Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference
4th April 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=4817

Approval of minutes from the last conf call (21st March)

See http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/12088

(IanR) Are there any comments on the minutes?
None
(IanR) Are there any objections to approving the minutes?
None

Call for AOB

(IanR) There is an Oasis Symposium in New Orleans during which a lightning roundup of TC progress will be held. Is anyone going who would represent WSRF?
None.
(IanR) I will prepare foils and load to the Web site. The default is that OASIS staff will do it. Please send email if you can volunteer.
(MartinC) I could do it.
Action: (IanR) Prepare WSRF TC summary foils for New Orleans

Action Review

(Bryan) Create a new issue to describe the aggregation suggestion here:
http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200503/msg00024.html **Done**
(Bryan) Move issue wsrf65 to 'resolved' TomM/DaveS to help craft sections in the AppNotes. **In Progress**
(TomM) Write up the proposal for issue wsrf44 for review via the list. There is a proposal on the list – **see below**.
(Bryan) Move issue 44 to 'resolved'. **Done**
(IanR) Send email to editors requesting pdf versions of specs without change history for use as new working drafts **Done**
(Bryan) Move issues wsrf97 and wsrf98 to 'resolved'. **Done**

New Issues (Bryan)

There are two new issues – wsrf104 which deals with membershipContent rule, and another (wsrf105) which proposes simplifying ServiceGroup.
(IanR) There are a number of issues within the simplification proposal. Can we separate these out before we open the issue?
Action: (Bryan) Move wsrf104 to open.

Request to Editors and possible "reviewer" assignments

From Bryan: "I think it would help if editors would let me know when documents are checked in that incorporate the resolution of an issue including the issue number. It might also be a good idea to assign some non-editor the task of verifying that edits have been successfully executed."
(Bryan) I've recently been through the latest drafts verifying that changes were present, but I didn't verify the actual text. It's hard to do.
(IanR) I will forward the list of issues that were addressed in the last set of specs.
(Bryan) I need a note from the spec editor to say when an issue is resolved and checked.
(IanR) Should we do this verification as an issue is addressed, or when we promote to working drafts (eg quarterly)
(Bryan) Best not to wait, I think.
(TomM) The change history in the document should include the list of issues addressed.
(IanR) Are there any volunteers to take on the role of verifying text changes?
(DaveS) Eventually the whole TC should read the specs, but the details on an ongoing basis could be done by individuals.
(IanR) This is the process from now on: the spec editors should send a note to the TC list to say which issues have been included in which draft. The chairs will then carry an action item to confirm that the verification has taken place.
Action: (IanR) Identify which issues are included in the latest drafts. The reviewers to be appointed at the next call.

Issue review - Chair

WSRF91: Resource Access Pattern reaction to the removal of ReferenceProperties
(DaveS) Do we update our specs now, or wait?
(IanR) Yes, and now there is a new schema.
(MartinC) This is a last call, not final.
(IanR) Nevertheless, there is a W3C namespace.
(Umit) The plan is for this to be stable for a month.
(MartinC) But the url may not resolve in three or four months' time. We could request them to keep his version active.
(Umit) We could use this version and provide formal feedback.
(DaveS) That is a separate issue. We won't have a final version for quite a time.
(IanR) Should we stick with 2004/08 or move to this new version.

(MartinC) If we are going to keep a CD around for a while (and not go for a standard) that is fine. What are our plans?

(DaveS) I think we update the specs to the last call, the expected changes after that would be small (namespaces etc).

(MartinC) We should update to the last call version, and review the stability at that point.

(IanR) Proposed: to resolve the issue by moving to the Last call, and resolve issue WSRF92 (Uppdate examples that reference WS-Addressing) this way, too.

(BryanM) Seconded.

(DaveS) Any objections?

None

(DaveS) Abstentions?

None

Action: (Bryan). Move to Resolved.

(Umit) Do we want to provide formal feedback on WS-Addressing.

(IanR) Many of the member companies have an interest in WS-Addressing independently. If we want to discuss this as a TC, we could open an issue to do it.

(Umit) It's useful because it has to be formally recorded and responded to.

(IanR) We don't have comments to make at the moment. These should be posted to the email list.

(DaveS) We can respond to say there are no comments, if that's how it turns out.

Action: (All TC Members) review WS-Addressing and post comments to the list by the next conf call.

WSRF99: Examples in the specs use the SOAP 1.2 namespace

(TimB) This is an inconsistency in our specs that we have a dependency on WS-I Basic Profile, but the examples use the wrong namespace.

(?) We should make sure that the examples don't use SOAP 1.2 features.

(DaveS) I don't think they do.

(TomM) Proposed to change the namespace to SOAP 1.1.

(Bryan) Seconded

(DaveS) Any objections.

None.

WSRF100: Confusion about requirement of using WS-BaseFaults for all faults from WS-Resources

(IanR) There are two issues: the binding to the soap spec and the requirement to use Base Faults vs only a Recommendation.

(TimB) The WS –Resource spec says WS Resources 'must' use base faults (but only lower case). This is a hurdle for Web services to jump over, but the OGSI spec required the equivalent of BaseFaults.

(DaveS) I think a 'SHOULD' is sufficient for the grid community; they are aware of the need to encourage uptake.

(Umit) Yes, that's what we need.

(DaveS) The proposal (Umit) is to change the current lower case 'must' to upper case 'SHOULD'

(SamM) Seconded.

(DaveS) Objections/Abstentions?

None

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

(SamM) I could take a look at this and see what can be done in terms of a SOAP binding

(IanR) We need to consider SOAP 1.1 and SOAP 1.2

Action: (Bryan) Open new issue on providing advice.

(IanR) The charter declares this out of scope.

(SamM) We could provide a non-normative example or put it in AppNotes

(IanR) I would prefer something in basefaults.

Action: (Sam) Investigate documenting recommendations/examples for the binding,

WSRF101: Use of non-normative references

(DaveS) There is a long list of these, which need to be cleared up to avoid the problem experienced by WSDM. We have a list of these things.

(TomR) We need to review them. Some specs have proprietary namespaces and seems to be advisory and not necessary. Proposals are here: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200502/msg00067.html

(DaveS) WSDM got a record number of 'NO' votes for the same problem. We should remove these barriers, by replacing the references with non-normative text summarizing the concepts.

(TomM) Does this also apply to WS-Resource

(TomR) Yes – there were no references there.

(IanR) What about WS-MD?

(TomM) How do we decide whether something is normative or non-normative?

(TomR) The specs themselves declare which references are non-normative, but I also checked whether the spec was referenced from our normative specs via namespace.

(IanR) Are there any 'normative' references that aren't used by namespace reference? What about WS-ReliableMessaging/Reliability. That isn't necessary and should be replaced by a summary of the concept.

(DaveS) The only exception would be WS-MessageDelivery. Are there objections to removing this?

(Umit) I think the advocates are not on the call

Action: (BryanM) Create an issue to discuss the removal of WS-MD from WS-Resource.

(TomR) Proposed to replace the non-normative references with abstract descriptions of the concepts.

(DaveS) This is different from the email – but that can be used as a guide.

(TimB) Seconded.

(DaveS) Objections/Abstentions?

(TomM) The security section looks tricky.

(IanR) We have to leave this to the editors. If a section becomes vacuous without the references, the answer may be to remove the section.

(DaveS) Are there any objections or abstentions now?

None.

Action: (BryanM) Move to resolved.

AOB

(Umit) Can we have a ballot for the face-to-face so that we know how many people will attend.
Action: (IanR)

Straggler Roll Call and Close

Closed 13:30 est

Summary of actions

(IanR) Prepare WSRF TC summary foils for New Orleans
(Bryan) Move wsrf104 to open
(IanR) Identify which issues are included in the latest drafts. The reviewers to be appointed at the next call.
(Bryan). Move issues wsrf91 and wsrf92 to Resolved. Both to adopt the 'last call' level of WS-Addressing.
(All TC Members) Review WS-Addressing and post comments to the list by the next conf call.
(Bryan) Move issue wsrf99 to 'resolved'.
(Bryan) Open new issue on providing advice for the binding of Basefaults to SOAP Faults
(Sam) Investigate documenting recommendations/examples for the binding of Basefaults to SOAP faults.
(Bryan) Move issue wsrf100 to 'resolved'.
(BryanM) Create an issue to discuss the removal of WS-MD from WS-Resource.
(BryanM) Move issue wsrf101 to 'resolved'.
(IanR) Create a ballot for attendance at the May face-to-face meeting.