing order The order of processing of a SOAP envelope's components