

### 3. Indicating Use of WS-Addressing

This specification supports a mechanism for indicating, in a WSDL description, that the endpoint conforms to the WS-Addressing specification. That mechanism uses WS-Policy Framework [[WS Policy 1.5 - Framework](#)].

#### 3.1 WS-Policy Assertions

The mechanism for indicating that a binding or endpoint conforms to the WS-Addressing specification is through the use of the Web Services Policy - Framework [[WS Policy 1.5 - Framework](#)] and Web Services Policy - Attachment [[WS Policy 1.5 - Attachment](#)] specifications. This specification defines three policy assertions.

For WSDL 1.1, these assertions may be attached to `wsd111:port` or `wsd111:binding`. For WSDL 2.0, they may be attached to `wsd120:endpoint` or `wsd120:binding`.

##### 3.1.1 Addressing Assertion

The `wsam:Addressing` policy assertion is a nested policy container assertion. The meaning of this assertion, when present in a policy alternative, is that WS-Addressing is required to communicate with the subject. In order to indicate that the subject supports WS-Addressing but does not require its use, an additional policy alternative should be provided which does not contain this assertion. This may be done in WS-Policy compact form by adding the attribute `wsp:Optional="true"` to the `wsam:Addressing` assertion.

##### 3.1.2 AnonymousResponses Assertion

The `wsam:AnonymousResponses` element MAY be used as a policy assertion nested within the `wsam:Addressing` assertion in accordance with the rules laid down by WS-Policy Framework 1.5 section 4.3.2.

The appearance of this element within a policy alternative indicates that the subject requires request messages that require responses to include response endpoint EPRs that contain the anonymous URI ("http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous") as the value of [address]. In other words, the subject requires response instances to be sent as anonymous responses.

The absence of the `wsam:AnonymousResponses` policy assertion within a policy alternative indicates that the subject prohibits response message instances using the anonymous URI as an address.

The None URI ("http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/none") may appear as the value of [address] in place of the anonymous URI; this value MUST be accepted.

- Deleted: endpoint
- Deleted: expresses explicit support for
- Deleted: with
- Deleted: endpoint
- Deleted: guarantees support for
- Deleted: does **not** indicate
- Deleted: endpoint
- Deleted: will not accept
- Deleted: request messages with response endpoint EPRs
- Deleted: that contain
- Deleted: ; it simply indicates the lack of any affirmation of support for anonymous URIs

### 3.1.3 NonAnonymousResponses Assertion

The wsam:NonAnonymousResponses element MAY be used as a policy assertion nested within the Addressing assertion in accordance with the rules laid down by WS-Policy Framework 1.5 section 4.3.2.

The appearance of this element within a policy alternative indicates that the subject requires any request message, that has responses to include response endpoint EPRs that contain a connectable URI as the value of [address]. This assertion is deliberately vague; its presence indicates that some non-anonymous addresses are required for instances of response messages, but doesn't constrain what such an address might look like. A receiver can still reject a request that contains an address that it doesn't understand or that requires a binding it doesn't support.

The absence of the wsam:NonAnonymousResponses policy assertion within a policy alternative indicates that the subject prohibits response message instances, using endpoint EPRs that contain a connectable URI address.

The None URI ("http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/none") may appear as the value of [address] in place of a non-anonymous address; this value MUST be accepted.

### 3.1.4 Examples (Compact Form)

*Example 3-1. Subject supports WS-Addressing, both anonymous and non anonymous responses prohibited.*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing wsp:Optional="true">
    <wsp:Policy/>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

*Example 3-2. Subject requires WS-Addressing, both anonymous and non anonymous responses prohibited*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy/>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

*Example 3-3. Subject requires WS-Addressing, and requires responses to be anonymous.*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing wsp:Optional="true">
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsp:ExactlyOne>
        <wsp:All> <!-- anon responses required -->
          <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:All>
      </wsp:ExactlyOne>
    </wsp:Policy>
  </wsam:Addressing>
```

- Deleted: endpoint expresses explicit support
- Deleted: for
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: with
- Deleted: something
- Deleted: other than the anonymous
- Deleted: In other words, the endpoint guarantees support for non-anonymous responses.
- Deleted: will be accepted
- Deleted: As with the other assertions, t
- Deleted: does **not** indicate
- Deleted: endpoint
- Deleted: will
- Deleted: not accept
- Deleted: request
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: with respons
- Deleted: e
- Deleted: something other than the anonymous
- Deleted: ; it simply indicates the lack of any affirmation of support for them
- Deleted: no statement on supported
- Deleted: EPRs
- Deleted: no statement on supported response EPRs
- Deleted: supports
- Deleted: explicitly (and optionally) supports anonymous and
- Deleted: non-
- Deleted: response EPRs
- Deleted:
- Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
- <wsam:AnonymousResponses wsp:Optional="true" />¶
- <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses wsp:Optional="true" />¶
- </wsp:Policy>

```
</wsp:Policy>
```

Example 3-4. Subject requires WS-Addressing, requires responses to be either anonymous or non-anonymous.

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsp:ExactlyOne>
        <wsp:All <!-- either anon and non-anon responses required-->
          <wsam:AnonymousResponses />
        </wsp:All>
      </wsp:All>
      <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses />
    </wsp:All>
  </wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
</wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

Example 3-5. Subject requires WS-Addressing and responses to be non-anonymous.

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses />
    </wsp:Policy>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

### 3.1.5 Examples (Normal Form)

Example 3-6. tbd

Example 3-7. tbd

Example 3-8. tbd

Example 3-9. tbd

Example 3-10. tbd

### 3.1.6 Finding Compatible Policies

When a client is looking for an endpoint with compatible policy, one common method used is to take the policy intersection between the policy which the client is looking for, and the policy asserted in the WSDL document; a non-empty intersection is sought. The policy used by the client must be written carefully to avoid unexpected results.

Deleted: explicit support of

Deleted: response EPRs

Deleted:

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
```

```
<wsam:AnonymousResponses />¶
```

```
<wsam:NonAnonymousResponses />¶
```

```
</wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
```

```
</wsp:Policy>¶
```

Deleted: explicit support of

Deleted: response EPRs

Deleted: . Subject supports WS-Addressing, no statement on supported response EPRs

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
           <wsp:All />¶
           <wsp:All>¶
```

```
<wsam:Addressing>¶
  <wsp:Policy>¶
```

```
<wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
```

```
<wsp:All />¶
```

```
</wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
```

... [1]

Deleted: Subject requires WS-Addressing, no statement on supported response EPRs

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
           <wsp:All>¶
```

... [2]

Deleted: Subject supports WS-Addressing, explicitly (and optionally) supports anonymous and non-

... [3]

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
           <wsp:All />¶
```

... [4]

Deleted: Subject requires WS-Addressing, requires explicit support of anonymous or non-anonymo

... [5]

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
           <wsp:All>¶
```

... [6]

Deleted: Subject requires WS-Addressing and explicit support of non-anonymous response EPRs

```
Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶
         <wsp:ExactlyOne>¶
           <wsp:All>¶
```

... [7]

Deleted: This is most obvious when the client is not looking for explicit support of a particular kind of

... [8]

Consider the following example, where we have a client who requires that the subject explicitly uses anonymous responses, and a WSDL which states that the subject requires use of either anonymous or non anonymous responses.

*Example 3-11. Client looking for an endpoint which supports Addressing, and which requires anonymous responses*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsp:ExactlyOne>
        <wsp:All> <!-- anon responses required -->
          <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:All>
      </wsp:ExactlyOne>
    </wsp:Policy>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

The client's policy (above) states the requirement for Addressing, and the requirement that responses are anonymous.

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsp:ExactlyOne>
        <wsp:All> <!-- either anon and non-anon responses required-->
          <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:All>
        <wsp:All>
          <wsam:NonanonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:All>
      </wsp:ExactlyOne>
    </wsp:Policy>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

The policy attached to the endpoint in the WSDL (above) states either anonymous or non anonymous responses are required. The intersection of this policy with the client's policy will be what the client is looking for.

Deleted: does not care whether

Deleted: endpoint

Deleted: supports

Deleted: endpoint

Deleted: does explicitly support

Deleted: WSDL states explicit support

Deleted: for

Deleted: <wsp:Policy/>¶

Deleted: but no

Deleted: requirement for explicit support of

Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶  
<wsam:AnonymousResponses/>¶  
</wsp:Policy>¶

Deleted: explicit support

Deleted: for

Deleted: empty, so the client will miss a compatible endpoint.

Deleted: <wsp:Policy>¶  
<wsam:Addressing>¶  
<wsp:Policy>¶  
<wsam:AnonymousResponses  
wsp:Optional="true"/>¶  
</wsp:Policy>¶  
</wsam:Addressing>¶  
</wsp:Policy>¶

This is what the client's policy could be; by stating that the wsam:AnonymousResponses assertion is optional, there will be a non-empty intersection with endpoint policies that do and do not contain this assertion.¶

Now let us consider a variation on this same situation, where the WSDL marks its explicit support of anonymous responses as ignorable.¶  
*Example 3-12. Client looking for an endpoint which supports Addressing, WSDL states (ignorable) explicit support for anonymous responses¶*

```
<wsp:Policy>¶
  <wsam:Addressing>¶
    <wsp:Policy/>¶
  </wsam:Addressing>¶
</wsp:Policy>¶
```

The client's policy (above) states the requirement for Addressing, but no requirement for explicit support of responses.¶

```
<wsp:Policy>¶
  <wsam:Addressing>¶
    <wsp:Policy>¶
      <wsam:AnonymousResponses  
wsp:Ignorable="true"/>¶
    </wsp:Policy>¶
  </wsam:Addressing>¶
</wsp:Policy>¶
```

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsp:ExactlyOne>
    <wsp:All/>
    <wsp:All>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsp:ExactlyOne>
            <wsp:All/>
          </wsp:ExactlyOne>
        </wsp:Policy>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
  </wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
```

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsp:ExactlyOne>
    <wsp:All>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsp:ExactlyOne>
            <wsp:All/>
          </wsp:ExactlyOne>
        </wsp:Policy>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
  </wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
```

*Subject supports WS-Addressing, explicitly (and optionally) supports anonymous and non-anonymous response EPRs*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsp:ExactlyOne>
    <wsp:All/>
    <wsp:All>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsp:ExactlyOne>
            <wsp:All/>
          </wsp:ExactlyOne>
        </wsp:Policy>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
    <wsp:All>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsp:ExactlyOne>
            <wsp:All>
              <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
            </wsp:All>
          </wsp:ExactlyOne>
        </wsp:Policy>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
  </wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
```

```

        </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
    <wsp:All>
        <wsam:Addressing>
            <wsp:Policy>
                <wsp:ExactlyOne>
                    <wsp:All>
                        <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
                    </wsp:All>
                </wsp:ExactlyOne>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
    <wsp:All>
        <wsam:Addressing>
            <wsp:Policy>
                <wsp:ExactlyOne>
                    <wsp:All>
                        <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
                        <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
                    </wsp:All>
                </wsp:ExactlyOne>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
</wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>

```

Page 3: [5] Deleted

Tom Rutt

2/26/2007 9:21:00 PM

*Subject requires WS-Addressing, requires explicit support of anonymous or non-anonymous response EPRs*

Page 3: [6] Deleted

Tom Rutt

2/26/2007 9:21:00 PM

```

<wsp:Policy>
    <wsp:ExactlyOne>
        <wsp:All>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy>
                    <wsp:ExactlyOne>
                        <wsp:All>
                            <wsam:AnonymousResponses/>
                        </wsp:All>
                    </wsp:ExactlyOne>
                </wsp:Policy>
            </wsam:Addressing>
        </wsp:All>
    <wsp:All>
        <wsam:Addressing>
            <wsp:Policy>
                <wsp:ExactlyOne>
                    <wsp:All>
                        <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
                    </wsp:All>
                </wsp:ExactlyOne>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>

```

```
</wsp:All>
</wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
```

Page 3: [7] Deleted

Tom Rutt

2/26/2007 9:22:00 PM

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsp:ExactlyOne>
    <wsp:All>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsp:ExactlyOne>
            <wsp:All>
              <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
            </wsp:All>
          </wsp:ExactlyOne>
        </wsp:Policy>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:All>
  </wsp:ExactlyOne>
</wsp:Policy>
```

Page 3: [8] Deleted

Tom Rutt

2/26/2007 9:25:00 PM

This is most obvious when the client is not looking for explicit support of a particular kind of response; failing to take care could mean missing a compatible policy.

Page 4: [9] Deleted

Tom Rutt

2/26/2007 9:33:00 PM

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:AnonymousResponses wsp:Optional="true"/>
    </wsp:Policy>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

This is what the client's policy could be; by stating that the `wsam:AnonymousResponses` assertion is optional, there will be a non-empty intersection with endpoint policies that do and do not contain this assertion. Now let us consider a variation on this same situation, where the WSDL marks its explicit support of anonymous responses as ignorable.

*Example 3-12. Client looking for an endpoint which supports Addressing, WSDL states (ignorable) explicit support for anonymous responses*

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy/>
  </wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

The client's policy (above) states the requirement for Addressing, but no requirement for explicit support of responses.

```
<wsp:Policy>
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy>
```

```
<wsam:AnonymousResponses wsp:Ignorable="true"/>
</wsp:Policy>
</wsam:Addressing>
</wsp:Policy>
```

The policy attached to the endpoint in the WSDL (above) states explicit support for anonymous responses, but marks that as an ignorable assertion. Now the result of the policy intersection with the client's policy will depend on whether the client is using lax or strict intersection. The strict intersection of this policy with the client's policy will still be empty. The lax intersection, on the other hand, will not be empty, so the client will find a compatible endpoint. These two examples show the use of `wsp:Optional` and `wsp:Ignorable`, and how they can be used to produce non-empty intersections between client and endpoint policies. For more detailed descriptions of the use of `wsp:Optional`, `wsp:Ignorable`, and strict and lax intersection, please refer to the WS-Policy Primer [[WS Policy 1.5 - Primer](#)].