

1 Issue 4041 Primer text related to ignorable  
2 V3 10-January-2006

### 4 2.7 Ignorable Policy Assertion

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

16 The use of Ignorable allows providers to clearly indicate which  
17 policy assertions indicate behaviors that don't always manifest on  
18 the wire and may not necessarily be of concern to a requestor.  
19 Using the Optional attribute would be incorrect in this scenario,  
20 since it would indicate that the behavior would not occur if the  
21 alternative without the assertion were selected. It is incumbent of  
22 Providers to declare the behaviors that will be engaged using  
23 policies although those behaviors may not exhibit wire level  
24 manifestations. The Ignorable marker allows them to be truthful.

26 To mark an assertion as "Ignorable" the policy assertion definition must  
27 be examined to determine that it has no wire behavior and that it is  
28 allowed to be marked as Ignorable. Assertion authors need to clarify  
29 that assertions may be marked as "Ignorable".

#### 31 *Example x. Ignorable Logging Policy Assertion*

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

33

34 The attribute 'wsp:Ignorable' has type xs:boolean. Omitting this  
35 marker is semantically equivalent to including it with a value of  
36 "false".  
37  
38

39 2.8 Nested Policy assertions  
40 ... (renumber subsequent sections)  
41

### 42 3.5 Strict and Lax Policy Compatibility

43

44 The previous sections outlined how normal-form policy  
45 expressions relate to the policy model and how the compatibility of  
46 requestor and provider policies may be determined. This section  
47 outlines how assertions marked as ignorable impact the process of  
48 determining compatibility.  
49

50 The use of the ignorable marker has no impact on normalization.  
51 Assertions marked as ignorable remain marked as ignorable after  
52 normalization. The use of ignorable markers *may* have an impact  
53 on determining compatibility of policy expressions.  
54

55 In order to determine compatibility of its policy expression with a  
56 provider policy expression, a requestor may use either a "lax" or  
57 "strict" mode of the intersection algorithm.  
58

59 In the strict mode two policy alternatives are compatible when  
60 each assertion in one is compatible with an assertion in the other,  
61 and vice versa. For this to be possible they must share a policy  
62 alternative vocabulary. The strict intersection mode is the mode of  
63 intersection discussed in the previous sections of this document.  
64 When using strict mode the Ignorable property does not impact  
65 intersection even when Ignorable flag is set to "true". In strict  
66 intersection mode these assertions are *not* factored out of the  
67 intersection.  
68

69 If the requestor wishes to ignore assertions in the provider's policy  
70 expression that are marked ignorable, then the requestor should use  
71 "lax" intersection. In lax mode all assertions marked as Ignorable  
72 (i.e. with the value "true" for the wsp:Ignorable attribute) are to be  
73 ignored by the intersection algorithm. Thus in lax mode two policy  
74 alternatives are compatible when each non-ignorable assertion in  
75 one is compatible with a non-ignorable assertion in the other, and  
76 vice versa. For this to be possible the two policy alternatives must  
77 share a policy alternative vocabulary for all "non-ignorable"  
78 assertions.

79

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

85

---

86