Issue 4041 Primer text related to ignorable
V3 10-January-2006 with proposed amendments 1-3 11-Jan-07 fjh

2.7 Ignorable Policy Assertion

Suppose Contoso decides that it will log SOAP messages sent and received in an exchange. This behavior has no direct impact on the messages sent on the wire, and does not affect technical interoperability. Some parties might have a concern about such logging and might decide not to interact with Contoso knowing that such logging is performed. To address this concern, Contoso includes a Logging assertion in its Policy to enable such parties to be aware of logging. By marking it as "Ignorable" Contoso indicates that a party may choose to either ignore such assertions or to consider them as part of policy intersection.

The use of the Ignorable attribute allows providers to clearly indicate which policy assertions indicate behaviors that don't always manifest on the wire and may not necessarily be of concern to a requestor. Using the Optional attribute would be incorrect in this scenario, since it would indicate that the behavior would not occur if the alternative without the assertion were selected.

It is incumbent of Providers to declare the behaviors that will be engaged using policies although those behaviors may not exhibit wire level manifestations. The Ignorable attribute allows them (policy providers) to do so.

Example x. Ignorable Logging Policy Assertion

```
<log:Logging wsp:Ignorable="true" />
```

The attribute 'wsp:Ignorable' has type xs:boolean. Omitting this attribute is semantically equivalent to including it with a value of "false".

2.8 Nested Policy assertions

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:43 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 16 pt

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:43 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 16 pt

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:43 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 16 pt

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:43 AM
Deleted: The use of Ignorable allows providers to clearly indicate which policy assertions indicate behaviors that don't always manifest on the wire and may not necessarily be of concern to a requestor. Using the Optional attribute would be incorrect in this scenario, since it would indicate that the behavior would not occur if the alternative without the assertion were selected. It is incumbent of Providers to declare the behaviors that will be engaged using policies although those behaviors may not exhibit wire level manifestations. The Ignorable marker allows them to be truthful.

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:44 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:44 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 16 pt

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:44 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 16 pt

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:44 AM
Deleted: To mark an assertion as "Ignorable" the policy assertion definition must be examined to determine that it has no wire behavior and that it is allowed to be marked as Ignorable. Assertion authors need to clarify that assertions may be marked as "Ignorable".

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: marker

… (renumber subsequent sections)

3.5 Strict and Lax Policy Compatibility

The previous sections outlined how normal-form policy expressions relate to the policy model and how the compatibility of requestor and provider policies may be determined. This section outlines how assertions marked as ignorable impact the process of determining compatibility.

The use of the Ignorable attribute has no impact on normalization. Assertions marked as ignorable remain marked as ignorable after normalization. The use of Ignorable attributes *may* have an impact on determining compatibility of policy expressions.

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: i

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: marker

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: i

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: markers

In order to determine compatibility of its policy expression with a provider policy expression, a requestor may use either a "lax" or "strict" mode of the intersection algorithm.

In the strict mode two policy alternatives are compatible when each assertion in one is compatible with an assertion in the other, and vice versa. For this to be possible they must share a policy alternative vocabulary. The strict intersection mode is the mode of intersection discussed in the previous sections of this document. When using strict mode the Ignorable attribute does not impact intersection even when Ignorable attribute value is "true". In strict intersection mode these assertions are *not* factored out of the intersection.

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: property

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: flag

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:46 AM
Deleted: is set to

If the requestor wishes to ignore assertions in the provider's policy expression that are marked ignorable, then the requestor should use "lax" intersection. In lax mode all ignorable assertions (i.e. with the value "true" for the wsp:Ignorable attribute) are to be ignored by the intersection algorithm. Thus in lax mode two policy alternatives are compatible when each non-ignorable assertion in

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:47 AM
Deleted: marked as Ignorable

one is compatible with a non-ignorable assertion in the other, and vice versa. For this to be possible the two policy alternatives must share a policy alternative vocabulary for all “non-ignorable” assertions.

When domain specific processing is to be performed in strict mode, it is up to that domain specific processing to interpret the Ignorable attribute. In lax mode it is not relevant since ignorable assertions are not passed to the domain specific processing step of the intersection algorithm.

Frederick Hirsch 1/11/07 9:47 AM
Deleted: marker