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1 Introduction

This document defines the WS-I Basic Profile 2.0 (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 2 introduces the Profile, and explains its relationships to other profiles.

Section 3, "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. Relationships to Other Profiles

1.1 Relationships to Other Profiles

This Profile is derived from the Basic Profile 1.1 [BP1.1] by incorporating any errata to date and including
those requirements related to the serialization of envelopes and their representation in messages from
the Simple SOAP Binding Profile 1.0 [SSBP1.0].

The Attachments Profile 1.0 [AP1.0] adds support for SOAP with Attachments, and is intended to be used
in combination with this Profile.

1.1.1 Compatibility with Basic Profile 1.1

This Profile (BP 2.0) is the first version of the WS-I Basic Profile that changes the version of SOAP in the
profile scope from SOAP 1.1 to the W3C SOAP 1.2 Recommendation [SOAP12-1], [SOAP12-2]. As such,
BP 1.1 conformant messages are inherently incompatible with those conformant with BP 2.0, while
receivers and instances processing these messages may or may not support these two versions of the
Basic Profile.

1.1.2 Relationship to Basic Profile 1.2

Similarly to this Profile, Basic Profile 1.2 [BP1.2] (BP 1.2) is derived from Basic Profile 1.1 [BP1.1].
Unlike this Profile, the version of SOAP in scope for BP 1.2 is, like BP 1.1, SOAP 1.1 [SOAP1.1]. To the
extent possible, this Profile and BP 1.2 attempt to maintain a common set of requirement numbers, and
common requirement and expository text. There are cases where the differences between SOAP 1.1 and
SOAP 1.2 necessitate unique requirements and/or differing requirement and expository text. Therefore,
some requirements and test assertions may present issues of forward or backward compatibility.

1.2 Guiding Principles

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, requirements do not need to be testable to be included in the Profile. Preferably, testing is achieved in a non-intrusive manner (e.g., by 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**
The Profile speaks to interoperability at the application layer; it assumes that interoperability of lower-layer protocols (e.g., TCP, IP, Ethernet) 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.

### 1.3 Test Assertions

This profile document is complemented by Appendix D Test Assertions (TA) that contains scripted (XPath 2.0) test assertions for assessing conformance of an endpoint to the BP2.0 profile.
Test assertions are not guaranteed to exhaustively cover every case where a profile requirement applies. In several instances, more than one test assertion is needed to address the various situations where a profile requirement applies.

Each profile requirement is tagged with:

- The level of conformance this requirement belongs to (either CORE, or HTTP-TRANSPORT). See the Conformance section.
- A testability assessment (TESTABLE, TESTABLE_SCENARIO_DEPENDENT, NOT_TESTED, NOT_TESTABLE)
- Optionally, one or more test assertion identifiers (e.g. BP1905)

The structure of test assertions and the meaning of the testability assessment are described in Appendix C. Testing

1.4 Notational Conventions

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 [RFC2119].

Normative statements in the Profile (i.e., those impacting conformance, as outlined in Section 2) are called “Requirements” and 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.

Extensibility points in underlying specifications (see Section 2.3) 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.

- soap12 - "http://www.w3.org/2003/05 soap-envelope "
- xsi - "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
- xsd - "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
- soapenc - "http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-encoding"
- wsd1 - "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsd1/"
- wsoap12 - "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsd1/soap12/"
- uddi - "urn:uddi-org:api_v2"
- wsast - "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing"
- xop - "http://www.w3.org/2004/08/xop/include"

1.5 Terminology

The following list of terms have specific definitions that are authoritative for this profile:
non-addressable

A CONSUMER or INSTANCE is deemed "non-addressable" when, for whatever reason, it is either unwilling or unable to provide a network endpoint that is capable of accepting connections. This means that the CONSUMER or INSTANCE cannot service incoming HTTP connections and can only transmit HTTP Request messages and receive HTTP Response messages.

rpc-literal binding

An "rpc-literal binding" is a wsdl:binding element whose child wsdl:operation elements are all rpc-literal operations.

An "rpc-literal operation" is a wsdl:operation child element of wsdl:binding whose wsoap12:body descendant elements specify the use attribute with the value "literal", and either:

1. The style attribute with the value "rpc" is specified on the child wsoap12:operation element; or
2. The style attribute is not present on the child wsoap12:operation element, and the wsoap12:binding element in the enclosing wsdl:binding specifies the style attribute with the value "rpc".

document-literal binding

A "document-literal binding" is a wsdl:binding element whose child wsdl:operation elements are all document-literal operations.

A "document-literal operation" is a wsdl:operation child element of wsdl:binding whose wsoap12:body descendent elements specifies the use attribute with the value "literal" and, either:

1. The style attribute with the value "document" is specified on the child wsoap12:operation element; or
2. The style attribute is not present on the child wsoap12:operation element, and the wsoap12:binding element in the enclosing wsdl:binding specifies the style attribute with the value "document"; or
3. The style attribute is not present on both the child wsoap12:operation element and the wsoap12:binding element in the enclosing wsdl:binding.

operation signature

The Profile defines the "operation signature" to be the fully qualified name of the child element of SOAP body of the SOAP input message described by an operation in a WSDL binding and the URI value of the wsa:Action SOAP header block, if present.

In the case of rpc-literal binding, the operation name is used as a wrapper for the part accessors. In the document-literal case, since a wrapper with the operation name is not present, the message signatures must be correctly designed so that they meet this requirement.
1.6 Profile Identification and Versioning

This document is identified by a name (in this case, Basic Profile) and a version number (here, 2.0). Together, they identify a profile (here, Basic Profile 2.0).

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.

1.7 Normative References

The following specifications' requirements are incorporated into the Profile by reference, except where superseded by the Profile:


[BP1.2] Basic Profile 1.2, OASIS Committee Specification Draft, May 2013. (TBD)


[WSDL11SOAP12] "WSDL 1.1 Binding Extensions for SOAP 1.2", W3C Member Submission, 05 April 2006 , http://www.w3.org/Submission/wsdl11soap12/


1.8 Non-Normative References


2 Conformance

Conformance to the Profile is defined by adherence to the set of identified 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 Requirements Semantics

The Profile is defined using a set of Requirements (see section 1.4 for the general format of a Requirement, including its identification). Each Requirement is an atomic normative statement targeting a particular artifact subject to conformance assessment. In other words, 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 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 [RFC2119] 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;

\[ \textbf{R9999} \] Any \textbf{WIDGET} \textbf{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.

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.

A Requirement is said “mandatory” if its keyword is of mandatory nature (e.g. MUST, MUST NOT, REQUIRED).

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

No other content is normative in this document outside the numbered Requirements and the conformance claim mechanisms (section 2.5). In particular:

- Examples material is not normative and only intended as illustrative.
- Appendix material is not normative.
- Test Assertions associated with this profile specification are not normative.
- Explanatory text introducing Requirements is not normative.
- Notes are not normative.
- Schemas are not normative.
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 soap12: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 [BP1.0])
- **INSTANCE** - software that implements a wsdl:port or a uddi:bindingTemplate (from [BP1.0])
- **CONSUMER** - software that invokes an INSTANCE (from [BP1.0])
- **SENDER** - software that generates a message according to the protocol(s) associated with it (from [BP1.0])
- **RECEIVER** - software that consumes a message according to the protocol(s) associated with it (e.g., SOAP processors) (from [BP1.0])
- **REGDATA** - registry elements that are involved in the registration and discovery of Web services (e.g. UDDI tModels) (from [BP1.0])
- **SIMPLE_SOAP_MESSAGE** - A MESSAGE that has as an entity-body that has a 'Content-Type' HTTP header field with a field-value of 'application/soap+xml'
- **XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE** - A MESSAGE that has an entity-body that has a 'Content-Type' HTTP header field with a field-value of 'multipart/related' with a type parameter of 'application/xop+xml'

2.3 Conformance Scope

The Profile's functional scope includes the set of specifications referenced by it. However the conformance requirements that are proper to each one of these underlying specifications (e.g. defining conformance to SOAP 1.1) are not part of the Profile. Only the requirements and restrictions put on the usage of these specifications are part of the Profile. In other words, claiming conformance to this Profile does not imply conformance to SOAP1.1, but it implies a particular way to use SOAP1.1.

The Profile's scope is further limited 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. These extensibility points are however listed here to point at possible risks of interoperability loss that are not addressed by 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.
However the Profile may still express constraints 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.

The Profile's scope is defined by the referenced specifications in clause 1.7, as limited by the extensibility points in Appendix A.

### 2.4 Conformance Clauses

This Profile concerns several conformance targets. Conformance targets are identified in requirements as described in Section 2.2. Conformance claims may apply to any above conformance target.

For a given conformance target, there are in addition two major ways to conform to this profile, identified by tags associated with each profile Requirement. These tags are CORE and HTTP-TRANSPORT corresponding respectively to two conformance levels: "Core" and "HTTP-Transport":

- "CORE" (transport-independent) conformance level. When the endpoint advertising conformance to this Profile is using a transport other than HTTP, then only the Requirements tagged with "CORE" apply to the conformance targets under responsibility of this endpoint.
- "HTTP-TRANSPORT" (HTTP transport-specific) conformance level. When the endpoint advertising conformance to this Profile is using HTTP, then all of the Requirements of the Profile tagged either with CORE or with HTTP-TRANSPORT apply to the conformance targets under responsibility of this endpoint.

These define two levels of conformance, as Core conformance is included in HTTP-transport conformance. In other words, conformance at HTTP-transport level implies conformance at Core level.

#### 2.4.1 Core Conformance

A conformance target (as defined in 2.2) is said to be conforming to this profile at the core conformance level if this target fulfills all the mandatory Requirements (see precise meaning in 1.4) that are tagged CORE and that identify this target type. Conformance at this level is independent from a message transport layer, e.g. could use a different protocol such as SMTP instead of HTTP.

#### 2.4.2 HTTP Transport Conformance

A conformance target (as defined in 2.2) is said to be conforming to this profile at the HTTP transport conformance level if this target fulfills all the mandatory Requirements (see precise meaning in 1.4) that are tagged either as CORE or as HTTP-TRANSPORT and that identify this target type.

In other words, conformance at this level implies conformance at Core level.

### 2.5 Claiming Conformance

This specification defines two mechanisms to claim conformance to the Profile the use of which needs be agreed upon by users: 1) the Conformance Claim Attachment Mechanisms [claimAttachment] (see Section 4), or 2) the Web Services Policy - Framework [WSPolicy1.5] and Web Services Policy - Attachment [WSPolicyAtt1.5] (see Section 4).

In a similar way as for extensibility points, the choice of a conformance claim mechanism is not part of the Profile definition: should the interacting parties decide to use one of them to advertise support for the
Profile, a prior agreement must be established that is beyond the scope of this Profile. Whether these conformance claim mechanisms are supported or not does not affect conformance to the Profile.

In consequence, although the use of these conformance claim mechanisms is optional, they are described in a normative way to help partners define such agreements unambiguously.

### 2.5.1 Claiming Conformance using the Conformance Claim Attachment Mechanisms

Claims of conformance to this Profile MAY be made using the following Conformance Claim Attachment Mechanisms [claimAttachment], Such claims concern specific groups of conformance targets as follows:

- **WSDL 1.1 Claim Attachment Mechanism for Web Services Instances** - MESSAGE, DESCRIPTION, INSTANCE, RECEIVER
- **WSDL 1.1 Claim Attachment Mechanism for Web 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 Basic Profile 2.0 conformance claim URI is:

```
http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic-profile/2.0/Conformant
```

When a web service instance is using HTTP, then all of the requirements of the Profile apply as specified in Section 2.4.2.

### 2.5.2 Claiming Conformance using WS-Policy and WS-PolicyAttachment

Mechanisms described in Web Services Policy - Framework [WSPolicy1.5] and Web Services Policy - Attachment [WSPolicyAtt1.5] specifications MAY be used to advertise conformance to this Profile. The Profile defines the following policy assertion for this purpose:

```
<bp20:Conformant xmlns:bp20="http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic-profile/2.0/">
```

A copy of the XML Schema is provided in Appendix B, for convenience.

The presence of this assertion indicates that the policy subject supports the requirements of this Profile in a manner that conforms to Basic Profile 2.0 (See Section ). This assertion also requires that CONSUMERS MUST use the effected protocols in a way that conforms to Basic Profile 2.0. The absence of this assertion says nothing about Basic Profile 2.0 conformance; it simply indicates the lack of an affirmative declaration of and requirement for Basic Profile 2.0 conformance.

The `bp20:Conformant` policy assertion applies to the endpoint policy subject.

For WSDL 1.1, this assertion can be attached to a `wsdl11:port` or `wsdl11:binding`. A policy expression containing the `bp20:Conformant` policy assertion MUST NOT be attached to a `wsdl:portType`.

For example, **CORRECT:**

```
<wsp:Policy xmlns:bp20="http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic-profile/2.0/">
  xmlns:wsp="http://www.w3.org/ns/ws-policy">
    <bp20:Conformant/>
  </wsp:Policy>
```

The example above shows a policy expression that requires Basic Profile 2.0.
For example,  
CORRECT:  

```xml
<wsp:Policy xmlns:bp20="http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic-profile/2.0/"
            xmlns:wsp="http://www.w3.org/ns/ws-policy"
            xmlns:wsam="http://www.w3.org/2007/05/addressing/metadata">  
  <wsam:Addressing>
    <wsp:Policy/>
  </wsam:Addressing>
  <bp20:Conformant/>
</wsp:Policy>
```

The example above shows a policy expression that requires WS-Addressing and Basic Profile 2.0.
3 Messaging

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

  Extensibility points:
  - E0001 - Header blocks - Header blocks are an extensibility mechanism in SOAP.
  - E0002 - Processing order - The order of processing of a SOAP envelope's components (e.g., headers) is unspecified, and therefore may need to be negotiated out-of-band.
  - E0003 - Use of intermediaries - SOAP Intermediaries is an unspecified mechanism in SOAP 1.2, and their use may require out-of-band negotiation. Their use may also necessitate careful consideration of where Profile conformance is measured.
  - E0004 - SOAP role values - Values of the SOAP role attribute, other than the special uri 'http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/next', represent a private agreement between parties of the web service.
  - E0005 - Fault details - Faults may have Detail elements. The contents of these elements are not described in SOAP 1.2.
  - E0024 - Namespace Attributes - Namespace attributes on soap12:Envelope and soap12:Header elements
  - E0025 - Attributes on soap12:Body elements - Neither namespaced nor local attributes are constrained by SOAP 1.2.

- SOAP Version 1.2 Part 2: Adjuncts (Second Edition) [SOAP12-2]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0026 - SOAP envelope in HTTP Response message to WSDL one-way operation - The SOAP 1.2 Request Response Binding specification does not specify the purpose or processing of such envelopes.

- RFC2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1 [RFC2616]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0007 - HTTP Authentication - HTTP authentication allows for extension schemes, arbitrary digest hash algorithms and parameters.
  - E0008 - Unspecified Header Fields - HTTP allows arbitrary headers to occur in messages.
  - E0010 - Content-Encoding - The set of content-codings allowed by HTTP is open-ended and any besides 'gzip', 'compress', or 'deflate' are an extensibility point.
  - E0011 - Transfer-Encoding - The set of transfer-encodings allowed by HTTP is open-ended.
  - E0029 - Use of messages other than SOAP 1.2 or XOP messages

- RFC2965: HTTP State Management Mechanism [RFC2965]
- WS-Addressing 1.0 - Core [WSAddrCore]
- WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding [WSAddrSoap] (except for sections 4, 5.1.1, 5.2.1 and 6.2)
  Extensibility points:
  - E0027 - Use of SOAP role attribute and WS-Addressing - WS-Addressing allows multiple instances of headers such as wsa:To, wsa:ReplyTo, and wsa:FaultTo, so long as they are targeted to different SOAP roles.
Endpoint references are extensible - When extension attributes or elements appear as part of an endpoint reference, the processing model for such extensions is defined by the specification for those extensions.

- WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata [WSAddrMeta] (except for sections 4.1.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 5.2)
- SOAP Message Transmission Optimization Mechanism [SOAP12-mtom]
- XML-Binary Optimized Packaging [xop]
- XML Media Types [RFC3023]

These extensibility points are listed, along with any extensibility points from other sections of this Profile, in Appendix A.

### 3.1 Message Serialization

This Profile is intended to compose with mechanisms to describe whether messages are encoded as SIMPLE_SOAP_MESSAGES or XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGES. As such it does not mandate that both of these encodings be supported for any given operation. Indeed, neither of these encodings need be supported if an alternate encoding such as that described in the Attachments Profile 1.0 [AP1.0] is used.

SOAP 1.2 defines an XML structure for serializing messages, the envelope. This Profile places constraints on the use and serialization of the soap12:Envelope element and its content:

This Profile allows for the use of protocol bindings other than HTTP. Section identifies the use of Simple SOAP and XOP encoded messages using HTTP. This subclause identifies how encoding is handled for HTTP only. [RFC2616] and [RFC3023] provide guidance for HTTP, supplemented by requirements throughout this profile. If another transport protocol is used, the responsibility for defining how to handle transport-specific features (e.g. content encoding) falls to the specification of the binding of SOAP to that transport protocol.

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fourth Edition) [XML1.0]
- Attachments Profile Version 1.0 [AP1.0]

#### 3.1.1 XML Envelope Serialization

R9701 An ENVELOPE MUST be serialized as XML 1.0. CORETESTABLE

BP1019

#### 3.1.2 Unicode BOMs

XML 1.0 allows UTF-8 encoding to include a BOM; therefore, receivers of envelopes must be prepared to accept them. The BOM is mandatory for XML encoded as UTF-16.

R4006 A RECEIVER MUST support the presence of a UTF-8 Unicode Byte Order Mark (BOM) in the SOAP envelope when the envelope is correctly encoded using UTF-8 and the "charset" parameter of the HTTP Content-Type header has a value of "utf-8" (see RFC3023). CORETESTABLE_SCENARIO_DEPENDENT BP1306

R4007 A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the presence of a UTF-16 Unicode Byte Order Mark (BOM) in the SOAP envelope when the envelope is correctly encoded using UTF-16 and the "charset" parameter of the HTTP Content-Type header has a
3.1.3 XML Declarations

Presence or absence of an XML declaration does not affect interoperability. Certain implementations might always precede their XML serialization with the XML declaration.

R1010 A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the presence of an XML Declaration in the SOAP envelope (as specified by Section 2.8 of [XML1.0], "Prolog and Document Type Declaration").

3.1.4 Character Encodings

As a consequence of Section 4.3.3 of [XM1.0], "Character Encoding in Entities", which requires XML processors to support both the UTF-8 and UTF-16 character encodings, this Profile mandates that RECEIVERS support both UTF-8 and UTF-16 character encodings.

To improve interoperability, the "charset" parameter of Content-Type HTTP header field must be used to determine the correct character encoding of the message.

As this Profile allows the use of protocol bindings other than HTTP, the transport is responsible for defining how encoding is handled as specified in Section for Simple SOAP and XOP encoded messages using HTTP. This applies to this section and Section .

R1012 An ENVELOPE MUST be serialized using either UTF-8 or UTF-16 character encoding. CORETESTABLE BP1018

R1018 A SIMPLE_SOAP_MESSAGE MUST indicate the correct character encoding, using the "charset" parameter. CORETESTABLE BP1018

R1019 A RECEIVER MUST ignore, if present, the encoding declaration of the envelope's XML declaration. CORETESTABLE_SCENARIO_DEPENDENT BP1306

3.1.5 XOP Encoded Messages

There exists some confusion among implementations about the proper encoding of the action parameter for XOP encoded messages. The multipart/related media type specification does not include an action parameter, though it does permit extensibility. Thus, the action parameter on the multipart/relatedContent-Type header has no defined semantic. The correct encoding is to include the action parameter inside the start-info parameter of the enclosing MIME multipart/related entity body as well as inside the type parameter of the root part. Nevertheless, existing SENDERs could emit an XOP message with the action parameter encoded as a separate parameter on the Content-Type header of the enclosing multipart/related MIME entity body. This Profile does not preclude a RECEIVER from accepting such a message.

See Section for conformance criteria when using HTTP.

R1020 A XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE MUST include the start-info parameter in the Content-Type header of the enclosing multipart/related MIME entity body. CORETESTABLE BP1020

R1021 A XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE MUST include the full value of the type parameter from the root entity body part inside the start-info parameter of the enclosing multipart/related
**MIME entity body part's Content-Type header.** CORE TESTABLE

**R1022** A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the action parameter of an XOP encoded message being included with the value of the start-info parameter inside the Content-Type header of the enclosing multipart/related MIME entity body.

For example, **INCORRECT:**

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Related; boundary=MIME_boundary;
   type="application/xop+xml";
   start-"<mymessage.xml@example.org>";
   start-info="application/soap+xml";
   action="ProcessData"

   --MIME_boundary
Content-Type: application/xop+xml;
   charset=UTF-8;
   type="application/soap+xml; action="ProcessData"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-ID: <mymessage.xml@example.org>
...

**CORRECT:**

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Related; boundary=MIME_boundary;
   type="application/xop+xml";
   start-"<mymessage.xml@example.org>";
   start-info="application/soap+xml; action="ProcessData"
Content-Description: A SOAP message with my pic and sig in it

   --MIME_boundary
Content-Type: application/xop+xml;
   charset=UTF-8;
   type="application/soap+xml; action="ProcessData"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
Content-ID: <mymessage.xml@example.org>
...

3.2 SOAP Envelopes

Section 5 of [SOAP1.2-1] Soap Envelope, defines a structure for composing messages, the "SOAP Envelope". The Profile mandates the use of that structure, and places the following constraints on its use.

3.2.1 SOAP Envelope Structure

There are obvious interoperability problems if different implementations do not agree on the number of allowable children for the soap12:Body element.

**R9980** An ENVELOPE MUST conform to the structure specified in SOAP Version 1.2 Part 1, Section 5, "SOAP Envelope" (subject to amendment by the Profile). CORE TESTABLE BP1600
An **ENVELOPE** **MUST** have exactly zero or one child elements of the `soap12:Body` element.  **CORE TESTABLE BP1881**

See the requirements in **Section 4.4.1** for the corresponding, requisite constraints on a DESCRIPTION.

### 3.2.2 SOAP Body Namespace Qualification

The use of unqualified element names may cause naming conflicts, therefore qualified names must be used for the children of `soap12:Body`.

**R1014** The children of the `soap12:Body` element in an **ENVELOPE** **MUST** be namespace qualified.  **CORE TESTABLE BP1022**

### 3.2.3 Disallowed Constructs

XML DTDs and PIs may introduce security vulnerabilities, processing overhead and semantic ambiguity when used in envelopes. As a result, certain XML constructs are disallowed by section 5 of [SOAP1.2-1]. Although published errata NE05 (see [http://www.w3.org/XML/xml-names-19990114-errata](http://www.w3.org/XML/xml-names-19990114-errata)) allows the namespace declaration `xmlns:xml="http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace"` to appear, some older processors considered such a declaration to be an error. These requirements ensure that conformant artifacts have the broadest interoperability possible.

**R1008** An **ENVELOPE** **MUST NOT** contain a Document Type Declaration.  **CORE TESTABLE BP1007**

**R1009** An **ENVELOPE** **MUST NOT** contain Processing Instructions.  **CORE TESTABLE BP1009**

**R1033** An **ENVELOPE** **MUST NOT** contain the namespace declaration `xmlns:xml="http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace"`.  **CORE TESTABLE BP1033**

### 3.2.4 xsi:type Attributes

In many cases, senders and receivers will share some form of type information related to the envelopes being exchanged.

**R1017** A **RECEIVER** **MUST NOT** fault on the absence of the `xsi:type` attribute in envelopes, except in cases where this attribute is required to indicate a derived type (see **XML Schema Part 1: Structures, Section 2.6.1**).  **CORE NOT TESTABLE**

### 3.2.5 SOAP 1.2 attributes on SOAP 1.2 elements

**R1032** The `soap12:Envelope, soap12:Header, and soap12:Body` elements in an **ENVELOPE** **MUST NOT** have attributes in the namespace "http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope".  **CORE TESTABLE BP1032**

### 3.3 SOAP Processing Model

Section 2 of [SOAP1.2-1] **SOAP Processing Model** defines a model for the processing of envelopes. In particular, it defines rules for the processing of header blocks and the envelope body. It also defines rules related to generation of faults. The Profile places the following constraints on the processing model:
3.3.1 SOAP Fault Processing

When a fault is generated, no further processing should be performed. In request-response exchanges, a fault message will be transmitted to the sender of the request, and some application level error will be flagged to the user.

Both SOAP and this Profile use the term 'generate' to denote the creation of a SOAP Fault. It is important to realize that generation of a Fault is distinct from its transmission, which in some cases is not required.

R1029 Where the normal outcome of processing a SOAP envelope would have resulted in the transmission of a SOAP response, but rather a fault is generated instead, the RECEIVER MUST NOT transmit the non-faulting response. CORE NOT_TESTABLE

Note that there may be valid reasons (such as security considerations) why a fault might not be transmitted.

3.4 SOAP Faults

3.4.1 Identifying SOAP Faults

Some consumer implementations erroneously use only the HTTP status code to determine the presence of a Fault. Because there are situations where the Web infrastructure changes the HTTP status code, and for general reliability, the Profile requires that they examine the envelope. A Fault is an envelope that has a single child element of the soap12:Body element, that element being the soap12:Fault element.

R1107 A RECEIVER MUST interpret a SOAP message as a Fault when the soap12:Body of the message has a single soap12:Fault child. CORE NOT_TESTABLE

3.5 Use of SOAP in HTTP

While SOAP itself is not transport specific, this Profile focuses on its use with HTTP and makes no requirements on the use of any other transport. Other profiles might be developed to focus on the particulars of other transports, but that is out of scope for this Profile. With respect to compliance to this Profile, any requirement that mentions the HTTP transport applies only when HTTP is being used. Any requirement that is not specific to HTTP (i.e. does not mention HTTP specifically) applies toward conformance regardless of the transport mechanism being used. For convenience, the HTTP transport-specific requirements have been identified and tagged as specified in Section 7 of [SOAP1.2-2] SOAP HTTP Binding defines a single protocol binding, for HTTP 1.1 RFC2616]. The Profile makes use of that binding, and places the following constraints on its use:

For this section, the conformance criteria for the use of HTTP as a transport protocol are specified.

3.5.1 HTTP Protocol Binding

Several versions of HTTP are defined. HTTP/1.1 [RFP2616] has performance advantages, and is more clearly specified than HTTP/1.0.

R1141 When HTTP is used as the transport, a MESSAGE MUST be sent using either HTTP/1.1 or HTTP/1.0. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE

BP1002

R1140 When HTTP is used as the transport, a MESSAGE SHOULD be sent using HTTP/1.1. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1001
Note that support for HTTP/1.0 is implied in HTTP/1.1, and that intermediaries may change the version of a message; for more information about HTTP versioning, see [RFC2145], "Use and Interpretation of HTTP Version Numbers."

### 3.5.2 Parameters on the Content-Type MIME Header

R1109 *If present, the values of the following parameters - type, start-info, action, and boundary - on the Content-Type MIME header field-value in a request MESSAGE MUST be a quoted string.* HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1006

### 3.5.3 HTTP Success Status Codes

HTTP uses the 2xx series of status codes to communicate success. In particular, 200 is the default for successful messages, but 202 can be used to indicate that a message has been submitted for processing. Additionally, other 2xx status codes may be appropriate, depending on the nature of the HTTP interaction.

R1124 *An INSTANCE MUST use a 2xx HTTP status code on a response message that indicates the successful outcome of a HTTP Request.* HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTABLE

R1111 *An INSTANCE SHOULD use a "200 OK" HTTP status code on a response message that contains an envelope that is not a fault.* HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1100

R1112 *An INSTANCE SHOULD use either a "200 OK" or "202 Accepted" HTTP status code for a response message that does not contain a SOAP envelope but indicates the successful outcome of a HTTP Request.* HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1101

Despite the fact that the HTTP 1.1 assigns different meanings to response status codes "200" and "202", in the context of the Profile they should be considered equivalent by the initiator of the request. The Profile accepts both status codes because some SOAP implementations have little control over the HTTP protocol implementation and cannot control which of these response status codes is sent.

### 3.5.4 HTTP Redirect Status Codes

There are interoperability problems with using many of the HTTP redirect status codes, generally surrounding whether to use the original method, or GET. The Profile mandates "307 Temporary Redirect", which has the semantic of redirection with the same HTTP method, as the correct status code for redirection. For more information, see the 3xx status code descriptions in [RFC2616].

R1130 *An INSTANCE MUST use the "307 Temporary Redirect" HTTP status code when redirecting a request to a different endpoint.* HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTABLE

[RFC2616] notes that user-agents should not automatically redirect requests; however, this requirement was aimed at browsers, not automated processes (which many Web services will be). Therefore, the Profile allows, but does not require, consumers to automatically follow redirections.

### 3.5.5 HTTP Cookies

The HTTP State Management Mechanism [RFC2965] ("Cookies") allows the creation of stateful sessions between Web browsers and servers. Because they are designed for hypertext browsing, Cookies do not have well-defined semantics for Web services, and, because they are external to the envelope, are not
accommodated by either SOAP 1.2 or WSDL 1.1. This Profile limits the ways in which Cookies can be used, without completely disallowing them.

R1122 An INSTANCE using Cookies SHOULD conform to RFC2965. HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTED

R1121 An INSTANCE SHOULD NOT require consumer support for Cookies in order to function correctly. HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTED

The Profile recommends that cookies not be required by instances for proper operation; they should be a hint, to be used for optimization, without materially affecting the execution of the Web service.

3.5.6 Non-Addressable Consumers and Instances

Definition: non-addressable

A CONSUMER or INSTANCE is deemed “non-addressable” when, for whatever reason, it is either unwilling or unable to provide a network endpoint that is capable of accepting connections. This means that the CONSUMER or INSTANCE cannot service incoming HTTP connections and can only transmit HTTP Request messages and receive HTTP Response messages.

Non-addressable CONSUMERS and INSTANCES, by their nature, cannot service incoming HTTP connections. Therefore any ENVELOPEs that they receive, either as requests (in the case of INSTANCES) or responses (in the case of CONSUMERS), MUST, when HTTP is used, be carried in the entity-body of an HTTP Request message.

R1202 When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the output message of a WSDL operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Response message. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1126a BP1126b

R1203 When an INSTANCE is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the input message of a WSDL operation supported by the INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Response message. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE

R1204 When an INSTANCE is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the output message of a WSDL operation supported by the INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Request message. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE

Note that INSTANCES can poll for requests from CONSUMERS using mechanisms such as those described in WS Make Connection [WSMakeConn].

3.6 Use of URIs in SOAP

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- [RFC3986] : Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax

Section 6 of [SOAP1.2-1] Use of URIs in SOAP describes the use URIs as identifiers. For example, the role attribute value is a URI that identifies the SOAP node(s) to which a particular header block is targeted. To ensure interoperability it is important that SENDERs and RECEIVERs share a common understanding of how such URI values will be compared. The Profile places the following constraints on the use of such URI values:
3.6.1 Use of SOAP-defined URIs

A SOAP 1.2 defined URI, such as the role value "http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/next", is treated as follows:

R1160 A RECEIVER, for the purposes of comparison of URI values of information items defined by the SOAP 1.2 specification, MUST treat the computed absolute URI values as simple strings as defined in RFC3986 (see RFC3986, Section 6.2.1).

CORE NOT_TESTABLE

3.7 WS-Addressing Support

WS-Addressing is a part of core Web services infrastructure. To facilitate interoperability and to provide a common baseline, profiling of WS-Addressing is focusing on WS-Addressing Core, WS-Addressing SOAP Binding and WS-Addressing Metadata.

Support for WS-Addressing by a specific "service" is optional. However, a service may require the use of WS-Addressing, in which case, for successful interaction with that service, a client will need to support it.

Note that two BP compliant web services instances may both support the use of WS-Addressing yet fail to agree on a common set of features necessary to interact with one another. For example, a RECEIVER may require the use of non-anonymous response EPRs (and advertise this via the wsam:NonAnonymousResponses nested policy assertion) yet a SENDER, for various reasons (e.g. the presence of NATs or firewalls), may only support the use of anonymous response EPRs.

The following Requirements are profiling the use of WS-Addressing.

3.7.1 Requiring WS-Addressing SOAP Headers

R1040 If an endpoint requires use of WS-Addressing by use of a wsam:Addressing policy assertion, an ENVELOPE sent by a SENDER MUST carry all required WS-Addressing SOAP headers. CORE TESTABLE BP1040a BP1040b BP1040c BP1142a BP1142b BP1142c BP1143a BP1143b BP1143c

3.7.2 NotUnderstood block in MustUnderstand Fault on WS-Addressing SOAP Headers

R1041 An ENVELOPE that is a MustUnderstand SOAP fault, sent from an endpoint that has a policy alternative containing the wsam:Addressing assertion attached to its WSDL endpoint subject, MUST NOT contain a NotUnderstood SOAP header block with the qname attribute value that identifies a WS-Addressing defined SOAP header block. CORE TESTABLE BP1041

3.7.3 Use of wsa:Action and WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata

WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata, Section 5.1 [WSAddrMeta] defines additional constraints on the cardinality of WS-Addressing Message Addressing Properties defined in WS-Addressing 1.0 Core [WSAddrCore]. These constraints are defined for every message involved in WSDL 1.1 transmission primitives. The Profile requires conformance to this section when WS-Addressing is used in conjunction with a WSDL 1.1 description.
R1142 An ENVELOPE that includes a `wsa:Action` SOAP header block and which is described using a WSDL 1.1 description MUST conform to WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata, Section 5.1.

3.7.4 Valid Values for action Parameter on the Content-Type MIME header When WS-Addressing is Used

There could be some confusion with regards to the range of valid values for the `action` parameter on the Content-Type MIME header when WS-Addressing is used.

When composed with WS-Addressing, the value of the `action` parameter, if present, is limited to the absolute URI that matches the value specified for `wsa:Action`. The `action` parameter is optional and is therefore not required to be present on the header. This is useful, for example, when the value of `wsa:Action` is sensitive and is therefore encrypted.

R1144 When the `wsa:Action` SOAP header block is present in an envelope, the value of the `action` parameter, if present, on the Content-Type MIME header of the MESSAGE MUST be an absolute URI that has the same value as the value of the `wsa:Action` header.

3.7.5 SOAP Defined Faults Action URI

WS-Addressing provides the URI `http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault` for "SOAP defined faults". However, it only recommends, rather than mandates its use for the SOAP 1.2 defined MustUnderstand and VersionMismatch faults. This Profile mandates the use of the WS-Addressing defined `wsa:Action` value for SOAP 1.2 defined MustUnderstand and VersionMismatch faults, for interoperability.

R1035 An ENVELOPE MUST use the `http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault` URI as the value for the `wsa:Action` SOAP header element, when present, for either of the SOAP 1.2 defined VersionMismatch and MustUnderstand faults.

3.7.6 Understanding WS-Addressing SOAP Header Blocks

WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding [WSAddrSoap] defines multiple SOAP header blocks (wsa:To, wsa:From, wsa:ReplyTo, wsa:FaultTo, wsa:Action, wsa:MessageID, and wsa:RelatesTo). These SOAP header blocks are part of the same module. A SOAP node that conforms to the Profile understands and honors all of these SOAP header blocks (when it understands WS-Addressing) or none at all (when it does not understand WS-Addressing).

R1143 When a message contains multiple WS-Addressing SOAP header blocks with at least one of those header blocks containing a `soap12:mustUnderstand='1'` attribute, then a RECEIVER MUST honor all the WS-Addressing SOAP header blocks or none of them.

3.7.7 Ignored or Absent WS-Addressing Headers

When WS-Addressing headers are present in a SOAP envelope, but do not contain a `soap12:mustUnderstand='1'` attribute, a RECEIVER may choose to ignore these SOAP headers (per R1143). Consistent with R1036, valid reasons may exist why (not where) faults are not transmitted.
R1145  If a SOAP envelope does not contain any WS-Addressing header blocks, or contains WS-Addressing header blocks that do not include any soap12:mustUnderstand="1" attributes, and the RECEIVER chooses to ignore them, then any response (normal or fault) SHOULD be transmitted. If it is transmitted then it is transmitted on the HTTP Response message (if available).  HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTED

3.7.8 Present and Understood WS-Addressing Headers

When any WS-Addressing header blocks are present in a SOAP envelope (where soap12:mustUnderstand="1" attributes exist or the header contents are understood), any non-faulting response will be transmitted to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:ReplyTo header. Should a fault be generated, it replaces the non-faulting response.

R1146 A RECEIVER MUST transmit non-faulting responses to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:ReplyTo header or generate a fault instead (per R1029).  CORE TESTABLE BP1146

SOAP 1.2 allows a RECEIVER to ignore headers that it does not understand. This behavior is particularly relevant for WS-Addressing headers that affect message processing and routing. As an example, take the following message sent to a SOAP node that does not understand the "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing" namespace:

For example,

```xml
<soap12:Envelope xmlns:soap12="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope"
    xmlns:wsa="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing">
    <soap12:Header>
        <wsa:MessageID>uuid:8B82EA41-1485-13A6-5631527DC83F4168</wsa:MessageID>
        <wsa:ReplyTo>
            <wsa:Address>http://server.foobie.com/NotifyEcho/asynchResp</wsa:Address>
        </wsa:ReplyTo>
        . . .
    </soap12:Header>
    <soap12:Body>
        . . .
    </soap12:Body>
</soap12:Envelope>
```
The SENDER expects the response to be sent "server.foobie.com". Yet, because it does not recognize the WS-Addressing 1.0 namespace, the RECEIVER will ignore the WS-Addressing headers as if WS-Addressing weren't engaged; consequently the SOAP response will be sent in the entity-body of the HTTP Response and may be missed by the SENDER.

Another example is where a message with an empty SOAP Body carries the semantic intent in its wsa:Action header.

In situations where the ability of the receiving node to understand WS-Addressing 1.0 headers is in doubt and the correct processing of the WS-Addressing is semantically significant (such as the two examples given), the SENDER is encouraged to add the soap12:mustUnderstand attribute with a value of "1" to the wsa:Action header. This prompts the RECEIVER to generate a MustUnderstand fault in cases where the WS-Addressing headers are not understood.

3.7.9 SOAP MustUnderstand or VersionMismatch fault Transmission

SOAP MustUnderstand and VersionMismatch faults are detected irrespective of the use of WS-Addressing headers. There may be valid reasons why (not where) faults are transmitted, e.g. security concerns or the HTTP Response connection is no longer available. In these cases the SENDER will not receive any SOAP envelope response.

R1036 Regardless of whether the wsa:ReplyTo or wsa:FaultTo SOAP headers appear in the incoming message, a RECEIVER that receives a SOAP envelope that generates either a SOAP MustUnderstand or VersionMismatch fault SHOULD transmit either fault. If it is transmitted, such a fault is transmitted on the HTTP Response message (if available). HTTP-TRANSPORTNOT_TESTED

3.7.10 Faulting Behavior with Present and Understood WS-Addressing Headers

When WS-Addressing headers are present in a SOAP envelope (where soap12:mustUnderstand="1" attributes exist or the header contents are understood), should a fault be generated, it will be transmitted to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:FaultTo header. WS-Addressing specifies expected behavior should the wsa:FaultTo header be absent.

R1147 If a fault is generated, the RECEIVER SHOULD transmit the fault (per R1029). CORENOT_TESTED

R1161 Other than those faults specified in R1036, faults in R1147 SHOULD be transmitted by the RECEIVER as specified in WS-Addressing 1.0 - Core, Section 3.4. CORETESTABLE

R1162 When the wsa:FaultTo SOAP header exists, the RECEIVER MUST NOT transmit faults to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:ReplyTo header. CORETESTABLE

R1148 If an error occurs when transmitting the fault in R1147, a RECEIVER MAY choose to send a fault related to this transmission error on the HTTP Response (if available). HTTP-TRANSPORTNOT_TESTED

Note: To avoid a recursive situation, if a fault is generated while trying to transmit to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:ReplyTo header (R1146) and the wsa:FaultTo header is absent, R1147 does not apply.
3.7.11 [message id] and One-Way Operations

When sending a one-way message the SENDER could choose to ignore any possible response - for example, a fault. However, if the SENDER is interested in receiving those messages, the SENDER will need to include a [message id] property in the one-way message to ensure that the response can be successfully transmitted (see Section 3.4 of [WSAddrCore] Formulating a Reply Message).

R1163 When applying the processing rules defined by WS-Addressing 1.0 – Core [WSAddrCore], Section 3.4, if a related message lacks a [message id] property, the RECEIVER MUST generate a wsa:MessageAddressingHeaderRequired fault. CORE TESTABLE

While the RECEIVER is under no obligation to transmit faults, including a [message id] property will provide the RECEIVER with sufficient information to generate a response if needed.

3.7.12 Refusal to Honor WS-Addressing Headers

There may be many reasons (e.g. security, unsupported wsa:Address values, ...) why a RECEIVER does not honor any WS-Addressing headers. In these cases and irrespective of where the condition occurs, when any WS-Addressing headers are present in a SOAP envelope (where soap12:mustUnderstand=1 attributes exist or the header contents are understood), the RECEIVER must generate a fault.

R1149 If a RECEIVER detects one of the error conditions specified in Section 6.4 of the Web Services Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding [WSAddrSoap], it MUST generate a fault using the [Code], [Subcode], and [Subsubcode] listed for that particular error condition. CORE TESTABLE BP1149a BP1149b BP1149c BP1149d

3.7.13 Use of Non-Anonymous Response EPRs

The WS-Addressing [destination] URI of an outgoing message influences where this message will be sent. In the case of the outgoing response (normal or fault), if this URI is a non-anonymous URI then this message will be sent over a separate HTTP connection from one used to carry the request message.

R1152 If an INSTANCE attempts to send a message to a non-anonymous [destination] URI then the message MUST be transmitted in the entity-body of an HTTP Request. CORE TESTABLE BP1152a BP1152b BP1152c

3.7.14 Optionality of the wsa:To header

WS-Addressing 1.0 - Core [WSAddrCore] and WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata [WSAddrMeta] are unclear about whether and when the wsa:To header element is required in a SOAP message. This Profile makes the following, clarifying requirement.

R1153 Except in cases in which an instance exposes a WSDL description and its endpoint includes a wsdl:port that has been extended with a wsa:EndpointReference, a RECEIVER MUST NOT fault a SOAP request message due to the absence of the wsa:To header. CORE TESTABLE BP1153a BP1153b

Although the wsa:To header is optional, as a matter of best practice implementations are encouraged to include this header (with a non-anonymous value) as its presence provides a greater degree of flexibility in handling certain situations; for example, when moving a service endpoint from one URI to another.

As per WS-Addressing 1.0 - Core, the [destination] message addressing property of a request message without a wsa:To header is "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous". Note that none of the WS-Addressing 1.0 specifications describes the semantics of sending a SOAP request message, over
HTTP, either without a `wsa:To` header or with a `wsa:To` header with the value of
"http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous". To clarify, such a request is considered to be
addressed to "the entity listening at the URI of the HTTP Request that contains this message". Sent over
a connection to http://www.example.org, the following three example messages are consistent:

For example,

**CORRECT:**

```
POST /NotifyEcho/soap12service HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: text/xml;charset=UTF-8
...
<soap12:Envelope ...>
  <soap12:Header>
    <wsa:To>http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</wsa:To>
  </soap12:Header>
  <soap12:Body>
    ...
  </soap12:Body>
</soap12:Envelope>
```

**CORRECT:**

```
POST /NotifyEcho/soap12service HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: text/xml;charset=UTF-8
...
<soap12:Envelope ...>
  <soap12:Header>
    <wsa:To>http://www.example.org/NotifyEcho/soap12service</wsa:To>
  </soap12:Header>
  <soap12:Body>
    ...
  </soap12:Body>
</soap12:Envelope>
```

**CORRECT:**

```
POST /NotifyEcho/soap12service HTTP/1.1
Content-Type: text/xml;charset=UTF-8
...
<soap12:Envelope ...>
  <soap12:Header>
    <wsa:To>http://www.example.org/NotifyEcho/soap12service</wsa:To>
  </soap12:Header>
  <soap12:Body>
    ...
  </soap12:Body>
</soap12:Envelope>
```

### 3.7.15 Extending WSDL Endpoints with an EPR

WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata [WSAddrMeta] is unclear about the relationship between the elements of
a WSDL 1.1 description of an endpoint and the values of the addressing properties of a message sent to
that endpoint. In particular, the value of the [destination] message addressing property needs to be
clarified in order to insure interoperability between SENDER and RECEIVER. There are two cases to
consider. The first case is where the `wsdl:port` has been extended with a `wsa:EndpointReference`
as described by Section 4.1 of [WSAddrMeta]. In this case the following requirement applies:

R1154  *When sending a request message to an endpoint which is
specified by a WSDL 1.1 description in which the `wsdl:port`
element has been extended with a `wsa:EndpointReference`, if
the wsa:Action SOAP header block is present, the SENDER MUST populate the wsa:To and reference parameter SOAP headers of that request message with the values of the wsa:Address and wsa:ReferenceParameters elements (respectively) of the extending endpoint reference.

Note that, since [address] is a required property of an endpoint reference, extending a wsd1:port with a wsa:EndpointReference has the effect of populating the [destination] property of the outgoing message, thus mandating the inclusion of the wsa:To header.

The second case is where the wsd1:port has not been extended with a wsa:EndpointReference.

R1155 When sending a request message to an endpoint which is specified by a WSDL 1.1 description in which the wsd1:port element has not been extended with a wsa:EndpointReference, if the wsa:Action SOAP header block is present, the SENDER MAY populate the wsa:To SOAP header of that request message with the value of the location attribute of the wsoap12:address extension element.

3.7.16 Combining Synchronous and Asynchronous Operations

WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata [WSAddrMeta] defines a policy assertion, wsam:Addressing, that is used to indicate whether WS-Addressing is supported or required. It is a nested policy container assertion and can contain additional restrictions (specifically the wsam:AnonymousResponses and wsam:NonAnonymousResponses policy assertions) on the value of the response endpoint EPRs in request messages. A top-level assertion without any nested assertions implies that both anonymous and non-anonymous are allowed. The WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata specification sets the scope of this assertion to be endpoint policy subject. However, with regards to the anonymous/non-anonymous restrictions, experience has shown that it is often desirable to have different policies for different operations on the same endpoint. For example, some of the operations of an endpoint may need to be synchronous while others may need to be asynchronous. It is worthwhile to indicate this difference in a WSDL description. In the absence of any guidance on the mechanism(s) for expressing such per-operation distinctions, individual implementations will create their own extensions for enabling this feature. To avoid the interoperability problems inherent in such an approach, the Profile defines the following extension to the behavior defined by WS-Addressing 1.0 Metadata.

WS-Addressing 1.0 Metadata allows policies containing the wsam:Addressing policy assertion to be attached to either a wsd1:port or a wsd1:binding. To these two options the Profile adds a third option which allows policies containing the wsam:Addressing policy assertion to be attached to wsd1:binding/wsd1:operation elements. When the wsam:Addressing policy assertion is attached to the wsd1:binding/wsd1:operation element, it applies to the operation policy subject. Nevertheless, it should always be the case that if one operation of an endpoint supports or requires WS-Addressing, then all operations of that endpoint must support or require WS-Addressing (although, potentially, with different restrictions). Furthermore, to simplify the calculation of the effective policy for each operation and decrease the possibility of creating conflicting policies, each operation within such an endpoint should affirmatively declare its policy with respect to WS-Addressing.

R1156 In a DESCRIPTION, a policy that contains the wsam:Addressing assertion MUST be attached to either a wsd1:port, a wsd1:binding or a wsd1:binding/wsd1:operation.
**R1157**  If a **DESCRIPTION** has a policy alternative containing the `wsam:Addressing` assertion attached to a `wsdl:binding/wsl:operation`, then all of the `wsdl:operations` within that `wsdl:binding` **MUST** also have a policy alternative containing the `wsam:Addressing` assertion attached to them.

CORE\_NOT\_TESTABLE\_XPATH

In addition to the above restrictions and as stated in R1158, the effective policy alternatives for a given policy subject must not contain conflicting assertions.

For example, **INCORRECT**:

```xml
<wsl:binding name="sc009SOAP12Binding" type="tns:sc009PortType">
  <wsp:Policy>
    <wsam:Addressing>
      <wsp:Policy/>
      <wsam:Addressing>
      </wsp:Policy>
    <wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:Policy>
    ...
    <wsdl:operation name="CreatePO">
      <wsp:Policy>
        <wsam:Addressing>
          <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
          </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
      </wsp:Policy>
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>
    <wsdl:operation name="GetPOStatus">
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>
    <wsdl:operation name="UpdatePO">
      <wsp:Policy>
        <wsam:Addressing>
          <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
          </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
      </wsp:Policy>
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>
    <wsdl:operation name="CancelPO">
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>
  </wsp:Policy>
</wsdl:binding>
```
The above example is incorrect for two reasons. Firstly, it violates R1157 because the GetPOStatus and CancelPO operations do not have policies containing the `wsam:Addressing` assertion attached to them. Secondly, the effective policies for both the CreatePO and UpdatePO operations contain conflicting assertions (a `wsam:Addressing` assertion that is unconstrained with regards to anonymous/non-anonymous and a `wsam:Addressing` assertion that is constrained to just non-anonymous) within the same alternative.

For example,

**INCORRECT:**

```
<wsd1:binding name="sc009SOAP12Binding" type="tns:sc009PortType">
    ...
    <wsdl:operation name="CreatePO">
        <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
                <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
            </wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsp:Policy>
    </wsdl:operation>
    ...
    <wsdl:operation name="GetPOStatus">
        <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsp:Policy>
    </wsdl:operation>
    ...
    <wsdl:operation name="UpdatePO">
        <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
                <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
            </wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsp:Policy>
    </wsdl:operation>
    ...
    <wsdl:operation name="CancelPO">
        <wsp:Policy>
            <wsam:Addressing>
                <wsp:Policy/>
            </wsp:Policy>
        </wsp:Policy>
    </wsdl:operation>
</wsdl:binding>
```
The above example is incorrect because the effective policies for both the CreatePO and UpdatePO operations contain conflicting assertions (a wsam:Addressing assertion that is unconstrained with regards to anonymous/non-anonymous and a wsam:Addressing assertion that is constrained to just non-anonymous) within the same alternative.

For example,

**CORRECT:**

```xml
<wsdl:binding name="sc009SOAP12Binding" type="tns:sc009PortType">
  ...
  <wsdl:operation name="CreatePO">
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
      </wsp:Policy>
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>

  <wsdl:operation name="GetPOStatus">
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy/>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:Policy>
    ...
  </wsdl:operation>

  <wsdl:operation name="UpdatePO">
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy>
          <wsam:NonAnonymousResponses/>
        </wsp:Policy>
        </wsam:Addressing>
      </wsp:Policy>
      ...
    </wsdl:operation>

  <wsdl:operation name="CancelPO">
    <wsp:Policy>
      <wsam:Addressing>
        <wsp:Policy/>
      </wsam:Addressing>
    </wsp:Policy>
    ...
  </wsdl:operation>
</wsdl:binding>
```
<wsdl:port name="soap12port" binding="tns:sc009SOAP12Binding">
  ...
</wsdl:port>
</wsdl:service>

The above example is correct. All of the operations in the soap12port of the s009Service require WS-Addressing. While the response EPRs for GetPOStatus and CancelPO are unconstrained, the response EPRs for the CreatePO and UpdatePO operations must be non-anonymous.

### 3.7.17 Conflicting Addressing Policies

When used together, the `wsam:AnonymousResponses` and `wsam:NonAnonymousResponses` nested policy assertions could result in an effective policy that contradicts WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata (i.e. "request messages sent to this endpoint must use response endpoint EPRs that simultaneously do and do not contain the WS-Addressing anonymous URI"). The Profile restricts the use of the `wsam:AnonymousResponses` and `wsam:NonAnonymousResponses` nested policy assertions to avoid this situation.

**R1158** In a DESCRIPTION the effective policy for a given endpoint MUST NOT contain both the `wsam:AnonymousResponses` and `wsam:NonAnonymousResponses` assertions within a single policy alternative. **CORE** NOT TESTABLE XPATH
4 Service Description

The Profile uses Web Services Description Language (WSDL) [WSDL1.1] to enable the description of services as sets of endpoints operating on messages.

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

- Namespaces in XML 1.0 (Second Edition) [xmlNames]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0017 - Schema annotations - XML Schema allows for annotations, which may be used to convey additional information about data structures. CORE
- Web Services Description Language (WSDL) 1.1 [WSDL1.1]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0013 - WSDL extensions - WSDL allows extension elements and attributes in certain places, including the use and specification of alternate protocol binding extensions; use of such extensions requires out-of-band negotiation. CORE
  - E0014 - Validation mode - whether the parser used to read WSDL and XML Schema documents performs DTD validation or not. CORE
  - E0015 - Fetching of external resources - whether the parser used to read WSDL and XML Schema documents fetches external entities and DTDs. CORE
  - E0016 - Relative URIs - WSDL does not adequately specify the use of relative URIs for the following: wsoap12:body/@namespace, wsoap12:address/@location, wsdl:import/@location, xsd:schema/@targetNamespace and xsd:import/@schemaLocation. Their use may require further coordination; see XML Base for more information. CORE

These extensibility points are listed, along with any extensibility points from other sections of this Profile, in Appendix A.

4.1 Required Description

An instance of a Web service is required to make the contract that it operates under available in some fashion.

R0001 Either an INSTANCE’s WSDL 1.1 description, its UDDI binding template, or both MUST be available to an authorized consumer upon request. CORE TESTABLE BP2703

This means that if an authorized consumer requests a service description of a conformant service instance, then the service instance provider must make the WSDL document, the UDDI binding template, or both available to that consumer. A service instance may provide run-time access to WSDL documents from a server, but is not required to do so in order to be considered conformant. Similarly, a service instance provider may register the instance provider in a UDDI registry, but is not required to do so to be considered conformant. In all of these scenarios, the WSDL contract must exist, but might be made available through a variety of mechanisms, depending on the circumstances.
4.2 Document Structure

Section 2.1 of [WSDL1.1] WSDL Document Structure defines the overall structure of an XML document for describing Web services. The Profile mandates the use of that structure, and places the following constraints on its use.

Note that Section Document Structure, contains additional, corrective requirements on the structure of a WSDL 1.1 document.

4.2.1 WSDL Import location Attribute Structure

WSDL 1.1 is not clear about whether the location attribute of the wsdl:import statement is required, or what its content is required to be.

R2007 A DESCRIPTION MUST specify a non-empty location attribute on the wsdl:import element. CORETESTABLE BP2098

Although the wsdl:import statement is modeled after the xsd:import statement, the location attribute is required by wsdl:import while the corresponding attribute on xsd:import, schemaLocation is optional. Consistent with location being required, its content is not intended to be empty.

4.2.2 WSDL Import location Attribute Semantics

WSDL 1.1 is unclear about whether WSDL processors must actually retrieve and process the WSDL document from the URI specified in the location attribute on the wsdl:import statements it encounters.

R2008 A CONSUMER MAY, but need not, retrieve a WSDL description from the URI specified in the location attribute on a wsdl:import element. CORENOT_TESTED

The value of the location attribute of a wsdl:import element is a hint. A WSDL processor may have other ways of locating a WSDL description for a given namespace.

4.2.3 XML Version Requirements

Neither WSDL 1.1 nor XML Schema 1.0 mandate a particular version of XML. For interoperability, WSDL documents and the schemas they import expressed in XML must use version 1.0.

R4004 A DESCRIPTION MUST use [XML1.0]. CORENOT_TESTED

4.2.4 XML Namespace Declarations

Although published errata NE05 (see http://www.w3.org/XML/xml-names-19990114-errata) allows this namespace declaration to appear, some older processors considered such a declaration to be an error. This requirement ensures that conformant artifacts have the broadest interoperability possible.

R4005 A DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOT contain the namespace declaration


CORETESTABLE BP2034

4.2.5 WSDL and the Unicode BOM

XML 1.0 allows documents that use the UTF-8 character encoding to include a BOM; therefore, description processors must be prepared to accept them.
R4002 A DESCRIPTION MAY include the Unicode Byte Order Mark (BOM). \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE NOT TESTED}}

4.2.6 Acceptable WSDL Character Encodings

The Profile consistently requires either UTF-8 or UTF-16 encoding for both SOAP and WSDL.

R4003 A DESCRIPTION MUST use either UTF-8 or UTF-16 encoding. \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE TESTABLE BP2201}}

4.2.7 Namespace Coercion

Namespace coercion on \texttt{wsdl:import} is disallowed by the Profile.

R2005 The \texttt{targetNamespace} attribute on the \texttt{wsdl:definitions} element of a description that is being imported MUST have same the value as the \texttt{namespace} attribute on the \texttt{wsdl:import} element in the importing DESCRIPTION. \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE TESTABLE BP2104}}

4.2.8 WSDL Extensions

Requiring support for WSDL extensions that are not explicitly specified by this or another WS-I Profile can lead to interoperability problems with development tools that have not been instrumented to understand those extensions.

R2025 A DESCRIPTION containing WSDL extensions MUST NOT use them to contradict other requirements of the Profile. \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE NOT TESTED}}

R2026 A DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOT include extension elements with a \texttt{wsdl:required} attribute value of "true" on any WSDL construct (\texttt{wsdl:binding}, \texttt{wsdl:portType}, \texttt{wsdl:message}, \texttt{wsdl:types} or \texttt{wsdl:import}) that claims conformance to the Profile. \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE TESTABLE BP2123}}

R2027 If during the processing of a description, a consumer encounters a WSDL extension element that has a \texttt{wsdl:required} attribute with a boolean value of "true" that the consumer does not understand or cannot process, the CONSUMER MUST terminate processing. \textcolor{green}{\textbf{CORE NOT TESTED}}

Development tools that consume a WSDL description and generate software for a Web service instance might not have built-in understanding of an unknown WSDL extension. Hence, use of required WSDL extensions should be avoided. Use of a required WSDL extension that does not have an available specification for its use and semantics imposes potentially insurmountable interoperability concerns for all but the author of the extension. Use of a required WSDL extension that has an available specification for its use and semantics reduces, but does not eliminate the interoperability concerns that lead to this refinement.

For the purposes of the Profile, all elements in the "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdll/" namespace are extensible via element as well as attributes. As a convenience, WS-I has published a version of the WSDL 1.1 schema that reflects this capability at: http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic/1.1/wsdll-2004-08-24.xsd
4.3 Types

Section 2.2 of [WSDL1.1] Types defines the wsdl:types element to enclose data type definitions that are relevant to the Web service described. The Profile places the following constraints pertinent to those portions of the content of the wsdl:types element that are referred to by WSDL elements that make Profile conformance claims:

4.3.1 QName References

XML Schema requires each QName reference to use either the target namespace, or an imported namespace (one marked explicitly with an xsd:import element). QName references to namespaces represented only by nested imports are not allowed.

WSDL 1.1 is unclear as to which schema target namespaces are suitable for QName references from a WSDL element. The Profile allows QName references from WSDL elements both to the target namespace defined by the xsd:schema element, and to imported namespaces. QName references to namespaces that are only defined through a nested import are not allowed.

R2101 A DESCRIPTION MUST NOT use QName references to WSDL components in namespaces that have been neither imported, nor defined in the referring WSDL document. CORE TESTABLE BP2107

R2102 A QName reference to a Schema component in a DESCRIPTION MUST use the namespace defined in the targetNamespace attribute on the xsd:schema element, or to a namespace defined in the namespace attribute on an xsd:import element within the xsd:schema element. CORE TESTABLE BP2107

4.3.2 Schema targetNamespace Structure

Requiring a targetNamespace on all xsd:schema elements that are children of wsdl:types is a good practice, places a minimal burden on authors of WSDL documents, and avoids the cases that are not as clearly defined as they might be.

R2105 All xsd:schema elements contained in a wsdl:types element of a DESCRIPTION MUST have a targetNamespace attribute with a valid and non-null value, unless the xsd:schema element has xsd:import and/or xsd:annotation as its only child element(s). CORE TESTABLE BP2107

4.3.3 soapenc:Array

The recommendations in WSDL 1.1 Section 2.2 for declaration of array types have been interpreted in various ways, leading to interoperability problems. Further, there are other clearer ways to declare arrays.

R2110 In a DESCRIPTION, declarations MUST NOT extend or restrict the soapenc:Array type. CORE TESTABLE BP2108b

R2111 In a DESCRIPTION, declarations MUST NOT use wsdl:arrayType attribute in the type declaration. CORE TESTABLE BP2108a

R2112 In a DESCRIPTION, elements SHOULD NOT be named using the convention ArrayOfXXX. CORE TESTABLE BP2108a
An ENVELOPE MUST NOT include the `soapenc:arrayType` attribute.

For example,

**INCORRECT:**

Given the WSDL Description:

```xml
<xsd:element name="MyArray2" type="tns:MyArray2Type"/>
<xsd:complexType name="MyArray2Type"
    xmlns:soapenc="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-encoding"
    xmlns:wsdl="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">
    <xsd:complexContent>
        <xsd:restriction base="soapenc:Array">
            <xsd:sequence>
                <xsd:element name="x" type="xsd:string" minOccurs="0"
                maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
            </xsd:sequence>
            <xsd:attribute ref="soapenc:arrayType"
                wsdl:arrayType="tns:MyArray2Type[]"/>
        </xsd:restriction>
    </xsd:complexContent>
</xsd:complexType>
```

The envelope would serialize as (omitting namespace declarations for clarity):

```xml
<MyArray2 soapenc:arrayType="tns:MyArray2Type[]">
    <x>abcd</x>
    <x>efgh</x>
</MyArray2>
```

**CORRECT:**

Given the WSDL Description:

```xml
<xsd:element name="MyArray1" type="tns:MyArray1Type"/>
<xsd:complexType name="MyArray1Type">
    <xsd:sequence>
        <xsd:element name="x" type="xsd:string" minOccurs="0"
        maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    </xsd:sequence>
</xsd:complexType>
```

The envelope would serialize as (omitting namespace declarations for clarity):

```xml
<MyArray1>
    <x>abcd</x>
    <x>efgh</x>
</MyArray1>
```
4.3.4 WSDL and Schema Definition Target Namespaces

The names defined by schemas and the names assigned to WSDL definitions are in separate symbol spaces.

R2114 The target namespace for WSDL definitions and the target namespace for schema definitions in a DESCRIPTION MAY be the same.  \textcolor{red}{\textsc{CoreNotTested}}

4.3.5 Multiple GED Definitions with the same QName

The schema components of all the \texttt{xs:schema} children, and their imports and includes, of the \texttt{wsdl:types} element comprise a single symbol space containing all the global element declarations. Thus, when global element declarations share a qualified name, a single component will be represented in the symbol space. If two declarations are identical, there is no ambiguity in the structure of the component, but if the declarations differ, it is indeterminate as to which of the declarations will be represented, which may lead to interoperability problems. Because defining an equivalence algorithm is impractical, this requirement warns against any appearance of declarations with the same qualified name. However, duplicate declarations are not strictly prohibited, as user inspection may determine that two declarations are actually identical (e.g. they were imported from the same set of components) and thus are unlikely to cause interoperability problems.

R2115 A DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOT contain multiple global element declarations that share the same qualified name.  \textcolor{red}{\textsc{CoreTestable}}  
BP2124

4.3.6 Multiple Type Definitions with the same QName

The schema components of all the \texttt{xs:schema} children, and their imports and includes, of the \texttt{wsdl:types} element comprise single symbol spaces containing all the type definitions. Thus, when type definitions share a qualified name, a single component will be represented in the symbol space. If two definitions are identical, there is no ambiguity in the structure of the component, but if the definitions differ, it is indeterminate as to which of the definitions will be represented, which may lead to interoperability problems. Because defining an equivalence algorithm is impractical, this requirement warns against any appearance of definitions with the same qualified name. However, duplicate definitions are not strictly prohibited, as user inspection may determine that two definitions are actually identical (e.g. they were imported from the same set of components) and thus are unlikely to cause interoperability problems.

R2116 A DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOT contain multiple type definitions that share the same qualified name.  \textcolor{red}{\textsc{CoreTestable}}  
BP2125

4.4 Messages

Section 2.3 of [WSDL1.1] \texttt{Messages} defines the \texttt{wsdl:message} elements that are used to represent abstract definitions of the data being transmitted. It uses \texttt{wsdl:binding} elements to define how the abstract definitions are bound to a specific message serialization. The Profile places the following constraints on \texttt{wsdl:message} elements and on how conformant \texttt{wsdl:binding} elements may use \texttt{wsdl:message} element(s).

Note that Section Message contains additional, corrective requirements on the structure of \texttt{wsdl:message} elements.
4.4.1 TBindings and Parts

There are various interpretations about how many `wsdl:part` elements are permitted or required for document-literal and rpc-literal bindings and how they must be defined.

R2201 A document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST, in each of its `wsoap12:body` element(s), have at most one part listed in the `parts` attribute, if the `parts` attribute is specified. CORE TESTABLE BP2111

R2210 If a document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION does not specify the `parts` attribute on a `wsoap12:body` element, the corresponding abstract `wsdl:message` MUST define zero or one `wsdl:part` elements. CORE TESTABLE BP2119

R2202 A `wsdl:binding` in a DESCRIPTION MAY contain `wsoap12:body` element(s) that specify that zero parts form the `soap12:Body`. CORE NOT_TESTED

R2203 An rpc-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST refer, in its `wsoap12:body` element(s), only to `wsdl:part` element(s) that have been defined using the `type` attribute. CORE TESTABLE BP2013

R2211 An ENVELOPE described with an rpc-literal binding MUST NOT have the xsi:nil attribute with a value of "1" or "true" on the part accessors. CORE TESTABLE BP1211a BP1211b

R2207 A `wsdl:message` in a DESCRIPTION MAY contain `wsdl:parts` that use the `elements` attribute provided those `wsdl:parts` are not referred to by a `wsoap12:body` in an rpc-literal binding. CORE NOT_TESTED

R2204 A document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST refer, in each of its `wsoap12:body` element(s), only to `wsdl:part` element(s) that have been defined using the `element` attribute. CORE TESTABLE BP2012

R2208 A binding in a DESCRIPTION MAY contain `wsoap12:header` element(s) that refer to `wsdl:parts` in the same `wsdl:message` that are referred to by its `wsoap12:body` element(s). CORE NOT_TESTED

R2212 An ENVELOPE described using an rpc-literal binding MUST contain exactly one part accessor element for each of the `wsdl:part` elements bound to the `wsoap12:body` element in the rpc-literal binding corresponding to the envelope. CORE TESTABLE BP1212a BP1212b

R2213 In a doc-literal description where the value of the parts attribute of `wsoap12:body` is an empty string, the corresponding ENVELOPE MUST have no element content in the `soap12:Body` element. CORE TESTABLE BP1213a BP1213b

R2214 In a rpc-literal description where the value of the parts attribute of `wsoap12:body` is an empty string, the corresponding...
ENVELOPE MUST have no part accessor elements.

Use of \texttt{wsdl:message} elements with zero parts is permitted in Document styles to permit operations that can send or receive envelopes with empty \texttt{soap12:Body}s. Use of \texttt{wsdl:message} elements with zero parts is permitted in RPC styles to permit operations that have no (zero) parameters and/or a return value.

For document-literal bindings, the Profile requires that at most one part, abstractly defined with the \texttt{element} attribute, be serialized into the \texttt{soap12:Body} element.

When a \texttt{wsdl:part} element is defined using the \texttt{type} attribute, the serialization of that part in a message is equivalent to an implicit (XML Schema) qualification of a \texttt{minOccurs} attribute with the value "1", a \texttt{maxOccurs} attribute with the value "1" and a \texttt{nillable} attribute with the value "false".

It is necessary to specify the equivalent implicit qualification because the \texttt{wsdl:part} element does not allow one to specify the cardinality and nillability rules. Specifying the cardinality and the nillability rules facilitates interoperability between implementations. The equivalent implicit qualification for nillable attribute has a value of "false" because if it is specified to be "true" one cannot design a part whereby the client is always required to send a value. For applications that want to allow the \texttt{wsdl:part} to be nillable, it is expected that applications will generate a complexType wrapper and specify the nillability rules for the contained elements of such a wrapper.

### 4.4.2 Bindings and Faults

There are several interpretations for how \texttt{wsdl:part} elements that describe \texttt{wsoap12:fault}, \texttt{wsoap12:header}, and \texttt{wsoap12:headerfault} may be defined.

\textbf{R2205} A \texttt{wsdl:binding} in a DESCRIPTION MUST refer, in each of its \texttt{wsoap12:header}, \texttt{wsoap12:headerfault} and \texttt{wsoap12:fault} elements, only to \texttt{wsdl:part} element(s) that have been defined using the \texttt{element} attribute. CORE TESTABLE BP2113

Because faults and headers do not contain parameters, \texttt{wsoap12:fault}, \texttt{wsoap12:header} and \texttt{wsoap12:headerfault} assume, per WSDL 1.1, that the value of the \texttt{style} attribute is "document". R2204 requires that all \texttt{wsdl:part} elements with a \texttt{style} attribute whose value is "document" that are bound to \texttt{wsoap12:body} be defined using the \texttt{element} attribute. This requirement does the same for \texttt{wsoap12:fault}, \texttt{wsoap12:header} and \texttt{wsoap12:headerfault} elements.

### 4.4.3 Unbound portType Element Contents

WSDL 1.1 is not explicit about whether it is permissible for a \texttt{wsdl:binding} to leave the binding for portions of the content defined by a \texttt{wsdl:portType} unspecified.

\textbf{R2209} A \texttt{wsdl:binding} in a DESCRIPTION SHOULD bind every \texttt{wsdl:part} of a \texttt{wsdl:message} in the \texttt{wsdl:portType} to which it refers to one of \texttt{wsoap12:body}, \texttt{wsoap12:header}, \texttt{wsoap12:fault} or \texttt{wsoap12:headerfault}. CORE TESTABLE BP2114

A portType defines an abstract contract with a named set of operations and associated abstract messages. Although not disallowed, it is expected that every part of the abstract input, output and fault messages specified in a portType is bound to \texttt{wsoap12:body} or \texttt{wsoap12:header} (and so forth) as appropriate when using the SOAP binding as defined in WSDL 1.1 Section 3. Un-bound \texttt{wsdl:parts} should be ignored.
4.5 Port Types

Section 2.4 of [WSDL1.1] defines the \texttt{wsdl:portType} elements that are used to group a set of abstract operations. The Profile places the following constraints on conformant \texttt{wsdl:portType} element(s):

4.5.1 Ordering of \texttt{part} Elements

Permitting the use of \texttt{parameterOrder} helps code generators in mapping between method signatures and messages on the wire.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[R2301] The order of the elements in the \texttt{soap12:Body of an ENVELOPE MUST be the same as that of the \texttt{wsdl:parts in the \texttt{wsdl:message that describes it for each of the \texttt{wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding \texttt{wsoap12:body element. CORE TESTABLE BP1111a BP1111b BP1012a BP1012b}}}}}
  \item[R2302] A DESCRIPTION MAY use the \texttt{parameterOrder attribute of an \texttt{wsdl:operation element to indicate the return value and method signatures as a hint to code generators. CORE NOT_TESTED}}
\end{itemize}

4.5.2 Allowed Operations

Solicit-Response and Notification operations are not well defined by WSDL 1.1; furthermore, WSDL 1.1 does not define bindings for them.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[R2303] A DESCRIPTION MUST NOT use Solicit-Response and Notification type operations in a \texttt{wsdl:portType definition. CORE TESTABLE BP2208}}
\end{itemize}

4.5.3 Distinctive Operations

Operation name overloading in a \texttt{wsdl:portType} is disallowed by the Profile.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[R2304] A \texttt{wsdl:portType in a DESCRIPTION MUST have operations with distinct values for their name attributes. CORE TESTABLE BP2010}}
\end{itemize}

Note that this requirement applies only to the \texttt{wsdl:operations} within a given \texttt{wsdl:portType}. A \texttt{wsdl:portType} may have \texttt{wsdl:operations} with names that are the same as those found in other \texttt{wsdl:portTypes}.

4.5.4 \texttt{parameterOrder Attribute Construction}

WSDL 1.1 does not clearly state how the \texttt{parameterOrder attribute of the \texttt{wsdl:operation element (which is the child of the \texttt{wsdl:portType element) should be constructed.}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[R2305] A \texttt{wsdl:operation element child of a \texttt{wsdl:portType element in a DESCRIPTION MUST be constructed so that the parameterOrder attribute, if present, omits at most 1 \texttt{wsdl:part from the output message. CORE TESTABLE BP2014}}}
\end{itemize}

If a \texttt{wsdl:part} from the output message is omitted from the list of \texttt{wsdl:parts} that is the value of the \texttt{parameterOrder} attribute, the single omitted \texttt{wsdl:part} is the return value. There are no restrictions on the type of the return value. If no part is omitted, there is no return value.
4.5.5 Exclusivity of type and element Attributes

WSDL 1.1 does not clearly state that both type and element attributes cannot be specified to define a wsdl:part in a wsdl:message.

R2306 A wsdl:message in a DESCRIPTION MUST NOT specify both type and element attributes on the same wsdl:part. CORE TESTABLE BP2116

4.6 Bindings

In WSDL 1.1, the wsdl:binding element supplies the concrete protocol and data format specifications for the operations and messages defined by a particular wsdl:portType. The Profile places the following constraints on conformant binding specifications:

4.6.1 Use of SOAP Binding

The Profile limits the choice of bindings to the well-defined and most commonly used SOAP 1.2 binding.

R2401 A wsdl:binding element in a DESCRIPTION MUST use the SOAP 1.2 binding as defined in the WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2. CORE TESTABLE BP2116

Note that this places a requirement on the construction of conformant wsdl:binding elements. It does not place a requirement on descriptions as a whole; in particular, it does not preclude WSDL documents from containing non-conformant wsdl:binding elements. Also, a binding may have WSDL extensibility elements present which change how messages are serialized.

4.7 SOAP Binding

The WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 [WSDL11SOAP12] defines a binding for SOAP 1.2 endpoints. This Profile mandates the use of the SOAP 1.2 binding as defined in WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2, and places the following constraints on its use:

Note that Section SOAP Binding contains additional, corrective requirements on the use of the SOAP 1.2 binding.

4.7.1 HTTP Transport

The profile limits the underlying transport protocol to HTTP.

R2702 When HTTP is used, a wsdl:binding element in a DESCRIPTION MUST specify the HTTP transport protocol with SOAP binding. Specifically, the transport attribute of its wsoap12:binding child MUST have the value "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/http". HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP2116

Note that this requirement does not prohibit the use of HTTPS; See R5000.

4.7.2 Consistency of style Attribute

The style, "document" or "rpc", of an interaction is specified at the wsdl:operation level, permitting wsdl:bindings whose wsdl:operations have different styles. This has led to interoperability problems. Additionally, use of document-literal binding, which generally allows for simpler
implementations than the rpc-literal binding, is encouraged. This hint is not always appropriate, especially in the case of some existing implementations, which continue to be supported by this profile.

**R2705** A `wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST either be a rpc-literal binding or a document-literal binding.** CORRETESTABLE BP2017**

### 4.7.3 Encodings and the use Attribute

The Profile prohibits the use of encodings, including the SOAP encoding.

**R2706** A `wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST use the value of "literal" for the use attribute in all wsoap12:body, wsoap12:fault, wsoap12:header and wsoap12:headerfault elements.** CORE TESTABLE BP2406**

### 4.7.4 Multiple Bindings for portType Elements

The Profile explicitly permits multiple bindings for the same portType.

**R2709** A `wsdl:portType in a DESCRIPTION MAY have zero or more wsdl:binding s that refer to it, defined in the same or other WSDL documents.** CORREN'T_TESTED**

### 4.7.5 Operation Signatures

Definition: operation signature

The Profile defines the "operation signature" to be the fully qualified name of the child element of SOAP body of the SOAP input message described by an operation in a WSDL binding and the URI value of the `wsa:Action SOAP header block, if present.

In the case of rpc-literal binding, the operation name is used as a wrapper for the part accessors. In the document-literal case, since a wrapper with the operation name is not present, the message signatures must be correctly designed so that they meet this requirement.

An endpoint that supports multiple operations must unambiguously identify the operation being invoked based on the input message that it receives. This is only possible if all the operations specified in the `wsdl:binding associated with an endpoint have a unique operation signature.

**R2710** The operations in a `wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST result in operation signatures that are different from one another.** CORRETESTABLE BP2120a BP2120b**

### 4.7.6 Multiple Ports on an Endpoint

When input messages destined for two different `wsdl:ports at the same network endpoint are indistinguishable on the wire, it may not be possible to determine the `wsdl:port being invoked by them. This may cause interoperability problems. However, there may be situations (e.g., SOAP versioning, application versioning, conformance to different profiles) where it is desirable to locate more than one port on an endpoint; therefore, the Profile allows this.

**R2711** A `DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOT have more than one `wsdl:port with the same value for the location attribute of the wsoap12:address element.** CORRETESTABLE BP2711**
4.7.7 Child Element for Document-Literal Bindings

WSDL 1.1 is not completely clear what, in document-literal style bindings, the child element of soap12:Body is.

R2712 A document-literal binding MUST be serialized as an ENVELOPE with a soap12:Body whose child element is an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:message part.  CORE TESTABLE BP1011a BP1011b

4.7.8 One-Way Operations

There are differing interpretations of how HTTP is to be used when performing one-way operations. The SOAP 1.2 Request-Response SOAP MEP specifies the expectations for the SOAP/HTTP binding.

R2714 For one-way operations, an HTTP Response MESSAGE MAY contain an envelope.  HTTP TRANSPORT NOT TESTED

R2727 For one-way operations, a CONSUMER MUST NOT interpret a successful HTTP Response status code (i.e., 2xx) to mean the message is valid or that the receiver would process it.  HTTP TRANSPORT NOT TESTABLE

One-way operations typically do not produce SOAP responses. However, some INSTANCEs may choose to communicate infrastructure-related faults (e.g. MustUnderstand, VersionMismatch) in the HTTP Response message. In addition to this, the use of some protocol extensions (e.g. WS-ReliableMessaging) may create the possibility for non-empty responses to one-way messages. For these reasons the Basic Profile 1.1 requirement that the HTTP Response message not contain a SOAP envelope has been relaxed. Note: the fact that an INSTANCE may choose to communicate infrastructure-related faults in the HTTP Response does not mean that the CONSUMER can expect it to do so.

The HTTP Response to a one-way operation indicates the success or failure of the transmission of the message. Based on the semantics of the different response status codes supported by the HTTP protocol, the Profile specifies that “200” and “202” are the preferred status codes that the sender should expect, signifying that the one-way message was received. A successful transmission does not indicate that the SOAP processing layer and the application logic has had a chance to validate the envelope or have committed to processing it.

4.7.9 Namespaces for wsoap12 Elements

There is confusion about what namespace is associated with the child elements of various children of soap12:Envelope, which has led to interoperability difficulties. The Profile defines these.

R2716 A document-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST NOT have the namespace attribute specified on contained wsoap12:body, wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault and wsoap12:fault elements.  CORE TESTABLE BP2019

R2717 An rpc-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST have the namespace attribute specified, the value of which MUST be an absolute URI, on contained wsoap12:body elements.  CORE TESTABLE BP2020

R2726 An rpc-literal binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST NOT have the namespace attribute specified on contained wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault and wsoap12:fault elements.  CORE TESTABLE BP2117
In a document-literal SOAP binding, the serialized element child of the soap12:Body gets its namespace from the targetNamespace of the schema that defines the element. Use of the namespace attribute of the wsoap12:body element would override the element's namespace. This is not allowed by the Profile. Conversely, in a rpc-literal SOAP binding, the serialized child element of the soap12:Body element consists of a wrapper element, whose namespace is the value of the namespace attribute of the wsoap12:body element and whose local name is either the name of the operation or the name of the operation suffixed with "Response". The namespace attribute is required, as opposed to being optional, to ensure that the children of the soap12:Body element are namespace-qualified.

4.7.10 Consistency of portType and binding Elements

The WSDL description must be consistent at both wsdl:portType and wsdl:binding levels.

R2718 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST have the same set of wsdl:operations as the wsdl:portType to which it refers.

CORE TESTABLE BP2118

4.7.11 Enumeration of Faults

A Web service description should include all faults known at the time the service is defined. There is also need to permit generation of new faults that had not been identified when the Web service was defined.

R2740 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION SHOULD contain a wsoap12:fault describing each known fault.

CORE NOT_TESTABLE

R2741 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION SHOULD contain a wsoap12:headerfault describing each known header fault.

CORE NOT_TESTABLE

R2742 An ENVELOPE MAY contain a fault with a detail element that is not described by a wsoap12:fault element in the corresponding WSDL description.

CORE NOT_TESTABLE

R2743 An ENVELOPE MAY contain the details of a header processing related fault in a SOAP header block that is not described by a wsoap12:headerfault element in the corresponding WSDL description.

CORE NOT_TESTABLE

4.7.12 Consistency of Envelopes with Descriptions

These requirements specify that when an instance receives an envelope that does not conform to the WSDL description, a fault should be generated unless the instance takes it upon itself to process the envelope regardless of this.

As specified by the SOAP processing model, (a) a "VersionMismatch" faultcode must be generated if the namespace of the "Envelope" element is incorrect, (b) a "MustUnderstand" fault must be generated if the instance does not understand a SOAP header block with a value of "1" for the soap12:mustUnderstand attribute. In all other cases where an envelope is inconsistent with its WSDL description, a fault with a "Client" faultcode should be generated.

R2724 If an INSTANCE receives an envelope that is inconsistent with its WSDL description, it SHOULD generate a soap12:Fault with a faultcode of "Client", unless a "MustUnderstand" or "VersionMismatch" fault is generated.

CORE NOT_TESTED

R2725 If an INSTANCE receives an envelope that is inconsistent with its WSDL description, it MUST check for "VersionMismatch", ...
"MustUnderstand" and "Client" fault conditions in that order.

**CORE\_NOT\_TESTABLE**

### 4.7.13 Response Wrappers

[WSDL1.1] Section 3.5 could be interpreted to mean the RPC response wrapper element must be named identical to the name of the \texttt{wsdl:operation}.

**R2729** An \textit{ENVELOPE} described with an rpc-literal binding that is a response \textbf{MUST} have a wrapper element whose name is the corresponding \texttt{wsdl:operation} name suffixed with the string "Response". \textbf{CORE\_TESTABLE} BP1005

### 4.7.14 Part Accessors

For rpc-literal envelopes, WSDL 1.1 is not clear what namespace, if any, the accessor elements for parameters and return value are a part of. Different implementations make different choices, leading to interoperability problems.

**R2735** An \textit{ENVELOPE} described with an rpc-literal binding \textbf{MUST} place the part accessor elements for parameters and return value in no namespace. \textbf{CORE\_TESTABLE} BP1008a BP1008b

**R2755** The part accessor elements in a \textit{MESSAGE} described with an rpc-literal binding \textbf{MUST} have a local name of the same value as the name attribute of the corresponding \texttt{wsdl:part} element. \textbf{CORE\_TESTABLE} BP1755a BP1755b

Settling on one alternative is crucial to achieving interoperability. The Profile places the part accessor elements in no namespace as doing so is simple, covers all cases, and does not lead to logical inconsistency.

### 4.7.15 Namespaces for Children of Part Accessors

For rpc-literal envelopes, WSDL 1.1 is not clear on what the correct namespace qualification is for the child elements of the part accessor elements when the corresponding abstract parts are defined to be of types from a different namespace than the \texttt{targetNamespace} of the WSDL description for the abstract parts.

**R2737** An \textit{ENVELOPE} described with an rpc-literal binding \textbf{MUST} namespace qualify the descendents of part accessor elements for the parameters and the return value, as defined by the schema in which the part accessor types are defined. \textbf{CORE\_NOT\_TESTABLE\_XPATH}

[WSDL1.1] Section 3.5 states: "The part names, types and value of the namespace attribute are all inputs to the encoding, although the namespace attribute only applies to content not explicitly defined by the abstract types."

However, it does not explicitly state that the element and attribute content of the abstract (complexType) types is namespace qualified to the \texttt{targetNamespace} in which those elements and attributes were defined. WSDL 1.1 was intended to function in much the same manner as XML Schema. Hence, implementations must follow the same rules as for XML Schema. If a complexType defined in \texttt{targetNamespace "A"} were imported and referenced in an element declaration in a schema with \texttt{targetNamespace "B"}, the element and attribute content of the child elements of that complexType would be qualified to namespace "A" and the element would be qualified to namespace "B".

For example,  
\textbf{CORRECT}:
Given this WSDL, which defines some schema in the "http://example.org/foo/" namespace in the
<definitions> section contained within a <definitions> that has a targetNamespace attribute
with the value "http://example.org/bar/" (thus, having a type declared in one namespace and the
containing element defined in another):

```xml
<definitions xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/" xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
 xmlns:bar="http://example.org/bar/"
 targetNamespace="http://example.org/bar/"
 xmlns:foo="http://example.org/foo/">
  <types>
    <xsd:schema targetNamespace="http://example.org/foo/"
      xmlns:tns="http://example.org/foo/"
      xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
      elementFormDefault="qualified"
      attributeFormDefault="unqualified">
      <xsd:complexType name="fooType">
        <xsd:sequence>
          <xsd:element ref="tns:bar"/>
          <xsd:element ref="tns:baf"/>
        </xsd:sequence>
      </xsd:complexType>
      <xsd:element name="bar" type="xsd:string"/>  
      <xsd:element name="baf" type="xsd:integer"/>
    </xsd:schema>
  </types>
  <message name="BarMsg">
    <part name="BarAccessor" type="foo:fooType"/>
  </message>
  <portType name="BarPortType">
    <operation name="BarOperation">
      <input message="bar:BarMsg"/>
    </operation>
  </portType>
  <binding name="BarSOAP12Binding" type="bar:BarPortType">
    <wssoap12:binding transport="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/http" style="rpc"/>
    <operation name="BarOperation">
      <input>
        <wssoap12:body use="literal" namespace="http://example.org/bar/"/>
      </input>
    </operation>
  </binding>
  <service name="serviceName">
    <port name="BarSOAPPort" binding="bar:BarSOAP12Binding">
      <wssoap12:address location="http://example.org/myBarSOAPPort"/>
    </port>
  </service>
</definitions>
```
The resulting envelope for BarOperation is:

```xml
<s:Envelope xmlns:soap12="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope"
            xmlns:foo="http://example.org/foo/>
<soap12:Header/>
<soap12:Body>
  <m:BarOperation xmlns:m="http://example.org/bar/">
    <BarAccessor>
      <foo:bar>String</foo:bar>
      <foo:baf>0</foo:baf>
    </BarAccessor>
  </m:BarOperation>
</soap12:Body>
</soap12:Envelope>
```

### 4.7.16 Required Headers

WSDL 1.1 does not clearly specify whether all `wssoap12:headers` specified on the `wsdl:input` or `wsdl:output` elements of a `wsdl:operation` element in the SOAP binding section of a WSDL description must be included in the resultant envelopes when they are transmitted. The Profile makes all such headers mandatory, as there is no way in WSDL 1.1 to mark a header optional.

**R2738** An **ENVELOPE** **MUST** include all `wssoap12:headers` specified on a `wsdl:input` or `wsdl:output` of a `wsdl:operation` that describes it. **CORE TESTABLE BP1009a BP1009b BP1009c BP1009d**

### 4.7.17 Allowing Undescribed Headers

Headers are SOAP's extensibility mechanism. Headers that are not defined in the WSDL description may need to be included in the envelopes for various reasons.

**R2739** An **ENVELOPE** **MAY** contain SOAP header blocks that are not described in the `wsdl:binding` that describes it. **CORE NOT_TESTED**

**R2753** An **ENVELOPE** containing SOAP header blocks that are not described in the appropriate `wsdl:binding` **MAY** have the `mustUnderstand` attribute on such SOAP header blocks set to '1'. **CORE NOT_TESTED**

### 4.7.18 Ordering Headers

There is no correlation between the order of `wssoap12:headers` in the description and the order of SOAP header blocks in the envelope. Similarly, more than one instance of each specified SOAP header block may occur in the envelope.

**R2751** The order of `wssoap12:header elements in wssoap12:binding sections of a DESCRIPTION MUST be considered independent of the order of SOAP header blocks in the envelope. **CORE NOT_TESTABLE**

**R2752** An **ENVELOPE** **MAY** contain more than one instance of each SOAP header block for each `wssoap12:header element in the`
appropriate child of wsoap12:binding in the corresponding description.

4.7.19 Describing action Parameter on the Content-Type MIME Header

See Section Parameters on the Content-Type MIME Header

R2744 If the action parameter on the HTTP Content-Type header is present in a MESSAGE, its value MUST be equal to the value of the soapAction attribute of the corresponding wsoap12:operation in the WSDL description, if this attribute is present and not empty.

See also R1109 and related requirements for more discussion of action parameter on the Content-Type MIME header.

For example,

CORRECT:

A WSDL Description that has:

```xml
<wsoap12:operation soapAction="http://example.org/foo"/>
```

results in a message with the action parameter on the Content-Type MIME header field-value set to:

"http://example.org/foo"

4.7.20 SOAPAction HTTP Header

Unlike SOAP 1.1, SOAP 1.2 HTTP binding does not use the SOAPAction HTTP header in the HTTP Request messages. Relying on the presence of SOAPAction HTTP header or the value of SOAPAction HTTP header may result in interoperability problems.

R2760 A RECEIVER MUST NOT rely on the presence of a SOAPAction HTTP header to correctly process a message.

R2761 A SENDER SHOULD NOT include the SOAPAction HTTP header.

4.7.21 SOAP Binding Extensions

The wsdl:required attribute has been widely misunderstood and used by WSDL authors sometimes to incorrectly indicate the optionality of wsoap12:headers. The wsdl:required attribute, as specified in WSDL 1.1, is an extensibility mechanism aimed at WSDL processors. It allows new WSDL extension elements to be introduced in a graceful manner. The intent of wsdl:required is to signal to the WSDL processor whether the extension element needs to be recognized and understood by the WSDL processor in order that the WSDL description be correctly processed. It is not meant to signal conditionality or optionality of some construct that is included in the envelopes. For example, a wsdl:required attribute with the value "false" on a wsoap12:header element must not be interpreted to signal to the WSDL processor that the described SOAP header block is conditional or optional in the envelopes generated from the WSDL description. It is meant to be interpreted as "in order to send an envelope to the endpoint that includes in its description the wsoap12:header element, the WSDL processor MUST understand the semantic implied by the wsoap12:header element."
The default value for the `wsdl:required` attribute for WSDL 1.1 SOAP Binding extension elements is "false". Most WSDL descriptions in practice do not specify the `wsdl:required` attribute on the SOAP Binding extension elements, which could be interpreted by WSDL processors to mean that the extension elements may be ignored. The Profile requires that all WSDL 1.1 extensions be understood and processed by the consumer, irrespective of the presence or the value of the `wsdl:required` attribute on an extension element.

**R2747** A CONSUMER MUST understand and process all WSDL 1.1 SOAP Binding extension elements, irrespective of the presence or absence of the `wsdl:required` attribute on an extension element; and irrespective of the value of the `wsdl:required` attribute, when present. CORE NOT TESTABLE

**R2748** A CONSUMER MUST NOT interpret the presence of the `wsdl:required` attribute on a `wssoap12` extension element with a value of "false" to mean the extension element is optional in the envelopes generated from the WSDL description. CORE NOT TESTABLE

### 4.8 Use of `@soapActionRequired` in WSDL 1.1 SOAP 1.2 Binding

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 [WSDL11SOAP12]

The WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 incorporates an attribute called `wssoap12:soapActionRequired` that has a default value of 'true'. This has the effect that, in order to have the action parameter omitted from the Content-Type HTTP header field, one would need to explicitly include the attribute in a description with a value of 'false'. The action parameter is defined by SOAP 1.2 to be OPTIONAL so as to enable use cases in which the sender of a SOAP message wishes to disallow casual inspection of the clear-text part of the message to infer its purpose or intent. Additionally, implementations are cautioned that they SHOULD NOT require the parameter's presence in a message in order to process the message.

The Profile WG believes that the `wssoap12:soapActionRequired` attribute runs counter to the SOAP 1.2 specification's intent. Therefore, the attribute has been profiled such that it MUST NOT be used, as it would tend to eliminate the very use cases that lead to the design of the SOAP 1.2 action parameter.

**R2756** A DESCRIPTION MUST NOT include the `wssoap12:soapActionRequired` attribute. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP2756

**R2759** A CONSUMER MUST treat the absence of the `wssoap12:soapActionRequired` attribute as if it had a value of 'false'. HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTED

**R2758** A MESSAGE MAY omit the action parameter from the Content-Type HTTP header field. HTTP-TRANSPORT NOT_TESTED

**R2757** A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the absence or presence of the action parameter on the HTTP Content-Type header field. HTTP-TRANSPORT TESTABLE BP1757
Although the WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 describes how the action parameter of the Content-Type header field is set by the `wsoap12:soapAction` attribute of the `wsoap12:operation` element, there are implementations that include the action parameter in request messages even in cases where the `wsoap12:soapAction` attribute does not appear in the `wsoap12:operation` that describes these requests. Note that, in some of these cases, the action parameter might have an empty string (""") value.

### 4.9 Use of XML Schema

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:


WSDL 1.1 uses XML Schema as one of its type systems. The Profile mandates the use of XML Schema as the type system for WSDL descriptions of Web Services.

**R2800** A DESCRIPTION MAY contain any content validated against [xmlSchema-1]. **CORE NOT TESTED**

**R2801** A DESCRIPTION MUST use [xmlSchema-2] as the basis of user defined datatypes and structures. **CORE TESTABLE BP2122**

### 4.10 4.10 WS-Addressing 1.0 - Metadata

WS-Addressing message addressing properties (MAPs) can be specified in a WSDL document. The Profile adds restrictions to such properties specified in WSDL.

The `wsam:Action` attribute is used in WSDL to specify the value of the `wsa:Action` SOAP header in the envelope. A default value computation algorithm is specified for the case where an explicit `wsam:Action` attribute is not specified.

**R2900** The value of the `wsa:Action` header block in an ENVELOPE MUST equal the value (either actual or computed) of the `wsam:Action` attribute for the corresponding WSDL `wsdl:input`, `wsdl:output`, or `wsdl:fault` contained in the target `wsdl:operation of the wsdl:portType`. **CORE TESTABLE BP1142a BP1142b BP1142c BP1143a BP1143b BP1143c BP1090a BP1090b**

**R2901** In a DESCRIPTION, the actual value of the `wsam:Action` attribute for the `wsdl:input` element contained in the target `wsdl:operation of the wsdl:portType` MUST be equal to the value of the `soapAction` attribute, if present, of the `wsoap12:operation` element contained in the target `wsdl:operation of the wsdl:binding`. **CORE TESTABLE BP2801**

Note that this requirement is closely related to **R1144**, which defines the relationship between the value of the `wsa:Action` SOAP header and the value of the action parameter of the HTTP Content-Type MIME header.
5 WSDL Corrections

The following sections contain requirements that correct errors and inconsistencies in the Web Services Description Language (WSDL) 1.1 [WSDL1.1]. These have been collected into this common section to serve as a reference point for other specifications.

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- Web Services Description Language (WSDL) 1.1 [WSDL1.1]

These extensibility points are listed, along with any extensibility points from other sections of this Profile, in Appendix A.

5.1 Document Structure

Section 2.1 of [WSDL1.1] WSDL Document Structure defines the overall structure of an XML document for describing Web services. This Profile mandates the use of that structure, with the following corrections:

5.1.1 WSDL Schema Definitions

The normative schemas for WSDL appearing in Appendix 4 of the WSDL 1.1 specification have inconsistencies with the normative text of the specification. The Profile references new schema documents that have incorporated fixes for known errors.

R2028 A DESCRIPTION using the WSDL namespace (prefixed "wsdl" in this Profile) MUST be valid according to the XML Schema found at "http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic/1.1/wsdl-2004-08-24.xsd". CORE TESTABLE BP2705

R2029 A DESCRIPTION using the WSDL SOAP binding namespace (prefixed "wsoap12" in this Profile) MUST be valid according to the XML Schema found at "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap12/wsdl11soap12-20060302.xsd". CORE TESTABLE BP2704

Although the Profile requires WSDL descriptions to be Schema valid, it does not require consumers to validate WSDL documents. It is the responsibility of a WSDL document's author to assure that it is Schema valid.

5.1.2 WSDL and Schema Import

Some examples in WSDL 1.1 incorrectly show the WSDL import statement being used to import XML Schema definitions. The Profile clarifies use of the import mechanisms to keep them consistent and confined to their respective domains. Imported schema documents are also constrained by XML version and encoding requirements consistent to those of the importing WSDL documents.

R2001 A DESCRIPTION MUST only use the WSDL "import" statement to import another WSDL description. CORE TESTABLE BP2101
R2803 *In a DESCRIPTION, the namespace attribute of the wsdl:import MUST NOT be a relative URI.* **CORE** **TESTABLE** BP2803

R2002 *To import XML Schema Definitions, a DESCRIPTION MUST use the XML Schema "import" statement.* **CORE** **TESTABLE** BP2101

R2003 *A DESCRIPTION MUST use the XML Schema "import" statement only within the xsd:schema element of the types section.* **CORE** **TESTABLE** BP2103

R2004 *In a DESCRIPTION the schemaLocation attribute of an xsd:import element MUST NOT resolve to any document whose root element is not "schema" from the namespace "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema".* **CORE** **TESTABLE** BP2106

R2009 *An XML Schema directly or indirectly imported by a DESCRIPTION MAY include the Unicode Byte Order Mark (BOM),** **CORE** **NOT** **TESTABLE**

R2010 *An XML Schema directly or indirectly imported by a DESCRIPTION MUST use either UTF-8 or UTF-16 encoding.* **CORE** **TESTABLE** BP2202

R2011 *An XML Schema directly or indirectly imported by a DESCRIPTION MUST use version 1.0 of the eXtensible Markup Language W3C Recommendation.* **CORE** **NOT** **TESTED**

For example,

**INCORRECT:**

```xml
<definitions name="StockQuote"
  targetNamespace="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions"
  xmlns:sq="http://example.com/stockquote"
  ...
  xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">
  <import namespace="http://example.com/stockquote"
    location="http://example.com/stockquote/schemas/stockquote.xsd"/>
  <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
    <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
  </message>
  ...
</definitions>
```

**CORRECT:**

```xml
<definitions name="StockQuote"
  targetNamespace="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions"
  xmlns:sq="http://example.com/stockquote"
  ...
  xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">
  <import namespace="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions"
    location="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions/stockquote.wsdl"/>
  <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
    <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
  </message>
  ...
</definitions>
```
5.1.3 Placement of WSDL import Elements

Example 3 in WSDL 1.1 Section 3.1 causes confusion regarding the placement of `wsdl:import`.

**R2022** When they appear in a DESCRIPTION, `wsdl:import` elements MUST precede all other elements from the WSDL namespace except `wsdl:documentation`. **CORE TESTABLE**

**R2023** When they appear in a DESCRIPTION, `wsdl:types` elements MUST precede all other elements from the WSDL namespace except `wsdl:documentation` and `wsdl:import`. **CORE TESTABLE**

For example,

**INCORRECT:**

```xml
<definitions name="StockQuote"
    xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/ wsdl/">
    ... 
    <import namespace="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions"
        location="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions/ stockquote.wsdl"/>
    ... 
</definitions>
```

**CORRECT:**

```xml
<definitions name="StockQuote"
    targetNamespace="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions"
    xmlns: sq="http://example.com/ stockquote"
    xmlns: xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/ wsdl/">
    <types>
        <xsd:schema targetNamespace="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions">
            <xsd:import namespace="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions"
                location="http://example.com/ stockquote/ definitions/ stockquote.wsdl"/>
        </xsd:schema>
    </types>
    <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
        <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
    </message>
    ... 
</definitions>
```
CORRECT:

<definitions name="StockQuote"
    xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">

    <import namespace="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions"
        location="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions/stockquote.wsdl"/>

    <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
        <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
    </message>

    <service name="StockQuoteService">
        <port name="StockQuotePort" binding="tns:StockQuoteSoap">
        ...
        </port>
    </service>

</definitions>

INCORRECT:

<definitions name="StockQuote"
    xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">

    <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
        <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
    </message>

    <service name="StockQuoteService">
        <port name="StockQuotePort" binding="tns:StockQuoteSoap">
        ...
        </port>
    </service>

    <types>
        <xsd:schema targetNamespace="http://example.com/stockquote">
        ...
        </xsd:schema>
    </types>

</definitions>

CORRECT:

<definitions name="StockQuote"
    xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema"
    xmlns="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">

    <import namespace="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions"
        location="http://example.com/stockquote/definitions/stockquote.wsdl"/>

    <message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
        <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
    </message>

    <service name="StockQuoteService">
        <port name="StockQuotePort" binding="tns:StockQuoteSoap">
        ...
        </port>
    </service>

</definitions>
<types>
  <xsd:schema targetNamespace="http://example.com/stockquote">
    ...
  </xsd:schema>
</types>

<message name="GetLastTradePriceInput">
  <part name="body" element="sq:TradePriceRequest"/>
</message>

<service name="StockQuoteService">
  <port name="StockQuotePort" binding="tns:StockQuoteSoap">
    ...
  </port>
</service>
</definitions>

5.1.4 WSDL documentation Element

The WSDL 1.1 schema and the WSDL 1.1 specification are inconsistent with respect to where wsdl:documentation elements may be placed.

R2030 In a DESCRIPTION the wsdl:documentation element MAY be present as the first child element of wsdl:import, wsdl:part and wsdl:definitions in addition to the elements cited in the WSDL 1.1 specification. CORE NOT TESTED

5.2 Message

Section 2.3 of [WSDL1.1] Messages defines the wsdl:message elements that are used to represent abstract definitions of the data being transmitted. This Profile defines the following corrections on wsdl:message elements.

5.2.1 Declaration of part Elements

Examples 4 and 5 in WSDL 1.1 Section 3.1 incorrectly show the use of XML Schema types (e.g. "xsd:string") as a valid value for the element attribute of a wsdl:part element.

R2206 A wsdl:message in a DESCRIPTION containing a wsdl:part that uses the element attribute MUST refer, in that attribute, to a global element declaration. CORE TESTABLE BP2115

For example,

INCORRECT:

<message name="GetTradePriceInput">
  <part name="tickerSymbol" element="xsd:string"/>
</message>

CORRECT:

<message name="GetTradePriceInput">
  <part name="body" element="tns:SubscribeToQuotes"/>
</message>
5.3 SOAP Binding

The WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 [WSDL11Soap12] defines a binding for SOAP 1.2 endpoints. This Profile mandates the use of the SOAP 1.2 binding as defined in WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2, with the following corrections:

5.3.1 Specifying the transport Attribute

There is an inconsistency between the WSDL 1.1 specification and the WSDL 1.1 schema regarding the transport attribute. The WSDL 1.1 specification requires it; however, the schema shows it to be optional.

R2701 The wsdl:binding element in a DESCRIPTION MUST be constructed so that its wsoap12:binding child element specifies the transport attribute. CORE TESTABLE BP2403

5.3.2 SOAP 1.2 Binding Extension

R2179 In a DESCRIPTION, a wsoap12:fault MUST specify the contents of the SOAP 1.2 fault Detail element. CORE NOT_TESTABLE

The wsoap12:fault element is meant to describe the SOAP 1.2 fault detail entries. WSDL 1.1 Binding Extension for SOAP 1.2 incorrectly says that it specifies the contents of the Reason element.

5.3.3 Type and Name of SOAP Binding Elements

The WSDL 1.1 schema disagrees with the WSDL 1.1 specification about the name and type of an attribute of the wsoap12:header and wsoap12:headerfault elements.

R2720 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST use the part attribute with a schema type of "NMTOKEN" on all contained wsoap12:header and wsoap12:headerfault elements. CORE TESTABLE BP2021

R2749 A wsdl:binding in a DESCRIPTION MUST NOT use the parts attribute on contained wsoap12:header and wsoap12:headerfault elements. CORE TESTABLE BP2021

The WSDL Schema gives the attribute's name as "parts" and its type as "NMTOKENS". The schema is incorrect since each wsoap12:header and wsoap12:headerfault element references a single wsdl:part.

For example, CORRECT:

```xml
<binding name="StockQuoteSoap" type="tns:StockQuotePortType">
  <wsoap12:binding style="document" transport="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/http"/>
  <operation name="SubscribeToQuotes">
    <input>
      <wsoap12:body parts="body" use="literal"/>
      <wsoap12:header message="tns:SubscribeToQuotes" part="subscribeheader" use="literal"/>
    </input>
  </operation>
</binding>
```
5.3.4 name Attribute on Faults

There is inconsistency between the WSDL 1.1 specification and the WSDL 1.1 schema, which does not list the name attribute.

**R2721** A `wsdl:binding` in a DESCRIPTION **MUST have the name attribute specified on all contained `wsap12:fault` elements.**

**R2754** In a DESCRIPTION, the value of the name attribute on a `wsap12:fault` element **MUST match the value of the name attribute on its parent `wsdl:fault` element.**

5.3.5 Omission of the use Attribute

There is inconsistency between the WSDL 1.1 specification and the WSDL 1.1 schema regarding the use attribute.

**R2722** A `wsdl:binding` in a DESCRIPTION **MAY specify the use attribute on contained `wsap12:fault` elements.**

**R2723** If in a `wsdl:binding` in a DESCRIPTION the use attribute on a contained `wsap12:fault` element is present, its value **MUST be "literal".**

[WSDL1.1] Section 3.6 indicates that the use attribute of `wsap12:fault` is required while in the schema the use attribute is defined as optional. The Profile defines it as optional, to be consistent with `wsap12:body`.

Since the use attribute is optional, the Profile identifies the default value for the attribute when omitted. Finally, to assure that the Profile is self-consistent, the only permitted value for the use attribute is "literal”.

5.3.6 Default for use Attribute

There is an inconsistency between the WSDL 1.1 specification and the WSDL 1.1 schema regarding whether the use attribute is optional on `wsap12:body`, `wsap12:header`, and `wsap12:headerfault`, and if so, what omitting the attribute means.

**R2707** A `wsdl:binding` in a DESCRIPTION that contains one or more `wsap12:body`, `wsap12:fault`, `wsap12:header` or `wsap12:headerfault` elements that do not specify the use attribute **MUST be interpreted as though the value "literal" had been specified in each case.**
6 Service Publication and Discovery

When publication or discovery of Web services is required, UDDI is the mechanism the Profile has adopted to describe Web service providers and the Web services they provide. Business, intended use, and Web service type descriptions are made in UDDI terms; detailed technical descriptions are made in WSDL terms. Where the two specifications define overlapping descriptive data and both forms of description are used, the Profile specifies that the descriptions must not conflict.

Registration of Web service instances in UDDI registries is optional. By no means do all usage scenarios require the kind of metadata and discovery UDDI provides, but where such capability is needed, UDDI is the sanctioned mechanism.

Note that the Web services that constitute UDDI V2 are not fully conformant with the Profile 1.0 because they do not accept messages whose envelopes are encoded in either UTF-8 and UTF-16 as required by the Profile. (They accept UTF-8 only.) That there should be such a discrepancy is hardly surprising given that UDDI V2 was designed and, in many cases, implemented before the Profile was developed. UDDI's designers are aware of UDDI V2's nonconformance and will take it into consideration in their future work.

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- UDDI Version 2.03 Data Structure Reference, Dated 19 July 2002 [UDDI2.03Data]
- UDDI Version 2 XML Schema [UDDI2schema]

These extensibility points are listed, along with any extensibility points from other sections of this Profile, in Appendix A.

6.1 bindingTemplates

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- Section 7 of [UDDI2.03Data] The bindingTemplate structure

UDDI represents Web service instances as uddi:bindingTemplate elements. The uddi:bindingTemplate plays a role that is the rough analog of the wsdl:port, but provides options that are not expressible in WSDL. To keep the WSDL description of an instance and its UDDI description consistent, the Profile places the following constraints on how uddi:bindingTemplate elements may be constructed.

WSDL's wsoap12:address element requires the network address of the instance to be directly specified. In contrast, UDDI V2 provides two alternatives for specifying the network address of instances it represents. One, the uddi:accessPoint, mirrors the WSDL mechanism by directly specifying the address. The other, the uddi:hostingRedirector, provides a Web service-based indirection mechanism for resolving the address, and is inconsistent with the WSDL mechanism.

**R3100 REGDATA of type uddi:bindingTemplate representing a conformant INSTANCE MUST contain the uddi:accessPoint element.**

For example,
6.2 tModels

This section of the Profile incorporates the following specifications by reference:

- Section 8 of [UDDI2.03Data] The tModel structure

UDDI represents Web service types as `uddi:tModel` elements. (See Section 8.1.1 of [UDDI2.03Data] Defining the technical fingerprint). These may, but need not, point (using a URI) to the document that contains the actual description. Further, UDDI is agnostic with respect to the mechanisms used to describe Web service types. The Profile cannot be agnostic about this because interoperation is very much complicated if Web service types do not have descriptions or if the descriptions can take arbitrary forms.

The appendix I.1.2.1.1 of [UDDI2.04API] Taxonomy Values allows but does not require `uddi:tModel` elements that use WSDL to describe the Web service type they represent to state that they use WSDL as the description language. Not doing so leads to interoperability problems because it is then ambiguous what description language is being used.

Therefore the Profile places the following constraints on how `uddi:tModel` elements that describe Web service types may be constructed:

The Profile chooses WSDL as the description language because it is by far the most widely used such language.

**R3002** REGDATA of type `uddi:tModel` representing a conformant Web service type MUST use WSDL as the description language.

To specify that conformant Web service types use WSDL, the Profile adopts the UDDI categorization for making this assertion.

**R3003** REGDATA of type `uddi:tModel` representing a conformant Web service type MUST be categorized using the `uddi:types taxonomy and a categorization of "wsdlSpec"`. CORE NOT TESTED
For the `uddi:overviewURL` in a `uddi:tModel` to resolve to a `wsdl:binding`, the Profile must adopt a convention for distinguishing among multiple `wsdl:bindings` in a WSDL document. The UDDI Best Practice for Using WSDL in a UDDI Registry specifies the most widely recognized such convention.

**R3010** REGDATA of type `uddi:tModel` representing a conformant Web service type MUST follow V1.08 of the UDDI Best Practice for Using WSDL in a UDDI Registry. [CORE NOT TESTED]

It would be inconsistent if the `wsdl:binding` that is referenced by the `uddi:tModel` does not conform to the Profile.

**R3011** The `wsdl:binding` that is referenced by REGDATA of type `uddi:tModel` MUST itself conform to the Profile. [CORE NOT TESTED]
7 Security

As is true of all network-oriented information technologies, the subject of security is a crucial one for Web services. For Web services, as for other information technologies, security consists of understanding the potential threats an attacker may mount and applying operational, physical, and technological countermeasures to reduce the risk of a successful attack to an acceptable level. Because an "acceptable level of risk" varies hugely depending on the application, and because costs of implementing countermeasures is also highly variable, there can be no universal "right answer" for securing Web services. Choosing the absolutely correct balance of countermeasures and acceptable risk can only be done on a case by case basis.

While Basic Profile conformance is important for the web services community to ensure interoperability, an instance is expected take whatever security countermeasures it deems necessary to protect itself; even if in that specific case it is acting outside of and is not in conformance with this Profile.

There are common patterns of countermeasures that experience shows reduce the risks to acceptable levels for many Web services. The Profile adopts, but does not mandate use of, the most widely used of these: HTTP secured with either TLS 1.0 or SSL 3.0 (HTTPS). That is, conformant Web services may use HTTPS; they may also use other countermeasure technologies or none at all.

HTTPS is widely regarded as a mature standard for encrypted transport connections to provide a basic level of confidentiality. HTTPS thus forms the first and simplest means of achieving some basic security features that are required by many real-world Web service applications. HTTPS may also be used to provide client authentication through the use of client-side certificates.

See conformance criteria in Section 2 when the HTTP(S) transport protocol is used.

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

- RFC2818: HTTP Over TLS [RFC2818]
- RFC2246: The TLS Protocol Version 1.0 [RFC2246]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0019 - TLS Cyphersuite - TLS allows for the use of arbitrary encryption algorithms. HTTP-TRANSPORT
  - E0020 - TLS Extensions - TLS allows for extensions during the handshake phase. HTTP-TRANSPORT
- The SSL Protocol Version 3.0 [SSLV3]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0021 - SSL Cyphersuite - SSL allows for the use of arbitrary encryption algorithms. HTTP-TRANSPORT
- RFC2459: Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and CRL Profile [RFC2459]
  Extensibility points:
  - E0022 - Certificate Authority - The choice of the Certificate Authority is a private agreement between parties. HTTP-TRANSPORT
  - E0023 - Certificate Extensions - X509 allows for arbitrary certificate extensions. HTTP-TRANSPORT

These extensibility points are listed, along with any extensibility points from other sections of this Profile, in Appendix A.
7.1 Use of HTTPS

HTTPS is such a useful, widely understood basic security mechanism that the Profile needs to allow it.

R5000 An INSTANCE MAY require the use of HTTPS. HTTP-TRANSPORTNOT_TESTED

R5001 If an INSTANCE requires the use of HTTPS, the location attribute of the wsoap12:address element in its wsdl:port description MUST be a URI whose scheme is "https"; otherwise it MUST be a URI whose scheme is "http". HTTP-TRANSPORTNOT_TESTED

Simple HTTPS provides authentication of the Web service instance by the consumer but not authentication of the consumer by the instance. For many instances this leaves the risk too high to permit interoperation. Including the mutual authentication facility of HTTPS in the Profile permits instances to use the countermeasure of authenticating the consumer. In cases in which authentication of the instance by the consumer is insufficient, this often reduces the risk sufficiently to permit interoperation.

R5010 An INSTANCE MAY require the use of HTTPS with mutual authentication. HTTP-TRANSPORTNOT_TESTED
## Appendix A. Extensibility Points

This section identifies extensibility points, as defined in "Scope of the Profile," for the Profile's component specifications.

Agreements on these extensibility points are out of the scope of the Profile and Profile conformance. An initial, non-exhaustive list of these extensibility points is provided here as their use may affect interoperability. In order to avoid interoperability issues not addressed by the Profile, out-of-band agreement on the use of these extensibility points may be necessary between the parties to a Web service.

In SOAP Version 1.2 Part 1: Messaging Framework (Second Edition) [SOAP12-1]:

- **E0001 - Header blocks** - Header blocks are an extensibility mechanism in SOAP. **CORE TESTABLE** BP1901
- **E0002 - Processing order** - The order of processing of a SOAP envelope's components (e.g., headers) is unspecified, and therefore may need to be negotiated out-of-band. **CORE NOT TESTABLE**
- **E0003 - Use of intermediaries** - SOAP Intermediaries is an underspecified mechanism in SOAP 1.2, and their use may require out-of-band negotiation. Their use may also necessitate careful consideration of where Profile conformance is measured. **CORE NOT TESTABLE**
- **E0004 - SOAP role values** - Values of the SOAP role attribute, other than the special uri 'http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/next', represent a private agreement between parties of the web service. **CORE TESTABLE** BP1904
- **E0005 - Fault details** - Faults may have Detail elements. The contents of these elements are not described in SOAP 1.2. HTTP TRANSPORT **TESTABLE** BP1905
- **E0024 - Namespace Attributes** - Namespace attributes on soap12:Envelope and soap12:Header elements HTTP TRANSPORT **TESTABLE**
- **E0025 - Attributes on soap12:Body elements** - Neither namespaced nor local attributes are constrained by SOAP 1.2. **CORE TESTABLE**

In SOAP Version 1.2 Part 2: Adjuncts (Second Edition) [SOAP12-2]:

- **E0026 - SOAP envelope in HTTP Response message to WSDL one-way operation** - The SOAP 1.2 Request Response Binding specification does not specify the purpose or processing of such envelopes. **HTTP TRANSPORT TESTABLE**

In RFC2616: Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1 [RFC2616]:

- **E0007 - HTTP Authentication** - HTTP authentication allows for extension schemes, arbitrary digest hash algorithms and parameters. **HTTP TRANSPORT TESTABLE**
- **E0008 - Unspecified Header Fields** - HTTP allows arbitrary headers to occur in messages. **HTTP TRANSPORT TESTABLE**
- **E0010 - Content-Encoding** - The set of content-codings allowed by HTTP is open-ended and any besides 'gzip', 'compress', or 'deflate' are an extensibility point. **HTTP TRANSPORT TESTABLE**
- **E0011 - Transfer-Encoding** - The set of transfer-encodings allowed by HTTP is open-ended. **HTTP TRANSPORT TESTABLE**
- **E0029 - Use of messages other than SOAP 1.2 or XOP messages** - Use of Messages other than a SIMPLE_SOAP_MESSAGE or a XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE is an extensibility point **CORE TESTABLE**

In WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding [WSAddrSoap] (except for sections 4, 5.1.1, 5.2.1 and 6.2):
- **E0027** - **Use of SOAP role attribute and WS-Addressing** - WS-Addressing allows multiple instances of headers such as wsa:To, wsa:ReplyTo, and wsa:FaultTo, so long as they are targeted to different SOAP roles. **CORE TESTABLE**

- **E0028** - **Endpoint references are extensible** - When extension attributes or elements appear as part of an endpoint reference, the processing model for such extensions is defined by the specification for those extensions. **CORE NOT TESTABLE**

In XML Schema Part 1: Structures [xmlSchema-1]:

- **E0017** - **Schema annotations** - XML Schema allows for annotations, which may be used to convey additional information about data structures. **CORE**

In Web Services Description Language (WSDL) 1.1 [WSDL1.1]:

- **E0013** - **WSDL extensions** - WSDL allows extension elements and attributes in certain places, including the use and specification of alternate protocol binding extensions; use of such extensions requires out-of-band negotiation. **CORE**

- **E0014** - **Validation mode** - whether the parser used to read WSDL and XML Schema documents performs DTD validation or not. **CORE**

- **E0015** - **Fetching of external resources** - whether the parser used to read WSDL and XML Schema documents fetches external entities and DTDs. **CORE**

- **E0016** - **Relative URIs** - WSDL does not adequately specify the use of relative URIs for the following: wsoap12:body/@namespace, wsoap12:address/@location, wsdl:import/@location, xsd:schema/@targetNamespace and xsd:import/@schemaLocation. Their use may require further coordination; see XML Base for more information. **CORE**

In RFC2246: The TLS Protocol Version 1.0 [RFC2246]:

- **E0019** - **TLS Cyphersuite** - TLS allows for the use of arbitrary encryption algorithms. **HTTP TRANSPORT**

- **E0020** - **TLS Extensions** - TLS allows for extensions during the handshake phase. **HTTP TRANSPORT**

In The SSL Protocol Version 3.0 [SSLV3]:

- **E0021** - **SSL Cyphersuite** - SSL allows for the use of arbitrary encryption algorithms. **HTTP TRANSPORT**

In RFC2459: Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and CRL Profile [RFC2459]:

- **E0022** - **Certificate Authority** - The choice of the Certificate Authority is a private agreement between parties. **HTTP TRANSPORT**

- **E0023** - **Certificate Extensions** - X509 allows for arbitrary certificate extensions. **HTTP TRANSPORT**
Appendix B. Schemas

A copy of the XML Schema (non-normative) for WS-Policy conformance claims is listed below for convenience:

```xml
<xs:schema targetNamespace='http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic-profile/2.0/'
    xmlns:xs='http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema'
    elementFormDefault='qualified'
    blockDefault='#all'>
  <xs:element name='Conformant'>
    <xs:complexType>
      <xs:sequence>
        <xs:any namespace='##other' processContents='lax' minOccurs='0'
           maxOccurs='unbounded'/>
      </xs:sequence>
      <xs:anyAttribute namespace='##other' processContents='lax' />
    </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```
Appendix C. Testing

C.1 Testability of Requirements

The testability of each Requirement is indicated as informational. It is a non-normative complement to this profile. It is represented by the following tags:

- **TESTABLE**: This means that the requirement could be tested, and that some test assertion(s) has been written for it.
- **TESTABLE_SCENARIO_DEPENDENT**: This means that a specific test scenario is needed in order to exercise the related test assertion, because the test assertion is designed to trigger only on specific input material. Producing this input material requires executing a scenario with specific data that is very unlikely to be produced by systems in production under normal operating conditions (e.g. material known to NEVER be recognizable by an endpoint.)
- **NOT_TESTED**: This is the case for most optional requirements (SHOULD, MAY), and for most Extensibility points as well as for requirements targeting UDDI. Some requirements may also require Schema awareness (ability to process schemas) from the Analyzer test tool. As this conflicted with the ability to use several freely available XSLT20 processors that are not Schema aware, such requirements have been marked “NOT_TESTED” unless this verification was done by tools prior to creating the test log file, which would then just contain some metadata indicating the results of these schema-related tests. A subsequent version may cover untested requirements. In this profile, the core requirements for assessing interoperability of implementations have been initially targeted
- **NOT_TESTABLE**: This means that these requirements cannot be tested based on the technology choices (black-box testing, XPath scripting)

C.2 Structure of Test Assertions

The test assertions are structured in XML, with some elements scripted using XPath2.0 and are automatically processable using the version 2.0 of the WS-I Analyzer tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion Part</th>
<th>What it means:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion ID (required)</td>
<td>A unique ID for the current test assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[markup: testAssertion/@id]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description (optional)</td>
<td>A plain text description of the current test assertion. At minimum expressing the TA predicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[markup: testAssertion/description ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (optional)</td>
<td>A plain text comment about the TA script and how well it covers the profile requirement. Explanation material for users, and developers (what could be improved, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[markup: testAssertion/comments ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target (required)</td>
<td>The artifacts to be tested, defined by an XPath expression that returns a list of XML nodes from the log file in input. For every artifact (node) selected by the Target expression, there will be a report entry for this TA in the test report, with a result of either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[markup: testAssertion/target ]</td>
<td>- passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotarget (optional)</td>
<td>Artifact that is related to the target, and that needs be accessed for the testing. Identified by an XPath expression that may refer to the related target node using the variable &quot;$target&quot;. For example, the target can be a SOAP message and the cotarget the WSDL file that describes this SOAP message. A cotarget must have a @name attribute that identifies it. The value of this attribute can be used as a variable (when prepending &quot;$&quot; to it) by subsequently defined cotargets, prerequisite and predicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite (optional)</td>
<td>The pre-condition for evaluating this Test Assertion on this target. If the prerequisite evaluates to &quot;false&quot; then the target does not qualify for this Test Assertion (the test report is &quot;notRelevant&quot;) The first part (preReq attribute) is an enumeration of Test Assertion IDs. Each one of the prerequisite TAs must either use the same target (e.g. SOAP Envelope, or WSDL binding, etc.) as this TA, or a target that is of a more general type than the main TA target. The target must &quot;pass&quot; each one of these prerequisite TAs in order to qualify for this TA. (e.g. the target of TA t1 can be a WSDL binding while the target of a TA t2 prerequisite of t1, can be the entire WSDL file). The second part (&quot;prerequisite&quot; element) is an XPath (boolean) expression of the same nature as the predicate. If present, it must evaluate to &quot;true&quot; for the target to qualify. If it fails, the result for the current TA in the report will be &quot;notRelevant&quot;. Otherwise, the target can be further evaluated by the predicate of the main TA. The expression may refer to the target explicitly using the variable name &quot;$target&quot;, or to any cotarget using its name as variable name ($[name]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate (required)</td>
<td>A logical expression that evaluates whether this target is fulfilling the profile requirement addressed by this test Assertion. By default: - A result of <strong>true</strong> means the requirement is fulfilled (reported as a &quot;passed&quot; in the test report). - A result of <strong>false</strong> means the requirement is violated (reported as a &quot;failed&quot; in the test report). However, in some cases and for testability reasons, the predicate may be designed as a partial indicator e.g. only...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicates some cases of fulfillment, or some cases of violation. As a result, when "true" indicates fulfillment it may be that "false" is unconclusive, or conversely "false" will indicate violation, but "true" is unconclusive. In such cases, the "Reporting" element specifies the meaning of the predicate result w/r to the profile requirement.

The predicate expression implicitly refers to the target (which is its "XPath context") although it may explicitly refer to it using the variable name "$target". It may refer to any cotarget using its name as variable name ("$[name]").

| Prescription (required) | Conveys the level of prescription associated with the profile requirement. At least three values may be used:
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| [markup: testAssertion/prescription/@level ] | • **mandatory**: maps to RFC2119 keywords MUST, MUST NOT, SHALL, SHALL NOT, REQUIRED (and sometimes MAY NOT)
| | • **preferred**: maps to RFC2119 keywords SHOULD, SHOULD NOT, RECOMMENDED, NOT RECOMMENDED
| | • **permitted**: maps to RFC2119 keywords MAY, OPTIONAL.

| Reporting (optional) | For each possible outcome of the predicate (true or false), specifies how it must be interpreted w/r to the profile feature. Two attributes are used that both must be present, when this element is present:
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [markup: testAssertion/reporting ] | • **@true attribute**: may take values among {passed, failed, warning, undetermined} (default is 'passed')
| | • **@false attribute**: may take values among {passed, failed, warning, undetermined} (default is 'failed')

The reported outcomes have the following meaning:

- **passed**: the target passes the test and can be considered as fulfilling the profile feature.
- **failed**: the target fails the test and can be considered as violating (or not exhibiting) the profile feature.
- **warning**: the test result is inconclusive. There is a possibility of profile requirement violation, that deserved further investigation.
- **undetermined**: the test result is inconclusive for this predicate value.

NOTES: the predicate of the TA may be worded in a negative way so that @false='passed' although that is not recommended. The result of a test should not be related to the prescription level, e.g. a "preferred" or "permitted" level should not imply that @false='warning'.

Other test results that are automatically generated and not
controlled by the "reporting" element are:

- **notRelevant**: the target failed the prerequisite condition and therefore does not qualify for further testing (i.e. the predicate expression is NOT evaluated on it).
- **missingInput**: a cotarget expression returned an empty node set.
- **notApplicable**: this target was not even selected by the target XPath expression, while being of the same general artifact type (e.g. message type).

### C.3 Test Log Conventions

The test assertions designed for this test suite are written to work over "test log" files that are assumed to follow some rules in their structure and content. These rules are more completely stated in the documentation associated with the log file description. Some of these rules are:

- Every message in the log must be uniquely identified: it must have a unique pair of values for:
  
  \{message/@conversation, message/@id\}, where @id is unique within each conversation.
  
  Typically, a conversation is used to identify an HTTP connection and the group of messages over this connection.

- A response message (for WSDL request-responses as well as RM lifecycle messages) always appears after the request message in the log file.

- A `wsa:RelatesTo` reference always refers to a message that has been logged before.

- A Fault message always appears after the message-in-error.

- An RM acknowledgement always appears after the messages it acknowledges.

- There should not be both a `doc-lit` and an `rpc-lit` bindings for the same portType.

- Imports must be resolved locally to the log file.
## Appendix D. Test Assertions

This is a non-normative complement to this profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The soap:Envelope contains other header blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>fn:true()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=warning, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>Extensibility Point WARNING: The soap12:Envelope makes use of extra SOAP headers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1904</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The soap12:Envelope contains @role with unspecified values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>every $rval in .//<em>/attribute::</em>:role satisfies ($rval = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/next">http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/next</a>' or $rval = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/none">http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope/role/none</a>')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>Extensibility Point WARNING: The soap12:Envelope contains @role with unspecified values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The soap12:Envelope contains a Fault with unspecified Detail content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>fn:true()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=warning, false=passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>Extensibility Point WARNING: The soap12:Fault makes use of optional Detail element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A receiver must not fault messages with envelopes that contain an XML Declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>$target/soap12:Header/ws:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply</a>' or not (@RelationshipType)] = $target/soap12:Header/ws:MessageID]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reporting:
- true=passed, false=warning

### Prescription:
- mandatory

### Error Message:
A soap Fault has been generated when receiving a message with an XML declaration: verify that this Fault has another cause - it must not be caused by the XML declaration.

### Diagnostic Data:
{SOAP message}

---

#### Test Assertion: BP1306

**Description:**
A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the presence of a UTF-8 Unicode Byte Order Mark. NOTE: This is a "scenario-dependent" test assertion, that will only trigger if the SOAP Header contains a header block of the form *:*R4006 or *:*R1019 (with any namespace prefix).

**Target:**

**Predicate:**

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=warning

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
A SOAP Fault has been generated when receiving a message with a UTF-8 Unicode Byte Order Mark. Please verify that this fault has another cause - it must not be caused by the presence of the B.O.M.

**Diagnostic Data:**
{SOAP message}

---

#### Test Assertion: BP1307

**Description:**
A RECEIVER MUST NOT fault due to the presence of a UTF-16 Unicode Byte Order Mark. NOTE: This is a "scenario-dependent" test assertion, that will only trigger if the SOAP Header contains a header block of the form *:*R4007 (with any namespace prefix).

**Target:**

**Predicate:**

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=warning

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
A soap Fault has been generated when receiving a message with a UTF-16 Unicode Byte Order Mark. Please verify that this Fault has another cause - it must not be caused by the presence of the B.O.M.

**Diagnostic Data:**
{SOAP message}

---

#### Test Assertion: BP1019

**Description:**
The soap12:Envelope in the message is a well-formed XML 1.0 document.

**Target:**
co-Target: metadata $target/../../wsil:messageContents[@validXml and @xmlVersion]

**Predicate:**
$target/../../wsil:messageContents[@validXml = fn:true() and @xmlVersion = '1.0']

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
The soap12:Envelope does not conform to XML 1.0.

**Diagnostic Data:**
{SOAP message}{any XML parser error messages}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The logged SOAP envelope is a UTF-8 transcript of an envelope originally encoded as UTF-8 or UTF-16. The HTTP Content-Type header's charset value is either UTF-8 or UTF-16. Looking at the messageContent element of the logged message, either (1) it has a BOM attribute which maps the charset value in the Content-Type header, or (2) it has it has an XML declaration which matches the charset value in the Content-Type header, or (3) there is no BOM attribute and no XML declaration, and the charset value is UTF-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>Either (1a) the message contains a Content-Type header but no charset value, or (1b) the charset value is neither UTF-8 nor UTF-16, or (2) there is a BOM attribute in the messageContent element, but its value does not match the charset value, or (3) there is an XML declaration, and the charset value does not match its value, or (4) there is no BOM attribute, no XML declaration, and the charset value in Content-Type header is not UTF-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>A XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE MUST include the start-info parameter in the Content-Type header of the enclosing multipart/related MIME entity body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'start-info' and @value != '']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE does not include the start-info parameter with proper @value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>A XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE SHOULD include the full value of the type parameter from the root entity body part inside the start-info parameter of the enclosing multipart/related MIME entity body part's Content-Type header.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>some $rootContentID in string(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'start-info']/@value) satisfies string(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'start-info']/@value) = string(wsil:messageAttachments/<em>:mimeHeaders/</em>:mimeHeader[ fn:lower-case(@key) = 'content-id' and @value = $rootContentID]/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'type']/@value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>The XOP_ENCODED_MESSAGE SHOULD include the full value of the type parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The envelope conforms to the structure specified in SOAP 1.2 Part 1, Section 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-Target:</td>
<td>$target/../@schemaValid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>$target/../@schemaValid = fn:true()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The envelope does not conform to the structure specified in SOAP 1.2 Part 1, Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The envelope must have exactly zero or one child elements of the soap12:Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>count(soap12:Body/*) le 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The envelope does not have exactly zero or one child elements of the soap12:Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Each child element (if any) of the soap12:Body element is namespace qualified (not the grandchildren).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:node-name(soap12:Body/*)) != &quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>A child element of the soap12:Body element is not namespace qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>DTDs relating to soap12:Header or soap12:Body documents, are not present in the envelope: no DOCTYPE element is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-Target:</td>
<td>$target/../@containsDTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>not(../@containsDTD = fn:true())</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The soap12:Header or soap12:Body elements in the envelope, were described with an included DTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion:</td>
<td>BP1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The SOAP envelope does not include XML processing instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-Target:</td>
<td>metadata $target/../@containsProcessingInstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>not(../@containsProcessingInstructions = fn:true())</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>a SOAP envelope contains XML processing instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The SOAP envelope does not contain the namespace declaration xmlns:xml=&quot;<a href="http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace">http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace</a>&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Test to see if the soap12:Envelope, soap12:Header, and soap12:Body elements have any attributes in either either the SOAP 1.1 or the SOAP 1.2 namespace. Although this tests for additional constraints beyond those in R1032 (namely attributes in the SOAP 1.1 namespace), it is felt that the existence of such attributes represent an error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The message has a soap12:Envelope, soap12:Header, or soap12:Body element with one or more attributes in either the &quot;<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/</a>&quot; or the &quot;<a href="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope">http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope</a>&quot; namespace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The value of the ws:a:Action element is <a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>normalize-space(string(/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)) eq '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/soap/fault</a>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion:</td>
<td>BP1040a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>If an endpoint requires use of WS-Addressing by use of a wsam:Addressing policy assertion, an ENVELOPE sent by a SENDER MUST carry all required WS-Addressing SOAP headers. NOTE: this TA is only verifying the presence of the wsa:Action header. The presence of other headers (once wsa:Action is present) is verified by the family of TAs BP1142x and BP1143x (related to R1142), which also contribute at testing R1040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>$target/soap12:Header/wsa:Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>The use of WS-Addressing was required, but the message did not include wsa:Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1040b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>This assertions tests one aspect of R1040; if an instance requires the use of WS-Addressing with anonymous response EPRs, any envelope sent by a sender must not contain response EPRs that include anything other than &quot;<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>&quot; as the value of their wsa:Address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>( not($target/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo) or ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo/wsa:Address = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>') ) and ( not($target/soap12:Header/wsa:FaultTo) or ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:FaultTo/wsa:Address = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>') )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>The service requires request messages to use response endpoint EPRs that contain the anonymous URI as the value of wsa:Address. The client sent a request with a response EPR that contained something other than the anonymous URI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1040c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>This assertions tests one aspect of R1040; if an instance requires the use of WS-Addressing with non-anonymous response EPRs, any envelope sent by a sender must not contain response EPRs that include &quot;<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>&quot; as the value of their wsa:Address. Note also that the absence of a ReplyTo header implies a default [reply endpoint] with wsa:Address equal to &quot;<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>( ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo) and not($target/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo/wsa:Address = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>') ) and ( not($target/soap12:Header/wsa:FaultTo) or ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:FaultTo/wsa:Address = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous</a>') )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Error Message:
The service requires request messages to use response endpoint EPRs that contain something other than the anonymous URI or without the ReplyTo header, which implies a default [reply endpoint] with the anonymous URI.

Diagnostic Data:
Complete message.

---

Test Assertion: BP1041

Description:
An ENVELOPE that is a MustUnderstand SOAP fault, sent from an endpoint that has a policy alternative containing the wsam:Addressing assertion attached to its WSDL endpoint subject, MUST NOT contain a NotUnderstood SOAP header block with the qname attribute value that identifies a WS-Addressing defined SOAP header block.

Target:

Predicate:

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

---

Error Message:
A MustUnderstand SOAP fault, sent from an endpoint that has a policy alternative containing the wsam:Addressing assertion attached to its WSDL endpoint subject, contains a NotUnderstood SOAP header block with the qname attribute value that identifies a WS-Addressing defined SOAP header block.

Diagnostic Data:
Complete message.

---

Test Assertion: BP1142a

Description:
The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a request message, with a ws:Action element, defined using an rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: If there is an EPR attached to the corresponding wsdl:port definition, then the ws:To element must be present - the ws:RelatesTo/@RelationshipType must be present with value "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply" (this is covered by 2nd cotarget presence) - The ws:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl - If the operation binding includes a wsdl:output element then there must be ws:messageID and a ws:ReplyTo elements present in the soap12:Header

Target:

Predicate:
(if ( /wsil:testLog/wsill:descriptionFiles/wsill:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding[[/soap12:Body[@style = 'rpc']]/wsdl:operation[@name = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body[@style='rpc'])[1])]]) then

( (if (somemessage_id in . satisfies ($message/sends/messagereference[@type = 'SOAPMessageReference']))) then

( (if (somemessage_id in . satisfies ($message/sends/messagereference[@type = 'SOAPMessageReference']))) then

) and (: correct ws:Action value :) (some $opmsg in

Predicate:

### Error Message:

An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a request message, with a `wsa:Action` element, defined using an rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: - If there is an EPR attached to the corresponding wsdl:port definition, then the `wsa:To` element must be present - The `wsa:Action` value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl - If the operation binding includes a `wsdl:output` element then there must be `wsa:messageID` and a `wsa:ReplyTo` elements present in the soap12:Header

### Diagnostic Data:

- Complete message.

### Test Assertion:

**BP1142b**

#### Description:

The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a response message with a `wsa:Action` element, defined using an rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the `wsa:ReplyTo` EPR in the related Request message must have the anonymous address - the `wsa:To` element, if present, must have the anonymous address - The `wsa:Action` value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl

#### Target:


#### Predicate:

- `(not($related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo) or ($related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo/soap12:Header/soap12:Header/wsa:Address='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous') ) and ( $target/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[ not ( @RelationshipType ) or (@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply') ] ) and ( $target/soap12:Header/soap12:Header[ not (wsa:To) or (wsa:To='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous') ] ) and (: correct wsa:Action value :) (some $opmsg in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:portType/soap12:operation[@name = @name ]/soap12:input satisfies ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:Action = ( if ($opmsg/@wsam:Action) then $opmsg/@wsam:Action else fn:concat($opmsg/../@targetNamespace, if (not(fn:ends-with($opmsg/../../../@targetNamespace,'/'))) then '/' else '', $opmsg/../../@name, '/', if($opmsg/@name) then $opmsg/@name else fn:concat($opmsg/../@name, 'Request' ) ) ) ) )

### Error Message:

An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a non-anonymous response message with a

### Diagnostic Data:

- Complete message.

### Test Assertion:

**BP1142c**

#### Description:

The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a non-anonymous response message with a
Target: myOpBinding

Description: Data:

Diagnostic Message:

Error Reporting:

Predicate:

Reporting:

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a non-anonymous response message with a wsA:Action element, defined using an rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsA:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsA:To element must be present, and must have a non-anonymous value - The wsA:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Test Assertion: BP1143a

Description: The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a request message, with a wsA:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - If there is an EPR attached to the corresponding wsdl:port definition, then the wsA:To element must be present - The wsA:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence) - If the operation binding includes a wsdl:output element then there must be wsa:messageID and a wsa:ReplyTo - If there is an EPR attached to the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsA:To element must be present, and must have a non-anonymous value - The wsA:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Test Assertion: BPP242a

Description: The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a request message, with a wsA:Action element, defined using an rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsA:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsA:To element must be present, and must have a non-anonymous value - The wsA:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a request message, with a ws:a:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - If there is an EPR attached to the corresponding wsil:port definition, then the wsa:To element must be present - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence) - If the operation binding includes a wsil:portEpr output element then there must be wsil:messageID and a wsil:ReplyTo elements present in the soap12:Header

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Test Assertion: BP1143b

Description: The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply IRI. For a response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsa:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have the anonymous address - the wsa:RelatesTo/@RelationshipType must be present with value "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply" (this is covered by 2nd cotarget presence) - the wsa:To element, if present, must have the anonymous value - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence)


co-Target: $myOpBinding

/descriptorFiles/wsdl:definition/wsdl:service/ wsdl:port[myOpBinding] 

co-Target: $related-Request

Predicate: ( not($Related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo/@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply') or ({$Related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:Address = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous' ) } and ( $myOpBinding/soap12:Header/wsa:To ) ) and ( if ( $myOpBinding/soap12:output ) then ( $target/soap12:Header/wsa:MessageID ) else fn:true() ) )

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsa:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have the anonymous address - the wsa:To element, if present, must have the anonymous value - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence)

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.
### Test Assertion: BP1143c

**Description:** The envelope must conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply IRI. For a non anon response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsa:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsa:RelatesTo/@RelationshipType must be present with value "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply" (this is covered by 2nd cotarget presence) - the wsa:To element, must be present and not anonymous - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence)

**Target:**

```xml
[soap12:Body/not (soap12:Fault) and soap12:Header [wsa:Action and (wsa:RelatesTo [@RelationshipType = "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply" or not (@RelationshipType))] ) ] [ some $myenv in . satisfies ( every $refP in $target/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo/wsa:ReferenceParameters/* satisfies some $header in $related ( $target/soap12:Body/*[1] ) ) ]
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
```

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a non anon response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsa:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsa:To element, must be present with a non-anonymous value - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence)

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.

---

### Test Assertion: BP1043a

**Description:** This assertion tests one aspect of R1143. It verifies that, if the ReplyTo EPR contains reference parameters, these reference parameters are properly echoed any response that claims to have originated from an instance that supports WS-Addressing.

**Target:**

```xml
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
(( $related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo and not ($related-Request/soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo/*[@Address = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous' ] ) ) and ($target/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [ not (@RelationshipType ) or (@RelationshipType = "http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply" ) ] ) and ($target/soap12:Header/*[@name = $dopmsg/../../../@name ] ) )
```

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** An envelope does not conform to WS-Addressing WSDL Binding, Section 5.1. For a non anon response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - the wsa:ReplyTo EPR in the related Request message must have a non-anonymous address - the wsa:To element, must be present with a non-anonymous value - The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the wsdl (this is covered by the cotarget presence)

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.
**Test Assertion:** BP1043b

**Description:** This assertion tests one aspect of R1143. It verifies that, if the FaultTo EPR contains reference parameters, these reference parameters are properly echoed in any fault response that claims to have originated from an instance that supports WS-Addressing.

**Target:**

```

```

**Predicate:**

```
(if ($related-Response/soap12:Header/soap12:Action) and ($related-Response/soap12:Body/soap12:Fault)

then every $refP in $target/soap12:Header/soap12:ReferenceParameters/* satisfies some $header in $related-

Response/soap12:Header/soap12:ReferenceParameters/* satisfies fn:resolve-QName(fn:name($refP), $refP) = $refP)

else fn:true())
```

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The fault response to a message that contained reference parameters in the FaultTo EPR is missing one or more of those reference parameters in its SOAP headers.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.

---

**Test Assertion:** BP1153a

**Description:** For a request message, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - If there is no EPR attached to the corresponding wsdl:port definition, then in case there is no ws:To element, the message should not be faulted.

```

soap12:Body soap12:Fault)
```

**Target:**

```

soap12:Body[not (soap12:Fault)] and soap12:Header[not (wsa:To)]]]
```

**Predicate:**

```
(if ($Target/soap12:Body/soap12:Action) and ($related-Response/soap12:Body/soap12:Fault)

then every $msg in $message/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message satisfies (not($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type)) and ($soapbinding


co-Target: $myOpBinding

```

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The response to a message that contained reference parameters in the ReplyTo EPR is missing one or more of those reference parameters in its SOAP headers.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.
Test Assertion: BP1153b

Description: For a request message, defined using a rpc/lit binding, the following must hold: - If there is no EPR attached to the corresponding wsdl:port definition, then in case there is no wsa:To element, the message should not be faulted.

Target:

```
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'request']
```

(error ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) and ($message/soap12:Body/*[1] or $message/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)
)

Predicate: 

```
if (error ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) and ($message/soap12:Body/*[1] or $message/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)
) then error ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) and ($message/soap12:Body/*[1] or $message/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)
else fn:true() )
```

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Error Message: An envelope for a rpc/lit bound request message, without wsa:To in a message bound to a port that is NOT extended with wsa:EndpointReference has generated a Fault in response. Verify that this fault is not caused by the absence of wsa:To.

Prescription: mandatory

Reporting: true=passed, false=warning

Test Assertion: BP1125a

Description: When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the input message of a WSDL doc/lit operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Request message.

Target:

```
```

Predicate: 

```
if (error ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) and ($message/soap12:Body/*[1] or $message/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)
) then error ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) and ($message/soap12:Body/*[1] or $message/soap12:Header/wsa:Action)
else fn:true() )
```

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.
When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the output message of a WSDL doc/lit operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Response message.

Target:

\[
\text{/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message/wsil:messageContents/}
\text{soap12:Envelope [soap12:Body[not (soap12:Fault)] and}
\text{not(soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType =}
\text{'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)]}) and ((some $repto in soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo satisfies fn:contains($repto, 'anonymous')) or not(soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo)) ] [ some $myenv in . satisfies (some $message in }
\text{//wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message satisfies ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type)) and ( some $port in}
\]

c-Target: myOpBinding

Predicate: $target/../../@type = 'request'

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope for a WSDL doc/lit bound request message, with a wsa:ReplyTo anonymous, was sent over an HTTP response.

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Test Assertion: BP1126a

Description: When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the output message of a WSDL doc/lit operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Response message.

Target:

\[
\text{not(soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType =}
\text{'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)]}) and (some $req in /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message satisfies $req/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:MessageID = $respenv/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply']
\]
\]

c-Target: myOpBinding

Predicate: $target/../../@type = 'request'

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope for a WSDL doc/lit bound request message, with a wsa:ReplyTo anonymous, was sent over an HTTP response.

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.

Test Assertion: BP1125b

Description: When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the input message of a WSDL rpc/lit operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Request message.

Target:

\[
\text{/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message/wsil:messageContents/}
\text{soap12:Envelope [soap12:Body[not (soap12:Fault)] and}
\text{not(soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType =}
\text{'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)]]) and ((some $repto in soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo satisfies fn:contains($repto, 'anonymous')) or not(soap12:Header/wsa:ReplyTo)) ] [ some $myenv in . satisfies (some $message in}
\text{//wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message satisfies ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type)) and ( some $port in}
\]

c-Target: myOpBinding

Predicate: $target/../../@type = 'request'

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: An envelope for a WSDL doc/lit bound request message, with a wsa:ReplyTo anonymous, was sent over an HTTP response.

Diagnostic Data: Complete message.
or not (@RelationshipType) and

co-Target: myOpBinding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP1126b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a CONSUMER is non-addressable, a SOAP ENVELOPE, that is described by the output message of a WSDL rpc-lit operation supported by an INSTANCE, MUST be bound to a HTTP Response message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

co-Target: myOpBinding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP1144</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The message must specify an action HTTP header with either a value that is an absolute URI that has the same value as the value of the ws:a:Action SOAP header, or a value of &quot;&quot; (empty string).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[wsa:Action/text() = 'action']/@value) or
### Test Assertion: **BP1002**

**Description:**
If it is a request, the arg #2 of POST is `<HTTP/1.1>` or `<HTTP/1.0>`. If absent, first line of the body is: HTTP-Version = HTTP/1.1. (or HTTP/1.0). If it is a response, it starts with `<HTTP/1.1>` or `<HTTP/1.0>`.

**Target:**

**Predicate:**
fn:contains(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine/text(), 'HTTP/1.0') or fn:contains(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine/text(), 'HTTP/1.1')

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
The message that is sent over HTTP, is not sent using HTTP/1.1 or HTTP/1.0.

**Diagnostic Data:**
All HTTP headers.

---

### Test Assertion: **BP1001**

**Description:**
If it is a request, the arg #2 of POST is `<HTTP/1.1>`. If absent, first line of the body is: HTTP-Version = HTTP/1.1. If it is a response, it starts with `<HTTP/1.1>`.

**Target:**
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message

**Prerequisite:**
BP1002

**Predicate:**
contains(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine/text(), 'HTTP/1.1')

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=warning

**Prescription:**
preferred

**Error Message:**
The message is not sent using HTTP/1.1.

**Diagnostic Data:**
All HTTP headers.

---

### Test Assertion: **BP1006**

**Description:**
The action header contains a quoted string of any value, including "".

**Target:**
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'request'][wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader]

**Prerequisite:**
BP1761

**Predicate:**
every $par in wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter satisfies not($par/@quoted) or not(fn:lower-case($par/@key) eq 'type' or fn:lower-case($par/@key) eq 'start-info' or fn:lower-case($par/@key) eq 'action' or fn:lower-case($par/@key) eq 'boundary') or $par/@quoted = fn:true()

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
action HTTP header does not contain a quoted string.

**Diagnostic Data:**
All HTTP headers.

---

### Test Assertion: **BP1100**

**Description:**
The message uses a "200 OK" HTTP status code.

**Target:**

**Predicate:**
contains(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine/text(), "200")

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescription:</th>
<th>preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The envelope of the response message does not contain a soap12:Fault and the message does not use a &quot;200 OK&quot; HTTP status code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Assertion:** BP1101  
**Description:** The response message, if successfully processed at HTTP level, is sent using either a "200 OK" or "202 Accepted" HTTP status code.  
**Target:** 
\[
/\text{wsil:message[@type='response'][\text{wsil:messageContents[not(soap12:Envelope)]][not(matches(\text{wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine, "4[0-9][0-9]"})]}}
\]  
**Predicate:** contains(\text{wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine, "200"}) or contains(\text{wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:requestLine, "202 Accepted"})  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** preferred  
**Error Message:** A response message without a SOAP message, is not using either a "200 OK" or "202 Accepted" HTTP status code, though successful at HTTP level.  
**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.  

**Test Assertion:** BP1150  
**Description:** The message must be a response sent in the entity body of the HTTP Response using the same HTTP connection as the request message of that operation.  
**Target:** 
\[
/\text{wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@contains(., 'MustUnderstand') or contains(., 'VersionMismatch')]}\]  
**Predicate:** \text{wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Body/soap12:Fault/soap12:Code/soap12:Value[contains(., 'MustUnderstand') or contains(., 'VersionMismatch')]}  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** mandatory  
**Error Message:** A response message was not sent in the entity body of the HTTP Response using the same HTTP connection as the request message of that operation.  
**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.  

**Test Assertion:** BP1151  
**Description:** The message must be sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection specified by the response EPR using the SOAP 1.1 Request Optional Response HTTP binding.  
**Target:** 
\[
**Predicate:** \text{$\text{myRequestMsg}[1]/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/ws:a:MessageID = $\text{target}/soap12:Header/ws:a:MessageID = \text{http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)]]] \]  
**Prerequisite:** \text{$\text{myRequestMsg}[1]/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/ws:a:ReplyTo and not(ws:a:ReplyTo/ws:a:Address = \text{http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous}' \] \]  
**Predicate:** \text{$\text{myRequestMsg}[1]/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[ (ws:a:To) and not (ws:a:To = \text{http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous}' \] \]  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed
Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A message was not sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection specified by the response EPR using the SOAP 1.1 Request Optional Response HTTP binding.

Diagnostic Data: Complete message

Test Assertion: BP1146

Description: A non-faulting response must be sent to the endpoint referred to by the wsa:ReplyTo header or generate a fault instead.


Predicate: ($target/@type = 'request') and (not($target/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:To) or not(fn:contains($target/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:To[1], 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')))

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A response message was sent to a destination other than the expected endpoint, i.e. different from wsa:ReplyTo in the request message.

Diagnostic Data: Complete message

Test Assertion: BP1152a

Description: The message must be sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection specified by the response EPR using the SOAP 1.1 Request Optional Response HTTP binding.


co-Target: myRequestMsg

Predicate: ($target/@type = 'request') and ($target/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[wsa:To] and not(fn:contains($target/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[wsa:To][1], 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')))}


### Test Assertion: BP1152b

**Description:** The message must be sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection specified by the response EPR using the SOAP 1.1 Request Optional Response HTTP binding.

**Target:**

```xml
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message
[wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)] and
wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Body[soap12:Fault] and
wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[not(wsa:Action) or not(fn:startsWith(wsa:Action, http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/))] and (some $req in
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message satisfies
$req/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:MessageID = wsi:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)] and
$req/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
($target/@type = 'request') and ( $target/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header [ (wsa:To) and not (fn:contains(wsa:To[1], 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')) ] )
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** mandatory  
**Error Message:** A response message was not sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection as required by the (non-anonymous) response EPR.  
**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message

### Test Assertion: BP1152c

**Description:** The message must be sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection specified by the response EPR using the SOAP 1.1 Request Optional Response HTTP binding.

**Target:**

```xml
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message
[wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)] and
wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Body[soap12:Fault] and
wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header[not(wsa:Action) or not(fn:startsWith(wsa:Action, http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/))] and (some $req in
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message satisfies
$req/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:MessageID = wsi:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
[wsa:RelatesTo[@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)] and
$req/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
($target/@type = 'request') and ( $target/wsilk:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header [ (wsa:To) and not (fn:contains(wsa:To[1], 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')) ] )
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** mandatory  
**Error Message:** A response message was not sent in the entity body of an HTTP request in a separate HTTP connection as required by the (non-anonymous) response EPR.  
**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message

### Test Assertion: BP2703

**Description:** The wsdl:definitions is a well-formed XML 1.0 document. The wsdl:definitions namespace has value: http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target:</th>
<th><code>/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile[fn:prefix-from-QName(fn:node-name(&quot;.*:definitions&quot;)) eq 'wsdl' or wsdl:definitions]</code></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:node-name(&quot;.<em>:definitions&quot;)) eq &quot;<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/</a>&quot; or ./</em>:bindingTemplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The wsdl:definitions is not a well-formed XML 1.0 document, or WSDL definition does not conform to the schema located at <a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/2003-02-11.xsd">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/2003-02-11.xsd</a> for some element using the WSDL-SOAP binding namespace, or does not conform to the schema located at <a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/2003-02-11.xsd">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/2003-02-11.xsd</a> for some element using the WSDL namespace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Error message from the XML parser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Assertion:** BP2756  
**Description:** A DESCRIPTION MUST NOT include the wsoap12:soapActionRequired attribute  
**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions`  
**Predicate:** not (.//wsoap12:operation/@soapActionRequired)  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** mandatory  
**Error Message:** A DESCRIPTION include the wsoap12:soapActionRequired attribute  
**Diagnostic Data:** 

**Test Assertion:** BP1761  
**Description:** A SOAP1.2 SENDER SHOULD NOT include the SOAPAction HTTP header  
**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[wsil:httpHeaders]`  
**Predicate:** not(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:httpHeader[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'soapaction'])  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed  
**Prescription:** preferred  
**Error Message:** A SOAP1.2 SENDER has included the SOAPAction HTTP header (instead of using the 'action' header)  
**Diagnostic Data:** 

**Test Assertion:** BP1757  
**Description:** A receiver must not fault messages that do not have the action parameter on the Content-Type HTTP header field.  
**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[not(wsil:httpHeaders/wsil:contentTypeHeader/wsil:parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'action']])`  
**Prerequisite:** BP1761  
**Predicate:** not (/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'response' and @conversation = $target/../../@conversation] or (./*:Envelope/*:Body/soap12:Fault))  
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=warning  
**Prescription:** mandatory  
**Error Message:** A soap Fault has been generated when receiving a message with no action parameter on the Content-Type HTTP header field: verify that this Fault has another cause - it must not be caused by this parameter absence.  
**Diagnostic Data:** {SOAP message}  

**Test Assertion:** BP2704  
**Description:** The wsdl:definitions using the WSDL SOAP binding namespace (prefixed "wsoap12" in this Profile) MUST be valid according to the XML Schema found at "http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap12/wsdll11soap12.xsd ".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Prescription</th>
<th>Error Message</th>
<th>Diagnostic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP2101</strong></td>
<td>Each wsdl:import statement is only used to import another WSDL description.</td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsdl:descriptionFiles/wsdl:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions[wsdl:import]</td>
<td></td>
<td>every $wsdlImp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies some $wsdlFile in /wsil:testLog/wsdl:descriptionFiles/wsdl:descriptionFile[@filename=$wsdlImp/@location] satisfies ( (fn:namespace-uri($wsdlFile/<em>[1]) = '<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/</a>' ) and ( fn:local-name($wsdlFile/</em>[1]) = 'definitions' ) )</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
<td>The wsdl:definitions is using the WSDL SOAP binding namespace (prefixed &quot;wsoap12&quot; in this Profile) in a way that is not valid according to the XML Schema found at &quot;<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap12/wsdl11soap12.xsd">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap12/wsdl11soap12.xsd</a>&quot;.</td>
<td>Error message from the XML parser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP2803</strong></td>
<td>The &quot;namespace&quot; attribute's value is not a relative URI.</td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsdl:descriptionFiles/wsdl:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions[wsdl:import]</td>
<td>BP2703</td>
<td>every $imp in $target/wsdl:import[@namespace] satisfies (starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;http://&quot;) or starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;HTTP://&quot;) or starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;urn:&quot;)) or starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;URN:&quot;)) or starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;ft&quot;) or starts-with($imp/@namespace, &quot;FT&quot;)</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
<td>A wsdl:import element does not contain a reference to another WSDL description.</td>
<td>Defective wsdl:import element(s) that does not reference a WSDL description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BP2103</strong></td>
<td>For the referenced definitions as well as all imported descriptions, The XML schema import statement is only used within an xsd:schema element.</td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsdl:descriptionFiles/wsdl:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions[descendant::xsd:import]</td>
<td>BP2202</td>
<td>every $imp in descendant::xsd:import satisfies ($imp/ancestor::xsd:schema and $imp/ancestor::wsdl:types)</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
<td>A XML schema import element was found outside of an xsd:schema element.</td>
<td>Defective XML schema import element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion:</td>
<td>BP2098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The &quot;location&quot; attribute is specified for the wsdl:import element, and has a non-empty value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>@location and @location != &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>A wsdl:import element does not have a &quot;location&quot; attribute, or has an empty value for the location attribute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Defective wsdl:import element.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>wsdl:import elements occur either as first children elements in the WSDL namespace of the wsdl:definitions element, or they are only preceded by wsdl:documentation elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>not(wsdl:import/preceding-sibling::wsdl:*[(local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'documentation') and (local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'import')] and (local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'types'))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>A wsdl:import element in the WSDL namespace under the wsdl:definitions element, is preceded by child elements other than wsdl:documentation or wsdl:import elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Display the WSDL import element(s) that failed the assertion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The wsdl:types elements occur either as first children in the WSDL namespace of the wsdl:definitions element, or they are only preceded by wsdl:documentation element(s) and/or wsdl:import(s) element(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
<td>BP2703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>not(wsdl:types/preceding-sibling::wsdl:*[(local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'documentation') and (local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'import') and (local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) != 'types')])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>wsdl:types element(s) in the WSDL namespace of the wsdl:definitions element were preceded by child elements other than wsdl:documentation or wsdl:import elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Assertion: **BP2700**

**Description:** The `wsdl:definitions` is a well-formed XML 1.0 document.

**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions`

**co-Target:** $target/@validXml

**Predicate:** $target/@validXml=fn:true()

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The `wsdl:definitions` is not a well-formed XML 1.0 document.

**Diagnostic Data:** Error message from the XML parser

---

Test Assertion: **BP2034**

**Description:** The candidate description does not contain the namespace declaration `xmlns:xml="http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace"`.

**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions`

**Prerequisite:** BP2703

**Predicate:** not(descendant-or-self::*[namespace::node()[1] = 'xmlns:xml="http://www.w3.org/XML/1998/namespace"'])

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** preferred


**Diagnostic Data:**

---

Test Assertion: **BP2201**

**Description:** The XML declaration statement uses UTF-8 or UTF-16 for the encoding.

**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions`

**co-Target:** $target/@encoding

**Predicate:** fn:starts-with(fn:lower-case($target/@encoding), 'utf-8') or fn:starts-with(fn:lower-case($target/@encoding), 'utf-16')

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** XML declaration statement within WSDL document does not use expected encoding (UTF-8 or UTF-16).

**Diagnostic Data:** XML declaration statement.

---

Test Assertion: **BP2104**

**Description:** The `targetNamespace` attribute on the `wsdl:definitions` element for the imported WSDL description has the same value as the namespace attribute on the `wsdl:import` element that imported the WSDL description.

**Target:** `/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:import`

**Prerequisite:** BP2101

**Predicate:** some $wimp in . satisfies some $descFile in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile[fn:ends-with($wimp/@location, @filename)] satisfies ($descFile/wsdl:definitions/@targetNamespace = $wimp/@namespace)

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The `targetNamespace` attribute on the `wsdl:definitions` element for an imported WSDL description does not have the same value as the namespace attribute on the `wsdl:import` element that imported the WSDL description.

**Diagnostic Data:** `wsdl:import` element.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Contained WSDL extension elements do not use the wsdl:required attribute value of &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdil:definitions/descendant::* [namespace-uri(.) != &quot;<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/</a>&quot; and not(namespace-uri(.) = &quot;<a href="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/">http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/soap/</a>&quot; and (local-name(.) = &quot;operation&quot; or local-name(.) = &quot;body&quot; or local-name(.) = &quot;header&quot; or local-name(.) = &quot;headerfault&quot; or local-name(.) = &quot;fault&quot; or local-name(.) = &quot;address&quot;) and (/ancestor::wsil:portType or /ancestor::wsil:binding or /ancestor::wsil:message or /ancestor::wsil:types or /ancestor::wsil:import)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>not(@wsil:required = fn:true())</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>An extension element within a WSDL element that claims conformance to the Basic Profile has a ws:required attribute with a value of &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td>Display the extension element that failed the assertion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2416</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>A DESCRIPTION MUST NOT use QName references to WSDL components in namespaces that have been neither imported, nor defined in the referring WSDL document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdil:definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>(every $qref in $target/wsdl:service/wsdl:port/@binding satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:binding/@type satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation/wsdl:input/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation/wsdl:input/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation/wsdl:output/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation/wsdl:output/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:operation/wsdl:*wssoap12:header/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:operation/wsdl:*wssoap12:headerfault/@message satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $wimp in $target/wsdl:import satisfies $wimp/@namespace = $ns ) ))))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>This DESCRIPTION uses QName references to WSDL components in namespaces that are neither imported, nor defined in the referring WSDL document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td>Defective QName(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>A QName reference to a Schema component in a DESCRIPTION MUST use the namespace defined in the targetNamespace attribute on the xsd:schema element, or to a namespace defined in the namespace attribute on an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xsd:import element within the xsd:schema element.


Predicate: every $qref in $target/wsdl:message/wsdl:part/@element satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/wsdl:types/xsd:schema/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $simp in $target/wsdl:types/xsd:schema/xsd:import satisfies $simp/@namespace = $ns )) ) and (every $qref in $target/wsdl:message/wsdl:part/@type satisfies ( some $ns in fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($qref),$qref/..)) satisfies ( ($target/@targetNamespace = $ns ) or (some $simp in $target/wsdl:types/xsd:schema/xsd:import satisfies $simp/@namespace = $ns ) or ($ns = 'http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema')) ))

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A QName reference to a Schema component in a DESCRIPTION does not use the namespace defined in the targetNamespace attribute on the xsd:schema element, or a namespace defined in the namespace attribute on an xsd:import element within the xsd:schema element.

Diagnostic Data: Defective QName(s).

Test Assertion: BP2106

Description: In a DESCRIPTION the schemaLocation attribute of an xsd:import element MUST NOT resolve to any document whose root element is not "schema" from the namespace "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema".


Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: xsd:import element does not resolve to document whose root element is not "schema" from xsd namespace

Diagnostic Data: Defective XML schema import element.

Test Assertion: BP2107

Description: The xsd:schema element contains a targetNamespace attribute with a valid and non-null value unless the xsd:schema element has xsd:import and/or xsd:annotation as its only child element(s).


Predicate: wsdl:types/xsd:schema[@targetNamespace != '' or (count(xsd:import) + count(xsd:annotation)) = count(child::*)]

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A xsd:schema element contained in a wsdl:types element does not have a targetNamespace attribute with a valid and non-null value, while having child element(s) other than xsd:import or xsd:annotation.

Diagnostic Data: Defective xsd:schema element(s).

Test Assertion: BP2108b

Description: The type soapenc:Array does not appear in these declarations, and the wsdl:arrayType attribute is not used in the type declaration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>not (xsd:schema[descendant::xsd:extension/@base = &quot;soapenc:Array&quot; or descendant::xsd:restriction/@base = &quot;soapenc:Array&quot;])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>An Array declaration uses - restricts or extends - the soapenc:Array type, or the wsdl:arrayType attribute is used in the type declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Defective declaration(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Assertion: BP2108a**

**Description:** The type soapenc:Array does not appear in these declarations, and the wsdl:arrayType attribute is not used in the type declaration.

**Target:** /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:types[xsd:schema]

**Predicate:** not (xsd:schema[descendant::xsd:element[@name = preceding-sibling::element/@name]])

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** A declaration is using the convention ArrayOfXXX.

**Diagnostic Data:** Defective declaration(s).  

**Test Assertion: BP2110**

**Description:** The declaration does not use the naming convention ArrayOfXXX.

**Target:** /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:types/xsd:schema

**Predicate:** not (xsd:schema[descendant::xsd:element[@name, 'ArrayOf'])

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** preferred

**Error Message:** A declaration is using the convention ArrayOfXXX.

**Diagnostic Data:** Defective declaration(s).  

**Test Assertion: BP1204**

**Description:** The soap12:Body of the envelope does not contain the soapenc:arrayType attribute.

**Target:** //soap12:Envelope

**Predicate:** not (descendant::*[@soapenc:arrayType])

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The soap12:Body of an envelope contains the soapenc:arrayType attribute.

**Diagnostic Data:** SOAP envelope.  

**Test Assertion: BP2124**

**Description:** No two global element declarations share the same qualified name.

**Target:** /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:types/xsd:schema

**Predicate:** count (xsd:element[@name = preceding-sibling::element/@name]) = 0

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** preferred
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>No two type definitions share the same qualified name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>(count (xsd:ComplexType[@name = preceding-sibling::ComplexType/@name]) = 0) and (count (xsd:SimpleType[@name = preceding-sibling::SimpleType/@name]) = 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Error Message | Two or more type definitions share the same qualified name. |
| Diagnostic Data | The elements containing the repeated qualified name. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>If the &quot;parts&quot; attribute is present, then the wsoap12:body element(s) have at most one part listed in the parts attribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>BP2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>not(.//wsoap12:body[@parts and contains(@parts,&quot; &quot;]])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Error Message | One or more wsoap12:body element(s) in a document-literal soabinding does not have at most one part listed in the parts attribute. |
| Diagnostic Data | Defective wsoap12:body element(s). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>If it does not specify the parts attribute on a wsoap12:body element, the corresponding abstract wsdl:message defines zero or one wsdl:part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>BP2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Error Message | A document-literal binding which does not specify the parts attribute, has more than one wsdl:part in the associated wsdl:message element. |
| Diagnostic Data | Defective wsdl:binding element. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The binding (in wsoap12:body elements) only refers to part elements that have been defined using the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"type" attribute


Prerequisite: BP2017

Predicate: every $sbody in wsdl:operation//wssoap12:body satisfies some $msgname in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation[@name = $sbody/@name]/*/[@name | local-name(.) = local-name($sbody/..)]/@message satisfies every $mpart in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message[@name = $msgname]/wsil:part satisfies $mpart/@type or $sbody/@parts and not(contains($sbody/@parts, $mpart/@name))

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: soabinding (in wsoap12:body elements) refers to part(s) that do not have the "type" attribute.

Diagnostic Data: {binding}[message with failed part]

Test Assertion: BP2012

Description: A doc/wsoap12:body/@use = 'literal') and (count($myOpBinding/@use) = count($myOpBinding/@use)) and not($myOpBinding/@style = 'rpc') and $myOpBinding/wsdl:output/wssoap12:body/@parts and (@parts = " or @parts = " " )ument-literal binding only refers in wsoap12:body elements to part elements that have been defined using the "element" attribute.


Prerequisite: BP2017


Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: The binding (in wsoap12:body elements) refers to part(s) of a soap12:Body element that do not have the "element" attribute.

Diagnostic Data: wsoap12:body element(s) that have non "element" parts attributes.

Test Assertion: BP1212a

Description: The Envelope of request message contains exactly one part accessor element for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.


c-co-Target: myOpBinding


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1212b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The Envelope of response message contains exactly one part accessor element for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>$wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'response' or @RelationshipType = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply</a>']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>$wsil:messageContents soap12:Body/* and not (soap12:Body soap12:Fault)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=_passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The content of the soap12:Body element of request message is inconsistent with its description. The envelope does not contain exactly one part accessor element for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1213a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The request message envelope has no element content in the soap12:Body element if the value of the parts attribute of the wsoap12:body is an empty string in the corresponding doc-literal description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>$wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'request' or @RelationshipType = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply</a>']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=Passed, false=Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The content of the soap12:Body element of response message is inconsistent with its description. The envelope does not contain exactly one part accessor element for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1213b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The response message envelope has no element content in the soap12:Body element if the value of the parts attribute of the soap12:body is an empty string in the corresponding doc-literal description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The response message soap12:Body element must be empty when, in the corresponding doc-literal description, the value of the parts attribute of soap12:body is an empty string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP1214a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The request message envelope does not contain any part accessor elements if the value of the parts attribute of the soap12:body is an empty string in the corresponding rpc-literal description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The response message soap12:Body element must be empty when, in the corresponding doc-literal description, the value of the parts attribute of soap12:body is an empty string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion</td>
<td>BP1214b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The response message envelope does not contain any part accessor elements if the value of the parts attribute of the wsoap12:body is an empty string in the corresponding rpc-literal description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The content of the response message soap12:Body element is inconsistent with its description. The envelope must not have any part accessor elements when, in the corresponding rpc-literal description, the value of the parts attribute of wsoap12:body is an empty string.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>SOAP envelope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Every <code>wsdl:part</code> from each <code>wsdl:message</code> in the associated <code>wsdl:portType</code> is referenced either by the <code>wsoap12:body</code>, <code>wsoap12:header</code>, <code>wsoap12:fault</code>, or <code>wsoap12:headerfault</code>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>A <code>wsdl:binding</code> does not bind every <code>wsdl:part</code> of a <code>wsdl:message</code> in the <code>wsdl:portType</code> to which it refers to one of <code>wsoap12:body</code>, <code>wsoap12:header</code>, <code>wsoap12:fault</code> or <code>wsoap12:headerfault</code>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>(Defective <code>wsdl:binding</code> element) [message with part(s) unbound]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>An &quot;element&quot; attribute on any <code>wsdl:part</code> element refers to a global element declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>every $part in wsdl:part[@element] satisfies some $ged in /xsd:schema/xsd:element satisfies ( ( $ged/../@targetNamespace = namespace-uri-from-QName( resolve-QName(xsd:string($part/@element),$part)) or (not ($ged/../@targetNamespace) and not (namespace-uri-from-QName( resolve-QName(xsd:string($part/@element),$part)) ) ) and local-name-from-QName(resolve-QName(xsd:string($part/@element),$part)) = $ged/@name) ) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BasicProfile-v2.0-csprd02  Standards Track Work Product  Copyright © OASIS Open 2014. All Rights Reserved.  27 April 2014  Page 109 of 132
### Test Assertion: BP1012a

**Description:**
The content of the request message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document for rpc12:Body binding. The order of the part elements in the soap12:Body of the wired message, is same as that of the wsdl:partS, in the wsdl:message that describes it for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.

**Target:**
`/wsil:messageLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type='request'] and not ( ./wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply ) ] ) ]`

**Predicate:**

**Error Message:**
A wsdl:message element containing a wsdl:part element that uses the "element" attribute does not refer, via that attribute, to a global element declaration.

**Diagnostic Data:**
Defective wsdl:message element.

---

### Test Assertion: BP1012b

**Description:**
The content of the response message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document for rpc12:Body binding. The order of the part elements in the soap12:Body of the wired message, is same as that of the wsdl:partS, in the wsdl:message that describes it for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.

**Target:**
`/wsil:messageLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type='response'] or ./wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply ) ] ]`

**Predicate:**

**Error Message:**
The content of the request message envelope does not match the wsdl:message definition for rpc12:Body binding. The order of parts in soap12:Body does not match the order of wsdl:partS in wsdl:message that describes it for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.

**Diagnostic Data:**
Non-matching WSDL operation and envelope.
fn:tokenize(xsd:string($dopmsg/@message), ',' )[fn:last()] and wsdl:part/@type] satisfies every $tst in ( for $i in 1 to fn:count($mbody/*) return //wsdl:message/wsl:part[not($dbody/@parts and not(fn:contains($dbody/@parts,@name)))][i]/@name = fn:local-name($mbody/*)[i] ) satisfies $tst = fn:true()  

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed  
Prescription: mandatory  

Error Message: The content of the response message envelope does not match the wsdl:message definition for rpc/lit binding. The order of parts in soap12:Body does not match the order of wsdl:parts in wsdl:message that describes it for each of the wsdl:part elements bound to the envelope's corresponding wsoap12:body element.  
Diagnostic Data: Non-matching WSDL operation and envelope.  

Test Assertion: **BP2208**  
Description: The wsdl:operation element is either a WSDL request/response or a one-way operation (no Notification or Solicit-Response).  
Prerequisite: BP2703  
Predicate: not([local-name-from-QName(node-name(.)) = 'output' and position() = 1])  
Reporting: true=passed, false=failed  
Prescription: mandatory  
Error Message: wsdl:operation was not a request/response or one-way operation.  
Diagnostic Data: Operation.  

Test Assertion: **BP2010**  
Description: name attributes of Operations are unique in the wsdl:portType definition  
Prerequisite: BP2703  
Predicate: not(wsdl:operation[@name = preceding-sibling::*/@name]) and not(wsdl:operation[@name = following-sibling::*/@name])  
Reporting: true=passed, false=failed  
Prescription: mandatory  
Error Message: name attributes are not unique within the portType definition.  
Diagnostic Data: list of duplicate name(s) and of elements that use them.  

Test Assertion: **BP2014**  
Description: The parameterOrder attribute omits at most 1 part from an output wsdl:message.  
Target: /wsil:testLog/wsi:definitionFiles/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:portType/wsdl:operation[@parameterOrder]  
Reporting: true=passed, false=failed  
Prescription: mandatory  
Error Message: An operation associated with an rpc-literal binding has a parameterOrder attribute that omits more than 1 part.  
Diagnostic Data: {defective portType}[output wsdl:message]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The <code>wsdl:message</code> element does not contain part elements that use both &quot;type&quot; and &quot;element&quot; attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td><code>not(wsdl:part[@type and @element])</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td><code>true=passed, false=failed</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td><code>mandatory</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>A <code>wsdl:message</code> element has at least one <code>wsdl:part</code> element that contains both type and element attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Defective <code>wsdl:message</code> element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2402</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The <code>wsdl:binding</code> element has a <code>wsoap12:binding</code> child element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
<td>BP2703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td><code>child::wsoap12:binding</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td><code>true=passed, false=failed</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td><code>mandatory</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The <code>wsdl:binding</code> element does not use a <code>wsoap12:binding</code> element as defined in section &quot;3 SOAP Binding:&quot; of the WSDL 1.1 specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td><code>wsdl:binding</code>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2403</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The contained <code>soabinding</code> element has a &quot;transport&quot; attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
<td>BP2703 BP2402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td><code>wsoap12:binding[@transport]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td><code>true=passed, false=failed</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td><code>mandatory</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>Transport attribute of the <code>soabinding</code> does not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td><code>soabinding</code> element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2404</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The contained <code>soabinding</code> element has a &quot;transport&quot; attribute, which has value: <code>http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/http</code>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
<td>BP2703 BP2402 BP2403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td><code>wsoap12:binding[@transport='http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/http']</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td><code>true=passed, false=failed</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td><code>mandatory</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td><code>soabinding</code> element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion:</th>
<th>BP2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assertion:
The wsdl:binding is either an rpc-literal binding or a document-literal binding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Prerequisite:
BP2404

### Predicate:
not(/wssoap12:body/@use != 'literal') and (count(/wssoap12:body) = count(/wssoap12:body/@use)) and (not(/wssoap12:body/@style != 'rpc') and not(/wssoap12:operation[not(@style) and not(/wssoap12:binding/@style)]) or (not(/wssoap12:body/@style != 'document')))

### Reporting:
true=passed, false=failed

### Prescription:
mandatory

### Error Message:
The "style" attribute of an operation in soabinding, does not have the same value of "document" or "rpc", as other operations of the binding.

### Diagnostic Data:
defective soabinding element.

### Test Assertion:
BP2406

### Description:
The use attribute has a value of "literal".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Prerequisite:
BP2703

### Predicate:
not(/[@use and @use != "literal"])

### Reporting:
true=passed, false=failed

### Prescription:
mandatory

### Error Message:
The use attribute of a wssoap12:body, wssoap12:fault, wssoap12:header and wssoap12:headerfault does not have value of "literal".

### Diagnostic Data:

### Test Assertion:
BP2705

### Description:
The wsdl:definitions in namespace http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/wsdl/ is valid in accordance with the wsi version of the wsdl 1.1 schema at http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic/1.1/wsdl-2004-08-24.xsd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### co-Target:
metadata

### Predicate:
$target/@schemaValid = fn:true()

### Reporting:
true=passed, false=failed

### Prescription:
mandatory

### Error Message:
The description file contains a WSDL definition which does not conform to the schema located at http://ws-i.org/profiles/basic/1.1/wsdl-2004-08-24.xsd

### Diagnostic Data:
Error message from the XML parser.

### Test Assertion:
BP2120b

### Description:
Each operation referenced by the binding results in a unique wire signature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### co-Target:
imagesig

### Predicate:
for $bop_1 in $target/wsdl:operation return fn:string-join( ( $bop_1/wsdl:input/wsoap12:body/@namespace , $bop_1/@name , for $opmsg in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:portType[@name = fn:tokenize(xsd:string($target/@type), ':')[fn:last()]/wsdl:operation return ( ( if ($opmsg/@wsam:Action) then $opmsg/@wsam:Action else $opmsg[@name] ) ) , if($opmsg/@name) then $opmsg[@name] else fn:concat($opmsg/../../../@targetNamespace,'/') ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) |'','' )

### Error Message:
Error message from the XML parser.

### Diagnostic Data:
Error message from the XML parser.
Prerequisite: BP2017
Predicate: fn:count($imagesig) = fn:count(fn:distinct-values($imagesig))
Reporting: true=passed, false=failed
Prescription: mandatory
Error Message: A binding has operations that are not unique.
Diagnostic Data: Defective wsdl:operation element(s).

Test Assertion: BP2120a

Description: Each operation referenced by the binding results in a unique wire signature.

Target: 

co-Target: imagesig


Prerequisite: BP2017
Predicate: fn:count($imagesig) = fn:count(fn:distinct-values($imagesig))
Reporting: true=passed, false=failed
Prescription: preferred
Error Message: A binding has operations that are not unique.
Diagnostic Data: Defective wsdl:operation element(s).

Test Assertion: BP2711

Description: don't know why this is listed as Not testable.


Predicate: not(wsoap12:address/@location = preceding::wsdl:port/wsoap12:address/@location) and not(wsoap12:address/@location = following::wsdl:port/wsoap12:address/@location)

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed
Prescription: preferred
Error Message: 

Diagnostic Data: 

Test Assertion: BP1011a

Description: The content of the envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document. In case of a doc-lit binding, the child element of soap12:body is an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part. It is assumed the doc-lit binding has only 1 part. (NOTE: BP211 assumed prereq for the cotarget)

Target: /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'request' and not (

..
### Data:

- Diagnostic Message:
- Error
- Prescription:
- Reporting:
- Predicate:

### Target:

- myOpBinding

### Test Assertion: BP1011b

**Description:**
The content of the response message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document. In case of a doc-lit binding, the child element of soap:12:Body by is an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part. It is assumed the doc-lit binding has only 1 part. (NOTE: BP211 assumed prereq for the cotarget)

**Target:**

```xml
<wsl:messageContents soap:12:Envelope soap:12:Body soap:12:Header
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
count(soap:12:Body/*) le 1
```

**Reporting:**

```xml
true=passed, false=failed
```

**Prescription:**

```xml
mandatory
```

**Error Message:**

The content of the envelope associated with a doc-lit WSDL binding does not match the wsdl:message definition, the child element of soap:12:body is not an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part.

**Diagnostic Data:**

Non-matching WSDL operation and envelope.

### Test Assertion: BP1111a

**Description:**

```xml
<wsl:testLog wsl:messageLog wsl:message (@type = 'response' or
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
count(soap:12:Body/*) le 1
```

**Reporting:**

```xml
true=passed, false=failed
```

**Prescription:**

```xml
mandatory
```

**Error Message:**

The content of the envelope does not match the wsdl:message definition, the child element of soap:12:Body is not an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part.

**Diagnostic Data:**

Non-matching WSDL operation and envelope.
Prerequisite:

myOpBinding

target:

Description:
The content of the request message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document. In case of a doc-lit binding, the child element of soap12:body is an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part. It is assumed the doc-lit binding has only 1 part. (NOTE: BP211 assumed prereq for the cotarget)

Target:

co-Target:

myOpBinding

Predicate:

count(soap12:Body/*) le 1

count(soap12:Body/@use != 'literal') and (count(soap12:Body/@use) = count(soap12:Body/@use))

Error Message:
The content of the request message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document. In case of a doc-lit WSDL binding does not match the wsdl:message definition, the child element of soap12:body is not an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part.

Diagnostic Data:
Non-matching WSDL operation and envelope.

Test Assertion:
BP1111b

Description:
The content of the request message envelope matches the definition in the WSDL document. In case of a doc-lit binding, the child element of soap12:Body is an instance of the global element declaration referenced by the corresponding wsdl:part. It is assumed the doc-lit binding has only 1 part. (NOTE: BP211 assumed prereq for the cotarget)

Target:

co-Target:

myOpBinding

Predicate:

some $myOpBind in $myOpBinding satisfies (not($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use != 'literal') and (count($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use) = count($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use))

Prerequisite:

some $myOpBind in $myOpBinding satisfies (not($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use != 'literal') and (count($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use) = count($myOpBind/..../soap12:body/@use))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>For doc/lit binding, the &quot;namespace&quot; attribute is not specified in any contained wsoap12:body, wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault, wsoap12:fault elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>BP2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>The binding is of style &quot;document&quot; and use &quot;literal&quot;, and the &quot;namespace&quot; attribute is specified in some wsoap12:body, wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault, wsoap12:fault element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td>Contained element with namespace attribute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The namespace attribute is specified on all wsoap12:body elements and the value of the namespace attribute is an absolute URI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>BP2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>every $wbody in ./wsoap12:body satisfies fn:count(fn:tokenize($wbody/@namespace,':')) &gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>A wsoap12:body element does not have a namespace attribute, or the namespace attribute value is not an absolute URI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data</td>
<td>wsoap12:body elements that failed the assertion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP2117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The rpc-literal binding does not have a namespace attribute specified on a contained wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault, and wsoap12:fault element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>BP2017 BP2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>not(.//wsoap12:fault[@namespace]) and not(.//wsoap12:header[@namespace]) and not(.//wsoap12:headerfault[@namespace])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message</td>
<td>An rpc-literal binding has the namespace attribute specified on contained wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault and wsoap12:fault elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diagnostic Data: {Defective wsdl:binding}{defective wsoap12:header, wsoap12:headerfault, or wsoap12:fault element}

Test Assertion: BP2118

Description: The list (or set) of wsdl:operation elements for the contained wsdl:binding is the same as the list of wsdl:operations for the referred wsdl:portType.

    co-Target: myportype

Predicate: every $operation in $myportype/wsdl:operation satisfies some $bop in $target/wsdl:operation satisfies $bop/@name = $operation/@name and (count($target/wsdl:operation) = count($myportype/wsdl:operation)) and not($operation/@name = preceding-sibling::wsdl:operation/@name )

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A wsdl:binding does not have the same list of wsdl:operations as the wsdl:portType to which it refers.

Diagnostic Data: {unmatching wsdl:binding element}{unmatching portType element}

Test Assertion: BP2021

Description: The wsdl:input element and wsdl:output element of each operation uses the attribute name "part" with a Schema type of "NMTOKEN" and does not use "parts", for both wsoap12:header elements and wsoap12:headerfault elements.


Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: The wsdl:input element or wsdl:output element of an operation does not use the attribute name "part" with a Schema type of "NMTOKEN" for wsoap12:header elements or wsoap12:headerfault elements, or it uses "parts".

Diagnostic Data: wsdl:input element or wsdl:output element of the defective operation.

Test Assertion: BP2022

Description: the name attribute is specified on the wsoap12:fault element.


Predicate: @name and @name != "

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: Defective wsoap12:fault element: the name attribute is not specified on the wsoap12:fault element.

Diagnostic Data: Defective wsoap12:fault element
### Test Assertion: BP2032

**Description:**
the name attribute that is specified on the wsoap12:fault element matches the value specified on the parent element wsdl:fault.

**Target:**

**Predicate:**
@name = wsoap12:fault/@name

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
Defective wsoap12:fault element: the "name" attribute value does not match the value of the "name" attribute on the parent element wsdl:fault.

**Diagnostic Data:**
Defective wsoap12:fault element

### Test Assertion: BP1005

**Description:**
The envelope has a wrapper element with a name equal to the name attribute on the wsdl:operation element suffixed with string "Response".

**Target:**
\( /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [@type = 'response' or 

**co-Target: related-Request**

\( /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [ @type = 'request' and (if (not(./wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' ) ] ) ] /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:MessageID = $targetsoap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' or not (@RelationshipType)] ) ] /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Body/*] 

**Predicate:**
fn:concat(fn:local-name($related-Request[1]/soap12:Body/*[1]), 'Response') = fn:local-name($targetsoap12:Body/*[1])

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
Wrapper element in the envelope does not have a value equal to the name attribute on the wsdl:operation element suffixed with string "Response".

**Diagnostic Data:**

### Test Assertion: BP1008a

**Description:**
The envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, in no namespaces, but the descendants of these are namespace qualified as defined by the schema in which their types are defined.

**Target:**
\( /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [@type = 'request' and not ( 

**co-Target: myOpBinding**


**Predicate:**
every $accessor in $target/soap12:Body/*/* satisfies ( fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(node-name($accessor)) = " or fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:node-
name($accessor) = 'http://www.ws-i.org/testing/2008/02/log/')

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: The request envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, within namespaces.

Diagnostic Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1008b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The response envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, in no namespaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-Target:</td>
<td>myOpBinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>every $accessor in ./soap12:Body/<em>/</em> satisfies ( fn:namespace-uri-from-QName(fn:node-name($target/soap12:Body/<em>[1])) ) = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/</em>/1]))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The response envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, within namespaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1755a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Each part accessor element in the envelope has a local name of the same value as the name attribute of the corresponding wsdl:part element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-Target:</td>
<td>myOpBinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate:</td>
<td>(some $mbody in ./soap12:Body satisfies every $accessor in $mbody/<em>/</em> satisfies some $dmsg in /wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding[@name = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/*/1]))] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The envelope referenced by an rpc-literal binding has a part accessor element with a local name that is not the same value as the name attribute of the corresponding wsdl:part element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Test Assertion: BP1755b

**Description:**
Each part accessor element in the response envelope has a local name of the same value as the name attribute of the corresponding wsdl:part element.

**Target:**
```
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'response' or
/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or (
@RelationshipType = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' ) ] ]
/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope[soap12:Body/* and not (soap12:Body/soap12:Fault)] [ some
$myenv in . satisfies some $message in /wsil:definitions/wsil:message satisfies
($message/wsld:part[1]/@type) ]
```

**co-Target:** myOpBinding
```
'rpc']]/ wsdl:operation [fn:string-join((@name, 'Response' ),'') = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-
name($target/soap12:Body/*[1]))]
```

**Predicate:**
```
(some $body in ./soap12:Body/satisfies every $accessor in $body/*/* satisfies some $dbody in
join((@name, 'Response' ),'') = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/*[1]))]/wssoap12:operation[style='rpc'] |
/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding/wsdl:operation[ @name=local-
name-from-QName(node-name($x))]/../wssoap12:binding[style='rpc' ] ]
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The response envelope referenced by an rpc-literal binding has a part accessor element with a local name that is not the same value as the name attribute of the corresponding wsdl:part element.

**Diagnostic Data:**

### Test Assertion: BP1010

**Description:**
The envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, in no namespaces, but the descendants of these are namespace qualified as defined by the schema in which their types are defined.

**Target:**
```
//soap12:Envelope[every $x in soap12:Body/*/* satisfies ( (not($x/@type) ) and ( every
$accessorChild in $x/* satisfies ( namespace-uri($accessorChild) = $ns ))))]
```

**Predicate:**
```
every $accessor in (//soap12:Body/*/*) satisfies ( for $accessorName in local-
name-from-QName(node-name($accessor)) return ( for $type in
/wsil:testLog/wsil:descriptionFiles/wsil:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message/wsdl:part[@name=$accessorName]/@type return ( for $nsTag in substring-before($type, '.') return ( for $ns in namespace-uri-for-prefix($nsTag, $accessor) return ( every
$accessorChild in $accessor/* satisfies ( namespace-uri($accessorChild) = $ns ))))))
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The envelope has part accessor elements for parameters and return value, within namespaces, or the descendants of these elements are not namespace qualified as defined by the schema in which their types are defined.

**Diagnostic Data:**

### Test Assertion: BP1009a

**Description:**
The Envelope includes all wssoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (if request) or wsdl:output (if response) of the operation referred to by its wsdl:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

**Target:**
```
/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [@type = 'request' and not (
/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply' ) ] ])
/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope[soap12:Body[(not (soap12:Fault))] [ some
$myenv in . satisfies ( every $message in /wsil:definitions/wsil:message satisfies ( (not($message/wsld:part[1]/@type) ) and ( every
$wsil:header in . satisfies ( namespace-uri($wsil:header) = $ns )))](
```

**Predicate:**
```
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The Envelope includes all wssoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (if request) or wsdl:output (if response) of the operation referred to by its wsdl:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

**Diagnostic Data:**
co-Target: myOpBinding

Predicate:
some $myOpBinding in $myOpBinding satisfies ( every $opBinding in . satisfies ( (if ($Target soap12:Body "$[1]" ) then ( some $dmesg in . ) ) ) ) and ( if ($Target soap12:Header $wa:Action) then (some $opmsg in . ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) and ( (if ($Target soap12:Header $wa:Action) then (some $opmsg in . ) ) ) ) ) ) )

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Precondition: mandatory

Error Message: Envelope does not include all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsd12:input (of request) of its bound operation.

Diagnostic Data:

Test Assertion: BP1009b

Description: The Envelope includes all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsd12:input (if request) or wsd12:output (if response) of the operation referred to by its wsd12:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

Target:

co-Target: myOpBinding

Predicate:
some $myOpBinding in $myOpBinding satisfies ( every $opBinding in . satisfies ( (if ($Target soap12:Body "$[1]" ) then ( some $dmesg in . ) ) ) ) ) and ( if ($Target soap12:Header $wa:Action) then (some $opmsg in . ) ) ) )

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Precondition: mandatory

Error Message: Envelope does not include all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsd12:input (if request) or wsd12:output (if response) of its bound operation.
### Test Assertion: **BP1009c**

**Description:**
The Envelope includes all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (for request) of the operation referred to by its wsdl:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

**Target:**
\[\text{wsil:testLog/wsIL:messageLog/wsIL:message [@type = `request` and not (/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = `http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply` ) ] ) \]} \]

**co-Target:**
\[\text{myOpBinding/wsIL:descriptionFiles/wsIL:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding[@name = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/*[1]))]}\]

**Prerequisite:**
\[

**Predicate:**
\[\text{true=passed, false=failed}\]

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
Envelope does not include all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (if request) or wsdl:output (if response) of its bound operation.

**Diagnostic Data:**

### Test Assertion: **BP1009d**

**Description:**
The Envelope includes all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:output (for response) of the operation referred to by its wsdl:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

**Target:**
\[\text{wsil:testLog/wsIL:messageLog/wsIL:message [@type = `response` or /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = `http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply` ) ] ]} \]

**co-Target:**
\[\text{myOpBinding/wsIL:descriptionFiles/wsIL:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding[@name = fn:local-name-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($target/soap12:Body/*[1])))]}\]

**Prerequisite:**
\[

**Predicate:**
\[\text{true=passed, false=failed}\]

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
Envelope does not include all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (if request) or wsdl:output (if response) of its bound operation.

**Diagnostic Data:**

### Test Assertion: **BP1116a**

**Description:**
The Envelope includes all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:output (for response) of the operation referred to by its wsdl:binding, and may also include headers that were not specified.

**Target:**
\[\text{wsil:testLog/wsIL:messageLog/wsIL:message [@type = `response` or /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = `http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply` ) ] ]} \]

**co-Target:**
\[\text{myOpBinding/wsIL:descriptionFiles/wsIL:descriptionFile/wsdl:definitions/wsdl:binding[@name = fn:local-name-from-QName(fn:resolve-QName(xsd:string($target/soap12:Body/*[1])))]}\]

**Prerequisite:**
\[

**Predicate:**
\[\text{true=passed, false=failed}\]

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
Envelope does not include all wsoap12:headers specified in the wsdl:input (if request) or wsdl:output (if response) of its bound operation.

**Diagnostic Data:**
Description: The action parameter on the Content-Type header if present has value equal to the value of the corresponding wsoap12:operation/@soapAction attribute, and an empty string ("") if there is no such attribute.


co-Target: myOpBinding

Predicates: some $myOpBind in $myOpBinding satisfies ( ($myOpBind/wsoap12:operation/@soapAction = $target/../wsil:httpHeaders//:contentTypeHeader//parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'action'] [ : and @type = 'request' ]) and not ( .//wsoap12:*[@style = 'rpc'] ) )

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: The action parameter on the Content-Type header if present does not match wsoap12:operation/@soapAction attribute.

Diagnostic Data: {All HTTP headers}[soapAction value from the soapbinding].

Test Assertion: BP1116b

Description: The action parameter on the Content-Type header if present has value equal to the value of the corresponding wsoap12:operation/@soapAction attribute, and an empty string ("") if there is no such attribute.


co-Target: myOpBinding

Predicates: some $myOpBind in $myOpBinding satisfies ( ($myOpBind/wsoap12:operation/@soapAction = $target/../wsil:httpHeaders//:contentTypeHeader//parameter[fn:lower-case(@key) = 'action'] [ : and @type = 'request' ]) and not ( .//wsoap12:*[@style = 'rpc'] ) )

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: The action parameter on the Content-Type header if present does not match wsoap12:operation/@soapAction attribute.

Diagnostic Data: {All HTTP headers}[soapAction value from the soapbinding].
Error Message: The action parameter on the Content-Type header if present does not match wssoap12:operation/@soapAction attribute.

Diagnostic Data: {All HTTP headers}[soapAction value from the soabinding].

Test Assertion: BP2122

Description: The data type definition if any within the wsdl:types element is an XML schema definition defined in the XML Schema 1.0 Recommendation with the namespace URI "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema".


c-o-Target: metadata

Predicate: $target/@schemaValid

Reporting: true=passed, false=failed

Prescription: mandatory

Error Message: A wsdl:types element contained a data type definition that is not an XML schema definition.

Diagnostic Data: Defective data type definition.

Test Assertion: BP1090a

Description: For a Fault response message with a wsa:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: The wsa:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the WSDL.

Target: /wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'response' or .]/wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[not(@RelationshipType) or (@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply')]

co-Target: relatedRequest

Predicate: $target/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo[not(@RelationshipType) or (@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply')] = $target

Reporting: true=passed, false=warning
**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** A Fault response message defined using a doc/lit binding has a wsdl:Action value that is not equal to that specified in the WSDL. This may be due to the fact that the fault was generated by some infrastructure component (e.g. WS-Addressing, WS-RM, etc.). Verify that the fault was generated by some WS-* infrastructure component and not by the application.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.

---

**Test Assertion:** BP10906

**Description:** For a Fault response message with a wsdl:Action element, defined using a doc/lit binding, the following must hold: - The wsdl:Action value in the soap12:Header must equal to that specified from the WSDL.

**Target:**

\[
\text{wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message[@type = 'response' or /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply')]]} \\
\text{wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope[ (soap12:Body/soap12:Fault) and soap12:Header[wsa:Action] [ some $myenv in . satisfies some $message in /wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message satisfies ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type ] ) ]} \\
\text{co-Target: relatedRequest} \\
\text{co-Target: myOpBinding} \\
\text{Predicate:} \\
\text{Reporting: true=passed, false=warning}

**Error Message:** A Fault response message defined using a rpc/lit binding has a wsdl:Action value that is not equal to that specified in the WSDL. This may be due to the fact that the fault was generated by some infrastructure component (e.g. WS-Addressing, WS-RM, etc.). Verify that the fault was generated by some WS-* infrastructure component and not by the application.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.

---

**Test Assertion:** BP2801

**Description:** The value (either actual or computed) of wsam:Action attribute for the wsdl:input element contained in the target wsdl:operation of the wsdl:portType MUST equal the value of the soapAction attribute, if present, inside the wsoap12:operation element contained in the target wsdl:operation of the wsdl:binding.

**Target:**

\[
\text{co-Target: myOpDefinition} \\
\text{Predicate:} \\
\text{Reporting: true=passed, false=warning}

**Error Message:** A Fault response message defined using a rpc/lit binding has a wsdl:Action value that is not equal to that specified in the WSDL. This may be due to the fact that the fault was generated by some infrastructure component (e.g. WS-Addressing, WS-RM, etc.). Verify that the fault was generated by some WS-* infrastructure component and not by the application.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.
**Reporting:** true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The value of wsam:Action attribute for the wsdl:input element contained in the target wsdl:operation of the wsdl:portType, does not match the @soapAction value in this operation binding.

**Diagnostic Data:** Operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1211a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Part accessor elements in the envelope do not have an xsi:nil attribute with a value of &quot;1&quot; or &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [@type = 'request' and not ( /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply</a>' ) ] ) ] /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Body/* and not (soap12:Body/soap12:Fault) [ some $myenv in . satisfies some $message in //wsdl:definitions/wsdl:message satisfies ($message/wsdl:part[1]/@type) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>co-Target:</strong></td>
<td>myOpBinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>not (soap12:Body/&quot;<em>/[attribute::xsi:nil = '1' or attribute::xsi:nil = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/</em>[1]))) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>Envelope referenced by an rpc-literal binding has part accessor elements with an xsi:nil attribute with a value of &quot;1&quot; or &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1211b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Part accessor elements in the response envelope do not have an xsi:nil attribute with a value of &quot;1&quot; or &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>co-Target:</strong></td>
<td>myOpBinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicate:</strong></td>
<td>not (soap12:Body/&quot;<em>/[attribute::xsi:nil = '1' or attribute::xsi:nil = fn:local-name-from-QName(node-name($target/soap12:Body/</em>[1]))) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting:</strong></td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription:</strong></td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Message:</strong></td>
<td>response Envelope referenced by an rpc-literal binding has part accessor elements with an xsi:nil attribute with a value of &quot;1&quot; or &quot;true&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diagnostic Data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Assertion</th>
<th>BP1149a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>This assertion tests one aspect of R1149. Specifically, if a consumer sends a request message with a non-anonymous response EPR to an instance which advertises that it only supports anonymous EPRs, any response from that instance must be the SOAP fault described by Section 6.4.1.7 of the Web Services Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding. Other possible fault conditions, such as invalid addresses, are not tested for by this assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>/wsil:testLog/wsil:messageLog/wsil:message [@type = 'response' or /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsa:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or ( @RelationshipType = '<a href="http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply">http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply</a>' ) ] ] /wsil:messageContents/soap12:Envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Assertion:</td>
<td>BP1149b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>This assertion tests one aspect of R1149. Specifically, if a consumer sends a request message with a non-anonymous response EPR to an instance which advertises that it only supports anonymous EPRs, any response from that instance must be the SOAP fault described by Section 6.4.1.7 of the &quot;WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding&quot; specification. Although the transmitted response is a fault, it does not match the definition in Section 6.4.1.7. This could be due to some other, overriding error such as a MustUnderstand fault. Inspect the response message and verify that this is the case. If not, the service is acting incorrectly by not transmitting the proper fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting:</td>
<td>true=passed, false=failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription:</td>
<td>mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Message:</td>
<td>The service requires the use of WS-Addressing with anonymous response EPRs. Any response to a request with non-anonymous response EPRs must be the fault defined by Section 6.4.1.7 of the &quot;WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding&quot; specification. The transmitted response is either not a fault or does not match the definition of this fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Data:</td>
<td>Complete message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Test Assertion: BP1149c

**Description:**
This assertion tests one aspect of R1149. Specifically, if a consumer sends a request message with an anonymous response EPR to an instance which advertises that it only supports non-anonymous EPRs, any response from that instance must be the SOAP fault described by Section 6.4.1.8 of the Web Services Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding. Other possible fault conditions, such as invalid addresses, are not tested for by this assertion.

**Target:**

```xml
<wsl:testLog/wsli:messageLog/wsli:message [@type = 'response']
   .wsli:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsia:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or (@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply')]
   /wsli:messageContents/soap12:Envelope
   /wsli:testLog/wsli:descriptionFiles/wsli:feature[@name="http://www.w3.org/2005/addressing/metadata/NonAnonymousResponses" and @mode="required"]
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
( if (not ($related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:ReplyTo) or $related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:ReplyTo/wsia:Address='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous'
   or $related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:FaultTo/wsia:Address='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')
   then
   else fn:true() )
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=warning

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The service requires the use of WS-Addressing with non-anonymous response EPRs. The response to a request with anonymous response EPRs must be the fault defined by Section 6.4.1.8 of the "WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding" specification. Although the transmitted response is a fault, it does not match the definition in Section 6.4.1.8. This could be due to some other, overriding error such as a MustUnderstand fault. Inspect the response message and verify that this is the case. If not, the service is acting incorrectly by not transmitting the proper fault.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.

---

### Test Assertion: BP1149d

**Description:**
This assertion tests one aspect of R1149. Specifically, if a consumer sends a request message with an anonymous response EPR to an instance which advertises that it only supports non-anonymous EPRs, any response from that instance must be the SOAP fault described by Section 6.4.1.8 of the Web Services Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding. Other possible fault conditions, such as invalid addresses, are not tested for by this assertion.

**Target:**

```xml
<wsl:testLog/wsli:messageLog/wsli:message [@type = 'response']
   .wsli:messageContents/soap12:Envelope/soap12:Header/wsia:RelatesTo [not (@RelationshipType) or (@RelationshipType = 'http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/reply')]
   /wsli:messageContents/soap12:Envelope
   /wsli:testLog/wsli:descriptionFiles/wsli:feature[@name="http://www.w3.org/2005/addressing/metadata/NonAnonymousResponses" and @mode="required"]
```

**Predicate:**

```xml
( if (not ($related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:ReplyTo) or $related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:ReplyTo/wsia:Address='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous'
   or $related-Request/soap12:Header/wsia:FaultTo/wsia:Address='http://www.w3.org/2005/08/addressing/anonymous')
   then
   else fn:true() )
```

**Reporting:** true=passed, false=warning

**Prescription:** mandatory

**Error Message:** The service requires the use of WS-Addressing with non-anonymous response EPRs. The response to a request with anonymous response EPRs must be the fault defined by Section 6.4.1.8 of the "WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding" specification. Although the transmitted response is a fault, it does not match the definition in Section 6.4.1.8. This could be due to some other, overriding error such as a MustUnderstand fault. Inspect the response message and verify that this is the case. If not, the service is acting incorrectly by not transmitting the proper fault.

**Diagnostic Data:** Complete message.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$target/soap12:Body/soap12:Fault</th>
<th>else fn:true()</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reporting:**
true=passed, false=failed

**Prescription:**
mandatory

**Error Message:**
The service requires the use of WS-Addressing with non-anonymous response EPRs. The response to a request with anonymous response EPRs must be the fault defined by Section 6.4.1.8 of the "WS-Addressing 1.0 - SOAP Binding" specification. The transmitted response is not a SOAP Fault message.

**Diagnostic Data:**
Complete message.
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