

## Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 21<sup>st</sup> March 2005

### ***Roll call***

The roll call is kept on the TC web site under the meeting record.

See [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/event.php?event\\_id=4816](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/event.php?event_id=4816)

### ***Approval of minutes from the last conf call (7<sup>th</sup> March)***

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/11715>

(IanR) Any objections to approving the minutes?

None

### ***Call for AOB***

(TomM) We'll be doing Issue 65 first, then 44, right?

(IanR) Yes.

### ***Action Review***

(Chairs) Investigate WIKI site for Developing AppNotes (Carried forward from 4th Feb).

(IanR) The response from OASIS is that this is in progress. **Done.**

(Sam, TomM, DaveS) Propose resolution to issue 65. Carried fwd from 21st Feb **See below.**

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF 101,102 to 'open'. **Done**

(TomR) Identify a point in time draft for WS-Addressing which is as stable (or better) then the 2004/08 submission on which WSRF depends, but closer to the expected final version.

(TomR) There isn't a 'final call version yet. The target is the end of March.

Details are on the Web Site. **Done**

### ***New Issues***

(TomM) There are some related to ServiceGroup, but none to talk about today – they will be posted to the list.

(WilliamV) I made a proposal for portType aggregation to the list (9<sup>th</sup> March)

[<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200503/msg00024.html>]

(DaveS) I think this should be an issue to make sure this is reviewed for conformance with the rest of the specs.  
(IanR) Shall we talk about this for 10 mins now?  
(DaveS) Ok.  
(IanR) Should this be put into Appnotes?  
(DaveS) Hang on,  
(?) Isn't there some strong wording to say that ports should be alternates for the same portType?  
(Umit) But there can also be multiple portTypes (in a service).  
(TimB) How would we determine whether the portTypes are to be related to the same resource?  
(Umit) We would have to invent that.  
(Igor) The question is whether we need extra info in the wsdl. In fact, this can be included in the epr. So, for example, the epr can contain the servicename or portName.  
(IanR) What is the real issue?  
(?) We need a description in the AppNotes about the implications of the definition of WS-Resource as the thing described by the WSDL.  
(DaveR) If there is nothing more in the epr then the resource disambiguator then the addressing issue is clear.  
**Action** (Bryan) Create this as a new issue.

### ***Issue WSRF25 Fault messages should indicate which subset of properties were modified successfully***

Postponed - SteveG not present.

### ***Interop Testing - TimB***

There have been four interop sites which have tested the 12 possible combinations. A further site was made available today. The results from the first four sites are reported here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/download.php/11947>

Out of the testing came two issues documented as wsrf99, and comments on wsrf100, a set of scenarios and increased experience and confidence in several implementations.

(TomR) What was the coverage of testing?  
(TimB) All messages and non-fault response  
(IanR) Were there any holes in the testing?  
(TimB) None were found, but we need to expand the tests to deal with faults, and encompass new operations such as putResourcePropertiesDocument.  
(IanR) We can use this for formal interop when the time is right.  
(TimB) We need to anticipate the next interop

(IanR) This should be when we are at the point of submitting to OASIS as a standard – the final committee draft.

(TimB) Agreed.

(DaveS) It would be good to have a site that is maintained for others to interoperate with in the future. The Fujitsu site will be available. (See <http://193.133.239.220:8080/axis/services/PrinterFactory>)

## ***Issue Review***

### **Issue 65 – mechanism to aggregate an operation across several resources in a ServiceGroup**

(TomM) We talked about many variations, and the natural way to do this is to extend the ServiceGroup with an application-specific operation. This allows the flexibility to control (eg) the scope of distribution of the operation, aggregate the responses. So, this should be described in the AppNotes.

(IanR) So the proposed resolution is to describe an application pattern in the AppNotes.

(DaveS) There was a community pushing for this, and we should say something about it, but it isn't something that should be normative.

**Action** (Bryan) Move to resolved.

**Action:** (Tom/DaveS) Help craft sections in the AppNotes.

### **Issue WSRF44: No obvious mechanism to include only members which extend a certain interface**

See presentation at:

[http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/document.php?document\\_id=11951](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/document.php?document_id=11951)

(WilliamV) We can't base selection on the contents of the WSDL because that isn't guaranteed to represent the capabilities of the service.

(TomM) Right, so the SG is an advertisement of what is allowed, but not an enforcer of it.

(DaveS) So, to address wsrp44, we only need to allow multiple portType names in the membership content rule (on slide 5) and leave implementation concerns out of it.

(TomM) This looks good.

(IanR) Any objections to this as the proposal?

(Umit) I would like to see the text.

**Action** (TomM) Write up the proposal for review via the list.

**Action** (Bryan) Move to resolved subject to review.

## ***Drafts status***

As a result of the recent ballot, the current set of editors drafts (2005/03) are now the new working drafts. We'll need to refresh the pointers on the web page.

**Action** (IanR) Send email requesting pdf versions of specs without change history.

### ***Issues (Continued)***

#### **WSRF97 QueryResourceProperties WSDL portType does not reference the property it requires as specified in XML schema**

This is a simple proposal to make the QueryResourceProperties portType look like the others.

(IanR) Any objections to adopting the proposal as the resolution?

None.

**Action** (BryanM) move to 'Resolved'.

#### **WSRF98: Cardinality of SetResourceProperty content**

(IanR) This is an obvious change to the SetResourceProperties message.

Are there any objections to the proposal?

None

**Action** (Bryan): Move to resolved.

### ***Straggler Roll Call and Close***

Closed 13:30 est

#### **Summary of actions**

(Bryan) Create a new issue to describe the aggregation suggestion here:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/email/archives/200503/msg00024.html>

(Bryan) Move issue wsrf65 to 'resolved' TomM/DaveS to help craft sections in the AppNotes.

(TomM) Write up the proposal for issue wsrf44 for review via the list.

(Bryan) Move issue 44 to 'resolved'.

(IanR) Send email to editors requesting pdf versions of specs without change history for use as new working drafts

| (Bryan) Move ~~to~~ issues wsrf97 and wsrf98 to 'resolved'.