

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Face-to-Face meeting 16th - 18th May 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=7762

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve minutes of April 18th telecon

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/12327>

There were no comments and no objections to approving the minutes.

Action Review

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF109 to open **Done.**

(Spec authors) – review AppNotes additions document at http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/12346/DraftAppNotesIssues63_95_22_52_89.doc **Done. (No comments)**

(IanR/TomM) Organise a call on RMD advertise via the TC web site. **Done.**

(Bryan) move issues WSRF103, WSRF106, WSRF104 to resolved. **Done.**

(Bryan) move issues WSRF105 to open. **Done.**

Agenda Review

Call for AOB

(DaveS) We need an update on WS-Addressing.

Validate closure of issues from updated documents

(IanR) We'll go through the specs and review the appropriate issues as per the editors instructions.

WS-Resource: Issues: 91, 92, 99, 101

WS-ResourceProperties Issues: 91, 92, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103 (*)

WS-ResourceLifetime: Issues: 91, 92, 99, 101, 103 (*)

WS-BaseFaults: Issues: 91, 92, 99, 100, 101, 106

WS-ServiceGroup: Issues: 44, 58, 59, 69, 87, 91, 92, 99, 101, 104, 103 (*)

AppNotes: Issues: 20, 22, 48, 52, 63, 65, 89, 103
(also need to check whether 91, 92, 99 have any impact on AppNotes)

The following are the issues:

- WSRF89: Document-literal serialization
- WSRF91: Resource Access Pattern reaction to the removal of ReferenceProperties
- WSRF92: Update examples to be compliant with the recent version of WS-Addressing
- WSRF99: Examples in the specs use the SOAP 1.2 namespace
- WSRF101: Use of non-normative references
- WSRF97 QueryResourceProperties WSDL portType does not reference the property it requires as specified in XML schema
- WSRF98: Cardinality of SetResourceProperty content
- WSRF102: InvalidDeleteResourcePropertiesRequestContent needed
- WSRF63: Which lifetime attributes (ala OGSF) should be specified for resource properties
- WSRF100: Confusion about requirement of using WS-BaseFaults for all faults from WS-Resources
- WSRF106: Not clear how to map faults for SOAP 1.1 and SOAP
- WSRF22: QName as attribute values or text nodes is problematic with signatures/encryption and intermediaries
- WSRF103: Multiple Service Port elements legitimate?
- WSRF44: No obvious mechanism to include only members which extend a certain interface
- WSRF58: ServiceGroup WSDL does not need imports for WSRF-RL WSDL/schema
- WSRF59: Inconsistencies in ServiceGroups
- WSRF65: Need a mechanism to aggregate an operation across several resources in a ServiceGroup
- WSRF69: Content should be declared with minOccurs="0"
- WSRF87: InitialTerminationTime in Add method needs to have stronger guarantee
- WSRF104: Content Rule Applies in Two Ways

WS-Resource

(IanR) DaveS is chair for this part.

(TomM) Line 211 - we need the isReferenceParametne=true attribute in the soap:header

(IanR) Yes – that should apply to all specs.

(Umit) Line 202 – the address for wsa namespace is wrong.

(TomM) About the removal of non-normative references: SOAP is non-normative

(IanR) But the only references we make are in the examples. Anyway, I'll put it back.

WS-ResourceProperties

(IanR) From the consistency perspective – we need the ‘Location’ to be the CD-01 name. The same goes for the page footer.

(SteveG) We need to reconsider an issue or raise a new one: consider relaxing the restriction on RP schema to have element children only.

Action: SteveG to review minutes from last face to face re: element children only in RP doc.

(SteveG) Resolution of issue 103 needed change to wsa:action. How do we get the schema imported into the WSDL?

(IanR) W’ll deal with that when we get to the WSDL.

(SteveG) What about the ResourceDisambiguator in responses. We should have ReplyTo and anonymous To in the Reply.

(BryanM) We should take out the header detail altogether.

(TimB) Yes – that’s just noise.

(IanR) This is a clarification to the SOAP 1.1 issue resolution. The editors should get rid of the headers in the examples in the specs.

(Unit) we need the wsa:action part to be there, but not the rest of the stuff

(SteveG) Line 1073 use of consistent InvalidModification fault.

(SteveG) There is a non-normative reference to the state paper. Do we want to continue with that reference? I propose not.

No objections.

(SteveG) Line 1850 – removal of references – we shouldn’t remove OGSi, yes.

(TomR) Right, that wasn’t an issue.

(SteveG) But all of the www.ibm.com... And ws-caf and ws-rm should go.

(IanR) We should take out refs to WS-Notification.

(SteveG) Then we need to remove the parts that describe subscriptions: these are normative references.

(IanR) ok.

(DaveS) Right, so we need to put a warning notice on the front page as WSDM did.

Action: (DaveS) Raise an issue to take care of the WS-N Dependency

(SteveG) What about the acknowledgements section?

(Umit) I’m not there!

(IanR) It’s the chair’s responsibility to fix it.

Action: (IanR) Update acknowledgements text and distribute.

(SteveG) Done the reference for the QueryResourceProperties portType...choice

(SteveG) The wsa:action attributes are in the WSDL, though this

(IanR) Does everyone agree that the right resolution is to out the attributes in WSDL?

(Umit) So this makes WS-Addressing a requirement.

(SteveG) That’s right, even if we didn’t have this in the portType.

(Umit) Well, there is a new namespace for the wsdl binding, and this is not at last call.

(DaveS) So, we should get rid of this attribute in the WSDL.

(IanR) The appnotes and Primer should not refer to the invisible ws-a/wsdl binding, but this might be a timeframe thing. We need to decide the status of the Primer/Anotes: are they OASIS-approved standards, or just other material produced by the TC.

(TomM) That’s an onerous process.

(IanR) It shouldn’t be, if we exploit the TC.

(MartinC) There is no harm to take it to a committee draft. I'm not certain that it should go to OASIS standard.

(IanR) we'll discuss the OASIS process later in the agenda.

WS-ResourceLifetime

(TimB)

(MartinC) The statements about security aren't very useful. Shouldn't we refer to WS-I?

(DaveS) The reference to WS-Security is more global than just the BSP security token mechanisms.

(MartinC) But BSP narrows it to something interoperable.

(TomM) What about the reference to WS-Addressing – is that right

(IanR) Yes – I should change the one in WS-RAP

Action: (IanR) Fix WS-RAP requirement for basefaults.

(DaveS) What about the references to WS-N

(DaveS) Need to split the references into normative and non-normative.

(OGSI/SOAP/WS-Security)

WS-BaseFaults

(IanR) What should the wsa:action say for faults

(DaveS) Need an issue to decide this.

Action: (DaveS) Raise a new issue to discuss.

(TimB) we need to fix the 'must be basefault' statement in WS-RAP.

WS-ServiceGroup

(TomM)...

(IanR) Should the action uri contain the cd-01 rev number?

(DaveS) If we changed the semantics in the next version, we would be able to distinguish it via a cd-02.

(IanR) Changing the reference each time we revise the specs is a pain. We should have something more generic.

(TomM) This is a general problem with namespaces and versioning,

(MartinC) We should have one WSRF namespace, or one per specs, which is orthogonal to the versions.

(IanR) At the moment a namespace-per-space means the schemas are easy to find at the namespace url.

Action: (DaveS) Propose new issue to discuss namespaces and versioning.

AppNotes

(IanR) Katy isn't here, but there's some news. Katy won't be able to carry on editing this document. Are there any volunteers to own it.

(RogerM) I would like to contribute.

(IanR) We have someone in IBM who could assist.

(RogerM) Ok – it will be a joint effort.

(IanR) Issue 20 isn't done, can't be closed. 22 and 48 are ok. Resolution to 52 needs to use the new InvalidModification. 63 is Ok. 65 missing. Resolution to issue 89 in section 6.1 (line 826) needs a reference to WS-I. 103: Not done.

(IanR) Editors should update before 10:10 tomorrow.

(Doc editors to upload new drafts before start of meeting)

New issues to consider - Bryan

WSRF 110: BaseFaults does not allow open content

(SteveG) The original idea was that extension should be used to include open content.

(BryanM) But this doesn't help if we want to design a generic listener which doesn't understand the extensions because they don't have the WSDL.

(TomM) but the extension-via-any can't be understood either.

(BryanM) The any stuff can be logged even though it can't be

(TomM) The original reasoning was that the type derivation introduces rigour into the definition which makes it possible to

(Umit) It's easier to implement the any kind of extensibility, but one loses the type information, if that is interesting.

(BryanM) Also, we shouldn't be defining a Basefault element if we don't want people to use it – only a type.

Action: Move to open

WSRF111: Missing fault messages for unexpected faults

(DaveS) Should internal faults be described by the specs.

(SteveG) We could say the 'a fault is sent including the followin' without specifying what the complete set of faults are.

Action: Move to open

Issues raised already in the meeting,

(TimB) Raise an issue to take care of the WS-N Dependency – whether to split that part from the main specs

(BryanM) This will be issue 112

Action: (Bryan) Move to Open

(DaveS) We also need to deal with WS-Addressing as a general status page issue.

(Bryan) This would be issue 113

(IanR) This would raise a red flag

(DaveS) That would happen anyway

(IanR) Can we defer this.

(MartinC) It's not worth it right now

(DaveS) Propose new issue to discuss namespaces and versioning.

(Bryan) This is issue 113.

Action: Move to open.

(DaveS) What action URI should be used for faults.

Action (Bryan) move to open

This will be issue 114.

Issue Resolution

Issue WSRF107: Consider whether the WS-MessageDelivery embodiment is needed

(MartinC) Now that there is consensus around WS-Addressing there is no need for a WS-MD-based mechanism, but this embodiment describes a different pattern whereby there is reference information that is not available when the EPR is created. This document

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/12515/wsrf-WS-Resource-1.2-draft-02-addition1.doc> describes a WS-A based equivalent

(SteveG) Does this satisfy the rules for embodiments?

(Umit) Lines 62-64 is where the details are.

(DaveS) I see the temporal separation issue..

(SteveG) but why does it need a new namespace?

(IanR) Isn't this a different issue?

(MartinC) I (and Anish) would like to consider

(SteveG) So, I see that it satisfies the rules, but what value is it over the existing WS-A embodiment?

(Anish) We wanted to decouple the resource identifier from the endpoint. The WS-Addressing WG don't describe the issue of comparison of references.

(DaveS) What's to prevent me from packaging the EPR and the identifier together once they've been found out?

(MartinC) This is W3C-theology-compliant.

(SteveG) I don't think it is any more compliant.

(Umit) How does the lifecycle work?

(IanR) I think the EPR and identifier are created at the same time and returned to the client.

(MartinC) Right, but they can be used independently – the id can be used at a different endpoint.

(IanR) It would be possible to have this same scheme by making the identifier into a reference parameters.

(MartinC) Right, but that would mean figuring out what else was in the EPR, which is against the spirit of EPRs.

(Anish) In addition to the decoupling part and the comparison part there is the problem of having multiple reference parameters in an EPR.

(TomM) The comparison issue has been considered in WS-A and WSRF has no normative requirement for this.

(Umit) Why does this identifier have to be separate from the EPR?

(MartinC) Because the EPR is opaque.

(Anish) Yes, if we defined refparms that can be used independently of the rest of the refparms that would do the job, but we don't.

(Umit) But anyone can do what they like with refparms.

(TomM) So you want to standardise the identifier and get the issue of identity that was thrown out of W3C WG into the WSRF TC.

(IanR) One could define a new embodiment which captures the requirements, but doesn't need the new namespace in Anish's proposal, instead we define a new element to go in the EPR.

(anish) So, we define a refparm in a schema and define an embodiment that says the EPR will contain this refparm?

(IanR) Yes. So the proposal is to morph this issue into a new proposal to replace the WS-MD embodiment.

(Anish) So, this at least pins down where the identity is within the EPR.

(DaveS) Seems to me we don't actually have to change the current spec.

(MartinC) But we need to ensure that there is a global wrapper.

Action: (IanR) A subgroup will work on a proposal and discuss again Tomorrow at 10:30 after an 8:30 am start.

Issue WSRF109: Clarify authoritative precedence earlier (Terminology)

(BryanM) This about which of text, pseudo-schema appendix and schema is authoritative.

(SteveG) The real issue is between the text and the schema in the files. Text contains more meaning, schema is less ambiguous.

(IanR) And schema is what implementations use to construct implementations.

(MartinC) It doesn't really matter which we choose. It is only a matter of managing discrepancies when they occur.

(TomM) We spend more time on the text specs. We don't spend much time on the wsdl and xsds.

(IanR) The motion is that the separate xsd and wsdl files are authoritative over the text. Carried (6-5).

Where there is disagreement between the separate xml Schema and wsdl descriptions of the messages defined by this specification and XML Schema and wsdl the normative descriptive text (including any pseudo-schema), the xml schema and wsdl takes precedence over the text.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

Meeting suspended at 18:00

Resumed 8:30 17th May

ServiceGroup

(Bryan) Need to consider new issues described here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200505/msg00070.html>

(DaveS) What do these things do?

(William) We get rid of the content element, and we need to express the relationship of the properties in the SG to those in the member resource. We need to know that the SG has all the properties the member does.

(TomM) It sounds like a complex assertion to make – if we say anything about coherency.

(DaveS) We could say something about the

(IanR) Looks like there are some new issues here.

(William) we need a new issue to describe Advertisement of the entire RP document in a SG entry. And

(DaveS) Couldn't this be done by a new content rule that specifies the RP document be in the content?

(William) That doesn't exclude other content in the entry.

(DaveS) Not sure about that.

(TomM) we need a new wrapper (instead of Content) to contain the RP document.

(William) We need a new membership content rule allow select resource properties from any member content – for example ResourceId.

Action: (Bryan) Create a new issue for SG containing RP document.

(DaveS) Also in the email is a question about set/bag semantics for SG members.

Currently its bag, set is too restrictive.

(TomM) This was discussed at the last face to face

(DaveS) And several times in the OGSi days.

(William) But we only have one kind of membership – we don't need the freedom.

(TomM) The implementation can do that within the current spec. The SG can advertise that, but we'll run right into the identity issue.

Issue WSRF105: ServiceGroupEntry as a WS-Resource is too Heavyweight

(TomM) There are lots of ways to paint a WS-Resource, but they all end up being the same weight.

(DaveS) If we removed the concept of the Resource from the ServiceGroup any lifetime semantic would have to be re-invented on whatever replaced it.

(TomM) Proposed to close with no action.

No Objections

Action: (Bryan) Move to Closed – no action.

Issue review

WSRF89: Document-literal serialization **Close**

WSRF91: Resource Access Pattern reaction to the removal of ReferenceProperties **Close**

WSRF92: Update examples to be compliant with the recent version of WS-Addressing **Close**

WSRF99: Examples in the specs use the SOAP 1.2 namespace **Close**

WSRF101: Use of non-normative references **Close**

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

WSRF98: Cardinality of SetResourceProperty content **Close**

WSRF102: InvalidDeleteResourcePropertiesRequestContent needed **Close**

WSRF63: Which lifetime attributes (ala OGSF) should be specified for resource properties
WSRF100: Confusion about requirement of using WS-BaseFaults for all faults from WS-Resources **Editors should see Text from Tom.**
WSRF106: Not clear how to map faults for SOAP 1.1 and SOAP **Close**
WSRF22: QNames as attribute values or text nodes is problematic with signatures/encryption and intermediaries **Close**
WSRF103: Multiple Service Port elements legitimate? **Need to confirm wsa:Action in WSDL – fault aspect and AppNotes issues**
WSRF44: No obvious mechanism to include only members which extend a certain interface **Close**
WSRF58: ServiceGroup WSDL does not need imports for WSRF-RL WSDL/schema
WSRF59: Inconsistencies in ServiceGroups **Close**
WSRF65: Need a mechanism to aggregate an operation across several resources in a ServiceGroup **Close**
WSRF69: Content should be declared with minOccurs="0" **Close**
WSRF87: InitialTerminationTime in Add method needs to have stronger guarantee
WSRF104: Content Rule Applies in Two Ways **Close**

(IanR) For the wsa:action for Faults, we need a common url for all faults. If this is defined in the WSDL it's obvious it goes in the fault header. Also there is a default action, but we can specify it elsewhere.

(Umit) But according to the WS-Addressing spec we need a marker in the WSDL.

(IanR) I Disagree. The default pattern for faults namespace/portType/Operation/Fault::faultname but it can be overridden by other specs (as WS-Addressing indeed does). We need an action URI for WSRF, and a way of declare it: url should be <http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsrp/fault>, and we need clarification of the WSA spec .

(SteveG) Can we close issue 103? We need to decorate the WSDL but issue 103 is not descriptive of this. We need a new issue.

(IanR) Can we solve this? The problem arises because we agreed the supremacy of the wsdl over the text, if it were the other way round we would be able to rely

(DaveS) Is there agreement to change the precedence rule?

(No objections, 4 abstentions)

The new text should be:

Where there is disagreement between the separate xml Schema and wsdl descriptions of the messages defined by this specification and XML Schema and wsdl the normative descriptive text (excluding any pseudo-schema), the normative text xml will take precedence over the separate files. The separate files take precedence over any pseudo-schema and any schema and wsdl included in the appendices.

Issue WSRF107

(IanR) The new embodiment proposal is http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/12698/wsrf-ws_resource-1.2-spec-wd-05.107.doc

(William) I don't understand the value of this if there are no comparison semantics associated with it. How does it help if two examples of wsrf-r:ResourceIdentifier are the same?

(tomR) There's a mistake on line 286 – the uri should be an attribute, but I agree we need to do it within the syntax of repparms.

(DaveS) We need to decide what to do: we should decide about the MD

(William) Seconded

(DaveS) about the removal of the WS-MD embodiment.

(No opposers, 2 absentions)

(DaveS) Carried. Should we also (in principal) add an embodiment with the ability for the server to provide a specific resource identifier.

(William) This has been discussed in W3C. We shouldn't be using WSRF to fix this fundamental issue of addressing on the web.

(MartinC) This is the same as embodiment 1.

(why do we need it

(Anish) Because it prevents IBM and HP sharing the knowledge about the identifier if they don't have common holder for it.

(William) Yes. So this is a problem in WS-Addressing.

(Anish) so, we shouldn't be in business of Reparms, and everybody should be free to

(William) Yes. Standardizing the systems become more brittle. Current;y, with only EPRs no-one cares what's inside them.

(Anish) But all people will see is an opaque epr unless they understand what's inside.

(William) This encourages people to look inside EPRs.

(Anish) But everyone will look inside.

(William) Yes, but for security reasons only.

(MartinC) Everyone who did CORBA had the same issue and cheated so that they could tell when an object reference changed.

(Umit) We have a use case to do with gateways that would make use of the identifiers.

(TomM) Right, but what are the semantics – we would have to agree that part, and that's where CORBA struggled.

(DaveS) Have we had enough discussion now? The proposal is to add the new embodiment section.

In favour: 3, Against: 6, Abstaining: 5

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

(MartinC) I propose we remove the 'embodiment' stuff, since there is only one way to do it – using WS-Addressing.

[Lunchtime]

Process Update

(IanR) There are changes to the standards approval process see: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/12694> (page 6)

Issue review (continued)

(continued from before lunch)

(MartinC) I propose we remove the ‘embodiment’ stuff, since there is only one way to do it – using WS-Addressing.

(Umit) I second Martin’s motion.

(MartinC) We should just say that WS Addressing is the only form of WS Resource Reference (by modifying section 2.4) and remove the WSDL embodiment section.

(SteveG) We should also move the text from section 3 and 3.1 into the AppNotes.

(DaveS) Let’s Vote

In favour 12, Abstaining 1.

Action: Raise a new issue. (116) and move to resolved.

Issue WSRF110: Basefaults does not allow open content

(DaveS) We need to decide if ew can provide a schema validation for general errors.

(BryanM) Or declare that the faults may not be validatable.

(DaveS) Would a MustIgnore=true attribute be acceptable?

(BryanM) Up ‘till now everything as been validateable.

(Umit) Well, in that case, the ‘any’ element isn’t a good idea.

(BrynaM) right, but at least the rest of the fault would be validateable

(BryanM) We could do something with substitution group

(Umit) But no-one understands them, and no tools.

(SamM) what about using <FaultCause type=baseFault> as the extension point.

(bryanM) Seems to me we lose the QName of the derived fault in the process of nesting the fault – it ends up being a FaultCause element.

(TomM) I think we need to declare Basefault as abstract and use a substitution group – that’s the only way.

(SamM) So we need an xsd:any in the Basefault top level, and a sequence of faultCauses with an xsd:any.

(IanR) I don’t see why we have maxOccurs=unbounded for FaultCauses – there should be max of one.

(DaveS) So we need a faultCause with an xsd:any type and an extra xsd:any to allow element extensions of base Faults.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved

Issue WSRF 111: Missing fault message for unexpected faults.

Action: (Bryan) Move to close as covered by the resolution to issue 100.

Issue WSRF 112: dependency on Notification

(SteveG) This is to deal with the possible separation of the specs to refer to the still-evolving WS-N specs.

(TomM) We could wait until after the 60-day review period to fix it. What about the status declaration on the front of the specs.

(DaveS) I propose we close without action.

No Objections

Action: Move to closed

Issue WSRF113: Correlation between NS and location

(IanR) We have had the idea that Namespace URL points to the document, and we change namespace with every rev of the document. This gets worse when we start to go through a review process which demands name changes.

(DaveS) Are there any objections to decoupling namespaces from document names

(No objections)

(DaveS) What should we call it?

Proposed to call it [http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsrf/rp\[w\]-1](http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsrf/rp[w]-1)

(DaveS) Any objections?

None.

Action: Move to resolved.

(Umit) what about the using a RDDDL document to provide an indirection to the various documents and switch to new versions when required.

(MartinC) I don't think it buys anything if there is only one document referenced by the namespace.

Suspended 16:30 for spec editing session on resolved issues.

Resumed 8:50 18th May

Issue Review

WSRF114 wsa:Action URI for fault messages/WSRF110

(IanR) I propose we need to change the resolution of WSRF114 so that each spec describes the action URL. Proposed text distributed here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200505/msg00089.html>

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

Acknowledgement text

The new list of people to be acknowledged includes voting members. Observers may included if they so request.

[Two people added by request]

Action: (IanR) Mail the list and the process to the mailing list.

Status section

Needs update per Ian's note: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200505/msg00089.html>

WSRF103 Multiple service Port elements

(IanR) Is this verified?

Yes

Action: (Bryan) Move to closed

WSRF109 Clarify authoritative precedence order

(IanR) Is this verified in all the specs?

Yes

Action: (Bryan) Move to closed

WSRF113 Correlation between NS and location

(IanR) We need to change the pointers in the appendices to say the wsdl/xsd are located at the namespace URLs. Wsdls/xsds may need to be renamed as (eg) "rpw-1"

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved

WSRF115 SG advertising RP doc

(TomM) Our current statement about content implies possible incoherence between Entry resource content and SG/Entry/Content. The new proposal of RPDdoc requires coherency.

(IanR) This would be bad – it's a burden on the implementers.

(TimB) We need to say that the content contains a document satisfying the schema of the member service RP Document.

(TomM) We need the statement about schema and that the contents SHOULD be consistent.

(William) So how can I say that in fact the results are coherent?

(SteveG) This is only possible with Policy.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

Date for next Face-to-face

Option 1: Week of 12th Sept in the UK. This will be at Fujitsu.

Option 2: (depending on WS-N) Week of 19th Sept in the UK. This will be at Fujitsu.

Detailed schedule depends on WS-N, probably the latter half of each week.

[Editing session to include and approve latest resolutions]

Ballot for approval of committee drafts

(IanR) This needs 14 approval votes.

(DaveS) The site lists 25 voting members, so we only need 13.

(MartinC) Charis and secretaries are extra.

(DaveS) So that's 2 chairs and secretary – 28.

(IanR) Let's do things spec by spec.

(TomM) I propose that WS-Resource 1.2 WD-06 be approved as a committee draft.

(MartinC) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, No abstentions.

(TomM) I propose that WS-ResourceProperties 1.2 WD-07.1 be approved as a committee draft

(MartinC) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, be approved as a committee draft

(TomM) I propose that WS-ResourceLifetime 1.2 WD-09 be approved as a committee draft

(MartinC) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, No abstentions

(TomM) I propose that WS-BaseFaults 1.2 WD-06 be approved as a committee draft.

(MartinC) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, No abstentions.

(TomM) I propose that WS-ServiceGroupBaseFaults 1.2 WD-05b be approved as a committee draft.

(SteveG) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, No abstentions.

(TomM) I propose that WS-AppNotes .2 Wd-01 be approved as a committee draft.

(SteveG) Seconded

In favour: 14 present, 2 via phone/IRC. No Opposers, No abstentions.

Review of Primer examples

(TimB) ShoppingCart and Printer examples illustrate the need for EPRs to address components of the system.

(TomM) Should the aggregates be serviceGroups?

(TimB) No, that's more complexity than is needed.

Action: (Tim) Construct an example based on Service group to enable the group to judge.

Next Conf call

Next telecom will be June 6 sharing the time with WS-N.

Close

Closed 12:10.

Summary of actions

(SteveG) to review minutes from last face-to-face re: element children only in RP doc
(Editors) Follow this new instruction about the soap headers in examples; only include required wsa:action element.

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF110 and WSRF111 to open.

(IanR) Update acknowledgements text and distribute to editors.

(DaveS) Raise an issue to take care of the WS-N Dependency. (112) **Done**

(DaveS) Propose new issue to discuss namespaces and versioning (113). **Done**

(DaveS) Need a new issue to decide on action uris for faults (114). **Done**

(SteveG) Review minutes from last face to face re: element children only in RP doc.

(Bryan) Create a new issue for SG containing RP document (115) **Done**

(IanR) Fix statement in WS-RAP about requirement for basefaults.

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF109 to resolved

(Bryan) Issue WSRF105 Move to Closed – no action.

(Bryan) Create a new issue for SG containing RP document. (115)

(Bryan) Close issues WSRF89, WSRF91, WSRF92, WSRF99, WSRF101, WSRF97, WSRF98, WSRF102, WSRF63, WSRF106, WSRF22, WSRF44, WSRF58, WSRF59, WSRF65, WSRF69, WSRF87, WSRF104.

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF107 to resolved

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF110 to resolved

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF111 to close as covered by the resolution to issue WSRF100.

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF112 to close (no action)

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF113 to resolved.

(Bryan) Raise a new issue. (116) to describe removal of embodiments 3.2 and move to resolved.

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF114 and WSRF110 to resolved.

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF103 and WSRF109 to closed.

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF113 and WSRF115 to resolved.

(Tim) Construct a Printer/ShoppingCart example based on Service group to enable others to judge.