<u>List of action items</u>

*Line numbers are for WD1.05 (PDF version). But not for Mark Peel's contribution.

Blue letters indicate they were implemented in WD 7/22/2004(1.06).

Red letters indicate they were agreed as resolution, but not implemented in WD7/22/2004(1.06).

Green letters are proposed resolution that were not agreed yet.

Summary of the action items:

TC is going to accommodate the following comments/questions/proposals: (57)

    A1-A10, CF1-CF17, CF19-CF20, CF22, CF24, CF27-CF30, CF36-37, CF42, MP1-MP10, and DB2-DB10

Status of the above resolutions are as follows: (57)

    Agreed and resolved in WS-R2004/7/22-1.06: (26)

        CF3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 37, 42, DB2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,

    Agreed, but not implemented in the WS-R2004/7/22-1.06: (11)

        A1-A10, and CF11

    Assigned as action items: (7)

        Jacques and Doug : CF1, 2, 10, 19 and 24

        Editors : CF5, 22,

    Proposals to be agreed: (12)

        DB9, 10,

        MP1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

    No proposals yet: (1)

        CF4

Based on a proposal from Anish:

A1) Below is the schema element and type decl that should be added to the schema at "ws-reliability-1.1.xsd" --

```
<!-- default reference scheme -->
<xsd:element name="BareURI" type="BareURIType">
<xsd:simpleType name="BareURIType">
   <xsd:restriction base="xsd:anyURI" />
</xsd:simpleType>
```

A2) Table 10, section 4.2.3.2 the value for the row 'Child element' is incorrect. ReplyTo element requires exactly one EII {any}.

A3) Section 4.2.3.2.1, replace:
"The Sending RMP MAY omit this attribute, when the value of the ReplyTo element is expressed with a value of type URI."
        with something like:
"The Sending RMP MUST omit this attribute, when the child element of the ReplyTo element is wsrm:BareURI"

A4) Section 4.3.1, replace:
"The format or schema of the value of this element is specified by the reference-schema attribute. If the attribute is omitted, the default format of ReplyTo element is URI as defined in [RFC 2396]."
        with:
"The format or scheme of the value of this element is specified by the reference-scheme attribute. If the attribute is omitted, the default scheme of ReplyTo element is wsrm:BareURI as defined in Section XXXX"

A5) Add a new section that defines the wsrm:BareURI element consistent with definition of other elements in the wsrm schema (editorial). This section should also point to Section 6 HTTP binding for an example of how things work with a simple URI. Anish: this is Left as editorial task, needs to be explained using a table or a new section. Leave for the editor.

A6) There are a few places where the attribute on the ReplyTo element is called 'reference-schema' rather than 'reference-scheme'. A quick search and replace should fix this. (Note: this is unrelated to the issue raised by Doug)

A7) Table 15 needs to be modified similar to table 10 in (1) above.

A8) Section 4.3.1.1 needs to be modified similar to (2) above.

A9) Section 6, the following lines need to be changed from:
"If a ReplyTo element present in a Request element or Poll Request header element, sent using the SOAP 1.1 protocol, contains only a URL and uses the 'http:' URL scheme, then the WS-Reliability response MUST be sent using the HTTP binding specified in section 6 of SOAP 1.1."
           to:
"If a ReplyTo element present in a Request element or Poll Request header element, sent using the SOAP 1.1 protocol, uses the wsrm:BareURI (default) reference scheme and uses the 'http:' URL scheme, then the WS-Reliability response MUST be sent using the HTTP binding specified in section 6 of SOAP 1.1."

A10) Changes to section 6 should also be made (similar to (8) above) for the SOAP 1.2 case. Replace Line 1355-1358 with:
  "If a ReplyTo element present in a Request element or Poll Request header element, sent using the SOAP 1.2 protocol, uses the wsrm:BareURI (default) reference scheme and uses the 'http:' URL scheme, then the WS-Reliability response MUST be sent using the HTTP binding for Request/Response MEP specified in SOAP 1.2."

A11) example 12, and example 17 need to be changed to include the 'BareURI' element (as a child element of ReplyTo)

Based on questions from Mark Peel:

MP1:

119-120: Synchronous messaging applications require immediate knowledge
of the message status (e.g., Error)

   Should "Error" read "fault"?

This was resolved since the sentence was removed.

MP2:

261-262: When an RMP supports both Deliver and Respond, then it MUST be
able to associate a payload obtained via Respond, with a payload
previously delivered (Deliver), based on Consumer demand.

   What does "based on Consumer demand" mean? When the RMP supports
both Deliver and Respond, it seems to me it should be able to associate
Respond payloads with the Deliver payloads that evoked them whether the
Consumer wants the Respond's payload or not. Does it add something
meaningful, or should we strike that clause?

Proposal: Removing "based on Consumer demand" in 259.

MP3:

407-408: The messaging scope of these agreement items may vary, as
messages may be associated with a group.

   The clause "as messages may be associated with a group" does not
explain why or under what circumstances messaging scope may vary (and
aren't all messages are associated with groups, even if they are
singleton groups?). Should we strike this clause?

Proposal：Removing "The messaging scope of these agreement items may vary, as
messages may be associated with a group." in 402-403.

MP4:

835: A Sending RMP MUST include a PollRequest element when the
ReplyPattern agreement item has the value "Poll".

   This language suggests the Sending RMP must add a PollRequest element
into any message with the RM-Reply Pattern set to Poll -- which
contradicts the examples given in 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 and would leave
WS-Reliability with no means of doing delayed acking. Suggested
rewording:

Proposal: Replace the sentence in 835-837:
 " A Sending RMP MUST include a PollRequest element when the ReplyPattern
agreement item has value "Poll". However PollRequest messages can also be used to
obtain delivery status for messages that were originally sent with "Response" or
"Callback" ReplyPattern elements."
          with
 "A Sending RMP MUST include a PollRequest element in a PollRequest Message. A
PollRequest Message is used to receive RM-Reply for a message sent with "Poll" as a
value of Request/ReplyPattern/Value element and the original message includes the
Request/AckRequested element. However PollRequest Messages can also be used to
obtain delivery status for messages that were originally sent with "Response" or
"Callback" as a value of Request/ReplyPattern/Value element, and when the original
message includes the Request/AckRequested element."

MP5:

835: A Sending RMP MUST send a message which includes a PollRequest
element for a group whose ReplyPattern Agreement Item has the value
"Poll" some time before the group expires.

   BTW, does this MUST apply even if the group does not require
Guaranteed Delivery?

Proposal: The proposal for MP4 resolves this comments.

MP6:

915: The Sending RMP MUST include the SequenceNumRange element when it specifies which messages in a group are queried for status.

Since SequenceNumRange (or SequenceNumberRange: see below) has a cardinality of 0 or more rather than 1 or more, I suggest this should read

915: The Sending RMP MAY include the SequenceNumRange element to request the status of 1 or more specific messages within a group.

Iwasa: I believe we don't have to change the original text, since it requests to include SequenceNumRange element *when* it specifies the messages to be queried. The proposal from Mark Peel above is correct, but it is not enough since it doesn't mention when the spec mandates the SequenceNumRange element.
Proposal(1): Resolve this comments with status quo.
Proposal(2): Or we can reword it as follows:
896: The Sending RMP MUST include the SequenceNumRange element only when it specifies which messages in a group are queried for status.

MP7:

1286: Note: In case a message is received with an ending marker, but not all previous messages have been received, then the group remains active. No termination process is initiated yet.

This note about the receiver side follows a description of sender side behavior.

Proposal: Move this sentence (Line number 1268-1269) to just after line number 1261.

MP8:

1931: Note: The expiry time is calculated at the time a message is sent, but adding this duration to the time the message is sent.

This unclear note follows B.6.1 and B.6.3. Should it read

Note: the expiry time duration value is calculated at the time a message is sent, but the Receiving RMP should add this duration to the time it received the message.

Proposal : Replace notes for B.6.1 and B.6.3 with:
  "Note: the expiry time duration value is calculated at the time a message is sent, but the Receiving RMP should add this duration to the time it received the message."

MP9:
   Also, I found a discrepancy between the spec and the schema: PollRequest/RefToMessageIds/SequenceNumRange in the 1.05 spec is PollRequest/RefToMessageIds/SequenceNumberRange in the 1.1 schema. While the schema rules, we may wish to alter the schema in this case, as its name is inconsistent with the request element to which it refers, i.e., Request/MessageId/SequenceNum.

Proposal: Replace the name of element in 1.1 schema:
   "PollRequest/RefToMessageIds/SequenceNumberRange"
        with
   "PollRequest/RefToMessageIds/SequenceNumRange"

MP10:
   Finally, a question. The group establishment logic outlined in 5.1.2 strongly implies a Receiving RMP cannot acknowledge messages received for a group if it has not received the group's SequenceNum==0 message: a message after the first might have invalid group items (e.g., using groupMaxIdleDuration instead of groupExpiryTime) and would get faulted after being ack'ed. Am I reading this correctly?

Proposal from Iwasa:
Add the following sentences after Line 1200:
   "c) If the Receiving RMP have received inconsistent group termination parameter is

in use for a message in the same group, then the Receiving RMP MUST return an InvalidMessageParameters fault. When the Guaranteed Message Ordering is in use, the fault MUST be returned for the first inconsistent message in order in the group. If Guaranteed Message Ordering is not in use, the Receiving RMP may return the fault to the first message that Receiving RMP found inconsistency."

And change the following sentence numbers appropriately. (i.e., replace c) with d), and replace d) with e).)

Based on comments from Chris Ferris:

CF1:   Action: Jacques and Doug will propose a resolution.
        (CF1, 2, 10,19, and 24)

CF2:   Action: Jacques and Doug will propose a resolution.
        (CF1, 2, 10,19, and 24)

CF3:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
        Done.
        All three places (Line 151, 155, 250-251) are replaced with
        "OASIS Web Services Security: SOAP Message Security 1.0". And only 155
has
        a reference keyword [WSS], since it is the first one except subtitle.

CF4:   Pending: Waiting for resolution of group termination issue.

CF5:   Action: Editors propose resolution.

CF6:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
        Done.
        Line 171-172 are replaced with:
        "A SOAP message containing a <wsrm:Request> header block."

CF7:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Replaced line205-206 with

"Completion of the Deliver operation for a Reliable Message."

CF8:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line222-225 was replaced with:

"A message the Sending RMP sends to the Receiving RMP, requesting

RM-Replies for identified earlier Reliable Messages. Support for this message

is REQUIRED as part of the Poll RM-Reply pattern (see section 2.5.3). This

message MAY also be used to augment other RM-Reply patterns."

CF9:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line 256-257 was replaced with:

"A Sending RMP MUST support the Submit operation. A Receiving RMP

MUST invoke the Deliver operation for every valid, in-order and non-expired

message it receives."

CF10:   Action: Jacques and Doug will propose a resolution.

(CF1, 2, 10,19, and 24)

CF11:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Not yet done.

I like someone do this edit, since I might not understand enough.

CF12:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line430-431 was replaced with:

"If GroupExpiryTime is used for a group, then the item GroupMaxIdleTime

MUST NOT be used, and vice versa."

CF13:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Removed a sentence on 484-485.

CF14:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line507-508 was replace with:

"Message instances resulting from separate invocations of Submit MUST NOT

share the same Message Identifier."

CF15:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line509-511 was replaced with

"When resending a message with the same Message Identifier, the message contents must not be changed."

CF16:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

"MUST" on line 602 was replaced with "MAY".

CF17:   Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Removed a sentence starting at 669, and added the following sentences after 793:

"If the MessageOrder element appears in the message received, the Receiving

RMP MUST NOT deliver the message until all messages with the same Request/MessageId/@groupId value and a lower Request/MessageId/@number

value have been delivered."

CF18:   N/A

CF19:   Action: Jacques and Doug will propose a resolution.

(CF1, 2, 10,19, and 24)

CF20: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
       Done.
       "messaging scope" on 402 is replaced with "scope".

CF21: N/A

CF22: Action: Editors propose resolution.

CF23: N/A

CF24: Action: Jacques and Doug will propose a resolution.
       (CF1, 2, 10,19, and 24)

CF25: N/A

CF26: N/A

CF27: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
       Done.
       The following sentence on the line 217-218 was removed:
       "For the Callback and Poll RM-Reply Patterns, RM-Replies for multiple
       Reliable Messages MAY be included in a single Reliable Messaging
response."

CF28: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
       Done.
       Line 408 was replaced with:
       "Agreement items applying to the Message Scope MAY be applied at the
Group
       Scope. The default scope of applicability for each RM Agreement item is:"

CF29: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.
       Done.
       Line541-542 was removed.

CF30: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Line 666-668 was replaced with:

"In a request message, the sender MAY include either a @groupExpiryTime or

a @groupMaxIdleDuration, but not both, corresponding to the group

termination parameters specified in Section 5.1.2."

CF31: N/A

CF32: N/A

CF33: N/A

CF34: N/A

CF35: N/A

CF36: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

Description for InvalidMessageId in Table22 was replaced with:

"This fault is sent in any of the following cases:

1. If @groupId (for MessageId or RefToMessageIds) is not present, or is present

with an invalid value.

2. If @number in SequenceNum element is not present, or is present with an

invalid value.

3. Attributes (from and to) of SequenceNumRange are not present, or are

present with invalid values."

CF37: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done with resolution of CF36.

CF38: N/A

CF39: N/A

CF40: N/A

CF41: N/A

CF42: Action: Editors incorporate the resolution in the next working draft.

Done.

-Four "any" element were removed from Figure6 and 7.

-Line 600-602 was replaced with:

"In a case where the text of the specification is shown to be in conflict with schema statements, the schema statement prevails.

The schema for some of the elements specified in this section includes specification of extensibility elements and attributes. The extensibility features expressed formally in the schema are specified in section 4.6.

If a message contains additional elements or attributes not described in this specification, the Reliable Messaging Processor MAY ignore them."

-Added section 4.6 as follows:

"4.6 Extensibility features of Schema

The schema namespace with prefix wsrm, which is part of this specification, specifies extension mechanisms for some schema elements.

The following elements, which have a complex sequence type, are specified in the schema to allow the presence one or more extension elements, of type xsd:any, at the beginning of the sequence, as well as one or more extension attributes:

* Request

* Response

* PollRequest

* NonSequenceReply

* SequenceReplies

* ReplyRange"

Based on proposal from Doug Bunting:

DB2   Done.

        line 10

        Updated the editor list with editor team members

DB3   Done.

        Deleted the line 17 at WD 1.05

DB4   Done.

lines 25-26

Changed "The errata page for this specification is at" to "If necessary, the errata page for this version of the specification will be located at" and confirm this location is under TC control.

DB5   Done.

line 67

Replaced "is a SOAP Module (as defined by [SOAP 1.2]), which"

　　　　with

 "is a SOAP ([SOAP1.1] and [SOAP 1.2]) based specification, which" and removed "([SOAP1.1] and [SOAP 1.2]) on line 68- 69.

DB6   Done.

lines 78, 81

Removed "Under this aspect"

DB7   Resolved with no action. I couldn't find this phrase.

lines 105-106

"On the sending side, like on the receiving side" adds nothing.

Delete this phrase.

Agreed fix for editing team to apply.

DB8   Done.

lines 117-119

Deleted the bullet about "application level synchronous messaging".

DB9   Not yet done. Iwasa has a proposal for this resolution.

Table 2

Our specification is supposedly useful for both SOAP 1.2 and 1.1. If we need a namespace prefix only for SOAP 1.1, something is very wrong in our specification. Add some SOAP 1.2 examples and define namespace prefix for that namespace here.

Doug: We do not define a prefix for Soap 1.1. We never use soap 1.2 in the examples.

Doug: one soap 1.2 example would fix this.

Ø Action: Editing team to propose fix Doug B comment 9.

Proposal from Iwasa:
--
      - Adding a namespace for soap1.2 in the table2 as follows:
        soap12: http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope
      - Replacing a namespace for SOAP in example 1 to soap12. In other words,
        replacing line 628 and 629 with
        xmlns:soap12="http://www.w3.org/2003/05/soap-envelope"
      soap12:mustUnderstand="1">
--

10   Not yet done. Iwasa has a proposal for this resolution.
     Section 1.3
     editorial
     This "conventions" section seems the appropriate place to describe what in the document is normative. Normative is not mentioned until page 41 at the moment! Are examples and notes normative, for example? Are the examples without "(Normative)" in the subject non-normative? Is the associated schema normative (see lines 600-602)?
     Describe what in the document is normative.
This is a question of writing it down in the spec. Members should proposed text to clarify what is normative in the spec.

Doug: this is part of the issue that Mark mentioned on line 835. We have a number of places where we personify elements and make required statements on their behaviour. After the next draft, all members should provide comments on this point.

Here is a proposal from Iwasa.
--
I believe we should clarify as follows:
  - examples are non-normative,
  - notes are non-normative, and
  - all text except above two is normative
  - if it does not explicitly mention whether the text is normative or non-normative.

In other words, I propose to add the following sentences in the last portion of section 1.3:

"All text in this specification is normative, except the following three:

- examples,

- notes, and

- any texts explicitly mentioned as non-normative."

--