GGF DOCUMENT SUBMISSION CHECKLIST (include as front page of submission)	
	COMPLETED (X) - Date
1. Author name(s), institution(s), and contact information	X
2. Date (original and, where applicable, latest revision date)	X
3. Title, table of contents, clearly numbered sections	X
4. Security Considerations section	X
5. GGF Copyright statement inserted (See below)	X
6. GGF Intellectual Property statement inserted. (See below) NOTE that authors should <u>read</u> the statement.	X
7. Document format -	
The GGF document format to be used for both GWD's and GFD's is available in MSWord, RTF, and PDF formats. (note that font type is not part of the requirement, however authors should avoid font sizes smaller than 10pt).	X

This page intentionally left blank to align document for 2-sided printing.

GWD-R (proposed)

Von Welch, NCSA
Rachana Ananthakrishnan, Argonne National Laboratory
Frank Siebenlist, Argonne National Laboratory
David Chadwick, University of Kent
Sam Meder, University of Chicago
Laura Pearlman, Information Sciences Institute
February 2005

#### Use of SAML for OGSA Authorization

### Status of This Memo

This document has been submitted to the Global Grid Forum OGSA Security Working Group for consideration as recommendations document in that area of OGSA authorization.

The latest version of this document can be found at:

https://forge.gridforum.org/projects/ogsa-authz

### Copyright Notice

Copyright © Global Grid Forum (2005). All Rights Reserved.

#### **Abstract**

This document defines an open grid services architecture (OGSA) authorization service based on the use of the security assertion markup language (SAML) as a format for requesting and expressing authorization assertions. Defining standard formats for these messages allows for pluggability of different authorization systems using SAML.

# Table of Contents

Abstract	3
1 Introduction	
2 Conventions Used in this Specification	
3 Relationship to Ongoing SAML Activities in OASIS	
4 Overview of Extensions	
4.1 Extended Authorization Query	
4.2 Simple Authorization Decision Statement	
5 SAML Extensions	
5.1 Element <extendedauthorizationdecisionquery></extendedauthorizationdecisionquery>	7
5.2 Element <simpleauthorizationdecisionstatement></simpleauthorizationdecisionstatement>	
6 SAML Authorization Element Usage in OGSA	
6.1 (Extended)AuthorizationDecisionQuery	9
6.2 Assertion Element	
7 SAML Authorization Service PortType	14
7.1 OGSA Authorization Service ServiceData Declarations	14
7.2 OGSA Authorization Service Operations	14
7.3 Full WSDL	15
8 Security Considerations	16
9 Acknowledgements	16
10 Author Information	16
11 Glossary	
12 Intellectual Property Statement	
13 Full Copyright Notice	
14 Normative References	
15 Informational References	
Appendix A. Intellectual Property Issues with SAML	
Appendix B. Globus Toolkit Version 4 use of Callout: URI encoding of EPR	
Appendix C. ChangeLog	19

# 1 Introduction

This specification defines the use of Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) [SAML] for requesting and expressing authorization assertions and decisions from an OGSA authorization service and allows for the communication of authorization decisions from such a service to a service fielding a request from a client. This specification is written to meet the requirements for OGSA Authorization stated in [OGSAAuthzReq].

The SAML AuthorizationDecisionQuery element is defined as the message to request an authorization assertion or decision and an ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery message is specified to allow for more expression of desired parameters of the response. A SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement is specified to allow an easy to parse response to a request as opposed to an enumeration of rights.

Section 2 describes the conventions and namespaces used in this document. Section 3 discusses the relationship of this document to ongoing work in the OASIS standards body, Section 4 contains a non-normative description of SAML extensions defined in this document and Section 5 is a normative definition of those extensions. Section 6 is normative and defines how SAML elements should be used to form OGSA authorization assertions and requests. Section 7 contains the minimal WSDL for the authorization service portType. The document concludes with Acknowledgements, GGF copyright and intellectual property statements, author affiliation and contact information, references and a glossary.

Appendix A lists known intellectual property claims against SAML.

# 2 Conventions Used in this Specification

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC-2119 [RFC2119].

It is assumed that the reader is familiar with the SAML [SAML], Open Grid Services Infrastructure [OGSI] and Open Grid Service Architecture [OGSA] documents. This document uses terminology as defined in the Authorization Glossary as produced by the GGF Working Group on Authorization Frameworks and Mechanisms [Authz-Glossary].

This specification uses namespace prefixes throughout. These prefixes are listed in Table 1. Note that the choice of any namespace prefix is arbitrary and not semantically significant.

Prefix	Namespace
saml:	urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:assertion
samlp:	urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:protocol
ogsa-saml:	http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/03/ogsa-authz/saml
sd:	http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2003/03/serviceData

Table 1: Namespace prefixes used in this specification

# 3 Relationship to Ongoing SAML Activities in OASIS

This section is a **non-normative** discussion of the relationship of this document to the standards activities ongoing in the OASIS standards body with regards to SAML.

At the time of this writing, SAML 1.1 is the latest version of the SAML specification released by the OASIS Security Services Technical Committee [OASIS-SSTC] and it is upon this version of SAML that this document is based. It is also unclear at this time what the future of the authorization functionality of SAML will be with the upcoming 2.0 release of SAML. It is very likely that there will be substantial revision, possibly with a deprecation of the current SAML

authorization functionality, which would be subsumed by the eXtensible Access Control Markup Language Technical Committee [OASIS-XACML] in version 2.0 of their specification.

However, the OGSA Authorization working group decided to press ahead with the use of the 1.1 version of SAML despite its uncertain future. The primary reason for this was the urgent need in the Grid community for a solution. Instead of waiting for a more stable solution to emerge, it was decided that we should proceed with a solution at the present time. This would both provide a standard for current implementers and allow real world experience to be gained, which we could use to help with developments of a future standard either in GGF or OASIS.

It should also be noted that SAML was chosen due to the availability of an open source implementation [OpenSAML].

#### 4 Overview of Extensions

This section provides **non-normative** discussion of the extensions in Section 5 of this specification.

The goals of these extensions are to allow an entity requesting an authorization decision to indicate the following desires in regards to the response and for the responder to oblige those requests if it can and desires:

- To request a simple decision in regards to that query instead of a list of allowed rights of the subject.
- To request either the assertion(s) or response be signed.
- To provide one or more URIs for services from which attributes regarding the subject may be obtained.

## 4.1 Extended Authorization Query

This document defines an extended authorization query which adds the following features to the standard SAML authorization query:

- A mechanism to allow a requestor to indicate their interest in a simple authorization response
  rather than a full set of AuthorizationDecisionStatements. The intent is to allow a PEP to
  request an easily parsed decision regarding any number of requested actions. The response
  allows the PEP to know easily if all actions were allowed or any were denied without having
  to parse a list of statements.
- An abstract mechanism, AuthorizationAdvice, to allow a requestor to pass information to the PDP, which it may choose to use in making a decision. This document also defines one such element, SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice, which allows a requestor to pass a pointer to the source of attribute information regarding the subject.
- A mechanism to allow a requestor to indicate their preference in regards to whether the
  response is signed and how. This is useful for saving work on the PDP in situations where
  some clients may be passing the response to another party (e.g., in a push mode of
  operation) while others will be direct consumers and hence don't need signatures since the
  transport layer provides sufficient security.

# 4.2 Simple Authorization Decision Statement

In the SAML authorization query protocol, a resource normally sends a query to the decision service with an enumeration of the actions being attempted by a requestor. The decision service responds with an assertion containing the set of actions that the requestor is authorized to perform.

While this works well for situations where the resource may be interested in knowing what subset of the actions the requestor is allowed to perform, in "all or nothing" situations where the resource is only interested in knowing if the requestor can perform all the enumerated actions, it requires the resource to process the entire list to verify if all the actions originally requested are listed.

This specification defines a new StatementType, the SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement element, which contains a reference to the original ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery and a simple boolean decision in regard to that query as a whole. This allows an easy-to-parse decision to be rendered on the query as a whole, as well as potentially significantly reducing the bandwidth needed to transmit the decision.

#### 5 SAML Extensions

This section is **normative**. It defines extensions to SAML elements for use in OGSA authorization. See the previous section for a non-normative description of these extensions.

These extensions are made to the SAML 1.1 schema using the type derivation method as described in Section 6.3 of [SAML].

# 5.1 Element < Extended Authorization Decision Query >

The ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery element allows the entity making the query to indicate its preferences in regard to the query response. This element extends the SAML AuthorizationDecisionQuery element.

An ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery element contains the following additional attributes:

## RequestSimpleDecision [Optional]

This elements indicates the requestor's preference in regard to having the response in the form of a single SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement (as defined in this document) instead of one or more SAML AuthorizationDecisionStatement elements.

#### Recipient [Optional]

This element is deprecated and its use should be avoided.

## RequestSigned [Optional]

This element is used to request that a signature be included with the response. This element MUST contain the QName of the element to be signed, that is, samlp:Response or saml:Assertion. A responder to a query with this attribute set SHOULD sign the response as requested, but is under no obligation to do so and MAY return an unsigned response (or one signed in a different manner than requested). An entity receiving an unsigned response when they requested a signature SHOULD disregard it, but MAY choose to use it depending on the application context.

An ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery element contains the following additional element:

## AuthorizationAdvice [Optional]

This abstract element allows for additional information to be included with the query that the responder MAY use when rendering a decision. This element is defined in Section 5.1.1 of this document.

The following schema fragment defines the <ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery> element and its ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQueryType complex type:

### 5.1.1 Element < Authorization Advice>

The <AuthorizationAdvice> element is an extension point that allows for additional information to be included with an authorization query that MAY be used by the responder.

The following schema fragment defines the <AuthorizationAdvice> element and its AuthorizationAdviceAbstractType complex type:

<element name="AuthorizationAdvice" type="ogsa-saml:AuthorizationAdviceAbstractType"/>
<complexType name="AuthorizationAdviceAbstractType" abstract="true"/>

## 5.1.2 Element <SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice>

The <SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice> element supplies a statement that the designated attributes associated with the specified subject may be obtained from the referenced URI. Its purpose is to advise the PDP as to where it may find attributes for the subject when working in the *credential pull mode* of operation.

<SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice> is of type SubjectAttributeReferenceAdviceType, which extends the AuthorizationAdviceAbstractType with the addition of the following:

AttributeDesignator [Any number]

These elements list the attributes that may be located at the referenced URI. If this component is absent, then it implies that all attributes can be found at the referenced URI.

Reference Attribute [Required]

This attribute provides the URI from which the attributes may be obtained.

The following schema fragment defines the <SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice> element and its SubjectAttributeReferenceAdviceType complex type:

## 5.2 Element <SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement>

The <SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement> element specifies the decision made about a corresponding SAML AuthorizationDecisionQuery request. Its purpose is to allow a response to the statement as a whole without enumeration of the rights in the response, which in turns allows for easier processing of the response by the requestor.

It has the complex type SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatementType, which extends the StatementAbstractType by adding the following attributes to it:

# Decision [Required]

The decision made by the responder.

## Recipient [Optional]

If the ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery to which this statement is in response contained a Recipient attribute, the Recipient attribute MUST be present and its value MUST match the value of this field in the ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery. Otherwise, this attribute SHOULD NOT be present.

The following schema fragment defines the <SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement> element and its SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatementType complex type:

# 6 SAML Authorization Element Usage in OGSA

This section is **normative**. It describes how SAML authorization elements are used to meet OGSA requirements for authorization assertions and decisions as described in [OGSAAuthzReq]. It first describes the use of the AuthorizationDecisionQuery and ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery elements, which are used by entities to request authorization assertions or decisions from an authorization service. This is followed by a description of the statements that can be returned in the response, either one or more standard AuthorizationDecisionStatement elements or a SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement element.

#### 6.1 (Extended)AuthorizationDecisionQuery

The AuthorizationDecisionQuery or ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery (as defined in Section 5.1) elements are used by clients to request an authorization decision. This section describes constraints on fields in these elements.

The AuthorizationDecisionQuery element MUST include the following elements:

- A Subject element containing a Nameldentifier element specifying the identity of the initiator of the action being authorized.
- A Resource element specifying the resource or resources to which the request to be authorized is being made.
- One or more Action elements specifying the action(s) being requested on the resource(s).

The query MAY include the following element:

Optionally one or more Evidence elements containing one or more supporting credentials
about the initiator (or pointers to them), plus any contextual information, plus a public key
certificate chain that may be used to authenticate the initiator.

The following subsections describe both the use of and extensions to these elements for OGSA authorization.

#### 6.1.1 NameIdentifier Element

This element, contained in the Subject element, contains the name of the initiator. The syntax of the Nameldentifer element is unchanged from the SAML specification. In some scenarios, the authorization service (PDP) MAY require the Subject and client names to be the same. In other scenarios, the authorization service MAY allow trusted clients to request authorization decisions on behalf of any Subject.

# 6.1.1.1 X.509 Proxy Certificate Format Identifier

The SAML specification defines how some common identity types are asserted. This document defines how entities authenticated using X.509 Proxy Certificates [RFC3820] should be encoded. The SAML specification, in Section 7.3.3, defines method for expressing X.509 subject names that MUST be used for X.509 Proxy Certificate authenticated identities with the subject name of the end entity certificate that issued the proxy certificate chain as the subject name to be encoded.

The URI for this method is

urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.1:nameid-format:X509SubjectName

### 6.1.1.2 Wildcard Subject Identifier

This document defines a method to be used in order to obtain public rights, that is, rights available to any subject. To indicate that such a request is being made, the Nameldentifier element MUST contain the following URI as the Format attribute:

# http://www.gridforum.org/ogsa-authz/saml/2003/06/NameIdentifier/any

The Subject string MUST be "\*", i.e., an asterisk.

#### 6.1.2 SubjectConfirmation Element

When a subject was authenticated using a X.509 Identity [RFC 3280] or Proxy Certificate [RFC 3820], the SubjectConfirmation element SHOULD contain the X.509 certificate chain presented by the subject as follows:

If the subject was authenticated using a Proxy Certificates, the ConfirmationMethod element MUST contain the following URI:

## http://www.gridforum.org/ogsa-authz/saml/2004/01/am/gsi

If the subject was authenticated using a standard X.509 Identify Certificates, the ConfirmationMethod element SHOULD contain the following URI (as defined by [SAML]), however it MAY contain the URI for Proxy Certificate authentication in the event an implementation does not distinguish between the two.

# URI: urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:am:X509-PKI

The SubjectConfirmationData element SHOULD contain the certificate chain presented by the subject encoded as a certificate path (i.e. an X509PKIPathv1 element) as described in [WSS-X509].

# 6.1.3 Resource Element

The Resource element is defined as a URI and is unchanged from the SAML specification.

### 6.1.3.1 Grid Services

If the resource being referred to is a Grid service the resource element MUST contain the Grid Service Handle (GSH) of the service as described in [OGSI].

#### 6.1.3.2 Wildcard Resource

This specification also defines a wildcard resource. This has two different meanings depending on whether it is in a query (request to a PDP) or a statement (response from a PDP):

- In an AuthorizationDecisionQuery or ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery, the use of
  the wildcard resource URI states a desire by the entity making the query to learn the
  subject's rights on all the resources of which the authorization service believes itself to
  be authoritative. Typically such a query will be used by an initiator who will cache the
  results and present them to resources later in a decision push mode of authorization.
- In an AuthorizationDecisionStatement, it states the subject has the given privileges on all
  resources that accept the authorization service as authoritative. This statement may be
  used when the authorization service is the authority for a group of resources with
  identical policy.

This wildcard URI MUST be specified as follows:

## http://www.gridforum.org/ogsa-authz/saml/2003/06/resource/any

The Resource string MUST be "\*", i.e., an asterisk.

#### 6.1.4 Action Elements

The Action element describes the operation or method to be authorized. The Action element is composed of a string describing the operation and a URI specifying the namespace of the action.

### 6.1.4.1 Grid Service Operation Invocation

This specification defines the following namespace:

### http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/03/ogsa-authz/saml/action/operation

This namespace is used to define an operation invocation on a Grid Service, specified in the Resource element, by the specified Subject. The action string MUST contain the name of the operation being invoked.

Note that operations regarding service data MUST be handled as actions on the service data itself as described in the following section.

In a future version of the spec we expect to change this so that the action string contains the qualified name of the operation being invoked.

### 6.1.4.2 Grid Service Data Access

[OGSI] defines service data elements (SDEs) associated with a Grid Service and methods for finding, setting and deleting SDEs. These actions are encoded in SAML Action elements by using the Action namespace to indicate the type of access (find, set or delete) and the Action value to indicate the name of the SDE on which the access is being attempted.

This scheme is intended to work with the queryByServiceDataNames QueryExpression and the setByServiceDataName and deleteByServiceDataNames UpdateExpressions as defined in Section 9.2 of [OGSI]. More complicated forms of query functionality may not fit into this scheme and it is expected they will require a more complicated method of encoding the expression and response.

http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/01/ogsa-authz/saml/action/sde/find

This namespace MUST be used to indicate a findServiceData operation (or its equivalent) being invoked on the specified Grid Service by the specified Subject. The action string MUST contain the QName of the Service Data element being accessed.

### http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2003/06/ogsa-authz/saml/action/sde/set

This namespace is used to define the modification of a ServiceDataElement. The action string MUST contain the QName of the Service Data element being deleted.

## http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2003/06/ogsa-authz/saml/action/sde/delete

This namespace is used to define the deletion of a ServiceDataElement. The action string MUST contain the QName of the Service Data element being modified.

#### 6.1.4.3 Wildcard Action

This specification also defines a wildcard action. This action has two different meanings depending on whether it is in a query or an assertion:

- In an AuthorizationDecisionQuery or ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery, it states a desire to learn all of the subject's rights on the specified resource. An example of where this might be used, is by a policy enforcement point co-located with a resource, that expects a number of requests from a subject and will use a wildcard action query to obtain all of the subjects rights which it will cache as to do further access control without the contacting the authorization service.
- In an AuthorizationDecisionStatement, it states the initiator has all privileges on the resource. This will often be the case where the initiator is the policy authority for the resource in question.

This wildcard action MUST be specified as follows. The namespace URI MUST be:

### http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/03/ogsa-authz/saml/action/wildcard

The Action string must be "\*", i.e., an asterisk.

## 6.1.5 SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice Elements

The AuthorizationDecisionQuery and ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery elements may contain zero or more SAML SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice elements that may be used to hold references to supporting credentials regarding the initiator. This document does not further constrain the contents of this element.

#### 6.2 Assertion Element

The SAML Assertion element is used by one entity to assert security statements pertaining to another entity. While an Assertion element can contain a variety of SAML statements, for the purposes of this document we consider only three types of statements:

- 1. AuthorizationDecisionStatement
- 2. SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement (defined in this document)
- 3. AttributeStatement

The first two statements may be returned in response to an AuthorizationDecisionQuery, whilst the latter may be presented in the Evidence element of an AuthorizationDecisionQuery or ExtendedAuthorizationDecisionQuery.

When returned by an authorization service to an entity, the Assertion element will be enveloped in a SAML Response element as described in the SAML specification.

The Assertion element includes the following elements:

1. An optional Conditions element specifying the conditions for use of the assertion.

- 2. An optional Advice element specifying advice for use of the element.
- 3. Any number of AuthorizationDecisionsStatements
- 4. Any number of AttributeStatements in Evidence elements
- 5. An optional Signature element allowing the Assertion to be verified.

The following subsections describe the use and extensions to these elements for OGSA.

#### 6.2.1 Conditions Element

Implementations SHOULD NOT use this element unless they are confident it will be understood by the PEP.

The Conditions element contains optional time constraints and any number of Condition elements (note difference in plurality between Conditions and Condition element names) on the returned assertion. Condition elements serve as an abstract element for extension, and should be used to express the policy conditions on operands and context/environment that the authorization service was unable to evaluate due to insufficient information being provided by the client. It is envisioned that future specifications will be able to extend the Condition element to return fine-grained policies for parameters on operation invocation and service data access, using, for example, elements of XACML.

#### 6.2.2 Advice Element

The Advice element MAY be ignored by the recipient of the assertion, therefore it MUST NOT contain any information essential to the operation of the PEP. Information that MAY be placed into the Advice Element includes: evidence supporting the assertion, and identification of the policy used in making the assertion.

# 6.2.3 AuthorizationDecisionStatement Element

The AuthorizationDecisionStatement element contains the Subject, Action, and Resource from AuthorizationDecisionQuery, and includes a Decision attribute.

The Decision attribute can take the value of Permit, Deny or Indeterminate. Indeterminate MUST be returned if the PDP could not render a decision due to error or lack of information.

## 6.2.4 AttributeStatement Element

The AttributeStatement element MAY be included in the Evidence element of an AuthorizationDecisionQuery, to signify attributes of the subject that were used when rendering the authorization decision. For example, when role-based access control is being used, the attribute statement(s) could contain the role(s) of the initiator.

## 6.2.5 Signature Element

This specification places no constraints on the Signature element. Implementations SHOULD sign assertions when they do not have a protected and authenticated connection to the evaluator of the assertion.

#### 6.2.6 Required Assertion Attributes

Major Revision

MUST be set to 1

Minor Revision

MUST be set to 1

AssertionID

SHOULD be set to a statistically unique 128 bit number

Issuer

This MUST be a string unambiguously identifying the issuer. A URI MAY be used. Where the Issuer name is an X.500 DN, it MUST have the format as specified in RFC 2255 [RFC 2255]. For example, if the issuer was a PDP with distinguished name of cn=PERMIS ADF, o=University of Michigan, c=us, the URI would be:

Idap:///cn=PERMIS%20ADF,o=University%20of%20Michigan,c=US

#### IssuerInstant

MUST be the date/time that the Assertion was issued in UTC form as specified in Section 1.2.2 of [SAML].

# 7 SAML Authorization Service PortType

This normative section has the WSDL that defines the interface (operation and service data elements) that an OGSA Authorization service MUST define in its WSDL. These elements MUST be defined in addition to the basic Grid Service WSDL defined in Section 19.1 of [OGSI]. Authorization services MAY also define other service data or operations in addition to those defined in this section.

#### 7.1 OGSA Authorization Service serviceData Declarations

The OGSA Authorization service portType includes the following serviceData elements:

# 7.1.1 supportedPolicies

This element MAY contain identifiers for any or all access control policies that authorization service is capable of rendering decisions regarding.

```
<sd:serviceData name="supportedPolicies"
type="xsd:anyURI"
minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"
mutability="mutable"
modifiable="false"
nillable="false"/>
```

## 7.1.2 supportsIndeterminate

This element expresses the authorization service's ability to return an Indeterminate decision. It is expected that some legacy systems may not allow the return of Indeterminate.

```
<sd:serviceData name="supportsIndeterminate"
    type="xsd:boolean"
    minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"
    mutability="static"
    modifiable="false"
    nillable="false"/>
```

#### 7.1.3 signatureCapable

This element expresses the authorization service's ability to sign the assertions and/or responses.

```
<sd:serviceData name="signatureCapable"
type="xsd:boolean"
minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"
mutability="static"
modifiable="false"
nillable="false"/>
```

# 7.2 OGSA Authorization Service Operations

The OGSA Authorization service portType includes the following operations:

### 7.2.1 SAMLRequest

#### Input

SAML Request Message

# Output

SAML Response Message

This operation defines the basic mechanism for which queries are sent to the authorization service and responses are returned. Faults will be encoded in the response in the standard SAML manner, so no faults are defined at the WSDL level.

## 7.3 Full WSDL

The following is the WSDL used for the SAML-based authorization service. The first WSDL is for the SAML-specific portions of the authorization service. The second shows the SAML WSDL combined with the OGSI Grid Service WSDL to create an OGSA SAML Grid Authorization Service.

```
<definitions name="AuthorizationService"</pre>
 targetNamespace="http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/03/ogsa-authz/saml"
 xmlns:samlp="urn:oasis:names:tc:SAML:1.0:protocol"
 xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/"
  <message name="SAMLRequestInputMessage">
   <part name="body" element="samlp:Request "/>
  </message>
  <message name="SAMLReguestOutputMessage">
   <part name="body" element="samlp:Response"/>
  </message>
  <gwsdl:portType name="SAMLRequestPortType">
   <operation name="SAMLRequest">
    <input message="tns:SAMLReguestInputMessage"/>
   <output message="tns:SAMLRequestOutputMessage"/>
   </operation>
  </gwsdl:portType>
```

```
<sd:serviceData name="supportedPolicies" type="xsd:anyURI" minOccurs="0"
    maxOccurs="unbounded" mutability="mutable" modifiable="false" nillable="false"/>
    <sd:serviceData name="supportsIndeterminate" type="xsd:boolean" minOccurs="1"
    maxOccurs="1" mutability="static" modifiable="false" nillable="false"/>
    <sd:serviceData name="signatureCapable" type="xsd:boolean" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="1"
    mutability="static" modifiable="false" nillable="false"/>
    </definitions>
```

#### An OGSI SAML Authorization Service:

```
<definitions name="AuthorizationService"
    targetNamespace="http://ogsa.globus.org/samples/authzService">
    <import location="../../ogsi/ogsi.gwsdl"
        namespace="http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2003/03/OGSI"/>
        <import location="../../security/authorization/authz_port_type.gwsdl"
            namespace="http://www.gridforum.org/namespaces/2004/03/ogsa-authz/saml"/>
        <gwsdl:portType name="AuthzServicePortType" extends="ogsi:GridService authz:SAMLRequestPortType"/>
        </definitions>
```

# 8 Security Considerations

This specification defines an authorization service based on the SAML specification for OGSA and is completely about security. Implementers of this specification need to be aware that errors in implementation could lead to denial of service or improper granting of service to unauthorized users.

In particular, mutual authentication between the client and the PDP is highly desirable and strongly recommended. PDP implementations SHOULD sign assertions when they do not have an authenticated connection to the evaluator of the assertion, and MAY sign them when they do have. PDP implementations MAY be unwilling to respond to authorization decision queries from clients who are not authenticated.

# 9 Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Rebekah Lepro-Metz, Tom Scavo and Dane Skow for feedback and comments on the document.

The basic SAML operations WSDL in Section 7.2 was taken from a version by Irving Reid of Baltimore Technologies (in email to the OASIS SSTC: http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/security-services/200302/msg00008.html).

#### 10 Author Information

Von Welch NCSA vwelch@ncsa.uiuc.edu

Rachana Ananthakrishnan Argonne National Laboratory ranantha@mcs.anl.gov

Frank Siebenlist Argonne National Laboratory franks@mcs.anl.gov

David W. Chadwick
The Computing Laboratory
University of Kent
D.W.Chadwick@kent.ac.uk

Sam Meder University of Chicago meder@mcs.anl.gov

Laura Pearlman Information Sciences Institute University of Southern California laura@isi.edu

## 11 Glossary

This document uses the terms as defined in the Authorization Glossary as produced by the GGF Working Group on Authorization Frameworks and Mechanisms [Authz-Glossary].

The following additional terms are used in this document.

Client – the entity making a decision request to the authorization service (it could be the target, the initiator, or a proxy acting on behalf of the initiator).

## 12 Intellectual Property Statement

The GGF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the GGF Secretariat.

The GGF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this recommendation. Please address the information to the GGF Executive Director.

## 13 Full Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) Global Grid Forum (date). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the GGF or other organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Grid Recommendations in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the GGF Document process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the GGF or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE GLOBAL GRID FORUM DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE."

#### 14 Normative References

[Authz-Glossary] Lorch, M., Skow, D., Thompson, M., "Authorization Glossary", Global Grid Forum, February 2004.

- [OGSI] "Open Grid Service Infrastructure, Version 1.0", Global Grid Forum, April 5, 2003.
- [RFC 1630] T. Berners-Lee, "Universal Resource Identifiers in WWW", RFC 1630, June 1994.
- [RFC 2255] T. Howes, M. Smith. "The LDAP URL Format", RFC 2255, Dec 1997.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [SAML] OASIS, Assertions and Protocol for the OASIS Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) V1.1, September 2003.
- [WSS-X509] "Web Services Security X.509 Certificate Token Profile", OASIS Standard 200401, March 2004

#### 15 Informational References

- [OASIS-SSTC] OASIS Security Services Technical Committee. http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc home.php?wg abbrev=security. January, 2004.
- [OASIS-XACML] OASIS eXtensible Access Control Markup Language Technical Committee. http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc\_home.php?wg\_abbrev=xacml. January, 2004.
- [OGSA] Foster, I., C. Kesselman, J. Nick, S. Tuecke, "The Physiology of the Grid: An Open Grid Services Architecture for Distributed Systems Integration", XXX
- [OGSAAuthzReq] Welch, V., et al, OGSA Authorization Requirements, June, 2003.
- [OpenSAML] OpenSAML an Open Source Security Assertion Markup Language implementation. http://www.opensaml.org. January, 2004.
- [RFC 3280] Housley, R., Polk, W., Ford, W., and Solo, D., "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and Certificate Revocation List (CRL) Profile". RFC 3280, IETF, April 2002.
- [RFC3820] Tuecke, S. Welch, V., Engert, D., Thompson, M., and Pearlman, L. "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Proxy Certificate Profile", RFC 3820, IETF, June 2004.

# Appendix A. Intellectual Property Issues with SAML

RSA (http://www.rsa.com) claims intellectual property rights on portions of the SAML specification. They offer a reciprocal license to implementers of SAML. Details of their claim and the license may be found at: http://www.rsasecurity.com/solutions/standards/saml/

## Appendix B. Globus Toolkit Version 4 use of Callout: URI encoding of EPR

Version 4 of the Globus Toolkit (GT4) is based on the Web Services Resource Framework (WSRF), which uses the WS-Addressing specification to identify service endpoints.

We provide here a brief description of how GT4 encodes the address for its services into a URI. This is intended to provide a non-normative example of how more complex address structures can be encoded into simple URIs.

- 1. The Reference Properties element is canonicalized and hashed using SHA-1
- 2. The hash is encoded using Base64 encoding.
- 3. The Base64 encoding is URL-encoded as per [RFC 1630].
- 4. The URI identifying the service is formed by concatenating the Address element URI, a question mark ("?") and the encoded hash of the Reference Properties element from the previous step.

Here is an example of a resulting URI using this process. Everything prior to the "?" is the URI from the address element; everything after the "?" is the hash of the Reference Properties element:

http://192.168.1.100:3411/wsrf/services/AuthzCalloutTestService?q4D%2B31NtjfehDAnn07NUwBP2j34%3D

# Appendix C. ChangeLog

This section to be deleted by the GGF editor prior to publication.

Changes from January 2005 to current version:

- "should" to "SHOULD" in 6.1.2
- Removed editor's comment in 6.1.2
- Updated WSS-X509 reference.
- In Appendix B: Added step about properly URI encoding hash per RFC 1630.
- Updated acknowledgements.
- Numerous minor editorial corrections from Tom Scavo.
- Table 1: Corrected namespace prefixes to be lowercase.
- Clarified second sentence of the second paragraph of 6.1.4.2.
- Section 6.1.5: Changed to reflect renaming ofSubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice element.
- Table 1: Corrected ogsa-saml namespace to match with what is in 7.3.
- Section 7.3: Removed unused xmlns:soap namespace.
- Section 7.3: Corrected xmlns:samlp namespace to match what is in Table 1.
- Section 11: Removed reference to "ADF" since it was undefined in this document.
- Section 10: Updated David Chadwick's contact information.

 Section 5.1: Added text clarifying what client should do if they receive an unsigned response when a signed response was requested.

- Section 6.1.2: Clarified between ConfirmationMethod between when authentication was done with proxy certificates and end entity certs.
- Section 6.1.4.1: Added note about moving to qualified name in future version of the document.

# Changes from December 2004 to January 2005 version:

- Removed Appendix A (SAML Overview)
- Section 5.2: Recipient field SHOULD NOT be included if sender did not include it.
- Section 6.1: Clarified intent that clients should use messages if they want an authorization decision.
- Section 6.1 and 6.1.2: Changed proxy certificate reference to RFC 3820. Added reference to RFC 3280.
- Section 6.1.3.2: Changed "of which the authorization service is aware" to "of which the authorization service believes it is authoritative."
- Section 7.3: "OGSI Grid Authorization Service" to "OGSA Grid Authorization Service"
- Numerous non-normative editorial changes suggested by Dane Skow.

# Changes from May, 2004 to December, 2004 version:

- Added Appendix C giving an example of how GT4 creates URIs from WS-Addressing elements.
- Marked Recipient field in 5.1 as depreciated since it is insufficient to stop replay attacks.

#### Changes from January, 2004 to May, 2004 version:

- Split references into Normative and Informational
- Added WSDL to section 7
- Deleted section 6.1.5.1 due to lack of clarity and content.
- Section 5.2: Removed InResponseTo element from SimpleAuthorizationDecisionStatement since it is already in Response element.
- Cleaned up references
- Section 5.1.2: Corrected base for SubjectAttributeReferenceAdvice to AuthorizationAdviceAbstractType